CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

3327

CONTAINING

THE PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES

OF THE

FIFTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

VOLUME XIX.

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.
1888.

VOLUME XIX, PART V.

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD,

FIFTIETH CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION.

worker as well as the farmer. Taking it item by item, we find this astounding result: That for every dollar of reduction of duties in the iron schedule, $26 are added to the burdens of the public, already too onerous to be borne. Instead of reducing taxation, as advised by the Administration, instead of checking the flow of the people's money into a Treasury already dangerously full; instead of relieving a tax-ridden people clamorous for relief; instead of following in line with the declarations of every public officer this Government has ever had, that when we were collecting more money than was needed, taxes ought to be reduced; this bill actually proposes to increase them. Taking the home consumption statement from the Bureau of Statistics, which gives the importations and rates of duty for 1887, it will be found that about sixty-seven items are left by this bill in the iron schedule with rates unchanged; that upon about fifty-six items rates are reduced, and upon about forty items rates are increased. But an examination of the changes discloses the startling fact that the aggregate reductions amount to but $353,000, while the increase of duties on iron, etc., proposed by the bill, aggregates over $9,000,000. It is not drawn in the interest of the Southern farmer, for among other things raised are cotton ties, on which the planter is taxed $158,910 more than before, besides the consequent tribute on those of domestic manufacture. It is not intended to benefit the Western and the Northern farmer, for fence-wire, rods, etc., by this bill are made to pay over a million and a half more than under the present law.

It is not devised to help the suffering consumers of tin-plate, whether it be canners of fruit, meat, fish, or vegetables, or the consumers of canned goods, for they are taxed for the useless can and the implements of cookery, and for the very roof over the kitchen, over $6,000,000 more than at present. The manufacturer of steel rails is no better off under the bill, for the duties on imported ingots, from which he makes his product, are raised nearly half a million, while his rails are reduced to $14 per ton—a cut both ways. In short, this bill benefits nobody and injures everybody. It finds the duties on iron and steel on an average of about 40 per cent. and it raises them by 50 per cent. or to nearly 60 per cent. ad valorem. From whatever point you look at it, it is a misbegotten, ill-shapen, portentous, unjustifiable monster, with no excuse for existence and no purpose in its life but to obstruct the Democratic party and to delay the justice which the country demands. [Applause.]

COLONIAL DUTIES.

Mr. Chairman, during this debate I have listened with a great deal of interest to gentlemen on the other side of the House, who have so glowingly referred us to the fact that Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, and their compeers were the fathers of protection in this country. Sir, the first duties upon imports established by the Colonial Government after our independence, were substantially as follows: There were but few articles selected, namely, liquors, sugar, tea, coffee, cocoa, molasses, and pepper. Under the head of liquors, Madeira wine, at that period of our history the beverage of the rich, and Jamaica rum consumed by the great masses of the people of that day, covered the liquor schedule. Upon Madeira wine was imposed an import duty of twelve-ninetieths of a dollar per gallon; Jamaica rum, four-ninetieths of a dollar; Bohea tea, used by the wealthier classes, six-ninetieths of a dollar per pound; other teas, twenty-four ninetieths of a dollar, the latter being the heaviest tax imposed. Upon all other articles imported 5 per cent. of their value.

After the Constitution of 1789 had been adopted, it was James Madison, of Virginia, who brought into the House of Representatives the first tariff bill, and who urged its passage. He then read the import duties of 1783, added a clause or two on tonnage, and urged the committee to adopt it or at least to make it the basis of a temporary impost. The first proposition was that the mass of goods, wares, and merchandise coming in from foreign ports should be taxed 5 per cent. on their value; but in the list of articles on which special duties were to be laid, the bone of contention, sir, appeared to be on Jamaica rum. Two duties were suggested, one of 15 cents and one of 12 cents a gallon, which soon divided the Committee of the Whole. And before this question was settled the debate turned on the good and ill effects of low and high duties; but finally Jamaica rum was taxed at 10 cents a gallon.

When a duty of 8 cents per gallon was proposed on molasses, immediately every member from Massachusetts arose and protested. It was too much; the people would never bear it. They shouted, sir, that the capital engaged in the business of distilling rum in Massachusetts out of this molasses summed up half a million of dollars. Yet it was now proposed to destroy this great industry which contributed so much to the prosperity and welfare of the nation, and with such persuasive earnestness, sir, did they plead, that the Committee of the Whole consented to lower the duty to 2½ cents per gallon. Some articles were thrown out and some were taxed without discussion, but a few gave rise to sharp debates. The greater part of two days was spent wrangling over salt. The bill then under consideration was reported to the House, but, sir, wool, and tin in pigs and bars, were on the free-list, and in three weeks thereafter became a law by the approval of President Washington. Under the tariff of 1783, eight articles were specified subject to impost duty. The number of articles named and taxed under the tariff of 1789 did not exceed thirty-two, all others being covered by the 5 per cent. clause. It is this tariff of 1789, introduced by Madison, approved by Hamilton and Jefferson, the average import duties of which did not exceed 7½ per cent., that the gentlemen on the other side of the House tell us to-day the fathers of the Republic inaugurated, as protectionists, namely, a tariff in which the duties averaged 7½ per cent. ad valorem in 1789, with a bankrupt Government, which could not borrow a dollar, and to-day, one hundred years after, with $150,000,000 in the Treasury over our wants, the average duty is 47.7 per cent. ad valorem.

But, Mr. Chairman, what was our policy in 1852, with other nations, when we believed in trading with the outside world? In March, 1852, the United States sent a fleet to compel the Japanese, a great nation numbering 35,000,000 people, to open their ports to the commerce of the world, and the thing was done; and in 1858 a treaty of amity and commerce was signed between the two nations. Regulation 7 of that treaty provides for the following duties on imports into Japan:

Class 1. All articles in this class shall be free.
Class 2. A duty of 5 per cent. shall be paid on the following articles imported into Japan, namely, all building material, rigging, or repairing, or fitting out of ships, whaling gear of all kinds, provisions salted, bread and breadstuffs, living animals, coals, rice, steam machinery, zinc, lead, tin, and raw silk.
Class 3. All intoxicating liquors, a duty of 35 per cent.
Class 4. All other goods, 20 per cent.

And now, should the Japanese station a fleet off San Francisco or New York to demand open, fair, and unrestricted trade with us, in the name of civilization, what answer could we make to them that they might not have made to us?

THE PURPOSE OF THE PRESENT BILL.

But, Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration has not been framed entirely upon the principles I have stated. The majority of the Committee on Ways and Means realize and appreciate the condition of affairs existing in the country to-day; and however desirous they might be to extend that full measure of relief to the wage-worker and the great agricultural classes of the country, to which they are so justly entitled, invested capital has its claims upon them. They appreciate the fact that during the past twenty-five years, under the present system of protected industries, immense sums of money have been invested in the various manufacturing industries of the country, and that any bill which the committee might introduce should have due regard for the capital invested in such manufactures; that it would be unwise for any great political party having the power to do so to at once attempt to readjust the conditions of to-day, which would undoubtedly cause serious loss to those who had invested their capital under a previous condition of affairs. Keeping these objects in view, we sought, first, to relieve these manufacturing industries by placing on the free-list, as far as we possibly could, such articles as are essentially necessary to them to enable them to compete, not only in their home markets, but in the markets of the world. Secondly, in the revision and readjustment of the various schedules, under the existing tariff, to leave ample duties on all merchandise that could possibly be imported from abroad in competition with our home products, and to protect our home manufacturers and the labor employed by them; and, as the best evidence of our efforts in this direction, I can only compare the average rates of duties under the existing tariff with what they would be under this bill if it should become a law, namely, the average ad valorem duties on dutiable goods under the existing tariff of 47.7 per cent. ad valorem, and the average under the proposed bill of 40 per cent. ad valorem. This shows a reduction under the present bill equal to 7.7 per cent. ad valorem.

A tabulated comparison of the difference between existing duties and those proposed under the bill now before the House would show as follows:

Recapitulation and comparison of the duties collected upon imported goods under the existing tariff, with the changes and modifications proposed by the bill under consideration.

Free-list.	Importations of 1887.		Average ad valorem under—	
	Values.	Duties.	Present.	Proposed.
			Per cent.	*Per cent.*
Wood, salt, hemp, chemicals, metals, etc.	$61,672,120.42	$16,799,450.75	27.24	.....
Wool	18,206,987.97	5,390,054.73	29.60	.....
Total free-list	79,879,108.39	22,189,505.48	27.78	.....

Recapitulation and comparison of the duties collected upon imported goods under the existing tariff, etc.—Continued.

Schedules (dutiable).	Importations of 1887.		Estimated—		Average ad valorem under—	
	Values.	Duties.	Duties under proposed bill.	Amount of duties remitted.	Present.	Proposed.
					Per cent.	*Per cent.*
A. Chemicals	$5,050,325.28	$2,012,120.51	$1,133,846.78	$878,273.73	39.84	22.45
B. Earthenware and glassware	10,492,067.32	6,920,108.16	5,163,820.44	1,756,287.72	65.96	49.21
C. Metals	16,152,789.24	8,456,847.29	6,976,374.70	1,480,472.59	52.35	43.19
D. Wood and wooden ware	889,558.56	307,805.13	260,217.95	47,587.18	34.60	29.25
E. Sugar	68,897,102.27	56,515,601.67	45,223,513.73	11,292,087.94	82.04	65.64
F. Tobacco	26,441.00	21,567.00	10,064.60	11,502.40	81.57	38.06
G. Provisions	3,335,987.68	1,711,805.92	1,380,320.92	331,485.00	52.89	42.65
I. Cotton and cotton goods	2,423,585.23	1,233,599.57	955,989.28	277,610.29	50.90	40.00
J. Hemp, jute, and flax goods	17,434,514.05	6,228,310.41	4,185,954.62	2,042,355.79	35.72	24.01
K. Wool and woolens	42,448,127.04	29,256,442.90	16,925,861.70	12,330,581.20	68.92	39.87
M. Books, papers, etc	57,298.01	13,982.25	10,425.35	3,556.90	24.40	18.19
N. Sundries	11,221,253.04	4,991,936.33	3,905,795.33	1,079,141.00	44.42	34.79
Total dutiable	178,329,048.72	117,663,127.14	86,132,185.40	31,530,941.74	65.98	48.30
Total free-list	79,879,108.39	22,189,505.48		22,189,505.48	27.78	
Total	258,208,157.11	139,852,632.62	86,132,185.40	53,720,447.22	54.16	33.36

According to the foregoing schedule the proposed reduction of duties on imports is	$53,720,447.22
And according to the estimate of Joseph F. Miller, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, the reductions of internal revenue under the proposed bill will be	24,455,607.00
Or a total reduction of	78,176,054.22

Of the $53,720,447.22 reduction of duties on imports under the proposed bill, should it become a law, $22,189,505.48 are derived from articles placed upon the free-list, leaving the sum of $31,530,941.74 as the gross reduction made or proposed by the committee, applicable to all our varied industries; and yet, sir, the majority of this House and of the committee are charged with being free-traders!

The estimated amount of money that will be in the Treasury of the United States at the end of the present fiscal year, ending June 30, 1888, over and above all liabilities of the Government due at that date, is $150,000,000. Since the Secretary of the Treasury has resumed the purchase of bonds this month (May) the amount offered and purchased daily will not equal even the surplus of the daily taxes collected from the people after paying therefrom the daily expenses of the Government.

The bill now under consideration has been formed for the double purpose of reducing the surplus and relieving the country of needless taxation. The changes made, the majority of the committee believes, will accomplish these objects; but let it be clearly understood that the interests of labor have been steadily held in view at every stage of our proceedings, and we believe that this bill furnishes that protection to labor which our opponents profess to give, but to which their policy is directly opposed. The effect of this bill will be, not to reduce his wages, but to lessen to him the cost of the necessaries of life, and to decrease his dependence upon the employer. Extreme poverty and liberty never exist together. Starving men and women can not be free. Dependent upon the employer for the opportunity of earning bread, and frequently for the roof over his head, the steadiness of his work dependent, not upon the law of supply and demand, but upon the will of the trust, the employé in protected industries becomes the personal and political slave of his employer. It is the condition of this class, who must necessarily be either a menace to liberty or its bulwark, that the committee has primarily sought to better. Protection, so called, will add no penny to the wage-worker's pay or give one day's additional labor in the year, but it will rob him out of an undue proportion of his earnings to purchase the necessaries of life and keep him a trembling dependent, since the recent history of this country shows that the tendency of the protected industries is toward combination in the form of trusts, under which production is arbitrarily suspended, raising prices to the consumer and throwing the workman out of his job. Monopoly more terrible, more dangerous to the liberties of a country, more oppressive to the laborer, can not be imagined.

This aristocracy, soulless and remorseless, is totally unlike that which exists abroad under the patents of the sovereign. The members of the latter draw their stated incomes from fixed sources and redistribute them among the people in the expenses of their living. But the members of our plutocracy, the plutocracy of subsidy, the monopolizers of American markets, are continually changing, by the operation of their own will, the objects and the volume of the taxation which they levy upon the public, and the proceeds go to swell the fortunes of adventurers, which, when combined together, threaten the political subjugation of the public. Their exactions are limited only by their desire to take or by the ability of the masses to pay.

THE FARMING CLASS.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion upon no class of our people do the present fiscal burdens of our country bear so heavily as upon the farming class. It is not in the power of the Government, by any policy that can be adopted, to protect the farmer in what he raises and has to sell; but the Government can impoverish and virtually pauperize him and his family by not only imposing a high duty upon everything he consumes, which is or may be imported, but also by prohibitory duties upon commodities made in this country and necessary to his comfort, which place it in the power of the home manufacturer, by combinations and trusts, to charge what he pleases for his wares. What a mockery of protection the Republican tariff of 1883 is for the farmer! In a speech made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], referring to the advantages that the protection theory gave the farmer, he used the following language:

Among the advantages conferred upon the farmer by our protective tariff, is that derived from a direct protection to the products of his farm and the industries incident thereto, as shown by the following table:

(Referring to the duties upon farm products under the existing tariff:) Beef and pork, 1 cent per pound; hams and bacon, 2 cents per pound; butter, 4 cents per pound; lard, 2 cents per pound; cheese, 4 cents per pound; wheat, 20 cents per bushel; oats, 10 cents per bushel; corn 10 cents per bushel; rye, 15 cents per bushel; live animals, 20 per cent. ad valorem; wheat flour, 20 per cent. ad valorem; corn-meal, 10 cents per bushel.

I claim, sir, that not an article named in the foregoing schedule would be imported into this country in competition with the American farmer, if they were all upon the free-list, with the exception of wheat, which could only come from Canada, and if every bushel of wheat raised in Canada should be sold in the United States it would not affect the price of the American wheat one-tenth of 1 cent per bushel [applause], but the country would be the gainer if it were sold here, so far, at least, as the cost of transportation and commissions for storage and selling accrued to our railroads and commission men. The home price of our wheat, corn, beef, pork, butter, lard, and cheese, and of all the products of the farm produced in excess of home consumption, and which have to be exported to Europe to find a market, is determined by the price of the commodity in the markets of the world, plus the cost of transportation. This is beyond controversy.

I will also avail myself of a portion of the tables submitted in the speech of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] in relation to the farm products of this country, and the quantities exported, for the fiscal year of 1886–1887, as follows:

Products.	Production.	Exportation.		
	Farm value.	Export value.	Farm value.	Per cent.
Breadstuffs:				
Corn	$610,311,000	$20,052,704	$11,790,046	1.9
Wheat	314,226,020	142,666,563	87,668,833	27.9
Meats	748,000,000	78,152,731	62,522,185	8.4
Dairy products:				
Butter	192,000,000	1,983,698	1,437,773	.8
Cheese	32,000,000	7,594,633	6,455,438	20.2
Textile fabrics: cotton	257,295,327	206,222,057	177,895,501	69.1

Why the tariff of 1883 did not contain a duty upon the importation of cotton into this country I do not understand; for most assuredly, sir, if the duties provided for under the tariff of 1883 gave protection to the products of the Northern farmer, the same theory ought to have given it to the cotton planter of the South; at least it would be just as consistent, practically applied, when we consider the exportations of the farm products of the whole country.

If the products of our farms could have been sold at home for the one thirty-second part of 1 cent more than the export price, not

one pound would have gone abroad; and every pound consumed at home would have been exported if it had commanded abroad one-half of 1 per cent. in value more than the home price; for the home price is governed by the price the surplus exported will command in the foreign markets. One of the strong arguments that the protectionist makes to the farmer is the home market that protection is alleged to insure for his produce. It is a fallacy and a fraud, and intelligent farmers will not be longer deceived by it.

Let us suppose a case in my own State: Let us take, say, the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, located at Braddock, on the Pennsylvania Railroad, 10 miles east from Pittsburgh and 478 miles from Chicago, employing a large number of men. Contiguous to these works lives an industrious farmer with a hundred acres of land. His products consist of wheat, corn, oats, hay, hogs, and cattle. His proximity to these extensive works, where his surplus produce can be delivered in an hour, and where thousands of hungry mouths are ready to consume it, surely gives him an advantageous market, according to the protectionist's theory. But let us see, let us take one of the products of the farm as an example of the others, for they all come under the same law of supply and demand and price. The man in the iron works can not eat wheat; it must first be reduced to flour; so the farmer takes a load of 33⅓ bushels of wheat, just 1 ton, to the miller, who is also on the railroad and near the steel works.

Now, let us see what controls the miller in making a price to the farmer: first, self-interest, to purchase it as cheap as he can; second, to buy the farmer's wheat at a price which after being ground into flour will enable him to sell it to the mill-men in competition with flour sold by the grocery-man at the corner, which has been manufactured at St. Paul or Minneapolis, Minnesota, leaving him (the miller) a margin of profit for grinding and his labor. Surely the miller can not pay the farmer any more for his wheat because it was raised on land adjoining the steel works; he can only pay what he would pay for the same quality of wheat in the Chicago market, plus the cost of transportation to his mill. The miller explains the situation to the farmer and gets his wheat for that price, or probably less, because the farmer's market is restricted practically to the local mill. But where does Chicago wheat come from? Where is it grown and what law of values determines its selling price? It comes from the great regions of the Northwest; is grown upon the rich and fertile prairies of that section, upon land that can be had almost for the asking, or at most at a cost of from $3 to $15 per acre, upon land requiring no barnyard to make a crop, and where the straw is burned in the fields as the easiest and cheapest way of getting rid of it. The price in the Chicago market is determined day by day, if there is not a "corner" in wheat, by the price at Mark Lane, London.

The farmer at Braddock, after selling his wheat, returns to his home and family. He had bought his farm at a cost of $100 per acre, made a payment in cash upon it, from the savings of years of toil and labor, secured the deferred payments by a mortgage, hoping that by his industry and labor upon his farm and its favorable location he would make money enough to meet the interest and pay off his mortgage at maturity. He has sold his wheat at 90 cents per bushel, grown upon land which cost him $100 per acre, sown and harvested this wheat by labor for which he had to pay from $15 to $18 per month and board, and after the taxes upon the land and his help are paid, and other debts connected with the raising of his crop are settled, he finds that both ends will not meet; that the price he has received for his wheat will not cover cost of production.

Discouraged, but not disheartened, the farmer arises the next morning before the sun is up; hitches up his team and drives to town. He needs an iron or steel beam for some purpose on his farm, and goes to the steel mill to buy it; and upon asking the price is told that he can have it for 3.3 cents per pound, or at the rate of $66 per ton; and he is further informed that 3.3 cents per pound for steel beams is the uniform price at all the steel mills in the United States. Now, the farmer protests that 3.3 cents per pound for steel beams appears to him to be an exorbitant price; that his boy works in the steel mill, in the beam department, and that in figuring over the cost of making steel beams last night with his boy they could not make them out to cost more than $29 or $30 per ton at the mill; that $66 per ton gave the steel works a profit of $36 per ton; and that he thought something must be wrong; what it was he did not just understand, but yesterday he brought into town 33⅓ bushels of wheat, just one ton, and he could only get 90 cents per bushel for it, or 1½ cents per pound, the equivalent of $30 per ton, and that this price did not pay him the cost of raising it; in fact, he lost money on it instead of making $36 per ton profit, as the steel works did on the beams, to meet the interest and pay the mortgage on his farm; that he could not understand why he should be obliged to raise and sell 73 bushels of wheat, or over two tons, to enable him to purchase one ton of steel beams, costing less than $30 per ton to produce and make. The answer of the steel-man was, that this condition of affairs all grew out of the pauper labor of Europe, and the necessity of protecting home labor, and to make a home market for the farmer's wheat, oats, corn, cattle, and hogs. The farmer being unable to refute this unanswerable argument, paid 3.3 cents per pound for his beam and departed a wiser man. In the evening the son returned, and with the father began to discuss the transactions of the last two days, endeavoring to ascertain why the farmer's wheat would only command 1½ cents per pound at the steel-works, while the farmer had to pay 3.3 cents per pound for his steel beams. The farmer feared he had made a fatal mistake when he bought the farm; but he had been influenced in the purchase by a speech he had heard in the fall of 1884, delivered by a very distinguished statesman, one Mr. KELLEY, at the opera house in Braddock, in which that gentleman ably set forth the advantages of protection to home labor, and eloquently dwelt on the home market it would create for the products of the farm, while enhancing the wages of the mill-hands. But the son could not see the advantage of Mr. KELLEY'S kind of protection, either to himself, the mill-hand, or his father, the farmer. The price of the latter's product in the home market being regulated by the price in Mark Lane, London, he was of course trading in an open market, and took nothing whatever by the so-called protection. As to his own wages in the mill, if he got any share of the tariff subsidy in the form of wages, it was so small as to be inappreciable and to count for practically nothing as against the prices he was made to pay for the "tariffed" necessaries of life; but considering the employer's share, and the necessities of a "protected" employer's life, he was not so surprised that the "boss," as alleged in the newspapers, could rent Cluny Castle, in Inverness-shire, Scotland, to spend his summers in; and as he believed that the net profits of Carnegie Brothers on the two items of steel rails and steel beams alone, throwing out of account all other items of their production, were, on 30,000 tons of steel beams, $1,000,000, and on 192,998 tons of steel rails, at $10 per ton, $1,929,980, or a total profit on these two items alone of nearly $3,000,000, the son, with an eye to facts and figures, declared his extreme amazement at the proposition of Carnegie Brothers to reduce wages 10 per cent., for the wage-workers of that establishment thought they might decently leave this pitiful percentage in the hands of that labor in whose name and for whose alleged benefit they receive the enormous bounty extorted from the consumers of the United States upon those two capital articles; and that while the employés not only thought they were justly entitled to this 10 per cent. they were yet fighting for a principle dearer to them than mere dollars and cents. It was a principle involving not only the great economic problem of this age, but of past ages, and must be the great problem of the future—a fair division between labor and capital; and if the wage-worker at Carnegie Brothers' works could be forced into subjugation by Pinkerton special detectives, their just rights denied them, and the imported pauper labor of Europe could be utilized as a means for the subversion of their rights, he could see very little hope in the future for the wage-worker in this country.

IRON AND STEEL, AND THE EDGAR THOMSON STEEL WORKS.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I propose, if I can, to prove that the boy's conclusions in regard to his own wages are correct. In 1886 Hon. Daniel Manning, then Secretary of the Treasury, issued circulars to the various manufacturing industries of the country, asking them for certain information in regard to the cost of manufacturing, including labor and material, the object of the circular being to gather together certain data to lay before Congress in connection with a revision of the tariff. Among others to whom this circular was sent was the "American Iron and Steel Association," with offices at Philadelphia—an association representing, I may say, the entire iron and steel industry of this country. This association sent out to the various manufacturing industries that formed the association a circular letter, asking that the information desired by the Secretary of the Treasury should be reported to them, and that they would forward it to the Department. Among the replies received by the association was the following communication from Thomas M. Carnegie, chairman of Carnegie Brothers & Co. Limited, Pittsburgh, Pa.:

Notwithstanding your able argument in favor of reporting details of cost of production of iron and steel, as requested by the Secretary of the Treasury, and in a less objectionable form by yourself, I am of the opinion that our interest would not be served by making such returns as you indicate. (See page 373, Report of the Secretary of the Treasury on revision of the tariff, with accompanying documents, 1886.)

I am prepared to supply a portion of the information desired by the Department, and which Carnegie Brothers & Co. Limited declined to give, taken from their own books.

I hold in my hand, sir, a copy of a contract, executed under seal, which I saw copied from the original myself, of the schedule of wages as awarded by the board of arbitration, selected by the Knights of Labor and the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, fixing the wages of the employés of that company in the steel-mill department for the year 1887; and from this contract I submit a statement based upon the absolute amount of money paid to these employés in connection with the steel-rail department of that company. They are not theoretical figures; they are the absolute results in dollars and cents, and fully and clearly set forth the earnings of the wage-workers working in that company.

STEEL RAILS.

Under the terms and conditions of this contract the following is the cost of manufacturing a ton of steel rails, of 2,240 pounds, at the Edgar

Thomson Steel Works, located near Pittsburgh, Pa., during the year 1887, one of the largest establishments of the kind in the United States:

Market price of 1 ton of No. 1 Bessemer pig-iron at the mill	$18.00
Converting same, per ton	1.50
Blooming, per ton	.72
Finishing, per ton	1.87
1¼ tons Connellsville coke, average $1.35 per ton	1.62
	23.71
Add for net loss on material, first to last, 13 per cent.	3.08
Total	26.79
Divided as follows:	
Labor	$4.09
Material and waste	22.70
	26.79

The percentage of labor cost to the cost of production is 15.26 per cent. The percentage of labor cost to the average selling price of steel rails, namely, selling price of rails, $37.50; labor, per ton, $4.09, is 10.9 per cent. The present rate of $17 per ton duty on steel rails is equal, under the present tariff, to an ad valorem duty of 85 per cent.

STEEL BEAMS OR STRUCTURAL IRON.

The principal difference in cost of making a ton of beams or structural steel and a ton of steel rails is about 30 per cent. additional in the cost of labor:

Cost of steel rails	$26.79
30 per cent. on $4.09 labor	1.23
Total	28.02

The value of steel beams imported into the United States in 1887 at foreign ports of shipment was 1.2 cents per pound, or $26.88 per ton, and the duty upon the same under the present tariff is 1½ cents per pound, or the equivalent of $28.88 per ton, or 102.75 per cent. ad valorem.

These estimates of cost in the United States represent net cost, without profit or allowance for interest on or depreciation of plant, or for fuel for steam power, or Spiegeleisen, or manganese, the cost of steam-power and Spiegeleisen adding very little to the cost per ton.

The cost of labor paid for the manufacture of a ton of steel beams, based upon the cost of production per ton, namely, labor $5.33, cost $28.02 is 19 per cent. The percentage labor received based on the selling price of a ton of steel beams, namely, $5.33 for labor and $66 per ton selling price, is 8.7 per cent.

The total output of steel rails, blooms, ingots, and beams at these works during the year 1887, was as follows:

	Tons of 2,240 pounds.
Steel rails	192,998
Blooms	220,235
Ingots	241,874
Steel beams (estimated)	30,000

The number of men employed in producing the above, classed as skilled labor, and the actual wages paid them per day, as awarded by the board of arbitration of the Knights of Labor and accepted by the managers for the year 1887, were as follows:

CONVERTING DEPARTMENT.

Seventy-six men working on turns of eight hours, requiring for twenty-four hours 228 men: Gross amount paid 76 men per turn, under contract, $230.02; average daily wages of each man in the converting department, $3.02.

BLOOMING DEPARTMENT.

Twenty-seven men working on turns of eight hours, requiring for twenty-four hours 81 men: Gross amount paid 27 men per turn, under contract, $76.02; average daily wages of each man, $2.81½.

RAIL DEPARTMENT.

Forty-two men working on turns of eight hours, requiring for the twenty-four hours 126 men: Gross amount paid 42 men per turn, under contract, $126.89; average daily wages of each man, $3.02.

FINISHING DEPARTMENT.

One hundred and nineteen men working on turns of twelve hours, requiring for the twenty-four hours 238 men: Gross amount paid 119 men for twelve hours, under contract, $230.01; average daily wages of each man, twelve hours, $1.93.

Total amount of skilled labor employed, 673 men. Average daily wages paid 673 men, $2.58.

The number of tons of steel rails produced per man at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works during the year 1887, the number of days employed not being taken into consideration, was 286.77 tons per man per annum.

As the total output of the entire force of men engaged in the Edgar Thomson Steel Works in 1887, in the converting, blooming, rail, and finishing departments, was: ingots, 241,874 tons; blooms, 220,235 tons, assumed to be represented by the steel-rail product of the mill, namely, 192,998 tons, and as the total output of the steel rails in the United States, according to the official statements, was 2,049,638 tons for the year 1887, this would, by inference, make the total number of skilled employés engaged in this industry in the United States, during the year 1887, 7,147 men.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us ascertain from these figures, if we can, what it costs the people of this country under the protectionists' theory and the existing tariff of to-day for steel rails alone, to equalize what they claim to be the difference between labor and material in England and labor and material in the United States, and then to ascertain, if we can, what proportion of this protection, claimed for the equalization of labor, labor receives. In producing a ton of steel rails, we started with the Bessemer pig-iron. The average price per ton of No. 1 Bessemer pig-iron during 1887 did not vary materially from $18 per ton in Pittsburgh, and the average price for the same quality of iron in England during the same period was $12.50 per ton, or a difference of $5.50 per ton.

As I have shown, the cost paid for the labor to produce a ton of steel rails at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works was $4.09, and allowing a difference of even 50 per cent. in labor between England and the United States, which is excessive, to protect the wage-worker in this country engaged in the steel-rail factory against the so-called pauper labor of England, it would require $2. These two items of the difference in cost of pig-iron and the difference in labor would equal $7.50; and a duty on steel rails, therefore, of $7.50 per ton would cover every claim upon which the theory of protection is based. But it costs something to get a ton of steel rails from Liverpool to our seacoast, and the average freight and insurance during the year 1887 from Liverpool to New York was about $2 per ton, which is the equivalent of so much more protection to the producer in this country, and this, if deducted from the $7.50, would still further reduce the necessary duty, even under their own theory, to $5.50 per ton. But let us be liberal with them; let us call the freight and insurance 50 cents per ton, and then a duty of $7 per ton, under their own claims and theories, would be ample. The present duty is $17 per ton, and, if I am correct in my figures, $10 per ton in excess of what is absolutely necessary, as they claim, not only to protect home labor, but to cover the difference in the cost of pig-iron.

I have shown that the cost to produce a ton of steel rails at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works in 1887 was $26.79; and surely a profit of $5 per ton on the number of tons of steel rails produced in the United States ought to satisfy the most avaricious manufacturer, and this would bring their selling price up to $31.79 per ton, just about the average price in the United States to-day, namely, $31.50 to $32 per ton at the mill, and $5 per ton profit on the output of steel rails for 1887 would be the equivalent of $10,248,190 of profits divided between ten or twelve establishments engaged in this industry in this country. But, sir, the average price at which steel rails sold for in the United States during the year 1887 was $37.12½ per ton, or $5.33 in excess of the price to-day, or $10,924,570.54 additional profit on the output of 1887, or an aggregate profit of $21,171,760 to be divided between ten or twelve steel-rail mills in the United States; and, sir, I am satisfied that this is not very much out of the way.

When we come to structural iron and steel beams, although the output is much less than steel rails, yet the figures are more astounding. A fire-proof building can not be erected in the country that structural iron and steel are not a material part of its cost. It is a large part of the cost in the railway and highway bridges of the country. Its use not only adds to the durability of all structures, but in our large cities lessens the chances of conflagrations and reduces the rates of insurance. I have shown that the cost of a ton of structural steel produced at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works during the year 1887 was about $28.02. But let us call it $33. You can not to-day buy a ton of steel beams for less than 3.3 cents per pound, or $66 per ton.

It is well known, sir, that the steel-beam industry of this country to-day is in a trust; and I have further shown that the average price of these steel beams imported into this country during the year 1887, upon which duties were levied, was 1.2 cents per pound, or $26.88 per ton, and that the duty upon them under the existing tariff is 1½ cents per pound, or $28.88 per ton, the duty exceeding the value of the imported article $2 per ton. The output of these steel beams at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works during the year 1887 averaged about 100 tons per day, or 30,000 tons per annum, and the difference between the cost of its production, $33 per ton, and $66 per ton, the selling price, leaves a margin of $33 per ton, or $1,000,000 profit on this one product alone; and I ask this House and the country whether or not the Committee on Ways and Means is justified in reducing the duty on steel rails from $17 per ton to $11 per ton, and on steel beams from 1½ cents per pound to six-tenths of 1 cent per pound, which leaves the duty on steel rails under the proposed bill equal to 55 per cent. ad valorem, in place of 85 per cent. ad valorem under the existing tariff, and on steel beams at 44½ per cent. ad valorem, in place of 102 per cent. under the present law?

Mulhall, in his History of Prices, in referring to wages, page 127, says that the percentage of wages paid of the value of manufactures produced in the United States since 1850 was: In 1850, 23.3 per cent.; in 1860, 21.2 per cent.; in 1870, 19 per cent., and in 1880, 17.8 per cent.; and that the British operatives earn, as a rule, in wages from 30 per cent. to 33 per cent. of the value of the manufactures they produce, while in the United States the workman gets only 17.8 per cent. On

page 125 he states the advance in artisans' wages in England and France between the years 1840 and 1880 was as follows:

Occupation.	France.	England.
	Per cent.	Per cent.
Blacksmiths	45	64
Masons	55	70
Carpenters	55	60
Plumbers	57	70
Cotton spinners	42	48

COST OF BEAMS IN OTHER MILLS.

Mr. Chairman, I also have before me a pamphlet entitled "The Edgar Thomson Steel Works," dated 1887. It is an authentic pamphlet, furnishing certain data, which could have only come from the proprietors of the company. I will only quote an extract from the last page:

To keep the works running, on an average daily output of 1,400 tons of iron and manganese and 800 tons of rails, requires the handling, by loading and unloading, of 7,920 gross tons of material daily, namely, 2,300 tons of iron ore, 1,450 tons of coke, 670 tons of limestone, 1,400 tons of pig-metal, 1,000 tons of cinder, 800 tons of rails, 300 tons coal, sand, brick, molds, refractories, etc., a greater tonnage for these works alone than the entire cotton crop of the United States.

If, sir, the proprietors of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works were indicted before a United States grand jury for obtaining money under false pretenses, namely, as parties to the tariff act of 1883, if this admission would not convict them, then I am at loss to know what would. With an average outpnt daily of 1,400 tons of pig-iron and 800 tons of steel rails, their total consumption of coal is so insignificant as to be included in the items of "sand, brick, molds, refractories, etc.," at 300 tons total of these articles; and the number of tons of coke consumed, 1,450 tons, which, at the market price of to-day, figures $1.10, would make a total cost per day of $1,595, equal to a cost for fuel of only 72½ cents per ton on an output of 1,400 tons of pig-iron and 800 tons of steel rails, and in which estimate no allowance is made for natural gas.

Comparisons are always odious, but the latter part of this extract says:

A greater tonnage for these works alone than the entire cotton crop of the United States.

I will endeavor to make some approximate estimates and comparisons, which this pamphlet has failed to provide. One of the members of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, Limited, admitted to me within the past month, within 200 feet of where I now stand, that a statement, made by myself in the fall of 1886, was correct, namely, that he drew out of the company as dividends in one year the sum of $1,500,000, the equivalent of $5,000 per day for three hundred days in the year, and this was but one member of the firm, with no statement of profits undivided. No intelligent business man will put the profits of this company at less than $5,000,000 in prosperous years, and we will allow them to employ 7,500 wage-workers.

Mr. Chairman, I wish distinctly to state here that I believe it to be the duty of every man to accumulate every dollar possible in fair and open competition with his fellow-men; and that the dollar so accumulated by his industry, energy, and economy is entitled to its due share of protection by the Government without discrimination as between the rich and poor. I care not how many millions of dollars any man may thus accumulate; but, sir, what I protest against is that while the great masses of the people are weighed down in their struggle for existence the favored few are permitted to rob them, under the pretense of protection to home industry and home labor. [Applause.]

COTTON.

Let us find out if we can what the cotton-planter of the South is doing:

The average price per pound for cotton in 1886, on the plantation, was 8½ cents on a bale of 500 pounds		$42.50
The most reliable estimates of cost of production gives labor 50 per cent. of the selling price of cotton on the plantation, namely, per bale	$21.25	
(As against only 8.7 per cent. of the selling price of a ton of steel beams which labor receives at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works.)		
Incidental cost to planter over labor cost	6.25	
		27.50
Profit to planter per bale for interest on plantation and for supervision		15.00

This sum, $15 per bale, on 6,500,000 bales, yield of 1886, would be $97,500,000. The total plantation value of the cotton crop of 1886 was $269,989,812, equal to a gross return for each acre cultivated of $14.75.

The Commissioner of Agriculture, in his report of 1886, page 417, says:

The planters of the Southern States are selling the cheapest cotton in the world and buying all supplies at enormous prices, a practice with which only fertile lands, abundant crops, and persistent industry can save from bankruptcy.

PROTECTED AND UNPROTECTED INDUSTRIES.

According to the pamphlet referred to in connection with the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, they represent that their whole area of ground is 154 acres, and we will concede that they employ 7,500 wage-workers—which they do not—in their various industries. According to official returns of the Agricultural Department, there are now under cultivation in the production of cotton 18,000,000 acres, and a fair estimate of the number of adults employed in cultivating these fields, allowing four bales to an adult, is 1,625,000 wage-workers, and allowing each one to represent a family of five, it would give a total of 8,125,000 of our people dependent upon this industry for a support and a living. I have estimated the net profits of the entire cotton crop of 1886 at $97,500,000, which represents the interest on the cost of the 18,000,000 acres of land and the supervision and other contingent expenses and liabilities to the planter.

Assuming that my statement that the said company's net profits in the most prosperous years are $5,000,000, I would be pleased to have some mathematician work out for me the relative comparative profits realized by the protected industries of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, employing 7,500 men, with an estimated capital of $20,000,000, occupying 154 acres of land and improvements on same, and the profits realized by the unprotected planters of the South, cultivating 18,000,000 acres of land, and employing 1,625,000 adults in this industry, supporting 8,125,000 of our population. Yet, sir, when the committee introduced this bill into the House and proposed to put the cotton-ties in which this cotton had to be baled for exportation on the free-list, the gentlemen on the other side of the House denounced it as a discrimination against home industries and the theory of protection.

GRAIN REGIONS OF THE NORTH.

And now, Mr. Chairman, when we turn from the cotton-fields of the South to the grain regions of the North, we find that the condition of the latter is no better than that of the former. I shall not attempt to go into any detailed discussion as to why this is so, but will simply call the attention of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], and submit to him an interrogatory, which he need not reply to until he has had an opportunity of seeing and conversing with the farmers of his own State, when, undoubtedly, he can do so more intelligently than now. According to the agricultural returns from the State of Michigan for the year 1885, we find the following cereals were produced:

Indian corn	bushels	30,706,000	Barley	bushels	1,200,000
Wheat	do	31,261,000	Buckwheat	do	423,000
Rye	do	250,000	Potatoes	do	12,880,000
Oats	do	21,780,000	Hay	tons	1,507,232

We also find that it required 4,690,304 acres to grow them; that the total value of the crops was $64,445,697; and that the gross yield per acre averaged $13.74; that under the census of 1880, the number of persons in that State engaged in farming was 240,319; and I would ask the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], after he has ascertained from the farmers of his State what they realized in the way of profits from these cereals, to compare their percentage with the profits of the protected industries of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, as illustrated in connection with the cotton crop, and to give me his conclusions regarding the discrepancy.

NATURAL GAS.

And here, in immediate connection with this illustration, drawn from the Edgar Thomson Works, of the operations of a monopoly duty, swelling the profits of the manufacturer into most unreasonable, and even appalling figures, whilst adding nothing to the wages of labor, either common or skilled, and at the same time restricting the market of the farmer for his produce, though simply pillaging him upon his purchases of implements and apparel, I beg to call the attention of this House, and of the country, to the new and natural force, which is, in my opinion, destined to revolutionize, indeed, has already in large degree revolutionized some departments of American manufactures. I allude to natural gas. It is used at the Edgar Thomson Works; but it appears that the economy of its use has not as yet enabled the proprietors to reduce the price of their product, or to add anything to the wages paid.

It is, sir, the cheapest and most effective fuel ever discovered or invented by man. The world can not show its equal. The Almighty has placed it in apparently inexhaustible quantities in the very heart-center of our so-called protected industries; and the applications of which it is capable are innumerable and unlimited. It needs not to be mined; it transports itself; it may be piped anywhere; it requires almost no labor to handle it, and it leaves no residuum or débris to be removed. It is the ideal fuel, and so hastens, cheapens, and improves the quality of production as to place ultimately every manufacturer within reach of its incalculable advantages beyond any possible competition of foreign rivalry. What then do the manufacturers, so fortunately situated, require to enable them to "take the start of this majestic world and bear the palm alone?" Nothing, sir, but free raw material, open markets around the globe, no unnecessary restrictions here or there, cheap food, cheap raiment, and cheap blankets. Western Pennsylvania, Eastern Ohio, and large areas besides, which are soon to be supplied with this marvelous agent, would, if they understood their true interests, and in a brief time will, exchange the pitiful cry of more subsidies for the most thriving industries on earth, for a thundering demand for freedom of exchanges and cheap supplies.

ACCUMULATED WEALTH OF THE UNITED STATES.

The truth, sir, can not be too often stated, nor falsehood too often exposed. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have frequently

referred to our immense strides in the accumulation of wealth between 1850 and 1880, and this I admit; but, sir, they claim that protection has done this in the building up of our manufacturing industries. I will take their own figures, upon which they base this claim. I submit the following official table, which tells its own story:

The wealth of the United States and its development from 1850 *to* 1880.

[Compiled from the reports of the United States Census.]

Years.	True value of real estate and personal property.					
	Total.	Per capita.	Distribution.	Total.	Per capita.	Per cent. of group.
1850	$7,135,780,228	$308	Agriculture	$4,967,343,580	$171	69.61
			Manufactures	533,245,351	23	7.47
			Railroads	296,260,128	13	4.15
			All other	1,338,931,168	101	18.77
1860	16,159,616,068	514	Agriculture	7,980,493,063	254	49.39
			Manufactures	1,009,855,715	32	6.25
			Railroads	1,134,452,909	36	7.02
			All other	6,034,814,381	192	37.34
1870	24,054,814,806	624	Agriculture	8,899,966,997	231	37.00
			Manufactures	1,694,567,152	44	7.04
			Railroads	1,632,980,616	42	6.79
			All other	11,827,300,041	307	49.17
1880	43,642,000,000	870	Agriculture	12,104,081,440	241	27.74
			Manufactures	2,790,272,606	56	6.39
			Railroads	4,112,367,175	82	9.42
			All other	24,635,278,779	491	56.45

Years.	Increase during decade.						
	Total.	Per cent.	Per capita.	Distribution.	Total.	Per cent.	Per capita.
1860	$9,023,835,840	126.46	$330	Agriculture	$3,013,149,483	62.66	$110
				Manufactures	476,610,364	89.39	18
				Railroads	838,192,781	282.94	31
				All other	4,695,883,212	350.72	172
1870	7,895,198,738	48.86	226	Agriculture	919,473,934	11.52	26
				Manufactures	684,711,437	67.80	20
				Railroads	498,527,707	43.94	14
				All other	5,792,485,660	95.98	166
1880	19,587,185,194	81.43	442	Agriculture	3,204,114,443	36.00	72
				Manufactures	1,095,705,454	64.66	25
				Railroads	2,479,386,559	151.83	56
				All other	12,807,978,738	108.30	289

Years.	Increase since 1850.						
	Total.	Per cent.	Per capita.	Distribution.	Total.	Per cent.	Per capita.
1860	$9,023,835,840	126.46	$330	Agriculture	$3,013,149,483	60.66	$110
				Manufactures	476,610,364	89.39	18
				Railroads	838,192,781	282.94	31
				All other	4,695,883,212	350.72	172
1870	16,919,033,578	237.11	545	Agriculture	3,932,623,417	79.17	127
				Manufactures	1,161,321,801	217.78	37
				Railroads	1,336,720,488	451.20	43
				All other	10,488,368,872	758.69	338
1880	36,506,219,772	511.60	1,019	Agriculture	7,136,737,860	143.66	199
				Manufactures	2,257,027,255	423.26	63
				Railroads	3,816,107,047	1,288.09	107
				All other	23,296,347,610	1,739.37	650

NOTES.—Gold being at a premium of 25 in 1870, the data for that year reported by the United States Census have been reduced to gold value.

"Agriculture" represents the value of the farms, farm implements and machinery, and of live-stock.

"Manufactures" represents the capital invested in manufactories.

"Railroads" represents the cost of constructing the railroads.

WM. F. SWITZLER,
Chief of Bureau.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, *May* 4, 1888.

The principal facts to be remembered in connection with the foregoing table, are:

First. That of the gross accumulations of wealth between 1850 and 1880, as shown by the census, namely, $36,506,219,722,

	Per cent.
Farm lands and personal property on same, gave	19.55
Capital invested in manufactures	6.18
Railroads	10.45
All other industries and suburban property	63.82
	100.00

Second. That the percentage of gain in manufactures in the decades named was as follows:

	Per cent.
Between 1850 and 1860, low tariff	89.39
Between 1860 and 1870, high tariff	67.80
Between 1870 and 1880, high tariff	64.66

Third. That the percentage of gain in farming lands and personal property on same was as follows:

	Per cent.
Between 1850 and 1860, low tariff	60.66
Between 1860 and 1870, high tariff	11.52
Between 1870 and 1880, high tariff	36.00

Fourth. That had the agricultural resources of the country between 1870 and 1880 maintained the same relative gain shown between 1850 and 1860, the latter period being under a tariff for revenue and the former under a protective tariff, the increase would have been $2,125,000,000 more, or within $665,272,606 of the total value of capital invested in manufactures in the United States in 1880.

Fifth. That the percentage of manufactures to the wealth of the country accumulated in thirty years is only 6.18 per cent.

I would also refer, here, to the fact that between 1860 and 1880, the number of immigrants that arrived in this country, was 5,093,333; the larger proportion of which, it is reasonable to suppose, engaged in agricultural pursuits.

It is also claimed that the balance of trade in our favor since 1873 is the result of the protective theory. From 1873 to June 30, 1887, our exports exceeded our imports by $1,611,973,748.

Our total exports for the year 1886 were $665,964,529, of which $484,954,595 were derived from agriculture; and the exports of cotton and cotton-seed oil, represented in the latter item, were $207,201,616, or nearly 50 per cent. of the agricultural products exported, and the ratio of agricultural products exported to the total exports was 72.8 per cent. If, sir, the same ratio is applicable to the balance in our favor between the years 1873 and 1887, it will show that of this balance the non-protected industries of this country—

The farmer and cotton-planter gave you 72.8, or	$1,173,516,888
Other industries, 27.2, or	438,456,860
Total	1,611,973,748

COAL MINING.

And now, Mr. Chairman, permit me to refer to another great industry in my State, coal-mining; an industry, sir, which protection does not protect, and then compare the wages paid in the Edgar Thomson Steel Works with the wages of the skilled miner.

Under the tariff of 1883 the following products manufactured in this country, if imported, are subject to the following equivalent ad valorem duties:

	Per cent.
Pig-iron	50.59
Iron railroad bars	65.26
Bar-iron	46.42
Steel rails	54.57
Railway fish-plates	92.75
Anchors	68.26
Steel beams, girders, etc	102.75

Twelve or fifteen miles from the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, on the Youghiogheny River, at Scott Haven, is located the mines of the Youghiogheny River Coal Company, a large coal-mining property, employing a large number of men. Coal from these mines has for years past been shipped to a greater or less extent to Havana, Cardenas, Matanzas, Sagua, and other West India ports, in competition with the coal produced by the so-called pauper labor of England. It is exported largely to Canada; it finds a market as far South via the ocean as Galveston, Tex., and as far North as Boston, Mass. I submit, sir, the names of and the actual wages earned by and paid to forty skilled miners working at these mines between April 1 and December 1, 1887, in comparison with the wages paid the skilled workmen in the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, the latter industry protected by duties averaging from 50 per cent. to 102 per cent. ad valorem, as follows:

Statement showing the earnings of a number of miners regularly employed at the Youghiogheny River Coal Company's mines from April 1 *to December* 1, 1887.

Name.	Number of days worked.	Total amount earned.	Average daily earnings.
Daniel Harrington	168½	$636.17	$3.78
John Wolff	174½	780.05	4.48
Fred. Walters	174½	529.36	3.04
John B. Miller	176½	632.18	3.59
Joseph Southern	176	751.32	4.26
Peter Beck	170½	564.52	3.32
Adam Darr	152	477.09	3.14
Patrick Nolan	166	418.80	2.52
Valentine Naw	149	565.05	3.79
James Farrow	177	625.75	3.53
James Robinson	178	921.00	5.17
Thomas Seddon	163	407.03	2.50
Peter McAlinden	174	489.46	2.81
George Doerhaver	150	485.28	3.23
Hugh Donnelly	153	678.72	4.43

Statement showing the earnings of a number of miners, etc.—Continued.

Name.	Number of days worked.	Total amount earned.	Average daily earnings.
Isaac John	172	$450.35	$2.61
Robert Cain	167	473.83	2.83
Charles Mortle	163	451.76	2.77
Robert Herniman	179	543.86	3.03
George Fein	170	576.70	3.37
Robert Carroll	171	564.57	3.30
David Edwards	151	515.90	3.41
Charles Metz	157	484.09	3.08
Robert White	156	376.02	2.41
John Mellville	157	511.01	3.25
John Gibson	167	413.62	2.47
John Donnelly	166	519.76	3.13
Joseph W. Mortle	167	485.67	2.90
Sampson Spate	150	530.05	3.53
Robert Davis	165	629.97	3.81
David Lake	170	661.47	3.85
James Abercrombie	149	426.55	2.86
Patrick Curran	154	430.26	2.79
Frank Herniman	170	644.84	3.79
George Ashoff	169	553.98	3.28
John Dick	171	678.51	2.97
William H. Webster	163	488.73	2.99
John Robertson	163	569.42	3.48
Total	6,269½	20,942.70	3.34

Average earnings of each miner for period, $551.12.

The wages paid the foregoing skilled miners, selected as a fair representation of that class, were highest daily wages for eight hours' work, $5.17, and the lowest, $2.41. Average wages earned per day by them, $3.34 per man, and the average total amount earned by each man for the same period, was $551.12. Of the total number of all grades of labor, skilled and unskilled, including boys employed in and about the mines, namely, 757, the average wages earned per day per man was $1.96.

According to the official report of the Secretary of Internal Affairs of the State of Pennsylvania for the year 1884, the number of miners employed, wages paid, and tons of coal produced, was as follows:

	Miners.	Wages paid.	Coal.
			Tons.
Anthracite coal	83,316	$29,906,262	25,651,664
Bituminous coal	38,906	14,752,786	18,084,941
Total	122,222	44,659,048	43,736,605

From a practical experience of over one-third of a century in the coal mines of my State, both anthracite and bituminous, I am justified in stating that the wage-worker receives for his labor, directly and indirectly, from 70 per cent. to 85 per cent. of the selling price of the coal at the mines, as against the 8 per cent. that labor receives at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, on the selling price of a ton of steel beams! The tariff does not protect the coal-miner, but robs him in just so far as it increases the cost of what he consumes by the imposition of duties the Government does not need to meet its requirements. And, Mr. Chairman, if time would permit, I could submit facts in connection with the prices of labor in the various industries of this country, not confined to my own State, but in the States of Iowa and Illinois, proving beyond any question, from the pay-rolls I could submit, that the average wages received by the wage-worker of the country outside of the protected industries show that protection does not benefit the wage-worker in the protected industries of the country.

WOOL.

I turn now, sir, to another vexed question—wool. When I call it vexed, I do not mean that it is not clear or easily solved upon correct principles, but only that our friend, the Bourbon, takes his stand upon wool and howls the more lugubriously, albeit more unreasonably, than on anything else, because he hopes thereby to delude the farming interest to his support. This bill puts wool on the free-list. It does so, I make bold to maintain, not only in the interest of the woolen manufacturer, but in that of sheep husbandry itself.

In referring to the woolen schedule and its effects upon the people of my own State, it is fair to infer that relatively it will have the same effect upon the people of the other States of the Union. I am compelled to refer to the census of 1880, and to resort to statistics, which are not as interesting to the general reader as the latest novel, but may be more instructive. According to the Agricultural Report of 1886, the number of sheep in Pennsylvania was 1,189,481; number of farms in the State (census of 1880) 213,542; average number of sheep to the farm, 5.5; pounds of wool clipped, 5,645,984; average weight of fleece, 4¾ pounds, which, at the estimated market price of to-day, 32 cents per pound, would give a total value of $1,806,714.88. Should the bill as reported by the Committee on Ways and Means become a law, the result upon the people of my State would be as follows: First, upon the farmers: The 213,542 farms produced, as stated above, in 1886, 5,645,984 pounds of wool, equal to 26 pounds of wool to the farm, and the duties upon foreign wools of the same quality, unwashed, under the present tariff of 10 cents per pound would amount to $564,598.40. If making wool free would cause the value to decline equal to the duty now imposed, which it would not, in my judgment, it would show a gross loss to the 213,542 farms of $2.60 each, or a total of $564,598. *Per contra*, the per capita consumption of domestic and imported woolen and worsted goods, according to the census of 1880, was $6.50, which multiplied by five, the estimated average number in a family, would be $32.50.

The proposed reduction in the woolen schedule is 29 per cent. from the present tariff, or 29 per cent. of the cost of the woolen goods consumed, which would be an equivalent saving of	$9.42
The proposed reduction of the duties on sugar, namely, $11,000,000 on the imports, and $1,000,000 reduction on the cost of home production, would be $12,000,000, or the equivalent of 20 cents per capita on a population of 60,000,000, or on a family of five	1.00
	10.42
From which deduct the estimated loss to each family of	2.60
It would on these two items alone show a saving to every family in the State of Pennsylvania of	7.82

The profit and loss account of the bill under consideration to the people of the State, based on the population of 1880, namely, 4,282,891, would show a saving of $1.56 each, or $6,681,309.96 on these two items alone, and not taking into consideration the large savings that will accrue to them from the other proposed reductions under the bill. But, sir, let us examine the woolen schedule as proposed in the bill, from the standpoint of the Pennsylvania manufacturer of woolen and worsted goods, and which I claim is applicable to the woolen manufacturers of the whole country. According to the census of 1880 there were in the State of Pennsylvania manufacturing establishments of woolen goods as follows:

Number of mills or factories producing—	
Woolen goods	324
Woolen hats	23
Worsted goods	28
Total	375
Total amount of capital invested	$24,537,743
Cost of material used for one year	29,497,945
Gross wages paid	7,046,273
Pounds of wool consumed, grown in the United States	28,556,077
Imported wools, pounds	5,005,271
Total consumption of wool, pounds	33,561,348
Total value of the manufactured articles produced for the year ending June 30, 1880	$44,132,590
Average number of hands employed:	
Males over sixteen	10,790
Females above fifteen	9,477
Children	3,571
Total number of persons	23,838
Average wages paid per hand per year, $287.20.	

It will be seen, Mr. Chairman, that while Pennsylvania consumed 33,561,348 pounds of wool in her mills in the year 1880, she only produced within the State, in 1886, 5,645,984 pounds, or 16¾ per cent. of the quantity required in 1880, and that there were employed in this industry 23,838 of her population. It is hardly necessary to discuss the importance of cheap raw material to such an industry. Wool, sir, is the purest raw material, if any commodity known to trade can be designated as raw material. That it is to a very great extent the product of the soil and climate where it is grown is unquestionable. Now, the entire fleece of no animal can be used, as a rule, in the manufacture of the same kinds and qualities of cloth. In other words, the wool grown on different parts of a sheep not only has a different value but is adapted to different purposes, and while the unwashed wools of South America lose from 66 per cent. to 70 per cent. of their weight in washing, those of Australia show a shrinkage of but from 52 to 60 per cent., and the English and the Irish wools show a shrinkage of but from 33 to 35 per cent. Under existing conditions the home manufacturer is unable to supply his mills with foreign wools, and the large importations of woolen goods, to which I will refer, is the result. To enable the manufacturer of this country to compete in his home market and to export a surplus abroad, he must be able to purchase his wool as favorably not only as to price but as to selection of qualities and kinds as does his foreign competitor.

The estimated total production of wool in the United States in 1886, according to the best authorities, was 300,000,000 pounds, and the estimated amount required, or its equivalent in woolen or worsted goods, to meet our necessities was 600,000,000 pounds. It will be seen, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that we did not produce in 1886 within 300,000,000 pounds of wool necessary for our home consumption. The importations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, were 23,000,000 pounds, which would leave an estimated deficit of 277,000,000 pounds. We can best ascertain how this deficit in our requirements is made up by referring to the importations of manufactured woolen and worsted goods for the year ending June 30, 1887, which amounted to $42,448,127.04, upon which there was collected by the Government a tax of

$29,256,442.90. Not one pound of American wool was used in the manufacture of the woolen and worsted goods covered by these large importations, nor did an American wage-worker receive one dollar in connection with their manufacture; and it is a conceded fact to-day that of all our industries not one is so depressed as the woolen industry. If there can be an exception, it is that of the carpet manufacturers, which can be accounted for from the fact that the duties on the wools used by them are merely nominal, while on the higher grades they are practically prohibitory. The present duty of 10 cents per pound on unwashed wools is equivalent to 30 cents per pound on scoured wools.

No better illustration of the results of moderate duties or free raw material can be pointed to than the carpet industries of this country. Russian carpet wools, grown in Southern Russia, bordering on the Black Sea, practically scoured, are largely imported into the United States for the manufacture of carpets. A fair average price for these long combing wools at Black Sea ports is from 17 cents to 20 cents per pound, our currency. The duty upon same, under our existing tariff, is 5 cents per pound. Wool, scoured, suitable for the manufacture of men's wear, under the present tariff, pays 30 cents per pound. To-day, owing to this low duty on carpet wools and the superior genius of our American workmen, and notwithstanding the higher wages paid in the United States, I am credibly informed that if this 5 cents per pound is removed from Donskoi and other carpet wools we can compete with the world on carpets, and keep our home market.

But another important factor meets the manufacturer in the purchase of his wools: it is those artificial restrictions and resulting complications which deprive him of the mastery of his own business, and often makes the difference between complete success and total failure; and in this connection it may be well to inquire how the tariff of 1883 has affected the woolen and worsted industries of the country, particularly in connection with our home market, which the protectionists are so desirous of keeping for our home manufacturers. A statement of the cost of producing a pound of worsted yarns in this country and in England, under the existing tariff, taking the yarns as the basis of the cost of the manufactured article, may perhaps account for the present condition of our woolen and worsted industries and the large importations I have referred to; and I submit, sir, the following tables:

TABLE No. 1.—*Cost of making 1 pound of 30s yarn out of English wool under the present tariff in the United States.*

Wool, cost in London 11*d.* or in United States currency		$0.22
Commissions, freight, and charges, say		.02
Duty		.10
		.34
Take, say, of greasy wool	pounds	100.00
Which would shrink	do	20.00
Leaving of clean wool	do	80.00
Eighty pounds, costing $34, equals 42½ cents per pound clean, or 100 pounds costs		$42.50
Deduct value of noil made, 10 pounds, at 25 cents		2.50
Divide by top produced, 90 pounds		40.00
Equals 44 cents, cost of top.		
Take 1 pound of top, costing		.44
Spinning to 30s, including waste		.28
Cost of 1 pound yarn under existing tariff		.72
Market price of this yarn in England, 1*s.* 8*d.*, or		.40
Add duty, 12 cents and 35 per cent. ad valorem		.26
Commission, freight, and charges		.04
Total		.70

This table shows that under the tariff of 1883 you can import 1 pound of 30s yarn, manufactured in England, for 2 cents per pound less than it can be made in the United States for, out of English wool imported into this country.

TABLE No. 2.—*Cost of making 1 pound of 30s worsted yarn out of English wool, under the bill under consideration—wool free.*

100 pounds of wool at 22 cents		$22.00
Commissions, freight, and charges		2.00
Total		24.00
80 pounds costing $24 = 30 cents pound, clean, or—		
100 pounds costs		30.00
Deduct value of noil made, 10 pounds at 25 cents		2.50
Divide by top produced, 90 pounds		27.50
Equals 30 cents cost of top.		
Take 1 pound of top costing		.30
Spinning to 30s, including waste		.28
Cost of 1 pound yarn under present bill		.58
Market price of this yarn in England, 1*s.* 8*d.* or		.40
Add duties, 40 per cent. ad valorem		.16
Commissions, freight, and charges		.04
Total		.60

This table shows that under the proposed bill 1 pound of the same yarn made from English wool can be made in the United States for over 2 cents per pound less than it can be imported from England for, and the cost of production reduced 14 cents per pound less than it costs under the tariff of 1883.

TABLE No. 3.—*Cost of making 1 pound of 36s fine worsted yarn out of Australian wool, under tariff of 1883.*

Wool cost in London 11*d.*, or in United States currency		$0.22
Commissions, freight, and charges, say		0.02
Duty		0.10
Total		0.34
		Pounds.
Take, say, of greasy wool		100
Which will shrink 55 per cent		55
Leaving of clean wool		45
45 pounds, costing $34=75 cents per pound clean, or 100 pounds, costs		$75.00
Deduct value of noils made, 18 pounds, at 45 cents		8.10
Divide by top produced, 82 pounds		66.90
Equals 82 cents, cost of top per pound.		
Take 1 pound of top costing		$0.82
Spinning to 36s, including waste		0.35
Cost of 1 pound yarn under existing tariff		1.17
Market price of this yarn in England, 2*s.* 5½*d.*, or		$0.59
Add duties, 18 cents and 35 per cent. ad valorem		0.39
Commissions, freight, and charges		0.04
Total		1.02

This table shows that it costs 15 cents per pound more under the tariff of 1883 to make 1 pound of fine worsted yarn in the United States, out of Australian wool, than what the same yarn can be made for in England and imported into the United States:

TABLE No. 4.—*Cost of making 1 pound of 36s fine worsted yarn out of Australian wool, under the bill now before the House—wool free.*

100 pounds of wool, at 22 cents		$22.00
Commissions, freight, and charges		2.00
Total		24.00
45 pounds, costing $24=53 cents per pound clean, or 100 pounds, costs		53.00
Deduct value of noils made, 18 pounds, at 45 cents		8.10
		44.90
Equals 55 cents cost of top per pound.		
Take 1 pound of top, costing		.55
Spinning to 36s, including waste		.35
Cost of yarn under proposed bill		.90
Market price of this yarn in England 2*s.* 5½*d.*, or		.59
Add duties, 40 per cent. ad valorem		.24
Commissions, freight, and charges		.04
Total		.87

This table shows that under the proposed bill it will cost 3 cents per pound more to make 1 pound of yarn of the same quality and wool in the United States, than it can be imported from England for, but that the proposed bill reduces the cost of manufacture in the United States and the import price 15 cents per pound less than it now costs.

TABLE No. 5.—*Cost of making 1 pound of 36s yarn out of Australian cross-breds under the present tariff.*

Wool, costing in London 14*d*, or in United States currency		$0.28
Commissions, freight, and charges, say		.02
Duty		.10
Total		.40
Take, say, of greasy wool	pounds	100
Which would shrink 30 per cent	do	30
Leaving clean wool	do	70
70 pounds, costing $40= 57 cents per pound clean, or 100 pounds cost		$57.00
Deduct value of noil made, 15 pounds at 35 cents		5.25
Divide by top produced, 85 pounds		51.75
Equals 61 cents cost of top.		
Take 1 pound of top costing		.61
Spinning to 36s including waste		.35
Cost of 1 pound yarn under existing tariff		.96
Market price of this yarn in England, 2*s.* 2*d*, or		.52
Add duty 18 cents and 35 per cent. ad valorem		.37
Commissions, freight, and charges		.04
Total		.93

This table shows that it costs 3 cents per pound more under the tariff of 1883 to make 1 pound of this yarn in the United States out of Australian cross-bred wool than what the same yarn can be had for in England and imported to the United States.

TABLE No. 6.—*Cost of making 1 pound of 36s yarn out of Australian cross-breds under the bill now before the House.*

100 pounds of wool, at 28 cents	$28.00
Commissions, freight, and charges	2.00
Total	30.00
70 pounds, costing $30=43 cents per pound clean, or 100 pounds cost	43.00
Deduct value of noils made, 15 pounds, at 35 cents	5.25
Divide by top produced, 85 pounds	37.75
Equals 45 cents cost of top.	
Take 1 pound of top costing	.45
Spinning to 36s, including waste	.35
Cost of 1 pound of yarn under proposed bill	.80
Market price of this yarn in England, 2s. 2d., or	.52
Add duties, 40 per cent. ad valorem	.21
Commissions, freight, and charges	.04
Total	.77

This table shows that under the proposed bill it will cost 3 cents per pound more to make 1 pound of yarn of the same quality and wool in the United States than it can be imported from England for, but that the proposed bill reduces the cost of manufacture in the United States and the import price 16 cents per pound less than it now costs.

The aim of the majority of the committee has been, first, to readjust the duties upon woolen and worsted goods so as to enable the manufacturers not only to pay the same wages they are now paying but to cheapen goods, thus enabling them to command the home market, which they are largely deprived of, and to compete in the foreign one. Free raw wool and the duties proposed on the manufactures of wool will accomplish that object unless we are grievously mistaken. "But what," cries the politician, "of the flock and the flock-owner; will not the removal of the duty reduce the value of the fleece by just that amount?" No, sir; in my judgment, it will not. Even if it did, the average flock-owner, in common with all other husbandmen, would gain more than his loss in the reduced cost of the necessaries of life provided in this bill. But let us see the probable effect upon the value of wool, should wool pass to the free-list. Wool, like every other commodity, is governed by the law of supply and demand. We now produce in this country about three hundred millions of pounds less than we require, as is clearly shown by our consumption of imported woolens. Immediately wool is free, our manufacturers begin to draw upon the markets of the world for raw material to meet the American demand. The result is an advance in wool in foreign markets, and an advance abroad would advance the price here, tariff or no tariff. And this, sir, is no mere speculation; it is the known history of wool under the circumstances supposed. Albert Gallatin, as far back as 1832, stated the facts as follows, and precisely as any reasonably informed economist would state them to-day:

> The object of the wool-growers is that that market should be enlarged, but this can not be done effectually unless the domestic manufacture is firmly established; and for that purpose it is necessary that the raw material should be obtained on reasonable terms. To enhance its price by persevering in the existing exorbitant duties is not less inconsistent with sound policy than with justice. * * * The value of the hides and raw skins imported free of duty and consumed in the United States has for the last nine years exceeded $1,800,000 a year. It is evident that if in order to protect the raising of American cattle by giving an additional value to the hide a high duty had been laid on those imported, the domestic manufacture of leather in all its branches, instead of being in its present flourishing state, would have been most materially injured, and we should have been obliged either to import from Europe or to purchase at exorbitant prices all those articles which it now supplies at a moderate rate.
>
> The reduction in England of the duty on foreign wool to 4 cents a pound has caused a fall in price of the woolen goods without injuring the wool-grower at home. The free introduction of the species not raised here would, by encouraging the manufacture generally, ultimately enlarge the market for the domestic wool. It is the only way to introduce the manufacture of blankets and to reduce the price of home-made flannels and of the coarser species of cloth.

We produce in this country some wools equal to any in the world, but most of them are the coarser and cheaper grades, which are best adapted for the filling of the manufactured goods; while the long-fibered wools of England, America, and Australia are specially adapted for the warps. The wools of Texas, the Territories, and the Pacific Slope, where the sheep are largely pastured on the Government domain, or vast stretches of land comparatively valueless, are the lower grades. They can not be used without admixture of the higher grades, and were the manufacturer able to import these higher grades free, the circumstances would immediately enlarge the market, and raise the prices of domestic wools, a proposition not in the least doubtful, but borne out by our experience in the past.

OUR MERCHANT MARINE.

No people, Mr. Chairman, can be a great people who do not "go down to the sea in ships." With longer coast lines than any other nation in the world, producing a greater quantity of sea-borne tonnage, if we eliminate coal, we are yet dependent upon other nations for ships to do our carrying. But for the energy and enterprise of the English people during the past thirty years it would be impossible for us to find transportation for the commodities we produce in excess of our own requirements for exportation, and we are dependent upon the foreigner to-day for the marketing of our surplus, produced, by the way, almost exclusively by our unprotected industries. Transportation enters so largely into the cost of sea-borne merchandise as to average 10 per cent. of the value of the commodity transported; and while England and her colonies owned 58 per cent. of the sea-going tonnage of the world, according to the returns of 1883, the proportion of the United States was 4.5 per cent.; and it can hardly be denied that the profits of England from this source will far exceed the apparent difference between her exports and imports, as shown by her trade reports.

What has brought about this state of affairs? If we go back to 1860, we find that of our own exports and imports, American vessels carried 67 per cent. as against 33 per cent. in foreign bottoms, and that in 1882 we carried 16 per cent. as against 84 per cent. in foreign bottoms; and the Annual Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, for 1887, page 59, says: "There was a decline in the proportion of value of commodities carried in our own vessels, from 75 per cent. in 1856, to 14 per cent. in 1887. Prior to the year 1860, the ships of the world were constructed of wood, and the great sea-carrying trade of the world was done by sailing vessels. The great pineries of the State of Maine and the white oak of the swamps of Florida could not be combined into a trust. American ingenuity and enterprise were free to exert themselves in any direction that led to prosperity. In 1860 the sea-borne tonnage of the world flying the American flag was about equal to that of England. We were the second if not the first maritime people in the world. At that date the relative population between England and the United States was, England 28,730,000, and the United States 31,440,000. According to the census of 1880, our population exceeded that of England by 15,760,000 and the relative sea-borne tonnage of the world was, England 58 per cent. and the United States 4.5 per cent."

But, Mr. Chairman, I think I hear some of my Republican friends ask, "What of the Alabama and the Shenandoah?" And they will tell you, sir, that the war of the rebellion exterminated the flag of our trade from the ocean. I will admit, sir, that the war of the rebellion was the cause of American ship-owners transferring their wooden ships to foreign flags; and, sir, if in these transfers they received a fair equivalent of their value at that time, from a pecuniary and commercial point of view, the country ought to have been a large gainer by the transaction. The wooden sailing ship was doomed in the year 1860, and the iron and steel ship, propelled by steam, was destined to supplant it upon economic grounds. The life of an iron ship and the cost of maintaining it, as compared with a wooden ship, its ability to carry 20 per cent. more cargo than a wooden ship of the same custom-house tonnage, the utilization of the compound engine, followed by the triplicate, and to-day the quadruple engine, bringing the consumption of fuel down to a minimum, and making steam absolutely cheaper as a propelling power than the winds, all combined to doom the wooden ship. The construction of the Suez Canal left it no longer optional as to what the ship of the future was to be. Can it be claimed, sir, that the people of this nation could not and would not have adjusted themselves to this changed condition of affairs, had not unwise legislation prevented them from doing so? What is a steel or iron ship, sir? What proportion of its cost consists of structural iron or steel beams? And how was it possible for the individual enterprise of this country to engage in the construction of iron ships when steel beams could be bought in England for $26.88 per ton, while the same beams cost in the United States 3.3 cents per pound, or $66 per ton? What has brought us to this low state? The policy of restriction. Protecting a few sickly ship-yards, we turn out an occasional vessel for the coastwise trade.

Under this policy, sir, cruel, barbarous, Bourbon, our magnificent foreign merchant marine has sunk into insignificance, and that seminary of dauntless sailors, that sure reserve of national defense, which once excited the admiration of Burke and of Chatham, has disappeared under the blight of your illiberal laws! We rank, in consequence, far down, not merely in our capacity to carry on the seas, but in our ability to fight on them. And because we have ceased to be a respectable naval power, we hear to-day the proposition to empty the Treasury upon land defenses, to take the place of the sea defenses you have blindly destroyed.

THE THEORY OF PROTECTION.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I will briefly state what I understand to be the theory of protection as advocated by the Republican party, and what that party claims to be the practical results of such a policy upon the country, as shown by the last thirty years, in its favor.

First. That a tariff for protection has given and will give the wage-workers working in the protected industries of the country higher wages, steadier work, and cheaper living.

Second. That the duties imposed on the agricultural products of the country protect the farmer, give him a home market at an enhanced price for his produce, and lessen the burdens he would otherwise be subject to.

Third. That the policy of protection has made the country rich and prosperous whenever high protective tariffs have prevailed, and that the reverse has been the case under moderate tariffs for revenue with incidental protection; and the protectionists point to the immense accumulations of wealth in the United States in the three decades be-

tween 1850 and 1880, namely, $7,135,780,228 in 1850, and $43,642,000,000 in 1880, or an increase of $36,506,219,722 in thirty years.

This is all that is claimed for protection.

If, sir, these propositions can be demonstrated to be true by practical results, I pledge myself to vote with the gentlemen on the other side of the House.

I claim that I have shown by the facts submitted that even the skilled wage-worker employed in the protected industries of the country receives no higher and often not as high wages as the wage-worker in the unprotected industries of the country. That while undue protection does not increase the wages of the wage-worker employed in the manufacturing industries of the country, it adds enormously to the cost of his living, as well as to that of the minister of the gospel, the doctor, the lawyer, the carpenter, the mason, the blacksmith, the widow and the orphan, and that large class of our people living upon limited incomes, those too old to work; and upon no class is its effects more disastrous than upon the agricultural classes; that the home-market theory to the farmer is a fallacy; that if the census of 1880 is reliable, and that 17,392,099 of our population were engaged in the five great classes of occupations, that of the agricultural products produced and consumed in the United States the relative consumption would be as follows:

		Per cent.
Agriculture	7,670,493, or	44.1
Professional and personal services	4,074,238, or	23.4
Trade and transportation	1,810,256, or	10.4
Mining and engineering	1,104,517, or	6.4
Manufacturing	2,732,595, or	15.7
Total	17,392,099	100.0

Which would show, sir, that the farmers and those dependent upon them were consumers to the extent of 44.1 per cent. of what they produced themselves, while three classes named consumed 40.2 per cent., leaving only 15.7 per cent. for those engaged in manufacturing.

That the protection theory has exterminated our shipping from the seas of the world; that the tables submitted, showing how the accumulated wealth of the United States has been made between the years 1850 and 1880, demonstrates that protection to home industries had little or nothing to do with it.

THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY.

We are here, sir—we, the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, and of this House—in defense of American industry. We alone offer it protection; we seek alone the independence and aggrandizement of domestic labor by liberating it from unnatural restraints and allowing it the undisturbed possession and the complete enjoyment of its own earnings. The other side offer it—what? A monopolized market in which to buy the necessaries of life on the one hand, and on the other a labor market subject to the caprice of trusts! In short, they promise it the inestimable boon of working in the protected industries, where no share of the bounty alleged protection affords is allotted to labor, and of bearing in common with the rest of the people of the United States the terrible exactions of the protective system to enrich the privileged classes.

Will laboring men accept that generous tender and vote with the monopoly party under coercion of the employer? If they do, the hideous disaster, foreseen by Jefferson, as the natural result of the restrictive and subsidy policy, will rush down upon us, and the Government of the Union will pass into the hands of those who openly propose to pervert its powers and employ them to plunder the people for their own enrichment. I do not believe, sir, that American liberty is destined to be extinguished in this ignominious fashion. Surviving, as it has, armed assault, and every form of intrigue, it will not perish of the base corruption of subsidy, it will not be throttled by mere greeds or smothered by vile monopoly.

As to the spirit of this side of the House, the spirit in which we enter this struggle for the very life of the Constitution and the emancipation of American labor, I can not better express it than in the language of Andrew Jackson, the illustrious Democrat and beloved patriot, who, like our Presidential leader of to-day [applause], summoned the people to the reclamation of precious rights, slowly and almost imperceptibly filched away by the money power in a long course of years. "No," said the immortal hero:

> No; the ambition which leads me on, is an anxious desire and a fixed determination, to return to the people, unimpaired, the sacred trust they have confided to my charge—to heal the wounds of the Constitution and preserve it from further violation; to persuade my countrymen, so far as I may, that it is not in a splendid government, supported by powerful monopolies and aristocratical establishments, that they will find happiness, or their liberties protected, but in a plain system, void of pomp—protecting all, and granting favors to none—dispensing its blessings like the dews of heaven, unseen and unfelt, save in the freshness and beauty they contribute to produce. It is such a government that the genius of our people requires—such a one only under which our States may remain for ages to come, united, prosperous, and free.

[Prolonged applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the following colloquy occurred:

Mr. BAYNE. Will my colleague [Mr. SCOTT] permit a question?

Mr. SCOTT. I will yield for a question, provided the gentleman does not attempt to answer it himself.

Mr. BAYNE. My colleague stated a few moments ago that wheat is produced on land in Dakota, where land is worth almost nothing per acre; and that it is also produced by the farmer on lands near Carnegie Brothers' mills, where land is worth $100 an acre. Now, if a plant such as that of Carnegie Brothers were placed out in the Territory of Dakota, will my colleague explain whether the rise in the value of the lands surrounding that plant, to $100 an acre, would not be an advantage to the people of Dakota and to the farmer who would produce wheat on the adjacent land?

Mr. SCOTT. I will answer my colleague very briefly. The value of any property is not in what it costs, but in what it will produce. I may put up a magnificent building upon which I may spend a million dollars, and yet I may have to go to the poor-house to live, so far as the income from that building is concerned. The question is, what is the value of that farm to enable the farmer to live and raise his crops?

Mr. BAYNE. Or to sell his land for other purposes and realize a profit.

Mr. SCOTT. Suppose his land was sold under an execution by the sheriff at a loss. But my colleague must excuse me. I would give way to him, but I can not. The House having kindly extended my time, I must not trespass upon its kindness.

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks, when one hour had expired,

Mr. MILLS said: I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] be permitted to conclude his remarks.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

Mr. SCOTT resumed and concluded his remarks as already given.

Mr. GEAR obtained the floor.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. The gentleman from Michigan will not object, I am sure, to yielding me the floor for one minute to announce that I will define my position on the subject of the tariff about half past 2 o'clock to-morrow afternoon. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. After the gentleman from Mississippi has had some of the experience I have had to-day he will discover that he may lose his place and not be able to define his position at all. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. GEAR. Mr. Chairman, the President of the United States, in his annual communication to Congress at the present session, disregarded all those questions which every other Chief Magistrate of the country has discussed, with the exception of a single one, and that was the question of the reduction of the tariff. In his aggressive attack upon all the manufacturing producing industries, and upon all the labor engaged in them, he has made the tariff by his message the underlying question of the day. It is now soon to go to the American people to determine by their votes whether they will stand by the Republican party, which for the past twenty-seven years has, by its wise legislation, inaugurated and carried forward to a high degree of prosperity the material interests of the country, and whether they will continue to support a policy by and under which we, as a nation, have become powerful and wealthy; a policy under which we, as a nation, are accumulating wealth and the means of supplying comforts as well as necessities more rapidly than any other people in the world, or whether they will reverse that policy by following the dogma of free trade.

Mr. Chairman, nearly three-fourths of all the voters of this country to-day came into the possession of the right of suffrage under the Morrill tariff law. This question has not been discussed at all, and I for one am glad to have it discussed now, so that it may be perfectly understood by the present generation of voters. It may be that the detail of statistics may be dry and uninteresting, yet they are of great importance and value to the people who are called to act upon the important issue of protection or free trade, which has been presented to them for their determination. It is, Mr. Chairman, to that class of men who are deeply interested in the pending tariff discussion that I propose chiefly to confine my remarks. I want to show to them that where a fairly protective policy has been the rule our country has been prosperous in a high degree, and that when the contrary policy of "free trade" or a "tariff for revenue" has been adopted that financial embarrassment and a marked depression in the price of labor and produce has immediately followed.

The student of history can not but have observed that the revolution, which resulted in the birth of the American Nation, had its origin not only in the intense desire which the people of the thirteen colonies had for political freedom, but also in the oppressive course of the British Government regarding the industries and traffic of our people.

Much of the sentiment in favor of the revolution was the result of an intense desire on the part of the people to free themselves from the commercial thraldom to which they had for many years been subjected. This struggle for political and commercial liberty on the part of the colonists was intense and prolonged for seven years, at the end of which a full acknowledgment of our rights was conceded by Great Britain. The termination of that struggle was an epoch in the world's history, marking as it did the birth of the American Nation—a nation founded on the will of the majority of the people and with the right to administer its own affairs as might best "promote the general welfare" of all.

The question of the constitutionality of levying imposts for the protection of American industries was settled by the First Congress, which had among its members many of those who had sat in the constitutional

convention. Each and all of those great patriots are on record as to the constitutional right of the Government to enact what may be called a tariff for the protection of American manufactures and American labor.

The second act of the First Congress was enacted not only to raise revenue, but it was also declared in set terms that it was enacted for the purpose not only of raising revenue, but for the "encouragement and protection of manufactures." The duties levied under this act were all small, but it stimulated the industries of the new nation, and we at once began to manufacture to a great extent. While, as I have said, the duties levied under this act were not large, yet the protection theory as stated in the act itself gave confidence to our people and at once stimulated our infant industries, and American manufacturers attained a position on the commercial map of the world.

The question arises, what has our tariff policy been, and what has been its result? As I have shown that protection entered largely into the first tariff act; a degree of protection believed to be ample, as shown by the debates. This principle underlay all the legislation up to the adoption of the compromise act of 1833. Many of the duties, it is true, proved inadequate; others became so in the course of time. The wars which followed the French revolution gave much of the carrying trade to this country. This trade was rendered precarious by reason of the British orders in council and the decrees of Napoleon, each declaring paper blockades of the ports of our country. Protection was to some extent necessarily afforded while the embargo, which followed, compelled our people for awhile to rely upon the products of our own country. Nevertheless, with all these incidental aids to industry, the war of 1812 found us deplorably unprepared. The country, having no woolen manufactures, could not clothe its soldiers; not even a blanket could be made. An eminent writer, Dr. Bushnell, says:

> We had been free-traders, buying all such things because we could buy them cheaper, but we now discovered that we might better have been making the blankets at double the cost for fifty years.

The same was true of saltpeter, guns, cannons, swords, and iron and steel out of which to make them.

We began also to discover that the very insignificant article of salt coming short in the supply was made a dead necessity, and manufacturing it for ourselves at double the cost would have been a true advantage. We very soon discovered in the facts referred to the lowness of our organization and the very incomplete scope of our industrial equipment. In fact, Americans began to see the justice of the world's criticism that we did not amount to much, that we could not do anything for ourselves. A manufacturer of Birmingham, England, in view of the war then anticipated, prophesied that on its breaking out "the crops of the United States would be devoured with vermin, because there was not skill enough in America to manufacture a mouse-trap."

A fine opinion our British cousins had of us! And practical free trade seemed to justify their estimate. At the close of the war the country was fairly flooded with British goods, and although a small measure of protection was accorded by the tariff of 1816, yet, owing to the cheapness of labor across the ocean, the decay of the manufactures which had been encouraged into being was steady. Some disappeared entirely; especially was this true in regard to the manufacture of earthenware, glass, and red and white lead, while that of iron was barely kept alive.

Let me place on the stand in regard to the condition of the country at the time a Democratic witness, a gentleman standing high in the councils of his State and still higher in the councils of his party, when he became the nation's Chief Magistrate—James Buchanan, the last Democratic President before the present one. When he was in Congress in 1824 he said in regard to this period of depression:

> A few years ago the traveler going into the mountain districts of Pennsylvania would have found a great number of furnaces and forges in active operation. Their owners were not only prospering themselves, but they spread prosperity around them. These manufactures presented the best and surest market to the neighboring country for the products of agriculture. Thus they diffuse wealth among the people, money circulated freely, and the manufacturer, the operator, and the farmer were equally benefited. The present aspect of those districts present a melancholy contrast to that which I have just described. It is a just comment upon the policy of that country which will not afford a reasonable protection to its own domestic industries, and therefore give to foreigners a decided preference in its markets. Although that portion of Pennsylvania abounds with ore, with wood, and with water power, yet its manufactures generally sink into ruin and exist only as a standing monument of the false policy of the Government.
>
> The manufacturers and their laborers have both been thrown out of employment, and the neighboring farmer is without a market. Again have we so soon forgotten the lesson which experience taught us during the war with Great Britain? Our foreign supply was then cut off and we could not manufacture in sufficient quantities for the increasing domestic demand. The price of the article became extravagant, and both the Government and agriculturist were compelled to pay double the sum for which they might have purchased it had its manufacturer before that period been encouraged by proper protection policy.

If it be true that history repeats itself, are we not now liable, in the event of the Democratic doctrine of the Mills bill prevailing, to have a recurrence of the picture so graphically presented by Mr. Buchanan?

The general decay of our manufacturing interests caused great distress and much complaint, the result of which was the election of a Congress in favor of a greater degree of protection, and this Congress enacted the tariff of 1824, under which there was a general building up of the manufacturing interests.

Webster said of Hamilton's policy of protection that by it "we smote the rock of the national resources and abundant streams of revenue gushed forth." This was amply proven by the tariff act of 1824; so beneficial was its result that it was followed up by the tariff of 1828, which was still more protective in some features, but less so in others. The years that followed the tariff of 1824, up to 1833, were among the most prosperous the country has ever known. The industries of the country were prosperous, the national debt was paid off, and a surplus accumulated in the nation's Treasury. A large share of this surplus was loaned to the States, which loans exist to this day. Then, as now, a large portion of the Democratic party were clamorous for "free trade." The debates in Congress were lengthy and bitter, and their reading will well repay the student desirous of information on this question.

The contest culminated in the compromise act which went into effect July 1, 1833. This compromise made a gradual annual reduction of the duties on manufactured goods. Its evil results soon became manifest, for almost at once began another period of decadence of American manufactures. The accumulations of the country, which had grown to a large amount by years of protection, sought other channels of investment; speculation spread everywhere; lands far beyond existing settlements were platted in town lots and sold and resold at wondrous figures; shinplaster banks, under the fostering policy of General Jackson depositing the Government funds in them, sprung up all over the country, and everybody was getting rich on paper. Meanwhile the solid wealth of the country was slipping away and being rapidly drained to pay for imports. The immediate catastrophe came, and the financial crash of 1837 will ever remain as a monument to the improvidence of "free trade" or tariff for revenue.

Then followed the tariff of 1842 with the same result of reinvigorated industries, revived commerce, and renewed activities. Then came the tariff of 1846. The period during which this tariff was in operation is sometimes claimed by free-traders (or those who know least about it) as an era of remarkable prosperity and as evidencing the beneficent effects of free trade. The real facts in regard to this tariff are, first, that while the tariff of 1846 was not satisfactory to the protectionists it was by no manner a free-trade tariff, and second, while the period was one of great prosperity (due to causes altogether foreign to the tariff, as I shall show), it also caused that era of remarkable adversity second only in its disastrous sweep to that of 1837.

The tariff enacted by the Democratic Congress of 1846 was, as I have said, partly protection; that is, the protection idea was not abandoned. The Calhoun wing of the Democratic party wanted a tariff that utterly eliminated all idea of protection to American manufactures, a tariff that levied its duties solely on articles not raised in this country. The administration, for instance, of which Mr. Polk was the chief, wanted an import duty levied on tea and coffee. (In this respect the Democratic party of to-day, are in accord with that party of 1846). But sufficient Democrats under the leadership of John Wentworth, of Illinois (who is living to-day in better political faith, however), united with the protectionists to defeat this measure. The result was that in the bill protective duties (to a certain extent) was levied on many articles of manufacture. I have said the Calhounists wanted duties levied on articles not produced in this country. I shall except one thing, the Southern product sugar. This was protected efficiently by this so-called free tariff.

The vice of that tariff was in its adoption of the system of levying duties by percentage of value instead of an absolute amount of duty per pound. Thus, by the percentage rule, when goods were cheapest abroad, they would pay the least duties, and thus came into competition with our manufacturers when they could do them most harm. When this tariff was adopted English iron, then being a glut in the market, was put down to $40 per ton in New York. The American iron had been selling at $60 per ton. The duty now being lowest, the American who could not compete was driven to the wall, and forge after forge was closed, until the amount of home production was largely reduced and the industry became unprofitable.

Some say, "Well, well, we got the iron cheaper." This was true until the American producers were driven out of the market, when the price was put up to $80 per ton. If the duty now collected had been made specific, so that no matter what the value of the goods it would have paid the same duty, the American industry could have survived and become profitable. But dependent on these prices, consequently the duties fluctuated, and on the fluctuation of the foreign market and such combination as the foreign producers could readily enter into, there was little or no encouragement to investors of capital in manufactures.

Again, when the tariff of 1846 was enacted, Ireland was suffering from famine and Europe generally from shortness of crops. There was consequently a great demand for American breadstuff. This great demand had hardly fallen to a normal condition when the discovery of gold in California (which had accrued to us under the war with Mexico) started a monetary revolution, some of the effects of which yet endure. The influx of $4,000,000 worth of bullion per month gave an impetus to business and enabled us to go on buying the products of foreign looms and forges, which the free-traders said our goods and products would

pay for. We paid the manufacturers of Europe with our coin and bullion in place of produce.

Sir, in all those years the balance of trade was against the United States. From the enactment of the tariff of 1846 up the 1861 we exported to settle the balance of trade two hundred and seventy millions of coin and bullion. And our Democratic friends call that era a prosperous one.

Next, as if still further to help out the free-traders, came the Crimean war, which gave American grain the monopoly of the European markets and run up prices of wheat, corn, and farm products to an unparalleled figure. But all these adventitious aids only served to postpone the evil day.

In 1857 the tariff was again reduced. Six months later came the crash. Nearly all the banks then in existence suspended specie payment and most of them failed entirely and values were wiped out. And on whom did the loss fall mainly? Mr. Chairman, on the labor of the country. Produce went to low prices and general distress prevailed.

Many of you who hear me will remember the embarrassment and suffering that attended that great financial earthquake. But I have not time to dwell upon it. Suffice it to say that the depression it brought about continued until some time after the breaking out of the civil war. When that deplorable event occurred much had to be procured abroad which now, under a more provident system, is produced at home.

In 1861 a Republican Congress enacted what is known as the "Morrill" tariff, which in the main has been adhered to up to this time. Under this tariff our manufactures have grown and developed until now, and instead of being compelled to go abroad for some of the most necessary things, we are supplying the world with them to a large extent. Under this tariff we have, as a nation, developed in a wonderful degree, and are increasing in wealth at a rate per annum far surpassing that of any other nation in the world. Yet we find, after a quarter of a century's prosperity under the workings of the "Morrill" tariff, a large proportion of the Democratic party clamoring for "free trade" or a "tariff for revenue only." Disregarding entirely the lessons of our past history, they are trying to educate the people to the idea that under "free trade" or "revenue tariff" the people will prosper in a still higher degree. Let me call your attention to the folly of this argument. They claim that the benefits of protection are reaped mainly, if not wholly, by the employers. I have yet to see the free-trader who has attempted to refute the argument of Mr. Dickinson, the noted statistician, on this question. In a recent article he says:

Most telling illustration, that of a great cotton-mill with a capital of $1,000,000 producing 17,000,000 yards of sheeting each year at 6½ cents per yard, and employing 950 operatives. The same work would require 95,000 men with the old-fashioned spinning-wheels and hand-looms, and the product would be a coarse and inferior article, to be had only by the few who could afford to pay the high price necessary to be charged for it. But of the whole cost of production in this mill $940,000 is paid in wages, $15,000 represent taxes, and $145,000 include cost of supplies, transportation, salaries, and, finally, profits, which a liberal calculation fixes at $60,000 a year.

This argument, in my mind, settles the question in a nut-shell. As it is with the wages of making cotton cloth, so it is in the manufacture of all raw materials. The labor of the country is paid the largest amount of money in the shape of wages and (that the rule, almost without exception) to the manufacturer the small profit. But let us consult British authority on this subject. In 1880, the London Times, reviewing speeches made at a banquet of the free-trade Cobden Club, held July 10, said:

The United States have seen not the error of their ways. It is doubtful if they are in the road for seeing them. England has gone on for the last fourteen years or so repeating that America could not long put off adopting free trade. There is not, our Philadelphia correspondent declares, the slightest sign of the fulfilment of this long-standing prophecy. The United States do not approach the question from the same standpoint of view as ourselves. The object of their statesmen is not to secure the large amount of wealth for the country generally, but to keep up by whatever means the "standard of comfort among the laboring classes."

Long may it be, Mr. Chairman, the object of the American statesmen "to keep up by whatever means the standard of comfort among the laboring classes." When this is lost sight of it will be a bad day for the American people. It would appear from the English authority quoted, that the guiding object of our statesmen of the protection school was to make the condition of our country the very reverse, we might say, of that melancholy one bemoaned by Goldsmith, that poet of the people, when he wrote:

Ill fares the land, to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay.

And in view of the doctrine advanced by the London Times, free-traders may ponder the following from the same poet:

Ye friends to truth, ye statesmen who sway,
The rich man's joys increase, the poor's decay;
'Tis yours to judge how wide the limits stand
Between the splendid and the happy land.

Let us consult another English authority. The general manager of the Staffordshire Iron Works, belonging to the Earl of Dudley a Mr. Casson, when visiting this country a few years ago, said to a representative of the Pittsburgh Gazette:

I find that in many respects you have the advantage of us as regards mechanical appliances, while in others we are greatly ahead of your manufacturers. We can manufacture iron at just one-half the cost, so far as the price of labor is concerned. I find that your rate of wages is about exactly double what we have to pay.

The whole burden of the English song is the high wages paid to the American laborer, and, as I have shown, they are urgent that we reduce th price of our labor to a level with theirs. From their standpoint, this would bring prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, if by any act of ours we reduce the price of American labor to a level with English labor, I imagine that, loud as are the complaints of our labor to-day, we shall hear a still louder wail from every hamlet in the land in denunciation of this measure.

But the testimony of the Clark Thread Company, running houses at Paisley, Scotland, and Newark, N. J., may be called conclusive on this point. In a letter written in 1882 that company furnishes a statement of the wages it paid. I will condense it. What are called spoolers, reeders, and cop-winders got at Paisley $3.60 per week; at Newark, $8. Twisters were paid at Paisley $2.35; at Newark, $5.50. Slippers got at Paisley $1.65; at Newark, $3; and cleaners at Paisley, $1.50; at Newark, $2.50. So much for women's wages. What did the men get? At Paisley, carpenters and mechanics got $7.25; dyers, $7; bleachers, $6.50; firemen, $6 per week. At Newark the carpenters got $17; mechanics, $18; dyers, $15; bleachers, $13.50, and firemen, $12.50 per week.

It is proper to say at Paisley the hands worked only fifty-five hours in a week; at Newark, fifty-nine; a difference of four hours in favor of Paisley. Nevertheless, making full allowance for the shorter time, the wages at Newark were better than those paid at Paisley by from 16½ to 113 per cent. in the case of the women, and by from 101 to 138 per cent. in the case of the men, or an average throughout of just double.

To like effect is the testimony of the agents of the Grafton (Mass.) Linen Thread Mills, who have mills also at Johnston, Scotland. They say that the operators at the former place get twice the wages they get in Scotland, while the cost of living is not 50 per cent. higher. But there is yet better evidence on this head from official statistics. Carroll D. Wright, now head of the national Labor Bureau, was, prior to his appointment to his present position, for many years chief of the bureau of labor statistics for Massachusetts, and as such published many valuable reports concerning the industrial classes.

One of the most valuable of these appeared in 1883; it was a history of wages and prices, and covered the period from 1752 to 1883, inclusive, and embraced also a comparison with the wages paid in Great Britain. I find by this table that from 1880 to 1883 was the period of highest wages for the following occupations: Agricultural laborers, $1.37 per day, or 62 cents more than the average for the 130 years; blacksmiths, $2.28, or 85 cents more than the average; bookbinders, $1.91, or 48 cents more than the average; butchers, $2.03 over the average; carpenters, $2.42, $1.08 over the average; carriage-makers, $2.40, 51 cents over the average; clock-makers, $2.30, 76 cents over the average; cotton-mill operators, $1.47 over the average; laborers, $1.48, 71 cents over the average; machinists, $2.49, 52 cents over the average; masons, $2.79, $1.29 above; metal-workers, $2.16, 62 cents above; nail-makers, $1.84, 66 cents above; painters, $2.32, 74 cents above the average; paper-mill operators, $1.71, 58 cents above the average; printers, $2.18, $1.61 above; shoemakers, $1.87, 57 cents above; stone-quarrymen and cutters, $2.33, 63 cents above; tanners and curriers, $2.09, 61 cents above; woolen-goods makers, $2.28, 82 cents above; woolen-mill operators, $1.31, 24 cents above.

From this same work I learn that the average increase of wages from 1860 to 1863 was 28.36 per cent., while the increase in the cost of groceries was only 10 per cent., and in fuel less than 10 per cent., while the enhanced cost of provisions on the other hand was 35.30. The same work makes a comparison of the wages paid in Great Britain and Massachusetts between 1860 and 1883. From this I gather in ninety industries the average wages in Massachusetts was 75.40 per cent. higher than in Great Britain. Comparing manufacturing and mechanical industries the difference in favor of Massachusetts was 73.02 per cent.

Mr. Wright sums up his conclusion thus:

We find that on any basis of yearly expenditure the prices of articles entering into the cost of living were, to the average, 17.29 per cent. higher in Massachusetts in 1883 than in Great Britain; that in this figure 11.49 per cent. was due to higher rents in Massachusetts, leaving 5.80 per cent. as indicative of the higher cost of living in Massachusetts, as compared with Great Britain, as regards the remaining elements of expense; this with from 75 to 100 per cent. greater wages.

Can any fair-minded man want any stronger evidence that the benefits of protection accrue mainly not to the employer, but to the employé? Where else in the world is labor in the aggregate as well paid, or enjoys in the same degree what we deem the comforts of life, and, I might add, the luxuries, as in the United States under the protective policy of the Republican party as maintained for the last quarter of a century?

Again, it is a common argument with free-traders that the duty levied on any imported article raises by so much the price of that article; so if it were taken off the same could be afforded for much less. It is true that a duty levied on sugar, tea, coffee, spices, and many articles not the growth of this country increases the price of the article by the amount of the duty; and it is also true that a tariff, when first levied, before the manufacture of the article is in successful operation,

does increase the cost to the consumer, but the experience of the past twenty-five years has demonstrated the fact that when our manufactures became well established the duty operated against the foreign manufacturer alone.

It has been well said that—

No economical law is more capable of demonstration than this, that manufactured articles are invariably cheapened in the cost of production and in the prices at which they are afforded to consumers as the home demand for them enlarges.

Take nails, worth in 1840, $6; in 1861, $3.50; and in 1883, $2.40; and in 1888 less than $2 per hundred pounds. Their average value for the past eight years, or since gold and silver became of equal value, that is, from 1878 to 1887, was $45.45 per ton, while the average price of nails for the eight years prior to 1861 was $62.08 per ton, the figures ranging from $80.50 per ton in 1854 to $48 in 1860. Taking pig-iron for the same length of time, we find the average from $36.87½ in 1854 to $22.25 in 1858, while under protection the average was ranging from $28.50 in 1880 to $17.875 in 1885. The price of bar-iron averaged for the same period $71.83, ranging from $91.33 to $58.75, while in the latter period it averaged $51.21, the highest being $61.41 and the lowest $39.37 per ton, during the protection period being lower than the lowest under free trade. In woolen goods the prices have fallen from 30 to 60 per cent. lower than they were 1860. From 1820 to 1850 common salt ranged in price from $8 down to 75 cents per bushel. I refer my distinguished friends on the other side to the speeches of Thomas H. Benton on this question. Nearly all the salt during those years was imported, only a few thousand barrels being made annually in West Virginia and a small amount in New York.

Again, according to the statements of our free-trade friends, salt should be sold at a higher rate by the amount of duty imposed on it. Under the protection given the salt manufacturers the production of the salt-works in New York and Michigan has developed to an enormous degree, nearly one hundred salt-works being in operation. The tariff has been reduced time and again, and the amount of duty on this is now only 22½ cents per barrel of 5 bushels, or 4½ cents per bushel, and the result is that the price of salt has steadily declined, being quoted at 61 cents at the works and 85 cents in Chicago, and it is retailed all over the West at $1.20 to $2 per barrel, according to the transportation charges. Are not our free-trade friends in error in claiming that the tariff increases the cost of salt to the consumers?

If it be true, as claimed by the free-traders, that the consumer pays the tariff duty, why is it that muslin, prints, and many classes of cotton textile goods, on which the tariff is from 2½ to 4½ cents per yard, are not worth any more in this country than in England? Yet, as a matter of fact, a dollar in any country store in Iowa, 1,000 miles from a cotton-mill, will buy as many yards of muslin or prints as in any store in England—a statement which can be verified by the reports of the English papers. Furthermore, by the superior quality of our cotton fabrics we are successfully competing with England for the Japan and Chinese markets for this class of goods.

If it be true that the tariff increases the cost of manufactures, why do we find the English papers full of advertisements of American stoves, organs, pianos, fixed ammunition, cutlery, axes, hoes, and other agricultural implements, on all of which there is a tariff, which are just as cheap and much better in style and quality than those made abroad? It is said that "an Englishman's house is his castle." Notwithstanding the so-called burden of protection Americans seem to be in a fair way to storm the castle.

Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested the other day when I heared the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. MILLS] speaking in regard to the great burden in the shape of a tax which was placed on "the poor man's blanket." He talked so pathetically in regard to this subject that I wondered whether what he said could be true. I recollected that we had out in my State a woolen mill or two, and I concluded to send out to that State for a pair of blankets. I have those blankets here, and I ask that two of these page-boys take those blankets out into the area in front of the Clerk's desk that members may see them. [The blankets were exhibited in accordance with Mr. GEAR'S request.] Sir, there is a pair of blankets as good as can be made in England or anywhere in America. They weigh 5 pounds and 2 ounces, and it required for their manufacture 11 pounds of wool. They are made of Iowa wool in an Iowa mill by Iowa employés. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Texas spoke of $2.50 as the cost in one case and $2.70 as the cost in another case of a pair of 5-pound blankets; and remember, each of these blankets is just 5 pounds. The gentleman from Texas said that the duty on those blankets would be $1.90 per pair, and that this was the amount which the manufacturer put in his pocket. Now, sir, to manufacture this pair of blankets which the House has before it took 11 pounds of wool, at 27 cents a pound.

Mr. STRUBLE. Where were they made?

Mr. GEAR. At Bonaparte, Iowa, in my district. Now, 11 pounds of wool at 27 cents per pound would be $2.97; to that add 61 cents, which the gentleman from Texas says is the cost of making, and the amount will be $3.58; add to that the duty on blankets, $1.90, and the amount is $5.48. Now, if it be true that the amount of the tariff duty is added directly to the cost of the American blanket, the cost of these blankets should be $5.48; and, allowing the retailer a fair profit, they should sell at $6 per pair. But, sir, I have a certificate from the manufacturer certifying as to the quality and price. The wholesale price is $4.50; and the retail price at any store in Iowa, the cash discount paying the freight, is $5 per pair. [Applause.]

I want to call attention to the fact that my friend from Texas in his illustration does not give the price at which the American blankets he talked about are sold—not at all; and I want to call attention also to the fact that the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, when they revise the tariff, and, as they say, take the tax off "the poor man's blanket," do not take off one penny in favor of the poor man. They impose an ad valorem tax on all kinds of blankets, and "the poor man's blanket" pays the same ratio of taxation that the rich man's blanket does. Yet our Democratic friends are posing around this country as the sole and only friends of the poor man.

The manufacturer of those blankets, who lives in my district, is a gentleman who does not vote the Republican ticket; he is a good, old-fashioned Democrat.

Mr. WARNER. But he will vote the Republican ticket hereafter.

Mr. GEAR. I do not know, but one of the most prominent Democrats in my town told me this morning that if the Mills bill should pass no Representative in Congress from the State of Iowa who voted for it could come back to Congress. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I ask the Clerk to read the letter and accompanying bill which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Office of Isaiah Meek, successor to Meek Bros., proprietor of Bonaparte Woolen and Flouring Mills, and dealer in wool and grain.]

BONAPARTE, IOWA, *May 4*, 1888.

This is to certify that I sold to JOHN H. GEAR blankets as per bill attached; that they are all wool; that at present the wholesale price is 90 cents per pound and retail price $1.

ISAIAH MEEK.

BONAPARTE, IOWA, *May 4*, 1888.

Mr. JOHN H. GEAR, Washington, D. C., bought of Isaiah Meek, successor to Meek Bros., proprietor Bonaparte Woolen and Flouring Mills:

One pair blankets, 5 pounds, $1 ..... $5.00

Received payment. $5.00

ISAIAH MEEK.

Mr. GEAR. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that the passage of the pending tariff bill will not only seriously injure the wool-grower of my State, but it will also close up the mill where that blanket was made, and put out of employment the labor engaged in its manufacture.

In controverting the theory that manufactures are made higher to the consumer by protection, let me take the article of cutlery.

Professor Wayland's Political Economy, published in 1842, page 140, contains this proposition:

We pay a heavy duty on cutlery in this country, while not a thousandth part of the cutlery used is made here. It would be vastly cheaper to pay bounty sufficient to raise all the cutlery made in this country to its present price, and it would be for aught I suggest as good for the cutler.

But had this sage counsel, intended to discourage the infant manufacturers, been followed we would not have the cheap cutlery we have to-day, while we would have been dependent on foreigners for most we use instead of now obtaining our supply almost wholly from American workshops; and, furthermore, those American workshops would not now be flooding the markets of the world with their products and crowding those of Britain at the very threshold of her factories.

But, broadening our view, let me make some comparisons between protective and free-trade periods. In 1860 our manufactures aggregated only $855,000,000 on an invested capital of $1,001,000,000. Employment was given to 1,311,246 persons, to whom was paid in wages $378,878,996, or an average of $290 each per year. The product was $1,972,755,642, and in 1880, 2,752,595 operators were paid $947,953,795, or an average of $346 per year. In the mean time the cost of living had not materially changed. I take a table from the report of the Director of the Mint, 1881, giving prices in 1860 and 1880:

Articles.	1860.	1880.
Flour, superfine, per barrel	$5.19	$4.13
Pork, mess, per barrel	18.09	13.23
Beef, per barrel	5.19	11.12
Ham, per pound	.096	.084
Lard, per pound	.117	.079
Sugar, per pound	.08½	.07
Sugar, loaf, per pound	.098	.08 5/8
Tallow	.10	.06½
Molasses, New Orleans, per gallon	.46½	.37
Standard sheeting, 36 inches, per yard	.071	.07 7/8
Standard sheeting, 23 inches, per yard	.07	.05½

All will remember that in 1880 there was a strong tendency to high prices, by reason of the general prosperity of the country; in 1860, on the other hand, as older people will recollect, there was a general depression in prices, following the disastrous panic of 1857. Consequently the cost of living ought to have been lower in 1860 than in 1880. It

will be observed the difference, if any, was rather in favor of the latter year. In 1860 our steel production was 11,838 tons; in 1880 it was 1,397,015 tons. Copper in 1860 was produced to the amount of $2,288,182; in 1880 it was $8,849,961. A fall in price attended the increased production ranging from 6½ to 8 cents.

In Iowa the augmentation from 1860 to 1880 in manufacturers was as follows: Number of establishments, from 1,939 to 6,921, or over 250 per cent.; in capital invested, from $7,347,886, to $33,987,886, or more than 350 per cent.; in hands employed, from 6,307 to 25,382, or about 350 per cent.; in wages paid, from $1,922,000 to $9,725,962, or about 400 per cent. The average pay increased from $304.87 to $343.65 per annum. The increase in value of products, that is, after deducting value of materials employed, was from $5,359,066 to $22,741,615, or almost 300 per cent. The aggregate value of products was $71,045,926. In the former years 36 per cent. of the product went into wages; in the latter year, 43.

The first cast-steel establishment, or at least the first to endure, was founded about 1860.

So well did the tariff of 1861 do its work that in a dozen years the steel manufacture of Pittsburgh alone amounted to more than the entire importation of steel, while the remainder of the country manufactured almost as much as was imported (and these figures do not include Bessemer and steel-headed nails). This product was furnished to consumers at from 2 to 3 cents a pound less than it was ever furnished for prior to the establishment of the American industry, even though the duty on the foreign article was now three times as great as under former tariffs, and to-day American manufacturers of steel have taken the contract in successful competition with those of Great Britain for the steel for our new armored cruisers and steel guns of caliber equal to those of any European power.

When the first Bessemer-steel works were undertaken in America the price of steel rails purchased for American railroads and delivered at English ports, when the present duty was imposed, was $155 a ton in gold. Now American mills furnish them at $31.50 to $33.50 per ton, giving the English manufacturer not over $15.50 per ton after paying the duty to pay freight, if any, and all the cost of raw material and labor. Does anybody believe that without American competition their rails would have been furnished them for twice the money?

I quote from a recent number of the Industrial World:

How important it was to the steel-rail industries of the country that neither the Randall nor the Morrison tariff-reduction bill was enacted into a law may be seen from the fact that even with the present impost duty of $17 per ton on steel rails large importations of English-made rails are coming to this country. The Alabama and Great Southern Railway, 295 miles long, is to be relaid with foreign-made rails imported via New Orleans. Home-made rails can be obtained at Eastern mills for, say, $31.50 per ton, and at Western mills at $33.50 per ton. So that to compete with products here the foreign rails can yield the manufacturer only $15.50 per ton, according to the point in this country at which they are delivered, and assuming they may come across the ocean as ballast.

But were manufactures alone thus benefited? By no means. During the period from 1860 to 1880 the production of Indian corn increased over 100 per cent., that of wheat more than 150 per cent., the total of cereals 120 per cent., and the wool product 260 per cent. During this time the population increased only about 50 per cent., and manufactures, as before indicated, showed an increase of about 125 per cent., so that agriculture got its full share of the enhanced prosperity by protection. The truth is that protection duties encouraged the production of these goods at home, so that we have the products of both home and foreign markets to select from, instead of being compelled, as otherwise, to depend on the foreign market in which to make our purchases.

However beneficial free trade may appear to be on paper, I have yet to find the first country that has prospered under it. I am aware that the example of Great Britain may be cited; that country has done better than any other under the system. But there the mutterings of discontent are gathering in volume until they can be heard across the ocean. What is known as the "fair-trade" party, an organization growing in the number of its adherents rapidly, is hostile to free trade; while Ireland has certainly not been benefited by it. But whether successful or not, what kind of preparation for free trade was there in England? Its manufactures were built up under a comprehensive system of protection, combined with vigorous repression, as in the case of Ireland and in the American colonies, where needed for the furtherance of the object.

An early act of the English Parliament specially offered all cloth-workers of other lands safety and protection carrying into England, Scotland, Ireland, and Wales. In after years Ireland received less consideration, or rather more of it, but of a less favorable kind. An act of Edward III made it a felony to export wool until otherwise ordered by the king and council. Another act prohibited everybody not of the royal family wearing any cloth thereafter brought into what is now the United Kingdom, unless the same was made therein. And merchants, by another act, were prohibited from bringing cloths into England. Another act of the same reign prohibited all merchants from carrying any manner of wools, leather, wolfels (skins with wool on), or lead to the seacoast for shipment, on pain of penalty and loss of member and forfeiture of all property. Although this was repealed in the same reign, the exporting of wools and wolfels, etc., was prohibited by later enactments. Another act prohibited for a time bringing any card for wool into England or Wales. The preamble to this bill giving the reason for its passage, in the quaint style of the time, reads thus:

Whereas many thousands of woolen card-makers and card wire-drawers of London, Bristol, Gloucester, Norwich, Coventry, and of many other of His Highness' cities and towns, have heretofore lived and well maintained themselves, their wives, families, and children by the benefit and use of their and faculty of card-making and drawing of wire within this realm; and now, of late time, by reason of the common bringing in of foreign cards for wool out of France and other foreign ports, the said card-makers and card wire-drawers have been so much impoverished that scant the twentieth person that has heretofore lived by the said trades is now maintained and get work thereby.

Free trade worked then about as it does now, it appears.

Parliament went at one time so far in its determination to uphold the woolen manufacturers and discourage the importations of foregn linen, as to require the dead to be buried in nothing but woolen clothing, and in a coffin lined with no other material.

An act towards the close of the seventeenth century, having in view the enhancement of England's interests, prohibited the exportation of wool or wolfels, or woolen manufactures, from Ireland to any place but England; and the same act forbade the woolen manufacturers of the English plantations in America, as the colonies were called, from being exported out of the plantation where produced to any other plantation, or to any other place whatsoever; that is, they might be used where produced, but nowhere else, lest they should conflict with English manufacturers.

Various acts of Parliament were passed especially aimed to improve the business of England at the expense of the colonies. No sugars, cotton, wool, indigo, etc., grown in the English colonies, were allowed to be exported except to England. Ships in the colonies were required to bring them to England. Nothing grown or manufactured on the continent of Europe could be sent to the colonies but by way of and in English ships. This was afterward modified so as to allow "servants, horses, and victuals," as the act puts it, to be imported from Scotland or Ireland; salt for the fisheries, and wines from the Azores. No hats or felts were allowed to be transported from any of the colonies to any other. In 1750 Parliament forbade the erection in America of any mill for slitting iron, or plating forge to work with a tilt-hammer, or furnace for making steel, and British statesmen are at the same business to-day—in another way, however.

I am aware that it may be said that these were the enactments of hardier ages. This is true; but they built up British manufactures, and their enduring effects enable the Island nation to sustain as gallantly as she does the losing cause of free trade.

With our soil and our resources there is no excuse for our not producing everything which can in reason be produced in our immense territory, and our legislation should be shaped so as to assist in freeing our nation from commercial thraldom to other lands. What we can not produce, such as tea and coffee and sugar, let us get as cheaply as possible, and let no duty enhance their cost. [Applause on the Republican side.]

This is, in my opinion, the true policy for a nation; a policy which will best promote the general prosperity of the American people. The great advantage of the protection system to the agriculturist is that it gives him a uniform market. Chief-Justice Story, *nomen clarum et venerabile*, says on this question that—

A large and uniform market at home for a nation's products has a tendency to prevent those many rises and falls in prices which are so deeply injurious to the farmer and planter.

The "Cobden Club," of England, an association composed of rich men who are largely interested in manufactures, which is supplemented by its honorary members in high places here, is to-day sowing broadcast through this country "free-trade" pamphlets in order to persuade the American people that "free trade" is necessary to us. Why this is being done may well be asked. The answer is, if they can to a degree break down the American manufacturer, and thereby force our operatives into agriculture, they can then monopolize our markets for goods at their own prices and take their pay in American produce at prices fixed by themselves. The question is well stated by Chief-Justice Long:

Is America ready to give everything to Europe without any equivalent, and take in return whatever Europe may choose to give us on its own terms?

Could the results of "free trade" be more clearly stated?

We should ever bear in mind that in all ages there has been an irrepressible conflict between monarchical and republican forms of government. This has been well expressed by Missouri's great Senator, Thomas H. Benton, who said that—

Foreign interference and foreign influence in all ages and in all countries had been the bane and curse of free government. And that such interference and influence are far more dangerous in the insidious intervention of the moneyed power than possible invasion of fleets and armies.

Should not this interference on the part of the "Cobden Club" be considered by our people as an "insidious interference of the moneyed power?"

While it is true that we have much in common with the English people, yet the Government and the interests of the two countries are in direct opposition of each other. Lord Robert Cecil, in a debate in the English Parliament, explained exactly the relations between England and the United States when he said:

They were rivals politically, rivals commercially; again we are both manufac-

uring people, and in every port as well as in every court we are rivals to each other.

In this conflict between "free trade" and protection we have on our side the interest of the manufacturer, the artisan, the laborer, and the producer of America; on the other, a large portion of the Democratic party backed by the whole monetary interests of England. Of this foreign influence we as Americans should be especially jealous. The passage of the Mills bill in the interest of "free trade" is a victory for British commerce. For this kind of victory is a prostration to our American and producing industries, and I must confess that I see but little difference between being subjugated by British commerce or by British cannon. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Nature has been bountiful of her gifts to the American people. In addition to the mines of precious metals, she has given them vast deposits of iron, copper, lead, coal, and other base metals in a lavish degree in many portions of the country.

To utilize these requires labor, which alone can develop all this vast amount of raw materials into implements and the manufactured articles in order to enable us not only to live in comfort but to supply the wants of other nations. She has also given a kindly climate and a fertile soil, which is adapted to the growth of most of what we consume. In fact, no other nation is so well fitted by its natural conditions to maintain itself almost absolutely independent of foreign nations and influences as we, the American people.

Bearing these facts in mind, is it not for the best interests of our nation to adapt its policies in such manner as to give the "greatest good to the greatest number," and to do this is not protection to our home labor an absolute necessity?

Sir, we are told in the Good Book that "He that provideth not for his own household hath already denied the faith and is worse than an infidel." What are we, Mr. Chairman, as a nation but an aggregation of households? And is not the divine command as imperative on us as on an individual? Is it not our bounden duty to so legislate as to provide for our own people rather than for those of other countries?

Mr. Chairman, there are many glaring inconsistencies in this bill. It is cunningly drawn so as to command the support of that portion of the country which the Democratic party counts on for its main support, the "solid South;" and it is also a direct blow at the industrial and agricultural classes of the Northern States from which come the Republican majorities.

Let me illustrate. Take rice; the bill leaves rice, produced in South Carolina and Louisiana, with a duty of nearly 100 per cent., and also increases the duty on uncleaned rice, which is not only in the interest of the Southern rice producers, but will inevitably drive out of the business cleaning-mills of New York City and elsewhere. Why not make the duty on rice as it was before the war and thus give the consumers of this country, who use 250,000,000 pounds annually, the benefit of this cheap and desirable food?

Again, the bill reduces the tariff on sugar about 22 per cent. Why, may I ask, would it not be a sound policy to take off entirely the fifty-eight millions of tariff revenue on sugar? Sugar is an article of absolute necessity for all. Why levy what is a direct tax of over a dollar per capita on all our people for the benefit of its few raisers in the South? Sugar-cane, Mr. Chairman, is not indigenous to this country; it is an exotic with us, easily injured by frost or bad weather. Even the refuse stalks, or "bagasse," owing to climatic influences, can not be utilized for fuel as it is in Cuba without a large expenditure for a peculiar kind of furnace to burn it in.

Let me call the attention of the committee to the small area of land in the cultivation of sugar in the United States as compared with the acreage of corn in any Congressional district in my own State.

In 1879 there were but 181,592 acres in sugar-cane in Louisiana, and the United States but 227,776 acres. In the seven counties comprising the district I have the honor to represent on this floor, there were in cultivation the same year 481,126 acres in corn over twice as many acres as there were in sugar-cane in the whole United States. And, sir, the agricultural products of those seven counties are three times the value of the sugar crop of the United States, and yet we are taxed $58,000,000 annually for the direct benefit of the sugar-planter. Think of it!

And yet after nearly half a century's protection there is not as much sugar grown to-day as there has been in times past. This country does not produce over one-tenth of the sugar we use; and yet the people of the United States paid during the past year nearly $26 an acre in the tariff on sugar as a rental on the 227,776 acres in the cultivation of cane. Is it not better by far for us to pay a bounty of $20 a hogshead on the sugar raised in the United States in 1887, which would amount to about $7,000,000, or about 2 cents a pound, and thus save $49,000,000 which will be paid this year in the shape of a direct tax on the breakfast and tea table of every family in the land?

This would be a practical relief to the laboring classes whom our Democratic friends on the other side of the House are so loud in their professions to aid.

A bounty of the kind I have suggested, coupled with the proviso that this should not apply to countries that levy an export tax on sugar exported to this country, would, in my opinion, stimulate not only the growth of cane sugar in the South, but would also at the same time give an impetus to the production of sorghum and beet-root sugar, which our Western prairies and California are so well adapted to produce. The result would be that eventually we would produce all the sugar that the people of this country have use for.

All the interests of the reliable Democratic States are cared for in this bill. The sumac of Virginia is protected, and cement, which was first reported to be put on the "free-list," is now left with a protection of 10 per cent. because of the fact that in Democratic Kentucky is found not only one of the largest cement manufactories in the country, but it is also the banner State of Democracy.

The lead of Missouri is but slightly reduced, and even the peanut interests of North Carolina are looked after with care. In the draughting of the bill by the majority of the Committee of Ways and Means the interests of those States, a large number of whose members sit here elected by methods well known to this House and the country, have been tenderly touched where touched at all. Again, Mr. Chairman, this bill aims a blow at the prosperity of the agriculture of the North, the West, and the Pacific Slope by the fact that it places on the free-list many articles grown in Canada and other foreign countries, which will be an injury to our home producers of those articles.

Take one agricultural industry in my own State of Iowa for illustration. Flax is a fairly remunerative crop in that State under the protection now given to it and its product, flaxseed-oil. Let me show you how it works. A poor man comes to Iowa to make a home for himself and family. He buys 160 acres of land on long credit, with interest on the deferred payments, and this accounts for a large amount of the mortgages we hear so much about. In the olden time it took a whole season to break up a portion of his land to be ready to sow grain in the second season; since we have had a fair duty on flaxseed he commences to break up his land in the spring and as fast as he has 10 acres broken he puts it in flax. By the 1st of July he has 50 acres broken and sown in flax, from which he can realize five or six hundred dollars the first year, and in addition have his ground ready for wheat or corn the succeeding season. The result is that he is able to make his payment on his land and support his family during his first season.

In addition we have in Iowa eleven oil-mills, costing a large amount of money, and employing many men in their operation. This raising of flax in the West has been the means of the erection of these oil-mills and has reduced the price of oil, as was shown by my colleague, [Mr. HENDERSON], to a much lower price than it has ever been bef re.

By putting flaxseed and its product on the free-list you accomplish two things, you place the Iowa flax-raiser in direct competition with the ryot laborer of the East Indies and drive the oil-mills of the countr into "innocuous desuetude," and when this is done our people will inevitably pay higher prices for oil than now.

Again, we in Iowa have hoped that in the near future we would have factories erected in our State to utilize the lint of our flax fields into thread and linen. That hope, if this bill is to pass, will never come to fruition. The lint will rot on the ground where it is thrashed.

Again, the raising of potatoes under the existing protection is a fairly remunerative business in Iowa, the people of that State shipping to Chicago from five to seven hundred thousand bushels annually. This bill nominally retains the tariff on potatoes at 15 cents a bushel, yet really admits them free. I have no doubt that under this definition potatoes will be admitted free, thus letting in the Canadian potatoes by the cheap water transportation, while the small farmers in Iowa have to pay freight on their crop on two to four hundred miles of railway transportation.

These, Mr. Chairman, are only a few of the inconsistencies of this bill. Time will not permit me to elaborate its many injuries to the manufacturing, agricultural, and laboring interests.

But it may be well to inquire who has asked for the enactment of this proposed law. I have failed to hear presented on the floor of this House any petitions, nor have I seen in the RECORD any petitions asking us to pass this bill; but, on the contrary, from all parts of the country have come hundreds of petitions, not from manufacturers alone, but those who eat their "bread in the sweat of their faces," protesting against its passage. From the East, from the North, from the great West, and the States of Oregon and California the people have protested against its passage. Shall we close our ears to their protests?

I have personally been in receipt of many petitions and of letters by the score from my own State, from manufacturers, wool-growers, artisans, farmers, and laboring men, protesting against the bill. Sir, the people of my State believe in a fair degree of protection to American industries of all kinds.

Why, Mr. Chairman, we in Iowa have not timber enough to build a fleet of canoes, yet I, in common with my colleagues, have been in receipt of many letters and petitions from the laborers of that State, yea, from the Knights of Labor, urging us to vote for a subsidy to American vessels, so that the American flag may again be seen on the waters of the ocean as it was in the days of yore.

The last revision of the tariff was made by the Republican party. Since that revision the Democratic party has been in the ascendency

in the lower House of Congress, which alone has the right to originate a measure of revenue; they have signally failed in adjusting the revenues to the constantly increasing surplus in the Treasury.

It is to the Republican party that the country must look for a proper adjustment of these economic questions. If a revision of the tariff is needed let us revise it by all means, but let it be done in such a manner as will not prostrate the industries of the country, as has been done by the Democratic party in the past; for it should be borne in mind that any revision of the tariff which will tend to throw out of their employment American laborers can but prove disastrous to the best interests of all, for labor, when employed at fair wages, is always contented. Drive labor out of employment by free trade or by any other method and at once it becomes demoralized and restless. [Applause.]

Sir, we are entering on one of the most remarkable political campaigns this country has witnessed—second only in interest to that of 1860. Already the millions of voters are arming, not with swords and bayonets, not with cannons and muskets—the time for that, thank God, is past—but with

> A weapon that comes down as still
> As snow-flakes fall upon the sod;
> But executes a freeman's will,
> As lightning does the will of God.

Sir, in this contest the candidate of the Democratic party is already known. The President has so dominated his party that they can not nominate any one else. On whom the choice of the Republican party will fall I do not know, but this I do know: he will be one well worthy to lead the Republican hosts to victory in that conflict. On the banner of the Democratic party will be inscribed free trade. Sir, behind that banner will follow all who believe in that fallacy, backed up by all the power and influence of the Cobden Club of England. On the Republican banner will be emblazoned protection to American industries, a fair ballot, and an honest count. Under the Republican banner will march all who believe in the progress and upbuilding of the American nation. On this issue we make the fight, and of its result I have no fear, for, Mr. Chairman, it is said that "coming events cast their shadows before." When the result is known it will be found that the American people have pronounced in unmistakable tones their condemnation of the principles underlying the Mills bill. And that at the close of that election day we shall hear from Lake to Gulf, from Maine to the "Golden Gates" of the Pacific pæans of victory welcoming the return to power of the Republican party, which has, by the policy it inaugurated, done so much for the moral and material elevation of the American people, and that for another quarter of a century in the future American interests will be as carefully guarded as they were from 1861 to 1883.

During the delivery of Mr. GEAR'S remarks the hammer fell.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague be permitted to proceed for ten minutes longer.

Mr. HOOKER. I hope the gentleman will be permitted to go on until he has concluded his remarks.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. If the time is extended it is simply taken from the time of somebody else.

Mr. SPRINGER. I hope the gentleman will be allowed to proceed for five minutes longer any how.

Mr. GEAR. I can probably conclude my remarks in that time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request for an extension of the time of the gentleman from Iowa for five minutes?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEAR then resumed and concluded his remarks.

[Mr. DIBBLE withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. HAUGEN addressed the committee.

He was interrupted in his remarks by the arrival of 5 o'clock, when the Chairman stated that under order of the House the committee must rise.

Mr. HAUGEN. How much of my time remains?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has fifty minutes of his time remaining.

The committee rose; and Mr. MCCREARY having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9051) and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Under previous order the House now takes a recess until 8 o'clock to-night.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House at 8 o'clock p. m. was called to order by Mr. MCCREARY, who directed the reading of the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 11, 1888.

I hereby designate Hon. J. B. MCCREARY to preside as Speaker *pro tempore* at the session of the House this evening.

JNO. G. CARLISLE, *Speaker.*

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK,
Clerk House of Representatives.

Mr. DOCKERY. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of bills under the special order.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. DOCKERY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the title of the first bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5961) to increase the pension now paid to Mrs. D. P. Woodbury.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read the titles of the bills in their regular order on the Calendar, and unless some member present calls the bill up for consideration it shall be passed over, not losing its place on the Calendar.

There being no objection, it was so ordered.

JOHN KALBFLEISCH.

The first pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. GROSVENOR) was the bill (S. 331) granting a pension to John Kalbfleisch.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Kalbfleisch, Company A, One hundred and sixteenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, at the rate allowed for loss of leg above the knee.

The report (by Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 331) granting a pension to John Kalbfleisch, having examined the same, report it back with the recommendation that it do pass, and in support of this action adopt and make part hereof, as containing the facts of the case, the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, which is as follows:

"[Senate Report No. 63, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

"The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 331) granting a pension to John Kalbfleisch, private in Company A, One hundred and sixteenth Ohio Volunteers, have examined the same and report:

"That John Kalbfleisch enlisted on August 22, 1862, in Company A, One hundred and sixteenth Ohio Volunteers, in the war of 1861; that while in the service and in the line of duty, on or about the 24th day of February, 1864, in jumping from a train of cars in motion, he sustained a serious injury to the right leg, resulting in amputation, which operation was performed in the field hospital in camp at Sleepy Creek, West Virginia, where his company was stationed, performing guard duty for the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.

"He was honorably discharged on the 15th of May, 1865. He was pensioned March 27, 1869, to date from May 15, 1865, and dropped from the roll by order of the Secretary of the Interior of date June 18, 1877, upon the theory that the disability was not received in the line of duty; and this is the only question in the case.

"All the evidence, from the filing of the original application for a pension down to the date of the last appeal for a restoration of Kalbfleisch to the rolls, shows that he was a good soldier, obedient, attentive, and faithful from the beginning to the end of his long service.

"The officer in command at Sleepy Creek testifies that on the day on which he received his injury he issued to him and two comrades a pass to go to a place called Hancock to procure sole-leather to repair their shoes, which were badly worn. This statement is corroborated by several other members of the company to which Kalbfleisch belonged, who had personal knowledge of the fact. The pass thus issued required the return of Kalbfleisch and his comrades at 4 p. m. They walked to Hancock, about 5 miles distant, and returned on the railroad in a freight train, which arrived at the camp a little before the hour at which the pass would expire.

"The railroad track was practically in the camp, and when the train arrived at its regular place for stopping, although they should have remained on the train, which they did not, they would have been in fact in the camp, amenable to its rules and regulations, subject to its discipline, and entitled to its privileges. It was usual for the train to stop at that point, but on this particular day it did not.

"The two comrades of Kalbfleisch jumped from the moving train and were uninjured. Kalbfleisch slipped, or was caught by his clothing or in some other way on the door of the freight-car in which they were riding as he was about to jump, and fell from the train, his right leg being drawn under the wheels of the car and crushed. He was immediately surrounded by his comrades in the camp and at once carried to the field hospital. There are a number of affidavits by these men, and there are also affidavits by the comrades who accompanied him to Hancock, and who jumped from the train before him without injury, to the effect that Kalbfleisch was not intoxicated—not perceptibly under the influence of liquor, although it was admitted by himself and comrades that one of these latter had procured liquor at Hancock in his canteen, and that all of them had drank moderately of it.

"But the fact that the two comrades, one of whom owned and had possession of the canteen all the time, jumped from the train and walked easily away; that the slip of Kalbfleisch in jumping, as described in the affidavits, would have been a perfectly natural one for any other perfectly sober man to make in the hurry and excitement of the moment; and the further fact that the quantity of liquor in their possession was insufficient to incapacitate them, or either of them, from taking ordinary care of himself if it was all drank by them, or by either of them, together with the abundant testimony above referred to in contradiction of this theory of excessive drinking, leaves it with no satisfactory support, nor is it believed by the committee that the soldier was strictly outside the line of duty.

"The testimony shows that he went only 4 or 5 miles away from the camp; that he went on a proper and necessary errand in the line of duty and by authority of his commanding officer; that he was mindful of this duty to return at or before the hour named in his pass, and that rather than be absent beyond the appointed time for him to be in camp, as he necessarily would have been if he had allowed himself to be carried by on the train, he risked his life in jumping from it while in rapid motion.

"He was actually in the camp when the accident occurred, and but for his injury would have been ready for any duty required of him. He did immediately receive as a soldier in the line of duty the first and highest privilege of the camp, namely, hospital service in the field hospital of the camp. He received afterwards the surgeon's certificate of disability on account of the accident 'received while in the line of duty,' and after that an honorable discharge on account of 'the disability resulting from such injury while in the line of duty.'

"The committee are unanimously of the opinion that John Kalbfleisch should be restored to the roll, and they recommend the passage of the bill."

Mr. GROSVENOR. I think no stronger statement of this case can be made than the statement embraced in the report of the committee, and unless some member of the committee desires to oppose the passage of the bill, I will say nothing further, but will submit it on the statement here made.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

REBECCA E. SHOEMAKER.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. WILLIAMS) was the bill (H. R. 6990) to place the name of Rebecca E. Shoemaker on the pension-roll.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to place the name of Rebecca E. Shoemaker, widow of David R. P. Shoemaker, deceased, late a private of Company E, Eleventh Ohio Volunteers, on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. YODER) was read, as follows:

Rebecca E. Shoemaker is the widow of D. R. P. Shoemaker, late a corporal in Company E, Eleventh Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

Said D. R. P. Shoemaker died on 2d day of October, 1877, from disease of the liver. The claimant made application for pension on the ground that said disease was contracted by the deceased while in the Army in the line of service. The claim was rejected on the ground that the disease was not due to his military service. The evidence filed in the case is very contradictory, but an analysis of it gives the following well-established facts, to wit:

D. R. P. Shoemaker enlisted in Company E, Eleventh Ohio Volunteer Infantry; was promoted corporal; was captured at the battle of South Mountain; confined in Libby prison; was exchanged, and returned to Ohio in feeble health; was treated for liver disease by Dr. Debra; returned to regiment December 22, 1862, and was discharged on surgeon's certificate of disability December 31, 1863, and was treated for liver disease in 1864. He was a man of fine education, of good habits, and physically sound prior to his enlistment. The evidence is contradictory as to his habits from 1872 to the date of his death, and the Pension Office decided the doubt against the claimant; but from the evidence, carefully examined, the committee are of the opinion that the soldier died from disease contracted while a prisoner of war, and do therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JOHN E. LEWIS.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. LANE) was the bill (H. R. 7665) granting a pension to JOHN E. LEWIS.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John E. Lewis, a private, late of Company F, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment of Illinois Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. LANE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred House bill 7665, submit the following report:

John E. Lewis, the soldier in this case, made application to the Pension Office for a pension, and the claim was rejected on August 17, 1882, on the ground that the soldier was not mustered into the United States service. The facts are, as appear from affidavits on file and the record in this case, that the soldier enlisted August 12, 1862, and was discharged September 1, 1862, before he was mustered into service, and that on the 28th day of May, 1880, his declaration for a pension was filed with the above result.

There are several affidavits on file with this committee in support of this claim. Dr. I. B. McNutt swears that he knew the soldier personally since 1865, and has treated him ever since, and that the soldier has scrotal hernia of the left side, and that he treated him in August, 1887, for a very distressing disease of the lower bowels as well as stomach, which the doctor believes was the result of a strangulation caused by the aforesaid hernia in the scrotal sack until it set up an irritation of the stomach and bowels, and that affiant considers the disability one-half of his time by reason of said injury.

The claimant testifies that he enlisted in Company F, One hundred and fifteenth Regiment Illinois Infantry, for three years, on the 11th day of August, 1862, and immediately went into Camp Butler in Illinois, and was assigned to duty in said company, and for more than one month discharged the duty of a soldier; stood guard and did post duty along with the other members of the company, and drew clothing and rations, and answered roll-call as long as he was able. Some thirty days after his enlistment he was ordered to assist a teamster in turning a loaded army wagon in a narrow street, and the wagon fell on him in turning in such a way as to produce a rupture in the left side or groin, producing scrotal hernia of the left side, and because thereof he was unable to perform any more military duty, and was discharged by order of the post surgeon about the 13th day of September, 1862.

Affiant further testifies that when he went into Camp Butler he was examined by a board of surgeons and accepted, and that he had been discharged on account of the above injury, and that he has, since said injury, been disabled at least three-fourths of his time, and that his age is now fifty years.

W. T. Linn and George A. Henderson, two members of said company, on their oaths fully indorse the statement of the said soldier, as above set forth, as to his enlistment and injury.

Charles H. Griffith, captain of the company, testifies that the soldier enlisted, as above set forth, and was a member of said company; that the soldier, acting under the order of Colonel Fanning, who had charge of the post, assisted in turning an army wagon; the wagon tipped and fell on the soldier, which caused a rupture, or what is called scrotal hernia, of the left side, which so disabled him that he was unfit to perform further military duty, and was examined, in a denuded state, by the post surgeon and held not to be able to perform military labor or duty, and was discharged.

The consideration of all this testimony, as well as the papers on file in the Pension Office, leads to the conclusion that the soldier enlisted and was injured while in the service in line of duty, but before he was mustered into the service, and was examined then and there by the post surgeon, and his injury then and there received was pronounced by said surgeon to disqualify and disable said soldier from military duty, and in view thereof the committee recommend that said bill do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

LEMUEL R. REA.

Mr. ROGERS. I desire to ask a favor of the House. Under other circumstances I would not do it. I have had a sick family for two weeks. I have come here to-night rather under protest. There is a single claim I am interested in—the case of a man totally blind. I desire to leave the House as early as possible. I have not asked the House to consider a case this session and should be glad if that favor is granted to me.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. I think I must object.

Mr. ROGERS. If my wife were not sick I would not ask to interfere with the business of the committee. As I said, I came here to-night under a protest.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. I shall not object, but I do not want this to be regarded as a precedent for calling up any other bill outside of the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. ROGERS. Then I call up the bill (S. 2419) granting a pension to Lemuel R. Rea.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Lemuel R. Rea, late a private in Company I, Second Illinois Cavalry.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions recommended the following amendment:

After the word "cavalry" insert "at $40 per month."

The report (by Mr. WALKER) was read in part.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the report.

There was no objection.

The report in full is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2419) granting a pension to Lemuel R. Rea, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to adopt as their own the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, which is as follows:

"This claim was rejected by the Pension Office on the ground that the disabilities alleged by the claimant—blindness, piles, and lung disease—did not result from the service. Rea enlisted August 6, 1861, in Company I, Second Regiment Illinois Cavalry, and was discharged August 11, 1864.

"The testimony shows that at enlistment he was 'remarkably healthy,' and that he 'took great pride in his ability to endure hardship and undergo fatigue.' James S. McCullough, who knew him from boyhood, testifies that the claimant was 'a strong, healthy young man' at enlistment, and adds:

"'Living on a farm adjoining his father's home enables me to state without hesitation what I am sure is a fact, namely, that he lost his health after entering the service.'

"The claimant alleges that while in camp at Camp Massac, near Metropolis City, Ill., in October, 1861, he had an attack of the measles, which induced piles and lung disease, and which occasioned weakness of the eyes that finally, in 1881, resulted in total blindness.

"That he did so suffer from measles is shown by an abundance of testimony. 'There was a very heavy rain, that flooded the quarters, and he got very wet.' The next morning was very cold, and on account of the measles his comrades were obliged to remove him to a neighboring house; they did not think he would live.

"Anthony Coyle, a comrade, who was detailed to attend Rea and several others who were suffering from the measles, testifies that 'he complained frequently about his suffering' after his recovery, 'particularly from bleeding piles and weakness in his eyes.' On account of the disabilities that resulted from this sickness he was often excused from duty. 'All the boys knew he was weakly, so he was never pushed hard while on fatigue duty.'

"Walter E. Price, a comrade, testifies:

"'I have seen him when on scouting duty grow pale and almost fall from his horse; at such times he has told me he was suffering with the piles. His eyes were weak when he had those bad spells. That his weakness resulted from his wounds I have not a doubt.'

"S. S. Irwin, another comrade, testifies that—

"'Rea had a cough and was generally regarded as weak-lunged. He also suffered with his eyes. There was a time that he wore goggles. He was appointed farrier of his company, to make his duties easier.'

"That the claimant has never since ceased to suffer from piles is abundantly shown. On a special examination the examiner in his summary said:

"'That the claimant had measles in the service, and that, most probably resulting therefrom, his eyes became diseased, there is no doubt in my mind. Granting "soundness" at enlistment, he certainly contracted piles in the service, and has been disabled thereby more or less since his discharge.'

"In 1879 Rea had a protracted spell of sickness, consequent on his weakness and general debility; in 1881 he had another attack, and this time erysipelas settled in his eyes, causing total and permanent blindness. The Pension Office then seized on the proximate cause of the blindness (erysipelas) and disregarded the former weakness of the eyes and general weakness of the system, which might naturally enough have induced the erysipelas, and rejected the claim not only for blindness, but also for piles, which was overwhelmingly established.

"The claimant comes of an excellent family, is a reputable and worthy citizen, is totally blind, has a family of nine children, and is in sore need of help."

Your committee believe the claim to be meritorious, and therefore return the bill with the recommendation that it do pass, amended, however, by inserting after the word "cavalry," in line 5, the words "at $40 per month."

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment of the committee will be agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word about that amendment.

Several MEMBERS. It is not necessary. The bill is all right.

Mr. ROGERS. What I desire to say is very brief, and if the committee do not sanction it I shall have no more to say. I understand that the regular rate of pension for total blindness is $72. The report

of the Committee on Invalid Pensions does not state why they propose to reduce it to $40 in this case, and I think the amendment ought not to pass. I think this man ought to have whatever pension is allowed to other persons who are totally blind. With these observations I submit the case. If the Committee of the Whole think he ought to have but $40 a month, of course I have nothing more to say.

Mr. LYMAN. You say the man is totally blind?

Mr. ROGERS. Totally blind; the report so states—totally and permanently blind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is advised that the bill simply places the applicant on the pension-roll subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

Mr. ROGERS. That is exactly what I desire. I do not care to have any sum fixed in the bill. I desire that the Pension Office shall rate him.

Mr. SPOONER. What rate does the committee's amendment propose?

Mr. ROGERS. Forty dollars.

Mr. SPOONER. By whom was the bill reported?

Mr. ROGERS. By Mr. WALKER, of Missouri, who is not present.

Mr. SPOONER. I submit that there must have been some reason for the amendment.

Mr. CHEADLE. Mr. Chairman, does the report state that this man is totally blind?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands.

Mr. CHEADLE. Then it seems to me that it would be ridiculous to make the pension for total blindness in this case $40 a month, when the law fixes the rate at $72. We ought to be consistent in these matters.

Mr. CASWELL. Will the Chair please have read again that portion of the report which speaks of this man's blindness?

The Clerk read as follows:

The claimant comes of an excellent family, is a worthy and reputable citizen, is totally blind, has a family of nine children, and is in sore need of help.

Mr. CASWELL. Why do the committee propose to reduce the pension to $40?

Mr. ROGERS. They do not state the reason in their report, and I know of no reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon the amendment reported from the committee.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. What is the provision of the bill now, that the man shall be placed on the roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension law?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to thank the committee for its courtesy.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to take up a bill which I introduced at the request of an officer of the Pension Bureau. It is not for anybody in my district. I shall not be here for the next week or two, and therefore I ask that the bill be now taken up.

Mr. FORD. That is just my fix. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN]?

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOMPSON] objects. The Clerk will report the next bill.

HENRY L. POTTER.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. SPINOLA) was the bill (H. R. 7857) to increase the pension of Henry L. Potter.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension of Henry L. Potter, late colonel of the Seventy-first Regiment of New York State Volunteers, to $72 per month during his natural life, together with arrearage from January 4, 1876, the date of making his application, to June 17, 1878, at $30 per month, and from June 17, 1878, at $72 per month, in lieu of the pension heretofore paid and now received by him.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) was read, as follows:

The record of the claimant is as follows: He entered the service as lieutenant-colonel of the Seventy-first New York Volunteers, July 18, 1861; he was granted thirty days' leave of absence November 25, 1861, on the ground of disability, resulting from a severe contusion of chest and injury to spine, caused by his horse falling with and upon him; wounded in action August 27, 1862, in battle at Bristoe Station, Va. Register of commissioned officers shows him severely wounded in the left hand at date and place aforesaid.

Under date of October 29, 1862, he was granted thirty days' sick leave on account of this wound. The surgeon's certificate shows that the wound of hand had not yet healed, and there remained a fistulous opening, through which purulent matter discharged. Mustered in as colonel May 1, 1863. On August 20, 1863, he was granted sick leave for twenty days upon the following surgeon's certificate:

"I have carefully examined this officer, and find that he is suffering from gastro-enteritis, nephritis, dysentery, causing general debility, besides contusion of left leg above the ankle, caused by a piece of shell striking the part at the battle of Gettysburgh."

He was finally discharged, to date December 31, 1864.

Colonel Potter is now in receipt of pension at the rate of $30 per month, or total in rank, on account of gunshot wound of left hand and wrist, gunshot and shell wound of left leg, chronic diarrhea, and injury to chest.

The wound of hand alone entitles this officer to total in grade, or $30 per month, because of the anchylosed condition of the wrist. The wound of knee, according to the report of the examining surgeons, is 7 inches from knee, and has the appearance of having been severe in character. The disability is of a muscular character. The other injury of the leg is confined to its inner side. The cordicle is highly discolored. The muscles of the leg are flabby, and the measurements around are decidedly less than those of the right. The concussion incident to the injury serves to explain the numbness, muscular inability, and swollen condition of ankle. Disability from wounds of leg one-half total.

In addition to the wounds above described, Colonel Potter is now and has been suffering for many years with lung affection as well as its usual sequel, disease of heart. The medical referee of the Pension Office, under date of December 30, 1886, admits the latter to be the greater of the disabilities under which Colonel Potter is laboring, but gives it as his opinion that the same are not shown to be chargeable to the military service. In this view he was sustained by the Secretary of the Interior on March 26, 1887.

The Secretary says: "The appellant claims that his disabilities are so great as to require the constant aid and attendance of another person, but, even admitting this to be true, he has not shown that all his disabilities are due to the incidents of service. Colonel Potter is now receiving the highest pension of his rank, for the proved disabilities, that can be allowed under the law. It remains for him to make good his claim by presenting the necessary evidence * * *" In other words, were it shown to the satisfaction of the Pension Bureau that disease of heart and lungs are chargeable to the military service, Colonel Potter would be allowed a pension of $50 per month.

It would seem that the severe injury to chest, which is a matter of record, and which disqualified Colonel Potter for a long time for the performance of military duty, should afford ample explanation of the present condition of lungs and heart. But your committee find that the fact that he has been suffering from these diseases ever since discharge is established by lay and medical testimony the reliability of which is not questioned. The attending physicians attribute this condition to the combined effects of the wounds, injury, and diarrhea, all conceded to have their origin in the service and line of duty. There is much evidence presented to the committee, all tending to show that this officer, because of the combined disabilities, is dependent upon the personal aid and attendance of others daily to administer medical relief and for other purposes.

Colonel Potter was a most gallant officer, on many occasions by his personal and daring efforts turning apparent defeat into glorious victory. His bravery and daring on many fields of battle was duly recognized by Generals Sickles, Hooker, and others, who invariably assigned him and his gallant command to where the greatest danger threatened. He is now a complete wreck, and having served his country well, should not be left to suffer in his old age.

While the committee is fully impressed with the justness of the relief asked for, yet neither the rules of the committee nor of the House would warrant to accede to all the provisions contained in the bill under consideration, but unhesitatingly agree to afford such relief as precedents will warrant; and therefore report favorably on the bill and ask that it do pass, amended, however, by striking out all after the word "volunteers," in line 6, and inserting therein instead the words "to $50 per month."

The amendment recommended by the Committee on Invalid Pensions was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ELISHA GRISWOLD.

The next business on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. CHIPMAN) was the bill (S. 835) for the relief of Elisha Griswold.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Elisha Griswold, formerly of Company F, Third Michigan Cavalry.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 835) for the relief of Elisha Griswold, agree with the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions as to the facts.

The said report is as follows:

"The applicant entered the service January 23, 1864, in Company F, Third Michigan Cavalry, and was discharged February 12, 1866. He filed his application for a pension January 20, 1880, claiming that in January, 1865, he fell from a swing in a building occupied as a barracks and struck on his head and shoulder, sustaining injuries that have proved painful and materially interfered with his performance of manual labor. His statements as to the circumstances of the alleged injuries are substantiated by several comrades, and the examining surgeon gave him a one-half rating and the examining board a three-fourths rating.

"His application was rejected December 18, 1885, on the ground that the alleged injuries were not received in the line of duty.

"The soldier received his injury while engaged in recreation in the barracks where he was quartered. Notwithstanding, your committee are of opinion that such recreation is a necessary part of a soldier's life, and therefore recommend the passage of the bill."

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ENLOE. I wish to ask consent to have a bill taken up out of its regular order. It is a bill granting a pension to a constituent who, from all the information I have, will probably live but a very short time. The report is not long. If the House is willing to take up the bill, I would like to have it done at once, as I am scarcely able to be here this evening, and desire to retire.

Mr. THOMPSON, of California. I call for the regular order.

LEWIS DAVIS.

The next business on the Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5903) for the relief of Lewis Davis, a soldier of the war of 1812.

Mr. FINLEY. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and required to place the name of Lewis Davis, of Laclede County,

Missouri, a soldier of the war of 1812, on the pension-roll, at the rate of $33.33½ per month.

The report (by Mr. BLISS) was read, as follows:

The record shows that the claimant served in Capt. William Wallser's company, Thirty-ninth Infantry, from October 26, 1813, to October 26, 1814, in the war of 1812 with Great Britain. He is now a pensioner under act of February 14, 1871, at the rate of $8 per month. He is aged about ninety-two years. The committee recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the words "thirty-three and a third dollars," wherever the same may occur in said bill, and substituting in lieu thereof the words "twenty dollars," and that the bill so amended pass.

The question being taken on the amendment reported by the committee, to strike out "thirty-three and one-third dollars" wherever it occurs in the bill and substitute "$20," it was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

GEORGE W. KINCAID.

The next business on the Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7719) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kincaid.

Mr. FINLEY. I ask that this bill be considered.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, &c., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, of George W. Kincaid, war of 1812, to $50 per month.

The report (by Mr. FINLEY) was as follows:

The committee find the facts to be as stated in Senate Report No. 1373, Forty-ninth Congress, first session, which report is hereto annexed and made a part of this report, and is as follows:

"The committee have examined the papers in this case with very great interest. It is an application for increase of pension by a soldier of the war of 1812, and who is now fast verging to the close of a century of life, having been born in 1790.

"The claimant enlisted on the 28th of December, 1812, and was discharged on March 15, 1815, upon the certificate of Surg. T. Watkins, by reason of disabilities incurred by diseased liver and pulmonary affection.

"The claim was rejected on the ground that no certificate could be found on file, and that there was no evidence identifying the claimant as the soldier performing the service alleged.

"The claimant for increase is already a pensioner under the acts and supplements thereto giving pension to soldiers of the war of 1812.

"He is utterly and entirely destitute, and for many years has been wholly dependent upon his neighbors for care and subsistence, as the evidence discloses in a petition signed by numerous citizens and herewith appended as a part of this report:

"*To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States:*

"The petition of the subscribers, citizens of Richland County, Ohio, respectfully showeth that George W. Kincaid, whose residence for a great many years has been Belleville, Richland County, Ohio, was a soldier of the war of 1812; that his only means of support for many years has been the pension of $8 per month granted to the soldiers of that war. They further represent that in consequence of his great age, being now about ninety-six years of age, he has become so helpless that he requires the constant care and attendance of a nurse; that for several years this additional expense has been borne by his neighbors, as he has no family or relatives able to support him. In view of his services to his country, and his great age and helplessness, we respectfully ask that his pension be increased to $30 per month, which will barely pay the expense of his support for the remainder of his life.

"And as in duty bound, we will ever pray, etc.

"S. F. Hines, Wm. Gerloch, H. Farber, H. L. Maury, O. E. Oberlin, Irwin Fisher, R. J. Hubbill, Eli L. Hess, Reuben Evarts, Ben. O. Smith, O. S. Hawley, Gustav Etz, J. M. Reed, Wm. Long, U. F. Armstrong, C. V. Morrow, Wm. C. Beattie, T. A. Swonger, A. W. Lewis, J. J. Charles, Wm. Le Fever, Leroy Le Fever, J. M Alexander, J. R. Tennan, D. A. Lanehart, J. H. Burkholder, E. L. Garber, Wm. H. A. Raudebaugh, C. J. Brown, E. A. Brown, C. A. Lafferty, John Winemiller, S. B. Donel, M. Sharp, J. C. Potts, C. B. Waters, C. Strome, A. E. Shafer, Cyrus Gatton, B. Scott, W. A. Black, Cyrus Day, Wm. F. Madden, B. J. Levins, A. M. Young, C. N. Ink, W. H. Batterson, D. M. Teeter, A. G. Fans, J. C. Nelson, Charles Etz, J. P. Walsh, B. F. Greely, J. Jay Dean, R. W. Bell, J. W. Kelly, O. H. Gurney, A. Cunningham, Bent Charles, O. Howard, Henry Spain, Daniel Walker, W. H. Smith, H. O. Sheidley, Chas. Purcell, Jacob Winemeller, Wm. F. Charles, J. F. Greely, Aaron Leedy, J. S. Garber, John Gatton, J. W. Rhinehalt, Calvin Robinson, D. L. Young, George Rhein, B. C. Brown, Dr. W. T. McMahon, A. Fitz-John, J. E. Howard, Frank Shafer, A. J. Flaharty, M. L. Bonar, J. V. Oberlin, H. L. Canfield, D. J. Rummel, H. C. McCluer.

"In his own sworn statement made before Hon. John Meredith, probate judge of Richland County, Ohio, on the 20th day of January, 1861, the veteran claimant qualifies as to his own identity as the same Kincaid who was a sergeant in Captain Barnard's company, Fourteenth United States Infantry, during the war with Great Britain declared in 1812. That his disabilities were incurred in Sackett's Harbor, N. Y., while in the line of duty, from which he has never recovered. For three years after his discharge he resided in Baltimore, and was treated for said disease of the liver by Surgeon Watkins, long since deceased. That he lived at other places for short intervals, and has been treated by other physicians, but received no benefit therefrom.

"His first application for the required increase of pension was made in 1861, and he testifies that the long delay in seeking aid from the Government arose from his ignorance of the rules of the Department and the law. In June, 1862, for some unknown reason, not stated in the records on file in the Pension Office, the further progress of the case was suspended. He comes now before Congress for the relief which, in the opinion of the committee, he should have had long years ago.

"In further proof of his identity the records of the Third Auditor's Office for September, 1835, the accounts of Paymaster Dobbin, United States Army, show George William Kincaid to have been a sergeant of Captain Barnard's company, Fourteenth United States Infantry, the dates of his enlistment, discharge, and the reason for the same.

"Further, the following certificate from Captain McIlvaine is to the minds of the committee conclusive:

"'I do hereby certify upon my word and honor as a late officer and a gentleman that I know George William Kincaid, and that he served in the Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry faithfully and honestly in the late war, and that he was under my command as an attendant at the recruiting headquarters in Baltimore, and that I left him doing duty in the office under Colonel Lane and Captain Cummings in 1814.

"'WM. McILVAINE,

"'*Late Captain in the Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry.*

"'WHITE HALL, BALTIMORE COUNTY, *July* 18, 1835.'

"Samuel B. Hugo, a surgeon's mate in the war of 1812, certifies to his personal knowledge as to the service of the claimant in that war.

"In January, 1861, Drs. H. O. Mack and S. M. Chandler made a personal examination of the claimant's condition, and found him suffering from chronic derangement of the liver, and by reason of this and a combination of diseases to be totally disabled from obtaining a living by manual labor.

"In view, therefore, of the foregoing testimony, which is conclusive to the committee as to the merits of the case, and from the great age of the claimant, they recommend the speedy passage of the bill."

The committee therefore adopt said Senate report as the report of this committee, and recommend that the accompanying bill do pass, with the following amendment: In line 6 strike out the words "fifty dollars" and insert in lieu thereof the words "thirty dollars."

The amendment reported by the committee, to strike out, in line 6, the words "fifty dollars" and insert in lieu thereof the words "thirty dollars," was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

WILLIAM COMPTON.

The next business on the Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6574) for the relief of William Compton.

Mr. FINLEY. I call for the consideration of this bill.

The bill was read, of follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay William Compton, a soldier in the regular Army, in the Thirty-ninth Tennessee Infantry and other regiments, from 1814 to 1819, $25 a month, instead of $8 a month, as at present allowed and paid him.

The report (by Mr. FINLEY) was read, as follows:

The official records show that William Compton was duly enlisted on the 30th of June, 1814, and served in Capt. Richard H. Bell's company, Thirty-ninth Regiment United States Infantry, and was transferred to the Seventh United States Infantry, and after the treaty of peace he was sent in command to Creek Nation and was discharged at St. Mark's, Fla., June 29, 1819, from Captain Blackstone's company, Seventh United States Infantry, thus serving five years, being the entire time for which he enlisted.

On the 31st day of March, 1871, he filed an application for pension, and was allowed a pension of $8 per month, commencing February 14, 1871, under the service-pension act of that date. On the 2d day of April, 1887, the pensioner applied for an increase, alleging blindness, deafness, nervousness, and general disability on account of extreme old age, being unable to perform any kind of manual labor.

As the service-pension act fixed the rate of pension at $8 a month, and no provision being made for any increase over that amount, his application was rejected.

The soldier now appeals to Congress for relief, and asks that his pension be increased from $8 per month (the rate he is now receiving) to $25 a month.

He is now nearly ninety years of age; has no property; no one to care for him, and is totally unable to perform any kind of manual labor.

In view of the foregoing facts and in consideration of the soldier's long, faithful, and honorable service in behalf of his country, his extreme old age, his feeble condition, his poverty, and his high standing as a citizen, your committee recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

HANNAH H. LATHAM.

The next business on the Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8506) for the relief of Hannah H. Latham; which, as no member called for its consideration, was passed over.

W. A. LEMASTER.

The next business on the Calendar was the bill (S. 647) for the relief of W. A. Lemaster.

Mr. FINLEY. I call for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to pay to W. A. Lemaster, of Iconium, Iowa, the whole sum of the pension due to George Lemaster, deceased, at the date of the death of said George Lemaster, to wit, June 23, 1873, said pension having been erroneously withheld from said George Lemaster from March, 1861, during and up to June 23, 1873: *Provided*, That said W. A. Lemaster shall first make proof satisfactory to said Secretary that he is the sole surviving heir of the said George Lemaster, deceased.

Mr. MATSON. I make a point of order against this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. MATSON. At these Friday evening sessions the business is expressly limited to the consideration of bills granting pensions. This bill is in the nature of a claim against the Government, and is not now entitled to consideration.

The CHAIRMAN (after examining the bill). The Chair is clearly of opinion that, in accordance with the special order under which these Friday night sessions are held, this bill can not be now considered. It is in the nature of a claim; and the special order confines the business of these Friday evening sessions to bills granting pensions.

Mr. MATSON. I move that the bill be reported to the House with the recommendation that it be referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. This bill was considered in the Senate by the Committee on Pensions, and in this House, after a reference to the Committee on Pensions, it has been reported favorably. I make the point that under the circumstances any rule which might have excluded this bill from consideration has been waived, and that it is competent now for the Committee of the Whole to consider it.

The CHAIRMAN. Within the recollection of the Chair, a similar point to the present was made in the Forty-ninth Congress, and it was then held that bills of this character were not in order at Friday night sessions. The question is now on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MATSON].

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, is it necessary that this

bill should be reported back to the House with the recommendation that it be referred to the Committee on Claims?

Mr. CHEADLE. I make the point of order that if it is not proper for the Committee of the Whole to consider the bill, it is not competent for them to make any order whatever with reference to its disposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the motion is in order.

Mr. ADAMS. Undoubtedly the motion is in order. It will rest, of course, in the discretion of the House whether the bill shall take the course proposed. The bill, having been considered and reported by the Committee on Pensions, is properly on the Calendar. The point of order may be well taken that it can not be considered this evening; but it does not follow that the bill must be referred to any committee.

Mr. PERKINS. It should retain its present position on the Calendar.

Several MEMBERS. Certainly.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. That was the point I was making on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If the Chair will allow me, I should like to be heard on this point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. MATSON. I apprehend the motion is perfectly in order, but I do not wish to hamper the gentleman who has charge of the claim, and therefore withdraw it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The motion having been withdrawn, it is not necessary for me to say what I intended to say, that the motion is clearly out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state, after a full investigation of this question, that it occurs to the Chair if the bill is properly on the Calendar it ought to remain there.

The Chair is advised differently, though, by a number of gentlemen, but thinks, after all, that it should remain on the Calendar, and if we have no jurisdiction of it, that we should not disturb it at all. Hence it will remain where it is.

HENRY C. RICHARDSON.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar (called up by Mr. FINLEY) was the bill (H. R. 3706) granting a pension to Henry C. Richardson.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Henry C. Richardson, late of Company K, Fifth Kentucky Volunteers.

Mr. FINLEY. This bill, if passed, will only give this man a pension of $2 a month for the loss of a finger; and as the report is lengthy, I ask consent to dispense with the reading of it.

Mr. MATSON. Let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. HUNTER) was read, as follows:

Henry C. Richardson was enrolled as a private in Company K, Fifth Kentucky Infantry Volunteers, October 15, 1861, and was discharged November 4, 1864. On April 13, 1885, he filed in the office of the Commissioner of Pensions a claim for pension on account of the loss of the third finger of the left hand on the 8th of October, 1862, near the battle-field of Perryville, Ky. This claim was rejected October 16, 1886, upon the ground that claimant had declared his inability to furnish evidence showing that the alleged injury was received in the line of duty.

The certificate of Claiborne J. Walton, M. D., shows that the claimant has lost the third finger of his left hand at the metacarpal joint.

In an affidavit filed April 1, 1886, the claimant states that his finger was shot away by the accidental discharge of his gun; that he was sitting upon a fence with his gun in his hands when the rail upon which he was sitting broke and threw his weight on the hammer of the gun and caused the discharge by which his hand was injured. He states that he does not now remember any one who was present when his injury was received.

In an affidavit filed January 21, 1886, the claimant states that the captain in charge of his company at the time is now dead, as are also the lieutenant and first sergeant. The claimant states also that he was injured as alleged about 4 p. m. October 8, 1862; that when so injured he was in the rear upon leave granted by his captain; that at the time he was suffering from chronic diarrhea, and that his captain had told him to go to the rear, and to remain there "until he got better, and when able to do so to rejoin his company."

The records of the War Department furnish the following information touching claimant's service:

"September and October, 1862, absent; accidentally wounded at Perrysville; now in Louisville, Ky.; same to December 31, 1862; January and Fubruary, 1863, absent; sick in Hart County, Ky., October 20, 1862; the claimant returned to duty April 6, 1863; July and August, 1863, on detached service as teamster and so continued, so far as shown by company records on file, until May, 1864, when he was reported sick at Nashville, Tenn.; he was mustered out of service, with detachment, November 4, 1864."

In response to a letter from the Pension Office, John D. Brent, late captain of Company K, Fifth Kentucky Volunteers, under date of September 23, 1886, says:

"Henry C. Richardson lost his finger on or about the battle of Perryville, in 1862, by the accidental discharge of his gun. He was a faithful soldier and did his duty when able."

D. T. Moneypenny states under oath that he knows that the claimant—

"Was wounded at Perryville, Ky., in the left hand, by the loss of his third finger; said finger was shot off close to the palm of the hand, leaving no joints; saw him a short time before he was wounded; also saw his wound dressed."

P. T. Richardson, a member of claimant's company, states under oath that the claimant—

"Was wounded at Perryville, Ky., in the left hand, by the loss of his third finger; said finger was shot off close to the palm of the hand, leaving no joints. He also says that he saw him at time he was wounded."

The reputation of these witnesses is reported good by the postmaster at Munfordville, Ky.

In view of the fact that claimant did faithful service for more than three years, more than two years of which service was rendered after he received the injury of left hand, and in view of the fact that said injury was undoubtedly received while he was in the service, although he is unable to furnish evidence showing technical "line of duty," your committee recommend the passage of the bill for his relief.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

WILLIAM BURK.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6245) for the relief of William Burk.

Mr. FINLEY. I ask the consideration of that bill.

Mr. FORD. I rise to a question of order. Do I understand that the order made this evening contemplates that any member present can call up a bill when it is reached on the Calendar? For instance, that a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions could call up his own bills or bills reported by him as they are reached, although the members who may have introduced them are not present to call them up for themselves?

The CHAIRMAN. Any member has the right when the bill is reached on the Calendar to ask its consideration under the order made to-night.

Mr. FORD. Whether interested or not?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to all the provisions and limitations of the pension laws of the United States, the name of William Burk, late lieutenant of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer United Infantry.

The report (by Mr. HUNTER) was read, as follows:

The claimant filed a claim for pension in the Bureau of Pensions April 19, 1875, which was rejected upon the ground that at the time when the claimant contracted the alleged disability he was not in the military service of the United States.

The records of the War Department show that the claimant was mustered into the service as first lieutenant of Company D, Thirtieth Kentucky Volunteers, to date May 2, 1864.

The claimant alleges that about the month of "December, 1863, he was called to fill the position of first lieutenant of said Company D," and that about the month of February, 1864, at Monticello, Ky., he contracted rheumatism, which has totally disabled him for the performance of manual labor.

Notwithstanding the fact that the records of the War Department fail to show that the claimant was in the service in said company and regiment, there is abundant evidence on file to show that the claimant was, at the time when he alleges he contracted the disability, with the company, and was engaged in the performance and discharge of the duties of a soldier, and did contract rheumatism, which affected his left leg and ankle. The evidence on file establishes also the continuance of said disease to the present time.

The medical examinations show that the claimant's left leg has wasted away, and that there exists anchylosis of the hip, knee, and ankle joints. The evidence filed by claimant satisfactorily shows that prior to his service in said company and regiment the claimant was free from rheumatism. It appears from the evidence that the claimant is in destitute circumstances.

Your committee would recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the word "united" in the seventh line thereof, and by substituting therefor the word "mounted;" and by inserting, after the word "infantry," in the eighth line thereof, the words "and to pay him a pension at the rate of $17 per month," and when so amended that the bill do pass.

The amendments recommended by the committee were adopted.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ABIGAIL SULLIVAN.

The next business on the Private Calendar, the consideration of which was asked by Mr. FINLEY, was the bill (H. R. 6577) granting a pension to Abigail Sullivan.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to all the limitations, restrictions, and provisions of the pension laws of the United States, the name of Abigail Sullivan, widow of the late William Sullivan, late of Company G, Twelfth Kentucky Volunteer Infantry.

The report (by Mr. HUNTER) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6577) granting a pension to Abigail Sullivan, have had the same under consideration, and respectfully report:

William Sullivan, husband of Abigail Sullivan, was a soldier in Company G, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, from October 15, 1861, to February 20, 1863; that he was discharged on account of disability contracted in the service in January or February, 1862; that his disability continued from date of discharge until his death in 1876, gradually and continuously growing worse; that in his lifetime he applied for pension on account of said disability, which was not allowed until after his death; that after his death his widow applied for pension as his, the soldier's widow, which was rejected on the ground that soldier did not contract the disease of which he died in the service, but that he died from pneumonia.

This conclusion of the Department must have been reached from the testimony of Dr. Baugh and Mary Ann Meisser. The former was not present and did not see soldier during his last sickness, and Mary Ann Meisser was not a physician and only gives her opinion. Dr. Baugh gave his opinion from what he had heard of the case, but testifies that soldier was sound when he entered the service; was in feeble health and not able to labor at date of and after discharge; that prior to his death soldier had been quite feeble, was suffering from general prostration of nervous system, and his lungs were affected from colds and disease contracted in the service. It is also shown by other reliable witnesses and by the record that soldier was partially paralyzed and suffering from rheumatism at date of discharge and suffered from same until his death, having a bad cough and complaining of severe pain in his left leg, hip, side, and breast.

The committee deem it unimportant as to whether pneumonia was the disease with which he died or not, since it is, in the opinion of your committee, evident from the proof before them that soldier contracted such bodily disability in the service of the United States and in line of duty as continued up to and

must have invited and necessitated the disease of which he died, and besides, the proof as to the soldier's disability prior to and at time of death constitute a state of case likely to, and most probably did, result in pneumonia.

The committee, after a careful consideration of all the facts presented to them in the records in the Interior Department and other proof, are satisfied this is a meritorious case, and recommend that the bill pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

PENELOPE MORTON.

The next business on the Private Calendar, the consideration of which was asked by Mr. THOMAS, of Kentucky, was the bill (H. R. 3690) granting a pension to Penelope Morton, widow of Lieut. James Morton.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Penelope Morton, widow of James Morton, late lieutenant Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteers.

Mr. THOMAS, of Kentucky. This bill, Mr. Chairman, or rather a bill identical in all respects with it, was passed by both Houses of Congress at the last session, but failed to receive the approval of the President.

Mr. MATSON. Let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. HUNTER) is as follows:

A bill was introduced in the Forty-ninth Congress to grant a pension to James Morton, late lieutenant Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteers.

The appended report, which the committee adopt, clearly and fully sets forth the evidence in the case:

"[House Report No. 3265, Forty-ninth Congress, first session.]

"James Morton was mustered into Company F, Twenty-second Kentucky Volunteers January 10, 1862, and resigned February 18, 1863.

"The claim was rejected by the Pension Office on the ground of no record, and that the disability did not make its appearance until after his resignation.

"The claimant states: December, 1862, he was detailed for picket duty; that it rained all night, and he became thoroughly wet and chilled, and was forced to march next morning without breakfast, and that night slept on some palings taken from a fence to keep out of the water, and the following morning was chilled through and stiff, and caught a severe cold, which lasted until he arrived home. The alleged rheumatism did not make its appearance until a few days after his arrival home, which was in March, 1863.

"Dr. Charles W. Secrest states that he became acquainted with claimant in 1857, and saw him up to his enlistment, and knows that he was an able-bodied man in every respect.

"J. W. Fulton states that he was a physician in early life, and knows claimant was a sound man and free from rheumatism at enlistment.

"W. J. Worthington, colonel of claimant's regiment, states that he knew claimant well prior to and at enlistment, and there was not a more robust man in the command until claimant contracted rheumatism, near Vicksburgh, by exposure to almost continuous rain and having to lie on the damp ground without shelter, and adds that this claim is certainly a meritorious one.

"F. C. Robb, adjutant of claimant's regiment, states that he has known claimant for about twenty-five years, and knows that he was a sound, stout, and healthy man when he entered the service, and believes his (claimant's) rheumatism was the result of exposure to bad weather while in the service.

"Thomas Bush, comrade of claimant, states that—

"'Claimant was very sick after the charge on Chickasaw Bluffs, and vomited a great deal. They were out in the swamp of Mississippi River without tents and exposed to bad weather, and believes claimant's rheumatism resulted from said exposure.'

"Capt. John L. Goodman testifies that—

"'When the claimant went into service he was uncommonly strong and healthy, and free from any disease; that in the latter part of December, 1862, the men had to lie on the wet ground while the army was moving from the mouth of the Yazoo River to Chickasaw Bayou, and on the day the charge was made claimant complained of sickness and looked sick: that he gave out during the charge and was compelled to lie down on the battle-field, and from that time on complained of being sick, claiming it to have been brought on by exposure and lying on the wet ground.'

"John Pratt, claimant's comrade, testifies that—

"'At the charge on Chickasaw Bluffs claimant was taken sick, and affiant knows that it was in consequene of claimant being exposed to the weather.'

"A. S. Davis, another of claimant's comrades, testified substantially as above.

"Lieutenant-Colonel Worthington states that claimant has never recovered from the rheumatism contracted during service, and is now hopelessly and permanently crippled.

"Adjutant Robb states that since claimant came out of service he has been disabled by rheumatism.

"J. W. Fulton, who in early life was a physician, states that he has seen the claimant off and on since his discharge, and that he has suffered continuously from rheumatism, first of an inflammatory character, and then chronic.

"Dr. Secrest states that he saw the claimant in 1867, and he was then not able to help himself on account of rheumatism. Up to 1881 claimant was one-half disabled, and since that time he has been totally disabled until about six months ago, when claimant was able to go on crutches.

"John Moran states that in June or July, 1863, he was working with the claimant, and claimant was then complaining of rheumatism in one of his legs, and had to quit work on account of said disease, and knows claimant has had it every year since.

"Mathew P. Stewart states that he was at claimant's house in 1863, and claimant was then complaining of rheumatism, and was suffering from that disease. Affiant boarded with the claimant from 1864 to 1866, and knows claimant suffered from rheumatism more or less during the time he staid with him.

"Voluminous testimony from the most influential and upright citizens in Greenup County, Kentucky, and Scioto County, Ohio, testify to claimant being a man of honor, standing high in the estimation of all to whom he is known; that claimant at one time possessed a large property, but has consumed it all on account of his disease, and while it lasted would not appeal to the Government for help, and a consideration of his claim would not only be appreciated by the claimant, but by all the old soldiers in his community.

"The claimant is well known to Hon. W. H. Wadsworth, member of the Forty-ninth Congress, who can say that the claimant is a deserving and reputable citizen.

"Your committee, after an examination of the case, find the claim to be a meritorious one. They therefore recommend the passage of the bill, amended by striking out lines 6 and 7 and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'of James Morton, late lieutenant Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteers.'"

Before said bill was finally acted on the said James Morton died. A bill was then introduced in the Forty-ninth Congress granting a pension to Penelope Morton, widow of said James Morton. This bill passed both Houses late in the session and was sent to the President for his approval, but not in time for his examination, and the bill failed for want of approval. Said bill is hereto attached and referred to. The bill under consideration is the same as passed and referred to above.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

During the reading of the report,

Mr. WILLIAMS said: I move to dispense with the further reading of the report.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PERKINS in the chair). The gentleman from Kentucky has stated that this bill passed both Houses of Congress at the last session, but failed to receive Executive sanction. If there be no further objection, the reading of the report will be dispensed with, and it will be ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The report is printed above.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JANE BROWN DUNN.

The next business on the Private Calendar, the consideration of which was asked by Mr. MATSON, was the bill (H. R. 8159) granting a pension to Jane Brown Dunn.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jane Brown Dunn, daughter of William H. H. Dunn, late a private in Company A, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, and Company L, Fourth Indiana Cavalry, and to pay her a pension of $12 per month from and after the passage of this act.

The report (by Mr. MATSON) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8159) granting a pension to Jane Brown Dunn, submit the following report:

William H. H. Dunn was a private in Company A, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, and in Company L, Fourth Indiana Cavalry, in which service he died on the 4th of December, 1863. His only child, Jane Brown Dunn, then a minor, was pensioned at the rate of $8 per month, commencing June 4, 1864, and ending by limitation December 5, 1877.

She now represents that she is prostrate and utterly helpless from spinal disease; that the death of her father left her without relatives and entirely dependent upon strangers upon whom she has no claim, and she prays for the passage of a special act for her relief.

Respectable citizens of Hanover, Ind., the home of the petitioner, make the following statement:

"To our knowledge she has been for over a year entirely prostrated, so as not to be able to raise herself in her bed, and we are sure the granting of a pension to her will meet the approbation of all who know the helpless condition in which she is placed.

"J. B. GARRITT,
"*Professor of Hanover College.*
"W. T. RANKIN,
"*Merchant.*
"DAVID ENNIS,
"*Late Captain Company A, Twenty-second Indiana Volunteers.*
"F. J. BRANDT,
"*Postmaster, Hanover, Ind.*
"L. H. JONES,
"*Late Private Company I, One hundred and forty-fifth Indiana Volunteers.*"

Dr. E. L. Conklin, of Madison, Ind., makes oath that Jane B. Dunn is and has been under his professional care, and that she is a confirmed invalid from curvature of the spine.

The pension laws do not apply to the case of this helpless and dependent daughter of the dead soldier, but there are precedents for extending relief by special enactments in cases of this kind. The committee therefore report the bill favorably, and recommend that it do pass with an amendments triking out the word "twelve," in line 9, and inserting "eighteen."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

CHARLES W. SANBORN.

The next business on the Private Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. DINGLEY) was the bill (H. R. 362) to increase the pension of Charles W. Sanborn.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to increase the pension of Charles W. Sanborn, late a private in Company H, Seventeenth Maine Regiment, by giving said Sanborn a proper rating for right inguinal hernia, as an additional disability to those for which he is now pensioned.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 362) to increase the pension of Charles W. Sanborn, having considered the same, report as follows:

Claimant was a private in Company H, Seventeenth Maine Volunteers, and was pensioned for chronic diarrhea and gunshot wound of the foot, but failed to include hernia in his application. Soldier subsequently made application for an increase on account of hernia, which claim was rejected by the Department.

The evidence on file in this case conclusively shows that before soldier was discharged, and while at home on furlough and dangerously sick, a hernia appeared. On this point Dr. Albion Cobb testifies in these words:

"I am a surgeon and physician, and as such have, from time to time, since my return from the Army, attended Charles W. Sanborn. Said Sanborn has, and had at the time of his discharge from the service of the United States, a scrotal hernia on the right side, in regard to which I have repeatedly given advice and treatment; that being a medical officer in the same division with said Sanborn I knew him while in the Army at the front, and knew that he was sick with

chronic diarrhea, and thereby reduced to an extreme degree of debility, and I believe and have no doubt that the debility, together with the violent straining occasioned by said diarrhea, was the predisposing and exciting cause of said hernia."

This claim was specially examined, and the special examiner found as follows: "I have no doubt but the hernia resulted from weakness, as is alleged. The surrounding circumstances were such that the witnesses could not well be mistaken as to the time they saw the hernia, as the soldier required the same care as an infant. As to his emaciated and feeble condition for at least eight months there can be no doubt. I think the claim meritorious, and recommend its admission."

It need only be added that soldier before discharge was for a long time so sick as to require constant and unremitting care, and that during that time the hernia appeared, unquestionably due to extreme debility and the results of straining at stool, and that the hernia was seen and examined by many persons during that time, including one physician. Your committee are fully persuaded that a mistake was made in not allowing this claim in the Pension Office, and therefore report the bill back favorably, and recommend its passage.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

RAPHAEL FOWLER.

The next business on the Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. WEBER) was the bill (H. R. 8217) granting a pension to Raphael Fowler.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the name of Raphael Fowler be placed upon the pension-roll of the United States as the dependent father of Raphael S. Fowler, late a private in the Fifty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteers, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) is as follows:

That it satisfactorily appears from the evidence in this case that Mr. Fowler, the beneficiary, is now a man seventy-three years of age, and is now living with and supported by one of his sons; that in the fall of 1860 his wife died, leaving him with eight children, five sons and three daughters, the oldest then being twenty-three years of age, and the youngest being three years of age; that in the fall of the same year he, with three of his children, was taken sick, and one of the children died. He was then compelled to break up his family, placing the younger ones with relatives.

Immediately on the breaking out of the war of the rebellion his oldest son enlisted in the Twenty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteers; that another son enlisted in the Ninth Illinois Cavalry; that another son, Raphael S. Fowler, in October, 1861, enlisted in the Fifty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteers; that being anxious to be with this last son, his namesake, the beneficiary, though past the age for military service, enlisted in the same company with his son, Raphael, and served with him until his death, he being killed in the battle of Corinth, Miss., in 1862.

The son left surviving him neither mother, wife, nor child. That the beneficiary remained in the service until July, 1865, he having re-enlisted in the Fifty-seventh Regiment Illinois Veteran Volunteers, when he was honorably discharged. That he has lost all property of every kind; has become too old and feeble to support himself by his own manual labor, and is now entirely dependent upon others for his support. That all his children are in poor circumstances, with families depending upon them for support.

The committee think that this poor old man, having given to his country the service of himself and three of his sons, and the life of one of them, and now dependent upon others for his support, is justly entitled to the relief given by this bill, and they therefore recommend that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

EVELINE M. ALEXANDER.

The next pension business on the Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4578) granting a pension to Eveline M. Alexander, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Alexander.

Mr. WHEELER. If the gentleman is not present who introduced the bill I ask that it be considered.

Mr. WEBER. Let me state to the gentleman from Alabama that Mr. SAWYER is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHEELER. At the suggestion of some gentlemen around me, that the gentleman from New York may desire to be present, I withdraw the request.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be passed over informally, retaining its place on the Calendar.

ELIZA ANN SHAVER.

The next business on the Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. SEYMOUR) was the bill (H. R. 891) granting a pension to Eliza Ann Shaver.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eliza Ann Shaver, as mother of Benjamin N. Shaver, late of Company E, Twenty-second Regiment New York State Cavalry.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 891) granting a pension to Eliza Ann Shaver, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Eliza Ann Shaver is the foster-mother of Benjamin N. Shaver, who enlisted in Company E, Twenty-second Regiment New York Cavalry, December 18, 1863, and died November 6, 1864, while a prisoner of war, at Salisbury, N. C.

The soldier, as shown by the evidence, was adopted by the claimant at the age of three weeks, and was taken care of and provided for by her until enlistment at the age of seventeen years. She was a widow at the adoption of the soldier, and has remained so ever since. Was never possessed of any real estate, while her personal property does not exceed in value the sum of $125. For many years, and up to within a short time, she was supported by a son-in-law, but his death has cut off this avenue of support, and at the age of seventy-six is now left without means of adequate support. The evidence also shows that the soldier contributed to the claimant's support during his service. She has no status before the Pension Bureau, because the law provides for natural mothers only.

But Congress having in similar cases granted relief, and believing from the evidence presented that the case under consideration is meritorious, your committee report favorably on the accompanying bill and ask that it do pass, amended, however, by inserting after the word "as," in line 6, the word "foster," and also after the word "cavalry," in line 8, the words "and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

EDMUND RYAN.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. BELDEN) was the bill (H. R. 7097) granting a pension to Edmund Ryan.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Edmund Ryan, dependent father of Michael Ryan, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension under the provisions and limitations of the general pension law.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7097) granting a pension to Edmund Ryan, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Edmund Ryan is the father of Michael Ryan, who was killed in battle at Bull Run, August 30, 1862, while serving as private in Company K, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteers.

The father applied for pension October 2, 1878, but his claim was rejected by the Pension Office on the ground that he was able to support himself at time of the son's death.

About 1859 claimant and his son, the soldier, contracted for the purchase of a salt block in Onondaga County, New York, and in security therefor mortgaged a house and lot, all the property the father owned. The son's enlistment necessitated the employment of a laborer, which reduced the profits in the works, and gradually the business began to run down, until the mortgage upon the house and lot was foreclosed. Claimant was thus left without means of support except that derived from his daily labor. For a time he was employed at the salt-works at a salary of $25 per month, but old age has compelled him to abandon all work, and, at the age of eighty-two years, he is dependent upon the charity of others.

The soldier left neither wife nor child surviving him. His mother died before his enlistment.

Congress has always liberally responded to appeals made by dependent parents of deceased soldiers, who, under the provisions of existing laws, are prevented from a successful prosecution of their claims before the Pension Bureau.

The case under consideration appears to be meritorious and coming within the well-established precedents. Your committee therefore report favorably on the accompanying bill, and ask that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

EMELINE C. YOUNG.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. BELDEN) was the bill (H. R. 6949) granting a pension to Emaline C. Young.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Emaline C. Young, widow of Roswell Young, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-ninth New York Volunteers, and pay her a pension, subject to the provisions and limitations of the general pension law.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions recommended the following amendment:

In line 5 strike out "Emaline" and insert "Emeline."

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Emeline C. Young."

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read in part.

Mr. SPINOLA (interrupting the reading). I ask unanimous consent that only the findings of the committee be read, and that the report be printed in full in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The report in full is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6949) granting a pension to Emeline C. Young, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

The claimant is the widow of Roswell Young, who enlisted in Company D, One hundred and forty-ninth New York Volunteers, September 5, 1862, and was discharged therefrom August 15, 1865. He received a shell wound of shoulder at the battle of Chancellorsville, Va., May 3, 1863, for which he drew a pension at date of his death, February 8, 1885.

The widow's claim has been rejected by the Pension Office on the ground that in the opinion of the medical referee the death-cause is not shown to be chargeable to the soldier's military service.

Dr. Erastus S. Mumford, the attending physician, and who made a post-mortem examination of the body, testifies:

"Attended the soldier about a month in spring of 1883. Had severe pain in left side, extending from the shoulder into the back and hip. Had high fever and vomiting. It was difficult to diagnose the case, but attributed the trouble to the wound of shoulder. In July and August, 1883, soldier was confined to bed, suffering from the same symptoms.

"From that time until November, 1884, affiant treated soldier more or less for the same trouble in a milder form. On December 26, 1884, found soldier in bed, weak, vomiting, pain in side, with hardened condition of stomach and liver, and continued to treat him until his death, February 8, 1885. Post-mortem found an enlarged liver scirrhus, extensive disease of stomach and pancreas. The whole upper part of the abdominal cavity was broken down, and the organs contained therein in a state of suppuration. There is no history of cancer in the family, and it was affiant's opinion that the disease was induced by the acute and chronic inflammation which had supervened from the wound of shoulder."

The wound was evidently a serious one, as soldier was under treatment for a long time after its receipt and transferred to the Invalid Corps. There is also record of treatment for chronic rheumatism while in the service.

Claimant was married to the soldier in 1844. After the receipt of his wound

she went to the hospital in which he was treated and remained there as nurse, giving much of her time to the care of other wounded soldiers. She is now old and left without friends or means of support.

The soldier's death-cause is known, but the origin of the fatal disease must necessarily be more or less involved in doubt; but the sworn statement of the attending physician, who stands high socially and professionally, would seem to justify your committee in solving the doubts in the case in favor of this old and poor widow, and therefore return the accompanying bill with the recommendation that it do pass.

The amendments were agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JESSIE M. BARTHAUER.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. CHIPMAN) was the bill (H. R. 8722) granting a pension to Jessie M. Barthauer.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension-rolls, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jessie M. Barthauer, widow of William C. Barthauer, late private of Company A, One hundredth Regiment New York Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read in part.

Mr. CHIPMAN (interrupting the reading). I suggest that only the letter part of the report be read, containing the recommendation of Commissioner Black.

There was no objection.

The report in full is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions have had presented for their consideration, under the joint resolution of May 29, 1830, through the honorable Secretary of the Interior, a letter addressed to him by the honorable Commissioner of Pensions, recommending favorable consideration of the pension claim of Jessie M. Barthauer.

From this letter and the files of the Pension Bureau it appears that Jessie M. Barthauer is the widow of William C. Barthauer, who served as private in Company A, One hundredth New York Volunteers, from August 22, 1862, to May 8, 1865. At the assault at Fort Wagner, July 18, 1863, he received a serious wound of left hand resulting in nearly total loss of same. He also received a gunshot wound of left thigh. From these wounds he suffered more or less the rest of his life. The pains became excruciating, often depriving him of sleep. He had necrosis of the bone of left wrist, and an open ulcer; the thumb had been amputated and the four fingers were stiff and entirely useless.

In the left thigh there was atrophy of the muscles, and an injury to the sciatic nerve. To relieve the suffering due to his wounds, morphine was taken under medical advice, increasing the doses as his sufferings became more intense. For the six days preceding his death his pains had been so severe that he could not sleep, but he abstained from the use of morphine until the night before his death, when he purchased ten half-grain pills. The next evening the attending physician was called in and found him in coma. The patient did not recover therefrom, dying six hours later.

The Commissioner of Pensions says:

"This claim is recommended for the action of Congress for the reason that the deceased had no suicidal intent, but resorted to the use of the narcotic which caused his death for the purpose of relieving the intense suffering caused by the wounds received in the service."

Your committee concur in the recommendation of the Department, and therefore submit a bill for the relief of the widow, and ask that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JAMES LUCAS.

The next business on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. CLARK) was the bill (S. 1096) granting a pension to James Lucas.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James Lucas, late a private in Company H, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read in part.

Mr. O'DONNELL. I request that the further reading of the report be dispensed with, and that it be printed in full in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The report in full is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1096) granting a pension to James Lucas, have examined the same and report:

The full statement of facts contained in the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, which is hereto attached and made a part hereof, induce the committee to believe that this is a meritorious case, and they therefore recommend that the bill do pass.

"The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred a bill granting a pension to James Lucas, have examined the same and report:

"A bill to pension this claimant passed the Forty-ninth Congress. The report was full, showing clearly that he was entitled to a pension. That report was as follows, and is adopted:

"The claimant was a private in Company H, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteers. His military record is without blemish. In the beginning of the year 1881 he applied for a pension, alleging his disability to be rheumatism, incurred in the service. The Pension Office rejected him 'on the ground that the disease alleged, rheumatism, had not disabled him to such an extent as to entitle him to a pension, as shown by the evidence.'

"The claimant appealed from this decision, and the Pension Office was sustained by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, which, like the first decision, is based entirely on the report of the medical examining boards.

"The committee do not agree with the conclusions of the Pension Office and the Assistant Secretary, but assume that there is ample testimony to show that the man is disabled and has been so since his discharge.

"John W. Smith, captain of his company, says, of his own knowledge, claimant incurred the disability alleged, rheumatism and pains in the back, which still (April, 1881) exist.

"In April, 1881, Dr. Bishop, of Fond du Lac, Wis., the claimant's home since the war, swears that he treated him periodically the last previous ten years for pain in the left side and for rheumatism, which at times was so severe as to totally disable him. This, as medical testimony, is more reliable than that of the examining boards, before which, after three examinations, all of which did not probably consume an hour, he is dismissed with the information that there is nothing the matter with him, only that he was a broken-down old man.

"James H. Pease, of Fond du Lac, has known the claimant since 1870, during all of which time he has been afflicted with weak back and joints, and rheumatism; that he has been unable to labor to any extent, and often not at all—sometimes confined to his bed. Nine respectable citizens of Fond du Lac testify that they have known the claimant many years, some of them since he returned from the war, and that he has been continuously afflicted with rheumatism and unable to labor to any material degree. Here, then, we have the evidence of the captain of claimant's company, who also has a good record; that of a respectable and regularly attending physician, and nine reputable citizens, most of them known to the Senator who makes this report, against the reports of the examining boards, one of which says, when pressed for a careful examination:

"'The muscles and tendons appear normal and healthy. He is 5 feet 6 inches high; actual weight, 124 pounds.'

"The committee can not reconcile the statements that he is a broken-down old man, reduced by emaciation to 124 pounds, with 'muscles and tendons in a normal and healthy condition.'

"The committee report the bill favorably, with a recommendation that it do pass."

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

BASILE CHAMPAGNE.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. CASWELL) was the bill (S. 801) for the relief of Basile Champagne.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Basile Champagne, late private in Company B, First Wisconsin Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read in part.

Mr. SPINOLA. I ask that the further reading of the report be dispensed with, except the recommendations of the committee, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The report in full is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 801) for the relief of Basile Champagne, have examined the same, and report:

The report of the Senate Committee on Pensions in this case, hereto attached and made a part hereof, makes a very full statement of the facts in this case and commends the case to the committee, and they therefore recommend that the bill do pass.

"The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 801) granting a pension to Basile Champagne, have examined the same, and report:

"The claimant enlisted September 14, 1861, in Company B, First Regiment Wisconsin Volunteers, and he was discharged March 2, 1863. Prior to enlistment he worked in the northern pineries in his State, and the evidence shows that he was a healthy, hardy young man. He was discharged for disability incurred in the service, and the surgeon calls his disease hepatization of the right lung. The claimant disavows any affection of this character, but says he was treated for diarrhea and kidney trouble. He says the diarrhea was cured, but the kidney disease has gradually increased, and that its severity is and for a long time has been such as to disqualify him for manual labor

"The claim was rejected—that for chronic diarrhea, on the ground that he had not suffered from this cause since discharge; and that for kidney disease, because the War Department has no record that he was so afflicted, and because the claimant is unable to furnish evidence of its origin and existence. It is true that the War Department has no record that he had and was treated for kidney disease. Such accurate information is not furnished, nor can it be expected from this source. The Adjutant-General, however, does report that—

"'From enrollment to April 30, 1862, he was present. May and June, 1862, absent without remark. Return for June, 1862, sick at Shelbyville. Return for July, 1862, same. Return for September and October, 1862, in hospital at Bowling Green, Ky. So reported to February 28, 1863. March and April, 1863, discharged at Bowling Green for disability.'

"It is well known that the Department resources for information in pension cases are very meager, often contradictory, and seldom satisfactory. It is something in this case that they show that he was sick and required care and medical treatment for months in hospital. He probably did have diarrhea, for it was prevalent among soldiers, but he admits candidly that he recovered from it. He insists pertinaciously upon being pensioned for kidney disease, and there is evidence that he had it in the service, has it now, and has had it in the interval between the time of his discharge and the present time.

"Two witnesses, who are not impeached, swear that they were well acquainted with claimant from 1856 until he enlisted, and know that he was a sound man.

"Two of his comrades swear that they were with him in hospital; that he was treated for diarrhea; that he had a lame back, and they were informed it was from kidney disease.

"Another comrade, who was in hospital with him, says he was told that he had trouble with his kidneys, and he knows that he complained a great deal of his back and had to go to the sink very often.

"On examination by the special examiner, who is trying to make the witness contradict himself as to kidney disease, this witness says:

"'I do not really know that it was kidney disease, but I heard him complain of a lame back and said he had a pain there.'

"Again he volunteers this remark:

"'We were two pretty-looking birds when we were discharged. I weighed about 90 pounds and he about the same.'

"Here is what Dr. Cooper, a respectable citizen of Green Bay, says:

"'I have lived and practiced medicine in Green Bay and vicinity for the last thirty years; was surgeon of the Seventh Wisconsin Infantry; have known Basil Champagne, who is claimant for a pension, since the year 1865; have attended him and his family; he has been afflicted with general disability, a manifest disease of the kidneys, which will terminate in Bright's disease; he has been under treatment most of the time; I have kept no memorandum, but have considered his case hopeless.'

"There are three medical reports of surgeons directed to examine the claimant by the Pension Bureau, no two of which agree. The board at Fond du Lac report that there are no signs of kidney disease; that he is not well nourished; physical appearance is not good; the lungs are sound, but they found a severe follicular pharyngitis, causing cough and expectoration, which seems to indicate that there is inflammation in the passage from the throat to the stomach.

"The examining surgeon at Fort Howard makes a very superficial report,

He says examination does not reveal any particular disease of the kidneys. The symptoms point to some functional disease of the bladder, involving the ureters and perhaps the kidneys to some extent. From what he can learn from general appearance claimant is able to perform ordinary manual labor.

"If this doctor had explained that there are two ureters, one on each side, that they are the excretory ducts conveying the urine from the kidneys to the bladder, he would have shown that they are both diseased and that they are a severe and sympathetic cause of suffering.

"Dr. Reeve, examining surgeon at Appleton, says:

"'Applicant is, in my judgment, suffering from chronic nephritis, manifested by pain and tenderness in the region of kidneys, particularly the left one, by frequent urination, and by general weakness. And he rates him three-fourths disabled. Nephritis is in common terms inflammation of the kidneys.'

"The claimant was rejected by the Pension Office, and on appeal he had honestly admitted that his diarrhea was cured, but persisted in claiming that he had kidney disease, incurred in the service; and on this he is rejected on the ground that the War Department furnishes no evidence of it. In the opinion of the committee there is sufficient evidence to establish the incurrence and the existence of the disease.

"It is urged against him, in the rejection by Interior Department, that he delayed his application fifteen years. It is a well-known fact that soldiers postpone application from a dread of encountering the delays and difficulties attending the prosecution of a claim. He may have been tardy in claiming the compensation he earned and needs, but it lacks but two months of nine years since he filed his application, only to be rejected after having, in the opinion of the committee, established his claim by competent proof.

"The bill is reported favorably with the recommendation that it do pass."

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

DAVID A. SERVIS.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. GUENTHER) was the bill (S. 820) granting a pension to David A. Servis.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred above bill (S. 820) granting a pension to David A. Lewis, submit the following report:

This is a peculiar case. The claim was rejected at the Pension Office on the ground that the injury was not due to the service. A case similar to this has received the favorable report of the committee at this session.

The facts as established in the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, hereto attached and made a part hereof, present a case which by that committee and former committees have been favorably reported upon, and they therefore recommend the passage of this bill.

"The claimant was a private in Company B, Twenty-first Wisconsin Volunteers, and he claims a pension for injury to his eyes by the accidental discharge of a cartridge. The testimony shows that while at Bridgeport, Ala., acting as hospital nurse, one of his comrades filled a large pipe which claimant was in the habit of smoking with powder, placing a thin layer of tobacco on top; that claimant, ignorant of the trick, lighted the pipe, which exploded and blew him half across the tent. There is no record testimony in the case, nor does it appear that any notice was taken of this wanton act of his tent-mate.

"The application was rejected on the ground that the injury, to whatsoever extent it exists, was not due to the service. It was incurred in the service. It was due to the willful and reprehensible act of a soldier, for whose conduct the military branch of the Government was responsible. If he had killed this claimant, his wife would have been pensioned. That he escaped death and incurred injury to the most sensitive and valuable organ of his physical structure does not exempt the Government from the obligation of compensation and relief. Surely the Government is as responsible in this case as is the corporation that by accident destroys life or limb, and upon which the decisions of the United States courts have repeatedly imposed pecuniary penalties.

"The committee believe that the claimant should be pensioned to the extent of the existing damage to his eye-sight, and report the bill favorably with a recommendation that it do pass."

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PERKINS). The Chair requests the attention of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER.] In the report the applicant in this case has a different name from what appears in the bill. Which is correct?

Mr. GUENTHER. At this moment I do not know. I suppose the name David A. Servis, as it appears in the bill, is correct.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MELVINA GREENWOOD.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration was the bill (S. 805) granting a pension to Melvina Greenwood.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Melvina Greenwood, widow of William B. Greenwood, late a private in Company B, of the Sixteenth Regiment of Wisconsin Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read in part.

Mr. SPINOLA (interrupting the reading). I ask that the further reading of the report be dispensed with, except the conclusion.

There was no objection.

The report in full is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 805) granting a pension to Melvina Greenwood, submit the following report:

They have carefully examined the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions on above bill, and which is made a part of this report:

"The claimant is the widow of William B. Greenwood, private Company B, Sixteenth Wisconsin. She claims that he died of disease contracted in the service, and the Pension Office sets up the objection that he was diseased before enlistment.

"The Army doctor who issued the discharge certificate says he is unfit for duty by reason of heart affection, superinduced by rheumatism prior to entering the service. He was examined, pronounced sound, and accepted as sound at the time of enlistment. He was put on guard duty at Camp Randall, Madison, Wis., where, by severe exposure, it is claimed he incurred the disease of which he died.

"Twelve witnesses, some of them physicians who knew him well, testified that he was entirely sound, and all disavow the superinducing cause of rheumatism.

"The examiner who briefed the case rejects on the ground that Katharine K. Armstrong testifies that before enlistment the soldier was compelled to seek a change of climate. This witness, who was his elder sister, and in his youth supplied the place of a mother, says that when he was a boy he took cold easily; that he went to Buenos Ayres, remained four years, and came back sound and healthy. But the examiner, tenacious to reject, says:

"'It is presumed that even if the heart disease did not exist prior to enlistment, the foundation for it was laid.'

"And the widow is deprived of her pension on the presumption of a possible but not probable 'foundation.'

"A large proportion, if not a majority, of the pension cases appealed to Congress are rejected by the Pension Office on the ground of prior existence of disease. In the opinion of the committee this is not good ground for rejection, because it is an implied admission of the inefficiency of the Government's agents to determine soundness, and a repudiation of the obligation ensuing the examination and acceptance of the soldier. In this case the committee do not accept the fact of the existence of disease before enlistment, nor the presumption that the soldier in his youth laid a foundation for it.

"The bill is reported favorably, with a recommendation that it do pass."

They have also carefully examined the papers on file in the Pension Office. There was no dispute about the fact that the soldier had the heart disease while in the Army and died from that disease, or that the beneficiary was the lawful wife of the soldier.

The claim was rejected simply on the ground that the cause of the disease which produced death existed prior to enlistment. The only evidence upon which this was based, aside from the statement in certificate of discharge that the disease existed prior to enlistment, was contained in the affidavit of his sister, "that in his boyhood he was subject to coughs and liable, upon exposure, to cold; that she supposed at one time that his lungs were affected, and a change of climate was advised; that on account of such advice he left the State of Wisconsin and went to Buenos Ayres, in South America; that after a lapse of four and one-half years he returned apparently perfectly healthy, and that she never heard him complain of heart disease or of any affection of the heart; that he was always, after his return, strong and hearty and able to and did work at his trade as a carpenter and at farming."

The evidence shows the soldier was properly examined by the United States examining surgeon and received into the service.

Dr. James J. Brown testifies that during the year 1864, and at the time the soldier was discharged, he was assistant physician at the hospital where the soldier then was and from which he was discharged, and that he had reason to suppose that the soldier was under his care; that he does not know, and did not know at the time of his examination, that the disease on which the soldier was discharged was superinduced before enlistment by rheumatism or any other disease, and that he believes such a statement in his discharge may be unjust to the soldier and without proper knowledge of the fact.

A large number of witnesses, his acquaintances, having opportunities for knowing, testify as to his soundness prior to and at the time of his enlistment. The agent of the Government examined him and pronounced him sound. The evidence further shows that while on duty in the service he was exposed to storm and rain with poor protection against cold and rain; was soon taken sick with the measles and sent to the hospital, where he remained until transferred to another hospital and discharged therefrom with the heart difficulty.

The committee are of the opinion, from all the evidence in this case, that the evidence strongly corroborates the declaration of the surgeon examining him at the time of his enlistment, who then pronounced him sound and healthy, and they therefore recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

EMMA VON BERNEWITZ.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. CLARK) was the bill (S. 1717) granting a pension to Emma Von Bernewitz.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Emma Von Bernewitz, a nurse in the Medical Department, United States Army.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read in part.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I ask that the further reading of the report be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

The report in full is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1717) granting a pension to Emma Von Bernewitz, submit the following report:

The Committee on Pensions in the Senate made the following report on this bill:

"The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred a bill granting a pension to Emma Von Bernewitz, have examined the same, and report:

"Mrs. Von Bernewitz served as nurse in the Medical Department nearly three years. She made application to the Pension Office and filed proofs, but the Commissioner of Pensions informed her that her only resource was by special legislation. It is not questioned that she performed the service claimed, nor that she is entitled to relief.

"The bill is reported favorably with a recommendation that it do pass."

The committee would further state that from the evidence in the case, from the report of the Surgeon-General's Office, it appears that she was in the service of the United States as army nurse at general hospital at Quincy, Ill., from September, 1863, and the certificate of the surgeon, United States Army, at Quincy aforesaid, dated May 31, 1865, grants her an honorable discharge at that date.

Dr. F. W. John Rittler, in his affidavit, states—

"He has been a practicing physician, practicing medicine at Quincy, Ill., since before the war; had known Mrs. Von Bernewitz since 1859, and knew her and saw her while acting as nurse. When she entered the hospital as nurse in fall of 1862 she was a strong, healthy woman, with apparently sound eyes. She devoted her energy, strength, and health in taking care of the sick and wounded in this hospital. When she was honorably discharged from the service of the United States she returned a broken-down woman physically, and with a disease of the eyes, contracted, no doubt, by coming in contact with contagious diseases while in the United States service. That affiant has known said Emma Von Bernewitz ever since he met her in 1859, and she has not been able since leaving said United States hospital to perform any manual labor, nor could she, on account of her weak eyes, fill any position in an office, which, with her education, she could otherwise have filled. She has since earned a living by giving music lessons. Affiant states these facts from personal knowledge."

This testimony is fully corroborated by the testimony of two ladies who knew her when she entered said hospital and while there and ever since, and show her present condition to be a woman broken down in health, with sore eyes, which has continued since her service in the hospital, and that she is compelled to earn a living by giving music lessons.

The committee believe this a meritorious case, and recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

WILLIAM HEALY.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 806) granting a pension to William Healy, reported adversely from the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

On motion of Mr. DOCKERY, the bill was indefinitely postponed.

JAMES M'CAFFREY.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. PERKINS) was the bill (H. R. 215) granting a pension to James McCaffrey.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James McCaffrey, dependent father of Edward McCaffrey, late first lieutenant of Company A, One hundred and sixty-fourth New York Infantry Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The claimant is the father of Lieut. Edward McCaffrey, of Company A, One hundred and sixty-fourth New York Infantry, who was killed in the battle of Cold Harbor. The mother of the soldier died prior to the war. The application for pension was rejected on the ground that the father at the time of his son's death was able to support himself by manual labor, though it is shown that he had comparatively no property at that time and that the son contributed generously to his support. The father is now sixty-six years of age, so crippled by rheumatism that he can perform no labor, and without means of support.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with a recommendation that it do pass.

JAMES H. DARLING.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. PERKINS) was the bill (H. R. 780) granting a pension to James H. Darling.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James H. Darling, late of Company G, Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Infantry Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

Claimant was a private of Company G, Seventy-third Ohio Volunteers, having enlisted November 19, 1861, and was discharged December 12, 1862. On June 18, 1879, claimant filed his application for a pension, alleging that he contracted rheumatism at Camp Logan, Ohio, about January 20, 1862; his claim was rejected because "the evidence failed to show the origin of the alleged disability in the service and line of duty," and the claimant alleging his inability to furnish the required proof as to origin.

Two neighbors, who had known claimant for thirty years, testified in 1881 that he was a stout, able-bodied man, able to do all manner of farm work before his enlistment, and know that claimant had no such thing as rheumatism. It is shown by the testimony of Comrades McKee and Makinson that claimant broke down with rheumatism at Camp Fetterman, West Virginia, and was sent home about February 1, 1862, on account of his disability. In corroboration of this the report of the adjutant-general, United States Army, shows:

"Claimant reported on roll for March and April, 1862; at home, on sick-list, May and June, 1862; absent without leave, July and August, 1862; deserted March 5, 1862. Charges of desertion and absence without leave are removed; he went to his home in Jackson County, Ohio, by proper military authority, some time during March or April, 1862, where he remained sick and unable to travel to December 12, 1862, when he reported at Columbus, Ohio; he was discharged at that post December 12, 1862, on surgeon's certificate of disability."

It is shown by the evidence that claimant has been a sufferer from rheumatism since his discharge, at times being compelled to use crutches. Two medical examinations by examining surgeons of the Pension Office, dated March 7, 1881, and March 22, 1882, show him to be disabled by rheumatism, and the affidavit of Dr. C. Campbell, of Cherrydale, Kans., dated March 24, 1885, shows him still disabled.

Your committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with a recommendation that it do pass.

MARY MONTI.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. RICE) was the bill (H. R. 2529) granting a pension to Mary Monti.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Monti, widow of Ferdinand Monti, formerly an employé in the Quartermaster's Department of the United States Army during the war with Mexico, and pay her a pension from the date of the death of her husband.

The report (by Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina) was read, as follows:

Ferdinand Monti, the deceased husband of the petitioner, was a pensioner by special act of Congress at the date of his death, which, the testimony of his physician shows, was accelerated by the loss of his leg.

It is shown in the evidence on which the special act was allowed that he served from 1846 to December, 1848, as a wagon-master in the Quartermaster's Department, during the war with Mexico, and that while in the line of duty at Vera Cruz, engaged in removing quartermaster stores and arms from that city, he was shot in the left leg above the knee, and in consequence of which his leg was amputated.

He also participated in the battle at Pueblo, and for gallant conduct during that engagement and for meritorious services to the Government he was presented by Congress, through General Lane, with a silver medal. (See Report 179, vol. 4, H. R. Reports, second session, Forty-third Congress.)

His widow would be entitled to a pension under existing laws if her deceased husband had been an enlisted man, or his name mentioned in any public act of Congress, or the one under which the medal was awarded to him, which act was of a general and not of a specific character. Mrs. Monti is poor and dependent upon her own exertions for a living, and is over sixty-two years of age.

Your committee respectfully recommend that the bill herewith reported be amended so as to strike out the words "and pay her a pension from the date of the death of her husband," where the same appear in lines 8 and 9, and that it do pass as amended.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with a recommendation that it do pass.

CHARLES GLAMANN.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. LYMAN) was the bill (H. R. 2215) granting a pension to Charles Glamann.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension-roll the name of Charles Glamann, late of Company C, Ninety-second Illinois Volunteer Infantry.

The report (by Mr. SPOONER) is as follows:

Charles Glamann was a private of Company C, Ninety-second Illinois Volunteers. His claim for pension was rejected by the Pension Office upon the ground that the injury to his left arm, upon which his claim is founded, was not incurred while in the line of duty within the meaning of the general pension law.

The soldier seems to have been somewhat unpopular with some of his comrades, and while in camp with his company, and engaged in cooking for his mess, a brick or part of a brick was thrown by a comrade, James Malarky, with whom he had previously had some difficulty, which struck Glamann's left arm near the elbow, producing a serious injury, from which he is yet suffering. Glamann does not appear to have been at fault or engaged in a quarrel at the time.

Dr. James Bradley, an examining surgeon for the Pension Office, gives the following description of injury and its results:

"The injury above named is a fracture of the olecranon process, a separation of the fractured ends, by putting the arm in semi-flexed position, as applicant states, a ligamentous union as a result. Arm can not be entirely straightened, and supination is limited, the arm possessing that quality to one-half or two-thirds the extent of the sound arm."

Under rulings of the Commissioner, the Pension Office holds that where a soldier has sustained injury, however serious, by the assault of a comrade, even if such assault was without fault upon the part of the soldier, no pension can be granted under general law.

Your committee and Congress have, however, frequently relaxed the rule, and granted pension for injuries and disabilities incurred in such circumstances; and, considering this case as one within the lines established by many precedents and fairly entitled to such recognition, recommend the passage of the bill with an amendment, by inserting in the fourth line of the bill, after the word "pension-roll," the words, "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

LEWIS FICHTHORN.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. SPOONER) was the bill (H. R. 2174) granting a pension to Lewis Fichthorn.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Lewis Fichthorn, late a private in Company K, One hundred and thirty-first Pennsylvania Infantry Volunteers, and in Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. SPOONER) is as follows:

Your committee find that Lewis Fichthorn was a private in Company K, One hundred and thirty-first Pennsylvania Infantry Volunteers, and in Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers.

His claim for pension was rejected by the Pension Office on the ground that the evidence failed to show satisfactorily that the soldier's disability—bronchitis and lung disease—originated in the service.

The testimony in the case is voluminous, including testimony taken by special examiners of the Pension Office, and is conclusive in showing that the soldier at the time of and prior to his enlistment was an unusually sound, vigorous, and healthy man. It is equally clear and conclusive that he is now, and for years past has been, suffering from serious throat and lung diseases of continuously-increasing severity, entirely incapacitating him for any manual labor.

Upon the question of incurrence of said disease there is some unreliable and contradictory testimony on file, but, rejecting all that seems of doubtful character, there remains the testimony of neighbors, employers, and comrades to establish to the satisfaction of your committee that the claim and statement under oath of the soldier are true, and that his name should be placed on the pension-roll.

The original cause of the soldier's disease was a cold contracted while on guard at barracks in Philadelphia in March, 1864, resulting in temporary loss of voice, bronchitis, and lung disease of varying but increasing severity thenceforth to the present time, accompanied from time to time during a number of years past by hemorrhages, as the result of which the soldier has become a feeble, emaciated invalid, almost entirely disabled, and growing feebler day by day.

The evidence clearly establishes that he was a good, faithful soldier, serving his country with loyal devotion, and as a result of which service we find him to-day a helpless invalid, and clearly demanding the recognition from his country which he now asks.

Your committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ELLIOTT JOHNSON.

The next bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. THOMAS H. B. BROWNE) was the bill (H. R. 8285) to remove the political disabilities of Elliott Johnson.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the legal and political disabilities imposed by the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States, by reason of participation in the late rebellion, be, and they hereby are, removed from Elliott Johnson, of Accomack County, in the State of Virginia.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

DELILAH VANDEVENDER.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. MATSON) was the bill (H. R. 4831) granting a pension to Delilah Vandevender.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Delilah Vandevender, dependent mother of Jacob Vandevender, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MATSON) is as follows:

The petitioner is an applicant as dependent mother of Jacob Vandevender, who was a private in Company D, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Indiana Infantry, who died at Huntsville, Ala., August 29, 1865. The Commissioner of Pensions rejected the application on the ground of non-dependence at the time of the son's death, and on the admission of the father that for a period subsequent to the son's death he was able to work and support his family. There is no attempt to conceal the latter fact. The father did work and supported his family, and there was no effort to obtain a pension until he became physically disabled, as is proven by medical and other evidence, and they were menaced with poverty.

Under a rigid and arbitrary construction relief might be denied these people in old age, infirmity, and need on the ground assumed by the Pension Office, that there was no dependence at the time of the son's death; but the fact remains that there is now and for a long time has been dependence; that both are dependent, and that this condition of distress might not exist if the son was alive to aid them, now that they are old, poor, and infirm. It may be that no legal obligation exists to extend to them the very small and inadequate relief provided for in this bill, but the committee are of the opinion that the moral obligation will be recognized, and that Congress will freely extend the aid that can be conceded from no other source.

The bill is reported favorably, with a recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

WILLIAM SCOTT.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. CHEADLE) was the bill (H. R. 7115) granting a pension to William Scott.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of William Scott, of Kokomo, Howard County, Indiana, a special surgeon at hospital number 14, Nashville, Tenn., and then surgeon of the Eighty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, upon the pension-roll, subject to the rules and regulations governing the Pension Department.

The report (by Mr. MATSON) is as follows:

This bill is for the relief of Dr. William Scott, who alleges that he contracted chronic diarrhea while on duty as special surgeon at hospital No. 14, Nashville, Tenn., acting under appointment of Governor Morton, of Indiana, and before he was commissioned surgeon of the Eighty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteers. The claim was rejected by the Pension Department on the ground—

"Because it is shown by claimant's own statements as well as by the records filed at the date of origin he was not mustered in the service of the United States, but was under appointment of Governor Morton."

Dr. Scott's military service, as shown by the records of the Surgeon-General's Office, is as follows:

"Dr. William Scott entered into contract for services as acting assistant surgeon, United States Army, June 3, 1863, at Murfreesborough, Tenn., and was on duty with Ninety-fourth Ohio Volunteers to August 10, 1863, and at Cumberland General Hospital, Nashville, Tenn., from August 11 to August 31, 1863, when his contract was annulled on account of the ill health of his family. He is next reported on duty with his regiment, the Eighty-ninth Indiana Volunteers, as assistant surgeon from December, 1864, to February, 1865; and as surgeon from February, 1865, to July, 1865, when mustered out of service."

The Surgeon-General's Office also contains the following:

"The records of this office show Dr. I. C. Johnson and —— Scott to have reported to the medical director, Department of the Cumberland, July 9, 1864, under special appointment from Governor Morton. Dr. I. C. Johnson was ordered same day to report to surgeon in charge No. 1, general hospital, Nashville, Tenn. Dr. Scott was ordered same day to report to the surgeon in charge general hospital No. 14, Nashville, Tenn."

Charles R. Greenleaf, major and surgeon, United States Army, under date of Washington, July 12, 1887, in reply to an inquiry of Dr. Scott, says in regard to his service as contract surgeon in hospital No. 14, Nashville, Tenn., in June, July, or August, 1864:

"I am instructed by the Surgeon-General to say that the records of this office show that under date of Nashville, Tenn., July 9, 1864, Dr. —— Scott having reported under special appointment from Governor Morton, will report without delay to Surgeon S. E. Fuller, United States Volunteers, for duty at hospital No. 14."

There is abundant proof that Dr. Scott was in active service of the United States at Nashville in June, July, or August, 1864, as stated, and that the incurrence of the disability for which he asked a pension took place as stated in his application; that it continued and was aggravated during his term as surgeon of the Eighty-ninth Indiana, and that he still suffers from its effects.

The committee are therefore of the opinion that said William Scott was regularly in the service of the United States at the date above mentioned, that his disabilities occurred while in the Army and in line of duty, and so believing, we submit a favorable report and recommend the passage of the bill with the following amendment: In line 8 strike out all after the words "subject to the" and insert the following: "provisions and limitations of the pension laws."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

BENJAMIN F. BYERS.

The next business on the Calender called up (by Mr. CHEADLE) was the bill (H. R. 5574) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Byers.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Benjamin F. Byers, of Frankfort, Clinton County, Indiana, late a private in Company F of the One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, subject to the rules and regulations governing said Pension Office.

The report (by Mr. MATSON), which was not read in full, but was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5574) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Byers, have had the same under consideration, and now submit the following:

Benjamin F. Byers was drafted and afterward had the privilege of enlisting, which he did, and was enrolled on the 14th day of February, 1865, in Company K, One hundred and fiftieth Regiment Indiana Infantry, and was honorably discharged on the 14th day of August, 1865.

On the 1st of November, 1884, he made application for pension, alleging that while in the military service and in line of duty—performing squad drill—he hurt or sprained the left leg. He admits that his leg was not as stout as the other before going into the Army, but the examining surgeon, Dr. L. B. Gentry, who examined him for admission into the Army, had been his family physician for many years before this, and knew of his defective leg, yet he accepted him as a sound, able-bodied man.

After his discharge and return home his leg has increased in disease until his condition is now diagnosed elephantiasis. He received no hospital treatment, but received medicine a few times from Dr. L. B. Gentry, brigade surgeon, above named. There is medical evidence on file, and the claimant admits that his leg was diseased to some extent before he was forced to enter the Army. His claim was rejected by the Commissioner of Pensions on the ground that the alleged disability, elephantiasis, existed prior to enlistment.

In the opinion of the committee it is satisfactorily proven that the soldier received the hurt in his left leg as alleged, that he was excused from further duty at that time by the officer in charge, and that he was unable for further service by reason of said injury, and was excused from the same until he was mustered out; that the disease has continued to increase constantly ever since he returned home, until it has culminated in elephantiasis, as above stated.

The committee believe that this is a meritorious case, and therefore submit a favorable report and recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. CHEADLE. I move to amend the bill by striking out the words "subject to the rules and regulations governing said Pension Office," and inserting in lieu thereof the words "subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

FLETCHER S. DEWEY.

Mr. MATSON. The next business on the Calendar is the bill (H. R. 2215) granting a pension to Fletcher S. Dewey. It has been reported adversely, but I move that it be reported to the House with a recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. My colleague [Mr. HOLMAN], who introduced the bill, informs me that there is a desire to present additional evidence.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the bill will be reported to the House with the recommendation stated. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

JAMES FERRIS.

Mr. MATSON. I move that the next bill on the Calendar, House bill 366, granting a pension to James Ferris, which has been reported adversely, be reported back to the House with the recommendation that it lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

HEMAN RANKINS.

The next business on the Calendar called up (by Mr. DINGLEY) was the bill (H. R. 7974) granting a pension to Heman Rankins.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the pension laws, the name of Heman Rankins, late a private in Company B, First Maine Coast Guards Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) was read, as follows:

Claimant was a private in Company B, First Maine Coast Guard Volunteers, and was discharged for disability. He made application for pension, alleging disease of liver and kidneys, due to a severe cold contracted at Fort Foote, Md. Soldier was unable to furnish medical testimony to establish his claim in consequence of the death of physicians, but there is on file the sworn affidavits of six comrades, who are certified to as men of credibility, showing that the cold was contracted as alleged, and that it resulted in malarial disease.

There has been filed with the committee a petition signed by 105 citizens of Camden, Me., representing that claimant is eighty years of age, in poor health and destitute circumstances, and that in their judgment he is justly entitled to pension. His last medical examination shows that, in the opinion of the medical examiner, he is suffering from chronic lumbago and sciatica, which disease can readily be recognized as a result of malarial poisoning, having its origin in a severe cold.

Your committee are of opinion that the weight of testimony is largely in favor of the claimant, and hence report the bill back with a favorable recommendation.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ANASTASIA WALTER.

Mr. GUENTHER. I ask unanimous consent that we go back to a bill on page 57 of the Calendar, which, by mistake, I overlooked when it was reached in regular order.

There being no objection, the Committee of the Whole proceeded to the consideration of the bill (S. 816) granting a pension to Anastasia Walter.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Amastasia Walter, widow of Peter Walter, late a private of Company G, of the Twenty-sixth Regiment of Wisconsin Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER), which was not read in full, but was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

The facts in this case are very fully set forth in the report of the Senate committee, which is made a part hereof, and they lead the committee to believe that the beneficiary is entitled to the relief asked for, and they therefore recommend that the bill do pass.

"[Senate Report No. 197, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

"Peter Walter, the husband of the claimant, was a private in Company G, Twenty-sixth Wisconsin Volunteers. He was wounded at the battle of Gettysburgh; was pensioned at the rate of $8 a month, which was afterwards increased. His widow claims that the wound ultimately caused his death; produced considerable testimony in support of this theory, which the Pension Office denied. The claimant appealed, the office decision was sustained, the Secretary holding that the issue was purely one of 'pathological sequence.'

"The certificates of medical examination show that the disability was from a gunshot wound of the hip-joint. The effects described are stiffness of the joint, atrophy of the muscles, weakness, and partial paralysis of the leg.

"There is evidence showing that the wound was very severe and caused the soldier continuous suffering, which increased to the time of his death. On this point Dr. Hallock, his family physician, says:

"'He was wounded in the left hip and was unable to do manual labor. He complained to me very often of the wound. It would swell up and then break open and discharge bloody pus. The said wound might have caused his death from blood poisoning or embolism, as he died very sudden.'

"Philander H. Lewis testifies to his intimate acquaintance with the soldier, and says:

"'I know Peter Walter complained a great deal from gunshot wound in his left hip, and that he died very sudden.'

"Dr. Hallock again testifies:

"'Knew the soldier during the last six years of his life; was his physician during that time. He often complained of his wound. He was very nervous, and always afraid it would break out again. He was partially deranged for a few months before his death, induced, as I believe, from effects of his wound and worry over it.'

"P. H. Lewis testifies that he was well and intimately acquainted with the soldier, being near neighbors, and saw him nearly every day for at least ten years before his death; that during the last three years they occupied the same building; that during all this time he complained of his wounds; that during the six months prior and up to his death he complained of suffering great agony and pain; that from the best knowledge and belief of affiant, Peter Walter died from the effect of his wound. His reasons for this belief are as follows:

"'During the last month prior and up to the time of his death affiant had frequent conversations with him, and he stated to affiant that he thought the pain and suffering he endured from his wound would end his life in a short time. This affiant was also a soldier.'

"John G. Hilderman testifies that he was intimately acquainted with Peter Walter, being neighbors, and saw him every day for five years, a portion of which time they lived in the same house; that he complained of his wound; that during three months prior and up to the time of his death he suffered great agony and pain, and from the best of his knowledge and belief he died from the effects of his wound.

"Dr. Hallock again testifies that Walter died of congestion of the brain, brought on by pains and worry.

"Without taking into consideration the opinions of the doctors as to the connection between the injuries the soldier received and the death cause, there does not appear to be any inconsistency in the conclusion that congestion of the brain was directly traceable to the cause of his constant and prolonged suffering. His wound, as shown by his honest and disinterested neighbors, gave him pain and agony, and it does not require a knowledge of surgery to trace fever, irritation, and congestion to acute and constant suffering from an incurable wound, the admitted effect of which has been to produce 'stiffness of the joint, atrophy of the muscles, weakness, and partial paralysis of the leg.' It is in evidence that a short time prior to his death it had become red, inflamed, and painful. Here was a man in poverty receiving a pension of $10 a month, looking for death and the expectation of leaving his family helpless. All of these conditions were, in the opinion of the committee, enough to produce congestion of the brain, and they are traceable to the service and the strict line of duty.

"The bill is reported favorably, with a recommendation that it do pass."

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MRS. ABBA E. JACKSON.

The next business on the Calendar called up (by Mr. DINGLEY for Mr. REED) was the bill (H. R. 8629) granting a pension to Mrs. Abba E. Jackson.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Abba E. Jackson, late a nurse in the Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER), which was not read in full, but was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

Pension in this case is asked on the ground of services rendered as a nurse in Armory Square Hospital, Washington, during the war of the rebellion. The annexed memorial of the petitioner fully explains the circumstances and the extent of the charitable work she did for the Government.

"*To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"The undersigned respectfully represents that she is the widow of Rev. E. W. Jackson, who during the war of rebellion was chaplain of Armory Square Hospital, Washington, D. C. Early in 1862 the wards were ready, and were soon filled to repletion with the wounded from the battle-fields of Bull Run, Chantilly, Groveton, etc., and from that hour till the close of the war Armory Square was the receptacle of 'stretcher cases' and the more severely wounded. All who died *in transitu* were brought there for burial. This added greatly to the labors and responsibilities of the chaplain, and he was probably the only chaplain in the department who had charge of the 'dead house.' By special orders of Dr. Bliss, the head surgeon, the chaplain had all care of the soldier from his death till his body was delivered to the ambulance drivers for burial, and all correspondence with relatives and friends of deceased soldiers was turned over to him for attention.

"Your petitioner was living in a house erected at their own expense near the hospital, and was able to literally give her time and strength to her country's cause in nursing the sick and wounded and supplying them with the little home comforts not always to be obtained in the regular routine of hospital life. From 500 to 1,000 sick and wounded were to be fed, nursed, and cared for day and night. Many will still remember the shelter and sympathy they found at our humble home, when overwhelmed with grief as they came to see sick or wounded loved ones and found them either in the dead-house or buried at Arlington or the Soldiers' Home.

"Another branch of the hospital work which the chaplain superintended personally was the preparing and sending to their homes the bodies of officers and soldiers (sometimes thirty or even a greater number in a month), besides exhuming, embalming, and forwarding many who, in the absence of orders to the contrary, had been buried in Washington. In all these cases, without money and without price, she attended personally to those little details where the tenderness of woman's care does much to assuage the bitterness of sorrow, and often with her own hands lined or upholstered the plain soldier coffin, making it more presentable to the friends at home, who were unable to purchase a better one than the Government provided.

"In all these labors, particularly in writing letters for soldiers, she was assisted by her sister, Miss Mattie McLellan, of blessed memory to many soldiers, who gave her life to her country's cause. After a service of two years and eight months in hospital life, in July, 1865, borne on a stretcher by soldiers through the cities of Washington, New York, and Portland, she was laid in her bed at her childhood home in Gorham, Me., from which she went out no more till in September, 1867, when she rested in peace.

"In all those months and years of weary toil they neither asked nor received any compensation from Government except her husband's pay as chaplain.

"Since the death of her husband, in June, 1873, she has worked diligently with her hands and taken care of herself, but is not able to do so any longer. She therefore respectfully asks for some remuneration from Government in recognition of honorable services faithfully performed for the brave who suffered and died in the wards of Armory Square Hospital. And as in duty bound will ever pray.

"ABBA E. JACKSON."

When Chaplain Jackson resigned in July, 1865, Dr. D. W. Bliss, the head surgeon, gave him a letter, highly complimenting him for his valuable services, counsel, and advice, making mention of his wife in the following words:

"I can not close without paying a slight tribute to the benevolent and Christian labor of your devoted wife, who has been untiring in her devotion to the sick and wounded, and in providing comforts and shelter for their friends. She has always labored with unostentatious Christian devotion for the living, and with her own hands prepared and arranged the soldier's shroud, and placed the flowers of affection around his cold and lifeless form. In the absence of dear friends she has tenderly performed the part of the Christian mother and sister, which has won for her the love and esteem of all."

Numerous additional certificates are on file setting forth Mrs. Jackson's valuable and unselfish services, and also representing that her health was seriously impaired thereby. Her home was literally a hospital, and those less fortunate than herself freely shared her food and money. Among those who have so testified are ex-Governors Perham and Robie, of Maine; Lieut. Col. Henry R. Millett, of the Fifth Maine Volunteers, and several soldiers who received her bountiful charity and kind care.

The case is certainly one deserving of special consideration, and your committee therefore report the bill back favorably, with a recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

CAROLINE PAUTEL.

The next business on the Calendar called up (by Mr. CASWELL) was the bill (H. R. 7111) granting a pension to Caroline Pautel.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Caroline Pautel, widow of Frederick Pautel, late of Company D, Thirty-second Regiment of Wisconsin Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER), which was not read in full, but was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

Caroline Pautel, the beneficiary, is the widow of Frederick Pautel, late private in Company D, Thirty-second Regiment Wisconsin Volunteers, who enlisted in the Army August 21, 1862, and was discharged June 12, 1865. He was granted a pension for chronic rheumatism in 1884, commencing June 13, 1865.

His last examination by the pension examining board was March 17, 1886, and the surgeons describe his condition at that time as follows:

"We find this applicant very much reduced, emaciated, and debilitated; skin shrunken, sallow; there is muscular atrophy, with irritability of muscles, everywhere. Trunk drawn to the right, movements of all kinds imperfect and appear painful. We regard this condition as the result of general muscular rheumatism. We regard him nearly totally disabled for the performance of manual labor."

Upon this report soldier's pension was increased to $14 per month. The soldier died September 15, 1886, leaving surviving him the beneficiary, his widow, and four children, now under sixteen years of age. The soldier was shown to be a man of good character.

The widow made an application for a pension, but the same was rejected on the ground that the soldier's death was from disease of liver, not due to chronic rheumatism, for which he was pensioned. The only medical evidence in the case as to the soldier's last sickness, and as to the disease from which he died, is contained in the affidavit of Dr. W. D. Reid, a physician of over thirty-seven years' standing, and was for several years holding the position of examining surgeon under appointment of the Commissioner of Pensions, showing his high personal and professional standing. We quote his affidavit nearly in full:

"That I was acquainted with Frederick Pautel from October, 1881, when I examined him by order of the Pension Department, until his death, September, 1886, seeing him frequently as his family physician after April, 1884. That when I examined him for pension in 1881, in addition to the chronic rheumatism certified to upon which pension was claimed, a jaundiced appearance of the skin was noticeable, which I attributed to malarial poisoning, and which he claimed had been more or less prominent for years. That when first called professionally, April, 1884, he was confined to his bed; the symptoms of rheumatism, especially

of the hip, were much worse than when examined for pension in 1881. The jaundiced appearance continued, and in addition pain, tenderness over the region of the liver, with severe gastric symptoms, retching, vomiting, with pain and flatulence of the intestines. That these symptoms of rheumatism and of the visceria continued, sometimes better and sometimes worse, with constantly increasing emaciation and debility, until his death.

"I regarded his symptoms as scirrhosis of the liver, but as there was no *post-mortem* dissection the exact pathological condition is not known. The heart may have been at fault and produced or contributed to the dropsy. Certainly the rheumatism continued to the end. That as there is no history of alcoholic intemperance, syphilis, or gout, the usual causes of scirrhosis, and as there is a well-marked and long-standing history of rheumatism, which is an occasional cause and always an auxiliary when present in an indirect manner, by impairing the vital power and damaging the heart, it is reasonable to suppose, and it is my opinion, that the rheumatism was the cause, at least an auxiliary, in producing the fatal result."

The committee believe from the testimony of the physician who attended the soldier during the last years of his life, including his last sickness, that the disability for which the soldier was pensioned so far contributed to and was so far the cause of the soldier's death that his widow is entitled to the relief granted by this bill, and therefore recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

LYDIA BURRIDGE.

The next business on the Calendar called up (by Mr. BELDEN) was the bill (H. R. 8400) for the relief of Lydia Burridge.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Lydia Burridge, mother of Edwin Burridge, late of Company E, Third New York Light Artillery, and pay her a pension, subject to the provisions and limitations of the general pension laws.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER), which was not read in full, but was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

Lydia Burridge is the mother of Edwin Burridge, who died of chronic diarrhea while serving as private in Company E, Third Regiment New York Light Artillery. Mrs. Burridge lost two other sons and a son-in-law by reason of disease contracted in the military service during the late war. Her application for pension has been rejected by the Pension Bureau because at the time of the son's death her husband was able to and did support the claimant. It appears that at that period the husband had a small place, assessed at $850. This place was purchased with the help of the sons. It is admitted that at the time of the son's death the husband was in fair health, and at the age of fifty-three years was able to do a fair day's work. He is now seventy-seven years of age, and consequently has passed the period of manual labor.

The claimant has been sick much of the time in late years, thus increasing the expenses of the household. Old age of the husband has compelled him to exchange his small farm for a house in the village, which affords him a residence, but no income.

Claimant is now seventy-eight years of age, and while she has no title to a pension under the general law for reasons heretofore stated, your committee are clearly of opinion that her present condition clearly brings her within the more liberal practice of Congress in this class of cases, and therefore report favorably on the accompanying bill, and ask that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MARY F. HARKINS.

The next business on the Calendar called up (by Mr. CASWELL) was the bill (H. R. 3016) granting a pension to Mary F. Harkins.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary F. Harkins, widow of —— Harkins, late of Company E, First Regiment of Wisconsin Infantry.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER), which was not read in full, but was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, was as follows:

The beneficiary named in this bill is the widow of John Harkins, who enlisted in Company E, First Wisconsin Volunteers, October 1, 1862, and was discharged June 8, 1865. He was granted a pension, which he received up to the time of his death, which occurred May 5, 1882. He died, leaving surviving him the beneficiary, his widow, and two children—one, George, born June 10, 1875, and one, John, born November 25, 1875. The soldier drew a pension for a gunshot wound of right foot.

Of his last examination, made March 26, 1881, A. Farr, the examining surgeon, reports as follows:

"The scar extends from the second metatarsal bone near the tarsal end across the foot to the fifth metatarsal bone near its tarsal end. The scar is 3 inches long and one-half inch wide. It is very tender to the touch; at times it inflames. I have treated him several times when the foot and leg were very much swollen and tender; appeared to be inflammation of the ——. I treated him soon after his discharge, and as often as once a year since. Cramps frequently take him in the foot when walking."

The soldier died from "rupture of the heart."

The widow made application in behalf of the minor children and in her own behalf for a pension, which was rejected by the Pension Office on the ground "that the immediate cause of death, rupture of the heart, was not due to wound for which soldier was pensioned."

The only medical evidence giving any light upon this matter is given by Dr. Farr, holding the position of examining surgeon under appointment from the Commissioner of Pensions, which is sufficient indorsement of his high personal and professional character.

His statement as to condition of soldier at time of his last examination is above quoted.

In his affidavit, made after soldier's death and sworn to July 26, 1884, he says:

"In 1875 I attended John Harkens for neuralgia of the head and heart. It was caused by a wound in the leg. The cicatrix was painful and irritable, so much so that his nervous system was greatly affected by it. I have no doubt but it was the remote cause of his death. I have always been his family physician."

In his affidavit, sworn to March 26, 1883, he states that he knew John Harkins; that he was his family physician.

"That the said John Harkins had been treated by this deponent for a wound in the foot, which he received in the Army, more or less every year since he returned from the Army. This wound in his foot was a source of trouble and uneasiness to the said John Harkins. It made him irritable and nervous. I verily believe that said wound in his foot made and affected his whole nervous system, and produced and was the direct cause of his death; that it affected his nervous system to such a degree that it caused and brought on heart trouble. That said John Harkins died on the 5th day of May, 1882, from rupture of the heart, caused by the bursting and parting of the fibers of the right ventricle. That said John dropped dead suddenly. That I gave said John Harkins a prescription a short time before he died for nervousness."

In another affidavit he states:

"That to the best of his knowledge and belief said rupture of the heart was brought on by the nervous effect which said wound had on the system."

In view of this evidence the committee believe that it can be truthfully said that the procuring cause of the soldier's death was the gunshot wound received in the service, and that the widow is entitled to the relief granted by this bill, and they therefore recommend that the bill do pass.

Mr. CASWELL. I move that the blank in the bill be filled by inserting the word "John."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

LYDIA D. HOLTZ.

The next business on the Calendar called up (by Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin) was the bill (S. 811) granting a pension to Lydia D. Holtz.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Lydia D. Holtz, widow of William F. Holtz, late a private in Company G, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER), which was not read in full, but was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

They have carefully examined the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions on this bill, made a part hereof, and have also examined the papers on file in the Pension Office, and they think that when the wife "by the advice of friends" commences an action for a divorce from her husband "for her personal safety," and on account of his "cruel and abusive treatment," and obtains a divorce, she can hardly claim to be his widow. The evidence fails to convince us that the divorce was obtained against her protestation.

They then report adversely upon said bill and recommend that it do not pass.

"[Senate Report No. 284, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

"William F. Holtz, husband of the claimant, was a private in Company G, Fourth Minnesota Volunteers. She applied for a pension as his widow, and was rejected on the sole ground that the parties were divorced some two or three months before her husband died.

"It is apparent from affidavits and communications in the possession of the committee that the husband of this woman, from some cause unknown, made her life a burden to her. She was constantly liable to and did receive from him cruel and abusive treatment, which she bore to the endangerment of her life. Some seven months prior to her husband's death, by the advice of friends, they jointly made application to the court for a divorce, which proceeding they very soon mutually regretted.

"They appealed to the court to stay the proceedings, to which appeal no heed was paid. The wife was forbearing, the husband was penitent; both dreaded the sundering of their matrimonial ties. In token of his determination to do better the husband wrote a promise to maintain her, not to strike or threaten any personal abuse, and in matters upon which they could not agree to submit to the advice of his Lutheran clergyman or to Judge Heminpe.

"Pending the proceedings for divorce, the wife says her husband frequently came home promising each time better conduct. 'A few days before the time for a final hearing he came home, and we both became reconciled and mutually agreed to end the divorce proceedings.' Her husband gave her money, and she went to town to proclaim the fact of their reconciliation. The judge angrily refused to stop the proceedings, and against their mutual remonstrances, and after their reconciliation, they received their divorce papers.

"The simple story is that this suffering woman, for her personal safety, felt compelled to submit to a divorce; that the step was taken reluctantly by both; that as it progressed and a separation became inevitable neither of them could endure the thought; they became reconciled and ordered the proceedings to be stopped; that finally they were divorced in spite of themselves, the officers of the law disregarding their mutual protestations. In the opinion of the committee a divorce so accomplished should not have recognition, and so far as it affects this woman's claim to a pension we think it may properly be regarded as null and void, and that she should have all the rights in the adjudication of her pension case as though no proceedings had been had.

"The bill is reported favorably with an amendment, striking out all after the word 'infantry,' in line 8, with a recommendation that it do pass."

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ELLEN SEXTON.

The next business on the Calendar called up (by Mr. RICE) was the bill (H. R. 8174) granting a pension to Ellen Sexton.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Ellen Sexton, widow of Daniel Sexton, late a private in Company K, Tenth Regiment of Minnesota Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL), which was not read in full, but was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, is as follows:

The claimant in this case is the widow of Daniel Sexton, late a private in Company K, Tenth Minnesota Infantry. Soldier enlisted August 13, 1862, and was discharged June 11, 1864. He died May 29, 1875, of consumption.

The case was rejected on the ground that the fatal disease was not due to disease contracted in line of duty. The captain of his company testifies that the soldier was in good health at time of enlistment, but while in the Indian campaign, in the winter of 1862-'63, he was taken sick and was transferred to the Invalid Reserve Corps, and was discharged in June, 1864, having consumption and being unable for duty, said disease being brought on by exposure and hardships incident to the campaign.

The certificate of disability upon which he was discharged, dated June 11, 1864, recites:

"He is incapable of performing the duties of a soldier because of great weakness and constant aching pains in all of the extremities. The tibia in both legs is covered with nodes, and the muscles wasted away. He is salivated most of

the time and has dyspepsia, and he has not done any duty for the last four months and has been sick a year, and he is unfit for military duty in the Veteran Reserve Corps. In my opinion the disease was contracted since the last enlistment.

"(Signed by J. W. Daniels, surgeon in charge of hospital.)"

The soldier filed an application for pension immediately upon discharge.

Dr. C. D. Williams testifies that he treated him in 1865 for hemorrhage of the bowels, and that it was a severe and dangerous case.

James King swears that the soldier enlisted in 1862 in good health, and that he saw him when discharged, and to all appearances he was a broken-down man and unable to make a living by manual labor, apparently suffering from consumption.

Christ Connolly and others substantiate the foregoing.

The adverse testimony in this case, and upon which the case was rejected in the Pension Office, is that the claimant contracted a disability in the service through his own vicious habits, which may have contributed to hasten his death. It is not in the power of any man to determine the degree to which each cause contributed to cause the death of the soldier.

In cases similar, where your committee have been utterly unable to decide the cause of death, they have invariably given the widow the benefit of the doubt, and they therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ADA PIATT, LEOTA PIATT, AND JESSIE PIATT.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 4743) granting a pension to Ada Piatt, Leota Piatt, and Jessie Piatt.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the names of Ada Piatt, Leota Piatt, and Jessie Piatt, minor children of Josiah Piatt, deceased, late of G Company, Eighty-ninth Regiment Illinois Infantry Volunteers, and to pay to their lawfully constituted guardian, for them, a pension, to take effect from the date of their father's death.

The amendment of the committee was read, as follows:

Strike out the following words in the bill:

"And to pay to their lawfully constituted guardian for them a pension, to take effect from the date of their father's death."

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4743) granting a pension to Ada Piatt, Leota Piatt, and Jessie Piatt, submit the following report:

The parties named in this bill are the minor children of Josiah Piatt, deceased, late of Company G, Eighty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteers. The mother of these children is dead. They are aged, respectively, fourteen, nine, and seven years. The soldier applied in 1865 for a pension for heart disease resulting from an injury received in the service. The pension was granted and at the time of his death the soldier was in receipt of the pension. The application of the children was rejected on the ground that the death of the father was not the result of the disease for which he was receiving a pension.

The only evidence submitted showing the cause of death is that of Dr. George L. Lucas, who testifies—

"That he was called to see the soldier April 29, 1882, and found him suffering from acute pneumonia and heart disease; that owing to above disease of lungs and heart he died on the 3d day of May, 1882; that, in his opinion, if he had not had disease of the heart he might have recovered from the disease of lungs, but owing to the complication, might rather be said to have died from heart disease and pneumonia."

The doctor further says that owing to the fact that applicant lived 16 miles from him he was able to see him but three times during his last illness.

No one will ever be able to determine what the actual cause of death was, but your committee feel that the helpless orphan children of this faithful soldier, who for two years served his country devotedly, should have the benefit of the doubt, and therefore recommend the passage of the bill with an amendment striking out all after the word "volunteers," in line 8.

The amendment of the committee was agreed to; and the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JOHN H. ROUNDTREE.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5759) granting a pension to John H. Roundtree.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John H. Rountree, late of Company G, Thirty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteers.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (by Mr. SPOONER) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5759) granting a pension to John H. Rountree, respectfully report:

John H. Rountree was a private in Company G, Thirty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteers. He was discharged the service upon surgeon's certificate of disability "because of scrotal hernia," it also being stated in said certificate that the soldier said:

"That for some months before enlisting he had pain and occasional swelling in the left side of the scrotum; that while drilling at Camp Strong, Iowa, the latter part of August last, the pain became intense and the swelling much increased. He has been in hospital and under treatment most of the time since, and done no duty."

His claim for pension was rejected by the Pension Office upon the ground that the soldier's disability existed prior to enlistment, presumably on account of the above-recited statement in said certificate being considered a record, and as such not to be disproved by any oral testimony.

The soldier personally made oath to his physical soundness at the time of and prior to his enlistment, and to the incurrence of said disability in the service; and the same facts are sustained and verified by the following testimony:

Dr. Staples testifies that he first became acquainted with the soldier in 1856, at which time he began to practice in his father's family, and knew him continuously until his enlistment in 1862; never had occasion to be consulted for him, and did not know but he was of sound health.

J. L. Wilson, who has known the soldier since 1856, and worked with him for years, including work breaking prairie with him in the spring and summer of 1862, prior to his enlistment, and went in swimming with him quite often, testifies that until after the soldier's discharge from service he never heard him complain or knew of his having any physical disability.

David H. Gill and William C. Long, who have also been intimate acquaintances of the soldier since 1856, corroborate the fact of physical soundness of the soldier prior to enlistment; and the latter testifies to seeing the rupture or varicocele when visiting the soldier at Camp Strong, when he was told by Rountree that he had been ruptured in a battalion drill a few days previously.

N. Gaskill, a comrade, of soldier's company, testifies to soldier coming to him at night after battalion drill and saying something was wrong with him, and showing the place of injury, which Gaskill told him was a rupture.

In the light of all the testimony on file, including the certificates of the examining surgeons, your committee are of the opinion that the fact of the physical soundness of the soldier at the time of his enlistment is sufficiently established; that the soldier is and has been afflicted both by hernia and varicocele, two distinct disabilities, and that it is probable that only some moderate symptoms of varicocele prior to his enlistment, if anything, gave occasion for the statement mentioned in said certificate of disability, which disease, if not incurred in, was undoubtedly greatly aggravated and increased by his military service, and should not be confounded with nor affect the claim of soldier based upon hernia.

Your committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

STEPHEN SINGLETON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 860) granting a pension to Stephen Singleton.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and hereby is, directed to place the name of Stephen Singleton, late a private in Company G, Eighty-seventh Indiana Volunteers, on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (by Mr. SPOONER) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 860) granting a pension to Stephen Singleton, respectfully report:

Stephen Singleton was a private in Company G, Eighty-seventh Indiana Volunteers, and was discharged June 10, 1865, after nearly three years' service.

His claim for pension, based upon injuries received and disease contracted in the service, was rejected by the Pension Office because of absence of record evidence of such injury or disease and lack of evidence required by the strict rules of the Pension Office.

The testimony of his family physician, Dr. Harris, and of his neighbors, Falconberg, three of the name of Kennedy, and Lewis Beagles, show that the claimant was a strong, healthy man prior to his enlistment.

Lieut. George Urquhart, of his company, states that while in line of duty, being detailed as teamster with the wagon-train near Savannah, Ga., about December 26, 1862, the claimant was thrown from his horse and severely injured, several of his ribs being fractured, in consequence of which said officer was called upon to detail another man to take his place. Lieutenant Urquhart was not an eyewitness of the injury, but knew of it as an officer of claimant's company and saw claimant soon afterwards.

Assistant Surgeon Gould, of claimant's regiment, testifies that he saw Singleton after his injury (a day or two after, he thinks); that three or four of his ribs were fractured; that the injury was followed by severe pleuritic inflammation, and continued to give him trouble up to the time of his discharge.

His comrades, Graves and Culp, whose good reputations fully verified, testify that claimant was much exposed to rain and snow at Camp Rolling Fork, Kentucky, in October, 1862; that he became quite lame from rheumatism; was treated therefor by one of the army surgeons; never had the disease before that.

His neighbors testify that since the soldier's return from his army service in 1865 he has suffered from rheumatism; and that he has been and is largely incapacitated for labor.

Dr. West, who treated him from his discharge, died in the spring of 1868; but Drs. Graham, Marsh, and Meredith have all treated him since for pains in side or rheumatism, Dr. Graham commencing such treatment soon after soldier's return from service.

The lack of direct medical evidence of soldier's physical condition at the time of and immediately after his discharge, occasioned by the death of Dr. West, is, in the opinion of your committee, supplied by the testimony of neighbors, who are certified to be credible witnesses, corroborated by the testimony of Drs. Graham, Marsh, and Meredith, above referred to.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

SALLIE T. WARD.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8574) granting a pension to Sallie T. Ward, widow of the late W. T. Ward.

Mr. HUNTER. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

Mr. CHEADLE. I give notice I will demand a quorum on this bill.

Mr. MATSON. I ask for the reading of the report.

Mr. BYNUM. I ask the bill be passed over, to retain its place on the Calendar.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

MARY A. WELLS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5792) granting a pension to Mary A. Wells.

Mr. O'DONNELL. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Mary A. Wells, a resident of Marshall, Mich., at the rate of $25 per month, on account of disa-

bility resulting from disease contracted while serving as a hospital nurse during the war of the rebellion.

The amendment of the committee was read, as follows:

Strike out, in line 6, the word "twenty-five" and insert the word "twelve."

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5792) granting a pension to Mary A. Wells, submitted the following report:

The bill proposes to place Mary A. Wells on the pension-rolls at the rate of $25 a month. She was appointed a nurse in April, 1864, by Miss L. L. Dix, superintendent of the Western Sanitary Commission. James E. Yeatman, president of the commission, certifies to her great skill and fidelity, and to the efficiency of her service. Miss Dix and many others with whom she came in official contact describe her as in all respects a valuable and faithful coadjutor in their humane work.

She was pecuniarily well off when she entered the service, but is now poor and eighty-five years of age. Her age, her services, her necessities all appeal to the Government for kindly recognition. The good women who nursed the sick and cared for the wounded have a strong place in the affection and respect of their countrymen. It is very hard to contemplate one who was so full of charity and patriotic devotion in her vigor now destitute in her age.

We recommend that the bill do pass, but that it be amended by substituting "twelve" for "fifty" in the sixth line.

The amendment of the committee was agreed to; and the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ELIAS SHAFER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6907) granting a pension to Elias Shafer.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of law, the name of Elias Shafer, late of Company K, Twenty-third Michigan Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of $45 per month, in lieu of the sum he now receives.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6907) granting an increase of pension to Elias Shafer, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Elias Shafer was a private in Company K, Twenty-third Regiment Michigan Volunteers, and is now a pensioner at $36 per month for loss of right leg above the knee, from wounds received at the battle of Resaca, Ga., May 14, 1864. From the files of the Pension Bureau it further appears that in August, 1863, while crossing the Cumberland Mountains, pensioner became ruptured on right side. This fact is established to the satisfaction of the Pension Bureau, and on December 10, 1887, a new certificate was issued to him including this additional disability, but because the combined disabilities are not of such a character as to require the regular aid and attendance of another person, that bureau is estopped from granting a pension above that provided for the loss of a leg above the knee.

Medical examinations in the case show the following as to rupture: He has a complete inguinal hernia of the right side. External ring is relaxed and large enough to admit two fingers. The strapping of the limb necessarily interferes with wearing of the truss and increases the irritation.

Claimant's power of locomotion is necessarily more impaired by this complication than it would be by the loss of the limb only. In consequence of his inability to take regular exercise he has become broken down in health and emaciated. At a height of 5 feet 10 inches his weight is only 124 pounds.

Congress has always liberally responded to calls for relief in this class of cases, and the one under consideration being particularly meritorious, your committee report favorably on the accompanying bill and ask that it do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

LEWIS C. KECK.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7577) granting a pension to Lewis C. Keck.

Mr. O'DONNELL. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and instructed to place on the pension-roll the name of Lewis C. Keck, invalid son of David Keck, deceased, late a private in Company I, Sixth Michigan Heavy Artillery, said pension to be at the rate of $18 per month.

SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect from and after its passage.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7577) granting a pension to Lewis C. Keck, report:

Keck was the son of Daniel Keck, deceased, who was a private in Company I, Sixth Regiment Michigan Heavy Artillery. He was placed on pension-rolls until he was sixteen years of age, his pension number being 148483, and the pension ceased November 18, 1876.

Petitions and affidavits filed with the committee show that he is deaf and dumb, has poor eye-sight and stomachic difficulties, and utterly incapable of self-support. He is dependent on a step-father, who is very poor, and that whether he can continue to receive this support is very doubtful.

The committee recommend that the bill do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

FREDERICK BENO.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 39) to grant an increase of pension to Frederick Beno.

Mr. HERMANN. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

Mr. MATSON. I ask that it be passed over informally.

Mr. HERMANN. I hope that will not be done. There is not a more meritorious case on the Calendar. This man is entirely paralyzed, absolutely unable to move, and confined to his bed.

Mr. MATSON. What is he drawing now?

Mr. HERMANN. Fifty dollars, but he is compelled to have the service of one or two assistants. He is poor, destitute, with no means to employ assistants.

Mr. MATSON. Very well; let it go.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and required to increase the pension of Frederick Beno, of East Portland, Oregon, to $72 per month.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (by Mr. THOMPSON, of California) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 39) to grant an increase of pension to Frederick Beno, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

A careful examination of the files of the Pension Bureau discloses the fact that claimant's disabilities are of such a character that the relief asked for should be granted without hesitation, and therefore respectfully return the accompanying bill, and ask that it do pass, the committee taking the liberty of adopting the report of the Senate committee in the case as their own, which is as follows:

"That said Beno was a private in Company F, Twelfth Missouri Infantry, and was severely wounded in thigh and arm at the battle of Vicksburg, May 22, 1863, and was only pensioned first at $4 a month; afterward increased to $50, and is clearly entitled to $72, as fully appears by the inclosed letters.

"All the papers in the Department clearly establish this claim, and your committee recommend the passage of the bill, with an amendment, inserting company and regiment in which he served.

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
"*Washington, D. C., December* 6, 188—.

"DEAR SIR: I desire to especially call your attention to the pension case of Frederick Beno, certificate No. 131076, who desires to have his allowance increased from $50 per month to $72 per month, the full sum which I understand can be given for a total disability.

"I desire to state, on my own personal knowledge, that Mr. Beno is totally disabled, being unable to walk and having no use of his arms or legs. He suffers intensely, and his neighbors frequently hear him several hundred yards away screaming in his misery. He is compelled to take morphine from six to twelve times a day, and has done so for years, to suppress his pain. From the use of morphine his body has become poisoned, until sores have appeared all over him, scarring his body almost completely.

"It is necessary to have some one by him all the time to attend him. Both testicles have had to be removed. He has a wife and three children, and possesses no property, but is a subject of charity upon his relatives, friends, and neighbors. His pain causes him to become delirious at times, and I have seen him in a perfectly insane and raving state; in fact, he is frequently insane, and when in that condition is dangerous to handle, for he then appears to have the power to strike wildly with his arms.

"In his sane moments I have conversed with him regarding his service in the war, and strange to say, notwithstanding his terrible condition, he becomes enthusiastic over the fact that he has sacrificed everything in defense of his country; and I have heard him say he would do it all over again rather than to see his country destroyed.

"If there was ever a case that possessed true merit for a full allowance for total disability it is this one.

"Yours, truly,

"M. C. GEORGE.

"Hon. W. W. DUDLEY, *Commissioner of Pensions.*"

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, PENSION OFFICE,
"*Washington, D. C., September* 18, 1886.

"SIR: In response to your inquiry of recent date relative to the pension claim of Frederick Beno, late of Company F, Twelfth Missouri Volunteers (certificate No. 131076), I would state that I have caused the evidence to be carefully examined and have personally considered the case.

"Claimant's physical condition, as set forth in your letter, would seem to entitle him to the highest rate of pension conferred by law, but the act of June 16, 1880, granting an increase from $50 to $72, provides only for those who were receiving or, as liberally construed by this office, entitled to receive $59 at date of the passage of said act.

"As claimant was not in receipt of $50, and as the evidence does not show his condition to be such as to have entitled him to said rating at that time, it is evident that he is not entitled to the benefits conferred by said act, and there is no provision under the law by which his present rating can be increased.

"Very respectfully,

——— ———, *Commissioner.*

"W. B. TAYLOR, Esq., *East Portland, Oregon.*"

"EAST PORTLAND, OREGON, *October* 21, 1887.

"SIR: I have the honor to make the following report relative to Frederick Beno, Company E, Twelfth Missouri Volunteers. I have this day carefully examined him and find him a complete and total wreck, both physically and mentally.

"He can not stand on his feet. He can not dress or undress himself. He is almost helpless.

"Respectfully, your obedient servant,

"W. W. ROYAL.

"Hon. JOHN H. MITCHELL,
"*United States Senate.*"

"HEADQUARTERS SUMNER POST, No. 12,
"DEPARTMENT OF OREGON, G. A. R.,
"*East Portland, Oregon, November* 3, 1887.

"GENTLEMEN: We wish to draw your attention to the case of Frederick Beno, late private Company E, Twelfth Missouri Infantry, who, from the nature of wounds received in the late war, is not only rendered mentally and physically helpless, but a constant and suffering charge to others. The amount of his pension ($50) is barely sufficient to meet the expenses of attendants, to say nothing of his support and medical attendance. Death has lately deprived him of his most vigilant and loving attendant (his wife), thus leaving him doubly dependent on others for care and comfort.

"You will readily perceive that with daily medical attendance and constant personal attendant, together with the amount necessary for his support, that $50 per month is entirely inadequate to meet the demands.

"We ask, therefore, that you use your utmost endeavors to have his pension increased to an amount sufficient to meet his daily expenses, until death, the only cure, shall relieve him from further want.

"We send herewith a surgeon's certificate of the patient's personal condition and disabilities.

"Hoping you will give this matter your attention and support at the earliest practicable period,

"We remain yours, obediently,

"C. E. BARTON,
"*Post Adjutant.*
"FELIX R. NEAL,
"*Post Commander, Sumner Post, No. 12, Dept. of Oregon, G. A. R.*

"To the United States Senators and Representative from Oregon, Messrs. MITCHELL, DOLPH, and HERMANN."

"STATE OF OREGON, *County of Multnomah:*

"On this 11th day of November, 1887, personally appeared before me W. W. Royal, a practicing physician, residing in East Portland, county and State aforesaid, who, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he has this day carefully examined Frederick Beno, an applicant for increase of pension, and found him a complete and total wreck, both physically and mentally; that he is unable to stand on his feet; can not dress or undress himself, and is almost helpless.

"W. W. ROYAL, M. D.

"Subscribed and sworn to this day and year first above written.

"[SEAL.] W. F. CREITZ,
"*Notary Public in and for the State of Oregon.*"

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ADVERSE REPORT.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2840) to pension Winemah Riddell.

The CHAIRMAN. What disposition will be made of this adverse report?

Mr. FINLEY. I ask that it be allowed to remain upon the Calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

SUSAN JONES.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3125) for the relief of Susan Jones.

Mr. BYNUM. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Susan Jones, widow of Marion Jones, formerly a member of the Thirteenth Missouri Volunteers.

The amendment of the committee was read, as follows:

Strike out in line 7 all after the word "of" and insert "Company C, Thirteenth Illinois Volunteers."

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (by Mr. MATSON) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3125) for the relief of Susan Jones, have had the same under consideration, and now submit the following report:

The applicant for relief under this bill is the widow of Marion Jones. The military history of the said Marion Jones, as gleaned from the papers before the committee, is as follows:

The records of the Adjutant-General's Office show that—

"Marion Jones was enrolled September 1, 1861, as a private in Company C, Thirteenth Illinois Volunteers, which regiment was subsequently designated the Twenty-second Ohio Volunteers, to serve three years, and was present with his company from enrollment to April 30, 1862. On the muster-rolls of the company from April 30, 1862, to October 31, 1862, he is reported "absent, sick in hospital at Corinth;" on subsequent rolls to August 31, 1863, "present;" on rolls for September and October, November and December, 1863, "detached in Eleventh Ohio Battery;" on subsequent rolls to June 30, 1864, "present;" on roll for January and February, 1864, "re-enlisted as a vetern volunteer, February 28, 1864;" on roll for July and August, 1864, "absent on veteran furlough since July 22, 1864;" on roll of Company B, same regiment to which transferred, for September and October, 1864, "sick in Columbus, Ohio;" on the roll for November and December, 1864, "deserted November 28, 1864;" and on the muster-out roll of the company, dated August 28, 1865, Little Rock, Ark., "deserted November 20, 1864, at Columbus, Ohio."

The widow in her application says that her said husband served continuously until the month of July, 1864, in which month, he being then stationed at Little Rock, Ark., left that place for Columbus, Ohio, for the purpose of procuring a furlough, since which time she has never heard of him, and she believes that he died or was killed while on the road from Little Rock to Columbus.

There is ample testimony to show that the said Marion Jones disappeared at the time stated, and that the widow or any of her relatives or friends have never seen or heard of him since. There is evidence that she was legally married to the said Marion Jones, and that she has never since remarried; that she has no estate of any kind, personal or real, and is entirely dependent on her own labor for support and maintenance; and that she was the mother of Calvin Gritten, who was a private in Company L or T, Seventh Regiment Indiana Cavalry, who died May 15, 1869.

The record shows that the said Marion Jones was a faithful soldier during a three-years' enlistment, and that when his term expired he re-enlisted as a veteran, and that at the time of his disappearance there was no cause why he should have deserted. The committee believe that now, after the lapse of twenty-three years, it is fair to presume he was either killed or died while on his way from Little Rock to Columbus.

The committee believe this is a meritorious case, and therefore submit a favorable report, and recommend the passage of the bill with the following amendments: In line 7 strike out all after the word "the" and insert "Company C, Thirteenth Illinois Volunteers."

The amendment of the committee was agreed to, and the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ANN V. FERGUSON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 7944) granting a pension to Ann V. Ferguson.

Mr. BYNUM. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of Ann V. Ferguson, of Indianapolis, Ind., a nurse in the United States Army during the late war of the rebellion at Hospital No. 1, Murfreesborough, Tenn., and other places, upon the pension-rolls, and that she be paid a pension during the remainder of life at the rate of $20 per month.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee recommend striking out "twenty" and inserting "twelve dollars per month."

Mr. BYNUM. I think the committee have heretofore pensioned nurses at $20.

Mr. SPOONER. The ordinary rate is $12.

Mr. BYNUM. Then I do not object.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (by Mr. MATSON) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7944) granting a pension to Ann V. Ferguson, have examined the papers on file, and submit the following report:

Ann V. Ferguson was regularly appointed as an army nurse by the sanitary commission of Indiana for the United States armies. She nursed at the Hospital No. 1, Murfreesborough, Tenn., and other places until the close of the war. Capt. Theodore W. McCoy testifies that claimant came to the army at Murfreesborough, Tenn., as a volunteer nurse, the first one that within his knowledge came to that part of the Army; that from the time she came she labored diligently, and rendered invaluable service as nurse in the field and general hospitals in and around Murfreesborough. She became the head of the volunteer nurses in one of the general hospitals, and remained there until the army moved in June, 1863. Her services are further attested by affidavits of persons who knew her and the valuable services she performed during the war.

The claimant is now sixty-nine years of age; in needy circumstances; broken in health, and physically unable to do anything for her support. There is no evidence that she received any compensation for her services as nurse, but, on the contrary, that she contributed from her own means in alleviating the suffering of our sick and wounded soldiery. She is alone in the world, her husband having died at Murfreesborough, Tenn., while looking after the interests of the soldiers by the request of the sanitary commission of Indiana.

Your committee favor the passage of the bill, and recommend it do pass with the following amendment: Strike out "twenty," in line 9, and insert "twelve."

The amendment of the committee was agreed to; and the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

LIEUT. JAMES G. W. HARDY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 8281) for the relief of Lieut. James G. W. Hardy.

Mr. CHEADLE. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-rolls, subject to the provisions and limitations of the general pension laws, the name of James G. W. Hardy, late second lieutenant Company K, Eleventh Regiment of Indiana Cavalry Volunteers, to commence from date of discharge.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (by Mr. MATSON) is as follows:

The facts in this case are these: James G. W. Hardy enlisted in Company H, Sixty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteers, in August, 1862; transferred to company B in 1863, and in October of that year detailed to recruit for a new regiment of cavalry. January 9, 1864, he was mustered as second lieutenant of company K, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Cavalry. He resigned, to take effect February 4, 1865, upon the following certificate:

"GRAVELLY SPRING, ALA., *January* 22, 1865.

"Lieut. James G. W. Hardy, of Company K, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment (Eleventh Cavalry) Indiana Volunteers, having applied for a certificate on which to ground a resignation, I hereby certify that I have carefully examined this officer, and find him with fracture of right humerus of ten months' standing, which, not having been properly adjusted, disables him so that he can not mount a horse from the ground, or draw a saber, in consequence of which he is, in my opinion, unfit for duty. He is, in my opinion, physically disqualified for service in the Veteran Reserve Corps.

"SAMUEL H. BUSHNELL,
"*Assistant Surgeon Eleventh Indiana Cavalry.*"

The manner in which this injury was incurred is thus stated in Pension Office letter of rejection:

"On or about January 15, 1864, he was traveling on the railroad from Indianapolis to La Fayette, Ind., on business connected with recruiting for his regiment, and near the former place he raised the window by which he was sitting and put his right elbow on the sill; while in this position his arm was struck by some object outside the car, and was fractured and otherwise injured."

While a strict construction of the law concerning "contributory negligence" would deprive Lieutenant Hardy of his right of damages against the railroad company, and might justify the Pension Office in its adverse action, your committee regard it as a case clearly within the duty of Congress to grant relief. Lieutenant Hardy's arm was broken and permanently disabled while in the service, zealously and effectively laboring for the interests of the public service, and we recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. MATSON. I move to amend by striking out that portion which provides the pension shall begin from the date of discharge.

The amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ENOCH WEATHERS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6973) for the relief of Enoch Weathers.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Enoch Weathers

late captain of a company of Indiana militia during the Morgan raid, subject to the conditions and limitations of the pension laws.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (by Mr. MATSON) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6973) for the relief of Enoch Weathers, have considered the same, and now submit the following report:

Enoch Weathers enlisted in a volunteer militia company formed in Crawford County, Indiana, in July, 1863, called the Marengo Light Guards, organized expressly for the purpose of suppressing the "Morgan raid."

The organization was in conformity to the militia law of Indiana, approved May 11, 1861, and it is proved that said company elected its officers and was mustered into the Indiana Legion, and that each member thereof took the oath of allegiance. The said Enoch Weathers was elected captain of said company, and was duly commissioned by Governor Oliver P. Morton. He asks that Congress pass a special act for his relief on the ground that while acting as a member of said company, and in line of duty, about the 17th day of July, 1863, at New Albany, Ind., while assisting in bringing a cannon on board of a boat he was ruptured in the right side by being severely struck with the tongue of a gun-carriage. He has made no application for pension for the reason that the Pension Department do not consider claims arising from injuries received by persons belonging to State militia organizations.

Lee Hazelwood testifies that he was the family physician of the claimant for twenty years prior to the rebellion, and was personally acquainted with him, and had good reason to know that he was a sound, able-bodied man, and free from hernia of any form when he joined the Union forces at the time of the Morgan raid in 1863. He also testifies that on or about July 20, 1863, claimant called at his office asking for advice and medical treatment. On examination, he found that he was badly ruptured—inguinal hernia of the right side; that he reduced the hernia and applied a truss, which answered the purpose for the time; that claimant said this rupture was caused by aiding and assisting in moving artillery at New Albany, Ind. He also says he knows from observation that said hernia continues to exist, and has gradually grown worse, disabling him more or less each year since 1863, and by reason of said hernia he is not able to perform manual labor over one-third of his time.

Dr. William B. Ballington, acting surgeon of said organization, testifies as follows:

"That on or about the 17th day of July, 1863, while in line of duty, in the Morgan raid at New Albany, Ind., Enoch Weathers was severely ruptured in the right side and was under my treatment for the same for some one or two days. I know these facts from personal knowledge."

Nathan N. Morgan, acting colonel, testifies as follows:

"I was the acting colonel of the Home Guard forces that marched after the Confederate John Morgan when he made his raid in 1863. Enoch Weathers was a duly commissioned captain of the Marengo Light Guards and served under me in the raid. At New Albany, Ind., I ordered him to put a cannon on board a steam-boat in order to transport same to Leavenworth, Ind. While assisting to get the cannon on board the boat he was jerked violently and injured. I saw him a few minutes after the accident and found him very sick, and he told me he had been ruptured by being jerked by the cannon. He continued indisposed until the forces were disbanded at Leavenworth, Ind."

John House testifies:

"I was a member of claimant's company; that on or about the 17th July, 1863, while helping to put a cannon on board a boat at New Albany, Enoch Weathers was injured in form of rupture, which disabled him from duty. I know these facts from personal knowledge, being present at the time."

Jacob Hutzlar, Michael R. Tucker, and William T. Vance all testify that they have been personally acquainted with Enoch Weathers for over thirty years; that prior to 1863 he was an able-bodied man, and that since that time to the present he has been suffering from rupture.

The evidence fully establishes the fact that the claimant enlisted, was mustered in, and served as a soldier as above set forth; that he was a sound, healthy man, free from hernia prior to and at the time of his enlistment; that he was ruptured as claimed; that said rupture was incurred in the service and in line of duty; and that said hernia or rupture has continued since its incurrence up to the present time.

After a careful examination of all the evidence submitted, the committee are of the opinion that this is a meritorious case, and so believing they submit a favorable report, and recommend the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ANNA M. THIELE.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 6976) for the relief of Anna M. Thiele.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to reinstate the name of Anna M. Thiele on the pension-roll, and pay to her the same amount of pension to which she was entitled, and for which she was rated as the widow of Peter Simonson, deceased, late captain of the Fifth Indiana Battery, and chief of artillery on the staff of General Stanley.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (by Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6976) for the relief of Anna M. Thiele, submit the following report:

Claimant was the widow of Peter Simonson, who was commissioned in September, 1861, as a captain of the Fifth Indiana Battery, and for meritorious services was promoted chief of artillery on General Stanley's staff, and from his promotion until the time of his death he served in that position; that while in the service and in the line of duty he was instantly killed while engaging the enemy on the 16th of June, 1864, before Pine Mountain, near Atlanta, Ga. As the widow of said Peter Simonson she was pensioned from the death of her husband until her marriage with Herman Thiele, October 28, 1870.

Claimant lived with her second husband for several years, when he abandoned her after having got possession and control of what little property she had received from her first husband, and leaving her without any means of support with an aged father dependent upon her. That her second husband died at Portland, Oregon, October 2, 1882, leaving no estate. She now seeks to have her name replaced upon the pension-rolls as the widow of Peter Simonson at the same rate she was entitled to and received up to the date of her remarriage with Herman Thiele.

It is an established rule of this committee where a husband has been killed in battle while engaging the enemy to recommend such class of cases to the favorable consideration of Congress. This claimant is advanced in years and is in destitute circumstances, and relies upon her own exertions for support. Her second husband squandered all her means and abandoned her, leaving her in her old age destitute. We therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

HENRY T. BRIDGES.

Mr. MATSON. I move that the committee rise.

Mr. PERKINS. Before that is done I ask unanimous consent, at the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE], who was unable to remain in the House, to call up the bill (H. R. 6545) to increase the pension of Henry T. Bridges. This soldier is in a dying condition, and the bill ought to pass.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to grant an increase of pension to Henry T. Bridges, late a soldier of the United States in the war with Mexico, and to pay him, from and after the passage of this act, $30 per month.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no objection, the report will be printed in the RECORD.

The report (by Mr. BLISS) is as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6545) to increase the pension of Henry T. Bridges, have considered the same, and report as follows:

The claimant, Henry T. Bridges, served in the Mexican war in Company B, Second Tennessee Volunteers, from the 4th day of June, 1846, to the 25th day of May, 1847, a period of nearly one year, as shown by the records of the War Department. He applied for pension in 1856, claiming that while in the military service, and especially while at Vera Cruz, where he participated in a battle, and at Cerro Gordo and Jalapa, Mexico, in the spring of 1847, he contracted a severe illness, for which he was treated in hospital, and which necessitated his being carried in a wagon on the march to Jalapa, and that, although he somewhat recovered, he suffered a relapse on his return to the United States.

In this declaration he did not state the exact nature of his diseases, but in the testimony filed therewith (in 1856) it appeared that the diseases were of the lungs and rheumatism, one comrade stating that near Tampico, Mexico, one of claimant's ankles became swollen, so that he was carried in an ambulance. The hospital records not having been preserved, and the testimony of a commissioned officer not having been furnished, the claim, upon the death of the claimant's attorney, was abandoned, and not reopened until about 1876.

In April, 1883, the claim was allowed for chronic bronchitis, and pension has been paid for that disease alone at the rate of $8 per month from January 24, 1876, to January 23, 1885, and $16 per month thereafter.

In addition to the chronic bronchitis, for which claimant is pensioned, there is also a claim for rheumatism and dyspepsia on file among the pension papers, and it appears that the disability from these latter diseases, with the bronchitis, have rendered claimant a confirmed invalid and permanently disabled him for performing manual labor. Upon this point the examining board of three physicians at Cairo, Ill., May 19, 1886, report as follows:

"The claimant is anæmic and weak; chest is flat, with ribs and clavicle very prominent; percussion notes are dull over both lungs; the respiratory murmur is feeble, and is accompanied by sibilant and mucous râles varying in degree and position; has frequent cough; throat and fauces are red and inflamed. The right elbow-joint is enlarged and partially stiffened; can not be fully extended by about 15 degrees. Both knees are enlarged and stiffened by plastic deposits, neither can be fully extended or flexed by 10 or 15 degrees.

"These joints do not seem tender to moderate pressure. There is an exostosis as large as a hen's egg 2 inches below upper end of left fibula; it appears tender. The left tibia is enlarged nearly one-half throughout the shaft of the bone. There is an exostosis about 1 inch in diameter elevated three-fourths of an inch near spine of right tibia, and another about 3 inches above knee-joint of posterior side of femur. The instep in both feet is depressed, producing slight talipes valgus. We consider this man permanently disabled for the performance of any manual labor."

At a previous examination by Examining Surgeon J. T. Jones, of Jackson, Tenn., the claimant was found to be severely affected by dyspepsia as well as bronchitis and severe disability from rheumatism.

From the claimant's statements to these surgeons, it appears that about 1870 the rheumatism began to assume its severe form of enlarged joints and the growth of bony tumors, and Dr. D. S. Laws, a reliable physician, testifies to the continued existence of that condition ever since, and gives it as his opinion, after studying the claimant's diseases for twenty years, that the rheumatism, bronchitis, and dyspepsia grew from the same cause.

The claimant has presented to your committee reliable testimony showing that he was affected by rheumatism, as well as piles and bronchitis, at his return from the service in 1847, and that said diseases have continued to affect him ever since that year. There is also testimony in the pension claim which establishes the existence of rheumatism and dyspepsia (or diarrhea) during the soldier's military service, and of the continuance of dyspepsia since that time.

Your committee are well satisfied that the rheumatism, which constitutes claimant's chief affliction and which confines him to his house, prevents him from performing manual labor and renders his existence almost unendurable, had its commencement in the winter of 1847, near Tampico, Mexico, where claimant's "ankles were swelled," as was sworn to by his comrade, John M. King, in an affidavit filed in the pension claim more than thirty years ago.

The soldier served a long period of service, endured the privations incident to an army in an enemy's country, participated in battles, and is now in his old age rendered helpless by diseases in that way incurred.

Your committee are of the opinion that the bill should pass, and return it to the House with that recommendation.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MATSON. I move that the committee do now rise.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I ask that the bill (H. R. 7907) granting a pension to Mary Ann Lang be taken up for present consideration.

Mr. MATSON. I must insist upon the motion, as we will not have more than time to pass the bills already acted upon.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCCREARY having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. DOCKERY reported that the Committee of the Whole House, having had under consideration the Private Calendar under the special order, had directed him to report sundry bills to the House with various recommendations.

BILLS PASSED.

The following bills, reported from the Committee of the Whole, were severally considered and ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, were accordingly read the third time, and passed; namely:

A bill (H. R. 6990) to place the name of Rebecca E. Shoemaker on the pension-roll;

A bill (H. R. 7665) granting a pension to John E. Lewis;

A bill (H. R. 2116) granting a pension to Johanna Eckhardt;

A bill (H. R. 6574) for the relief of William Compton;

A bill (H. R. 3706) granting a pension to Henry C. Richardson;

A bill (H. R. 6577) granting a pension to Abigail Sullivan;

A bill (H. R. 3690) granting a pension to Penelope Morton, widow of Lieut. James Morton;

A bill (H. R. 362) to increase the pension of Charles W. Sanborn;

A bill (H. R. 8217) granting a pension to Raphael Fowler;

A bill (H. R. 7097) granting a pension to Edmund Ryan;

A bill (H. R. 8722) granting a pension to Jessie M. Barthauer;

A bill (H. R. 215) granting a pension to James McCaffrey;

A bill (H. R. 780) granting a pension to James H. Darling;

A bill (H. R. 2174) granting a pension to Lewis Fichthorn;

A bill (H. R. 4831) granting a pension to Delilah Vandevender;

A bill (H. R. 7974) granting a pension to Heman Rankins;

A bill (H. R. 8629) granting a pension to Mrs. Abba E. Jackson;

A bill (H. R. 7111) granting a pension to Caroline Pautel;

A bill (H. R. 8400) for the relief of Lydia Burridge;

A bill (H. R. 8174) granting a pension to Ellen Sexton;

A bill (H. R. 5759) granting a pension to John H. Roundtree;

A bill (H. R. 6907) granting an increase of pension to Elias Shafer;

A bill (H. R. 7577) granting a pension to Lewis C. Keck;

A bill (H. R. 6973) for the relief of Enoch Weathers;

A bill (H. R. 6976) for the relief of Anna M. Thiele;

A bill (H. R. 6545) to increase the pension to Henry T. Bridges; and

A bill (H. R. 5756) granting a pension to David Gibbons.

The following bills reported from the Committee of the Whole with amendments were severally considered, the amendments concurred in, and the bills as amended ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, were accordingly read the third time, and passed, namely:

A bill (H. R. 7857) to increase the pension of Henry L. Potter;

A bill (H. R. 5903) for the relief of Lewis Davis, a soldier of the war of 1812;

A bill (H. R. 7719) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kincaid;

A bill (H. R. 6245) for the relief of William Burk;

A bill (H. R. 8159) granting a pension to Jane Brown Dunn;

A bill (H. R. 891) granting a pension to Eliza Ann Shaver,

A bill (H. R. 2529) granting a pension to Mary Monti;

A bill (H. R. 2215) granting a pension to Charles Glamann;

A bill (H. R. 7115) granting a pension to William Scott;

A bill (H. R. 5574) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Beyers;

A bill (H. R. 3016) granting a pension to Mary F. Harkins;

A bill (H. R. 4743) granting pensions to Ada Piatt, Leota Piatt, and Jessie Piatt;

A bill (H. R. 5792) granting a pension to Mary A. Wells,

A bill (H. R. 3125) for the relief of Susan Jones;

A bill (H. R. 7944) granting a pension to Ann V. Ferguson;

A bill (H. R. 8281) for the relief of Lieut. James G. W. Hardy; and

A bill (H. R. 6949) granting a pension to Emeline C. Young; the title of the latter being amended to conform to the amendments in the bill.

The bill (H. R. 8285) to remove the political disabilities of Elliott Johnson was considered.

Mr. THOMAS H. B. BROWNE. I move to amend this bill by making it read "Johnston," as the name is incorrectly spelled.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed (two thirds voting in favor thereof).

The following Senate bills reported from the Committee of the Whole were considered, ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, were passed; namely:

A bill (S. 331) granting a pension to John Kalbfleisch;

A bill (S. 2419) granting a pension to Lemuel R. Rea;

A bill (S. 835) for the relief of Elisha Griswold;

A bill (S. 1096) granting a pension to James Lucas;

A bill (S. 801) for the relief of Basile Champagne;

A bill (S. 816) granting a pension to Anastasia Walter;

A bill (S. 820) granting a pension to David A. Servis;

A bill (S. 805) granting a pension to Melvina Greenwood;

A bill (S. 1717) granting a pension to Emma Van Bernewitz;

A bill (S. 811) granting a pension to Lydia D. Holtz;

A bill (S. 860) granting a pension to Stephen Singleton; and

A bill (S. 39) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Beno.

Mr. MATSON moved to reconsider the several votes taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

RECOMMITTED.

The bill (H. R. 2115) granting a pension to Fletcher S. Dewey was reported back with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The recommendation of the Committee of the Whole was concurred in.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

The bill (H. R. 366) granting a pension to James Ferris was reported back with the recommendation that it be laid on the table.

The recommendation of the Committee of the Whole was concurred in.

The bill (S. 806) granting a pension to William Healy was reported from the Committee of the Whole with the recommendation that it be indefinitely postponed.

The recommendation of the Committee of the Whole was concurred in.

ANNA MERTZ.

Mr. CANNON. I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill (S. 1237) granting a pension to Anna Mertz.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Anna Mertz, the widow, and the minor children of Charles A. Mertz, late a captain of Company K, Sixty-second Illinois Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. LANE) is as follows:

The committee to whom was referred the bill (S. 1237) beg leave to report that they have considered the same, and adopted the report of the Senate on said bill as their own report, which is as follows:

"[Senate Report No. 448, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

"The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1237) granting a pension to Anna Mertz, widow, and the minor children of Charles A. Mertz, have examined the same, and report:

"The claimant is the widow of Charles A. Mertz, deceased, who was a captain in Company K, of Sixty-second Regiment of Illinois Volunteer Infantry, in the war of the rebellion. The husband was mustered into the service as captain, April 10, 1862, and resigned June 7, 1863. It appears from the certificate of Dr. John W. Cameron, surgeon of the regiment, dated Jackson, Tenn., 6th day of January, 1863, that he was suffering from disease in such manner as to require a furlough of thirty days, and furlough was recommended for that time. He returned, however, to the regiment at Jackson, Tenn., but on the 17th of May, 1863, the surgeon of the regiment again certified that he was wholly unfit for duty, and that there would be no probability of his recovery in less than six months, if at all. Upon this he tendered his resignation, and the same was accepted. He returned home, but never recovered.

"It appears from the testimony of his comrades and neighbors on file that he was a sound, healthy man before he entered the Army. It is shown that he was attacked while in the service, from the labor and exposure incident thereto, with chronic intermittent fever, followed by acute dysentery, which debilitated him to the extent that he was wholly unfit for duty. Upon his return home, as appears from the evidence of his neighbors, and Dr. Keneper and others, he was continuously affected with chronic diarrhea, catarrh, and intense pains in the head. To ease his suffering, he frequently took laudanum and morphine under the advice of physicians. This relief was, however, temporary. He never applied for a pension, although he constantly attributed his complaints to his army service. He worked occasionally at his trade, but was subject at any time to attacks of very severe diarrhea, accompanied with acute catarrhal pains in the head and face.

"On the 1st of December, 1884, he died from the effects of an overdose of morphine taken to alleviate his suffering. The evidence does not show that he had a prescription from a physician upon the occasion of the fatal dose. It shows that he had, under medical advice several times given him, taken the same medicine, and was in the habit of taking it when attacked by his disease. We think the death clearly traceable to the disease as its primary cause.

"The widow is very poor; has two children of this soldier, offsprings of her marriage with him, depending upon her support.

"We recommend passage of the bill, amended by inserting 'captain' in seventh line in place of 'private,' which is a misdescription of the deceased."

In consideration of the facts of this case the committee recommend that said bill do pass.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CANNON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MATTHEW H. REYNOLDS.

Mr. FORD. I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill (H. R. 4774) granting a pension to Matthew H. Reynolds.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to put the name of Matthew H. Reynolds, late private of Company B, First Michigan Cavalry, on the pension-roll, subject to the limitations and provisions of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4774) granting a pension to Matthew H. Reynolds, having considered the same, beg leave to report as follows:

Reynolds enlisted August 25, 1861, as a private in Company B, First Regiment Michigan Cavalry, and was discharged November 27, 1862, "on account of rheumatic lameness of the back and shoulders, with acute pain through the lungs." The certificate of disability for discharge further stated—

"He was severely injured in the back by a load of logs falling upon him before his enlistment, and has suffered from that injury nearly all the time since."

On July 1, 1879, Reynolds filed an application for a pension, and alleged that while in the line of duty near Manassas, Va., and being engaged in shoeing a young horse, he became injured and contracted rheumatism. His claim was rejected July 15, 1884, on the ground "that claimant's alleged rheumatism is the result of an injury to his back incurred prior to his enlistment, as shown by the certificate of disability upon which he was discharged the service."

From the testimony submitted to the committee it can not be doubted that, at the time of his enlistment, Reynolds was a sound, able-bodied man. Albert Hoag and Daniel Fraser, in a joint affidavit, testify that they well knew Reynolds prior to his enlistment, and that he was a "strong, healthy man." Edward M. Watson testifies that he enlisted at the same time with Reynolds, and in the same company, and that he distinctly remembers Reynolds as a sound, healthy man, and that—

"Reynolds was one of the first men put on duty as company blacksmith, and during the year that I remained with his company don't think he was away or unable for duty. In fact, I do not hesitate to state that in 1861 he (Reynolds) had no visible ailments that I ever heard of, and I was acquainted with him for several years previous to the war."

Edward N. Negus, late first sergeant of Reynolds's company, testifies that he knew Reynolds at the time of his enlistment, and that he was then, to all appearances, as sound and healthy as any man in the regiment. That Reynolds, upon enlistment, was at once appointed company blacksmith, and served in that capacity until discharged. Also, that in 1862—

"Reynolds was shoeing one of the company horses, it being a colt that had been captured a few days before; the horse struggled and threw Reynolds, and wrenched his back, from which hurt he never recovered while in the service."

Dr. Louis D. Cyr, of Marquette, Mich., testifies that he knew Reynolds for four or five years before he enlisted, and that he then seemed to be strong and vigorous and not suffering from any disease.

In an affidavit dated the 26th of March, 1888, and which has been submitted to the committee, the claimant, Reynolds, emphatically and positively denies that he was ever injured by a load of logs falling upon him; that he never had anything to do with logs or logging prior to the war; that he never was on or near a load of logs; that before enlistment he was engaged in mining in the iron region of Northern Michigan; that the surgeon must have made a mistake in certifying that he (Reynolds) was injured before enlistment by a load of logs falling upon him; that the surgeon evidently confounded him (Reynolds) with another blacksmith named Hutchins, who worked at the forge, but who could not shoe horses or ride in the saddle on account of some weakness or injury to his back. And he further says, "It is my belief that the surgeon has mixed his (Hutchins) case with mine."

This recent affidavit is hereto appended and made a part of this report.

Reynolds is now an inmate of the Michigan Soldiers' Home, and, owing to his injury, is in a perfectly helpless condition.

The committee recommend that the bill do pass.

"STATE OF MICHIGAN, *County of Kent, ss:*

"In the matter of the claim for original invalid pension of Matthew H. Reynolds, of Company B, First Regiment Michigan Cavalry Volunteers.

"Personally came before me, a notary public in and for aforesaid county and State, Matthew H. Reynolds, of Soldiers' Home, in the county of Kent, State of Michigan, reputable and entitled to credit; and who, being duly sworn, declares in relation to the aforesaid claim as follows:

"My post-office address is Soldiers' Home, Grand Rapids, Mich.; my age is sixty-two years. Having lately learned that my claim for pension as given above was rejected because some one has claimed that I was injured before my enlistment by a load of logs falling on me, I do most solemnly swear that the allegation is false; I never was injured by a load of logs; I never was on or near a load of logs; I never had anything to do with logs or logging previous to the war, as I was engaged in the iron business and was living in the mining regions of Northern Michigan. I would respectfully call attention to the fact that Capt. E. L. Negus, in command of my company, has also sworn that I was as sound a man at my enlistment, in August, 1861, as any man in the regiment; and has also testified to the very time when I was injured, viz, at or near Centreville, Va., in August, 1862, while at work shoeing a wild colt which had been captured from the enemy.

"I would also call attention to the fact that I shod horses over a year in all sorts of weather—often in the mud; sometimes set as many as twenty shoes in a day. My witnesses—Edward Watson, Joseph Harris, George Harris, Albert Hoag, James Maloney, Matthew Hardyman—have each testified to my being a sound man before the war. There was another blacksmith named Hutchins, who worked at the forge, but could not shoe horses or ride the saddle, on account of some weakness or injury to his back, and it is my belief that the surgeon has mixed his case with mine. As I have been perfectly helpless for many years on account of said injury to my back, incurred while in the United States service, and am now confined in the Michigan Soldiers' Home Hospital, I entreat the kind consideration of your honorable body.

"MATTHEW H. REYNOLDS."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FORD moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ELLEN M. THIERS.

Mr. O'DONNELL. I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill (H. R. 5789) granting a pension to Ellen M. Thiers.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Ellen M. Thiers, a resident of Battle Creek, Mich., at the rate of $25 per month, on account of disability resulting from disease contracted while serving as a hospital nurse during the war of the rebellion.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions recommended the following amendment:

In line 6 strike out "$25" and insert "$12."

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5789) granting a pension to Ellen M. Thiers, submit the following report:

Ellen M. Thiers was appointed a nurse in the hospital service of the western department of the Chicago sanitary commission, and her appointment confirmed by Miss D. L. Dix, general superintendent of nurses in military hospitals of the United States. She entered the service in 1863; was detailed for duty at Paducah, Ky., and served in the hospital there until the close of the war in 1865. She had the general supervision of two wards, and her labor was very severe.

The hospital was in a very high building, and she, in the performance of her duties, was obliged many times a day to descend from the top to the bottom and to ascend again twenty-five steps. This brought on her sickness peculiar to women, from which she has suffered ever since, and has resulted in fatty degeneration of the heart. She is now an old woman, and is unable to labor by reason of the ailments she incurred in the service, and is dependent on relatives for support.

We recommend that the bill be amended by inserting "twelve" in lieu of "twenty-five" in the sixth line, and as amended, passed.

The amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. O'DONNELL moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of 10.30 p. m. having arrived, the House, pursuant to order, stands adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. DINGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9922) granting a pension to Mrs. Eliza N. Cromwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNN: A bill (H. R. 9923) for the relief of Samuel F. Davidson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. JOSEPH: A bill (H. R. 9924) for the relief of James P. Chase—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9925) for the relief of James P. Chase—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAIRD: A bill (H. R. 9926) for the relief of James Pace—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9927) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of P. Dunphy—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 9928) for the relief of Julia Ann Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. C. A. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 9929) for the relief of Samuel B. Horne—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUNTER: A bill (H. R. 9930) granting a pension to Joseph B. Reed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BYNUM: Petition of Adam Girten and 90 others, citizens of Shelby County, Indiana, in favor of amendment of the postal laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CHEADLE: Petition of Dr. A. J. Purdy and 72 others, citizens of Benton County, Indiana, for the establishment of a soldiers' home in Indiana—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COX: Memorial of the Century Association of New York, accompanied by a letter from Hon. John Bigelow, in favor of the recognition of literary property and its rights—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORNEY: Petition of J. N. Franklin, De Kalb County, Alabama, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FULLER (by request): Petition of C. W. D. Lathrop, in reference to the adjustment of his salary as fourth-class postmaster—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HIRES: Petition of the Moorestown Grange, No. 8, of New Jersey, in favor of pure food—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOWARD: Protest of certain citizens of New Albany, Ind., against the reduction of the tariff on window-glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McKINLEY: Petition of Local Assembly No. 6824, Knights of Labor, of Youngstown, Ohio, against civil pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAISH: Petition of John Black, of Edward Collins, of Jane Ann Clapsaddle, of estate of Abraham Brein, of Emanuel Wherley, of Sarah Patterson, and of John Bushman, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MANSUR: Petition of 30 citizens of Nebraska, for the organization of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. NEAL: Petition of John M. Kimbrough, Monroe County, Tennessee, for reference of his case to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: Petition of privates of hospital corps, for increase of salary—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: Evidence in support of House bill 9691, for the relief of William L. Lenan—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of heir of Mrs. Fereby Johnson, of Rutherford County, Tennessee, for reference of his case to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS (by request): Petition of certain citizens of the Choctaw Nation, for relief—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also (by request), petition of certain citizens of Hot Springs, Ark., for the pre-emption right as to certain lots—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. C. A. RUSSELL: Petition of Samuel B. Horne, for relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HENRY SMITH: Petition of J. H. Haviland and 21 others, citizens of Rock County, Wisconsin, against any change in the Bureau of Animal Industry, and in favor of pure food—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOOLE: Petition of the Montana Society Civil Engineers, for the passage of the pending Cullom-Breckinridge bill to establish a bureau of harbors and water ways—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of James H. Yarborough, and of C. W. Hengley, of Davidson County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. BAYNE: Of A. C. Walker and other druggists of Sewickley, Pa.

By Mr. S. I. HOPKINS: Of George W. Allen and others, citizens of South Boston, Va.

By Mr. JACKSON: Of druggists of Claysville, Pa.

By Mr. PENINGTON: Of James M. Griffin and of John J. Gallagher & Bro., of Wilmington, Del.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. PUGSLEY: Of J. B. McLaughlin and 72 others, citizens of Ross County, Ohio.

By Mr. SAYERS: Of sundry citizens of Austin, Tex.

The following petition for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, was received, and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. PHELPS: Of citizens of Bergen County, New Jersey.

The following petition, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. BELMONT: Of ex-Union soldiers of Suffolk County and of Queens County, New York.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. FORNEY: Of M. E. Dozier, George F. Gaither, and Patrick Tucker, committee of organized labor in Alabama.

By Mr. LIND: Of 66 citizens of Brown and Rock Counties, Minnesota

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *May* 12, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER laid before the House bills of the Senate of the following titles; which were severally read twice, and referred to the committees indicated:

The bill (S. 269) to grant to the Fort Smith and El Paso Railway Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The bill (S. 449) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Maj. Gen. Henry Knox at Thomaston, Me.—to the Committee on the Library.

The bill (S. 658) for the erection of a public building at the city of Beatrice, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 1322) providing for the erection of a public building at the city of Hastings, Nebr.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 1507) providing for an additional associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Territories.

The bill (S. 1725) for the relief of the legal representatives of Lewis W. Washington, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (S. 1813) for the relief of Susan B. Hopkins, widow of Arvah Hopkins, late of Tallahassee, Fla., deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 1929) to authorize the purchase of five manuscript volumes (being letter-books) of William Vans Murray, formerly minister at The Hague and at Paris—to the Committee on the Library.

The bill (S. 2024) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Mississippi River at or near Clarksville, Mo., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 2536) granting to the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company the right of way through the Nez Percé Indian reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The bill (S. 2542) to reimburse certain persons who expended moneys and furnished services and supplies in repelling invasions and suppressing Indian hostilities within the territorial limits of the present State of Nevada—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

The bill (S. 1430) to forfeit certain lands heretofore granted for the purpose of aiding in the construction of railroads, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SAWYER, for Saturday and Monday, on account of important engagements.

To Mr. DARLINGTON, until Tuesday, on account of important business.

To Mr. GAINES, for ten days, on account of important business.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. O'DONNELL, by unanimous consent leave was given to withdraw from the files of the House papers in the case of Nelson Green, Forty-ninth Congress, without leaving copies, no adverse report having been made thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 339) for the relief of J. E. Pilcher;

A bill (H. R. 671) for the relief of the heirs of John S. Fillmore, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 1473) authorizing the President of the United States to arrange a conference between the United States of America and the Republics of Mexico, Central and South America, Hayti, San Domingo, and the Empire of Brazil; and

A bill (H. R. 6831) to detach the county of Audrain, in the State of Missouri, from the eastern, and attach it to the western, judicial district of said State.

PORT OF NEW ORLEANS.

Mr. LAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the House Calendar and put upon its passage the bill (H. R. 3376) to extend the limits of the port of New Orleans.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limits of the port of entry of New Orleans, La., shall be, and the same are hereby, extended so as to include that portion of the parish of Jefferson lying between the Mississippi River, Lake Pontchartrain, the upper line of the parish of Orleans, left bank, and a line running parallel thereto, commencing at the Mississippi River at a point 2 miles above the upper line of the said parish of Orleans, and extending to Lake Pontchartrain.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I think there ought to be some explanation of that bill.

Mr. LAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the Southern Pacific Railroad having been extended through from Texas, they found it necessary to procure space for wharves at New Orleans. They could not be accommodated in the city within the limits of the port, and in consequence they had to purchase property beyond, and they now wish to have the limits of the port extended so as to take them in.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Is this concurred in by the Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. LAGAN. Yes; they are working now under permission from him to receive goods.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I have no objection, Mr. Speaker.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LAGAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING, EMPORIA, KANS.

Mr. RYAN. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1913) and put it on its passage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will send for the bill and will recognize the gentleman later.

OLD UNITED STATES COURT BUILDINGS, UTICA, N. Y.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 103), and that it be now put upon its passage.

The joint resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Department of Justice be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to transfer and relinquish to the city of Utica, State of New York, all the right, title, and claim of the United States to the rooms in what is described as the city hall, in said city of Utica, which were formerly used for the United States courts and officials thereof under a deed or lease executed on the 25th day of May, 1857, the same having been entirely abandoned by the said courts and officials thereof, a new building having been erected by the Government for the convenience and occupancy of said United States courts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SHERMAN]?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Will the gentleman explain the object of the bill?

Mr. SHERMAN. The letter of the Attorney-General at the end of the report covers the whole case. I ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, *Washington, February* 13, 1888.

SIR: Your letter of the 9th instant has been received, transmitting House resolution 103 respecting the rooms of the United States at Utica, N. Y., leased for court purposes. In reply, you are informed that the Department has long had no use of the rooms for the purpose mentioned. They have been annually a source of some expense to the Department in its official supervision of the same through the marshal of the northern district of New York, and some other slight expenses. In my annual report to Congress, December 1, 1887, legislation was recommended to dispose of the interest of the United States in the rooms.

It is understood that there is no probability of a future need for them by the courts. I therefore renew my recommendation that Congress shall dispose of them in such a manner as it shall deem proper, and, in my judgment, the action proposed by the joint resolution is appropriate.

Very respectfully,

A. H. GARLAND,
Attorney-General.

Hon. J. R. NEAL,
House of Representatives.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHERMAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

A. M. ANDERSON AND OTHERS.

Mr. COWLES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5222) for the relief of A. M. Anderson and others.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, an amount sufficient to adjust and settle the accounts of A. M. Anderson, Hall Caldwell, A. C. Bryan, and C. C. Crumpler, special deputy collectors employed by J. J. Mott, then collector of the sixth collection district of North Carolina, during and for the months of January and February, 1879, to each, or to his legal representative or heirs at law, the pay of a special deputy collector for the two months above mentioned, they having been employed by the said collector of the district on said duty, and never having received any compensation therefor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. COWLES moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the bill to which I referred a while ago is not on the Speaker's table. I wish to remind the Chair that I called it up some days ago and asked unanimous consent, but my friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] suggested that I should let it lie on the Speaker's table until I could find an opportunity to bring it up later.

Mr. MILLS. What is the nature of the bill?

Mr. RYAN. It is a public-building bill.

Mr. MILLS. I must object to that bill.

Mr. RYAN. It is not quite necessary for the gentleman to object just yet. I am merely informing the Speaker of the status of the bill. I understand that by a mistake it was referred to the committee, although it was intended that it should remain on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The Chair remembers the circumstances. It was to have been retained in the hands of the Chair, but it was inadvertently sent to the committee. The Clerk will read the bill, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The Clerk read the title of the bill, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9770) for the erection of a public building at Emporia, Kans.

Mr. MILLS. Do I understand the Chair to say that that bill is now before the House?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that it be now considered.

Mr. MILLS. I stated that I objected to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS. Five days have been granted for the consideration of public-building bills, and besides that other days have been set aside for that purpose. I am willing to have unanimous consent to go on with other business in the morning, but I am unwilling that public-building bills shall absorb any more of the time of the House.

THOMAS MATHEWS AND OTHERS.

Mr. NUTTING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4581) for the relief of Thomas Mathews and others, and that the bill be put upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to investigate the claims of Thomas Mathews, for the sum of $54.80; H. A. Crane, for the sum of $37.80; William McChesney, for the sum of $20.20; John K. Post & Co., for the sum of $324.20; E. W. Rathbun & Co., for the sum of $585.20; Irwin P. Sloan, for the sum of $611.40; C. C. Morton, for the sum of $103.20; Charles H. Getman, for the sum of $115.20; Edward Monen, for the sum of $124.60; Smith, Murdock & Co., for the sum of $107.60; Daniel L. Couch, for the sum of $142.80; Failing and Pratt, for the sum of $71.40; Failing and Rundell, for the sum of $45.60; L. A. Card, for the sum of $75.20; E. L. and S. Thornton, for the sum of $35.80; Paige, Fairchild & Co., for the sum of $64; D. P. Fairchild, for the sum of $55.20; O. M. Bond & Co., for the sum of $49.20; I. P. Wetmore, for the sum of $32; Ross & Co., for the sum of $72.60; Bond and Jenkins, for the sum of $23.20; Crane, Belden & Co., for the sum of $46.20; Bond, Kinyon & Co., for the sum of $8.40; Kinyon, Wright & Co., for the sum of $41.80; Charles O'Harra, for the sum of $10.40; Page & Co., for the sum of $7.20; Hogoman and Murdock, for the sum of $35.60; Cheeney, Ames & Co., for the sum of $10.80; now or formerly importers in the customs district of Oswego, N. Y., being the several amounts of fees alleged to have been unlawfully collected of them respectively, by collectors of customs at the port of Oswego, N. Y., from the 1st day of April, 1873, to the 31st day of December, 1882, inclusive, under section 2654 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (second edition); and in case he shall be satisfied that such claims or any part or parts thereof were unlawfully collected, he shall refund the same to the said firms or parties, or their legal representatives, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated.

The report (by Mr. BURROWS) was read, as follows:

That the Committee on Ways and Means of the Forty-eighth Congress made favorable report of this bill after referring the claims therein provided for to the Secretary of the Treasury for consideration, and after due investigation this committee adopt their favorable report, and append hereto a recent letter from the Secretary of the Treasury in relation thereto.

The collector of customs at the port of Oswego, N. Y., from the 1st day of April, 1873, to the 31st day of December, 1882, inclusive, demanded and collected of the persons and firms hereinafter named the several sums set opposite their respective names. These several sums are made up of fees collected by the collector at said port during the time named for certificates claimed to be of the character authorized and covered by section 2654 of the Revised Statutes (section 2, act of March 2, 1879, Statutes at Large, vol. 1, page 706.)

The legality of these several payments was tested in the case of Cochrane v. Schell, Supreme Court of the United States, October, 1882, term, in which decision it was held that the stamp affixed to consular invoices (on importations similar to those made by the persons named in the bill) was not such a certificate as warranted the collection from the importer of a fee of 20 cents. In a letter from the Secretary of the United States Treasury concerning the subject-matter of this bill and the fees therein mentioned, dated December 19, 1884, the Secretary disposes of the whole matter. Following is a copy of the letter:

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
"*Washington, D. C., December* 19, 1884.

"SIR: In response to a communication made under your direction on the 24th of June last to the Secretary of the Treasury, submitting for his consideration H. R. 7106, a bill for the relief of Thomas Mathews and others, I have the honor to return herewith a copy of a letter under the date of the 10th instant from the collector of customs at Oswego, N. Y., advising the payment to Thomas Mathews and the other persons named in the bill of the amounts set opposite the several names of the same persons in his letter. The claims to these sums arise under a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States procured at the October term, 1882, in the case of Cochrane *vs.* Augustus Schell, in which decision it was held that the stamp affixed to consular invoices (on importations similar to those made by the persons named in the bill) was not such a certificate as warranted the collection from the importer of a fee of 20 cents. The sums named in the letter were for fees of this character exacted under the supposed authority of section 2654 of the Revised Statutes (section 2, act of March 2, 1879, Stats. at Large, vol. 1, page 706). Accompanying the letter are detailed statements of the sums collected from each person named in the bill, with the date of collection as taken from the records of the collector's office.

"The claimants would seem to be justly entitled to a refund of the amounts exacted of them.

"Very respectfully,

"CHAS. E. COON, *Acting Secretary.*

"Hon. H. A. HERBERT,
"*Of the Committee on Ways and Means,*
"*House of Representatives.*"

The following is a list of the persons and firms affected by this bill and covered by the letter of the Secretary of the Treasury and the letter of the collector of the port of Oswego, N. Y., to wit:

Charles H. Getman	$115.20	Irwin P. Sloan	$611.40
J. K. Post & Co	324.20	Edward Monen	124.60
E. W. Rathbun & Co	585.20	Smith, Murdock & Co	107.60
Kinyon, Wright & Co	41.80	Hogoman & Murdock	35.60
Paige, Fairchild & Co	64.00	Charles O'Harra	10.40
Cheeney, Ames & Co.	10.80	Page & Co	7.20
William McChesney	20.20	Bond, Kinyon & Co	8.40
Crane, Belden & Co	46.20	C. C. Morton	103.20
Bond & Jenkins	23.20	Thomas Mathews	54.80
O. M. Bond & Co	49.20	E. L. & S. Thornton	35.80
Failing & Pratt	71.40	Failing & Rundell	45.60
Ross & Co	72.60	D. P. Fairchild	55.20
L. A. Card	75.20	I. P. Wetmore	32.00
H. A. Crane	37.80		
Daniel L. Couch	142.80	Total	2,911.60

These sums, there is no doubt, were collected without authority of law, and in the opinion of your committee ought to be returned to the parties named. These several sums are now in the Treasury of the United States.

"TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *February* 9, 1888.

"SIR: The Department is in receipt of a letter, dated the 6th instant, from Mr.

Henry Talbot, clerk of your committee, in which he incloses bill H. R. 4581, entitled 'A bill for the relief of Thomas Mathews and others,' and requests that you be advised whether the Department has any information in the matters referred to in the bill since the date of its communication to Mr. Herbert, of the Committee on Ways and Means of December 19, 1884, which is embodied in the report of the committee on the bill in Forty-eighth Congress (Report No. 2698).

"In reply, you are informed that the Department has no knowledge of any facts or matters which have occurred in connection with the claims set forth in the bill since the date of its said letter which would throw any further light upon the merits thereof.

"It would seem, however, upon reading said letter of the 19th December, 1884, that the Department failed to call the attention of the committee to the fact that the customs fees in question, which the bill proposes to refund to Mr. Mathews and the other parties mentioned, were paid at the custom-house at Oswego, during the period stated, without protest and appeal, and consequently that under the provisions of the fifteenth section of the act of June 30, 1864 (U. S. Statutes at Large, volume 13, page 202), now section 2932 of the Revised Statutes, the decision of the collector of customs at Oswego, in exacting such fees, became 'final and conclusive.'

"Respectfully, yours,

"I. H. MAYNARD,
"*Assistant Secretary.*

"Hon. J. C. BURROWS,
"*Committee Ways and Means,*
"*United States House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*"

The amendments recommended by the committee were agreed to. They are embodied in the bill, as printed above.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. NUTTING moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

FORT SMITH AND EL PASO RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, being called away from the House last evening by illness at my home, I requested the Clerk not to permit a Senate bill in reference to right of way through the Indian Territory to be laid before the House until I could be present to-day. As I have been detained in reaching the House this morning, the bill to which I allude has been taken up and referred. It is the bill (S. 269) to grant to the Fort Smith and El Paso Railway Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be now taken up and put upon its passage. A House bill identical in its terms with this Senate bill has, by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Indian Affairs, been favorably reported in this House. The bill simply grants the right of way from Fort Smith to El Paso through the Choctaw and Chickasaw country and one or two Indian reservations.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with.

Mr. BLOUNT. Did the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] state that this bill has been unanimously reported?

Mr. ROGERS. It has been in both Houses; and it contains all the restrictions heretofore agreed on by Congress in reference to grants of right of way through the Indian Territory.

There being no objection, the reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROGERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, House bill No. 9582, similar in terms to the Senate bill just passed, will be laid on the table.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER OF THE NORTH.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 2572) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North by the Duluth, Rainy Lake River and Southwestern Railway Company.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. NELSON. This bill has been favorably reported by the Committee on Commerce. With the amendments recommended by the committee, the bill is in the usual form for bridge bills. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the bill at length.

There being no objection, the reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The amendments reported by the Committee on Commerce will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the beginning of section 2 strike out the words:

"That the said bridge shall be constructed as a pivot draw-bridge, and shall be so constructed that a free and unobstructed passage may be secured to all water crafts, rafts, or logs navigating said river at the point aforesaid."

And insert the words:

"That the bridge authorized by this act shall be constructed as a pivot draw-bridge, with a draw over the main channel at an accessible and the best navigable point, and with spans giving a clear width of water way measured at the lowest stage of water known at the locality, of not less than 80 feet in the clear on each side of the central or pivot pier of the draw, and the bottom chord of said bridge shall not be of less elevation than 1 foot above the plane of the highest known flood at the locality; and provision shall also be made in the location and construction of abutments and approaches to allow the free passage of flood water; and the piers of said bridge shall be parallel to and the bridge itself at right angles to the direction of the current of said river. And said corporation shall provide, at its own expense, such sheer-booms, guide-piers, and other devices as may be necessary to facilitate the safe passage of boats or other water-craft through the spans of said bridge."

In line 26 of section 2 strike out the words "Secretary of War" and insert the words "Light-House Board."

After the word "bridge," in line 9 of section 4, insert "and equal privileges in the use of said bridge shall be granted to all telegraph companies."

Add as a new section the following:

"SEC. 7. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date thereof."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. NELSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

LYDIA D. HOLTZ.

Mr. MILLS. I now demand the r gular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] desires to call attention to an error in reference to the bill (S. 811) granting a pension to Lydia D. Holtz.

Mr. DOCKERY. The bill just mentioned by the Chair was reported adversely from the Committee on Invalid Pensions by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SAWYER], but by inadvertence it appeared upon the Private Calendar as if reported favorably, the Calendar not showing that there has been an adverse report. In consequence of this fact, the Committee of the Whole House last evening, acting under a misapprehension as to the nature of the report which had been made, laid the bill aside to be reported favorably to the House; and later in the evening it was passed by the House and the motion to reconsider laid on the table. I now ask unanimous consent that the action of the House in passing the bill be reconsidered, and the action of the Committee of the Whole House in favorably reporting it be vacated so that the bill shall remain on the Private Calendar for future consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There being no objection, the order requested by Mr. DOCKERY was made.

CONVICT LABOR.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 9932) to prevent convict labor from competing with organized labor, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Labor, and ordered to be printed.

MAJ. JAMES BELGER.

Mr. FORD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back the bill (H. R. 9196) for the relief of Maj. James Belger; which was laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, reported back, in the nature of a substitute for the foregoing, a bill (H. R. 9933) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Maj. James Belger with the rank and grade of colonel; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I now demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the morning hour for the presentation of reports be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. I now ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to present may hand them in at the Clerk's desk for reference to the appropriate Calendars.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

TARIFF.

Mr. MILLS. I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of bills raising revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HAUGEN], whose remarks yesterday were interrupted by the rising of the committee, is entitled to the floor.

Mr. HAUGEN resumed and concluded his remarks, which are now published entire.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, if it were not for the "surplus," the Democratic party would, indeed, be in dire distress for an argument upon which to base their claim to continuance in office. Four years ago their rallying cry was "Cleveland and reform." It would be sheer mockery to repeat that cry in the coming struggle, for not even the saintly Mugwump is any longer capable of sustaining the President as a reformer. The President himself by his silence on the subject admits that "civil-service reform" no longer occupies that prominent position it did in the balmy autumn days of 1884. "Public office" has become a "Democratic trust," and not a "public trust," and is rapidly coming to deserve the scondemame nation as those other unholy combinations which prey upon the public under the misapplied name of "trusts."

There is no longer, thinks the President, that supreme danger in accepting a second term of the highest office in the gift the American people, of which he was so apprehensive in his letter of acceptance. In his immaculate hands no danger of abuse lurks in the great power of appointment to effect the goal of personal ambition.

The view changes before the Presidential vision. The "public trust" of 1884 has given way in 1887 to the "surplus," with the "vicious, inequitable, and illogical tariff" heaving into sight. We were on the very brink of ruin, according to the President's message, on the 5th of December, 1887. He starts out with saying:

> You are confronted at the threshold of your legislative duties with a condition of the national finances which imperatively demands immediate and careful consideration.

And further on—

> It will not do to neglect this situation because its dangers are not now palpably imminent and apparent. They exist none the less certainly, and await the unforeseen and unexpected occasion when suddenly they will be precipitated upon us.

The danger, he tells you, is there, although "not now palpably imminent or apparent." Queen Elizabeth, in like manner, was in the habit of telling the House of Commons when that body clamored for administrative reform in England, that she knew best what was for the welfare of her subjects, and that they better attend to those duties He Majesty graciously assigned them. History records no such supreme insight into affairs "not palpable or apparent" to the citizen or legislator since the days of "Good Queen Bess" until the reign of Grover the First.

But the alarm seems to have faded away as gently as the last echoes of the Presidential message. While his fellow-partisans took up its sad refrain and carried it to every nook and corner of the land, the people of the United States, confident in the strength and stability of their institutions, refused to be convulsed. The public mind and business confidence are certainly as composed as at the date of the message. As a prophet of evil the President is a failure.

Even this Democratic House betrays by its masterly inactivity its failure to appreciate the warning signal of impending danger, for, although the alarm note was sounded in early December, no remedy is proposed by the Democratic Committee on Ways and Means, the only source from which it could originate, before the middle of April. Suspicion might suggest that Democracy fears to meet the issue recklessly precipitated upon it by the President without first hearing from its nominating convention in June, and that the interval has been purposely bridged over by inaction. The next few weeks will disclose whether this is well founded.

The bill before us, Democrats say, is intended to meet the danger of an accumulated surplus in the Treasury. I believe as firmly as any Democrat that no more revenue should be collected than necessary to meet the expenses of the Government economically administered. But parsimony is not economy. I would pay the nation's just debts and moral obligations as well. I would at least make an honest effort to fairly, equitably, and liberally compensate the herbic veteran volunteer soldiery, whose prowess in its death throes preserved the nation's life and integrity. I would consider with liberality, without wastefulness, the imperative needs of our internal commerce, and improve our great national highways, recognizing that to the interior portions of the country the navigability of our lake and river routes furnishes the surest safeguard against extortionate railway charges.

The President entertains different views. He vetoed the dependent pension bill, as well as the river and harbor appropriation bill passed by the last Congress. It might well be asked, was there premeditated malice in this? Had he signed those bills, as Congress by its well-considered action said he ought, and the needs of the country demanded that he should, the excess of our income over our expenditures during the last fiscal year would not have added alarmingly to the surplus, and, what is of more importance, it would have been an act of humanity in the one case, relieving thousands of sufferers, and in the other would have cheapened the cost of transportation of every bushel of grain carried from interior and Western States to the seaboard. For some inexplicable reason—unless he considered it necessary to create a surplus, so that he might have some pretext on which to base his attack upon the protective system of the country—he failed to meet the reasonable expectations of his countrymen. Now, using this surplus, for which he is individually largely responsible, as a shield, he proceeds to launch against the enterprise, the genius, the thrift of the people the venomous darts of free trade by parading in his message the surplus as the necessary result of what he is pleased to term the "vicious, inequitable, and illogical tariff." And to his stubborn resolution his party bows in abject submission.

The President in his message expresses doubt as to whether the law authorizes the payment of the bonded debt out of moneys now in the Treasury in advance of its maturity. By the unanimous vote of this House he was relieved of his doubt, not even Democrats having the effrontery of upholding him in this misconstruction of a plain law. Had the President continued the policy of his own and former Secretaries of the Treasury he would have had no surplus to point to. This doubt never occurred to his mind until some $17,000,000 had been paid out of the Treasury by his Secretary. Then first did it occur to the President that there was danger that he would be deprived of his dear surplus. Had he continued to obey the law as he started in, the money locked up in the Treasury would have been restored to its legitimate channels of trade and the interest on the bonds purchased saved to the people.

It is made apparent in this prolonged discussion that harmony does not altogether prevail in the ranks of the supporters of this bill. They are all agreed that a protective tariff, in the language of the President, is "vicious, inequitable, and illogical," except where it has breathed the spirit of life into some industry in the district of a Democratic member.

SUGAR.

The Democratic sugar of Louisiana, costing the people of my State some $2,000,000 per year of unnecessary and vexatious taxation, without a redeeming feature, which it has been repeatedly demonstrated has failed of the only legitimate object and purpose of protection, that of stimulating an industry in order that it may eventually meet the wants of our own people, and thus by force of home competition lower the price, has been treated more tenderly by the Mills bill.

If there were any reasonable hope that continuing the protective duty on sugar would result in production approximately commensurate with our consumption, I for one should object to its abolition; but after a trial of twenty-seven years, and a cost to the people of this country of hundreds of millions of dollars in vain efforts to encourage and stimulate an industry which refuses to respond, it does seem that the sugar tax ought to be abolished.

Sugar is certainly one of those articles commonly called the necessaries of life, used by the poor and rich alike, and the abolition of this duty would cheapen sugar to the consumer and would insure a decided and material relief to the Treasury by cutting off one of the principal—indeed, the very largest—source of revenue. But the sectionalism of the bill is apparent at the very outset, and the planter of Louisiana need have no fear. His special interest will receive no harm at Democratic hands. There is but little relief offered in this direction by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, considering the opportunity here presented to accomplish their avowed purpose of materially reducing the surplus.

During the fiscal year 1886 and 1887 we imported sugar to the value of $68,897,102.27, the duty collected thereon amounting to the enormous sum of $56,515,601.67.

Including with the tariff on sugar the $1,496,836 collected on imported molasses gives a total of $58,012,464 paid out for the encouragement of this industry, which has so far failed to furnish one-eleventh of our consumption.

While I do not admit the general proposition so frequently laid down by the other side, that the price of an article is increased by the amount of the duty where the subject of the duty is an article which is capable of development to the extent of our demands, I do admit that where so small a part of our consumption is of domestic culture and manufacture as is the case with sugar the proposition is approximately correct.

So that, according to the favorite Democratic method of illustration, whenever a poor laborer takes his hard-earned wages and at the grocery invests them in sugar, for every dollar's worth of sugar purchased he is taxed by the rich planter and sugar refiner an additional 82 cents. This "robber tariff," to quote the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, enables the monopolistic "sugar trust" and sugar barons to take out of the consumer's pocket $1.82 for that which, were the duty removed, would cost him $1.

We produce only about 9 per cent. of the sugar consumed in this country, and the expense of this duty to our people is even greater than the amount collected, as the same rule of increased cost must be similarly applied to the Hawaiian sugar admitted free of duty, and which last year amounted to $9,255,351, as well as to domestic sugars. It would likewise affect the price of molasses and sirups. Of these we imported last year 38,007,700 gallons, valued at $5,355,475; 113,574 gallons of this being admitted free under the Hawaiian treaty. The duty is 4 cents per gallon on the lower and 8 cents on the higher grades.

It is proposed by my Republican friends, I believe, to substitute for this duty a bounty to be paid directly to the producer. On principle a bounty does not strike me favorably. Once established any effort to decrease or abolish it would encounter the most determined opposition. But I do not propose to set my judgment up against the intelligent opinion of my party. Very few men are able to sustain successfully or profitably to their constituents the rôle of independents, and I have no such conceit or inclination. I was elected as a Republican by a Republican constituency, which has the right to expect to find me in the Republican column. I do not intend to disappoint them.

It is satisfactorily demonstrated that the proposed plan to repeal the duty on sugars and grant a bounty instead, retaining only sufficient duty to meet the cost of this bounty, will save to the people about $50,000,000 per year, and at the same time leave the producer as fully protected as under the present law. This will certainly recommend itself to every citizen earnestly desiring a reduction of income, and to whose political ambition the surplus scarecrow is not absolutely essential. The planter ought not to object, for his protection remains intact. The consumer certainly will not, for he will be saved $50,000,000 per year. The Democratic politician alone will feel that his chief occupation, that of berating Republicans for heaping up the people's money in the Treasury, will be gone.

In this connection it is proper to say that the new diffusion process which seems to have been successfully introduced in Kansas, holds out the hope that we are on the eve of a revolution in the sugar industry, and that the sugar necessary for our consumption may still be produced by our own labor and prove profitable to the agriculturist, and result eventually in reducing the price to the consumer. If this desirable result can be attained, the broad, rich prairies of Kansas, and fertile fields of Wisconsin as well, now producing cereals, will be largely turned into cane-fields, thus reducing the oversupply of grain, and giving to our people sugar of our own production. As the grain crop of one State competes with that of every other in the common market, the effect of transforming to any considerable extent the grain-grower into a cane-grower will be an advantage to both.

RICE.

Rice is another Democratic product—I dare not say Southern, for fear of being accused of sectionalism, admitting, however, that I love the North better than the South, my own State better than any other, even in the North, but my adopted country as a whole better than any other country on this or on the other side of the Atlantic, not excepting that land of pine-clad mountains, laughing water-falls, and beautiful fiords, with a history humble as a nation, but of heroic individualism—the Land of the Midnight Sun. [Applause.]

A duty was placed upon rice in 1846, and it has since remained dutiable. It is a crop to the production of which, as hitherto to sugar, nature seems to have fixed a limit. It is healthful and nourishing, and a duty enhancing its cost to the consumer and failing to encourage its production to an extent influencing in any perceptible degree the market price, is indefensible with a large surplus in the Treasury. The following statement of the crops raised, prices prevailing, and duty will illustrate my argument:

Rice crop of the United States before and since the war.

Years.	Pounds.	Prices per pound.
		Cents.
1840	63,948,000	2¼ to 4
1845	71,492,400	2½ to 4½
1850	112,237,800	2½ to 3½
1855	70,872,000	2½ to 5½
1860	119,344,800	3 to 4½
1865	5,000,000	9½ to 14
1870	52,892,400	5½ to 9½
1875	85,000,000	6½ to 8½
1880	122,000,000	5½ to 8
1885	150,000,000	3½ to 5½
To-day		4½ to 6½

Tariffs.

Years.	Rate.
1840	Free.
1841	Free.
1842	Free.
1846	20 per cent. ad valorem (average ½ cent per pound).
1857	15 per cent. ad valorem (average ½ cent per pound).

	Cleaned.	Uncleaned.	Rough.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
1861	1½	1	
1864	2½	2	1½
1883	2½	1½	1½

	Cleaned, ad valorem.	Uncleaned, ad valorem.
	Cents.	*Cents.*
Duty at present	2½ = 90 per cent.	1½ = 75 per cent.
Duty as proposed	2 = 80 per cent.	1½ = 67 per cent.
Duty 1861 to 1864*	1½ = 45 per cent.	1 = 33 per cent.
Duty before the war	Highest 20 per cent.	

* Foreign rice much higher than now, hence specific duty was less per cent. on value.

Yearly consumption per head, England (1886), 10¾ (10.76) pounds.
Yearly consumption per head, United States (1886), 4 (4.02) pounds.
Rice at 3 cents per pound, cleaned in New Orleans, nets planter on plantation, as follows:
Forty-four bushels (10 barrels clean), per acre, low yield, $22.
Sixty bushels (16 barrels clean), per acre, average yield, $33.
Eighty bushels (20 barrels clean), per acre, not unusual yield, $48.
Better than wheat.

The last two rice crops have not varied materially from that of 1885, about 150,000,000 pounds. We imported in 1887, 94,686,659 pounds. With cheaper rice it is safe to say a much larger amount of this food product would be consumed per capita, as the table shows is the case in England. In their search for "raw and unmanufactured material" to be placed upon the free-list why did not the Democratic committee include in their proposed bill rough and uncleaned rice?

LEGITIMATE PROTECTION.

Unlike a bounty, a protective duty works its own repeal when imposed on legitimate objects; that is, such as are capable of development to the extent of our wants. A bounty remains stable, and its expense increases with the increase of domestic production. Under a proper protective duty, when home production approximates a point commensurate with the demand, prices, by the very force of domestic competition, gravitate to their natural level, the tax fading away without the least disturbing or alarming effect upon business. The price of many articles of clothing used by the laborer and artisan is no higher here than in England, showing that as to those goods protection has effected its purpose. From personal experience as to prices, I remember myself that in the latter part of the sixties a pair of ducking overalls, such as was then commonly used by lumbermen, cost $2.50; reduced to a gold basis, not less than $1.75. This sum will to-day buy a whole suit of the same material, and better made. A pair of driving-boots, costing at that time $10, costs to-day $5. Instead of ducking, the lumberman now uses woolens, paying for a Mackinaw suit $5, finding it cheaper and more comfortable.

The cost of a lumberman's outfit going into the woods in Wisconsin at present, may be stated as follows:

1 pair woolen pants	$2.50
1 Mackinac coat	2.50
2 pairs socks, at 75 cents	1.50
2 pairs drawers, at $1.25	2.50
2 undershirts, at $1.25	2.50
1 pair mittens	.75
2 overshirts, at $1.75	3.50
1 pair boot packs or rubber shoes	2.75
Total	18.50

These goods are of the very best material, and are principally manufactured in St. Paul and Minneapolis. The wearing-apparel is wool. The above is a complete outfit for winter use and wear.

And reduced to gold his wages are now higher than they were twenty years ago. Even the poor man's blanket, which is giving our friends on the other side so much concern, and with which they have been vainly trying to cover the hideous skeleton of free trade, is little, if any, dearer here than in England.

The cost of a pair of five-pound woolen blankets in England is $4.45. American blankets of precisely the same weight and quality cost $5.20. The duty is $4.25 and custom-house fees 65 cents. If the free-trade argument, that the cost is increased by the amount of the duty, were true, the poor man's blanket should cost $9.35 instead of $5.20, and that without allowing anything for transportation and incidental expenses of exchange.

But the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACDONALD], whom I do not see in the House, whose figures submitted here a few days ago I have examined, would go at it in this way:

Price of one pair poor man's blankets	$5.20
Robber tariff	4.95
Price of one pair poor man's blankets with robber tariff removed	.25
Gain to poor man	4.95

—*Congressional Record*, page 3947.—

He would have you believe that under free trade a pair of blankets could be bought here for 25 cents. This is exactly the process of his deductions in figuring up the "gain" on necessaries under this bill. The proposition is too absurd for further comment. That gentleman also seems to labor under the misapprehension that an ad valorem duty is imposed on the article at its retail value here, for he quotes salt in his list at $3 per barrel (which is more than twice its value, even in Minnesota) and the duty at $1.20. The gentleman's statement will need a great deal of salt to preserve it through the summer months for use in the fall campaign. [Applause and laughter.] The same gentleman from Minnesota, in his over-anxiety to strengthen his case by large figures, includes among the necessaries of life "manufactures of silk" (page 3942 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD). On this article he says $15,540,301 duty was collected last year, a great share of it, no doubt, ruthlessly abstracted from the toiling farmers of the Third Minnesota district. The gentleman nicely discriminates between silks and diamonds, classing the former as "necessaries," but the latter as "luxuries." The evolutionary process seems at present to be resting at "silks" in the gentleman's district. When he returns he may, however, find his farmers reaching out for diamonds. He is a Ruskin in his tastes, who claimed that the true policy was to cheapen luxuries

so that the poor might afford them as well as the rich, and he will easily catch up with the procession.

The statement made on this floor that common cotton prints can be bought here as cheaply as in England has not and can not truthfully be disputed. In some cases the duty is as high and even higher than the selling price here. The more expensive cotton fabrics are somewhat higher here than in England, owing to the fact that more labor enters into them and that our laborer demands and receives better wages than his European brother; but even in those the difference in price is not equal to the duty.

The report of the Bureau of Statistics on our foreign commerce shows that of $32,275,935 worth of cotton goods imported in 1887 a relatively small part consisted of goods entering into the clothing of the laborer's or farmer's family, allowing, of course, that common grades entered largely into the consumption of all classes. The statement is as follows:

Articles.	Quantities.	Values.
Cotton, manufactures of:		
Cloths—		
Not bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed.....square yards...	3,021,696	$301,636
Bleached, dyed, colored, stained, painted, or printed .....square yards...	24,928,404	*3,033,946
Total.....square yards...	27,950,100	3,335,582
Clothing, ready-made, and other wearing-apparel, not including knit goods.....	.....	436,356
Embroideries lacings, insertings, trimmings, and lace window-curtains.....	.....	10,467,073
Knit goods:		
Stockings, hose, half-hose, shirts, drawers, and all goods made, fashioned, or shaped on knitting machines, or frames, or knit by hand.....	.....	6,910,104
Thread (not on spools) yarn, wraps, or warp-yarn .....pounds...	1,894,798	919,994
All other.....	.....	6,871,244
Total cotton, manufactures of.....	.....	28,940,353

In this table the largest item, nearly one-third of the whole, consists of luxuries. The next largest would also, in a modest community of laborers or farmers, be considered in that class, for very few of these people wear imported stockings, hose, half-hose, &c., of which this item consists. How few luxuries enter into the item "all other," it is impossible to say. The cotton goods entering mainly into the clothing of the laborer and farmer are contained in the three first items and amount to only the sum of $3,771,938, while 60,000,000 people necessarily use of these common good,—necessaries to every family—hundreds of millions of dollars' worth a year. To the question whence these goods are supplied, the answer is, from our own manufactories. Home competition in the common cotton fabrics has reduced the price until it has successfully closed the door to foreign competition. Supplying all our wants it has lowered prices until these goods are cheaper than at any previous time. Protection has effected its purpose. The modester the attire the less is the tax imposed on the wearer under a protective duty.

This ought to set at rest the oft-repeated charge that the tariff bears most heavily on the clothing of the poor, as far as cotton goods are concerned at least.

SALT.

Salt has been laid down in Milwaukee within the last three years at 53 cents per barrel, wholesale. The empty barrel costs between 20 and 25 cents. Calling it 20 cents, would leave 33 cents per barrel for the salt. The tariff is 12 cents per hundred-weight, or 36 cents per barrel of 300 pounds. According to the Democratic argument advanced here that the wicked Republican tariff increases the price of an article by the amount of the duty thereon, salt ought to be given away in Chicago and Milwaukee, and 3 cents per barrel paid the purchaser for taking it away, or, in other words, the price of a barrel of salt should be that of the cost of the empty barrel, less 3 cents. This refers to Michigan salt. Removed from water transportation, the value of an article as heavy as salt is rapidly increased by railway charges, and the price to the consumer at inland points may be many times its original cost where produced. But at lake ports it costs as much to haul a barrel of salt from the dock to the residence as the price of the salt amounts to.

An examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD containing this debate leads me to the inevitable conclusion that, even in the minds of those gentlemen who have most vehemently urged the passage of this bill and their free-trade views upon the country, there lurks after all a suspicion that dire results may possibly follow should it become a law.

Each one carefully guards the special interest of his district. They impliedly admit the danger of the experiment by their anxiety to try its effect upon Republican communities first. If free trade is such a good thing, why not tear down the walls surrounding the Louisiana sugar-planter and give him the advantage of the world's market? If Louisiana is for protection let her declare it by her vote. If she believes in the theories of President Cleveland give her a practical trial of them. No Republican State is here asking to have the duty on wool removed, and they represent the large majority of wool-growers in the country. They have knocked in vain at the door of the Committee on Ways and Means to be heard in opposition to it.

Under the Mills bill the Democratic sugar, rice, coal, iron, and whisky of the South are left untouched or but slightly interfered with, while the Republican wool, lumber, salt, and farm products of the North are subjected to the experimental dissecting-knife of these Democratic tariff-tinkering quacks.

I refer in this connection to several speeches coming from Democratic supporters of the Mills bill upon this floor. During the remarks of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN], a Democratic member of the committee reporting this bill, a question was raised by the venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] as to whether a certain clause in the bill might not be so construed by anti-protective Treasury officials as to put iron ore and coal upon the free-list. My genial friend from Virginia [Mr. O'FERRALL], in whose district, by the way, coal mining is quite an important industry, became very much alarmed. "Put coal on the free-list? Never!" says my friend to himself. "I am a free-trader, it is true, but not in Virginia coal. I am a follower of the Presidential policy of putting raw materials on the free-list, but the President meant Republican wool, not Democratic coal." He rose in his seat and interrupted the gentleman from Tennessee, but being informed that no such intent had ever possessed the Democratic end of the committee, and that if it should appear that any such danger lurked in its terms the bill should be so amended as to remove all question, the gentleman from Virginia found peace for his troubled soul and quietly and serenely let the discussion go on. (Page 3599, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

A few days later my much-esteemed friend from Virginia with eloquence earnest and fervid, denounced the Republican robber tariff and declared himself unqualifiedly for the Mills bill. Coal troubled him no longer.

Even the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL], whose kind heart would shut out no labor and no product of labor—even the much-abused and long-suffering Chinaman finds a warm nook in his affections—has a tender regard for rice. But rice is a product of South Carolina. I do not desire to misquote the gentleman, and will therefore use his very words:

[Page 3575, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.]

Mr. DAVIS. Do you approve of those features of this bill which put wool on the free-list and yet protect rice?

Mr. HEMPHILL. I approve of this bill from beginning to end.

A few minutes latter he announced the oft-repeated Democratic doctrine that he believed in buying where we can buy the cheapest, undoubtedly with a mental reservation as to rice, and was again interrupted as follows:

Mr. PERKINS. If we should be permitted to buy where we can buy the cheapest, why should we not be permitted to hire where we can hire the cheapest?

Mr. HEMPHILL. Exactly. I think that is right.

California Chinamen will please take notice that South Carolina is extending to them a hearty welcome. [Applause and laughter]

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] will support the Mills bill, but thinks the glass-blowers of his district deserve more consideration than it gives them, and may be expected to ask to amend in that particular. It has a bitter taste to him on that account, but should he fail he will try to swallow the pill and smile. (RECORD, April 30).

My friend from Michigan [Mr. TARSNEY] favors the bill, of course, as a Democrat in good standing should; but we may look for an earnest effort from the gentleman to restore salt to the dutiable list. On the whole that gentleman prefers "a sliding scale," and, inferentially at least, must be opposed to this sudden and abrupt placing of wool, lumber, salt, etc., on the free-list. He is more of a believer in the late Hon. William R. Morrison, of "horizontal" memory, than a disciple of Mills. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3643).

And last, but not least, the wool interest finds a defender in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who dissents, it would seem, from his colleague, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, and thinks that even on the boundless prairies of the Lone Star State free wool is not just the thing. He is contented, however, with an ad valorem duty of 25 per cent.; thinks that amount about right for a Texas sheep. (Page 3914, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD).

It is safe to say, however, that these gentlemen will all eventually vote for the Mills bill. Not that they believe in it, but it follows closely in the line of the President's ukase, and party discipline demands their support. Their Moses has spoken and they are preparing to follow his lead into the wilderness for another weary tramp of twenty-four years.

Of our Northern Democrats it is unnecessary to speak. They are humble followers, not leaders, in the Democratic procession. They received such a castigation only a short month ago at the hands of their valorous Southern leaders for following out the wishes of their constituents in supporting the bill to refund to the States the direct war tax, amounting to some $17,000,000, that it is with fear and trembling they now approach the Democratic altar to solemnly declare with their

hearts in their throats that they are for the Mills bill just as it is, and they are, oh, so sorry that they acted as they did in laying their unsanctified hands upon the sacred surplus. [Laughter.] Why, the indignation of my distinguished friend and neighbor from Minnesota [Mr. MACDONALD] rose to such a pitch at the outrage of having some sixty men of this House filibuster to prevent that just measure to restore to the people of this country $17,000,000 of war tax from passing that he rushed into print and in one of the daily papers of this city denounced such infamous proceedings whereby the will of the majority was thwarted, not even hesitating to thereby censure (by necessary implication) his learned colleague [Mr. WILSON], whose more perfect party training had taught him that Democracy means Southern supremacy, and who had early got himself into line on that basis. [Applause]

Not three days had passed after this public explosion on the part of my friend before he, too, became convinced that it was dangerous to reduce the surplus by $17,000,000 just before election, even to pay just debts, when the money would largely go to the loyal States of the North. I did not expect him to consider the $446,000 which Wisconsin would have received, but did think he would stand by his colors for Minnesota. But he and his fellows have learned, what Mr. Cleveland discovered in the early summer days of 1885, that the majority and controlling element of their party being at the solid South, the wishes of that section must be respected. Had the outcome of the war resulted in defeat to the North, no one can say what the feeling of that section would have been. But if the Southern sympathizers with our unsuccessful cause had, after the restoration of peace, bowed in that servile submission to our dictation, which is now evinced by the Northern Democrats to their Southern masters, they could only have provoked the contempt the brave soldier entertains for the cowardly deserter.

THE FARMER AND THE TARIFF.

Much has been said about the farmer and whether he is benefited by protection. The farmer in my part of the country is decidedly a laborer. He is almost universally a small land-owner, small as compared with the farmer of the prairie States west of the Mississippi. The number of farms in Wisconsin in 1885, was 136,108, or about one farm to each 11½ inhabitants, the population being 1,563,413. The aggregate value of farms was $568,187,288, averaging $4,174 each. The value of farms is governed largely by their distance from cities and manufacturing towns, showing that their productive value increases accordingly as the market is accessible.

While lumbering still holds the first rank, considerable progress towards other manufacturing in various branches has of late been made, and quite a number of woolen mills have been built, nearly all, however, thus far in the southern part of the State.

The State has been largely settled by men whose only capital was industry, intelligence, economy, and perseverance. It has been an almost unbroken rule that in new settlements the farmers have spent their winters in the logging-camps, which have offered steady employment at fair wages. As the pine receded to the north before the woodman's ax new settlements followed, and the same thing was repeated. This continues until a time when the development of the farm and increase of his stock demands the whole time and attention of the owner. But the advantage of the proximity of the lumber camp and mill does not cease with his ceasing to be a wage-worker. The market they afford has always taken a goodly share of his surplus produce. The advantage of his location has insured the husbandman good prices, besides the ready sale of produce which would not bear transportation to distant city markets. Since the extension of railways into our pine belt, carload after carload is, during the logging season, shipped from Southern and Western Wisconsin, from Minnesota, Iowa, and Illinois, and even from more distant Dakota, to supply the loggers with hay, oats, corn, butter, lard, cheese, beef, pork, beans, peas, and milling stuffs.

The lately developed Gogebic iron range, with its 15,000 people settled in there within the last three years, also makes a constant and reliable market. Goods shipped to the camps and mines are, as a rule, purchased directly from the country dealer along our railway lines.

How well the advantages of an easily accessible market is understood and appreciated by our farming communities was made very apparent in the western counties of Wisconsin three years ago. A proposition was submitted by a railroad company having in contemplation the construction of a railroad from Chicago to St. Paul to build upon a designated line provided the towns through which it would pass would raise a specified amount of money to assist in the construction. This proposition received universal approval by the farmers along the line whose farms lay so close to it that they had reason to expect to receive any benefit from the new conveniences to reach the market.

The recognition of the advantage of a home market is universal. Many farm products do not bear long transportation, and they are frequently those most profitable with a near market and make up the important difference between profit and loss.

DIVISION OF LABOR AND TRANSPORTATION.

The home market saves transportation, charges of middlemen, and consumes articles which would otherwise swell the volume to be exported, and which would, if exported, help to reduce prices by flooding the foreign market. Besides all that, the home market is somewhat within the control of the seller. If he does not receive fair treatment and fair prices the causes are within reach of his own investigation. Every farming community gives welcome greeting to any kind of manufacturing whose establishment it can secure, from a saw-mill down to a cheese factory, and willingly taxes itself to get it, wisely considering such contribution money well invested.

With the new division of labor which yearly takes from the country population to add to that of the town, it is made more essential than ever before that the distance between the producer and consumer should be reduced. Protection has effected this largely for New England, and I confidently believe will do the same for the West and South if we are permitted to continue the good work commenced. The farmer is more dependent on the mechanic and manufacturer than at any previous period in the world's history, for he receives nearly all his goods ready-made.

The fact that he is relieved from many cares in this manner enables him to more closely devote his intelligent energy to his special calling. The tiller of the soil of half a century ago had to be somewhat of a carpenter, not a little of a cobbler, and frequently something of a blacksmith. But these avocations have disappeared from the farm. The hum of the spinning-wheel and stroke of the loom are legends to the young American housewife of to-day. Even the farmer's clothing is no longer made at his home. It is cheaper bought ready-made, just as good in quality, and does not distinguish him from his brother laborer in the city. He has more interest in the city and town than formerly, for work not connected strictly with agriculture is done in the centers of population, and his sons and daughters hie thither for employment when not needed on the farm.

This is the natural outgrowth of the use of machinery. It belongs to the evolution of our age. In the industrial race individual labor can not compete with the mill where one engine or water-wheel moves thousands of spindles and scores of looms, and where the workman by constant attention to one duty acquires the quick precision of the machine he attends, by his very efficiency cheapening the product. More produce has to be sold off the farm than formerly when much of the work now substituted by articles ready made was done on the farm. Even in Wisconsin I think it true that the population on farms constitutes but little if any more than half of the total population, and that of the products which leave the farm two-thirds never cross the State line.

Eliminating from the computation the counties within easy reach of Chicago, and a much larger proportion is consumed in the State. But as to those counties, Chicago is a home market and a most valuable one. I hope to see the day when Southern cotton will pass directly North from the cotton-fields to reach the markets of the Upper Mississippi Valley, and relieve us from the extra cost of roundabout transportation of 1,000 miles to Eastern cotton mills. And if you can not send it to us manufactured, let us have it raw, and we will manufacture it ourselves, provided you do not by continual threats of disturbing the whole industrial system of the country keep timid capital from making the necessary investment.

TRANSPORTATION WASTE OF FORCE.

All unnecessary transportation is a waste of energy, and our development ought to tend in the direction of reducing it to the minimum. Of all things I am impressed with the importance of supplying our own necessaries of life. With our vast area, offering every variety of soil and climate, every dollar expended in the development of our latent possibilities raises the wall of defense against possible foreign foes, and largely serves the purpose of naval and military expenditures.

Transportation only consumes; it does not create. It is a tax on every article carried, and should be avoided as far as possible, and the forces now going into its wasteful service released for more profitable and productive labor, or at least not increased unnecessarily. This can only be done by encouraging the building up of home markets. As we are legislating for this country and not for any other, the first step is to relieve our people from dependence upon the foreign market. Every bushel of wheat consumed here is a bushel less added to the foreign surplus, and every acre of land taken from wheat-growing and applied to other purposes means so much less wheat for an already overloaded foreign market. We largely control the grain prices in Liverpool by the quantities we send there.

Wheat bears transportation better than any other cereal, having the greatest value proportioned to its weight; and still, at present prices, wheat raised 300 miles or more west or northwest of Chicago pays one bushel out of every three to transportation companies between the place of its production and Liverpool. Every third bushel is given away for the transportation of the other two. A considerable part of the price received for the other two bushels is paid for carrying back such articles as the farmer needs.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the industrial and commercial system Democrats promulgate when they want "to tear down the walls in order that our farmers may have the open markets of the world." The Republicans, on the contrary, teach the doctrine that articles at present imported shall be manufactured in this country as far as nature has

provided us the means and facilities for manufacturing them. The farmer may well pray Heaven that he may be released from the foreign market by an enlarged home market that will still further supply its place.

THE THEORY OF BARTER.

We are told that unless we buy from England, England will not buy from us, etc. But according to the Democrats themselves, England, being a free-trade country, does what they say we should do—she "buys where she can buy the cheapest and sells where she can sell the dearest," without consulting what will most please us.

I venture to say that the English consumer never asks where the flour he uses comes from, or whether the wheat he buys grew in India, Russia, Asia Minor, or the United States. The free-trader pictures to himself an American farmer with a sack of wheat on his shoulder entering an English clothing store, offering it for sale. The English merchant tells him that he can not buy American wheat unless the farmer will buy his woolen goods; he is willing to barter, but pay out his English shillings for No. 1 hard Dakota wheat, never. Now this ridiculous and much-repeated "you-buy-of-me-and-I-will-buy-of-you" argument is the merest theoretical vapor. Modern business is not conducted in that way.

The grain merchant of England is much like his American brother. He, too, has been thrown into one specific line of business. He deals in grain and nothing else. By the time the grain product reaches the English consumer he does not know whether to credit it to India, Russia, or the United States, and it is very likely that he does not care so that he gets it at a reasonable figure.

We buy very freely of Brazil, our imports from that country during 1887 amounting to $52,953,176, nearly three-fourths thereof being coffee, while our exports to Brazil amounted to only $8,071,653. But not even a free-trade Congressman would refuse his morning decoction of coffee because the balance of trade was in Brazil's favor. Such a question as that never occurs to the American coffee merchant, and it is fair to presume that his English cousin still bears some slight resemblance to him. Neither one permits Democratic free-trade theories to obscure his business vision.

THE HOME MARKET THE BEST.

The home market now is the farmer's best market. It consumes nine-tenths of his yearly product, leaving for export only one-tenth. If the exports could be reduced to half of their present volume the result would no doubt be enhanced prices.

Each country brings from other lands only what is necessary to supply deficiencies in its own productions. If the crops are good in western Europe, the wheat bins of India, Russia, and America are drawn on very lightly, and the American wheat-grower suffers a decline of prices. When the European crops are poor the demand for our wheat and that of our competitors increases. But at best the foreign market is the most unsatisfactory and uncertain to the farmer, and is that market from which he mostly needs to be emancipated. England pursued a strongly protective policy, not for twenty-five years, merely, which Democracy thinks ought to have set our industries upon a sure footing, but for centuries, and thereby built up and diversified her industries until she proudly claimed to be the workshop of Europe. She is now endeavoring through the free-trade party in this Congress to regain in the United States that supremacy which she lost a century ago.

HOME TRADE.

The fact that commerce is guarantied by the Constitution to always remain free between the States gives the American producer a constant accessible market to meet the wants of sixty million customers. This is a world in itself, and worth more to all classes of producers than all other countries combined many times over.

Our soil and climate are as divers as those of all Europe. We may not be able to supply the products of the tropics, but there is no reason why we should lean on Europe for any of our necessaries. He would be a mean man indeed who would not lift a finger or pay a cent to aid in securing for his own town, city, or village a mill, a factory, or a furnace which would increase the number of consumers of some articles and the producers of others. And he who would pass by his home merchant for a more distant market would be no better. As a rule it pays well to trade with the home merchant, even if his prices are a little higher than those of a more distant market.

LABOR PRINCIPAL PART OF ALL PRODUCTS.

Wages are lower in England than in the United States, and capital commands a lower rate of interest. When we consider that the value of any manufactured article consists almost wholly of labor, our present wages certainly could not be maintained were we put in open competition with England.

In computing the amount of labor in a given article I dissent most emphatically from the method adopted by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, who proceeds upon the theory that the labor entering into a coat is only that bestowed upon it by the tailor. I should commence with the care, attention, and labor which the farmer bestows upon his flock, and follow the sheep until the shearing. I would follow the wool through its various manipulations until the coat was handed over the counter by the salesman, and add to the whole a small sum for the use of the farm for grazing purposes, upon the theory that the farm represents the owner's accumulated labor, upon which he is entitled to a fair return. The labor of developing it and putting it in condition for grazing purposes and raising the necessary fodder, besides furnishing shelter for his flocks, should most certainly be included, and all this labor receives its share of protection, under properly adjusted duties. Wool may be the manufacturer's "raw material," but it is the farmer's finished product. It is the result of his patient toil and care. Lumber is the "raw material" of the cabinet-maker, but it is the finished product of the saw-mill, logs being the finished product of the woodsman. From the time the first blow is struck to build the camp until the last stroke of the painter's brush the value of lumber is constantly enhanced by the labor expended upon it. As there is no duty upon logs, shingle-bolts, and stave-bolts, the protection upon lumber applies to it only in those stages where labor forms its principal value.

RESOURCES OF WISCONSIN.

When I stop to consider the vast natural resources of the State that honors me, her rapidly-growing manufacturing industries, her mines, which are just being developed, and her advantageous natural location, with the two most extensive water-way systems known to internal commerce touching her eastern, northern, and western borders, I feel it my duty to protest upon this floor against that spirit of vandalism which would not only retard her triumphal march toward more diversified industries, which she is rapidly attaining, but which would make her further progress impossible.

If it were not for the constant threats of the enemies of protection to overturn that system to which we largely owe our economic success, investments in manufacturing enterprises would long ere this have reached a degree which would have nearly if not quite supplied this people with the ordinary necessaries of life now imported.

CRITICISMS.

I can not permit this opportunity to pass without making some comment on the peculiar position of my distinguished friend from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], whose anxiety to explain his position on this question led him to argue the case before it was in court, and to discuss the tariff while addressing the House on the Indian appropriation bill. I will not dwell on his new terminology of "high tariff, low tariff, and revenue tariff," for which he is kind enough to promptly furnish a glossary, evidently recognizing the necessity of one.

My friend commences and closes his argument with protestations that he is in favor of protection, but spends an hour in denouncing its policy. He gives it credit for nothing, but lays many sins at its door. Our Democratic friends crowded about him in great glee, chuckling over the supposed new convert. There was more rejoicing over this one sinner than over the one hundred and fifty-odd Democratic worshipers of the English idol. [Laughter.] Moved by the *esprit de corps* of his Democratic surroundings, the spirit of free-tradeism visibly affected the manner of his delivery, and when in closing his discourse by introducing some personal correspondence breathing a spirit harmonious with his own, he laid particular stress on the phrase, "Let the bill pass, and it is the Waterloo of protection"—the writer referring to a bill introduced by the gentleman himself, not to the Mills bill—I say when he read that phrase no man watching the joyful countenances of his Democratic admirers and their hearty applause of this sentiment could have any doubt that their purpose is to destroy the protective policy of the country entirely. "Waterloo to protection" is their aim; and, like Samson of old, they have laid their hands upon the very pillars upon which the temple rests.

Why my friend should introduce this letter with such apparent approval of its sentiments I do not comprehend if he is in favor of protection. Neither do I see the application of the "Waterloo to protection" which it applies to the bill referred to, which had been introduced by the gentleman himself early in this session. There is no consistency between the gentleman's bill and his speech. The letter referred to must have encouraged my friend to make the speech, for the general reduction which he advocates in his address in order to reach what he calls "a low tariff" finds no place in his bill. That proceeds upon the Republican theory of placing a few articles on the free-list, leaving the rest untouched. But it may be that he found it more difficult to give his "low-tariff" views practical shape in a bill than a theoretical airing in a speech. [Laughter.] In his bill he proposes to place upon the free-list sugar, rice, salt, coal, lumber, manilla, jute, and sisal grass; perhaps, also, some minor and less important articles. He advocates in his address both the propositions embraced in his own bill and his general reduction theories, and suggests that he will, as a compromise, take the internal revenue off tobacco. I take no issue with the gentleman's bill.

As to the more important additions it proposes to the free-list I agree with it, but those who have so indiscriminately praised the gentleman's speech and his bill can not have read both, for no man would by comparing them suspect them of the same authorship. His bill is

the very opposite of the Mills bill; and although so warmly greeted by enthusiastic Democrats as the lost lamb they had just discovered, I will not do the gentleman the injustice of even suspecting him of favoring a bill so injurious to his section of the country and mine as the bill under discussion. It is safe to say no believer in the Mills bill would vote for my friend's bill. If the gentleman's views are presented in his bill he is not in favor of a "Waterloo to protection," and I prefer to judge him by it rather than by his enthusiastic speech.

There is a characteristic streak of Minneapolis enterprise and having an eye to the main chance about the letter he reads from Mr. Pillsbury. Mr. Pillsbury first proceeds to renominate my friend to his present position (in which he so well guards the interests of his district, as he sees them), but comes very soon to what to a Minneapolis miller is the milk in the cocoanut, in this manner:

I hope, whatever is done, that the duty on jute cloth will be removed. There is only one manufactory in the country that I know of that manufactures the jute cloth, and they make it direct into the seamless bags.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And he is incorrect about the number of mills, too.

Mr. GUENTHER. Democrats are generally incorrect.

Mr. HAUGEN. Yes, but that is only the usual free-trade inaccuracy. Mr. Pillsbury is one of the largest mill-owners in Minneapolis, and "seamless bags" appear to him more important than any other article on the protected list. He takes a kindly interest in my friend's district, getting a large supply of his wheat from that section, and, while an honorable gentleman, has never been suspected of figuring the price paid for his wheat down to the nicety of the duty on the "seamless bags" in which he ships his flour.

Jubilant Democracy, intent upon fostering my friend's infant industry of free-trade speech-making, has ordered 200,000 copies of his speech for circulation among the farmers of the Northwest, as I learn from a free-trade Scandinavian paper published in Chicago.

As false reports have been industriously circulated as to the sentiment of the people of the Northwest on this great question, I too (although my time is very limited) will pause long enough to read a single letter, not from a millionaire mill-owner, for I count, unfortunately, no millionaires among my correspondents, but I shall take a man from the great body of my constituents, a laborer. My correspondent belongs to that sturdy race which, after creating a Wilhelm and a Bismarck, has under their leadership built up the strongest, most independent, and most patriotic nation of modern Europe, and at whose martial tread all Europe trembles. [Applause.] Not only is he a representative German, but a patriotic American, having risked his life in our late war to preserve an unbroken Union.

Here is his letter:

BUFFALO CITY, *March* 23, 1888.

DEAR SIR: I received several CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, together with some seeds from United States Department of Agriculture, for which please accept my heartfelt thanks.

The speech of Hon. O. H. PLATT, "Is the President a Free-trader?" is a good one, and the Republicans in this vicinity endorse every word the Senator says in regard to it. The speech of Hon. CHARLES F. MANDERSON is a masterpiece, and also meets the approbation of the Republicans up here, and all the old soldiers of all parties. We want no fooling with the tariff; we want American industry and labor protected, especially all that can be produced in this country, and if we are getting too much money on hand, why, good Lord! I think we have use for it if we look at our coast defenses and our ships of war. I think we could spend more money for a good purpose than we have to spare at present. Then there are the old soldiers of the late war that the Government did not do justice to. Give them more liberal pensions, equalize the bounties, etc. The Government did well by the bondholders; why can it not do equally well by the men that made it possible that there is so much money on hand now? But let the Government do with the surplus money whatever it is a mind to, but for Heaven's sake do not tinker with the tariff. Protect the American workman from the pauper labor of the old country.

With my kindest regards and best wishes for your welfare, I remain sincerely yours,

JOS. N. SCHNEIDER,
Buffalo City, Buffalo County, Wis.

Hon. N. P. HAUGEN, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

[Applause.]

There is no "seamless bag" over the head of Mr. Schneider; no Minneapolis flour in his eyes. [Laughter and applause.]

In order to "protect," the wall must be high enough to retard the enemy's progress and defeat his attack, and I believe in raising it to that height wherever necessary to protect American labor in the mine, in the factory, or in the field. That is the very purpose of protection, and agreeing to that, as Republicans do agree, there is no opportunity to bandy words as to whether its baptismal name shall be "low tariff" or "high tariff," and I leave it to my friend to use any term his æsthetic taste may suggest. [Laughter.]

The term "free trade with incidental protection," is to me paradoxical. To the extent that a duty is protective it fails to furnish revenue, and to the extent that it furnishes revenue it fails to protect.

Every ton of steel rails produced in the United States takes the place of a ton which but for its production here would be imported. If our planters would supply our needs in the sugar line; our wool growers, woolen and cotton mills in the clothing line, and if our mines and furnaces would supply the necessary steel and iron, there would be a deficiency under the present rate of duties instead of a surplus. I know it is impossible to attain that goal at once, but with proper encouragement the tendency would be in that direction, and our income, except from articles like sugar, which has so far proved that the magic wand of protection can not infuse it with sufficient life-force, would decrease in proportion to the increased home production.

ARE OUR MANUFACTURERS OVERPROTECTED?

The fact that duty upon many imports of manufactures brings in a large income is an evidence either that they have not yet reached that stage of development when the duty ought, in justice to our home interests, to be lowered, or that the American manufacturer of those articles is not overprotected. I fail to see where his profits come in when the Englishman furnishes the goods, for there can be no profits without sales. The tenacity with which American salesmen hang to a customer or a market once secured does not suggest the abandonment of either to foreign competitors until the smallest margin of profit is eliminated. A market once lost is too difficult to recover. Our manufacturers are not guilty of the folly of keeping prices at such a figure as to drive their customers into the English market. Admitting their cupidity, they have never been thought guilty of such stupidity as that. There is plenty of capital seeking investment in this country, even at a low rate of interest, if assured against loss. If manufacturing is as profitable as Democrats say it is, why does not capital seek investment there?

Had I the wealth of some of my Democratic friends and believed as they talk on this subject of profits to the manufacturer, and was as anxious to turn an honest penny as I know them to be, I do not think I should allow such splendid opportunities to double my money pass. The fact undoubtedly is, that there is no such profit in manufacturing as represented. Figures are manipulated here to prove assertions which when examined have the lie stamped upon their very face.

LUMBER, VALUE, WAGES, ETC.

The following article throws light on the relative value of lumber in the Northwestern States, and as to whether the laborer profits by advanced prices, as is so frequently denied here. It is from the Northwestern Lumberman of March 24, 1888:

A majority of the arguments in favor of free trade or against it are neither solid nor convincing.

Something approaching sound sense on the tariff question might be looked for in the columns of a paper of the standing of the New York Evening Post. Such a paper should let alone the tricks of the pot-house politicians and confine itself to facts, or, if facts can not be obtained, then certainly to good logical arguments; but that paper, in an endeavor to make a point, discards both facts and logic. It recently said:

"The price of lumber has been rising in the United States as the forests have fallen beneath the woodman's ax. Have the wages of loggers and raftsmen risen in proportion? Of course not. Lumbermen's wages have been governed by the supply and demand of labor. The supply is as large as the working population of the country plus the immigration from Europe. The supply of white-pine lumber is restricted to a narrow belt fringing the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes, and the profits of the owners are secured to them by a tariff of $2 per thousand, which we must not disturb, forsooth, because Canadians are not taxed."

As bearing on what the New York paper calls the advance in the price of lumber, we have gathered the cargo prices of No. 2 common boards and strips, and joists and scantlings in the Chicago market for a term of sixteen years. The price of each for every year was obtained for May, soon after the opening of navigation; for August, when the season was about half over; and for December, immediately preceding the close of navigation. In the table following the range of prices is given. The New York "free-lumber" editorial writer is at liberty to understand that Chicago is the leading white-pine market of the Northwest; that it receives about a quarter of the output of the mills of the three white-pine producing States, and that therefore a similar range of prices would apply to other markets in this section.

Years.	No. 2 common boards and strips.	Joist and scantling.
1872	$16.00 to $17.00	$11.75 to $13.00
1873	13.00	9.50 to 10.00
1874	10.00 to 10.50	8.25 to 9.25
1875	9.50 to 11.00	8.25 to 8.50
1876	9.00 to 11.00	7.25 to 8.00
1877	9.00 to 9.50	7.00 to 7.37½
1878	9.00 to 10.12½	7.00 to 8.37½
1879	8.00 to 11.00	6.37½ to 9.00
1880	11.00 to 12.00	8.50 to 9.00
1881	11.00 to 14.00	10.25 to 12.00
1882	13.00 to 15.00	10.75 to 13.50
1883	11.50 to 12.75	9.50 to 9.75
1884	10.25 to 12.00	8.62½ to 9.25
1885	10.00 to 11.25	8.50 to 9.50
1886	11.00 to 11.50	9.25 to 10.00
1887	12.50 to 13.00	10.00 to 10.12½

If the editor who writes such absurd stuff as is quoted from the Evening Post can gain any consolation from the figures herewith printed, nobody will begrudge it. If he had been to the pains to have talked five minutes with any New York lumberman of experience he would have learned that lumber has not been "rising." That, however, we fear, would not have answered the purpose. It is reasonable to suppose that but comparatively few of the readers of the Evening Post are lumbermen or acquainted with the history of the lumber market. The great majority of its readers are ignorant on the subject; therefore the false statement is given to them with the expectation that it will be swallowed whole.

"Have the wages of loggers and raftsmen risen in proportion? Of course not." Well, of course they have, and in greater proportion. The figures composing the table below are taken from the books of one of the largest manufacturing companies in Michigan—a company that for nearly ten years has cut from 50,-

000,000 to 75,000,000 feet of lumber yearly, and may therefore be considered representative:

Years.	Sawyers and teamsters.	Foremen.
1872	$20.00 to $26.00	$45.00 to $50.00
1873	20.00 to 26.00	45.00 to 50.00
1874	20.00 to 26.00	45.00 to 50.00
1875	20.00 to 26.00	45.00 to 50.00
1876	18.00 to 24.00	45.00
1877	18.00 to 24.00	45.00
1878	14.00 to 20.00	35.00 to 40.00
1879	16.00 to 22.00	40.00
1880	16.00 to 22.00	40.00
1881	16.00 to 22.00	40.00 to 45.00
1882	18.00 to 24.00	40.00 to 45.00
1883	18.00 to 24.00	40.00 to 45.00
1884	18.00 to 24.00	40.00 to 45.00
1885	20.00 to 26.00	45.00 to 50.00
1886	22.00 to 30.00	50.00 to 60.00
1887	20.00 to 32.50	52.00 to 65.00

CANADIAN LAWS AS TO LUMBER.

In order to throw some further light on this question of lumber I desire in this connection to add that the spirit with which any step in the direction of free lumber is met in Canada is sufficient reason why the duty upon lumber should for the present be retained. Canada has a heavier import duty upon lumber than we, her duty being 25 per cent. ad valorem. But in addition to this she has put an export duty upon logs and shingle-bolts, which we admit free. I make the following extract from the Revised Statutes of Canada of 1886, volume 1, page 411:

EXPORT DUTIES.

816. Shingle-bolts, per cord of 128 cubic feet, $1.50.
817. Spruce logs, board measure, $1 per 1,000 feet.
818. Pine logs, board measure, $2 per 1,000 feet.

The governor in council is authorized to increase this export duty on pine logs to $3 per 1,000 feet. This is the kind of Canadian reciprocity we meet with when we put lumber on the free-list. Modern legislation, except that proposed by the Democratic free-trade party, is in the direction of self-reliance and independence of each country of the resources of any other, and Canadians legislate, and very properly, for Canada and not for the United States.

REDUCED INCOME NOT THE RESULT OF REDUCTION OF DUTY.

In 1883 the duty on wool was materially reduced. We had then 50,000,000 sheep. The shock given to wool-growing by the reduction of the duty in 1883 has resulted in reducing the number of sheep, according to the report of the Agricultural Department of January and February, 1888, to 43,544,755.

The importations of wool and woolens have increased more than enough to balance the lower duty, and we are receiving on those articles under the lower present duty more revenue than under the higher duty preceding 1883, showing that lowering the duty does not reduce the surplus, but is very likely to increase it, as it stimulates importation. The Mills bill puts raw wool—the farmers' product—on the free-list, depriving it of all protection. So far we would undoubtedly reduce our surplus income, if that was the only thing to be kept in view. But this bill also reduces, to a greater or less extent, the duty on manufactured woolens, and judging by our experience under the law of 1883, this will in all probability increase instead of diminish the revenue, thus defeating the declared object of the bill.

IMPORTS OF AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS.

Of farm products, other than wool, we imported during the year ending June 30, 1887, the following, amounting in all to $22,084,529 in value:

Barley	bushels...	10,355,594	$6,173,208
Corn	do.....	30,536	16,636
Oats	do.....	87,380	29,579
Oatmeal	pounds...	939,502	37,857
Rye	bushels...	18,469	10,720
Wheat	do.....	277,842	218,867
Flour	barrels...	1,013	3,302
All other			150,059
Total			6,640,228
Live animals, free			3,138,201
Live animals, dutiable			4,677,997
Meat products of all kinds			434,853
Butter			38,125
Cheese	pounds...	6,592,192	874,261
Condensed or preserved milk			459,000
Total			1,806,239
Beans and peas	bushels...	648,388	607,853
Potatoes	do.....	1,432,490	543,091
Pickles, etc			387,177
All other vegetables in natural state			516,319
All other vegetables in prepared state			295,911
Total			2,350,351
Tobacco imported			3,471,513

Most of these articles were imported from Canada to compete directly with our farmers in their own market. Without protection or with a lower duty a much larger volume of these products would undoubtedly have crossed our northern borders, and with sufficient protection, a much less. I would so increase the duty on these farm products as to give this market to our own agriculturists rather than to those who do nothing to support our schools, build our highways, sustain our General Government in war and peace, and feel no interest in maintaining and uplifting our standard of citizenship. If those who claim that the farmer receives no benefit from protection, which I do not admit, honestly desire to give it to him, let them, instead of taking away the protection the present law affords, extend it by increasing the duty on the above articles. Twenty-two millions of dollars is no small matter to the farmer within reach of Canadian competition, and the influence of these importations reaches beyond those narrow bounds. You can not improve the market of the New York farmer without sending a healthy thrill throughout the whole agricultural system of the country. Our market ought to belong to our own farmers, and I am in favor of giving it to them.

To show the keen interest the German farmer feels in the preservation of his home market, I read the following extract from a late report by Minister Pendleton. It also shows the keen appreciation the German peasant feels in the independence of the empire and its ability to be self-sustaining, and is interesting for that reason as well. It is from a petition of the "German Peasant Association" directed to Prince Bismarck, and contains 5,414 signatures from 616 localities. After asking for increased protective duties on agricultural products, it proceeds:

We trust that your highness will intervene, not only for our sakes, but for the sake of the empire, for your highness knows better than we that an empire which does not live on the products of its own land is always in a dangerous condition, because it is in an important manner dependent on foreign countries, and in times of war can easily be lost.

We therefore pray that your highness will take measures to shut the door against all foreign grain and meat-stuffs for the present, or to make the importation so difficult by reason of increased taxation that cultivation of grain and the raising of cattle may again be remunerative with us, or that at least we shall be relieved by the amount of taxes from the burden of taxation.

This would be useful not only to us peasants, but also to the inhabitants of the cities, for the wages of the inhabitants of the cities would rise, whilst bread and meat would probably be influenced as little in price as heretofore by the price of grain and provisions.

And this is the tendency in all countries. Market after market is closed against our farmers, and yet they are told that they must rely on the foreign market.

MILLS BILL OPPOSED TO INTEREST OF FARMER.

The Mills bill puts on the free-list beans, peas, vegetables, seeds, meats, game, poultry, flax and linseed-oil, and very probably potatoes, under the phrase "vegetables not specially enumerated." With custom-house officials whose political free-trade bias has led them, in violation of law, to undervalue imported goods in the past, the potato would undoubtedly escape the duty.

Each of these articles, taken separately, may seem unimportant, but agricultural imports form a respectable and quite surprising aggregate even under the present duty, as we have seen.

DIVISION OF BENEFITS UNDER PROTECTION.

Free-traders contend on the one hand that all the profits of manufacturing go to the employer and none to the laborer. In the next breath they propose to give the manufacturer cheaper raw material, so that he may be enabled to pay higher wages. It is strange how free-trade sophistry makes a philanthropist out of the same employer who under protection takes all the profits to himself. I have not reached the point where I can go to either extreme. It is fair, I think, to say that the employer and laborer are both benefited. The American laborer demands better wages, better food, and better shelter than his European rival, and he gets them. The community is benefited by helping those who need it most, and they are always the working classes. We have fewer dependents upon public charity according to our population than has any other civilized country in the world.

IMMIGRATION THE TRUE INDEX TO THE CONDITION OF LABOR.

It is urged with apparent sincerity upon this floor that the American laborer is not benefited by protection, and that his condition here is no better than that of the laborer of Europe. If such is the fact, the movement of population from Europe to this country can not be explained.

During the last eight years 4,377,940 immigrants have arrived in our ports. They have come here because they knew they could better their condition by so doing. The cry of the Democratic party that the protective tariff had ruined our industries and robbed the laborer of his hire they knew before leaving their native homes was false. Nineteen out of every twenty of them, it is safe to say, belong to the laboring class. They are the sober, intelligent, liberty-loving laborers of Europe. They are patient and economical, and take kindly and quickly to our institutions and customs. It is a rare exception that the transplanted laborer or peasant becomes dissatisfied with the change. That is reserved for those who belong to the so-called better classes and who cling to European class distinction. These latter I would advise to remain at home, for they form the grumblers and discontented croakers of our foreign-born population, unable to adapt themselves to our popular institutions and methods.

But let one hundred frugal peasants or laborers start from any portion of western or northern Europe and land them in the United States, and you will find that within three years they will have laid by, if wage-workers, a goodly sum with which to secure independent homes. Missives of love go back to dear ones left behind, telling them of the better outlook for the poor man, the laborer, the farmer, the artisan here than in the fatherland; how much better they are fed, clothed, and housed, and how much better they are treated by their employers—the latter not an unimportant matter. The ocean mails are full of these messages, frequently accompanied with the necessary bills of exchange to carry some friend or relative to the same haven of promise. Nothing to my mind more closely records the temper of our wage-working citizens than does the volume of immigration, and as a large percentage of our wage-workers are of foreign birth it is a fair indication of the state of feeling, satisfactory or unsatisfactory, of the laboring classes. The fact that last year more than half a million people were thus attracted to our shores is conclusive against the argument, so often repeated during this debate, that the laborer of this fair land does not have any share in our industrial prosperity.

These people know better before they leave their beloved though humble homes the true condition of the laborer in America than do the Representatives on this floor, for they get their information directly from the laborer and not from the employer, nor diluted through a labor bureau. They know the troubles and hopes and aspirations and inspirations of their brethren, as they are only known to persons of the same social conditions in life. No immigration bureau—and some States have such—no agent of land or transportation companies could induce these people to leave their homes were not the reports from friends gone before favorable. I call as witnesses on behalf of the Republican party and the protective policy it has so wisely inaugurated and fostered, and the industrial prosperity thereby created, these millions of foreign-born citizens, and with their united voice I impeach the Democratic slanders uttered in this Chamber that Americans are the oppressors of labor, and America the nursery of industrial despotism. [Applause.]

Being an "imported article" myself I claim the right to speak upon this subject. [Applause and laughter.] Having been a wage-worker upon the farm, in the mill, and in the pineries of my State, I am familiar with the habits of thought of these men and the treatment they expect and demand of their employers.

The farm hand of Wisconsin takes his meals at his employer's table, and should an effort be made to turn him off to shift for himself with a peck of meal, 5 pounds of bacon, and a quart of molasses per week, to be cooked by himself, as I understand is the customary way of providing the farm hand in many portions of the South, he would most indignantly protest. And he ought to protest.

Only a few days ago representatives of Southern States held a convention in Hot Springs, Ark., for the purpose of encouraging immigration into the South. Let me say to the people of the South: If you desire immigrants treat your employés like men of equal rights with yourselves, and no conventions will be needed to induce them to come. [Applause.] Honor labor and it will honor you. [Applause.] But until you do, all advertisement of your vast resources and invitations contained in formal resolutions will avail you nothing, for the first comers will be disappointed and immediately report the fact to their friends. In Europe the condition to which a laborer or peasant is born clings to him through life. It is about impossible for him to better his condition by a change, no matter how strenuous efforts he may make. He may have to receive assistance from friends to emigrate; but he comes to us with a fervent desire to better his condition and become the equal of his formor associates, and refuses to be relegated to the position of the slave—a worse condition than that from which he fled.

LABORERS' CONDITION AT THE NORTH.

The laborer in the Northern States at least is treated better than the laborer of Europe, and no Democratic manipulation of figures can disprove it, and statements to the contrary are as ridiculous as they are ignorant. He receives better pay with us than in Europe; his labor furnishes him with more comforts of life, talk as you will about the high prices which protection compels him to pay for his purchases. The little luxuries known to the American farmer and laborer are unknown to the same class in Europe. In Europe he would never dream of a carpet on his floors or pictures on his walls. And such a thing as being the proud possessor of an organ or a piano never enters his thoughts. I am proud of a country in which the laborer and farmer and mechanic can boast of the luxuries, even, that they are enabled to provide for their family, and I am unwilling to abandon a policy which has so far proved so much to their interest.

WHO PAYS THE DUTY?

On the question as to whether the importer or the consumer pays the duty the fact that many articles of the same quality sell at the same price in England and the United States shows that the consumer suffers nothing. But even if the price in some instances is somewhat enhanced the purchasing power of American labor so far exceeds the purchasing power of European labor that the advantage is largely in favor of the former.

Sir Charles Tupper, minister of finance of Canada, in a speech delivered in the Canadian house of commons on the 10th of last month on the fisheries treaty which he had been trying to negotiate with this country, congratulated Canada on the prospects of the passage of the Mills bill, and in referring to it used the following language:

Modified it may be, but I am inclined to think the amendments will be still more in the interest of Canada than as the bill stands to-day. We may congratulate ourselves upon securing the free admission of our lumber, upon which was paid during the last year no less than $1,315,450. On copper ore, made free by the Mills bill, we paid, or there was paid—to make it meet the views of the honorable gentlemen opposite more correctly—$66,945. On salt, $21,592 duty was paid. This is rendered free by the Mills bill. I am sorry to find, as I hoped would be the case from the first copy of the bill that came to me, that potatoes were not included amongst vegetables. I am sorry to find there is a doubt as to whether the term "vegetables not specially enumerated" will not exclude potatoes.

The statement of Sir Charles is that "we"—the Canadian importer—paid the duty, and not the American consumer. His Democratic friends here, from whom he hopes so much—for Canada—maintain just the reverse.

TRUSTS.

In the early part of this session several bills and resolutions were introduced to inquire into the causes and suggest a remedy for the abuses of combined capital monopolizing commerce and forcing upon the consumer unreasonable prices, and to inquire whether our customs duties were in any way responsible for this condition of affairs. If, as is claimed by the other side, the tariff is responsible for the trusts it is fair to presume that those committees, composed in every instance of a majority of Democrats, would have been only too anxious to have reported the fact, so that they might have used it in this debate.

A majority of the members on each of the committees having this subject under consideration belonging to the Democratic anti-protection wing of this House, it is justifiable and right to infer from their silence that they are unable to ascribe the formation of trusts to our protective system. That is repeatedly charged upon this floor, but the committees have not the hardihood to officially so declare. After industrious inquiry and patient investigation they remain silent. They can not fail to recognize the fact that the largest and most formidable trusts are not in protected articles at all, as will witness the Standard Oil Trust, the Anthracite Coal Trust, the Coffee Trust, etc. Here again is apparent the kindly feeling of our Democratic friends for the sugar industry of Louisiana. The Sugar Trust is one of the most abominable of all monopolistic efforts to rob the consumer by an enforced increase of prices. But the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] in his late reference to this subject in the Senate does not include it in his list of trusts; and my friend from Minnesota [Mr. MACDONALD], as I was naturally led to expect, in his enumeration of diabolical trusts conveniently forgets this Beelzebub of all trusts.

I have examined the records of other Democrats, and, with rare exceptions, I find that they cautiously tip-toe around the sleeping monster with finger to their lips, lest they might awaken him. [Applause.] They are silent on the sugar trust. Let the gentlemen having those matters in charge propose the remedy for this new evil in our industrial system and I promise them my support. But trusts are not unknown in other lands, and it seems to me far preferable to contend with them within the jurisdiction of our own legislation and courts than to be subject to the impositions of foreign trusts beyond our jurisdiction. The common-law maxim, "There is no wrong without a remedy," will not fail to provide the proper restraining force in regard to trusts. It is idle to lay all the ills that flesh is heir to to the tariff, as s so glibly done.

PROTECTION THE OUTGROWTH OF CIVILIZATION.

The drift of intelligent thought in all civilized countries is towards protection. The fact that wages in Germany and France are lower than in England is no argument against protection. Germany has not yet seen the close of her first decade under a protective policy, and France, within the same period, finding her protective duties too low to effect their purpose, increased them. These countries have therefore not yet had time to receive its beneficial results to their full extent. Official reports show that wages are better in Germany now than under free trade, that there are fewer men idle, and that the tax for the support of those dependent upon society—the poor-tax—has materially decreased.

The leading nations of Europe (except England) have all adopted the protective system of duties, and the smaller ones are fast following. Switzerland within the last few months, to the great chagrin of Mr. Boyd Winchester, consul-general, appointed by this administration to preach the gospel of free trade to the liberty-loving mountain dwellers of that country, and whose late report is my authority, has adopted a a highly protective tariff. Germany has lately increased her protective duties; so have Russia and several States of South America. With an extended suffrage, Scandinavia, which the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] erroneously puts on the free-list, is fast getting into the protective ranks. Protection was the issue in last year's election in Sweden and carried by a majority so strong that the King felt obliged to reorganize his ministry upon the basis of a protective duty on imports.

And here let me say that at an international exposition held in Vienna about five years ago of school exhibits and methods of teaching

and at which this country was represented, this same country of Sweden took the first medal. Intelligence and protection go hand in hand. [Applause.]

Norway has not fully recovered from the shock of her ministerial crisis of a few years ago, which resulted in the impeachment of the then ministry. But Mr. Johan Sverdrup, who led the progressive forces in that fight to a successful issue, and who is the present prime minister of Norway, is a decided protectionist, and it may reasonably be expected that in the near future she will follow the example of the sister kingdom. Of Denmark it is unnecessary to speak, as the present revolutionary ministry, in order to maintain itself against the attacks of the liberal wing of the legislative body, has resorted to repeated prorogations and prevented any financial legislation for years.

The following, from the pen of Emil Schalk, is a pertinent exposé of the relation of protection to our advanced civilization:

THE LOGIC OF PROTECTION—THE DISTINGUISHING FEATURE OF CIVILIZATION.

Protection in every form, in its fullest meaning, applied to every sphere of life, is the distinguishing feature of civilization. Without protection society and civilization can not exist; barbarism, savage life, the life of a brute, alone prevails. Protection is the slow-working agency which gradually lifts man to higher planes of civilization. It reduces the dangers and chances in the struggle for life. Society charges itself with guarding the individual against dangers and difficulties by which he may be beset.

In the natural state each individual has to fight hunger and thirst, the inclemencies of climate and weather, and his mortal enemies besides, who are ever plotting his destruction. It is by means of protection that the life of man differs from that of the animal; for protection is the result of man's highest intellect, of his faculties of reflection and forethought. We build houses to protect ourselves by day and night from the inclemencies of the weather. We make clothes to suit the season, now to shield us from the scorching rays of the sun, and then to protect us against the freezing winds of the north. We cultivate fields and erect storehouses; we raise cattle and collect provisions to ward off starvation; we create insurance companies against accident and fire; we create life insurance to protect the brood should the wage-earner die; we create savings-banks to prevent want in our old age, and thus through every phase of civilized life protection may be traced like the red threads in the ropes of the English navy.

Governments, laws, institutions, are but so many arrangements for the protection of the individual in his life, limbs, possessions, and in his right to enjoy life and happiness. Civil laws define his rights, and courts protect him in them. Criminal laws are enacted to shield society from the efforts of the wicked; police and courts are there to enforce the protection. Armies and navies serve no other purpose than to protect nations against other nations. But the protection which civilization to-day accords the individual goes far beyond that of life and limb and material possessions. Names, honor, thoughts, writings, inventions, business, even the name a man may choose to give his goods or merchandise are protected. And among civilized nations some go still further and accord to individuals protection in their occupations, their means of earning a living against the inroads made by individuals of other nations. These countries take to heart Shylock's words:

"You take my house when you do take the prop
That doth sustain my house; you take my life
When you do take the means whereby I live."

And just as this protection in the means of earning a living is but a natural and logical consequence in the advance of civilization, another link in the chain of protection which makes up civilized life, so is free trade the very reverse of protection and civilization. It is a return to the methods of barbaric life. It is the fight of each against all, of individuals against the species, and of entire organized species against the individual. It means want of forethought and reflection in the individual and in society as a whole.

HOPE FOR THE SOUTH.

With the civilizing influence which a freer discussion of public questions and fairer elections would bring to the South, may we not hope that she too will fall into line with the most enlightened thought of the age? If example is worth anything it points conclusively towards protection.

REPUBLICAN PROPOSITIONS.

It is proposed by the Republicans of this House to repeal the internal-revenue tax on alcohol used for medicinal purposes and in the arts, as well as that upon tobacco, except, I believe, cigars. These are purely "war taxes," and the income from these sources amounts to over $30,000,000 per year. I do not defend the use of tobacco. It may be a "luxury" to some, but it has become a "necessary" to very many. This tax is as heavy on the poor as on the rich.

Whether tobacco be a luxury or not matters little to the family. A man with the habit well fixed upon him would deny himself and family many a comfort and even necessary of life rather than to go without his tobacco. A saving to him in the cost of tobacco means more comforts for the family.

The repeal of these internal-revenue taxes and of the duty on sugar, and increasing the duty on farm products sufficiently to protect them against Canadian competition, would make a certain reduction of our our income of more than $80,000,000 per year. This would be sure and effective and go as far in the direction of reduction as our present income warrants. The excess of our income over our expenditures is variously estimated at from $60,000,000 to $100,000,000 per year. Gentlemen on the other side having this matter in charge are not fully agreed as to that. I am also in favor of placing on the free-list all other articles which there is no reasonable hope that we can suecessfully produce ourselves to the extent of our wants, and of generally readjusting the duty on the basis of the difference between the cost of production here and the cost of the same article of foreign manufacture laid down in our market. I would do this with a view to the protection of our own labor, treating it with that liberality its enlightened citizenship gives it a right to demand. I would treat it liberally, not stingily.

The Mills bill does not give reasonable hope of half of the reduction proposed by the Republicans. It is an insidious attack upon the industrial system of the country, and discriminates against the North; and I hope it will be defeated. I should protest just as earnestly did the East propose legislation which, to my mind, would work as injuriously upon my section of the country as will be the effect should this bill become a law.

We have embarked upon a prosperous voyage, and our strength lies in our union. Our position, covering largely the temperate zone of a vast continent, our boundless area of fertile lands, our inexhaustible mineral wealth, our cosmopolitan population composed of the enterprise and vigor of all the nations of Europe, and blending rapidly into harmonious homogeneity, all tend, with a proper direction of our energies, to make us the most intelligent, the most independent, the wealthiest, the happiest people upon earth. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Mr. Chairman, the issue presented by this bill has been often misstated in this debate. It is not that of protection or free trade. No one insists upon such a statement of the issue except some desperate Western Republican Representative who is forced by the party lash to betray his constituency in opposing a measure which will bring relief to his own people from the curse of unjust and oppressive taxation. This he does with a hope that he may find an excuse which will shield him from the wrath of those who sent him here. It is well known that there are no advocates of free trade at this time in Congress; even those who in theory believe free trade preferable to protection concede that the amount of the public debt and pensions render free trade at present impracticable. But the false arguments of such unfaithful Representatives will fail to deceive the country or their outraged constituents. A leading Republican newspaper of the Northwest, the Chicago Tribune, tersely states the issue, and gives timely warning to Western Congressmen that by such arguments they deceive none but themselves, as will be seen by the following extract from a leading editorial of that paper:

The real controversy is between those of all parties who want high taxes for the sake of plunder, and those of every party who will resist further plucking, and every Republican Congressman from the West should understand that this presents a local issue which is not to be indefinitely postponed or obscured in a partisan fog, but which must be met now and in accordance with the interests of his constituents.

I especially commend this clear statement of the issue by this great Republican organ to Republican members from the Northwest, and advise them to revise their speeches before distributing them where the Tribune circulates, by striking out the phrases which charge that this bill presents the issue of free trade against protection, and the charge that the President advocates free trade in his message. I give this friendly advice that their constituents may not arraign them for duplicity as well as subserviency to Eastern monopolists. The message of the President expressly refutes such a charge when he used in his message the following language:

Our progress towards a wise conclusion will not be improved by dwelling upon the theories of protection and free trade. This savors too much of bandying epithets. It is a condition which confronts us, not a theory. Relief from this condition may involve a slight reduction of the advantages which we award our home productions, but the entire withdrawal of such advantages should not be contemplated. The question of free trade is absolutely irrelevant; and the persistent claim made in certain quarters that all efforts to relieve the people from unjust and unnecessary taxation are schemes of so-called free-traders, is mischievous and far removed from any consideration for the public good.

Senator SHERMAN in 1867, when discussing the tariff, rebuked this reckless and demagogical use of the term "free trade" when he said:

In considering so complicated a subject as a tariff, nothing can be more deceptive than the application of such general phrases as a "protective tariff," "a revenue tariff," "a free-trade tariff." Every law imposing a duty on imported goods is necessarily a restraint on trade. It imposes a burden upon the purchase and sale of imported goods and tends to prevent every importation. The expression, "a free-trade tariff" involves an absurdity. * * *

The only issue raised by this bill is whether we shall reduce the high taxes created during the war, which are wholly unnecessary now, and which produce distress among the masses of the people, and, if so, upon what subjects of taxation the reduction shall be made? An examination of the bill will show that out of the two hundred and seventeen millions of tariff taxes collected last year it only proposes a reduction of less than fifty-four millions. If it becomes a law it will still leave tariff taxes aggregating one hundred and sixty-three millions. It will only reduce the present rate of tariff taxes from 47 to 36 per cent., being a reduction of only 11 per cent.

Now, sir, Senator SHERMAN, the probable Republican candidate for President this year, said in 1867 it was "simply an absurdity to talk about a free-trade tariff, and to talk about a protective tariff is unnecessary, because the wit of man could not possibly frame a tariff that would produce $140,000,000 in gold without amply protecting our domestic industry." If he is good authority on such a subject, and he is so held by the Republican party, this bill still leaves twenty-three million more on the tariff list, than, as stated by Senator SHERMAN will afford ample protection to our manufacturing interests.

Sir, this bill, in my judgment, does not go far enough; it does not go as far as the President in his message indicated it should go; nor as far as Senator SHERMAN has declared it might safely go; yet it does afford great relief to an overtaxed and distressed people, and therefore it shall have my cordial support. The principle upon which this re-

vision is based is right; it is a conservative and judicious modification of the tariff upon a fair business basis; it does no injustice to any interest, and if adopted will prove to be beneficial to all. The protectionists should be thankful that a more radical measure is not demanded by the majority, and I warn them now that if this fair and reasonable proposition is rejected the people will send those here who will enact a far more radical measure.

In his annual message to Congress the President informed us that the present rate of taxation exacts from the people over one hundred million annually more than is needed to meet the necessary expenses of the Government, and it is ascertained that on the first day of July next we shall have over one hundred and sixty millions surplus in the Treasury. Last year we collected a tax of two hundred and seventeen millions from four hundred and sixty millions on dutiable imported goods from foreign countries, which is an average rate of taxation of 47 per cent. Think of it, sir! Forty-seven dollars of taxes on each $100 worth of the actual value of these imports. State taxes are thought to be high when they are 47 cents on each $100 worth of property at a low valuation, and yet the Government is demanding this enormous rate of taxation and collecting at least one-half more tariff taxes than we have use for.

And in the face of these facts, when the President and the Democratic party propose a moderate reduction of about one-fourth the amount collected from these articles, our effort is opposed—with one exception—by every Republican member of this House. The taxes we propose to reduce are collected from sugar, molasses, woolen and cotton goods, glass and glassware, manufactures of iron and steel, lumber, salt, and many other of the necessaries used by the people in their homes, on their farms, for wearing apparel and for food. The principles and policy advocated by the President, and which are ingrafted in this bill, are not novel; they are such as have received the sanction of every Democratic national convention held in the past; they are the teachings of the Democratic fathers, and are in accordance with the assurances he gave the people when he was elected. In proof of these assertions I will call attention to the expressions of Democratic leaders and Democratic platforms, which were incorporated in a speech that I made in this House in 1884 on the tariff bill then pending, and which I will attach as an appendix at the end of my remarks.

REPUBLICAN AUTHORITY FOR THE PRESIDENT'S RECOMMENDATIONS.

Several of the advocates of the protected monopolists have asserted in this debate that this movement for tariff reduction emanates from the South; that this bill is prepared solely by Southern men in the interest of Southern States; that it is inspired by those who were engaged in the rebellion. The gentleman from Kansas has gone to the ridiculous extreme of reading from the constitution of the defunct Confederate States in support of these intimations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it may be that there are some voters on the Kansas prairies simple minded enough to believe such absurd assertions. I will therefore present the views of some of the most influential and ablest of the Republican leaders, who, as it will be seen, have indorsed every principle and line of policy announced in the President's message and incorporated in this bill. This was done before either of them were written. They have already repeatedly received the most emphatic, unequivocal, and authoritative indorsement by representative bodies and representative officials and members of both the Democratic and Republican parties. The spirit of the document is concentrated in that one of its concluding paragraphs which declares that—

The simple and plain duty which we owe to the people is to reduce taxation to the necessary expenses of an economical operation of the Government and to restore to the business of the country the money which we hold in the Treasury through the perversion of governmental powers. These things can and should be done with safety to all our industries, without danger to the opportunity for remunerative labor which our workmen need, and with benefit to them and all our people, by cheapening their means of subsistence and increasing the measure of their comforts.

This is, as has been suggested, a lucid exposition of existing financial and economic conditions, and is a terse presentation of a practical remedy. It is a wise and just consideration for existing rights and is an earnest deprecation of any legislation inimical to the true interests of either labor or capital. Its temperate suggestions were entitled to receive, and in any era of disinterested patriotism and morality would have received prompt acceptance by both parties, whom it simply challenged to an honest fulfillment of their repeated promises.

The Democratic members respond to that challenge by undertaking with unanimity the accomplishment of tariff reform, to which the party has so often pledged itself in national conventions.

The message is the acid which has demonstrated the baseness of the coin of Republican pledges of tariff reform; and the Republican party responds to its challenge not by denying, but by deliberately repudiating the pledge contained in the platform of its last national convention and the formal messages, reports, and utterances of its own Presidents, Secretaries, and distinguished members. That party whose Presidential aspirants now sneer at the President's allusions to the dangers threatened by a vast and increasing surplus wrung from the people in superfluous taxes, in the platform of 1884 denounced the Democratic party (though for twenty-four years it had been out of power) for having "failed completely to relieve the people of the burden of unnecessary taxation by a wise reduction of the surplus." And then in its own behalf it added this solemn promise:

The Republican party pledges itself to correct the irregularities of the tariff and to reduce the surplus.

From that day to this with characteristic insincerity it has urged no correction of tariff irregularities and no reduction of the surplus, but has devoted all its energies to the defeat of tariff correction and to the squandering of the surplus.

For venturing to courteously invite them to a fulfillment of that pledge the President is hysterically denounced as a free-trader and the enemy of American industries by the absurdly inconsistent party, every one of whose elected Presidents since 1872 who ever sent a message to Congress, has at one time or another made official recommendations identical in spirit and almost identical in phraseology with those which are now denounced by monopoly-ridden zealots as little better than free-trade blasphemy.

In his annual message in 1873 President Grant said:

I would recommend a revision and codification of the tariff laws.

And renewing the discussion more at length in 1874, even when recommending a necessary increase of revenue, he said:

Those articles which enter into our manufactures and are not produced at home, it seems to me should be entered free. Those articles of manufacture which we produce a constituent part of, but do not produce the whole, that part which we do not produce should be entered free also. I will instance fine wool, dyes, etc. * * * There are many articles entering into home manufactures which we do not produce ourselves, the tariff upon which increases the cost of producing the manufactured articles.

President Arthur repeatedly recommended tariff-reform. His message in 1881 declared:

The tariff laws also need revision, but that a due regard may be paid to the conflicting interests of our citizens important changes should be made with caution.

President Arthur also recommended the Tariff Commission, the "abstract and brief chronicle" of which shows that, packed instrument of protected monopolists though it conceded the propriety of a reduction of 20 per cent. in tariff duties, then "paltered with us in a double sense" by submitting a schedule which justified Democratic criticism by producing no reduction, but increased taxation instead. In 1882 he deprecated a total abolition of excise taxes because it—

would almost inevitably prove a serious if not an insurmountable obstacle to a thorough revision of the tariff and to any considerable reduction in import duties. * * * I recommend an enlargement of the free-list, * * * a simplification of the complex and inconsistent schedule of duties upon certain manufactures, particularly those of cotton, iron, and steel, and a substantial reduction of the duties upon those articles and upon sugar, molasses, silk, wool, and woolen goods.

In his final message in 1884 he had the temerity to indicate a yearning after the markets of the world in the following paragraph:

The healthful enlargement of our trade with Europe, Asia, and Africa should be sought by reducing tariff burdens on such of their wares as neither we nor the other American states are fitted to produce, and thus enabling ourselves to obtain in return a better market for our supplies of food, of raw materials, and of the manufactures in which we excel.

Even more notable is this identity of sentiment between President Cleveland and those eminent Republican fiscal officers, Lincoln's last Secretary of the Treasury, Hayes's only Secretary of the Treasury, and Arthur's two Secretaries of the Treasury.

In 1868 Secretary McCulloch, holding over from Lincoln's second Cabinet, declared:

The indications are decided that the more enlightened sentiment of the country demands that the tariff shall hereafter be a tariff for revenue and not for protection, and that the revenue to be derived from it shall be no larger than, in connection with those received from other sources, will be required for the economical administration of the Government, the maintenance of the public faith, and the gradual extinguishment of the public debt.

Mr. JOHN SHERMAN, whose versatility of opinion has inspired his friend and biographer, Judge Lawrence, to commend him on sympathetic grounds to the support of every variety of American voters, as being politically a sort of conjurer's inexhaustible bottle, with every variety of sentiment on tap, declared in 1868 that—

Every advance toward a free exchange of commodities is an advance in civilization; every obstacle to a free exchange is born of the same narrow, despotic spirit which planted castles upon the Rhine to plunder peaceful commerce; every obstruction to commerce is a tax upon consumption; every facility to a free exchange cheapens commodities, increases trade and production, and promotes civilization. (Report on International Monetary Standard, June 9, 1868, page 180.)

In 1867, when enormous revenues were required to meet current expenses and interest on the vast public debt, and when no surplus restricted the volume of circulating media, Mr. SHERMAN declared, as I have already stated, that—

The wit of man could not possibly frame a tariff that would produce $140,000,000 in gold without amply protecting our domestic industry.

Yet now legislation which would "frame a tariff that would produce" nearly $170,000,000 is stigmatized by Mr. SHERMAN as being "free trade."

In 1882 Secretary of the Treasury Folger's annual report said:

It is believed that the time has arrived when a reduction of the duties on nearly all the articles in our tariff is demanded and feasible.

In 1884 Mr. McCulloch, the last Republican Secretary of the Treas-

ury, as "relief from the present burden of taxation, urgently and justly demanded," recommended:

First. That the existing duties upon raw materials which are to be used in manufactures should be removed.

Second. That the duties upon the articles used or consumed by those least able to bear the burden of taxation shall be reduced.

As lately as 1870 Senator ALLISON had this to say of the Democratic Walker tariff of 1846:

The tariff of 1846, although confessedly and professedly a tariff for revenue, was, so far as regards all the great interests of the country, as perfect a tariff as any that we have ever had.

He further said:

But I may be asked how this reduction shall be made. I think it should be made upon all leading articles, or nearly all, and for that purpose, when I can get an opportunity in the House, if no gentleman does before me, I shall move that the pending bill be recommitted to the Committee on Ways and Means with instructions to report a reduction upon existing rates of duty equivalent to 20 per cent. upon the existing rates, or one-fifth reduction. Even this will not be a full equivalent for the removal of all the internal taxes upon manufactures.

Now, if Senator ALLISON thought that the tariff on import duties in 1870, when the rate was less than 47 per cent., could be safely and wisely reduced 20 per cent., is it unreasonable or dangerous to the manufacturing interests if the policy of the President should be adopted, as provided in this bill, which reduces the rate from its present amount of 47 per cent. only 11 per cent., which is 9 per cent. less than Senator ALLISON advocated?

When I first saw the assertion in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means that the abolition of the tax on wool and reduction on woolen goods would benefit the woolen manufacturer and not injure the wool-grower, I supposed that idea was original with that committee; but upon examination I find that it is likely they derived the idea from Senator ALLISON, and upon a further examination of the debates in past Congresses I find that Senator ALLISON might have obtained the same idea from Daniel Webster, who was the great advocate of protection in the closing years of his life, although he was originally a revenue reformer. A similar expression will be found in his speech on the tariff in 1824. Senator ALLISON used this language in speaking of the wool schedule in the tariff bill of 1870:

Such a reduction (on wool and woolens) would benefit the consumer and not injure either the wool-grower or wool-manufacturer.

Then he proceeds at length to explain why a reduction of the tax on wool and woolen goods will—as substantially asserted in the report of the Committee on Ways and Means—inure to the advantage of the wool-grower and the manufacturer of woolens. (See volume 81 of Congressional Globe of 1870, Appendix, page 194.)

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLY] and the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS] vigorously assailed the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means with the charge that they had placed bituminous coal on the free-list. They both seemed to fear that this bill would destroy the bituminous coal interests of Pennsylvania and Maryland, and close a majority of the coal fields of this country. It is true the word coal can not be found on the free-list of this bill, but they have argued themselves into the belief that by the repeal of some provision of the revenue law the bill does by indirection accomplish that result.

It is strange, Mr. Chairman, that the Democratic members of this House, even if it were true, which it is not, had so placed bituminous coal on the free-list, should be charged with high crimes and misdemeanors by gentlemen on the other side, when the records of Congressional debates will show by such action they have simply stepped in the footprints of prominent Republicans now in the United States Senate.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman permit me a moment, as I happened to enter the door just as I heard my name mentioned?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Certainly.

Mr. KELLEY. I had the honor of having put anthracite coal on the free-list, because it was always harped upon that I was advocating coal in the interest of Pennsylvania. I had it put on the free-list by my own motion and labor.

Now, I say that the bill known as the "Mills bill" does, in a roundabout way, but most effectually, put it there, because it perfectly repeals the duties on coal and iron ore, while it comes with a protestation that it has not repealed either.

Coal and iron ore are crude minerals unwrought, and the bill puts crude minerals unwrought on the free-list. It omits to put into the bill the provisions by which the duties are now imposed on coal and ore; and in its last section it provides that all matters conflicting—I forget the precise language used—with the provisions of the bill are hereby repealed. So that in three separate patches the bill makes effective work of the duties on coal and iron ore.

Now, the argument made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN], when I insisted that this was the legitimate and only proper construction of the bill, was that "if it was so," they would put on such amendments as to make the construction unquestionable and in express terms, and I want them to do so and not stand pleading hereafter that the courts or the Departments have given an "unexpected" construction when they give the only one which can be given to the third clause, namely, that coal and iron ore being crude minerals the duty was repealed.

I do not care whether they repeal or retain it; I only wish they would say which they are going to do.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I was not present when the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLAN] discussed that subject, and therefore do not know what he said. I am informed, however, by those around me that he did state that if the construction put upon the bill in reference to bituminous coal by the gentleman from Pennsylvania was a proper one, he would be in favor, and the Committee on Ways and Means would be in favor, of so amending the bill as to leave coal where it is to-day.

Mr. KELLEY. Coal and iron ore?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. And iron ore also.

Mr. KELLEY. I am glad I happened to come in as my name was mentioned.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me to suggest that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] demonstrated that the bill was not liable to the objection suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

Mr. KELLEY. I thought I had demonstrated it was.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Maryland should dismiss the fears they have expressed with regard to the intentions of the Democratic party as to coal. But I want to say this: I do not understand why it is a crime for a Democrat to ask for free coal when the gentlemen who to-day give direction to and are the most potent among the leaders of the Republican party have demanded that all coals should go upon the free-list at a time when the rate of tariff taxation was less than it is to-day.

I have before me minutes which I have made from the record, which show that in 1871 General Garfield, the man for whom the gentleman from Pennsylvania voted for President and whom your party elected President, voted to put coal and salt on the free-list. So did Senator FRYE, of Maine. So did Senator HALE, of Maine. So did Senator DAWES, of Massachusetts, and Senators CULLOM, HAWLEY, ALLISON, and the late General Logan voted to put coal on the free list.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman from Illinois pardon me a moment?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Certainly.

Mr. KELLEY. And I remember that as a protectionist I stood within a few feet of where I am and denounced the men who wanted protection for everything their States produced and wanted free trade in everything that other States produced. So I do not dispute with you about that. But let me say a word about the dead Garfield.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I will remind the gentleman that my time is limited.

Mr. KELLEY. Your time can be extended.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Very well; with that understanding I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLEY. I refused to vote for General Garfield as Speaker when he was the nominee of the caucus of my party on account of my lack of faith in his protection doctrines. But after the visiting statesmen, as they were called, of whom I was one and General Garfield was another, made our visit to New Orleans and visited Mr. Lawrence's sugar plantation and sugar factory I never doubted General Garfield's complete and thorough regeneration from all the sins of the Cobden doctrine.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Let me ask the gentleman in what year that visit was made?

Mr. KELLEY. In 1876.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. At what time?

Mr. KELLEY. You know when we went down there.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I think it was in November. I want the accurate dates.

Mr. KELLEY. It was in November. General Garfield went with the proprietor of the estate and some of the laboring people all over that sugar plantation, and in the afternoon we were dining. There were probably thirty people at the table, and when it came to be General Garfield's time to respond to a sentiment, he said:

I shall probably surprise some of the gentlemen who hear me. I know one who will be greatly surprised at what I am about to say; for I am prepared to avow myself an humble disciple of the leading advocate of the protective system in the American Congress.

And walking from his seat, at one end of the table, to mine, at the other, he grasped my hand and in that presence said, "Henceforth I am your humble disciple on questions of economy connected with the revenues of our Government; my abstract opinions have vanished before the material facts with which I have become acquainted here to-day. I am, with WILLIAM D. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, a protectionist henceforth."

Therefore, as a protectionist, I voted, for President, for the man I had refused to vote for as Speaker, when the caucus of my party had nominated him, because I believed him to be a free-trader. I want to say I do not regard it as a crime to repeal a duty; I only think it a matter of bad judgment.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Now, will the gentleman from Pennsylvania allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. At what time did General Garfield make that declaration which bound you to him so closely and affectionately?

Mr. KELLEY. In New Orleans.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. In November, 1876?

Mr. KELLEY. I believe it was in November, 1876.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. It does seem to me the gentleman from Pennsylvania has got his dates greatly mixed. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLEY. It may have been December. The public papers will fix the date. It was during the visit to New Orleans of what were called the visiting statesmen of both parties.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The memory of the gentleman from Pennsylvania must be treacherous.

Mr. KELLEY. No, sir; not on that point.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The gentleman states he voted against General Garfield when a candidate for the Speakership because he believed him to be a free-trader, and yet he says General Garfield changed his opinion on that question a year before he was nominated by the Republican caucus as candidate for Speaker, and a complete reconciliation had occurred between them.

The gentleman was at New Orleans, as I well remember, in the fall of 1876. General Garfield was put in nomination by the Republican caucus for Speaker in the fall of 1877, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] voted against him. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KELLEY. He had been a candidate for Speaker before that.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Why did you vote against him in 1877 when he was again nominated by the caucus for that position?

Mr. KELLEY. Because I preferred another for Speaker.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The man who opposed him was Mr. RANDALL. He was the Democratic caucus nominee and Garfield was the nominee of the Republican caucus, of which the gentleman from Pennsylvania was a member.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. RANDALL was not a candidate before the caucus of my party.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I remember well that when we were debating the tariff bill of 1882 I arraigned the gentleman here as having abandoned his convictions and yielded obedience to the dictates of a caucus of the Republican party in regard to amendments on the then pending bill, and he admitted that he had yielded his convictions upon those important economic questions in obedience to the mandate of the caucus, and said he felt it to be his duty as a party man to obey the action of the caucus of his party; yet he now confesses that in 1877, a year after he was convinced that Garfield was no longer a free-trader, he refused to obey the action of a Republican caucus which commanded him to vote for Garfield as the caucus nominee of his party.

Mr. KELLEY. That may be as you will; but there are from twenty to thirty witnesses to establish the occurrence of the scene I have recited, among them gentlemen of both parties. Whatever may have been my deviations from party rectitude or party discipline, there still remains the fact, which can be established by many witnesses, that there was an avowal of an absolute conversion by James A. Garfield—an avowal made at a dinner party on the plantation of Mr. Lawrence, which plantation is now owned, I believe, by Governor Warmoth, who was present on the occasion.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. My friend has not yet made it clear to me what were his reasons for disregarding the action of the Republican caucus a year after that, when the same Garfield had been nominated by the caucus in which he participated.

Mr. KELLEY. What right have you to interrogate me as to my personal relations and personal reasons? [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.] There are other questions than tariff in the world. There are sometimes personal questions. On all political questions I will answer you as fully and frankly as I can, but when you attempt to probe my personal convictions and feelings I tell you they are sacred.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I have no desire to pursue this controversy with the gentleman further, Mr. Chairman, but——

Mr. KELLEY. I helped to elect Garfield in 1880, and, as my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] says, in common with my party I was satisfied with his letter of acceptance and with his inaugural address and message.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I of course accept the explanation made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania without impugning his sincerity at all; but if he did not vote against Garfield in 1877 because of a mistrust of his loyalty to the cause of protection, it does seem strange to me that he and his colleague, Mr. BAYNE, and several others of his Republican colleagues from Pennsylvania, refused to vote for Garfield at that time, and it is also very singular that the question was raised in Pennsylvania, and the loyalty of the gentleman and his colleagues to their party was impugned because they failed to vote for Garfield in 1877, and so strongly was the accusation made against their party fealty that one of them, Mr. Killinger, was compelled to publish a circular in his defense, in which he assigned as a reason for his action that the gentleman and Mr. BAYNE and himself and other Republicans of Pennsylvania had no faith in the sincerity of Garfield's loyalty to the doctrine of protection.

Mr. KELLEY. In 1877 the protest against making Garfield Speaker was——

Mr. TOWNSHEND. But Garfield had made his confession and received his absolution from you a year before that. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KELLEY. The protest was because persons who assumed to control the Republican party announced that it had been determined that Garfield should be the candidate for Speaker before gentlemen had an opportunity to be heard in the caucus. There was the real question.

Now, sir, I am not speaking for myself; I am speaking for other people.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to consume my time in pursuing this controversy any further with the gentleman. I desire to say now that I understood from the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. WOODBURN] when he was on the floor the other day that it was denied that General Garfield ever was a member of the Cobden Club, and afterwards, when my colleague from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] was on the floor arraigning the Speaker of this House for being a member of the Cobden Club, I asked him the modest question whether the Speaker had joined the club before Garfield had joined it, and he answered me, or I understood him so to answer, that Garfield had never sought election to that club, had never accepted its election to membership, and had repudiated it. And yet, Mr. Chairman, I have in my hand a circular with which I know the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] must be familiar, because it was circulated through the State of Pennsylvania in 1877, in which General Garfield was charged with being a member of the free-trade Cobden Club, and which denied that he had ever repudiated his connection with it.

These declarations excited my curiosity. I was puzzled by the contrariety of opinion on that side of the House, and in order to satisfy my mind I wrote to Mr. David A. Wells, who was a personal and intimate friend of General Garfield, for a statement of the facts. I have received an answer from him which I hold in my hand. In this letter he explains fully General Garfield's connection with the Cobden Club, and I wish to show by it that the gentlemen who have been reflecting on Mr. CARLISLE and Mr. COX not only supported a Cobden Club member for Speaker of the House, but afterwards zealously supported his election to the Presidency of the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KELLEY. I have never denied that Garfield was a member of the Cobden Club, nor that until 1876 his tendencies were all toward free trade.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Up to 1876?

Mr. KELLEY. Yes; and therein you have the cause of several of the coolnesses that occurred with some publicity between Mr. Garfield and myself when we were both members of this House; but that he avowed himself clearly, squarely, and broadly as a protectionist against all other faiths in connection with our system of revenue I can produce a score of witnesses to testify.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I have been quite liberal in allowing the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] to use my time, and I trust he will see that the House gives me a sufficient extension to cover the time which I have given him.

Mr. KELLEY. I trust the House will extend the gentleman's time.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I now ask that the letter of Mr. Wells be read by the Clerk.

The letter was read, as follows:

NORWICH, CONN., *May* 8, 1888.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your question concerning General Garfield's connection with the Cobden Club, I would say that he was elected a member of the club in 1869, at the same time and in company with Edward Atkinson, Ralph Waldo Emerson, E. P. Whipple, John Quincy Adams, and William Lloyd Garrison, of Massachusetts, and William C. Bryant, Henry Ward Beecher, and David Dudley Field, of New York; that he acknowledged the compliment and accepted the membership in a letter to the secretary of the club, and that his membership continued, without any revocation on his part, until the day of his death. And I will further add that it was not then the custom of the club, nor has it since been, to elect any person to their membership as an honorary recognition of their literary or political distinction, or without an assurance previously given, either directly or through friends, that the person nominated desired an election and accepted the principles of the club as expressed in the motto imprinted upon all its correspondence and publications, namely, "Free trade, peace, good-will among nations."

I also assert that President Garfield, of my own certain knowledge, was a believer in the principles of free trade down to a period as late as a year previous to his nomination for the Presidency, and that it was in no small part through intercourse and discussion with him in 1867 and 1868 that I abandoned my original belief in the doctrines of protection, and becoming a free-trader, subsequently (in 1870) accepted a membership in the Cobden Club.

In making these statements I prefer no accusation of disingenuousness or hypocrisy against General Garfield, and neither do I think him fairly open to a suspicion of such conduct. He probably accepted the definition of Canning, that true statesmanship consists in finding the line of safe change in public policy; and while accepting the principles of free trade and looking forward to the day when they will constitute the basis of commercial intercourse between all nations, he at the same time held that such a result in this country could be best and most speedily attained through gradual and tentative reforms, and that in the then temper of the American people the advocacy of radical measures was both inexpedient and useless.

I am, yours, most respectfully,

DAVID A. WELLS.

Hon. R. W. TOWNSHEND, M. C.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call special attention

to the fact, which has now been conceded, that General Garfield was a member of the Cobden Club, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania bears testimony to the fact that General Garfield entertained free-trade opinions as late as 1876. I wish further to call attention to the testimony given by Mr. Wells——

Mr. CANNON. Will my colleague allow me——

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The gentleman will be kind enough to wait until I get through with my statement on this point. I wish to call attention to the testimony given by Mr. Wells, that General Garfield never retracted his acceptance of his election to that club; and so far as we are able to judge to-day he died a member of the Cobden Free-Trade Club. Not a scintilla of evidence has been produced to the contrary. There have been some bald assertions that he repudiated any connection with that club; but in the absence of testimony justly entitled to credence I will still entertain the belief that General Garfield was a member of the club when he died, as testified by the letter of Mr. Wells. Now I yield to my colleague.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I think it makes but little difference if General Garfield, at one period of his life, entertained the opinions which gentlemen here undertake to impute to him. The views which different individuals entertain on questions of this kind are a matter of growth, experience, business expediency; and David A. Wells himself was at one time a protectionist. We know that General Garfield accepted the Republican nomination for the Presidency, and by that acceptance, as well as by speeches long before that nomination, he declared himself a sound protectionist. That his reaching of these conclusions was a matter of progress does not, I think, prove anything.

Take my own case. When I commenced my public life in this House and my investigation of the questions upon which I was called to vote, my leanings were substantially toward "revenue reform" from my colleague's standpoint. Through the years intervening until the present time, I have experienced on these questions a growth, until I presume I am now recognized as a pretty sound protectionist.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I hope my colleague will not take up my time by making a speech.

Mr. CANNON. And I expect to see my colleague [Mr. TOWNSHEND] forsake his present theories and gravitate toward protection.

Mr. REED. Oh, no! [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Several MEMBERS. That is expecting too much.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect ever to change my present convictions and abandon the position I now occupy on this tariff question so long as my conscience permits me to be a faithful representative of the agricultural interests of the West. Whenever I shall have reached that point when under the party lash I can be forced to betray the interests of my constituents to the monopolists of this country I may abandon my present position and join the company of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. With personally good feeling toward gentlemen who come here from the West, and without personally impugning their motives, I say that no member, whether he be sincere or not, who represents a Western agricultural district can under present circumstances, with such a tariff system as that now in existence, vote against measures for the reformation of the tariff without betraying the interest of his constituents.

Mr. KERR. I wish to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I do not complain so much of those Representatives who live in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania, and whose constitutents are being enriched out of the hard earnings of the farmers of the West; but, sir, I can not look upon the conduct of representatives of the agricultural districts of the West in favor of protection in any other light than a betrayal of the best interests of the people who sent them here.

Mr. KERR. Now may I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. CANNON. Will my colleague allow me——

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I do not impute anything improper personally to these gentlemen; they may be deluded; but even if they are sincere in their advocacy of protection, I tell them now that they are sadly deluded, and deluded to such an extent as to obstruct what is for the best interests of the people who have placed them in this House.

Mr. KERR. Do you repudiate the pledge contained in your last national platform, that you would raise all your revenues by a tariff? Do you repudiate that now?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. There is no such provision in the platform.

Mr. KERR. It is in your platform; and a gentleman on your own side—the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TARSNEY], who spoke the other day—said that upon that platform there was no room for an internal-revenue system.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I deny that there is any such declaration in the platform.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman from Michigan read it, and made that statement, and he was a member of the platform committee.

Mr. CANNON. Will my colleague allow me a word? He has used pretty strong language when he accused his colleagues and friends here of betraying the interests of their coustituents.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I will hear the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. I concede to my colleague honesty of conviction and purpose, and I claim the same for myself. If he will allow me——

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Mr. Chairman, I was proceeding, when interrupted, to show that the record of proceedings of this House bear me out in the statement that the policy and principles recommended in the President's message have been previous to its preparation indorsed by prominent Republican leaders. I hold in my hand a memorandum of some references which I desire to submit as follows:

On January 31, 1870, my distinguished predecessor in Congress, Hon. S. S. Marshall, offered a resolution favoring a revenue tariff. A motion was made to lay it on the table but the present Senator ALLISON, and Senator CULLOM, of Illinois, refused to vote in the affirmative; they voted in the negative and thereby indirectly indorsed the doctrine of a revenue tariff.

On the 14th of March, 1870, Judge S. S. Marshall offered a resolution indorsing the principles of the Walker bill which those on the other side call a Democratic free-trade tariff, and on a motion to lay it on the table General Garfield and the present Senators ALLISON, HALE, and HAWLEY voted in the negative, thereby showing their sympathy with the Walker tariff bill.

On the 23d of February, 1870, Senator ALLISON, Banks of Massachusetts, CULLOM of Illinois, Senator DAWES of Massachusetts, Senator HAWLEY, and Senator Logan all voted in favor of free coal on the resolution offered by Mr. Ward of New York.

On June 6, 1870, on a resolution of Mr. Ward in favor of free coal, Senator ALLISON, General Banks, Senators CULLOM, DAWES, HALE, HAWLEY, and the late Senator Logan voted in the affirmative.

On April 30, 1872, on Judge Lyman Trumbull's amendment to place coal and salt on the free-list, General Garfield, Senators HAWLEY, HALE, and FRYE voted in the affirmative, and at the same session Senator HALE offered a resolution to place salt and coal on the free-list. In the House March 14, 1871, Senator EUGENE HALE moved to put salt on the free-list. HALE, FRYE, Garfield, and HAWLEY voted in the affirmative. At the same session, on Farnsworth's motion to repeal the duty on foreign coal, among the ayes were DAWES, FRYE, Garfield, HALE, HAWLEY, and Tyner.

In 1888 Mr. Blaine denounced any reduction of the tariff when its average rate of tax is over 47 per cent.; yet no longer ago than 1883, in his "Twenty Years in Congress," Mr. Blaine had this to say of the so-called Democratic free-trade or revenue tariff of 1846, when its average rate of tax was 23.2 per cent., or less than half as extortionate as that which now annually wrings from labor and puts into the Treasury more than $200,000,000 and then puts into the pockets of pampered and protected monopolies $550,000,000 more. Says Mr. Blaine:

> The tariff of 1846 yielded abundant revenue. Money became very abundant after the year 1849; large enterprises were undertaken, speculation was prevalent, and for a considerable period the prosperity of the country was genuine. The principles embodied in the tariff of 1846 seemed for the time to be so entirely vindicated and approved that resistance to it ceased not only among the people but among the protective economists, and even among the manufacturers to a large extent. So general was this acquiescence that in 1856 a protective tariff was not suggested or even hinted by any one of the three parties which presented Presidential candidates.

In 1857 nearly all the Republicans in Congress, including such men as Hamilton Fish, Charles Sumner, and Henry Wilson, voted for the bill which then reduced the duties even lower than was provided in the Walker tariff of 1846.

On that bill 18 New England votes were cast for the bill, and only 9 against it. (See Report 12, Senate, Forty-eighth Congress, first session, page 298.)

I cite the action of the gentlemen mentioned because when less radical action is recommended by President Cleveland and by the Committee on Ways and Means in the bill before us, they are denounced as guilty of disloyal tendencies, of yielding to the dictation of Southern sentiment, of advocating free trade, and a desire to destroy home manufacturing industries.

Of course the Republican Senators mentioned had a right to advocate Democratic views on the tariff and to change their former opinions.

Sir, why have so many of these eminent statesmen abandoned such strong convictions and denounce to-day what they so firmly, patriotically, and eloquently advocated a short time ago? It may be they sincerely changed their convictions or it may be because the party to which they belong is dominated by the shylocks of monopoly, who demanded that they should sacrifice allegiance to the country when in conflict with allegiance to party. Monopoly is indeed a cruel master. From the proofs that I have presented it will be seen that the President has not only followed the dictates of his conscience and the demands of the duty imposed upon him by his high office, but obeyed the teachings of the Democratic fathers and proven his loyalty to true Democratic principles.

Had he sat supinely in the White House, and ignored the evils which produce the distress now prevailing in the land, and the threatened direful disasters to the business and prosperity of the country, then might the party which placed him in power and the people of whose interests he is the guardian have accused him of dereliction of duty; but by his message he has done what common sense, common honesty, and humanity demand. He has done what the leaders and platforms of the Democratic party have demanded; he has advocated what Republican Presidents and statesmen have advocated at a recent period.

THE USE OF MONEY IN ELECTIONS.

From the reckless demagogues who advocate protection we often hear

the assertion that British gold has been used to promote the cause of free trade in this country and to aid in the election of members of Congress in that interest.

Such false statements are really too contemptible to notice here. I do not believe that English statesmen desire free trade in this country. England's prosperity depends mainly on her supremacy upon the seas and the control of foreign markets. They see how effectually protection has annihilated our merchant marine and swept nearly the last vestige of it from the seas, and how effectually it bars the market of the world against us. The interest of England is benefited more by protection than by free trade in this country; but I have alluded to this false cry for the purpose of asserting that, whilst there is no proof of such use of British gold, we have evidence that those who have filled their coffers by this system of legalized robbery are guilty of using money to prevent the election of revenue-reform Democrats to Congress.

By the use of money it is believed they caused the majority of more than one Democratic member of this House to be reduced at the last election, and I have no doubt the defeat of some others can be traced to the use of money by the protective monopolists. This will probably be an easy year for the managers of the Republican party to raise a large campaign fund, for I have no doubt the monopolies and trusts, for whose interest that party in Congress and in State conventions is zealously working, will furnish a very liberal campaign fund to prevent the election of tariff reformers to the next Congress. They can well afford to do this, and no doubt will do so. Indeed, they have already opened the campaign by the distribution of documents among the farmers of the West, as will be seen from the following editorial in the Bulletin, the organ of the iron and steel association:

365,413.

This is the exact number of tariff tracts published by the Industrial League, of Philadelphia, which were distributed from the office of the American Iron and Steel Association from the 1st of January last to the close of business on the 5th of March. On the 28th of February the president of the Industrial League, Mr. Joseph Wharton, paid to Allen, Lane & Scott, for printing tariff tracts, one bill which amounted to $2,638.36.

In a later issue it said:

657,487 TARIFF TRACTS.

From the 15th of January until the close of business on April 25, 1888, the American Iron and Steel Association distributed gratuitously 657,437 well-printed tariff tracts, published by the Industrial League, of Philadelphia.

We think that we know the exact influence which has caused the suspension of Mr. Philpot's free-trade newspaper, The Million, at Des Moines, Iowa. In 1886 the Industrial League, of Philadelphia, sent 72,556 protective-tariff tracts to Iowa, and down to the 1st of November in the present year it had sent 37,062 to the same State. These were distributed among the farmers and other voters of that State. The Million could not live under this steady fire of hard facts and common sense.

REPUBLICANS ADMIT SURPLUS MUST BE REDUCED.

It is conceded by prominent Republicans in this debate that the enormous surplus revenue flowing into the Treasury must be stopped by reduction of taxation. I quote, as follows, from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]:

That the accumulation of such a surplus must be averted there can be no question. A constantly-accruing and ever-increasing surplus not only invites to profligacy, but insures swift financial disaster. There can be, therefore, no conflict of opinion, but that there must be such a modification of our tax laws as will insure a reduction of revenue to the basis of probable governmental expenditure. But a reduction of the revenue is not the only, nor indeed the chief end to be attained. The method by which that reduction is to be accomplished has become the main point of controversy, and indeed the only point about which there is any serious conflict of opinion.

A Republican Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], in speaking of the President's message, said:

However much we may differ in respect of the methods of reduction, we doubtless will all agree that the annual revenue of the Government should be reduced. It is not wise nor just to collect more revenue than is needed for the proper purposes of the Government. We are doing this unwise and unjust thing. This ought not to continue. How can it be stopped? By amending the revenue laws.

Senator WILSON said further on, as follows:

We are collecting about $60,000,000 more revenue each year than the expenditures of the Government require. How are we to rid ourselves of this condition? Of course, by reducing the aggregate of taxation; and the President gave us a suggestion in his message of the proper line of policy to be pursued in effecting this reduction.

THE REAL ISSUE.

It is true, as the gentleman from Michigan has said, that the method by which that reduction is to be accomplished has become the main point of controversy. The President and the Democratic party demand that this reduction shall come from the thousands of articles of food, clothing, household goods, and things used in the workshops and on the farms. The potent Republican leaders demand that the reductions shall be confined to whisky and tobacco. The position of the two parties is clearly illustrated by their past and present course on this subject in Congress.

HISTORY OF PRESENT TARIFF SYSTEM.

Before proceeding further with what I have to say, let me briefly state that substantially the present system of Federal taxes was created about the beginning and during the war. When the Democratic party went out of power in 1861 the rate of tariff taxes was less than 20 per cent., which was so adjusted as to realize about $50,000,000 per annum. Shortly thereafter the Morrill tariff bill was adopted, and before the close of the war the rates of tariff duties were enormously increased. That war legislation, so far as it relates to custom duties, with some modification, has substantially remained in force ever since.

The reasons urged for the enormous increase of the tariff taxes were that the war rendered it necessary that taxes should be increased in order that sufficient revenue might be raised to purchase supplies for the Army and defray the general expenses of the war; and as an internal-revenue tax of 5 per cent. upon the gross products of manufactures had been laid in order to increase their profits, and as a compensation to the manufacturers for this tax, very heavy duties were imposed upon imports. At the time this system was adopted it was declared and promised by the Republican leaders, who had charge of the tariff legislation, that when the war should end and the special internal-revenue tax upon the manufactures that I have mentioned should be repealed, then the high rates of tariff duties on imports should be reduced.

Other internal-revenue taxes were laid also during the war, such as taxes on bank stock, bank checks, and bank deposits, and tax on incomes, on tobacco, alcoholic spirits, etc. The reasons for these high war taxes seemed plausible, and the people acquiesced; but the cunning agents of monopoly, shielding themselves behind these patriotic pretenses, so framed the law that it yielded $5 of private taxes to the manufacturing monopolies whilst it put only $1 of revenue in the Treasury. Thus not only were the people required to pay vast sums of public taxes to the support of the Government, but, through the medium of this cunningly devised scheme, were forced in a fivefold degree to enrich the manufacturing monopolists of Pennsylvania and New England, thus proving that there is much truth in the saying of Dr. Johnson that "the first refuge of scoundrels is in patriotism."

When the war ended, when peace had been declared, and the volunteers had been discharged and returned to their homes, no more money being required to furnish rations, equipments, arms, ammunition, and other supplies for the vast army of the Union volunteers, and the special tax on manufactures having been repealed, then the Democratic party demanded that the promises made when the high rates of tariff duties were laid should be kept, and that the heavy burden resting upon the people for the enrichment of the manufacturing monopolies should be reduced. Some Republicans like Senator ALLISON, General Garfield, and others of that party seconded the demand of the Democratic party in 1870.

It was conceded by the real managers of the Republican party that taxes could be safely reduced, but that taxes of this kind should not be disturbed; they said they were willing to take the internal-revenue taxes off of banks, incomes, etc., but were unwilling to any material extent to take off the tariff duties on imports. They said that whilst the war-tariff taxes were not then needed for governmental purposes, yet they desired to maintain them in order to foster and protect home manufactures; in other words, they proposed to leave the high taxes on the poor and to only relieve the wealthy and the corporations. When the Democratic party demanded free Bibles they refused, but gave free playing cards; when it demanded a reduction of taxes upon woolen blankets they gave a reduction of the taxes upon whisky; when it demanded a reduction of taxes upon the absolute necessities of the poor they freed bank checks and bank deposits from taxation.

The positions of the two parties on this question then became clearly defined. The Democratic party was shown to be the champion of popular rights and of the poor; and the Republican party was shown to be then, as now, the champion and protector of monopolies and capitalists. A great issue was then formed between the two great parties, which has continued to divide them ever since. This issue has to a considerable extent been obscured until very recently by the artful introduction of false issues by the leaders of the Republican party. They have revived and attempted to keep alive the dead issues which were settled by the war, and by appeals to passions and prejudices engendered by the war. It is with a view to deceive the people and to obscure the real issue that gentlemen on the other side, whenever a tariff bill has been brought up for discussion in this House, have endeavored to divert the public mind by picturing the horrors and sinfulness of African slavery, bloody-shirt arguments about the sentiments of the Southern people, and vilification of the purposes of the Democratic party. They have in this way diverted the attention of the masses of the Republican party from the injustice practiced on the people under the guise of protection of labor.

Whilst the public gaze has been kept on the South the monopolies have been filching from the pockets of the people their hard earnings. The Republican party having been converted into a supple agent of protected monopolies, they have furnished that party with much of its campaign fund and the specious arguments with which the people have been deluded.

CHANGE IN THE ORIGINAL CHARACTER OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY.

That party in its origin was a party of principle. Among those who breathed the breath of life into it were some of the noblest characters in the history of this country—brave and patriotic men. The names of Seward, Chase, Blair, Trumbull, Palmer, Greeley, Sumner, Curtin, and Wells will ever be honored.

But, sir, after slavery had been abolished and the Union had been

maintained, and the great objects for which that party was created had been accomplished, it passed under the control of a spoils-hunting band, and it was prostituted to base purposes. When this became apparent the great men whose names I have mentioned abandoned it, and nearly every one of them became affiliated with the Democratic party. The Republican party in its present aspirations and policy is a buccaneer among political organizations; it has been sold by its leaders to the monopolists; like the soldiers of fortune of old, it has hired its sword for lucre; it has enlisted itself in the cause of monopolistic piracy.

I do not believe that the people can longer be deluded by the false issues under which this great question of tariff reform has been buried.

RESULTS OF DEMOCRATIC ADMINISTRATION.

Fortunately the Democratic party came into power three years ago, and after a fair trial the country has been convinced that all the predictions of evil made against it by its foes are false. The people can no longer be deceived by charges against its loyalty or its capacity for safe administration of the Government. They know full well that no rebel claim has been paid, that no negro has been re-enslaved, that no soldier has lost his just right to pension, that the business interests of the country have not been endangered, that the public moneys have not been squandered in extravagant appropriations, and that the purity, wisdom, and patriotism of the administration of Grover Cleveland has been equal to any that has existed in the past.

The people can no longer be misled by the lies and slanders of selfish demagogues; and now when the demand is made for relief from the high protective war taxes the people can not be deceived by bloody-shirt speeches over issues settled over twenty years ago. The bombast of Western Republican members in regard to the defunct Confederate constitution and the mournful dirges of the Pennsylvania politicians in regard to negro slavery will be unavailing in the face of the distress suffered by their constituents under the operation of this scheme of plunder. The West will no longer be deluded by her false and unfaithful representatives. The truth will be told on every stump in the coming campaign.

And the people will see as clearly as we see here, that this is not an issue between free trade and protection, but that it is an issue for a fair, just, and honest adjustment of the tariff taxes. They will see that the charges that the Democratic party is hostile to legitimate manufacturing interest, or that it is a free-trade party, are untrue. They full well know that the policy of our party is to continue to levy taxes on imports, and whilst it opposes protection for the sake of protection, and insists that no more taxes shall be taken from the people than are necessary for governmental purposes, it does agree that the tariff taxes shall be so adjusted as to afford encouragement to the legitimate manufacturing industries and labor. For the first time since the war the real position of parties on this question has been clearly seen by the masses.

THE OBJECT OF PROTECTION.

The object, and the only object, of protection, as claimed by its candid advocates, is to give prosperity to manufacturing industries and provide better wages for the laborer employed in these industries. This it does by laying such high taxes upon foreign imports as will restrain them from coming into competition with domestic productions.

PROTECTION OF LABOR.

One of the most glaring false pretenses of the Republican party is that it advocates protection as a benefit to labor.

High Republican authority as to the ability of American labor to compete with foreign labor and as to the ability of the United States to exclude foreign manufactures is afforded in the letter of Hon. W. M. Evarts, Secretary of State under Mr. Hayes, transmitting the consular reports on the state of labor in Europe to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, May 17, 1879 (Forty-sixth Congress, first session, House Executive Document No. 5, pages 36, 37, 38.)

Says Secretary Evarts:

The average American workman performs from one and one-half to twice as much work in a given time as the average European workman. This is so important a point in connection with our ability to compete with the cheap labor manufactures of Europe, and it seems at first thought so strange, that I will trouble you with somewhat lengthy quotations from the reports in support thereof. * * *

For the first time our manufactures are now assuming international proportions. At a time of universal depression we have met those nations which held a monopoly of the world's markets, met them in their strongholds, etc. * * *

Within the last fifteen years we have demonstrated our ability by the brilliant development of our own resources to exclude by honest competition foreign manufactures to a large extent from our shores.

In striking contrast with the present Republican fashion of sneering depreciation of the importance of foreign markets, Secretary Evarts continues:

The question which now peremptorily challenges all thinking minds is how to create a foreign demand for these manufactures which are left after supplying our home demands. We can not stand still, for the momentum of increase will soon become so great that it will push us outward anyway; to push us safely and profitably is of so much importance as to almost overtop all other public questions of the hour. This question appeals equally to the selfishness and patriotism of all citizens, but to the laborer it appeals with tenfold force, for without work he can not live, and unless we can extend the markets for our manufactures he can not expect steady work, and unless our manufactures can undersell foreign manufactures we can not enlarge our foreign markets.

But with this intelligent glimpse of the importance of the external universe and its value as an outlet to the accumulating surplus of American manufactures his vision suddenly narrows to the restricted area visible from the protectionist point of view, discovers that the true method of cheapening products so as to enable American manufactures to undersell in the markets of the world, consists not only in the obviously sensible and humane process of cheapening raw materials, but in the uniform protectionist process of cheapening labor. Quotha:

The first great truth to be learned by the manufacturers and workingmen is that the days of sudden fortunes and double wages are gone. We must realize the fact that ocean steam communication has annihilated distance and brought the nations face to face. This drawing together of the nations means equalization in trade, profits, wages, etc., the advantage being with those who soonest accept the situation. In the near future the workingman of New York can not expect twice or thrice the wages of his fellow-workman in Europe while all other things, food, rent, clothing, etc., are on an equality.

Under no consideration must we have strikes; under no consideration must our factories lie idle. If our manufacturers can not run their establishments profitably—and capital will no more remain permanently invested unprofitably than will labor work for nothing—and pay the prevailing wages, our working people must help them to make profit by consenting to a reduction of wages!

The assertion of Secretary Evarts that the double efficiency of the American workingman and the "individuality" and "inventive genius in mechanical appliances" of the American people have enabled us to a great extent to exclude foreign manufactures, and his suggestion of the "overtopping" importance to us of finding in the markets of the world an outlet for our surplus manufactures, are in absolute harmony with Democratic views; but his conclusion that the cheapening of our manufactured products shall be accomplished by a "reduction of wages," instead of by a reduction in the cost of raw materials, is anti-Democratic, though quite in accord with the sentiment which has prompted protected industries to import cheap foreign labor, instead of trying the experiment of importing free and therefore cheap raw materials.

Prosperity to American industries and American labor is to be won, not, as Secretary Evarts, one of the eminent champions of high protection, suggests, by "equalizing" the "wages" of American and foreign labor, but by equalizing the cost of the materials used by the American and foreign manufacturers.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], who is so greatly distinguished for his accomplishments and eloquence, has furnished evidence which exposes the hollowness of the pretension that protection is desired for the benefit of labor. He said:

The gentleman from California [Mr. MORROW] this morning read an appeal from the people of California that Congress should not take the tax off lumber; because they were entitled to so much stumpage, $2 a thousand, and so much on the boards: and he said it would be the grossest act of injustice to those people, to the employés and to the men who owned the lumber, to take the tax off.

Now, I want to say that that is strikingly illustrated in a little production which I chanced to find the other day in a Philadelphia paper, and another in an Eastern Maryland paper. One of the gentlemen whose views are set forth here is talking on the subject of the tax on lumber, and I may remark in passing that no people in the country are more interested in that question than the people of Mississippi, because we have in that State the grandest pineries in the world. While those in Michigan and the other Northwestern States have been used up by manufacture and destroyed by prairie fires, we have in Mississippi pine forests almost inexhaustible in quantity and in a virgin state, yet we are not going to quarrel with the bill of the Committee on Ways and Means because it happens to touch upon that industry of our people. That, however, is the ground upon which the gentleman from California [Mr. MORROW] opposes the bill—that it would take off a portion of the tax on lumber.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. The people of Michigan are buying up those Mississippi timber lands.

Mr. HOOKER. I know it, but we have just stopped you by resolution. You have got enough of the public lands. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOOKER. I have not the time now. I have read the views of this gentleman who is named here as Mr. Blanchard, of Chicago.

"THE TARIFF IN A NUTSHELL.

"Mr. Blanchard, of Chicago, in a short speech a few days ago, said more to show up the evils of a high-tariff system than others have done in labored speeches and ponderous volumes. Mr. Blanchard is a refreshing sample of a protected operator who is willing to tell the truth and shame his demoniac majesty, and furnishes a beautiful illustration of the utter selfishness that governs the beneficiaries of a high protective tariff. He says: "I am high tariff on lumber, but low tariff on copper, iron, wool, cotton, leather, glass, etc. I will tell you why. I own timber lands and sell stumpage; besides, I operate largely myself, and this tariff puts money into my pocket. I get $2 per 1,000 feet for my stumpage, and $2 per 1,000 for my boards. I have just sold 5,000,000 feet of lumber. Now, $2 per 1,000 on 5,000,000 feet is just $10,000. That is the difference to me between high tariff and free lumber. I am high tariff on lumber, I am. The blessed tariff, they tell us, is all for the benefit of the American laborer. What do you suppose I did with the $10,000. Divide it among my workmen? Not a bit of it. I put it right into this calfskin wallet, I did." [Laughter.]

"Of all my workmen I am the only protected American laborer. Wages depend upon supply and demand, my friends, and not upon taxes." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

"When you see two men after one boss wages are low; when you see two bosses after one man wages are high; and that is the whole of it—the theory, principle, and practice."—*From the Easton (Md.) Ledger.*

I read now an abstract from the Philadelphia Telegraph, entitled—

"THE TRUTH ON THE QUININE TARIFF.

"To those who think that whatever is is right, and therefore should not be disturbed, and that the tariff is a thing existent and therefore not to be altered in any manner whatsoever, we heartily commend the history of the duty on quinine, which six years ago was virtually prohibitory. It will be remembered that a hard fight had to be fought to secure the repeal of the duty upon this important medicinal agent. At the time of the repeal of the duty there were five firms manufacturing quinine in this country. Three of them were in this city, and all declared through the columns of the Evening Telegraph, either by their own letters or in interviews with reporters, that if the bill of repeal passed

they would be compelled to discontinue the manufacture of quinine. The price of the article was then $3.50 per ounce, or $2.95 less than when the duty was on.

"Neither of the five great firms which previously manufactured quinine has since discontinued its manufacture, and all are, it is fairly to be assumed, making satisfactory profits from its manufacture under the reduced price. The making of quinine in this country six years ago was a monopoly, from which individual fortunes represented by millions of dollars were realized. It is but just to say, however, that there has been a large increase in the growth in the cinchona bark from which the medicine is made, and the added supply of raw material has helped to lessen the price of the product.

"There are other great monopolies to-day in the country which could and should be destroyed by the reduction of the excessive duties on their manufactures. The worst of them all is the sugar trust, a monopoly which oppresses every consumer in the land. The quinine experiment should be tried upon it."

The following table, prepared by Mr. Henry J. Philpot, of Des Moines, Iowa, will illustrate the hypocrisy of the claim that the war tariff must be kept up to benefit labor. Its effect in reality is to give the lion's share to trusts and iniquitous monopolists. This tariff system is building up in this country a powerful, unscrupulous plutocracy.

Name of trust.	Protected by duties averaging, per cent.—	Adjusted to guaranty a bonus in each $100 of product amounting to—	Their whole expense for labor in $100 worth of product being—
Salt trust	50	$33	$25
Earthenware trust	56	36	40
Bessemer-steel trust	84	46	9
Plow-steel trust	45	33	29
General steel trust	45	33	29
Nail trust	45	33	22
General iron trust	45	33	25
Copper trust	24	22	22
Zinc trust	52	28	25
Tin trust	32	24	21
Lead trust	74	43	65
Glass trust	55	36	45
Soap trust	26	19	8
Linseed-oil trust	54	35	5
Rubber-shoe trust	25	20	24
Envelope trust	25	20	11
Paper-bag trust	35	26	15
Cordage trust	25	20	12
Average		30	24

Other laboring men as well as farmers have discovered that the Democratic party is the workingman's best friend, and that through the success of that party lies the roadway to relief. The local papers of the past few days contain evidence of this, as will be seen by reference to the following paragraph:

WORKINGMEN AIDED BY DEMOCRATS.

The Federation of Labor held an open meeting at Hilton Hall last night, at which addresses were made by E. W. Oyster and Paul T. Bowen. Mr. Oyster made the first address, and in it reviewed the history of labor legislation in this country. He showed conclusively that all the bills passed by Congress which were oppressive to the workingmen had been passed by the votes of Republican members, while the slight relief that the workingmen had since obtained by legislation was due to the efforts of the Democrats.

The same tariff that plunders all other consumers also plunders the laborers in the factories which are so highly protected.

EFFECT OF PROTECTION ON THE FARMER.

I do not concede that protection is of any real benefit to any class of laborers; but if this claim is admitted to its fullest extent, no matter how great may be the benefits to the manufacturer and the laborer employed by them, the intelligent students of political economy who are not biased by partisan prejudices will confess that protection confers no benefit upon the grain-growers, the provision-producers, and farmers generally, but, on the other hand, that policy does increase the cost of all that he buys upon which tariff taxes are laid. Now, when we remember that tariff taxes are laid upon about four thousand articles, including nearly everything that the farmer buys, that is used on his farm, or in his house, or he has on his back, and that the rate of this taxation is 47 per cent., it will be seen that they are very heavily oppressed by that system of taxation, and that those who are engaged in agricultural pursuits, if no good reason can be furnished for its retention, are entitled to insist that the policy shall be abandoned.

I regard the claim that the farmer is benefited by protection as the most untenable of all the propositions advocated by protectionists, and that it is a most audacious misrepresentation and can only be used for the purpose of deceiving them and inveigling them to vote the Republican ticket. My friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] is too good a man to be charged with willful misrepresentation, but I must insist that he is sadly deluded when he urged that the farmer was benefited and protected by the tariff taxes on wheat, corn, vegetables, and other farm products. As proof of his error I will call attention to what a Senator from his own State, who I understand to be his first choice as a candidate by the Republican party for President next fall, has said upon this very point. When discussing the tariff bill then pending, on March 24, 1870, Senator ALLISON said in this Hall:

The agricultural interest, it will be seen, is much the largest interest in its aggregate product as well as in the number of persons employed. I believe no one will claim that this large interest is directly protected. It is true that under customs laws there is a small duty upon wheat, barley, oats, and other agricultural products, but it does not afford any protection to the great wheat and grain-producing regions of the country. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Wilson], in discussing this question yesterday stated that the cost of wheat in New England is about 85 cents per bushel, while in Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin the price is about 65 cents per bushel. The Canadian wheat is the only wheat that comes in competition with our own. Canada being nearer New England than the wheat-growing States more than makes up the duty in the reduced cost of transportation.

What is true of wheat is equally true of other grains. Therefore the farmer has practically no protection at all, and whatever benefit he derives is from what the home market furnishes for home products. Unfortunately for the farmer, the market price of wheat is fixed by the price which the surplus will bring abroad, or the price of wheat in London or Liverpool. At that market, where the surplus is sold, and which fixes the value of the whole crop, he comes in competition with the grain produced in the Crimea, in Hungary, and in the region of the Baltic, from fields cultivated by what is known, in comparison to our own, as pauper labor.

But I am told we must so legislate as to furnish a home market for all our agricultural products, and this can only be done by high tariff. Any one examining the subject will see that our agricultural products increase more rapidly than our population, so that if we do not export these products in their natural condition, we must do so by converting them into manufactured articles, and export these articles. But this can not be done under a high tariff, for all nations will buy manufactured products where they are the cheapest, and the nation selling the cheapest will control the market. This rule excludes our highly-taxed manufactures made from highly-taxed materials from the markets of the world, although we have natural advantages possessed by no other nation.

So fully has Senator ALLISON answered his follower on this floor that it is unnecessary for me to dwell longer upon this point, and I would not do so were it not for the fact that a number of other gentlemen representing Western constituents, have advanced the same views as my friend from Iowa.

THE TARIFF A BURDEN AND OF NO BENEFIT TO THE FARMER.

An examination of the facts will demonstrate that the tariff in every sense is a burden, and not a benefit to the farmer. In the first place let us ascertain whether it brings him any good by laying a tariff upon his products. There is a tax upon corn of 10 per cent.; now, if you will examine the statistics of 1885, you will find that we exported from this country and sold in foreign markets, nearly fifty-three million of bushels of corn, and yet only forty-five hundred bushels were imported into the country.

Where is the man so stupid as to suppose that any rate of tax upon corn can advance its price in this country one mill? We are the corn producers of the world. We have no need to import corn, for the reason that we raise more than we can use and are compelled to seek a foreign market for the surplus which is not needed by our own people; and the price obtained for that surplus in foreign markets fixes its value here. The amount of corn that we exported probably realized $25,000,000. The corn that we imported did not cost us but little over $2,000. But they have insisted that wheat is protected also, and there is a tax on wheat of 20 per cent.

Now let us see what the statistics of 1885 show with regard to wheat; we exported in that year 132,851,835 bushels of wheat, being over one-fourth of our whole crop, and we imported only 212,311 bushels, which, as all know, was imported by the mills on the Canadian border, in order that they might have the profits of grinding it into flour mainly for exportation to the markets of the world. In addition to the wheat exportation of that year, we sent abroad $52,000,000 worth of wheat flour. I have no statistics showing what amount of flour—if any—was imported into this country, but I doubt if any considerable quantity was imported, for we make the best flour and sell it at the lowest price of any country on the globe. I will not pursue these statistics any further. It can not truthfully be claimed that protection advances the price of farm products, because their prices are regulated by what they will bring in foreign markets; and if wheat and corn were placed upon the free-list, without any tariff taxes whatever upon them, they would not be affected to the extent of one mill in their market value.

This will be more clearly seen by examining the New York market reports and comparing the prices of grain in that market during the period when the so-called free-trade Walker tariff was in operation from 1850 to 1860 with the prices realized in that market under the present tariff during the past ten years. I read from Spofford's American Almanac for 1888.

Highest prices of corn and wheat in New York from 1851 *to* 1860.

Years.	Corn.	Wheat.
1851	$0.68	$1.22
1852	.78	1.15
1853	.82	1.80
1854	.98	2.50
1855	1.15	2.80
1856	.94	2.17
1857	.98	1.95
1858	1.03	1.50
1859	1.05	1.65
1860	.95	1.70

Highest prices of corn and wheat in New York from 1877 to 1886.

Years.	Corn.	Wheat.
1877	$0.58	$1.85
1878	.60	1.31
1879	.64	1.56
1880	.61	1.59
1881	.76	1.56
1882	1.09	1.43
1883	.70	1.24
1884	.66	1.05
1885	.57	1.05
1886	.55	.95½

My colleague [Mr. CANNON] has called attention to a time in Illinois and Iowa before the war when the crop was very abundant and the facilities for cheap transportation would not enable the farmer to get his surplus to the New York market. Under these circumstances corn was no doubt for a short time sold for 10 cents a bushel. This would have occurred again in Illinois and Iowa at times during the past few years if the facilities for transportation had not enabled the farmer to market his surplus corn in the foreign markets at very low freight rates. That low price has, at one time at least, prevailed not far from that gentleman's home since the war.

A CONTRAST OF THE EFFECT OF PROTECTION IN THE EAST AND THE WEST.

As an evidence of the benefits of the tariff to the manufacturing classes and of its evil effects upon the farmers it is well for us to contrast the condition of these two classes. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ALLEN], who represents one of the largest manufacturing districts in the United States, has given us a graphic description of the prosperity and happy condition of those employed in the factories in Massachusetts, which I will quote below. He said:

If I desired to inflict tables of figures upon you, I could show you conclusively that under this system our working people are better paid and live almost as cheaply as in other countries even as it is, while the immense advantage they derive in their dress, their habits of life, the education of their children, their little homes, their accumulated savings in our banks all over the land, tells a story of richness, happiness, contentment which figures would not begin to express.

* * * * * * *

I wish I could take this body of men to the heights opposite the city of Lowell, Mass., where, with one glance of the eye sweeping up and down the stream, would be literally seen miles of cotton-mills, perhaps the finest in the world, equipped with the most ingenious labor-saving machinery known to this wonder-working age, and filled from basement to roof with a thinking, throbbing army of intelligent and skillful men and women.

* * * * * * *

Standing upon this spot in the early evening as the sun goes down, you would see first from one and then another of the thousands of windows the lights flashing out; twinkling and flashing as they are reflected from the bosom of the flowing river, they rival in brilliancy the stars of an October night. Listen, and the bells ring out their peal, the gates fly open, and from them issue thousands of working men and women, well clothed, well fed, well housed, pleasant to look upon, happy and contented, moving quietly to their own homes in many cases—the ideal laboring wage-earners of a New England manufacturing city.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has confined his description to the condition of the working classes; he has not told us of the immense wealth which has been accumulated by the owners of the factories in which these people work; he has not called attention to the palatial mansions in which they live, the luxuries which their families enjoy, and the immense incomes they receive, which guard them against care and anxiety for the wants of this world. My friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] seemed desirous of rivaling the gentleman from Massachusetts in describing the condition of the farmers of the West. One would imagine from what he said that the farmer is to-day very prosperous, that his home is filled with luxuries, and that he enjoys a life of ease and pleasure, as will be seen by the following remarks that I quote. He said, speaking of the present condition of Western farmers:

The "log cabin" has disappeared. Comfortable homes, a good carpeted room, a spring wagon, a barn, a buggy or carriage for the trip to church or the town, a country paper, and often a good daily, books, plenty to eat and wear; these are the fruits of protection that the farmer enjoys to-day. This is the rule in the great Northwest, and pinching poverty is the exception.

Sir, I am sorry that I am unable to confirm the truthfulness of the description which he has given of the Western farmer; I have lived among them for thirty years; I was born on a farm and spent the early years of my life there, and most of all that I have in this world is invested in farming lands and real estate in one of the most fertile and prosperous agricultural States in this Union; and I therefore feel that I have a right to claim that I know as much of the condition of the Western farmer as my friend from Iowa.

First, I will say, that whilst I know the life of a farmer is more independent, and better calculated to make good men, and good women, than those reared in any other station, better soldiers are found on the farm in time of war, and better citizens are found there in time of peace. It is a nursery for the most upright, biggest brained, broadest minded, and the largest souled people in the world. Anarchists are not reared on the farm, socialism and communism do not exist there, more Christianity, honesty, and patriotism are found upon he farm than anywhere else.

In truth, the agricultural classes constitute our bulwark against infidelity and social disorder. Agriculture is the basis of all wealth, private and public. For these reasons I feel that it should be the purpose of legislation and of the administration of the Government to foster and encourage agriculture, and as far as practicable lighten its burdens. I must say, however, there is more hard work and privation on the farm than will be found among those who are engaged in any other occupation. The farmer works more hours per day, is exposed more frequently in bad weather, and gets less pay for his labor than any other class of workingmen.

There is now much distress and hard times among the agricultural classes of this country. High and unjust taxation and the low prices obtainable for crops have proved disastrous to the farmers. So far as the Western farmers are concerned, I must confess that many of them are in debt, as will be seen from a statement of the mortgages which exist upon the farms of the West. They pay larger rates of interest, more, perhaps, than those engaged in any other class of business. The following is a statement of the amount of the mortgages which exist to-day against the farms in the States that are named in the following list, published in the Binder, a farmers' organ, at Marion, Ill., in my Republican colleague's [Mr. THOMAS'S] district.

MORTGAGES ON OUR FARMS.

The amount represented by the faces of the farm mortgages in Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Michigan, Minnesota, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, and Missouri are:

In Ohio	$701,000,000
In Indiana	398,000,000
In Illinois	620,000,000
In Wisconsin	250,000,000
In Michigan	350,000,000
In Minnesota	175,000,000
In Iowa	351,000,000
In Nebraska	140,000,000
In Kansas	203,000,000
In Missouri	237,000,000
Total farm mortgages in these States	3,422,000,000

The actual value of the farms lying in the ten States is to-day about $13,000,000,000. In this valuation due allowance has been made for the enormous volume of emigration which has poured into Kansas, Nebraska, and Minnesota, and into the northern portions of Michigan and Wisconsin since 1880.

Mr. J. Burrows, the President of the National Farmers' Alliance, writes in the Farmers' Voice of the 11th ultimo:

I regret as much as any man living the poverty and dependence of farmers which exist at this day to an alarming extent, though denied by some.

Why does this distress exist among the farmers of the West? Of course failure of crops and insects have had much to do with it, but far less than the onerous, unfair, and dishonest taxes which are laid upon them, not only for governmental purposes, but for the purpose of furnishing bounties to other favored classes in this country. It is because an average tax of 50 per cent. is levied upon all the cotton goods that they buy in order that wealth and prosperity may exist among the owners and employés of the cotton mills in the district of my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. ALLEN], and an average of 47 per cent. is collected from them on all the necessaries and comforts they buy in order to furnish bounty-money to those engaged in manufacturing industries. It is because they are impoverished in order that other classes may be enriched; because they are preyed upon by the manufacturing monopolies, and by the infamous trusts or dishonest combines which have been recently formed.

Let me call attention to some of the many taxes that are laid upon the farmer in order to benefit the manufacturing classes. It must be recollected that the amount of taxes collected by the Treasury on the articles mentioned represents only one-fifth of the amount which goes into the pockets of the manufacturers through the legerdemain of our protective tariff system, for where one dollar goes into the Treasury under this system, four dollars go into the pocket of the manufacturer. The following is a list of some articles the farmer uses:

TAXES ON THE KITCHEN.

	Per cent.
The iron the stove is made of	45
Hollow ware, pots, and kettles	53
Copper and brass utensils, if any	45
Crockery, of the commonest kind	55
Glassware, of the cheapest kind	45
Table cutlery and spoons	45
Pickled or salted fish	25
Salt	26
Sugar	48
Vinegar	56
Pickles	35
Rice	123
Oranges, and other foreign fruit, about	20

TAXES ON THE PARLOR.

Carpet, if made of druggets	74
Carpet, if made of tapestry	68
Furniture	55
Wall-paper	25
Window curtains	45
Looking-glass	60
Ornaments or knickknacks	35

TAXES ON THE WARDROBE.

Men's clothing, of wool	48
Woolen hosiery and undershirts	75
Cotton hosiery and undershirts	45
Woolen hats and caps	53
Gloves	60
Blankets	60
Alpaca dresses	63
Any other woolen dresses	70
A pair of scissors	45
Brass pins	45
Hair pins	30
Penknives	50
Needles	25
Steel pins	45
Ink	20
Paper	25
Razors	45

TAXES ON SUNDRIES.

Castor oil	102
Castile soap	56
A dose of Epsom salts	30
Insect powder	20
Salad oil	34
Commonest window-glass for houses	80
Paint (white lead) for the farm-house	51
Brick	25
Roofing slates	30
Horseshoe nails	31
Trace-chains	53
A hand-saw	40
Files	40
Spool thread	60
Bag and bagging for grain	40
A burr-stone	20
Combs and brushes	30
A wooden pipe	80
An alpaca umbrella	50
Any iron or steel a farmer may need, average of	45
Tin cups, skimmers, dippers, and all tinware	42
Tin-plate for canning meats and fruits	34
Fencing boards, $2 per thousand	
Pine boards for building, about	20
If planed, a	33
Fencing posts, about	30
Shingles for roof	25
Lath for house-building	20
Barbed wire for fencing	55

It is out of the sweat and privations of the farmer of the West that the vast fortunes enjoyed by many of the millionaires of the East have been created. The Vanderbilts and the Goulds, in the transportation of his products to market and his supplies for his home, have accumulated hundreds of millions of dollars, and the protective manufacturers who have levied contributions on his clothing and food and tools and articles of nearly every description that he uses have enriched themselves to the extent of thousands of millions of dollars. And now, when his friends come and ask for a reasonable and fair reduction of this enormous burden upon him, they are denounced, vilified, and slandered by the subsidized agents and press of the great monopolies.

Sir, I admire the candor, if I can not admire the unjust doctrine of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ALLEN] when he says, speaking of the benefit of protection to his district:

> Every man looks upon legislative matters more or less prejudiced by his own surroundings and environment. For that reason I come to this question with a deeper interest, perhaps, than to any other measure presented or likely to be presented at this session of Congress.
>
> I see the fortunes of my own people in this measure, and my interest is natural and intense. [Applause.]
>
> Mr. Chairman, I suppose if Massachusetts was to divide to-day upon the question of protection or free trade, the number of people in favor of protection would outnumber its opponents by a vast majority not easily computed in figures, and I am sure in my own Congressional district such a division would result in a majority of more than 10,000 in favor of the champion of the protective side of the argument, and I dare say that even such an estimate would fall below the actual figures.
>
> This question of a tariff is the one great topic of conversation to-day among the people in all the industrial sections of the country. These men know their own interests as only experts can, and they are watching the course of their Representatives upon this issue.
>
> I have tried to express the feelings of my own people upon this question, and I should be remiss in my duty to them if I failed in any degree to do my utmost to preserve for them, and by this I mean for the whole country, the continuance of a policy of legislative protection under which they have prospered, and which, if we can judge anything from past experience, offers such bright promise in the future.

There is a conflict between the interest of the people he represents and the interest of the farmers represented by gentlemen from the West. I wish the Republican Representatives from the West were as true to the local interest they represent as the Republican members from the East are faithful to their constituents. If Republican districts in the West were faithfully represented on this floor we would strike down the infamous features of the tariff which are a curse to them, and they might again bask in the sunshine of prosperity which beams so beneficently upon protected classes in the Eastern States.

Some of the advocates of the protectionist sneer at the efforts of farmers and other friends to secure reform in our tariff system, and belittle the interest which they have in it. Now let us see whether the farmer is not affected, and has a right to inquire into the operations of our tariff system. From the statistics that we are able to obtain it is believed that out of the sixty million of population of the United States nine million of them are farmers, who, with those connected with them, constitute over thirty million, or more than one-half of the entire population. They own five million of farms worth $11,000,000,000; the products of their farms amount to three billion, and they own over two billion and five hundred million worth of live-stock; their implements of husbandry amount to $600,000,000, and their improvements and fences to one hundred and fifty million.

These figures would indicate that he is very deeply interested in this subject and that he is entitled to have his interest considered as well as other classes when a bill like this is under consideration. As we have seen, protection is of no advantage to him; he is the victim of protection; he is injured by it. Consider for a moment the arguments used by the friends of protection on this floor. They say that unless the high rates of duty now existing are maintained some of the flourishing factories in this country will be forced to close and their business perish because protection forces people not interested in these factories to buy goods from them at a higher price than they can obtain them from foreigners.

These factories, they say, can not prosper, if, for instance—as this bill proposes to do—we reduce the tariff from 54 per cent. to 15 per cent. on the bagging in which the farmer sends his wheat to the Liverpool and other markets, domestic and foreign. That the factories engaged in making bagging in this country may fail because the farmer or his agent might exchange some of his wheat at Liverpool for bags which he can buy for far less money than he can in this country. Now, in order to maintain the prosperity of the home bagging factories they demand that we shall prevent the farmer from so doing by forcing him to pay 54 per cent. tariff duty on the bags when they come into this country; or, in other words, on each $100 worth of bags that he may buy in Liverpool, or exchange his wheat for, it is necessary to make him pay a penalty of $54 for doing so.

In this way, although he is forced to sell his wheat in the cheapest market of the world, you compel him to buy his supplies at home, in one of the dearest markets of the world. By this method you deny him the right to purchase his bagging and other supplies from his own customers, and compel him to purchase them from some folks in this country who manufacture the bagging and supplies, and who will add nearly all the tax which is laid upon the supplies to the other profits they make in manufacturing them. This is called protection to the American bagging manufacturer. Of course, it can be plainly seen that what is prosperity and advantage to the American bagging factory is an injury and disadvantage to the farming classes.

Now, if the farmer should say this is not right; that he is forced to sell his surplus wheat at Liverpool in a free-trade market, because he can not sell it at home for as much as he can obtain there, and if he shall insist that he ought to be permitted to buy his supplies where he can obtain them the cheapest without paying such a heavy penalty, and that it is an outrage and dishonest to compel him to contribute so much of his wheat money to enrich and protect the American bagging manufacturer—I say, if the farmer should make complaints like these, and is a resident of the district of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS], the gentleman for whom he probably voted as a candidate for Congress, would call him a free-trader and insist that he was disloyal; he would be told by that gentleman, "You have no need for a foreign market; the domestic market is good enough for you, and you should content yourself with such prices as your products will bring in the home market."

Such a farmer would be told by his Representative that notwithstanding he is compelled to compete with the half-starved and half-naked farm laborers of India, whose wages are only 6 cents a day, yet it is right and it is to his advantage that he should be forced to contribute a large portion of his wheat money to the owners of our manufacturing establishments and the workmen engaged therein in order that they may be prosperous.

THE FATE OF A SYSTEM SUPPORTED BY THEFT AND LYING.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment the time is past when the intelligent farming class of this country can be deceived by such fallacy and absurd arguments as are used by the advocates of protection. They will say by their votes next fall that a business that can not be maintained without theft or lying ought to perish; and that when they see that we mean to reduce the bounties that they pay to the bagging factories from 54 down to 15 per cent., and on an average that we propose to reduce the tariff taxes on all the necessaries and comforts of life from 47 to 36 per cent., they will say by their votes at the polls, the Democratic party is right, and that the incidental protection afforded by the tariff rates provided in this bill is sufficient to give encouragement to all legitimate enterprises and afford fair wages to the workmen employed in them.

The operation of the high taxes which are laid upon the agricultural classes of this country, without any returning benefits to them, have at last induced a very large portion of them to organize in associations for their own protection. The Farmers' Alliance is one of them; the Wheel Association in the Southwest is another of them, and in my own State an organization known as the Farmers' Mutual Benefit Association has been formed. All of these associations denounce the principle of protection, and have declared it to be their determination to oppose the encroachment of all forms of monopoly. The Farmers' Mutual Benefit Association, to which I have alluded, has adopted as its creed

or platform principles and doctrines which have been in the main advocated by the Democratic party from its foundation to this day.

Among them is opposition to protective tariff, opposition to the national-bank monopoly, a forfeiture of the land grants which have unjustly robbed the American citizen of his heritage in the public domain. The records of Congress will show that the Democratic party has consistently and bravely battled for all these reforms. When we came into power three years ago we found that nearly 200,000,000 acres had been given away by the Republican party to the railroad corporations of the country; in fact, we found that nearly all the fertile lands on which homes could be made had been stolen by the railroad corporations through the agency of their lobbyists in and outside of the halls of Congress.

Among the first achievements of the Democratic Administration and the Democratic majority in the lower House of Congress was to restore many millions of acres of these lands back to the ownership of the people, and we shall not cease to labor in that direction until we have forfeited every acre of the land to which the railroads have not already acquired such a title as we will by legislation have no power to disturb.

In regard to the national-bank monopoly I feel that the day is not far off when its end will be at hand. It is not a Democratic institution, and, in my judgment, we should without delay pass a bill which will take its circulation from it and substitute in lieu thereof Treasury notes. I am unable to conceive why the Treasury note, which costs the Government nothing but the paper and ink that is used in printing it, does not furnish as safe a circulating medium as a national-bank note, which has been so expensive to the people. That monopoly, however, if not ended by legislation, will before very long be ended by the payment or retirement of the public debt. I know that the friends of the national-bank monopoly, led by a Republican Senator [Mr. FARWELL] from my own State, are proposing measures to continue the existence of the national-bank monopoly by fixing as a basis for it other securities than those of Government bonds. But I have no apprehension that they will succeed in their efforts as long as we have a Democratic President in the White House. I have introduced a bill for the purpose of substituting Treasury notes for national-bank circulation which I hope may have favorable action before this Congress adjourns.

The protective tariff creates monopolies and trusts; it makes tramps of men and paupers of women; it breeds discontent among the working classes and causes strikes and derangement of business. It is well that the farmers have been aroused and are organizing to protect themselves from the evils of this dishonest and ungodly system.

OUR ADVANTAGE IN CONTROLLING FOREIGN MARKETS.

In connection with what has been said by the protectionist against the extension of our foreign market, I desire to say that a foreign market is of more importance and ought to bring more wealth to this country than to any other on the globe. Our situation is better than any other and we can more effectually control the trade of the world. China, Japan, and the islands of the Pacific Ocean front our western shore. Fronting our eastern shore are Europe and the islands of the Atlantic. The southern countries, rich in natural resources, are on the coast-line with us.

Lying between the two great oceans, occupying the midway ground on the lines of transportation of the commerce of the world, we have power to control the trade between the peoples of the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. It must pass either through our hands or must disadvantageously pass around us. Our people are the most enterprising, our farmers and mechanics are the most skilful in the world. We should have no fears of competition with any people on the globe. We certainly possess advantages doubly greater than any other nation; our flag should be found above the decks of our ships laden with commerce in every port, in every sea. The statistics of the world should show that there is a larger tonnage of American register bearing the products of our farms and workshops than can be shown by any other nation in the world.

And, sir, it would be so if it were not for the narrow policy of protection which has erected a Chinese wall around our land and closed our ports against the riches of the world's commerce—the fell spirit of the policy of New England which, whilst it has enriched that section, has impoverished all others in the country and blasted the American merchant marine In 1858, under a revenue tariff, the prosperity of our merchant marine was one of the proudest boasts of the American citizen. Over 73 per cent. of our exports and imports were carried in American vessels.

Since the Republican party came into power under the baleful influence of the protectionist of the East, they enacted our oppressive tariff system, and our shipping has gradually grown less and less, until last year less than 14 per cent. of our imports and exports were carried on American vessels. Our tariff system may have been a blessing to New England and Pennsylvania, but it has also been a blessing to Old England. It has made her the mistress of the seas. Our western port of San Francisco is in comparison with the distance to England at the door of China, and yet England monopolizes the trade with China. Out of the nearly three hundred millions of foreign commerce year before last with China we had but twenty millions of it. We are on the coast-line of southern countries, and yet out of about seven hundred millions of commerce there, England has three times as much of it as the United States.

Sir, but one thing is needed to enable us to take the scepter of the seas from England, to make our country the master of the trade of the world—it is to abolish the protective tariff and the substitution of a revenue tariff, with such incidental protection as it will justly afford.

I beg leave to quote the following from my remarks on this subject in my speech of May, 1884:

AGRICULTURE OUR DEPENDENCE FOR NATIONAL WEALTH.

We are now sending but very few manufactured articles abroad. If it were not for our farm products, which constitute 77 per cent. of our products, the balance of trade would be against us and we would soon become pauperized, notwithstanding we have every natural advantage for manufacturing over any nation on earth.

* * * * * * *

WHY ENGLAND OUTSTRIPS US IN TRADE.

We have all the raw materials in inexhaustible abundance within our own borders, the best and most intelligent workmen in the world in our midst, yet the little storm-beaten island of England, 3,000 miles away, has outstripped us in all the markets of the world in the sale of manufactured articles. She undersells us everywhere. She sends her ships to our ports. She buys cotton of our planters, transports it back to her shores, manufactures the raw material into articles of commerce, then comes right to our door and undersells us in Mexico, Central America, and South America; yea, even passes contemptuously beyond us to the other great ocean and wrests from us the trade of the Pacific. Why is it so? Is it because the Englishman is more enterprising or energetic than the American? All the world knows that is not true. It is because she has established friendly commercial relations with the world; she has cast down all her barriers of protection and opened her market to the products of every country.

REMEDY FOR OVERPRODUCTION—MARKET FOR OUR PRODUCTS.

Seeing the stagnation in our own trade and the danger of overproduction upon us, I turned my thoughts as a legislator some time ago to the question of devising a policy for extending our markets abroad. My attention was directed, of course, to the rich countries that lie south of us, Mexico, Central America, and South America. It seemed to me that with such an advantage of position and juxtaposition we could control that grand market.

We have now one railroad in operation and are building other lines which will penetrate to the very heart of the ancient dominion of the Montezumas. The Boston merchant may ship his goods by rail without breaking bulk to the City of Mexico, exchange them if he will for the rich products of that land which are so much needed in this country; whereas the English merchant must brave the perils of the sea for 3,000 miles, then reship his goods by rail at Vera Cruz. Our communication with Central and South America is not as close and easy as that with Mexico, but it is still far better than the communication with Europe.

The similarity of our political institutions naturally produces a greater desire on the part of those countries for trade with us than with the monarchies of the Old World. The products of the southern countries, in the main being different from our own, are just such as are needed by us, while our agricultural and mechanical products are equally as much needed by those countries. This makes it of mutual advantage for trade with us. Having the facility for supplying them with all they need, I have no doubt we ought to and can control that market to the exclusion of all other countries. An examination of the official statistics will show that the annual foreign commerce of these countries amounts in the aggregate of exports and imports to $653,701,000. They will further show that England imported into those countries $88,520,000; France imported $82,771,000, and that the share of the United States amounted to only $36,044,000; that even Germany's exports to those countries outstripped ours.

Now, why has England taken from us this trade which is within our reach? The answer is easy. It is because commerce with England is free, while that with the United States is shackled and hampered by our accursed tariff system.

AMERICAN CUSTOMS UNION.

In order that we might reform this blight on our commerce and secure that market for the surplus of our own workshops and farms I introduced in January last a joint resolution of which the following is a copy:

"Whereas the establishment of free commercial intercourse among the nations now existing upon the continent of America will promote the friendly political relations, internal commerce and industry, and secure a more extensive market for the surplus products of each of said nations: Therefore,

"*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to invite the co-operation of the governments of the American nations in securing the establishment of a commercial league by and between the said nations, to be known as the Customs Union of America, the arrangement of a common basis of import duties from other countries than those which may compose said league, and that the commercial intercourse among the people of all the American States may be freed from the payment of any customs or other dues whatever; and that a common system of weights and measures may be also established for the purpose of facilitating such intercourse."

It will be seen that this joint resolution looks to the establishment of a customs union with a common basis of duties as against all other countries and the establishment of free trade among the nations on this continent. Such a proposition is no doubt acceptable to protected manufacturers as well as to the advocates of free trade in this country, for while it establishes the same freedom of trade with these countries that now exists among our own States, great advantage would flow to our manufacturers in having an exclusive market protected against competition from all other countries. Our own manufacturers surely can have no fear of competition with manufacturers in the southern countries, for they have no manufacturing establishments of any consequence located there.

If that market could thus be secured then the danger of overproduction would pass away, and every mechanic and farm laborer who is idle to-day would find constant and remunerative employment. Thus would the marvelous resources of this continent be developed and the busy hum of prosperity be heard on every hilltop and in every valley of our land. This joint resolution, if adopted, would accomplish for the American nation what the customs union or Zollverein of Germany has accomplished for the prosperity and trade of the people of Germany.

I reintroduced the same proposition in the present Congress in the shape of a bill, with some elaboration and providing an appropriation of $100,000 to carry the same into effect, and I am happy to say it has been adopted with some modification by both Houses of Congress, and only waits the President's signature to make it a law. It will be a grand consummation if we shall witness, as we shall during the next year, a zollverein congress including representatives from all the republics of this continent and the Empire of Brazil, establishing free trade

among the nations of the western hemisphere, and I shall be always gratified that I am the originator of this very important proposition.

Now, in conclusion, let me say the line of demarkation between the two great national parties is clearly defined in this bill. Those who are not in favor of the policy announced in the President's message are in danger of finding themselves in the camp of the enemy. It is the only vital political issue before the country, and, as I have shown, the President stands where Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, Polk, Douglas, and other great leaders of the Democratic party stood. He stands upon the principles announced in every national platform of the party. If there should be any one in our council who is inclined to disagree with us upon this issue, I commend to his consideration the patriotic course of George M. Dallas, then Vice-President, who was a Pennsylvanian. His State then, as now, regarded protection as of paramount importance to its local interests. But, sir, he was not a mere local politician, looking for a seat in Congress; he was a statesman of broad views; the range of his vision extended beyond State lines and embraced the whole country. When he found that the voice of the majority of his party was in favor of the Walker tariff bill of 1846, he surrendered his local prejudices and local considerations, and gave his vote to his party and his country. The bill for which he voted reduced the tariff rates to the basis of 22 per cent. By his act on that occasion he set an example worthy of imitation of all the Democrats similarly situated to-day, when we have a bill under consideration that does not bring the tariff down to a lower rate than 36 per cent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we have seen that the sole issue presented by this bill is whether we shall reduce the taxes on the necessaries of life—on food, raiment, and shelter—or whether we shall make the reduction only upon whisky and tobacco. Whether we shall aid in giving more comfort, prosperity, and happiness to the poor man's home, or despoil it by increasing the temptation for drunkenness, poverty, and woe. On one side stands the Democratic party under the leadership of the President, all those who would avoid calamitous financial disaster by reduction of the surplus, and all who are opposed to monopolies and trusts and the greed of capital. On that side lies the interest of nineteen-twentieths of the laboring men of America. Humanity, justice, and common honesty are there.

On the other side of this great issue are arrayed the Republican party under the leadership of one who has been repudiated by the people at the polls. On that side will be found the great monopolies and trusts, who with their ill-gotten wealth will no doubt furnish large sums of money in order to perpetuate their grasps upon the earnings of the people. With them stand the lovers of free whisky.

On this great vital issue the Democratic party is content to go to the country and abide its fate at the polls. With such an invincible leader, with such a glorious cause, we can not fail. Every true Democrat will rally around the standard of his party; they will bury personal animosities, will form into line of battle, will face the enemies of the rights of the people, and will strike and spare not. [Applause.]

APPENDIX.

[Extracts from speech delivered by R. W. TOWNSHEND on May 6, 1884.]

RECORD OF DEMOCRATIC PARTY ON TARIFF.

I will now present the record of the Democratic party on this great question as made by the declaration of its founders and the enunciation of its principles in its national and State platforms.

In the beginning of our Government when our fathers had just emerged from the despotism of England's rule, which prevented the establishment of manufactures in the colonies, a justification existed, if any could ever exist, for laying duties with a view to protection. We had then no manufacturing interest of consequence. The antipathies to England were very great, and, together with the great necessity of building up our home manufactories, which were in reality in their infancy, the fathers had strong temptation to advocate protection.

MADISON'S VIEWS.

But, sir, in the first Congress that assembled under the Constitution, in 1789, Mr. Madison, who has been quoted by some gentlemen as favoring the doctrine of protection, defined his position, which is decidedly antagonistic to every principle of the heresy of modern protection. It is as follows:

"In the first place, I own myself the friend to a very free system of commerce, and hold it as a truth that commercial shackles are generally unjust, oppressive, and impolitic. It is also a truth that if industry and labor are left to take their own course they will generally be directed to those objects which are the most productive, and this in a more certain and direct manner than the wisdom of the most enlightened legislature could point out. Nor do I think the national interest is more promoted by such restrictions than that the interest of individuals would be promoted by legislative interference directing the particular application of its industry.

"For example, we should find no advantage in saying that every man should be obliged to furnish himself, by his own labor, with those accommodations which depend on the mechanic arts, instead of employing his neighbor who could do it for him on better terms. It would be of no advantage to the shoemaker to make his own clothes to save the expense of the tailor's bill, nor of the tailor to make his own shoes to save the expense of procuring them from the shoemaker. It would be better policy to suffer each of them to employ his talents in his own way. The case is the same between the exercise of the arts and agriculture—between the city and the country, and between city and town—each capable of making particular articles in abundance to supply the other; thus all are benefited by exchange, and the less this exchange is cramped by Government the greater are the proportions of benefit to each. The same argument holds good between nation and nation, and between parts of the same nation."

Who can doubt if Madison was sitting with us to-day he would not denounce the present system of protection and vote to reduce our protective duties?

JEFFERSON'S VIEWS.

The farthest verge in the direction of protection to which Mr. Jefferson ever went, and this was in the infancy of our manufacturing industry, was when he said:

"Agriculture, manufactures, commerce, and navigation are the most thriving when left most free to individual enterprise. Protection from casual embarrassments, however, may sometimes be reasonably interposed."

Jefferson wrote to Mr. Giles in 1825:

"Under the power to regulate commerce they"—

The Federalists—

"assume indefinitely that also over agriculture and manufactures, and call it regulation to take the earnings of one of these branches of industry, and that, too, the most depressed, and put them into the pockets of the other, the most flourishing of all."

JACKSON'S OPPOSITION TO PROTECION.

Now let us see how Andrew Jackson stood on this question. In his eighth message, at a time like the present when a large surplus existed in the Treasury, that apostle of Democracy declared:

"The influence of an accumulating surplus upon the legislation of the General Government and the States, its effects upon the credit system of the country, producing dangerous extensions and ruinous contractions, fluctuations in the price of property, rash speculations, idleness, extravagance, and a deterioration of morals, have taught us the important lesson that any transcient mischief which may attend the reduction of our revenue to the wants of the Government is to be borne in preference to an overflowing Treasury."

Again he said:

"The safest and simplest mode of obviating all the difficulties which have been mentioned is to collect only revenue enough to meet the wants of the Government, and let the people keep the balance of their property in their hands to be used for their own profit."

In his farewell address (1837) the Sage of the Hermitage, as his parting advice, said:

"The taxes which it"—

The United States—

"lays upon commerce—being concealed from the real payer in the price of the article, they do not so readily attract the attention of the people as smaller sums demanded from them directly by the tax-gatherer. But the tax imposed on goods enhances by so much the price of the commodity to the consumer, and as many of these duties are imposed on articles of necessity which are daily used by the great body of the people, the money raised by these imports is drawn from their pockets."

POLK OPPOSED TO PROTECTION.

Mr. Polk is sometimes charged with being a protectionist. Read his declarations and see how shamefully he has been slandered.

"[Polk's first annual message, December 2, 1845.]

"The attention of Congress is invited to the importance of making suitable modifications and reductions of the rates of duty imposed by our present tariff laws. The object of imposing duties on imports should be to raise revenue to pay the necessary expenses of Government. Congress may undoubtedly, in the exercise of a sound discretion, discriminate in arranging the rates of duty on different articles, but the discriminations should be within the revenue standard, and be made with the view to raise money for the support of Government."

PRESIDENT PIERCE OPPOSED TO PROTECTION.

I will now ask the attention of the House while I read an extract from President Pierce's annual message, December 4, 1854:

"I therefore renew my recommendation for a reduction of the duties on imports. The report of the Secretary of the Treasury presents a series of tables showing the operation of the revenue system for several successive years; and as the general principle of reduction of duties with a view to revenue and not protection may now be regarded as the settled policy of the country, I trust that little difficulty will be encountered in settling the details of a measure to that effect."

My time is too limited for further quotations from Democratic leaders. I will now invite your attention to the creed of the party, to its articles of faith as found in its national and State platforms.

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL PLATFORMS ON THE TARIFF.

The first declaration of principles which can be called a platform for the party was that of a Congressional caucus, which was known as Republican at that day as distinguishing it from Federalist, adopted at Philadelphia, on which Jefferson was first elected to the Presidency. It declared for—

"6. Free commerce with all nations, political connection with none, and little or no diplomatic establishments."

The next Democratic platform was that of 1838, adopted by our first national convention for nominating candidates for the Presidency and Vice-Presidency. It was the platform on which Van Buren was elected. It declared—

"Hostility to any and all monopolies by legislation, because they are violations of the equal rights of the people.

"The true foundation of republican government is the equal rights of every citizen in his person and property and its management."

The next Democratic platform was that of 1840, adopted by the Presidential convention at Baltimore, which contains these resolutions:

"4. *Resolved*, That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of another, or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country.

"5. *Resolved*, That it is the duty of every branch of the Government to enforce and practice the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs, and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the Government."

The Democratic convention of 1844 reaffirmed the fourth and fifth resolutions of the convention of 1840.

The Democratic national convention of 1848—

"*Resolved*, That the fruits of the great political triumph of 1844 have fulfilled the hopes of the Democracy of the Union in the noble impulse given to the cause of free trade by the repeal of the tariff of 1842 and the creation of the more equal, honest, and protective tariff of 1846, and that in our opinion it would be a fatal error to weaken the bands of a political organization by which these great reforms have been achieved and risk them in the hands of their known adversaries, with whatever delusive appeals they may solicit our surrender of that vigilance which is the only safegard of liberty."

The Democratic convention of 1852—

"*Resolved*, That it is the duty of every branch of the Government to enforce and practice the most rigid economy in conducting our public affairs, and that no more revenue ought to be raised than is required to defray the necessary expenses of the Government and for the gradual but certain extinction of the public debt.

"*Resolved*, And to sustain and advance among them constitutional liberty by continuing to resist all monopolies and exclusive legislation for the benefit of the few at the expense of the many."

In 1856 the Democratic national convention—

"*Resolved*, That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of another, or to cherish the interests of one portion of our common country."

It also repeated verbatim the first resolution quoted above of the convention of 1852, and then it—

"*Resolved finally*, The time has come for the people of the United States to de-

clare themselves in favor of free seas and progressive free trade throughout the world."

In 1860 both the Douglas and Breckinridge platforms reaffimed the resolutions of 1856, quoted above.

In 1872 the Democratic convention (so called) at Baltimore—which was, in fact, a Greeley, and not a Democratic convention at all—did not adopt any Democratic resolutions, but indorsed the platform of the Liberal Republican convention held at Cincinnati, which contained the following curious declaration, making the tariff a "local issue:" * * * "We remit the discussion of the subject [protection and free trade] to the people in their Congressional districts and the decision of Congress thereon, wholly free from executive interference or dictation."

This is the only hiatus in the chain of assertions by the Democratic party of the doctrine of a tariff for revenue only. It resulted in the shameful defeat of a candidate supported by the party in defiance alike of principle and of policy.

In 1876 the Democratic convention spoke with no uncertain voice:

"We denounce the present tariff, levied upon nearly four thousand articles, as a masterpiece of injustice, inequality, and false pretense. It yields a dwindling not a yearly rising revenue. It has impoverished many industries to subsidize a few. It prohibits imports that might purchase the products of American labor. It has degraded American commerce from the first to an inferior rank on the high seas. It has cut down the sales of American manufactures at home and abroad and depleted the returns of American agriculture—an industry followed by half our people. It costs the people five times more than it produces to the Treasury, obstructs the processes of production, and wastes the fruits of labor. It promotes fraud, fosters smuggling, enriches dishonest officials, and bankrupts honest merchants. We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue."

In the Democratic platform of 1880 the old doctrine was tersely reproclaimed.

"Home rule, honest money, consisting of gold, silver, and paper convertible on demand; the strict maintenance of the public faith, State and national, and a tariff for revenue only."

DEMOCRATIC STATE PLATFORMS.

Now read the platforms of the Democratic conventions in the States, and I call the special attention of certain Democrats in some of those States who have not only departed from the faith of the fathers on this great question but also from the authoritative declarations of the national Democratic conventions and of the conventions of their own States. We will begin with Maine.

Maine.—1869: "We reaffirm our adherence to the doctrine of free trade." 1870: "Free trade is the right of the people." 1875: Tariff for revenue.

New Hampshire.—1876: "We favor a tariff for revenue only." 1878: Simple revenue.

Vermont.—1876: "A tariff for the purpose of revenue only."

Massachusetts.—1870: "Except so far as the legitimate wants of the Government may require, free trade is the true policy of the country." 1871: "We demand a tariff for revenue only." 1877: St. Louis platform. 1884: Reaffirms Cincinnati platform 1880. * * * "Believing that the present enormous surplus in the national revenues is demoralizing and dangerous; that it should be cut down without further delay, not by increasing public expenditures, but by lessening the burden of taxation; that the burden should be removed from the necessaries of life and not from whisky and tobacco, and that the policy of taxing imports, not for the purpose of raising revenue but of obstructing trade, is unsound and must ultimately be abandoned."

Connecticut.—1870: "A tariff for purposes of revenue only." 1871: Denounces the Republican party "because it has failed to reform the abuses of the tariff, permitting still the principle of protection and favoritism to override the idea of revenue." 1874: Declared it was "opposed to unjust and unequal systems of taxation, which tend to favor one class at the expense of other classes of the people," * * * and to all monopolies, which operate to the benefit of privileged persons and classes. 1876: "The tariff law should be adjusted for the purpose of revenue only." 1884: Call for Democratic convention, issued by Connecticut State central committee, April 2, 1884, "who are opposed to the processes of ring combinations and the continuance of a war tariff in time of peace, by which the people are plundered, are cordially invited to act with the Democratic organization in the selection of delegates and the election to follow."

Rhode Island.—1876: "Tariff for revenue." 1878: Saint Louis platform of 1876.

New York.—1871: "Government should lay no tax on imports except for revenue purposes." 1874: "Federal taxation for revenue only." 1876: "We are in favor of a tariff for revenue only." 1877: "A tariff for revenue only." 1880: "A tariff for revenue only."

New Jersey.—1871: "Taxation upon luxuries and the abolishment of taxes upon the necessaries of life." 1875: "Tariff for revenue." 1876: "Tariff for revenue." 1877: Saint Louis platform of 1876.

Delaware.—1876: "Tariff to raise revenue and not to favor special classes."

Maryland.—1873: "Revenue alone." 1875: "Only a sufficient revenue for general uses." 1877: Saint Louis platform of 1876.

South Carolina.—1876: Saint Louis platform of 1876.

West Virginia.—1880: Indorsed Cincinnati platform of 1880.

Ohio.—1869: "A tariff based upon revenue principles alone, upon the closest possible approximation to free trade." 1870: "No candidate for Congress nor for any other office is worthy of support who is not in favor of a low revenue tariff which closely approximates to free trade." 1871: "We are in favor of a strictly revenue tariff." 1875: "A tariff for the sole purpose of raising revenue." 1876: "We are in favor of a tariff for revenue only." 1877: "A tariff for revenue only."

Indiana.—1870: "We are in favor of a tariff for revenue only."

Illinois.—1871: "Taxes should be levied solely for the support of Government." 1878: "Revenue only." 1880: "No tariff for protection."

Michigan.—1874: "We demand a tariff for revenue only." 1882: "Aggressive revenue reform in the direction of free trade."

Iowa.—1877: "A tariff for revenue only." 1878: "A tariff for revenue only." 1883: "A tariff for revenue only." 1884: St. Louis platform of 1876 and Cincinnati platform of 1880.

Minnesota.—1874: "A tariff for revenue only." 1876: "A tariff for revenue only." 1883: "Revenue only."

Wisconsin.—1871: "A tariff for revenue only." 1876: "A tariff for revenue only."

Kansas.—1878: "A tariff for revenue only."

Nebraska.—1874: "A tariff for revenue only." 1878: "Perfect commercial freedom, wherein we may sell where we can sell the highest and buy where we can buy the lowest."

Nevada.—1878: "A tariff for revenue only."

Oregon.—1872: "We are in favor of a tariff to raise money only for the necessary expenses of the Federal Government." 1882: "A strict revenue standard."

California.—1876: "A tariff for revenue only."

Colorado.—1878: "Opposition to all monopolies and class legislation."

Missouri.—1874: "A tariff for revenue only." 1878: "A tariff for revenue only."

Kentucky.—1876: "A tariff for revenue only."

Louisiana.—1876: St. Louis platform of 1876.

Arkansas.—1878: "Revenue alone."

Alabama.—1880: Denounces a protective tariff. Favors a "simple revenue tariff."

Tennessee.—1870: "No candidate is worthy of support who is not in favor of a low revenue tariff which closely approximates free trade." 1874: "Solely with a view to collection of the necessary revenue."

Texas.—1882: "A tariff for revenue only."

The following proceedings occurred during Mr. TOWNSHEND'S speech:

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND] has expired.

Mr. McKINLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] be allowed to conclude his question.

Mr. HOOKER. And that the gentleman from Illinois on this side [Mr. TOWNSHEND] be allowed time to reply.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I call for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McKINLEY]?

Mr. McKINLEY. That the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] be allowed to conclude his question, and that his colleague [Mr. TOWNSHEND] be allowed ample opportunity to reply.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I beg my friend from Ohio to remember that I yielded to the interruptions of my friend from Pennsylvania with the understanding that my time should be extended. As a considerable part of my hour has been occupied by these interruptions, I now ask that my time be extended until I finish the discussion of other points I desired to present.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I will yield five minutes of my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN], who is next to be recognized, states that he will yield five minutes of his time to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Five minutes, Mr. Chairman!

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. Is the gentleman from Maine to speak to-day?

The CHAIRMAN. He is next to be recognized.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. If he yields a portion of his time, I make no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine yields five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Oh, Mr. Chairman, that is not fair to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Before I accept the courtesy of the gentleman from Maine, I desire to ask fair play of the House. I yielded to interruptions under a promise of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that my time should be extended. If I had anticipated that this courtesy would be denied me, I would not have consented to yield the length of time I have yielded to these different gentlemen to inject their speeches into mine.

Now, I say, sir, in view of the liberality we have heretofore extended to members on both sides of this House, I am entitled to just as much time as I have lost by the interruptions by gentlemen on the other side.

Mr. REED. Gentlemen on this side do not object, but the objection comes from the gentleman's own side.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. It makes no difference from whom the objection comes. I yielded out of a spirit of courtesy to interruptions, and I am fairly entitled to as much time in addition to what has been allotted to me as was consumed by the interruptions.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the gentleman from Illinois be allowed to proceed with his remarks without limit as to time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McKINLEY].

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I regret very much to object, but my friend from Illinois unnecessarily yielded to others, and in that way his time was consumed.

Mr. CANNON. I move that my colleague's time be extended for fifteen minutes.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I object.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Will I be permitted to occupy but two seconds of time?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN] has yielded ten minutes of his time to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I thank the gentleman from Maine for his courtesy; but I will occupy only two seconds of time in saying that no one shall hereafter speak longer than one hour during this debate, I do not care where the request comes from, and I do not care who has made the objection.

Mr. BAYNE. Our side does not object to the gentleman proceeding until his speech is concluded.

Mr. ADAMS, of Illinois. That is not fair on the part of my colleague.

Mr. HOOKER. I do not care whether it is fair or not; I shall object.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I do not care whether the objection came from this side of the House or not, I shall hereafter object to all extensions of time, and I will adhere to it.

Mr. SPINOLA. The gentleman from Illinois ought to be permitted to conclude his speech. It is only fair to him that it should be done.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH], who is to speak to-day, and is entitled to the floor during the afternoon, asks by unanimous consent to yield fifteen minutes of his time to the gentleman from Illinois. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Now will my friend permit me?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I have but fifteen minutes and shall need it all.

Mr. CANNON. I think it is only just you should give me a minute after what you have said.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I have said that I imputed no improper personal motive to any gentleman on that side, but that on the contrary it was a misapprehension of duty rather than a refusal to perform what they conceived to be their duty.

Mr. CANNON. Then the whole thing is a mere difference of opinion, according to the gentleman——

Mr. MCKINLEY. I hope the gentleman from Illinois will now withdraw his remark that he would object to everybody asking for an extension of time hereafter.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I will accept the kindness extended to me by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] with thanks, and will withdraw the remark I made about objecting hereafter to extension of time to others.

The CHAIRMAN. By unanimous consent, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND] will proceed in the fifteen minutes yielded to him by the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Has not a member entitled to an hour the right to yield any portion of that hour if he pleases without asking unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. He has the right to yield when he has been recognized, but not before. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN], who is entitled to the floor next, has the right to yield, as time is an important element in the matter.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Before proceeding with my remarks I desire to yield two minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I only want to say that when I meet my colleague [Mr. TOWNSHEND] personally, man to man, he and I get along very well together. When I listen to him in his speeches on this floor, however, and sometimes interrupt him in the House, it occurs to me his habit and his highest ambition is not to discuss a question upon the broad ground of principle and public policy, but to delve back into the past and try to establish his cause by showing that somebody who disagrees with him now agreed with his views at some former time. Why, Mr. Chairman, Saul of Tarsus was a Jew, brought up at the feet of Gammaliel; but he was stricken down and became a Christian.

Now, even John C. Calhoun, the great apostle of the gentleman's views, in early life and in the American Congress, was an avowed protectionist, but afterwards a free-trader, because he thought he foresaw that it was necessary if he would champion and maintain the cause of slave labor in his section that he should be in favor of that policy. But that proves nothing. It is no argument to apply here. A child or a youth, a boy in his early manhood, a college-bred young man, may easily believe one thing, but from the broad standpoint of experience may believe and recognize another which is antagonistic to the first.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, to live long enough, respecting my friend as I do, to serve long enough in this or some other Congress with him——

Mr. PERKINS. How long will that be?

Mr. CANNON (continuing). To see him wake up and discuss these questions upon the broad ground of principle, as he is so competent to do——

A MEMBER. Is that a joke?

Mr. CANNON. If he could only get his mind out of the rut of denunciation, which means nothing. I say I hope to live long enough to see this change.

Mr. STEELE. How long do you hope to live? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. REED. Oh, that is only Illinois politeness. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Now, right upon that point, and I believe I have a little of my time remaining——

Mr. MILLIKEN. I will yield you more time. I would rather you should make my speech than make it myself.

Mr. CANNON. I will not take more than a minute.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Go on.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman said I misrepresented my constituents, my farming constituency, in the interest of Massachusetts and the bloated bondholders and manufacturers of the East. Let us see what there is in the gentleman's statement.

Sir, Illinois to-day, born to the Union in 1818, has more wealth and property than Massachusetts has at the close of her more than two hundred and fiftieth anniversary. Illinois to-day, with her magnificent, progressive Chicago and her hundred growing young cities, springing like giants into prosperity and population, is of equal importance or greater importance in its manufacturing interests than Massachusetts. And some of these days the Rip Van Winkle sleep that overspreads the business interests of the district which my friend now represents in Southern Illinois will be broken, and the sound of the hammer and the hum of the spindle will be heard, to the joy of his farmer constituents, and then I know the gentleman will be converted. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to inflict myself upon the House during the entire hour granted to me under the rule, because I find my voice in such condition that I doubt my ability to do so even had I the inclination. I purpose to give a portion of my time to my old friend from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN], who represents a district filled with industries, where both natives and foreigners are at work, both classes living side by side in comfort and prosperity under the present tariff, none of whom who have come to that district from foreign communities being now desirious of leaving it and going back to better their condition, as we must suppose would be the case were there any soundness in the arguments of gentlemen upon the other side.

Now, my friend from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND] who has just taken his seat, seemed to be greatly troubled about a leader who he said had been repudiated by the people. It is very wonderful that a gentleman in a foreign land, troubling nobody, pursuing his own business, taking no part in American politics except to be interested, as every patriotic American should be, in the magnificent progress of our country, should be such a source of anxiety as he seems to be to some of our friends on the other side of the House.

He says he was repudiated by the people, but the statement is not true. He was repudiated by certain Democratic methods which prevented, in certain sections of this country, the people from speaking their voice through their ballots and having those ballots returned truly and counted in the election. And I say to the gentleman to-day neither he nor his party dare to accept the honest verdict of the people of this country. Ay, if he knew that the honest verdict throughout the land was to be accepted he would have no more hope of the election of his candidate than he would hope to climb to the heavens on a rainbow, or to go to heaven himself, holding the political tenets he holds to-day. [Laughter.] Intimidating voters, committing frauds at the ballot-boxes, making false counts and false returns, and resorting to every kind of iniquity to put their candidates into office has become as much a part of the methods of the Democracy as holding conventions and voting at the polls. Many of their brightest lights and most effective workers are in penitentiaries for their assaults upon the franchise, but altogether too many of them are still running at large.

So much in reply to the gentleman; and now I will turn to the subject before the House.

During the debate upon this question most everything has been discussed that has entered into the imagination of man. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have talked of the crushing weight of Federal taxation, as if some taxation were not absolutely necessary to sustain the Government; as if they expect to run the Government without it, and relieve the people of that burden. Of course they expect nothing of the kind.

They have declaimed against the maintenance of a surplus, which has accumulated during a Democratic administration, and harangue like men denouncing to the people somebody who designs to rob them.

Now this is all absurd nonsense, or something worse. No member of this House is so stupid or bigoted, I believe, as to think that any party or person desires to make the necessary evil of taxation more than necessarily burdensome, and I know no one who does not agree that the surplus should be disposed of by a reduction of the revenues of the Government.

HOW SHALL THE REVENUES BE REDUCED?

But how shall the revenue be reduced is the question? It does not follow that I am opposed to the reduction of the revenue of the Government and distributing the surplus among the people because I do not favor the Mills bill.

I may think I have proposed a better method of doing it. Indeed, I think I have in a bill which I introduced early in this session of Congress, and which has been smothered in the Committee on Ways and Means, the Democratic majority of which brought forth, after much secret labor, the Mills bill now before us. There are two ways of reducing the public revenue. One is to so do it as not to disturb the business nor injure the industries of the country. The other is to make the new tariff bill an instrument for the destruction of property and a disaster to American workingmen. Mr. MILLS and a great majority of his party in this House have chosen the latter method. In this I can not stand with him.

A FRIEND TO EVERY LEGITIMATE INDUSTRY.

I am a friend to every legitimate industry in this country, wherever located. I would no more ruin by vicious and partial legislation the rice-grower of South Carolina than the lumberman of Maine. Both should be tendered the friendly hand and neither receive a smiting blow from the General Government. And I would give aid, strength, and dignity to labor in Texas as readily as in New England. I would help it in both and injure it in neither. Legislation inimical to industrial investments and labor in America is not necessary to effect a reduction of our revenues, nor for any other commendable purpose.

THE MILLS BILL WORSE THAN THE TWO MORRISON BILLS.

But the Mills bill, worse than its two predecessors in the Forty-

eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses, is formed upon a different theory. The two Morrison bills were fair in one respect at least, that they reduced the duties in all parts of the country alike. They surrendered the profits of our industries and the wages of our workmen to the foreigner, as this bill does, but they treated all to the same dose of poison.

The Mills bill, however, seeks to reduce our revenues not only by surrendering the vantage ground which Americans occupy in the fields of labor and industry, but it selects certain sections of the country for particularly severe punishment.

HOW THE MILLS BILL AFFECTS MAINE.

Look at my own State, Maine, for instance. That is neither a Democratic nor a doubtful State; and the Mills bill aims a fatal blow at almost all its great industries. Maine has $10,000,000 invested in lumber. In its forests, on its rivers, in its mills, and upon its vessels, carrying its lumber to the markets of the world, thousands of its people are employed, and immense sums are paid for labor. Yet the Mills bill would consign this industry to New Brunswick. Our great stone industry, nearly as large, capable of indefinite expansion—for the raw material is exhaustless—an industry in the cost of whose products 95 per cent. is for labor, it relegates to the same foreign province.

It coolly directs our wool-growers to slaughter their flocks and go out of business, and let those parts of their land which is adapted to nothing but sheep grazing lie idle. It informs our starch-makers, our cattle-raisers, our growers of potatoes and vegetables that they must sell their products as cheaply as their poorly paid Canadian neighbors, who live with small comforts and no luxuries, or be driven out of the markets of their own country. And the Democratic party which, under the inspiration of the Cobden Club, the Parsee merchant, and British influences, has labored and brought forth this bill, have taken measures to bind us in truculent, unjust, and dishonorable bonds to Canada unless we shall place fish on the free-list; and the same British-American combination are endeavoring to repeal the wise laws enacted by our forefathers, which protect the last vestige of our ship-yards and make it possible to create an American marine and provide sailors to man an American navy.

Now what do you gentlemen leave to Maine after making sure the destruction of her lumber, stone, wool, potatoes, and starch industries; her fisheries and her ship-yards?

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. We have left you your potatoes. We have not put them on the free-list.

Mr. MILLIKEN. You have put "vegetables" on the free-list, and the dictionary defines the potato as a vegetable.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Oh, you have been looking up definitions.

Mr. MILLIKEN. And I don't believe you would have left us our potatoes if Massachusetts had not wanted to get them.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. No doubt we are glad to have free trade with Maine, it being largely to our advantage; but your Republican colleague [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] proposes to have free trade with Canada.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Well, I do not agree with Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I have always known, though, that it was to the advantage of Massachusetts that she has had free relations with Maine.

Mr. JACKSON. This bill gives the Canadians free trade with us, but we must pay to get into Canada.

Mr. MILLIKEN. It gives most everybody free trade with us. Now, Mr. Chairman, I repeat the question: What does this bill leave Maine? You answer: Her manufactories, do you? No; you so curtail the duties upon such goods as they produce that her mills will have to stop, her workshops will be shut, and her immense water-power already occupied will run to waste and the enterprises now seeking to further utilize it will be arrested.

WHAT ADVANTAGES ARE TO BE REAPED BY SACRIFICING OUR INDUSTRIES?

And what advantages are to be reaped for the sacrifice of these great industries not only in Maine but in all the northern tier of States? Shall we get cheaper lumber, or wool, or fish, or ships? Do not gentlemen realize that when we shall have destroyed our own industries, besides the effect upon the market of taking out of it our immense products, the foreigner will enter it, having a monopoly of it? Will he then sell to us cheaper than our own people competing with him and competing with each other sell to us now? No; he will do as he has always done under similar circumstances. He will charge us all he can get, not what he can afford to sell for, and the house-builder, the ship-buyer, and the consumer of our wool and starch will each send his money out of the country and pay a higher price for these articles than he now pays to his own countrymen who produce them from our own raw material and by the labor of our own workmen.

THE MILLS BILL ATTACKS NORTHERN AND REPUBLICAN INDUSTRIES.

But why does this wonderful child of foreign and native parentage, the Mills bill, attack so savagely these particular industries? Why does it leave rice to pay 113 per cent. duty and sugar more than 75 per cent.? Do our people need sugar and rice less than they need monumental stone, wood-pulp, and fish? Why are the latter, which pay very low duties, put on the free-list, and the former left protected by almost the highest duties in the schedule?

Indeed, the committee have gone so far as to repudiate their free raw material professions by leaving coal and iron ore well protected. Why have they done this? Sugar is a product of Louisiana and Texas, rice of South Carolina and Georgia, and the bituminous coal fields and iron mines of West Virginia, Alabama, and other Southern States, scarcely opened, are, in the committee's view, sadly in need of protection to insure their development. The anthracite coal of Pennsylvania is already on the free-list.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I hope my friend from Maine will allow me to say that my heart has been greatly cheered this morning by the explanation of the "father of the House," the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], that under the Mills bill coal and iron ore are both put on the free-list, and I object to the gentleman from Maine taking the words out of the mouth of the man who gives tone to the tariff discussion on his side of the House.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I desire to say to my friend from Massachusetts that I was not here when the "father of the House" made that statement, so that, as between him and me, my statement is original. But I am greatly gratified to know that the heart of my friend from Massachusetts is cheered.

Mr. DINGLEY. I do not know which "father of the House" the gentleman from Massachusetts refers to; but one of the fathers of this bill, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN], assured the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. O'FERRALL] that neither iron nor coal were placed by it on the free-list, on which assurance the gentleman from Virginia said he was in favor of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I rely upon the "father of the House" on this side [referring to the Republican side, on which Mr. RUSSELL was sitting]. He has explained the matter thoroughly this morning; and I have been much comforted thereby. I trust the bill will pass without any further amendment. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. I desire to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am not the descendant in the most remote degree of the father or the grandfather of this House, and that I do not accept any responsibility for what the "father of this House" says. Perhaps I do not know to whom the gentleman from Massachusetts refers; but I know I have no paternity within these walls.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I refer to the venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], who occupied the floor here during the speech of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND].

Mr. REED. And the only one who did occupy it during that proceeding. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. I was not present to hear the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and therefore can not discuss it with the gentleman from Massachusetts, for before expressing an opinion upon it I should prefer to hear it from the gentleman himself rather than accept the gentleman's version of it, however honestly rendered.

THE BILL SECTIONAL AND POLITICAL.

The bill is sectional and political. It was not framed to reduce the surplus and equalize the duties upon imports, nor as a just measure of relief to the people, but to favor Democratic States and make votes in doubtful districts; and that is the reason why, when examined as a measure of revenue reform, it appears to be so complete a monstrosity.

FREE RAW MATERIAL.

But the proposition of free raw material which the President makes, which is in every Democratic speech made in this House, and which is a continual song in the mouth of the free-trader, is about as absurd as any part of the free-trade argument. What is raw material? Nothing that has been made valuable by human labor; nothing that has been wrought or developed by the skill or muscle of man. But free-traders make their classification to suit themselves. Some place raw material at one stage of manufacture and some at another, and when an article has been wrought to the condition next to the last degree of perfection, so that they would not protect any workman except him whose labor has been applied to the last process of production, most of our free-traders cease to call it raw material.

It requires the wool-grower, the carder, the weaver, the spinner, the transporter, and the tailor to make a suit of clothes. When the suit is finished the free-trader talks of wool as the raw material in it; and yet in its production no one has done more work than the wool-grower. Why should not he, as well as his colaborers in producing that suit of clothes, be protected?

The construction of a building requires the work of the brickmaker, the bricklayer, the lime-quarryman, the lime-burner, the lime-cask maker, the transporter, the mortar-maker and hod-carrier, the lumberman, and mechanic. Our free-trade Democratic friends call bricks and lime the raw material; and yet while 90 per cent. of the cost of the building is for labor, more than 95 per cent. of the cost of bricks and lime is in the labor which has brought them out from the clay-bank and the quarry.

And why should not they who did the first work in the constructing of this building be as well protected as he who did the last work, or the work at any intervening stage of its construction? This free-raw-material proposition of the free-trader is a deceptive one. It is an attack upon protection which gentlemen on the other side think will

be the more effective because it is plausible and taking. There is no really raw material upon which any duty exists.

I desire to append here the following speech and resolutions of Hon. A. S. Hewitt, now Democratic mayor of New York City, made at a workingman's meeting some time ago:

[Extract from Mr. Hewitt's speech.]

Protection to American manufacturers, but protection to labor and laborers. The value of every manufacture is made up entirely of the wages paid to produce it. Coal and iron in the mines cost nothing. They are the free gift of God. But they are excavated by the pick and shovel of the workman; by him they are wheeled, carted, boated to market; by the workman they are carried to the mill; by the workman the furnace is heated and charged; by him the iron is puddled, rolled, put up for market, carried thither, and sold. It is labor, labor, labor that constitutes every addition to the value of the article, and it is the man who bestows that labor who should enjoy all the fruits thereof. It should not be divided, as in Europe, and the great part given to a king or a lord, but the whole of it belongs to and should be enjoyed by the men who make it.

Mr. Hewitt continued that he was not a Whig, but a Democrat; still he went for protection now, and should support General Taylor because he would sign a bill to protect American labor. He did not ask for any unreasonable duty. He only asked for a duty equal to the difference between American labor and English labor, so that American rolling-mills might employ their workmen at American wages instead of stopping work.

The following is from the series of resolutions which Mr. Hewitt offered:

"*Resolved*, That this meeting, composed of men who depend for their livelihood upon the labor of their own hands, hold the following facts and principles to be undeniably true, namely:

"That natural wealth is the fruit of individual labor.

"That, therefore, is the best government and the best policy which secures to the hand that earns it the largest possible return for its labor.

"That the superiority of free institutions and economical government is proved by the fact that in the United States the average wages of labor are from three to four times as large as under the monarchical governments of Europe.

"That while foreign labor is paid at this price it would be worse than insanity to adopt any policy by which the wages of our own labor should be reduced to the same level, because it would be throwing away all the advantages secured to us by a free and economical government.

"That if the whole productive industry of the country were employed in producing the articles which we sell abroad, which are mainly breadstuffs and provisions, cotton, rice, and tobacco, we should produce a much larger quantity than we could sell; foreign markets would soon be glutted with these articles; the price of them would fall; the labor that produced them would, as a matter of course, receive less remuneration than it now does; the only stopping point in the decline of wages would be the starving point, and the inevitable result would be that we should be forced to give equal labor for equal labor, instead of one day's labor for four, as we have been doing for many years.

"That, therefore, if we would keep up the price of labor we can not employ the whole productive labor of the country in raising such articles as we export; and the farmers, of all men in the community, are most interested in employing in some other way that amount of labor which, if devoted to agriculture, would produce a glut and a consequent fall in prices in the foreign markets; and that the only way in which such surplus labor can be employed is in producing certain manufactured articles, which can be bought cheaper in foreign countries, not because it takes less labor there to produce them, but because that labor is paid at a less price.

"That hence arises the necessity for a tariff which, properly devised, is merely a system whereby the price of labor, which naturally results under a free and economical government, is prevented from being reduced to the pauper level of labor which just as naturally results under governments where the first fruits of labor, instead of being secured to the hand that earns them, are filched away in order to maintain the costly splendor of thrones and the idle extravagance of an enervated aristocracy.

"That as the tariff should be designed to guard the interests of labor, no matter how employed, but most immediately the farmers' interests, justice to the whole community requires that duties should be imposed only upon such articles as can be produced here with the same amount of human labor as in foreign countries; in other words, upon such articles for the production of which our natural advantages are at least equal to those possessed by foreign nations.

"That the amount of duty imposed upon such articles should be the exact difference between the amount of the wages of labor paid for their production here and the amount required for their production abroad. That the operation of a tariff which does not impose sufficient duty to cover this difference in the price of labor must necessarily reduce the price of such labor, or force it into agricultural pursuits, whereby those who are consumers of breadstuffs become producers, resulting speedily in the accumulation of a large surplus and a consequent fall in prices; in other words, a fall in the price of the labor which produces them, and in the average wages throughout the country in every department of industry."

Mr. Speaker, I commend this speech and resolutions, from so high Democratic authority as Mr. Hewitt, to the thoughtful and prayerful consideration of the free-trade Democracy to-day.

THE PRINCIPAL ATTACK OF THE DEMOCRACY IS UPON WOOL.

But why the wolfish craving to get at the throat of the American sheep which appears in the Mills bill? Why are all the Democratic dogs set upon him? Why the desire to destroy him? He certainly has been regarded as an inoffensive, non-combative creature; and yet our free-trade friends appear to think him worthy of their steel. What has he done to so call down their vindictive wrath upon him?

Let us see what he has done. His numbers have increased until in 1883 50,000,000 of sheep could be counted in our American flocks. He has improved in quality until now he furnishes fine food for the people and the finest fleeces upon the globe, amounting to 350,000,000 of pounds annually, and worth more than $75,000,000. The American sheep sold for mutton amount each year to nearly 15,000,000, for which the farmer and sheep-raiser receive more than $30,000,000. There are 700,000 people engaged in wool-growing. They employ 500,000 people in that industry. These men and their families, who depend upon sheep-raising for their living, number at least 4,000,000 persons; and the sheep are often pastured upon poor, rough, and hilly lands, which is fit for nothing else, and they do more to restore to fertility old and worn-out lands than any other domestic animals.

In 1883 the duty on wool was reduced, and the result was the loss of 6,000,000 of sheep from our American flocks. Now the plan of the Mills bill is to entirely repeal the duty of from 10 to 12 cents per pound on wool. Will that not entirely destroy American sheep-raising? And for whose benefit? The farmer? No; he wishes to continue to produce wool and mutton at a fair profit. The people? No; they want the wool to wear and the mutton to eat. Who, then? Why, the foreign sheep-raiser in South America and English colonies, who will rush his cheap wool into our markets until he has caused the slaughter of our flocks, and then, having stopped this great annual American supply of 350,000,000 pounds of wool and 15,000,000 of sheep, and having complete control of our markets, he will make us pay more for wool and mutton than we pay now. So we shall have destroyed a great industry of immense benefit to our people, driven 1,200,000 people out of employment to crowd other avocations, only to pay higher prices for our blankets and clothing.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Do I understand the gentleman to say that there are 1,200,000 people supported by wool-growing in this country?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I mean to say there are 700,000 wool-growers and that they employ 500,000 men.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I understood the gentleman to say that there were something like 1,200,000 people supported by this industry.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Well, 7 and 5 make 12—at least in the arithmetic of protectionists, perhaps not in the arithmetic of free trade.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I wish to remind the gentleman that the whole product of wool in this country is only a little more than $70,000,000; so that these persons supported by wool-growing would need a much higher rate of protection in order to enable them to live. The gentleman's calculation would allow them something like $70 a year each.

Mr. MILLIKEN. We believe they do need a higher rate of protection. We believe that the reduction made in 1883 in the rate of duty upon wool was wrong; we desire to put the duty back where it was.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. One of the glaring absurdities of the wool argument on the gentleman's side of the House is the assumption that 2,000,000 or more of people are making a living upon $70,000,000 of product, which would give them about $35 or $40 a year each to live upon.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But the wool product is double what the gentleman says it is.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. How many sheep are there in the country?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am speaking of the amount in dollars and cents; your statement gives only about one-half of the real amount.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. It has been stated that there are 44,000,000 sheep in this country; and does the gentleman mean to say that the wool product is at the rate of $2 per sheep?

Mr. GROSVENOR. More than that.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Well, I have sheep and I do not find the wool product to be at any such rate.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Your sheep, I presume, are a poor breed.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I have simply to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that his statements are incorrect; and besides, in other parts of the country people live more cheaply than they do in the sublimated parts of the State of Massachusetts, such as the gentleman inhabits.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. If they live on $35 a year each, I pity them.

Mr. MILLIKEN. They do nothing of the kind. The wool product, as I have already stated, is $75,000,000, while the product of sheep sold is annually $30,000,000. Besides, many of them are farmers and engaged in other avocations.

Now what avocations need or desire these one million two hundred thousand men. Does the farmer who complains of low prices for his products, the coal and iron miner who says his ranks are crowded, and that he gets poor wages and can not work on full time, the workers in factories and shops, at the forges, and on railroads—do these or men of any other employment wish this accretion to their numbers and the consequent lower prices for wages which would surely follow?

PROTECTED INDUSTRIES.

Gentlemen talk of the protected industries, and the President says that but 2½ millions of our seventeen millions of laborers enjoy the fruits of protection; that is, they are engaged in protected industries. What a narrow and absurd view of the subject. The protection and maintenance of one industry helps all other industries. It not only increases the market for their products, but every avocation discontinued must send out its employés to compete with workingmen in other avocations, or into idleness and poverty. Hence every industry is interested that every other industry should live and flourish.

Mr. DIBBLE. Will the gentleman permit a question? Does he not know that the President in his message says also that, though there is only a small proportion of the labor of the country employed in protected industries, that portion is entitled to protection as much as if it embraced every laborer?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I agree with the President upon that; and if he were as sound on everything else he would be a good Republican.

Why, suppose our manufacturing should cease to exist, as the Mills bill provides, where would the millions of men employed in it go? Some other avocations would have to be crowded with them or support them in the poor-houses of the country. And yet this debate has developed the fact that our manufactories are the chief objects of attack in this bill. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARDY] arraigned the six New England States and New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey for having advanced under protection beyond the other States.

If this be true, it has come from the fact that these nine States have availed themselves of the advantage which a protective revenue system has given to the whole country alike; that they have used their advantages like good and faithful servants, while the complaining States have, like the sluggish servant, hidden their talents, that is, their opportunities, in the ground; and it is equally true that these American manufactories have furnished to our people goods at a price 30 per cent. lower than they formerly got them from foreign manufactories. A denial of this, and the claim that these American manufactories have flourished by making goods cost more to the consumer than was paid to English manufacturers during the days of low duties, is a denial of the patent facts of history; but our Democratic friends say they have unduly prospered under protection, and the system must, therefore, be abolished.

THE FREE-TRADE DEMOCRACY SAY NEW ENGLAND IS GETTING TOO RICH.

Yes, they say we are getting too rich, and that our manufactures are giving too good markets to our farmers, who are getting too profitable returns for their products; that our farm lands are becoming too valuable; that our workingmen are receiving too great wages; that our manufactories are building up too many beautiful and thrifty towns; too many comfortable and cozy homes; erecting too many public schoolhouses for poor and rich alike; affording too many opportunities for industrious hands and busy brains to convert the fertility of our soil, the power of our rivers, the treasures of our forests, and all our manifold resources into that which gives comfort and joy to mankind; and that all this thrift and happiness must be blasted by the smiting hand of free trade because, forsooth, the laggard, the slumberer, and the scoffer have not entered into their enjoyment.

What an indictment against protection to say that it has given so great thrift and conferred so many blessings upon the States which have made use of its advantages; and what a reason for introducing that policy of free trade which would stop our mills, close our factories, drive our fishermen from the ocean, and paralyze all our industries.

Oh, yes; you proclaim that you would rob New England of her prosperity; that the Mills bill is designed for that, because you say the hands of her busy toilers under the benign shield of protection have made her streams to hum with turning spindles, her quarries to resound with thousands of workmen's hammers, and flocks and herds to fatten upon her hillsides.

Would you not be more patriotic and humane should you decide to avail yourselves of the same advantages which are offered to you as to us and build up industries and gather wealth thereby, and so raise yourselves to our level of prosperity, rather than attempt, as you do in this bill, to transport our advantages across the waters to the foreigner and let him fatten by reducing us to your own professedly poor condition? Your policy is even worse than that of the dog in the manger; for he sought to drive the cattle from the food he could not eat, while you envy us the advantages which are held out to you as well as to us, and which you may use, but will not make the exertion to do so.

But you are going to have them. They will be forced upon you. This un-American, pro-British bill will not become a law. There is too much patriotism in Congress and among the people to so disgracefully and stupidly surrender our birthright to the emissaries of foreign powers. The rich resources of the South are beginning to be known; and assured and stimulated by protection, she will soon see hives of industry all about within her borders, and the miner and the farmer, and the lumberman, will anathematize him who does not support the American rather than the British revenue system in America.

She will soon realize that "it is a condition and not a theory that confronts her," and she will throw overboard her old free-trade theory to adequately meet her condition.

THE ADVANTAGES OF PROTECTION GO TO LABOR.

But some of our friends on the other side reiterate the stale old cry that the advantages of protection go to the manufacturer and not to the employé. Do these gentlemen know how many employés have become employers? But the savings-banks in the manufacturing States, with their enormous deposits and many depositors, make answer to the statement. And, moreover, the fact that so many people from the Old World come to these nine manufacturing States to find employment, while none go back to better their condition, shows where the workingman finds his best chance in the world.

LABOR STRIKES.

Oh, but you have labor strikes in the nine manufacturing States, say our free-trade friends. Yes, and in some others. Why have not you had such strikes? Do you know? I will tell you. It is because your laborers have been so oppressed that they have not had the power and self-reliance to strike. They have not had among them sufficient money to sustain a strike. They suffer wrongs that the Northern laboring men would not endure for a month. They are peaceable laborers; peaceable as dead men. They do not even protest against being robbed of the primary rights of an American citizen—the right under the Constitution to exercise the electoral franchise and receive the benefit of a fair result of their ballots.

More than forty members of Congress hold their seats against the wishes of a majority of voters in those several States and districts, because these peaceable laboring men are too much crowded down and crushed to claim and secure their rights guarantied to them in the organic law of their country. It requires some power, courage, and hope to strike for justice. Strikes prove always an unsatisfactory condition of affairs, but not the worst condition, nor even necessarily a worse condition than that next preceding it. Why have there not been so many strikes in the past? Why did they not occur during the dark oppressive ages of Europe? Why did not the slaves strike for freedom? Because the heel of oppression was too heavy, and the oppressed too weak to assert their rights. It is because the workingmen in our Northern States, nourished by protective laws, have become strong in intelligence and money to sustain themselves, and, as a consequence, in will and purpose, that they stand up, the unbent images of God, their faces as high as their employers', and demand their rights.

But the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] says that it is not the laboring man but the protected industries which are being paralyzed by protection. And so it goes. Gentlemen have to administer all kinds of nostrums to their free-trade patient to keep him alive and give him character. The gentleman from Missouri, where the power of the labor organizations have been felt, affirms that protection enriches the manufacturer and gives nothing to labor; while the gentleman from Massachusetts, where great manufacturing establishments exist, declares that it is the protected industries that are paralyzed by being protected.

BOTH CAPITAL AND LABOR REQUIRE PROTECTION.

Now, the fact is that both capital and labor in America want that control of the American market which protection gives. They can not afford to share its profits with all the world, nor be entirely robbed of them by the free admission into this country of the products of poorly paid labor. Let them—I mean both the employer and the employé—have the benefit of this market, the best market on the globe; let its profits be assured to them and not given away to the foreigner, and they will settle between themselves what shall be the share of each. The first point to be gained—and protection alone can secure this—is to give them the shilling which the American market affords, rather than the sixpence which they will get if the products of cheap European labor come in freely to compete with them; and then they will take the shilling rather than the sixpence and make their own division of it.

LABOR WILL GET ITS SHARE UNDER PROTECTION.

And labor will not fail to get its share. As I have before intimated, the laboring organizations in America have become strong. Protection has given them the advantage to make them so, and they are all the time growing stronger. Capital and corporations may establish trusts and make their combinations, but for the first time in the world's history, and in our country, almost alone, labor is combining with the strength which comes with intelligence and thrift; and it will have, because it has the power to command it, a just portion of the combined profits of capital and labor. He who doubts this doubts the advancing intelligence of the people, and is blind to the signs of the times.

But if there are no profits the laborer's share, as well as that of the employer, will be nothing; or, if the profit be small and scant, as it is in those countries whose pauper-made goods our Democratic friends would admit freely to our market to compete with the products of our own labor, then the share of each must be scant and small as it is there. The free admission of the products of European labor to our markets will subject American workingmen to the same price for their toil as European laborers obtain. All must fare alike where all have equal admission to the same board, and equal prices for the toil of American and European workingmen must result in like conditions of life.

The comfortable homes of which so many of our workingmen may boast, the children at school instead of in the workshop, the decent clothing, the respectable position of their wives and families, and the manly independence and self-assertion of the American workingman can not exist with the scanty pittance which is paid to labor abroad. And worst of all would be the idleness and consequent poverty, misery, and crime which could not but follow the glutting of our markets with cheap foreign goods, and the consequent expulsion from them of American productions.

THE FARMER.

And where would this leave the farmer, him to whom, together with the laboring man, every demagogue appeals, in a way that is an insult to his intelligence? Now, I desire to promote by every rational and honest means the prosperity of the farmer and workingman. First, because I have been both, and know how to sympathize with them;

and, secondly, because I regard the farmers as the great conservative element of our people, and because the workingman is he whose strong arms and sturdy will turn our crude resources into materials for the comfort and happiness of mankind. But the professional farmer and laborer, he who with hands as soft as a kitten's ear, never having done a day's manual labor in his life, and who knows not enough about farming to set a hen, who goes about giving us theories upon labor and shouting his love of the workingman and farmer from the house-top, is not a character that inspires my confidence or commands my respect.

OUR HOME MARKET.

The farmer wants the best market for his produce and the workingman wants the same for his toil. They have it now at home; but whatever gives away the American market to the foreigner, as free trade proposes to do, is inimical to both farmer and toiler, and to every producer of whatever pursuit in the land.

Yes, our home market is the best in the world; the best for the farmer, because he sells in it to those whose earnings enable them to pay him the most for his products; the best for the laborer, because he works for those whose profits enable them to pay him the most for his toil; the best for the manufacturer, because he therein sells his goods to a more thrifty nation of consumers than can anywhere else be found. This home market with all its unrivaled advantages the Democratic free-traders propose to open and share with all the producers upon the globe who choose to come to it to sell their pauper-made goods. And will they not come to it? Ay, they are looking through and over our fence of protection to it as eagerly as hungry flocks and herds ever looked from barren pasture lands into fields of rich blue-grass and clover.

The protectionists say that these rich fields are our own; that their fertile acres are for our own people, those who live under our flag, fight our battles, pay our taxes, develop our resources, enhance our industries, and contribute to the greatness and glory of our country. We say to the honest and industrious foreigner, "You may come in through the gate and enjoy with us, but you shall not reach over or through and gather our substance while you remain on the other side of the fence, and are neither with us nor of us nor for us."

The Democratic free-trader says, on the other hand, it costs something in the way of taxes to keep up this fence, and while we are all benefited by the enjoyment of our great advantages we are not all benefited alike. Some who are more industrious than others get more than an equal share of these blessings; therefore we will throw down the fence and let all the world reach in and despoil our fair fields of prosperity.

OUR CARRYING TRADE.

And gentlemen who have for years refused to vote even the smallest subsidies to our shipping have the temerity to say that protection has demolished our carrying trade. Somebody the other day quoted James Russell Lowell upon this subject. That gentleman is not good authority in New England. He began life pretty well, but, as George Francis Train once said of Lord Brougham, "He has been a sort of cucumber politician—best when he was green." He has become so galvanized with the notions of Old England that New England can hardly recognize that he is one of her sons, and is beginning to be sorry for the fact that he is.

It is not the tariff that has affected our carrying trade unfavorably. Its decline began in 1855, long before the present tariff was instituted. Afterwards, from 1861 to 1865, our ships were swept off the ocean by Democratic cruisers of English build, and Democratic hostility to protective legislation for our foreign carrying trade has completed its ruin. Our domestic carrying trade, which has had the benefit of protection, is in a fairly flourishing condition. But even that our free-trade Democracy wish to surrender to the foreigner.

NOW, WHO ASKS THAT THIS RUIN BE WROUGHT?

Gentlemen tell us that a great cry comes up from the people for it. And whom do they call the people? Why, certain free-trade newspapers, members of the Cobden Club, college *doctrinaires*, and Democratic politicians. But what of the Knights of Labor? Have they been at the doors of the Capitol urging the passage of the Mills bill, that great work of the greatest committee of the House? No. On the contrary, their protests against it have been many and loud. What of the merchants, and workingmen, and farmers, and all men who earn their bread in the sweat of their faces? Where are their petitions? In the petition-boxes, presenting a picture of the disaster which they believe this bill will work.

A few men anxious to surrender our markets as they are to give up our ship-yards, our fisheries, and our manufactories to foreign possession, and a few British-inspired newspapers, and a flood of circulars from the Cobden Club, make a great noise, and it is called the voice of the people. They will hear the voice of the people, the real, living, actual people of this country, if this bill shall pass, when the workingman, deprived of labor, or shorn in the rate of his wages; when the farmer, seeing the departure of his home market; when the manufacturer, looking upon his untenanted mills; when the merchant, realizing in diminished returns for his goods, the pinching poverty of his customers, shall let their ballots speak at the polls.

Their petitions are here now. They have come up from the workingmen in almost every industry in the country, but they have been unheeded by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, and they are not such workingmen as Henry George; not the theoretical workingmen; not they who swell up and cry out, "Look at me; big Injun workingman; workingmen's great friend and advocate," but practical workmen who put their hands to labor, who do work and not talk it simply, and who know from the best of all teachers, hard experience, what the workingman's interest is. And they do know it better than any free-trade theorist or college doctrinaire can tell them. They have, many of them, known enough to come to this protected land of plenty, and those who knew not before are fast learning what it is that gives them houses here whereas they had none in the lands they came from, what gives them comfort and education for their children here while they had none there. They know it is not the free-trade Democracy which, while with loud speech pretending to be the laboring man's friend, has for generations held him down under the heel of absolute despotism in one section of the country and deluded him with specious promises and pretensions in the other, but that great Republican party which broke the shackles of bound and fettered labor in the South and now maintains a wall of protection to it all over the country; which has never bought and sold the man and woman who toil in any land, and will not consent that they shall be prostrated and swept down by a deluge of cheap products of pauper labor from Europe now.

That party which gave to the poor people of the country the homestead law; to the freedman schools and the ballot, and has fought always, as now, to give high wages and the means of intelligence to those who toil and to their children, that is the party which has been the friend in fact, and not simply in speech, of the workingman, which recognizes labor as the magician that, with the wand of toil, touches our country's resources and summons them forth in forms of usefulness and beauty; which sees in the thrift of the laborer the prosperity and progress of the people, and which has treated him with respect, never despising nor oppressing him at any period of our history in any section of our land.

WHO SUPPORT THIS BILL?

Who are the supporters of this bill? The men who a few years since did not believe in the Republic and do not believe in protecting its industries now; they who wrote in a new constitution of a new Confederacy which they attempted to set up within the domain of the Union these words: "Nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry." These men dominate the Democracy to-day as they did prior to the war. They were then and are now recognized in England and here as free-traders; they are now, as then, the American pets of the British free-trade aristocracy. They and their Northern followers constitute the present Democratic party, and they support this bill for the destruction of American industries as they did the measures taken for the destruction of the American Union twenty-five years ago; and I confidently predict that their present project will fail as completely and fortunately for the country as did their former one.

Let it be admitted, if you please, that they were honest in their undertaking then, but the conflict which it precipitated was none the less terrible for that; and their success, had they been victorious, would have produced consequences no less disastrous. If they be honest in their present purpose they are no less deluded now than then; they no less fail to comprehend the right and wrong of the situation; and their success, could they achieve it, would bring ruin hardly less complete to the nation.

Secession and free trade were born of the same parentage and reared in the same school. The one has had its day and died, smothered in the blood it caused to flow and amid the throes of a civil war which it created. God forbid that such a calamity shall be in store for us as that the other shall ever have its day in this country. If it shall have it, then it will meet with a like defeat; but what patriotic man does not deplore the wrecks it must necessarily make in the mean time?

A BETTER WAY TO REDUCE THE REVENUES.

There is a better way than that proposed in the Mills bill to reduce the revenues and prevent the continual accumulation of a surplus in the Treasury. We are now paying duties amounting to $58,000,000 annually upon imported sugar. I introduced early in the session a bill to repeal this sugar duty, and to pay a bounty equal to the present rate of duty upon sugar raised in the country. The bounty would amount to not more than $6,000,000; so that $52,000,000 of taxes would be saved to the people and the surplus reduced to that extent. This would destroy no American industry. It would leave sugar protected just as it is now and be sure to reduce the surplus, something that the Mills bill will not do, because it is very certain to increase the revenues by increasing importations as much as it curtails them by its free-list.

But you fear the word "bounty." Then, let us reduce the sugar duty to $8,000,000 per year, and let that sum, or so much of it as may be necessary, be paid to the American sugar-planters to equal the rate of duty now upon the sugar they produce. This will be as much a duty as if we collected the $58,000,000 which we now do. It will remedy all the trouble about the surplus and harm no one. Indeed, it will do more to stimulate experiments in making sugar from sorghum and

beets as well as from cane than a duty as now imposed. The sugar interest of France, Germany, and Italy has been developed by direct bounties, and several States of our country have resorted to this method with good results and no harm done to any one. This policy would more than anything else quicken the efforts of our people to invent new processes of manufacture as well as to try new materials for the production of sugar.

And this plan would not be sectional in its effects. Sugar is consumed equally in all parts of our country. It is an article of prime necessity in every State and town in the land, and it equally affects all classes. The use of sugar is confined to neither poor nor rich, nor workman nor employer. It is the largest food charge in every family, and there is no article of consumption the cheapening of whose cost would be so generally and sensibly felt. The reduction of the duty would be very large, the present tariff being 76 per cent., and therefore be a greater saving to the people than could be made upon anything else. Indeed, it would carry more comfort to more American homes than any change in our revenue laws which can be made.

IT WOULD BE IN THE LINE OF PROTECTION.

And this plan also would be entirely in line with the protective principle. The industry is to be protected. It is not proposed to protect it by a high duty, because the prime object of a protective duty, namely, the growth and expansion of the industry protected, and the competition arising therefrom, can not, at present at least, be secured in the case of sugar. The sugar-growing territory of our country is limited, and we produce no more sugar now than we did thirty years ago. The bounty will stimulate the experimenter and inventor, and when he shall have found the process of producing an unlimited amount of sugar in our country at a fair cost, the duty may be repealed if it shall then be found to be desirable to have it done. The repeal of the sugar duty and protection of the sugar industry at the same time, in the manner which I have stated, is American in its policy. It does not sacrifice any industry to the foreigner, nor any one industry to any other industry or interest in our country.

OUR POWER TO PROTECT LABOR.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] when he argues that "we have no power to protect labor," mistakes the plan and purpose of protectionists. We do not seek to protect one product of our own country against another, but all of them that require and deserve it from foreign competition. And this has proved successful beyond measure. It has raised the price of labor; has given us a splendid home market for our products, diversified our industries and made us as independent industrially as we are politically; it has stimulated the creation of new industries, caused competition among our own people, and reduced prices to the consumer below what he heretofore has paid for goods from abroad; it has developed our resources and given labor to our workmen and brought to us a prosperity never before realized by any people among the nations of the earth.

Under protection we have recovered from the destructive ravages of a great war; have paid thousands of millions of indebtedness and interest on the same; covered our land with thriving towns, fertile farms, and great cities; and quadrupled our national wealth. Under this policy ours has become a land to which every enterprising mind looks; to which every strong arm and bold heart endeavors to come; to which hundreds of thousands do come every year; and from which none go away to find better returns for investment and labor elsewhere.

FREE TRADE OR PROTECTION THE ISSUE.

But to conclude, let me say that the issue is now fairly and clearly made between the great parties of the country, the Democratic free-trader and the Republican protectionist, and I am glad it is so. We see no more such dodging of this question on the part of our Democratic friends, as they have hitherto attempted with such success as their skill obtained by long experience in that art entitled them to. The President's message, the Mills bill, and the tariff debate in this House have done one good if no other. They have disclosed to the country that the Democratic policy is free trade and nothing short of that; and if the present bill goes not quite to that length, its advocates do; that is sustained upon free-trade ground and no other, and that the Democratic party only awaits a convenient opportunity to come out of its already broken shell into as fully fledged a champion of free trade, pure and simple, as the most ardent of its leaders or the most radical English member of the Cobden Club, to which it has contributed so many adherents in this country, could desire.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] in his recent very eloquent speech puts himself in that attitude; the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] says he is ready for it, and every argument yet made for the passage of the Mills bill is an argument for free trade.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. DIBBLE] made, to be sure, a speech with much good protection doctrine in it, especially as applied to rice. Had he applied his logic to lumber, wool, building stone, and the great Northern industries, it would have been a first-class high-tariff speech worthy of the best protectionist in the land.

NO RIGHT TO PROTECT LABOR.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], as I have already stated, says that we have no right to protect labor. Well, I should say it is not very well protected in his State. It has there no rights which white men feel bound to respect, and no representative in Congress because it is trodden under the despotic heel of those who do not believe in protecting the workingman in the independent and dignified position which he holds in the North, and which the Republican party of protection intends he shall continue to hold. The question, then, is simply whether we shall so reduce the revenues as not to harm American industries and prostrate American labor in the interest of foreign capital; or shall we refuse to save to Americans the fruits of American advantage?

The Democratic party propose to surrender to the foreigner our farms, our manufactures, our fisheries, our ship-yards, our carrying trade, our lumber, and the opportunities of our workmen to sell their toil at a fair price. We propose to maintain the standard of American wages for American workmen, the American price of products for American farmers, and diversify our industries, as we have been doing, building towns and cities, and pushing forward the prosperity of the country under the encouragement of protective duties. On this issue we are to go to the people. I have too much confidence in their intelligence to doubt the result.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate for the country and for the proper consideration of the tariff that this bill had its birth in secret and its cradle in a partisan caucus. A revision of the tariff more than any other measure affects the vastly extended industries of the country, both labor and capital, in all their ramifications. No universal changes should be made in the system without giving a hearing to the interests affected and receiving their explanation of the practical results of such legislation. This was done at the last revision of the tariff, and the changes made therefore produced no shock or disaster to business.

I only enter into this debate as a business man, and with a view to represent fairly the varied interests of my district. I know that I voice the opinion of a majority of business men when I say that a tariff bill, originated as a party measure, discussed as a party measure, and enforced by a party caucus, can not win the confidence of the people of this country.

This bill is generally believed, in its taxing provisions, to have been the work of an alien-born resident of the United States, himself engaged in no productive industry or labor whatever, a mere representative of middlemen interested in the importation of foreign goods.

It is further understood that the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means adopted his propositions with only the modifications necessary to get sufficient Democratic support to pass the bill. But whatever its origin or manner of completion, it is nothing else than a bill to increase the quantity of foreign goods imported and used in this country. This also means a less amount of American goods manufactured and used here. This, in turn, means less capital employed here in industry, fewer laborers finding employment, more money sent abroad in payment for imported goods, less money accumulated at home, and a serious check to American enterprise and development. For agriculture it also means fewer mouths to feed or less wage-money to buy with and diminished home consumption; less money for wool and death to the sheep.

The bill has already had the effect of diminishing by one-half the number of operatives employed in one of the largest carpet manufactories in the State of New York. They could not proceed in the accumulation of stock while threatened by their own Congress with ruin for the benefit of their English competitors. Other industries of the country are for the like reasons hedging against the apprehended invasion of foreign goods.

There is another reason, Mr. Chairman, why our people in all the great industrial States feel alarmed from the presence of this bill in the House. Its chief advocates do not come from the industrial districts, from the regions where coal and iron, wool and cotton are converted to the uses of man, and where capital, invention, and enterprise have given great development to national wealth, where industry and diversified employment sustain millions of men.

They have not visited the great workshops of the United States. Their ears do not know the meaning of the roar of the furnace, the clang of the trip-hammer, the hum of the spindle; their eyes have not seen the early morning march of the tin-bucket brigade; as they go to earn the daily wage which gives them daily bread and makes them honored and respected laborers instead of wandering tramps.

We feel, therefore, that their judgment upon a tariff measure without practical knowledge of our national industries and of the vast and inseparable interdependence of one industry upon another for its life and support, is unsafe and untrustworthy. The reason put forward for this attack upon our industries is the necessity of preventing the accumulation of a surplus revenue. There are three ways to diminish this revenue.

One is the total abolition of the duties on a given article; another the reduction of the duty on articles of which we consume only a fixed amount; and a third is the laying of a duty so high as to prohibit importation. The authors of this bill have not pursued any of these methods except in some minor articles. They have reduced the rates on articles of unlimited consumption. They call this a reduction of

the revenue. Yet it is known and admitted that this bill will lead to increased importation, and therefore it is pure assumption to say that on these classes of goods there will be a reduction of revenue. In proportion as they destroy our domestic production these importations will increase. On the other hand, we maintain that the necessary reductions should be effected by the total abolition or of a part of the internal revenue and by a reduction on such imported articles as sugar, of which the annual consumption is a fixed quantity and chiefly supplied from abroad. This will facilitate instead of disturb or destroy our home industries, and will effect a precise and known reduction of our revenue.

These results appear to me so plain that this whole anti-protection movement can not be considered so much an attempt to reduce the revenues as to force Representatives on this floor to sacrifice the interests of their own constituents in order to give an indorsement to the President's free-trade message. In other words, they are promoting the interests of the Democratic candidate for the Presidency by an attack on the labor and industries of this country in favor of foreign manufacturers and traders.

Mr. Chairman, the United States are greater consumers of the products of labor than any other nation on the globe. It is therefore the best market on the globe. They not only consume more, but they pay better. Europe would rather get control of this market than of any other entire continent, save her own. By our American system of protection we have built up this market and now largely control it. This bill is the first step to give it up to England, from which we rescued it in 1789, when our Constitution established the Union and a sovereign Congress with power to encourage and protect home industries. It is our control of this market which has built up our vast industries and given employment not only to our native laborers but to vast numbers who have come to us from abroad. Thev have indeed come to us in such numbers that many can not find employment to-day.

What will you do with the surplus labor? Every bale or ton of additional goods imported in competition with our own means a bale or ton less manufactured by our own labor. We can not pay for the same thing wages to the American laborer and to the English laborer; one or the other must give way and go hungry. I wish both might be fed, but as long as only one can eat it is our duty to see that Americans earn the wages and eat the bread. Nor can you buy this additional bale or ton without paying for it. That means that you are sending money out of the country instead of spending it in the country. This signifies not only less home capital to use, but less home capital to tax. In fact it is a question simply whether we shall enrich a foreign country and people or enrich our own.

A patriot can not long hesitate where his duty lies. It is an admitted duty of every government, so far as legislation can do it, to provide a system which shall maintain all classes of its population in employment and in the means of comfortable living. I find in this proposed legislation the first step in the contrary direction, and my people would not justify me in giving such a measure my support.

The American system of fostering and protecting home industries is in direct contrast and antagonism with the English system of a tariff for revenue only. The struggle between them has been going on for twenty-five years and more. The former system has prevailed here for a quarter of a century, and with results which have caused the wonder and won the admiration of the civilized world. The census portrays the result better than I can do it. The revenue tariff only has prevailed during that period in England and Ireland. The result there is also known to the world. Has it proved a benefit to Ireland? Let her people, escaping by the million to this and other shores, answer for her. What do Englishmen say for themselves? They certainly are competent witnesses in their own affairs. For years they have been bewailing the losses and ruin which have come to their agriculture, both in reduced productions and reduced prices. The depression in manufactures and trade have become so public and serious that a parliamentary commission was recently appointed to inquire into its causes. That commission in its report declares that the industrial crisis in England has continued since 1875, which was the year when the remarkable prosperity of the United States became evident after the passage of the act for the resumption of specie payments. This commission gave as the reason for the depression the low profits of manufacturers.

An English writer, from whom I shall quote further presently, commenting on the commission's report, says:

> That low profits mean reduced wages of labor or the employment of a les number of laborers and less consumption by the worker.
> Low profits for the Lancashire and Birmingham manufacturers mean narrowed circumstances in this country.
> For many decades we have not seen such a cheapness of wheat and manufactured goods as we see now, and yet we are suffering from a crisis.

I call the attention of the Democratic lovers of the English system to this notable admission. You are struggling, you say, for cheaper goods and cheaper means of living in this country. They have had both in England, the country whose policy you would imitate, and yet their crisis and their sufferings have come upon them and continue to-day.

It ought to open your eyes, for it shows that cheapness does not mean procperity; it proves how much better it is to buy what you want, even dearly, and have the money to pay for it, than it is to be able to buy cheaply and have no money to pay for it. This last is the condition of England to-day, and upon their own testimony.

At the very time the Committee on Ways and Means were reporting this bill in aid of English manufacturers, and for the introduction of the English system into this country, Prince Kropotkin, an economic writer and reformer of England, published an article in the Nineteenth Century Magazine upon the industrial condition of England. His article is entitled "The Breakdown of our Industrial System." The very title should induce the President and his adherents in this House to call a halt in their crusade against the American system, which protects our own industries and our own labor. While you are urging us to abandon these interests in favor of the British system of a tariff for revenue only, this writer addresses his article to Englishmen, showing them how their system has already broken down. He says workmen have become—

> mere flesh-and-bone parts of some immense machinery.

Even the agricultural laborer will become—

> A tramp who will never again see the field he has harvested once in his life.

He demands a reform which shall improve the condition of the laborer—

> Where each aggregation of individuals large enough to dispose of a certain variety of natural resources—it may be a nation, or rather a region—produces and itself consumes its own agricultural and manufactured produce.

You will observe that in this manner he describes exactly the object which the American system has so largely promoted in this country. He adds, speaking of England, that—

> The present industrial system already bears in itself the germs of its proper ruin.

And affirms that—

> Each nation must be her own agriculturist and manufacturer.

The same article reviews the industrial condition of different nations of the world, and when he turns from England to Belgium, another revenue-tariff country, he simply says:

> The immense factories at Verviers are silent; the Belgian weavers are misery-stricken.

While carefully avoiding any recommendation of the protective system, he shows the industrial condition of different countries entering into competition with England, and speaks particularly of the growing industries of Germany, Austria, Italy, Russia, and Spain, all of which countries have protective tariffs. He then adds:

> Finally, a terrible competitor to all European manufacturing countries has grown up of late in the United States. * * * Manufactures must grow in the States; and they are growing at such a speed—an American speed—that in a very few years the now neutral markets will be invaded by American goods.

While this alien but far-sighted English writer sees that our system has already prepared the way for invading the neutral markets of the world, our Democrats are telling us that we must change that system and suffer adversity instead of prosperity before we can compete in foreign markets. This is strange logic, that we must be embarrassed at home and our home system broken down by the politicians before we can prosper abroad. No better explanation can be given of the law and method of our American prosperity than the following statement which he gives as to the general law of development:

> As soon as any industry has taken firm root it calls into existence hundreds of other trades, and as soon as the first steps have been made and the first obstacles have been overcome the growth of industries goes on at an accelerated rate.

In that sentence is written the industrial history of the United States.

I need not go farther for testimony touching the break-down of that English system for the introduction of which into our country this bill is the opening wedge. Every business man of our commercial cities knows that the condition of England is that described by the Parliamentary commission, and so vividly stated by Prince Kropotkin.

It is true, and it is natural, that the President's message and this bill should be hailed by Englishmen as the dawn of a better day for them, but will it be the dawn of a better day for our country? It betokens for the United States, in my judgment, rather the gloom of a threatening night. It will open a wider market for British goods, but by just so much it narrows the market for American products; by so much as it gives employment to British labor it takes employment from American labor; it abandons the elements of our existing prosperity and introduces the elements of English adversity; for industrial upbuilding it substitutes industrial break-down. [Great applause.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say to those present that their perfect attention will not embarrass me in the least [laughter], nor will occasional demonstrations of approval of what I have to say be objected to. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, I am not here to lecture on manners, but I will take this occasion to say that I do not think it good form for gentlemen to be sitting around reading, writing, and talking when a gentleman is trying to instruct them. Mr. Chairman, I approach the discussion of this question, on which so much has been said in this House within the last few weeks, with much of embarrassment anddiffidence. But, sir, there are some views in connection with the pending matter that I desire to present.

I have listened with great interest to the discussion that has been had up to the present. I trust we are nearing the end of this great

debate. I have endeavored to give a fair and impartial hearing to what has been said. I was told early in this discussion, and have been told all through it by the opponents of tariff reform, that we of the South came here bound and hampered by prejudice, and I was anxious to be enlightened, and if the logic of the question was contrary to the views I entertain I was anxious to be righted.

I have heard from some gentlemen opposing the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means some as good arguments as can be made in behalf of a bad cause.

I have heard a great many as poor and illogical arguments as could be made in any cause. Many of the arguments against this bill remind me of the discussion between Mr. Baps and Mr. Toots and Sir Barnet Skettles, given by Dickens in Dombey and Son. Mr. Baps solemnly and seriously propounded the question to Mr. Toots: "What are you going to do with your raw materials when they come into your ports in return for your drain of gold?" Mr. Toots, to whom the question seemed perplexing, replied that he'd cook 'em. [Laughter and applause.]

But Mr. Baps did not seem to think this would do, and when he met Sir Barnet Skettles he propounded the same interrogatory to him. Sir Barnet had much to say upon the question and said it, but it did not appear to solve the question, for Mr. Baps retorted, "Yes, but suppose Russia stepped in with her tallows," which struck Sir Barnet almost dumb, for he could only shake his head after that and say, "Why, you must fall back on your cottons." [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, the solution of this great question, and of many questions that have been presented here by gentlemen who have spoken against the Mills bill, is about as satisfactory as this discussion between the gentlemen to whom I have referred.

Mr. Chairman, what is the condition with which we are confronted? An overflowing Treasury, an overtaxed people. It is not my purpose, sir, to speak of the surplus or of its corrupting, corroding, and debauching influence. The Government amply and liberally, if not extravagantly, provided for in all its departments—the legislative, executive, and judicial, the military, the naval, the Indians, the Agricultural and the State Departments—all with all the money they need; with a Pension Bureau as large as a department of the Government, distributing eighty-odd million dollars annually for pensions, and yet we will have in the Treasury by the close of this fiscal year more than $150,000,000 for which the Government has no use. Withdrawn from the avenues of commerce and trade, it lies here to excite the cupidity of jobbers and corruptionists, and is a constant temptation to extravagant legislative schemes.

Mr. Chairman, the great question with governments in the past has been how to raise the necessary revenues; the question of taxation has been one that has engaged the attention of statesmen in all ages of the world, and has often produced revolution and drenched nations with blood. What then, sir, would you suppose would be the greatest pleasure of the representative of a free people confronted by the condition which we have before us? It seems to me that it would be the reduction of taxation and the lightening of the burdens of the people. Mr. Chairman, when I embarked in politics and statesmanship I looked forward with more pleasure to the accomplishment of some such good as this for my constituency than to any personal triumphs. What is the trouble here? It seems to be to devise ways and means to prevent taking the burdens of taxation off the people, instead of how to reduce taxation. I had always understood that taxation was an evil to be borne because it was necessary, and that unnecessary taxation was something of which every representative of a free people would be glad to rid them; but sir, it seems I am mistaken, and what are the arguments against the reduction of taxation? What interest is it that stands here to thwart every proposition to reduce the revenues to the actual needs of the Government?

It is the immense capital engaged in manufacturing. The manufacturers of America—the richest and most powerful in the world—are here through their representatives and their agents with their bureaus and their literature, resisting every effort to reduce taxation to the needs of the Government. I have listened for some definite proposition from the opponents of the bill reported here by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee as to what we should do to avert the disasters that the present condition threatens. They tell us the tariff should be revised, but they say it should be by its friends, and they are its friends. Now, Mr. Chairman, they must excuse me if I decline to wait on them to do it; we want it done this century, and I trust and believe they will not be intrusted with power in that time. I would as soon think of sending to the jail to get a jury to try the criminal docket as to depend on the defenders of the present system to reform the tariff and reduce taxes.

Besides, sir, what proposition do they present? No two of them are agreed. One says he would reduce taxation by repealing the internal revenue; another says he opposes taking the tax off of whisky; another says he would take it off of sugar; but the father of the protective system [Mr. KELLEY], who gave us to understand to-day, in relating the conversion of Garfield to the theory of protection, that protectionists regarded themselves as followers or disciples of himself, insists that it would be a crime to take the duty off of sugar. Others take the position that taxation should not be reduced at all, and that the proper thing to do is to increase expenditures, and various schemes are proposed for spending the surplus. Some of them insist that much of it might be paid out in pensions. It does seem to me, Mr. Chairman, that eighty-odd millions of dollars annually for pensions ought to satisfy the most enthusiastic friend of the soldier.

I am aware that we of the South are accused and probably suspected of being influenced by improper motives in our opposition to increasing this amount; but I appeal to you gentlemen of the North to consider that this money is collected from all parts of the country and distributed almost exclusively in one section. You can see how essential it is to us that some limitation should be put to this tax that goes out from us, but never returns. There are other suggestions for increased expenditures, but, sir, I have heard no complaint from the masses of the people in this country that we are not spending enough. I have heard no demand from them for increased expenditures. On the other hand, they think as I do, that the expenditures might and should be curtailed.

Others say that the Government should devote this surplus, as it is now doing, to the purchase of Government bonds. This is, I grant, the best we can do with the surplus after we have it; but the question is, is it good statesmanship to tax the people who are paying themselves 8 and 10 per cent. interest on money to raise money for the Government to anticipate its debts and purchase at enormous premiums, as it is now doing, its bonds that are drawing only 4 or 4½ per cent.? The Government is now having to pay more than 26 per cent. premium in order to take up its 4½ per cent. bonds, and within the last few weeks has paid out nearly $4,000,000 in premiums on the purchase of bonds.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said, I have been anxious to be informed about this matter and to know just exactly what the truth of the matter was. I have listened, as I said awhile ago, to gentlemen over there; and how do they begin the discussion of this question? How do they propose to go about enlightening me as to what I should do? I am told that coming from the section I do, coming from the section the majority of the Ways and Means Committee do, bound hand and foot by the ideas engendered, as they tell us, by slavery, more than thirty years ago, that we have no business to be tampering with this question.

I have practiced law some, Mr. Chairman. I always found that when the lawyer had a very bad case on the merits his scheme was to befog and becloud the issue, and to side-track the jury. I have known some lawyers, shysters, who had one particular branch of the law in which they thought they were perfect, and every case they ever had they attempted to run in that line. For instance, I know a shyster who won a case once on the doctrine of estoppel; he never had a case since but he attempted to draw it into estoppel. I know an old gentleman in Mississippi who won a case on a demurrer. He was not a lawyer. But he was sued again after that, and he wrote to his lawyer, "Please send me a couple more of those demurrers" [laughter]; "these fellows have sued me in two more cases." His great idea was that a demurrer was the thing that knocked every case out of court.

You have all heard of the doctor who threw all his patients into fits because he said he was sheol on fits. [Laughter.] Now the gentlemen who opened this debate on that side, the two first, and a great many smaller lights who have followed, have put this into a question of slavery. They had won a case on slavery, and they think if they can throw the tariff into slavery they will be all right, for they were sheol on slavery. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, the father of the protective system [Mr. KELLEY], told us here on this floor how he fought slavery, and then he associates every effort to reform the tariff with slavery. Slavery is his demurrer. Slavery is his estoppel. I have no doubt in his day and in the days of slavery he was a power. It was the same with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS].

And then my neighbor and good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE], one of the disciples of the old father, the other day in the heat of debate got into this slavery business. I do not blame him much for that because I do not think there was any malice in it; I think it was a case of emotional insanity. [Laughter.] When the gentleman was descanting on the beauties of protection in Allegheny County, and he was asked by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] about the strike in the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, where the Pinkerton detectives were keeping out the laboring men, the gentleman flew off, and insisted on talking about slavery in the South. There was no malice aforethought in that. If he had committed murder under those circumstances he would have been acquitted on the ground of emotional insanity, for if anything drives a Pennsylvanian insane when talking about protection it is to speak to him about strikes and Pinkerton detectives. [Laughter and applause.]

And I now desire to give some attention to the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. FORAN, *et tu Brute!* [Laughter.] He too read the South a lecture, and told us much about ourselves that we did not know—another instance in which I had to go from home to get news. I wonder where he learned all he knows about the South! [Laughter on the Democratic side.] I will tell him now, and I believe it is true, that if he knows no more about the doctrines of protection and free trade than

he knows about the South he ought never to speak on those subjects.

Mr. FORAN. I learned something about the South in 1864. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Oh, yes; that is your estoppel; that is your demurrer. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORAN. Well, it was an estoppel, sure enough.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Yes, the gentleman learned something about the South in 1864. He says that he is a Democrat, but that the Republicans are the fathers of this high protective tariff which he extolled so highly, and which he says has made better men and more of them than any other system.

Mr. Chairman, if he has found a perfect system of government which makes better men and more of them than any other system, and which, he says, is doing the country so much good, and if he clings to the prejudices of 1864, with which so many other gentlemen in the Republican party seem to be afflicted, in the name of common sense how does he get to be a Democrat? [Laughter.] It seems to me that he would cast his lot with that party which inaugurated the system he admires so much, and which he tells us has made better men and more of them than any other system, and that tries to keep itself alive on the prejudices engendered in 1864 which he seems to desire to keep alive.

But, Mr. Chairman, let us see what he says about the South, and then we will look at what he says about himself:

> The fact is, the South, because of the curse of slave labor, found herself at a disadvantage, as compared with the North, in diversified industrial pursuits Slave labor was adapted to only one industry, agriculture, and that being the case it was of course to the advantage of the South, at least for the time being, to purchase those manufactured goods she needed in the cheapest market she could obtain, while she sold her staple products in the highest market she could obtain. It will therefore be seen that the free-trade sentiment in this country was the outgrowth of peculiar conditions and peculiar environment, and perhaps nowhere in the history of the world is the tenacity of prejudice more strongly exemplified than in the fact that this sentiment continues a quarter of a century after the conditions and environment which gave it birth have passed away and no longer exist. Many gentlemen upon this floor can not help being free-traders. They were born so. It is rather the result of congenital causes than conviction based upon research and investigation.

And again, speaking of the bill under discussion, he says:

> It came from gentlemen whose knowledge of the great labor problem was derived from tableaux and object lessons. Ring up the curtain, behold the lights of other days, free-trade days; at the front of the stage an uncovered pine table, upon which is a lighted tallow candle, and farther back, in the shade, is a black man couchant and a white man and a rawhide rampant.
>
> I do not say these things in bitterness; I only refer to them to show how very difficult it is to break away from the prejudices that are born with us, or to break through the environment of conditions that have influenced most of our lives. One of the greatest evils the curse of slavery brought upon our kinsmen of the South was the creation of a caste, because it has outlived all the other evils which flowed from this Pandora box. There is no despotism so cruel and harsh as the despotism of caste. It is supersensitive to any intrusion into its fancied realm, and anything whose tendency is to ennoble and elevate human dignity and independence always encounters its fiercest hostility.

Mr. Chairman, we are very much obliged to the gentleman from Ohio for the assurance that he says these things about us out of a spirit of loving-kindness. If he had been bitter in this talk it would really have hurt our feelings [laughter], but his kindness of heart when he undertakes to lecture us really overcomes us.

That is the picture the gentleman gives us of the South. These are the things he attributes to us. Let us now hear him speak of himself. He has told us what sort of people these Southerners are. Now, let us hear him tell about himself:

> I believe in Democracy, but there is no Democracy in this bill. I know of but one guide by which to shape my official as well as my private conduct, and that is the light which comes from my inner, moral consciousness—by this light my convictions of right and duty are formed; and if the time should ever come when party or any other kind of prejudice becomes stronger than my judgment, and I find that the courage of my convictions is departing from me, I will be ready to exclaim with Brutus in honest candor and sincerity—
>
> Be ready, gods, with all your thunderbolts
> Dash me to pieces.

Well, Mr. Chairman, as the old darkey said about me one time in Mississippi, when he was following me in a speech, "the gentleman recommends himself so much higher than anybody else can recommend him it aint necessary for me to say anything more about him." [Laughter.] But I want to call the gentleman's attention to the lesson taught by a teacher who is recognized as good authority in the benighted South. He will find it in about the eleventh verse of the eighteenth chapter of Luke, where he may read:

> The Pharisee stood and prayed thus with himself, God, I thank Thee, that I am not as other men.

Mr. FORAN. Is it the Pharisee that is occupying the floor now?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. No, sir; the Pharisee is the man who erects such a high standard for himself as the gentleman from Ohio does, and discounts so much the honest convictions and judgments of other people. Let me remind the gentleman that that pharisaical performance was not commended by the teacher to whom I have referred.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] demonstrated the other day, if anything is capable of demonstration by testimony, that protection does not enhance wages in this country; that the difference between the price of labor in this country and the price of labor in Europe is not the result of protection, but arises from the fact that the labor of this country is more productive; that it does more work for the money, makes more pairs of shoes for the same money, makes more yards of prints for the same money than labor in Europe does. He showed by indisputable proof that a pair of shoes, the making of which cost 34 cents in England, cost only 25 cents in Massachusetts and that a pair that cost 50 cents to make in England only cost 33 cents in Massachusetts, and he illustrated it with print cloth and other things; no one has been able to meet this. It was shown that American labor earned more wages, but because it accomplished more and not on account of the tariff.

But the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FORAN] attempted to reply to the gentleman from Texas, and what was the argument to which he was finally driven? Why, sir, it was that money in this country is worth more than money in Europe. That was about all he got out of his argument, that the tariff served to protect money in this country and give it a larger return than money in Europe will bring.

I here insert a table that will show how utterly fallacious is the claim that labor gets the benefit of the protective tariff:

Table, compiled from Tenth Census, showing value of various manufactured products, per cent. of labor cost, rate of duty existing and proposed.

Industries.	Value of product.	Labor cost.	Percentage of labor.	Present tariff.	Proposed rate.
				Per ct.	*Per ct.*
Carpets	$31,792,802	$6,825,218	21.5	47	30
Cotton goods	210,950,383	45,614,419	21.6	50	40
Bolts, nuts, etc	10,073,330	1,981,300	19.7	50	35
Nails and spikes	5,629,240	1,255,171	22.3	43	34
Iron pipe, wrought	13,292,162	1,788,258	13.5	70	35
Oil, castor	653,300	44,714	6.8	194	97
Oil, linseed	$15,303,312	$681,677	4.4	54	21
Screws	2,184,532	456,542	20.9	50	35
Wool hats	8,316,369	1,893,215	22.2	54	40
Woolen goods	160,666,721	25,826,392	16.1	70	40
Worsted goods	33,549,942	5,683,027	16.9	68	40

It will be seen from this that the present tariff or protection is more than double the whole cost of the labor; so that if the labor in other countries cost nothing at all no such tariff as this would be necessary to protect labor here, nor does the proposed reduction in the Mills bill bring it down to the cost of labor in any case here given.

You all heard Mr. Scott, of Pennsylvania, in his speech tell us about the stockholder in the Edgar Thompson iron and steel works who told him their profits were $5,000,000 annually. That this one man's profits were one and a half millions annually, or $5,000 a day. You also heard from Mr. FORD, of Michigan, where the chancery suit in his State developed. That the Jackson Iron-Mining Company on a capital of $300,000 had declared dividends to the amount of $5,355, or 89½ per cent. annually, beside largely increasing their plant.

I wish I had the time to demonstrate this fully. I here insert an article from the San Francisco Examiner that shows where the benefits of protection go:

WHERE THE MONEY GOES.

That there is a good deal of dissatisfaction in the United States with the way the annual industrial product of the country is distributed is not to be denied. The amount of this product as marketed is put by Joseph Nimmo, jr., Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, at $9,000,000,000; by Edward Atkinson, including products unmarketed, at $10,000,000,000. Both add for items omitted, $100,000,000. The working force—that is, the wage-earners and small farmers of the country—number 16,200,000; the workers of a higher grade, managers, directors, superintendents, and so on, paid by salaries and fees, number 1,600,000.

Mr. Atkinson and other economists agree on $432 as the average annual earnings of wage-receivers as above defined. This will include what they consume of their own unmarketed product. Next, the services rendered by persons engaged otherwise than in production (physicians, domestic servants in cities and so on) reach an annual value of $1,200,000,000. Rents, which stand for the service rendered by fixed capital, reach $800,000,000. Thus the total annual value of the produce of all the labor of every kind in the United States, including the profit on all the jobs and schemes and pools and trusts, is fully $12,000,000,000. Of this amount the wage and salary earning classes together (numbering 17,300,000) receive $8,100,000,000; leaving as the annual profit of mere capitalists, "operators," and so on, the sum of $3,900,000,000.

Thus the owners and controllers of wealth receive at least 32½ per cent. of the total product of the country. Other estimates make the proportion 37½ per cent. Wage-receivers save a sum which, while it looks important in savings-bank returns, is a mere nothing—a vanishing quantity—in the enormous figures of actual annual production. An annual saving, an annual addition to existing wealth is in fact made which averages $900,000,000, and it is made almost exclusively out of the share of total product captured by pre-existing wealth. Thus, while it is not true that the poor are growing poorer as a class, it is strictly and demonstrably true that only the rich are growing richer.—*San Francisco Examiner*

If I have the time, Mr. Chairman, I think I can demonstrate, as I shall endeavor to do, that the protection we have in this country is protection to money, to capital, and not to labor.

I am sorry my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], who usually sits upon my right, is not here to-day, for I listened with great interest to his voluminous figures upon the resources of New England. I have no desire to enter into any contrast between the South and New England. I have nothing in the world to say against New England, except that I do not think it exactly the right thing for New England after having gobbled up in the way of taxation all we of the South had to then brag to us about her wealth and taunt us with our poverty.

Really I do not know whether that is exactly the right thing to do under any circumstances. But the gentleman from New Hampshire filled pages after pages of the RECORD with figures and statements, showing the wonderful resources, the vast capital that New England had engaged in manufactures; and while he did not figure out the result of his statement in every instance, I have taken occasion to figure out some of the results; and where he gives us the amount of capital invested, the amount of wages paid, the quantity of raw material of every description which is bought, the result shows an average of more than 20 per cent. interest or annual income upon this immense capital; and the half of the capital of New England is not engaged in manufactures either.

I give here some of his figures, from which it will be seen that the profits of the carpet industry are more than 20 per cent. net to capital.

In the entire country there are about two hundred and sixty thousand manufacturing establishments of all kinds, employing two million seven hundred and fifty thousand people. The total capital invested in 1880 was nearly three billions of dollars. The total value of all material used was about three and one-half billion dollars, while the aggregate annual value of the products thereof was over five and one-half billion dollars. The share that the six New England States, with less than one-thirteenth of the population of the country, take in this combined manufacturing industry of the Union is that of about thirty-five thousand manufactories, or over one-eighth of all, and they employ six hundred and fifty thousand people, more than one-fifth of all.

Of the total capital invested they employ within their own borders over six hundred and fifty millions, more than one-fifth of all; of the total value of materials used they consume nearly seven hundred millions, over one-sixth of the whole; and they yield in products of manufacture nearly twelve hundred millions of dollars, about one-fifth of all. And yet it is coolly proposed by hostile legislation to strike down this great wealth-producing, tax-paying section of our country, the section from which came the money to bind the Eastern States to the Pacific Ocean with bands of iron, which out of her abundance has built Western railroads and Western cities, and which to-day stands with open hand and generous purse ready to help rehabilitate the South whenever in good faith she is invited so to do.

And again:

The manufacture of carpets in the United States has been largely developed during the period of the high tariff. We now successfully compete with the best manufacturers of Europe, in Brussels, ingrain, Wilton, Axminster, Venetian, tapestry, velvet, cottage, and Dutch carpets, as well as rugs, druggets, lastings, and serges. The country has invested a capital of twenty-two millions of dollars in these manufactures of wool, which give employment to twenty-one thousand people, whose wages are upward of seven millions of dollars annually.

The materials used include thirty-five million pounds of foreign wool, two million pounds of domestic wool, twenty-five million pounds of scoured wool, inclusive of waste and shoddy, besides about fifty million pounds of mohair and camel's hair. These materials, together with chemicals, dye-stuffs, etc., cost the manufacturers about twenty millions a year, and the finished product sells for about thirty-three millions of dollars.

In this industry the New England States have invested eight millions of dollars, more than one-third of the whole, and they give employment to five thousand people, paying them over three millions of dollars annually. They use nearly one-half of the foreign wool, thus being the heaviest tariff payers, and also use almost one-half of the scoured wool. Their annual production is worth, at wholesale prices, over ten millions of dollars, or nearly one-third of the total product of the country.

The gentleman tells us, also, that New England has much of her capital invested in railroads in the South, and then he winds up by telling us that with all this capital which her people have in savings-banks, etc., they are now ready, when invited in good faith, to come South and invest it there; that is, to let us have it to build up our resources. If he were here, I wanted to ask him whether they were going to let us have this capital without interest, because from what I know of New England I suspect that if this capital is permitted to come South, they will expect a very good return for it, and we shall have that to pay. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I have his figures here. I have not time to refer to them in detail.

Mr. MILLIKEN. As the gentleman is speaking of New England, of which I happen to be in small part a representative, will he allow me a word? Can he cite to us instances where New England has accumulated great returns from her investments in the South? And can he not cite to us some very conspicuous instances where New England has lost all her investments in the South by reason of repudiation by Southern States and by people of the South of debts which they honestly owed to New England for money which New England people had honestly invested there?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Trying to befog the issue by going back to repudiation. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. Well, repudiation is a pretty sad thing for the man whose debts are repudiated; it may be nice, it may be a joke for the repudiator, but it is a pretty earnest thing for us.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. How much did you ever invest in the South? [Laughter.] I will pay your part of it now, and that will settle the matter between you and me. You may draw upon me this evening for whatever may have been the amount of your investments that have been repudiated by the South.

Mr. MILLIKEN. There are friends of mine who had a good deal of money invested in your State, and who never realized a cent from it.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Well, I will tell you why your people never got their money.

Mr. MILLIKEN. It was because your people repudiated the debt.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. The case is like that of a man who bought some mules at a very high price, and before they were paid for took the benefit of the bankrupt law. The fellow who sold him the mules came along and said, "I can not afford to lose all this money." "Well," said the debtor, "you ought not to have sold your mules so high." [Laughter.] If you people of New England had not charged so much interest on your money, you might have got it back; but you wanted too much; we could not pay your demands; you bankrupted and broke us. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. But my friend has not answered my question. I asked him to specify cases where the South has paid usury to New England. I would like to know the individual instances.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. We are paying them all the time; we are paying them now upon the railroad investments down there and other investments in the South.

Mr. MILLIKEN. The gentleman can not particularize.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I had intended to speak further of the statements of the gentleman from New Hampshire when I was led off by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN], who never fails to lead off. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from New Hampshire, after reciting the acquisitions of New England, which are marvelous, says that the New England hen lays more eggs than the Southern hen [laughter], and the New England cow gives more milk than the Southern cow. I do not know exactly how the fact is. They say that the New England hen is not protected against the pauper hen of Canada. Some gentleman here told us about how many dozen eggs were brought in from Canada last year; the number, I believe, was fourteen million dozen or fourteen hundred million dozen, I do not remember which; and what is a difference of a few hundred million dozen eggs in a debate like this? [Laughter.]

I have been trying to figure it out how the New England hen did so much better than the Southern hen. I understand they have got a patent hen-nest in which they deceive the hen into laying a great many more eggs. [Laughter.] You have heard of the patent hen-nest where, after the hen has laid an egg, they have the nest so arranged that the egg slips out of sight, and the hen gets up, looks round, and not seeing any egg goes back and lays another. [Laughter and applause.] That is the only way in which I can figure it out that the New England hen does so much better than the Southern hen. But I will tell you about our Southern cows and our Southern hens, that the eggs they do lay and the milk they do give are genuine eggs and milk. [Laughter and applause.] No fiction about it, we practice no fraud on our hens.

Now, Mr. Chairman, when I heard the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] on New England, felicitating himself about the condition, there, it reminded me of a correspondence I was reading a few days ago between Miss Anastasia Pugsley and Miss Gemima Morgrige, in which Miss Anastasia, felicitating herself upon the domesticity of her surroundings, said she was never in her life so happy as in the contemplation of drinking her own milk, and fattening her own calves, and laying her own eggs. [Great laughter and applause.] She would have been competent to enter the Home Market Club of Boston. [Laughter.]

By the way, I will say to my friend from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY], just in front of me, who has visited the Home Market Club of Boston, recently that I received a circular from it a few days ago from that club. I wish to call the attention of the committee to it. It is an interesting document. I think I have it here somewhere. Yes; here it is.

I will read it. It is from the Home Market Club of Boston, and I suppose we have all received a copy. And I wish to say right here, if there is anybody who is not posted on the subject of the tariff and the effect this sort of legislation is going to have on the infant industries of the country, he is without excuse, for if the same diligence and the same effort were made to convert the heathen by sending out gospel tracts and pamphlets that have been resorted to by the friends of protection we would have had the millennium long before this. [Laughter.]

What are the objects of the Home Market Club of Boston? Let me read:

The object of the executive committee has been to arouse the attention of the public to the dangers surrounding the all-important interests of New England sustained by the protective tariff.

The all-important industries of New England! If the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FORAN] would lend me that poetry of his I would say—

No pent-up Utica contracts our powers.
The whole boundless New England is ours.

That is New England. [Laughter.] What is the object of the Home Market Club?

Mr. FORAN. If the gentleman would confine himself to my speech he would get along a good deal better.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. In exposing the absurdities of the gentleman's speech I could spend several hours, but I do not wish to take up that time, as I do not think the gentleman's speech made much impression.

Here is another extract from that Home Market Club circular:

The dinners given by the club at the Hotel Vendome to Senators FRYE, HOAR, and SHERMAN, and Congressmen MCKINLEY, GOFF, and BUTTERWORTH have been widespread in their influence, and the public meetings which have been held in many parts of the State have been equally successful in arousing public sentiment to the importance of the issue before the country.

I want to warn you, gentlemen, about those dinners. [Laughter.] The same mail which brought me that circular brought me the record with the letter of Mr. Murat Halstead apologizing for being a member of the Cobden Club. He said he was at a whitebait dinner over there which got him into it. [Laughter.] I have his apology here, and will read it.

Hon. C. A. BOUTELLE,
House of Representatives:

The story that I am a member of the Cobden Club is correct. One night in London with Cyrus Field, a personal friend of Cobden, I boarded a small steamboat at Westminster and was carried to Greenwich. There we had a whitebait dinner, twelve courses of fish and as good cold champagne as was ever drank in Maine. It was a lovely dinner. There was a distinguished man in the chair and a toast-master who whooped things up and made them lively. I made a speech about the white wings of commerce on the ocean and the large rivers in America, and the distance Cincinnati was from salt water, and the indifference of her people on the tariff question.

He gives that as his excuse for getting into the Cobden Club. [Laughter.] I expect in the course of a few years, when this policy of protection, of which the gentlemen who visited the Boston Home Market Club are such devotees, has been exploded, we will find them excusing themselves with the same sort of excuse that Mr. Halstead gives; they will excuse their speeches there by charging it to that splendid dinner the club gave them. Why, we learn from Mr. KELLEY that General Garfield's conversion to the doctrine of protection took place at a dinner in New Orleans. It is wonderful, the effect of these dinners. [Laughter.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. Does the gentleman speak from his own experience?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I speak from the experience of Mr. Halstead and of General Garfield, and the statement of the Home Market Club, all of which has been given.

Mr. Chairman, there are many other things I would like to say, but I find my time is rapidly drawing to a close. I do want, sir, however, to call the attention of this House, not in arrogance, not in a spirit of boastfulness, but in all sincerity, to a few points about the South. I wish I had time to have read to those gentlemen who have been talking about the South here a letter written by a distinguished citizen of my own State on the South, in which he defends it against some charges that have been made on this floor. I refer to Dr. B. F. Ward, of Winona, Miss. Here is what he says. I wish I had time to give you the whole of the letter. He is replying to a letter Prof. Tillett, of Nashville, Tenn.:

No careful observer will probably deny that among the wealthy and fashionable classes at the North there is more idleness and extravagance, more folly and arrogance, more dissipation and vice, and a more impassable barrier between rich and poor than ever existed in the most opulent social circle of slave-holders. For however aristocratic they may have been, they were always courteous and refined. In the North the tendency to divide society on financial lines has grown with constantly increasing intensity for more than half a century, until now it is almost definitely established. The very rich and very poor are as widely separated as Dives and Lazarus. In the old South, on the contrary, there were processes constantly at work, effecting a gradual and steady diffusion of wealth, which preserved in a great measure the homogeneity of society.

Prominent among the agencies were the matrimonial alliances so often contracted between the families of the rich and poor. In fact, it was the rule for the active, intellectual, ambitious young men from the poorer families to marry the daughters of wealthy planters. Instead of attempting to restrain these alliances they were generally encouraged by wealthy parents with a view to preserving the physical and mental vigor of their families without sacrificing their estates. To employ a homely but expressive phrase, "brains and money were constantly combining" to build up and preserve in the old South the finest society in the world, to the exclusion of those twin evils, the millionaire and the tramp.

The fine moral and intellectual organization of Southern children has heretofore been largely due to the fact that their mothers were exempt from the hardships of physical drudgery and the depressing effects of impending want. The poorest man in the South supported his family with comparative ease, because of the gently rising gradations in society and the universal liberality of the stronger toward the weakest. How is it in those countries so long freed from the "curse of slavery," but where mechanical invention is progressively increasing the congestion of wealth and stimulating luxurious living among the rich, while it alarmingly swells the ranks of the hungry laborer, the socialist, and the pauper? Take Massachusetts, the "hub" of free schools, free labor, and boasted intelligence, as a fair representative. The average expenses of laboring men, who are the heads of families, in Massachusetts amount to $754.42, while their earnings average $558.68. In other words, the workingman falls short of a support for his family $195.74, or 32 per cent. It is wrung from the toil of the mother and children, not through the discharge of the ordinary domestic duties of woman's sphere, but in the wages mill. Again he says:

One-third of the enterprises of great pith and moment, rather than the nursery of scribblers. She has made history for others to write and sell. She has carved with the sword the pathway of the pen and made America the stronghold of the Anglo-Saxon race. The first resolutions declaring the right of the colonies to be "free and independent" were introduced into a Southern Legislature by a Southern man. The first resolutions to the same effect were presented in the Colonial Congress by another Southern man, and took form and consistence in the Declaration of Independence, under the matchless genius of still another Southern man. A Southern man led the patriot armies to victory, and established the possibilities of the proudest nation on the earth. A Southern man was prime mover of the convention that framed the Constitution. When the Government had been created, its organic law was still an unexplained book, a ponderous oar in unskilled hands.

It was left for the greatest legal mind of the age, a Southern Chief-Justice, to analyze and stamp upon it the construction which will be accepted as long as the Constitution is respected. A Southern man framed the ordinance for the organization and government of the great Northwestern Territory, an instrument second in importance only to the Constitution of the United States. A Southern man was the author of the Republican theory of popular government which prevailed during the sixty years of our greatest prosperity, peace, and happiness. Of the fifteen Presidents of the Continental Congress, eight were from slave States. From 1789 to 1853, a period of sixty-four years, embracing eleven administrations, the slave States furnished eight Presidents, whose terms of service covered fifty-two years.

During the same time the free States furnished three Presidents, whose combined terms covered twelve years. Of twelve Vice-Presidents, four were from slave States. Under these eleven administrations, the slave States supplied fourteen Secretaries of State, eleven Secretaries of War, six Secretaries of the Treasury, nine Secretaries of the Navy, and eight Postmaster-Generals. Of fifty-five Presidents *pro tempore* of the Senate, thirty-one Speakers of the House, twenty-two were from slave States. Of five Chief-Justices, two, and the only two of great eminence, were from slave States. Of twenty-nine Associate-Justices, seventeen were from slave States. Of twenty-one Attorney-Generals, fourteen were from slave States. Of one hundred and eighty-five public ministers to foreign countries, ninety-nine were from slave States.

Without going further into exhaustive details, for which material is abundant and overwhelming, we affirm, without fear of decent denial, that along the lines of these fifty-two years are ranged all the broad and lofty conceptions of statesmanship, all the bold and fruitful enterprises, all the grand and comprehensive achievements from which have evolved the pride, the power, and the glory of the American people.

The war of 1812 was scarcely less important in its results than the war of independence. The one left us an embryonic nation; the other developed full-grown power, wiping out the results of twenty-five years, planting our flag upon the ocean and dissolving every doubt in the minds of foreign powers that we were a government, *de facto*, and entitled to a place in the front rank of nations. This war, we are told by a Northern historian, "was a Southern measure for the protection of Northern interests;" yet it was inaugurated and pressed to a triumphant issue under the administration of a Southern slaveholder, supported by a "solid South," in the face of the almost solid opposition of the free States. Who were the master spirits of that struggle? Such men as Clay, Calhoun, Monroe, Grundy, Lowndes, and Crawford; while only five Senators north of the Delaware voted to sustain it.

In the gloomiest and most critical days of the conflict, New England, which "writes all the books," was holding a secession convention, denouncing the war and intriguing with the emissaries of Great Britain. As a consequence, when England sent her powerful fleet to invest our ports, she exempted the coast of New England from the operations of the blockade. When the success of the war had established its popularity in the free States, a Southern man formulated the financial policy which extinguished its immense debt in less than twenty years.

Under these same "slothful and demoralizing" auspices of slavery the great Indian wars were fought, their magnificent country opened to white settlement, the savages removed, and measures adopted for their civilization. Florida was acquired from Spain, and from France that vast domain, the Louisiana Territory, comprising more than one million square miles, greater in extent and richer in resources than the whole territory of the then existing United States, and giving us the sole ownership of the Mississippi River from its sources to the Gulf. This one achievement, conceived and accomplished by a Southern President, through the supreme skill and courage of a Southern diplomatist, overshadows in its stupendous proportions, outweighs in the vastness of its results every national measure presented by Northern statesmanship and secured by Northern enterprise since the landing at Plymouth Rock. It was this far-reaching stroke of Southern diplomacy which elicited from the great Napoleon the prophetic remark that the "acquisition of Louisiana forever strengthens the power of the United States and gives to England a maritime rival that will some day humble her pride."

The war for the independence of Texas and the administration of its government by its Southern Presidents was another manifestation of the "slothful energies" of the "dependent idlers" and "overseers." The war with Mexico and the annexation of Texas were assailed by the free States with the same vehement opposition which they had presented to the last war with England; but a Southern President again held the helm, the pluck and patriotism of the "gentlemen idlers" once more prevailed, and Columbia took in her embrace the giant of whom it has been graphically said: "If Texas were laid on the face of Europe, with the head resting on the mountains of Norway, one palm covering London and the other Warsaw, it would stretch across the kingdom of Denmark, across the empires of Germany and Austria, across Northern Italy, and bathe its feet in the Mediterranean."

It is capable of producing 12,000,000 bales of cotton and will have a cattle range left larger than the whole State of New York. This war, prosecuted by the enervated, non-progressive "overseers," gathered into the national domain also the Territory of New Mexico, itself larger than the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; extended the national boundary to the Pacific, and opened to the world the Golden Gate of California.

Mr. Tillet, in his haste to elevate the new South by degrading the old, forgets that most of the representative men of the new South, her Senators, Congressmen, Cabinet officers, governors, judges, jurists, leading journalists, college professors, eminent divines, and successful men of business in every line were born and educated under the "curse of slavery." There is no new South. The term is a misnomer and a myth. It is simply a phrase costume in which old prejudices masquerade through modern prints, seeking to pervert the education of Southern children into the conviction that their ancestors, if not criminal, were little more than a race of "idiots," blunderers, blockheads, and failures. But the present or future generations will never find reason to be ashamed of the brainwork of the old South.

But I want to take a little time to talk about the constituency I represent here. Our great staple product, Mr. Chairman, is cotton. We raise cotton for sale, and we sell it in the markets of the world. The Government fixes no price and makes no law that requires any man to pay more for that cotton than we can get for it in Liverpool.

I wish I had time to explain fully to some of you gentlemen who have not seen it the process of making cotton. We commence getting ready for it in January, and we get through with the crop about February in the next succeeding year. We bed the ground, put the seed in, and the cotton comes up.

First the cold nights come and nip it, then the cotton becomes "possum eared," then it takes "sore-shin," then it gets "lousy" [laughter]; the cut-worms cut it down, and it does seem in spite of all the planter can do that he is going to lose his crop of cotton. Then after passing through these trials grass begins to come and he has to work it out, and he has the greatest trouble in the world in saving a stand. If he gets it through this stage then he has got the drought and the flood, the cyclone and the simoon, to contend against; but if he gets through these difficulties and he gets his cotton up, then it begins to "rust," the red rust or the black rust; then it begins to blight; then comes frenching and the shedding of squares and forms; then comes the

"army-worm," and then the "boll-worm;" then if it escapes all these, when it begins to open the rains and winds come and knock it out and get it dirty; that injures the price. Now, with all these difficulties to be encountered, it can readily be seen that he has great difficulty in reaching what he started out in the spring to get. He never makes as much as he thought he would or ought to make.

But, then, if he escapes all these and gets through with it, he begins to gather the cotton in the fall. I wish I had time to tell you about how these crops were produced just after the war; with what sort of horses and tools we made the cotton out of which you gathered that $68,000,000 now lying in your Treasury as the cotton tax. I know all about it, for with these "lily-white hands" I helped to make it. [Laughter and applause.]

But then the man who has gone through with all of these things takes his children, after the crop is open, and gathers it; and he hauls it to the gin-house and gins it and packs it into bales and takes it to market. A few bales only he gets, for the best he can do, the result of his own labor and that of his family for a whole year, is from three to five bales, which will be an average yield for a small family, and it brings him from $40 to $50 per bale, or $150 to $250 for his crop. Now, gentlemen, tell me is it exactly the right thing to say to that man when he takes that cotton to market, "Sir, you must contribute 47 per cent. of what you buy, or 25 per cent., or any other per cent.—I do not care what it is—to enable the capitalists in New England to get 22 per cent. on their investment?"

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman allow me a question for information? I do not wish to interrupt him——

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. If I can have my time extended I should be very glad to do so.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I hope the gentleman's time will be extended. I desire to ask him a question upon this very subject of the New England manufacturers, and to whom he says the cotton producers pay 40 or 47 per cent., which he alleges to be extorted from them. Is it not true that the goods that your Southern people buy from these manufacturers are sold to them to-day at a reduction of 30 per cent. from what they were a few years ago, and for less than they bought them before the tariff was imposed? And do they not get a much better price for their cotton than they got for it before the war?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Let me give you a little statement. You all say that the tariff makes cheaper goods?

Mr. MILLIKEN. It is an absolute fact.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. And they tell us in the next breath that it is necessary to keep up the tariff to enable the manufacturer to get a better price for his goods and to enable him to pay higher wages for his labor. Now, I have no doubt a statesman can see through that; but just to a common country fellow like myself, you know [laughter]—"now you see it and now you don't see it" [laughter]—there is a great deal of thimble-rigging about that to my mind. "You must keep up the tariff to keep up prices; but the tariff brings down prices." I do not see the logic of that. If the tariff brings down prices what do the manufacturers want with a tariff?

Mr. GUENTHER. Because you are color blind.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Well, you say it is, but I can not see it.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Read history and you will find it is so.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Yes, it is like most of the facts you give us upon this subject.

Now, gentlemen, I want to say we have been told, and told here upon this floor, here in this debate, that "the tariff has made New England what it is, and is going to give you people in the South, whenever you accept all the beneficial provisions, all that great prosperity that pertains to New England." To hear these gentlemen talk you would suppose that they put the tariff upon the same ground as the plan of salvation; it is a thing you have to accept in order to get the benefit of it. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, we have been going on with this thing for the last fifty years. When these men take their cotton to market and the man gets back home, and his wife and little children gather around him and ask, "What did you bring us back for this cotton we helped to make?" "Well," he says, "not much, because I had to pay my debts and my taxes, and then I had to pay 47 per cent. of my cotton crop to enable the manufacturer of New England to get 22 or 25 or 50 per cent. on his capital invested in manufacturing."

Take the figures produced here by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] and say if he did not show by those figures what I am now stating. If the statistics do not show that they do not show anything. And gentlemen are ready enough to rely on the census and other statistics when they are in their favor.

Mr. FORAN. Allow me to say——

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. You have had your say. I do not yield.

When the little girl of that cotton-planter retires at night do not you reckon she prays, "O, Lord, be merciful to the manufacturer of New England and hasten the day when he will get enough to allow us to have some of the proceeds of our cotton to bring home at Christmas time to buy a few of the luxuries of life?" [Laughter.]

Mr. BAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. My time has nearly expired.

Mr. BAYNE. We will extend your time. Is the price of cotton fixed at London or at Boston?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. It is fixed at Liverpool.

Mr. BAYNE. Does not the British manufacturer treat you in the same way as the Boston manufacturer?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Yes; but he does not levy any tariff on us. It is the Boston man who gets the tariff, not the British man. [Applause.] If the Boston man gave us any more for our cotton than the Britisher, it would be a reasonable exchange, but he does not. [Applause.]

I said a while ago they have been telling us all along for years and years back, all this is going to come back to you after a while; we will give you a home market and your money will find its way back to your pockets. Well, gentleman, let me tell you about that. I had a letter yesterday morning giving me the names of several old veterans in my State who fought in the Seminole wars, who fought in the Indian disturbances and Mexican war, and who are now very old. Old man Hiram Richardson, Capt. Benjamin Lorridge, old man Johnnie Phillips, Mr. Sam Ross, Mr. Thomas Cunningham—whole lot of old men down there who fought the battles of your country years ago, and are now old and some of them poor. They have been paying out their money for the benefit of New England for fifty years, and are going to die before it gets back to them. Would it not be a little better to allow these old men to keep their own money?

A MEMBER. They can not take it with them.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. No, they can not take it with them, as the gentleman suggests. That is the trouble. But they might have some of the pleasures and some of the benefits while they are here—if they could keep what they work for. But gentlemen on that side say it is going to come back. These old men and their sons and daughters have been deprived of the advantages they might have had but for the iniquities of the tariff. It will never get back. My doctrine is to let every man keep his own money and spend it as he pleases, unless it is necessary for the support of the Government.

Is it exactly the right thing to do to take that money away from these people to add to the profits of capital? You talk to me about capital. I have no prejudice against capital. But a gentleman passed me here the other day with a petition in his hand protesting against the passage of the Mills bill, and he said there were 320 names on it, representing $350,000,000. And that has been heralded here as a reason why this bill should not pass. Suppose I had brought here a petition signed by 320 poor honest citizens of my district—I could have brought one signed by 20,000 of them. Suppose I presented such a petition; no one on that side would have attached any importance to it. But I say, for my part, I care more for the capital of the man whose capital is his sweat, whose capital is his muscle, whose capital is his energy; I say that appeals more to me than the petition signed by 320 names representing $350,000,000, making a protest against this legislation, and demanding more of the blood, more of the sweat, more of the energy of the toiling masses of this country than they have been getting already. When such a petition comes I spit upon it with contempt; 320 men having $350,000,000 can afford surely to rest on moderate profits. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, they tell us to "Hold on, hold on; this thing will come out all right. It is a little hard on you people now, but it is the making of the home market; it is the making of New England." It reminds me of the old chestnut—you have all heard it—but it illustrates the point as well as a new one would, of the young fellow who took his daddy out to help him train his dog to be a bear-dog. The old fellow acted as the bear; the puppy got the old man by the nose and was giving him fits, when he shouted to the boy, "Help, come take him off." "Oh," said the boy, "daddy, hold on, stand it, it is hard on you, but it is the making of the pup. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GUENTHER. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Mississippi be extended.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I am very much obliged to the committee, because, although I do not wish to tire the gentlemen present or to trespass upon the time of those who are to follow me, there are one or two other things that I do wish to call attention to in connection with these protests that have been received from the manufacturers against the passage of this Mills bill. I remember that a few years ago when our people, many of them, were shaking with chills and malarial fever, because they were not able to buy quinine at $3.50 an ounce, a proposition was made here by some benevolent gentleman to give them free quinine. The subject has been referred to before in this debate but I want to bring to the attention of you gentlemen whose hearts are moved by the appeals that are coming in from the manufacturers the circumstances surrounding that quinine legislation.

When that bill was before the House it gave rise to some discussion, and I find that one gentleman [Mr. BINGHAM] said: "It is a bill

that ought not to pass." Mr. Chairman, what was the condition of affairs at that time? Quinine was selling at $3.50 an ounce, and the duty upon it was 20 per cent. What is the condition now? Why, sir, it is selling, I believe, at from 35 to 50 cents an ounce. Now, if I were to adopt the protectionists' mode of argument, I would ascribe this entire reduction from $3.50 to 50 cents an ounce to taking off the duty, but I will not indulge in any such absurdity. In passing I want to say a word about the arguments of the protectionists. I commenced my speech by saying that I thought taxation was a curse, to be resorted to only as a matter of necessity, but if the protectionists are right, all my early training and ideas on that subject are at fault. I was reading some time ago that beautiful but depressing story written by Dr. Johnson, "Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia." Dr. Johnson begins the tale, you remember, by saying: "Ye who listen with credulity to the whispers of fancy and pursue with eagerness the phantoms of hope, who expect age will perform the promises of youth, and that the deficiencies of the present day will be supplied by the morrow attend to the history of Rasselas, Prince of Abyssinia."

Then he goes on with the story and tells how the prince escaped from the happy garden and wandered off all over the world and visited all the wise men of the earth in search of the true secret of perfect happiness and prosperity. He went everywhere, and finally came back to the happy valley feeling like Solomon of old, that all was vanity and vexation of spirit.

But, sir, what a pity it is that he had not met a modern protectionist! The whole question would have been solved for him at once. He would have asked: "What is the secret of universal happiness and prosperity?" and the answer would have been, "Taxation! Taxation!" That answers the whole question. Every good that has come to the people of this country is ascribed to tariff taxation. Tell me of a single solitary benefit that they do not attribute to protection. There is not one. But I started out to tell you about the quinine. [Laughter.] Mr. BINGHAM said "it is a bill that ought not to pass," but a vote was taken on the bill.

Before that vote was taken, however, the quinine people sent in their protest, and that is what I want to call attention to now. I have here the original protest sent to the Committee on Ways and Means with the autograph signatures of the quinine manufacturers predicting what would be the results of the enactment of the bill. I wish gentlemen could read it all. It is on the stereotyped plan of the protests of the manufacturers of to-day who are sending their protests against the Mills bill, gotten up very much like the protests against the reduction of the duty on curled hair, very much after the order of the protests against the reduction of the duty on bone-black, and other such protests that have come here from time to time.

Now, what do these gentlemen (the manufacturers) say about quinine? They ask:

> Why should objection be made to a duty of 20 per cent.? Why should the chemical industry be singled out to be ruined?

They are going to be ruined, you see.

> Will the consumer be benefited? We assert most emphatically he will not. Prices will fluctuate; average rates will be as high or higher than they have been during the existence of the protective tariff. But even should the wholesale price be as low as now at times, a consumer using it in small quantities will get no benefit from it. In whose interest, then, is the duty to be reduced?

And so they go on and say that it will close their works, that it will be the last of the quinine industry in this country, and that the people of this country will then have to pay a good deal more for their quinine than they are paying, and they figure out exactly how the increase will be made and how the people will have to pay a great deal more. Well, I see by the RECORD that some gentlemen were "taken in" by that appeal. I see that my neighbor from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] voted against free quinine. I see that Mr. BINGHAM voted against it. I see that Mr. BURROWS voted against it.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman, but I wish to inquire of the Chair if the time of the gentleman from Mississippi was extended without limit.

The CHAIRMAN. It was extended without any limit being made, which, in the absence of any other understanding, would mean that it was extended for one hour.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I will put a limit on it myself pretty soon. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, to continue this quinine case. I see that Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania, voted against free quinine; I see that Mr. PHELPS voted against free quinine, a gentleman who, I noticed in the papers this morning, made a few disinterested remarks the other day to the colored men in favor of protection, and urged them to stand by protection for the sake of their colored brethren in the South. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Is it not a fact that the cinchona bark from which quinine is made is not and can not be produced in this country, and that when quinine was put on the free-list, except in so far as the manufacture was concerned, it was like putting coffee and tea on the free-list, or any other article that we can not produce here? And, that being so, was it not an act directly in the line of the protective policy to put quinine on the free-list?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. No, sir; they manufacture quinine here from the bark; and here is the protest of these protectionists against reducing the duty on quinine, because it would destroy that industry in which so many men were engaged and which such good wages were paid.

Mr. MILLIKEN. But is the bark produced here?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. No, sir. But the duty was not on the bark; it was on the quinine, the manufactured article. [Laughter].

Mr. MILLIKEN. But there would have been no duty on quinine if the bark had not existed.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Now, is not that a wise answer? "There would be no quinine if there were no bark." That is about on a par with the protectionist's ordinary ideas.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Do you dispute the proposition?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. No, sir.

Mr. DAVIS. As the time of the gentleman from Mississippi has been extended, will he allow me a question?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Oh, yes.

Mr. DAVIS. I understood the gentleman to take the position that his constituents are very much burdened and oppressed by the increased cost of dry goods—cotton cloth.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. We are on quinine now. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS. I know you are on that now, but you were on the other a while ago. I do not know much about quinine, because I am out of the medical business now, but I know some little about cotton cloth. I wish the gentleman to state whether he has any idea how much his people are oppressed by the tariff on cotton goods—how much more the gentleman pays for his cotton goods than the Englishman pays at his own home.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Does quinine hurt you, doctor, that you want to get me away from it? [Laughter.]

Mr. DAVIS. I suppose the gentleman understands my question. I will let him stick to quinine, if he prefers it.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Very well; I prefer it.

Mr. KERR. In regard to quinine, is it not true that since the removal of the tariff on this article there has been discovered a process of obtaining the bark without killing the tree, as was formerly done? Is not that the fact?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. It is the fact, as I understand; but that is not the thing I am talking about. I am talking about the assertion of these people engaged in manufacturing quinine that if the duty were removed we would kill the industry and thereby deprive of employment and wages the laborers engaged in that manufacture. I am not talking about killing the tree; that was not the objection which was made.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman allow me now to turn to the question of cotton goods?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I am not through with quinine yet.

Mr. DAVIS. Oh, very well.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. Will the gentleman from Mississippi allow a namesake and friend to make a suggestion?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. Will not the gentleman from Mississippi limit his time so far as to decline to allow his remarks to be broken in upon by further questions? I ask this in behalf of gentlemen who have an interest in being heard after the gentleman from Mississippi has concluded.

Several MEMBERS. That is fair.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I hope the gentleman will limit himself, and not allow anybody to interrupt him.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I shall not occupy, I think, more than fifteen minutes. Of course, if I want to give some part of that to Mr. DAVIS or some other member, there will be no objection.

I want to say something further in regard to this quinine business. Senator MORRILL, who, as gentlemen know, is an authority on the subject of tariff, said, when this bill taking off the duty was passed in the Senate:

> Then, Mr. President, it is manifest that the parties concerned in this business have already engaged a large amount of raw material. They will be closed at once, although the duty is but 20 per cent. on the article.

Now, here is the moral in this thing; I want you all to bear it in mind. The quinine manufacturers sent their protest here, asserting that if this duty of 20 per cent. upon quinine were removed their factories would be closed and their men thrown out of employment and the price of quinine would be higher. The friends of protection in the House and the Senate made the same declaration, that the effect would be to close that business. Now, I want you gentlemen to take in this point: If this prediction, made by those who desired the duty on quinine continued, was not fulfilled; if the manufacturers went on and increased their business in spite of the removal of the duty; if thus the gentlemen who voted against putting quinine on the free-list were mistaken, may they not be mistaken about curled hair and black bones and other things? [Laughter.]

Is it exactly the right thing for a man who has been so badly mis-

taken about quinine to set up his judgment now as infallible in regard to the effects of a reduction upon other branches of business, and to protest against any reduction of the tariff? Why, sir, here are Powers & Weightman, who, we are told, would be thrown out of business, whose employés, we were informed, would be turned loose; why, sir, as the history of this industry shows, their factory was burned out soon after this removal of the duty, yet they have prospered to such an extent that they have rebuilt their factory, the labor engaged in the manufacture of quinine has increased, and wages have not diminished.

Mr. GUENTHER. Is the gentleman quite sure that the statement he has just made is correct?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. That is my understanding.

Mr. GUENTHER. It may be your understanding; but I do not think you are right.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I know that the firm is still in business, for I had a circular from them a day or two ago.

Mr. GUENTHER. They are in business; but the gentleman must bear in mind that they manufacture a great many other articles than quinine.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. But they are still in the quinine business.

Mr. GUENTHER. To some extent, certainly. But I know of one establishment that removed their factory to Cassel, in Germany, in consequence of the abolition of the duty.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. And several others were set up here in its place.

Mr. GUENTHER. I want to ask the gentleman whether he ascribes the lowering of the price of quinine to the removal of the duty.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Not wholly.

Mr. GUENTHER. Well, I am glad the gentleman does not.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I do not ascribe it to that cause wholly, because 20 per cent. would not take off $3 from $3.50. But here is the thing I have been trying to impress upon the gentlemen—this removal of the duty did not break up the business.

Mr. GUENTHER. To some extent it did.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. No, sir. The business is better than it was before; there are more people engaged in it, and more money is paid out for wages.

Mr. DAVIS. As an economical question the tariff on dry goods is far more important. There are hundreds of millions of dollars of capital invested in their manufacture in New England. Now, how much does your proposed tariff impose upon the Mississippi planter or the laborer by the tariff on cotton goods?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. I do not know; but I do know the gentlemen on that side of the House deny it imposes any, and here is the thing I told you some time ago I could not understand. If it does not make the price higher what in the name of common sense do you want protection for? [Applause.]

Mr. DAVIS. I wish to ask you the extent of the burden which is put upon the Mississippi planter or laborer by the tariff on cotton goods. I would like him to answer, if he knows, the amount of that burden. If not, with his permission I will state the extent of it, as shown by the comparison made by Mr. Carroll Wright, the Commissioner of Labor, of the comparative cost of dry goods in Massachusetts and Great Britain:

Dry goods.—From the high, medium high, medium, medium low, and low prices for dry goods, we secure two percentages, both in favor of Great Britain. If all goods in all grades are compared we find that dry goods were 13.26 per cent. higher in Massachusetts in 1883 than in Great Britain. If the comparison is made on the basis of all goods in the medium, medium low, and low grades, from which workingmen obtain their supplies, the figure in favor of Great Britain is .9, or less than 1 per cent.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

This is the cost in Great Britain and Massachusetts, respectively. It would cost something of course to get those goods across the water. That is the cost, and with the revenue tariff the cost to the consumer should not be higher here than there.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. How about the other 4,000 articles in the tariff?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. You see, doctor, the trouble is we are forced to buy them from you people. But I do not wish to lose my time, as I have a great many other things to say; and I wish especially to make some remarks about the practice of forming "trusts." Gentlemen say they form trusts in reference to things not protected. That is true; and those are commodities of this country alone. But they form trusts on things which are protected. And right here I will take a minute or two to refer to the gentleman from San Francisco [Mr. MORROW]. I believe he sent up a wail here the other day about the failure of Coleman & Co., whose borax production was about to be interfered with by this tariff bill. Because of that he said they had failed. I have the thing right here and would like to refer to it.

Now, here is one of the complaints against the Mills bill. The failure of that firm is attributed as a result of the Mills bill. I see it stated in the public prints that Mr. Coleman had signed an agreement for his firm limiting the total production of borax from 3,800,000 tons to 1,200,000 tons, under which arrangement the price had risen from 3 cents to 6 and 8 cents.

Mr. MORROW. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Certainly.

Mr. MORROW. Before the native article was produced in the market the price for forty years was never less than 28 cents, and from that they have reduced it to 6½ cents.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Before it was produced in the market. Who produced it? God produced it. It does not need any protection. It is mined and taken out of the earth. It is not produced.

These gentlemen who had the control of this borax production have formed trusts and agreed, as I have said, that only so much shall be produced in order to keep the price up. But it seems that the Mills bill has struck that down in some way. I say, "Go for them, every mother's son of them." [Laughter.] And if there can be no worse charge made against the Mills bill than that it has destroyed these trusts and every man engaged in them, I say it has done a grand good wook. Only go on and keep doing the same thing, and when all these trusts have been broken down we will have a general revival of business all over the country. I wish I had words with which I could burn them on the language of Mr. Touts I would cook 'em. [Laughter and applause.]

But let us see how this firm of Coleman & Co. have been broken down by the Mills bill. The assets of the firm are stated to be $4,500,000, and their liabilities at $2,000,000. I wish you would break me to-morrow in the same way. [Laughter.] Yet these people are complaining of the injury done to the production of borax, while the poor laboring people in the country are oppressed with taxation and demanding relief from that taxation.

Ah, gentlemen, this may be a menace, it may be a menace to the trusts of this country, and I thank God it is; but it is a menace that every honest consumer and every tax-payer will hail with delight. I wish, Mr. Chairman, I could say all that I feel on this subject. I here give you a table of the protected interests that have formed a trust to put up prices on the people. It will be seen that the average protection which the tariff allows these eighteen trusts is 30 per cent., while the average cost of labor is 24 per cent., which gives them a bonus of 6 per cent. after paying for all the labor:

Name of trust.	Protected by duties averaging, per cent.	Adjusted to guaranty a bonus in each $100 of product amounting to—	Their whole expense for labor in $100 worth of product being—
Salt trust	50	$33	$25
Earthenware trust	56	36	40
Bessemer-steel trust	84	46	3
Plow-steel trust	45	33	29
General steel trust	45	33	29
Nail trust	45	33	29
General iron trust	45	33	25
Copper trust	24	22	12
Zinc trust	52	28	25
Tin trust	32	24	21
Lead trust	74	43	6
Glass trust	55	36	40
Soap trust	26	19	8
Linseed-oil trust	54	35	5
Rubber-shoe trust	25	20	24
Envelope trust	25	20	11
Paper-bag trust	35	26	15
Cordage trust	25	20	12
Average		30	24

This speech has been made pursuant to some notification which I gave on yesterday, but in the disconnected and disjointed way in which I have talked I am afraid it will pan out very much like the speech of a friend of mine. He telegraphed me that he had made a speech, and for me to buy the papers the next morning and that I would find out about it. The papers had always been very kind to my friend, and I had no doubt they would have a good word to say for him, so I bought a paper. It was not very comforting. [Laughter.] It said he had been called upon at a public meeting to make a speech, but he was evidently not prepared. [Great laughter.]

I had intended in speaking about the cotton culture, and what the cotton planters of the South had done for this country, to show, I have the statistics here, something of what these people—the conton-planters and the laborers of the South—have done for the country in planting and rearing cotton. Why, sir, they have produced more than one hundred million bales of cotton since the close of the war, and brought into this country the enormous sum of nearly $5,000,000,000 from exports, besides furnishing to the manufactories of New England the sinews with which to carry on their immense manufactu ring enterprises. Think of it that these thriftless Southern cotton planters, as you are pleased to call them, have furnished for export nearly $5,000,000,000 worth of cotton since the war. This has kept the balance of

trade in favor of this country, it has filled your Treasury with gold and enabled your Government in a most critical financial period to resume specie payment. I wish I had time to read you some interesting statistical tables I have prepared on this subject.

Do they not deserve some consideration? Are they to be turned out of this Hall with the statement that they come from a race of people that are bound hand and foot by prejudice? Ah, sir, I wish I had time to go into that whole question, but I do not desire to detain the House further. I only wish to say that I do not care in which end of the Capitol the gentleman stands up to say it, but for the people of the South I assert that he who intimates or charges that they have any aspirations inconsistent with the honor and the glory of this country, or the prosperity and the welfare of all of its people, he either does not know whereof he speaks, or he willfully and maliciously perverts the truth, and slanders a brave and honorable people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

We can not, sir, have all the wealth of New England, and while we glory in their wealth and their prosperity I must say that when I am told about it I feel a little like the man who said that he saw but little consolation to him to be told that he and Jay Gould had a hundred millions of dollars if Jay Gould had all of it. [Laughter and applause.] And while the prosperity of New England is a great thing, and a thing to be bragged about and all that, it is a poor consolation to know that New England has all the wealth and the prosperity and we are constantly being twitted with our poverty.

Why, what are the Southern people? They are a people who would like to avail themselves of all the privileges that are within their reach. Gentlemen are attempting to make them out as a stubborn people, and a people who will not reach out their hands and take what is offered. When I hear the gentleman from New Hampshire and the gentleman from Ohio coming up here and making love to each other, billing and cooing, it reminds me, and if I had my voice I would give it to you in song, of the cooing of Bettina and Pippo in the Mascot, when New England says: "I my factories love," and Ohio responds, "And I my sheep," and New England says, "When they make their biggest gobble, gobble, gobble" [great laughter], and Ohio says, "When they softly bleat, bah, bah." [Renewed laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I will not trespass further upon the time of the House. New England hens may lay more eggs than ours, the New England cows may give more milk than ours, but, sir, we of the South, thank God, though we have not much of this world's goods to brag about, we may not be able to boast of that intelligence in book-writing capacity that some other sections of the country have, but, sir, we have many of the prettiest, many of the best, and the noblest and truest, most virtuous women on God's green earth; and we have got some of the grandest, bravest, best, and most generous men in the world among us. [Great applause.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, if in the course of these few feeble and hurried remarks [laughter] I have said anything that is calculated in the least to reflect on or wound the tender sensibilities of the New England hen or the Ohio sheep, I ask pardon now, sir, and trust it will be granted. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, the many speeches already delivered and yet to be delivered on this question, abounding in figures, tables, and calculations in which the general and local interests of the country have been so ably discussed, have determined me, in the brief time that I shall take, to make only observations, without going into details, as to what would be the general result, in my judgment, if this bill should become a law, and what immediate effect it would have on the people whom I represent.

If we, in the deliberation of this important measure, which it is conceded by all involves the welfare of all the people, would thoughtfully examine each section when under consideration and vote thereon uncontrolled by the dictation of a caucus and uninfluenced by party policy, each member being governed by individual judgment obtained from his own personal observation and from the evidence and arguments advanced, then even this bill might be so perfected that its results would be beneficial.

Right here let me say that in my votes on the different propositions as they come up I shall not allow myself to be controlled by partisan spirit, but shall vote on each one according to my best judgment after being convinced that the vote so cast will be conducive to the interests of the whole people. I recognize that the masses of the Democratic party, who differ so radically with us on this question, are just as patriotic and just as much interested in the welfare, advancement, and glory of our country as those who belong to the party of which I am a member, and that they, in advocating the principle of non-protection, are actuated by pure and patriotic motives. While I have always been considered, and have always been, a firm believer and advocate of the Republican cause, yet I have never allowed party feeling so to sway me that I would not concede to my opponents a love of country and an honesty of purpose.

The President of the United States in sending his message to Congress and placing before the country the issue—shall the customs levied for revenue be so collected as to foster and protect home industries?—and by ranging himself and his party squarely against this proposition, has taken away all the possibilities of a deceptive campaign by his party in the different manufacturing States of this country. For this action he deserves the unqualified praise of every Republican. For years the Democratic party has deceived the people of my district, at least, as to the true status of their party on this question. Even my immediate predecessor, a Democrat, was proclaimed throughout the district a protectionist, and that it was not inconsistent but in accord with the principles of Democracy for him to be so. In vain will the political managers of the Democratic party in the manufacturing States again attempt to inaugurate their dishonest methods of campaign. The President of the United States, a Democrat, has effectually, by his message, proclaimed that it was dishonest to blow both hot and cold on this question. All honor to him for that!

Some of the Democrats from the manufacturing States of the North have comforted themselves by what they consider a fact, that this bill is not in the interests of free trade. From the majority of the speeches made by the members advocating the passage of this bill, in which they so glowingly set forth the deplorable condition of the country, attributing the same to the protective feature of the present law, and following closely their arguments, the result which will follow the passage of this bill will be free trade. Henry George, who is certainly one of the keenest observers of events, as he is also a close reasoner, says, in relation to the discussion in Congress of the bill, of the speech of Mr. MILLS, as follows:

> Mr. MILLS's speech in opening the tariff debate, as printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, justifies the impression produced by the telegraphic reports. It is a manly, vigorous, and most effective free-trade speech, abounding with telling points that go to the very heart of protection. It ought to be largely circulated as a campaign document.

Also of the speech of Mr. MCMILLIN, he says:

> If there remained in the mind of any one a lingering doubt lest the issue between the two giant parties should be belittled into a mere question of tariff tinkering, Mr. MCMILLIN's speech on the reopening of the tariff debate on Tuesday last should dispel it. "I would be gratified," said the Tennessee Congressman, "to have any man explain the justice of requiring one man to contribute a tax in order to make another man's vocation." This is not talking tariff reduction. It is talking free trade.

Mr. Chairman, I am a protectionist, and am so because from observation I am satisfied that the results of a protective tariff are beneficial to the people. Let me give to this committee an uncolored statement of the condition of the people of one of the largest manufacturing districts, whose welfare would be jeopardized by the passage of this bill. Essex County constitutes the Sixth Congressional district of the State of New Jersey. The city of Newark, located in this county, has a population of 165,000, and out of this number there are employed in the different trades nearly 49,000. The city of Orange and the townships have a population of about 50,000, and the number of employed is estimated at 10,000. It has often been asked of me what was manufactured in my district, but the question what was not manufactured there, would be more easily answered.

We manufacture thread, leather, hats, jewelry, clothing, sewing-machines, buttons, trunks, corsets, shoes, brass goods, celluloid, engines, boilers, harness and saddlery, paper boxes, pottery, fertilizers, tin-ware, iron and steel, silk, hardware, tools, smeltings, cutlery, sash and blinds, carriages, undergarments, shirts, bags and satchels, straw hats, iron moldings, files, shades, zinc, chemicals, cigars, saws, locks, varnish, skates, coach-lamps, wall-paper, clocks, faucets, smoothing-irons, lime and cement, brushes, all kinds of machinery, tacks, licorice, needles, pianos, organs, awnings, carbon lights; and so I might continue to enumerate.

The present bill, if passed in the shape in which it now is, would materially affect many of the different industries of my constituents and the almost immediate result would be a reduction of the wages of the individuals employed in these industries. The present duty on most of the articles manufactured in my district represents about the difference between the wages paid to those employed in this country and those paid in Europe. It would be impossible to arrive at the conclusion, from careful observation of the existence of matters in my district, of those advocating the passage of this bill, that the protective tariff results only in the enormous profit of the manufacturer and the downtrodden and deplorable condition of the wage-worker.

Without fear of contradiction I make the assertion that manufacturers and employers, Democrats and Republicans alike, would pronounce such conditions founded on theory simply ridiculous, because in practice they do not exist. The average wages in all branches of trade in my district are from 100 to 150 per cent. higher than the wages paid in England. A large percentage of the mechanics of my district emigrated to this country from England, Scotland, Ireland, Germany, in fact from all nations of Europe. They left their mother country for the purpose of enjoying the blessings of free institutions and to better their condition. Let us see if they have accomplished their purposes.

If the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, or any other doubting Thomas who has in so glowing phrases sounded the glories of free trade, will accept my invitation I will take him to my district and will ocularly convince him that his theories and calculations are all wrong. I would take him first to the different sections of the city

of Newark and show to him entire wards built up with comfortable and substantial dwellings owned and occupied by the mechanics and operatives employed in the various factories.

There are in Newark about thirty thousand dwelling-houses, and very few people own more than the house in which they live. Twenty-four thousand of these are owned by individual owners, the large per cent. by far being mechanics and wage-workers. I could point out to him many a mechanic who works at the bench adjoining that at which his employer is also busily engaged, who is, financially, in as good and oftentimes far better condition than the employer, who comes under the class so severely and unjustly denounced on the floor of this House as a bloated monopolist.

Mr. Chairman, it has always been a matter of pride to our city that, with the exception of a few industries the nature of which requires an enormous capital, the manufacturing industries are run in small establishments, the proprietor in almost all cases having been himself for years an employé, and whose share of the profits in comparison with the wages paid makes the result practically co-operative. I would further take him to the savings-banks of our city and show to him that our wage-workers have laid aside for a rainy day the sum of nearly $10,000,000. [Applause.]

There are many organizations which are in their nature beneficiary, acting in the capacity of life-insurers, which are supported by these mechanics. Then I would take him to the different building and loan associations, the bulk of whose members again are wage-workers, and show him their prosperous condition. But this is not all. I would then take him to the farming districts in mine and the adjacent counties, and the farmers there will tell him that they find a ready and a very profitable market for their productions.

From what I have seen, Mr. Chairman, in the different manufacturing cities throughout this country, the conditions existing in my district are not exceptional; and are we, by our votes, called upon by the Ways and Means Committee of this House to break down this system that has been so beneficial in its results? No. What they should strive for, and what the intelligent mechanic demands, is not the establishment of a policy that means to him a reduction of wages, but such legislation, as far as it can be had, that shall give to the individual worker a fair and just remuneration for his labor.

Do not, in your discussion of this question, gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee, think that you will be able to deceive the people. They well know that your monopolists and your millionaires have not been created by following manufacturing pursuits, for in these the intelligent wage-worker has, and will see to it that he shall receive his share of the profits, leaving but a reasonable recompense for the capital invested. No! they have heretofore been created by corrupt legislation, enacted in part here in the Halls of Congress and by the Legislatures of the different States, almost without exception, where designing men had succeeded by corruption and bribery to enact laws which enriched them and robbed the public. It should be a matter of congratulation that at last the American people have become aroused, so that political death will strike the man who will knowingly lift up his voice or give his vote for the passage of laws which have for their purpose the personal enrichment of one individual or set of individuals.

Mr. Chairman, when the people shall be fully informed of the manner in which their petitions have been treated by the Ways and Means Committee, and how their representatives have been denied the right of appearing before the committee to urge that justice should be done to their interests, they will become justly indignant. I introduced a bill which was referred to the Ways and Means Committee, in behalf of an industry which is now suffering from competition with the convict labor of the Austrian prisons. There has been no relief given in the Mills bill, and I am compelled to say to those engaged in that industry that a committee of the House refused to give a hearing, denying the right of explanation to their representative.

I am informed that all the petitions presented to this House and referred to the Committee of Ways and Means for consideration, signed by probably hundreds of thousands of workingmen, are filed up unread, unconsidered, and thus treated with contempt. This ignoring of the right of petition of the people will not do in a republican form of government, and they will resent the insult offered at the polls. In the opening of my remarks, I said that if the members would consider each section of the bill, and vote thereon uncontrolled by the dictation of a caucus, and governed by individual judgment obtained from their own personal observation and from the evidence and arguments advanced, even this bill might be so perfected that its results would be beneficial.

But there can be no hope that the bill will be so considered. The Democratic majority of this House—and I am now speaking of them as a party, not as individuals—has proven itself to be incompetent to enact proper legislation. I say this with the experience of the past few days before me. A more preposterous and outrageous piece of legislation than was the passage of the river and harbor bill never better deserved the unmitigated condemnation of an intelligent people. A bill appropriating nearly $20,000,000 passes this House, leaving out sufficient appropriations in cases where the necessity for improvement was great, and full of schemes which are questionable, to say the least of them, and placed there, it will be so considered by the people, for the purpose of catching votes, is rushed through, under a suspension of the rules, in thirty minutes, no opportunity for amendment being given.

I am much afraid that the remaining appropriation bills will be brought into the House and the endeavor made to pass them too, without due consideration. If the Republicans were in the majority and were responsible for such pernicious legislation, what a howl of indignation would be heard throughout the length and breadth of the land from the Democratic press. As in the river and harbor bill, the sections of this bill show that it was constructed for the purpose of obtaining votes. Salt is put on the free-list, an article cheap and the consumption of which forms but an inconsiderable item of expense in the household.

Take sugar, one of the heaviest expenses in every household, and we shall find the reduction but slight. Was the majority of the Ways and Means Committee casting their nets for the Louisiana vote? The speakers on the other side advocating the passage of this bill, have appealed to our patriotism to consider this question in an unpartisan spirit, and having done this they show their own inconsistency and the shallowness of their own patriotic motives by framing this bill in committee, from which the Republican members were excluded, and by calling a caucus inviting the members of their own party to propose such alterations and amendments which, if adopted by their caucus, are to bind the member to cast his vote for the passage of the bill. When the bill shall have thus been perfected they will bring it into this House and ask the Republican members to swallow, out of sheer patriotism, the nauseous dose which they have concocted.

Mr. Chairman, the only sure method of reducing the revenue is to place articles, if thought politic, on the free-list, or by reducing or abolishing the internal-revenue taxes. These taxes are the cause of the establishment of the most dangerous monopolies which we have in this country. The whisky ring is interested in keeping up the tax which prevents the man without capital from becoming a competitor. The tobacco interest is opposed to the total abolition of the taxes, because it would enable many skillful workmen with small means to start in business for themselves, and thus directly benefit the consumer both as to the quality and the cost of the article.

It is further unequal taxation, because the consumer pays the tax, and why should I, who do not smoke or use tobacco in any form, be thus exempted from my fair contribution to the expenses of the General Government?

In conclusion, I would say that the differences between capital and labor will soon be determined by the intelligent wage-workers, and while it is true that there have been and that there still will be strikes and lock-outs until these differences are adjusted, yet the conditions in this country, as depicted by the advocates of this measure, are overdrawn and exist only in their own morbid imagination. Few Democratic votes will be gained, but thousands will be lost by statements made on the floor of this House that the generation is even now here which will behold the Southern auctioneer standing in the market places of our Northern cities and selling the products formerly manufactured there in sight of the furnaces from which the smoke is no longer curling—articles which must be produced, and can only be so produced by underpaid labor; but this state of affairs, I predict, will never come to pass. Whenever the people of the South shall be able to produce articles which require in their manufacture skill and intelligence, the labor which is employed will by the peaceful revolution now going on receive its fair and just compensation; and in this fight the intelligent mechanic of the North will never submit to be reduced to the condition of his fellow-worker, white or black, at the South, but by combination and by powerful organization he will elevate to his own level his Southern brother.

Mr. Chairman, if this bill is considered, as all actions indicate it will be considered, in a partisan spirit, then I trust it will never pass this House. We should not let our actions be controlled by the effect it might have in the coming election. If in the coming election side issues are forced upon the Republican party, and questions purely social, moral, and religious in their character, belonging exclusively to the conscience of the individual, the home, the school and the church, are interjected, then the result even in our manufacturing State might be considered doubtful. If, however, this is made the only question at issue, as I think it should and will be, then my district, and I believe the State of New Jersey, will rebuke the men who have sought to cripple their industries by the overwhelming defeat of the Democratic party, it being responsible.

If this question was not of the most vital importance to my constituents, I should have contented myself with offering such amendments as their welfare demands when the bill comes up for consideration, but I should have thought myself derelict in my duties if I had not entered my formal protest against this legislation, the results of which would be disastrous. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] reserves the remainder of his time.

Mr. HOOKER. I move that the committee rise, if no gentleman on that side desires to speak this afternoon.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. NELSON. I understand that the 5 o'clock adjournment rule does not take effect until we get through the general debate on the tariff bill.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not.

Mr. NELSON. Under the existing rule, as I understand, the time for adjournment is not reached until half-past five.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order adopted yesterday the time for the adjournment at 5 o'clock does not arrive until after the conclusion of the general debate on this bill. This day being Saturday, the time for adjournment would be 5 o'clock p. m., unless otherwise ordered by the House. The gentleman from Mississippi moves that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9051) had come to no resolution thereon.

JOHN FLETCHER.

Mr. MATSON. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill (H. R. 128) for the relief of John Fletcher.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to John Fletcher, of Franklin, Ind., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $3,450, for loss of cattle while in the employment of the United States, in the year 1870, by the Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indians.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ADAMS. Let the report be read.

Mr. MATSON. The report is lengthy. I can state the facts.

Mr. ADAMS. Let the gentleman make the statement.

Mr. MATSON. This bill is for the reimbursement of a gentleman who was under contract to deliver certain cattle to a fort in one of the Territories; while under the orders of the officer supervising the contract, and while his party were moving from one point to another, they were stampeded by Cheyenne and Arapahoe Indians, and he lost his cattle. The loss as found by the committee is placed at $3,450.

The matter has been repeatedly investigated in every recent Congress, beginning with the Forty-fifth. The bill has been reported favorably nine times by the House committee, and by the Senate committee as often. In the last Congress it passed both Houses, but did not reach the President in time for his signature.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none.

Mr. MATSON. If any further explanation is desired, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL], chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, is prepared to give it.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MATSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

E. B. EDDY.

Mr. MOFFITT. I call up from the Private Calendar, for present consideration, the bill (H. R. 7675) for the relief of E. B. Eddy, of Hull, Quebec.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $348.56, being the amount of customs duties improperly collected from said Eddy at the custom-house at Morristown, N. Y.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MOFFITT moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE OVER TENNESSEE RIVER.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill H. R. 8623.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections, if any.

The bill was read by its title, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8623) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at or near Guntersville, Ala., and for other purposes,

with amendments by the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the bill. It is recommended by the Committee on Commerce with amendments, and is in the usual form.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to dispensing with the further reading of the bill?

Mr. ADAMS objected, but subsequently withdrew his objection.

There being no further objection, the reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. FORNEY. There are amendments to be acted upon.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Without objection the amendments will be voted on in gross.

The amendments were adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FORNEY moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF MARION, IOWA.

Mr. KERR. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill S. 1795.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 1795) for the relief of the First National Bank of Marion, Iowa.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $450 to the First National Bank of Marion, Iowa, as interest from October 1, 1880, to January 1, 1883, on United States 4 per cent. coupon bonds numbered 205 and 22703, for $500 each, and numbered 16847, 22135, 22138, and 5442, for $1,000 each, the coupons representing the interest on said bonds, for the period above indicated having been destroyed while detached from the bonds and in the custody of the United States postal authorities: *Provided, however*, That a satisfactory bond of indemnity shall be filed with the Secretary of the Treasury before said payment shall be made.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. KERR moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE NEAR CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7564) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Chattanooga, Tenn., and that the bill be put upon its passage. I will state that it is drawn in the usual form, contains the usual provisions, is approved by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War, and has been reported unanimously from the Committee on Commerce. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Is there any amendment recommended?

Mr. NEAL. Yes; there are one or two amendments.

The amendments were read, as follows:

In section 2, line 11, after the word "bridge," insert "and equal advantages in the use of said bridge shall be granted to all telegraph companies."

In lines 23 and 24 strike out the words "Secretary of War" and insert "Light-House Board."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. NEAL moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill as amended was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

SURVEY OF CERTAIN HISTORIC GROUNDS, ETC.

Mr. STEELE, by unanimous consent, reported from the Committee on Military Affairs the bill (S. 354) to provide for the survey of certain historic grounds, locations, and military works.

Mr. ROMEIS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of that bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be made, by an officer of the Engineer Corps, in co-operation with the Maumee Valley Monumental Association, an examination and inspection of each of the following-named historic grounds, locations, and military works, to wit:

The burial-place on Put-in-Bay Island of the sailors of the Navy in the war of 1812.

Fort Industry, at the mouth of Swan Creek, on the Maumee River.

Fort Miami, on the north and west side of the Maumee River, 7 miles above Fort Industry.

Fort Meigs, and the burial grounds of the soldiers of the war of 1812, near the same, on the south and east bank of the Maumee River, 10 miles above the mouth of Swan Creek.

A suitable portion of the battle-field of Fallen Timber, on the north and west bank of the Maumee River, 4 miles above Fort Meigs, where Anthony Wayne defeated the allied Indian nations under Turkey Foot, August 20, 1794.

Fort Defiance, at the confluence of the Auglaize and Maumee Rivers, erected by General Wayne in August, 1794.

Fort Wayne, at Fort Wayne, Ind., at the confluence of the St. Joe and St. Mary's Rivers, which was erected by General Wayne in October, 1794.

And he shall cause to be made a survey and full report to Congress of the location, situation, and condition of the same, and the amount of grounds necessary for the proper protection and improvement of the aforesaid works, forts, battle-fields, and burial places in and near the same, as well as the probable cost thereof; and the said report shall be accompanied with the necessary maps and drawings.

SEC. 2. That the sum of $150 is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the expense of the examination and inspection provided for in this act.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. OATES. I do not know that I am opposed to the bill, but I would like to have a little further opportunity to examine it before being called on to consider it.

Mr. STEELE. What is the amount of money appropriated by the bill?

Mr. ROMEIS. Only $150. The Senate has passed the bill twice.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been before the Committee on Military Affairs in two Congresses. It merely provides that an engineer officer shall go out there and define the lines of the property owned by the Government, with a view to any steps that may be taken hereafter for its protection or improvement.

Mr. OATES. If that is all the bill provides, I have no objection to it.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROMEIS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The House bill (H. R. 1738) was laid on the table.

REFUND OF DUTIES TO THE STATE OF NEW YORK.

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1692) to refund duties paid by the State of New York on arms imported in 1863, and that the bill be put on its passage. This bill was before the House some weeks ago, and objection was then made to its consideration by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSTON] because he wanted it amended by striking out the provision allowing the State a premium on the gold. That amendment has been adopted by the committee, and I think there can be no further objection to the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the bill, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The bill was read, as follows:

Whereas an act entitled "An act to remit duties on arms imported by States," approved July 10, 1861, and the act supplementary thereto, approved July 25, 1861, have expired by limitation: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to refund, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the duties paid by the State of New York on arms imported in 1863, amounting to the sum of $42,796.87, which sum includes the premium paid in the purchase of gold for the payment of said duties: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Treasury shall be satisfied that the said arms were purchased in good faith for the use of the troops of the State of New York organized to aid in suppressing the then existing insurrection against the United States.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

Strike out all from the word "three," in line 7, to the word "*Provided*," in line 10, and insert the following: "Amounting to the sum of $30,943.96."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

A MEMBER. I call for the reading of the report.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, from what committee does this bill come?

Mr. TRACEY. It is reported from the Committee on War Claims.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The report (by Mr. BLISS) was read, as follows:

That this claim was presented to the Forty-ninth Congress, and a report was made in regard to it by the Committee on War Claims on the 23d of March, 1886. As the examination by your committee has led them to the same results with those arrived at by the committee of 1886, they do not think it necessary to recapitulate the facts, but refer to that report, and therewith annex a copy for information.

Your committee therefore recommend that the bill referred to them do pass.

[House Report No. 12, Forty-ninth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on War Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5011) to refund duties paid by the State of New York on arms imported in 1863, having examined the same and accompanying papers, submit the following report:

This claim is for duties paid by the State of New York on arms imported in 1863, and used in arming troops that were mustered into the service of the United States.

The foreign cost of the arms has been repaid by the United States, but the cost of importation has never been refunded. The application made by the State that it might be released from paying the duties was denied, for the reason that the act to remit duties on arms imported by States, approved July 10, 1861, and the act supplementary thereto, approved July 25, 1861, had expired by limitation.

It is evident that the foreign cost of the arms having been repaid by the United States, that part of their cost that the State was compelled to pay to the United States should also be refunded.

It seems to your committee that the duties paid were quite as much a part of the cost, charges, and expenses to the State in arming the troops as the original cost of the arms.

The duties were paid in gold, and at a time when the premium on gold was very high, which, of course, increased largely the expense to the State.

Your committee therefore recommend that said State of New York be reimbursed the amount of said duties paid on arms purchased by said State in 1863, and thus used in arming troops which were mustered into the service of the Federal Government, and that said bill do pass.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Subject to the right to make objection, I would like to inquire why this bill did not go to the Committee on Ways and Means, as it relates to the subject of refunding duties. I would like to know also whether there has been any correspondence with the Secretary of the Treasury, in which he has recommended this legislation.

Mr. TRACEY. Yes, sir; there is a letter from Mr. Secretary Folger, in which he recommends the refunding of the money, but does not commit himself on the point of paying a premium on the gold. That, however, is now stricken out. That was the feature of the bill which was objected to by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. JOHNSTON], and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER], and which has heretofore delayed the passage of this bill through Congress. There is also a letter from Acting Secretary of the Treasury Fairchild reaffirming the statement made by Mr. Folger, and saying that he sees no reason to dissent from his conclusion.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. Has the bill ever been before the Committee on Ways and Means?

Mr. TRACEY. It was before the Ways and Means Committee in the last Congress, but my understanding is that, under our rules, it had to go to the Committee on War Claims in this House.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. What was the action of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. TRACEY. The Ways and Means Committee reported the bill favorably to the House, but it never was acted upon. That is my understanding. I was not a member of the House at the time.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. On the question of jurisdiction, why does the gentleman insist that the Committee on War Claims has jurisdiction over this matter?

Mr. TRACEY. I understood it was the opinion of the Speaker that it should go to that committee under the rules of this House of Representatives.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. The refunding of duties is a matter which comes distinctly under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. TRACEY. Well, Mr. Speaker, this is a matter in which I have no personal interest, and if the gentleman chooses to object, I suppose the bill must go over.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I dislike very much to object to a bill which the gentleman assures the House is entirely just and proper; but the claim is a considerable one, and the gentleman does not seem to present at this time any clear recommendation from the Treasury Department on the subject.

Mr. TRACEY. I have a number of papers here relating to the claim, but as I did not anticipate any objection I did not think it necessary to read them.

Mr. TURNER, of Georgia. I should certainly feel bound to object, unless the claim were clearly made out.

Mr. TRACEY. With the permission of the House, I will read a letter dated February 7, 1884, from Charles J. Folger, then Secretary of the Treasury:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *February 7, 1884.*

SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 4th instant, in regard to a claim pending before your committee, for the refunding of duties paid on arms purchased by the State of New York in 1863 and used in arming the State troops, which are stated to have been mustered into the service of the Federal Government; the State of New York being represented in the matter by J. B. Stonehouse assistant adjutant-general of the State.

A letter was addressed by this Department to the Speaker of the House of Representatives on January 12, 1882, transmitting papers connected with the matter.

In addition to what was stated in that letter and its inclosures, I may add that on July 27, 1861, Congress passed an act directing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the governor of any State or its duly authorized agent, the costs, charges, and expenses properly incurred by such State for enrolling, subsisting, clothing, supplying, arming, equipping, paying, and transporting these troops, etc.

The arms referred to in this claim were imported for the use of the State of New York, in equipping Federal troops, on which the State was compelled to pay the duties.

I understand that so far as the cost price of the arms is concerned, the State has been in part at least reimbursed under authority of the act referred to, but that the duties have not been refunded.

It seems to me that the duties paid were quite as much a part of the cost, charges, and expenses to the State in arming the troops as the original cost of the arms and freight paid thereon.

These arms were purchased and the duties paid at a time when the premium on gold was very high, which of course increased largely the expense to the State.

Whether any claim for the enhanced expenses on this account should be allowed is for the committee to consider.

I therefore recommend an allowance of the claim in such an amount as may be proven to the satisfaction of the committee to be proper.

I may add that the arms in question were not, as I understand, imported within the time specified in the acts approved July 10, 1861, and July 25, 1861 (12 Statutes, pages 255, 274), and so authority for refund of the duties in question was not accorded by the act last mentioned.

Very respectfully,

CHAS. J. FOLGER,
Secretary.

Hon. ABRAM S. HEWITT,
Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives.

Mr. BLAND. Inasmuch as the session of to-day must, under the standing order, close in a few minutes, I think we may as well adjourn. I make that motion.

Mr. CANNON. I wish the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] would allow me to have passed a bill involving only $100.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. BLAND that the House adjourn, it was not agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill which has been read?

Mr. RANDALL. I would like to ask one or two questions in regard to this matter—in the first place, whether any claim of similar nature has ever been allowed?

Mr. TRACEY. Yes, sir. Let me read a communication on the subject from the Commissioner of Customs:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS,
Washington, D. C., February 12, 1888.

SIR: In answer to your verbal request of this morning, I can see no objection to stating that the amount of $29,883.50, duties paid on imported arms by the State of New York, was refunded to that State in 1861 under the act of July 10, 1861.

Refunds were also made under similar circumstances to the States of Massachusetts and Pennsylvania.

Respectfully, yours,

JOHN S. McCALMONT,
Commissioner of Customs.

General J. G. FARNSWORTH,
Arlington Hotel, Washington, D. C.

Mr. RANDALL. I understand that this claim arose during the war.

Mr. TRACEY. Yes, sir; in 1863.

Mr. RANDALL. I have no recollection that such a claim as this has ever been passed by the House, though I may be entirely in error. If the gentleman has any instance to cite, I would be glad to have him do so, because this may be a precedent for other claims.

Mr. TRACEY. The duties in this case were paid under protest; and the chief of ordnance for the State of New York, in his report made at the end of that year, stated that it was fully understood the money paid for duties would be refunded.

The SPEAKER *ro tempore*. The Chair must state that the hour fixed by the standing order of the House for adjournment on Saturdays has arrived; and it is the duty of the Chair——

Mr. CANNON. I do not understand that the rule to which the Chair refers operates until the close of the general debate on the tariff.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Under the order now operating the House on Mondays and Saturdays must adjourn at half past 5 o'clock. The order fixing the hour of adjournment at 5 o'clock does not take effect until the close of the tariff debate. In pursuance of the standing order, the Chair is now compelled to declare the House adjourned until 11 o'clock on Monday next.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. CHIPMAN: A bill (H. R. 9934) for the relief of Mary Ann Hough—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALL: A bill (H. R. 9935) to increase the pension of Isaac Hurd—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9936) granting a pension to Elijah D. Powell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9937) granting a pension to Ephraim Erb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH: A bill (H. R. 9938) for the relief of George W. Wilburn—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9939) granting a pension to Elizabeth G. Bryan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 9940) granting a pension to Rosina B. Fox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9941) granting a pension to St. John H. Piero—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: A bill (H. R. 9942) granting a pension to William McDowell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEEL: A bill (H. R. 9943) to grant a pension to John Carlock—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPRINGER: A bill (H. R. 9944) granting a pension to Robert Bivans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SYMES: A bill (H. R. 9945) for the relief of Henry C. Withers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. G. M. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 9946) granting a pension to Enoch B. Vice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: A bill (H. R. 9947) to pension John Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 9948) for the relief of William H. Campbell—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BACON (by request): Petition of citizens of Corvallis, Meagher County, New York, to preserve mineral lands—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. JEHU BAKER: Petition of the citizens of East St. Louis, through the mayor and city council, for the erection of a public building in that city—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, resolutions of workingmen's mass meeting at Cooper Union May 8, 1888, in opposition to the Mills tariff bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Protest of the farmers of Crosswicks, N. J., against any reduction of the duties on agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CASWELL: Petition of 46 citizens of the First district of Wisconsin, for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: Petition of A. Dartner and other brush manufacturers of Detroit, Mich., against reduction of duties on brushes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DUNN: Paper in the claim of Samuel F. Davidson, of Phillips County, Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRIMES: Petition of Bennet W. Bonner, of Carroll County, Georgia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARE: Petition of citizens of Gainesville, Tex., forthe payment of Indian depredation claims on the frontier—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. S. I. HOPKINS (by request): Petition of the Woman's National Industrial League, for an appropriation of $1,500 for the Working Women's Home in the District—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. T. D. JOHNSTON: Petition of James M. McMinn, of Henderson County, North Carolina, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM: Petition of citizens of Parker County, and of Palo Pinto County, Texas, for payment of Indian depredation claims of citizens on the frontier—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. LEE (by request): Petition of John B. Burroughs, for estate of Mary W. Ashton, of Fauquier County, Virginia, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LIND: Memorial by the Montana Mineral Land Association against the conveyance of mineral lands to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of Joseph Brown and 14 others, for reduction of postage on seeds, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, remonstrance of Charles E. Woody and 37 others, of Boston, Mass., against bill to create a national bureau of harbors and water ways—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SAYERS: Petition of citizens of Medina County, Texas, for the payment of Indian depredation claims of citizens on the frontier—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. SYMES: Memorial of citizens of Colorado, in favor of reservoirs—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. E. J. TURNER: Petition of citizens of Mitchell County, Kansas, for payment of claims for Indian depredations to citizens of Kansas—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. WALKER: Petition of William H. Campbell, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of Newton Hackworth and of Caroline E. Ryan, widow of John Ryan, of Jackson County, Alabama, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOST: Petition of Sydney P. Lytle, of Augusta County, Virginia, son of Lydia V. Lytle, deceased, of Loudoun County, Virginia, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

The following petition for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists was received and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. CANDLER: Of Dr. J. M. Saunders and others, druggists, of Georgia.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. BACON (by request): Of 11 citizens of Stony Point, N. Y.

By Mr. COGSWELL: Of John D. Ellis and others, of Beverley, N. J.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. CANNON: Of C. M. Douglas and others, of Sumner, Ill.

By Mr. GROUT: Of John Carbel and 31 others, citizens of Canaan, Vt.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. BACON (by request): Of 143 citizens of Rockland County, New York.

By Mr. HOLMES: Of 232 citizens of Greene and Crawford Counties, Iowa.

By Mr. LANHAM: Of 26 citizens of Donley County, Texas.
By Mr. STEELE: Of 76 citizens of Adams County, Indiana.

The following petition for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. WALKER: Of citizens of the Fourteenth district of Missouri.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *May* 14, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of April 17, 1888, an estimate of the cost of removing a sand-bar recently formed at the entrance to the harbor of Block Island, R. I.; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in answer to a resolution of March 27, 1888, certain information as to the necessity of fortifications upon Puget's Sound; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of March 27, 1888, certain information as to the appropriation necessary to carry into effect the joint resolution directing the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the practicability of constructing reservoirs for the storage of water in the arid regions of the United States, etc.; which was read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. What disposition does the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] desire to have made of the communication?

Mr. STEWART. Let it be printed, and I will look at it. I think it ought to be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think it should be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. STEWART. It looks to an appropriation.

Mr. SHERMAN. But the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry will have to pass upon the question.

Mr. PADDOCK. Primarily it belongs to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. STEWART. I do not think it belongs to the Committee on Agriculture. I would say with regard to it that a joint resolution has passed Congress at the present session directing the Secretary of the Interior, through the Geological Survey, to make investigations as to the arid regions of the United States, with a view of locating reservoirs and promoting irrigation.

Mr. PADDOCK. Is not that in the interest of agriculture?

Mr. STEWART. I think that it is dealing with the public lands. If the communication is to be referred to a committee, I think it ought to go to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. PADDOCK. Very well.

Mr. STEWART. It deals with the question of public lands. It may be in shape, however, to go to the Committee on Appropriations as it is, but I suggest that it be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the communication will be referred to the Committee on Public Lands and printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of the senate and house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, praying for legislation which will prevent the immigration and importation into the United States of convicts, lunatics, idiots, and other persons liable to become a public charge; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented the petition of Charles E. French, of Boston, Mass., praying that the Secretary of the Treasury be authorized to refund and exchange bonds, with a view to the reduction of the public debt; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of A. D. Tansey, late postmaster at Plainfield, N. J., praying payment of the amount that was found due him by the Government on a readjustment of his salary, under the act of 1854; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FARWELL presented a petition of citizens of Mercer County, Illinois, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of citizens of Edwards County, Illinois, remonstrating against any change in the Bureau of Animal Industry, as at present constituted, etc.: which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BUTLER presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, S. C., remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill 1448 to create a national bureau of harbors and water ways; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Charleston, S. C., praying that a law be passed which will provide for a reduction of letter postage from 2 cents to 1 cent an ounce; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Bankers' Club of the city of Chicago, praying for the passage of House bill 1527 to make bills of lading conclusive evidence; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Transportation of the State of Nebraska, praying for the passage of House bill 8367, providing for the regulation of the rates of railroad companies chartered by the United States by the States or Territories through which such railroads run; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MORRILL presented a petition of citizens of Wallingford, Vt., praying for a more efficient protection of agriculture by preventing fraudulent importations of cattle; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALLISON presented a petition of citizens of Tombstone, Ariz., praying that provision be made for the settlement of claims for Indian depredations; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented the petition of George E. Jones, late postmaster at Boonesborough, Iowa, praying to be paid earnings as computed under the act of 1854, in the office of the First Assistant Postmaster-General; which was referred, with the accompanying papers, to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. FAULKNER. I present a memorial of the Farmers' Alliance of Yellowstone County, Montana Territory, remonstrating against any change being made in the Bureau of Animal Industry as at present constituted, etc., and a memorial of the St. Louis (Mo.) Butchers' Union, consisting of 500 members, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Palmer bill for the extirpation of pleuro-pneumonia and other infectious diseases among cattle, and also thanking the Senators from Missouri and Kansas, Mr. VEST and Mr. PLUMB, for the facts so clearly set forth on the floor of the Senate in the debate on this bill. I move that the memorials lie on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a memorial of John Sunderland and 21 other citizens of Macon County, Missouri, remonstrating against the passage of the Palmer bill for the suppression of pleuro-pneumonia and other cattle diseases; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PALMER presented the petition of Anson H. Baker and 21 other ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Chesaning, Mich.; and the petition of James A. Meviele and 19 others, ex-Union soldiers and sailors, and Carrie E. Wilson and 17 others, members of the Ladies' Relief Corps of Chesaning, Mich., praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of J. S. Hilton, H. G. Drew, J. H. Cassady, and 11 other citizens of Dundee, Mich., praying for the passage of Senate bill 283, for the better protection of the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Butchers' Protective Association, of Detroit, Mich., signed by Thomas Barlow, president, and John I. Mason, secretary, praying for the continuance of the Bureau of Animal Industry as at present organized, etc.; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HISCOCK presented a memorial of over 1,000 employés of the Globe Woolen Company, of Utica, N. Y., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Mills tariff bill, and in favor of Congress adhering to the past policy of protection for American productions; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. CHANDLER presented the memorial of A. M. Wilkins, J. N. Prince, C. D. Trow, and Henry C. Day, officers of Sonhegan Grange, No. 10, Patrons of Husbandry, of Amherst, N. H., remonstrating against the passage of the Mills tariff bill; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SAWYER presented a memorial of J. H. Haviland and 36 other citizens of Rock County, Wisconsin, remonstrating against any change being made in the Bureau of Animal Industry as at present constituted, etc.; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. TURPIE presented the petition of Warren O. Harold and 100 other ex-Union soldiers, citizens of Marion County, Indiana, praying for the establishment of a national soldiers' home at Indianapolis, Ind.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SPOONER presented a petition of citizens of Stockholm, Wis., praying that there be inserted in the river and harbor bill an item appropriating the sum of $15,000 for continuing the improvement of the harbor at that place; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CAMERON presented two petitions of citizens of Tionesta, Pa.,

praying for the repeal of that portion of the internal-revenue law classing druggists as liquor dealers, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Harrisburg, Pa., praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MANDERSON. I present a petition of the board of transportation of the State of Nebraska, over their official seal, suggesting the fact that by the claim of the Union Pacific Railway Company, and other companies chartered by act of Congress, they are not subject to State control or legislation, and asking that proper legislation be had to produce the result that they shall be under such control.

As the petition is very short, but a few lines, and comes from one of the State boards of Nebraska, I ask that it be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF BOARD OF TRANSPORTATION OF THE STATE OF NEBRASKA.

To the Senators and Representatives in Congress assembled, and to the Senators and Representatives from the State of Nebraska in particular:

It is known to you that the transcontinental railroads, and especially the Union Pacific Railway, chartered by act of Congress, claim that by virtue of such Federal act or acts of incorporation they are not subject to State control and legislation.

The board of transportation does not concede this claim, nor in any manner admit the same, but, on the contrary, contends and believes that Congress did not intend to create, and did not in fact create a corporation or corporations within the State limits superior to the State governments themselves, and not subject to police regulation and the local laws the same as domestic corporations, and that the highest judicial authority will ultimately so hold. Yet, nevertheless, as Congress has reserved to itself the power to amend each and every one of the several charters granted to these transcontinental corporations, it may be the shortest and quickest solution of this question to declare by Federal enactment the law upon this subject.

Such an act has been prepared and introduced in the House of Representatives by Hon. KNUTE NELSON, of Minnesota, a copy of which accompanies this communication. Therefore we, the board of transportation of the State of Nebraska, respectfully request and urge that you and each of you give this measure your cordial support. It is right and just and in accord with the spirit of our institutions and free government, and as in duty bound will ever pray.

Witness our hands and the official seal of the board of transportation of the State of Nebraska, this 26th day of April, A. D. 1888.

[SEAL.]

H. A. BABCOCK.
G. L. LAWS.
WM. LEESE.
C. H. WILLARD.
JOSEPH SCOTT.

Be it enacted, etc., That where any railroad company heretofore chartered or incorporated, or which hereafter may be chartered or incorporated by act of Congress, has built or constructed and operates, or shall build, construct, or operate a railroad through, across, or into the territorial limits of any State or Territory of the United States, the tolls, rates, and fares made or charged for the transportation of property and passengers over or upon such road or roads for traffic within the limits of a State or Territory, and the tariffs and schedules thereof, shall be subject to the legislative control of and by the several States and Territories through, across, or into which such road or roads are constructed, built, or operated, anything in the charter of, or acts of Congress creating such company or companies, or any law of any State or Territorial Legislature enacted in pursuance of such charter or act of incorporation, to the contrary notwithstanding.

SECTION 1. That section 1 of this act shall be limited in its operation, and shall apply only to the carriage and transportation by such company or companies of passengers and property wholly by railroad or partly by railroad and partly by water (when both are used under a common management, control, or arrangement), from one place or station to another place or station, both being within the territorial limits of one and the same State or Territory, and shall in no case apply to any commerce between the States, Territories, or into foreign countries.

Mr. MANDERSON presented a petition of ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Nebraska, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLUMB. I present the petition of Capt. John Cowdon, praying that so much of the river and harbor bill as refers to the improvement of the Mississippi River be referred to the Committee on Improvement of the Mississippi River. I present the petition in duplicate, and I ask that one copy be referred to the Committee on Commerce and the other to the Committee on Improvement of the Mississippi River. I will state in connection with the petition, without any special knowledge in regard to the matter at issue, that in view of the fact that it is a subject of very serious discussion, I hope that one committee, or both, will arrive at some definite conclusion which will relieve Congress from this perpetual doubt as to whether the improvement which is being carried on is after the proper plan or not.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The petition will be referred as suggested, if there be no objection.

Mr. PLUMB presented a memorial of Cadmus Grange, No. 350, Patrons of Husbandry, of Cadmus, Kans., and a memorial of the Manhattan (Kans.) Grange, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Palmer pleuro-pneumonia bill; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the mayor and city council of the city of Parsons, Kans., praying for the passage of a general law providing for the erection of Government post-office buildings in every city and village of the United States containing 3,000 inhabitants or over; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented two petitions of citizens of Osage County, Kansas, praying for the enactment of such statutes as shall provide for the adequate punishment of crime against women and girls; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. REAGAN presented a petition of 40 citizens of Erath County, Texas, and a petition of citizens of Callahan County, Texas, praying that an appropriation be made for the payment of Indian depredation claims; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BOWEN presented a petition of 12 male citizens of Colorado Springs, Colo., and a petition of 21 male citizens of Longmont, Colo., praying for the better legal protection of women and girls within the Territorial, admiralty, and maritime jurisdiction of the United States; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Dr. Charles Ambrook, on behalf of the Boulder (Colo.) Medical Association, praying for the removal of duties from medical books, surgical instruments, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary to report favorably, with amendments both in the body of the bill and the title, the bill (H. R. 5932) providing for the holding of the terms of the United States courts in the district of Minnesota, and I return with it a paper which was not before filed here, being a petition on the subject which was laid before the committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar and the accompanying paper will lie on the table.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 905) to incorporate the District of Columbia Suburban Railway Company, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1051) to amend the act giving the approval and sanction of Congress to the route and termini of the Anacostia and Potomac River Railroad in the District of Columbia, reported it with amendments.

Mr. STEWART. I am directed by a majority of the Committee on Military Affairs to report an original bill, accompanied by a report.

The bill (S. 2918) to reimburse the State of Nevada for moneys expended or obligations incurred by said State and the Territory of Nevada and afterwards assumed and paid by said State in the suppression of the war of the rebellion, and for guarding the overland mail and emigrant route, was read twice by its title.

Mr. WALTHALL. I wish to state that several members of the Committee on Military Affairs do not concur in the report just submitted by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. STEWART. I stated that it was a majority report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 157) for the relief of Newton S. Murphey, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom the subject was referred, reported a bill (S. 2919) to define the routes of steam railroads in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2727) authorizing the purchase of a site for a building for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States, reported it without amendment.

Mr. CAMERON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the petition of the Bennington Battle Monument Association, praying that an appropriation of $22,000 be made to complete that monument, submitted a report thereon, accompanied by a bill (S. 2920) relative to the Revolutionary battle-field of Bennington; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BOWEN, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 111) for the relief of William M. Keightley, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2403) to adjust the accounts of the Department of Agriculture, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2475) to increase the appropriation for the erection of a public building at Winona, Minn., reported it without amendment.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1404) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River, and to establish it as a post-road, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6440) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River at or near the city of Omaha, Nebr., reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8343) to authorize the construction of a wagon and foot-passenger bridge across the Noxubee River, at or near Gainesville, in the State of Alabama, reported it with amendments.

Mr. CALL, from the Committee on Education and Labor, to whom the subject was referred, reported a bill (S. 2941) to incorporate the national academy of dental science; which was read twice by its title.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 128) for the relief of John Fletcher;

A bill (H. R. 215) granting a pension to James McCaffrey;

A bill (H. R. 328) for the allowance of certain awards made by a board of claims to certain citizens of Jefferson County, Kentucky;

A bill (H. R. 362) to increase the pension of Charles W. Sanborn;

A bill (H. R. 780) granting a pension to James H. Darling;

A bill (H. R. 882) to correct the muster of and for the relief of George W. Davenport;

A bill (H. R. 891) granting a pension to Eliza Ann Shaver;

A bill (H. R. 2116) granting a pension to Johanna Eckhardt;

A bill (H. R. 2174) granting a pension to Lewis Fichthorn;

A bill (H. R. 2215) granting a pension to Charles Glamann;

A bill (H. R. 2529) granting a pension to Mary Monti;

A bill (H. R. 2527) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North by the Duluth, Rainy Lake River and Southwestern Railway Company;

A bill (H. R. 3016) granting a pension to Mary F. Harkins;

A bill (H. R. 3125) for the relief of Susan Jones;

A bill (H. R. 3376) to extend the limits of the port of New Orleans;

A bill (H. R. 3690) granting a pension to Penelope Morton, widow of Lieutenant Morton;

A bill (H. R. 3706) granting a pension to Henry C. Richardson;

A bill (H. R. 4581) for the relief of Thomas Mathews and others;

A bill (H. R. 4743) granting a pension toAda Piatt, Leota Piatt, and Jessie Piatt;

A bill (H. R. 4774) granting a pension to Matthew H. Reynolds;

A bill (H. R. 4831) granting a pension to Delilah Vandevender;

A bill (H. R. 5212) for the relief of Andrew J. Nugent;

A bill (H. R. 5222) for the relief of A. M. Anderson and others;

A bill (H. R. 5574) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Beyers;

A bill (H. R. 5756) granting a pension to David Gibbons;

A bill (H. R. 5759) granting a pension to John H. Roundtree;

A bill (H. R. 5789) granting a pension to Ellen M. Thiers;

A bill (H. R. 5792) granting a pension to Mary A. Wells;

A bill (H. R. 5903) for the relief of Lewis Davis, a soldier of the war of 1812;

A bill (H. R. 6245) for the relief of William Burk;

A bill (H. R. 6545) to increase the pension to Henry T. Bridges;

A bill (H. R. 6574) for the relief of William Compton;

A bill (H. R. 6577) granting a pension to Abigail Sullivan;

A bill (H. R. 6907) granting an increase of pension to Elias Shafer;

A bill (H. R. 6949) granting a pension to Emeline C. Young;

A bill (H. R. 6973) for the relief of Enoch Weathers;

A bill (H. R. 6976) for the relief of Anna M. Thiele;

A bill (H. R. 6990) to place the name of Rebecca E. Shoemaker on the pension-roll;

A bill (H. R. 7097) granting a pension to Edmund Ryan;

A bill (H. R. 7115) granting a pension to William Scott;

A bill (H. R. 7564) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Chattanooga, Tenn.

A bill (H. R. 7577) granting a pension to Lewis C. Keck;

A bill (H. R. 7665) granting a pension to John E. Lewis;

A bill (H. R. 7675) for the relief of E. B. Eddy, of Hull, Quebec;

A bill (H. R. 7719) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kincaid;

A bill (H. R. 7857) to increase the pension of Henry L. Potter;

A bill (H. R. 7944) granting a pension to Ann V. Ferguson;

A bill (H. R. 7974) granting a pension to Heman Rankins;

A bill (H. R. 8159) granting a pension to Jane Brown Dunn;

A bill (H. R. 8174) granting a pension to Ellen Sexton;

A bill (H. R. 8217) granting a pension to Raphael Fowler;

A bill (H. R. 8281) for the relief of Lieut. James G. W. Hardy;

A bill (H. R. 8285) to remove the political disabilities of Elliott Johnston;

A bill (H. R. 8400) for the relief of Lydia Burridge;

A bill (H. R. 8623) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at or near Guntersville, Ala., and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 8629) granting a pension to Mrs. Abba E. Jackson;

A bill (H. R. 8722) granting a pension to Jessie M. Barthauer;

A bill (H. R. 9673) for the relief of the counties of the Territory of Arizona, and to legalize the indebtedness thereof and provide for funding the same;

A bill (H. R. 9793) authorizing a loan of arms and equipments to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 103) authorizing and directing the Department of Justice to transfer certain rooms which have been occupied by the United States courts and officials to the city of Utica, N. Y.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 39) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Berg;

A bill (S. 269) to grant to the Fort Smith and El Paso Railway Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 331) granting a pension to John Kalbfleisch;

A bill (S. 354) to provide for the survey of certain historic grounds, locations, and military works;

A bill (S. 801) for the relief of Basile Champagne;

A bill (S. 805) granting a pension to Melvina Greenwood;

A bill (S. 816) granting a pension to Anastasia Walter;

A bill (S. 820) granting a pension to David A. Servis;

A bill (S. 835) for the relief of Elisha Griswold;

A bill (S. 860) granting a pension to Stephen Singleton;

A bill (S. 1096) granting a pension to James Lucas;

A bill (S. 1237) granting a pension to Anna Mertz;

A bill (S. 1717) granting a pension to Emma Van Bernewitz;

A bill (S. 1795) for the relief of the First National Bank of Marion, Iowa; and

A bill (S. 2419) granting a pension to Lemuel R. Rea.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 347) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Youngstown, Ohio, with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following concurrent resolution; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President be requested to return to the House the bill (H. R. 2699) for the relief of the heirs of the late Solomon Spitzer, for the purpose of correcting the same. And the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to insert in said bill the word "unexpected" instead of the word "unexpended."

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (H. R. 339) for the relief of J. E. Pilcher;

A bill (H. R. 671) for the relief of the heirs of John S. Fillmore, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 1473) authorizing the President of the United States to arrange a conference between the United States of America and the Republics of Mexico, Central and South America, Hayti, San Domingo, and the Empire of Brazil;

A bill (H. R. 6831) to detach the county of Audrain, in the State of Missouri, from the eastern and attach it to the western judicial district of said State;

A bill (H. R. 7348) granting to the city of Grand Forks, Dak., the right to build two free bridges across Red River;

A bill (H. R. 8464) for the relief of Merchants' National Bank of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.; and

Joint resolution (H. Res. 148) to print 12,500 copies of the eulogies on Seth C. Moffatt, late a Representative in Congress.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. VANCE. A petition was presented some time ago, praying that a pension be granted to Minerva Tilley, of North Carolina, for services rendered the United States Government in the Florida Indian war; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and reported adversely upon by that committee. I asked that it be laid on the table in order that I might introduce a bill so as to secure the sense of the Senate upon the propriety of granting the prayer of the petition. I now introduce a bill granting a pension to Minerva Tilley, which I ask may be read the first and second times, and placed on the Calendar in connection with the adverse report or the petition upon the same subject.

The bill (S. 2921) granting a pension to Minerva Tilley was read twice by its title, and ordered to be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2922) setting apart a tract of land to be used as a cemetery by the Alvarado Cemetery Association, of Georgetown, Colo.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2923) for the relief of Mrs. Josephine D. Hellyer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TURPIE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2924) to increase the pension of Sterne H. Fowler; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 2925) in relation to cadets at the Naval Academy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 2926) for the relief of Madison V. Boeitnight; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 2927) to provide for the redemption of lands sold under trust deeds in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2928) authorizing the issue of 2½ per cent. fifty-year bonds, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SPOONER. I move that 50 extra copies of the bill be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COKE introduced a bill (S. 2929) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct and operate a railway, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2930) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct a bridge across Red River at or near Hooks' Ferry, Red River County, Texas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SPOONER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2931) to provide for a commission to determine the location of steam-railroads and depots in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PLUMB introduced a bill (S. 2932) granting a pension to the minor children of Levi M. Hunter; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2933) for the relief of Hall & Gregory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2934) granting a pension to Mary Sullivan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HISCOCK introduced a bill (S. 2935) for the erection of a public building at the city of Elmira, N. Y.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, introduced a bill (S. 2936) granting a pension to George Fosgate; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLAIR (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2937) to prevent convict labor from competing with organized labor, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2938) granting a pension to James McDonald; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2939) granting a pension to Margaret E. Adamson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PADDOCK introduced a bill (S. 2940) to provide in certain cases for the regulation of railway companies chartered by the United States by the several States and Territories in which the railways of such companies run and are operated; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. HISCOCK introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 81) providing for the purchase of five hundred copies of Scribner's Atlas for the use of the Department of State; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

THE VETO POWER.

Mr. STEWART introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 80) proposing an amendment to subdivisions 2 and 3 of section 7 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. STEWART. The joint resolution proposes to reduce the vote in the two Houses requisite to pass a bill over the veto of the President from two-thirds to a majority. I think the time has come when a majority vote ought to be sufficient to pass a bill over the veto of the President. I ask that the joint resolution be printed and lie on the table, and I shall at a convenient time call it up and make some remarks upon the subject.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The joint resolution will lie on the table.

AMENDMENTS TO CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. HARRIS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2952) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies taken and used by the United States Army, as reported by the Court of Claims, under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1883, known as the Bowman act; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2952) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies taken and used by the United States Army, as reported by the Court of Claims, under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1883, known as the Bowman act; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. CALL and Mr. FRYE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill, appropriating $100,000 for improving the Missouri River at Omaha, Nebr., and $50,000 for improving the Missouri River at and near Plattsmouth, Nebr.; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BROWN. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the river and harbor bill. The amendment pertains to the completion of the existing project at Romerly Marsh, on the coast of Georgia. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and printed.

The motion was agreed to.

SAVANNAH HARBOR IMPROVEMENT.

Mr. BROWN. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by me to the river and harbor bill, which I desire to have read for information. I shall then move to refer it to the Committee on Commerce, and I desire to submit a few remarks in support of the motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 10, line 217, strike out "$90,000" and insert after the word "improvement" the words:

On project for securing a channel 28 feet deep at mean high water, from the city of Savannah to the sea, $250,000.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I move the reference of the amendment just offered to the river and harbor bill, for an increase of the appropriation made in the House bill for the harbor of Savannah, to the Committee on Commerce, and I respectfully ask that the Senate indulge me while I submit a few remarks on the motion at this time, and I especially ask the attention of the Senators who are members of the Committee on Commerce, to whom the amendment is to be referred. It is no part of my purpose to make any assault upon the river and harbor bill as it passed the other House, on account of the liberal appropriations it makes to harbors connected with other cities. I wish them all good success and prosperity, and hope that all obstacles may be removed as speedily as possible which may stand in the way of their commercial growth. My object is not to ask that less be done for other Southern cities, but to ask that some measure of justice be extended to the city of Savannah.

The great Central Railroad system has its offices and its terminal at Savannah. It controls over 2,200 miles of railroad, and has intimate business relations and connections and exchanges business with several thousand additional miles. The Central system, and the Savannah, Florida and Western system, and the East Tennessee system, in connection with the steam-ship lines that run from Savannah to New York and Boston, comprising about 5,000 miles centering at Savannah, pour into her lap an immense commerce, which is increasing in tonnage with great rapidity every year. The only thing that has prevented an enormous growth has been the want of sufficient depth of water to accommodate the sea-going commerce. That has been in some measure remedied, and every foot additional depth that is given to the harbor causes a large commercial increase in the business of the city. When the estimate for the last project by the Secretary of War for getting 28 feet depth of water shall be carried out, the commerce of Savannah will reach annually several hundred millions of dollars. But I will refer more particularly to that project after a little while. For the present, I desire to call attention of the Senate, and especially of the Committee on Commerce, to the unjust and unreasonable discrimination which has been made against Savannah in the river and harbor bill. To show this I have prepared some figures and tables giving the amount proposed to be appropriated to each of several cities for the current year, and also giving the commerce of the city as reported by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War. Take first the city of Charleston.

CHARLESTON.

The estimate for completion of the work of improving the harbor is $3,000,000. Appropriations already made, $1,482,500. Balance to be appropriated under the project, $1,525,000. (See page 1132, volume 2, part 2.)

Commerce:	
Exports	$17,410,000
Imports	635,000
	18,045,000

Proposed to be appropriated under the House bill for this year, $350,000.

MOBILE.

By reference to Senate Report No. 1884, second session, Forty-ninth Congress, page 79, I find the imports and exports of Mobile to be put down at a little less than $3,000,000 for 1886. The project is to have a channel 23 feet deep. The estimate is $1,500,000.

The appropriation proposed by the House bill for the present year is $250,000.

CUMBERLAND SOUND.

Page 1191, volume 2, part 2:

Cost of work, estimated	$2,071,023
Already appropriated	367,500

Amount proposed by this bill for the current year, $112,500.

Exports	$3,034,595
Imports	1,625,590
Total commerce for 1886 (see page 1198)	4,660,185

TEXAS.

Sabine Pass (page 1385, volume 2, part 2):

Estimated cost	$3,177,606.50
Appropriated to the present time	548,750.00

There are no commercial statistics of this port in the last report of the Secretary of War, but by reference to the Senate Report No. 1884, Forty-ninth Congress, second session, it will be seen that the commercial statistics are given to the 30th of June, 1884, the latest attainable, to wit, lumber, wool, cotton, hides, and assorted merchandise, of an aggregate value of $125,434. The amount proposed by this bill to be appropriated for Sabine Pass for the current year is $250,000.

Aransas Pass and Bay up to Rockport and Corpus Christi (page 191, volume 2, part 1):

Estimated cost	$1,571,293.00
Amount spent up to June 30, 1887	393,556.95
Amount proposed to be appropriated in the present bill	100,000.00

So far as I can find, the report of the Secretary of War gives no commercial statistics, for the reason, I suppose, that there is not a heavy commerce to report.

Galveston (page 1416, volume 2, part 2):

Estimated cost of the improvement	$8,478,000.00
Amount appropriated to July 1, 1887	1,778,000.00
Total sea-going commerce of the port is	73,874,701.00

The amount proposed to be appropriated for the current year is $500,000 and $100,000 for improving the ship-channel in Galveston Bay, making $600,000 for the ship-channel and the entrance to the port.

SAVANNAH.

According to the report of the Secretary of War for 1887, volume 2, part 1, page 145, the appropriations for the harbor of Savannah from 1874 to 1881, inclusive, amounted to $482,000. In 1881 the Secretary of War was directed by statute to have an estimate made of the cost of deepening the channel to 22 feet. The engineers estimated that it would cost $730,000 to accomplish the object. In 1882, two hundred thousand was appropriated; in 1884, two hundred thousand, and in 1886, one hundred and fifty thousand, leaving one hundred and eighty thousand balance of the estimate for completing the channel to 22 feet in depth. It is now proposed to divide the one hundred and eighty thousand into two installments. On account of the failure to pass the river and harbor bill at the last session of Congress, and on account of the unfinished condition, there has been much filling in, and it is very important that a sufficient amount should be at once appropriated and let the work be completed.

But in this connection it is proper that I should refer to the act approved August 5, 1886 (see House Executive Document No. 57, first session Fiftieth Congress). The Secretary of War was directed to have a survey and estimate made of the cost of improving the harbor of Savannah, from the Cross-Tides above Savannah to the bar, with the view of obtaining 28 feet of water in the channel. The engineer reports that including 10 per cent. for engineering, the total cost is estimated at $6,660,000 (page 2, letter of Secretary of War transmitting engineer's report). Of course, the execution of this project would take a number of years, and it would enhance the commerce of Savannah in much greater proportion than it has ever been enhanced by the opening of the channel to the depth of 22 feet, which in its unfinished condition has almost doubled the business in a few years. The Chief of Engineers also estimates that $600,000 of this appropriation can be profitably expended during the current year (General Gillmore's annual report for 1887, Appendix N, page 1058).

Now, in view of the liberal amounts appropriated to the other Southern cities to which reference has been made, for the improvement of their respective harbors, I ask that the sum of $250,000 be appropriated to complete the old project and begin the new, in the harbor of Savannah.

While this would not meet the requirements, as estimated by the Chief of Engineers, and would be only about one-third of the amount that could be profitably expended this year, still the $250,000 would complete the old project, and in connection with it, commence the dredging that would be made in deepening the ship-channel to 28 feet, so as to accommodate vessels of heavy draught; and it would be expected that it would take a number of years to complete this improvement, but when completed the position of Savannah as a first-class port would be assured, and an immense commerce would be conducted through that port.

But a word, Mr. President, in reference to the present commerce of Savannah as compared with the other cities to which the House bill makes most liberal appropriations.

COMMERCE OF SAVANNAH.

By the same report of the Secretary of War, volume 2, part 2, page 1164, it will be seen that the exports through the port of Savannah during the year were $51,028,190 in 1886. The imports through the harbor were $51,118,524, making an aggregate of imports and exports, which passed through the harbor by water, of over $100,000,000. The above statement does not include receipts and shipments by rail, nor does it include the value of domestic traffic, local manufactures, etc., but is confined strictly to the volume of exports and imports which have a direct connection with the water-way transportation of the city and harbor of Savannah.

I have here a table annexed to letter from O. M. Carter, first lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, addressed to Colonel Gillmore, giving the comparative commerce, exports and imports, of Charleston, Savannah, and Norfolk for fifteen years from 1870 to 1885 inclusive, by which it will be seen that the commerce of Norfolk, exports and imports, for the fifteen years was $140,548,164, the commerce of Charleston for the like period amounted to $292,068,325, while the commerce of Savannah for the like period amounted to $408,276,869, showing the commerce of Savannah for the period above mentioned to be almost as great as that of Charleston and Norfolk together.

Mr. President, I do not come before the Senate to ask favors for the city of Savannah, I come to demand at least the semblance of justice in her behalf, and to enter my protest against the favoritism and partiality contained in the House bill as it comes before the Senate. It seems to me that the bill as it stands would be subject to the objection that its purpose is to serve local interests, and promote local prosperity for a few places, at the expense of others of much greater commercial importance.

The commerce of Savannah, as I have already shown, is greater than the commerce of Mobile, Cumberland Sound, Sabine Pass, Aransas Pass, and Galveston all combined. There is no other harbor in the United States where each dollar appropriated does more to improve a harbor and build up a thrifty commerce than the harbor of Savannah. Still the House bill appropriates to the five harbors mentioned, which all combined have less commerce than Savannah, $1,312,000 for the current year, while Savannah with a greater commerce than all of them combined is to have but $90,000. There is no justice, there is no reason, there is no equity in such discrimination. To do the same measure of justice to Savannah that is done to the other cities mentioned the appropriation ought to be $500,000, but I am only asking two hundred and fifty thousand, the same sum given to Mobile, the same sum given to Sabine Pass, less than half the sum given to Galveston, and one hundred thousand less than Charleston. Mr. President, I desire to be understood as submitting the earnest protest of Savannah against the favoritism and injustice of the House bill. But I can not doubt that the Committee on Commerce of the Senate will so amend the bill as to grant this reasonable request on the part of one of the most important commercial ports of the Union, and the most important port on the South Atlantic coast, with more extensive and complete railroad connections than any Southern seaport city. In addition to this, and in connection with her other rapidly growing trade, it is a well-known fact that Savannah does the largest business in naval stores of any port on the face of the earth.

Mr. President, to show the unjust discrimination made by the bill as it passed the House in favor of other Southern harbors against the harbor of Savannah, I append to my remarks the following tabular statements, which I trust will command the attention of the Senate, and convince the judgment of Senators that it is their duty to correct the error and redress the wrong done to the city of Savannah by the bill as it passed the House of Representatives.

Table showing amount proposed to be appropriated, exports, imports, and total commerce.

City.	Appropriation.	Exports.	Imports.	Total Commerce.
Savannah	$90,000	$51,028,190	$51,118,524	$102,146,714
Charleston	350,000	17,410,000	635,000	18,045,000
Mobile	250,000	.....	.....	*3,000,000
Cumberland Sound	112,500	3,034,595	1,625,590	4,660,185
Sabine Pass	250,000	.....	.....	125,434
Aransas Pass, etc	100,000	.....	.....	.....
Galveston	600,000	.....	.....	73,894,701

*Less than $3,000,000.

Savannah has had appropriated since 1874, $1,034,000; estimated for Savannah to get 28 feet of water, $6,660,000. Galveston has had appropriated $1,778,000; estimated for Galveston, $8,478,000—estimate for Galveston $1,818,000 more than the estimate for Savannah. Estimated to give Savannah 28 feet of water, $6,660,000. Balance of estimate not yet appropriated to give Galveston 25 feet of water, $6,700,000.—Forty-ninth Congress, second session, Report No. 1884, page 84.

I will here remark that I think the commerce of Charleston and Mobile are imperfectly reported, but I have given the best estimates that are in my reach.

One more short table and I have done.

Take another combination in the following table:

City.	Amount proposed.	Commerce.
Savannah	$90,000	$102,146,714
Mobile	250,000	*3,000,000
Cumberland Sound	112,500	4,660,185
Sabine Pass	250,000	125,434
Aransas Pass	100,000	
Galveston	600,000	73,874,701
Total	1,312,000	81,660,320
Savannah	90,000	102,146,714

*Less than $3,000,000.

From the above it will be seen that while Savannah, whose commerce amounts annually to $102,146,714, only gets $90,000 appropriation, the five ports mentioned receive $1,312,000, or over twelve times as much, while their aggregate commerce, according to the Engineer's reports, amounts to only $81,660,320, or about $20,000,000 less than that of Savannah alone. What justice is there in this absurd proposition?

Mr. President, I move that the amendment be printed and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

IMPORTATION OF LEAD ORES.

Mr. STEWART submitted the following resolution, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the Senate without delay if there is any regulation of his Department under which lead ores which contain gold or silver are admitted free of duty. If so, under what law are lead ores put on the free-list because they contain other valuable mineral besides lead; and also to inform the Senate what amount of lead ores have been imported into the United States during the past ten months of the present fiscal year, and what amount of silver ore has been imported into the United States during the same period, and what percentage of lead, if any, was contained in such silver ore.

THE MEAT PRODUCT.

Mr. VEST. I offer a resolution which I ask may be read, lie on the table, and be printed, giving notice that I shall call it up to-morrow.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators shall be appointed by the President of the Senate, whose duty it shall be to examine fully all questions touching the meat product of the United States, and especially as to the transportation of beef and beef cattle, and the sale of the same in the cattle markets, stock-yards, and cities, and whether there exists or has existed any combination of any kind by reason of which the price of beef and beef cattle have been so controlled or affected as to diminish the prices paid the producer without lessening the cost of meat to the consumer; that said committee may hold its sessions during the recess of the Senate at such times and places as it may determine, and shall have power to send for persons and papers and also to employ a stenographer and a sergeant-at-arms, all the necessary expenses of said committee to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and said committee shall make report to the Senate at its next session by bill or otherwise.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be printed and lie on the table.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills, received from the House of Representatives, were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 215) granting a pension to James McCaffrey;
A bill (H. R. 362) to increase the pension of Charles W. Sanborn;
A bill (H. R. 780) granting a pension to James H. Darling;
A bill (H. R. 891) granting a pension to Eliza Ann Shaver;
A bill (H. R. 2116) granting a pension to Johanna Eckhardt;
A bill (H. R. 2174) granting a pension to Lewis Fichthorn;
A bill (H. R. 2215) granting a pension to Charles Glamann;
A bill (H. R. 2529) granting a pension to Mary Monti;
A bill (H. R. 3016) granting a pension to Mary F. Harkins;
A bill (H. R. 3125) for the relief of Susan Jones;
A bill (H. R. 3690) granting a pension to Penelope Morton, widow of Lieutenant Morton;
A bill (H. R. 3706) granting a pension to Henry C. Richardson;
A bill (H. R. 4743) granting pensions to Ada Piatt, Leota Piatt, and Jessie Piatt;
A bill (H. R. 4774) granting a pension to Matthew H. Reynolds;
A bill (H. R 4831) granting a pension to Delilah Vandevender;
A bill (H. R. 5574) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Beyers;
A bill (H. R. 5756) granting a pension to David Gibbons;
A bill (H. R. 5759) granting a pension to John H. Roundtree;
A bill (H. R. 5789) granting a pension to Ellen M. Thiers;
A bill (H. R. 5792) granting a pension to Mary A. Wells;
A bill (H. R. 5903) for the relief of Lewis Davis, a soldier of the war of 1812;
A bill (H. R. 6245) for the relief of William Burk;
A bill (H. R. 6545) to increase the pension to Henry T. Bridges;
A bill (H. R. 6574) for the relief of William Compton;
A bill (H. R. 6577) granting a pension to Abigail Sullivan;
A bill (H. R. 6907) granting an increase of pension to Elias Shafer;
A bill (H. R. 6949) granting a pension to Emeline C. Young;
A bill (H. R. 6973) for the relief of Enoch Weathers;
A bill (H. R. 6976) for the relief of Anna M. Thiele;
A bill (H. R. 6990) to place the name of Rebecca E. Shoemaker on the pension-roll;
A bill (H. R. 7097) granting a pension to Edmund Ryan;
A bill (H. R. 7115) granting a pension to William Scott;
A bill (H. R. 7577) granting a pension to Lewis C. Keck;
A bill (H. R. 7665) granting a pension to John E. Lewis;
A bill (H. R. 7719) granting an increase of pension to George W. Kincaid;
A bill (H. R. 7857) to increase the pension of Henry L. Potter;
A bill (H. R. 7944) granting a pension to Ann V. Ferguson;
A bill (H. R. 7974) granting a pension to Heman Rankins;
A bill (H. R. 8159) granting a pension to Jane Brown Dunn;
A bill (H. R. 8174) granting a pension to Ellen Sexton;
A bill (H. R. 8217) granting a pension to Raphael Fowler;
A bill (H. R. 8281) for the relief of Lieut. James G. W. Hardy;
A bill (H. R. 8400) for the relief of Lydia Burridge;
A bill (H. R. 8629) granting a pension to Mrs. Abba E. Jackson; and
A bill (H. R. 8722) granting a pension to Jessie M. Barthauer.

The following bills from the House of Representatives were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (H. R. 128) for the relief of John Fletcher;
A bill (H. R. 328) for the allowance of certain awards made by a board of claims to certain citizens of Jefferson County, Kentucky;
A bill (H. R. 4581) for the relief of Thomas Mathews and others;
A bill (H. R. 5222) for the relief of A. M. Anderson and others; and
A bill (H. R. 5215) for the relief of Andrew J. Nugent.

The following bills from the House of Representatives were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Commerce:

A bill (H. R. 2527) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North by the Duluth, Rainy Lake River and Southwestern Railway Company;
A bill (H. R. 3376) to extend the limits of the port of New Orleans;
A bill (H. R. 8623) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at or near Guntersville, Ala., and for other purposes; and
A bill (H. R. 7564) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Chattanooga, Tenn.

The bill (H. R. 8285) to remove the political disabilities of Elliott Johnston was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (H. R. 9673) for the relief of the counties of the Territory of Arizona and to legalize the indebtedness thereof, and provide for funding the same, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

The bill (H. R. 882) to correct the muster of and for the relief of George W. Davenport was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 7675) for the relief of E. B. Eddy, of Hull, Quebec, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The joint resolution (H. Res. 103) authorizing and directing the Department of Justice to transfer certain rooms which have been occupied by the United States courts and officials to the city of Utica, N. Y., was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

ANCIENT AND HONORABLE ARTILLERY.

The bill (H. R. 9793) authorizing a loan of arms and equipments to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company was read twice by its title.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent that that bill be now put on its passage; and I ask that it be read for information, and call the attention of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] to it.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he shall deem proper, to loan to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts one hundred and fifty rifles and equipments, belts, bayonets, scabbards, and cartridge-boxes, for use at the celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of that company, to be returned in good order on or before the 1st day of July next.

By unanimous consent the bill was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT YOUNGSTOWN, OHIO.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 347) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Youngstown, Ohio.

The first amendment was, in line 2, after the word "purchase," to insert "acquire by condemnation:" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to purchase, acquire by condemnation, or otherwise provide a suitable site, and cause to be erected thereon, at the city of Youngstown, in the State of Ohio, a substantial and commodious public building, with fire-proof vault, for the use and accommodation of the post-office, internal-revenue office, pension office, and for other Government uses.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that that amendment be concurred in.

The motion was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 10, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" and in line 15, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" so as to read:

The site, and the building thereon when completed according to plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall not exceed the cost of $75,000; and the site purchased shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of at least 50 feet, including streets and alleys; and for the purposes herein mentioned the sum of $75,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The amendment was concurred in.

HEIRS OF SOLOMON SPITZER.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following resolution from the House of Representatives:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *May* 11, 1888.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President be requested to return to the House the bill (H. R. 2699) for the relief of the heirs of the late Solomon Spitzer, for the purpose of correcting the same; and the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to insert in said bill the word "unexpected" instead of the word "unexpended."

The resolution was concurred in.

REPRINTING OF A REPORT.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent that the memorial of George Ticknor Curtis, remonstrating against any action on the part of Congress against the awards made by the Government of Mexico, etc., be reprinted for the use of the Senate. It was ordered to be printed the other day, but there was a mistake made in the heading, and it is very important that it should be in proper shape.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection, and the order to reprint will be made.

SENATOR FROM INDIANA.

Mr. HOAR. I rise to make a privileged report. I am directed by the Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom was referred certain resolutions of the joint convention of the two houses of the Legislature of the State of Indiana concerning the election of DAVID TURPIE as United States Senator, and sundry other memorials, to report thereon. I suppose the report should be read at length.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read at length, if there be no objection.

Mr. HOAR. If the Senate desires to proceed to other business, I shall consent to have the report printed without being read at this time. It will take, I suppose, about five minutes to read it; but it can be printed and lie over.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let it be printed in the RECORD. That will answer the purpose.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Unanimous consent is asked that the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections be printed in the RECORD. That order will be made if there be no objection.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom were referred certain resolutions of the joint convention of the two houses of the State of Indiana concerning the election of Hon. DAVID TURPIE as United States Senator, and a memorial signed by F. Winter and seventeen others, members of the Legislature of said State, protesting and remonstrating against the admission of Mr. TURPIE as a member of the Senate of the United States from the State of Indiana, and a communication signed by F. Winter and John M. Griffiths, in behalf of a committee appointed by the joint convention of said assembly of said State, for the purpose of presenting to the Senate of the United States the facts attending the election of DAVID TURPIE as aforesaid, have considered the same, and respectfully report:

Mr. TURPIE received a certificate of his election from the governor of Indiana, which constitutes a prima facie title to his seat, and has been admitted thereupon to take the oath.

The two houses of the Legislature of Indiana having failed to concur in the appointment of a Senator, met in joint convention, and after sundry ballotings, in which no person had a majority of the votes cast, a ballot was had in which Mr. TURPIE received two more votes than all others. A quorum of said joint convention and a quorum of each house was present and voted. The proceedings were in all respects regular, and resulted in a valid election of Mr. TURPIE, unless the facts which the remonstrants offer to prove constitute a valid objection.

They offer to show, first, that there being a vacancy in the office of lieutenant-governor, Hon. Robert S. Robertson was duly elected to fill such vacancy, and thereby became entitled by the constitution and laws of Indiana to preside over the senate; but that on the meeting of the senate on the 6th day of January, 1887, being the first day of the session of the Legislature at which said alleged election of Mr. TURPIE took place, one Alonzo G. Smith usurped the office and function of such presiding officer, was supported and maintained in such usurpation by a majority of said body, excluded Mr. Robertson from said office and function and continued so to preside and so to exclude Mr. Robertson during all the sessions of said senate, including its attendance on said joint convention, until after the said alleged election of Mr. TURPIE.

Second. That before said alleged election the senate wrongfully and for the purpose of obtaining a majority for said TURPIE in said joint convention, declared two members, who had been duly and lawfully elected members thereof, not entitled to their seats, and declared two other persons, who had not been duly and lawfully elected, to be entitled to such seats, and thereupon seated such persons; and that this was done without right, without evidence, and without hearing or debate, and that said persons so seated thereafter were present and voted for Mr. TURPIE in said convention, and that without such votes said TURPIE would not have received a majority.

The committee are of opinion that the facts offered, if proved, will not warrant the Senate in declaring the sitting member not entitled to his seat. There can be no doubt that the body in question was the constitutional senate of Indiana. The journals of both houses of the Legislature of the State have been submitted to us. It appears that the body was recognized as the senate by the governor and by the house of representatives. Statutes to which its constitutional assent was necessary were enacted and have become part of the law of the State. It seems to us that, without entering upon the question whether there was a vacancy in the office of lieutenant-governor which Mr. Robertson was duly elected to fill, the recognition of Mr. Smith by a majority of the senate as its lawful presiding officer and the recognition of the senate as a lawfully organized body by the other house, as well as by all its own members, who remained and took part in its legislative proceedings, and by the executive department, require us to consider it as the lawful senate, lawfully organized so far as to be entitled to take part in the joint convention which elected a Senator of the United States.

We also think that the judgment of the senate of Indiana as to the title of Messrs. Branahan and McDonald, the two members in question, to their seats is binding upon the Senate of the United States. This body is made by the Constitution the judge of the election, qualifications, and returns of its members. The senate of Indiana is likewise the judge of the election, qualifications, and returns of its own members. We must determine all questions arising out of the proceeding of the electors. But who sustain the character of electors is to be determined by the legislative body of the State. We can not inquire into the motive which controlled its judgment. In rendering that judgment, whether it shall give a hearing to parties, permit debate, examine witnesses, act upon evidence or without evidence, are matters within its own discretion. If that discretion were exercised in the manner charged by the remonstrants, a majority of the committee think that a great public crime was committed, for which the offenders are responsible to the people of Indiana, but we can not try the question. A majority of the committee do not mean to be understood as now committing ourselves to an opinion upon the question whether the Senate can not refuse to admit to a seat a claimant who owes his election to a legislative body which is itself the result of fraud or crime, which has overcome the true will of the people, even if it has possessed itself of legislative authority and of the technical evidence of a rightful character, or whether the judgments of such a body as to the title to seats of its individual members are entitled to any respect whatever. If that question shall hereafter unhappily arise, it will be dealt with on its own merits. The committee ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the several memorials.

Mr. HOAR. The report is a unanimous report of the committee, asking to be discharged from the further consideration of the memorials, thereby confirming the title of the Senator in question to his seat. I suppose there should be a vote of the Senate accepting that report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be received and the committee discharged, and the report printed in the RECORD, if there be no objection.

Mr. SHERMAN. There should be no action taken until it is printed.

Mr. HOAR. I shall call it up to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report, then, will be placed on the Calendar, and the order informally announced by the Chair as to discharging the committee will be vacated.

OHIO VALLEY CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9711.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HAWLEY in the chair). The Chair ought to ask if the morning business is completed. If there be no further morning business the Senator from Iowa moves to proceed to the consideration of the bill moved by him.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government and the Bureau of Agriculture and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, from July 4 to October 27, 1888.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, this bill is an appropriation to enable the Executive Departments to be represented at the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States. The Committee on Appropriations recommend sundry amendments. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill may be dispensed with so far as to allow the amendments to be considered as they are reached in the regular reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill. The first amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations was, in line 6, after the word "Fisheries," to insert "under the direction of the President of the United States;" so as to make the clause read:

That the head of each of the several Executive Departments of the Government, the Commissioner of Agriculture, and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and Commission of Fish and Fisheries, under the direction of the President of the United States, be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to prepare and make suitable exhibits at the said centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, beginning on the 4th of July and closing October 27, 1888.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out from line 13 to line 23, as follows:

That there shall be appointed a committee of Congress composed of nine members, three to be appointed by the President of the Senate and six by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Said committee shall constitute an advisory board to confer with the managers of said exposition and the heads of the several Executive Departments and bureaus in reference to the character, extent, and conduct of the governmental exhibit provided for herein. Said advisory board is authorized and directed to visit said exposition and make such report to Congress in that behalf as they may deem needful and proper.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. After the date "1888," at the end of line 12, there should be a colon instead of a period, so that the proviso will fit in and come immediately after "1888."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That correction will be made.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in line 23, after the word "that," to strike out "said committee" and insert "the President;" in line 24, before the word "discretion," to strike out "its" and insert "his;" and after the words "custody as," in line 30, to strike out "said committees may provide" and insert "he may direct;" so as to make the clause read:

Provided, That the President may, in the exercise of his discretion, allow such documents and exhibits as relate to early settlement at Marietta, Ohio, and the establishment of civil government in the territory northwest of the Ohio River, to be taken to Marietta and exhibited during the time from July 15 to 19, 1888, inclusive, under such restrictions and custody as he may direct.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 37, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty" and insert "forty-five;" so as to make the clause read:

That to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government, the Department of Agriculture, and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in said exposition, to be held as aforesaid, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $145,250, apportioned as follows.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out line 54 as follows:

For expenses of advisory board, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 55, after the words "that the," to strike out "said advisory board" and insert "President;" in the same line, after the words "if in," to strike out "their" and insert "his;" so as to make the clause read:

That the President may, if in his judgment it shall be deemed necessary and expedient in order to secure the best results with greatest economy, transfer a part of the fund hereby apportioned to one Department or bureau to another Department or bureau. The term bureau wherever used herein shall be construed to include the Agricultural Department and the Smithsonian Institution.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. In line 61 I move to strike out the word "and," and after the word "Institution" to insert "and Commission of Fish and Fisheries;" so as to read:

The term "bureau" wherever used herein shall be construed to include the Agricultural Department, the Smithsonian Institution, and Commission of Fish and Fisheries.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in line 63, after the word "authorized," to strike out "and requested;" so as to read:

That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to detail an officer of the Pay Department of the Army or Navy to disburse the fund appropriated by this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 67, after the word "effect," to strike out "of," and in line 69, after the words "and a," to strike out:

Board of audit composed of not less than three persons, one of whom shall be appointed by the committee of Congress: *Provided, however*, That payment of the expenses incurred by the advisory board shall be made on vouchers approved by the president of said board.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Person to be designated by the President to make final audit of said accounts.

So as to make the clause read:

The payments on account of expenses incurred in carrying out and into effect the provisions hereof shall be made on itemized vouchers approved by the representatives of the Department incurring the liability and a person to be designated by the President to make final audit of said accounts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 88, before the word "officer," to strike out "committee;" so as to make the clause read:

That no officer or employé appointed as aforesaid shall be paid extra or additional compensation by reason of services rendered in virtue of such employment; but nothing herein shall be so construed as to prevent the payment of the just and reasonable expenses of any officer or employé appointed or employed under and by virtue of the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. In line 77, after the word "agriculture," I move to strike out the word "and," and after the word "Institution" to insert "and Commission of Fish and Fisheries;" so as to read:

That the head of each of said Executive Departments, and of the Department of Agriculture, Smithsonian Institution, and Commission of Fish and Fisheries.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. In line 5, on page 2, after the words "National Museum," I move to insert a comma, and the same in line 33, after "National Museum."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That correction will be made.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHERMAN. As it is very important to have the amendments acted upon as soon as possible in order that the Government may be represented in the exposition which is to convene early in July, I hope the Senator from Iowa will ask for a committee of conference now on the amendments, so as to expedite the business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair omitted to put the question on the adoption of the preamble.

The preamble was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. In view of the suggestion made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and request a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. ALLISON, Mr. DAWES, and Mr. COCKRELL were appointed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 11th instant approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 70) appropriating $30,000 for the International Exhibition in Brussels, Belgium.

The message also announced that the President had this day approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

An act (S. 2614) to authorize the Batesville and Brinkley Railroad to build a bridge across the Black River, in Arkansas;

An act (S. 1828) to provide for a light-house at Newport News, Middle Ground, Va.;

An act (S. 2506) for the establishment of a light-house, fog-signal, and day-beacon in the vicinity of Goose Rocks, Fox Island Thoroughfare, Maine;

An act (S. 2458) to amend an act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac River, at the foot of Pennsylvania avenue east; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 68) authorizing the Secretary of War to receive for instruction at the Military Academy at West Point José Andrés Urtrecho, of Nicaragua.

BALTIMORE AND POTOMAC RAILROAD.

Mr. FARWELL. I move to take up for consideration at this time Calendar number 938, being the bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Illinois if the Committee on the District of Columbia has not also taken action in regard to the other railroad company, and whether it has not reported a bill in regard to it. I should much prefer, so far as I am concerned, that we should consider the bills together. I do not think it is just to pass this by itself, and I can not give my consent to taking up one of them unless the other is to be taken up also.

Mr. FARWELL. I can inform the Senator that the committee have taken action upon the other matter, but it does not interfere with this in the least, and does not include this. The committee instructed me to report this bill, and to ask for its passage.

Mr. COCKRELL. Has the other bill been reported?

Mr. FARWELL. Yes, sir, to-day.

Mr. COCKRELL. But is it not to be considered in connection with this?

Mr. FARWELL. No, sir. The committee instructed me to report this bill as it is; and all it does is to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to condemn land to the south of Maryland and Virginia avenues, for railway purposes only, and to enable them to get to a square of land which they own, near the Long Bridge.

Mr. COCKRELL. What does the other bill do? I should like to have the whole question settled when it is up.

Mr. FARWELL. The other bill permits the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to enter at the Boundary and E streets and tunnel a mile and a half or a mile and a quarter, and then go along by the Baltimore and Potomac tracks to Sixth street, and then come in on this side of Sixth street at a point opposite the present station. In addition to that, it authorizes the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company to lay a railroad track on the North side of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad to the Long Bridge.

Mr. COCKRELL. Here is the difficulty I see about the matter: If we give one company vested rights down there and it condemns property, and the other company in order to get to the depot should want to occupy the same ground, there would be a controversy, and they would never adjust it.

Mr. FARWELL. I will say to the Senator from Missouri that so far as having a station opposite the present Baltimore and Potomac station is concerned the latter company raises no objection.

Mr. COCKRELL. How will it be about the property condemned? How is the Baltimore and Ohio Company to run its road across the same property?

Mr. FARWELL. Not at all. They come in on the north side all the way. There is no conflict at all.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to have the whole matter settled together. That is the only point with me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the bill is before the Senate.

Mr. VANCE. The bill has not yet been taken up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did say that he understood unanimous consent was given, but the Chair will put the question.

Mr. FARWELL. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, somewhat hastily perhaps, announced that he had heard no objection.

Mr. FARWELL. Is there objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Senators say they did not hear.

Mr. FARWELL. Is there any objection?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair now asks the question, is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. VANCE. I object. It is manifestly proper that the bill which has been reported from the committee this morning should be acted on first so as to let both these great lines come into the city on an equality. If we give one line all it wants, it seems to me we may have difficulty in the way of the other bill. I think it is manifestly proper that the bill just reported should be acted upon first.

Mr. FARWELL. There is no conflict whatever between the bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. VANCE. I have objected once or twice already. I do not mean to take any more of the time of the Senate at present.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I think this bill ought to go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Delaware objects.

Mr. FARWELL. I move, then, to take up the bill notwithstanding the objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The question being put, there were on a division—ayes 19, noes 13; not a quorum voting.

Mr. FARWELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HARRIS. I desire to appeal to the Senator from Illinois not to press this motion this morning. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER], who is in charge of another bill with which the Senator from Illinois and myself are perfectly familiar, is absent, and he has some interest in this. I think perhaps it will be better policy to take up and consider first the bill that I suppose was reported this morning by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. FARWELL. The Senator from West Virginia agrees to this bill. He does not object to it.

Mr. HARRIS. I am aware of the fact that the committee has reported this bill, and I do not wish the Senator to understand that I am in any sense antagonizing the bill; but I think perhaps it will be better policy to consider the other bill first, or consider them both, so that one shall follow immediately after the other.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL] to take up the bill, on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. FRYE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN].

Mr. HARRIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], whom I do not see in the Chamber, but feeling satisfied that he would vote "nay" on this question if present, I shall so vote.

Mr. MANDERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. QUAY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER]. I am not aware how he would vote on this motion, and therefore I shall not vote.

Mr. RANSOM (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. STOCKBRIDGE].

Mr. SABIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KENNA], but with the understanding which I have I am at liberty to vote on this question, and I vote "yea."

Mr. TELLER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GIBSON], and therefore shall not vote.

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. CHACE. My colleague [Mr. ALDRICH] is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT].

Mr. DAVIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired generally with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE], who has not voted, and I therefore withdraw my vote.

Mr. QUAY. I am informed by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL] that the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] is in favor of this bill. That being the case, I vote "yea."

Mr. EVARTS (after having voted in the affirmative). The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] not being in his seat, I withdraw my vote.

The result was announced—yeas 21, nays 19; as follows:

YEAS—21.

Allison,	Chandler,	Paddock,	Sherman,
Blair,	Cullom,	Plumb,	Spooner,
Bowen,	Dolph,	Quay,	Stewart.
Brown,	Farwell,	Riddleberger,	
Cameron,	Hiscock,	Sabin,	
Chace,	Ingalls,	Sawyer,	

NAYS—19.

Bate,	George,	Pasco,	Vest,
Berry,	Hampton,	Pugh,	Walthall,
Call,	Harris,	Reagan,	Wilson of Iowa,
Cockrell,	Hawley,	Saulsbury,	Wilson of Md.
Edmunds,	Jones of Arkansas,	Vance,	

ABSENT—36.

Aldrich,	Dawes,	Hearst,	Palmer,
Beck,	Eustis,	Hoar,	Payne,
Blackburn,	Evarts,	Jones of Nevada,	Platt,
Blodgett,	Faulkner,	Kenna,	Ransom,
Butler,	Frye,	McPherson,	Stanford,
Coke,	Gibson,	Manderson,	Stockbridge,
Colquitt,	Gorman,	Mitchell,	Teller,
Daniel,	Gray,	Morgan,	Turpie,
Davis,	Hale,	Morrill,	Voorhees.

So the motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia, the pending question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. VANCE, to add to section 2 the following proviso:

Provided, That the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company shall be required to remove their track and depot from the public grounds which they now occupy and locate them upon the lands so acquired.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, for some years past the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company has occupied the public mall in front of the Capitol and erected its depot on Sixth street, and, without any rent or charge, it has occupied that ground for a long period of time.

The proposition of the bill which the Committee on the District of Columbia reported this morning to the Senate, which will be before this body for its consideration very soon, is to give the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company like privileges to come in upon the north and easterly side of the track of the Baltimore and Potomac road and enter the mall on the opposite side of Sixth street, and build its depot almost directly opposite the depot of the Baltimore and Potomac Company. That amounts to a destruction of the Mall for the purposes for which it was originally intended, and it will have to be abandoned as a place of pleasure and of public resort by the citizens of the capital.

My proposition, therefore, is to compel the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to withdraw its depot and tracks and locate them upon the land which this bill authorizes the company to acquire just outside the Mall. If that were done we should then have an end to this obstruction and occupation of the public grounds in the city. If it is not done, equal and similar rights and privileges can not be refused to any other corporation that desires to come in and avail itself of the public property of the United States. For that reason I have offered this amendment, which I hope will meet with the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senate is perfectly familiar with the magnitude and the ability of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company. It has probably the best managed railroad system in the country, if not in the world, managed with a large spirit. Wherever it has had an opportunity it has displayed public spirit and patriotism. I have no sort of feeling of hostility to it or criticism of it. The model civil service of the country, if not of the world, is to be found in the organization of that concern. But I do regard it as a national misfortune that the road was permitted to come in upon that magnificent mall in the way that it was; and that without a dollar of compensation the company was presented with the most valuable piece of land in the city of Washington, and it has proceeded to extend its privileges to occupy, to the practical exclusion of the public, one of the fine streets of the city. It is now proposed virtually to sanction and to perpetuate this, and to permit another railroad company to come in by the side of it.

If there be power enough in the public sentiment of the country and the Congress of the United States I trust it will, at least in the last emergency, provide some limit for these companies so that they may not extend their machine-shops and warehouses down even to the Monument, covering this fine piece of ground.

I do not blame them, in one sense, for taking all that is given them; but it strikes me that the course of Congress in presenting this magnificent property to this company is most extraordinary. I feel obliged to vote against the whole proposition.

Mr. FARWELL. The question of the removal of the passenger station is not considered in this bill at all. It was considered before the Committee on the District of Columbia, and was unfavorably considered. It was not agreed to. This bill does not touch or involve the question of the location of the depot or its removal. It simply pro-

vides that to enable the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to transact their freight business with some comfort and take the cars out of the streets they may condemn land south of Virginia and Maryland avenues. That is all the bill does except in addition to that it permits the company to go onto a block they own near the river and near the Long Bridge. That is all the bill proposes.

I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I hope the bill will not pass. I think Washington City with its parks and public grounds and buildings already laid out and made should be the model city of the world, and the convenience of the people and those who come here should be consulted in all respects where it can be done without detriment to the beauty and the plan of the city.

I have no doubt that the Baltimore and Potomac depot should be removed from its present location, and that the whole magnificent boulevard or park on the river should be thrown open to conveyances of every kind.

I should have no objection if it was necessary to giving this or any other railroad company a site at the cost of the people of the United States wherever it could be found without destroying the beauty of the magnificent front on the river, which ought to be extended and ought to be improved, without being interrupted by a railway-crossing of any railroad.

There is no convenience of the people of Washington which requires that that railroad company should have its depot immediately upon or adjacent to Pennsylvania avenue. It might as well be a quarter of a mile or a full mile removed. The depot might as well be on the banks of the Potomac River, or it might as well be further down the river, with our present facilities and our increasing facilities for rapid transit. The little time consumed in reaching the depot would be infinitesimal, while to permit this corporation to continue running its tracks across one of the most beautiful parks of any city, capable of being made so, a necessary lung of the city, and with the improvements which the Government has made there, is, in my judgment, altogether wrong, and not to be permitted by any wise consideration of public policy.

For one, I shall vote against this bill and any bill to locate the depot of any railroad company in immediate proximity to Pennsylvania avenue.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. Mr. President, the proposition made by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] would destroy interests far more important than the streets of Washington City. It is a bigger question than running a railroad from Virginia avenue down to a little brick house near Pennsylvania avenue, where perhaps somebody's horse will be frightened. Adopt the suggestion of the Senator from North Carolina and there can be no traffic, freight or passenger, from North to South unless it shall pass through a tunnel to the Long Bridge; and if the Senator from North Carolina does not know that it certainly is his misfortune. The practical result would be to make all Virginia west of the Blue Ridge a part of West Virginia, and all of Southside Virginia a part of North Carolina.

His amendment tends to that effect. The pending bill is one which I can indorse thoroughly. With the amendment put upon it proposed by the Senator from North Carolina I suppose I could console myself, as a more distinguished Senator once said when he told his colleagues that he could go from Washington to Chicago in the light of his own effigy. This bill, if passed with this amendment, would destroy, so far as we are concerned, the entire interstate-commerce act; and the amendment is only intended—I am not a searcher of hearts, but when I use the word "intended" I think that is the effect—to destroy this measure by one method or another; that is, to make everything go back out to corporations and destroy the only one that gives the western part of Virginia any line of freight and passenger connection.

I beg pardon for not being able to make myself very well understood on account of the condition of my throat.

I submit to the sound judgment of the Senate whether, according to the suggestion I have made, it is proper to consider such a proposition at this time. This is my nineteenth year in legislative life, and in that time I have had some interest in questions relating to railroad matters in the South, and in that time I have listened to every railroad president from here to the Gulf, and this is a renewal of what I knew twelve years ago. I ask the Senate to stop and consider if it is not better to pass the bill of the Senator from Illinois without the amendment now proposed, not as a political factor, but as an industrial one. There is, without making any reflection, something under this.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, I could not very well hear what the Senator from Virginia said, but I should be glad to be informed by him or any one else how the location of the depot on the public grounds on Sixth street, at the corner of Missouri avenue, would answer all the purposes of opening up Southern traffic and travel, as he seems to desire, and how the change of that same depot a few blocks south of the Avenue would have the opposite effect.

SESSION WITH CLOSED DOORS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business. The Sergeant-at-Arms will clear the galleries and close the doors of the Senate.

After three hours the doors were reopened.

RUDOLPH LOBSIGER.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be priated:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State relative to the claim of Mr. Rudolph Lobsiger, a Swiss citizen, against the United States, and recommend that provision be made by law for referring the matter to the Court of Claims for examination on its merits.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *Washington, May* 14, 1888.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State, accompanied by a report of Mr. Somerville P. Tuck, appointed to carry out certain provisions of section 5 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the ascertainment of claims of American citizens for spoliations committed by the French prior to the 31st day of July, 1801," approved January 20, 1885.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *Washington, May* 14, 1888.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Improvement of the Mississippi River, to whom was referred the amendment to the river and harbor bill submitted by Mr. BOWEN, proposing to appropriate $25,000 to enable the Geological Survey to investigate the extent to which the arid region of the United States can be redeemed by irrigation, the segregation of the irrigable lands, the selection of sites for reservoirs, etc., reported it favorably and moved its reference to the Committee on Commerce; when, on motion of Mr. STEWART, the proposed amendment was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PADDOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2762) to provide for the erection of public buildings for post-offices in towns and cities where the post-office receipts for three years preceding have exceeded $3,000 annually; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CALL and Mr. SABIN submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the Indian appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BLAIR and Mr. PADDOCK submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SABIN introduced a bill (S. 2942) granting a pension to Samuel Burwell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2943) granting a pension to Henry Chamberlain; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (2944) granting a pension to Mrs. Lizzie G. Parker; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2945) granting a pension to J. S. May; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

On motion of Mr. HOAR, it was

Ordered, That Carrie V. Miller have leave to withdraw from the files of the Senate the papers in her case, there being no adverse report.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 2 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 15, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 14, 1888.

MELTER OF MINT.

John W. Browning, of Colorado, to be melter of the mint of the United States at Denver, Colo., *vice* William Stapleton, resigned.

APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY—POST-CHAPLAIN.

Charles C. Pierce, of Pennsylvania, to be post-chaplain, May 12, 1888, *vice* Jackson, retired from active service.

PROMOTION IN ARMY.

Tenth Regiment of Cavalry.

First Lieut. William Davis, jr., to be captain, May 10, 1888, *vice* Smithers, retired from active service.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *May* 14, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. WEBER, from Monday, May 14, to Saturday, May 19, inclusive, on account of important business.

To Mr. DE LANO, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. MATSON, until Saturday, on account of important business.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

By unanimous consent, leave was granted to Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas, to print in the RECORD certain remarks on the bill (H. R. 9600) to declare the duties, enforce the obligations, and regulate the service of railroad companies as carriers of interstate commerce, and for other purposes. [See APPENDIX.]

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled a bill of the following title; when the Speaker signed the same, namely:

A bill (H. R. 8464) for the relief of Merchants' National Bank of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

LOAN OF CERTAIN ARMS AND EQUIPMENTS.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the House Calendar and take up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 9793) authorizing a loan of arms and equipments to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized, under such regulations as he shall deem proper, to loan to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company of Massachusetts one hundred and fifty rifles and equipments, belts, bayonets, scabbards, and cartridge-boxes, for use at the celebration of the two hundred and fiftieth anniversary of that company, to be returned on or before the 1st day of July next.

The committee recommended the adoption of the following amendment:

In the ninth line, after the word "returned," insert "in good order."

There being no objection, the bill was considered, the amendment adopted, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LONG moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF TARIFF DEBATE.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to submit a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That general debate in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the bill (H. R. 9051) entitled "An act to reduce taxation and to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue," shall close on Saturday, May 19.

Mr. MILLS. If there be no objection, I demand the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. MILLS moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

GEORGE W. DAVENPORT.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 882) to correct the muster of and for the relief of George W. Davenport and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to correct the muster of George W. Davenport, late second lieutenant of Company C, Eighth Michigan Cavalry, upon the records and rolls of the War Department, so as to show said Davenport as mustered into the military service as second lieutenant of Company C, Eighth Michigan Cavalry, on December 15, 1862, and honorably mustered out on April 30, 1865; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay said George W. Davenport, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum of money equal to the pay of a second lieutenant of volunteer cavalry from December 15, 1862, to April 30, 1865, first deducting any sum or sums which said Davenport has received on account of his services in the war of the rebellion during the time mentioned aforesaid.

The committee recommend that the bill be amended as follows:

In line 9 strike out the words "December fifteenth, eighteen hundred and sixty-two," and insert in lieu thereof the words "January fifteenth, eighteen hundred and sixty-three."

In line 10 strike out the words "April thirtieth" and insert in lieu thereof the words "January sixteenth."

In lines 15 and 16 strike out the words "December fifteenth, eighteen hundred and sixty-two," and insert in lieu thereof the words "January fifteenth, eighteen hundred and sixty-three."

In line 16 strike out the words "April thirtieth" and insert in lieu thereof the words "January sixteenth."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, the amendments agreed to, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. FORD moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ANDREW J. NEWGENT.

Mr. WARNER. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5212) for the relief of Andrew J. Newgent, and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby directed to pay Andrew J. Newgent, of Jackson County, Missouri, the sum of $375, or so much thereof as may be necessary, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full payment for two horses taken from said Newgent by the Confederate forces, while he, the said Newgent, was lieutenant-colonel commanding the Second Batallion Missouri State Militia, the said horses being the private property of said Newgent.

There being no objection, the bill was considered and ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WARNER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I now demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. This being Monday, the regular order is the call of States and Territories for the introduction and reference of bills and joint resolutions. Under this call resolutions and memorials of State and Territorial Legislatures, and also resolutions of inquiry addressed to the heads of Departments, are in order.

REPEAL OF CERTAIN SPECIAL TAXES.

Mr. LAWLER introduced a bill (H. R. 9950) to repeal certain special taxes on retail dealers in liquors, retail dealers in malt liquors, and dealers in manufactured tobacco; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

POSTAL TELEGRAPH SYSTEM.

Mr. LAWLER also introduced the following resolution; which was read and referred to the Committee on Rules:

Whereas petitions bearing the signatures of more than 2,000,000 citizens of the United States request Congress to pass the bill and provide for the establishment of a postal telegraph system: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Committee on Rules be, and they are hereby, requested to set apart a day, to be a continuing order, for the consideration of House bill No. 3404, reported by the Committee on Commerce.

PUBLIC BUILDING, CHICAGO.

Mr. LAWLER also introduced a bill (H. R. 9951) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to cause such changes and improvements to be made in the United States custom-house, post-office, and subtreasury building at Chicago, Ill., and erect such additions thereto as in his judgment may be necessary to provide sufficient accommodations for a post-office in said city; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

ELECTRIC WIRES UNDERGROUND.

Mr. TOWNSHEND (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 9952) to provide for placing the electric wires connecting the several Departments of the Government at Washington, D. C., under ground; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TOWNSHEND (by request) also introduced a bill (H. R. 9953) to provide for placing the wires used by the District of Columbia under ground; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT RENO, NEV.

Mr. WOODBURN introduced a bill (H. R. 9954) for the erection of a public building at Reno, Nev.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

PROFESSIONAL CRIMINALS OF AMERICA.

Mr. CUMMINGS (by Mr. COX) introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 166) authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to contract for the purchase of copies of the publication entitled Professional Criminals of America, for use in the United States consular service; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT HORNELLSVILLE, N. Y.

Mr. DAVENPORT introduced a bill (H. R. 9955) for the erection of a public building at Hornellsville, N. Y.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. BROWER introduced a bill (H. R. 9956) for the relief of certain soldiers and sailors of the late war; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

EDUCATION BILL.

Mr. BROWER also submitted a resolution requesting the Committee on Education to report Senate bill 371, being the bill to aid in the establishment and temporary support of common schools; which was referred to the Committee on Education.

COAL.

Mr. SMITH, of Wisconsin, introduced a bill (H. R. 9957) to provide for the discovery, location, and reservation of coal on the public lands; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

MILWAUKEE, LAKE SHORE AND WESTERN RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. HUDD introduced a bill (H. R. 9958) granting to the Milwaukee, Lake Shore and Western Railway Company the right of way through the Lac de Flambeau Indian reservation in the State of Wisconsin; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

CADETS OF NAVAL ACADEMY.

Mr. WADE introduced a bill (H. R. 9959) in relation to cadets at the Naval Academy; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ST. PAUL'S LUTHERAN CHURCH, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. ATKINSON introduced a bill (H. R. 9960) to discharge the St. Paul's Evangelical Lutheran Church, in the District of Columbia, from the payment of certain taxes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

TERMS OF PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT.

Mr. NEAL introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 167) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States changing the terms of office of the President and Vice-President of the United States; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the business which may be called up by the Committee on the District of Columbia. If the day is not claimed by that committee, then the regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. MILLS. I move to dispense with the call of committees for reports.

The motion was agreed to, two-thirds voting in favor thereof.

Mr. MILLS. I make the usual request that all gentlemen having reports to make be permitted to file them with the Clerk.

There was no objection.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. MATSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 4505) granting a pension to Vincent Bowlin;
A bill (H. R. 7345) for the relief of Samuel J. Jackson;
A bill (H. R. 6503) for the relief of Benjamin F. Samuel;
A bill (H. R. 5941) granting a pension to Nicholas Klock;
A bill (H. R. 3544) granting a pension to Joseph W. McConnell;
A bill (H. R. 6371) granting a pension to Jesse M. Stillwell;
A bill (H. R. 8705) granting a pension to Mary G. Adams, widow of Elsey G. Adams, deceased;
A bill (H. R. 4501) granting a pension to Jesse M. Stillwell;
A bill (H. R. 133) to increase the pension of Samuel Lilly;
A bill (H. R. 8698) granting a pension to Ida Richards;
A bill (H. R. 7483) granting a pension to Barbara Murphy;
A bill (H. R. 9194) granting a pension to Alice Mullin and her minor children;
A bill (H. R. 5100) increasing the pension of Eliza J. Houck, widow of Phillip Houck;
A bill (H. R. 5414) granting a pension to Catharine Falvey;
A bill (H. R. 4500) granting a pension to Melvin Seward;
A bill (H. R. 2165) for the relief of Benjamin Burtram;
A bill (H. R. 5575) granting a pension to James J. Snyder; and
A bill (H. R. 6505) for the relief of Charlotte Fredrick.

SENATE BILLS REPORTED ADVERSELY.

Mr. MATSON also, from the same committee, reported back adversely bills of the Senate of the following titles; which were severally referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (S. 1007) granting a pension to John S. Coleman;
A bill (S. 2447) granting a pension to Mary J. Goslee;
A bill (S. 2330) granting an increase of pension to William Gallagher;
A bill (S. 766) granting an increase of pension to John Moore; and
A bill (S. 2084) to restore to the pension-roll the name of Joseph Lewis.

ARREARS OF PENSIONS.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back bills of the following titles; which were laid on the table:

A bill (H. R. 1330) to repeal all acts of limitation as to the beginning of pensions;
A bill (H. R. 1359) to define the time when pensions granted under the invalid-pension laws shall take effect;
A bill (H. R. 1377) to amend an act making appropriations for the payment of the arrears of pensions granted by act of Congress approved January 25, 1879, and for other purposes;
A bill (H. R. 1384) granting arrears of pensions;
A bill (H. R. 1393) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the payment of arrears of pensions granted by act of Congress approved January 25, 1879, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1879, and for other purposes;
A bill (H. R. 1412) to amend section 2 of an act making appropriations for the payment of the arrears of pensions granted by act of Congress, approved January 25, 1879, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1879;
A bill (H. R. 1457) granting arrears of pension;
A bill (H. R. 1543) to remove the limitation in the payment of arrears of pensions;
A bill (H. R. 1453) to grant arrears of pensions in certain cases;
A bill (H. R. 1556) to remove the limitation in the payment of arrears of pensions;
A bill (H. R. 1633) to amend section 4718 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and for other purposes;
A bill (H. R. 1717) to repeal the proviso of section 2 of the act of March 3, 1879, making appropriations for the payment of arrears of pensions;
A bill (H. R. 1723) to remove the limitations in pension cases;
A bill (H. R. 1824) to extend the provisions of the arrears-of-pension act approved March 3, 1879, to pensioners under special acts of Congress, and to repeal the limitation of arrears act;
A bill (H. R. 3350) to amend section 2 of an act making appropriations for the payment of the arrears of pensions granted by act of Congress approved January 25, 1879, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1879;
A bill (H. R. 3429) to remove the limitation in the payment of arrears of pensions;
A bill (H. R. 3431) to amend section 2 of chapter 187, United States Statutes at Large, 1877 to 1879, entitled "An act for the payment of the arrears of pension granted by act of Congress approved January 25, 1879," and for other purposes; and
A bill (H. R. 5068) to amend section 2 of an act making appropriations for the payment of the arrears of pensions granted by act of Congress approved January 25, 1879, and for other purposes.

He also, from the same committee, reported, in the nature of a substitute for the foregoing, a bill (H. R. 9961) relating to the arrears of pensions; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NATHANIEL FRANCIS.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (9795) granting a pension to Nathaniel Francis; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JULIA BRYAN.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8704) granting a pension to Julia Bryan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SUSAN SINGLETON.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9130) granting a pension to Susan Singleton; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on

the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LYDIA HEINY.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 9034) granting a pension to Lydia Heiny; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

LOUISA ROGERS.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8549) granting a pension to Louisa Rogers; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. LAURA HOOPER DENBY.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1760) to increase the pension of Mrs. Laura Hooper Denby; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JEPTHA A. JONES.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1173) increasing the pension of Jeptha A. Jones; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JULIA A. RHOADS.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 842) granting a pension to Julia A. Rhoads; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES W. BOWMAN.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2449) granting a pension to James W. Bowman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BENJAMIN A. BERTRAM.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1762) granting a pension to Benjamin A. Bertram; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CATHARINE M'QUADE.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2448) granting a pension to Catharine McQuade; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES WHITE.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2520) granting a pension to James White; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY CURTIN.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2653) granting a pension to Mary Curtin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. CATHARINE K. WHITTLESEY.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2274) granting a pension to Mrs. Catharine K. Whittlesey; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CATHARINE BUSEY.

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 333) granting a pension to Catharine Busey; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELIZABETH A. SOUTH.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6848) for the relief of Elizabeth A. South; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SAMUEL PIERCY.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 3710) granting a pension to Samuel Piercy; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ALBERT O. ROBB.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9399) granting a pension to Albert O. Robb; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN TAAFFE.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 6220) granting a pension to John Taaffe; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. JUDITH DEIG.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9314) granting a pension to Mrs. Judith Deig; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHARLES S. BAKER.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 9792) to increase the pension of Charles S. Baker; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MILTON MERWIN.

Mr. SAWYER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 9649) continuing the pension of Milton Merwin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PHEBE A. ROMAINE.

Mr. CHIPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7321) granting a pension to Phebe A. Romaine, widow of Joseph Romaine; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RUSSELL L. DOANE.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 2507) granting a pension to Russell L. Doane, of Sanilac County, Michigan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LOVINIA A. MARSH.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 3761) granting a pension to Lovinia A. Marsh; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HIRAM R. ELLIS.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 881) granting a pension to Hiram R. Ellis; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

THOMAS STRODDER.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8087) for the relief of Thomas Strodder; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NATHANIEL M. BERRY.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 1856) granting a pension to Nathaniel M. Berry; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELLEN J. SNEDAKER.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2313) granting a pension to Ellen J. Snedaker; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM C. WALLACE YOUNG.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1575) granting an increase of pension to William C. Wallace Young; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ERNST HEIN.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2413) granting an increase of pension to Ernst Hein; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, ALEXANDRIA, LA.

Mr. NEWTON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back the bill (H. R. 1482) to provide for the construction of a public building at the city of Alexandria, State of Louisiana; which was laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, reported, in the nature of a substitute for the foregoing, a bill (H. R. 9962) for the erection of a public building at Alexandria, La.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

DAVID A. YEAW.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9595) granting a pension to David A. Yeaw; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CYNTHIA J. CARLTON.

Mr. SPOONER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 154) restoring to the pension-roll the name of Cynthia J. Carlton; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

D. G. SCOOTEN.

Mr. SPOONER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2435) granting a pension to D. G. Scooten; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARTHA V. COLEMAN.

Mr. SPOONER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (S. 1264) granting a pension to Martha V. Coleman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELEANOR S. LAWSON.

Mr. SPOONER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 175) granting a pension to Eleanor S. Lawson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN D. JONES.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 775) granting an increase of pension to John D. Jones; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. NANCY E. SPENCER.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 783) granting a pension to Mrs. Nancy E. Spencer; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

EDWIN E. CHASE.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2571) granting a pension to Edwin E. Chase; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. EMILINE ANDERSON.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2366) granting a pension to Mrs. Emiline Anderson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELVIRA M. DORMAN.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2830) granting an increase of pension to Elvira M. Dorman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELIZA M. SCANDLIN.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2779) granting a pension to Eliza M. Scandlin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN G. MERRITT.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2738) granting an increase of pension to John G. Merritt; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ALLEN BLETHEN.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2700) granting an increase of pension to Allen Blethen; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

H. H. RUSSELL.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2609) granting a pension to H. H. Russell; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NATHAN B. RARICK.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2578) granting a pension to Nathan B. Rarick; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, PEORIA, ILL.

Mr. POST, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9059) appropriating $12,000 for the completion of the public building at Peoria, Ill., and increasing the limit of the cost of said building; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. CHIPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 8573) granting a pension to William Partlow; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 3578) granting a pension to Philip Curran; and

A bill (H. R. 7915) granting a pension to Eliza E. Peterson.

I. H. CORN.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 8930) for the relief of I. H. Corn; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ALBERT WATSON.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9824) for the relief of Albert Watson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GEORGE S. THWING.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2240) for the relief of George S. Thwing; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SARAH J. FOY.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2829) granting a pension to Sarah J. Foy; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ROBERT H. STURGESS.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 767) granting a pension to Robert H. Sturgess; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

DAVID H. LUTMAN.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2206) granting a pension to David H. Lutman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM COLLINSWORTH.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1122) granting an increase of pension to William Collinsworth; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARGARET M. MILLER.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1500) granting a pension to Margaret M. Miller; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELIZA J. MAYDEN.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1254) granting a pension to Eliza J. Mayden; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SALLIE R. ALEXANDER.

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1909) granting an increase of pension to Sallie R. Alexander, widow of Lieut. Col. Thomas L. Alexander, United States Army; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MINOR CHILDREN OF PATRICK FRAWLEY.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2655) granting a pension to the widow and minor children of Patrick Frawley; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LYDIA HAWKINS.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2655) granting a pension to Lydia Hawkins; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN LEARY, DECEASED.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1076) granting a pension to the widow of John Leary, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

AUSTIN P. COX.

Mr. MANSUR, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6067) for the relief of Austin P. Cox; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. MANSUR also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 6530) for the relief of Manual Mason;

A bill (H. R. 4563) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to refund money wrongfully paid for duties on imports by Daniel Marcy; and

A bill (H. R. 7619) for the relief of John P. Clum.

THOMAS G. MACKIE.

Mr. MANSUR also, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6069) for the relief of Thomas G. Mackie and the heirs at law of William A. Hyde, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM H. TABARRAH.

Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 948) for the relief of William H. Tabarrah; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

R. D. BABCOCK.

Mr. CAREY also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5225) for the relief of R. D. Babcock; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

IRREGULARITIES IN COMPENSATION OF GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS.

Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department, reported back favorably the joint resolution (H. Res. 164) for the appointment of a joint committee of both Houses of Congress to inquire into existing irregularities, if any, in the compensation of the officers and employés of the Executive Departments and bureaus of the Government; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GRANT OF CERTAIN LANDS, WYOMING.

Mr. WHEELER also, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back favorably the bill (S. 850) granting certain lands in the Territory of Wyoming for public purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. MILLS. I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of bills raising revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. HATCH rose and was recognized.

Mr. PAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] may have an extension of his time, not exceeding thirty minutes, if he so desires, in order to conclude the remarks which he is about to make to the committee.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, I am very much obliged to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON] and to the Committee of the Whole for the courtesy extended to me. Nothing less than the magnitude of the interests involved in the pending bill and its effects upon the prosperity and welfare of the people of the whole country would induce me to trespass upon the patience of the House at this time. But, Mr. Chairman, I feel that I would be faithless to my own convictions, derelict in my duty to the people I have the honor to represent upon this floor, and disloyal to the interests confided to the Committee on Agriculture, of which I have the honor to be the chairman, if I refused or neglected to speak earnestly and plainly upon what I consider a legislative crisis in the history of the country. I shall offer no apology to this House, as I have never offered one anywhere, for speaking in behalf of the agriculturists and of the agricultural interests of the country.

Agriculture is the oldest and the most honorable occupation of man. It is the foundation of our earliest civilization, and its development marks the periods of the passage in the history of the world "from savagery to barbarism and from barbarism to civilization." It is to-day the foundation of all commercial and material progress in this country. It marks in every age of the world the steps of civilization as clearly and distinctly as the posts mark the miles on the road. The history of the world teaches us that in all ages, in every country, agriculture has borne more than its fair proportion of the burdens of government.

Whether taxation has been exacted from it in kind, or under whatever system taxes have been levied, agriculture has always borne more than its just proportion, and too often, as in our own country, has been the prey of skillfully devised systems of taxation for the benefit and enrichment of some favored class. This, Mr. Chairman, is particularly true in the nineteenth century and under our republican form of government in the year 1888.

No system of taxation can be devised which benefits one class of the people in a country that does not bear with equal hardship upon some other class or classes. It is utterly impossible to devise a scheme of taxation that will inure to the benefit of one class without imposing a corresponding burden upon other classes. Under our system of taxation the largest proportion of the money exacted from the people by the Federal Government comes through the custom-house. It is either levied upon articles that are not manufactured in this country, in which case the Government gets the sole benefit of the tax, or it is levied upon articles that are manufactured in this country as well as in foreign countries, and in all such cases the Government gets its proportion of the tax, while the manufacturer of the protected articles is also benefited by the tax; and the proposition which has been stated upon the floor of this House by more that one gentleman, that a tax upon an article manufactured abroad and brought into this country through the custom-house does not add to the cost of the article to the consumer is too ridiculous to be met by argument.

A gentleman who can persuade himself to believe that proposition certainly could not be convinced by argument, even if one should rise from the dead. The idea that a tax upon a manufactured article does not add to its cost to the consumer is as ridiculous as the idea that the freight charges added to the cost of an article transported 1,000 or 3,000 miles does not add to its price to the consumer. No tax can be levied upon a manufactured article that does not benefit the manufacturer, and a long line of the ablest writers and speakers upon this question, covering a period of a hundred years, have stated time and again that the manufacturer alone receives the benefit of such taxes. And, Mr. Chairman, within the last few years there has been added to the roll of illustrious authorities who have declared this to be a maxim in political economy the name of the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], an extract from whose life of Hamilton was read upon this floor by the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] the other day, in which it is stated that the tariff tax inures to the benefit of the manufacturer alone.

Now, sir, if that proposition be true, the agriculturists and the great mass of consumers of this country certainly have no share in the profits made by the manufacturers, and therefore no share in the benefits resulting from this species of taxation.

Mr. Chairman, there has been enough written and said upon this subject within the last week or two in the House of Representatives to deter almost anybody from attempting a set tariff speech at this stage

of the discussion of the pending bill. History has been ransacked, libraries have been overhauled, and everything of interest upon the question that has been printed within the last hundred years has been quoted upon this floor.

I have been looking through the RECORD at some of the printed speeches, and they remind me of one of those new-fangled patch quilts, some of them "crazy-quilts" at that. They are patched all through with quotations and tables, and again quotations, in a manner which must appal the reader (and which certainly does appal the speaker), who is to follow their publication. I do not, therefore, expect, and do not undertake, to say anything new upon this subject; but I do wish to call the attention of the House and, as far as my words can reach, the attention of the country to the proposition I have laid down, that a tax which enriches the manufacturer impoverishes the farmer. We have seen in this discussion a good deal of skill and ability on the part of our friends on the other side in the manner in which they have conducted their part of it, so as to lead not only the minds of the members on this floor, but the minds of the people throughout the country, into a discussion of the principles of taxation, as if we were undertaking here to inaugurate a brand new system of tariff.

I wish it were true. I am ready for that contest whenever it comes. I do not believe in the present system. I do not believe in the principles on which the present system is based. But what is the bill under discussion and pending before the House to-day? Is it a departure from any principles involved in the Morrill tariff act? Not at all; it preserves, I am sorry to say, every principle and feature of that law. It is simply a proposition of modification and reduction. It does not touch a principle involved in what is known as the Morrill tariff act. I wish we had a bill pending before the House to-day based entirely upon a principle of equality and fairness—better and deeper than we can get in the present measure. But I do not intend to be led off by the adroitness and skill of our friends on the other side into discussing the principles involved in this bill. They are fastened upon us; and all we can hope to do, and all that this bill seeks to do, is simply to reduce under the present system the amount of taxes now collected by the Government and put into the Treasury; that is all.

What is the condition of the Treasury of the United States to-day under the present tariff law? What is the attitude of the Government of the United States contrasted with that of all the other nations of the earth in regard to this subject of taxation? Let us look for a moment.

At a meeting of the National Institute of Statistics, held in Europe, a detailed comparison of the revenues and expenditures of seven of the leading states of Europe was given by M. Cerboni, superintendent of accounts, or perhaps I should rather say auditor-general of the Kingdom of Italy. The total receipts and expenditures for these different nations for the year 1885–86 were as follows:

Austria—	
Receipts	$380,000,000
Expenses	382,000,000
England—	
Receipts	465,000,000
Expenses	480,000,000
France—	
Receipts	602,000,000
Expenses	583,000,000
Germany—	
Receipts	$477,000,000
Expenses	478,000,000
Italy—	
Receipts	282,000,000
Expenses	286,000,000
Russia—	
Receipts	613,000,000
Expenses	624,000,000
Spain—	
Receipts	167,000,000
Expenses	175,000,000

With the exception of France, not one of these seven countries I have named levies $1 of tax upon its people over and above the amount needed for the ordinary and extraordinary expenses of the Government. Not a single European country to-day exacts more tribute from its people than it needs for the expenses of its government; and I say here to-day that there is not a kingdom in Europe that would dare to exact of its people $100,000,000 a year in excess of the needs of the government. Such an exaction would produce a revolution in any country in Europe. There is not a government upon the face of this earth, except the United States, that is strong enough to lay the heavy and hard hand of the taxing power upon its people in excess of the wants of that government. But under the system which has been fastened upon us, what have we been doing? In 1885–'86, the year referred to in the figures I have read, the gross receipts of our Government were $336,000,000, in round numbers, and the expenditures $221,000,000; in 1886–'87 the receipts were $371,000,000; actual expenses, $244,000,000; disbursements for all purposes, only $267,000,000, showing a surplus revenue in 1885–'86 of nearly $94,000,000, and in 1886–'87 nearly $104,000,000.

Under the present system the Government of the United States is exacting from the people of this country nearly a hundred million dollars a year more than it needs. For what purpose is this tribute levied? I propose to undertake to show for what purpose it is done. It is done to enrich favored classes that have fastened their fangs upon the legislation of this country. It is done to enrich one class of people at the expense of the masses. The wholes ystem was conceived in greed and avarice, and it has been maintained from that day to this by misrepresentation, corruption, and fraud.

Mr. PLUMB. Will my friend from Missouri allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HATCH. With great pleasure.

Mr. PLUMB. Are any of the European countries which have been named by the gentleman engaged in paying their public debt?

Mr. HATCH. I answer, yes, sir; some of them are paying their public debt, and some of them are paying interest on their public debt. France is paying part of her public debt. But the gentleman knows as well as I do that the United States Government to-day is not in a position to pay its public debt; and it has been placed in that same position by the same political party that inaugurated the system of legislation that exacts tribute from one portion of the country for the benefit of another.

But over and above all the needs of the Government beyond every dollar that the Government of the United States can use legitimately to-day, except to take the surplus and go into the open maket and pay an exorbitant price for these bonds, we are exacting from the people, taking from the arteries of trade and commerce, nearly $100,000,000 that ought to be left in the pockets of the honest people of the country.

Mr. PLUMB. I would like to ask one more question, if the gentleman pleases.

Mr. HATCH. Certainly.

Mr. PLUMB. Does not section 3693 of the Revised Statutes provide that the interest-bearing debt of the United States may be paid whenever bonds bearing a less rate of interest can be sold at par in coin; and if so, why not pay the public debt?

Well, my friend, I am one member of this House who has stood here for nine years pleading for the payment of this public debt.

Mr. HERBERT. We paid all that we could pay under the law, and now we are buying it.

Mr. HATCH. We paid every dollar that was due and are glad to do it, and if I have received any one instruction more emphatic than another from the people whom I have the honor to represent upon this floor, it is that I should always vote to pay the public debt. I have never seen occasion to vary from that principle. We are willing to be taxed for that purpose; but we are not willing to be robbed day after day and year after year to put money into the coffers of bloated monopolies and favored manufacturers of the country. That is the position the agricultural community of this country assumes to-day; and right here the gentleman's question reminds me of what I had intended to refer to later on, but shall take occasion to call attention to now.

If gentlemen on that side would read history, if their memories were not so treacherous, if they would learn the lesson which experience would teach from what transpired on this floor in the Forty-sixth Congress, they would accept with avidity and gladness the bill tendered to them by the Democratic party to-day.

My friend from New York sitting near me [Mr. COX] remembers it, all gentlemen around me remember it, when in the Forty-sixth Congress Mr. Fernando Wood, of New York, then chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, reported to the House what was known as the Wood refunding bill, where he offered to the national banks, through the measure then presented, a bond, I believe, if my memory does not deceive me, of 3 per cent., and when what was known as the Carlisle amendment was put on the bill and passed the House and Senate; but the national banks, in the exercise of their arrogant power, induced the President of the United States to veto that bill; and yet within less than twelve months afterwards they would have given $10,000,0000 to have had it passed.

Never from that day to this has there been a time when as liberal a bill in their interest could be passed through the House of Representatives; and if gentlemen on the other side would learn a lesson from the experience of the past they would not only take this bill now before them, but they would take it by a unanimous vote upon that side and be glad to get it; for I tell you, gentlemen, if it is rejected now, within less than twelve months you will be willing to give millions of dollars to get as moderate a reduction of taxation as we now propose. In my judgment, if this bill is not passed by this Congress the voice of the people sweeping over the length and breadth of the land will place a membership in the Fifty-first Congress that will take this system, and, instead of simply reducing it as we propose to do, will bring it down to a point where it will do equal and exact justice to all the interests of the country without regard to favored classes or sections.

We have had some very remarkable statements made during the course of this debate. I think one of the most eloquent, easily and gracefully delivered speeches that I have ever had the pleasure of listening to was delivered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]; and one of the most laudatory of his own section that was ever delivered was delivered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER]. I propose to notice a few of the statements made by these gentlemen. The figures that I propose to embody in my remarks have been verified by the statistician of the Agricultural Department, and I believe they are exact and absolutely correct.

Now, it has been stated, and no man denies it, that since 1850 this country has grown in wealth and in prosperity at a ratio unprecedented in the history of any nation on earth. Notwithstanding the four years of the civil war, notwithstanding the destruction of property during that period—from 1850 to 1880—the country had grown to an extent almost startling when we contemplate it. It has grown up into the billions. I know it to be true; the figures state it. Gentlemen upon the other side as well as upon this side have quoted them, and I believe them to be correct. But where has that money been concentrated? What favored class, if any, in the United States have reaped the benefit of that great accumulation of wealth? Has it been equally and evenly distributed throughout the land? No. Has it, in any single State or section of the country, been distributed to all classes alike? No. Has one class solely got the benefit of it? Yes. Now, look first at the general figures before I come down to itemizing some of them.

The nearest estimate that can be made of the value of the agricultural wealth of this country is based upon the valuation of farms, farm animals, farm implements, and machinery. The ownership of the land, its improvements, the ownership of all the stock upon the farm, the ownership of all the tools and machinery necessary to run it, constitute the farmer's capital. In 1850 the farmers of this country owned $3,967,343,580 of property. In 1860—mark this—they had increased their aggregate wealth from the sum named to nearly eight billions, or, to be more exact, $7,980,493,063, a little more than doubling the original capital in ten years, and showing by calculation a net increase of about 101 per cent. In 1870 they had increased from $7,980,493,063 to $11,124,958,747; not quite 40 per cent. In 1880 they increased from $11,124,958,747 to $12,104,001,538, or only about 9 per cent. Between 1850 and 1860 we had the lowest tariff and the lowest rate of tax collections that we have had in this country for the past seventy years. Between 1870 and 1880 we have had the highest we have ever had. Between 1850 and 1860 the farmers of the country more than doubled their wealth, and between 1870 and 1880 they accumulated but 9 per cent. increase.

I append an exact and verified table of the figures.

	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.
Farms	$3,271,575,426	$6,645,045,007	$9,262,803,861	$10,197,096,776
Farm animals	544,180,516	1,089,329,915	1,525,276,457	1,500,384,707
Farm implements	151,587,638	246,118,141	336,878,429	406,520,055
Total	3,967,343,580	7,980,493,063	11,124,958,747	12,104,001,538

While I do not claim that the high tariff since 1861 is the sole cause of this decay in the industry of more than half our people, I do most earnestly contend that in that fact is to be found the secret of one of the most potential causes of the terrible blight and depreciation of values which has befallen American agriculture.

If this is not true, why is it that during the same decades, and fostered and protected by this system, the manufacturing districts have so enormously increased in wealth? There is but one answer. Protection benefits the manufacturer alone, while it oppresses and levies tribute upon all other classes.

Now, contrast the statements made and the figures given with the following table of the wealth per capita of the nine manufacturing States with that of all the other States, from 1850 to 1880 inclusive:

Wealth per capita according to census estimate of true valuation.

Years.	For the nine manufacturing States, Maine to Pennsylvania, inclusive.			All other States.		
	True value of real and personal estate.	Population.	Per capita.	True value of real and personal estate.	Population.	Per capita.
1850	$3,130,989,851	8,626,851	$363	$4,004,790,377	14,565,025	$275
1860	5,591,607,424	10,594,268	528	10,568,008,644	20,849,053	507
1870	15,290,032,687	12,298,739	1,243	14,778,485,820	26,259,641	563
1880	19,530,000,000	14,507,407	1,353	24,012,000,000	35,648,376	674

This shows that the wealth per head was nearly as much in other States as in the Eastern and Middle States in 1850 and 1860, while in 1880 it was twice as much per capita in the nine manufacturing States named.

The population of that region had increased 68 per cent., and wealth 527 per cent. The population of the other States had increased 145 per cent., and their wealth 500 per cent.; *i. e.*, the increase of wealth in the manufacturing States is greater with an increment of 68 per cent. of population than in the other States, which show an increase of 145 per cent. in population.

But the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER], who, I am sorry to see, is not in his seat this morning—I do not know that I could make any impression upon him, but I would like him to hear what I have to say—the gentleman from New Hampshire, with a pride that was very commendable and an eloquence that is not excelled by that of any gentleman on this floor, gave us a graphic picture of the six New England States, how much they had gained in wealth, and he claimed that this prosperity was due to the present tariff laws, and I agree with him, as it is a complete vindication of my own position. Now let us see what proportion and what classes of the people of the six New England States have accumulated this property, and with what consummate tact and skill these gentlemen attempt to withhold from their constituents at home and from this House the real facts.

Oh! they fight the West as an agricultural producing region and not a manufacturing one; and they say we are sectional if we undertake to reform the tariff because it is in the interest of the West. I want to find out whether the agriculturists of the six New England States between 1870 and 1880 received their equal, fair, and just proportion of this immense accretion of wealth. In 1850, in the six New England States, the total value of the farms, farm animals, implements, etc., the wealth of the agriculturists of the six New England States, aggregated the amounts shown in the following table:

Total values of farms, farm animals, implements, etc., of the six New England States.

States.	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.
New Hampshire	$66,432,023	$83,297,400	$99,295,801	$88,715,604
Maine	66,852,031	97,424,385	131,128,193	123,805,039
Vermont	78,749,737	114,196,989	168,506,189	140,811,400
Massachusetts	121,933,644	139,888,690	138,482,891	164,288,956
Rhode Island	19,100,640	22,179,388	25,496,346	29,039,040
Connecticut	82,086,453	104,480,565	145,033,019	135,185,831
Total	435,154,525	561,467,417	707,942,439	671,846,058

In 1880, after more than ten years of profound peace and unexampled prosperity, ten years of the largest accumulations of wealth that New England has never seen, the wealth of her agriculturists fell off from $707,000,000 to $671,000,000, a loss of over $36,000,000; while the same figures demonstrate the fact that the largest relative or percentage gain in agricultural wealth was during the low-tariff period between 1850 and 1860.

This system, merciless as death itself, robs alike the neighbor and the stranger; robs a portion of their own people as it does the people of the Mississippi Valley. The agriculturists and people to-day are poorer, relatively, than they were in 1870; and the census of 1890 will show that the decrease has been greater since 1880 than in the decade that I have named.

Mr. HERBERT. Illustrating the value of the home market they talked so much about.

Mr. HATCH. I will come to that presently. I want the two gentlemen from Massachusetts [Mr. BURNETT and Mr. RUSSELL], whom I see before me, who are representatives of this agricultural interest in New England, and my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. MCKINNEY], during this coming campaign to hold up to the farmers of New England this fact, that while New England has grown rich the farmers of New England have grown poor. In spite of their home market, in spite of the advantages of large cities and manufacturing towns and all the blessings that flow from this high protective tariff, as stated by our friends upon the other side, the agriculturists of New England are poorer than they were ten years ago.

Some gentleman upon the other side has spoken of the three great States of New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, the other three manufacturing States. From what has been said you would suppose that the agriculturists had grown very rich. What do the figures show in regard to those States—New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania?

Value of farms, farm animals, farm implements, and machinery.

	1850.	1860.	1870.	1880.
New York	$650,202,067	$936,366,584	$1,494,738,190	$1,216,637,765
New Jersey	135,342,305	202,131,598	286,854,890	212,678,330
Pennsylvania	464,098,693	754,166,275	1,194,786,853	1,095,405,324
Total	1,249,643,065	1,892,664,457	2,976,379,873	2,524,721,419

A loss of over four hundred and fifty millions in the last-named decade.

Mr. BLAND. Of farm values?

Mr. HATCH. This statement includes farm values, improvements, stock, and farming implements. They include the entire capital and wealth of the farmers of those States. And Pennsylvania, the most favored of all the States under the present system, with her myriad of highly protected industries, her unexampled accumulation of wealth in the hands of favored classes, her long role of millionaires laid the iron hand of protection upon her farmers, and in the name of "American industries" robbed the agriculturists of $99,381,529 in the decade between 1870 and 1880, and it is still going on in an increased ratio.

What a picture the little State of New Hampshire cuts in this table, the State that was so extolled by my friend [Mr. GALLINGER]. He held it up in contrast with Southern States and showed how much more money they were making than could possibly be made in the agricultural States of the South. How, then, stands New Hampshire in this race? In 1850 the agriculturists of that State had a value of $66,432,023; in 1860, $83,297,400; in 1870, $99,295,801. In 1880 they had lost nearly eleven millions of dollars, having only $88,715,693.

Now if this system of protective tariff piles up this immense amount of money, which has been stated, in the New England and other manufacturing States, I ask again, who gets it? As stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts in his history of Alexander Hamilton, the manufacturer alone gets it. But they say to us in the West, if you will simply build up manufactories and diversify your industries you will grow rich as we do. But, my friends, we do not want to grow rich as you do. Public sentiment in the West is upon a higher plane than robbing one portion of its own people to enrich another portion. [Applause.] Whenever you devise a system of taxation that will bear equally upon all the people of the West then we want to support it. But when you present to us a proposition that we shall rob nine men out of ten in the Mississippi Valley simply to make one man rich we reject it with scorn and contempt. And that is what you are doing.

Mr. CHEADLE. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. HATCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHEADLE. I understood you to say, in stating the evidence of wealth of the farming class, that it consisted in their lands and stock. Do you take into consideration the money they have on deposit at interest?

Mr. HATCH. Well, my friend, between 1850 and 1860 the farmers had some surplus money at interest; but since your party has been robbing them under the existing tariff system they have not any surplus money left. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CHEADLE. Will the gentleman now permit me to state just one fact?

Mr. HATCH. I can not yield for the gentleman to make a speech. If he wants to ask a question——

Mr. CHEADLE. As a representative of an agricultural district, I want to make just one statement of fact——

Mr. HATCH. Let the gentleman get his own time. I can not yield for a statement.

Mr. CHEADLE. I only desire to say——

Mr. HATCH. I decline to yield to the gentleman for his statement.

Mr. CHEADLE, while Mr. HATCH was proceeding with his remarks, endeavored to make himself heard.

Mr. HATCH. Oh, yes, I will stir you up worse than that before I get through. You gentlemen who are here representing agricultural districts in the West and are opposing this bill will find a storm of indignation when you go home that will be as much as you can meet. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I know whereof I speak.

Mr. KERR. I desire to ask the gentleman——

Mr. HATCH. The misfortune of the gentlemen over there is that whenever any one on this side of the House undertakes to make a point on this tariff bill they try to break the force of it; not with argument, but by undertaking to ask questions. They are living, breathing interrogation points. [Laughter.] There are some gentlemen over there who never take the pains to expend time and labor in the preparation of a speech of their own, but are always trying to get their names into somebody else's speech. They remind me very much of what I heard a distinguished Presbyterian divine of Kentucky say once when he referred to the fact that the greatest of English poets had stated that some men are born great, others achieve greatness, and others have greatness thrust upon them. If the poet had lived in this day and generation and been acquainted with the House of Representatives he would have added a fourth class—the class of men who are continually thrusting themselves upon greatness. [Laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. Only a question.

Mr. HATCH. I will yield to the gentleman for a question, if he will not make a speech.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I wish to ask whether it is entirely becoming for the gentleman from Missouri to make that charge against this side of the House, in view of the fact that we have extended his time half an hour, although there are many gentlemen here still desirous to speak?

Mr. HATCH. That has nothing in the world to do with the question I have stated, for I have patiently sat in my seat during this entire debate and have never interrupted a gentleman on either side by a question. I am not in the habit of doing so. When a gentleman has anything to say on this floor let him say it in his own time; and if I want to reply I will take my own time to do it, and not try to force myself into his speech. I was under the impression that the extension of time was given to me and not to gentlemen who seek to consume it with questions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHEADLE] asked me whether I included in my statement the money owned by the farmers. So far as was possible to get at that matter in taking the census of what the farmers own their money is included. This is a statement of the agricultural wealth of the country. But I want to state here, without the fear of successful contradiction, that the bank deposits by farmers in the agricultural districts of the country have been steadily going down, growing "beautifully less" under this tariff, ever since 1860. I know a bank in my own county to-day which was in existence between 1850 and 1860; and you know it (addressing Mr. BIGGS, who sat near Mr. HATCH); you borrowed many a dollar from it with which to handle stock—I refer to the old Branch Bank of the State of Missouri, at Palmyra. It still exists under a different name. Between 1850 and 1860, in Paris and Palmyra, the county seats of Monroe and Marion Counties, and other large agricultural counties, 75 per cent. of the stock of the local banks and of all the money deposited therein belonged to the farmers. Is not that true?

Mr. BIGGS. It is; I know it to have been the fact.

Mr. HATCH. And to-day 75 per cent. of the loans of those banks are made to the farmers. That is the way the tables have turned. I challenge the statement of the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] when he says that one-third of the deposits in the savings-banks of New England are made by farmers. I deny that statement; and I challenge him at any time during this discussion to produce any statistics to show that any such proportion of the farmers of New England are depositors in the savings-banks. I know that the farmers are getting poorer every year. I know it by personal experience; I know it by personal intercourse with leading farmers in the West; I know it by statistics which no man can gainsay. And it is perfectly natural that it should be so. The burden of this tariff taxation falls upon them; they pay the heaviest proportion of it. Everything that they buy is taxed, and everything that they sell is free.

I see the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER] in his seat. I want to refer to a very singular statement made by him and a table printed in his speech. On page 3895 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that gentleman, with a facetiousness that has never been equaled on this floor except by one or two other distinguished gentlemen, undertook to ridicule the idea that the farmers are not protected under our existing tariff legislation; and he gave a list of the imports of farm products——

Mr. GUENTHER. Do you propose to protect the farmers?

Mr. HATCH. Do I propose to protect them? Well, if you will just listen a few minutes, you will hear my answer to that question; I will show you how I propose to protect them. I propose to protect them simply by keeping them from being robbed, that is all. I want to protect them against robbery, but not against fair competition in the open markets of the world.

But the gentleman from Wisconsin prints a list of farm products imported into the country, and under the head of breadstuffs he has placed barley; and then in a note——

Mr. GUENTHER rose.

Mr. HATCH. Let me get through my statement. You will be more uneasy before I am done with you. According to the gentleman's statement nearly $6,000,000 worth of breadstuffs were imported in three months, and over $4,000,000 worth consisted of barley. Barley is brought from Canada to Milwaukee and Rochester and Detroit, and made into beer, every bushel of it made into beer. I ask, then, is barley a breadstuff? Does the gentleman claim that barley is a necessary of life?

Mr. GUENTHER. It is to some persons. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to show the skill with which these gentlemen try to mislead the people. They talk about the imported "breadstuffs," when four millions out of the six millions are barley for beer! And the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER] makes a great speech about that.

Mr. ATKINSON. Is the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] aware of the fact that in the report on Commerce and Navigation barley is classified as breadstuffs?

Mr. HATCH. Oh, yes, I know it is; and the man down there that classified it in that way knows as little about it as my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER] or the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GUENTHER. We know as much in Wisconsin about agriculture as they know in Missouri.

Mr. HATCH. Then the gentleman says wheat is protected. Wheat protected! Oh, yes. They say, "We protect the farmer by putting a tariff of 20 cents per bushel on wheat." What farmer in Wisconsin is so ignorant that you can palm that off on him? What farmer lives to-day in the Mississippi Valley, who grows a bushel of wheat, that you can palm off on him the proposition that he is protected by a duty on wheat? Gentlemen talk about wheat coming over the Canadian line; and that duty was laid upon wheat to protect a few farmers upon the Canadian border.

Mr. GUENTHER. Will the gentleman permit me——

Mr. HATCH. I can not yield further.

Mr. GUENTHER. Then the gentleman should not assail me.

Mr. HATCH. I do not propose to assail the gentleman. I assail his argument. The gentleman has had his time, and I did not interrupt him.

Mr. GUENTHER. Will the gentleman allow me one question?

Mr. HATCH. Yes; ask me a question, if you want to.

Mr. GUENTHER. Do you know the difference between the price of wheat in Canada and the price of wheat in Wisconsin?

Mr. HATCH. I do, and I am going to tell you. I will give you all that information. Just hold still for a minute or two. I know it hurts. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GUENTHER. Oh, no, it does not hurt me.

Mr. HATCH. Now, Mr. Chairman, in 1887 the United States produced 456,000,000 bushels of wheat, that is, we were the largest wheat-producing country in the world. In the same year Canada produced 36,000,000 bushels. And yet we, producing 456,000,000 bushels, are afraid of Canada with her little 36,000,000 bushels! If you take out of the Canadian product one-ninth, or 4,000,000 bushels, for seed, that leaves Canada only 32,000,000 bushels to feed her own people and for export. And yet gentlemen tell the farmers of the United States that they are protected because we levy a duty of 20 cents a bushel on wheat! Gentlemen, you do not deceive anybody by that proposition. There was a time when wheat was exported from the United States to Canada. I heard the Hon. Frank Hurd, at Trenton, N. J., on the 27th of January, 1887, make the statement I am about to read, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURNETT] heard it, too, and it has been published. Mr. Hurd said:

I remember the time when this country shipped millions of bushels of grain annually to Canada. A number of firms in our city of Toledo, Ohio, grew rich out of the trade with Canada under the reciprocity treaty. Now Canada has a specific duty of 25 cents a bushel on your wheat, avowedly for the purpose of retaliation.

Oh, yes, Canada has put a duty of 25 cents a bushel on American wheat, and the American farmer, when he wants a few bushels of Canadian wheat or barley to improve the quality of his grain or to get a new variety, has to pay a tariff of 10 or 20 cents a bushel on it.

Mr. GUENTHER. Mr. Chairman, I have waited very patiently for the gentleman's answer to my question about the difference between the price of wheat in Canada and the price of wheat in Wisconsin, or Minnesota, or Michigan.

Mr. HATCH. I have got that table here, and when I come across it I will give the gentleman the figures.

Mr. GUENTHER. I thought you knew it. I thought you knew everything about agriculture.

Mr. HATCH. How much is it? Can the gentleman state it himself?

Mr. GUENTHER. You state it. This is not my speech.

Mr. HATCH. No; but if this was his speech the gentleman would cut a much better figure when he goes back to Wisconsin in the next campaign. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GUENTHER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the gentleman whether he has not taken up enough of my time. I am afraid he is in the condition of the infant he described here the other day, and that he is crying for peppermint. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GUENTHER. Oh, no; my stomach is in excellent condition. [Laughter.]

Mr. HATCH. Now, gentlemen talk about the price of wheat, and we have heard a great deal on that subject. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] gave an illustration the other day that ought to be an answer to every gentleman upon the other side on this question of the price of wheat. The value of wheat is fixed in the markets of the world. The value of every bushel of wheat or grain in Canada, in Kansas, in New York, in Massachusetts, or in any State, is fixed by the markets of the world, plus the cost of the transportation that is necessary to take it to the center of trade. The price of wheat in Canada is controlled by its quality or grade and the locality at which it is offered for sale, just as it is in this country.

Mr. MORGAN. And the center of trade is where the surplus goes.

Mr. HATCH. There is where the surplus goes.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], in the very eloquent and classical speech that he made a few days ago, stated that only about 10 per cent. of the products of the farmers of this country were exported. Yes; we do not export much of the peas and strawberries and "goober" peas, and all that; but why is not the gentleman candid and frank enough in his statement to say to the House and to the country what proportion of the great cereal crops are exported? Mr. Chairman, three-tenths of all the wheat grown in this country is exported. Between 1876 and 1880 one-third of the entire crop was exported. A little over one-half of the tobacco crop is exported; and about seven-tenths of the entire cotton crop. Of all meat products, from 8 per cent. to 10 per cent.; and of pork products alone 15 per cent. is the average for the last twenty-five years, and within that time it has reached a total export of 25 per cent. We have exported in one year the product of seven millions of hogs.

There are a good many things in that table that never were raised for export; they are strictly for home consumption, and a very large proportion are for consumption in the immediate family that raises them. A very small proportion of perishable vegetables and fruits go abroad.

But the point that I want to emphasize right here is this: That the farmers of Missouri and the Mississippi Valley have the price of their great products fixed by what that surplus brings in the markets of the world. Liverpool fixes the price of wheat for the world; and it amuses me to find gentlemen upon the other side, almost with tears in their eyes, pleading for protection from pauper labor of Europe in behalf of their rich manufacturers. Have you ever heard one of them say a word about the pauper labor of Europe as it affects the agricultural classes of this country?

Mr. BIGGS. Not one.

Mr. HATCH. Not one, says my friend from California. I know it; not one. Not one word is uttered or one thought given in behalf of the great masses of our people who are the bulk of the laborers of this country, the agricultural masses of our community. And what sort of competition do they have to meet?

Mr. Chairman, here is a table embodied in a crop report, No. 46, of the Department of Agriculture, and on page 590 I find a tabulated list of the wages of agricultural laborers in some of the countries producing wheat. Listen to it. India, that produced in 1887, 239,000,000 bushels of wheat to throw upon the markets of the world, in 1886 paid for wages (reduced to dollars and cents in our currency) $2.38 a month, and in 1884 it was just $2 a month.

The wages of agricultural labor were equivalent to $2.28 per month in 1876, $2.01 in 1884, and if the same nominal rate in 1887, the reduction in value of the rupee would make $1.81, or nearly 7 cents per day for twenty-six working days. The rupee is rated at 43.6 cents in 1876, 38.6 in 1884, and 34.6 in 1887.

The following statement shows the interior average prices of wheat, and also the wages of agricultural labor.

Provinces.	Wheat, per bushel.		Wages, per month.			
	1876.	1884.	1876.		1884.	
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*R. A.**		*R. A.**	
Northwestern Provinces	51	56	4 3	$1.83	3 13	$1.49
Oude	47	53	3 5	1.44	2 15	1.13
Punjab	50	45	5 14	2.56	6 2	2.38
Central Provinces	37	44	4 5	1.88	4 5	1.63
Bombay	88	76	8 4	3.60	8 13	3.25
Bengal	66	68	6 8	2.83	6 0	2.38
Assam	88	88				
British Burmah	68	128				
Mysore	143	108	7 0	3.05	7 0	2.63
Madras	110	92				
Central India	94	59	5 0	2.18	4 12	1.82
Rajputana	84	63	3 13	1.66	4 0	1.51
Hyderabad	67	63	7 0	3.05	6 12	2.89
Average	58	53.7	†5.23	2.28	5 22	2.26

* In rupees and annas; 16 annas to the rupee. † Rupees and decimals.

Think of it for a moment: 7 cents a day the laborer in the wheat fields of India gets; and our friends who are in favor of this system of building up the industries of the country, of piling up the money in the pockets and coffers of the manufacturers, never look beyond that manufacturing interest or have a word to say when they are confronted with the proposition that the American wheat-grower comes into competition with foreign labor that can live on $2.38 a month or as low as 7 cents a day. It is all right for the farmers to compete with the cheap and most degraded labor of the world, but it is terrible if the American artisan and machinist and mechanic have to come into competition with the skilled and cheaper labor of Europe.

I here append a table showing the wheat supply of the world for the years 1880 to 1887, inclusive, that those interested may examine carefully the condition and price of the labor with which the American wheat-grower must compete in raising this most valuable and important cereal.

Wheat of the world.

Countries.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.
	Bushels.	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*
Europe	1,128,000,000	1,160,000,000	1,283,000,000	1,553,000,000
United States	499,000,000	383,000,000	504,000,000	421,000,000
Canada	30,000,000	32,000,000	47,000,000	30,000,000
Mexico	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
South America	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000	25,000,000
India	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000	250,000,000
Australasia	36,000,000	32,000,000	30,000,000	32,000,000
Africa and Western Asia	130,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000
Total	2,111,000,000	2,025,000,000	2,282,000,000	2,654,000,000

Countries.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.
	Bushels.	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*
Europe	1,270,000,000	1,183,000,000	1,108,000,000	1,245,000,000
United States	513,000,000	357,000,000	457,000,000	456,000,000
Canada	45,000,000	47,000,000	38,000,000	36,000,000
Mexico	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000	13,000,000
South America	25,000,000	25,000,000	29,000,000	34,000,000
India	251,000,000	299,000,000	258,000,000	239,000,000
Australasia	46,000,000	37,000,000	22,000,000	35,000,000
Africa and Western Asia	130,000,000	134,000,000	130,000,000	130,000,000
Total	2,293,000,000	2,095,000,000	2,055,000,000	2,188,000,000

But to continue the line of thought I was pursuing. I am sorry the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] is not in his seat. I think the climax of absurdity was reached in that gentleman's remarks when he said of the woolen industries of the United States—and I want to quote his exact words as I find them on page 11 of the printed speech. He says:

The great wool-growing interest of the country, a matter of prime interest to all civilized people, only in the infancy of its development.

The wool industry of the United States only in the infancy of its development! We have heard a good deal of "infant industries," but this is carrying it further than I thought a gentleman would have the temerity to do on this floor. I want to put into my speech in the RECORD, so that the gentleman will read it and learn the facts, a reference to some of the early lessons of his childhood that he will find taken from the Bible. As far back as the fourth chapter of Genesis we find, in the second verse:

And Abel was a keeper of sheep.

And when he has digested that and familiarized himself with the flocks of Abel, I want him to turn to the twenty-first chapter of Genesis and read the verses, 21 to 31, inclusive, where Abraham presented Abimelech with sheep and oxen.

And Abraham set seven ewe lambs of the flock by themselves.

That they might be a witness and a commemoration of his having digged the well in dispute.

Wherefore he called that place Beersheba.

And if he is not satisfied with that, let him turn to the thirty-second chapter of Genesis and read there verses 9 to 20, inclusive, where Jacob makes the peace-offering to Esau, including two hundred ewes and twenty rams; a larger flock perhaps than any farmer owns in the district represented by the gentleman from Michigan.

Wool-growing an infant industry! The oldest in the history of man, coming down to us consecrated by ages, marking the very footsteps of civilization and the pathway of progress. Shepherds throughout the world have been caring for their flocks since the oldest history of man; and yet the gentleman talks about it and about wool-growing as an "infant industry!"

I have not time to go into all that I had intended to say upon this wool question; but as a representative of the Western farmer, a wool-grower myself to about the same extent as probably an average of ninety-nine farmers out of one hundred in the Mississippi Valley, I declare that the farmers of the Mississippi Valley to-day, almost unanimously, are in favor of free wool and a corresponding reduction upon the manufactured woolen goods of the country. Give us a reduction of manufactured woolen goods; give us the open markets of the world in which to sell our products, and the American farmer will undertake, wherever it can be profitably done, to grow wool in competition with any other country in the world. Except upon the plains of the Territories and States of the far West the growing of wool as a matter of profit is not an industry; it is simply an incident upon the farms.

The farmers in the Mississippi Valley keep small flocks of sheep for their value in the market as mutton, and the wool crop is simply an incident to that industry.

In support of these positions I will append two articles from the Chicago Tribune of recent date, carefully prepared, ably written, and strengthened by unquestioned facts and figures:

UTTER FAILURE OF THE HIGH WOOL TARIFF.

The chief reduction effected by the Mills bill is in putting wool on the free-list. No other single item of the bill, save that on sugar, would lead to a reduction of over $2,000,000 of revenue, while the free-listing of wool will of itself cut down the surplus revenues over $12,000,000 and lead to the cheapening of clothing more that one hundred millions a year. Free wool, therefore, must be considered the distinctive feature of the bill, and the ultra protectionists who have made this provision of the measure their strongest attack should be encouraged to continue the fight on the ground of their own choosing.

No tariff is more unjustifiable than that on raw wool, and the pretense that the levy operates to protect and benefit farmers is already disproved by incontrovertible facts. Eagerly seeking to make a handle of the wool tariff, because this tax was imposed ostensibly for the protection of farmers, the bounty-monopoly advocates now find they have caught a Tartar, but they should not be permitted to shift the argument and abandon the ground of their own selection. Free wool is the chief provision in any genuine tariff-reform bill, and on that main issue the contest must turn.

As the Tribune has repeatedly shown from the official record, the number of sheep in the States of Ohio, Michigan, Pennsylvania, New York, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, and Minnesota decreased during the period of high wool duties between 1867 and 1882 from 29,879,222 to 14,761,150, or a loss of one-half—a frightful decline of a product in so short a time, and so highly protected. Wool-growing was better maintained during the period of high protection in Pennsylvania and Ohio than in any other States east of the Missouri, but even in these exceptional States the loss was heavy. The Pittsbugh Post has prepared the following table on wool-growing in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio, the figures being taken from the census of 1860, the agricultural report of 1887, and the Treasury report on wool prices:

1860—NO TARIFF.

Sheep in Pennsylvania	1,631,540
Sheep in Ohio	3,546,767
Sheep in New York	2,617,855
Prices—fine	56 to 60 cents
Prices—medium	45 to 50 cents
Prices—coarse	40 to 42 cents

1887—HIGH TARIFF.

Sheep in Pennsylvania	1,094,323
Sheep in Ohio	4,562,913
Sheep in New York	1,579,866
Prices—fine	33 to 34 cents
Prices—medium	37 to 38 cents
Prices—coarse	33 to 35 cents

SOME OF THE RESULTS.

Decrease of sheep in three States after twenty years' high protection	539,090
Decrease in prices—fine wool	23 to 26 cents
Decrease in prices—medium wool	8 to 12 cents
Decrease in prices—coarse wool	7 cents

If such results as these had followed a reduction of duties or the placing of an article on the free-list the lamentations of the high-tariff monopolies would continue without ceasing; but they must now face the fact that the wool tariff failed to secure even for sheep-growing farmers the results promised, and that even in New York, Pennsylvania, and Ohio wool-growing declined disastriously under high protection. What was promised at the time this tariff was adopted? Mr. Stephen Colwell, the most active and influential person in devising the wool tariff of 1867, said:

"Give us the needful protection and we will engage that sheep husbandry will increase and be remunerative, while woolen manufactures will expand and diversify, affording a market for the raw material and rescuing the people from their dependence on foreign lands for their clothing, which they will be able to procure permanently at home at less cost than abroad."

How completely each of these promises has been falsified! Instead of sheep husbandry being extended and made remunerative it has dwindled away and fallen off fully 50 per cent. in the States east of the Missouri, and but for the value of sheep as mutton none of the animals could now be raised at a profit in this portion of the country. Instead of woolen manufacturing being expanded and diversified factories can be found all through the manufacturing sections of the East that have been standing idle for years or working only on half time, and, as a leading woolen manufacturer recently said, an advertiser who would offer to buy a woolen-mill at 50 per cent. of its cost would have "more answers than if he wanted a bull pup."

Instead of having a home supply of wool, nearly one-half the wool used in the United States is imported, notwithstanding a 41 per cent. duty, and the raw wool and that embodied in woolen goods brought into this country from abroad with duties added on both, cost the people at least $60,000,000 per annum. The tremendous burden of a high tax and incident bounties on an article of prime necessity used by every man, woman, and child has been endured for twenty years without producing any of the benefits promised to the farmer, the wool manufacturer, or the wearer of woolen goods.

Mr. Colwell said at the time the high wool tariff was adopted, "The protectionists only asked that their policy should receive a fair trial," and pointed "to the other industries wherein their promises were fulfilled." The trial was granted, and after twenty years the experiment has proved a wretched failure to the growers of sheep and an onerous burden to the people. All persons concerned in wool-growing, as farmers, manufacturers, or consumers, have suffered great injury, and benefit has accrued to no one except a handful of wealthy ranchmen who have great flocks of sheep on the Government and cheap lands of the far Southwest herded by shepherd dogs and the underfed Mexican greasers on nominal pay. And it is the underselling of these ranchmen that has broken down the wool market and almost ruined the sheep-growing business east of the Missouri.

As the flocks of sheep steadily decrease under the coddling of a high tariff of 41 cent. protection in all the States east of Western Kansas and Nebraska, west and south of the ninety-seventh parallel of longitude, in the ranch country, the number of sheep increases. It is the competition of this great area, where sheep can be raised for almost nothing, that is killing our wool-growing in all the old Western, Central, and Eastern States. The following table exhibits the average size of flocks in 1880 and the per cent. of increase to 1885 in the competing sections:

States.	Owners.	Average flock.	Increase.
			Per cent.
Nebraska	2,119	157	135
Kansas	3,804	216	30
Utah	2,001	282	8
Washington	1,067	428	18
Oregon	4,605	560	99
California	4,326	1,430	11
Idaho	128	1,465	60
Colorado	406	3,075	14
Montana	137	3,400	67
Nevada	97	4,000	68
New Mexico	814	5,450	13
Texas	8,390	9,480	118
Wyoming	44	13,600	33
Arizona	35	23,220	74

The increase here has been, from 1880 to 1884, from 17,710,351 to 25,319,877. Nothing has checked it.

The high wool tariff enables these States and Territories to undersell and seize the American market for wool; and yet scores of Congressmen whose constituents are going out of the wool-growing business refuse to vote to give their people cheaper clothes by placing wool on the free-list. Who are they representing, any way? Certainly not the people living east of the Missouri River.

These gentlemen from the East, who talk so glibly about a home market for the products raised upon the farm and what a value it is to the farmer if he has got a market at his door, do not understand the condition of things in the Mississippi Valley, where farming is upon a broader scale than raising products from little truck patches. There the farmer is dependent not alone upon his home market, but upon agriculturists in other sections of the country and the markets of the world. Where does the farmer of Missouri go for a market for the surplus mules and horses that he raises? To the South. He goes to the cotton-planters and sugar-planters and rice-planters of the South. The very best market that the Western farmer has to-day for the surplus of

the grain upon his farm he finds when he goes to the Southern planter. He goes to him to sell his stock and his bacon. The farmers of the West are as much interested in the price of cotton as the cotton-planter himself. If cotton is depressed, if there is a short crop at the South, there is a low market for the mules and the horses and the surplus produce of the farms of the West. All this boastful talk about the home market for the farmer has been so often exploded that I will not take up the time of the House to go into it further, except simply to affirm that, with the facilities of transportation we have to-day, the farmer of New England has got to sell all but the perishable products he raises in competition with the other sections of the country.

I say the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BURNETT], who is said to be the owner and proprietor of the model dairy farm of New England, to-day can not sell the surplus butter produced in that dairy in Boston except at a price fixed by the creameries of Iowa and Northern Illinois.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. That is true.

Mr. HATCH. I know it to be true. Transportation and facilities of exchange have obliterated distances in this country; and except for the little truck which perishes in a day and must be marketed at once, no farmer is benefited by a home market; because when he takes anything worth raising into the market to sell he has got to have the price fixed for it by the markets of the country.

Now, what burdens are imposed upon the farmers of the country under the present system. And how moderately and modestly the majority on this side of the House propose to reduce them at this time! Look at salt. Every farmer in the United States is bound to have salt. He can not raise his stock without it. There are two hundred and sixty-eight salt manufactories in the United States, according to the census of 1880; and now they are all under one trust. The entire product is fixed by a trust. There are two hundred and sixty-eight manufactories, with a capital of $8,225,740, and an average number of hands of 4,289; and sixty millions of people every day of their lives pay tribute to these two hundred and sixty-eight manufacturers of salt. Every head of stock in the United States, as it licks its little daily portion of salt to preserve its life, pays tribute to two hundred and sixty-eight manufacturers of salt.

The farmer buys his piece of land and undertakes to improve it by building a house, and every single article he wants to put into that house is taxed in the interest of a monopoly—his lumber $2 a thousand; his window-glass 61 to 68 per cent. for the smaller sizes and 94 to 108 per cent. for larger sizes of window-glass. Now, there were fifty-eight manufacturers of window-glass in 1880. I have understood there was a convention of them held here some time this winter, and they numbered seventy-two, but in 1880 there were fifty-eight protected by an average of about 65 per cent. for the small sizes of glass, and sixty million of people, as they look out of their windows on the bright light of heaven, have to pay tribute to fifty-eight manufacturers. Every poor man starting in the struggle of life, who tries to build a shelter for his family; every poor man starting in the race with an ambition to own a home of his own—in my judgment the grandest ambition that ever took possession of a young man—before he can put a light into his window must pay 65 per cent. tribute to these fifty-eight manufacturers. And they come and tell us, "If you remove this exorbitant tax, or even cut it down, you will destroy our industry;" and they tried to frighten my friend from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] when on the floor by shaking the red flag of window-glass industry at him.

Why, my friend, if you people in Maryland who are engaged in the manufacture of window-glass are not unlike all the other citizens of Maryland, when you tell them that sixty million people are paying tributes to these few glass manufacturers, they will stand by you in your vote upon this bill. Stop their industry? I do not believe a word of it. But suppose it does stop it; if it has got to be subsidized with the blood and the labor of sixty million people, let it go; let it stop. Tell your fifty-eight manufacturers to go and engage in some honorable industry that does not have to be subsidized by the people to make it profitable. Gentlemen talk here about this little industry and that little industry having to stop if we do not subsidize them. Then, in God's name, let them all stop. Let them stop, and go and engage in some honorable business that does not have to take money out of the pockets of the rest of the people in order to make it profitable. That sort of argument has no terrors for me—none in the world. I never could see any sense in robbing one hundred men to make one man rich, and it is nothing but robbery.

Grindstones—there is not a farmer in the United States that can run his farm without a grindstone, and that is taxed, too. Grindstones are taxed about 15 per cent. Linseed oil, which the farmer needs to paint his house and his other buildings, is taxed 54.79 per cent. There is a tax of 76½ per cent. on vinegar, and they call that a protection to the farmer. Some gentlemen on the other side of the House have set forth in their speeches tabular statements in which they include vinegar as a farm product or industry, but I can tell those gentlemen that Yankee industry has wrought a wonderful change of late years in the manner of producing vinegar. It is now a manufacturing industry and in 1880 had 306 establishments in full operation. Vinegar made upon the farm has entirely disappeared from the commerce of the country.

Mr. HIRES. Can the gentleman explain to the House upon his principles how it happens that the poor man that he talks about buys his window-glass now under this "oppressive" system cheaper than he bought it under the tariff which was in force in 1861?

Mr. HATCH. Oh, well, if that is true—if the tariff does not increase the price to the consumer—why do you want to keep it on?

Mr. BUCHANAN. But if it does not hurt you, why do you want to keep it off?

Mr. HATCH. But it does hurt us; and if you were not afraid you would let us take it off. You want to keep the tariff on because you know that it enhances the profits of the glass manufacturer. If that is not true, what is the sense of keeping it on?

Mr. Chairman, I am admonished that my time has nearly expired. I have a word to say to my political brethren on this side of the House before I close. Gentlemen upon the other side who are opposing the passage of this bill are offering nothing in its stead for the relief of the people. They are divided among themselves upon every proposition, as has been fully explained to the House. They would not dare to vote to-day to repeal the entire internal-revenue taxes. They will not go before the country upon a platform of free whisky and free tobacco, and taxed clothes and taxed window-glass, taxed lumber and taxed salt. I know they will not do it, and it is all hypocrisy and cant to pretend that they will do it.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. We will try them on it.

Mr. HATCH. It is all hypocrisy and cant, for hypocrisy and cant, like injustice and oppression, find congenial shelter under this robber flag of protection. But, my friends, we are advancing rapidly. In the Forty-eighth Congress a tariff bill had been introduced by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and on the 6th day of May, 1884, after it had been in Committee of the Whole for awhile, the enacting clause was stricken out. Gentlemen would not even wait for the perfecting of the bill under the five-minute rule, but voted to strike out the enacting clause. Again, in the Forty-ninth Congress, they voted against going into Committee of the Whole to even consider a tariff bill. But now we have not only got a tariff bill under discussion, but there is a fair prospect of its passing the House. Moderate and conservative as it is, it will give some relief. It will pass, and I believe that when it comes to the final vote, every Democrat on this side of the House will vote for it.

The gentleman from Michigan, with an assumed irony which I have never heard surpassed, undertook to break the force of that sentence of the President's message which states that it is a condition and not a sentiment that confronts us. Yes, my friends, it is a condition. It is the condition of the agricultural masses of the country that I have undertaken in my feeble way to lay before the House. It is the condition of the great mass of the laboring and producing classes of the country. It is that condition which confronts us to-day; it is one of bondage to these manufacturing establishments; and the time is coming, and that very soon, when the bands of that bondage are to be broken by the action of this House.

Mr. Chairman, for eighteen hundred years that which, more than anything else, has given to the Christian hope and strength in his struggle with the enemies of Christianity has been that grand declaration of Paul to the Phillippians, when he said that every knee shall bow and every tongue shall confess the divinity of the Saviour and the fundamental truth of the Christian religion. As a Democrat, believing in the power of Democratic principles to relieve our people from this great oppression, I rejoice to-day with exceeding great joy that the time is coming and coming quickly, coming with the first bright days of June, when every Democratic knee in the United States shall bow to the decrees of the overwhelming majority of the Democratic party, and every Democratic tongue shall confess revenue reform as the fundamental principle of the Democratic party. [Loud applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SYMES. Mr. Chairman, the so-called tariff question has been discussed more in this country than any other. Ever since Alexander Hamilton, the greatest genius of the American financial and industrial policy, made his report in 1789 to the First Congress upon raising and collecting the revenue, the tariff has been the leading topic of discussion and a leading question in the division of political parties. All parties have agreed in the past, and still agree, that the collection of duties on imports is a legal and proper mode of raising the ordinary revenues for the support of the Government. All parties have in the past agreed that direct taxation or internal revenue should be resorted to only in times of great emergencies and when the demands of the Government are greater than it is practicable to levy or raise by taxing foreign imports. The leading American thinkers and statesmen who have risen above the behests of local demands or the temporary exigencies of a political campaign have always held to this fundamental principle of American revenue and taxation. I can not, in my limited time, take a view of and cite from the history of these questions.

But it will not be denied that the statesmen of both parties have never advocated resorting to internal taxation in this country except

in pressing emergencies, and such taxes have been immediately removed when the extraordinary demands that gave rise to them have ceased. Internal or direct taxes have been imposed upon the American people only three times in the history of the Government. The first time was in 1791–'92, and it lasted until 1801. President Jefferson, in his first message to Congress, specially recommended the repeal of these internal taxes, and they were repealed. In his second message he spoke of internal taxation as extraordinary, and only to be resorted to in great emergencies. The war of 1812 with England created such an extraordinary demand on the Treasury that internal taxation had to be again resorted to. So soon as that emergency was over President Monroe in 1817 specially recommended its repeal. No other internal or direct taxes were levied until the war of the rebellion, when they became necessary to assist in the preservation of the Union. So it appears that all internal taxes have been immediately repealed when the demands of the Government made it practicable, with the single exception of the large internal-revenue taxes which have been continued during the past fifteen years.

The repeal or material modification of the present internal taxes has been and is now opposed by the Democratic party. In this, as in many other things, we find the Democrats advocating a policy contrary to the judgment and opinions of the great statesmen from whom they pretend to derive their political principles. Under the leadership of the President they are endeavoring to fasten permanently upon the people of this country a system of internal or direct taxation which is at war with the true theory of the American system. They insist on keeping up this direct tax, with its inquisitorial methods and its 4,000 officers scattered over the country, after the extraordinary emergency under which it was adopted by the Republican party had passed away. Although the demand for this direct taxation seemed imperative when the same was adopted during the war, still it must be doubted whether the people of the country would have indorsed such a system, or Congress have enacted it, if it had even been supposed it was to be a permanent direct-tax system engrafted upon the institutions of this country. It has heretofore been the pride of the American people that they had no inquisitorial direct-tax system characteristic of the governments of Europe; that, having no standing armies in time of peace, the demands for a direct-tax system could only arise to supply deficiencies in time of war or other great emergencies.

Mr. Chairman, there is good reason and the best of causes for this American system of taxation, and the policy of raising substantially all the revenues of the Government in time of peace by duties on imports and resorting to direct taxation only when necessary to meet the extraordinary demands of the Government in time of war. This is the only method by which stability and permanency can be given to the commercial, financial, and industrial interests of the country.

All must concede that a very high tariff, a very low tariff, or a medium tariff will result in establishing, building up, and giving prosperity to or causing the decline or destruction of, as the case may be, many leading industries of the country. If the tariff is to be made by Congress very high or very low, according to temporary emergencies of the Government, it will overthrow all the future prosperity and permanency of our manufacturing and industrial interests. Such a vacillating policy of legislation, depending upon real or imaginary contingencies, or on the opinions of some politician who temporarily occupies the Executive chair, must necessarily subvert and destroy the industrial American system, which supplies the ordinary revenues of the Government, protects American labor, and gives material prosperity to the whole nation.

Mr. Chairman, a change in the permanency of this American system will remit us to those dark and bankrupt times from 1846 to 1857, brought upon the country by the Democratic party after they had succeeded in defeating the father of the protective system, Henry Clay, by falsely pretending before the people in the Presidential campaign of 1844 they would not repeal the tariff of 1842. The history of that campaign and the course of the Democratic party seems to be repeating itself. The revenue reformers in the last campaign insisted they did not propose to so revise or change the tariff as to interfere with the wages of American workmen or with the great industrial and manufacturing interests. But immediately after the election of the first Democratic President in a quarter of a century, a combined effort is made to so lower the import duties and so add to the free-list that it must result in a great reduction of wages to the laboring men and in the overthrow and destruction of many of the industrial interests of the country. The result of raising the ordinary revenues for the support of the Government by duties on foreign imports must be that many manufacturing, mining, and other industries which furnish raw material to the manufacturers will be protected from foreign competition.

A confidence in the permanency of such a system of taxation has caused hundreds of millions of money to be invested and expended in the erection of permanent plants for manufacturing, mining, and other industries closely allied to them. Millions of artisans and skilled laborers in these protected industries have become dependent upon the prosperity of these factories for the support of themselves and their families. This state of things has continued for a long series of years. Manufacturing and kindred industries have become permanently established. The capitalists, owners, and operatives in this great system of industries have staked their capital, their enterprise, and their energy upon the permanency of this American system of protection by tariff which has existed for so many years. It can not be said those protective tariffs which have built up these industries were, to any considerable extent, war taxes. It can not be said that those interested had any reason to suppose the new unheard of and untried policy proclaimed by the President and the Democratic party at this time, of reducing the surplus and the revenues by the repeal of the tariff taxes instead of by the abolishment of the internal-revenue system, could have been apprehended. The history of all political parties from the origin of the Government seemed to demonstrate that no such radical change in the American system of finance and taxation would be entertained.

The extraordinary demands of the Government for the revenues collected both from the tariff and internal taxes have ceased. The war has long since ended. The great national debt created by the war has been nearly paid off. A large surplus is accumulating in the Treasury, which must be disposed of, and the revenues of the Government must be reduced. All concede this. There is no conflict of opinion between the two parties upon the proposition that the surplus and the revenues must be reduced. This is the question that confronts us to-day.

Mr. Chairman, it is the same question which confronted the Government and the people when Jefferson was elected President in 1801. It is the same question that confronted the people and the administration after the election of President Monroe in 1817; and it is the same question that has been before this country practically since the election of the first Democratic House of Representatives in 1874. The Republican party had a majority in the Forty-seventh Congress, and made a revision and reduction of both the tariff and internal taxes. A small portion of the Democratic party since 1874 have advocated that the internal revenues should be reduced as well as the tariff taxes. But after the election of President Cleveland the avowed policy of the party is to maintain permanently the internal-revenue and direct-tax system, and to make such a reduction in the duties on imports and by adding to the free-list that the revenues derived from tariff taxes added to the internal-revenue receipts shall be only sufficient to support the Government.

President Cleveland in his last onslaught upon the protective system and harangue in favor of free trade, by courtesy called his third annual message, specially urges the retaining, permanently, the internal-tax system and the reduction of the revenues of the Government by the repeal of tariff taxes.

The Republican party advocates the repeal or modification of the internal-tax system, because a war measure, and the maintaining of such tax on imports as will not interfere with the prosperity of the manufacturing and other kindred industries depending upon them, and such as will not affect the employment or lower the wages of the American workmen.

The position of the President and his party is entirely impracticable, if we should admit that it was politic. The Republican party claims that the tariff should be equitably and properly revised, and some reductions made so as to correct the inequalities and suit it to the industrial changes that have taken place since the Republicans last revised it in the Forty-seventh Congress. But they are opposed to making such a reduction of the tariff as would reduce the surplus in the Treasury and the revenues to the ordinary needs of the Government, without also a large reduction of the internal revenues.

To attempt to reduce the tariff taxes to the extent of seventy-five millions a year, which is necessary, if no reduction of internal revenue is made, would destroy American industries and impoverish American labor. Only theoretical free-traders, Bourbon Democrats, or those as deficient in information upon these economic subjects as the President seems to be, would proclaim such a policy or attempt such a task.

The Secretary of the Treasury estimates the revenues of the Government for the fiscal year 1888 to be $383,000,000 and the actual expenditures at $316,000,000. Of this the receipts from customs are two hundred and twenty-eight million, from internal revenue one hundred and twenty millions, and miscellaneous thirty-five millions. How can a reduction of seventy-five millions be made in the two hundred and twenty-eight millions of import duties without so reducing protective duties as to flood the country with the products of cheap foreign labor, close many manufacturing and kindred industries, and throw millions of laboring men out of employment. We have listened to and we have heard many free-trade revenue reform speeches to learn how it was proposed to accomplish this object so urgently recommended by the President and his followers in Congress, but it has not been pointed out in any practicable way.

FREE RAW MATERIAL.

Mr. Chairman, what is raw material? If there is a phrase in the English language that has been and now is abstractly and deceitfully used, it is "free raw material." Congress and the people have been treated to an exceedingly large supply of very free and very raw material on this tariff question of late. It has certainly been free enough and raw enough

to suit the most ultra free-trader. For the past three weeks it has come forth in this Hall "like the outbursting of a fountain from the earth, with original, spontaneous, and native force." It has issued forth as free and as raw as the whisky that oozes through the worm of the illicit distillery in the most reliable Democratic free-trade districts.

The President insists upon free raw material. He says:

> The radical reduction of the duties upon raw material used in manufacture or its importation is, of course, an important factor in any effort to reduce the price of these articles. It would not only relieve them from the increased cost caused by the tariff on such material, but the manufactured product being itself cheapened, that part of the tariff now laid upon such products as a compensation to our manufacturers for the present price of raw material could be accordingly modified. Such reduction or free importation would serve largely to reduce the revenue. It is not apparent how such a change can have any injurious effect upon our manufacturers.

The President here shows his want of comprehension of the whole tariff system. In one paragraph he persuades the farmers that the tariff which protects the manufacturer is a great wrong to them. In another paragraph he attempts to show the manufacturer that he will be benefited by putting what he calls "raw material" upon the free-list. The President forgets or ignores the fact that putting "raw material" on the free-list would ruin many of the great agricultural, mining, and other industries of this country.

The President and his party claim that their special object is to reduce the revenue without injuring any of the great industries of the country. If all the dutiable articles now imported, generally referred to as raw material, were put upon the free-list it would reduce the revenue only about twelve millions. The following table shows the amount of duties collected on the different dutiable raw materials imported during the year 1886:

Coal-tar dyes	$522,686	Hops	$217,917
Potash	104,716	Iron ore	525,193
Soda	1,448,263	Marble	229,672
Coal	581,000	Salt	706,324
Copper ore	108,096	Lumber	867,849
Hemp	194,136	Zinc	88,900
Manila	626,895	Wool	5,126,108
Jute	293,788		
Sisal-grass	493,751	Total	12,419,699
Hay	184,351		

Place all of these articles upon the free-list and it would almost destroy the wool, flax, hemp, and jute industries of the farmer, greatly depress the trade and production of lumber, and depreciate the value of the iron and copper mining and coal industries. Still it is claimed that the paramount object is to reduce the revenue. Then, why does not the Mills bill put sugar on the free-list and pay a bounty to the producers? The revenue collected on sugar and molasses amounts to about sixty millions per annum. It is a necessary article of food to 60,000,000 people. Here 60,000,000 people are taxed about $1 per head to protect a very small industry. I would build up the sugar industry in this country. I would pay such bounties to the producers of sugar from cane, from sorghum, and from the sugar-beet as would make it profitable and an object to build up this industry for the future benefit of this country. But I would not tax a necessary article of food $68,000,000 per annum for this purpose. I would at least reduce the tariff on sugar until the revenue collected should be only sufficient to pay bounties to insure its production and build up the industry. If there were no other purely revenue and direct taxes that could be repealed sufficient to reduce the revenue to the required amount for the economical administration of the Government I would put sugar on the free-list and pay the bounty direct from the Treasury. Putting sugar on the free-list or so reducing the tariff as to derive only a sufficient revenue to pay bounties on the American production will reduce the surplus revenue $40,000,000 more than putting all raw materials on the free-list.

The more we examine this bill the more we are forced to the conclusion that its object is to bring about free trade more than a reduction of the revenue. The more it is scrutinized in detail the more it will be found that the duties on the articles which produce mostly a revenue tariff are not so diminished as to reduce the revenue in a material degree. It is simply an attack upon the protective system and goes as far in the direction of free trade as its authors dare go with any hope of passing the measure.

The free-trader says, "England and other European countries admit raw materials free." So they do, because they have not got and can not produce the quantities of raw material they must have. These free-traders will not understand the breadth and the illimitable extent and variety of the resources of our country. To buy raw material abroad when it is found to an unlimited extent at home because England and other European countries are compelled to buy it for want of a sufficient quantity accords with other free-trade fallacies. Our country produces nearly every kind of raw material, and the few classes which can not be produced here are now on the free-list. They seem to forget that our country produces every article that flourishes between the torrid and frigid zone, from the orange of Florida and California to the lakes of ice in Maine and Minnesota; that the traveler in our country may now in the course of a few days, by the agency of steam, gather samples of every variety of cereals, fruits, and mineral productions which he could formerly find in a voyage around the world. It would be folly to try and enforce a material and industrial policy upon this country because it has been followed by the government of an island that might be laid down within one of our States or Territories. It is only the Bourbonism of the free-trader or the Anglomania of the college professor and Mugwump that could seriously contemplate such a policy.

FREE TRADE HAS INJURED ENGLAND.

Mr. Chairman, it might be supposed from the continued statements of the free-traders, by courtesy called revenue reformers, that the manufacturing and agricultural classes of England had been benefited and had prospered under free trade. Our large importing merchants, who make great fortunes by bringing into this country the products of cheap foreign labor and selling it in competition with the products of our better-paid labor, refer us to England as illustrating the benefits of free trade. That class of capitalists who represent English capital and seek investments in the character of business enterprises which are aided and made monopolies by the grants of special privileges and franchises from both our State and National Governments, and who receive unduly large profits and dividends which are sent across the ocean to enrich English capitalists, all cite you to England to show the benign influence of free trade.

All those college professors and theoretical free-traders who obtain their ideas and thoughts from English free-trade writers, who know nothing of the practical workings and results of free trade in England or of protection in this country, cry out for free trade, and refer to England to prove their theories. Every Bourbon Democratic politician who has slept a Rip Van Winkle sleep for the last quarter of a century, and has learned nothing from the actual workings and results of the protective policy in this country, or of free trade elsewhere, flippantly asserts that free trade has worked beneficially in England.

Mr. Chairman, the fact is that free trade in England has proved very injurious, and has blighted the former prosperity of her industrial and laboring classes.

There are many reasons why a protective tariff should exist in this country above all others. The institutions of our country, the political status and equality of all men, whether laborers or millionaires, the diversified and illimitable character of our natural resources, the variety of climate and products, and the necessity that our working classes should receive much higher wages than those of other countries make a protective policy indispensable. Still it can be shown that a universal free-trade policy has injured England and Ireland, and given to their continental neighbors important advantages over them.

DEPRESSION OF TRADE IN ENGLAND.

Mr. Chairman, in 1885 a royal commission was appointed to inquire into the depression of trade and industry in England. It was composed of thirteen prominent business men, economists, and statesmen. It made an exhaustive inquiry into the causes of the depression, and examined as witnesses leading economists and business men. It extended its inquiries through its foreign service to all countries. It made from time to time, during the year 1886, reports of the testimony of witnesses and of the answers of laboring and commercial organizations to its questions. The last report was made in December, 1886. The whole work consists of five parts and of over 2,000 large pages. It covers the entire field of British trade and industry and their relations to other countries. The conclusions of these very able commissioners set forth in their final report on the causes of the depression and continued decline of British trade and industry should be studied by every free-trader.

I obtained this report in parts, as it was issued from time to time in 1886. I examined it with care. I wanted to find out why it was that the country to which we are always referred by college professors, Bourbon Democrats, Mugwumps, and other free-traders as the model of industrious and commercial prosperity admitted such a continued depression and languishing of its trade and manufactures as to require a special commission to expend much time and money in investigating the causes. The commissioners assign among others two special causes of the depression: the protective tariff which they say has built up the manufacturing industries of the United States, and to a large extent excluded foreign importations; and the protective tariffs of Germany and other European countries, which have not only excluded British goods, but have also resulted in large importations of manufactured goods into England from Germany, Austria, and other countries. They conclude that not only has England's foreign market been partially taken away from her by protective tariffs, but that her home market is being seriously injured by the foreign competition of nations whose industries have been built up by protective tariffs.

The commission says in its final report:

> We are disposed to think that one of the chief agencies which have tended to perpetuate this state of things is the protectionist policy of so many foreign countries which has become more marked during the last ten years than in any previous period of any similar length. The high prices which protection secures the producer within the protected area naturally stimulates the production and impels him to engage in competition in foreign markets.

The commission also speaks of foreign competition in their home market as one of the causes of depression, and says:

An effect of a similar kind, though less in degree, has been produced by the increased competition in our own market of foreign manufactured and partly manufactured goods, the importation of which appears to grow at a more rapid rate than population.

In dealing with the results of the depression the commission says:

We have observed above that the complaint proceeds chiefly from the classes who are more immediately and directly concerned in production, and there can be no doubt that of the wealth annually created in the country a smaller proportion falls to the share of the employers of labor than formerly. The diminution in the rate of profit obtainable from production, from agriculture and manufacturing, has given rise to a widespread feeling of depression among the producing classes. It is from these classes, and especially from the employers of labor, that the complaint chiefly proceeds.

Those, on the other hand, who are in receipt of fixed salaries, who draw their incomes from fixed investments, have comparatively little to complain of. Those classes of population who derive their income from foreign investments or from property not directly connected with foreign industries, appear to have little ground of complaint. On the contrary, they have profited by the remarkably low prices of many commodities.

Mr. Chairman, it is the capitalists, the monopolists, the importing merchants, and those who derive large fixed incomes from bonds and other investments who are and who have always been clamoring for free trade in this country. It is from the employers of labor, from the workingmen who produce the products and build up the industries of the country that the demand comes for a protective tariff. We can not quote further from this very able report or cite the testimony which supports its conclusions. When leading English statesmen and economists and manufacturers describe as two of the prominent causes of the admitted depression and declining state of England's trade and industries to be foreign tariffs and bounties and foreign competition with continental nations as the result of those tariffs, why do Democrats ignore these facts and ask for free trade?

We have also learned from this report that it is not alone English competition that demands a protective tariff in this country. If England, with her advantages as a manufacturing nation, and considering the condition of her laboring people as compared with that of the American workingman, is being injured by competition with the products of European and Asiatic labor through her free-trade policy, how can America open her markets to the manufactures and labor of Germany, France, and other European nations? If England suffers from free importations of the continental nations, what will become of America when subjected to the same foreign competition?

Sir Edward Sullivan, a member of the British Parliament, has written a very able and practical work upon the destructive effects which foreign competition by free trade has brought upon English industries. The English laboring classes occupy somewhat an intermediate position between the American and those of the continental nations of Europe. The result has been that large importations into England of the products of cheaper labor have greatly depressed English manufactures. Mr. Sullivan states this result as follows:

The labor problem in this country (*i. e.*, in England) is easily stated; but its solution is another matter. A, B, C, D, E, and F are industrial communities, all having the same or nearly the same advantages of material, machinery, etc., but in B, C, D, E, and F wages are from 20 to 50 to 70 per cent. lower than in A; and moreover, the workmen in B, C, D, E, and F work much longer hours and are more thrifty than the workmen in A, and consequently most manufactured articles are produced cheaper in B, C, D, E, and F than in A.

If therefore B, C, D, E, and F are allowed to send into A's markets, duty free, anything they can produce cheaper than A can, it is evident they must undersell A, and the employment of A's workmen will be destroyed. There can be no mistake about this; it must be so and it is so. It is just what is happening. In France, Germany, Austria, Belgium, Holland, Russia, Egypt, and India the workers work for from 20 to 70 per cent. less wages and about 20 per cent. longer hours. * * * The result is that, all other conditions being equal, they can produce almost everything cheaper than we can. And this they are doing; and our free-traders, in illustration of the warning that a certain person "always finds work for idle hands to do," are working night and day to devise further means to enable them to deliver their cheap goods in our markets at the lowest possible cost, and their efforts are completely successful. Every year the delivery of foreign goods enormously increases, and every year the employment of our workers enormously diminishes; and this is very simple.

It would happen to France, Germany, etc., if they were fools enough to follow our example. * * * The less fitted our working people are by habit, by education, and example to hold the lists of cheap labor against the world, the more important becomes our duty to protect them. It is not indeed a question whether we wish to do so or not. We must do so. Our workers must have work. It is childish nonsense talking about theory and appealing to figures and returns in a case of this sort, when the wolf is at the door. There is the fact that is patent to all the world that there are half a dozen industrial communities who can all produce their goods cheaper than we can, and owing to bonuses and preferential railroad rates, advocated by our free-traders, can actually deliver them in our markets at less cost than we can produce them. Now, what are we to do? Are we to listen to the dictates of common sense, of self-preservation, of national duty, of natural affection, and protect the industries of our work-people and prevent them being pauperized and forced to leave the country, or are we to listen to the blatant folly of the free-trade popes and let the industrial interests of our workers slide? No one can come near your free-trader for selfishness and want of sympathy.

Mr. Chairman, this is the clear and consummate statement of an Englishman upon the blighting effects of free trade on the industrial interests of England in her relation to her continental neighbors. The same statement applies with greater force as to what would be the results upon this country of free trade with England, and in a greater degree of free trade between this country and the continental nations of Europe.

Mr. Sullivan says that in England there are 34,000,000 people—30,000,000 who are dependent on work, and 4,000,000 who are dependent on capital; that no doubt—

protection to labor, that is, protection to the 30,000,000 who live by labor, will make things dearer to the 4,000,000 who live by capital. * * * But which most concerns the prosperity, even the existence, of the whole community of 34,000,000; that the 30,000,000 should be employed and able to live and thrive, or that the 4,000,000 should live in greater luxury and that the 30,000,000 should starve or leave the country? It is only free-trade enthusiasts who could entertain the question; but they do. * * * A duty of 10 per cent. on the production of foreign workers would give work to 30,000,000 of workers. "Perhaps," say the free-traders, "but then our poor capitalists would have to pay 20 per cent. more for their luxuries."

Mr. Chairman, some of our free-trade statesmen had better study the actual result of free trade in England before they try to impose its curses upon this country. The free-trade theorists say that we must have free trade to supply a foreign market. Do not these American free-traders know that the production of the world exceeds the consumption of the world; that the old countries of the world are overcrowded with the products of cheap labor; that if it were not for the protective tariff our country would be flooded with these products; that many classes of our manufacturing industries would cease, and our laboring people be thrown out of employment; that there would be no room for the hundreds of thousands of foreign immigrants to find work, and that our country would be filled with tramps to a greater extent than it was after the panic of 1873?

The protectionists in America, France, Belgium, Germany, and Austria, state as a premise that the production of the world exceeds the consumption of the world and therefore they must take steps to prevent their markets from being swamped by the surplus productions of the world. In other words, they must protect their industries against the foreign competition of the world. It is the first duty of a nation to protect its own laboring people and its own industries from the competition of the outside world. A nation that will not do it must suffer the consequences.

Mr. Sullivan again says:

In every industrial country in the world except England it is recognized that the first duty of a government is to promote the employment of the people; in other words, to protect their industries. In every other industrial country but England the industries of the people are protected. Is it so certain that all the whole world is wrong and England only right? In every country except England it is allowed that the interests of those who both produce and consume are greater than the interests of those who consume. In every industrial community out of England it is allowed that employment is of more importance than mere cheapness. In England alone it is maintained that cheapness is of more importance than employment.

Mr. Chairman, I commend this statement of this very able and learned English economist to the Democratic free-traders in this country. Will they learn nothing from the experience of other nations? Will they not recognize the fact here stated that free trade does not exist in any country except England and Ireland? Do they not know that the protective policy has been adopted by the statesmen of Germany and other nations of Europe as absolutely necessary to their industrial and material prosperity? Will they not recognize the fact that Germany, Austria, Russia, Belgium, and France have been watching and protecting the industrial and manufacturing interests of their countries, especially during the last few years, wherever they were likely to be injured by competition with others? Do they not know that so soon as the manufacturing and industrial skill and enterprise of America produce any particular character of goods so as to be able to compete in a limited degree with the markets of Germany, of France, and of Autstria, that when it is made known in those countries, such protective import duties and regulations are immediately adopted as to prevent the American foreign competition? This is the foreign policy which has been and is being adopted, and it should satisfy the free-traders that relying upon a foreign market exists only in theory and can not exist as a fact.

PROTECTION HAS LOWERED THE PRICE OF MANUFACTURED GOODS TO THE CONSUMER.

The free-traders are continually stating that import duties are a tax upon the consumer alone, and that all manufactured articles or raw materials which are protected result in advancing the price to the extent of the tax collected. The President, exhibiting his sublime want of knowledge upon this subject, states in his message that—

These laws (tariff laws) as their primary and plain effect raise the price to the consumer of all articles imported and subject to duty precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles.

The gentlemen upon the other side of the House have stated and even assumed this to be true in the face of all the facts to the contrary. After the above statement by the President, we can not help but admire what he says shortly afterwards in the same message to the effect that—

This reference to the operation of our tariff laws is not made by way of instruction, but in order that we may be reminded of the manner in which they impose a burden upon those who consume imported articles and create a tax upon all our people.

It is fortunate that one who shows such an entire want of knowledge upon the subject does not make his assertions "by way of instruction" to anybody, because instruction from such sources could not fail to mislead all who relied upon it.

Many illustrations to show the error of this position can be made. I will refer to only a few.

Russian sheet-iron sold at 18 cents per pound in this country for many years before its manufacture in this country; under a protective duty of 2½ cents per pound manufactures for American sheet-iron were established and put into competition with the Russian. Russian sheet-iron has fallen to 9½ cents per pound and American sheet-iron is sold for still less. The skilled workmen employed in this industry are paid very high wages. The Russian workmen are paid very low wages. Thus, the American consumer saves 8½ cents per pound on every pound of sheet-iron he buys. But, according to the statement of the President and his followers, the 2½ cents per pound should be added to the price before the tariff and sheet-iron would sell for 20½ cents per pound. If the tariff tax were taken off and the American sheet-iron factories closed the product of the low wages of Russia would again flood the country and prices would advance, because there would be no local competition.

The lead-mining industry furnishes another strong illustration that the protection which builds up and prospers important industries, at the same time creates a competition with the foreign articles, which reduces the price to the consumer. The following table, from The Mineral Resources of the United States for 1886, shows the production of lead in the United States from 1825 to 1886:

Years.	Total production.	Desilverized lead.	Non-argentiferous lead.	Percentage of desilverized lead.
	Short tons.	*Short tons.*	*Short tons.*	*Per cent.*
1825	1,500			
1830	8,000			
1831	7,500			
1832	10,000			
1833	11,000			
1834	12,000			
1835	13,000			
1836	15,000			
1837	13,500			
1838	15,000			
1839	17,500			
1840	17,000			
1841	20,500			
1842	24,000			
1843	25,000			
1844	26,000			
1845	30,000			
1846	28,000			
1847	28,000			
1848	25,000			
1849	23,500			
1850	22,000			
1851	18,500			
1852	15,700			
1853	16,800			
1854	16,500			
1855	15,800			
1856	16,000			
1857	15,800			
1858	15,300			
1859	16,400			
1860	15,600			
1861	14,100			
1862	14,200			
1863	14,800			
1864	15,300			
1865	14,700			
1866	16,100			
1867	15,200			
1868	16,400			
1869	17,500			
1870	17,830			
1871	20,000			
1872	25,880			
1873	42,540	20,159	22,381	47.7
1874	52,080			
1875	59,640	34,909	24,699	58.5
1876	64,070	37,649	26,421	58.8
1877	81,900	50,748	31,152	62.0
1878	91,000	64,290	26,770	70.6
1879	92,780	64,650	28,130	69.7
1880	97,825	70,135	27,690	71.7
1881	117,065	86,315	30,770	73.7
1882	132,890	103,875	29,015	78.3
1883	143,957	122,157	21,800	84.8
1884	139,897	119,965	19,832	86.4
1885	129,412	107,437	21,975	83.0
1886	135,629	114,829	20,800	85.0

It will be seen from this table that the production was unimportant for many years. It was only 1,500 tons in 1825. It only reached 25,800 tons in 1872, and it increased to 97,800 tons in 1880, and to 135,600 tons in 1886. This wonderful increase in the production of lead caused by the great development of the mining and smelting industries in the Rocky Mountain States and Territories resulted in a great reduction in price to the consumers. Although the consumption has increased 300 per cent. in the past fifteen years, and although a very large proportion of the price paid by the consumers is absorbed by the railroad and transportation companies, the price has been reduced to the consumer about 30 per cent.

The following table shows the average prices of lead in New York from 1870 to 1886, inclusive:

Highest and lowest prices of lead at New York City, monthly, from 1870 to 1886, inclusive.

[Cents per pound.]

Years.	January.		February.		March.	
	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.
1870	*6.30	6.20	6.25	6.17	6.20	6.10
1871	*6.30	6.15	6.25	6.20	6.20	6.15
1872	*6.00	5.90	6.00	5.87	6.00	5.87
1873	*6.37	6.25	6.50	6.40	6.50	6.25
1874	*6.00	5.90	6.25	6.00	6.25	6.12
1875	*6.20	6.00	5.90	5.85	5.75	5.62
1876	*6.00	5.87	6.37	6.00	6.50	6.40
1877	†6.15	6.12	6.40	6.20	6.75	6.50
1878	4.35	4.00	3.87	3.65	3.87	3.62
1879	4.50	4.00	4.50	4.50	4.50	3.25
1880	6.10	5.50	6.00	5.87	5.95	5.30
1881	5.00	4.30	5.10	4.80	4.85	4.62
1882	5.15	4.95	5.20	5.00	5.12	4.85
1883	4.70	4.60	4.60	4.50	4.65	4.50
1884	4.50	3.75	4.10	3.75	4.15	4.10
1885	3.70	3.55	3.70	3.60	3.70	3.62½
1886	4.70	4.50	4.90	4.60	4.95	4.85

Years.	April.		May.		June.	
	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.
1870	6.25	6.15	6.25	6.20	6.25	6.20
1871	6.20	6.10	6.18	6.10	6.15	6.12
1872	6.12	5.90	6.62	6.25	6.62	6.40
1873	6.50	6.25	6.62	6.35	6.55	6.12
1874	5.25	5.90	6.00	5.75	6.00	5.62
1875	5.87	5.80	5.95	5.90	5.90	5.75
1876	6.40	6.12	6.50	6.10	6.50	6.25
1877	6.50	6.25	6.00	5.55	5.70	5.50
1878	3.75	3.50	3.50	3.25	3.50	3.12
1879	3.25	2.87	3.12	2.87	3.80	3.12
1880	5.75	5.40	5.25	4.40	4.75	4.50
1881	4.85	4.37	4.70	4.25	4.50	4.25
1882	5.00	4.90	4.85	4.60	4.90	4.55
1883	4.62	4.40	4.55	4.40	4.45	4.40
1884	4.05	3.62½	3.75	3.52½	3.65	3.37½
1885	3.70	3.62½	3.75	3.60	3.85	3.62½
1886	4.90	4.65	4.75	4.65	4.90	4.60

*Gold. †Currency.

From this it will be seen that in 1870, when this country produced only 17,830 tons of lead, the price was $6.25 per hundred in New York, and in 1884, when the production was 139,897 tons, the average price in New York was from $3.65 to $3.57 per hundred. The consumption of lead has almost kept pace with the great increase in production. With the exception of 1878 and 1879, when considerable quantities of lead were sent to China, the export of lead has been small as compared with the home consumption.

The tariff on lead since the act of March 3, 1883, has been $2 per hundred on lead in pigs, bars, and blocks.

By the Mills tariff bill this is reduced to one and one-quarter cents per pound or $1.25 per hundred. The margin of profit on lead ore and smelting, and particularly on lead and silver ore which produces desilverized lead, is very small. This reduction of three-quarters of a cent per pound, $15 per ton, would enable the Spaniards with their cheap labor and cheap mining and smelting of lead to glut the American market and greatly cripple, if not practically destroy, the great lead industry of the United States.

The value of the lead production of the United States has increased from about $3,000,000 in 1872 to about twelve millions in 1887. This industry has been built up in a part of the United States that before was almost a desert. It has quickened and vitalized the agricultural, commercial, transportation, and other kindred industry of a permanent nature in the Western and Rocky Mountain country. Vast regions of the public domain would have remained undeveloped on account of inaccessibility and distance from seashore markets but for the building up of this great industry. It has added to the wealth of the nation. It is estimated that it has added to the wealth of the nation a sum almost equal to the principal which has been paid on the national debt. The lead industry supplies a better market for the products of the manufacturer, the farmer, and every industry west of the Missouri than any other interest. It has supplied to railroads and transportation companies an amount of freight traffic without which they could not have paid interest on their bonds. Forty dollars per ton is deducted in Salt Lake City from the New York price of lead,

which the railroads and the Eastern refineries absorb. The following table shows the amount of transportation and freight created by the ore-producing lead and smelting industries in the Western and Rocky Mountain region:

Railway tonnage of the Union Pacific system in the mountain country, the Utah Central Railway, and the Denver and Rio Grande Western Railway for 1887.

Freights.	Tonnage.	Per cent.
	Pounds.	
Merchandise, etc., received	1,831,581,647	94.895
Merchandise, etc., forwarded	1,718,463,429	75.895
Ores and bullion received	98,542,535	5.105
Ores and bullion forwarded	414,759,273	24.135
Ores, bullion, and merchandise received at smelting and mining stations	1,018,338,893	55.599
Ores, bullion, and merchandise forwarded from smelting and mining stations	1,304,505,166	75.909

Grand total of merchandise, etc., ores, and bullion received and forwarded from all stations, 4,063,376,884 pounds.

Grand total of merchandise, etc., ores, and bullion received and forwarded from smelting and mining stations, 2,322,844,059 pounds, or 57.140 per cent.

A glance at this table shows that a great depression in or a partial destruction of the lead-mining industry of the Rocky Mountains would, in a great measure, destroy the prosperity of that region.

It has caused the construction of thousands of miles of railroad across the desert, through the cañons, and over the mountains. As the volume of the production has increased it is shown that the price has fallen. The average wages to miners and laborers in the lead mines of Utah, Colorado, and other portions of the Rocky Mountain country is $3 per day, while the lead-miners of Spain, with which the reduction of the tariff would bring them in direct competition, is about 50 cents per day.

It is not a raw material in any correct sense of the word. The ore from which the lead is smelted lies in the mountains as valueless as the ordinary stone until millions of dollars are invested in the sinking of shafts, the erection of mining machinery, pumps, and the costly plants of the great smelting works. The plants and machinery at the large lead and silver producing mines in Colorado, Utah, and other places cost more money than many of the greatest manufacturing establishments in the East. The great smelters of Denver and Pueblo in Colorado, of Salt Lake and other cities of the Rocky Mountains are among the most expensive establishments in the world. The United States consumed, in 1887, 164,000 tons of lead, which, at $70 per ton, amounts to over $11,000,000. If the proposed reduction of the tariff on lead is made a large portion of this sum would have to be sent abroad in gold, for the lead would be imported from countries with which we have little trade.

PLATE-GLASS.

In 1864 a duty was imposed on plate-glass of from 3 to 60 cents per square foot. It was a duty for revenue only because no polished plate-glass was produced in this country prior to 1870. The cost to consumers before this was from $2 to $2.50 per square foot for such polished plate as was generally used in this country. Between 1868 and 1875 extensive manufactories were established at New Albany, Louisville, Butler, Pa, and Crystal City, near St. Louis, and others, on account of this tariff. The home competition by the building up of this industry has reduced the price to consumers about $1 per square foot, or about one-half Still, the President asserts in substance that the duty on plate-glass must make it cost to the consumer over 50 per cent. more. Before the industry was created in this country the plate-glass trade was controlled by a few importers in New York, who, in combination with the foreign manufacturers, maintained a monopoly upon it. Mr. Sullivan, in his work on English free trade hereinbefore referred to, shows how the free importation of plate-glass from the Continent has destroyed that industry in England; and he points out how it is one of the most beneficial industries to any community or country.

IMPORTING CHEAP GOODS IS POVERTY TO THE IMPORTERS.

The theory that a country or people may prosper or profit by buying the products from foreign countries because they can be produced cheaper abroad is an absurd free-trade fallacy. The revenue reformer says: Why, if these foreigners can sell us their manufactured goods cheaper than we can produce them, we can profit by buying them and importing them. This doctrine ignores the fact that the more diversified the industries of a community or country are the more it will prosper and the richer it will grow. It ignores the fact that money sent out of a country to pay for imported goods, with a few exceptions, makes that country so much the poorer.

Suppose a community has been manufacturing and selling in the home market $1,000,000 worth of goods at a fair profit, because there was a protective tariff of 20 per cent. on the article. This tariff is repealed and the same million dollars' worth of goods is imported and sold for $800,000. The free-trader says that the community has saved $200,000 by purchasing these goods. Let us see. In the first case one hundred men were employed in the factories. This directly increased the population of the village over 300. Many small farmers in the vicinity prospered by furnishing these operatives with "garden stuff" and farm products. The erection of the factories in the first place doubled the value of their farms and additional shops of all kinds have been opened. The tailor, the shoemaker, and the bonnet-maker, and any number of trades prospered directly and indirectly by the manufacture and sale of this $1,000,000 worth of goods.

The owners of the factories, perhaps, live in the neighborhood, and their 10 per cent. profit of $100,000 a year is expended there; twenty-five thousand in living expenses and seventy-five thousand by investing in real estate, in building improvements or extending their factories, and in employing more labor. The owners and operatives pay a share of the taxes to support the village school, the county, State, and municipal government. Suddenly the free-traders repeal the 20 per cent. tariff. The operatives can not accept low enough wages to compete with foreign goods. The factories are closed, and one hundred men are thrown out of employment. The farmer has no market for his "truck." The tailor, the shoemaker, and the bonnet-maker shops are closed. The owners of the factories take what capital they can save from the wreck and go elsewhere seeking investment. The little farms depreciate 50 per cent. in value; town lots, houses, and shops are almost worthless. The community becomes suddenly bankrupt, its people scattered, and some of them tramps looking for an existence.

They complain that the repeal of the 20 per cent. tariff has ruined their industries and them. The free-trader says, "No; you do not understand the true principle of political economy or you would see that buying the million dollars' worth of articles that were manufactured in the foreign country actually saves to the people $200,000, because the million dollars' worth of goods now actually costs only $800,000 to the consumers." "But," says the intelligent American operative, "that $800,000 has gone to the laborers of a foreign land. We are deprived of the means of subsistence and the country is $800,000 poorer. You may say that we can buy these and other kinds of goods a little cheaper but we have nothing to buy with. We are seeking work at reduced wages and can find none." The free-trader says again, "You must seek employment in another trade or business where foreign competition and the low wages of other countries can not compete with and destroy your industries."

If the Democratic free-trader can succeed in reducing the tariff as they propose, it will overthrow and destroy the manufactures, the industries of our country, pauperize the laboring classes, and impoverish the whole country in the same manner as when applied, by illustration, to this little community.

FREE TRADE IS SIMPLY FOREIGN COMPETITION.

As Mr. Sullivan says in applying the subject to England:

Freed from the cloud of words, the platitudes, theories, and sophisms by which it will be assailed, the question before the country is simply this: Can a manufacturing country like England, whose products are excluded from the markets of Europe and America, continue to admit, duty free, the manufactured products of those countries without interfering with the general employment of our people? * * * The bankers, the merchants, the brokers, the agents, the shippers, and those who deal with money and with exchanges in the sale and transportation of foreign goods will say "yes;" and so will those with realized and fixed incomes, the drones of the community, the consumers of silks, of satins, and light wines and a thousand and one articles of luxury that we get from abroad. But if you ask the great body of producers, the capitalists, who have invested their money in manufacturing and similar enterprises, the great employers of labor, the operatives, the toilers and moilers, the working bees of our teeming hives of industry, they will say "no."

This statement is specially applicable to the condition of America. Can we, after having under the protective policy built up manufacturing industries and when our products as fast as they come into competition with the products of other nations in foreign markets are excluded therefrom by the protective tariffs of those countries, admit, duty free, the products of those countries without interfering with the general employment of our people? The prosperity of a community must depend upon the general employment of its people and the rate of wages paid. As said, general employment and good wages mean contentment, sobriety, self-respect, and the general progress and improvement of the working classes. The want of them mean the reverse of all this. General employment at good wages is what creates industrial prosperity and adds to the wealth of a country. It is far more important to a community than cheap goods of any kind.

The destruction of a few great manufactures by repealing the tariff on their products causes many other industries to languish. The prosperity of a few great industries causes many others to prosper. The industries of a country are so closely connected and interwoven that you can not injure a few of them without injuring a great many of them. Any system or policy that will injure the manufacturing interests will injure the agricultural interests, the mining interests, and the great trade of internal commerce. These great industries must stand or fall together. By free trade and foreign competition they will fall.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] made the statement that the question narrowed itself to a contest between the drunkard's appetite and the poor man's back, attempting to convey the idea that the poor man had to pay a higher price for a suit of clothes than before the tariffs of 1861-'62, but that the tax on distilled

spirits was not a tax on the poor man. He ignores the fact that of the sixty millions of tax paid on distilled spirits every year, it is estimated that about thirty millions is for alcohol and other spirits used in the industries, fifteen millions of which is consumed in chemical manufactures. Here is a tax on raw material used in domestic industries larger than the total duty paid on all foreign raw material. There is no doubt that the consumer pays this. England takes the tax off of spirits when used in the industries. Germany refunds it all, and France a part, when it is used under the same conditions. Industrial alcohol is used free in Italy and Austria.

But the American free-trader requires these useful industries to pay over $95 for a barrel of spirits, more than four times its intrinsic value, which would be less than $20 if the tax was removed from this raw material. The poor man pays this when he buys anything at the family drug-store. The principle of taxing liquor which is used as a beverage is not opposed; but no one but a blind free-trader bent upon ruining the manufacturing industries would insist on continuing the tax on alcohol and other spirits used in the arts and industries. The poor man pays less per yard for a good class of American cassimeres to-day than he did for a poor quality of English cassimeres before the tariff. A stated and balanced account will show that the wages of a laboring man would buy him and his family 50 per cent. more of the necessaries and luxuries of life in the American market than they would in 1859–'60. The same account stated and balanced correctly shows that an equivalent amount of farm produce will purchase for the farmer and his family 50 per cent. more of the necessaries and comforts of life than it would in 1859–'60. Such statements as those made by the gentleman from Tennessee are only calculated to deceive.

THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF BENEFITS THE FARMER.

Mr. Chairman, it is continually stated that the farmer gets none of the benefits and bears an undue proportion of the burdens of protection. The President, in his annual onslaught on the tariff, by courtesy called his annual message, attempts to sympathize with the farmer. He says:

> The farmer and agriculturist, who manufactures nothing, but who pays the increased price which the tariff imposes upon every agricultural implement, upon all he wears, on all he uses and owns, except upon the increase of his flocks and herds and such things as his husbandry produces from the soil, is invited to aid in maintaining the present situation.

The free trade that first existed, which it was supposed would benefit the farmers, was the repeal of the tariff on wheat, corn, and provisions by England, known as the corn law. Every free-trader and Cobden Club man in England said that this would greatly benefit the laboring man, thereby giving him a cheap loaf, and every one of their blind followers in this country said that it would prove of immense benefit to the American farmer by enhancing the price and furnishing a foreign market for his grain and provisions. It did open the markets of England and Ireland free to the products of the American farmer. What has been the result? During the last ten years there has been a continual decrease in the amount of wheat exported and the export price has continually depreciated. The following table from the report of the Bureau of Statistics shows the number of bushels of wheat exported from the United States and the export price for the seven fiscal years from June, 1879, to June, 1886, inclusive:

Years.	Bushels.	Value.	Average price per bushel.
1879–'80	153,252,795	$190,546,305	$1.244
1880–'81	150,565,477	167,698,485	1.114
1881–'82	95,271,802	112,929,718	1.185
1882–'83	106,385,828	119,879,341	1.127
1883–'84	70,349,012	75,026,678	1.066
1884–'85	84,653,714	72,933,097	0.862
1885–'86	57,759,209	50,262,715	0.870

Our decrease in exports during this period, according to the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, is as follows:

Years.	Bushels.	Value.
1879–'80	159,565,477	$167,698,485
1886	57,759,209	50,262,715
Decrease	92,806,368	117,435,770

So that the free-trade policy of England which was to create an unlimited market for the wheat of the American farmer and advance its price has proved untrue. In seven years our exports of wheat from this country decreased over 92,000,000 bushels and the value of the exports fell off over $117,000,000. In other words, the farmers of the United States received $117,000,000 less for the wheat exported in 1886 than for the export of 1879. This was a loss of over 61 per cent. in the amount of wheat exported, and of over 70 per cent. in the value of the exports. The export value of a bushel of wheat in 1881 was over $1.24 and in 1886 it was only 87 cents.

During this time there has been no export duty in this country or import duty in England on wheat. Absolute free trade has existed between these two countries so far as grain is concerned, and the resultant facts are apparent to every one.

This ought to show the American farmer that British free trade and Cobden Club laws have not and will not furnish him a foreign market or a high price for his products. What is the special cause of this falling off in the amount of exports and the depreciation in the export price of wheat? It is that England, by her policy towards her colonies, has imported her wheat from India instead of from America. England has expended almost hundreds of millions of money in building up the agricultural industries of her possessions in India. She has built thousands of miles of railroad and aided in the construction of hundreds of miles of irrigating canals, which has resulted in a very large increase in the production of wheat in India. The Indian ryots, as the small wheat farmers of India are called, who work for about 10 cents per day, are brought into competition with the labor of the American farmer to such an extent that they can produce wheat cheaper than the American farmer, notwithstanding the great advancement in agriculture and agricultural machinery in this country.

The following table, from the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics for 1886, shows the amount of exports of wheat from India and the export price from 1879–'80 to 1885–'86, the same period covered by the table above showing the exports of American wheat:

Year.	Bushels.	Value.	Average price per bushel.
1879–'80	4,109,495	$5,396,491	$1.313
1880–'81	13,896,168	15,952,105	1.148
1881–'82	37,078,571	41.871,765	1.129
1882–'83	26,402,893	29,534,467	1.122
1883–'84	39,118,791	43,202,651	1.105
1884–'85	29,550,741	30,703,430	1.040
1885–'86	39,312,969	38,943,436	.991

From this it will be seen that while the exports of American wheat for seven years have fallen off from 153,000,000 bushels in 1879 to 57,000,000 in 1886, the exports of wheat from India have increased from 4,000,000 bushels in 1879 to over 39,000,000 bushels in 1886. The American exports of wheat have declined over 69 per cent. The India exports of wheat have increased over 900 per cent.

The American farmer can not rely in the future upon a market for his wheat in England. The continued decline of exports from this country and the continual increase of exports from India will drive the wheat of the American farmer entirely from the British islands during the next decade.

Mr. Sullivan, in the work referred to, has pointed out the great decline in English agricultural interests since the imports of wheat from India began under her free-trade policy. He has incontrovertibly shown that the agricultural interests of England are being destroyed by this policy, but the moneyed classes and the capitalists of the British Empire of England and of India are being benefited. The English free-trade policy is governed by the money princes and capitalists of the world. Their policy is to build up a foreign commerce and a foreign import trade, because from it they accumulate their millions. In conceiving and originating legislation they adopt and enforce a policy which they think will advance the interests and increase the accumulations of these classes. I believe that if the policy of England, which has been somewhat destructive of the agricultural interests of Ireland and of England, had not been compensated for, in the eyes of English statesmen and capitalists, by the trade and commerce created by the imports of wheat and other products from India, the tariff on American wheat would have been readopted in England years ago.

If the American farmer can not depend upon England as a foreign market for his wheat or produce when his home market is destroyed by the decline or overthrow of the manufacturing interests and the increase of agricultural products, where can he look? In what part of the world must he seek a market?

Mr. Chairman, comparatively a small amount of wheat has been imported into Germany and other continental nations. At different periods, when there was a foreign war, or a drought around the Baltic or upon the plains of Russia, there would be a demand for some American wheat, and America would supply the deficiency. During the last few years, since the export has so greatly diminished, some wheat has been exported to South Germany. What is the result? A short time since, to cut off this import of wheat from America, a new tariff was established on wheat in Germany. This new tariff is $1.19 on 220 pounds, or about 30 per cent. ad valorem. The New York Nation, in commenting upon this action of Germany, says:

> The object of it is to exclude American wheat from South Germany and to compel Bavaria, Baden, and the Rhine country to buy Prussian wheat exclusively. But it is much cheaper to supply the South German people with American wheat from London. Moreover, the South Germans are accustomed to American wheat; they even like it better than Prussian wheat. On the other hand, Prussian wheat is very conveniently situated for the English market, and very inconveniently for the South German market. Accordingly, a bill has been introduced in the Reichstag to enable North German merchants to ex-

port wheat to England and to import an equivalent amount of American wheat to South Germany free of duty. In order to make the swap easy and frictionless, it is proposed that the exporter of North German wheat shall have the right to sell his permits of importation just as he would sell a bill of exchange. The drollery of all this circumlocution, by which the consumer is sacrificed to the producer, has not penetrated the German mind to any great extent, but there is much suffering in South Germany in consequence of the deprivation of American supplies of food. Why do not some of our high-tariff men, who are such fast friends of the American farmer, propose a measure of retaliation?

What a prosperous time the American farmer will have when by such devices he is entirely shut out of foreign markets, and our Secretary of State, a member of the Cobden Club, is trying to enforce retaliatory measures in his behalf.

The Nation is a very high-toned free-trade organ, but it has here stated a few facts showing the extreme measures the German Government has resorted to to exclude American farmers from German markets. Germany has lately adopted custom-house regulations and tariffs, as I am informed by men who have been exporting meats and the products of animals, which practically prohibit the importation of American food-products into the German Empire. Still the President and his free-trade followers point out how the farmer is injured by American protection and how a free-trade policy in this country would be to his benefit.

We now import annually over $60,000,000 worth of food supplies, and this bill proposes to add more of these agricultural products to the free-list. If the object is, as avowed, to protect the American farmer, why does not this bill provide for protecting the farmers' products against foreign competition? It is building up a home market by manufacturing and diversified interests that will advance the farmers' produce and add to the value of his real estate. In 1771 Dr. Franklin wrote from England, where he had been watching with his masterly mind the growth of her industries, and said:

Every manufactory encouraged in our country makes part of a market for provisions within ourselves and saves so much money to the country as must otherwise be exported to pay for the manufactures he supplies. Here in England, it is well known and understood that whenever a manufactory is established which employs a number of hands it raises the value of land in the neighboring country all around. It seems, therefore, the interest of our farmers and owners of land to encourage our young manufacturers in preference to foreign ones.

The first and greatest statesmen of the Republic wrote to the same effect, that it was only by building up a home market that the American farmer could look for prosperity and wealth. Why is it not proposed by the bill to remove the tax from tobacco? Has not the farmer as much right to conduct a tobacco farm as a corn or wheat farm? Such inconsistencies in this Mills bill, the authorship of which remains in mystery, shows that its object is free trade, pure and simple. Disguise it as they may, this bill means free trade and unrestricted foreign competition.

This bill puts wool on the free-list. This is an unjust blow to one of the most important agricultural industries in this country. The President in one paragraph of his message pretends to sympathize with the farmer. In another he recommends taking the tariff off wool, because, he says, it is raw material. It is the finished product of the farm. Ask the farmer who has invested all his means in a sheep farm which is still encumbered by a mortgage if it is raw material to him. He has watched his flocks grow and increase by expending all his time and energy and that of his family in herding them in summer and feeding them in winter. During an unexpected hard winter he has run in debt to buy grain to save them from the severities of the storm.

The following extract and table show how the wool industry has been injured by the reduction of the tariff in 1883:

The wool-growers have especial reasons at this time to appeal to their brother farmers for support. At a time when their industry is depressed as it hardly ever has been before by foreign competition, permitted by a reduction of duties in 1883, by Treasury rulings since, and by systematic frauds in foreign ports, the President proposes in his annual message the repeal of all duties on wool. In the two years before the change of duty, and in the past two years, the imports for consumption were as follows:

Year.	Quantities.	Duties.	Year.	Quantities.	Duties.
		Cents.			*Cents.*
1881	67,416,967	7.20	1886	107,910,549	4.75
1882	63,016,769	6.11	1887	114,404,174	5.16
Average	65,216,868	6.65	Average	111,157,361	4.95

Under efficient protection the production of wool rose from 60,000,000 pounds in 1860 to 308,000,000 pounds in 1884, the year after the change of duty. It has since declined to 285,000,000 pounds in 1886, and according to estimates of the Agricultural Bureau to 265,000,000 pounds in 1887. Meanwhile the stocks of domestic wool unsold at the close of 1887 are greatly increased; 31,974,000 pounds are on hand, an increase of 6,620,157 pounds at Boston alone. To the mischief done by reduced duties there is added, first, the great fraudulent importation of Donskoi and other washed wool, under pretense that it is unwashed, a systematic fraud by which the United States consul at Odessa reports to the State Department that the Government has been defrauded for years out of more than $15,000,000 in duties. Each pound of foreign wool thus fraudulently imported, already scoured and shrunken, takes the place of 2 to 4 pounds of American wool in natural condition.

The importations of wool have nearly doubled, while the American wool-growers have been going to bankruptcy to aid the Australian wool-farmers. The wool-growing industry, as is well known, can not exist in the United States to any considerable extent in open, unrestricted competition with wool production in Australia, South America, and other countries. In 1883 the wool-clip of the United States was 320,000,000 pounds; in this year only about 260,000,000.

The agricultural interests must stand or fall together. The Australian and other foreign wool-growers are now brought into direct competition with the American wool-growers. The American wheat-farmer is brought into competition with the Indian ryot, who hires his labor for 10 ten cents per day. Many large wheat-farmers will be compelled in a few years to diversify their industry by keeping flocks of sheep to fertilize an impoverished soil. There are large tracts of land in the West and Rocky Mountain country fit only for raising sheep. Shall this great industry be destroyed or shall it be protected, so that America will grow all the wool required for American manufacture.

As has been so well said:

Price is one thing, ability or means with which to pay is quite different.

Diversified industry gives prosperity and means to purchase necessaries for all. Low prices and cheap goods are only a mockery to those whose business has been so depressed by foreign competition they have no means to buy at any price.

Destroy the sheep industry of this country, turn 200,000 people out of employment and the million dependent on them for support; then the foreign wool-growers will put up the price, American manufacturers will have to buy their wool abroad, woolen goods will advance, and we shall have another practical illustration of free-trade theories.

WE SHOULD HAVE A NATIONAL REVENUE POLICY.

Mr. Chairman, I am for what Henry Clay called the American system. I am as much opposed to importing any revenue or tax system from England or other European countries as I am to importing their products of cheap pauperized labor. I am for a national as opposed to an international system of political economy. This is in accord with the progress of the times as well as with the distinct and peculiar condition of the material and political institutions of our country. Since Germany has adopted her national system of protection to her own industries and products, as against the former free-trade policy, she has built up her own industries as against England, in spite of all her difficulties. International free trade is not only impracticable, but it is impossible. There can be no such a thing as universal free trade except by reciprocity treaties between the commercial nations of the world. Every country in the world except England is now pursuing to some extent the policy of a national protective system.

The royal commission on the depression of British trade find as a fact that the protective policy which has been adopted to a great extent by the continental nations of Europe during the last ten years is one of the great causes of England's industrial decay.

During the last few years, whenever it is discovered by the statesmen of Germany, France, Austria, Russia, and other nations that the imports of any particular class of products by foreign competition are destroying the profit of their own industries, they immediately proceed to legislate or pass decrees which prohibit such foreign competition. Germany has within a short time practically excluded our wheat, our meats, and other provisions from her market. Prominent witnesses who testified before the royal commission said that the policy of other countries had become such that they saw no other way for even England to protect her industries except by a protective tariff against the importation of goods from the continental nations.

I have no time here to refer to the testimony or to the conclusions of the able commissioners upon this subject; but it can not be denied that the general tendency throughout the commercial world during the past two decades is to establish a national as distinguished from an international system. It is what the able German writer, Frederick List, calls the national as distinguished from the cosmopolitical economy. He says that—

The actual workings and results of a national protective policy as distinguished from the international free-trade policy are being adopted the world over.

Notwithstanding the dogmatic and theoretical assumptions, the free-trade system is necessarily built upon the basis of international reciprocity.

How can there be such a thing as free trade when nine-tenths of the nations of the world are adopting and enforcing a national protective policy? J. B. Say demands as a premise for the comprehension of his free-trade theories a universal republic and peace the world over. The political economy of Smith, Say, and others means cosmopolitical or world-wide economy. The theories of the advocates of free trade in America are built upon this international system; that is, they are built upon a myth. They ignore national boundary lines. It is not necessary to discuss whether universal free trade, by the abolition of protective tariffs and revenue laws the world over and the blotting out of all national boundary lines, so far as trade and commerce are concerned, would be beneficial to the human race. Such a thing is impossible. If a free-trade policy were adopted by us, and by the importation of cheap raw material and cheap laborers from China and Europe the price of labor greatly reduced, and goods were manufactured so

cheap that we could compete in the foreign markets, the protective tariffs of other countries would prevent their exportation from this country, but could not prevent the flooding of this country with the cheap goods of foreign nations and the closing of American factories.

SOUTH AMERICAN TRADE.

Mr. Chairman, I would, as a part of this system of American political economy, reach out after a foreign market and build up a foreign trade where practicable. We ought to be able to build up a large South American trade. If the proper policy was pursued we could soon export large quantities of manufactured goods to our South American neighbors. They are our natural commercial allies. If we should pursue the policy of England and Germany towards these South American countries, we could in time take from them a large portion of the trade. They built up this trade by paying large subsidies to the lines of ships that created it. Here is the one opportunity we have where it is practicable to build up a foreign market, and the Democratic free-traders prevent it. The Republicans have many times attempted to subsidize steam-ship lines between America and South American ports to build up this trade, and such subsidies have been as many times defeated by the free-trade Democrats. They have even refused to vote liberal pay for carrying the mails to incidentally aid in building up this American commerce.

Mr. Chairman, our political institutions, the future material welfare of our country, the freedom and equality of our citizens all demand the permanent establishment of a national system of political economy entirely free and independent from the commercial and industrial as well as from the political institutions and policies of other nations. I would make the protection of American labor from foreign competition he keystone in the arch of this American industrial system; I would extend the ægis of that national protective system to all the industries and productions of our broad land; I would protect from foreign competition the cotton, rice, fruits, sugar, oranges, peanuts, and bananas of the Southern planter, as well as the corn, wheat, meats, and other provisions of the Northern farmer; I would protect the almond, the olive, the grape, and raisin culture of California, as well as the lumber and other interests on the Northern boundary; I would protect the great lead, iron, coke, and coal-mining interests of the South, of the Rocky Mountains, and of the Middle States; I would protect the great manufacturing interests everywhere, South as well as North, East as well as West; I would proclaim to the world that we propose to protect our home markets and our home labor from the competition of cheap foreign goods and pauperized labor everywhere. And, sir, I would henceforth protect our laboring men and their families from the importation and immigration of contract and pauperized laborers as well as from the importation of the products of their work. I believe the time will come when this will be imperatively necessary. As President Garfield said:

> It is our glory that the American laborer is more intelligent and better paid than his foreign competitor. Let Americans devote themselves to the welfare of America.

Mr. Huskisson, in the England Parliament, said:

> To enable capital to obtain a fair remuneration labor must be kept down.

We say, to enable labor to obtain fair remuneration wages must be kept up.

Lord Brougham said in Parliament:

> England can afford to incur some loss on the exports of English goods for the purpose of destroying foreign manufactures in their cradle.

The protective policy has prevented the destruction of our manufactures against the wish of American statesmen. The law prohibiting the importation of Chinese labor has assisted in preventing the degradation and poverty of the American workingmen. Many quotations could be made to show the irreconcilable differences between the English and the American policy. The English capitalist and statesman indorses and approves the President's message and his free-trade policy. Others during this discussion have cited from the comments of the English press and statesmen in favor of that un-American document. The intelligent American laborers of this country are protesting against it and the industrial policy it advocates. These American workmen will put their protests into practical form next November, when they will deposit their ballots "as silent as snow-flakes in the valley at midnight." But they will establish the permanent policy of national protection, and they will remove from positions of power and influence the free-traders and the authors and advocates of free-trade bills.

The American nation is devoted to industry. Its origin and history have been industrial and not warlike. Its conquests and advancement have been made through the arts, sciences, and industries. The American armies are armies of workingmen. On their banners are not written the names of cities sacked, "countries pillaged to enrich our own," but the names of inventors, civilizing influences, labor-saving machinery, and the independence, education, and elevation of the laboring man.

Mr. Chairman, the blindest policy of all is the attempt to array the West and South against protection. The West and South need a protective tariff more than the East. The New England States, even with the vacillating protection they received before 1861, built up a manufacturing and diversified industry and accumulated wealth that gave them a commanding position over the Middle, Western, and Southern States. When the high tariff of 1861–'62 was enacted the manufacturing industries crossed the Alleghany Mountains and spread over the great Middle and adjoining Western States. It diversified their industries and built up their manufactures until they exceeded those of New England. Commerce and the wholesale trade followed the manufactures until the great cities of the Ohio and Mississippi Valleys and the Lakes far exceeded those of New England in wealth and commerce.

Next came the efforts of the Democratic party in the Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-eighth, Forty-ninth, and now in the Fiftieth Congresses, to break down the protective system. The persistent and able opposition of the Republican party, aided by a few Democrats, defeated the passage of the free-trade bills in the Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, Forty-eighth, and Forty-ninth Congresses. This defeat caused the manufacturing industries to advance across the plains and mountains of the far West, and to penetrate and invade the Southern States. The result is we see the iron and steel and lead mining and manufacturing industries of Colorado, Alabama, and Tennessee. We behold the trade and commerce and manufactures of Kansas City, Omaha, Denver, Pueblo, Atlanta, Birmingham, and other cities fast growing ahead of their rivals in the Eastern and Middle States. I speak of the South in connection with the West because their interests in this industrial advance are identical. The Eastern and Middle States with their enormous capital and accumulated wealth can do much better without protection than we of the West and South.

> Westward [and southward] the course of empire takes its way;
> The four first acts already past,
> A fifth shall close the drama with the day;
> Time's noblest offspring is the last.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the last and noblest drama of industrial offspring will be that of the West and South. And when this free-trade bill shall be defeated, and the people put their seal of condemnation upon it next November, then will begin an era of manufacturing and commercial growth in the South and West before unheard of. One of the ablest of European writers on economies and protection relates the fact that Washington, on the day of his inauguration, wore a suit of home-manufactured cloth, in order, in the simple and impressive manner so peculiar to this great man, to give all his successors in office and to all future legislators a memorable way in which the welfare of this country is to be promoted.

How this lesson has been lost upon President Cleveland and the Democratic party.

Mr. Chairman, I caution any gentlemen or any political party not to attempt to overthrow the American protective system. He who supposes that system had its origin or continuance in legislative statutes is ignorant of its history or does not grasp its import. It is the result of a growth. It is the crystallized sentiment and opinion of the American people. It has been evolved from the necessities and conflicts of our industrial system as much as our national unity has been evolved from the necessities and conflicts of our political system.

Mr. FUNSTON. Mr. Chairman, the discussion of the tariff question has already been long drawn out, the mine has been thoroughly worked, and there is but little that can be added on either side of the question without repeating what has already been brought to the attention of this House. Were I an attorney in the case I would certainly be willing to rest the cause of protection on the evidence already adduced. This, however, is a case in which not only the cause at issue is being tried, but the litigants themselves are expected to go on the stand and give the reason for the faith that is within them. This is my only apology for my appearance at this time. I am for American interests as against the balance of the world.

> If any provide not for his own * * * he is worse than an infidel.

However much my heart may go out for the unfortunates in the Old World, my first duty is to my own countrymen. Therefore, I am a protectionist in the full sense of the word. I would protect our country against foreign invasion, whether it be armed troops to lay waste our happy land or the manufactured products of half-paid labor to cripple our industries and destroy the occupation of our laboring people. Mr. Chairman, I am not here to-day to plead for the protection of any special class or interest as against any others that are equally worthy. The policy of the friends of protection should be to build up and maintain a system which reaches out and includes every man, whether rich or poor, whether living on the plains of the West or among the hills of New England; whether on the lakes of the North or the orange groves of the South; a system which builds up and sacredly protects every honest industry in which an American citizen secures employment or invests a dollar; a system which benefits not only those who are directly engaged in the protected industry, but all others who have the good fortune to be American citizens.

A tariff bill based on any other principle is one-sided and disproportioned, and ought to be honestly adjusted, or otherwise permitted to perish in its own narrowness and selfishness. Protected coal for Virginia and free wool for Ohio is not a protective system. Protected sugar for Louisiana and free salt for Michigan is not a protective system. Protected rice for South Carolina and free lumber for Oregon is not a protective system. Protected wheat for Minnesota and free fruit

for California is not a protective system. Such a scheme is little-souled, narrow-minded, partisan and sectional, and unworthy of a place among the plans of statesmen. Such is, indeed, the character of the bill which we are called upon to consider at this time. It bears the ear-marks of the politician in its partiality to those States the Democratic party hopes to carry at the next Presidential election. It exhibits the accustomed contempt of the Democracy for the interests of the agriculturist and the mechanic by placing many of the productions of their toil on the free-list, while, by reducing the duty on many articles only just enough to increase their importation and keep up the revenue, it blunders as to its method of reducing the surplus.

Whatever may have been the design of its framers, the sure result can only be the destruction of many of our industries in which thousands of laborers find honest employment and great amounts of capital a legitimate investment. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL], whom I do not see in his seat, well says in his speech of the 29th of April.

> We are going in the same track that our predecessors followed in 1857 and 1871.

The gentleman doubtless spoke more wisely than he knew. I agree with him fully, and to assist him in proving his case I will read an extract from President Buchanan's message to Congress dated December 8, 1857, in which he says:

> We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet notwithstanding all these advantages our country in its monetary interests is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions and in all the elements of natural wealth we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

The able gentleman from Massachusetts speaks for his party when he says "we," and he utters the fact, whether he knows it or not. There can be no doubt of the intentions of the Democratic party to return to their old beat of 1857. The same sad prospects, the same outlook of social misfortune and industrial desolation await the unfurling again of their free-trade banner. It brings to us a vision of the past—the silent wheels, the smokeless stacks, the deserted workshops, the widespread want of 1857. [Applause.] These calamities seem to have a charm for the average Democrat equaled only by the charm of wild-cat banks, half-paid labor, and cheap foreign goods. As to the question of labor in these halcyon days of Democracy, I speak from personal knowledge when I say that the strongest and best of laborers were hired on the farm in those days at $125 to $150 per year, and boarded themselves, and the same class of hands are to-day receiving from $250 to $300 per year.

What is true of farm laborers, as relates to increase of wages, is true also in all other branches of industry. No man who has the least knowledge of the fact will deny that the laborer of to-day is paid an increase of from 40 to 65 per cent., according to occupation, over what he was paid in 1857 to 1860. I desire here to submit a table, which is the result of careful study and investigation by the Springfield (Mass.) Republican, showing the per cent. of advance of wages of employés since the period before the civil war to the present time: Railroads, 35 per cent.; cotton, 50 per cent.; woolen, 65 per cent.; paper, 55 per cent.; buttons, 55 per cent.; cigars, 50 per cent.; whips, 44 per cent.; domestics, 65 per cent.; iron, 64 per cent.; wool, 64 per cent.; day labor, 40 per cent; average of the whole, 52 per cent. But the eloquent and able gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] would tell us, as he did in his address to this House on the 26th of last month:

> That labor is as much a commodity selling in the market as the materials to be worked up. If the demand is great wages will go up; if the demand is small wages will go down.

Does the gentleman stop to reflect that it is protection which creates the demand for the labor?

No one, even of the most radical free-trade convictions, has asserted on this floor that protection does not build up and sustain manufactures and other industries which demand the labor of many thousands of men. It is the creator of demand for labor, and therefore the creator of wages, high or low, as the tariff itself is high or low. No one who admits that demand regulates wages and that a tariff creates the demand can arrive at any other conclusion. There is but one side, then, of this question for the laboring man, and that is the side that gives him the wages. That free trade or a duty for revenue only will create a demand for labor no one upon this floor has had the temerity to assert. That point has been studiously avoided by all who have maintained the free-trade side of this question. It is the missing link in their chain of argument.

What is to become of the laboring man when the demand for his services is superseded by foreign labor expended upon imported goods is a question of graver importance than that of a few cents on a bolt of cloth or a barrel of salt. The labor question has become a most important factor in our system of government and no innovation should be made which in any way affects this question without carefully ascertaining beyond a peradventure that the change will be in accord with the labor interests of the country. Yet it is proposed by this bill now under consideration to remove the protective duties in whole from many important industries in which thousands of our countrymen are employed, and to materially reduce protection on others, the inevitable result of which will be the destruction of those industries and shutting out of employment thousands of men who are now earning a comfortable living. As a reimbursement for all this loss and industrial disturbance they are told that a limited number of manufactured articles which they may desire to buy can be purchased a few cents cheaper in consequence of the adoption of free-trade principles.

Do gentlemen ever reflect that the question of cheapness is not the all-important question with the laboring man? The question of employment at good wages is of far greater importance to him. None are less inclined to higgle over prices than he. None are more willing to live and let live than he. Something to buy with is what concerns him most. Goods may be cheap, they may be offered at half price, but what advantage is that to the man who is out of employment and out of money? The fact that goods are cheap only adds to his aggravation. No gentleman on the free-trade side of this question, who has referred to the protection on farm products, has failed to assert that the duty on them does not add to their market value, except in the single case of wool. If this be true, then the laboring man can expect no reduction in the prices of articles that go upon his table. If this be true, beef and pork and bread and butter and all other articles of like kind, which make up the most expensive part of his purchases, will remain the same as to-day, while, if the most that is claimed for free trade be true, he may expect to obtain his wearing apparel a few dollars cheaper per year than under protection.

But this can not apply to cotton goods, for they are already cheaper in this country than in any other part of the world. In any event, the proposed reduction must be confined to woolen goods. Now, if it be true that free wool is the panacea which shall cure all his ills, the sovereign and only remedy provided for his relief, let us see how great that relief will be. The present duty on wool is about 10 cents. In a suit of woolen goods there are from 3 to 7 pounds of wool. If all be true that the free-traders say, the suit costs about 50 cents more than it should under free trade. Allowing two full suits each year, $1 would be saved to the laboring man by free wool. And to save this $1 he is asked to join in a crusade against the manufacturing interests of the country, by which his wages will be reduced at least one hundred times that amount, and most likely he will be thrown out of emploment altogether.

It has been uniformly urged on the other side of this House that the manufacturer absorbs all the benefits of protection and that he does not permit them to extend to the laborer. Might we not right here urge with equal force that in case the duty is removed from wool the manufacturer will absorb all the benefits and that he will not permit them to extend to the purchaser, so that after all the $1 to be saved may prove to be only a myth? While I do not want to be understood as saying that free wool alone would bring about this reduction in wages, I do want to be understood that whenever you strike down one of the great protected industries of this country all others must go with it.

The American system of protection is one wherein every industry is interrelated with and interdependent upon every other. Each industry stands as a pillar in a structure. Let some free-trade Samson pull down one of these pillars and the whole temple of American industry must fall. When this American system is destroyed labor in Europe and in this country must stand on the same level as to wages.

In this connection I submit a few tables taken from a most valuable book, entitled "Wages, Living, and Tariff," by E. A. Hartshorn, to show what that labor level will be. The current wages paid in flax and hemp spinning mills in Great Britain and in this country are:

	New York.	England.
	Per day.	*Per day.*
Spinners, women	$1.00	$0.30
Twisters, women	.85	.28
Rovers, women	.75	.28
Spreaders, women	1.00	.30
Card feeders, women	.85	.30
Overseers, men	3.00	1.40
Hacklers, men	2.00	.85
Children	.40	.08

	Newark.	Paisley.
	Per week.	*Per week.*
Cop-winders	$8.00	$3.50
Finishers	5.50	2.50
Reelers	8.00	4.25
Spoolers	8.00	3.25
Foremen	20.00	7.00
Pickers	7.00	4.12
Hank-winders	7.00	3.75

	New York.	Scotland.
Wool-sorters:	*Per week.*	*Per week.*
Overseer	$18.00	$7.50
Men	12.00	5.50
Dyers, men	7.00	3.75
Carding:		
Overseer	20.00	16.50
Card-tenders, girls	4.00	2.00
Spinning:		
Overseer	18.00	7.50
Men	12.00	
Boys	4.00	1.50

	New York.	Scotland.
	Per week.	*Per week.*
Warping:		
Overseer	$18.00	$7.50
Dresser-tenders:		
Men	10.50	.....
Women	3.50	.....
Children	3.50 to 4.00	1.50
Weaving:		
Overseer	30.00	16.50
Section hands	13.50	7.50
Weavers	10.00	3.75
Finishing:		
Overseer	35.00	15.00
Shearers	7.50	3.75
Pressmen	8.00	3.75
Giggers and fullers	7.50	3.75

	New York.	Bolton.
	Per week.	*Per week.*
Card-grinders, men	$8.28	$5.59
Card-strippers, men	7.86	5.59
Slubber-tenders, girls	6.00	4.36
Mule-spinners, men	10.50	5.95
Frame-spinners, girls	4.50	2.31
Wrappers, girls	6.00	4.22
Weavers, men, per loom	.....	1.30
Weavers, girls, per loom, $3 or	.....	.....
Loom jobbers, men	9.00	.....
Mule overlookers, men	12.25	9.00
Mechanics, average	18.00	10.22
Engine drivers	13.00	7.54
Firemen, average	18.00	10.22
	8.40	5.00

Comparative rates of weekly wages paid in Europe and in the United States in 1878.

[Condensed from the Report of the Secretary of State on the State of Labor in Europe, derived from facts reported by the United States consuls, Washington, 1879.]

Occupations.	Belgium.	Denmark.	France.	Germany.	Italy.	Great Britain.	United States.	
							New York.	Chicago.
Bakers	$4.40	$4.25	$5.55	$3.50	$3.90	$6.50-$6.60	$5-$8	$8.00-$12.00
Blacksmiths	4.40	3.90	5.45	3.55	3.94	7.04- 8.12	10-14	9.00- 12.00
Bookbinders	.....	3.72	4.85	3.82	3.90	6.50- 7.83	12-18	9.00- 20.00
Bricklayers	6.00	.....	4.00	3.60	3.45	7.58- 9.03	12-15	6.00- 10.50
Cabinet-makers	4.80	.....	6.00	3.97	4.95	7.70- 8.48	9- 13	7.00- 15.00
Carpenters and joiners	5.40	4.25	5.42	4.00	4.18	7.33- 8.25	9- 12	7.50- 12.00
Farm laborers	.....	.....	3.15	2.87	3.50	3.40- 4.25	.....	.....
Laborers, porters, etc.	3.00	.....	.....	2.92	2.60	4.50- 5.00	6- 9	5.50- 9.00
Painters	4.20	4.15	4.90	3.92	4.60	7.25- 8.16	10- 16	6.00- 12.00
Plasterers	5.40	.....	.....	3.80	4.35	7.63-10.13	10- 15	9.00- 15.00
Plumbers	6.00	.....	5.50	3.60	3.90	7.13- 8.46	12- 18	12.00- 20.00
Printers	.....	4.62	4.70	4.80	3.90	7.52- 7.75	8- 18	12.00- 18.00
Shoemakers	.....	3.30	4.75	3.12	4.32	..... 7.35	12- 18	9.00- 18.00
Tailors	.....	4.10	5.10	3.58	4.30	5.00- 7.30	10- 18	6.00- 18.00
Tinsmiths	4.80	3.90	4.40	3.65	3.60	6.00- 7.30	10- 14	9.00- 12.00

Mr. Chairman, I hardly need follow this branch of my subject further, only than to anticipate the charge which may be made that in the last table the industries mentioned are but little, if any, influenced by the tariff. That is true so far as relates to a direct influence, but the indirect influence of the protective system is in many instances greater than the direct. As an illustration: A woolen mill is started and a thousand men employed at good wages. Their benefit is direct, because that industry is protected. But the butcher who feeds them finds a ready market at good prices, and he too is benefited, though his business is not enumerated on the tariff schedule. So, also, with the carpenter who erects the building, the workmen who dig the foundation, the artist who does the painting, the blacksmith who repairs the tools, as also the baker, the grocer, the hotel-keeper, and hundreds of other avocations not mentioned in the tariff list. These all receive an impetus because of the men employed, and their benefits are indirect. Nor do the benefits of that woolen mill just mentioned stop with those who are benefited secondarily. It continues to others who move up and take the places of those employed, and so on until many thousands are favorably affected.

When three hundred thousand mills and manufactories of all kinds, as there are to-day all over this great country, are put in motion, the effect is felt in the most distant parts and becomes the nourishing life-blood of the whole people. Nor are the benefits confined to those who perform manual la or. The school-teacher is better paid, because so many find employment in other business than his. The doctor finds a wider scope for his practice, because so many have chosen callings other than his. The lawyer and the preacher the same; and all are better paid, because so many others have something to do and something to pay with.

Mr. Chairman, after all we have heard from the gentlemen on the other side of this Chamber about the deplorable condition of our people under what they have chosen to call a robber-tax, we instinctively turn to them and survey their condition. We find a greater number of the laboring people owners of their owns homes than in any other country upon the face of the earth. They wear better clothes and are supplied better at their tables, and are better educated and paid than the laboring people of any other country. We can not exaggerate by saying that the American laborer has the comforts of life as well as many of the luxuries in larger quantities than any other working people. When their families are encountered in the churches or in the schools or in any of the walks of life no one can determine by their appearance to what class they belong—whether poor or rich. They do not look like a people who were robbed. They themselves know to the contrary, as their votes in the industrial States have always testified. And when we behold the nation's progress in wealth and all the elements of civilization during the last twenty-five years we are indeed lost in amazement.

I shall not attempt to repeat the facts here; suffice to say that even within the last eighteen years it has been more than double that of any other nation in the world. And all this has been done notwithstanding the so-called robber-tariff tax of which we hear so much. The gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, says it has been done in spite of the tariff. Does any man, even the gentleman from Texas himself, believe it? Does any man believe that without protection the mining interests of iron ore would have increased 110 per cent. since 1870, coal 66 per cent., and many other industries in like proportion? Does any man believe that under free trade any judicious business man would have put a dollar into manufacturing enterprises in this country while he could have carried on such industry in England at a labor cost of 25 per cent. to 100 per cent. less than here? The cost of ocean transportation can not be offered as an obstacle in the way of English competition. If I have been correctly informed, the rocks that pave the streets of New Orleans were brought from England as ship-ballast in ships used in the cotton trade.

I have no doubt that the English manufacturers would gladly lay down their goods in our country free of the cost of transportation. They could well afford to do it, for the monopoly of the American market would amply reimburse them. Every American citizen should spurn it. I for one do not want it. I would rather see the skies of Tennessee and Pennsylvania darkened with the smoke of their furnaces; I would rather hear the clatter of their machinery and behold their industrial classes employed at good wages than to have English goods thrown upon our shores at any price, however cheap. And now, Mr. Chairman, as to the farmer, who seems to be made the burden of complaint by the gentlemen on the other side. Why all these tears for the farmer? Why this lamentation, while at the same time you persist in removing the duty on foreign wool? Wool is the only farm product which you admit to be enhanced in value by the tariff. I want to say to you, gentlemen, that the farmers are asking none of your sympathy. They know your hands are against them, and the only favor they ask of you is not to insult their intelligence with the specious assumption that they are so ignorant as to believe in your theories or trust to the promises which you hold out to them with one hand while you tear down their industry with the other. Put up the duty on wool instead of taking off what it now has, and you will give them some reason to believe in your wisdom and sincerity. The farmer is not dead to his interests. He knows better perhaps where they lie than the men who are assuming to champion his cause. But little if any complaint comes from him of the high prices alleged to have arisen by reason of the tariff.

Of all the petitions which have reached my table in the last four years, not one has come from a farmer asking for the reduction of the tariff on wool or on any other article. He knows there is not an article of clothing or machinery or tools for the farm that is not cheaper to-day than it was in the free-trade days of 1860. He knows, too, that there has been a gradual and continuous cheapening of goods and manufactured articles of all kinds from 1860 down to the present time. He knows that the lives of our fathers and mothers, which were so full of toil at the loom, the spinning-wheel, and other tedious, dreary forms of labor, have, through the fostering care of our protective system, been rendered comparatively happy and easy, so that where once was heard the monotonous clinking of the shuttle are now heard the sweet tones of the organ and the piano. Books and newspapers have taken the place of knitting-needles and spinning-wheels. The farmers of the country have taken their places upon a higher and better plane of culture, from which they do not propose to be lured by the siren notes of the free-trader.

We hear but little complaint from them of high prices of things which they have to buy.

A first-class double-spring-seated farm wagon finished, in better style than were the carriages of our fathers fifty years, ago now sells at $65 retail; Fitchburg cassimere, 85 cents per yard; cashmerets, 35 to 38 cents a yard; best standard sheeting, 8 cents per yard; good calicoes, 4½ to 6½ cents per yard; nails, 3 cents per pound, and all others of the real necessaries of farm life at the same low rates. Thanks, gentlemen, restrain your sympathy; bestow it where it will be more appropriate and better appreciated. What the farmer most desires is a good market. What he has to buy is not a question so serious with him as what he

has to sell. If you will only give him a good market in which to sell his products, make his market as easy of access and as convenient as are his places of purchase, he will ask no odds in the battle of life. This is fast becoming the case now under the benign influences of the American system of protection. The great cities of Chicago, St. Louis, and Kansas City are fast becoming the leading markets of the world.

The great State of Illinois is one vast work-shop. Missouri, with her rich mines of iron, coal, and zinc, is only held back by the mirage of free trade. Kansas is rapidly following with her smelting furnaces, glass factories, foundries, and machine-shops. The farmer of the West welcomes them as the best friends of his interests. In them he sees a market which is far preferable to that of London, 4,000 miles away. Engaged in these industries he sees thousands of consumers employed who are his customers, and who, if not so employed, would be his competitors in agricultural pursuits, thus doubling the productions of the farm, which must necessarily result in an over-supply of the home market of all such commodities as the farmer produces. Thus his home market is destroyed, his production doubled, and he driven to markets beyond the sea, where with a vast surplus he must come into competition with the cheapest labor of the world. Gentlemen tell us that the London market governs the price of our farm products. London can fix the prices of our products only so long as she pays more than is paid in America.

The American market has to gain but 4 per cent. on the farm productions of the country to make the home demand equal to the home supply, and then not London but our own home demand will control the prices of all home products. The farmers of this country want to hasten that time. Every interest impels them to it. Every patriotic impulse urges it upon them. They want neither English markets nor English goods, and will hail with delight the day when we shall have only American markets and American goods. [Applause.] I for one am ready to put up the fences around the outside and nail up the gates. Gentlemen have talked upon this floor about giving the farmers the world's market as if our protective tariff had shut them out from the markets of the world. Such talk is absolutely silly. We have no export duty. The products of this country can leave our shores without the least obstruction. The markets of the world are before them, such as they can get into.

But we find an economic system much like our own surrounding every country in Europe except England, and even she is not absolutely free, for she collects $100,000,000 annually. Were we to adopt absolute free trade not a single market of the world would be freer to us than it is to-day. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM], in his remarks on this floor on the 26th of April, declared that our tariff rendered manufactured products so expensive that we cannot sell them at competitive prices in foreign markets. Is the gentleman aware that many of our most valuable products, such as steel, etc., are taken in the raw state from the mines and that nothing but labor is employed to convert them into manufactured products, and the fact that the articles when manufactured have protection does not prevent them being sold in foreign or home markets just the same as if unprotected?

To be more explicit, if a home manufacturer have a crate of pottery worth $90, and there is a duty of $10 a crate on pottery, which added to the $90 would make the selling price $100, that would not prevent the home manufacturer selling his crate in a foreign market at its actual value, which is $90, if he chose to do so. The gentleman's argument is in a great measure fallacious, for it can not apply to those products into which nothing but labor enters, nor can it apply to goods manufactured from cotton or other materials of which we are exporters, as the duty on such materials does not affect the price. Mr. Chairman, England is the only nation in Europe that makes any pretense to free trade. Does any one believe she adopted that policy through any feeling of brotherhood for the balance of the world? Does any one believe that she did so through any feeling of brotherly love for America? To say so would be to stultify the history of that people in their relations to this country.

For eight hundred years England maintained the most inflexible barriers of protection; and not protection only, but in many articles their exclusive policy amounted to prohibition, preventing entirely the importation of such things as came in competition with her own industries. Even while the American colonies were dependencies of Great Britain she prohibited the exportation of American sugar except in English vessels, which were compelled to discharge their cargoes in English ports; and so jealous was she of her own colonies that she made it a capital offense to transport sheep from England to America, in order that she might keep down the American wool industry.

Skilled mechanics were prohibited under penalty of death from emigrating to America. The shipment to America of looms and other machinery for manufacturing the various textiles was prohibited under heavy penalties. Lord Chatham declared at one time that the Americans ought not to be permitted to manufacture even so much as a boot nail; and the English Parliament, that great body to which Englishmen delight to point, came within three votes of passing a bill by which every American industry was to be laid waste by English soldiery, and all this while the American colonies were still British possessions. Does any man believe that a nation guilty of these flagrant outrages against her own colonies would have her conscience aroused with sentiments of benevolence and philanthropy after those colonies had become an independent power and had stricken off the galling restrictions and prohibitions of the mother country? Are gentlemen so stupid as to suppose that England has changed her policy as a measure of brotherly love for us?

England does nothing for love; she does all things for money or other substantial gain. When she had finally converted her whole island into a workshop; when she had become an industrial giant, capable of competing with the balance of the world; when she discovered that she must import food products valued at $800,000,000, and raw material for manufacture to the amount of $650,000,000; when she became aware that she needed a market abroad of $1,200,000,000 annually for her manufactured products; when she knew that to ship manufactured products to England would be like "carrying coals to Newcastle," then it was, and then only, Mr. Chairman, that she found it to her interest to abolish her protective system and ask the balance of the world to do likewise. England accumulated her wealth and strength under a protective tariff régime. Free trade as yet is not her settled policy. It is but an experiment, and it is one, too, against which many of her wisest statesmen are opposed. Sir Edward Sullivan a few years ago said:

> Thirty years ago England had almost a monopoly of the manufacturing industries of the world; she produced everything in excess of her consumption, other nations comparatively nothing. The world was obliged to buy from her because it could not buy anywhere else. The discoveries of gold and steam immensely increased the demands and the purchasing power of the world, and consequently the demand for the products of England. Her wealth increased by leaps and bounds that were bewildering; she was intoxicated with success; with her immense accumulated wealth, her machinery, her coal, her iron, her insular position, she thought herself unassailable; she laughed at the possibility of foreign competition; she offered to fight the rest of the world with her right hand tied behind her back. She said to the world, "I will receive anything you can send me without duty," adding at the same time an expression of hope that they would in turn receive her goods. But they said, "No; we gladly avail ourselves of your kind offer of admitting our goods; certainly we will send you all we possibly can. At present, unfortunately, we have nothing to send; we can not yet supply our own wants, but when we have more capital and your machinery and workmen, we hope to have a large surplus to send you." Well, that was thirty years ago. Now, France and America and Belgium have got our machinery and our workmen and ample capital, and they are sending us a yearly increasing surplus that is driving our own goods out of our own market, and every year they are more completely closing their markets to our goods.

The language of Lord Sullivan is the language of thousands of other Englishmen who believe that England's interests require the readoption of a judicious protective policy in order to maintain the industrial supremacy which she has achieved.

And now, Mr. Chairman, about the so-called robber tax on the poor man's blankets. If there is one thing in this discussion which has received more attention than another by the Democrats of this House it is the tariff on blankets. They have abused it more than the tariff on any twenty other articles on the schedule. The opprobrious epithets of the English language have been exhausted in denunciation of that tariff. One would suppose to hear this tirade that a Democrat regards such tariff as surpassed in enormity only by outright murder. But when we turn to the bill under consideration, which comes from the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee, and which they ask us to vote for, we find they have placed a tariff of 40 per cent. on blankets. If the tariff on blankets is robbery, why this robber tax of 40 per cent.? Why does this Democratic committee put but 50 cents on a gallon of wine and $1 on a $2.50 blanket?

This shows the insincerity of their pretensions. It shows either that they do not believe what they say, or believing they themselves are the willing robbers. Why did they not take all the duty off blankets and put it on whisky and tobacco, if they are sincere in their assertion that those articles should bear the burden of taxation?

Mr. Chairman, we have heard so much about tariff taxation upon the people one would almost suppose that all our State and school and road taxes were the result of the tariff, while the fact is, there is not one penny levied upon any man or his property by the tariff outside of the importer of foreign goods. You may say the results are the same as a tax on the people, but it is not a tax on the people; and we think we are prepared to show that neither the results nor principles involved are the same as a tax. No one, I presume, disputes the right of the Government to levy a duty upon imported goods for purposes of revenue, for the protection of American manufactures, for the regulation of commerce with foreign nations. The first and second divisions of these propositions are sanctioned by the plain language of the Constitution and by acts of Congress passed during its first session, while nearly all were yet living who had been members of the constitutional convention that framed our present national compact, while many of these makers of the Constitution were also members of Congress, and, too, while Washington, who had been president of the constitutional convention, was also President of the United States.

Surely in this presence the institution of the protective system which has been fortified by legislative enactment from the inception of our Government down to the present time, can not fail to be in accordance with the very genius and spirit of the American institutions.

In connection with the third division of this proposition it is important to note a valuable item of history, cited by Hon. John A. Kasson in a recent article in the Forum, according to which, in the year 1766, Benjamin Franklin, when before a committee of the English Parliament, said:

I never heard any objection made in America to the right of Parliament to levy duties to regulate commerce.

Again:

The payment of duties to regulate commerce was never disputed.

These early constitutional and legislative predilections show that the principle was fundamental in our organic compact, and that the origin and development of the foreign-commerce clause of the Constitution were perfectly normal and necessary. I may say, however, that the right under the Constitution to levy duties is not now and here a disputed question.

This right is reinforced by a principle which obtains in many of the States and nearly every incorporated city. The corporate authorities of the city say to all outsiders, "We have built the city at great expense; these streets have been paved at the expense of our people; these magnificent halls and parks are the fruits of the taxation of our persons and property; everything you see comes from our toil; our merchants and citizens have borne their share of all this expense; thousands of people are located here; it is unsurpassed as a market; but before you can drive in your wagon loaded with the same kinds of goods that are produced by our artisans or sold by our merchants, and before you can be permitted to run up a red flag in front of their doors you must pay money into the treasury of this city for the acquisition of privileges which we only have secured at great sacrifice, labor, and expense."

Mr. Chairman, this is protection for the city and for the citizens of the city, and for the arts and artisans of the city. No one questions this right; no one regards it as a tax on the people of that city. The Republican party of America stands precisely in the relation of the city and its citizens to the outside world. It says to Europe and to all cheap-labor countries, "We have here the best market in the world. It was established through the toils and hardships of our fathers. It has been built up and is now maintained by the magnificent pluck and energy of our people. We make more money and spend it faster than any other nation of equal magnitude on the face of the earth. But before you, who have no interest whatever in our country; you, whose hands are rather against us than for us, before you can be permitted to run in your cheap foreign goods and compete with our own citizens, you must pay money into the Treasury of the United States." This, Mr. Chairman, is protection to our citizens and to our industries. Do you call that a tax on the people?

But you say "The amount paid for the admission of the goods is added to the price of the goods, and that the consumer pays it, and this is a tax."

I know a certain county wherein the farmers believed they were paying too much for goods. They organized a co-operative association, rented a house, hired a foreman and clerk, and obtained their goods at a price a large per cent. below what they had been paying for them. Dare any one say that because the hire of the foreman and clerk and the rent of the house were computed in fixing the selling prices of the goods those items were a tax on the stockholders? Any business man would say that those items were a part of the expense in a business transaction for saving or making money. In 1861 the people of this country, through the National Government, entered into a business arrangement wherein they proposed to lay duties on all foreign goods which came into competition with our own productions.

Under that system such goods have gradually grown cheaper, year by year, until an average reduction in prices of 28 per cent. has been reached. Our own manufacturing enterprises have been stimulated and developed, a higher degree of skill has been attained in every department, and as a result of this American system we have this magnificent reduction in the prices of our own home manufactures. Dare any man call that a tax? It would be the sheerest nonsense, and I have no better name than twaddle for such tirade. It falls beneath the dignity of argument. We are told, however, that the reduction in the prices of goods is due to the invention of machinery. Do gentlemen stop to reflect that the progress of invention is the result of a desire to cheapen production rather than to secure a patent? The protective tariff is as great a stimulant to the inventor as it is to the manufacturer.

Will any man assert that the recent discoveries and inventions for the manufacture of sugar from sorghum would have been made had there been no protection on sugar? I know something of the gentleman to whose efforts we are indebted in a great measure for the development of the sorghum-sugar industry. I know that he spent a fine fortune of his own and risked all that he could get from others, and as a last resort came to Congress and through the committee of which I am a member got further assistance. Will any one tell me that that man would have done and risked all I have mentioned had sugar not been on the protected list? It was because it was there and because he had faith in his countrymen that it should remain there; in other words, because he believed that there was a fortune for him in the manufacture of sugar, that this work has been accomplished. Thus it will be seen that a protective tariff stimulates invention. Under its influence the greatest proficiency has been attained in machinery and saving methods.

Mr. Chairman, men have almost recklessly invested their money in manufacturing enterprises during the last twenty-five years. They have done so because of their belief that they would have not so much a high market to sell in as a fair and steady market, and that their Government would stand over them with the shield of protection by which at no time could designing capital of Europe crush them by a combined movement. Under this benign influence millions of dollars have been invested and millions of men employed directly and indirectly. One invention has been added to another, waste and loss have been reduced to a minimum, and by the progress of invention every particle and fragment have been utilized for some beneficent purpose. Competition has sprung up on all sides. Wages have gone up and prices of goods have gone down. As a manufacturing people we are to-day making such rapid strides that unless some untoward misfortune, such as is implied in the Mills bill, overtake us we shall within a decade lead all the nations of the earth.

That a frightful surplus is accumulating in the Treasury no one will deny. So far as it has accumulated through the duties on foreign imports it is the result of our natural relations to the balance of the world. It could not be otherwise unless we choose to forego all advantages arising from our isolated condition, the value of our country to foreigners as a market, and the the general prosperity of all who trade with us. To stop the flow of money to the Treasury would be like stopping the flow of blood to the heart and the result much the same. The remedy for the accumulation of a great surplus is in sending it out again through proper channels to perform its functions among the people; not by spending it like silly children, but by wise and judicious investments. What would a good business man do were he so fortunate as to accumulate in his safe a few thousand dollars more than he needs for current outlay? If he were doing business in a rented house he would probably put up one of his own which would be an honor to himself and an ornament to his town and the erection of which would give employment to the laboring men of his community.

The Government is to-day doing business all over the land in rented post-office buildings, many of which, even in cities of great importance, are inferior wooden structures, liable to burn down at any moment, and for which, too, exorbitant rents are often demanded. The Government should at once begin the erection of suitable buildings for post-offices and other Government purposes in every town where the Government business has attained any considerable magnitude.

Fortifications should be erected on our seacoast to protect our cities in case of war. I do not believe in war, and as a means of discouraging war I want to put ourselves in such condition that no nation will consider it safe or profitable to make war upon us. I would build a navy worthy of the great people that we are, and I would be prepared to demand that all international differences be settled by peaceable arbitration. I would encourage and foster the merchant marine by granting bounty for every league steamed or sailed in carrying the United States mails. I would make the bounty sufficiently ample to carry our mail and establish our trade in every nook and corner of the earth. I am sick of this cant about the tariff destroying our carrying trade and thus our merchant marine. Our carrying trade to-day is, according to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury, $1,400,000,000 annually, whereas it was but $500,000,000 in 1860, an increase of nearly 300 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, the carrying trade is all right. The only trouble is that it is carried in British vessels. The British built and armed and equipped rebel privateers during our civil war, and under the guise of Confederate cruisers and under the protection of the Confederate flag they burned, or drove under foreign flags, the whole of our merchant marine; and they are now exacting from this country $150,000,000 annually for having thus successfully usurped our carrying trade. Mr. Chairman, I want to see the national Treasury respond liberally to the demands made upon it to build up and foster our merchant marine, which, by proper encouragement, would be able to do its full share of the world's traffic and secure its full proportion of the world's wealth and lay it down at our doors.

I would see every soldier who served our country in the hour of her dire distress, or his widow, placed upon the pension-roll at fair rates for the remainder of life. [Applause.]

After what I have now enumerated, or even half of it, in the way of appropriate expenditure has been provided for, there will be no occasion to destroy our great economic system to get rid of the surplus as the Democrats of old burned their barns to get clear of the rats. Every dollar will be placed in circulation among the people, and that, too, through the hands of those who work for wages. All business will receive a new impetus and all departments of industry will flourish with new-born prosperity.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the time is near at hand when every

American will fully realize the importance of maintaining our American protective system, and when the laborer, the capitalist, the farmer, and the banker, the merchant, and the manufacturer may all unite to work out the great destiny of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. Mr. Chairmon, I have listened with some pleasure, and I am glad to think with some profit, to the discussion which has taken place on the pending bill. Freely, frankly, and gladly I say this. At the same time I must confess that often, very often indeed, have I been amused at the arguments made and ideas entertained by gentlemen upon the subject of tariff taxation. When I hear gentlemen say they would protect the wheat-grower, the corn-grower, the beef and pork fattener, and many other things equally foolish, my face involuntarily becomes wreathed in broad smiles, which are beyond my power to suppress. The voicing of such ideas leads me to believe that nothing in the world so much confuses and confounds the average mind as the effort to solve the effect of reciprocity privileges in matters of trade.

Sirs, in the industries of this country we have those producing commodities which can not in the open markets of the world compete with similar commodities produced elsewhere. We also have those who produce commodities which in the open markets of the world can compete. Both these classes of our citizens produce commodities that enter into the traffic and commerce of our people, and are sent from locality to locality, from State to State, and those of one class from country to country, as the wants of the people of those localities, States, and countries may demand, always limited, however, by the ability to buy.

Besides these we have still others, and these constitute a very large per cent. of our people, performing that kind of labor which can only be performed in the locality where performed, and with which there can be no competition except by persons living in the locality where such labor is required.

All our people are consumers. The man who, by his labor, produces an article which, regardless of competition, can be sold in our own or shipped and sold in another country, needs no protection. To talk about protecting him is the sheerest nonsense. After you have protected him all you can he is still unprotected. All such men are interested in an unfettered and uninterrupted commerce.

The man who, however, produces that which can not compete, even in the markets at home, wants protection. If we are to have the benefit of the products his industry produces he must be protected. But how much ought he to be protected? More than is necessary to enable him to compete with the foreign producer? Not at all. He should be protected, if at all, to such an extent as will enable him to compete in the home market. If he can compete in foreign markets he needs no protection.

In all our legislation we must remember that all our people are consumers; that their rights and interests are to be considered. We must remember that a large per cent. of our people are producers of those things which sell in the open markets of the world—at home and abroad—and that their interests are not to be ignored.

Consumers want the widest market in which to buy. Producers who produce those things which sell in open and even-handed competition, want the privilege of the widest market in wh...h to sell. If the wants of the consumer are to be curtailed, if the privileges of the unprotected producer are to be abridged, curtail and abridge those wants and privileges enough, and only enough, to protect the man who needs protection. Levy a tariff high enough to afford him such margins as will enable him to make and sell his goods. Do not make it so high as to cut off foreign competition. When you cut off reasonable competition you make of him a monopolist. When you have made of him a monopolist, with all the human nature inherent in the poisoned adder warmed into life, he turns and smites the hand that furnished the meat upon which he fed and thereby grew into strength.

"Competition is the life of trade." I would never lose sight of competition. As a protectionist—and I claim to be one—I would make my tariff high enough to enable our own people to compete. As a free-trader—and I claim to be one—I protest against making the tariff so high as to destroy competition from abroad. To deny protection at home builds up monopoly abroad; to prevent competition from abroad builds up monopoly at home. Trade and commerce give employment to labor, and the most profitable employment that can be given. To obstruct commerce is a detriment to every consumer. If all are consumers, then it is a detriment to all. To obstruct commerce is not only a detriment to every consumer, but is an additional detriment to every man who produces a surplus of that which is able to stand competition in the open markets abroad—that which could, and otherwise might, find its way to another land.

I belong to that numerous class of American citizens who believe in the greatness of our country, and in the greatness of her opportunities—in many, very many, yes, in the great majority of things, surpassing all the balance of the world; with her energies and efficiency unshackled capable of producing the grandest results.

In the production of all those things wherein we surpass all the rest of the world we should give ourselves the utmost freedom: while in those things wherein others surpass us we need not fear the hurtful influence of giving them a reasonable show of freedom.

With the capacity of producing, and with profit, much that is needed abroad, we simply fetter our ability to sell by paralyzing their ability to buy. The man who has a thing for sale wants to find a buyer. The man who wants to buy looks for the man who has for sale. A sale and a purchase are the counterparts of each other. A sale is the mate of a purchase, while a purchase is the twin of a sale. Every device that denies us the right to buy from abroad anything that can be bought cheaper there than we can produce it here, only tends to prevent our selling abroad an equal amount of something that we can produce cheaper here than it can be produced abroad.

An individual, a single individual, if he has it to sell, can easily sell for money more than he buys. Why? Because all he has for sale is so incomparably small in proportion to the ability of the balance of the world to buy and pay money that he sells with comparatively little difficulty. The people of a great nation aggregating sixty millions of people, producing a great surplus and capable of producing a greater, find it difficult to fall in with persons able to buy. While an individual may sell more than he buys, if he buys more than he sells he must have funds to draw from, a credit to appeal to, or something that will be accepted in payment.

If he has no money, no credit, no property to exchange, but has labor to sell, he may sell his labor and buy. Labor being the only thing he has to exchange for the necessaries of life, refuse to take his labor and he is unable to buy your goods, unable to buy your spare bread; refuse to take his labor, and his wife goes without the necessary raiment to keep her comfortable; refuse to take his labor, and his children cry for bread to appease their hunger. With want and starvation staring him in the face, he is ready to work at half price. Yes, rather than suffer his loving wife to shiver, rather than see his children starve, he works at quarter price.

With all his labor sold at quarter price he can not buy so very much. His inability to buy leaves you with an overproduction. Ay, the overproduction is not an overproduction; it is an underconsumption. Plenty of people to consume all that is made and a good deal more if liberally supplied, and plenty to make more if a price was found for the labor. The employer can not employ when he finds no market for his goods. An unnatural condition of things is brought about by an unnatural effort to build up something by legislation, instead of allowing it to be built by reason of the natural demand for it. By such methods, business, trade, and everything else is depressed because of the obstruction to natural laws.

The overcrowded populations of Europe, hemmed within circumscribed limits, handicapped for the want of opportunities, are suffering and starving for the indispensable necessaries of life, and yet within easy reach of all those necessaries if a sale for their labor could only be found. All to gratify the greed of the American cormorant, who is only interested in shackling labor that he may "corner" some commodity and give thereto a price higher than it would otherwise command, an unnatural selling price.

After thus philosophizing, Mr. Chairman, let us inquire how it is that the people of one country trade with the people of another country, and what are the ordinary means and usual methods of carrying on this trade. The merchants of one country buy from and sell to the merchants of the other country. Each buys what his customers need and are able to pay for; not just what their customers want, but what they are able to pay for. Tell me, sirs, that money is so plentiful in any country that the people can *ad libitum* pay money! If they can not pay money they must go in debt or sell the product of their labor.

The people of one country rarely become in debt to the people of another country for the little current trade thus taking place from day to day, from week to week, and from year to year, by sending back and forth the things as needed. These little balances are paid and settled without passing money. No indebtedness is suffered, except for short intervals. If any considerable indebtedness is incurred, it is by reason of the fact that the wealthy people of one country make loans for the purpose of making public improvements in the other country, or for the purpose of enabling the people of the other country to carry on war, or by making investments in such other country for their own individual purposes.

In making these loans the money is not sent over, but the material is bought and sent over with which to make the improvement, or the supplies to carry on the war are likewise bought and sent over.

England, by reason of her great wealth, in this way has made loans to many of the people elsewhere. And, generally speaking, not exactly loans, but they invest in stocks and become themselves the owners of the foreign properties. A few years ago we were importing more than we were exporting. All arising out of the fact that foreigners were taking stock in our railroads then being built. Now they are receiving their dividends by an excess of exports being sent them by us.

By reason of these investments England sent for long years more exports than she brought home imports. Now, by reason of the payment of

interest and of dividends, and of the receipt of incomes from foreign properties, she is importing largely more than she is exporting. Since 1871 her imports have exceeded her exports more than $400,000,000 per annum, and yet, in the face of all this, she has during the same period of time imported more gold and silver than she has exported by more than $100,000,000, or an average of more than $5,000,000 per annum.

I mention this because the great idea of business with many people is to sell, and sell for money only; take nothing in exchange but money. Confine trade to such narrow limits and it is gone; it comes to a dead standstill. The history of trading between all nations shows that countries that do not produce the precious metals, gold and silver, and countries that produce less of these metals than their proportionate part based upon their wants, needs, and capabilities, as compared with the wants, needs, and capabilities of other countries, always import more gold and silver than they export, while countries that produce more of these metals than their proportionate part, considering their wants, needs and capabilities, always export more than they import. The United States, prior to 1849, the date of its becoming a precious-metal-producing country, imported more than she exported, while since she has exported very much more than she has imported. To give exact figures—taken from the American Almanac—the United States, for the twenty-five years ending June 30, 1849—

Imported (gold and silver)		$258,820,276
Re-exported (foreign)	$165,565,529	
Exported (domestic)	24,300,529	
Total exported		189,865,058
Excess of imports (twenty-five years)		68,955,218

Excess averaging more than two and three-fourths millions per annum.

From June 30, 1849, to June 30, 1887, we imported gold and silver		$937,450,431
Re-exported (foreign)	$322,541,197	
Exported (domestic)	1,818,631,834	
Total exported		2,141,173,031
Deduct total imports		937,450,431
Excess of exports		1,203,722,600
Average annual exports		56,346,658
Average annual imports		24,669,748
Average annual excess of exports		31,676,910

I present these figures simply to show, if we are capable of producing large quantities of "stuff" that might be sold abroad but we refuse to so sell unless we are paid money, we are simply shutting the doors of commerce in our own face. The fact is that we are producing more than 30 per cent. of all the gold produced in the world and more than 40 per cent. of all the silver so produced—from seventy to one hundred million of dollars per annum out of about two hundred millions. What we do not produce is mostly produced in Australia, Mexico, and the South American countries. The European countries, countries in which we find the most and best market for our surplus, are not money-producing countries, and consequently are unable to buy with money. This makes it impossible to sell to them for money. They are money-importing and not money-exporting countries. The fact that we produce such a large per cent. of the gold and silver produced in the world makes it impossible for us to import more gold and silver than we export. The inevitable laws of trade decree otherwise. For short seasons, sometimes for two or three years at a time, this rule may be reversed, but it will later on average itself up. You had just as well try to dam up the Mississippi River at flood-tide with the grasses that vegetate upon its banks as to change the current of this natural law. If, therefore, we would sell our products abroad we must not be afraid of buying from abroad, because the only thing with which most foreigners can buy is with the product of their labor.

I have taken from pages 110 and 314 of the American Almanac certain figures from which I have formed the table marked Table A and made a part of my remarks. In said table is shown in one column the amount of money, gold and silver, in most all the countries of the world, and in another column the imports of said countries for the period of one year. By comparing these two columns together it will be seen that with the exception of Japan, British India, Spain, France, Mexico, and Portugal not a single one of the rest could buy at the rate they bought for the year reported for a whole year if compelled to buy with money only. The money—

	Months.
In Germany would last her	7
In Belgium	5½
In Great Britain and Ireland	5
In Italy	5

In all others less than five months, aside from those above excepted. And in those the money would last longer simply because they do not buy so much. Japan especially is a very exclusive government, never exactly fencing herself in by walls like China, but almost as exclusive in her intercourse with others.

The following is Table A, to which I have referred.

TABLE A.

Name of country.	Amount of imports.	Amount of gold and silver.	Amount of gold and silver per capita.
Argentine Republic	$117,123,120	$9,000,000	$3.54
Australasia	298,663,465	70,000,000	25.01
Austria-Hungary	217,438,950	118,500,000	3.31
Belgium	283,650,000	132,500,000	23.58
Bolivia	6,150,000	5,400,000	2.32
Brazil	103,691,240		
Canada	104,424,561	13,826,000	3.07
Central America		2,692,000	.93
Chili	52,888,846	6,000,000	2.47
Colombia	12,504,000	4,500,000	1.50
Cuba		28,181,000	22.07
Denmark	58,751,508	18,327,000	8.74
France	846,872,600	1,470,900,000	39.41
Germany	942,744,112	556,920,000	12.31
Great Britain	1,748,317,360	680,847,000	19.31
Greece	21,150,345	5,404,000	2.73
Hayti		4,780,000	8.36
India, British	355,668,862	1,027,000,000	4.07
Italy	515,368,950	220,000,000	7.73
Japan	32,660,390	139,468,000	3.80
Mexico	40,285,360	50,000,000	5.22
Netherlands	453,627,340	74,489,000	8.54
Peru	19,250,000	1,882,000	.62
Portugal	10,563,448	40,000,000	8.79
Russia	304,496,528	119,769,000	1.21
Spain	111,737,910	200,000,000	12.03
Sweden and Norway	94,452,760	17,939,000	2.77
Switzerland	197,630,185	31,700,000	11.14
Turkey	87,272,845	74,800,000	3.00
Uruguay	25,275,349	5,601,000	2.28
Venezuela	17,256,389	5,000,000	1.86

Our best market is England, to which we sell more than 50 per cent. of our exports; to Germany, France, Belgium, and other European countries fully 30 per cent. of the other 50. Yet there are men on this floor following the lead of the Plumed Knight, who would break down our trade with these countries, and at the expense of so doing make strained efforts at reciprocity treaties with South American and other new countries, so as to enable their constituents to exchange their manufactured products for the agricultural products of such new countries.

All that portion of our people who produce that which will sell, not only in our own markets, but in the markets of other countries, are interested in removing all obstacles that shackle commerce and trade. If we have those among us who produce that which can not be sold abroad, ay, that which in the open markets at home can not even stand the competition of foreign goods, they are of course interested in placing obstructions in the way of competition from abroad. So at last it depends altogether on where we live, and in what business we are engaged, whether in Pennsylvania or Indiana, in a locality that must needs beg quarter for their goods or in a locality that sends its goods into the broad markets to compete with everybody, as to whether we are interested in fettering trade. If that which Indianians have for sale can stand the competition not only at home but abroad, she wants an open field.

If that which certain individuals in Pennsylvania produce can not compete abroad, nor even at home, without fettering commerce, those individuals are of course interested in fettering commerce.

If we would sell to England, France, Germany, Belgium, and other European countries, we must make them able to buy. In the very nature of things they can not buy with money. They use gold and silver in the fine arts, and then there are "wear and tear" in that they have. Not being precious-metal-producing countries, they are compelled to buy their money.

In the fine arts gold and silver are used in making watches, jewelry, plated ware, and many other things. Pages 78 and 79 of the report of the Director of our own Mint shows that in 1885 we used in the fine arts $11,152,120 of gold and $5,198,413 of silver. Some years we use as much as $20,000,000. The loss annually of gold and silver by friction and by use in the fine arts is almost equal to the annual output of all the mines of the world. The increase of output does not more than keep pace with the increase of wealth, population, and of business necessities. An unusual output has more of a tendency to go into the fine arts than to swell circulation.

My distinguished colleague, who has so long and so ably represented the Sixth Indiana district upon this floor [Mr. BROWNE], told us a few days ago that "free trade is only safe between nations having equal industrial conditions. The nation possessing industrial advantages always destroys or cripples the trade of its weaker and less fortunate rival." In my judgment the industrial conditions in our own country are inferior to none, and on his own theory we ought to court free trade with every nation, but I deny that free trade with each other hurts either, so long as the weaker is not yoked to the stronger, and compelled to do its trading there. If there be other places with which

it can trade and is denied that right and compelled to trade with the stronger, then the stronger puts the weaker to the wall. What is true between nations is equally true between States. The mere fact of the jurisdictional line dividing the two being in the one case a line between nations wholly separate and independent of each other, or a line between States only partially separate and independent of each other, makes no sort of difference whatever.

Pennsylvania possesses superior advantages to Indiana in some things—coal and iron ore—and may be said to possess superior industrial advantages, and by reason thereof to be the superior of Indiana in "industrial relations." The fact that free trade exists between Pennsylvania and Indiana hurts neither, but it is the yoking of Indiana to Pennsylvania and compelling Indiana to buy Pennsylvania's iron, instead of allowing Indiana the unobstructed privilege of buying elsewhere. Pennsylvania has iron ore, coal, timber, good soil, and substantially everything we have in Indiana, her coal and iron ore being of a superior quality and more cheaply mined, and because of this far surpasses Indiana in her ability to make cheap iron, and she is the equal of Indiana in all the other items. Such being the case, she comes to Indiana and says:

"Let us form a compact; let's develop our resources and diversify our industries. If you will agree to pay us a little more for iron than you can buy it of England, that will enable us successfully to go into the business and develop the trade. But after being developed you must still continue to buy our iron."

Indiana says: "Well, you buy our wheat, beef, pork, and agricultural implements, and we will do it."

"Oh," says Pennsylvania, "we can't do that. We can raise all the wheat, beef, and pork, and make all the agricultural implements we want."

"Well," says Indiana, "unless you take our wheat, our beef, our pork, and our agricultural implements we will not have anything with which to pay you."

"Never mind, never mind," says Pennsylvania. "You sell your wheat, your beef, your pork, and agricultural implements to the fellows in Europe for money; this will enable you to pay us money."

"Yes," but says Indiana "those fellows in Europe, I am afraid, have no money; I understand they have none, but plenty of labor to produce the iron, and you know at last it is simply swapping labor."

"Oh, oh, oh, come," says Pennsylvania, "I see you don't understand this question. The fellows in Europe can sell their iron some place else and get the money."

"But," retorts Indiana, "where is she going to find a market for her iron?"

"Oh, pshaw!" says Pennsylvania, "that don't make any difference. She will find some place. Give yourself no trouble about that. Come, come; we will pile up the money here at home; that is what we are after. It will do us all good. We are ready to do the fair thing."

Yes, the proposition of the white man to the Indian to divide the game was equally fair when he said, "I will take the turkey and you may have the buzzard, or you may have the buzzard and I will take the turkey."

And here is the unequal contest to which the gentleman of pig-iron fame from Pennsylvania invites my colleague [Mr. BROWNE], whose district is an agricultural district and also a manufacturing district, but manufactures only that which will stand competition, not only at home, but also from abroad. The clever, whole-souled, good fellow that my colleague is, because of his enthusiasm on the subject of diversifying our industries and making our country great, walks right up to the yoke made to work on him, and allows his Pennsylvania friend to place it upon his neck, and then, like a dumb driven ox, submits to its galling influence.

My distinguished colleague further says:

The intelligent farmer knows that the policy that gives the country an extended and diversified industry is beneficial to him.

Yes, when the Revolutionary war closed and we became a separate and independent power on the face of the earth, the thirteen colonies, with the territory ceded therewith, aggregated about 800,000 square miles. Soon thereafter, in 1803, that far-seeing statesman, Thomas Jefferson, made the famous Louisiana purchase, by which we acquired 800,000 miles more of territory, thus enlarging our opportunities for extending and diversifying our industries.

In 1819 we took in Florida with 60,000 square miles adapted to orange culture, by which our industries were extended and diversified. Again in 1845, Texas with her 265,000 square miles became an easy acquisition; then by the Ashburton treaty our claim to the Oregon territory with its 310,000 square miles was acquiesced in—both largely extending our ability to diversify our industries. Then, as a result of the Mexican war the Rocky and trans-Rocky Mountain country, with its auriferous and argentiferous products came to us, containing over 500,000 more square miles of territory. Then New Mexico with its 56,000 square miles was purchased. Here was cheap land, and that gave us not only gold and silver, but cheap wool; then came Alaska giving us the seal fisheries, etc. But what more benefit was all this than it would have been under a foreign government, with the privilege granted and permanently secured to us of free ingress and egress and right to occupy and own the soil and trade back and forth without let or hinderance?

If diversified industry is a thing to be acquired by legislation, then the more legislation the better. The nearer brought home to our own doors the better. Let us change our Federal Constitution and allow States to obstruct the right of its citizens to purchase from other States. Let the States so amend their constitutions as to allow counties and townships the right to obstruct the purchase of things not made within their own little narrow limits. While my people have more interests in common with the people of Pennsylvania than with Europeans, they have more interests in common with other citizens of Indiana than with the citizens of Pennsylvania; and while they have more interests in common with other citizens of Indiana than with those of Pennsylvania, they have more in common with those found within the confines of the counties in which they live, and still greater when narrowed down to township limits.

Indianians have a common interest in their State government and in the raising of funds to carry on the same. The residents of the county have the same interest, and a still further interest, in common in their own county affairs and in the raising of funds to provide for those affairs; and the citizens of the township have those same interests and also have still the further interests in common in township and municipal affairs and in the raising of funds to supply the sinews of war right at home.

We do not so much object to paying taxes for the general good of Indianians, and less to paying taxes for the general good of those residents of the county, and still less to paying taxes for the general good of those residing in our township or city. But the Lord deliver us from paying taxes to build up and diversify Pennsylvania industries, and to put shekels into the pockets of a few dozen barons rich in a few hundred furnaces. Will my distinguished friend from Indiana offer a proposition to so amend the Federal Constitution as to give States the right to collect customs duties, and invite his Pennsylvania brethren to contemplate the change?

While we are greatly interested in wishing Pennsylvania well, my people are more concerned about where they can get their iron cheaper, and still more concerned about where they can the better exchange their own labor therefor, because at last if they can not swap their labor they are unable to buy. If they can swap a dollar's worth of labor for a dollar's worth of European labor, they are not entirely satisfied to give a dollar and a half's worth of labor to Pennsylvanians for what ought to be worth only a dollar, and if they can not even swap the dollar and a half's worth to Pennsylvania for the dollar's worth, because Pennsylvania does not want and has no use for the dollar and a half's worth, they are without the means to buy.

My distinguished colleague further says:

Duties should be increased, and particularly on rye, wheat, and potatoes, cabbage and other vegetables.

If my colleague thinks he can catch any of his constituents by the soft sop of increasing the duty on wheat he has a very low estimate of their intelligence. To say that he made the statement "to supply the home demand" for correct ideas would be to say the "home demand" is more in need of protection for intelligent school-teachers to diversify their ability to teach a little common sense. Canada is the only country from which we could import wheat successfully, and ours is the only country that can export wheat successfully to Canada. We charge a duty of 20 cents a bushel against them; they charge a duty of 25 cents per bushel against us. As a revenue measure this will do, but as a measure of protection, just to keep the two peoples from trading with each other, how foolish. Each country raises a surplus and that surplus finds a market in Europe. While my colleague from Indiana would protect rye, wheat, cabbage and other vegetables, other gentlemen would protect lumber, coal, iron ore, etc. The tariff on these things is not and never was a protective tariff. On these articles it is and always was a revenue tariff only.

My colleague quotes from Mr. Converse to show that successful military campaigns can not be carried on without woolen clothes for soldiers.

Ay, there is your key-note, and is the only point in the whole line of argument in favor of protection; the only argument that has any pretense of merit, in suffering taxation for the purpose of diversifying industries. If it is war we are preparing for, that is unquestionably a good argument; and especially if putting wool on the free-list is to annihilate the sheep. "In time of peace prepare for war," is an adage that found its way into the literature of the world when "war" was the rule and "peace" the exception.

In a greatly modified degree that adage still has some force in some of the European countries. With us it has no force, because with our surroundings and prospects "peace" may be regarded as the rule and "war" as the exception. To tax ourselves heavily for wool and the prime necessities of life with so little prospect of war and mainly to be prepared for war is borrowing trouble too far ahead. England has higher-priced land than we have and has more sheep according to population than we have, and according to territory sixteen times as many, and yet she puts wool on the free-list. Germany and France each have higher-priced land than we have and each have six times as many sheep according to territory as we have, and yet they each put wool on the

free-list. If these three first-class European powers, in close proximity to the warring nations of the world, can thus raise sheep and wool free and take the risk, why not we? My colleague further inquired why coal and iron ore were not placed on the free-list. I listened to hear, and hoped to hear him say, but he did not, that he was in favor of these materials going on that list. On account of the small value attached to coal and iron ore in comparison to the cost of transportation, whether on or off the free-list could make but little difference the one way or the other. The tariff on them is a revenue tariff and certainly not a tariff for protection. If placed on the free-list very little more would be imported than is now imported. The substantial good effect that would have grown out of it would be the effect it would have in removing the prejudice in the minds of many of our people against having anything placed on the free-list and in giving less pretense to those engaged in the protected industries for keeping up high duties.

If placed on the free list, where would we continue to get our coal? With possible rare exceptions, just where we get it now. The labor cost of mining coal and placing it on the cars is very small. If we are to rely on the information found in the second volume of Compendium of the Census of 1880, pages 1237 to 1245, inclusive, the coal mined in the United States during the census year, when mined and placed on the cars, was worth on an average all over the United States the sums of—

	Per ton.
For anthracite coal	$1.47
For bituminous coal	1.25

At some places it was worth more, and at some places less, but this was the average. Pennsylvania furnished all the anthracite and a very large part of the bituminous. The latter in—

	Per ton.
Pennsylvania was worth	$0.96
Maryland	1.15
West Virginia	1.15

Of the 42,000,000 tons mined during the census year 22,000,000 tons were mined in those three States. Taking the whole country on an average and the labor cost for mining was—

	Per ton.
For anthracite coal	$0.79
Bituminous	.78

But in Pennsylvania the labor cost was only 61 cents per ton for bituminous, and but little more in Maryland, West Virginia, and in many of the other States. So that the labor cost was small, and it is smaller to-day.

When carried to market the cost is greatly increased, not by labor, but by transportation, the extent of increase depending on distance of transportation. At the little city where I live when at home coal, and that of a superior quality, can be and is put on the cars for about $1 per ton. It is started East, West, North, and South, paying heavy freights on short hauls and from a half to three-fourths of a cent per ton per mile for long hauls. When it gets 100 miles off at a half a cent per ton 50 cents per ton are added for freight, and at three-quarters 75 cents per ton, and so it increases as it gets farther from home. It gets as far East as Cincinnati, as far West as St. Louis, as far South as Evansville, and as far North as Chicago. When it reaches the latter place, which is the most distant, being 258 miles, its chief cost is the cost of transportation. When it gets to Chicago it finds no competition from the pauper labor of Europe, but it finds the most nipping and close competition from the labor-producing coal coming from Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, and competition possibly not so nipping of other railroads leading into Chicago, but such as to require it, when it gets there, to be thrown upon the market at $2.50 per ton.

If when it got there it would bring $3.50 per ton, every person who has ever done business with railroads knows that the freight would be just $1 per ton more. Railroads always make the rate so as to cover all margins. But leaving out of view the extra dollar, let us sum up the cost of transportation. Twenty flat cars carrying twenty or more tons each make a fair train-load; then:

20 flat cars, 20 tons each, 400 tons, $2.50		$1,000.00
Labor cost 400 tons, 60 cents per ton	$240.00	
Capital cost to mine owners, 40 cents per ton	160.00	
1 conductor 2 days, $5	10.00	
1 engineer 2 days, $4	8.00	
1 fireman 2 days, $3	6.00	
2 brakemen 2 days each, $1.50	6.00	
Total labor cost		430.00
Other cost of transportation		570.00

Now, I imagine an intelligent coal-miner of my town becoming nervous for fear coal on the free-list would so cheapen the article that the railroad company would be forced to do its work cheaper or go out of the business.

For the purpose of further elucidating this coal matter, I looked up, that I might examine the question thoroughly, the report of the Secretary of the Treasury for the year ending June 30, 1887, on commerce and navigation. I was specially led to do this because I received a circular from some coal-men in Southwest Virginia. I presume a copy of the same circular was sent to all the other members of this House. These fellows down in Virginia claimed they were 360 miles from the nearest part of New England. They set up a terrible wail about their woe-begone condition in the event coal went on the free-list. They imagined they would go to the demnition bow-wows without the benefit of clergy. They could not stand the competition of Nova Scotia coal. All New England would get their coal from Nova Scotia. I first looked on the map. I found Pennsylvania with her cheap coal and cheap labor much nearer than Virginia. I next looked up Nova Scotia to see what manner of beast it was thus voraciously to "chaw" up these West Virginia people. When I found Nova Scotia I discovered her population equal to that of about two Congressional districts, mostly engaged in agriculture, and the balance in the fisheries. I then asked a Connecticut man—a Democrat, of course—where they got their coal. He answered, "Pennsylvania." I said, "I thought you got, or, if the duty was taken off, could get, your coal from Nova Scotia." He said, "Pshaw! the Nova Scotia coal is no good." "What kind is it?" said I. "A sort of rotten, semi-bituminous stuff. For manufacturing purposes it might do to mix with other coal. For domestic purposes no one would have it."

I then turned to look up our foreign coal trade. I got the report on commerce and navigation, to which I have already alluded. I turned about to its several tables and found all the coal imported and exported for the year ending June 30, 1887; wherefrom imported and whereto exported. The following is a statement of the same:

In 1887 we imported coal from—

British Columbia	$1,081,[illegible]
Australia	921,[illegible]
Scotland and Ireland	633,[illegible]
Nova Scotia	14,[illegible]
Canada	23,[illegible]
England	2[illegible]
All other countries	6,[illegible]
Total imports of coal	2,713,[illegible]

We exported to—

Canada	$3,[illegible]
Nova Scotia	2,[illegible]
Newfoundland and Labrador	[illegible]
Cuba	[illegible]
United States of Colombia (South America)	[illegible]
Mexico	[illegible]
England	[illegible]
British West Indies	[illegible]
Danish West Indies	[illegible]
French West Indies	[illegible]
Dutch West Indies	[illegible]
France	[illegible]
Germany	[illegible]
Hawaiian Islands	[illegible]
Venezuela	[illegible]
Porto Rico	[illegible]
All other countries	[illegible]
Total	4,[illegible]

From the above table it will be seen that the coal imported came mainly from Australia, British Columbia, Scotland, and Ireland. That coming from Australia and British Columbia was landed at San Francisco and Wilmington, Cal.; and when it reached those ports it sold at more than twice what our Indiana coal will sell for at Chicago, and this after deducting the 75 cents per ton tariff. That coming from Ireland and Scotland came as ballast—"a ground-hog matter." In fact, the coal imported and exported, except that imported into California and that exported to Canada and Nova Scotia was carried as ballast.

But what astonished me most was to find so large an amount exported and sold to Canada. Little Canada about supplied her full consumptive demand from us, and that in view of the dangerous and unobstructed proximity to Nova Scotia coal. Of that exported to Canada the anthracite was sold for $4.15 per ton, the bituminous for $2.65 per ton. A moment's reflection, with a mere modicum of common sense, would readily convince any one that coal on the free-list would not enable Nova Scotia to compete with our own coal people. Enough on the coal subject at present. I shall want to recur to the subject further on in my remarks, in connection with the manufacture of pig-iron.

During the present session of Congress to the present time almost every mail has brought me some circular on the subject of the tariff, so many, in fact, that I could not read them. I presume other members of the House have been afflicted in the same way. Generally speaking, they came from interested parties or parties who thought they were interested. Occasionally one came from a professional crank, who felt that he owed it as a duty to his country to enlighten members of Congress on the all-absorbing question. Among these circulars (not from the cranks, but the others) for weeks early in the session petitions poured in from California, Oregon, and Washington Territory by the basketful protesting against placing lumber on the free-list or disturbing the duty thereon.

Lumber on the free-list, if you were to believe the wail set up by them, and all the industries on the Pacific Slope were ruined. A receiver would have to be appointed. Bankruptcy was inevitable. The cheap labor of British Columbia would annihilate the lumber business in all that Western country. About the time the coming of these peti-

tions had reached a white heat, a grave and reverend seignior—Senator DOLPH, from Oregon—broke forth in the other end of the Capitol, chiming in with the lumber interests of that far-off country. But in his speech he cited the fact that from Puget Sound, in Washington Territory, last year there were shipped to China, Hong-Kong, the Hawaiian Islands, and other foreign countries, 103,000,000 feet of lumber, five times as much as the whole output of British Columbia, and he stated that he had no doubt that his own State—Oregon—had done as much, but confessed he had no figures as to his own State.

All this in the very teeth of the even-handed competition from British Columbia and the cheap labor of that sparsely settled province. Lumber chopped and made ready for market by Chinese cheap labor, which it was bemoaningly suggested would be imported into that "neck of woods" to do cheap work. The idea of a California timber-owner complaining about Chinese cheap labor in British Columbia when California had one hundred times as many Chinamen as had British Columbia, and when the average lumber-owner of California had been lying awake of nights scheming in his own mind how to utilize the cheap labor of China for nothing. Talk about borrowing trouble. The thought that troubled the old maid past three-score and ten to such an extent that it brought tears to her eyes and grief to her heart is nowhere.

Not only from the grave and reverend seignior of the other end of the Capitol, but from the honorable Representative from the Sixteenth Pennsylvania, come lamentations on the lumber question. He says:

> Remove the duty from lumber and you immediately bring the hemlock and spruce and lower grades of pine of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and the Canadas into direct and ruinous competition with the low grades of pine everywhere used for the same purposes as the hemlock and spruce, and particularly with the pine of Virginia, the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida. Following upon such action the mills will close, the laborer be thrown out of employment.

Mr. MCCORMICK tells us that—

> Reasonably accurate estimates fix the amount of hemlock in his district at 50,000,000,000 feet.

I was in hopes that Pennsylvania would give us a rest, but it seems she has a monopoly, not only of cheap methods for iron making, but that she has millions of other cheap things that she wants to make high by closing the doors against all her competitors. Now, when we begin to need a wider field in which to buy our lumber, the lords rich in a few million acres of cheap wood lands, lands which the good Lord above gave, we find the monster monopoly intrenching itself behind its ancient bulwarks. Away with such supreme selfishness! Down with all such monopoly!

The idea, the Government paying the homesteaders out West a bonus for growing trees; and by our tariffs on lumber paying a bonus for destroying trees. Sirs, lumber ought to go on the free-list; coal ought to go on the free-list; iron ore ought to go.

Mr. BAYNE. How about sugar?

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I will tell you about sugar. I would like to see sugar go on the free-list, and I think it ought to go there; but I have said that I am willing to place the tariff high enough to enable our people to succeed in their efforts at competition. Sugar has about the hardest struggle to compete of any of our industries, and without protection would possibly go to the wall. The tariff on lumber, on coal, and on iron ore is not at all necessary to enable our people to compete. These industries will all flourish whether on the free-list or not. The reason I would like to see sugar go on the free-list is because I believe it would give us cheaper sugar. The gentleman from Pittsburgh, if I understand him, does not believe that reducing the tariff lessens the price of the protected article. If I thought as does the gentleman, I would favor keeping the duty intact on sugar, because it gives us a large revenue. The duty, however, by the Mills bill is reduced on sugar more than it is on pig-iron. And I know full well, and shall demonstrate before I get through, that Pennsylvania, with her cheap coal and cheap iron ore can, without any tariff, make pig-iron in competition with England or any other country.

Time is passing, Mr. Chairman, and it is about time I was beginning to get serious. We must protect our labor. Ay, yes, there is the rub. But who are our laborers that need protection? Our farmers? No, you can not protect them, for they are compelled as a matter of dire necessity to sell their products wherever the sun shines, the rain falls, or man eats, and stand all competition. The farmers constitute 44 and a fraction out of every 100 of our working people. Our trade and transportation people, consisting of merchants, clerks, railroaders, teamsters, etc.? No, their vocations can not be taken from them by Europeans so long as Europeans keep away from our jurisdictions. These constitute 11 and a fraction out of every 100 of our working people. Our professional and personal-service people, consisting of lawyers, doctors, preachers, school-teachers, theatrical performers, real-estate and insurance agents, barbers, hotel-keepers, livery-stable keepers, washerwomen, State, county, city, and Federal officers, including postmasters, 'squires, country constables, Congressmen, *et id genus omne?* No, not these, thank God; the pauper labor of Europe does not disturb the equilibrium of our minds, the honorable gentlemen upon the other side of the House not excepted. We constitute 22 and a fraction out of every 100 of our people. Not our coal miners; unless by tariff revision they be let down some back stairway in the dark, they are secure. Not our copper mining and copper manufacturing people for they can send their goods abroad and stand right on the battlements of the enemy's intrenchments and auction off their goods before the very eyes of the enemy. Surely not the few thousand of our people engaged in the petroleum business. The products of these laborers sell as readily in Europe as here. Besides, the Standard Oil fellows smell so badly that even protectionists are wishing them all sorts of bad luck. The sweet rains from heaven would fail to remove the odor of their business. Surely not our silver and gold mining people, for the good Lord in His infinite wisdom and goodness did not give the European people any gold and silver to work in. But, finally, what portion of our manufacturing people need protection from the baleful influences of competition with the pauper labor of Europe? Let us inquire. Not our printers or newspaper men; not our carpenters, brick or stone masons, plasterers, painters, plumbers, paper-hangers, or any one connected with house-building or house-repairing—paupers in Europe, with all their meanness, have never attempted to build a house and send it over here, nor have any of our people sent a house over there to get repaired; our milliners, dressmakers, seamstresses, tailors, and tailoresses—these have to reside here; not our bakers, our butchers, our grist-mill employés, our quarry men, our brick and tile makers, our blacksmiths, car-shop and foundry men, boot or shoe makers, saddle and harness makers, tanners, curriers, and all others working in leather—we can beat the world in leather, if you will only leave out kid gloves: six employés in a first-class establishment can make a $7 pair of boots in ten minutes by the watch; not our planing-mill men, sash, doors, and blinds factory men, wood-choppers, wood-turners, loggers, raftsmen, saw-mill men, furniture makers, coopers, and all others engaged in working wood, because we took out a patent on this business after England, Germany, France, and other first-class European powers lost their trees; nor those engaged in the manufacture of agricultural implements, numbering over 39,000 (although, by mistake, the President, in his annual message designated them as numbering only 4,891), and those engaged in making wagons and carriages, numbering over 45,000. And right here let me pause to remark, parenthetically of course: the largest wagon-manufacturing establishment in the world is in my own State—Indiana. The Studebakers, at South Bend, Ind., make more, better, and cheaper wagons than are made anywhere else in the world. And not only make, but ship their wagons to all parts of the world and sell them in competition with wagons made in the cheap-labor districts of Europe. If they were given the privilege of buying their iron and steel cheaper (in the making of agricultural implements the iron and steel used in their making costs more than the labor of the employés engaged therein), and a few other things used by them, but which are made higher by tariff duties, they could still more easily sell their wagons abroad.

Our agricultural implements are among the best and sell abroad in South America, Australia, and in most of the countries of Europe. Although sold in Europe cheaper than they are sold here at home, still at a good profit nevertheless. Our sewing-machines (the labor cost of making one is only from $4 to $6) are also sold in Europe, and nowhere so much as in England, Germany, and France, England leading all other countries. England with her free trade is not only our best customer in the purchase of our agricultural products, but she buys more of our manufactured products than any other country of the world. The people of that country may be pig-headed, but they understand their own best interests. With her highest-priced labor of any country in Europe she has no trouble in competing with the cheaper labor of France, Germany, Italy, and Belgium, and with the country possessing the cheapest labor she competes the easiest and most successful.

But let us revert to the proposition, what portion of our labor, if any, needs protection? And how much does it need? My distinguished colleague from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE] incidentally mentions them as those engaged in manufacturing iron and steel, cottons, woolens, hemp, leather, silks, earthenware, china, glass and glassware, and paper. About eight hundred thousand in all, or less than 5 per cent. of our laboring people. I assure him he could, with the utmost safety, have left out those working in leather. My own best judgment is that most if not all those named by my colleague need but very little protection, and that most if not all the protection given them only benefits the less than ten thousand employers under and for whom these less than eight hundred thousand laborers are working. These ten thousand employers constitute less than one out of fifteen hundred of our people. Certainly all pretended protection given them, beyond what is necessary to protect and enable them to continue their occupations without greater disturbance from foreign labor is an injury and not a benefit to their employés. To prove that fact shall be my effort to show, because if the wages of these employés are kept up to the same standard and as much employment given them under a reduction of the tariff they would be benefited.

I maintain that all reductions made that do not have the effect of crippling those carrying on manufacturing industries will, to the extent that it cheapens goods, cause a greater consumption of the goods, thereby creating additional demand for them and for the labor that produces them, and, as a consequence, greatly benefit employés by increasing the demand for their work by giving them cheaper things en-

able them to consume more and live better. Where the materials used, which constitute a chief part of the cost, can be obtained as cheaply here as in Europe, to the extent these materials enter into as a factor or element of cost no protection is needed, and where not needed should not and really can not be given. If given, it only operates to create monopoly.

Of the protected industries iron and steel, cotton goods and woolen goods are the most important, and of these iron and steel stand at the head and front of all the offending. Iron and steel enter not only into our private wants, but become a great factor in our public improvements—in fact are the mudsills upon which the substratum of our railroads and many other improvements, both public and private, are built.

Clothes only last a short time and have to be renewed often. Iron and steel last for years and need renewals less frequently. Clothing though of prime and most necessary importance is but a temporary investment. Iron and steel become a sort of continuous investment.

Ten dollars per ton on steel rails saves a thousand dollars per mile for every mile of railroad built, to say nothing of side tracks. Ten dollars per ton on iron saves almost as much more in the cost of rolling-stock, bridges, and other appurtenances to railroads. Two thousand dollars per mile is a big sum in the building of railroads, and if it could be saved more, many more, miles of railroad would be built, giving additional employment to labor. Freight and passenger tariffs would be greatly reduced. The people interested in the use of roads, in cheaper freights and passenger tariffs, would save the interest on two thousand dollars per mile in their continuous use.

Last year we built 13,000 miles of railroad. Two thousand dollars per mile would have been $26,000,000. That sum and the interest thereon become a vast sum. But railroads are not the only things which interest us in cheap iron and steel. Cheapen the machinery in our grist-mills, saw-mills, planing-mills, woolen-mills, cotton-mills, and the machinery in all our manufacturing establishments of every kind, wherever used, and our manufacturers can turn out cheaper goods of all kinds, because they need not lay aside so much of the earnings to cover interest. This will greatly cheapen the manufacturing plant and better enable our capital to compete with European capital.

That we can make pig-iron and steel rails almost as cheap, if not fully as cheap, as they can be made in England or elsewhere, any one who will take the pains to investigate, from a common-sense standpoint, may and can easily satisfy himself.

He who imagines that the per diem wages paid cut much figure in the cost of iron, steel, cotton, or woolen goods will readily become convinced of his mistake by a little common-sense investigation.

The cheapness of material, the effectiveness of labor, and surrounding conditions are far more important factors.

To prove this let facts be submitted. I will first take up pig-iron that being the substratum of all iron and steel values. The chief element of cost in making pig-iron is the cost of the iron ore and the fuel. These are as cheap in this country as they are in Europe; in fact, in places in this country, cheaper. Our census reports (see volume 2, Compendium 1880, pages 1237 to 1243, inclusive) show that the value of the anthracite coal (mined only in Pennsylvania) mined during the census year was worth $1.47 per ton, and of this value 79 cents were for labor cost; that the bituminous coal mined—averaging the whole United States over—was worth $1.25 per ton, and that the labor cost for mining was 78 cents per ton; that while such was the average value all over the United States, in Western Pennsylvania its value was 96 cents per ton, and the labor cost for mining 61 cents per ton. In Clearfield, Bradford, and Tioga Counties, Pennsylvania, it was worth $1.24 per ton, but the labor cost for mining, only 58 cents. In Maryland, $1.15 per ton, but only 61 cents labor cost for mining.

The report of the chief of the bureau of statistics of Pennsylvania, made in 1885 for the year 1884, shows that during that year (1884) the labor cost in Allegheny, Clearfield, Fayette, and Westmoreland Counties, where more than 16,000,000 tons of coal were mined, was but 48½ cents per ton. Allowing 25 cents per ton for the labor of converting about a fourth of the coal into coke. The labor cost of mining iron ore in Berks, Blair, Centre, Chester, Clarion, Cumberland, Huntingdon, Bedford, Lancaster, Lebanon, Lehigh, Northampton, Perry, and Snyder Counties, in that State, was, on an average, 69 cents per ton, while in Lebanon County 392,941 tons were mined by one hundred and sixty-five men, working three hundred days each, at a labor cost of only 17 cents per ton, each hand averaging over 7 tons per day. Think of it! Just like shoveling sand out of a sand-pit. Plenty of just such places can be found in the United States.

Now, during the census year ending June 30, 1880 (see volume 2, Compendium, pages 1138 to 1141, inclusive), there was invested in blast-furnaces in the United States $105,151,176. All these were not in operation, but such as were turned out 3,787,021 tons of pig-iron, valued at $89,315,569.

For the purpose of getting at the surrounding conditions, which, I have stated, is a chief and all-important factor of cost in the production of pig-iron, I have, from data found in volume 2, pages 1138 to 1141, Compendium 1880, formulated the following table, showing the number of blast-furnaces in the United States, in what State located, aggregate number of tons and stated values per ton of materials used, and quantity and value of product made.

TABLE B.—*Materials used and products made in the blast-furnaces of the United States, as per census.* (*See second volume, pages* 1138, 1139 1140, *and* 1141.)

Number of establishments.	Location of establishments.	Iron ore.			Bituminous coal.			Anthracite coal.			Coke.			Total product.	
		Number of tons.	Aggregate value.	Value per ton.	Number of tons.	Aggregate value.	Value per ton.	Number of tons.	Aggregate value.	Value per ton.	Number of tons.	Aggregate value.	Value per ton.	Number of tons of pig-iron.	Value, aggregate.
490	United States	7,256,684	$33,205,298	$4.58	1,051,753	$2,095,887	$1.99	2,615,182	$8,012,755	$3.06	2,128,255	$8,129,240	$3.86	3,787,021	$89,315,569
167	Pennsylvania	3,838,455	17,720,502	4.60	215,720	519,768	2.41	1,921,588	5,631,922	2.91	$1,054,452	3,563,566	3.37	1,930,311	45,573,740
82	Ohio	953,088	5,147,695	5.41	638,711	1,170,089	1.83	(*)			418,624	1,601,300	3.82	548,712	13,038,156
39	New York	609,642	2,315,439	3.80	(*)			496,684	1,252,009	3.13	94,237	182,694	5.33	313,368	6,816,241
13	New Jersey	314,199	1,511,942	4.80	(*)			225,713	779,676	3.40	17,000	108,278	6.36	157,414	3,428,747
8	Wisconsin	182,934	1,074,120	5.85	15,540	47,450	3.26	18,052	103,799	5.74	55,896	355,386	6.00	118,282	3,295,835
20	Michigan	201,179	1,162,961	4.80	(*)			(*)			(†)			119,586	3,145,062
7	Illinois	150,540	924,750	6.14	27,715	86,220	3.11	11,205	65,249	5.82	101,440	624,490	6.15	95,468	2,301,850
12	Missouri	169,982	772,012	4.54	21,576	59,028	2.70	(*)			110,730	673,170	6.10	95,050	2,227,017
12	West Virginia	134,538	626,758	4.65	4,047	4,907	1.21	(*)			120,737	348,047	2.88	80,050	1,631,096
12	Alabama	142,286	138,640	.97	7,000	10,500	1.50	(*)			42,035	154,451	3.67	62,336	1,405,356
19	Kentucky	102,667	373,474	3.64	58,245	90,499	1.55	(*)			37,275	121,690	3.30	58,108	1,248,652
18	Tennessee	102,656	217,780	2.03	9,000	11,250	1.13	(*)			74,408	182,241	2.45	47,873	840,022
8	Connecticut	46,147	242,542	5.25	(*)			(*)			(†)		3.08	18,779	644,911
9	Georgia	61,194	97,997	1.60	1,000	2,000	2.00	(*)			33,605	103,750	3.08	23,099	466,800
3	Indiana	31,744	218,458	6.88	54,100	93,450	1.72	(*)			1,418	6,143	4.33	18,237	460,555
29	Virginia	40,759	81,204	1.99	(†)			(‡)			8,753	45,953	5.25	17,906	440,695
4	Massachusetts	21,564	88,326	4.05	(*)			(*)			(*)			9,043	312,810
1	Oregon	7,846	8,788	1.12	(*)			(*)			(†)			3,200	78,336
1	Texas	3,240	6,480	2.00	(*)			(*)			(†)			4,400	33,000
1	Vermont	1,050	8,100	7.71	(*)			(*)			(†)			620	24,800

* Uses other fuel. † Uses charcoal. ‡ Not reported.

In addition to the material disclosed in the above table there was used—

53,909,828 bushels of charcoal, valued at	$3,679,120
3,169,149 tons of fluxing material, valued at	2,547,336
Other material, kind not designated, valued at	910,667
Making the aggregate stated value of these materials	7,137,113

Now, by scanning over this table, we find iron ore, taking the average all over the United States, valued at $4.58 per ton, and ranging all the way from 97 cents per ton in Alabama up to $7.71 per ton in Vermont; bituminous coal averaging all over the United States at $1.99, and ranging all the way from $1.13 per ton in Tennessee to $3.26 per ton in Wisconsin; anthracite coal averaging all over the United States at $3.88 per ton, and ranging from $2.91 in Pennsylvania to $5.74 per ton in Wisconsin, and coke averaging all over the United States at $3.88 per ton and ranging in value from $2.45 per ton in Tennessee to $6.15 in Illinois. Think of it, my friends. Think of it ye who labor and are heavy laden. Iron ore at $4.60 per ton, bituminous coal at $2.41 per ton, anthracite coal at $2.91 per ton, coke at $3.37 per ton. What a commentary on the loving kindness of the good people, among whom are the meek and lowly miners getting about 15, possibly 20 per cent. of these values for their labor while speculation and transportation are getting the balance. Shame on such protection.

Now, let us see who is benefited by these prices. How much product—$89,315,569; and in what does its value consist. Let us see:

7,256,684 tons iron ore at $4.58 per ton	$33,205,278
1,057,753 tons soft coal at $1.99 per ton	2,095,887
2,615,182 tons hard coal at $3.88 per ton	8,012,755
2,128,255 tons coke coal at $3.80 per ton	8,129,240
53,909,828 bushels charcoal	3,679,120
Fluxing material	2,547,336
Other material	910,667
Total cost materials	58,580,283
Labor cost making 3,787,021 tons of pig-iron at $3.35 per ton	12,680,703
Total	71,260,986
Profit to capital	18,054,583
	89,315,569

Now let us proceed to make reasonable allowances and draw our deductions.

Ten per cent. on the capital invested ought to be enough; $2.58 per ton on the iron ore ought to be enough; $1.39 per ton for the bituminous coal ought to be enough; $1.88 per ton on the anthracite coal ought to be enough; $2.36 per ton on the coke ought to be enough. Every one familiar with the values of these materials knows that I have allowed enough. Those not familiar should refer to pages 1237 to 1243, volume 2, Compendium Census, and to pages 83 and 93 of the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics of Pennsylvania. On the fluxing material, charcoal, and other material, valued at over $7,000,000, I have no data from which to estimate. Hence I shall leave them unassailed, although I have no doubt these should stand their pro rata share of discounts.

This enables us to deduct from the capital all above 10 per cent. on the amount invested.

	Per ton.
On the iron ore all above	$2.58
On the soft coal all above	1.39
On the hard coal all above	1.88
On the coke all above	2.36

Let us proceed accordingly.

Profit on capital	$18,309,691	
Allow 10 per cent	10,515,176	
Amount deducted		$7,794,415
Iron ore	33,205,278	
Allow $2.58 per ton	18,691,910	
Amount deducted		14,513,368
Soft coal	2,095,887	
Allow $1.39 per ton	1,485,836	
Amount deducted		610,051
Hard coal	8,012,755	
Allow $1.88 per ton	4,120,741	
Amount deducted		3,085,814
Coke	8,129,240	
Allow $2.36 per ton	4,936,855	
Amount deducted		3,192,382
Total deductions		29,196,030

The amount of pig-iron made was 3,781,021 tons, which divided into $29,196,030 makes $7.75 per ton on the pig-iron, and at that time the tariff was only $7 per ton; more than enough to offset the tariff, to say nothing of ocean freights. Now, sirs, without invading the alleged value of over $7,000,000 worth of charcoal, fluxing and other material, I have eliminated more from the cost of the pig-iron than the whole tariff, and left enough to cover reasonable profits to capital and an abundance to pay for transportation at reasonable prices. My friend from Ohio [Mr. FORAN] says that capital can not work as cheap in this country as in Europe. It never will unless forced to do so; when forced to do so it will be found as full of activity here as any place in the world, and will adapt itself to the necessities. Necessity is the mother of invention. Capital will not be long in devising methods to meet the requirements, while the labor in these industries will command and receive what is established by the standard paid to other labor. Ninety-five per cent. of our people are working in other industries, and the price paid these, they being the bulk, will regulate and control the price paid the few. That labor is usually paid most which is most difficult and unpleasant to perform.

Mr. BAYNE. The question I desired to ask the gentleman was, how the 70 per cent. duty on sugar proposed by the Mills bill suits him?

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I understand the Mills bill reduces the duty on sugar 20 per cent.

Mr. BAYNE. But 70 per cent. is a very high rate.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. Yes, sir, it is very high, but the reduction is considerably greater than the reduction on pig-iron. Our conditions, sir, for raising sugar in this country are not good on account of being too much subject to loss by overflow every two or three years and by frost every two or three years. For these reasons I regard it as impolitic to try to compete with Cuba and other more favored countries. The margins for sugar-raising are small, but considerable capital is invested in the sugar industry. It has not been thought proper by any reductions made by the Mills bill to destroy any industry. Our conditions for making cheap iron in this country are as good as they are any place in the world. Considering the large margins in the profits on iron making, I regard the reduction from $6.72 to $6 on pig-iron as a much smaller reduction than the 20 per cent. reduction on sugar. We import nine-tenths of our sugar and produce but one-tenth. The duty goes into the Treasury. The duty, high as it has been and high as it is left, has not enabled any of our people to make a monopoly of furnishing us sugar.

We produce nine-tenths of the iron and steel consumed by us, and import only about one-tenth. The duty on the one-tenth goes into the Treasury while the increased price on nine-tenths goes into the pockets of our iron-mongers, among whom a large portion are constituents of the gentleman.

The large margin given by the duties on iron has created a monopoly and enables the iron men to limit the output and run up the price at times to the full limit of the margin given by the duty. The iron monopolists can better afford to suffer an importation of one-tenth of all we use than to lose nine-tenths of their profits.

Mr. BAYNE. The gentleman's proposition strikes me as strange logic.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I am not surprised that anything should strike the gentleman as strange which proposes to reduce the tariff on pig-iron.

Mr. BAYNE. But if $6.72 per ton is paid on pig-iron that goes into the Treasury.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. It does so far as imported pig-iron is concerned, but as to the pig-iron produced in the neighborhood of Pittsburgh it goes into the pockets of the manufacturer of pig-iron.

Mr. BAYNE. But if $6.72 per ton is paid on pig-iron, that $6.72 goes into the Treasury.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. So far as imported pig-iron is concerned it does; but if the gentleman will study the figures already given and another statement I have prepared especially for his edification, if he has not already a part of the pork in his pocket, he will see where the $6.72 per ton on the pig-iron made in and about Pittsburgh goes or has gone. The facts from which I make this statement I find in volume 2, Compendium Census 1880, pages 1138, 1139, 1140, and 1141. In this book and upon these pages I find that during the census year in the whole State of Pennsylvania there was invested in blast furnaces $44,596,850. I find she made 1,930,311 tons of pig-iron, valued at $23.55 per ton, or in the aggregate at the sum of $45,573,750. To make this pig-iron she paid—

For labor ($2.46 per ton)	$4,752,828
For materials	29,675,075
Making the alleged cost	34,427,903
Leaving for profit only	11,145,847

But does any one believe the materials cost or were worth any such sum? Let us see. Of what did those materials consist? The following is an inventory, namely:

3,838,455 tons iron ore at $4.60 per ton	$17,720,502
1,921,588 tons hard coal, at $2.91 per ton	5,631,922
215,588 tons soft coal, at $2.41 per ton	579,768
1,054,452 tons coke, at $3.37 per ton	3,563,566
1,970,931 tons fluxing material	1,490,928
4,993,919 bushels charcoal	324,757
156,223 other materials not named	415,132
Aggregate	29,675,075

Having no knowledge of the value of the three last items—fluxing material, charcoal, and "other" material—we pass them over.

Our own knowledge of the value of coal, coupled with the information obtained from second volume Compendium Census 1880, pages 1237 to 1243, both inclusive, and from Legislative Document, volume 2, 1885, in which is found the report of the chief of the bureau of statistics of Pennsylvania upon the subject of the cost of mining coal and iron ore in the State of Pennsylvania, enables me to make estimates and eliminations as follows:

First profit on capital	$11,145,847	
Allow 10 per cent. on capital invested	4,459,085	
Amount deducted		$6,686,762
3,838,458 tons iron ore, at $4.60	$17,720,502	
Allow $2.60	10,043,586	
Amount deducted, $2		7,676,916
1,921,588 tons hard coal, at $2.91	$5,631,922	
Allow $1.91	3,710,334	
Amount deducted, $1		1,921,588
215,588 tons soft coal, at $2.41	$519,768	
Allow $1.41	304,180	
Amount deducted		215,588
1,054,452 tons coke, at $3.37	$3,563,566	
Allow $2.37	2,509,114	
Amount deducted		1,054,452
Total deductions		17,555,152

Nine dollars and nine cents per ton on the 1,930,311 tons of pig-iron made just makes the above net sum of $17,555,152. Nine dollars and nine cents is $2.37 more than your persistent $6.72. With this $2.37 we can allow $1 more per ton on your iron ore and 2 per cent. more interest on the capital invested. What does my friend from Pittsburgh have to say now?

Mr. BAYNE. If my friend will go to the iron regions of Pennsylvania I think he will find, if he can run a mill on the principle he suggests, that I would be safe in guarantying him a salary of $50,000 a year.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I thank you. I am not in the pig-iron business. [Laughter.]

Mr. BAYNE. Such management as that might induce the gentleman to abandon politics and go into the pig-iron business.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. No, sir; I do not propose to become *particeps criminis* to your methods of robbery. I would like to go over into that region to teach economy and how to get an honest divide to the poor laborers who furnish the sweat and the muscle by which the large margins upon coal, iron ore, and pig-iron are made. They could well afford to pay $100,000 for a man half as smart as I am even in the pig-iron business. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. Is the gentleman aware that there are companies engaged in mining iron ore the stock of which (the par value of the share being $25) has been sold for $2,000 a share, a very considerable advance?

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. Yes, that is quite an advance—only 8,000 per cent. I am not versed in the intricacies of protection as affecting business about Pittsburgh.

Mr. SCOTT. My remark does not apply to Pittsburgh, but to the iron-ore regions of the Northwest, where the great bulk of the iron ore of the United States is produced.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. I have no doubt the gentleman's statement is correct. Although somewhat skeptical, I am prepared to believe anything relating to the combinations and trusts for keeping up the price of pig-iron.

Mr. SCOTT. I repeat the statement that in such companies shares of stock originally issued at $25 per share have been sold as high as $2,025 per share.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. Just so; and were it not that the gentleman from Pittsburgh has advertised himself so extensively, I should be surprised at the gall he exhibits in always putting in his oar, like a mousing owl, when any one mentions the subject of pig-iron.

Mr. BAYNE rose.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. If the gentleman will sit down I will give him all he wants to hear.

Mr. BAYNE. Just one moment.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. When the coal of fire begins to warm through the shell the tortoise begins to crawl. No, sir; my time is limited, and I can not suffer further interruptions.

Mr. BAYNE. Will not the gentleman allow me——

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana. Not at all. I have submitted to all the interruptions from the gentleman, who is all the time seeking to occupy the floor at the expense of another's time, that I wish to. [Laughter.] I ask the gentleman to sit down.

I claim, sir, to have given some attention to the question of making pig-iron. I know the chief cost is the materials, namely, iron ore, fuel, and limestone rock. By the use of these materials in the year 1884 (see report chief bureau of statistics of Pennsylvania) the furnace employés in Pennsylvania made 2,092,754 tons of pig-iron. For their labor, therefor, they were paid $4,333,783, or $2.07 per ton. But this was the average, and in that same chief's report I find that much of the 2,092,754 tons cost less. On page 94 of that report I find where one furnace turned out 27,488 tons, and that the laborers for their work in making it were paid $39,313, or only $1.45 per ton. I know, sir, that day wages are higher in this country than in Europe, but, sir, it is cheaper because more effective.

I find in No. 64 of our consular reports, made in June, 1886, an official communication from J. Schoenhoff, our consul at Tunstall, a very carefully-prepared detailed statement of the relative cost of iron ore and coal used in the making of pig-iron in the United States and in England and in Germany. His information about the cost in this country I see he takes from the second volume of our Census Compendium, 1880, and the report of the chief of statistics of Pennsylvania, by me already referred to, and I take it his information as to cost in England and Germany is equally as reliable, and I commend the communication to the prayerful consideration of my friend from Pittsburgh. Mr. Schoenhoff tells us that England's advantage over us, if any, is in the fact that her materials—coal and iron ore—are closer together; that the average distance required to remove all home iron ore—all except what is imported—is 45 miles; that Germany's advantage, if any, consists in the fact that the government owns all iron ore and coal lands and that no royalties are paid—a most wise and beneficent arrangement. He tells us, however, that 189,248 coal miners in Germany, for the year 1885, mined only 51,867,646 tons, or an average of only 274 tons per employé; that the coal when mined is not as good as ours; that in England employés average 325 tons per employé per year.

In the United States our miners average a much larger quantity. Take Allegheny, Clearfield, Fayette, and Westmoreland Counties in Pennsylvania (see report Chief Statistics, already referred to, page 83) and we find 24,928 employés, which includes all hands inside and outside, working on an average of 200½ days each in 1884, aggregating 4,996,911 days' work, turned out 12,365,550 tons of coal besides making 3,694,710 tons of coke. Ordinarily it requires 1¼ tons of coal to make 1 ton of coke, therefore requiring 4,618,387 tons of coal. Thus showing that each employé averaged 681 tons of coal to say nothing of the time consumed in making the more than 3,000,000 tons of coke.

Following Mr. Schoenhoff further and we find that our employés working iron-ore mines turn out a much larger quantity of ore. And last but not least our ore is as rich, producing as large a per cent. of metal, and our coal is unsurpassed.

Having put the knife to pig-iron and found that those engaged in making it and in furnishing and transporting the material out of which it was made, realized $7.75 per ton, more than enough to cover good fair profits, taking the average all over the United States and $9.09 in Pennsylvania, let us take the rolling-mills and put them through the same process of purification and elimination through which we have put the blast-furnaces, and what do we find? See volume 2, Compendium Census 1880, pages 1144 to 1151, both inclusive:

Capital invested	$89,781,900
Total value products	136,798,574
Cost of these products:	
Paid wages to labor	$34,004,709
Paid for material	88,277,293
Total cost	122,282,002
Profit to capital	14,516,572
Total	136,798,574

But of what did the materials consist? Let us take an inventory.

1. Iron ore	363,959 tons,	$7.41 per ton.
2. Pig-iron	2,705,509 tons,	$25.05 per ton.
3. Old iron rails		
4. Other old scrap-iron		
5. Hammered iron-ore blooms	114,762 tons,	$48 per ton.
6. Hammered pig or scrap blooms		
7. Purchased muck bars		
8. Charcoal	2,569,756 bushels.	
9. Hard coal	526,126 tons,	$2.58 per ton.
10. Soft coal	3,915,377 tons,	$2.31 per ton.
11. Coke	14,834 tons,	$3.27 per ton.

With the above data let us proceed to make our allowances and draw our deductions.

1. Profit on capital	$14,516,542		
Allow 10 per cent	8,978,199		
Amount deducted			$5,538,343
2. 363,959 tons iron ore, at $7.41 per ton	$2,700,167		
Allow $2.58 per ton	939,014		
Amount deducted			1,761,153
3. 2,705,509 tons pig, old iron rails, and other old iron, $25.05 per ton	$67,779,633		
Allow, less $7.75, or $17.30	46,811,939		
Amount deducted			20,967,694
4. 114,762 tons hammered iron ore blooms, hammered pig and scrap blooms, and purchased muck bar, at $48 per ton	$5,507,676		
Allow $25	2,869,100		
Amount deducted			2,638,576
5. 526,126 tons hard coal, at $2.58	$1,358,077		
Allow $2.08	1,096,014		
Amount deducted			$263,063
6. 3,915,377 tons soft coal, at $2.31	$9,047,654		
Allow $1.81	7,089,366		
Amount deducted			1,957,688
7. 14,834 tons coke, at $3.27	$48,589		
Allow $2.77	41,172		
Amount deducted			7,417
Total deductions			33,133,934

Total products, 2,353,248 tons, or $14.07 per ton on the rolled iron. On account of the fact that rolling-mills are further from the places where fuel is produced than furnaces are or should be, I have allowed higher prices for coal and coke used in the rolling-mills than I have for that used in the blast-furnaces, and yet reference to the census reports will show that the rolling-mills estimated these materials at a lower price than did the blast-furnace. It will be observed that most of the deductions have been made on account of profit on capital and the $7.75 per ton on pig-iron, which we found could be eliminated by our calculations made on the blast-furnaces. A similar calculation on Bessemer-steel rails would enable us to reduce that product to a value below $30 per ton. In view of these estimates it would seem that the tariff on pig and rolled iron and steel rails is much, very much, too high in the Mills bill unless we are anxious to give the producers of these commodities the power to combine and run up prices. One-half the amount levied in the bill would give our home producers an advantage such as to enable them to hold the markets just as well as they can now. As long as Pennsylvania can realize a profit of $10 per ton on iron by limiting her output to one-half of our consumptive demands she can make twice as much clear

money as she would make on $2.50 per ton profit and supply our full demand.

Iron ore prepared for the furnace when it leaves labor's hands, coal prepared for the furnace when it leaves labor's hands, are very cheap; in fact, as cheap in the United States, and especially in Pennsylvania, Maryland, West Virginia, Tennessee, and Alabama, as any place in Europe. The keeping up of the tariff affects not the price of labor, but enables corporate wealth and the greed of monopoly to gobble up the shekels and oppress the people. In Pennsylvania during the census year there was mined all the anthracite coal and eighteen and a quarter of the fifty-two million dollars' worth of bituminous coal mined in the United States. Of all the coal mined, 44 per cent. in value was anthracite and 56 per cent. was bituminous. Pennsylvania mined all the anthracite and more than one-third of the bituminous coal. Taking all in all, she mined 64 per cent., while the balance of the country mined 36 per cent. only. Iowa mined two and a half million dollars' worth of the fifty-two millions' worth. In Pennsylvania the coal when mined was worth 96 cents per ton, and labor cost paid for mining was only 61 cents per ton, while in Iowa the coal was worth $1.70, and the labor cost was higher than in Pennsylvania.

Of all the bituminous coal turned out in the United States during the census year, Pennsylvania turned out 43 per cent. in quantity, but in value only 35 per cent.; while Iowa turned out only 3.4 per cent. in quantity, but 4.7 per cent. in value, and notwithstanding the higher price of coal in Iowa in quality it was inferior to the Pennsylvania coal.

I apprehend that my good friends from Pennsylvania will hardly admit that wages are so much higher in Iowa as to justify this difference in the price of coal.

COTTON GOODS.

Let us next take up the cotton goods business.

In the cotton goods business, if we are to accept the statistics found in volume 2, Compendium Census 1880, pages 1124, 1125, 1126, and 1127, out of every $100 worth of goods, the materials, most all of which was cotton—

Cost	$54.40
The operative labor	21.60
Making a total	76.00
The balance	24.00

went to capital. Now, what do you want to protect? If only the $21.60, there is very little difference in the price of labor between the United States and England in the cotton goods business. But be liberal; say we pay $1 where they pay 75 cents. That being the case—

They would have paid	$16.20
While we paid	21.60
A difference of	5.40
This $100 worth of goods would therefore have cost	$94.60
But the unit of value is	100.00
Difference	5.40

If they make $94 60 while we make $100, then they would make $100 while we would make $105.70. Hence the amount, $5.70 on $100 worth of their goods, makes the difference, and 10 per cent. ad valorem duty is more than enough.

Next, take woolen goods. Turn to pages 1190 to 1201, both inclusive, volume 2 Census, and there we find a detailed statement covering 1,990 woolen-mills in the United States, that turned out more than $160,000,000 worth of goods. A careful analysis of the cost shows that out of every $100 worth of goods they cost—

Foreign and domestic wool	$41.16
Hair, noils, etc	.37
Cotton and cotton yarn	6.57
Woolen and worsted yarn	2.45
Chemicals	2.90
Wood and coal	1.09
All other material	4.00
Total cost of material	58.54
Paid wages to employés	15.79
Total cost	74.33
Balance to capital	25.67
Total value of product	100.00

Now, if wool is to go on the free-list, that, it is to be presumed, will cheapen it. Some say it will be higher. At any rate, we can buy from the same market that England and Europe buy from. For my own part, I feel that it will be cheapened. Let us now go over the items, and instead of $41.16 say it costs $35. The next item, though small, is as cheap with us as anybody, because admitted free of duty. The next three items, except for the little dab of labor in them, are as cheap with us as with any one. In their unfinished condition there is but little labor in them at most; but be liberal, take out $1.50 and there will be left $13.42. The wood and coal, I take it, are as cheap here as any place, $1.09. The other materials, I do not know what they are, but they are in a crude state and have but little labor about them; take out, however, 15 per cent. or 60 cents in the $4 worth, leaving $3.40, making for material $53.28; now, labor, $1.50, and 60 cents, $2.10, deducted above, added to the original $15.79 of labor cost, making total labor cost needing protection, $17.89; and this makes the cost of materials and labor $69.07, instead of $74.33 as before. Now add to this $69.07 the $25.67 to capital, and we have $94.74.

Thus by the cheapening process we have $94.74 instead of $100. In that $94.74 there is $17.89 of labor. If there be $17.89 to protect in $94.74 there would be $18.88 to be protected in $100. But suppose instead of $18.88 we say $20 to make it round figures. Now, say we pay $1, while England pays 66⅔ cents, then we would pay $20 while England would pay $13.33⅓, difference $6.66⅔. Protect this difference and the $5.70 difference in cotton goods, which would more than be covered by a 10 per cent. ad valorem duty! Then why make the ad valorem duty 30 and 40 per cent. and thus place it in the power of our manufacturers to combine and run up prices?

For the purpose of showing the labor cost in the manufacture of different articles I have prepared a table which I desire shall be marked Table C and made a supplement to my speech. This table I have prepared wholly from information drawn from volume 2 of our Census Compendium, 1880, pages 932–933, etc.

When armed with the capital and materials the cost of labor is not the big item, but is generally comparatively small. By reference to Table C it will be seen that the labor on $100 worth of—

	Cost.
Flour	$3.40
Refined sugar	1.80
Chemicals	10.00
Drugs and chemicals	10.80
Cheese and butter	6.60
Ground coffee, spices, etc	6.00
Starch	12.20
Tanned leather	8.10
Curried leather	6.70
Dressed skins	15.80
Boots and shoes	25.90
Saddles and harness	21.00
Lumber, sawed	13.60
Lumber, planed	16.00
Pig-iron	14.10
Bessemer steel	8.60

TABLE C.

Kind of industry.	Average number of employés.	Aggregate value of products.	Amount of wages paid.	Paid to wages.
				Per ct.
Blast-furnaces	41,875	$89,315,569	$12,680,702	14.1
Bloomers and forges	2,939	3,968,074	915,395	23.0
Rolling-mills	80,133	135,798,574	34,004,799	24.3
Bessemer, etc	10,835	55,805,210	4,930,349	8.6
Crucible and miscellaneous	5,196	10,670,258	2,945,539	27.6
Total and average	140,978	296,557,685	55,476,784	18.6
Cotton goods	172,544	192,090,110	42,040,510	21.8
Woolen goods	86,504	163,665,337	25,836,392	15.7
Mixed textiles	43,373	66,221,703	13,316,753	20.1
Dyeing and mixed textiles	16,698	32,297,420	6,474,364	20.0
Paper	24,422	55,109,914	8,525,355	15.4
Chemicals	29,520	117,377,324	11,840,704	10.0
Felt goods	1,524	3,877,736	439,760	11.3
Leather, tanned	23,812	113,348,336	9,204,243	8.1
Leather, curried	11,033	71,351,297	4,845,413	6.7
Leather, dressed skins	5,395	15,399,311	2,441,372	15.8
Leather goods	1,036	2,029,343	459,318	22.7
Boots and shoes	111,052	165,050,354	43,001,438	25.9
Saddles and harness	21,446	38,081,643	7,997,752	21.0
Lumber, sawed	147,956	233,268,729	31,845,974	13.6
Lumber, planed	15,289	36,803,356	5,890,724	16.0
Sash, doors, and blinds	21,898	36,621,325	8,540,930	23.3
Wood, turned and carved	5,635	6,770,119	2,148,944	31.5
Plumbing and gas-fitting	9,684	18,133,250	4,770,389	26.3
Patent medicines	4,025	14,682,494	1,651,596	11.6
Photographing	3,977	5,935,311	1,751,118	29.0
Sugar-refining	5,857	155,488,915	2,875,022	1.8
Sewing-machines	14,375	15,928,035	3,519,457	33.4
Steel springs, cars and carriages	1,539	3,654,802	699,412	19.0
Starch	3,119	7,477,742	919,197	12.2
Foundries and machine-shops	145,357	214,378,468	65,982,132	30.7
Roofing, etc	3,082	6,227,284	1,411,133	22.6
Smelting and roofing and brass scrap metals	311	8,411,100	158,300	1.8
Salt	4,289	4,829,596	1,260,023	26.0
Coal, bituminous	100,116	5,260,146	32,601,460	62.2
Coal, anthracite	70,748	42,139,740	22,693,407	53.9
Ore, iron	31,668	20,470,756	9,538,117	46.6
Ore, copper	6,258	$8,886,245	$3,214,031	36.2
Agricultural implements	30,580	68,640,486	15,359,610	22.3
Carriages and wagons	45,394	64,951,617	18,988,615	28.7
Carriage and wagon materials	7,502	10,114,352	2,733,004	27.0
Awnings and tents	1,268	1,968,942	334,465	17.0
Boxes (wooden for packing)	7,822	43,374,271	11,726,001	25.4
Brass and copper goods	12,461	26,661,571	7,665,292	28.7
Brick and tile	66,356	32,833,587	13,443,502	40.9
Cars, railroad and street	14,232	27,997,591	5,507,713	19.0
Charcoal	1,461	975,540	380,697	41.0
Cheese and butter	7,986	25,742,270	1,546,495	6.0
Clocks, watches, and watch-cases	11,052	15,634,339	5,279,056	33.1
Coffee, spices (roast and ground)	2,716	22,924,894	1,370,698	6.0
Coffins and burial-cases	4,415	8,157,760	1,895,805	23.2
Cooperage	25,973	93,714,770	8,992,603	26.6
Copper-smithing	868	2,087,773	529,302	25.9
Drugs and chemicals	9,545	38,173,658	4,157,163	10.8
Flouring and grist mills	58,407	505,185,712	17,422,316	3.4
Fruit and vegetable canning and preserves	31,905	17,599,576	2,679,960	15.2
Furniture and upholstering	52,087	75,196,705	21,737,128	28.9
Chairs	10,575	9,867,823	3,311,286	33.7
Handles (wooden)	1,575	1,656,698	436,664	26.3

I have not pretended to run clear through the list, but any person who may feel an interest in the matter, and who is familiar with the fundamental rules, addition, subtraction, multiplication, and division, and the time-honored rule of three, can easily extend it through the entire list.

The sensible man strikes more fools on the subject of wages than upon any other question extant. If gentlemen instead of continually harping on the difference in the per diem wages paid in this country and in Europe would compare the results of labor more, and would compare the per diem wages paid in the different States of this Union more, and in the different parts of the same State and often in different parts of the same Congressional district more, they might arrive at more correct conclusions as to why labor commands a better price at one place than another.

Some two months ago I had a constituent, a clever fellow and on most subjects very intelligent. He is interested in mining and shipping kaoline to Philadelphia, 800 miles distant, and I may say he has a most excellent plant when once rightly developed with all necessary conveniences.

He got scared about the tariff and came on here to exert his influence against any reductions. He called on me; I sympathized with him; was anxious to assist him. The duty reduced on kaoline or the products of kaoline would ruin him. He prepared at some trouble and expense to himself an argument on the price of wages—days' wages—between this country and Europe, seeming to forget altogether the fact that the question of labor was a mere song, that it was his distance from the railroad, that he had to team it over bad, rough roads with wagons and then pay high freights, twice as much as fair freightage ought to be, over railroads a distance of more than 800 miles. In further illustration of the wage question, I have prepared three tables which I shall mark D, E, and F, and make parts of my remarks.

The first of the three, being the one numbered D, prepared from facts found in volume 2, Compendium Census, beginning on page 944 and ending on page 1029, shows the average number of our manufacturing people at work in each of the States, the aggregate amount of wages paid, the average per employé per year, and the ratio of wages. Beginning with California, where wages are highest, and making the amount paid there the unit of comparison, and running on down to North Carolina, where wages are lowest, I find Pennsylvania away down eleventh in the list, paying $71.78, while California pays $100, New York $94.90, and down to North Carolina, where $31.10 settles the bill.

The second of these three tables, the one numbered E, prepared from facts found in volume 2, Compendium Census, beginning on page 1030 and ending with page 1095, shows the average number of our manufacturing people at work in each of the several cities named, the aggregate amount of wages paid, the average per employé per year, and the ratio of wages. Taking New York as a unit of comparison and running on down to Baltimore, where wages are lowest, I find Philadelphia, out of the thirteen cities considered, standing No. 10, occupying a column one nearer the top, but relatively several nearer the bottom than that in which Pennsylvania was found in the column of States. While New York pays $100, San Francisco $122.95, Chicago $102.12, and St. Louis $99.29, poor Philadelphia pays only $81.03.

But lest my distinguished friends from the Second, Third, and Fourth districts of Pennsylvania, who have been sent here to keep the yoke upon my constituents, for a time whereof the memory of man runneth not to the contrary; for long years living in the past, coming from a city evidently living in the past—lest they should think there was something wrong about all these calculations, I have prepared a third table, marked F, from volume 2, Compendium Census, on pages 1070 and 1076 respectively, showing the average number of people engaged in certain manufacturing industries in New York City, and in the same industries in Philadelphia, the aggregate wages paid in each branch of industry, the average per employé, and the ratio to the employés in the respective cities. Taking the price paid in New York as the unit of comparison, and I find that in Philadelphia wages range all the way from 47 to 87 cents, while $1 is demanded and paid in New York.

Now, sirs, at the time the census whose figures are used was taken Philadelphia had 185,527 persons engaged in the manufacturing industries of the city, out of a population of 847,170. New York had only 227,352 persons engaged in manufacturing industries, out of a population of 1,206,299. To have had as large a proportion of her population engaged in the manufacturing industries as Philadelphia, New York would have had to have 264,000 persons engaged in such industries, or 37,000 more than she did have; Chicago, instead of 79,414, would have had to have 110,000; St. Louis, instead of 41,825, would have had to have 76,000; San Francisco, instead of 28,442, would have had to have 51,000. This shows that Philadelphia was more of a manufacturing city than New York, Chicago, St. Louis, or San Francisco, and if high wages depend on a larger per cent. of population being engaged in manufacturing industries, why is it that wages are not higher in Philadelphia than in New York or these other cities? And if the competition of cheap labor breaks down and destroys high-priced labor, how is it that the 227,000 persons engaged in the manufacturing industries in New York are not driven from their business by the cheap pauper labor of Philadelphia?

The pauper labor of Europe in an open field destroying the high-priced labor of America! The pauper labor of Philadelphia destroying the high-priced labor in New York! Was anything ever more farcical? I invite my friends from New York to contemplate the scene. And I pause to say to my friends from Philadelphia, Uncle Charlie in particular, "If you have tears to shed, prepare to shed them now."

Our protectionist friends talk with exultation at our growth as a country (my distinguished colleague [Mr. BROWNE] calls it "phenomenal") and of our high-priced labor, attributing it all to the tariff; and shed crocodile tears lest it should be brought into competition with the pauper labor of Europe. Does not every well-informed man know that high-priced labor beats the world in an open field? It always has and always will.

Our country's greatness! What made it great? The tariff. Who built these magnificent monuments? The tariff. What enables us to grow such splendid corn? The tariff. How is it that Kentucky has such fine horses? The tariff. How is it that we have these fertile lands, this healthful climate, these intelligent people, the good sunshine, and the rainfall? The tariff. How is it that now and then we cull out a holiday and call it the Fourth of July? The tariff, of course.

I once heard of an old physician who had a student whom he was trying to bring up in the ways of a full-fledged Esculapian. He had a sick patient to visit. He took his pupil with him; they entered the patient's bed-room; the old doctor felt the patient's pulse, looked about, and said to the patient: "You have been eating eggs, haven't you?" "Yes," said the patient. The old doctor prescribed, and they left. On the way back the pupil asked: "How did you know he had been eating eggs?" "Because," responded the old gentleman, "I saw the shells under the bed." Another day passed and the old doctor sent the young man to see the patient. The young man went in, felt the patient's pulse, looked about, prescribed, and returned. When he gets back the old doctor asks him: "Well, how is Mr. Brown to-day?" "I don't know, but I am afraid he is going to die!" "Going to die! Why do you think so?" "Because he has eat a horse." "Eat a horse! Why, what makes you think he has eat a horse?" "Because I saw the saddle and harness under the bed."

Because our country has prospered our protectionist friends look around, and finding the tariff in sight, they gladly attribute our growth and prosperity to the tariff. Sirs, the tariff has handicapped our people; it has built up millionaires, created colossal fortunes. In doing so it has ground and oppressed the people, transfered the money from the pockets of the many to the pockets of the few.

Why, Mr. Chairman, away back in 1860 I remember hearing Henry S. Lane deliver a speech at Bloomfield, a town in my district. He and Thomas A. Hendricks were opposing candidates for governor. Hendricks dwelt with just pride on the rapid stride our country was making in the march of progress under Democratic rule. Lane replied, admitting that it had, but wondered if the sunshine, the equitable rainfall, the healthfulness of our climate, the fertility of our soil, the intelligence of our people, in short, the greatness of our opportunities, did not have something to do with it.

During the decade then just passed all former decades were badly left, just as every ten years are bound to surpass every preceding ten years. The rule of progress, sirs, is upon the law of geometrical progression, and not the law of arithmetical progression, 1 and 1 are 2, and 1 are 3, and 1 are 4, and so on; 2 and 2 are 4, and 2 are 6, and 2 are 8, and so on, arithmetical progression; 2 and 2 are 4, and 4 are 8, and 8 are 16, and so on, geometrical progression. Simple interest never compounded is arithmetical progression. Compounded and it is geometrical progression. One hundred dollars at 8 per cent. interest draws $8 per year, or $800 in a hundred years. But at 8 per cent. compounded and in less than ten years it doubles itself. In ten years it is $200; in twenty years, $400; in thirty years, $800; in forty, $1,600; in fifty, $3,200; in sixty, $6,400; in seventy, $12,800; in eighty, $25,600; in ninety, $51,200, and in one hundred years it is $102,400, or $101,500 more than by the simple way. In 1850 we had over seven billions of property, and in 1860 a little over sixteen billions.

For every $100 in 1850 we had $226 in 1860. This rate of increase would have given us a little over thirty-six billions in 1870 and a little over eighty-two billions in 1880. Instead, we had only thirty billions in 1870 and forty-three billions in 1880.

In 1850 we had 9,021 miles of railroad; in 1860 we had 30,635. For every 100 miles we had in 1850 we had 339½ in 1860. The same rate of increase would have given us over 104,000 miles in 1870 and over 356,000 miles in 1880. Instead, in 1870 we had 52,914, and in 1880 93,349. In all the essential elements of advancement the country never prospered like it did between 1850 and 1860. In the language of Henry S. Lane, wages are good; our country's prosperity is phenomenal. Our wide fields and room for diversification, our genial sunshine, our refreshing rainfalls, our winters and our summers, our seed-time and our harvest, our intelligence, our virtues, our good government, our grand opportunities make wages good and make our country prosper.

Although considerable of a skeptic, not much given to believe in th at which I can not hear, see. taste, feel, or smell, or deduce by an *à priori* course of reasoning from something that I can hear, see, taste, feel, or smell, I am disposed to give God the glory, and to sing:

Rise, shine, give God the glory,
Rise, shine, give God the glory,
Rise, shine, give God the glory,
In the year of jubilee.

TABLE D.

	Name of State.	Average number of employés in the manufacturing industries.	Aggregate amount paid in wages.	Average amount per year per employé.	Ratio of wages paid.
1	California	43,693	$21,065,905	$482	100.00
2	Colorado	5,074	2,314,427	455	94.40
3	Minnesota	21,247	8,613,094	405	84.01
4	Connecticut	112,915	43,501,518	386	80.08
5	Missouri	63,995	24,309,716	380	78.83
6	New York	531,533	198,634,029	375	77.80
7	Illinois	154,724	57,429,085	371	76.97
8	Nebraska	4,783	1,742,311	364	75.51
9	Delaware	12,638	4,267,349	361	74.89
10	Louisiana	12,167	4,360,371	358	74.28
11	New Jersey	126,038	46,083,045	350	72.61
12	Pennsylvania	387,072	134,055,904	345	71.78
13	Rhode Island	62,826	21,355,619	340	70.50
14	Ohio	183,609	62,103,800	338	70.10
15	Massachusetts	352,255	128,315,362	326	67.40
16	Wisconsin	57,109	18,814,917	330	68.30
17	Kansas	12,062	3,995,010	322	66.80
18	Michigan	77,591	25,313,094	326	67.56
19	Iowa	30 372	9,725,962	320	66.30
20	Kentucky	37,391	11,657,844	318	66.00
21	Indiana	69,508	21,960,888	315	65.30
22	New Hampshire	48,831	14,814,793	303	62.80
23	West Virginia	14,311	4,313,965	300	62.20
24	Vermont	17,540	5,164,479	294	61.00
25	Texas	12,159	3,343,087	275	59.60
26	Maryland	74,945	18,904,965	265	55.00
27	Maine	52,954	13,623,318	257	53.30
28	Alabama	10,019	2,500,504	249	52.00
29	Tennessee	22,445	5,254,775	235	48.00
30	Florida	5,504	1,270,875	230	47.70
31	Arkansas	4,557	925,358	230	47.70
32	Georgia	24,875	5,266,152	212	44.00
33	Mississippi	5,827	1,192,645	205	42.50
34	Virginia	40,184	7,423,261	185	38.30
35	South Carolina	15,828	2,836,289	180	37.30
36	North Carolina	18,109	2,740,768	150	31.10

TABLE E.

	Name of city.	Average number of employés in the manufacturing industries.	Aggregate amount paid in wages to all employés.	Average amount per employé per year.	Ratio of wages paid.
1	New York	227,352	$97,030,021	$427	100.00
2	San Francisco	28,442	14,928,534	525	122.95
3	Chicago	79,414	34,653,462	436	102.12
4	St. Louis	41,825	17,743,532	424	99.29
5	Boston	59,213	24,924,009	420	98.35
6	Providence	22,891	9,464,110	413	96.72
7	Cleveland	21,724	8,502,935	391	91.33
8	Detroit	16,110	6,306,460	391	91.33
9	New Orleans	9,504	3,717,577	390	91.33
10	Philadelphia	185,527	64,265,966	346	81.03
11	Louisville	17,448	5,835,545	333	78.00
12	Milwaukee	20,886	6,946,005	332	78.00
13	Baltimore	56,338	15,177,489	270	63.23

TABLE F.

	Kind of industry, manufacturing.	Average number employés in certain manufacturing industries.	Amount of wages paid.	Average wages.	Ratio of wages.
1	Artificial flowers and feathers, New York	3,498	$934,768	$267.00	1.00
1	Artificial flowers and feathers, Philadelphia	382	65,330	171.00	.64
2	Awnings and artificial tents, New York	203	74,212	365.00	1.00
2	Awnings and artificial tents, Philadelphia	140	25,964	185.00	.50
3	Paper bags, New York	218	74,709	342.00	1.00
3	Paper bags, Philadelphia	363	94,530	260.00	.76
4	Paper and other bags, New York	747	317,850	430.00	1.00
4	Paper and other bags, Philadelphia	152	40,215	264.00	.61
5	Blacksmithing, New York	569	367,959	646.00	1.00
5	Blacksmithing, Philadelphia	634	299,259	472.00	.73
6	Fancy and paper boxes, New York	2,355	671,620	285.00	1.00
6	Fancy and paper boxes, Philadelphia	1,435	263,216	180.00	.63
7	Baskets, rattan and willow-ware, New York	$106	$35,715	$337.00	1.00
7	Baskets, rattan and willowware, Philadelphia	42	7,154	170.00	.50
8	Belting, hose and leather, New York	257	150,694	586.00	1.00
8	Belting, hose and leather, Philadelphia	80	41,165	518.00	.87
9	Blacking, New York	86	56,500	657.00	1.00
9	Blacking, Philadelphia	144	44,480	309.00	.47
10	Boots and shoes, New York	5,587	2,474,050	423.00	1.00
10	Boots and shoes, Philadelphia	7,535	2,788,409	370.00	.86
11	Boxes, wooden packing, New York	515	306,682	595.00	1.00
11	Boxes, wooden packing, Philadelphia	427	169,990	398.00	.67
12	Carriages and wagons, New York	1,602	965,719	602.00	1.00
12	Carriages and wagons, Philadelphia	1,578	767,834	486.00	.80
13	Men's clothing, New York	47,647	14,012,805	294.00	1.00
13	Men's clothing, Philadelphia	17,666	4,085,239	231.00	.80
14	Women's clothing, New York	12,366	3,886,715	314.00	1.00
14	Women's clothing, Philadelphia	2,656	479,436	180.00	.57

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the Republican and Democratic parties on the subject of the tariff is radical, fundamental, irreconcilable. It is not a mere question as to the adjustment of a schedule of duties on foreign importations under a well-established governmental policy, but a question as to the policy itself. If it were a mere question of adjustment it could and should be removed from the domain of party politics to that of business, and be settled with reference to the demands of the revenue and of the business of the country for the time being. The everchanging conditions of trade and commerce and of industrial production necessarily require from time to time a readjustment of these duties, in order to promote and enforce the policy under which they are laid, and such adjustment should be left to the wisdom of Congress, unembarrassed by party strife.

But the question here is one of governmental policy, and is this: Shall duties be laid for the purpose of revenue only or shall they be laid not only for the purpose of revenue, but also with a direct view to the encouragement of home industries and home labor? If the policy be settled in favor of protection, then the matter of adjustment becomes a question of business to be settled by such mutual concessions between conflicting industries and interests as will best promote the good of the whole people, in effecting which every man may think and act free from the trammels of party. But if it be settled in favor of a tariff for revenue only, the only question of adjustment which can then arise will be as to what articles of foreign importation when subjected to tariff duties will best produce the revenue necessary for the maintenance of the Government without any reference to how home industries and home labor will be affected.

It is the avowed policy of the Democratic party to reduce tariff duties to the revenue basis, and the bill under consideration is brought in with that view. Indeed, I go further and charge that it is not only their purpose to bring tariff duties to the revenue basis, but to eliminate entirely from our revenue policy the idea of protection to American industries and American labor. The Democratic party is absolutely hostile to the protection idea, as is manifest by the last message of the President of the United States to Congress, and from the utterances of the leaders of the party on the floor of this House. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] said the other day:

We should levy taxes to obtain revenue, but not to restrict importations--

And that—

we will increase wealth if we lower the duties and let importations come in of those things which can be produced cheaper in other countries than our own.

This is the true Democratic faith as taught and practiced by the Southern Democracy, and was inspired not only by their selfish interests as slave-owners and cotton-growers, but by their peculiar construction of the Constitution of the United States. When the Constitution was adopted the people at once divided upon the question of its true construction; one party insisting that it created a government for the people of the thirteen original States sovereign within its sphere, and that in determining the extent and limit of its powers the Constitution should receive a fair and reasonable construction; a construction that would give it effect not only according to its letter, but its spirit; a construction that would imply all powers necessary to the due exercise of those expressly granted; in short, a construction which regarded the people of these States as constituting a nation and the Constitution as creating a government for them, whose sovereignty was paramount to that of the States.

But the other party insisted upon a strict construction, a construction which assumed for its basis that the Constitution created a mere agency for the convenience of confederated but sovereign States, and that it

possessed only such powers as were expressly given to it. This party, which afterwards became the Democratic party, founded all its doctrines and policies upon the dogma of strict construction, and denied to the General Government the most essential powers of government, even the right of self-preservation, because no express warrant therefor could be found in the Constitution. Upon this ground it denied the power to establish a national bank, to undertake or carry on internal improvements, to acquire foreign territory, and especially the right to lay duties for the purpose of protecting home industries, and whenever the tariff has been under discussion in Congress the question of the constitutionality of protection has been raised by the Democratic membership, and is raised to-day, notwithstanding one hundred years of Congressional legislation recognizing it.

So that a tariff for revenue in the light of history and as expounded by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, means the absolute destruction of the policy of protection. And if internal-revenue taxes are retained, as proposed by this bill, the additional amount of revenue necessary for the maintenance of the Government can be obtained from duties so laid as to avoid even accidental or incidental protection—that species of protection which the Democratic party has heretofore expressed a willingness to submit to for the sake of the revenue. It is possible to select articles not produced here (as in free-trade England, where they levy duties on tea and coffee) from which this additional revenue may be obtained, and who can doubt, in view of the utterances on the other side of the House in the course of this debate, that even this species of protection will be eliminated from our tariff policy if the Democratic party obtains full and complete control of the Government?

Are we prepared for a tariff for revenue only as thus understood? What will it mean to the industries of this country? I will tell you. It will mean a readjustment of the industrial system of this country on the basis of unprotected competition with the industrial systems of the whole world; it will mean that in order to hold our own market—a market in which we sell at good prices 90 per cent. of our immense production—our labor must come down to the European standard and accept the wages and adopt the methods of living of the laborers of England and Germany; it will mean that many of our industries must fail utterly and their men be turned out to crowd the labor market of the remaining industries, bringing wages still lower, or, unfitted by training and experience, to enter the field of agriculture, there to assist in swelling the surplus of unmarketable production, or else wander as tramps through the country. And it will mean in its ultimate manifestation danger to the peace and safety of the Republic.

Gentlemen on the other side talk glibly about our labor being able to compete successfully with that of any other country and promise us the foreign market as compensation for any impairment of the home market. Undoubtedly the American workingman in point of intelligence, energy, and industry has no superior on earth, and with anything like equal conditions would fear no competition, but the free-trader, fair-trader, tariff-for-revenue reformer, or whatever else he may call himself, refuses to see that the conditions are not equal and can not be made so except by bringing our standard of labor and living down to that of other countries. What are the conditions under which we must enter upon the competition involved in the policy of a tariff for revenue only? First, what is our condition? We have a population of about sixty million souls—at the last census 50,597,057—but there are only seventeen persons for each square mile of our territory. Our exports last year amounted to $703,022,923, while our imports reached the sum of but $692,319,768, leaving a balance of trade in our favor of $10,703,155, and this does not include the imports and exports of gold and silver bullion and specie upon which the balance of trade was also in our favor to the amount of $37,460,492.

Ever since and including the year 1874 the balance of trade has been very largely in our favor. Last year we exported wheat, wheat flour, and corn to the amount of $162,013,864, and the only grain imported was barley, to the amount of $6,568,833. Our exports to Great Britain were of the value of $363,101,143, while our imports from that country were only of the value of $165,067,463, being a balance against free-trade England of $198,033,680. Our debt on the first day of this month less cash in the Treasury was $1,181,632,855, but our income last year was $371,403,277 as against an expenditure of $267,932,180, leaving a balance of $103,471,097 applicable to the payment of this debt, of which $47,903,248 was so applied by the purchase of bonds for the sinking fund, and the remainder might well have been applied to the purchase of outstanding bonds of the Government but for the political necessity of maintaining a surplus, in order to pave the way for tariff reduction.

The pretense of doubt about authority under existing law to purchase bonds having served its purpose, and Congress, to relieve the President from embarrassment, having by resolution expressed the opinion that the law of 1881 means just what it says, we may hope to see the accumulating surplus hereafter applied to the extinguishment of the debt. These are conditions of prosperity and offer opportunities to the citizen of independence, of comfort, of leisure, for intellectual growth and development not to be periled by a radical change of policy, the result of which must be purely speculative, and which in any event will bring disturbance and distress to our industrial and business interests during the process of change from the old to the new basis. Surely it is a case, if there ever was one, where it is "better to let well enough alone."

But what are the industrial conditions in other lands, whose unrestricted competition we invite? Turn to Europe; there we find the land crowded with human beings, from two hundred to five hundred to the square mile, an average to the square mile of over two hundred persons, who scramble and push each other in the struggle for bread, whose lives are given over to the single effort to obtain the mere means of existence, and who have no part or lot in making or executing the laws under which they live. I speak of the great mass of the people, the common people, those who really bear the heavy burdens of European government, who support in idleness its great standing armies and the magnificence of its nobility and royalty. England is perhaps less extravagant in this respect than others, and yet she pays nearly $100,000,000 a year for her army and her royal family. The annuities to the royal family amount to $2,715,000, the keeping of the royal palaces to $199,910, and the expenditure of the army to $91,969,500, making a total of $94,884,410. The strength of the standing armies of the leading States of Europe is as follows, namely:

	Men.		Men.
Austria	267,179	Holland	53,000
Belgium	54,818	Portugal	32,000
Denmark	16,653	Spain	144,664
France	525,711	Russia	735,218
Germany	492,000		
Great Britain	149,391	Total	2,795,521
Italy	265,389		

Each of these countries has a debt per head of its population greater than the United States, except Italy—the debt per head ranging from $28 to $153—and in all but Austria, Germany, and Russia their imports largely exceed their exports, and especially is this true of grain and flour; and in all except France, Germany, and Great Britain the annual governmental expenditure is greater than the income. In France, Germany, and Great Britain there is often a deficit, and the expenses of government are only met by the most onerous systems of taxation imaginable. Everything is taxed; in addition to the ordinary subjects of taxation in all countries, they tax doors, windows, railway passengers, licenses, carriages, male servants, and many things which display an ingenuity in finding subjects of taxation that only the most pressing necessity could inspire. The consolidated debt of France amounts to the enormous sum of $4,745,619,245, and that of Great Britain to $3,681,393,440.

These are not conditions of prosperity, not conditions conducing to high or even fair wages for labor and the beneficent results incident thereto; and yet it is proposed to bring our labor to the standard of these tax-ridden, overcrowded, ignorant populations. This bill is to be the beginning of that end. It is but a short step from this bill to the revenue basis, and the proposition is plain, if not self-evident, that free competition with these peoples means acceptance of their standards. We have no longer even the advantage which distance from the field of their production formerly afforded us. The cost and delay of transportation which distance imposed has been so lessened by the railroad, the steam-ship, the telegraph, and ocean cable, that there is now practically no restriction upon competition between the two continents save that imposed by legislation, and to legislation we must look as the only efficient means of equalizing conditions or preventing injurious competition. And looking to the good of our people as the best way of working out our part in the great plan of human progress, we have heretofore so legislated, with reference to the conditions attending our national development, as to prevent hurtful competitions, and we must continue to do so unless we are willing to become mere hewers of wood and drawers of water for some better-equipped rival.

If there could be substantial equality of conditions, then free and unrestricted commerce would be possible, and would follow as effect follows cause. But if the nations are to be brought to substantial equality in this respect, the movement should be upward and not downward, forward and not backward, up from the low wages of pauper labor to the fair wages of independent, self-respecting, intelligent labor.

If the restrictions we have placed upon foreign commerce for the protection of our industries and our labor be removed, will the movement be upward or downward? The crowded millions of Europe are standing by the shores of the Atlantic, with a surplus of everything but food, waiting to throw their wares upon our rich market and realize returns that will bring to them plentier and cheaper food and the comforts which their poverty has heretofore denied them, and they will win the market; as the cheapest producers they will take possesion of our market and hold it, unless we cheapen our productions to their standard.

It is a question of labor, of cheap labor—the cheapest labor must win if the productions be of substantially equal value. It is hardly possible to conceive of anything having value and which may be made the subject of traffic and commerce, which is not enhanced in value by labor, and must have the stamp of labor upon it before it can be devoted to the use of man. Gold is of no value until drawn by the hand of labor from its hiding place in the earth or released from the slow-yielding grasp of the quartz—and so with all things; they must be consecrated to use by the hand of labor. And so it is, that whatever the

other advantages of a competitor, the element of labor is the controlling one, and the market will yield to the cheaper labor, the production being substantially as good as the competing one. It is only necessary to state this, it needs no elaboration or argument.

But it is said that the increased demand for our agricultural production will compensate for any injury to our manufactures. Necessarily the crippling of our manufactures will cheapen agricultural production, both by crippling the consuming power of the people and by the increased production which the return of the factory hand to the field will involve, and this cheapening and the introduction of foreign goods may increase the demand for wheat, corn, etc., but through the lowering of prices will benefit us but little, if at all. In the end we must accept European conditions and cheapen our labor so as to hold our market, or in large measure surrender commercial and industrial independence and devote ourselves to feeding the factories of Europe. Either way, we must lose our place in the great movement for the development of the earth's resources and the uplifting of its peoples, with which diversified industry has illustrated this age, and become mere stragglers in the rear of the procession.

Why should we voluntarily and unnecessarily embarrass ourselves in this race of life? We should lead the procession. Our area is continental; every variety of soil and climate is embraced within our boundaries. The lakes on the North, the gulf on the South, the great oceans on either hand, and the mighty rivers of the interior, supplemented with 150,000 miles of railway, afford facilities for transportation unequaled in all the world. Timber, coal, iron, and every production of forest, field, and mine necessary to the development of the highest civilization are here at the command of intelligent industry; and it is only necessary to avail ourselves of these advantages, it is only necessary to seize and improve the great opportunities which they afford in order to become the richest and most powerful nation of the world. Why, then, should we go to and depend on any other country for the things necessary for our national life and progress? And why, especially, should we go to them for the things we can produce ourselves? In order that we may get them cheaper, and in order that we may escape the clutch of monopolies, says the free-trader. But the answer to this is one approved by a hundred years of national experience, and is this: That home competition, the competition between our own producers and manufacturers, will insure reasonable prices to the consumer—much lower prices than would be accepted by the foreigner if in control of our market.

There has been a constant and rapid cheapening to the consumer of all productions since the beginning of our national existence, but more especially so since the enactment of the protective tariff of 1861. I will not offer tables of statistics to prove this; already the RECORD groans with figures that prove it beyond question. And in truth it is not questioned. The free-trader does not question the fact, but will attribute it to any cause under the sun rather than the protective tariff. Yet it is a fact that can not be controverted that in every leading industry home competition has brought down the price, and the lowering of the price dates from the laying of the first protective duty on the foreign article. It was so of steel rails, as often instanced, and of spool cotton, silks, woolens, blankets, etc. The country is too broad, its interests too varied, the enterprise of its people too great ever to become the helpless prey of monopoly.

There is a tendency, it is true, to combination on the part of capital through corporate organization, trusts, and what not, that is antagonistic to the welfare and happiness of the people which, while not growing out of, are made possible by the modern facilities for rapid communication and transportation. These agencies make possible the great combinations of capital which center in New York, London, and other great cities, and thence reach out to the whole world demanding tribute. They are not confined to any one country; they rise above all tariffs, whether protective or for revenue only, and exist wherever capital is found, and greed of gain and unscrupulousness combine with opportunity. It will not be claimed that a protective tariff gave rise to the Standard Oil combination, nor that a tariff for revenue only is responsible for the great English combinations of capital which exist to-day, nor that the revenue policy of France is responsible for the recent French copper syndicate. The tendency grows out of the peculiar commercial and business conditions of the age and these combinations must be met by legislation aimed at them directly, and of a character that will restrain the abuses of which they are guilty, and surely this end can better be attained by a study of the extent and character of their operations and the true and real causes of their existence than by an outcry against the tariff upon the demagogic assumption that it is responsible for them.

The tendency of the age is to the accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few at the expense of the many, and largely grows out of the abuse of corporate organization and power. These abuses call for radical measures, and unless the great corporations of the day are brought within limitations that will make them agencies of good and not of evil, they will possess the country and defy the Government, as many of them do now.

But our friends on the other side charge all these abuses against the protective tariff. On the other side of the ocean they are attributed to free trade. Sir Edward Sullivan, in an article in the Nineteenth Century of August, 1881, said:

> The workingmen are not working out the question by the abstract reasoning of others, but by their own experience; they know nothing of political economy, but they know what were the promises of the apostles of free trade, and they know what are the results. Bankers and brokers, and dealers in stocks, and importers of foreign manufactures may tell them that they are fools and do not know when they are well off. That may be so, but they know when they are badly off, and they are badly off now.
>
> The reports of their delegates state that a very large proportion of the operative population of Great Britain (they put it at one-third) is out of work; that the rest have not on an average more than four days' work a week; that for five or six years they have been consuming their savings and the funds of their trade societies. One rich trade society has paid no less than £200,000 in "work pay" during the last five years and reduced its capital to less than £100,000.
>
> Whatever the wealth of the country may be it has not penetrated down to them. Every year this wealth is accumulating into fewer hands; every year the gulf between rich and poor becomes deeper and broader. It is calculated that there are at this moment 14,500,000 of the people with less than 10s. 6d. a week to live on.

It would be just as fair to attribute to the protective tariff the evils of intemperance as to attribute to it the tendency of capital to form combinations, or of corporations to abuse their powers, or of the rich to grow richer and of the poor to grow poorer. Certainly the removal of the restrictions upon foreign commerce would not relieve us from these combinations unless through the destruction of the wealth of the country it should have that effect.

The foreign market as pictured to us by the free-trader is a delusion and a snare. We already sell there as much as there is any demand for. We successfully compete with other nations in the sale of cotton, grain, flour, petroleum, tobacco, and other things of our own special production, and can only hope to increase our exports materially by becoming the carrier of our own productions. Legitimately a nation should go abroad only for those things which it can not produce at home or can not produce in sufficient quantities to supply the demand of its people, and commerce between the nations should, in the main, be confined to these things. To go beyond this is to force the market of some other nation and do violence to the beautiful theory of the free-trader that a nation should shape its commercial policy for the common good of all mankind—for surely the common good of mankind would be best promoted by respecting the integrity of each country's market as to those things which it produces in quantities sufficient to satisfy the demand of its people. In this view we have little to complain of—our exports last year amounted to $703,022,923, classified as follows:

Agriculture	$523,073,774
Manufactures	135,317,574
Mining	11,758,720
The forest	21,126,212
The fisheries	5,145,771
All others	6,570,872
Total	703,022,923

The great disturbing element in the markets of the world is overproduction. Labor-saving machinery and appliances have so stimulated and increased production of every kind that, irrespective of commercial and industrial policies, there come times when the supply exceeds the demand and there ensues a business paralysis or stagnation that is only cured when consumption again overtakes production; and the great problem of the future is to so adjust the labor of the world to the new basis created by machinery as that it may find remunerative employment without bringing upon us the distresses incident to overproduction. And when this problem is solved it may solve the question of "strikes," which seemed to trouble the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] the other day, and which he attributed to the tariff, forgetting that the "strike" and "lockout" are free importations from free-trade England and that the argument that they grow out of the policy of free trade is much the stronger one.

Among civilized nations there is but one free-trader or rather but one tariff-for-revenue—only nation. All others, through restrictions on foreign commerce suited to their condition, endeavor to hold their own markets and support the policy which limits foreign importations to the things which they do not produce. The one nation which is an exception to this rule is England, and she is *sui generis*. Her insular position gives her special advantages as a maritime power. Very early she turned her attention to manufactures, and by a most rigid and even unscrupulous policy of protection, pursued for hundreds of years through tariffs and navigation laws, became the leading manufacturing nation and the ocean carrier of the world. Soon she was compelled to look abroad for food for her people and for raw material for her manufactures, and of necessity was compelled also to look abroad for a market for the surplus of her manufactured products, and so she began to plant colonies in every part of the world and adopted a policy with reference to them that compelled them to become consumers of her manufactures, in exchange for which they were required to furnish her food and raw material.

But she did not stop here; through diplomacy and with her cannons she from time to time took possession of markets all around the world, which she holds to-day, and when at last all these measures failed to meet her necessities, she as a measure of protection to her industries and trade, as purely protective in its operation and effect as the tariffs which she abandoned, adopted her so-called policy of free trade. Hav-

ing a large and constantly increasing surplus of manufactured goods which she was compelled to sell abroad to obtain food and raw material, she said to the nations whose markets were yet within their control, "Let us remove all restrictions on commerce; let trade be free; let me sell in your market freely and without restriction, and you shall so sell in mine, and great good will follow to us all." Sell in her market! Sell what? Sell manufactured goods there when every dollar's worth so sold would to that extent lessen her ability to buy the food and raw materials she must have? No; she did not intend that. She knew that she must because of her necessity and with her advantages could undersell her competitors not only in her own market but in all markets to which she was admitted duty free.

Her assurance of this was in her cheap skilled labor, her improved machinery, her abundant capital, her large production, and in the fact that she would carry to her own shores, upon her own terms, the greater part of the competing goods. Beside that, she still lays duties on foreign importations, and still discriminates against foreign manufactures, although gladly admitting all raw material free. For instance, she lays duties on tobacco and coffee, but discriminates in favor of her home manufactures, by placing still higher duties on roasted or ground coffee or any form of manufactured tobacco, and so with many other things. She takes care of her own household and deserves credit for it, but offers nothing to compensate us for admitting her to our market on equal terms. If we had the cheap labor, the capital, and the ships, England would still be a formidable competitor in the markets of the world. She already has control of markets in every quarter of the globe from which it would be difficult indeed to dislodge her, and she would maintain a keen competition for all others. In any view of the matter the foreign market as compensation for the loss or any serious impairment of our own great home market is a delusion and a snare.

If the time shall ever come when through the crowding of population and the accumulation of wealth our labor shall be cheapened and the other conditions coexist to render us independent of the competition of other nations, it will then be time enough to throw down our walls of protection and invite the unrestricted competition of the world. Until then it is the part of wisdom to sustain the policy and hold the market that has made us a prosperous people and given us a high place among nations.

If we look abroad for a market we ought first to turn our attention to securing control of, or at least an equal share with other nations in, the markets of this hemisphere. They are already valuable and steadily growing more so. There is a wonderful increase in the wealth and population of the South American states, and a growth in trade, industry, and all the peaceful arts which gives promise of a rich commerce. But to-day we fall behind Great Britain, France, Germany, and even Belgium in our trade with most of these states. Last year the exports of the Argentine Republic amounted to the sum of $69,835,000 and her imports to $95,408,000, and her trade with the countries named stood as follows:

Country.	Imports from.	Exports to.
Great Britain	$33,432,660	$10,071,850
France	17,022,038	22,342,183
Germany	8,044,875	6,950,908
Belgium	7,721,817	10,924,737
United States	7,673,284	3,580,466

In 1886-'87 the exports of Brazil to Great Britain amounted to $32,410,720, and her imports from Great Britain to $34,378,435, while her exports to the United States were $52,593,716, and her imports from the United States were only $8,071,653, a balance against us of $44,522,063. For the same year the exports of Chili to Great Britain amounted to $11,387,185, and her imports from that country to $8,041,985, while her exports to us amounted to $2,863,233, and her imports from us to but $1,393,725. Our trade with these three countries is fairly representative of our trade with all the countries of that continent. There are twelve lines of steamers from the Argentine Republic to Europe, and an ocean cable to London, but none to the United States. This tells the story of European supremacy in the markets of these States. To secure the trade of these countries we must offer them as good if not better facilities for an exchange of products than they enjoy with Europe.

To do this we must have our own ships and be able to establish as many steam-ship lines as their commerce demands. But we have no ships and we find the ocean covered with the subsidized ships of Great Britain, France, Germany, and other nations, and independent of the subsidies with which these nations protect their commercial marines, we find that because of the high price of American labor we can neither build nor sail ships as cheaply as they, and consequently can not compete with them in the carrying of even our own trade. In this situation there is but one of two things to do—sit still and do nothing as we have been doing for so many years, or else by subsidy build up a commercial marine as we have built up our system of internal transportation, by unlimited appropriations to railroads and for the improvement of rivers and harbors—subsidies that will enable us to compete successfully with other nations for the carrying trade of the world.

But at this point the Democratic party meet us again with the constitutional objection—a want of power. I would find the power in that fair and reasonable construction of that instrument of which I have spoken, which gives it effect not only according to its letter but its spirit, and I believe with Col. J. R. G. Pitkin, whose language I now quote from a speech recently delivered by him before the National Convention of the American Shipping and Industrial League at New Orleans, that—

> A nation by its right to be, to conserve itself, must expand its powers; and it loyally construes its charter when it regulates commerce to that end. The Constitution that belted a union of thirteen States must be let out to the girth of the great nation which is not to be emaciated and stifled by a narrow construction of the letter that is perfidy to the spirit. It is not an instrument in which can be found by remote implication an intent or sanction to waste our substance on foreign fleets in an annual drain of $150,000,000, or to divest from our labor the legitimate dues by which it may be a nerved, sanguine, steadfast American force to compel wide elbow room in the world.

The only remedy the Democratic party suggests to relieve the unhappy condition of our commercial marine is what they call "free ships;" which means that we shall abandon ship-building—let it become to us one of the lost arts—and buy our ships on the Mersey and the Clyde, forgetting that subsidies to foreign ships still shut us out of the field of competition. What better use could be made of the surplus than to employ it in building up our shipping and in preparing the way for our admission on equal terms to the foreign market which our greatly increasing production renders so desirable? We can not afford to give up our own home market for the chance of a foreign market, or even in exchange for it; yet wise statesmanship requires us to inaugurate such measures as will in the no distant future secure to us equal advantages in the markets of the world. Let the "surplus" be devoted to rebuilding the Navy; to restoring our commercial marine to the proud position it once occupied; to the development and improvement of internal transportation; to the payment of liberal pensions to the old soldiers, who have made all the promise of our future possible, and the people will not complain; they will sanction and approve it all.

Notwithstanding the frightful pictures of distress growing out of excessive taxation to which we have been treated in the course of this debate, no man can lay his finger upon a single instance of real distress resulting from national taxation, and the people are nowhere complaining of it. In its daily round the sun does not shine on a more prosperous country than this, and their fancy pictures of distress are mere creations of the imagination, intended for use in the coming political campaign. A gentleman on the other side, from the State of Texas, complains that, admitting we pay higher wages than any other country, yet, to use his own language—

> It is also an established fact that the laborer in the United States can not, as a general rule, save anything from the result of his toil at the end of each year.

And adds—

> Then what is the difference between earning $1 per day or 10 cents per day, if the result is the same, namely, sufficient to eat to preserve life, and sufficient to wear to protect the body?

It is Buchanan's doctrine of 10 cents a day come again. This statement may fairly represent the condition of labor in the gentleman's State, and in the South generally, for some little observation in that region prepares me to believe it, and I am willing he shall confess for his section of the country, but not for mine. In no sense does his statement truly represent the condition of labor in Ohio, or anywhere north of Mason and Dixon's line. The deposits in the Northern savings-banks and in building associations refutes it, and it is absolutely refuted by the surroundings of comfort, convenience, and even of ornament and taste with which the homes of labor are filled in the North, whether on the farm, at the furnaces, or at the factories. Nowhere else in the world has labor such surroundings. You may find squalor and wretchedness in certain quarters of every great city, but there is no "general rule," as stated by the gentleman, applicable to the labor of the North.

Every man familiar with Northern life will bear testimony to the truth of what I say, and the census of 1880 shows that no more than 1 in 505 of the people of the Northern States receives public relief, while in England in 1868 about 1 in every 18 persons was in receipt of parochial relief. In the city where I reside, most of the men of family, who earn their living by labor in its numerous workshops and factories, own their homes, which they have purchased from the savings of their labor, and because of these savings small properties of $1,000 and less in value are almost as marketable as wheat and corn, and I undertake to say that this is not unusual in the towns and cities and in the country places of the North. The earnings of our labor have made it intelligent, independent, and self-respecting, as befits men who are charged with the responsible duties of a citizenship such as ours, and it demands a continuance of the policy which has protected it against the underpaid, underfed, and degraded labor of the old world, and if not heard now, will be heard in November. This is labor's battle and labor will decide it.

Petitions come here from the men in the mills, the factories, and workshops of the country, from the manufacturers who give them employment, from the farmers and stock-raisers, from the lumbermen, and

from the miners, asking for the preservation of this policy and for the defeat of the Mills bill as the forerunner of its destruction; but where are the petitions from the people anywhere in all the land asking for a reduction of tariff duties? Who is it that inspires this crusade against the industries of the country? Not the farmers, not the manufacturers, not the workingmen; no, not these, but would-be political economists, with learning enough to be dangerous; disciples of Calhoun, who have never been charged with the responsibilities of government until within the last three years, and whose knowledge of any industrial system is of one that is dead and into which the question of wages never entered, and English emissaries of free trade, organized for the conquest of the American market.

From these come the inspiration for this warfare against the prosperity of the country. These men have control of the Democratic party and our safety lies in depriving it of the power it so abuses, and which was so improvidently placed in its hands. That day is near at hand. The men who toil, the old soldiers of the Union, and all those who intelligently and sincerely desire the continued prosperity of the country will have their innings in November next, and will re-establish the American policy, the policy of Henry Clay, the policy of the old Whig party, and of the Republican party, on foundations so firm that even the Bourbon Democracy will be convinced of the futility of ever again assailing it. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to occupy any of the time of the committee in the discussion of the pending bill. Its merits, if any merit it has, and its demerits, and they are to my mind many and glaring, were so well known to every gentleman on this floor whom I could hope to reach or influence by anything I might say that any suggestions on my part seemed not needed. My mind has not changed on that score. But, Mr. Chairman, last evening I received such a petition from many hundreds of people in my district protesting against the passage of this most unjust, unwise, and uncalled-for measure that I am impelled to say a word in presenting it to the American Congress. This petition, Mr. Chairman, is signed by many hundreds of people in my little city who know what labor is. They live by the toil of their own hands. Glad am I to say that they are intelligent people. They understand the meaning of protection. They know what the passage of the Mills bill means to them, they know what it means to all American workingmen, and they raise their voices by this petition in solemn protestation against its passage.

Look at this petition, gentlemen of the majority. Its length is measured by yards and its signers are numbered by hundreds, and yet this is not the only petition of like tenor presented by me to Congress.

Thousands of laboring men in the district I have the honor to represent are begging Congress to defeat this bill. They are workers of wool and of cotton, of iron and of glass, the mechanic and the farmer. Mr. Chairman, do they stand alone in making this request? Need I make answer? Why, sir, the term of the gentleman from Texas is hardly long enough to enable him to count the number of names of those throughout this prosperous land who have invoked Congress by petition not to disturb our industries, not to cripple our manufactures, not to place our happy and contented and prosperous working people on a level with those less favored in other lands by the passage of the Mills bill.

These petitioners are not confined to any district or any State. Why, sir, I have received remonstrances even from the State of Texas. Is it because these petitioners are outnumbered by those favoring the passage of the bill that no heed is paid to them by the gentlemen across the aisle? Is it because the districts represented on this floor by Democrats are asking for its passage that a deaf ear is turned by the gentlemen of the majority to this petition I present, and hundreds of others like it?

Mr. Chairman, I do not recall that a single petition has been presented asking for the passage of the Mills bill. When the American people are interested they let that interest be known. If the people of these United States, or any considerable number of them, desired the passage of the Mills bill, think you, sir, they would have remained so long silent? Has not nearly every gentleman on this floor received many petitions in reference to the copyright bill, the pension bills, the educational bill, the swamp-land bill, the direct-tax bill, and numerous other measures now pending before the House? Have we not all received protests against this bill? If petitions have been sent here favoring its passage they have been smothered in obscurity.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard no farmers crying for the passage of this bill; nor do I believe I will while nine-tenths of their products are used for home consumption. I have heard no laboring man ask for its passage. Do you think, sir, they will so petition while their wages approximate double those paid in every other country on the globe?

Who is it, then, that wants the provisions of the Mills bill enacted into law? Ah, sir, I believe that question will be answered next November in no uncertain tones. I believe the verdict of the people at the polls will answer, "Not the American people, but the British free-traders and their allies." [Applause.]

Mr. STRUBLE. Mr. Chairman, I have sought this opportunity during the continuance of this extended, and in some respects remarkable, debate to give expression to some of the views entertained by me concerning this bill, and also concerning the policy of this Administration on the subject-matter thereof, and on a question intimately connected with the proposed revision of the tariff. Not that I shall enter upon a lengthy discussion of the latter, but that before this controversy closes I may state some of the things I would like to see done in the way of revising the inequalities of our present tariff law in harmony with the declarations of my party and the best and wisest sentiments of a majority of its thoughtful people. Nearly five sessions of experience in this body has taught me how difficult it is to accomplish the most inconsequential legislation if a single one of the three hundred and twenty-five members of the House sets himself actively and persistently at work to prevent that legislation.

How many of the hundreds who have from time to time been members of the lower branch of Congress have realized most emphatic, if not bitter, disappointment when, on assuming their relation with the House of Representatives of the United States of America, they found themselves surrounded on all sides by insurmountable walls in the name and form of rules, constructed by their antecedent legislators, ostensibly for the purpose of facilitating deliberation and legislation, but effectuating the most complete legislative tyranny possible to conceive! I can not answer, but know I am within the bounds of truth when I surmise their number to be "legion;" so when I wish to put upon record some of the changes I would like to see made in our existing law, or in the so-called Mills bill before it shall, if ever, become a law, I am sensible how unreasonable may be the hope that such changes as I may desire, if their wisdom were conceded by a large majority of the present membership of the House, will be made either in existing statute or pending bill. Notwithstanding the difficulties in the way, however, each member has his individual duty to perform, his responsibility here and elsewhere to meet, and for one I shall hesitate not in doing the best I can to make plain my position.

Mr. Chairman, among the few things—some commendable, some despicable—done by this Administration there are at least three for which it can not escape if it would the condemnation of a majority of the most thoughtful and intelligent people of the country. For three attacks, neither of which involved the least exposure to physical danger, this Administration will be justly celebrated. First, the attack on the silver dollar; second, that upon the outstanding greenbacks, and, third, that upon the protective system under which this Government has grown and prospered, and by reason of which, as we on this side of the Chamber believe and declare, she has attained financially, commercially, intellectually, and nationally the proud distinction accorded her by the civilized world. The first attack, as all gentlemen present remember, was begun early.

Indeed, it appears that so much was the President-elect wrought upon by his own fears, or the importunities of influential single standard gold men of the country—which on this precise point practically means New York City—that prior to the time when, under the Constitution and laws, he could officially say or do anything, the country was amused and surprised to find that he, on February 24, 1885, had deliberately written certain prominent members of his party then in the House of Representatives, urging them, by indirect if not direct words, to a repeal of the law of February 28, 1878, under and by virtue of which the regular monthly purchase and coinage of silver dollars are being carried on. This, sir, was a most remarkable spectacle, the like of which I do not recall.

How this early, this pre-official attack upon the financial system of the country was followed up by the Administration is readily shown by reference to the first official communication of the President to Congress—his first annual message.

Now, sir, while I do not intend to discuss for one moment the silver question as related to our present coinage laws, and only wish, as indicating an opinion, to make brief declaration of my sympathy with the principle of bi-metallism, I can not forbear, in view of the bitter—I had almost said venomous—attacks made upon our tariff system by the Administration and by the great majority of the Democrats in the House and in the Senate since this debate began, calling attention to this first assault of the President upon the silver currency of the country.

As a text to this immediate discussion a wild and apparently deep-felt alarm was sounded. Uttered by the President in his last partial annual message to Congress—reference to every other subject of national or international concern being spurned as unworthy in comparison with the one thing forming the alpha and omega of this state paper—the cry has been iterated and reiterated over and over again during this debate that our whole land is in peril most imminent and threatening.

Why, Mr. Chairman, to read the message attacking protection, and the Democratic vociferations of calamities now on the country, and every day augmented at most fearful rate, if one accepted as literally true either the President's extreme utterances, or discarding those, the wild, fanatical, and vicious declamations of many of the free-traders who have spoken since this debate began, he would conclude at once that this country is going straight to perdition by the shortest route possible.

Now, I say upon the history of this Administration, already of more than three years' duration, that these cries are those of alarmists in high places and nothing more.

To prove this let me briefly recur to the policy and utterances of the Administration on the silver question.

I have already cited the unusual, pre-official attack made, and indicated that it was thereafter officially followed up.

Let us refer to the first message of President Cleveland to Congress, turning to pages 22 and 23 of the messages and documents of 1885 and 1886 as printed, and we will find such sentences as these:

The necessity for such an addition to the silver currency of the nation as is compelled by the silver-coinage act is negatived by the fact that up to the present time only about fifty millions of the silver dollars so coined have actually found their way into circulation, leaving more than one hundred and sixty millions in the possession of the Government, the custody of which has entailed a considerable expense for the construction of vaults for its deposit. * * *

Every month two millions of gold in the public Treasury are paid out for two millions or more of silver dollars, to be added to the idle mass already accumulated. If continued long enough this operation will result in the substitution of silver for all the gold the Government owns applicable to its general purposes. * * * The proportion of silver and its certificates received by the Government will probably increase as time goes on, for the reason that the nearer the period approaches when it will be obliged to offer silver in payment of its obligations, the greater inducement there will be to hoard gold against depreciation in the value of silver, or for the purpose of speculation.

This hoarding of gold has already begun. When the time comes that gold has been withdrawn from circulation there will be apparent the difference between the real value of the silver dollar and a dollar in gold, and the two coins will part company. * * * The hoarding of gold which has already taken place indicates that we shall not escape the usual experience in such cases.

So, if this silver coinage be continued, we may reasonably expect that gold and its equivalent will abandon the field of circulation to silver alone. This, of course, must produce a severe contraction of our circulating medium, instead of adding to it. * * *

And on pages 25 and 26 of this same publication will be found such sentences as these:

We have now on hand all the silver dollars necessary to supply the present needs of the people and to satisfy those who from sentiment wish to see them in circulation; and if their coinage is suspended, they can be readily obtained by all who desire them. If the need of more is at any time apparent, their coinage may be renewed. * * *

That disaster has not already overtaken us furnishes no proof that danger does not wait upon a continuation of the present silver coinage. We have been saved by the most careful management and unusual expedients, by a combination of fortunate conditions, and by a confident expectation that the course of the Government in regard to silver coinage would be speedily changed by the action of Congress. Prosperity hesitates upon our threshold because of the dangers and uncertainties surrounding this question. Capital timidly shrinks from trade, and investors are unwilling to take the chance of the questionable state in which their money will be returned to them, while enterprise halts at a risk against which care and sagacious management do not protect. * * * I recommend the suspension of the compulsory coinage of silver dollars, directed by the law passed in February, 1878.

A year passed. The following message contained a brief reference to the coinage of silver and to the views expressed in his first communication to Congress, which were reaffirmed. Another year passed, and the subject of silver coinage was wholly ignored.

It may be the "hoarding of gold" referred to by the President has not only been commenced and continued in some parts of the country, and that somewhere in some secluded spot of "gold bugs" gold and silver have, as the President predicted, parted company, and it may be perilous, crushing times have come somewhere, but I want to say most emphatically that such conditions as the President prophesied have not come to pass in my section of the country. Why, sir, as matter of every-day fact, there has been more gold in the safes and on the counters of the bankers of Northwest Iowa since the above-quoted words were written than I ever knew of before in that part of the country.

If you had gone into any of the banks doing a general business in the district I have the honor to represent at any time during the past three years you would have seen, as can be seen now, plenty of gold, and the banks can hardly put it out, because people, under the magnificent financial system enacted by the Republican party, know that for every practical purpose of trade and financial transaction a paper dollar serves them as well as either gold or silver and is vastly more convenient to handle. In the light of this indisputable fact of the presence of an abundance of gold on the counters of the bankers of the West, what becomes of the great hue and cry of the President that silver was fast driving out gold; that the gold was fast being hoarded, and would soon disappear from the sight of all but the miserly hoarders of it.

What has become of the prediction of the President that financial and commercial disaster would follow unless the coinage of the silver dollar was suspended? Despite local disturbances and local failures to realize the measure of prosperity hoped for, the fact remains that in the grand West at least railroad and town building, entries upon and purchase of land have gone on at rapid rate, and while the farmers of the country have not realized as much for their farm products as they desired, nor as they ought, yet I deny that during these years following this alarm sounded by the President, they have been, as some here have essentially depicted, going pell-mell to the poor-house.

But I shall recur to the farmers later on in my remarks.

Now, I maintain that this plentifulness of gold in the West, in every bank, large or small, engaged in a general business, could not have existed during all this time since the President sounded his excited alarm, and announced the "parting of company" of the two metals, the hoarding of gold and its disappearance from sight, were it not that our general condition of trade and finance has been fairly good.

If the general condition of the country in regard to the existence of an ample gold fund in the hands of bankers may be properly estimated by the condition of the National Treasury as to gold receipts during the past four years, there would seem to be no fear of early disappearance of "shining shekels."

On November 1, 1884, there were in gold in the National Treasury..	$134,670,790
On November 1, 1885	142,598,569
On November 1, 1886	158,537,179
On October 1, 1887	192,567,181

Or a gain of nearly $60,000,000.

The last monthly statement of the Treasurer is not at hand, but the one of date of March 31, 1888, shows a net gold coin and bullion balance in the Treasury of $218,818,253.63, while the net silver balance was only $43,886,782.09. I am aware that this is not a decisive criterion by which to judge the accuracy of the President's predictions, and that to present such complete criterion might demand a full survey of the field of trade and finance, the condition of our exports and imports of the precious metals; but, inasmuch as I have only sought to prove there was no just occasion for the deep apprehension felt by the President in forecasting such near and direful consequences unless the coinage of silver should be immediately abated, the above reference is, in my judgment, quite sufficient.

The Administration's second attack was made upon the few million of "greenbacks" still in circulation and use among the people. Not only must silver go if the Administration can have its way, but the "greenbacks" must go quickly and not stand much on the order of their going.

Why, Mr. Chairman, when I have listened to these many, very many, iterations and reiterations from Democrats of this House and elsewhere, as they sound the praises ascribed this Democratic administration—how it is the government of the poor man, the foe of monopoly, the guardian angel of the "meek and lowly" as against the high and crafty, the rich and exacting—to all this nonsense that has flowed like an almost ceaseless current of sickening self-adulation I have felt, in the face of the solemn facts, like turning away in shame and disgust.

In his reply to the House resolution of February 3, 1886, reported by Mr. BLAND, calling him to inform the House, among other things,—

What amount of silver dollars was in the Treasury on the 4th day of March last that could have been applied in the payment of the interest-bearing debt and other dues of the Government, and what amount of such dollars is now held in the Treasury that could be so applied; also, what amount of silver certificates is held in the Treasury that could be reissued; also, what amount of interest-bearing debt is now subject to call, and will the same policy be pursued in the payment of silver thereon and on other public dues as in the past?—

Mr. Manning, then Secretary of the Treasury, after having referred to the number of silver dollars then in the Treasury, and answering the question as to what application could be made of those accumulating in the Treasury, said:

As to what application "could" be made of them—

Note the irony—

being questioned, I respectfully answer, besides what is elsewhere said, that by careful management, so as neither to contract the currency nor to force a silver basis, these silver dollars might all, in time, be applied to withdraw and cancel the United States notes, which are "other dues of the Government" now payable. But my power to do so is left in doubt by the act of May 31, 1878. I therefore suggest its repeal, in order to provide a larger use for silver. * * * No other part of the public debt is subject to call at the option of the United States before September 1, 1891, except the United States notes, to the payment of which in coin or its equivalent (besides the redemption which has been kept up since 1878) the faith of the United States was solemnly pledged in the act of March 18, 1869. The amount of these notes now subject to call is $346,773,116. * * * A reform of the currency, coupled with the payment of the two sums now alone payable at the option of the United States prior to September, 1891—

Meaning the residue of the 3 per cent. bonds, loan of July 1, 1882, amounting to $174,092,100, and the "greenbacks"—

would constitute a financial achievement exceeding any other which has heretofore been attempted within such a period of time.

It is true no formal attempt was made thereafter to summarily dispose of—pay off and cancel the $346,000,000 of the paper currency then and now in circulation—the remnant of that vast volume of similar paper money issued by the Government during the memorable struggle of 1861 to 1865; it is also true that the Secretary who penned the above condemnation of the remaining paper-currency issue not wholly based on coin has, since then, passed to his final resting-place; but the official act clearly expressing the hostility of this administration to the "greenbacks" of the nation remains. The attack was most seriously made, and the disposition to go the full measure that Wall street might wish disclosed.

The third attack, as I have seen fit to enumerate them in the beginning of my remarks, is that made by the President in his last annual message, and now being most vigorously and tenaciously supported by the free-trade members of this body upon the principle of economics so well defined by the word "protection." And while I would deplore success on the part of the Democratic party to seriously endanger this principle as applied in the collection of our necessary revenue, yet I must say I have experienced a profound satisfaction in the fact that now and hereafter during the approaching Presidential campaign, and I trust subsequent thereto and during the period of the existence of the present great competing parties, we are to know where the Democratic party as a party stands on this question; for whatever the mere verbal statement of the next Democratic platform may be, the position of that party is now more clearly defined by Presidential and Democratic

Congressional utterance than ever before, and no skillful manipulation of words at St. Louis whereby, as in the last national platform of that party, the protectionists in the East and the free-traders in the West could, and did, with apparent equal sincerity, maintain that the party was committed to one or the other principle as was necessary to allure the elector, can, in the coming campaign, obscure the fact or deceive men of ordinary intelligence as to the real attitude of the Democratic party toward this important issue. The fearless and able defense of the protective principle made by such Democratic members as RANDALL, FORAN, MCADOO, and a few others—members of this House—can not break the force attaching to the President's message and the great volume of Democratic utterance in the two Halls of Congress in support of it.

I say, then, welcome be the day, and all the days in political discussion, when the country on this question of tariff shall be able unmistakably to locate each of the great parties correctly, and know, as they must, that the one means unyielding opposition to protection and the advocacy of free trade, the other the same intense and uncompromising allegiance to that principle which has, in every platform since the organization of the Republican party, marked its history and will continue to be one of its cardinal doctrines to the end of its days.

Of the so-called Mills bill let me here say that while I entertain strong feeling that Congress should revise the existing tariff so as to bring about such an administration of our revenue system, both of customs duties and internal revenue, as will promise relief from so large a surplus in the future, I can not and will not support this bill unless materially amended; and while doubting that, in the condition of the legislative mind as it exists in the House at this time, it will be possible to secure such amendments as will make it acceptable, it appears to me to be my duty to favor its consideration through the various parliamentary stages of discussion, both general and under the five-minute rule, in the hope that eventually it may come forth bearing far less resemblance to its former self and presenting a face and form in no feature of which may be traceable the strong lines of free-trade venom which now so seriously disfigure it. Therefore, if at the conclusion of general debate the opponents of the measure shall attempt to have the enacting clause of the bill stricken out, as was done in the Forty-eighth Congress in relation to another bill relating to this subject, I shall deem it my duty to vote with those who favor further consideration, at the same time declaring that, unless amended in nearly all the particulars hereafter named, it shall receive, on the attempt to pass it, my emphatic negative.

The great demand of the hour is such legislation, not alone of revision of the tariff and internal-revenue laws, but of wise and judicious appropriations as will reduce the large excess now existing and prevent future unnecessary accumulations in the public Treasury.

I agree that the existence of an ample public purse should lead to no unjustifiable and unnecessary expenditure of the public money, but with this fact in mind I am free to say that there are some objects of national concern requiring outlays of money which may well receive the attention of Congress at this time.

First among these objects as they appear to my mind is a just enlargement and readjustment of our pension laws with a view to the administration of a larger measure of justice to the men who, by reason of service in the Army during the late war, are now maimed or diseased to an extent unfitting them partially or totally to earn a livelihood for themselves and those legally dependent upon them. And by this is meant not only a more liberal allowance to those who have and can establish their claims under existing laws and rules of the Department, but also ex-soldiers who, while, strictly speaking, unable to connect their present disabilities with army service, can show conclusively that their present ailments are not due to their own immoral and vicious habits, but to other causes for which they may not be responsible, and hence placing them where they may well receive reasonable aid from the Government.

To this class, irrespective of any disability of a pensionable degree, I would add every one of our living soldiers, who, being in the service and line of duty, was captured and incarcerated more than thirty days in any of the Southern prisons. These men, while in a position in which capture was a well-understood incident of war, and as to which they knew on enlistment they would stand in danger, nevertheless I contend they can not reasonably be held to the understanding that the imprisonment to which they might, on capture, be subjected, would not be in accordance with civilized warfare, and that they would be starved to death in dens and pens of disgusting, sickening filth, nor that their terms of confinement might, for any reason of public policy, if such was ever the case, be unduly lengthened because of any failure, avoidable or unavoidable, to effect their timely exchange, and thereby, and by reason of the inhuman hardships to which they were by their captors subjected, the chances of their final deliverance so much curtailed as to amount to a most serious lessening of the possibilities of life.

To this class, then, I would immediately grant reasonable pensions, to be in addition to any pension they may now draw by reason of any specific ailment or wound.

From my standpoint I venture to say that the sense of justice which in the Forty-ninth Congress led a Democratic House and Republican Senate to pass a dependent-pension bill in aid of the dependent soldiers of the late war, their widows and orphans, more nearly met the approval of the loyal people of this country than the act of the President that prevented the action of Congress becoming effectual.

A bill in the same Congress granting a qualified service pension to every soldier, sailor, or marine who, being sixty-two years of age, served in the war with Mexico fourteen days, or was, during their enlistment, *en route* to the seat war, passed the same Congress and was a well understood companion piece of legislation with the vetoed dependent-pension bill above referred to. This measure gave not less than 65 per cent. of the amount appropriated to Southern men, regardless of the fact whether they were rebels during the late war or not, always excepting the chief traitor.

This bill was readily sanctioned by the President; the other, providing very similar benefits for the Union soldier, was apparently as readily denied Executive sanction. Not only so, but a strong effort is now being made to enlarge the scope of the Mexican pension bill, and no doubt it will be done soon after the next election. Now, in view of all this, what is the manifest duty of Congress? Let the bill now pending on the report of the House Committee on Invalid Pensions on Senate bill No. 181, entitled "An act granting pensions to ex-soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to dependent relatives of deceased soldiers and sailors," be soon taken up and passed that the many and deserving people coming within its terms may know that the Congress of the United States holds in further remembrance the invaluable services of dependent ex-Union soldiers as well as those more unfortunate than they. Finally, but most emphatically, on this subject let the limitation upon the arrears of pension for disability be removed; its continuance is a disgrace to the Republic. I note with pleasure the report filed to-day on that subject, though I have not yet examined it. Next to these classes may be enumerated suitable improvement of the navigation of all important and navigable rivers and harbors, and the construction of suitable, substantial, and enduring public buildings in our larger cities, where the public interests are great by reason of large postal service, or in addition thereto the courts of the United States are permanently located.

Other manifestly worthy objects of public care and the public revenue might be enumerated, but these may suffice to indicate my views generally on the subject of appropriations. But all these being provided for from time to time, as can be done—and certainly it can not all be done in one year, nor two even, but will require many—there will yet remain at the present rate of national income, as I am led to believe, a considerable sum of money more than will be disbursed in the usual appropriations, and indeed, millions more than will be required. How shall this unnecessary amount be prevented from further lodgment in the vaults now so weary, if we may believe our Democratic free-traders, of their contents? We will see.

I count it one of the marked features of our present tariff law that not only the manufacturers and producers in other lines, but that our farmers are not forgotten. Here is the list of articles in which the farmer deals and the rate of duty according to existing law:

Animals, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Beef and pork, 1 cent per pound. Hams and bacon, 2 cents per pound. Meat, extract of, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Cheese 4 cents per pound. Butter, and substitutes therefor, 4 cents per pound. Lard, 2 cents per pound. Wheat, 20 cents per bushel. Rye and barley, 10 cents per bushel. Barley, pearled, patent, or hulled, one-half cent per pound. Barley malt, per bushel of 34 pounds, 20 cents. Indian corn or maize, 10 cents per bushel. Oats, 10 cents per bushel. Corn meal, 10 cents per bushel of 48 pounds. Oatmeal, one-half cent per pound. Rye-flour, one-half cent per pound. Wheat flour, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Rice, cleaned, 2½ cents per pound; uncleaned, 1¼ cents per pound. Paddy, 1¼ cents per pound. Rice flour and rice meal, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Hay, $2 per ton. Honey, 20 cents per gallon. Hops, 8 cents per pound. Milk, preserved or condensed, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Pickles and sauces of all kinds, not otherwise specially enumerated or provided for in this act, 35 per cent. ad valorem. Potatoes, 15 cents per bushel of 60 pounds. Vegetables, in their natural state, or in salt or brine, not otherwise provided for, 10 per cent. ad valorem. Vegetables, prepared or preserved, of all kinds not otherwise provided for, 30 per cent. ad valorem. Currants, 1 cent per pound. Fruits preserved in their own juice and fruit juices, 20 per cent. ad valorem. Flax straw, $5 per ton. Flax, not hackled or dressed, $20 per ton. Flax hackled, known as "dressed line," $40 per ton. Tow of flax or hemp, $10 per ton.

What has become of this farmers' list of duties in the Mills bill? "Gone where the woodbine twineth," every one of them, except the following:

Rice. Rice flour. Paddy, or rice having outer hull on. Peanuts.

There is nothing mean about this; is there? Oh, no; every grain, all meats, vegetables, potatoes, hay, and, in short, everything the Northern farmer raises, dropped quietly out of the present dutiable list, while the great rice and less important peanut crop is duly cared for.

The great food supplies of one section utterly neglected, the great food product of the other section duly protected. Ah, what sublime equity.

And then the potato yield of Northern fields forgotten, while the gay and festive peanut "bobs up serenely," kindly sandwiched between rice and raisins on one side and mustard and cotton manufactures on the other. The peanut is a lucky little fellow. [Laughter.]

Take him up tenderly,
Pinch him with care,
Fashioned so slenderly,
Young, and so fair!
Peanut.

[Laughter.]

This Mills bill is truly odious, as has been said. It proposes to accomplish a reduction of revenue by dropping out the whole range of Northern farm products, placing some other articles on the free-list, reducing the duty on many other articles of home production, at the same time making but a slight reduction in the rate of duty on sugar, none on rice, and carefully favoring the Southern cotton-raiser by letting in his iron and steel cotton-ties free, and by making reduction on nearly all manufactured products. I am unmistakably opposed to any such sectional propositions.

I am also opposed to placing flax and its straw on the free-list, or to reducing the duty on the oil.

The people in my part of the country have for many years raised a considerable surplus of flax, and in the general depression of prices, and at times of partial failure of crops, they have found it of good reliance as to certainty of yield and price, and so much so as to have been most helpful in their years of hardship and trial in developing a new country. Large oil mills have been erected in Iowa, Minnesota, and other States west, and at Sioux City, in the district I have the honor to represent, one of the largest and finest mills in the country has recently been constructed and is now operated, thus, to a marked extent, eliminating a considerable per cent. of distance and charges from the list of fees usually taxed on shipment of flaxseed to distant points of manufacture and consumption. During the past sixty days I have received and presented to the House more petitions, bearing more numerous signatures of people residing in Northwest Iowa, praying that the duty on linseed oil be not reduced, than on any other subject since the commencement of my Congressional service in 1883, unless it be a single petition from laboring men. The proposition to alter the duty on flax its oil and fiber has, if I can estimate the sentiments of a large number of my constituents, met their positive and hearty disapproval.

I am also opposed to placing wool on the free-list. It is a farm product and represents the little surplus yield of too many families in the land for me to favor its being placed on that list. In the Forty-eighth Congress my vote was cast against restoring this commodity to the rate provided by the law of 1867. That did not seem to me to be necessary, and my convictions are most positive now that the farmers and stockmen who are engaged in this industry should not be compelled to take a level with the sheep-raisers of Australia and the South American countries; and particularly so in view of the large increase in the importations of wools and wool manufactures during the fiscal year of 1887.

On page 26 of the last report of the Secretary of the Treasury, among other articles on the dutiable list as to which there was an increase of importations as compared with the previous year, he gives the following:

Wools:	
Combing	$919,796
Carpet	1,978,295
Wool manufactures	3,481,399

These values do not represent increased price so much as of quantity, and, therefore, of value more largely based on increased importation.

Before passing from this subject, however, I would like to suggest to both the majority and minority of the Committee on Ways and Means whether such change can not be made in any bill that may become law, if any shall this Congress, in respect of the basis of duty on wool, as will give to the River Platte country an equal opportunity with other foreign countries to enter its wool in American ports. My information is that, by reason of the character of the soil and climate, the South American wool, while of average quality with that from Australia, takes on and retains a much larger quantity of filth, thereby increasing its weight out of proportion with the cleaner grades from other countries, and making it impossible of equally favorable entry with other wools of similar quality but carrying less of dirt.

This unintentional discrimination now existing against the South American wool is, I am satisfied, operating to retard the extent of our commerce with that country, and this is my reason for calling attention to it.

But my most serious objection to this bill, the asserted object of which is to reduce the annual revenue, is that it entirely overlooks the one article on the dutiable list in dealing with which in a statesmanlike manner more money can be at once saved to the entire people of the country, and not the least harm be done those now or hereafter to be engaged in the production or handling of the commodity, than in dealing with any other article on that list.

I refer to sugar. In the annual statements of receipts and expenditures of the Government, actual or estimated, made by the Secretary of the Treasury from year to year, the form adopted and long maintained has become a familiar one. For instance, the estimated revenues of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, as stated on page 7 of the last report of the Secretary of the Treasury, are:

From customs	$228,000,000
From internal revenue	120,000,000
From sales of public lands	10,000,000
And so on down the grade, amounting in all to	383,000,000

Therefore it is that a glance at such statement at once rivets the eyes on the two immense sums resulting from customs and internal revenue. True, the aggregate of estimates of receipts from other sources is considerable, but none of them seem to be of a character to invite special attack when searching for sources of revenue to be curtailed. If I am not in error no one in all this debate has made a specialty of singling out any one or more of these minor sources of revenue. The war has been waged on these two, the free-traders selecting the customs duties as primarily the ones to afford the remedy sought, and the extreme and most radical protectionists aiming their guns at the internal revenue.

For my part, I do not think the latter should be the first resort in seeking a remedy, but that the customs list, and first that article upon that list which presents the greatest inequality in respect of the cost to the consumer as compared with the number of people and the area of country protected by the present duty.

At this stage of my remarks I can not, in deference to my own convictions and what I firmly believe to be the convictions of a large majority of the people of Iowa, and also of the Republicans of that State, refrain from taking issue with my esteemed colleague [Mr. KERR], as well as with a distinguished Senator from Iowa now serving in the other legislative branch of the Government [Senator WILSON], and whose judgment and ability I hold in high regard, upon the propriety of abolishing the internal-revenue system, and particularly the tax on liquors.

Those gentlemen and myself are in accord upon the great question of State prohibition as now represented by the statutes of Iowa, and when in the rapid course of political events it is apparent that it will be wise to extend that question to the broader domain of national legislation—as to which may God speed the day—I expect, if we are all living, to be in harmony with them then; but, sir, notwithstanding the fact that many excellent men and women in Iowa and elsewhere believe that in taxing men who engage in the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors the Government thereby and in so doing becomes a sharer, a partner in the abominable traffic, I differ with them. Now, if in the consideration of this question it is to be viewed solely from a high moral point and in relation to ethics alone, I would take no issue with these gentlemen but at once coincide, but I am disposed to look at it in this light: Here is a National Government charged with the authority and responsibility under the Constitution of maintaining a system of revenue that shall in its operations occasion as little burden and hardship upon the people as possible.

In the exercise of this power that Federal Government, which is purely official, deals with thirty-eight States, some of which are widely separated, having local conditions and sentiments on many questions as widely different as their locations; each one possessing a sovereignty absolute and complete on the question of the administration of its police power, and therefore each alone possessing the sole authority to decide what its policy shall be, whether to license or tax liquors and those who manufacture or sell them, or entirely prohibit such manufacture and sale. Bearing this in mind, we must agree that tobacco and liquors have, during much of our history, been treated as proper articles of taxation, particularly when large sums of money had to be raised; and both these commodities being of a class not necessary as food or sustenance for the body, while large and increasing sums of money must be had for national support, I can not see, as a practical question of statesmanship, why the tax should at this time be in the least removed from liquors and dealers, unless as to some grades used in the arts and sciences, nor why it should be to any considerable extent removed from tobacco, cigars, cheroots, etc.

It is a well-known fact that but about five of the States in the Union have passed prohibitory statutes. As to such, if the present national law operates to interfere with the sovereignty of the State, or the enforcement of her laws passed to suppress intemperance, I make bold to say that such changes in our Federal laws should be made as will not so interfere with those of any State. But this is one question, and the right and justice of taxation as applied to these things under our federal system is another. Let us be sensible and practical in this, holding ourselves ready to move to higher ground morally when good sense dictates it can be done and should be done as matter of statesmanship.

Another thought, briefly. The expenses of Government in a general sense must necessarily increase as development and expansion go on. Large and growing sums of money will annually be needed. All of these should not be raised from customs duties. Perhaps it might not be going too far to make a change in the tobacco schedule, to reduce the rate on all kinds or clear chewing and plain smoking altogether; but certainly other kinds should nor be touched, and the taxes on liquors and dealers should be maintained unless as to such kinds of intoxicants as may be used in the arts and sciences or be made from fruits; but on this I do not now declare.

Turning now to sugar, let me say the amount of duty collected on sugar last year was in round numbers, $56,500,000, being an increase of the previous year of $6,000,000.

Sugar, sugar-candy, and molasses show an increase of exactly $6,237,738 over the year before. Except iron, steel, and manufactures, it exceeds the increase of nearly all other articles combined, and the increase over iron, steel, and their manufactures is nearly $200,000. so that it not only in and of itself presents the most striking inequality in point

of relation of annual amount of duty to home product, persons, and area protected, but it is the one as to which the annual income is most rapidly increasing.

This being the case, what should be done? I answer unhesitatingly, put sugar on the free-list and give a bounty equal to present rate of duty to all persons who shall produce in this country from canes or beets 500 pounds of good marketable sugar.

The question may be asked, do you favor a general system of bounty giving? I answer, no; but that whenever, as in this case, our home industries can be protected and new ones established and developed by giving a bounty I am in favor of giving it. Why, sir, as has already been shown in this debate, we can actually save $50,000,000 each year and not in least jeopardize a single sugar plant in the land. If the sugar industry of the South had exhibited during all these years the power of growth, of expansion, promising extensive enlargement, as has and does manufacturing, and in that condition needed protection, I would probably regard the case on all fours with that interest. The cases are wholly dissimilar. There is one fact in connection with sugar manufacturing in this country well understood by members of this body, but not, in so far as I am aware, sufficiently emphasized in this debate.

As a nation we are, in my opinion, on the eve of a great and successful era of sugar manufacture from sorghum cane, if not from sugar-beets.

It has not been very many years since manufacturing sugar profitably from beets was regarded impracticable, but now the entire success of that method is attested by the more than 600,000 tons produce in Germany, over 460,000 tons in Austria, 400,000 tons in France, over 300,000 tons in Russia, and over 125,000 tons in Holland; so that to-day one-half of the sugar product of the world is made from beets.

During the past five years, and particularly during 1887, under the supervision of the Department of Agriculture, such experiments have been made as fully justify the conclusion that sugar-making from sorghum cane as a profitable business is assured, and that a good article of sugar can be manufactured from cane grown in Kansas (and if in Kansas, then in Iowa, Missouri, Nebraska, and other States) as profitably as from another quality of cane in Louisiana.

As gentlemen present know, there has recently been issued by the Commissioner of Agriculture a pamphlet containing in detail reports from the several chemists who during 1887 conducted experiments at sugar-making at Fort Scott, Kans., Rio Grande, N. J., and Lawrence, La.

This pamphlet contains also such an interesting "historical sketch" of the sorghum plant and the various attempts to demonstrate its adaptability to successful sugar production that I deem it of interest to present it, to be printed as a part of my remarks. It was prepared by Professor E. B. Cowgill, appointed by the secretary of the State board of agriculture of the State of Kansas to inspect and report upon sugar manufactured under an act of the Legislature of Kansas of date March 5, 1887, entitled "An act to encourage the manufacture of sugar," and appropriating $15,000 to cover a bounty authorized by the act of 2 cents per pound upon all sugar manufactured in that State from "beets, sorghum, or other sugar-yielding canes or plants grown in Kansas."

The historical sketch is as follows:

The sorghum plant was introduced into the United States in 1853-'54 by the Patent Office, which then embraced all there was of the United States Department of Agriculture. Its juice was known to be sweet, and chemists were not long in discovering that it contained a considerable percentage of some substance giving the reactions of cane-sugar. The opinion that the reactions were due to cane-sugar received repeated confirmation in the formation of true cane-sugar crystals in sirups made from sorghum. Yet the small amounts that were crystallized, compared with the amounts present in the juices as shown by the analyses, led many to believe that the reactions were largely due to some other substance than cane-sugar.

EARLY INVESTIGATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

During the years 1878 to 1882, inclusive, while Dr. Peter Collier was chief chemist of the Department of Agriculture, much attention was given to the study of sorghum juices from canes cultivated in the gardens of the Department at Washington. Dr. Collier became an enthusiastic believer in the future greatness of sorghum as a sugar-producing plant, and the extensive series of analyses published by him attracted much attention from sugar-makers in the South and students of the chemistry of sugar throughout the country.

SUGAR FACTORIES ERECTED IN KANSAS.

Stimulated by the analytical results published by Dr. Collier, interested parties erected large sugar factories and provided them with costly appliances. Hon. John Bennyworth erected one of these at Larned, in this State. S. A. Liebold & Co. subsequently erected one at Great Bend. Both of these factories made some sugar, both lost money, and both quit the business.

Sterling and Hutchinson followed with factories which made considerable amounts of merchantable sugar at no profit.

The factory at Sterling was erected by B. M. Sandys & Co., of New Orleans, who sought, by combining Mr. Sandys's thorough knowledge of sugar with the best practical skill of the South, to establish the sorghum-sugar industry on a proper basis. For two seasons this combination worked faithfully, and while the sirup produced paid the expenses of the factory, not a crystal of sugar was made. The factory then in 1883 changed hands and passed under the superintendency of Professor M. A. Scovell, then of Champaign, Ill., who, with Professor Webb, had worked out in the laboratories of the Illinois Industrial University a practical method for obtaining sugar from sorghum in quantities which at prices then prevalent would pay a profit on the business. But prices declined, and after making sugar for two years in succession the Sterling factory succumbed.

The Hutchinson factory at first made no sugar, but subsequently passed under the management of Professor M. Swenson, who had successfully made sugar in the laboratory of the University of Wisconsin. Large amounts of sugar were made at a loss, and the Hutchinson factory closed its doors. In 1884 Hon. W. L. Parkinson fitted up a complete sugar factory at Ottawa and for two years made sugar at a loss. Mr. Parkinson was assisted during the first year by Dr. Wilcox, and during the second year by Professor Swenson.

INFORMATION GAINED.

Much valuable information was developed by the experience in these several factories, but the most important of all was the fact that with the best crushers the average extraction did not exceed half of the sugar contained in the cane. It was known to scientists and well-informed sugar-makers in this country that the process of diffusion was theoretically efficient for the extraction of sugar from plant cells, and that it had been successfully applied by the beet-sugar makers of Europe for this purpose.

FURTHER WORK OF THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

In 1883 Professor H. W. Wiley, chief chemist of the Department of Agriculture, made an exhaustive series of practical experiments in the laboratories of the Department on the extraction of the sugars from sorghum by the diffusion process. His report sums up the results of his experiments as follows:

"1. The extraction of at least 85 per cent. of the total sugars present was secured. In many of the experiments, as will be seen by consulting the table, scarcely a trace of sugar could be detected in the exhausted chips.

"2. The production of a quantity of melada represented by from 10.9 to 12.28 per cent. of the weight of the cane diffused.

"This was secured with a cane in which the total sugars did not exceed 11.68 per cent. The percentage of melada by this process will be found just about equal to the per cent. of total sugars in the cane.

"It ought to be greater with a more perfect extraction, but I am speaking only of results actually obtained.

"This yield is just about double that obtained by the large factories at Rio Grande, Campaign, and other places.

"3. The production of a juice of great purity, which lends itself easily to processes of depuration.

"I consider the experiments, however, to have their chief value in the fact that they will call the attention of cane-growers to the advantages which a rational system of diffusion will have over pressure in the extraction of the saccharine matter.

"I hope to be able at the end of another season to report further progress in this interesting problem.

"In the present condition of the sorghum-sugar industry, in which it has alike to be protected from the overzeal of its friends and the opposition of its enemies, the process of diffusion offers the most promising outlook for success. It therefore seems the duty of this division to make a more practical test of this process and on a larger scale."

To make the necessary further experiments with diffusion required the expenditure of large sums of money. As already shown, the private companies had lost heavily. They were utterly unable to complete the experiments so hopefully begun by the Department of Agriculture.

THE AID OF CONGRESS SOLICITED.

At this crisis Hon. W. L. Parkinson and Mr. Alfred Taylor, of Ottawa, Kans., after consulting with others interested in the then languishing sorghum-sugar industry, went to Washington to call the attention of Congress to the important results promised for the diffusion process, and to show that without the aid of an appropriation all that had hitherto been accomplished would be practically lost. The Kansas delegation in Congress became interested. Senator PLUMB made a thorough study of the entire subject, and, with the foresight of statesmanship, gave his energies to the work of securing an appropriation of $50,000 for the development of the sugar industry. This appropriation was made during the last days of the session of 1884. The season was too far advanced to erect and use the diffusion apparatus with sorghum-cane, and it was by the Commissioner of Agriculture sent to Louisiana, and sorghum got no benefit from this first appropriation.

ANOTHER APPROPRIATION.

In 1885 Senator PLUMB, at the request of Judge Parkinson, Professor Swenson, and others, again labored for an appropriation for experiments with diffusion. It was shown by Judge Parkinson and all others interested in the sorghum-sugar industry that this was the only hope for success. Fifty thousand dollars for this purpose was again added to the agricultural appropriation bill, on the amendment of Senator PLUMB. This was expended at Ottawa, Kans., and in Louisiana. The report of the work at Ottawa closes as follows:

"1. By the process of diffussion 98 per cent. of the sugar in the cane was extracted, and the yield was fully double that obtained in the ordinary way.

"2. The difficulties to be overcome in the application of diffusion are wholly mechanical. With the apparatus on hand the following changes are necessary in order to be able to work 120 tons per day: (*a*) The diffusion cells should be made twice as large as they are now; that is, of 130 cubic feet capacity. (*b*) The opening through which the chips are discharged should be made as nearly as possible of the same area as a horizontal cross-section of the cell. (*c*) The forced feed of the cutters requires a few minor changes in order to prevent choking. (*d*) The appartus for delivering the chips to the cells should be remodeled so as to dispense with the labor of one man.

"3. The process of carbonatation for the purification of the juice is the only method which will give a limpid juice with a minimum of waste and a maximum of purity.

"4. By a proper combination of diffusion and carbonatation the experiments have demonstrated that fully 95 per cent. of the sugar in the cane can be placed on the market either as dry sugar or molasses.

"5. It is highly important that the Department complete the experiments so successfully inaugurated by making the changes in the machinery mentioned above and by the erection of a complete carbonatation outfit.

"Respectfully,

"H. W. WILEY, *Chemist.*"

But while so much had been accomplished by the joint efforts of the United States Department of Agriculture and the Ottawa company, the financial results were so disastrous to the company as to leave them utterly unable to further cooperate with the Government in the prosecution of the work.

THE FORT SCOTT COMPANY ORGANIZED.

At this juncture Judge Parkinson saw that he must either submit to defeat or organize a new company to co-operate with the Department of Agriculture, should Congress be wise enough to make another appropriation. In this straight he went to Fort Scott and organized the Parkinson Sugar Company, which is now composed as follows: J. D. Hill, president; Eli Kearnes, vice-president; M. Swenson, secretary and chemist; W. Chenault, treasurer; W. L. Parkinson, manager; C. F. Drake, A. W. Walburn, W. W. Pusey, J. W. Converse, and David Richards.

Taking up the work where all others had failed, this company has taken a full share of the responsibilities and losses, until it has at last seen the Northern sugar industry made a financial success.

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES MAKES AN APPROPRIATION.

The report of 1885 showed such favorable results that in 1886 the House made an appropriation of $94,000, to be used in Louisiana, New Jersey, and Kansas. A new battery and complete carbonatation apparatus was erected at Fort Scott. About $60,000 of the appropriation was expended here in experiments in diffusion and carbonatation.

In his report Dr. Wiley arrived at the following conclusions:

"In a general review of the work the most important point suggested is the absolute failure of the experiments to demonstrate the commercial practicability of manufacturing sorghum sugar. The causes of this failure have been pointed out in the preceding pages, and it will only be necessary here to recapitulate them. They were—

"1. Defective machinery for cutting the canes and for elevating and cleaning the chips, and for removing the exhausted chips.

"2. The deterioration of the cane, due to much of it becoming overripe, but chiefly to the fact that much time would generally elapse after the canes were cut before they reached the diffusion battery. The heavy frost which came the 1st of October also injured the cane somewhat, but not until ten days or two weeks after it occurred.

"3. The deteriorated cane caused a considerable inversion of the sucrose in the battery, an inversion which was increased by the delay in furnishing chips, thus causing the chips in the battery to remain exposed under pressure for a much longer time then was necessary. The mean time required for diffusing one cell was twenty-one minutes, three times as long as it should have been.

"4. The process of carbonatation, as employed, secured a maximum yield of sugar, but failed to make a molasses which was marketable. This trouble arose from the small quantity of lime remaining in the filtered juices, causing a blackening of the sirup on concentration, and the failure of the cleaning apparatus to properly prepare the chips for diffusion."

THE COMMISSIONER OF AGRICULTURE DISCOURAGED.

After the expenditure of so much money, and the publication of so discouraging a report as that of 1886, the Commissioner of Agriculture declined to ask for further appropriations.* But Senator PLUMB again came to the rescue, and, by a faithful presentation of the possibilities of the case, induced Congress to make an appropriation of $50,000, of which $24,000 was apportioned to Louisiana, $6,000 to Rio Grande, N. J., and $20,000 to Fort Scott, Kans.†

SUCCESS AT LAST.

This year the Fort Scott management made careful selection of essential parts of the processes already used, omitted non-essential and cumbrous processes, availed themselves of all the experience of the past in this country, and secured a fresh infusion of experience from the beet-sugar factories of Germany, and attained the success which finally places sorghum-sugar making among the profitable industries of the country.

STATE ENCOURAGEMENT.

The State of Kansas had, by all reports, been indicated as the center of the sorghum-sugar industry when it should be developed. Kansas statesmen in the Legislature, as early as 1885, conceded that the State should assist in the development of the new industry. In that year Hon. R. F. Bond, member of the house from Rice County, prepared and introduced a bill providing for a bounty of 1½ cents per pound, to be paid out of the State treasury, on all sugar manufactured in the State for five years.

The bill awakened a great deal of enthusiasm, and at the same time a factious opposition, and was lost. At the session of 1887 Senator Bawden, of Bourbon County, introduced a bill providing for a bounty of 2 cents per pound to be paid upon all sugar manufactured in the State for five years, the maximum amount to be paid in any year being limited to $15,000. This bill became a law.

It will thus be seen that the present condition of the sorghum-sugar industry is due to private enterprise, aided by Government and State appropriations, and directed by scientific and practical skill.

COMMISSIONERS OF AGRICULTURE LE DUC, LORING, AND COLMAN.

It should be mentioned in this connection that United States Commissioner of Agriculture Le Duc extended a strong and friendly hand to the sorghum-sugar industry during his term of office. His successor, Commissioner Loring, had the work continued by Professor Wiley, but was himself skeptical as to results. The present Commissioner, Hon. Norman J. Colman, had been an advocate of sorghum for many years before his accession to office, and had probably written and published more on the subject than any other man in the United States. Every friend of the struggling industry was gratified at his appointment. He has extended all the aid at his command, and may justly feel proud of the attainment of the present success under his administration of the Department of Agriculture.

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE INDUSTRY.

The experiments in making sugar from sorghum, which, as above shown, have been in progress for several years at the expense of private capital and the United States Deparment of Agriculture, have this year reached so favorable results as to place the manufacture of sorghum sugar on the basis of a profitable business, as will be seen by the report to his company of Hon. W. L. Parkinson, manager of the Fort Scott works.

The success has been due to, first, the almost complete extraction of the sugars from the cane by the diffusion process; second, the prompt and proper treatment of the juice in defecating and evaporating; third, the efficient manner in which the sugar was boiled to grain in the strike pan.

On page 31 of said report the process of sugar-making from the sorghum cane as now developed is as follows:

First. The topped cane is delivered at the factory by the farmers who grow it.

Second. The cane is cut by a machine into pieces about ½ inches long.

Third. The leaves and sheaths are separated from the cut cane by fanning-mills.

Fourth. The cleaned cane is cut into fine bits called chips.

Fifth. The chips are placed in iron tanks, and the sugar "diffused"—soaked out with hot water.

Sixth. The juice obtained by diffusion has its acids nearly or quite neutralized with milk of lime, and is heated and skimmed.

Seventh. The defecated or clarified juice is boiled to a semi-sirup in vacuum pans.

Eighth. The semi-sirup is boiled "to grain" in a high vacuum in the "strike-pan."

Ninth. The mixture of sugar and molasses from the strike-pan is passed through a mixing machine into centrifugal machines, which throw out the molasses and retain the sugar.

After a very full presentation in detail of facts relating to this manufacture, Professor Cowgill concluded his report, as follows:

There seems to be no doubt but that there is here developed an industry of vast importance to our State and nation. For the year ending June 30, 1886, there was consumed in the United States, foreign grown and manufactured, sugar amounting to 2,989,881,765 pounds. If two thousand new sugar factories were at once erected, and each should produce an annual product of one and a quarter million pounds of sugar, they would not supply the place of the sugars now imported.

*The non-action of the Commissioner is misunderstood by Mr. Cowgill. When the House Committee on Agriculture made the appropriation of the preceding year it was agreed that no subsequent grant should be demanded. It was in harmony with this agreement and not for the reasons stated, that the Commissioner did not ask for a further appropriation.

†The distributton of the money to the various stations was left to the discretion of the Commissioner, and was not mentioned in the bill.

The annual consumption of sugar per capita in the United States is about 56 pounds. The population of Kansas may be taken as 1,500,000. These people consume each year—56 by 1,500,000 equal 84,000,000 pounds of sugar. It will be safe to say that the annual average product of the factories will not exceed 1,500,000 pounds; so that fifty-six factories will be required to supply the sugar consumed by the present population of Kansas, and for which they pay over $5,000,000 annually.

Processes whereby sugar can be made at a profit from sorghum have been worked out. These are far from perfect, but present developments give promise of others in the near future, and will enable us to produce our own sugar on our soil, with the labor of our people. Those who invest in the new industry will be cautious about experimenting with unknown conditions. Kansas is, therefore, likely to lead in the development and become the first Northern sugar State.

In view of these encouraging facts, who will venture to contradict when I make the prediction that within twenty years America will produce all the sugar her people consume. Why, then, should we hesitate to extend the reasonable aid of government to this new and wonderful industry? My own State, following the example of Kansas, has appropriated money to aid its development within her borders, and now, and in this presence, I declare myself ready to vote aid to the broader field—the entire country.

After disposing of sugar in this statesman-like manner, then let other articles on the dutiable list be carefully scanned with the view to a wise revision, and not a hasty destructive cutting and slashing at this or that article, as it may seem one section of the country may be able to slap the other in the face without being too seriously bruised in return. Let there be no boy's play about this matter, but a most careful, business-like consideration in broad daylight under the shining sun of noonday, and not in dark, impenetrable corners, within stone buildings carefully guarded against "the other side;" lest, perchance, the "tricks of the trade" be discovered.

Mr. Chairman, no person can more than touch here and there in one hour's discussion of the tariff. Numerous points of interest suggest themselves to my mind which I would like exceedingly to discuss. Many must necessarily be passed by in silence. I have noticed, however, that of the classes of people singled out in this discussion, the farmer, laboring man, and manufacturer are those receiving the most attention. The free-trader in profession is the devoted friend of the farmer, likewise of the laboring man. Oh, how he loves them! As the soul of Jonathan was knit to that of David, so, if you will let him tell it, is the soul of a free-trader knit to the farmer and laboring man; but these being thus knit together, according to the free-trader's imaginings, the manufacturer is the hated and destested Saul who is ever seeking to destroy them. I think I have shown how the Southern free-trader's soul in this case is "knit" to that of the farmer. The "knitting" is, in so far as every product of the farm is concerned, to the neglect of the farmer and pinning him to the free-list. Not in an open, frank, manly way, but by quietly dropping him out of sight as to practical benefits, while holding him up before him to smile upon and deceive, as matter of fact.

The manufacturer—that man or association of men engaged in lawful, honorable, and successful business, for whom every town or city East and West, and particularly in the West, is earnestly striving to have locate within the corporate limits, knowing well how much such enterprises properly conducted conduce to local prosperity and mutual business helpfulness—what a wretch is he in the eyes of his bitter foe, the free-trader!

Now, sir, there is one thing very patent to me in connection with the larger manufactories of whatsoever kind. Whatever the past, the time has come in the business history of this world when these extensive manufacturing interests can not be successfully carried on without putting together in the same enterprise large aggregations of capital. If it were possible to foresee events affecting any given industry, it can with truth be said that no man now so engaged could have been induced to thus subject his capital to the united purpose of a business if he could at the outset have seen not only that his reasonable annual accumulations might be uncertain, but that his capital would be exposed to certain loss, and no man or set of men now in any given manufacturing business will stay in it longer than they can not avoid, if it is certain they are not to make any money.

The success of all honorable, well-conducted business means the success of those immediately connected therewith as laborers and those engaged in other employments about them. So it is we of the West are laboring and planning to induce other gentlemen having money to come among us and build and operate enterprises that not only tend toward but do in fact enlarge the whole community's interests, and I am happy to say we are meeting with increasing success in this line. And let me say further that at the next census Iowa will surprise many of the incredulous in the growth of her manufacturing enterprises. The cities of that State, large and small, have been putting forth persistent efforts to secure capital from elsewhere than their immediate neighborhood to join with theirs in starting some new enterprise that should employ labor, and send forth blessings and good cheer not only, but add to the permanent property interests of those investing and the community. And I beg leave to cite one of the most striking illustrations of the success of this activity of our people.

In 1880 Sioux City had a population of 7,300. To-day she has over 30,000, and has witnessed a most marvelous growth and prosperity. How has this come? Not by accident. Not by waiting for the slow but sure development of the surrounding country alone. Mainly by

reason of the determination of her people to make Sioux City a financial, commercial, manufacturing railroad center, and with tireless energy and liberal donations of money and grounds her citizens have secured a large foundry, plow factory, vinegar works, bottling works, flouring mills, immense flax mills, and numerous other important industries, and finally, to cap all, in addition to an old and extensive pork factory, long in operation, during 1887 her citizens secured the location of four immense pork and beef establishments, two of which are now in operation, having already constructed large plants, one by Silverhorn, the other by Fowler Brothers, costing hundreds of thousands of dollars, thus making Sioux City the largest meat center west of Chicago; and if any of you gentlemen who hear me are skeptical on this subject just make a trip to this rapidly-growing, only corn palace city of the world, and you will thereafter affirm the truthfulness of my statements.

With only two lines of railroad in 1870, she now has, with branches, ten, and others building. I tell you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, no gloomy picture of poverty-stricken farm life will fit that part of the country. Since 1879, the year of the last grasshopper appearance, thousands of farms have opened in Northwest Iowa on lands costing from $4 to $10 per acre, which, with reasonable improvements added, are now well worth $20 to $50 per acre, and, sir, I am proud of this opportunity to utter words of merited praise of that interesting prosperous section of the country.

Mr. Chairman, I have noticed the free-trade taunt that our manufactories are along the seaboard and away off from the farmers of the West, and therefore they might as well be across the ocean. Out upon such miserable nonsense as this!

While, as all know, the great institutions of trade, and especially to manufactures of cottons, woolens, etc., were early planted near the Atlantic, and that there the great bulk of them by the very reasonable law of the case will remain, yet he who will not cast his eye over the States of the West and see their growth in manufacture is blind beyond cure. You of the other side say we of the West can not have successful manufacture, and I say you do not know or else sadly pervert the facts. The whole great West is rapidly increasing in manufacture.

To illustrate this fact I have chosen Indiana, the smallest of Western States in area, having only 36,350 square miles gross area, and not the largest in point of manufacturing interests, Illinois being among the most important of the whole country.

In 1850 the mechanical and manufacturing establishments numbered 4,392; capital invested in them, $7,750,402; hands employed, 14,440; amount paid in wages, $3,728,844; value of materials, $10,369,700; value of products, $18,725,423.

And in 1880 the following magnificent increase was shown to exist: Number of establishments, 11,198; capital, $65,742,962; hands employed, 69,504; amount paid in wages, $21,960,888; value of materials, $100,262,917; value of product, $148,006,411.

Referring to the first biennial report (seventh volume) of the department of statistics for 1885 and 1886, on pages 24 and 25, after stating a table of statistics from which the above are taken, the author, William A. Peelle, jr., proceeds to say:

By consulting the foregoing table it will be seen that during the thirty years the number of establishments has increased 175 per cent.; capital, 828 per cent.; hands employed, 392 per cent.; total wages paid, 600 per cent.; value of material, 900 per cent.; value of products, 722 per cent. Since 1880 the increase has been steady and gratifying, and the sum totals, if they could be accurately obtained, would give to Indiana a proud prominence in the manufacturing industries of the country. It should be understood that the 11,198 establishments enumerated in the foregoing table do not include the mining operations of the State, nor those engaged in railroad work, other than car building and repairs. It would be difficult to exaggerate the importance of the questions which directly relate to labor, and by which are meant those enterprises which employ working people at stipulated wages by the day, week, or month. Even in Indiana the question forms an interesting study, and when considered for the entire United States its importance is increased an hundred fold.

The following figures, taken from the reports already referred to, will give the reader an idea of the gigantic strides by which this interest has advanced in the United States in the past thirty years:

Years.	Establishments.	Capital invested.	Number of persons employed.
1850	123,025	$533,245,351	957,059
1860	140,433	1,009,855,715	1,311,246
1870	252,148	2,118,208,769	2,053,996
1880	253,825	2,790,272,600	2,738,895

Years.	Amount of wages paid.	Value of materials.	Value of product.
1850	$236,755,467	$555,123,822	$1,019,166,616
1860	378,878,966	1,001,605,092	1,885,861,676
1870	775,584,343	2,488,427,242	4,232,325,442
1880	947,953,795	3,896,823,549	5,369,579,191

It will be observed from the foregoing table that during the thirty years named the increase has been as follows: In establishments, 108 per cent.; in capital, 423 per cent.; in employés, 200 per cent.; in wages, 300 per cent.; in value of material, 500 per cent.; in product, 400 per cent. It will be gratifying to know that Indiana in manufacturing enterprises has kept abreast of the advancing column of progress in such matters, and this may be readily seen in a recapitulation of the per cents. of growth in the United States and Indiana:

	Per cent. in United States.	Per cent. in Indiana.
Establishments	108	175
Capital invested	423	828
People employed	200	392
Wages paid	300	600
Value of material	500	900
Value of product	400	722

Such results as are shown by the foregoing figures are in the highest degree creditable to Indiana. They demonstrate that the people of the State are in active sympathy with the spirit of advancement and improvement abroad in the world, and that the State has taken a position in labor affairs which calls for a department as an adjunct to this bureau that shall be devoted entirely to the collection, compilation, and arrangement of labor statistics.

Among the establishments making up the grand total of 11,885 in 1886, were 73 agricultural; capital in grounds, buildings, and machinery, $1,846,950; average number employés, 1,719; total annual wages, $1,112,724; total value of manufactured product, $3,147,135. Boots and shoes, 1,270 establishments; capital in building, etc., $996,987; average number employés, 2,041; total wages, $723,355; value manufactured goods per annum, $1,800,830. Carriage manufactories and shops, 238; capital in buildings, etc., $821,455; average number employés, 1,613; value manufactured product, $2,121,760; total annual wages paid, $716,840. Drain tile establishments, 345; capital in buildings, etc., $1,153,607; average number employés, 2,166; value annual product, $1,751,945; total annual wages paid, $497,669.

Furniture and cabinet shops, 286; capital in building, etc., $2,919,610; average number employés, 5,729; value annual product, $6,913,298; total paid for wages, $2,423,865. Planing and saw mills combined, and saw-mills separate, 1,378; capital in building, etc., $4,668,366; average number employés, 9,194; value annual product, $14,333,319; total annual wages paid, $2,460,818.

Wagon manufactories, 289; capital in buildings, etc., $1,223,533; average number employés, 2,286; value annual product, $3,654,336; total paid for wages, $869,320.

And lastly, of those I will take time to mention—but not by any means least—is woolen mills: Number, 52; capital in buildings, etc., $1,167,802; average number employés, 2,038; annual value of product, $3,052,730; total wages paid, $869,359.

And, sir, I venture to say that when the census of 1890 is taken it will show a continuance of this same prosperity not only in the small State of Indiana, but extending over the entire West.

There are now fifty-two woolen mills in the State, producing over $3,000,000 of goods annually and paying over $600,000 in wages for the same period.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM], in his effort to show the failure of protection, cited the decrease of woolen mills in the six New England States from 1870 to 1880, the decrease being one hundred and seventeen in number, but he had not one word in his whole speech about the growth of the West, not a word of Indiana's splendid development, not a word of Indiana's gratifying exhibit of manufacturing enterprise.

Ah, BYNUM! BYNUM! statesman from the West, tall of form and handsome of face, why, in your mad zeal to defend the fallacious theory of free trade, should you thus turn from and ignore the glorious facts of which your own Western section is the abundant possessor?

I say the West is coming to the front on this subject—not as rapidly as we from that part of the land would like, but surely coming, and the next census will reveal the truth of this statement.

Why, sir, Illinois has among her many and important manufacturing establishments five cotton manufactories. Four years ago a large and valuable one was constructed, and has since been operated, in Aurora, the home of the gentleman from that district, Mr. HOPKINS. I do not presume it has made much above expenses, but the last I knew of it it was operating and employing a considerable number of hands.

An authoritative report from these mills at Aurora, Ill., makes the following showing:

Date of construction	1884
Cost of plant	$325,000.00
Capital in business	$75,000.00
Number of hands employed	230
Wages paid annually	$65,000.00
Value of annual output	$350,000.00
Number of looms	424

Other mills of this kind will follow. At this time, in the city of Des Moines, ground is being broken for a large cotton-mill. The splendid condition of Iowa was well portrayed by my colleague [Governor GEAR] last week in his speech on this bill. None know better than he how grandly Iowa has developed. Ours is an agricultural people, and yet so much do we appreciate the value of a diversity of employments that most active efforts are being put forth to induce capital to come among us and build up enterprises that shall afford and promote labor. And while we are comparatively young in years, and particularly in manufacturing, we are not ashamed of our progress.

Last week Governor GEAR flung out before your gaze a pair of excellent Iowa-made woolen blankets, the product of a mill that is operating at some profit, I trust, away out in the West—in Iowa. And when the next discussion comes on upon this subject in 1890, in the Fifty-first Congress, he will no doubt ask you to examine a fine bolt of cotton manufactured at the capital of our State.

The exhibit we now make is by no means insignificant. Mechanical and manufacturing establishments, 6,921; capital invested, $33,987,886; whole number employés, men, women, and youth, 28,354;

total amount paid in wages per year, $9,725,962; value of material used, $48,754,311.

Value annual products, $71,045,926; of capital invested in woolen establishments, there is $553,500; hands employed, 7,112; total annual wages paid, $117,792. And before leaving Iowa permit me to say that her condition, in point of manufacturing interests, is one of inf n ty.

Unequal and iniquitous discriminations in freight charges more than anything else have retarded manufacturing in the West. With the amendments to the interstate-commerce law that are certain of realization, and the continued improvement in the matter of equitable administration of the railroad business of the country, let me tell all of you gentlemen that the West with its magnificent water-powers, its gold, silver, coal, iron, and other minerals, is going to have a future, grand and glorious. And the West is willing, yea anxious, to co-operate with the East and the South in every good word and work calculated to advance the welfare and prosperity of our entire land. All she asks is an even, fair chance with other sections of the land in the matter of cheapness and equity of transportation, not only for her products East, but for yours of the East and South in return; that the products of other sections of the land which she must have may come to her borders bearing every legitimate and proper charge for every dollar of honest use of capital, compensation to laborers who handle them, and reasonable, necessary cost of transportation, but in no case and to no extent burdened with the inequity of a forced cost, the result of trusts and combines.

That which the West now most views with alarm is the disposition of moneyed men to conspire together to create unnatural and unjustifiable charges in retail establishments for articles they consume, while those from the farm must from the very nature of things always go to the markets free from any but the most reasonable and usual conditions and charges. Only when these products fall into the hands of capitalists can they be in the least manipulated, as oil, sugar, and numerous other necessary articles of consumption are now wickedly controlled by unconscionable financial pirates whose greed for gain is limited only by their inability to include the known world in their schemes of robbery.

If the West can be saved from the piracy of "trusts" and "combines," and have those natural conditions in other respects to which I have heretofore referred, she will maintain the reputation of the Western farmer and business man for thrift, energy, and business success.

Neither are Iowa farmers free-traders, no matter what they may be in Minnesota. At the last annual meeting of the Iowa State Grange the farmers spoke out in most positive tones on this question. I read part of their resolutions:

Resolved, 1. That the time has arrived in the history of our State and nation when the farmers should unite for the protection of their rights and the promotion of their interests morally, socially, intellectually, and financially.

2. We demand such a revision of the tariff laws as will protect the producer as well as the manufacturer.

3. That that part of President Cleveland's message referring to the reduction of the tariff is a direct blow at the farmers of this country, and in favor of monopoly.

4. That a great reduction of the tariff on all raw material produced in this country would greatly embarrass the agriculturists, while it would not accomplish the object sought; namely, a reduction of the revenue.

5. That a reduction of the tariff on articles produced in this country will not reduce the revenue, but increase the surplus, and, therefore, depreciate the value of our produce.

Now, Mr. Chairman, some remarks on the question of labor and laboring men, and I am done.

The Democratic party has no more of a monopoly of the fate and fortune of the laboring man than it has reputation for saving the Union from dismemberment. I grant that it never has armed itself against the former as it did against the latter; and, further than this, I am prepared to say it desires the best good of all the toilers of the land; but conceding this does not in the least argue that the Republican party has not been deeply concerned about the welfare of this class. No man having regard for truth can say that this party has neglected those whose days and nights are too heavily weighted with burdens we would all see lightened. The faith of the Republican party has ever been, and is, that the wisest national policy is the one that will afford to our toiling masses the most varied fields of employment; that will strengthen all forms of existing industry and constantly build up new ones; that as the West settles and develops every new enterprise possible of successful operation shall be brought into being, and thus aid most materially in fostering and sustaining her great distinguishing industry—the farm.

The Democratic party charges that we Republicans protect everything but labor, thus flatly contradicting a settled economic principle that labor and capital are inseparably connected with the other. We aim by making it possible for capital to find profitable investment to assure labor of healthful occupation, knowing that no profit can come to capital anywhere unless it call labor to its side and engage its assistance.

But have we not favored the protection of labor in other ways? Has not the Republican party indicated its desire to further protect labor by enacting legislation seeking to curtail Chinese immigration and joining the Democrats in prohibiting so-called contract labor? Most certainly.

And now, Mr. Chairman, one more point upon this question of our duty to our laboring classes, and I will close. The conditions of the crowded Old World with its dense population ought ere this to have aroused the statesmanship of America to a solemn duty not yet performed, and I fear not yet fully appreciated. It is maintained that when our population in all parts of this country shall be as numerous as theirs, we will be in their condition as to poverty and wretchedness of her dependent millions. I can not say it may not be so; at least, I fear it will come painfully near being so. Is there nothing, then, the Congress of the United States may do to postpone that day to the farthest limit possible? In all this debate, in so far as I have been able to attend upon it, not a word is remembered calling attention to the unrestricted immigration now and for years flowing in upon us from nearly every country on the other hemisphere. And what a spectacle it is. Why, sir, think of it. Over 471,000 upon an average each year received to these shores during the past eight years, and on they come and will come unceasingly, unless the Congress of the United States takes action to prevent.

I am aware sir, that this is a delicate question, one likely to provoke discussion, and perhaps unfriendly criticism in our respective districts, but in reflecting on the condition of labor now and of its probable future in this country, I have been led to the decided conviction that it is the duty of this Government to give serious and timely attention to this matter. Can we, in the very nature of things, permit this tremendous influx of people and not expect the most serious consequences to the whole country?

I am not speaking now as one alarmed because of a spirit of anarchy here and there in the land, for it appears to me the majesty of the law of Illinois has pretty effectually discouraged the violence of anarchy, if not the thing itself. Have we room for the born and unborn millions of Europe and Asia? No thoughtful person will say we have, but all will agree that some day a barrier must be raised. But when? Why not commence to deliberate earnestly about it now, and act? It is not yet too late. We still have room for all now within our borders, from whatsoever clime they have come, unless it be John Chinaman. He must go—*i. e.* if we have the power to make him—or he must, if away, remain; but all the rest of earth may come. Oh, the bald inconsistency of such a position!

Mr. Chairman, in a sense we are all foreigners, and in another I profoundly trust we are all Americans. It is our duty, as it should be our pleasure, to legislate for the benefit of our whole population, no matter whence they have come or whither they may go.

I would ask no question of any now here—whence came you—what your nationality or religion; but I would propound questions and insist on truthful answers of the untold millions yet to come, unless prohibited so doing.

It is a most difficult problem, I know, in the face of our unbroken history; but certain it is the common good—the welfare and prosperity of those who are designated as foreigners, their children and children's children—demands that the present rate of immigration should be at no distant day largely curtailed; and the statesman—be he Democrat or Republican—who shall successfully, and upon the fairest, most humane, and patriotic basis, propose and carry into effect legislation satisfactory to the American people, will have done his country a service of which his children may well be proud.

In order to bring to the minds of the members of this House the solemn facts with which we have to deal, I submit herewith tables found in the quarterly report of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, No. 2, 1887–'88, bearing on the numbers and nationalities of those who compose the immense number of people who are coming to us annually from other lands.

Shall we drift along years to come in a sense of security from the dangers of an overcrowded, unemployed population, or shall we, in a spirit of "charity to all and malice toward none," seek in this great question the ultimate good of every man, woman, and child in our great and beneficent Republic?

Statement showing the number and nationality of immigrants arrived in the United States during each year ending Dec. 31, from 1873 to 1887—inclusive.

	Countries.	1873.	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.	
1	England	60,600	43,396	30,040	21,051	18,122	19,581	40,997	64,199	76,547	70,893	61,432	53,270	44,710	58,422	83,036	1
2	Ireland	75,848	47,688	29,969	16,506	13,791	17,113	27,651	84,799	70,909	72,937	83,654	58,589	49,793	52,912	72,888	2
3	Scotland	13,008	8,765	5,739	4,383	3,408	3,700	8,728	14,495	16,451	15,957	10,839	8,791	10,174	13,916	22,067	3
4	Wales	868	558	419	294	232	311	1,046	948	1,316	1,633	1,430	1,011	931	1,343	1,614	4
5	Great Britain, not specified	31	15	12	9	1	1	2	6	7	8	6	95	2	8	4	5
	Total Great Britain and Ireland	150,355	100,422	66,179	42,243	35,554	40,706	78,424	164,438	165,230	161,428	157,361	121,756	105,610	126,601	179,609	

Number and nationality of immigrants arrived in the United States, from 1873 *to* 1887, *inclusive*—Continued.

	Countries.	1873.	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.	1885	1886.	1887.	
6	Austria	6,943	6,891	6,039	6,047	4,376	4,881	6,259	18,252	21,437	18,315	17,928	20,688	16,456	22,006	24,786	6
7	Belgium	1,306	705	623	454	367	454	733	1,484	1,939	1,129	1,673	1,722	1,363	1,641	2,987	7
8	Denmark	5,095	3,188	1,951	1,624	1,617	2,688	3,552	8,778	8,951	12,769	9,747	7,633	5,870	6,634	9,305	8
9	France	10,813	8,741	8,607	6,723	5,127	4,668	4,121	4,939	5,653	5,560	4,016	3,690	3,138	4,085	5,604	9
10	Germany	133,141	56,927	36,565	31,323	27,417	31,958	43,531	134,040	249,572	232,269	184,389	155,529	107,668	86,301	111,324	10
11	Gibraltar	8	5	4	16	1	.....	2	17	4	4	7	.....	7	11	8	11
12	Greece	37	20	27	24	18	13	23	22	17	177	25	56	171	106	509	12
13	Hungary	892	852	747	475	540	632	1,518	6,668	6,756	11,602	12,308	10,708	9,181	18,110	14,301	13
14	Italy (Continental)	7,473	5,787	3,315	2,862	3,610	5,163	9,627	12,756	20,101	29,349	29,512	14,441	15,480	30,472	46,185	14
	Italy (Insular):																
15	Sardinia	.....	8	.....	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	75	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	15
16	Sicily	34	72	29	116	48	228	14	25	2	13	25	52	5	93	71	16
	Islands of the Mediterranean:																
17	Corsica	.....	1	1	1	.....	.....	1	.....	1	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	17
18	Crete	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	18
19	Malta	4	10	5	2	7	1	2	1	4	.....	.....	4	8	1	2	19
20	Netherlands	4,640	1,532	1,073	709	572	652	1,199	3,730	10,812	7,880	4,926	3,731	2,499	2,667	5,276	20
21	Norway	18,107	6,581	4,465	6,031	4,333	5,216	9,488	23,054	26,967	27,197	21,295	13,806	11,692	13,059	18,322	21
22	Sweden	11,351	4,336	6,031	5,204	4,774	6,176	16,659	46,723	55,892	60,413	32,596	24,017	21,508	32,222	51,236	22
23	Portugal	34	52	1,212	816	552	648	576	161	59	89	650	186	593	71	108	23
24	Roumania	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	15	55	81	116	781	301	2,204	635	24
25	Russia	3,490	7,447	4,369	6,787	3,370	4,216	3,784	5,278	8,193	17,497	6,907	15,122	16,517	25,980	23,521	25
26	Finland	113	4	23	21	8	22	19	247	320	708	1,107	407	434	810	2,294	26
27	Poland	2,863	1,443	707	854	320	554	876	2,488	6,283	4,246	2,151	4,369	3,101	6,396	4,960	27
28	Spain	486	571	529	597	542	432	534	420	405	328	245	334	319	452	483	28
29	Switzerland	3,223	2,436	1,641	1,572	1,612	2,051	3,854	8,498	11,628	11,839	11,433	8,215	5,126	4,518	6,561	29
30	Turkey in Europe	78	21	36	46	25	23	34	62	50	118	80	187	155	178	171	30
31	Heligoland	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	2	31
	Total all other Europe	210,131	107,637	77,999	72,305	59,237	70,676	105,787	277,658	435,101	441,658	341,156	285,850	221,502	258,847	328,651	
	Total Europe	369,486	208,059	144,178	114,548	94,791	111,382	184,211	442,696	600,331	603,086	498,497	407,606	327,202	385,448	508,260	
32	Arabia	.....	.....	.....	13	.....	1	1	8	4	12	6	69	28	7	4	32
33	Armenia	2	.....	4	1	1	.....	.....	16	10	5	30	27	13	59	93	33
34	Burmah	.....	.....	.....	9	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	34
35	China	18,154	16,651	19,033	16,879	10,379	8,468	9,180	7,011	20,711	35,614	381	84	57	8	28	35
36	India	22	15	15	22	17	9	15	39	14	12	5	30	25	14	35	36
37	Japan	25	4	3	6	4	1	7	7	8	3	38	39	154	168	269	37
38	Persia	7	1	2	2	1	.....	.....	2	2	1	.....	3	4	.....	2	38
39	Syria	1	1	1	10	.....	39	.....	9	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	44	.....	39
40	Asia, not specified	10	32	30	113	5	1	4	6	26	10	82	59	23	23	331	40
	Total Asia	18,221	16,704	19,088	17,055	10,407	8,518	9,218	7,098	20,775	35,657	542	311	304	323	762	
41	Algeria	3	2	2	9	1	1	2	.....	5	14	.....	.....	2	3	.....	41
42	Egypt	4	8	3	3	.....	1	3	.....	4	41	3	8	9	35	8	42
43	Liberia	.....	1	19	14	.....	.....	.....	1	7	2	.....	.....	7	1	.....	43
44	Morocco	.....	3	.....	.....	.....	2	.....	1	3	.....	.....	.....	4	2	1	44
45	South Africa	2	1	6	.....	.....	7	1	3	11	1	.....	4	1	2	1	45
46	Africa, not specified	4	7	1	17	5	4	10	5	7	12	6	18	10	9	21	46
	Total Africa	13	22	31	43	6	15	16	10	37	70	9	30	33	52	31	
47	Quebec and Ontario	22,242	23,744	18,490	15,545	15,591	24,533	40,883	112,712	76,971	68,141	54,105	39,985	.....	.....	.....	47
48	Manitoba	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	446	1,163	1,398	1,143	524	.....	.....	.....	48
49	Nova Scotia	4,453	3,970	2,555	3,200	4,206	3,282	6,425	17,870	12,425	12,693	6,435	5,163	.....	.....	.....	49
50	New Brunswick	1,346	1,867	1,119	1,494	1,215	1,458	3,811	5,929	2,096	2,400	2,150	1,239	.....	.....	.....	50
51	Prince Edward Island	780	435	311	437	488	349	1,144	1,722	1,648	1,528	644	291	.....	.....	.....	51
52	British Columbia	282	446	839	484	553	372	842	782	611	427	2,300	164	.....	.....	.....	52
53	Newfoundland and Labrador	405	134	106	58	68	108	162	300	274	322	173	182	292	.....	.....	53
	Total British North American Possessions	29,588	30,596	23,420	21,218	22,121	30,102	53,267	139,761	95,188	86,909	66,950	47,888	a292	(a)	(a)	
54	Mexico	473	442	682	532	478	473	550	437	244	532	411	381	(a)	(a)	(a)	54
55	British Honduras	.....	11	1	.....	7	4	1	41	8	2	14	.....	4	4	.....	55
56	Costa Rica	.....	.....	3	.....	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	56
57	Guatemala	.....	1	1	1	3	.....	4	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	57
58	Central America, not specified	34	9	9	13	25	14	21	1	24	3	12	23	7	32	41	58
	Total Central America	34	21	14	14	36	18	27	42	33	5	26	23	11	36	41	
59	Argentine Republic	9	1	7	6	4	.....	2	5	1	9	3	4	12	2	9	59
60	Brazil	37	20	27	28	10	11	26	21	17	20	26	13	8	23	20	60
61	Chili	17	12	21	20	2	2	1	4	.....	1	3	.....	1	8	10	61
62	Ecuador	.....	2	.....	2	.....	.....	1	.....	4	.....	.....	.....	2	.....	.....	62
63	Guiana	27	6	7	3	4	2	1	7	3	17	12	2	9	.....	7	63
64	Peru	8	17	10	11	19	17	8	1	4	5	1	.....	.....	.....	1	64
65	United States of Colombia	35	23	22	20	21	7	23	27	22	5	9	4	9	369	248	65
66	Venezuela	23	20	34	37	14	16	9	51	16	24	11	27	10	20	46	66
67	South America, not specified	12	19	11	8	4	6	19	3	18	7	2	.....	.....	14	1	67
	Total South America	168	129	139	135	78	61	90	119	85	88	67	50	51	436	342	
68	Antigua	3	1	.....	1	.....	.....	2	5	12	3	11	.....	13	.....	3	68
69	Bahamas	82	435	460	559	248	289	361	297	415	424	311	394	341	35	62	69
70	Barbadoes	30	34	42	32	25	22	13	18	33	24	6	9	21	5	26	70
71	Cuba	1,089	1,147	899	880	614	494	838	1,406	418	773	987	1,341	1,191	2,961	3,477	71
72	Curaçoa	5	1	3	14	1	1	3	1	3	4	.....	2	2	8	11	72
73	Guadeloupe	7	.....	2	1	2	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	73
74	Hayti	16	27	2	10	21	4	24	35	.....	12	1	2	5	12	23	74
75	Jamaica	30	28	32	23	41	34	17	21	53	22	6	23	18	67	27	75
76	Martinique	1	7	5	.....	9	.....	1	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	76
77	Nevis	3	3	2	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	77
78	Porto Rico	28	21	32	17	5	13	10	37	20	12	12	28	9	17	44	78
79	Saint Croix	47	22	12	4	17	11	7	.....	17	34	13	10	28	12	18	79
80	Saint Thomas	1	5	15	9	.....	18	5	7	.....	2	2	.....	1	4	3	80
81	Trinidad	3	4	4	4	.....	7	6	2	5	6	2	.....	2	1	6	81
82	West Indies, not specified	629	14	20	13	26	30	24	37	33	77	87	29	299	713	778	82
	Total West Indies	1,974	1,749	1,530	1,568	1,010	923	1,312	1,866	1,009	1,394	1,458	2,133	2,721	3,835	4,478	
	Total America	32,157	32,937	25,785	23,467	23,723	31,577	55,246	142,225	96,559	88,928	68,892	50,480	3,075	4,307	4,861	

a The arrivals of immigrants from the Dominion of Canada and from Mexico, since July 1, 1885, are excluded from all tables of immigration, it being impracticable to collect statistics of immigration across our frontiers by railway cars and other land vehicles.

Number and nationality of immigrants arrived in the United States, from 1873 *to* 1887, *inclusive*—Continued.

	Countries.	1873.	1874.	1875.	1876.	1877.	1878.	1879.	1880.	1881.	1882.	1883.	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.	
83	Azores	1,397	1,262	989	906	791	873	741	682	1,225	1,457	1,276	1,755	823	1,206	1,298	83
84	Bermudas	45	61	21	29	18	13	6	29	40	61	19	55	28	8	2	84
85	Canary Islands	.....	16	2	2	3	3	2	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	85
86	Cape Verde	27	36	1	48	.....	6	.....	1	21	15	27	48	50	66	14	86
87	Madeira	3	1	7	2	.....	1	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	87
88	Saint Helena	.....	3	1	2	1	.....	1	3	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	88
89	Atlantic islands, not specified	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	14	3	9	13	11	89
	Total islands of the Atlantic	1,472	1,379	1,021	989	813	896	751	716	1,287	1,533	1,336	1,861	910	1,293	1,325	
90	Australia	863	1,224	941	1,257	743	634	834	1,122	904	947	427	542	400	579	528	90
91	Hawaiian Islands	134	210	133	20	.....	1	2	2	.....	5	284	420	345	674	1,088	91
92	New Zealand	10	3	5	4	2	.....	1	.....	1	2	1	4	3	1	5	92
93	Society Islands	43	29	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	93
94	Pacific islands, not specified	.....	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	1	4	3	.....	.....	.....	14	9	94
	Total islands of the Pacific	1,050	1,467	1,080	1,281	745	635	837	1,125	910	957	712	966	748	1,268	1,630	
95	Greenland, Iceland, and the Faroe Islands	4	182	11	30	1	168	252	348	31	36	251	9	29	147	5	95
96	Countries not stated	4	3	2	4	.....	1	.....	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	96
97	Born at sea	138	61	35	23	16	15	34	81	105	82	77	83	60	49	59	97
98	Picked up at sea	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	3	10	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	98
	Total all other countries	146	246	48	57	17	184	286	433	146	118	328	92	89	196	64	

Mr. COWLES. Mr. Chairman, I make no apology for taking a portion of the time set apart for the discussion of the bill now under consideration, in the subject-matter of which the people whom I have the honor to represent on this floor are so much interested.

Sir, the question of taxation is one of the first importance in every system of government, and its adjustment upon a proper basis and in proper degree, suited to the exercise of freedom and to the material prosperity of the citizen, is one of the greatest responsibilities of legislation. Especially is this so in a free Republic like ours, where all sovereignty abides with the people, and the officials of the Government, from the highest to the lowest, are but the servants or agents, if you please, of the people, intrusted for a limited time with the conduct of public affairs.

The unnecessary exercise of the taxing power robs the pocket of the citizen of more than is sufficient for the necessities of Government, and becomes an engine of oppression, which, in the hands of tyrants, is frequently the lever power for uprooting free institutions by gradual encroachment upon the rights of the people; and is a baneful influence in the extravagance and corruption which it engenders, and the constant temptation to wrong growing out of an overflowing Treasury.

The founders of government, and all those who come in the course of time to the enjoyment of its blessings, expect to be required to pay into the common fund their proportionate part of the taxes necessary for its economical and honest administration; but when we go beyond this, and persist for years and years in collecting for each year millions of money more than is necessary for the expenses of government, extravagant as they may be, we justly incur the indignation of an outraged people. That there is too much money collected by our different systems of taxation no one can deny, though some would, I believe, if the record did not stare them in the face with such an indisputable array of facts and figures; therefore, what to lop off and where to reduce should be the only matters of inquiry in the mind of any patriot who sits here as a representative of the American people. Partisan feeling should not enter into this inquiry, and the legitimate questions growing out of this bill should be considered purely as a most serious and important business proposition in which the welfare of the whole people whom we represent is involved.

It does no good to call each other hard names, nor is it profitable to recite the events of a quarter of a century and more ago, unless they bear upon the situation of our present duties and difficulties, and even then such references should be made in a manner not to arouse unpleasant feeling.

I know there are difficulties among those who sit on this side of the House as to the plan of reduction, the specific articles that should be included in it, and the limit to which it should extend as to each. I have no doubt but that, to some extent at least, the same differences exist on the opposite side of the House; therefore we should bear in mind that in the consideration of questions of this character, involving such diverse interests and matters of diverse opinion, conclusions are almost invariably reached through the medium of concession.

I have listened, sir, with a great deal of interest and, I trust, profit to the discussion as far as it has gone. The agitation of this most important question will certainly do good, and I think, sir, that I "can read between the lines" that ere long much that is useless and oppressive will be abolished and the means for raising revenue will be settled upon a business basis; not for the purpose of favoring monopolies; not to protect and enrich the few at the expense of the many, and they the poorer classes, but for the purpose solely of raising revenue sufficient for the necessary expenditures of the Government, and that, too, so as to distribute the burden in accordance with the ability to bear. It may not be done now, but the people are aroused, and they will and should be heard.

They demand, sir, that their money shall not be taken and locked up to be kept from the circulation that they so much need, or squandered in extravagant appropriations to pampered jobs, only to be again rapidly collected by the same system, to be again squandered. It is as impossible under the present system of revenue to maintain the circulation to the requisite standard for the needs of commerce and trade as it is for an eel to sustain life by continually swallowing himself.

Sir, we have too much revenue and too many systems of revenue. Strike down that which is effete and has been permitted to remain beyond the period of its allotted time, and give vital force and energy to that which since the organization of this Government has been established and maintained as the true source of Federal revenue.

It is not my purpose, sir, to enter into a minute discussion of the details of the present tariff laws or the proposed changes therein. The whole field has been gone over time and again in its discussion, and there are other gentlemen yet to speak to whom the whole country will look for information, who, it is expected, will deal principally with this part of our revenue system. But, sir, there is another branch of our revenue system to which I wish to pay my respects before I am done. To do this in order I wish to state that I understand it to be conceded on all sides that a revision of the tariff, not by increasing the free-list, but by reducing the tax on imported goods to the true revenue basis, which is to the point that foreign manufacturers will be able to pay and bring in their goods and commodities and exchange them for our goods and commodities, would very much increase the revenue now raised by the tariff; and I believe it is generally conceded that sufficient revenue can by this means be raised by the tariff alone for all the necessary expenses of Government.

I know that the argument was made by members on both sides of this House, in discussing the question of a reduction of the surplus in the Treasury in the Forty-ninth Congress, that, by a reduction of the duty on foreign goods or importations, you thereby would increase the surplus. If so, and it stands to reason that it is so, why not make the reduction of the tariff to a business basis and repeal the odious internal-revenue laws?

Impost duty or customs, which is but another name for tariff, in order to amount to a protective tariff must be and is so high as greatly to retard or prohibit the introduction of foreign goods and commodities, thus "protecting" those who produce these goods and commodities here from foreign competition, and thereby preventing a lowering of the price to the consumer. Now, however necessary to the fostering of our manufacturing interests this course may have been in the earlier days of our history, that time has long since passed, and the American manufacturers of to-day compete most successfully with the world in anything that it is profitable from natural causes to manufacture here, so that having the competition shut off from abroad by a very high protective tariff, they combine together here in "trusts" and "pools," which are nothing more than an agreement that they will not sell any given article or class of articles for less than a certain price in order to prevent competition among themselves, and thus, notwithstanding the increase of manufacturing interests, they keep up fictitious values at a high protective standard.

And it is a fact in the current history of trade that when, as frequently occurs, there is an overproduction of manufactures here the excess of goods is conveyed to foreign countries and sold at greatly reduced prices than they are offered for here, thus showing that protection for the sake of protecting has ceased to be necessary to the interests of our manufacturers, and that a tariff for revenue for the sake of reve-

nue, affording them the benefit of the revenue-tariff tax, would be sufficient.

Placing articles on the free-list does not always benefit the consumer here, and especially is this so when the articles are not produced in this country at all, for it sometimes is taken advantage of by the foreign countries producing the article to place on it a moderate export tax whereby the consumer, instead of paying a moderate tariff tax into our own Treasury, is paying a moderate export tax into the treasury of the foreign country. A healthy tariff tax, one that will admit of foreign trade and intercourse and thereby extend the markets of our own products to the world, and at the same time pay a revenue into the Treasury, is what we need. I am, sir, in favor of a tariff for revenue only, and revenue only by the tariff. I am not now and never expect to be a free-trader. Abolish the internal-revenue tax and system, and address ourselves to the tariff in a businesslike way, knowing that we have to raise revenue enough to answer the needs of the Government, and it can be easily done.

Whilst we are arranging this, if there should be any deficiency, we certainly have surplus enough in the Treasury to temporarily answer that, and if it should be necessary to supplement the revenue received by the tariff, then, sir, the most just plan and the least vexatious is to place the additional burden where it will be easiest borne—upon incomes. The burden of a protective tariff falls upon the consumers, who are for the most part poor people who earn their livelihood by labor, many of them toiling in the fields to make the very staple used in the factories, and the price of which is regulated by a foreign market. If our chief industries are still in their "infancy" they have been dwarfed by protection. Give them the fresh, stirring air of American liberty to spread and try their strength in exercise with other industries of like nature, and they will become more self-reliant, and the generous health that competition—which is truly said to be "the life of trade"—will infuse into them will extend through all branches of our industries, including the noblest and most essential of all, that of those who under burning suns "make their bread by the sweat of their brows," and upon whose labor government itself depends; without which neither church nor state can prosper, and the "infant industries," of which we hear so much talk, one and all, could not budge a spindle. What protection have the farming class but in the labor of their own strong arms?

Ah, sir, when we hear talk of labor here it is not the labor that fells the forests and converts waste lands into fertile fields and pastures. We hear nothing of the labor that turns the clods, but it is always the labor of the loom and the labor of the shops, labor on Government contracts, on the railroads, in the mines, and everywhere that is to be tenderly cared and legislated for, but not the labor that with sun-browned hands plows and digs the fields, making not only the staple and the bread and meats that clothes and feeds himself and family, but the staple and the bread and meat that clothes and feeds us all.

There is no protection for that class of labor; yet upon its massive and good-natured shoulders rests the burden of the world. "Infant industries" indeed! Ah, sir, there are other "infants" in this land that claim some "protection;" and these are the little rosy-cheeked cherubs with sunny hair and bright, sparkling eyes, that wear the little white and pink dresses and make glad the heart of the father as he returns from the fields. Let us lessen taxation and increase the circulation of money and its more equal distribution for their benefit. This—the scarcity of money—is an important question, as I believe, growing out of the present condition of the revenue laws; and they are responsible, in great measure, for the stringency of money matters for several years past and now. A rich and overflowing Treasury, sir, makes a poor people, whether the unnecessary taxes be levied and collected off of what are termed "luxuries" or "necessities" of life, for it takes money to pay taxes, and all money withdrawn from the people in this way leaves that much less for the payment of debts and the ordinary transaction of business, and this, sir, in my opinion, is the true cause of the hard times of which we hear, and justly hear, so much complaint.

And another result concomitant with this and growing out of the protective system of taxation, are the complaints of the wage-earners—the employés of the combinations of capital, which under this system easily control the money and markets of the whole country. They appreciate the advantage of the protective system to the employer in the increased profits of the business, and clamor for a share of the profits in increase of wages. Strikes and riots are the result, shaking the peace of communities and damming up the channels of commerce. The intelligent laborer sees the inequality of a system that protects wealth and leaves poverty naked; and so long as this system of taxation is maintained for protection and colossal fortunes are realized to the protected, with a rapidity that rivals the story of the wonderful power of Aladdin's lamp, out of the interests thus protected, and by the labor of the toiling millions of poor laborers of both sexes, so long will this feeling of unrest and dissatisfaction continue, and strikes and riots multiply until hydra-headed anarchy, crouching in the weeds of corruption and fostered by a system which tends to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, will at last threaten the very vitals of Government and the liberties of the people with its poisonous fangs.

Sir, it is high time to call a halt. Go look at the money-bags hoarded up under this double-barreled system of revenue in the building that stands at the other end of the avenue! See the returns for a day: and that to-day: $575,236 from customs, $948,768 from internal revenue. Look at the statement of the amount for the last month: Customs, $17,202,374.59, and from internal revenue for same period, $9,893,-649.03, and of the amount on hand, and realize that this is drawn from the legitimate profits of labor, and ask yourself the question, if it is not wonderful that the people are so patient. Hard times in this country? Why should this exist? A soil more fruitful and diversified, a climate more beneficent, a people more industrious and naturally intelligent can not be found anywhere on the face of the earth. There are no natural causes for prolonged hard times, and they must exist from abnormal causes somewhere in the body-politic. We are now feeling about the root of the evil; let us have the manhood to pluck it up, root and branch, and leave the surplus where it belongs—in the pockets of the people.

Does New England need to be "protected" longer from Old England? Why, put her on her mettle and make her throw off her swaddling clothes of "over-grown infancy," and she can beat England at her own game. The South and West might with more propriety call for a protective tariff, if such measure were constitutional, against New England, but with our advantage in the South of having our factories in the midst of the cotton-fields, I think all the protection we need is that contemplated by the Constitution—a tariff for revenue.

The amount of the tariff is paid by the importer, be he a foreigner or one of our own citizens. Now, there is scarcely any one so simple as to suppose that the importer buys the goods abroad and brings them here at his own expense, and pays the tariff as a gratuity for the benefit of the consumer, who finally buys the goods and consumes or wears them out, though there are some who endeavor to gull the people by making this argument, and ask with great gusto: "Who pays any tariff? Mr. Jones, do you pay any tariff? Mr. Smith, does any marshal or sheriff in this country collect any tariff of you? No, sir! the rich importer pays the tariff." Then you should ask him this question: "Do you pay any freight on the goods you buy at the store? Does the merchant when he makes out your bill, make a charge of so much for freight, or does the sheriff come around and collect the freight? No, sir; the rich merchant pays the freight."

But how long do you suppose the merchant would hold up if when he comes to marking and pricing his goods to you as a customer he took no account of the cost of laying them down at his store? We know from experience that the merchant charges for the cost of carriage by steam-boat, by railroad, and by wagon and team in the price he asks for the goods, for it is as much a part of the cost to him as the original cost of the goods, and the consumer, be he farmer, mechanic, lawyer, doctor, or preacher, pays the freight when he buys the goods to use, and it is just so with the tariff.

For instance, a man buys goods in New York or Baltimore and offers them for sale in any town in my State; does not any one know that he adds in the cost of bringing goods from where they are first bought to the point where he offers them for sale, and that it is just as much a part of the cost to him as if it had been a part of the first price paid for the goods, and that putting this to the first cost he adds his own per cent., and that the customer pays it all when he pays for the goods? So that to say that the importer pays the tax and not the people who buy the goods is an attempt to deceive. The tariff is as much a tax upon the consumer as if it was levied upon his property and collected out of it. It is simply one of the modes of raising revenue, one of the modes of taxation, and to my mind, as we have to support and pay taxes to General Government in some way, I prefer the mode by the tariff to that of any other, provided it is adjusted, as any tax should be, solely for the purpose of raising revenue, and not for the purpose of keeping out commerce and revenue, fostering monopolies, and rendering possible "pools" and "trusts," and thereby making necessary the extraordinary mode of internal-revenue taxes.

It is true that good men of both parties differ on this question, just as they do on many other questions that arise from time to time as the exigencies of public affairs may bring forth. For instance, the currency question, as to whether we shall have a suspension of the coinage of silver, or as to whether we shall have the one standard, and that of gold, instead of the two—gold and silver; whether we shall have national-bank money or only Treasury notes, or whether we shall abolish both and return to the old State-bank system had before the war, and good men and good Democrats may hold their old opinions on all such questions and still be good Democrats, as ascertained by that touchstone of principles contained in the first inaugural of the great and immortal Jefferson, the founder of our party, and to whose writings and teachings we would all do well to recur occasionally. The cardinal principles of Democracy are deeper, broader, stronger, and more inflexible than any of these questions. The former exist like a rule of right for all time and under all circumstances; the latter must of necessity change and accommodate themselves to the exigencies of the times for which they

may be provided. What I understand to be the cardinal principles of Democracy are so beautifully and succinctly stated by Mr. Jefferson in his first inaugural that it will not be amiss for me to quote them here:

Equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious or political; peace, commerce, and honest friendship with all nations—entangling alliances with none; the support of the State governments in all their rights, as the most competent administrations for our domestic concerns and the surest bulwarks against anti-republican tendencies; the preservation of the General Government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet-anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad; a jealous care of the right of election by the people—a mild and safe corrective of abuses which are lopped by the sword of revolution where peaceable remedies are unprovided; absolute acquiescence in the decisions of the majority—the vital principle of republics, from which there is no appeal but to force, the vital principle and immediate parent of despotism; a well-disciplined militia—our best reliance in peace and for the first moments of war, till regulars may relieve them; the supremacy of the civil over military authority; economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened; the honest payment of our debts and sacred preservation of the public faith; encouragement of agriculture, and of commerce as its handmaid; the diffusion of information and the arraignment of all abuses at the bar of public reason; freedom of religion; freedom of the press; freedom of person under the protection of the habeas corpus; and trial by juries impartially selected.

And he concludes then with this beautiful commentary:

They should be the creed of our political faith, the text of civil instruction, the touchstone by which to try the services of those we trust; and should we wander from them in moments of error or alarm let us hasten to retrace our steps and to regain the road which alone leads to peace, liberty, and safety.

Now, sir; the man who receives this faith and keeps it will prove his faith by his works and vote the Democratic ticket, for these are the essentials, the very life, soul, and blood of the body, and all other questions are subordinate thereto.

There are many other pages in the writings of this great statesman that are profitable reading now. He came to his administration in times not unlike these. It was after the great struggle of the Revolution and at a time when the country, involved in the debt incident to the war and the other expenses of government, had resorted to the duplex system of revenue which we have now, tariff and internal revenue.

When Mr. Jefferson came to the administration of public affairs quite a surplus for the times had gathered in the Treasury and continued to increase. The same complaints existed among the people that we now hear and have heard so long of the vexatious, oppressive, and obnoxious internal-revenue laws. What, under these circumstances, do we find among the first utterances of this great man with a heart always big with sympathy for the people, with a mind fully imbued with the causes which led to the great struggle for independence, the principles of our Constitution and Government, that he had so large a share in framing, and with a desire to maintain the freedom and liberties of the citizen in all his domestic and State affairs without unnecessary interference on the part of the General Government.

We find in his first annual message to Congress these words:

Other circumstances combined with the increase of numbers have produced an augmentation of revenue arising from consumption in a ratio far beyond that of population alone, and, though the changes of foreign relations now taking place so desirably for the world may for a season affect this branch of revenue, yet, weighing all probabilities of expense as well as of income, there is reasonable ground of confidence that we may safely dispense with all internal taxes, comprehending excises, stamps, auctions, licenses, carriages, and refined sugars, to which the postage on newspapers may be added to facilitate the progress of information, and that the remaining sources of revenue will be sufficient to provide for the support of Government, to pay the interest of the public debt, and to discharge the principals in shorter periods than the laws or the general expectation has contemplated. War, indeed, and untoward events may change this prospect of things and call for expenses which the imposts could not meet; but sound principles will not justify our taxing the industry of our fellow-citizens to accumulate treasure for wars to happen we know not when, and which might not perhaps happen but from the temptations offered by that treasure.

And again we find in the same document:

When we consider that this Government is charged with the external and mutual relations only of these States; that the States themselves have principal care of our persons, our property, and our reputation, constituting the great field of human concerns, we may well doubt whether our organization is not too complicated, too expensive; whether offices and officers have not been multiplied unnecessarily, and sometimes injuriously to the service they were intended to promote. I will cause to be laid before you an essay toward a statement of those who, under public employment of various kinds, draw money from the Treasury or from our citizens. Time has not permitted a perfect enumeration, the ramifications of office being too multiplied and remote to be completely traced in a first trial. Among those who are dependent on executive discretion I have begun the reduction of what was deemed necessary. * * * The inspectors of internal revenue who were found to obstruct the accountability of the institution have been discontinued.

And again, in his second annual message, we find the following, congratulating the country on what had been done:

When effects so salutary result from the plans you have already sanctioned, when merely by avoiding false objects of expense we are able, without a direct tax, without internal taxes, and without borrowing, to make large and effectual payments toward the discharge of our public debt and the emancipation of our posterity from that moral canker, it is an encouragement, fellow-citizens, of the highest order to proceed as we have begun, in substituting economy for taxation and in pursuing what is useful for a nation placed as we are, rather than what is practiced by others under different circumstances.

And lastly I will quote from his second inaugural address:

The suppression of unnecessary offices, of useless establishments and expenses enabled us to discontinue our internal taxes. These, covering our land with officers and opening our doors to their intrusions, had already begun that process of domiciliary vexation which, once entered, is scarcely to be restrained from reaching successively every article of produce and property. If among these taxes some minor ones fell which had not been inconvenient, it was because their amount would not have paid the officers who collected them, and because, if they had any merit, the State authorities might adopt them instead of others less approved.

There are more people in this country than many seem to have any idea of that think this is mighty good reading now. The Democratic platform adopted at Chicago arraigned the Republican party for not relieving the people of "crushing war taxes," which I suppose my friends on this side of the House who differ with me as to the repeal of the internal revenue will say applies only to the tariff; but, sir, in the same instrument under which banner we fought and won in the last campaign it goes on to say:

From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of Federal revenue. Such they must continue to be.

And still further on it pronounces that—

The system of direct taxation known as the "internal revenue" is a war tax, and so long as the war continues, etc.

Going on to declare how it should be applied.

In another Democratic platform of the same year, that of my own State, there is no such uncertain sound. It says:

Resolved, That we are in favor of the unconditional and immediate abolition of the whole internal-revenue system, as an intolerable burden, a standing menace to freedom of elections, and a source of great annoyance and corruption in its practical operation.

Resolved, That no Government has the right to burden its people with taxes beyond the amount required to pay its necessary expenses and gradually extinguish its public debt; and that whenever the revenues, however derived, exceed this amount, they should be reduced so as to avoid a surplus in the Treasury. We therefore urge upon our Senators and Representatives in Congress to exert themselves in favor of such legislation as will secure this end.

Resolved, That with respect to the tariff, we reaffirm the life-long and fundamental principles of the party as declared in the national Democratic platforms, and that the details of the method by which the constitutional revenue tariff shall be gradually reached, are subjects which the party's representatives at the Federal capital must be trusted to adjust; but in our opinion the duties on foreign importations should be levied for the production of public revenue, and the discrimination in its adjustment should be such as would place the highest rates on luxuries and the lowest on the necessaries of life, distribute as equally as possible the burdens of taxation, and confer the greatest good to the greatest number of the American people.

And this, sir, is supplemented by the executive committee of the Democratic party of North Carolina in the following resolution, adopted October 19, 1887:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this Democratic State executive committee that the internal-revenue laws should be immediately repealed; and our Democratic members of Congress are requested to use their influence, as they have heretofore done, to have said laws repealed, and to secure such modification of the tariff as will lessen the duties upon imports to such extent as will be possible, consistent with the economical administration of the Government.

And again, on February 23, 1888, they say:

Whereas the Democratic Legislatures of 1874, 1883, and 1885 passed resolutions asking for the repeal of the internal-revenue laws; and

Whereas the Democratic State convention held in Raleigh in June, 1884, unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That we are in favor of the unconditional and immediate repeal of the whole internal-revenue system as an intolerable burden, a standing menace to freedom of elections, and a source of great annoyance and corruption in its practical operations:" Now, therefore,

Resolved, That this Democratic State executive committee, in session at Raleigh, February 23, 1888, reaffirms the declarations of the Democratic party of North Carolina, and also reaffirms its own declaration made on the 19th of October, 1887, in favor of abolishing the whole internal-revenue system.

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to each member of Congress from North Carolina.

Sir, the platform and resolutions that have just been read voice the convictions and the hope of the Democratic party of my State, and with them I, sir, am and always have been in the fullest accord; and, sir, in their advocacy and support I claim the right of a free representative of a free people to act in accordance with my convictions, and I shall not go out of my party to do so; and I shall always, here and everywhere, stand by its cardinal principles, that so much concern the greatest blessing that a people can enjoy, that of personal liberty.

The aspiration to be free was planted in the breast of man as he came from the hand of the great Creator, and though often and for long periods crushed and oppressed until the darkness of usurpation and tyranny seemed to envelop the world and scarcely a glimmer of its pure ray could be seen, yet struggling ever upward through darkness toward the light, it still lives to enjoy the fullest realization of the hope that has sustained it always, in the Government founded and transmitted to us by our fathers.

The idea of Mr. Jefferson was to sustain the Federal Government by a tariff on imports and leave direct taxation for the States, and to be regulated by them. What a blessing this would be now. If he had lived at this period he would have seen a larger country suffering in greater proportion than its increased size from the same abuses he endeavored, with so much success, to reform in his own day and time, and there is no just reason to suppose that his mighty influence, united with the great majority of his own State, as well as of mine, would not be exerted now, as then, to rid the people of "internal-revenue taxes," "covering our land with officers," "and opening our doors to their intrusions," "which once entered is scarcely to be restrained from reaching every article of production and property."

These are his very words, and in quoting them to you I am reminded that only last session we were called upon to add to this system of taxation the "butter bill," which was done, and this session we are called upon to pass the "lard bill," which I am afraid will be done, and when we set a bad thing or principle in motion, with a downward grade and as greasy a track as these two articles make, who can say

where it will stop? The principle of these taxes is all wrong, and if I know what constitutes Democracy, it is undemocratic. The Democratic party of North Carolina is as honest and true as any political organization that ever existed in this country, and upon its success and control of our State government I verily believe depend the honor, the peace, and prosperity of our good old State. I have never deserted her in any struggle, and I can not and will not do so now, and mark my prediction, as the Democracy of North Carolina stood then, so it stands now and will stand in the coming campaign. She will not change because the flesh-pots of the revenue department have been transferred from Republican to Democratic officials.

We can not afford to barter the priceless inheritance of our manhood as a people and a party of principle for such a mess of pottage. To these declarations of my party of my own State I am now, and always have been, in full accord, and I give notice to you, gentlemen, on both sides of this Chamber, that when this bill comes up under consideration for amendment I shall claim the right of a Representative on this floor to offer an amendment to repeal the entire tax and system, and if that should fail of passing, then to repeal the brandy tax, and any other modifications that I may be able to get in, and shall endeaver to obtain a yea-and-nay vote on the same in the House, so that we may see, and the country may see, where the Representatives of the American people stand on this subject; and if any gentleman upon either side of this House is more successful than myself in point of time and opportunity in getting in such amendments, I pledge him here and now, I care not from what section he may come, or what may be his political creed and faith, my earnest and unqualified support to the measure.

Sir, go with me for a while and see the workings of this "infernal machine" in the country where I live. It is a land, sir, beautiful to look upon, abounding in fruit and grain, with mountains, valleys, and streams as picturesque as the pen of Scott e'er portrayed, and a climate abounding in exhilarating and health-giving influences, with waters that flow clear and cool from its life-giving fountains; yet, sir, in large districts of our country are communities without any railroad facilities, and the summer fruit grown upon trees planted and bearing long before this iniquitous law was made must fall and rot upon the ground, millions of bushels of it, because there is no way to market or save it profitably. This, sir, is by far the most cruel part of this law—the part that taxes fruit brandy. It is not claimed that there is any necessity for the revenue; there is, upon the other hand, a necessity for not obtaining it. Then why can not the farmer have the right to still his fruit free in a free country? "Oh," they say, "it would leave open gaps for avoiding the law taxing whisky." Can law be so framed as not to leave gaps for its avoidance? Is there no confidence to be placed in the honor of the people that they will obey the laws for their own self-respect and for the sake of obedience?

Then no such laws should have existence in a free country where the people rule. Give them this free license, sir, if you can do no more, and the remainder of the internal-revenue law will be executed all the more thoroughly, because this very liberty will bring public opinion more in accord with it; and without the support of public opinion no law can be executed with good effect. I would not give much for the nose of a revenue officer who could not tell the difference between brandy and whisky, and especially when the two are mixed to any considerable degree, and that, too, without any chemical process; for it is said by those who know that the mixing greatly deteriorates both in quality, flavor, and effect. But especially would detection be easy when we hear arguments here based upon the results accomplished by chemical science telling the kind, quality, and how much of each ingredient there is that enters into the manufacture of oleomargarine. There is no such trouble about the repeal of the brandy tax. It is only a story concocted by the big whisky interests to prevent its being given this advantage over grain distillations.

Now, sir, as to the whisky tax. It is not because we want more whisky, or cheaper whisky in the country, or more distilleries, that we demand a repeal of the law. There are in my State now at least five times as many whisky distilleries as there was before the law, and each one of those distilleries makes five or ten times as much liquor as they did before the enactment of the law; for before the enactment of this law there were but few distilleries in the whole State that operated except in the fall and early winter months. The custom through all our country, at this time when there was no surveillance and no tax on spirits, was to run the distilleries only from crop-gathering time until the early winter, when the hogs were fattened on the slop. Then the hogs were killed, the whisky was marketed, and the distillery closed until another year.

How is it now in the same country? They are usually run year in and year out, and when all the grain that our fertile lowlands yield has been bought and distilled it is brought from Cincinnati and the markets of the West to the nearest depot, and often hauled 40 and 50 miles and more into the country and distilled. We should always have plenty of grain in my country for man and beast, and yet, sir, I have seen the time there, and that, too, after years of plentiful crops, when poor laboring men, and women, too, who are unable to provide a year's supply in advance, might be seen going from house to house begging the privilege of buying corn enough to bread them until harvest, and having hard work to find it, and that because the remorseless worm of the still had devoured it before them.

Talk about the moral influence of this law! Tell it to those who know nothing about it, but tell it not to me. It sows a bountiful crop of oaths and makes smooth the way to a bountiful harvest of perjuries. The whole system is rotten to the core and is only held together by the cohesive attraction of public plunder. It is a menace and a threat to free institutions and is obnoxious to all liberty-loving people. Of course none of those who engage in the business of distilling get very rich by it; few of them make any considerable profit clear of expenses and contingencies, and many of them come to ruin; but, lured by the *ignis fatuus* of the increase of price which the tax makes, they press ahead, hoping to find the "potful of money at the end of the rainbow." If any of them should be for a time, through diligence, industry, sobriety, and strict attention to business, all of which are mighty hard on human nature in the circumstances in which he is placed—but if for a time he should be successful and come to the accumulation of some property, buy some new teams and wagons and some "Sunday clothes," there is another branch of this law watching with greedy eyes to pounce upon him as a hawk would upon a fat pigeon, for some violation of the law more technical than criminal, and straightway proceed to pick him clean, and when, after forfeiting his team and wagons to this rich and overflowing Treasury and serving his term in some filthy county jail, or in the penitentiary, he is released from the clutches of the law to make his way homeward, his patriotism, like Bob Acres's courage, all gone, and his only relief to "cuss" the court and the law that will not allow a man to do as he pleases with his own.

This is is the way it happens to the Government distiller that in some way gets crooked; but if a "blockader" gets caught, they make short work of him, and, as he stands under the sentence of the law, I imagine I can hear him soliloquize in the language of old "Groundhog Cayce," in a book by Miss Murfree, entitled The Prophet of the Great Smoky Mountains. The old man, speaking of the trials and difficulties which he has in his business, and which he can not understand, appealing to common reason, says:

> Lord A'mighty, air the corn mine, or no? Air the orchard mine or the raiders'? An' what ails me ez I can't make whisky an apple-jack same ez in my dad's time, when him an' me run a sour-mash still on the top o' the mounting in the light o' day, up'ards o' twenty year, an' never hearn o' no raider? Tell me that's agin the law nowadays? Waal, now, who made that law? I never, an' I ain't agoin' ter abide by it, nuther. Ez sure ez ye air born, it air jes' a Yankee trick fotched down hyar by the Federal Army. An' ef I had knowed they war goin' ter gin tharse'fs ter sech perseeutions arter the war, I dunno how I'd hev got my consent ter fit alongside of 'em like I done fower year fur the Union.

There is much in the language attributed to this illiterate old man that voices the same ideas that permeated the minds of our American ancestors when they fought and won the battles of the Revolution; the same that actuated our English ancestors when they wrenched from the mailed hand of King John the Magna Charta of British liberty.

This bill, sir, I consider the first serious proposition coming from the Ways and Means Committee of this House to afford relief from any part of this tax and from the inquisitorial rigors of this law, and as such it shall have my support. Removing the tobacco tax will be a good thing for the farmer, enabling him to sell his crop without subjecting himself to infringement of the law, and the abolition of retail licenses, for which I have labored most assiduously, will go a great way toward ridding the country of frivolous prosecutions in the Federal courts, for experience and observation show that in most of the cases originating there, after passing all the more serious charges in the information or bill, the prosecution dwindles down to a little retailing case that would scarcely comport with the jurisdiction of a justice of the peace or of a police court. Yes, pass these amendments to the law, and give to the Federal court judges the discretion of fixing the punishment for these offenses against the internal-revenue law without being confined by a minimum limit, and good people everywhere that know anything about the workings of this law will thank you and hope for more and better things.

In justice, sir, to the present administration of the law I am constrained to say that it is conducted on much more humane principles than heretofore. But a few years ago, and when the States were passing laws prohibiting the carrying of deadly weapons by the citizens, armed bands of revenue officers could be seen riding through the country with carbines swung around their shoulders and pistols hanging from their belts, in quiet hamlets and neighborhoods, frightening women and children, and arousing a spirit of antagonism among the men. But now, sir, in my own section at least, the arms have all been collected and sent back here to Washington, and yet the law is better enforced and more money collected than heretofore. But, sir, I shall always maintain that the whole thing ought to go, executed as it is by aid of spies and informers and inquisitions carried into the domiciles and cellars of the people, with no sanctuary so sacred as to keep out the invasion of the revenue officer. It is impossible to make it popular with the people that witness its administration without destroying their manhood and love of the principle of personal liberty, which, I pray God, may never be done.

Statistics show that under its influence the use of alcoholic liquors

is on the increase. In 1840 the amount used per head was 4 gallons for that year, and in 1883 it was 12 gallons per head. During the five years preceding 1884 the population increased about 15 per cent., but the consumption of distilled spirits increased 44.15 per cent. It has not lessened the appetite for it, nor is its respectability impaired by making it a "licensed," taxed "luxury," with the stamp and seal of the Government upon it, so that a man feels that when he takes a drink he is helping to support the Government, and to be really patriotic he must take all he can, and especially is this so on a rainy evening about a Federal court green when a poor fellow is waiting to be called in for trial. It takes a good deal under such circumstances to keep his patriotism above zero.

The people feel, sir, that these matters should be left to the regulation of their States respectively. They love their State governments, and more blood and treasure, including the days of the Revolution, have been spent to maintain the right of local self-government than for any other cause on this continent.

It is a question, sir, that involves the liberty of Maine as well as South Carolina; as much that of Indiana as that of Texas. Upon it, the very union of these independent States depend. Strike it down, take from the people this inestimable right and State lines become obliterated, Territories are merged into each other, and centralization and despotism inevitable follow. Make this law a perpetuity, as some argue should be done; keep the strong hand of the Government continually clutching and interfering with State courts and laws and the rights and occupations of citizens; fill the land with Federal officers and keep them there with the execution of their offices above the laws of the State, and you fill the hearts of good men with despair, though they never made a drop of whisky in their lives, though they may not even drink it, and though they may be opposed to its use.

Mr. Chairman, it is not the whisky-making or the whisky-drinking element of society that I represent in this argument, but I feel that I voice the sentiment of the law-abiding, God-fearing, Christian people of my country when I say, Down with the demoralizing system of internal revenue! The moral element of the land have got the true idea of this institution at last, which for so long a time—God save the mark—has run as an adjunct to morality and temperance, and their opposition will grow more and more intense as they learn more about it.

Sir, in my political prayers I pray first for the success of the Democratic party in my own State, and then in the Union. You have been told to look at the history of that period before 1876, to see from what we escaped in that memorable campaign. In the light of this history, and the certainty of its being repeated by Republican success, if the issue which is to come before the people in the next election could be submitted to me with this alternative, "You can not have both; which will you take, success in the State election or success in the Federal election;" much as I admire Grover Cleveland, our honored and beloved President, and much as I appreciate the honest, clean administration he has given us, and the confidence which the whole people of our country so justly have in his patriotism and integrity, and much as I hope for his renomination and election, I would emphatically answer, "You may take the Federal administration with all its offices, with all its money wrongfully torn from the people to waste and squander, with all its 'boodle,' but give me Democratic home rule in North Carolina."

There, sir, we have a constitution formulated by a Democratic convention, adopted by a Democratic majority of the voters of the State, laws enacted under it by Democratic legislatures, and kept in force by a Democratic administration; the colored man has the right to vote and does so as freely and without control as the white man; he has the right to hold office and all the rights of citizenship, with an equal distribution per capita of the public-school money; he is contented and happy and there is no friction or clash between the races as such, unless it is aroused by bad men at home and abroad with a desire to stir up strife between the races and thereby control the colored vote for their own selfish ends and not for the good of the colored man.

Left to themselves, sir, the colored people know that the best friends they have are the white people, with whom they have been reared and who know them best. It is a moral and political sin to disturb by such means the peace and quiet of that country that is now engaged in earnest effort in working out the solution of one of the greatest political problems in the world, and with an earnest desire to do justice to all. But, sir, if evil counsels must prevail, and the issue is to be presented to us as to which race we will have to control the destinies of this country or of our own State government, I say here and now, standing in my place as the representative of a brave and honorable people, that we expect to be able to maintain for North Carolina, and that, too, without a resort to violence, a white man's government, for white men and white women, and for white children.

Look, sir, at what the Democratic party has done for North Carolina. It has paid her debts, restored her credit lost under carpet-bag rule, brought confidence to our people and to those abroad having capital to invest, encouraged and built public improvements and promoted private enterprise, vastly increased our facilities for education, and has brought about, by giving us an honest and economical management of public affairs, a degree of individual and public prosperity never before known in the history of our State, and yet we have much to do and much that we can do. We are not begging for help or for greater "protection" than the rest of our fellow-citizens are entitled to.

We only ask the privilege under salutary laws of being allowed to work out our own salvation. Capital can find no safer place for investment. The next ten years will show greater improvement in North Carolina than the past twenty years have done, and in twenty years from to-day we will have reached a degree of prosperity not dreamed of now even by those who by their enterprise and labor are contributing so much to it. With a name as stainless as any star in the bright constellation of the Union that floats above our heads to-day, her sons and her daughters now, and generations yet to come, will rise up and call her blessed. [Applause.]

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the tariff bill had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

Several messages, in writing, from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed joint resolution and bills of the following titles:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 83) accepting the invitation of the French Republic to take part in the international exposition to be held in Paris in 1889;

An act (H. R. 48) for the relief of Benjamin M. Simpson;

An act (H. R. 3215) to authorize the construction of the Ohio Connecting Railway Company bridge; and

An act (H. R. 9430) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to award a gold medal of the first class to Capt. Thomas Sampson, of New York City, for rescuing five boys from drowning.

The message also announced that the bill (H. R. 1712) for the erection of a public building at Portsmouth, Ohio, having been presented to the President April 30, 1888, and not having been returned by him to the House in which it originated within the ten days prescribed by the Constitution, had become a law without his approval.

EDWARD FITZGERALD.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, by unanimous consent, reported back favorably from the Committee on War Claims the bill (S. 316) for the relief of Edward Fitzgerald.

Mr. ROGERS. The bill just reported by the gentleman from Kentucky is one which I endeavored to call up some time ago; but one or two gentlemen on the other side objected then to its consideration. They have since investigated the matter and do not now wish to object. The bill merely provides for the reference of a claim to the War Department, to be audited and reported back to Congress. It makes no appropriation. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be now considered.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Quartermaster-General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to examine the claim of the Right Rev. Edward Fitzgerald, Bishop of Little Rock, trustee of the Catholic Church in Arkansas, for timber and fuel belonging to said church, alleged to have been taken by the United States, or the armies thereof, at or near Fort Smith, in the State of Arkansas, during the war of the rebellion; and he may consider the evidence heretofore taken on said claim, so far as applicable, before the Commissioners of Claims and such other legal evidence as may be adduced before him in behalf of said trustee or in behalf of the United States, and shall report the facts to Congress, to be considered with other claims reported by the Quartermaster-General.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROGERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to

GRANT OF LAND TO WYOMING FOR PUBLIC PURPOSES.

Mr. CAREY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 850) granting certain lands in the Territory of Wyoming for public purposes. This bill has been favorably reported to-day by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER], from the Committee on Public Lands, and a House bill of similar purport was favorably reported some time ago.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the governor of the Territory of Wyoming is hereby authorized and empowered to cause to be selected and entered of the public lands contained within the boundaries of the Fort Sanders military reservation, in said Territory, as soon after the extension of the public surveys through said reservation as practicable, to an amount not exceeding 640 acres, as nearly as practicable in square form according to the public surveys; that the lands so selected and entered are hereby granted to the Territory of Wyoming for the purpose of enabling the said Territory to maintain thereon a fish-hatchery and other public institutions: *Provided*, That if the said Territory shall at any time permit the said lands hereby granted to be used for any purpose not contem-

plated by this act the said lands shall revert to the United States: *Provided further*, That nothing in this act contained shall be construed or have the effect to impair the rights of any person in or to any portion of said lands acquired under any law of the United States.

Mr. SPRINGER. Has this bill received the consideration of the Committee on the Public Lands?

Mr. CAREY. Yes, sir; and has been unanimously reported with a favorable recommendation.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPRINGER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the following resolution of the House:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President be requested to return to the House the bill (H. R. 2699) for the relief of the heirs of the late Solomon Spitzer, for the purpose of correcting the same; and the Clerk of the House is hereby authorized and directed to insert in said bill the word "unexpected" instead of the word "unexpended."

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 347) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Youngstown, Ohio.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 9793) authorizing a loan of arms and equipments to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government and the Bureau of Agriculture and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley from July 4 to October 27, 1888; also that the Senate requested a conference with the House on said bill and amendments, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. ALLISON, Mr. DAWES, and Mr. COCKRELL.

RUDOLF LOBSIGER.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. SPRINGER, referred, with the accompanying documents, to the Committee on War Claims:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State relative to the claim of Mr. Rudolph Lobsiger, a Swiss citizen, against the United States, and recommend that provision be made by law for referring the matter to the Court of Claims for examination on its merits.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 14, 1888.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a communication from the Secretary of State, accompanied by a report of Mr. Somerville P. Tuck, appointed to carry out certain provisions of section 5 of an act entitled "An act to provide for the ascertainment of claims of American citizens for spoliations committed by the French prior to the 31st day of July, 1801," approved January 20, 1885.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 14, 1888.

Mr. SPRINGER. That message, I presume, Mr. Speaker, should go to the Committee on the Judiciary, as it relates to pending litigation in the Court of Claims. I move that reference.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I make the suggestion that it is probable it should go to the Committee on Appropriations, as my recollection is that at the beginning of this session certain reports of the Court of Claims were referred to the Appropriations Committee with instructions to report back in reference to them.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Illinois to refer the message to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The motion was agreed to; and the message was accordingly referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent to offer a bill for my kinsman, Mr. CLIFTON R. BRECKINRIDGE; and also ask unanimous consent that other gentlemen having bills to offer may present them now for proper reference.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE LAND CLAIMS, FLORIDA AND OTHER STATES.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas (by Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky), introduced a bill (H. R. 9982) to revive and amend an act entitled "An act for the final adjustment of private land claims in the States of Florida, Louisiana, Missouri, and for other purposes," approved June 22, 1860; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Private Land Claims, and ordered to be printed.

BUSINESS FROM COMMITTEE ON LABOR.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, by unanimous consent, submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That Tuesday, May 22, immediately after the reading of the Journal, be set apart for the consideration of bills and resolutions reported from the Committee on Labor.

PER DIEM RATED SERVICE-PENSION BILL.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Speaker, I present to Congress, and ask to have printed in the RECORD, two very brief petitions, but signed by a very large number of persons. One of these petitions is signed by almost 1,000 soldiers of Lawrence County, Pennsylvania; the other petition is signed by 2,300 soldiers and citizens of Beaver County, Pennsylvania. These petitions were prepared with great care and labor. I can assure Congress that they are genuine signatures of actual citizens. They are both on the same subject, and are in favor of the per diem rated service-pension bill. I ask this because I believe this subject is one of great importance; that these petitions represent the general sentiment of the people of my district on this subject.

I offer them and call the special attention of Congress to the great demand there is by ex-soldiers and the citizens of our country for additional legislation on the subject of pensions. I am hoping that some heed will be given to these petitions, and that a day for the consideration of these and other general pension bills will be given by this Congress at an early date. I ask unanimous consent that one of these petitions, the two being identical in substance, may be printed in the RECORD without the signatures.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The petition is as follows:

To the honorable Senators and Representatives in Congress assembled:

We, the undersigned surviving soldiers and sailors of the Union Army and Navy, heartily indorse the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service during the war of the rebellion. And we urge upon Congress its immediate passage.

ESTATE OF THOMAS L. PRICE, DECEASED.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of Senate bill No. 475, for the relief of the estate of Thomas L. Price, deceased, and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to credit to Thomas L. Price, of Jefferson City, Mo., late brigadier-general of United States volunteers, and now deceased, the sum of $2,000, being the amount received at Jefferson City, October 7, 1861, of R. O. Wariner, a paymaster in the United States Army, by order of General John C. Frémont, for special public purposes at that post by said Price, then commanding said post, and to release the estate of said Price from any and all liability therefor.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed.

Mr. BLAND moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

OHIO VALLEY CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I ask that the committee of conference asked for by the Senate on the amendments to the bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government, the Bureau of Agriculture, and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and the Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the Centennial Exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, on June 4 to October 27, 1888, just reported from the Senate, be agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Without objection the House will nonconcur in the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked for.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The committee of conference will be appointed hereafter.

ESTATE OF FRANCIS M. MURRAY.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 251) for the relief of the estate of Francis M. Murray, deceased, and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the legal representatives of Francis M. Murray, deceased, late of McCracken County, Kentucky, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,500, for 3,000 bushels of stone-coal taken by and delivered to the steam-boats White Cloud and Silver Moon, in the year 1863, at Paducah, in the State of Kentucky, said boats being at the time in the employment of the Navy Department of the United States.

The Committee on War Claims recommend the adoption of the following amendment:

Strike out "$1,500," in line 7, and insert "$900."

There being no objection, the bill was considered, the amendment concurred in, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

A. R. HARTZELL.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill H. R. 3604.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3604) granting an honorable discharge to A. R. Hartzell, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That the order heretofore made, dishonorably dismissing from the military service of the United States A. R. Hartzell, late of Company H, First Regiment Iowa Cavalry, be, and the same is hereby, revoked, annulled, and set aside, and that the Secretary of War is ordered to grant to said Hartzell an honorable discharge, and to correct the records of his Department showing the removal of the said order of dismissal; and the said A. R. Hartzell is restored to all rights and privileges lost or suspended by such order.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let the report in that case be read.

The report (by Mr. GEAR) was read in part.

Mr. PERKINS (interrupting the reading). The report is rather long; and perhaps it would be as satisfactory to the gentleman from Illinois if I were to give a brief explanation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Very well.

Mr. PERKINS. It was charged that this man had been guilty of quitting his guard-post without the permission of his superior officer. His own captain, however, admits that the charge was not sustained in the trial by court-martial. But he was convicted of disobedience of orders, and according to the captain's testimony the sentence was a very arbitrary and severe one. It is to be remembered he was a private and not a commissioned officer.

Ten years after the war closed for some reason he was dishonorably discharged. That was in 1874. He was dishonorably dismissed as a soldier upon an order issued from the War Department. The effect of this bill is to annul that order. That is all there is of it.

Mr. SPRINGER. What was the order he disobeyed?

Mr. PERKINS. He refused to go on escort in December, 1862, being without an overcoat, unless he should be furnished one. The weather, according to the testimony of the captain and other officers, was exceedingly severe and cold. He was part of a command which had been ordered to escort some Arkansas militia to their homes to spend New Year's with their families.

Mr. SPRINGER. It was rather a severe sentence.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Does the committee recommend the passage of the bill?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, sir. I may say in addition that after this soldier had been confined fifteen days he escaped, and soon after his escape returned.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PERKINS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The report in full is as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs have had under consideration the bill and papers, with accompanying evidence, in the case of Adam R. Hartzell, for whom relief is asked by House bill 3604, and find that Adam R. Hartzell enlisted as a private in Company H, First Iowa Cavalry Volunteers, at Keokuk, Iowa, in August, 1861, to serve for three years, unless sooner discharged. He served with credit and distinction and as a brave and patriotic soldier until late in December, 1863, when he was placed under arrest by the captain of his company, and subsequently court-martialed. At this court-martial he was charged with quitting his guard without the leave of his superior officer, and "disobedience of orders." He was found guilty and sentenced to forfeit all pay and allowances now due or that shall become due him, except $2 per month of his monthly pay, and to be confined at hard labor with ball and chain until the expiration of his term of enlistment, in such military prison as the commanding general may designate.

In February, 1864, the military prison at Little Rock, Ark., was designated as the place of his confinement, and he was committed February 11, 1864. He remained in confinement until February 25, 1864, when he escaped therefrom. Soon after his escape he returned to his company, but not on duty. He messed much of the time with his company, and made no effort to conceal himself. His company was at the time at Little Rock, and his presence was known to his officers and comrades, and no effort was made to recapture him or to return him to prison. He belonged to the non-veterans of his company, and continued with them much of the time after his escape until they went home in the fall of 1864 to be mustered out. Hartzell accompanied the others home, but was not mustered out in consequence of having no descriptive roll.

This was the condition of things for several years, when Hartzell employed an attorney to secure for him an honorable discharge. But instead of granting an honorable discharge, the commanding general, Department of the Platt, in June, 1874, upon instructions from the War Department, furnished him a dishonorable discharge, to date February 25, 1864, and it is to relieve him of the odium of such dishonorable discharge that the present bill is presented. Much evidence has been filed in the War Department, and also presented to your committee, in support of the petition for an honorable discharge for this soldier. This evidence has been carefully considered by your committee, and from it the following conclusions are reached:

1. That the soldier was not guilty of quitting his guard without leave, as charged at the time of his court-martial.

2. That he was guilty of "disobedience of orders," but with these mitigating circumstances:

On the 31st day of December, 1863, at Little Rock, Ark., Captain Whisemand, with a part of his command, was ordered out to escort some Arkansas militia to their homes, some 40 miles distant, to spend New Year's with their families. Mr. Hartzell, belonging to this company, was detailed by the captain to be one of the escort. The weather was exceedingly cold for that locality, and the ride was long, and Hartzell, being without an overcoat, refused to go unless he could be furnished one. In fact the entire company was without overcoats, in consequence of their loss by fire, and Captain Whisemand, who detailed the soldier as a part of the escort, and who preferred the charges against him upon which he was court-martialed, says in his evidence filed with the committee that Hartzell refused—

"To go out upon the scout when ordered, and sought to justify his refusal on the grounds that he was willing to go if furnished with an overcoat, being without one himself and unable to get one. This was true, and it was also true that the weather was extremely cold and severe at the time, and a soldier ran a great risk of being frost-bitten, even with his overcoat."

This, in the judgment of your committee, from a careful examination of the testimony, was the sum of his offending; and while your committee is not inclined to look with leniency upon the offense of a soldier disobeying the orders of his superior officers, yet in the case of this soldier we are shocked with the severity of the punishment, and find nothing in the record or testimony to justify it. In fact Captain Whisemand, who preferred the charges, says in his testimony—

"That while the offense of refusing to go on a scout when regularly detailed was, in a military sense, a serious one and called for punishment, yet I had no idea that any such severe punishment would be inflicted as that announced by the court-martial.

"That if a sentence of two weeks' imprisonment had been imposed without any forfeiture of pay, I should have regarded it as entirely sufficient for the offense, and have always been of the opinion that the punishment fixed by the court-martial was unjustly severe under all the circumstances of the case."

It seems to your committee that this must be the feeling of all who review the circumstances of this case, and perhaps this explains why no effort was made to return the soldier to the military prison after his escape therefrom after a confinement therein of two weeks.

Why the soldier should have been dishonorably discharged from the service almost ten years after the term of his enlistment expired is unknown in reason or law to your committee. It was not a part of the judgment of the court-martial, and he was certainly not a deserter, and he had no notice of any charge against him that would justify such an order. In fact, the only charge that could have been made was that he had escaped from a military prison and did not voluntarily return to wear a ball and chain during the remaining time of his enlistment.

He belonged to an honorable family and for years has been living in the State of Kansas and is a respected citizen, and, in the judgment of your committee should be given an honorable discharge as a soldier.

In fact, your committee is of the opinion that he should be permitted to recover the money due him at the time of his arrest. And we recommend that the bill do pass.

ROAD TO NEW BERNE (N. C.) NATIONAL CEMETERY.

Mr. SIMMONS. I call up for consideration at this time, from the Union Calendar, the bill H. R. 4320.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4320) to authorize the construction of a graveled or macadamized road from the city of New Berne, N. C., to the national cemetery near said city.

Whereas there is now no public road leading to the national cemetery near the city of New Berne, N. C., but access to said cemetery can be had only over a private road belonging to and kept open at the discretion of the adjacent land-owners; and

Whereas the said land proprietors are willing to donate to the United States the right of way over their said lands from the said city of New Berne to the said national cemetery: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to construct a good and durable graveled or macadamized road from the city of New Berne, in the State of North Carolina, to the national cemetery, near said city, over such road and along such route as he may deem proper. And for the purpose of carrying into effect the foregoing provisions of this act the sum of $30,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, said money to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, or so much thereof as may be necessary for said purpose.

SEC. 2. That before any money shall be expended as aforesaid the title to the right of way shall be granted to the United States free of cost.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with the following amendment:

In the first section, line 9, strike out "$30,000" and insert "$20,000."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. How long is the road?

Mr. SIMMONS. It is about 2 miles in length.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SIMMONS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was

passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

C. B. WILSON.

Mr. SYMES. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill (H. R. 5080) for the relief of C. B. Wilson.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Postmaster-General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to give credit to C. B. Wilson, present postmaster at Buena Vista, Colo., for the sum of $225, money-order funds remitted by said Wilson, as said postmaster, to the post-office at Denver, Colo., in accordance with the postal rules and regulations, and mislaid or lost in the post-office at Denver, Colo.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Let the report be read.

Mr. SYMES. I think I can make a brief explanation which may obviate the reading of the report.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Very well.

Mr. SYMES. The claimant in this case in December, 1886, transmitted from Buena Vista to the postmaster at Denver, Colo., $225 of money-order funds. It is proved conclusively to the Department that the money was received in the Denver office, but was there lost or mislaid. The Postmaster-General specially recommends that the claimant be granted the relief asked for.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I withdraw the request for the reading of the report.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SYMES moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

HEIRS OF CHRISTOPHER COTT.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill (H. R. 956) for the relief of the heirs of Christopher Cott.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the heirs of Christopher Cott, late a private in Company B, Mc. Laughlin's Independent Squadron, Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, the pay, bounty, and all other allowances of a private of cavalry from the 30th day of April, 1864, to the 30th day of November, 1864, the supposed date of the said soldier's death.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. OUTHWAITE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JESSE COE.

Mr. HUNTER. I ask unanimous consent to call up from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill (H. R. 6233) for the relief of Jesse Coe.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of 5.30 p. m. having arrived, the House, pursuant to order, stands adjourned until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. LAWLER: A bill (H. R. 9949) for the relief of Patrick C. McQueeny—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLISS: A bill (H. R. 9963) to increase the pension of Mrs. Fannie A. Boyd, widow of Capt. O. B. Boyd—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: A bill (H. R. 9964) for the relief of Walter A. Newberry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9965) for the relief of John Cordova—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9966) for the relief of Alfred Rauland—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9967) for the relief of Christian Kunzie—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLTON: A bill (H. R. 9968) for the relief of John S. Williford—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9969) for the benefit of Garland Ford—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9970) granting a pension to Jacob A. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OATES: A bill (H. R. 9971) for the relief of Mrs. R. D. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 9972) to correct the military record of Milton Fuson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9973) pensioning Henry Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9974) for the relief of George Prescott—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAISH: A bill (H. R. 9975) granting a pension to Joseph Welsh—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEARD: A bill (H. R. 9976) to remove the charge of desertion from T. J. Nicholson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9977) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to extend a side track into square No. 1025 in the city of Washington—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 9978) for the relief of A. C. Robinson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9979) for the relief of Martha A. Bibb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9980) for the relief of the administrator of H. L. Carpenter—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9981) for the relief of James M. Martin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: A bill (H. R. 9983) granting increase of pension to Moses W. Adley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. C. R. BRECKINRIDGE: Petition of Samuel A. Lockhart, of Jefferson County, Arkansas, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. T. H. B. BROWNE: Petition of P. K. Bauman, for the estate of Frederick Bauman, of Spottsylvania County, Virginia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHEADLE: Petition of Col. J. R. Copeland and 164 others, citizens and ex-soldiers of Harrison County, Indiana, for the re-enactment of the arrears-of-pension act—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: Petition of Christian Kunzie, for relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Detroit Board of Trade, in favor of a winter bridge across the Detroit River—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. COWLES: Petition of citizens of Montana, for restriction on mineral-land grants to railroads—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DIBBLE: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce, of Charleston, S. C., in favor of incorporating the Maritime Canal Company of Nicaragua—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, memorial of the same, in favor of 1 cent postage per ounce on letters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, memorial of the same, in opposition to the bill to create a national bureau of harbors and water ways—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ERMENTROUT: Memorial of the Mat Makers' Protective Association, for the passage of the O'Neill bill—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, memorial of the Smith & Dove Manufacturing Company, of Andover, Mass., for preservation of the present tariff on flax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the State Board of Transportation of Nebraska, for the passage of House bill 8367—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GLASS: Petition of Jane Newhouse, widow of F. M. Newhouse, of Gibson County, Tennessee, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GUENTHER: Petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., against amending the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HEARD: Petition of Jonah White, for a pension as a Mexican war veteran—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. D. B. HENDERSON: Petition of E. P. Ripley, of Ackley, Iowa, for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HIRES: Petition of citizens of Bridgeton, N. J., for a reduction of postage on plants, bulbs, seeds, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JACKSON: Petition of D. C. Francis and 30 others, citizens of Lawrence County, Pennsylvania, against reduction of tariff on window glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McMILLIN: Petition of L. W. Walker, sr., of Sumner County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of A. D. Harris, heir of Thomas Harris, of Panola County, Mississippi, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: Petition of Moses W. Adley, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. POST: Resolutions of the Board of Trade of Peoria, Ill., against the action proposed by the so-called Wilson bill, and against any legislation having for its object the lessening of competition in interstate traffic—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of 14 ex-soldiers of Bryant, Fulton County, Illinois, in favor of the passage of the disability bill without amendment—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of A. J. Drumwright, and of heirs of Hiram Jenkins, of Rutherford County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROMEIS: Memorial of the Knights of Labor of Genoa, Ohio, opposing the granting of pensions to civil officers of the United States—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of John R. Bower and hundreds of citizens of Utica, N. Y., against the passage of the Mills bill—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HENRY SMITH: Petition of John Wellstein and 15 citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., in favor of House bill 8716, relating to convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. TILLMAN (by request): Petition of William Preacher and H. W. Platts and E. S. Roberts, heirs of Elizabeth Platts, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITTHORNE: Petition of Alford Loftin, of Joseph Williamson, of George T. Hughes, administrator of M. L. Stockard, and administrator of Jane W. Hamer, of Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. GRIMES: Of Bradfield & Slack, E. D. Pitman, and others, citizens of Troup County, Georgia.

By Mr. S. I. HOPKINS: Of druggists of Bedford and Montgomery Counties, Virginia.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. BACON (by request): Of 118 citizens of Rockland County, New York.

By Mr. SNYDER: Of D. L. Ruffner and others, citizens of West Virginia.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. DAVENPORT: Of citizens of Phelps, N. Y.

By Mr. GROUT: Of G. A. Webster and 34 others, of East Randolph, Vermont.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. FORD: Of members of B. F. Chapin Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Cheshire, Allegan County, Michigan.

By Mr. HEARD: Of citizens of Dallas County, Missouri.

By Mr. POST: Of 52 ex-Union soldiers of Peoria County, Illinois.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. A. J. HOPKINS: Of 98 citizens of Kane County, Ill.

By Mr. KERR: Of 141 citizens of Marshall, Cedar, and Benton Counties, Iowa.

By Mr. PAYSON: Of 98 citizens of Woodford County, Illinois.

By Mr. REED: Of 76 citizens of York County, Maine.

By Mr. SNYDER: Of 29 citizens of Fayette County, West Virginia.

By Mr. J. W. STEWART: Of 204 citizens of Rutland and Franklin Counties, Vermont.

By Mr. YARDLEY: Of 155 citizens of Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters were severally referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. J. R. BROWN: Of Y. J. Clark and others, citizens of Russell Creek post-office, Patrick County, Virginia.

By Mr. CANDLER: Of N. F. Bearden and others, citizens of Georgia.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *May* 15, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relative to the condition of the freedmen in the Chickasaw Nation in the Indian Territory; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs relative to the land claimed by the Tillamook Indians in Oregon, with copies of two ratified treaties; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. GEORGE presented the memorial of J. H. McCarty and other citizens of Choctaw County; the memorial of W. G. Morgan and other Patrons of Husbandry of Perry County; the memorial of M. Bankston and 25 other citizens of Franklin County; the memorial of A. M. Mansen and 22 other citizens of Newton County; the memorial of W. J. Crisler and 20 other citizens of Hinds County; the memorial of F. A. Howell and 17 other citizens of Holmes County; the memorial of Benjamin Drane and 99 other citizens of Choctaw County, and the memorial of G. G. Morgan and 17 other citizens of Perry County, all in the State of Mississippi, remonstrating against any change in the Bureau of Animal Industry; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PASCO. I present the petition of Joel B. Myers and 13 other citizens of Hillsborough County, Florida, with reference to legislation relating to the Fort Brooke military reservation near Tampa, Fla., and praying that certain rights claimed therein by them may be duly considered. I also present a similar petition of Dorcas Bryant and 16 other citizens of Hillsborough County, Florida. I understand that this matter is before the Committee on Military Affairs, and I move the reference of the petitions to that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, presented the petition of Robert Weare, of Little Rock, Ark., praying Congress to grant him a reissue of two honorable discharges from the Army and Navy, which he had received, but which were stolen from him; and also that he be paid all arrears of bounty, pensions, or other moneys to which he may be entitled; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented the petition of George A. Priest and 94 other ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Michigan, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of citizens of Meadow Creek, Mont., praying for the passage of laws securing the preservation of the mineral lands of Montana to citizens of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of John C. Cahoon, C. C. Cahoon, E. W. Dean, and 11 others, members of the Taunton Gun Club, and other citizens of Taunton, Mass., praying for the passage of Senate bill 283, for the better protection of the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. EDMUNDS presented the petition of Thomas H. Chubb and 13 other citizens of Post Mill Village, Vt., praying for the better protection of the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DOLPH presented a petition of the Port Townsend (Wash.) Board of Trade, praying that a larger appropriation be made for the support of the revenue-marine service; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. EVARTS presented a petition of 117 citizens of Orangeton and Clarksville, Rockland County, New York, praying for the passage of Senate bill 283, providing for the better protection of Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ALDRICH presented a petition of citizens of Montana Territory, praying that the mineral lands in that Territory may be reserved by law to citizens of the United States, and that the Northern Pacific Railroad Company may be prevented from acquiring any lands to which it is not clearly entitled; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

Mr. MORRILL. I am directed by the Committee on Finance to report a resolution, and I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance, by subcommittee or otherwise, are authorized to collect information, to take testimony, to employ a stenographer, to administer oaths, as they may deem most expedient; and the expenses thereof shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, under the rule.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask leave for the Committee on Finance to sit during the sessions of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Vermont asks that the Committee on Finance have leave to sit during the sessions of the Senate. It is so ordered, if there be no objection.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 849) granting a pension to Morgan Gordon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2677) granting a pension to Jane Reilly; and

A bill (S. 332) granting a pension to Harrison Wagner.

Mr. QUAY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2879) increasing the pension of Sophia Schimmelfennig, widow of Alexander Schimmelfennig, late brigadier-general and major-general by brevet; and

A bill (H. R. 6552) to increase the pension of James R. Porter.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2734) granting a pension to John E. Watts, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2385) granting a pension to Caroline R. Haseltine;

A bill (H. R. 2535) granting a pension to Ellen St. Cyr;

A bill (S. 2750) to increase the pension of Samuel A. Tate;

A bill (S. 2782) granting a pension to Charity J. Towns and minor children; and

A bill (S. 2162) for the relief of Mary M. Strong.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2050) granting a pension to Mrs. Bridget Hackett, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1307) to increase the pension of Washington T. Otey;

A bill (S. 2639) granting a pension to Mrs. Louisa Ward;

A bill (H. R. 809) granting a pension to Ephraim Reynolds;

A bill (H. R. 5429) to place the name of Smith V. Campbell on the pension-roll;

A bill (H. R. 4891) granting a pension to Alpheus Dyer;

A bill (H. R. 1074) granting a pension to Linnæus W. Risley; and

A bill (H. R. 6583) granting a pension to Sally B. Wilson.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2666) granting a pension to L. B. Skinner, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1750) granting a pension to George W. Wilburn;

A bill (S. 876) granting a pension to Catharine Simmonds;

A bill (S. 2101) granting a pension to Daniel K. Smith; and

A bill (S. 885) to increase the pension of Adrian C. Dodge.

Mr. PLUMB, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 228) donating certain lots to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for public schools, parks, and a public library, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, reported a bill (S. 2946) granting the use of certain lands to the city of St. Augustine, Fla., for a public park, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 3745) granting a pension to Mary O'Neil;

A bill (H. R. 8260) granting a pension to Lydia A. Hicks;

A bill (H. R. 3712) increasing the pension of Milton Judd; and

A bill (S. 2733) granting an increase of pension to Shadrach Brown.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to; and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2753) granting a pension to Louisa N. Noble;

A bill (S. 2800) to increase the pension of Sarah B. Young; and

A bill (S. 2732) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Rook.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of William C. Shimoneck, praying to be allowed an increase of pension, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 2947) granting an increase of pension to William C. Shimoneck; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7783) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Knoxville, Tenn., reported it with amendments.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 489) for the relief of John Finn, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the petition of William B. Stokes, late pension agent at Nashville, Tenn., praying for the passage of a bill to relieve him and his sureties from a claim alleged to be due the Government, submitted a report thereon, accompanied by a bill (S. 2948) for the relief of William B. Stokes, M. M. Brien, sr., Thomas Waters, and William T. Haskins; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1497) to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of Dakota, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments.

I wish to say in reference to the bill that it is not intended to antagonize the efforts now being made for the admission of Dakota as a State; but until the people of that Territory can be allowed to provide for themselves we must provide additional judicial facilities for them, and in order that they may be so provided the bill is reported favorably.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. STANFORD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 351) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Zanesville, Ohio, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1553) to provide for the purchase of a site for and the erection of a public building at Oakland, in the State of California, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred an amendment intended to be proposed to the Indian appropriation bill, to insert in line 107 of the printed bill, after "thousand," the words "five hundred," reported it favorably, and moved its reference to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred a resolution directing that committee to ascertain what rules or regulations prevail in the District for granting authority to house-owners to extend the fronts and the door-steps of their residences into the streets, and to establish carriageways across the sidewalks to and from their front doors, asked that it be printed with the accompanying letters from the commissioners of the District of Columbia on that subject; which was agreed to.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2844) granting a pension to Squire Burns;

A bill (S. 2857) granting a pension to Charlotte Ayers;

A bill (S. 2815) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Marsh;

A bill (S. 2758) granting a pension to Susan B. Murdock; and

A bill (S. 2684) granting a pension to Mary L. Page.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2683) granting a pension to Andrew J. Foust;

A bill (S. 2842) granting an increase of pension to William H. Welsh;

A bill (S. 2759) granting a pension to James M. Frost;

A bill (S. 2746) granting a pension to Ezra E. Annis;

A bill (S. 2899) granting a pension to Harriet Welch;

A bill (H. R. 2156) granting a pension to Warren Ohaver;

A bill (H. R. 9170) granting a pension to James W. Poag;

A bill (H. R. 354) granting a pension to Samuel McClure; and

A bill (H. R. 152) granting a pension to Mrs. Theresa Guelich.

WILLIAM LEMONS.

Mr. SAWYER. I am instructed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2928) granting a pension to William Lemons, to report it favorably without amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to consider the bill at this time. William Lemons is an old man over ninety years of age, and I am informed that he is in circumstances of extreme suffering.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of William Lemons, late a drummer in the war of 1812.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the following resolution, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance, by subcommittee or otherwise, are authorized to collect information, to take testimony, to employ a stenographer, to administer oaths, as they may deem most expedient; and the expenses therefor shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

FINANCE COMMITTEE HEARINGS.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by Mr. MORRILL, April 24, 1888, reported it without amendment, and the resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and they are hereby, authorized to employ a stenographer from time to time, as he may be necessary, to report such hearings as may be had before said committee, and to have the same printed for the use of the committee, and that such stenographer be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BLAIR introduced a bill (S. 2949) granting a pension to the widow of G. K. Warren; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2950) granting a pension to Milton Childers; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2951) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Morrison Elliott; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FARWELL introduced a bill (S. 2952) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to cause such changes and improvements to be made in the United States custom-house, post-office, and subtreasury building at Chicago, Ill., and erect such additions thereto as in his judgment may be necessary to provide sufficient accommodations for the post-office in that city; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 2953) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint Medical Inspector Thomas W. Leach a medical director on the retired-list of the Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 2954) granting a pension to William Gardner; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2955) to authorize the appointment of a commission to examine, test, and report upon the use, by different systems and methods, of dynamite and other high explosives for military and naval operations; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Coast Defenses.

Mr. EVARTS introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 83) for the relief of the Venezuela Steam Transportation Company; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 84) to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to have certain maps printed; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA REPRESENTATION IN CONGRESS.

Mr. BLAIR. I introduce a joint resolution providing for an amendment of the Constitution giving representation to the District of Columbia in the two Houses of Congress.

The joint resolution (S. R. 82) proposing an amendment of the Constitution giving representation to the District of Columbia in the two Houses of Congress was read twice by its title.

Mr. BLAIR. I have heretofore introduced this resolution in substance, but it failed to be printed by some error, and I now introduce it again, modified. I move that it be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and in doing this I wish to say, in an effort to express the importance of attention to this matter, that the population of this District by the last census exceeded that of the States of Oregon, Delaware, and Nevada.

In valuation of property it amounts to $99,401,787 by the same census, and it exceeds the assessed valuation of Nebraska, Vermont, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Oregon, Florida, and Nevada. The direct taxes of the District of Columbia paid since 1862 amount to $6,454,907.03, amounting in the last year alone to $142,172.10, exceeding the direct taxes paid by the States of Alabama, Arkansas, Maine, Mississippi, Nevada, South Carolina, and Vermont. For local purposes last year its taxation was $2,374,914.53.

I have some other figures that may be of use to the committee of which these are a recapitulation, and with the consent of the Senate I will pass them to the Reporter that they may appear in the RECORD.

According to the last census, the District of Columbia has a population larger than several of the States:

District of Columbia	177,624
Oregon	174,768
Delaware	146,608
Nevada	62,266

The population of the District is now estimated at from 200,000 to 250,000. In valuation of property it exceeds, according to the last census, a number of States—

District of Columbia	$99,401,787
Nebraska	90,585,782
Vermont	86,806,775
Arkansas	86,409,364
Colorado	74,471,603
Delaware	59,951,643
Oregon	52,522,084
Florida	30,938,309
Nevada	29,291,459

In addition to indirect taxation, which operates upon the District the same as upon the States, it has paid $6,454,907.03 taxes since 1862, under the internal-revenue laws. During the last fiscal year it paid of those taxes more than either Alabama, Arkansas, Maine, Mississippi, Nevada, South Carolina, or Vermont:

District of Columbia	$142,172.10
Alabama	78,542.76
Arkansas	97,630.38
Maine	50,286.45
Mississippi	$42,608.14
Nevada	70,419.50
South Carolina	100,146.83
Vermont	99,119.75

For local purposes it pays annually over $2,000,000 in taxes. Last year the amount was $2,374,914.53. Here, then, is a rapidly growing community, already close up to a quarter of a million in number, paying more taxes than some of the States, having more people than some of the States, and yet, as a member of Congress lately said, "at no point touching the administration of their own affairs." Is this right or expedient?

Mr. HOAR. I ask the consent of the Senate to make a brief statement in regard to this subject which will be of interest to the public.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BLAIR. As this is a modified form of the joint resolution I heretofore introduced, let it be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. HOAR. Several persons, gentlemen of standing and character in the District of Columbia, have applied to the Committee on Privileges and Elections for a hearing in support of the joint resolution. I communicated to them that I had no doubt the committee would give them a hearing if they should desire, but asked them to consider whether it would not be better for their case to present in print what they have to say. I have been informed by these gentlemen representing this sentiment that they would like to take that course, but that which ever course they take they would prefer to have the question deferred until the next session of Congress rather than to have the committee consider it and bring it into the Senate during the haste and crowded condition of business which will exist in the latter part of the present session. Unless some good reason shall appear to the contrary, I have no doubt the committee will comply with that desire, and will take the matter up for consideration at the beginning of next winter's session.

Mr. BLAIR. If I may be permitted to say an additional word I will state that this amendment originates in the desire to give to the people of the District substantial representation in the making of the general laws under which they live, and after the preparation of the original amendment which was made by citizens of the District on my suggestion of what I thought it ought to contain, I introduced the amendment as they had it prepared. There are some difficulties which would be likely to arise in the operation of such an amendment, should it be made as prepared, and those difficulties in this second preparation I have endeavored to obviate; but of course in so intricate and important a matter it is not to be presumed that any amendment will be likely to be so nearly complete as to not require substantial modification by the committee that considers it.

I am very glad that the matter is to be suspended until the next session of Congress. Meanwhile I think there may be somewhat extensive representations that the people of the District may make.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. ALLISON, Mr. CHANDLER, Mr. SPOONER, and Mr. STANFORD submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE and Mr. VANCE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the Indian appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 251) for the relief of the estate of Francis M. Murray, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 956) for the relief of heirs of Christopher Cott;

A bill (H. R. 3604) granting an honorable discharge to A. R. Hartzell, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 4320) to authorize the construction of a graveled or macadamized road from the city of New Berne, N. C., to the national cemetery near said city;

A bill (H. R. 5080) for the relief of C. B. Wilson;

A bill (H. R. 6233) for the relief of Jesse Coe; and

A bill (H. R. 7111) granting a pension to Caroline Pautel.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 38) granting the Washington and Idaho Railroad Company the right of way through the Cœur d'Alene Indian reservation;

A bill (S. 316) for the relief of Edward Fitzgerald;

A bill (S. 475) for the relief of the estate of Thomas L. Price, deceased; and

A bill (S. 850) granting certain lands in the Territory of Wyoming for public purposes.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government and the Bureau of Agriculture and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the Centennial Exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, from July 4 to October 27, 1888, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa, Mr. CLEMENTS, and Mr. BUTTERWORTH managers at the conference on its part.

SENATOR FROM INDIANA.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections in regard to the case of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE].

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further resolutions, concurrent or other, the order of morning business is closed, and the Senator from Massachusetts moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report of the Committee on Privileges and Elections concerning the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE].

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report is before the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the several memorials. I suppose that is all the action necessary.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the committee be discharged from the further consideration of the petitions and memorials in regard to the matter. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. CHANDLER. It seems to me, Mr. President, that one of the propositions enunciated by the committee in their report is too broad, and I desire to express my dissent from that proposition.

The committee make a reservation at the close of the report in which they state that they do not mean to be understood as declaring that the Senate, upon the question of the admission of a Senator to his seat, can not inquire into the legality of a Legislature; whether it is in form and in fact a Legislature competent to elect a United States Senator. But they also say they are of opinion, upon the offer made of proof of facts in this case as stated in the second proposition of their report, that the Senate have no authority to investigate such facts in connection with the question of a Senator's right to his seat. The offer of proof was as follows:

Second. That before said alleged election the senate—

That is, the State senate of Indiana—

wrongfully, and for the purpose of obtaining a majority for said TURPIE in said joint convention, declared two members, who had been duly and lawfully elected members thereof, not entitled to their seats, and declared two other persons, who had not been duly and lawfully elected, to be entitled to such seats, and thereupon seated such persons, and that this was done without right, without evidence, and without hearing or debate; and that said persons so seated thereafter were present and voted for Mr. TURPIE in said convention, and that without such votes said TURPIE would not have received a majority.

I concur in the general proposition that the Senate of the United States, when deciding upon the right of a Senator to his seat, should not undertake to investigate the legality of the election of members of the State Legislature which chose the Senator; but I think it is going too far to exclude the special case named in this second point of the report, where it may be made to appear that a Legislature in session, duly organized, as a preliminary to the election of a United States Senator, and as a part in fact of the proceeding of election, go on and in order to make a wrongful and fictitious majority eject certain members lawfully entitled to their seats and put others in their places.

It seems to me that there may be an extreme case in which it would not only be the right but the duty of the Senate to inquire into the circumstances of the ejection of members of a State Legislature from their seats, and that there is an exception, and there may well be an exception, to the general proposition that each branch of the State Legislature is entitled to decide for itself, and to decide for itself conclusively, the right of its members to their seats for the purpose of electing a United States Senator.

The question is one of some importance, and the rule as laid down by the committee may be one which will work in the future evil results because of the method prescribed for electing United States Senators by the United States statute on that subject. The act of 1866, as Senators well recollect, provides that if there is no election of Senator by a concurrent vote of the two Houses acting separately on the first day fixed by the act for an election, there shall be on the next day a joint convention, and that an election of Senator may, and shall then if possible, be made by that joint convention.

It may happen, it often has happened, that a Legislature thus assembled is of different politics in the two branches. There may be, for illustration, and I think there was in fact in this case, a Republican house of representatives and a Democratic senate, a Republican majority in one body and a Democratic majority in the other body.

Now, the proposition of the Senate committee in its broadest sense is that if, as preliminary to the election of a Senator, one of these bodies shall deliberately eject some of its members without right and shall substitute for those members others as members who had no right, for the purpose of creating a false and fictitious and manufactured majority in the joint convention, it is beyond the power of the Senate of the United States under any circumstances to inquire into the legality of that transaction.

I say that I think the committee have enunciated that proposition too broadly. I think that there may be a case where, under a proper construction of the Constitution, after a proper consideration of the law of 1866, if it shall appear that a majority is thus manufactured in a State Legislature, not as a regular and legitimate and ordinary course of business for the purpose of deciding as to the rights of members to their seats, but solely and clearly and plainly for the purpose of changing the political character of the joint body—I conceive that under these circumstances the Senate of the United States would unhesitatingly inquire into the legality of these transactions, and would treat the ejection of certain members and the introduction into the body of the State Legislature of other persons as a part of the *res gestæ*, as a part of the whole election by which a Senator is to be chosen contrary to the will of the Legislature as a whole.

The doctrine as laid down by the committee would go to the extent of preventing the Senate of the United States from disputing the legality of the election of a Senator in a case where, on the very morning of election, one body might undertake to eject a sufficient number of members from participation in the election, or might confine them where they could not take part in the election. The doctrine as broadly laid down by the committee might go to that extent, and it seems to me that the principles announced by the committee unanimously, as I understand, which as a general proposition may be correct, go altogether too far. I desire, therefore, to place upon record my dissent from the extreme doctrine thus too broadly stated.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, the considerations which have been suggested by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] have been the subject of very grave and anxious reflection on the part of a majority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

It is always unpleasant, when you have a constitutional or other public duty to perform, to feel yourself restrained from going into the merits of the entire question down to the bottom by any legal or constitutional barrier; but at the same time that is the theory upon which our government of checks and balances depends. Certain duties, certain judgments, certain ascertainments of fact are assigned under our Constitution and the laws to different tribunals, and each tribunal is bound to take as conclusive the adjudication of every other within its sphere. The Supreme Court of the United States, or the supreme court of any State renders a judgment between man and man; and when a suit is brought upon that judgment elsewhere, the second tribunal can not go into the question of mistake, of fraud, of duress, or of wrongful motive and purpose of any kind whatever, but it acts upon the judgment of the constitutional court.

Take a case which is quite analogous to the one with which the Senate now has to deal. A little while ago it was said, among the wretched campaign slanders of the time, that two judges of the Supreme Court of the United States were appointed for the purpose on the part of the Chief Executive, General Grant, of reversing the judgment of that court in an important controversy which had stirred very deeply the whole American people, an important constitutional question which affected the determination one way or the other of every contract to be executed in the future which required a payment of money from one man to another in this country. There never was a viler slander that came up from the stump. The names of the two gentlemen who were appointed to that bench at that time had been sent into the Senate before that judgment was announced from the bench; their names were here awaiting confirmation. I do not suppose there is any intelligent man, now that the excitement of that time has passed by, who seeks to find for the appointment to the bench of the Supreme Court of the United States of Judges Bradley and Strong any motive whatever, except the conspicuous excellence of those two gentlemen, and their conspicuous fitness for that lofty constitutional function. One of them has retired at the end of a long service, a model of the judicial character, and the other is by the general confession of bench and bar alike the foremost living jurist of the world, certainly the foremost living jurist upon this continent to-day.

But suppose it had been otherwise, would it have been lawful for any person who did not like the judgment of that exalted tribunal, who was called upon in any way as an executive officer or as a member of a State tribunal where that judgment might have been put in suit, to go into the question of the motive of the Executive who had the power of nominating, or of the Senate who had the power of confirming or rejecting the proposition to appoint them? The judgment of that constitutional court is a final judgment as to all the world.

In the same way, under the constitution of the State of Indiana, in the assignment of political power and its distribution between State and nation, each legislative body of that State, as of all the other States, is the final judge of the title to seats of the persons who compose it; and when you have got a lawful senate this body can inquire into nothing, when it seeks to inquire who was the person who cast his vote for a Senator of the United States, but what has been the judgment of that lawful senate as to that person's title to his seat. However much we may suspect or believe the influence of improper motives upon that

judgment, it is binding upon us under our oath of office to preserve the Constitution of the United States.

We have acted upon that doctrine in even a more important matter than this. It is declared in the Constitution that the several States of the Union shall determine the manner of choosing Presidential electors. We claimed on this side of the Chamber that that involved also the duty and the right on the part of the State authorities to ascertain the result of that election, and we declared that we could not go behind the result so ascertained and declared; and no doubt my honorable friend from New Hampshire will remember, unless I have very much misread the history of that period, that we declared that when the State tribunal had acted upon the question of the title to his seat in the electoral college of a State elector, that was conclusive upon the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States, and that we were to count the votes of the persons so declared entitled to that office.

Now in the same way we have the right undoubtedly, being the final judges of the election, qualification, and return of our members here, to see whether the elector in the Legislature of the State of Indiana in casting his vote was corrupted, or was under duress, or whether his vote in any way was wrested so that it was not the true and lawful act of that elector; but in determining who has the right to cast the several votes we are bound by the conclusive judgment of the legislative body of the State of Indiana. So we had only to inquire in determining whether the votes of these two men, Branahan and McDonald, were to be counted, which changed the result; whether the senate of the State of Indiana had pronounced them to be entitled to seats in that body; and we had no authority given us to say whether they did that against right, or against evidence, or for the purpose of changing the result of the election.

A question came up of the lawful organization of that senate, whether the lieutenant-governor or the person claiming to be president *pro tempore* of the senate was the lawful and rightful presiding officer. But there was a senate there, a senate of unquestioned authority. The governor of the State was recognizing it as a senate, receiving and approving the laws which it undertook to pass. The other house, the Republican house of the Indiana Legislature, was communicating with it as a senate, among other things inviting it to enter into this very joint convention in pursuance of the act of Congress; and it took its constitutional share in legislation and in laws which it passed, so organized and so presided over, by the entire acquiescence of the whole people of the State of Indiana, and is the law of that commonwealth to-day. And in addition to that, and a still more important recognition than that, every single member, Republican and Democrat alike of the body, in his individual official action recognized it as a lawful senate, acting for all lawful and constitutional purposes.

Therefore it seems to me, however much I may dislike the result, and however much I may disapprove the action of that body, if it be such as is set forth in this remonstrance, I do not see how, under my oath of office as a Senator, I can help giving effect to the votes of the persons whom that constitutional court, the senate of Indiana, declared, one by one, were entitled to act as electors on that occasion.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, when the Legislature of Indiana met nobody denied that the State senate in question was a constitutionally and legally organized body. A question then arose in the senate of Indiana as to the right of two persons to seats in that body, a question that had been by the constitution of that State left exclusively to the senate of that State to determine, and the Senator sitting in front of me [Mr. SPOONER] reminds me that the question of the right to seats in the other body, the house, was also presented. It was a Democratic senate and a Republican house. Each house exercised its constitutional right to pass upon the question as to who had been elected members, and rendered its judgment. In the house, as I recollect, a Republican was seated, at least one in place of a Democrat, who had held a certificate and who claimed to have been elected. In the senate two Democrats were seated in place of Republicans who had claimed to be elected and who, I think, held the certificates.

Mr. VOORHEES. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but there was just one ousted. There was one member, a Democrat, who sought his seat in the lower house who was denied it; and there was one Republican senator, whose seat was contested, who was ousted. Branahan and McDonald were contestants. McDonald was admitted.

Mr. TELLER. That does not change the legal aspect of the case.

Mr. VOORHEES. Not in the slightest.

Mr. TELLER. The senate of Indiana was exercising a constitutional right, a right given it by the constitution of the State, from which there was no appeal, and no tribunal created anywhere on the face of the earth could review their determination. They determined that the Democrat was elected. It is possible that they were influenced by their desire to create a Democratic majority. At all events, they were passing upon a question that they had a right to pass upon and that nobody else had a right to pass upon and that nobody else could review after they had passed upon it.

It does not lie in the power of the Senate of the United States, when it comes to a question of this kind, to review that decision, and no matter where it may take us, no matter where it may land us with reference to the misconduct of State Legislatures, it never was intended by the framers of this Government that that question of the right of members of the Indiana State Legislature to sit in either body there would ever be a subject of discussion in this body. We must accept the Legislature of Indiana that the people of Indiana in all departments of its State government recognized as their Legislature, and that we admit was a legally elected Legislature, although we may think the methods by which they secured a majority were unconstitutional and illegal, because we have not been authorized either by constitutional law or by statute to pass upon that question, and the committee in making this report have gone no further than former Senates have gone upon this question, and have not enunciated any new or strange doctrine to the American people. If the senate of Indiana outraged the rights of the people of Indiana, who elected another man from the one they seated, it is for the people of Indiana to settle with them.

The Senator from New Hampshire suggests that this doctrine may carry us too far, that it may carry us so far that if the Legislature of Indiana shall confine some members of that Legislature for the purpose of preventing them from voting, still we should not be allowed to inquire into that. Mr. President, the Legislature of Indiana would not then be exercising a constitutional duty or a constitutional power. That might be revolution, and that might raise an entirely different question. The committee have not dealt with that question. We have dealt with a Legislature declared to be legal in its inception, which the Senator would have us to say became illegal by the exercise improperly of a constitutional power conferred upon it by the constitution of Indiana.

Now, Mr. President, it is not worth while for this body in dealing with these questions to assume that there will be any such extraordinary conduct as is suggested; but if there should be, it will not be at all analogous to this case. What might then be the duty of the Senate in such a case would have nothing to do with what is its duty in this case.

I want to repeat again that this Legislature was legal when it was organized, and it was legal when it met in joint convention, unless it had by the introduction of one single member made itself an illegal body, which can not be presumed, and it was a Legislature that the governor of the State recognized, that the courts of the State recognized, and, as was said by the Senator from Massachusetts, the members of the house recognized it individually and collectively, and all the members of the senate, irrespective of party affiliations, recognized it, and the people of Indiana recognized it, and its enactments are the laws of Indiana to-day. Unless we are prepared to say that it was a body that could not enact legislation that would be binding on the people of Indiana, then we have no right to go into this question at all.

I am willing to stand by the language of this report, and even if the language had been stronger on that subject it would have met my approval.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, if I may be permitted a moment, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] rose to correct a statement of the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] in regard to the alleged unseating of members of the Indiana Legislature. We do not undertake to deal with the facts, but only with the allegations as stated. The Senator from Indiana stated that McDonald and Branahan were contestants. The precise fact is this: There was a man by the name of John McDonald who is alleged to have been unseated and Branahan put into his place. That was one of the questions at issue. Then there was another McDonald whose title to vote was disputed. He was, I believe, a regularly certified member, but his title to cast his vote was disputed by the Republicans, according to these allegations, on the ground that he was a postmaster or had some other incompatibility and was deemed, therefore, ineligible. The objection of the remonstrants, the gentlemen who contest Mr. TURPIE'S title, was to the recognition of both these men, Branahan on the ground that he was unlawfully put in his place by the exclusion of the Republican McDonald, and the Democratic McDonald on the ground that he had no right to sit there, he being ineligible; so that the objection related to two votes, both of which, it is said, were cast for the sitting member, and in regard to both of which the Committee on Privileges and Elections are of opinion that the judgment of the senate of Indiana is final. That, I believe, is the precise state of facts.

Mr. VOORHEES. The Senator from Massachusetts is exactly correct. I overlooked in my response to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] the fact that there was another McDonald. He was a sitting member, however, with a certificate of election, and nobody was contesting his title. My mind at the time simply reverted to the contest between Branahan and McDonald. It is not a matter of any consequence, however.

Mr. TELLER. I recollect the fact now as stated by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Indiana, but for the moment I had forgotten it. I knew there was a question raised on two senators. One had been admitted when he was outside at the beginning, and it was said the other ought to have been put out, but the Legislature declined to put him out. That is the case as I now recollect the testimony.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, it seems to me the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Colorado hardly state their case as they

have put it in the report. Near the bottom of the first page they say:

Second. That before said alleged election the senate wrongfully and for the purpose of obtaining a majority for said TURPIE in said joint convention, declared two members, who had been duly and lawfully elected members thereof, not entitled to their seats, and declared two other persons, who had not been duly and lawfully elected, to be entitled to such seats, and thereupon seated such persons; and that this was done without right, without evidence, and without hearing or debate, and that said persons so seated thereafter were present and voted for Mr. TURPIE in said convention, and that without such votes said TURPIE would not have received a majority.

If this report were what the Senators state, as I understand them, on the floor of the Senate, it would seem to me clear that they are right; but the report is inconsistent, as I think, with what they say on the floor of the Senate. If they admitted that the senate of the State of Indiana, in the honest exercise of its undoubted function of deciding as to the election and qualification of its own members, had proceeded to oust two of them who appeared to be lawfully elected, and who as a matter of fact were lawfully elected, and to give those seats to others who as a matter of fact were not lawfully elected, then I can see how the action of the senate of Indiana thus constituted or reconstituted might be final and sufficient to elect Mr. TURPIE; but the committee come here with an admission that the contestants offered to prove a direct violation of its constitutional duty by that body; in other words, the commission of a crime by the senate of Indiana, as much as though they had undertaken by murder to obtain a majority which might change the result in the choice of a Senator of the United States. According to the statement in the report it was an offer to prove a violation of constitutional law, the commission of a crime by that admittedly legal body and for the purpose of changing a result with a criminal intent.

It does not seem to me possible that the Senate of the United States, having the right to judge of the election and qualification of its members, can be held concluded by that which is admitted to be criminal conduct so far as an organized body can commit criminal conduct on the part of either the house of representatives or the Legislature jointly which sends a man here to claim a seat.

The explanation made by the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Colorado does not seem to me at all consistent with the offer which these contestants made of proof as stated in the report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I desire to state, as I did when I had the floor before, that I do not dispute the general principles advanced by the Senator from Massachusetts, nor the general proposition made in this report; but I continue of the opinion that it is altogether too broad a conclusion to say that where a State Legislature, or one branch of a State Legislature deliberately ejects members and puts others in their places in order to change the political character of the Legislature, and more than that, for the immediate and special purpose of electing a particular man to the Senate of the United States, who is then and there elected, this body can not inquire into such action.

Now, the proposition in the offer which was made of proof before this committee—and I understand very well that the Senator from Indiana, whose seat is now in question, does not admit that the facts could be proved as stated—but dealing with the offer of proof, the proposition was:

That before said alleged election the senate wrongfully, and for the purpose of obtaining a majority for said TURPIE—

ejected certain members and seated others.

That is the case; that wrongfully and with all these attending circumstances of outrage, in order that they might get a majority for this particular man for Senator, they then and there changed the complexion of that State Legislature.

Mr. President, I argue with considerable confidence that a case of that kind brings the ejection of the two members and the installation of two other persons so closely and completely and intimately into the election of a United States Senator that the Senate of the United States may fairly treat those acts as a part of the election of a United States Senator; and if in that election thus consummated there has been committed fraud or wrong in any way, the Senate of the United States may be a tribunal for the purpose of righting that wrong.

The Senator from Massachusetts has stated two illustrations, one the case where it might be supposed that the President of the United States appointed two justices of the Supreme Court in order to secure a particular opinion from the court to which the appointments were made. It seems to me that the illustration is not a good one. It is difficult to conceive how such a motive could be proved on the part of a President; and there is the further fact, that there is no tribunal which by any possibility in any form of proceeding could ascertain the motive of the President in appointing two justices on the supreme bench. The Senator appears to think his illustration is a good one and that there is a tribunal that has just as much right to pass upon the motive of the President in appointing two judges of the Supreme Court as this Senate has to deal with the election of a United States Senator. Then he may remain satisfied with his illustration.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator will allow me. I think if there were a suit brought before any court in this country on the judgment in the legal-tender cases the court would determine whether it would maintain that suit, having the same right to go into the question of the motive of the appointment of those two judges and their right to sit and determine that question as we have to go into the question of the motive of the senate of Indiana in declaring a certain person entitled to his seat in that body.

Mr. CHANDLER. I perceive that the Senator persists in his illustration and I still persist in differing from him. I think that a subordinate tribunal trying a case which involves the legality of the legal-tender act has not a right to go into the motive of the President of the United States in appointing two judges of the Supreme Court. It is not a tribunal for that purpose. But to say that the Senate of the United States, when it is engaged in investigating the election of one of its members by a State Legislature, can go into all the circumstances of that election and every step of that election, and can not go into the facts that are alleged in this offer of proof reported by the committee, is an entirely different claim.

The Senator also adduced another illustration. He says, in effect, that the Senate of the United States has no right to go into the question presented to-day by the offer of the remonstrants against the right of the Senator from Indiana to his seat, because the Electoral Commission in 1877 concluded that it had no right to go behind the findings of the returning boards in the Southern States. There is as to the case which furnishes this illustration a very wide and evident distinction, and that is that there was no tribunal which had any authority under the Constitution and laws of the United States to investigate the appointment of those electors which should appear to Congress to have been appointed in such manner as the Legislatures of the several States had prescribed.

When the Legislature of a State created a canvassing board and the canvassing board made their finding, the decision of eight out of the fifteen members of the Electoral Commission was that there was no power in Congress, in either or both branches, or in the Electoral Commission, to go behind that finding. There was no tribunal existing for that purpose. But if there had in fact been, within the contemplation of the Constitution, a tribunal created with authority to investigate the question of the election of electors of President and Vice-President of the United States, it would have been very difficult to resist the conclusion that the tribunal might inquire into more of the facts and more of the circumstances connected with the Presidential election than the Electoral Commission felt authorized to do; and there is a very clear and plain and wide distinction between the two cases.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator from New Hampshire if he means to say that this body can now go into the question whether the house of representatives in the Legislature of the State of Indiana when they seated the members that they seated—because if we go into the question as to one house we may go into it as to both houses of the Legislature—and say that it made a mistake when it did not oust the member who it was said ought to have been ousted because he was ineligible? Does the Senator seriously mean to claim that this Senate is to resolve itself into a tribunal to determine those questions?

Mr. CHANDLER. It will be difficult for me to convince the Senator from Colorado, because he says that the language of the report is not, as it stands, strong enough to suit him; but I deal with the language of the report. I say that if, as a part of the proceedings in the election of a Senator of the United States, the legislative body engaged in that election, just before the election and in such close connection with it that its action may be fairly treated by the Senate of the United States as a part of the election, wrongfully and for the purpose and with the effect of obtaining a majority for a particular individual, unseated members and seated others, it is competent for the Senate of the United States to go into that question.

The Senator from Massachusetts doubtless alluded to the decision of the Electoral Commission in order to make votes for his report on this side of the House; but I trust in the general interest of that report he has not succeeded by his reference to that decision, as I once did on a similar occasion in the Legislature of New Hampshire while trying to keep in a Democrat whose seat was contested, in driving so many Democrats away from him as to lose his case.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to discharge the Committee on Privileges and Elections from the consideration of the remonstrances filed and referred to that committee in the case of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE].

The motion was agreed to.

ADMISSION OF WASHINGTON TERRITORY.

Mr. STEWART. I gave notice that I should call up the bill for the admission of Washington Territory to-day, but the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] is quite unwell and would like to have it postponed until next week. I ask unanimous consent to have it fixed for Thursday week at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nevada asks that the bill for the admission of Washington Territory be made the special order for Thursday of next week at 2 o'clock. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1216, being House bill 1275. There will be no controversy about it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would state that the Calendar under Rule VIII being in order when the question of privilege was moved, the Chair had recognized the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL] to move the consideration of another bill, and in equity the Chair thinks he should now recognize the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. BROWN. I appeal to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. FARWELL. How long will the Senator take?

Mr. BROWN. Not five minutes.

Mr. FARWELL. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. DOLPH. I ask the Senator from Georgia to allow me to ask unanimous consent to have a bill made a special order, as I am now called to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. BROWN. I yield for that purpose.

SEACOAST DEFENSES.

Mr. DOLPH. I ask unanimous consent that Order of Business 603, being the bill (S. 62) to provide for fortifications and other seacoast defenses, be made the special order for two weeks from Monday next, to follow the Washington Territory bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon asks that the bill named by him be made a special order for two weeks from Monday next, at 2 o'clock in the afternoon. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills, received from the House of Representatives, were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

A bill (H. R. 956) for the relief of the heirs of Christopher Cott;

A bill (H. R. 3604) granting an honorable discharge to A. R. Hartzell, and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 4320) to authorize the construction of a graveled or macadamized road from the city of New Berne, N. C., to the national cemetery near said city.

The following House bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (H. R. 251) for the relief of the estate of Francis M. Murray, deceased; and

A bill (H. R. 6233) for the relief of Jesse Coe.

The bill (H. R. 5080) for the relief of C. B. Wilson was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The bill (H. R. 7111) granting a pension to Caroline Pautel was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT COLUMBUS, GA.

Mr. BROWN. I now move to take up the bill to which I have referred.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Georgia moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1216, House bill 1275.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (H. R. 1275) for the erection of a public building at Columbus, Ga., and appropriating money therefor, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT STEAM RAILROADS.

Mr. FARWELL. I move——

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask the Senator from Illinois to yield a moment to enable me to have a bill made a special order. I move that Calendar No. 1302, Senate bill 2919, be made the special order for Tuesday week.

Mr. FARWELL. Will the Senator from West Virginia state the object of the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANDERSON in the chair). The title will be stated by the Secretary.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2919) to define the routes of steam railroads in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What day does the Senator name?

Mr. FAULKNER. I named Tuesday week, as I thought that would give every one an opportunity to thoroughly consider the bill, a special order having already been fixed for the Monday preceding that, and also for Thursday. I desire to give full opportunity for all the Senators to consider the bill as now presented by the committee. It is an important matter, and it ought to be decided promptly one way or the other.

Mr. MORRILL. Does the Senator mean next Tuesday or a week from next Tuesday?

Mr. FAULKNER. A week from next Tuesday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the bill being made a special order for Tuesday of the week after next? The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. HAMPTON. I ask the Senator from Illinois to allow me to call up a House bill which is a matter of great consequence to the city of Charleston.

Mr. FARWELL. How long will it take?

Mr. HAMPTON. I think not two minutes.

Mr. FARWELL. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. HAMPTON. It is Order of Business 1217.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina asks that Order of Business 1217, House bill 4358, be now taken up. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4358) to increase the limit of cost for the public building in course of erection at Charleston, S. C.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BALTIMORE AND POTOMAC RAILROAD.

Mr. FARWELL. I now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 938, being the bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. MORRILL. I hope the Senator from Illinois will not insist on that motion. This is a minor question as compared with the one presented by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER], and just made a special order for a week from Tuesday next. I think the major question ought to be decided first, manifestly so. Having spent the better part of thirty-three years of my life in this city, I naturally take some interest in what so deeply concerns the welfare of the city as the location of the two railroads, the Baltimore and Ohio and the Baltimore and Potomac.

Mr. FARWELL. I beg the Senator's pardon one moment. This bill is not objected to by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad.

Mr. MORRILL. I understand that perfectly; but at the same time it is a question which is connected with the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad. When the major question shall have been decided the Senator will find me as liberal as himself towards either of these roads; but looking to the fact that this city is destined to stand in the primacy of all national cities in the world, I desire that we shall protect, if possible, the public parks. That is with me the principal and chief object in appearing on this matter. I desire to participate in the discussion of these questions. I do not feel well enough to do it to-day, but I hope to be prepared to do it a week from Tuesday, or I will make no further opposition.

Again, I desire to see the bill that has been presented by the Committee on the District of Columbia; it has not yet made its appearance on our desks in print. When that shall appear I shall be ready to offer a substitute which I not only hope will receive the approval of the Committee on the District of Columbia, but receive the approval of a majority of this body. I therefore trust that the Senator from Illinois will not press this measure forward at this time. I conceive it manifestly unfair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Calendar under Rule VIII being in order, the Senator from Illinois moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia. The question is on that motion.

The question being put, a division was called for, and the ayes were 8——

Mr. MORRILL. We shall have to have the yeas and nays.

Mr. VEST. I hope the Senator from Illinois will not persist in calling up the bill under the present circumstances. The Senator from Vermont states that his health is such that he can not debate the question to-day. Without saying what my view is in regard to the bill, I sincerely hope that we shall hear the Senator from Vermont on the question. There can be no such emergency as to authorize the pressing of the bill at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A division having been called for, the the Chair will announce the result of the count: The yeas are 8, and the noes 15. A quorum has not voted.

Mr. FARWELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. SPOONER. I appeal to the Senator from Illinois. I am in favor of this bill and joined in the report of the Committee on the District of Columbia in favor of it; but when the Senator from Vermont states that he desires to be present, and that he is ill and can not participate in the discussion to-day, and therefore prefers that the Senate defer action upon it, I submit to the Senator from Illinois that the bill ought not to be pressed at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On the pending question the Senator from Illinois demands the yeas and nays. Is there a second for the call?

Mr. BUTLER. I trust the Senator from Illinois will not insist on his motion. I am heartily in favor of considering the bill, but in view of the statement made by the Senator from Vermont I think it would scarcely be becoming to take up the bill now. Therefore, I shall feel

constrained to vote against the motion, whilst I should be very glad, indeed, to have the bill considered.

Mr. VANCE. If it be in order at this stage of the proceeding I desire to move, in deference to the request of the Senator from Vermont, the postponement of this bill until Tuesday next. He desires very much to discuss it, and he has announced this morning that he is not able to do so to-day, but hopes to be able to do so by next Tuesday, or if he is not then that he will withdraw his application before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would be compelled to hold that that motion is not now in order. The bill is not before the Senate. The motion is to proceed to its consideration, upon which there has been a division, which discloses that no quorum is present.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is evident there is a quorum in the Chamber, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to say a single word.

Mr. FARWELL. I will withdraw the request for the consideration of the bill under the circumstances.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois withdraws his motion to proceed to the consideration of the bill.

ADMISSION OF NEW STATES.

Mr. PLATT. While I was out of the Chamber a few moments since I understand that unanimous consent was obtained for the consideration of the bill for the admission of Washington Territory a week from Thursday next. I ask that that consent may also include the other two admission bills, for North Dakota and Montana. I think we may dispose of all of them in one day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator indicate them by the numbers on the Calendar?

Mr. EDMUNDS. They are understood. We all know what they are. I wish to say on the subject of unanimous consent that all this must be taken subject to other business not of a legislative character that the Senate may find it proper to attend to.

Mr. PLATT. I supposed all our unanimous consents were subject to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT] asks unanimous consent that the two bills referred to by him, one Order of Business 677, being the bill (S. 1196) to provide for the formation and admission into the Union of the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes, and the other Order of Business 819, being the bill (S. 2512) to provide for the formation and admission into the Union of the State of Montana, and for other purposes, shall be considered by the Senate after its disposition of the bill for the admission of Washington. Is there objection to unanimous consent being given? The Chair hear none, and it is so ordered.

HOURS OF LETTER-CARRIERS.

Mr. BLAIR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 865, being the bill (H. R. 1645) to limit the hours that letter-carriers in cities shall be employed per day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Calendar, under Rule VIII, being in order, the Senator from New Hampshire moves to proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

It provides that hereafter eight hours shall constitute a day's work for letter-carriers in cities or postal districts connected therewith, for which they shall receive the same pay as is now paid as for a day's work of a greater number of hours. If any letter-carrier is employed a greater number of hours per day than eight, he shall be paid extra for the same in proportion to the salary now fixed by law.

Mr. BLAIR. I wish to say that I am very anxious to dispose of this bill, and will ask the indulgence of the Senate beyond 2 o'clock, if it shall not then be disposed of.

The bill was reported by the Committee on Education and Labor with an amendment to add as a new section:

SEC. 2. That the Postmaster-General is authorized to make all necessary rules and regulations for carrying this act into effect.

Mr. BLAIR. The committee report the bill with this amendment, but on account of the great difficulty of securing attention to the bill and the really unimportant character of the amendment, the committee desire that it be disagreed to. I ask that the committee amendment be disagreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Committee on Education and Labor.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBEMARLE AND CHESAPEAKE CANAL COMPANY.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Calendar, under Rule VIII, being in order, the first bill on the Calendar in regular order will be announced.

The bill (S. 2039) for the relief of the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal Company was announced as first in order on the Calendar, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider it.

The bill proposes to direct the Secretary of the Navy to investigate the claim of the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal Company for tolls on vessels transporting naval supplies, and to award such sum as he may find equitably due, not to exceed $3,742.20, the award to be in full payment of all claims of the company against the Government.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAUDE H. MASTIN.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I move to proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 730, being the bill (S. 437) for the relief of Claude H. Mastin, surviving partner of the firm of Le Vert & Mastin, of Mobile, Ala.

Mr. VEST. Several of us have bills that we should like to have considered, and I simply want to call the attention of the Senate to this practice, after the Calendar has been taken up, of laying it aside. I have not the slightest objection to the Senator from Arkansas taking up his bill, but we ought to go on with the Calendar regularly, or else not attempt to enforce the rules of the Senate at all. We shall never get through the Calendar under the practice that the Senator from Arkansas now resorts to. I have on the Calendar three or four bills which I especially desire to have passed, but I have refrained from asking the Senate to take them up out of their order in the hope that the Calendar might be proceeded with regularly.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I deem it proper to say that I have no objection to taking up the Calendar and proceeding with it regularly, and I very much desire to do so. I have no objection to the Senator from Missouri calling up any bill out of order at any time, and will certainly not characterize his action as scrambling. The bill I move to take up has been on the Calendar quite a while; it has been reported time and again by committees of this body; it is a just and equitable claim, and in my judgment it ought to have been passed long since. I hope the Senate will proceed to its consideration.

Mr. VEST. I have bills of the same character on the Calendar.

Mr. MORGAN. It was at my request that the Senator from Arkansas moved to take up this bill. It is a bill to provide for the payment of a debt due to a firm, one member of which is dead. The daughter of Dr. Le Vert, the deceased member of the firm, is very infirm, is almost dying. The Government of the United States owes the firm a small sum of money for the use of property. The bill has twice heretofore passed the Senate. I think there will be no trouble at all in passing it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of Senators to the fact that debate on motions of this character is not in order under the rule, and can only be tolerated by unanimous consent.

Mr. HARRIS. I know debate is out of order, but I desire to say, as others have been allowed to be heard, that I hope the bill called up by the Senator from Arkansas will be disposed of, but it seems to me the wisest thing we can do is by unanimous consent to agree to take up the Calendar under Rule VIII, and devote, I would say to-morrow, next day, and the next day, at least two or three days in succession to it, so that we may run through the Calendar as we did three or four weeks ago, devoting day after day to it for such number of days as the Senate will consent to devote to it. And I will ask at this time unanimous consent of the Senate, if there be no appropriation bill interfering, that we take up the Calendar under Rule VIII to-morrow and devote at least the next two days to it immediately after the routine morning business is concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pending the motion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] asks unanimous consent of the Senate that to-morrow, immediately after the routine morning business, the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Calendar in its order. Is there objection to the request? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas to proceed to the consideration of the bill which has been indicated.

Mr. CHANDLER. What is the order of business?

The CHIEF CLERK. Order of Business 730, being the bill (S. 437) for the relief of Claude H. Mastin, surviving partner of the firm of Le Vert & Mastin, of Mobile, Ala.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, being the bill (S. 2083) to provide for the establishment of a Bureau of Animal Industry, and to facilitate the exportation of live-stock and their products, to extirpate contagious pleuro-pneumonia and other diseases among domestic animals, and for other purposes.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the bill taken up on the motion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] be proceeded with, displacing the unfinished business as to that bill.

Mr. BLAIR. I desire at this time to move another bill to displace the regular order; but I shall yield informally to the Senator from Arkansas to dispose of his bill.

Mr. HARRIS. If this bill is taken up under my motion, the Senator will have a chance presently.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee moves that Senate bill 437 be continued in consideration.

Mr. BLAIR. Should that be done, as soon as the bill is disposed of

will it be in order for me to move to proceed to consider any bill on the Calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands. If the Senate votes to consider this bill, the consideration of which is moved now by the Senator from Tennessee, it will displace the unfinished business.

Mr. BLAIR. But when the bill of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES] is disposed of, will it then be in order for me to make a motion to proceed to consider some other bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands, there being no unfinished business at that time and no special order for that time.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask the Chair to recognize me, then, when this bill shall have been disposed of.

Mr. PALMER. I am willing that Senate bill 2083, being the animal-industry bill, should be displaced. There is such a diversity of opinion that it will lead to great discussion, and I shall be out of the Chamber much of the time for the next two weeks, and therefore would prefer to have it go to the Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee to proceed with the consideration of Senate bill 437.

Mr. VEST. What is the fate of the bill in regard to the Bureau of Animal Industry?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It will be displaced by this motion, and will go to the Calendar in its order.

Mr. VEST. Then it goes back to the Calendar?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It goes back to the Calendar. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 437) for the relief of Claude H. Mastin, surviving partner of the firm of Le Vert & Mastin, of Mobile, Ala.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, in line 9, after the word "Hospital," to insert "and;" and after the word "thereto," in the same line, to strike out the words "and so forth;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and required to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $3,927 to Claude H. Mastin, surviving partner of Le Vert & Mastin; the said sum to be received in full payment and satisfaction for the rent of the Le Vert Hospital and damages thereto by the United States authorities.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GREENOUGH'S STATUE OF WASHINGTON.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, some days ago I offered a resolution in regard to the statue of Washington in the Capitol grounds, and it was referred to the Committee on the Library. At the request of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], a member of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, I wish to have that reference changed, with the consent of the chairman of the Committee on the Library, the Senator from New York [Mr. EVARTS], with whom I have conferred. I move that the resolution be withdrawn from the Committee on the Library and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the resolution to which the Senator from Missouri refers will be withdrawn from the Committee on the Library and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, together with the letter accompanying the resolution.

Mr. VEST. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

Mr. BLAIR. I move that the Senate proceed to consider Order of Business 1196, being the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a Department of Labor, a bill that passed the House of Representatives unanimously.

Mr. VEST. I hope we shall go on with the Calendar. I may be in a minority, but I shall insist on it.

Mr. BLAIR. My motion is in order. I hope the Senator will not oppose it.

Mr. VEST. It is a very important bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANDERSON in the chair). The Senator from New Hampshire moves to proceed to the consideration of House bill 8560.

The question being put, it was declared that the noes appeared to prevail.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask for a division.

Mr. HARRIS. I hope not.

Mr. BLAIR. The bill will take but a short time.

Mr. HARRIS. It will take at least an hour.

Mr. BLAIR. I have wanted for a long time to rid myself of the burden of this bill.

Mr. HARRIS. You can bear the burden a little longer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls attention to the rule that prohibits debate on a motion of this character. Is a division called for?

Mr. BLAIR. I desire to have the bill considered. If it is necessary to call for a division, I must do so, or call for the yeas and nays. I think there will be no further question made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is a division called for by the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. BLAIR. I ask that the question be put again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will put the question again on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a Department of Labor.

The question being put, it was declared that the noes appeared to prevail.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KENNA. Are the yeas and nays ordered? I saw but two hands up.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair saw a sufficient number rising to second the call for the yeas and nays. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire to proceed to the consideration of the bill named by him.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANDERSON (in the chair, when his name was called). The occupant of the chair announces that he is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN].

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. PADDOCK. I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS]. I do not know how he would vote if present.

Mr. ALLISON. I am paired with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY]. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 16, nays 14; as follows:

YEAS—16.

Blair,	Davis,	Hoar,	Teller,
Bowen,	Evarts,	Jones of Arkansas,	Turpie,
Brown,	Faulkner,	Palmer,	Voorhees,
Chandler,	George,	Sherman,	Wilson of Iowa.

NAYS—14.

Bate,	Coke,	Pasco,	Vance,
Butler,	Hampton,	Pugh,	Vest.
Call,	Harris,	Quay,	
Cockrell,	Morgan,	Reagan,	

ABSENT—46.

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Ingalls,	Riddleberger,
Allison,	Edmunds,	Jones of Nevada,	Sabin,
Beck,	Eustis,	Kenna,	Saulsbury,
Berry,	Farwell,	McPherson,	Sawyer,
Blackburn,	Frye,	Manderson,	Spooner,
Blodgett,	Gibson,	Mitchell,	Stanford,
Cameron,	Gorman,	Morrill,	Stewart,
Chace,	Gray,	Paddock,	Stockbridge,
Colquitt,	Hale,	Payne,	Walthall,
Cullom,	Hawley,	Platt,	Wilson of Md.
Daniel,	Hearst,	Plumb,	
Dawes,	Hiscock,	Ransom,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a quorum voting. The Secretary will call the roll of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Jones of Arkansas,	Saulsbury,
Allison,	Davis,	Kenna,	Sawyer,
Bate,	Dolph,	Manderson,	Sherman,
Blair,	Evarts,	Paddock,	Spooner,
Bowen,	Frye,	Palmer,	Stewart,
Brown,	George,	Pasco,	Teller,
Butler,	Gray,	Payne,	Vance,
Call,	Hampton,	Platt,	Vest,
Chandler,	Harris,	Pugh,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Hawley,	Quay,	Walthall,
Coke,	Hoar,	Reagan,	Wilson of Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The call of the roll discloses forty-four Senators present. A quorum being present, the call under the order for the yeas and nays will be proceeded with.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PLATT (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. EVARTS. I am unable to vote. I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

Mr. PADDOCK. I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS]. I do not know how he would vote.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 16; as follows:

YEAS—23.

Allison,	Davis,	Hoar,	Stewart,
Blair,	Edmunds,	Jones of Arkansas,	Teller,
Bowen,	Faulkner,	Manderson,	Turpie,
Brown,	Frye,	Palmer,	Voorhees,
Chandler,	George,	Sawyer,	Wilson of Iowa.
Cullom,	Hawley,	Spooner,	

NAYS—16.

Bate,	Coke,	Pasco,	Saulsbury,
Berry,	Gray,	Pugh,	Vance,
Butler,	Hampton,	Quay,	Vest,
Cockrell,	Harris,	Reagan,	Walthall.

ABSENT—37.

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Jones of Nevada,	Ransom,
Beck,	Eustis,	Kenna,	Riddleberger,
Blackburn,	Evarts,	McPherson,	Sabin,
Blodgett,	Farwell,	Mitchell,	Sherman,
Call,	Gibson,	Morgan,	Stanford,
Cameron,	Gorman,	Morrill,	Stockbridge,
Chace,	Hale,	Paddock,	Wilson of Md.
Colquitt,	Hearst,	Payne,	
Daniel,	Hiscock,	Platt,	
Dawes,	Ingalls,	Plumb,	

So the motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and will be read.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask the Senator from New Hampshire having the bill in charge to allow it to be laid aside informally, so that I may call up the pension appropriation bill.

Mr. BLAIR. I assent to that.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the request of the Senator from Iowa to be that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside for the consideration of the pension appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes; I ask that it be informally laid aside for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is so ordered, unless there be objection.

Mr. BROWN. Will the Senator from Iowa allow me to have an order made?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. BROWN. In the Forty-sixth Congress a bill was introduced in the Senate for the relief of Nathaniel P. Harbin. There was no adverse report, as I understand, and the papers are on the files of the Senate. I ask leave for his attorney to withdraw them.

The order was agreed to, as follows:

Ordered, That Nathaniel P. Harbin have leave to withdraw the papers in his case from the files of the Senate.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had yesterday approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

An act (S. 1148) to grant a right of way to the Kansas City and Pacific Railroad Company through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes;

An act (S. 2671) to create and organize the county of Latah;

An act (S. 1889) to authorize the Tennessee Midland Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River at any point on the line between the counties of Decatur and Perry, in the State of Tennessee, it may deem acceptable;

An act (S. 2198) to authorize the building of a railroad bridge at Little Rock, Ark.; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 73) relating to the disposal of public lands in certain States.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pension appropriation bill will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5445) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, which was reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the amendments may be considered as the bill is read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read and the amendments will be considered on the formal reading of the bill, if there be no objection. The reading of the bill will be proceeded with.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in line 11, after the word "Mexico," to strike out "seventy-nine million" and insert "eighty million four hundred and seventy-three thousand;" so as to read:

For Army and Navy pensions as follows: For invalids, widows, minor children, and dependent relatives, and survivors and widows of the war of 1812, and with Mexico, $80,473,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 15, after the words "*And provided further*," to strike out:

That in all pensions to widows, payments shall be made from the date of death of the husband.

And to insert:

That all pensions which have been, or which may hereafter be, granted under the general laws regulating pensions to widows in consequence of death occurring from a cause which originated in the service since the 4th day of March, 1861, shall commence from the date of death of the husband.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask for a division of the motion to strike out and insert. I desire first to have the question taken on the motion to strike out.

Mr. ALLISON. Is the question divisible?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly it is divisible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair presumes a division may be ordered if requested by the Senator from Missouri. The words proposed to be stricken out will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In lines 15, 16, and 17 the committee report to strike out the words:

That in all pensions to widows, payments shall be made from the date of death of the husband.

Mr. ALLISON. It does not seem to me that that would be the proper way to put the question on the amendment. The amendment is to strike out and insert. The Senator from Missouri moves to strike out, and not to insert. I do not wish to vote to strike this clause out unless the words in italics are inserted. It ought not to be a divisible amendment, although it may be under parliamentary rules. My impression, however, is that it is not divisible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chief Clerk will read Rule XVIII.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

RULE XVIII.

AMENDMENTS—DIVISION OF A QUESTION.

If the question in debate contains several propositions, any Senator may have the same divided, except a motion to strike out and insert, which shall not be divided; but the rejection of a motion to strike out and insert one proposition shall not prevent a motion to strike out and insert a different proposition; nor shall it prevent a motion simply to strike out; nor shall the rejection of a motion to strike out prevent a motion to strike out and insert. But pending a motion to strike out and insert, the part to be stricken out and the part to be inserted shall each be regarded for the purpose of amendment as a question; and motions to amend the part to be stricken out shall have precedence.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under this rule the Chair feels constrained to hold that the amendment is not divisible, and that the question before the Senate will be on striking out the words in lines 15, 16, and 17, and inserting the words which follow, printed in italics.

Mr. HARRIS. I raise a question of order on the amendment, that it is legislation upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. ALLISON. There is no doubt of the fact that it is legislation; but the provision is in the bill, and we are bound to deal with it in some way.

Mr. COCKRELL. If there is legislation in the bill after we strike out what the committee propose shall be stricken out, that can also be rejected. Then the whole provision will go out, and that is just what ought to be done. Neither the part proposed to be stricken out nor the part proposed to be inserted by the Senate committee ought to be left in the bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. It strikes me that that is rather a broad statement. When a widow applies for a pension, or for the continuance of a pension which was given to her husband, and the Pension Bureau decides that she is entitled to it, I see no logic in the world in insisting that the payment shall begin with the date of the application. It seems to me it is entirely just that the widow should draw pension from the date of the death of the husband. Of course there are some equities in individual cases, as if a widow should wait five years or ten years, being wealthy or able to get on without assistance; but that has nothing to do with the general principle.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will take advantage of its privilege under Rule XX:

The Presiding Officer may submit any question of order for the decision of the Senate.

The Chair will submit to the Senate the question whether the point of order is well taken that this is legislation.

Mr. ALLISON. I should be glad to have the Chair state the point of order. Is the point of order made by the Senator from Tennessee that the original text is not in order?

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Tennessee has no right to make a question of order upon the original text as it came from the other House; but where the Committee on Appropriations have incorporated in the form of an amendment that which amounts to general legislation, and have attached it to an appropriation bill, it is in direct conflict with the rules of the Senate and is clearly out of order. My question of order is upon the committee amendment.

Mr. ALLISON. Then the Senate is in the attitude of finding objectionable legislation on the bill, and having no power or control over it in the way of amendment. Surely that can not be the intent and purpose of any rule of the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. I am surprised to hear the Senator from Iowa make that statement, in view of the fact that he and I have witnessed controversies over this precise question a hundred times upon this floor, and if there has been the shadow of variableness or of turning in respect of its decision, I do not call to mind the time when we have failed to rule such an amendment out of order. Notwithstanding the fact that the House bill may contain legislation, if a Senate amendment to it amounts to general legislation it has been invariably held by the Chair to be out of order, and therefore it has not been entertained, so far as my memory goes.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not think the rulings of the Chair have been uniform in this regard; but it is certain that if this provision is stricken out now by a vote of the Senate it will be insisted upon by the other House, and then a conference will be appointed upon the disagreeing votes, and three conferees on the part of the Senate will do what the Senator from Tennessee says the Senate can not do under its rule.

Mr. COCKRELL. We can refuse to accede to the report of the conferees.

Mr. HARRIS. There is certainly no question about the fact that if the clause proposed to be inserted by the committee is ruled out of order and the Senate then chooses to strike out the text of the bill as it came from the other House, and leaves it an open question for the conference, the conferees may amend it in conference, and then each House will determine whether it will agree to the report of the committee or not. But my point is that the Senate ought to respect its own rules and observe its own dignity in respect to the provision, no matter what may be the result later.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator from Tennessee a question?

Mr. HARRIS. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. He speaks of what a committee of conference may do. Does he mean to maintain that a committee of conference can introduce legislation into an appropriation bill and be outside of the point of order when their report of such an amendment comes in? I should hope not.

Mr. HARRIS. I will state what I mean, Mr. President. I can not quite assent affirmatively to the suggestion that the Senator from Vermont makes; but the other House has sent us an appropriation bill which does contain a legislative provision. We have a perfect right to strike it out. We can not make a question of order upon it in the Senate and dispose of it in that way. The committee of conference has no higher right than the two Houses who constitute that committee, and general legislation upon an appropriation bill being forbidden by the rules of both Houses I should deny the power of a conference committee to insert general legislation. But where the Senate has stricken out a provision in the text of the bill the conferees on the part of the two Houses must either agree to the striking out or they must reinstate, or reinstate with an amendment or something in lieu of it, as is the usual practice. However, if I am asked the direct question, Has a conference committee the power to legislate upon a general appropriation bill? I am bound to answer, No; it has not.

Mr. EDMUNDS. So say I, Mr. President. A conference committee is not a joint committee, but it is a meeting of two distinct and independent committees. Therefore, when a report is made to this body by our conferees, as it can be made by nobody else, it is a report of our own committee, and they have no more right to put legislation in an appropriation bill than anybody else. I think that is very clear.

But the difficulty is the one suggested by the Senator from Iowa, that in spite of all our efforts to keep legislation out of appropriation bills we have not had the courage (I should not dare to say the good sense, because that would imply that we have not good sense, which all of us would deny, of course) to have a rule of the Senate providing that any legislation which comes to us in a House appropriation bill should, as a matter of order, be stricken out, and after being stricken out that action should be insisted upon to the very end. The House of Representatives, having the public interests in charge as well as we, if they undertook to affirm a thing in an appropriation bill that the Senate were not willing to agree to, whether it is an item or whether it is a law, would recede of course, just as we must always do when we put an amendment on a House bill or send over a bill of our own to them to some phrase in which they are unwilling to agree; if we want the bill passed at all we must recede from that phrase.

Yet go as far as the other House is willing to go, the matter is easy enough except for the technical difficulty that our rules do not provide, as they ought and as I have tried in an humble and ineffectual way hitherto to have them provide, that all general legislation in an appropriation bill which comes from the House of Representatives should go out as a matter of order; that it should not be left to any committee to consider whether they could improve it or do something else about it, but that we should say, "We will not consider questions of general legislation upon an appropriation bill."

This provision that the Committee on Appropriations propose is a great improvement upon the proposition of the other House, but both of them, I must admit, are clearly general legislation. We ought either to waive our own rule and agree to the committee's amendment, or, without going into a consideration of the merits of either the amendment or the original proposition of the other House, we ought to strike them both out and stick to it; and there is no danger in sticking to it in respect of the other House receding, because the other House is a body of equal good sense with our own and knows the relations that exist between two independent bodies.

There is great merit apparently in what our committee propose, although the object of all our laws about limiting the time for paying pensions is to guard against fraud and the temptation of speculators to make false claims of all kinds in the name of somebody and thus be working a continual fraud upon the Treasury.

That is the theory which limits applications for pensions, and the time when they are allowed to go back to. It is not because in a case that is perfectly clear it ought not to go back in that particular case, but because in all general laws you must provide for the general public safety by having limitations in order to avoid the presentation of false and fraudulent claims. These limitations only operate upon people who neglect to apply for and enforce their rights. The Government goes upon the principle that everybody understood his rights and must be governed by some general law and provision.

But this amendment of the committee is, I have no doubt, out of order, and the House provision is equally out of order in respect of the spirit of our rules. I do not know what their rules are; perhaps I have no right to know; but certainly it is against the spirit of our rules, and being so, it ought to go out as a matter of order without regard to its merit.

Mr. HARRIS. I wish to say to the Senator from Vermont that if he will formulate the rule he has just suggested as a matter of order in this body, to strike out legislative provisions in appropriation bills, as one member of the Committee on Rules I shall most cheerfully favor its adoption. But under our rules as they now stand we have no authority to do that. The only remedy we have in respect of general legislation on appropriation bills coming from the other House is the power of amendment, to strike it out.

I have agreed upon many occasions with the Senator from Vermont before to-day that this body ought to strike out general legislation from an appropriation bill, and when we have stricken it out because it was general legislation upon such bill, we ought to stand by our action and assert our view of the policy, or rather the impolicy and the vice, of putting general legislation upon appropriation bills.

I shall be very glad, if the Senator from Vermont will formulate the rule he suggests, to see it adopted and become a part of our standing rules; but as we have no such rule now, the only remedy is the question of order; and then we can strike out, if the Senator from Iowa will agree, the original provision in the House bill and let the conference committee see what they can do with it later.

Mr. HAWLEY. I can not agree with the Senator from Tennessee in the chief point he makes. We have matter in this bill which the Senate must either adopt as a whole or reject as a whole. It is a very singular condition of affairs that there shall be a clause in any bill which upon its first consideration in Committee of the Whole we must either throw out wholly or accept wholly.

If he says we can not raise the point of order on the original provision because it was put in by the other House, then we accept that proposition as in the bill like all other provisions and subject to all the liabilities of other provisions.

I can not consent that the Senate shall agree to a rule by which it shall take away from itself absolutely the power to amend. I will go as far as the farthest in striking out from every appropriation bill anything whatever in the nature of legislation. Congress spent four months eleven years ago fighting on that proposition, and the Republicans of the House of Representatives were absolutely right, in my judgment, in resisting the passage of even the appropriation bill for the support of the Army in the spring of 1877, and compelling an extra session upon that issue. I say I will go as far as the farthest; but if we are not to be able to apply our own rule against legislation to a bill that comes here from our committee, I do not care where it originated, then I want that phrase to stand upon an equal footing with every other phrase in the bill; that is, let it be open to amendment.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Connecticut allow me to ask him, if we relax our rule or ignore it as to legislative propositions upon appropriation bills coming from the other House, does he not realize the fact that appropriation bills will become the receptacle for a large proportion of our important legislation? We had as well abandon the struggle as either to relax or ignore the provisions of our rules and let appropriation bills become the vehicles for forcing through all manner of general legislation.

Mr. HAWLEY. But it is not I who am relaxing. Suppose that this has no business on the bill as general legislation, I should rule it out; I should be in favor generally, if the Senate will agree to it, whether the point of order be made or not, that the Appropriations Committee shall report, if you choose, to strike out from even its report a clause which is distinctly legislative. I would not relax the rule myself, and I will agree upon any course that shall be thought best to enforce it absolutely and without reservation; but if we are not to enforce it, if the Senator's point is good that it is a relaxation of the rule, that we can not raise the point of order upon legislation coming here from the other House, then I say let us hold to our right to amend that legislation. It is very illogical indeed that we should unconstitutionally deprive ourselves of the full power of legislation upon every line in the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not think the Senator from Connecticut need have any apprehension that the conferees on the part of the Senate would yield after the Senate had taken decided action. The proposition that came from the other House reads thus:

That in all pensions to widows, payments shall be made from the date of death of the husband.

I suppose that would include the one solitary Revolutionary widow that I believe there is, and some 11,000 widows of the war of 1812, and so on. It is proposed that the Senate shall strike that out and insert a clause which is clearly legislation. It is upon this amendment, proposed by the Committee on Appropriations, that the Senator from Tennessee has made his point of order. There can be no question but that the point of order is well taken, and that the amendment is amenable to the rule of the Senate prohibiting legislation upon an appropriation bill. If the Senate sustains the point of order which has been submitted to the Senate, I shall move to strike out the words:

That in all pensions to widows, payments shall be made from the date of death of the husband.

If the point of order is sustained, I hope the Senate will agree to strike out those words, and then it will go into conference, and I think the Senate need have no fears that the conferees on the part of the Senate will not adhere to the vote of the Senate, and will make no compromise upon this measure when they have been instructed by a vote of the Senate as to what they shall do.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to be instructed by the Senator from Missouri, or the Senator from Vermont, or some other great legal light, in regard to this matter. I understand that it has been settled by our parliamentary practice that the general appropriation bills are bills for raising revenue. They originate in the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives makes that claim, and we accede to it.

Mr. COCKRELL. No; I think not. I have never yielded it.

Mr. HOAR. We have acceded to it for many years.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think the Senate has never yielded it, and I can show the Senator reports of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives repudiating that idea.

Mr. HAWLEY. Reports of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives?

Mr. COCKRELL. I say House Judiciary Committee reports have been made absolutely against the idea that the House of Representatives had the exclusive right to originate appropriation bills.

Mr. HOAR. I understand that whatever may have been said by one particular committee in the House of Representatives, or whatever may have been said by Senators in times past, it is the settled construction of the clause in the Constitution that bills appropriating money to which bills for raising revenue are in order are bills for raising revenue within the meaning of the clause which provides that they shall originate in the House of Representatives. Nobody has undertaken to insist on the right of the Senate to originate one of these bills for a generation in any practical way.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator will allow me to suggest that I do not think the Senate has ever yielded to that proposition. Indeed, we pass appropriation bills for public buildings here every day and send them to the other House.

Mr. HOAR. I understand; but I refer to the general appropriation bills.

Mr. ALLISON. We have not, of course, attempted to take jurisdiction of that subject.

Mr. HOAR. Why not?

Mr. ALLISON. I think we ought to do it.

Mr. HOAR. I understand——

Mr. ALLISON. I think the Senate ought to take the initiative in regard to appropriation bills.

Mr. HOAR. What I wish to say is, that these are either revenue bills or they are not. If we yield as a matter of practice to the claim of the House of Representatives that they have a right to originate these general appropriation bills, whether we think we are right or think we are wrong, and make it the settled policy of this Government that these bills are to be treated as within the constitutional prohibition to the Senate and they must originate in the House of Representatives, that is one thing. If we do not think so, the committee of which the Senator from Iowa is chairman should introduce a certain number of general appropriation bills and send them down to the other House and stand on our rights. If we yield that right, as we have done for a generation, we are bound to assert the clause of the Constitution that goes with it, that the Senate being deprived of the power to originate bills of that class it shall have and may rightfully exercise the power to put amendments on those bills as on other bills.

Mr. COCKRELL. Why, then, did we make the rule?

Mr. HOAR. What I wish to have the Senator answer is this: We have got to take that constitutional deprivation accompanied with the duty which the Constitution has put upon it. If one branch of the Government is, for the public interest, deprived of the power of originating this class of bills, it must exercise, and it can not take away by its rule the power to exercise, the right to amend such a bill as other bills.

I do not regard it a good answer to this proposition to say we think the other House is wrong. There is not a Senator here who stands on his opinion that the other House is wrong, and asserts the right of the Senate. The other House has carried into our constitutional interpretation the doctrine that the thirteen or fourteen great appropriation bills of the year must be originated there, and that we can not touch them as initiative legislation. We yield to that doctrine, and as long as we yield to that doctrine we are bound to assert our constitutional right on the contrary to amend them as other bills.

Mr. COCKRELL. We have not yielded any particle of our right. The Senate has a constitutional right, and the right under its rules to amend all revenue bills, but the Senate has never recognized an appropriation bill as a revenue bill, nor has the House of Representatives ever claimed that an appropriation bill was a revenue bill. A revenue bill would be legislation. The House of Representatives has its rules prohibiting legislation upon appropriation bills. The Senate has its rules prohibiting legislation upon appropriation bills. The House of Representatives has no rule prohibiting legislation on revenue bills, nor as a matter of course has the Senate any such rule.

Here is an appropriation bill, pure and simple. It is not a revenue bill. It proposes nothing in the way of revenue. The other House, by inadvertence or otherwise, has inserted legislation. The Senate Committee on Appropriations proposes to strike out that legislation and insert other legislation. The point of order is made against the proposed amendment of the Senate committee. It is made for the purpose of getting at the whole question. If the Senate shall hold that that is legislation and so it shall be rejected, then a motion will be made to strike out the legislation which the other House has inserted, and I hope that motion will prevail. Then we shall have divested this appropriation bill of its obnoxious features under the rules of the House and of the Senate.

As I said, I doubt not the Senate Committee on Appropriations or its conferees will stand by the instructions of the Senate on that question, as they ought to do. I hope that the Senate will sustain the objection made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] that this is legislation, and when that is done I shall move to strike out the legislation the other House has inserted.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The Committee on Appropriations itself has reported to strike out this legislative clause in the House bill. It has also reported, it is true, to put in another clause in the place of it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes, and I tried to have a division of the question.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The amendment is an improvement upon the House provision undoubtedly. Our own committee are of opinion that the clause as it stands in the House bill ought not to be there, whatever their motive may have been.

But let us come to the substance of this business about these bills. The Senator from Massachusetts has not maintained that the Senate can not originate an appropriation bill. He has only said that it has been the practice for a good many years for the House of Representatives to originate these general appropriation bills.

Mr. HOAR. As of right, of exclusive right.

Mr. EDMUNDS. As of exclusive right, he says. I do not know where the evidence of that is; but I will assume for the sake of the argument that the other House does claim that it has the exclusive right to originate these bills, on the ground, as it professes, on this assumption that I make, that they are revenue bills—not bills for raising revenue, but bills for disposing of revenue—and that the Constitution reads in its true spirit according to that theory, that all bills for disposing of the revenues of the United States already raised must originate in the House of Representatives, for they fall, as the claim is thus, under the class of revenue bills. So be it, for the sake of the argument.

Then how can the Senate constitutionally originate and pass a bill which disposes of a single penny of the public money? The Constitution does not measure this right by the amount of money that is in the bill, but by the nature of the act that is being done; and the act that its framers were trying to secure was that the immediate and most direct and most frequently elected representatives of the people should be the originators of the taxing power, of taking money out of the pockets of the people and putting it into the Treasury. That is what it was, and all of it.

But if you take the other ground, and say that a bill for paying out money from the Treasury that has once been raised is a revenue bill (and it is not easy to pay it out until it is raised, because you can not get your requisition answered, however many laws you may pass), then you come to a proposition that, to my mind, is absolutely irrefutable; but you must go the whole length of that proposition, and not divide it on the question whether the bill contains $100,000 for a public building in Washington or $100 for a pension to a poor, broken-down soldier, or whatever may be the sum or amount or purpose of the money that is to be paid out of the Treasury. It is everything under the Constitution or it is nothing.

If the Senate has no right to pass an appropriation bill that takes a million dollars out of the Treasury, because it is a revenue bill, it clearly has no right to pass a bill that takes $10 out of the Treasury, because it is equally a revenue bill. Everybody knows, of course, who has the least common sense in the world, that that thing will not stand, and it never has stood.

But the House of Representatives, it is said, has contended by action (not otherwise that I know of) that large appropriations for the general purposes of the Government to carry on a Department, like the Indian appropriation bill, for instance, should originate with it. Suppose we originate one such bill and pass it; and they say, "we will not consider it;" that is, they lay it on the table, or do nothing; and suppose they stop there? Then of course the Government would stop,

if we carry it around to all the objects of appropriation; nothing could be carried on, and somebody would be very much to blame. Either the House of Representatives would not be re-elected, and it would get members of a better mind, or we should not be re-elected.

But suppose they did the other thing, which they would do, and which they have done on one or two occasions I believe in old times, just leave the Senate bill in a committee or on the table, as they do the largest part of our bills to this day which are not revenue bills, and act upon and pass a bill of their own which appropriates precisely the same amounts of money for precisely the same objects, and they send it here. We do not contend that the House of Representatives have no right to originate such a bill, and all that we know officially is that a bill of precisely the same character which we have sent to them is on their table not acted upon. I think that we could take heart of grace in such a case and pass their bill without losing anything whatever of dignity or of our constitutional rights. I do not think in such a case that the question of who shall go first in to dinner would allow us to let the people's dinner entirely cool and let the Government stop; and we should not have recognized any exclusive right in the House of Representatives to originate an appropriation bill at all.

We know that in a hundred instances nearly in every Congress, certainly two dozen or more bills of the Senate have passed and have been sent to the House of Representatives and have gone on their table or somewhere else, we do not know where, and a bill in the same language or in substance the same bill comes from the House of Representaves; and what do we do? Do we say the other House is assuming a prerogative of originating that kind of a bill to pay a pension to somebody or to erect a public building or to allow a bridge to be built, or whatever? Not by any means. We pass the House bill as a mere matter of convenience that they have sent us, not because they refused to entertain ours, but because they have passed a bill of the same character which comes here, and we gladly take it up and pass it at once in order that, both Houses agreeing to such a measure, it may pass and become a law. That is the object of it and that is all, and it is not giving away any right of the Senate or disturbing the constitutional relations of the two Houses that the other House have not acted upon a bill of that character which we have sent to them, and we have acted upon a bill of the same character which they have sent to us later. It is a mere matter of convenience in doing business.

The practice, therefore, does not make a construction of the Constitution, because the two Houses have never come to a distinct and official difference of opinion upon that question, and it is a difference of opinion that so long as the Government is to go on can really never arise, because we having passed such an appropriation bill, and the other House not acting upon it, from whatever motive, they pass one of the same kind that is satisfactory to us, as they have a right to do, and we pass it as a matter of course; and if they have any taste or sentiment about it, let them enjoy it; it is nothing to us. So I do not think that this practice proves anything in regard to what is the Constitution.

But now I come back to the point that we have under consideration. If the House of Representatives put into an appropriation bill or any other bill a clause which we think ought not to be considered in that general kind of legislation that the general object of the bill is for, we certainly may make rules for the safety of the public, as we think, and for the good order of our own proceedings, as to how we will treat such a bill. We may make a rule such as there is in the constitutions of many States already, that no bill shall contain more than one subject of legislation. Suppose we had a rule of that kind and a House bill comes here with forty subjects of legislation—an omnibus bill. We say, "We can not proceed to consider a bill of that kind; we have a standing rule prohibiting it;" and everything after the first subject shall be stricken out. We reduce it to one subject, for we say that an omnibus bill shall not be open to the consideration of the Senate to carry through the various local interests and considerations—I will not say jobs; I do not mean that at all—but the log-rolling business of putting together a variety of interests, each one of which may be good enough on its own feet or not, in order to get it through.

We have a standing rule of that kind, and so, without debate and without passing upon the merits of any of the other parts of the bill, we strike them out and send the bill back in that shape to the House of Representatives, and say we stand upon that. What can the House of Representatives do? It can say, "We will not have any bill at all, of any kind, upon any of these subjects;" or else it may say, "We will pass this bill as the Senate has passed it, having one subject only in it." That does not interfere with the independence of the two Houses. It only preserves the independence of each House, doing its own business in its own way.

We have the same right; and it is our duty to see to it that we will not tolerate legislation on a general appropriation bill which comes from the other House any more than we will tolerate putting on legislative amendments here and sending them back to the other House to endeavor to coerce them, in the mere operation of carrying on the Government, into agreeing to something which it is not convenient to consider in such a connection.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Mr. President, the point of order raised by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] is clearly, according to my understanding of the rule, well taken. I concur in the propriety of that rule which prohibits any amendment that proposes general legislation on an appropriation bill. I doubt not such a rule would be a wise rule in the House of Representatives. I do not know what their rules are on that point. But I dissent entirely from the view expressed here as to whether we should have a rule of our own, which would exclude from consideration an item in an appropriation bill, because in the judgment of this House it was legislation. I think it would be an attempt by the rules of the Senate to control the free action of another branch of the National Legislature.

It is competent for each House to make its own rules, and if the House of Representatives choose to have a rule which enables them to put legislation upon appropriation bills, it is their right to do so; and when that legislation comes here for our consideration we can, as an independent body, exercise and we ought to exercise our own judgment as to whether it is a wise provision of the bill. But to have a rule of the Senate which would virtually declare that the House of Representatives should put no such legislation upon a bill, even though their own rules justified it, it seems to me, would be an attempt upon the part of the Senate to control the action of the co-ordinate branch of Congress.

While I believe that it would be wise for the House of Representatives to adopt a rule similar to the one we have in the Senate, I do not believe it would be proper to undertake to control by any rule of the Senate the action of the other House in reference to anything they may see proper to put in an appropriation bill.

If the matter is submitted to a vote of the Senate, I shall vote to sustain the point of order made by the Senator from Tennessee, and I shall vote to strike out the provision, which I understand is considered to be an unwise provision, put in by the other House. But I do not want to see any rule of the Senate adopted, such as has been suggested by the Senator from Tennessee and the Senator from Vermont, which should exclude from consideration any item in an appropriation bill sent to us by the other House.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SAULSBURY. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If the Senator is right about that (and there is great force in what he says, though I do not agree with him; but he states it in the most forcible way), ought not the Senate to have the power of amending such an item in the House bill? If we can not exclude it from our consideration or from our sense of what is right about this class of bills, we certainly ought to have the power of putting it in better shape, if we can do so, than the other House have left it.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I do not know that I should oppose an amendment to our rules that would allow that to be done.

Mr. EDMUNDS. That then would open the whole case for any kind of legislation.

Mr. SAULSBURY. The question before the Senate at the present time is not as to whether we should have an amendment to our rules which would allow that to be done. The proposition before the Senate is whether the amendment proposed by the committee is obnoxious to the rule of the Senate. Upon that point I have no doubt.

Since this discussion arose I have taken occasion to look into the rules of the Senate, and I am satisfied that the point of order is well taken. I simply rose to enter my dissent from the views expressed by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Tennessee in reference to the propriety of a rule of the Senate which would exclude from consideration any item which was put into an appropriation bill by the House of Representatives that was obnoxious to a rule of the Senate, because I think that each House is perfectly competent to make its own rules and to govern its own action in reference to appropriation bills or any other bills.

Mr. HOAR. This controversy has been one of long standing. Whatever may be the reasoning of the Senator from Vermont or any other Senator upon the matter as an original question, it seems to me that it is impossible to deny that it is the practical construction of the constitutional clause that it covers the great general appropriation bills.

What was the reasoning on the part of the other House? It is true that the phrase in the Constitution is "bills for raising revenue," but under the English parliamentary system what was known as the budget was the bill which raised and expended the revenue for the general purposes of government, and the claim was that the historical purpose and the reason for putting that clause into the Constitution was to describe that kind of a bill, although the term "bills for raising revenue" was used.

That question came up in Mr. Webster's time; it came up in Mr. Seward's time, in 1855 or 1856, and it came up once after the war. Mr. Webster declared that although as an original proposition the contention of the House of Representatives was wrong and the contention of the Senate was right, yet that it was a matter which from the nature of the case must be decided by the judgment of the House of Representatives. Anybody who reflects a little on it will see that that is true, that practically it can not be otherwise, because the Senate has no constitutional objection to receiving any kind of a bill from the

other House, and the other House having a constitutional objection to receiving these bills from the Senate, it follows as a matter of course that the judgment of the other House must prevail on that subject.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator from Massachusetts allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly.

Mr. GEORGE. I desire to ask the Senator from Massachusetts how long it has been since the Senate has acquiesced in the claim of the House of Representatives to originate general appropriation bills?

Mr. HOAR. The last attempt made to the contrary on the part of the Senate, if I recollect aright, was in 1855 or 1856, with the exception of some bill which we sent down once during the war, or shortly after the war.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senate originated an appropriation bill and passed it in 1856.

Mr. HOAR. The other House rejected it.

Mr. ALLISON. They never took it up.

Mr. HOAR. That was the time when Mr. Seward entered into the discussion.

Mr. GEORGE. Had the other House previous to that time been in the habit of receiving general appropriation bills from the Senate and passing them?

Mr. HOAR. No; it never has been the habit, I understand. We have tried it two or three times, but we have always failed. Therefore it is the settled law of the land.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is not the law.

Mr. HOAR. It is the settled law of this land, a law growing, as a great deal of the common law has grown, out of a universal construction and acquiescence. Gentlemen get up once in three or four years and think that the Senate ought to assert its rights; and that it can assert its rights. The Senate can not assert its rights. As Mr. Webster originally declared, it is a question which must be settled by the House of Representatives, and it has been and is settled, and will remain settled by the House of Representatives.

Mr. HAWLEY. Let me say that because the Senate does not renew the fight every year or two, it does not follow that it confessedly abandons it. There is no statute of limitations running against a constitutional right of the Senate. It might wait fifty years and renew it. We wait as a matter of convenience; we waive no controversy upon it. We have upon our side I believe the unanimous report of the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives asserting the right of the Senate to originate appropriation bills. It is not the question to-day at all. I would not seek this occasion when the question is not up to waive a right that is unquestionably ours.

Mr. HOAR. I repeat, as my judgment, that practically this is a settled question, and it is utterly idle to treat it as otherwise. The greatest constitutional authority that ever sat in this body declared that the decision of that question by the House of Representatives must, from the necessity of the case, determine it, and the House of Representatives are as thoroughly committed to that principle as to any constitutional principle whatever. That being the case, and this matter being forever to be treated, at any rate being now treated as a matter which comes here in consequence of a constitutional privilege of the House of Representatives, the Senate throws away its own constitutional privilege if it construes its rules to mean that we can not amend such a bill as other bills, because the Constitution declares expressly that the class of bills, whatever they are, which the other House is to exercise its constitutional privilege of originating shall be subject to the constitutional privilege of the Senate to amend as other bills.

That being the case, it may be that we may renew the fight, as the Senator from Connecticut calls it. There is not much fighting in our spending a week in passing an appropriation bill and sending it over to the other House and having it laid on the table, and their sending one here and our adopting it on our part. We are entirely in their power. We can not reject their bill when they send it over here, because they have a constitutional right to send it. Therefore it follows that, so long as this bill is treated by the two branches as a bill to be originated in the other House under that clause, we not only have a right to amend it, but are bound by the Constitution to treat it as a bill to be amended as other bills.

Mr. ALLISON. I cannot agree with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] as respects the power of the Senate to originate appropriation bills. I do not understand that the House of Representatives claims the constitutional right to originate appropriation bills. As was stated by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], that question was referred only a few years ago to the Judiciary Committee of the House, and a majority of them, going over the whole question, decided that the power to originate appropriation bills was equal in the two Houses of Congress.

Mr. HOAR. What did the House of Representatives do about it?

Mr. ALLISON. Do you mean what was the action of the House of Representatives on that report?

Mr. HOAR. Yes.

Mr. ALLISON. No action was taken. There was a minority report, and the two reports lay on the table.

I remember very well that this whole question was debated in this body and in the House of Representatives at great length when I was a member of the other House. It took place when the Senate on some bill, I do not remember what bill, proposed to remove the income tax. The question came up whether reducing revenue was raising revenue. The House of Representatives stood then upon the idea that bills for raising revenue included every bill that changed or modified existing laws as respects taxation. There was a very able report made in this body by the then Senator from Pennsylvania, Mr. Scott, an able lawyer, signed also by Senator Conkling, as I remember. I know that those two Senators were upon the conference committee, because it was my fortune to be a member of it on the part of the House. They signed a report arguing with great gravity that the Senate had the power to originate measures for reducing taxation. So upon the principle of that Senate report we might now originate a bill in this body abolishing specific taxes. But nobody will claim that, I think. Certainly we ought not to make that claim now.

But the power to appropriate money is a different power from that which raises money, it seems to me. The reason why the provision was inserted in the Constitution applying only to bills for raising revenue was because the framers of that instrument did not intend that the House of Representatives should have the power which is held by the British House of Commons, the sole power to originate money bills. That is the prerogative of the House of Commons in England, and they have held from time immemorial that money bills include not only the power of taxation but the power of appropriating money.

Mr. HOAR. And the Lords can not amend them.

Mr. ALLISON. And the Lords, as the Senator from Massachusetts says, can not amend such bills.

Therefore the proposition which he has so well stated was inserted in the Constitution, saying that the Senate could amend revenue bills or bills raising revenue as they could amend other bills, because our fathers did not intend that even upon bills raising revenue by taxation the Senate should be deprived of the power of amendment complete and full; and so they inserted that provision.

I agree with what the Senator from Massachusetts states as respects our position here under our rules. If the construction which the Senator from Vermont and other Senators place upon this rule is the true construction, we have tied our hands so that we can not exercise the power of amending a legislative provision which we find in an appropriation bill, and we are put in the attitude of either being compelled to swallow this bill, defective as it may be, or to take our chances of rejecting it as a whole and sending it back to the House of Representatives. Certainly no rule which has ever been passed by this body intended such an absurdity, because we should thus practically place ourselves in the position of the House of Lords as respects money bills. We should say by such a construction of the rule that the House of Representatives may send us an appropriation bill, and put upon it such legislation as they choose, but when that legislation comes into this body we have not the power of amendment.

Mr. BUTLER. Have we not always exercised that power of amendment, may I ask the Senator?

Mr. ALLISON. We always do exercise it and always have exercised it. Although the literal interpretation of the rule as stated by the Senator from Vermont and the Senator from Tennessee may be the correct interpretation, I do not want to give the rule what I regard as an interpretation which ties our own hands and leaves the House of Representatives to do as they choose upon the appropriation bills. Whilst I agree that we have not the power to originate general legislation upon these bills, it seems to me perfectly clear that we have the power, or that we ought to have the power, of amendment. Take this rule as respects appropriation bills:

> No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

The spirit of that rule is that we shall not consider original legislative amendments in the Senate, but it does seem to me that a fair and liberal interpretation of it would allow us to modify a defective provision which we find in a bill coming from the House of Representatives.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If we can modify an original legislative provision that comes from the House of Representatives, can we not add to it?

Mr. ALLISON. We might add to it, but we might add anything that is germane to the particular amendment proposed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But, if my friend will pardon me——

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. We have no rule in the Senate which raises the question of the germaneness of an amendment to a legislative provision. We have a provision about the germaneness of items of appropriation, but once having a legislative provision in an appropriation bill which comes from the other House, if I do not disturb my friend——

Mr. ALLISON. Not at all.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If we once get a legislative provision from the other House, and that is the subject of amendment, it is a subject of amendment, so far as our rules go, without any limitation at all. Any amendment that a majority of the Senate thinks fit to put to that legislative provision is only changing or adding to the legislation which

the other House has sent; and the effect of that would be that our rule is gone entirely.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well; but I want to have a reasonable construction of that rule. Certainly we are putting ourselves in an absurd attitude when we say that we can not perfect a provision already in the bill, and then allow this provision to be stricken out, and put it in the control of three conferees on the part of the Senate to restore it, to modify it, or do what they please with it, and then either have it adopted by a majority vote in this body or have the bill killed, because either of these things can be done.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask my friend a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If the Senate is of opinion that it will not deal with legislative subjects in our appropriation bills, it has only to say so to the House of Representatives, and that is the end of it, because the House of Representatives, preserving its own dignity and independence, respects ours in the same way; and therefore the House of Representatives will never insist, the Senator may be sure, that an appropriation bill shall fail because the Senate will not agree to have legislation in it. We have tried that out on one exciting occasion and succeeded, and we always shall succeed on occasions that are not exciting, of course.

Mr. ALLISON. I only make these suggestions to show that although we adhere to the strict construction of the rule proposed by the Senator from Vermont, in the end at last these legislative provisions which are found coming from the House of Representatives are modified and changed in conference committees, and finally agreed to by both Houses.

Mr. EVARTS obtained the floor.

Mr. HAWLEY. Will the Senator from New York pardon me while I read a rule applicable to the conversation which has just been going on?

Mr. EVARTS. Certainly.

Mr. HAWLEY. I ask the attention of the Senator from Iowa. I read a rule that I think has been overlooked:

> No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill, nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject-matter contained in the bill be received.

That is precisely what the Senator from Iowa was saying; that an amendment to this House provision, germane and relative to it, might be considered, if we are obliged to accept the House provision.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, and if the Senator from New York will allow me a moment, the rule goes on to provide:

> Nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto.

That answers the Senator from Vermont in his statement that if we make one amendment we can make any other.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I know; but that is the question of appropriation. The moment you have stepped over the line and gone into legislation your rule does not apply at all.

Mr. EVARTS. Mr. President, the parliamentary situation in which we are placed by the views presented certainly puts the Senate in a very awkward predicament. Here we have a provision of the Constitution which attributes to the House of Representatives originating power over one great head of legislative authority. Under a construction of that clause in the Constitution it is held that general appropriation bills must originate in the House of Representatives. The Constitution, however, has been careful in guarding the power of the Senate as plenary in regard to amendments of anything that comes up under that great head of authority.

There is an effort in both Houses in the best interests of legislation that these appropriation bills shall be exclusively applied to appropriations in execution of laws authorizing the appropriations, and that new legislation shall not be interpolated in these appropriation bills. Now, we have sent up to us an appropriation bill from the House of Representatives. Inserted in that is a clause which apparently is wholly of original legislation and not of appropriation. We have then a power in the Senate to amend every part of the appropriation bill proper, but, from general legislation being lodged in the appropriation bill, it is said we can not amend the general legislation. A most extraordinary condition for a political body like this to be placed in! We have got a Constitution that gives an origination elsewhere of appropriation bills, it is said, but we are protected by a power to change them; and yet under this new order insisted upon here, if the House puts inside of an appropriation bill a matter that has nothing to do with the appropriation bill and is original legislation, we can not amend the original legislation that is hid away in an appropriation bill, though we can amend every clause and every line of the appropriation bill itself.

Look at the page on which these two propositions of strictly appropriation and of strictly legislative origination appear. There is an appropriation of $79,000,000; we can amend that to $80,473,000; but when you come down to a clause that does not relate to appropriation, but does relate to new legislation about what the pensions shall be, then we can not amend it.

Mr. President, I could wish that there might be such firmness on the part of this body as would strike out every piece of new legislation that is sent us here in an appropriation bill, and upon the gravest considerations. We have plenary authority under the Constitution in respect to new or general legislation, not under the head of "revenue," and we, therefore, can share really and responsibly both in the initiation and in the amendment of general legislation; but if a clause is permitted to come up here from the House of Representatives of general legislation imbeded in a general appropriation bill, we are dealing with that piece of legislation from the beginning to the end *in vinculis*. We have no freedom whatever of determining upon that item or particular piece of legislation. We can deal with it only in the position of being a part of a great and important legislative act of appropriation for the general purposes of government, and we are not free to deal with it. We have a rule that we will not propose, and any member by an objection can exclude from an appropriation bill under the guise of its amendment the introduction in this body of origination of legislation. They have, I suppose, a rule in the other House to the same effect; but there, as here, the rule may be passed over and it is passed over without an objection being raised, and it is then according to the rules of the Senate, as of the rules of the House, that the objection not being raised as a point of order, it is in to be considered on its merits.

Now the Senator from Massachusetts, as it seems to me, is quite right in thinking that when the House has overpassed that question of the point of order and of prudent and wise legislation, and has placed a legislative provision in an appropriation bill where it ought not to be, we can not look at that clause and say that we are shorn of our power of amendment of general legislation merely by its being injected in an appropriation bill. It must, therefore, be that we are equally free in regard to this clause that is now under consideration, to strike it out, which we can do, or if we tolerate its presence there as a piece of general legislation that we are to operate upon and act in making a law, we must have the power of amending that general legislation although it is included between clauses that relate to general appropriations.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I think the question before the Senate is confined to a very narrow compass. I think we must either assume a right to amend general legislation on an appropriation bill, if general legislation comes to us from the House of Representatives on a general appropriation bill, or we must insist, even to the defeat of the bill for general appropriations, that no general legislation shall be on such bills. The power of the House or the claim of the House to the exclusive right to originate appropriation bills is not found in the Constitution. It seems, however, to have been acquiesced in for so long a period that no member of this body is disposed now practically to dispute the right.

If the House claim as a constitutional privilege the right to originate and send to this body all general appropriation bills, then the right to include in a general appropriation bill is limited to the general appropriations, or, in other words, I think it a fraud upon the rules or on the right claimed by the House to originate general appropriation bills, to deny us that power, and then include in a general appropriation bill matters of general legislation concerning which we have the same power of origination as they have. A general appropriation bill which comes from the House to this body with a provision in it beyond mere appropriation, a provision of general legislation, contains within it, therefore, something outside of and beyond the claim of the House to originate these bills.

When that is done we have one of two courses to pursue. We ought to insist, in my opinion, as the first alternative, that as you claim the right to originate general appropriation bills you shall not send to us anything but what is pertinent to a general appropriation bill. If you do, we insist upon our right, which is as strong as your right, to originate all other matters of legislation, and, therefore, to originate the legislation which is improperly in the general appropriation bill, and we strike it out and stand by striking it out to the failure of the bill. If we are not prepared to do that, then it necessarily follows that when the House sends us general legislation on an appropriation bill we have the constitutional right, and it is our constitutional duty, to consider the propriety of that general legislation, to amend it in such form as we see proper. We must take either one or the other of these alternatives. I am for the first. I am for rebuking the House when it undertakes under a claim to originate solely for our consideration a general appropriation bill to insert in that bill matters which we have an equal power with them to originate. If we can not stand by that, as I think it is our duty to do, then I think we ought not to tie our hands by a rule of the Senate to prevent us from amending improper general legislation sent to us by the House of Representatives.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I have often heard discussion since I have been here of the rules which are cited to prevent the Senate from exercising its constitutional jurisdiction over any proposition that may come from the House of Representatives. To my mind the question is a plain one. The Constitution says "each House may determine the rules of its proceedings." What is a rule of proceeding? It is the method in which legislation shall be conducted. What is this rule? It is prescribing the method in which the Senate shall legislate; but up to this day the Senate rules do not determine the rules of proceedings

in the House, do not say to them "you shall make a bill such as the Senate thinks according to its rules of proceedings should be the proper form of legislation."

How can the Senate say that to the House? The Constitution says the House shall have the right to "determine the rules of its proceedings," and suppose the House does as it has done in this case, and as it always will do necessarily, sends us a bill with general legislation connected with appropriations, how can the Senate say, with the right of the House to determine absolutely its method of proceeding, "We will not legislate in any other way; we will put the whole legislation of the session in a bill of that description?" Has not the House, under that power conferred upon it, the power of such House to determine its rules of proceeding, absolute authority, independent of the Senate, to say in what form the bills shall be passed, whether in one form or another?

It seems to me to be a very plain question that we can not make any rule which shall prescribe to the House and the House can not make any rule which shall prescribe to us the method in which we shall determine our forms of proceeding. If that be so, what follows? It is equally true that no rule of this body can declare that the Senate shall not perform the constitutional function committed to it by the Constitution. It is manifest that such a rule, if there be one, is absolutely void. Imagine a rule which says that the Senate shall not perform its constitutional duty of trying an impeachment or of concurring in any bill which may be passed by the House or in any other of the functions prescribed to it. Certainly such a rule as that would be absolutely void and not binding on the conscience of any one.

Now what is this rule, if this construction be placed upon it, when the House of Representatives determine, with sovereign and absolute discretion, the method of proceeding in regard to legislation and sends us a bill, we should say "The Senate shall not consider nor amend it nor exercise its judgment upon it, but will limit that judgment;" and say "Why, this bill is not in the form our rules prescribe and therefore we will not exercise our judgment upon it?" It seems to me that such a position is entirely untenable.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs upon the point of order submitted by the previous occupant of the chair on the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALLISON. Before the question is submitted to the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations may be considered.

Several SENATORS. What is that?

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations may be considered.

Mr. HAWLEY. The Senator has his right distinctly under the rule. While the question can not be divided as to the part stricken out and the part to be inserted, the rule explicitly says that either may be perfected before taking the vote.

Mr. ALLISON. But we are now on the question of order, whether the amendment is in order, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in order, so as to avoid the objection under the rule.

Mr. COCKRELL. In other words, you want unanimous consent that the clause shall remain in the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. No; I want unanimous consent for the consideration of the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations so as to avoid any question of order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question of order having been submitted to the Senate, it must be decided unless withdrawn by unanimous consent.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent.

Mr. REAGAN. If it be assumed that the Senate have not the power to amend that portion of the House bill which is construed to be legislation, it seems to me that it is an extraordinary assumption, and no consent is required.

As to general appropriation bills, if I understand the question, we have a right to amend them.

Mr. ALLISON. That is the question.

Mr. REAGAN. I understand now it is supposed, because this bill appropriates money for pensions, we can not amend the provision of the bill which would be legislation under our rule. The House of Representatives have a similar rule, but if they send us a bill here which contains general legislation, undoubtedly we have a right to amend that legislation notwithstanding our rule. It would not do, I think, for the Senate to tie its hands and say that it would not legislate upon a bill sent here by the other House. I do not understand why it is that unanimous consent should be asked for on a subject like this.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to say to the Senator from Texas that under the third clause of Rule XVI, which provides that "No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill"—if that rule is to be respected and observed, there are two questions for the Presiding Officer of this body or the body itself, as the case may be, to decide; first, is this an appropriation bill within the sense of the rule? That question being determined in the affirmative, the next and only other question to be inquired into is: Is the provision legislative in its character? If so, it is forbidden by the rule.

I have not much respect for quibbling as to whether this is to be called general or special legislation. It seems to me general enough. Certain it is that it materially changes a general and public law, and so changing it, it seems to me to be broad enough, to be very general, to fall within the strict literalism and principle of this rule, and no matter whether the amendment is proposed to a legislative provision in an appropriation bill sent us by the other House, or whether it originates with our own committee or with a member of this body, if it be proposed to an appropriation bill and is in its character general legislation it is directly in violation of the third clause of the sixteenth rule of the Senate, and therefore out of order until we change that rule.

Mr. REAGAN. I have great respect for the opinion of the Senator fron Tennessee on a subject of rules. I understand that this is a bill making general appropriations for pensions, but I understand that it contains a provision not making an appropriation, but making a new law with reference to pensions. That is not an appropriation bill, and there is no way of torturing the language of the rule to make it cover general legislation in an appropriation bill. The Senator spoke of quibbling, but he did not refer to what I said, I suppose.

Mr. HARRIS. By no means. There was a remark *sotto voce* made behind me to which I replied on that point.

Mr. REAGAN. If this was plainly an appropriation bill I should sustain the rule decidedly as the Senator from Tennessee does, but when the House of Representatives puts general legislation into an appropriation bill, I insist it can not tie the hands of the Senate under the name of an appropriation bill and pass general legislation which we can not amend. How are we to do? Is it true that we are bound to accept what the House does or defeat the bill? Is that absolutely to be insisted on before the Senate? We either have the power to legislate under the Constitution, or we have not. The House has the power to dictate to us how we shall legislate, or it has not. If it sends us appropriation bills, we are bound by our rules not to amend them by general legislation; but if it sends us general legislation in an appropriation bill, it seems to me that our right is clear and unquestioned to amend or strike out or add to that legislation.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, if the other House puts legislation in an appropriation bill, according to the Senator from Texas, that abrogates the rule of the Senate and the Senate can put legislation on; but if the House does not put legislation on appropriation bills, then the Senate can not do it.

Now, the facts are that this question has been decided time and again by the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] when he was Presiding Officer, and by other Presiding Officers, that this kind of proposal is general legislation and is obnoxious to the rule of the Senate. It has been decided time and again, I say, and there is no question about that. It is general legislation.

Now, as to what we shall do, the Senator from Texas seems to think we must do something.

Mr. REAGAN. Allow me to interrupt the Senator.

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. REAGAN. It is general legislation amending general legislation, and not amending a general appropriation bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. Suppose it is amending general legislation, I say the House has a rule which prohibits legislation on appropriation bills; the Senate has a rule which prohibits legislation on appropriation bills; and now, because the House may have evaded or disregarded their rule, shall we disregard ours?

The only true way to do is to sustain the point of order and have this amendment stricken out, and then agree to the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations to strike out the House clause. Then we rid ourselves of the whole thing, and that is what ought to be done in this case. Therefore, I earnestly urge that the Senate sustain the point of order, and when the point of order has been sustained and the proposed amendment of the Senate committee is stricken out, then that the Senate will immediately concur in the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations and strike out the House clause. In that way we get rid of the whole matter.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from Missouri a question; whether the result of the course he suggests will not be to strike out this three-line clause of the House, and at last send the question to a committee of conference, and whether, if so, it is not morally certain that the committee of conference will come in recommending the Senate to recede from its amendment? And further, if that is the result, whether then, practically, the House does not have the exclusive privilege of originating amendments to appropriation bills, leaving the Senate only the privilege of saying "yes" or "no" to them generally; not, in fact, the privilege of saying "no" finally, but really deprived of all privilege of amending a House provision?

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, no; I do not think that follows at all.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask the Senator if that is not the practical result?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all. That will not be the practical result, and never has been. If the Senate sustains the point of order and the proposed amendment of the Senate Committee on Appropriations is stricken out, then the Senate will concur in the amendment of the committee striking out the House clause. Then the House can agree to that amendment or they can non-concur. If they non-concur the mat-

ter will go into conference, and I say to the Senator that the Committee on Appropriations would necessarily feel bound to stand by the action of the Senate, and that it is only a question of time when, the committee of the Senate standing by the action of the Senate, the House must recede.

Mr. President, I do not believe in the doctrine of the House of Representatives having the exclusive right of originating appropriation bills. It never has claimed that right, and it never has been conceded by the Senate. Members of the House have claimed it and individual members of the Senate have conceded it, but it has never been agreed to as a settled doctrine.

In 1881 the question was referred by the House of Representatives to the Committee on the Judiciary, and Mr. Knott, then a Representative from the State of Kentucky, and since governor of that State, on the 2d day of February, 1881, submitted to the House of Representatives a report from the Committee on the Judiciary, which is Report 147, House of Representatives, Forty-sixth Congress, third session, in which the whole question is very elaborately discussed, and in which he shows conclusively that the House has not the constitutional right exclusively of originating appropriation bills. It has that right in regard to revenue bills, and the Senate does not dispute that right; but the Senate has the right to amend those revenue bills just as it chooses, and the House has never disputed that right.

This is the condition of the thing: The House has a rule prohibiting legislation on appropriation bills. By some means this clause was put in this bill. The Senate has a rule prohibiting legislation on appropriation bills. Now the Committee on Appropriations proposes legislation as an amendment to this House legislation. That is not the only solution of the question, and it is not the proper solution of the question. The proper solution of the question is for the Senate to hold that this amendment of the Committee on Appropriations is legislation on an appropriation bill, as is clearly indicated in Rule XVI, which has been read. There can be no question of this proposition. Then the Senate will concur in the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations to strike out the legislative clause of the House bill; then it will go to a conference, and then the committee of conference on the part of the Senate will adhere to the instructions of the Senate, and the House will recede.

Mr. CHANDLER. I think the result would be that the committee of conference on the part of the Senate would recede, and I believe that is the general result under the existing practice.

Moreover, I do not consider that this amendment proposes general legislation to an appropriation bill. The House put upon the bill the simple provision that whenever pensions are given to widows payments shall be made from the death of the husband. The Senate Committee on Appropriations simply propose to say that the pensions shall commence from the death of the husband where the cause of pension originated in the service after the 4th day of March, 1861, and to make the whole provision retroactive. That is the whole length and breadth of the proposed amendment of the Committee on Appropriations, and yet we are told that under a rule which says that general legislation shall not be proposed in the Senate we can not amend a provision that pensions to widows shall commence from the date of the death of the husband so that they shall only so commence when the cause of the pension originated after the 4th of March, 1861.

It seems to me that this is a narrow and very limited construction of the rule, and that its true and sensible spirit is that, while general legislation shall not be proposed here as an original proposition, yet when the Senate is dealing with general legislation which comes on an appropriation bill from the House of Representatives it may amend that general legislation, and is not confined to the narrow line which is laid down by the Senator from Missouri and others here of simply saying "yes" or "no" to the House provision.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the propositions on which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] in their arguments stand, and that is that the Senate may judge for the House what is the force, and effect, and meaning of its own rules, and that our judgment shall be binding as to what is the rule of the House.

The Senator from Missouri says the House has a rule prohibiting general legislation on a general appropriation bill, and the Senate may so decide. That is what his argument asserts. How can the Senate decide what is the rule of the House as against the House's own interpretation of its rules? The House has sent us an appropriation bill with general legislation upon it. Who shall say that its rules prohibit it from doing so? Who shall say that it slipped in there somehow? All legislation slips in somehow. The sovereign exercise of the power of legislation by a body authorized to do it when it is made is absolute and complete. It is the one thing required by the Constitution.

The House has legislated in a particular form, it has judged of its own rules in that act, and now it comes here for what? What does the Constitution say to each individual Senator here, and there is no gainsaying that proposition? It says you shall judge and consider such propositions in the nature of legislation as the House of Representatives sends to you for consideration; you shall exercise your best judgment as to what shall be stricken out, rejected, or accepted, but whether it shall be rejected, accepted, or modified, you shall exercise upon that your judgment and discretion, and decide according to the best of your ability whether it should be changed into another form, whether it should be totally rejected, or whether it should be accepted in whole or in part. That is the constitutional duty allotted to each Senator, and there can be no doubt with regard to it.

Mr. BLAIR. Will the Senator allow me to ask if we do not exercise that discretion by striking out the clause? It is not necessary to strike it out on its merits. Do we not exercise that function as legislators if we object for one reason or another?

Mr. CALL. Not at all. The difference is as wide as heaven from earth. When you say we will not amend it, although we think it better for the public interest to change it into another form, yet we will reject it, not because in our judgment the public interest so requires, but because the form in which the other House has seen fit to send it to us is objectionable to us—in that reason and in that act there is a limitation of the exercise of your discretion, and you have conceded the whole constitutional function of the Senate.

Mr. BLAIR. Not at all, it seems to me. I see no reason why it may not be for the public good to carry out the rules of the Senate, to have some formal definite procedure, to insist that the House shall not mix up appropriation bills with general legislation, so that instead of dividing separate propositions of legislation into distinct and separate bills, as they ought to be, a system of legislative procedure which should bring all the legislation of the session in one bill would manifestly be against the public interest to be considered at all, and that is the principle involved here, it seems to me.

The House of Representatives sends us an appropriation bill which contains general legislation, and it might as well include all manner of subjects. It is general legislation on pensions and specific appropriations necessary to carry out existing law; so that when the Senate exercises its discretion upon the bill which is here, to exclude this general legislation, to strike it out absolutely, because that sort of confusion in the form of bills is against public interest, we are acting with reference to the exercise of a wise discretion, as much as though we rejected it; because in this particular case the pension should commence at the death or the date of the application. That is to say, it is as good a reason for striking this out, that it is bad procedure and would be generally ruinous as a legislative precedent, as it is to say that the pension ought not to commence at the date of death or the date of the application.

Mr. CALL. I will answer the Senator. The constitutional function of a Senator in the respect to which he refers is limited by the Constitution—it is limited by that provision which says the House shall determine for itself whether all subjects of legislation shall be in one bill or whether they shall be in a hundred bills, and, therefore, no Senator can rightfully say that he will not consider upon their merits the subjects-matter of legislation which the House has sent here because in our judgment to put general legislation upon bills appropriating money is improper and unwise and for the public injury. The Constitution has said you shall not so judge that matter, because the House shall have the absolute right to decide for itself; therefore you can not do it.

Again, the provision of the Constitution was doubtless intended for a good purpose. Suppose the House should say: "We will not consider any other form of legislation but this," and the Senate should say: "We will not consider any other form of legislation but this that suits our idea," how are the two co-ordinate functions to be performed? It can only be done by giving to each, as the Constitution says, the absolute power to judge and determine its own rules of proceeding; otherwise one body must give way to the other, and they can not be co-ordinate and independent in their functions. For each House to determine its rules of proceeding in respect to a subject which each House must consider requires each House to consider on its merits whatever the other may send it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is the amendment in order under the third clause of Rule XVI? Senators in the affirmative will say "ay," in the negative "no." [Putting the question.] The ayes appear to have it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us have the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the form of the question?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is, Is the amendment in order under the third clause of Rule XVI?

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BERRY (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BOWEN]. I do not know how he would vote if he were present.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PADDOCK (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS]. If he were here, I should vote "yea."

Mr. PAYNE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES]. Not knowing how he would vote if present, I withhold my vote.

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). I am paired generally with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL]. I do not see him in the Chamber, and therefore I withhold my vote.

Mr. TURPIE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. EVARTS (after having voted in the affirmative). I see that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] is not in his seat. I therefore withdraw my vote, as I am paired with him.

Mr. BUTLER. I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON].

Mr. MANDERSON. I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]; but I understand the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] is not paired, so I transfer the pair to the Senator from Oregon and vote.

Mr. ALDRICH. My colleague [Mr. CHACE] is absent from the city, and is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT].

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I understand there is not a quorum voting. I suggest to the Senator from New York [Mr. EVARTS], as I am paired with his colleague [Mr. HISCOCK], and he with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], that we might transfer our pairs and each vote. With the consent of the Senator from New York [Mr. EVARTS], I will transfer my pair with his colleague [Mr. HISCOCK] to the Senator from Alabama, and the Senator from New York and I can vote.

Mr. EVARTS. Very well, I vote.

Mr. GEORGE. My colleague [Mr. WALTHALL] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER].

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 18; as follows:

YEAS—22.

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Palmer,	Stewart,
Allison,	Evarts,	Pugh,	Stockbridge,
Blair,	Frye,	Quay,	Teller,
Call,	Hawley,	Reagan,	Wilson of Iowa.
Chandler,	Hoar,	Sawyer,	
Cullom,	Manderson,	Sherman,	

NAYS—18.

Bate,	Faulkner,	Jones of Arkansas,	Vest,
Blodgett,	Gray,	Kenna,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Harris,	Pasco,	Wilson of Md.
Coke,	Hampton,	Saulsbury,	
Edmunds,	Ingalls,	Vance,	

ABSENT—36.

Beck,	Daniel,	Hearst,	Platt,
Berry,	Davis,	Hiscock,	Plumb,
Blackburn,	Dawes,	Jones of Nevada,	Ransom,
Bowen,	Eustis,	McPherson,	Riddleberger,
Brown,	Farwell,	Mitchell,	Sabin,
Butler,	George,	Morgan,	Spooner,
Cameron,	Gibson,	Morrill,	Stanford,
Chace,	Gorman,	Paddock,	Turpie,
Colquitt,	Hale,	Payne,	Walthall.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senate decides the amendment to be in order. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], reporting this bill, to explain to the Senate what will be the effect of the legislative provision inserted in the bill by the House of Representatives. The language is:

And provided further, That in all pensions to widows, payments shall be made from the date of death of the husband.

I should like to know about how many widows there are on the pension-roll, how many widows there are who will be pensioned under the general laws hereafter, for about how many years back they will draw pensions, and how many hundred millions of dollars it will take out of the Treasury to satisfy these arrears.

Mr. ALLISON. You mean as proposed by the House bill?

Mr. COCKRELL. First, the clause as proposed by the House bill and then the amendment of the Senate committee, so that we shall see exactly what the two propositions are.

Mr. ALLISON. If Senators will turn to the report which accompanies this bill (Report No. 1285) they will find a statement of the probable cost of this bill as it is now proposed to amend it.

Mr. COCKRELL. But how is it with the House provision standing?

Mr. ALLISON. The provision in the bill as it came from the House is so vague and uncertain that I should not like to make an estimate. I think it will apply to all cases of widows' pensions, including the service-pensions to the widows of the war of 1812, and the widows of the Mexican war, and also all pensions granted by special act of Congress.

Mr. COCKRELL. In other words, is not the language broad enough, "that in all pensions to widows, payment shall be made from the date of death of the husband," to include all widows who are pensioners, and would it not include the war of 1812 and the Mexican war and all other wars, Seminole, and Black Hawk, and everything of the kind?

Mr. ALLISON. The committee so construed it. Referring to the next question put by the Senator, the provision as found in the bill amended by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate applies, I believe, to 1,702 cases of widows up to this time. They now receive a pension from the date of the allowance and not from the date of the death of the husband.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. ALLISON. If the Senator will turn to page 4 of the report he will find that it does not apply to very many widows, from the fact that up to 1880 the law provided that all widows should receive pensions from the date of the death of the husband. So it only relates to widows who have been granted pensions since 1880. The number I can not just state, but it is stated in this document, and the total amount required for payment is about $800,000, as estimated by the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Is that under the House bill or under your amendment?

Mr. ALLISON. Under our amendment.

Mr. FAULKNER. I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations as a matter of information whether the amendment of the committee as proposed does not limit this to widows who come in under the general law and are granted pensions by the Pension Bureau, while those granted pensions under special acts of Congress will not receive the benefit of this amendment?

Mr. ALLISON. Widows who have received pensions under special acts of Congress will not be included under the amendment made by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FAULKNER. What is the justice of the exclusion of those widows while you include those who are pensioned under the rules of the Pension Bureau? It is only a question generally of the construction of the evidence, the analysis of it, and the weight of it that causes Congress to overrule the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. ALLISON. That is supposed to be always the case. We did not desire to enter into the question of allowing widows arrears of pension when the pension was granted by special act of Congress, which might run one year, ten years, or twenty years, and we supposed in such cases the act should be final as to each particular case decided by Congress. Does the Senator think we ought to enlarge this provision in that respect?

Mr. FAULKNER. In answer to the Senator from Iowa, I will say that these parties ought to be put on an equality, and if they are not on an equality there is injustice.

Mr. ALLISON. I quite agree with that statement. Up to 1880 all the widows received pensions from the date of the death of the husband. Since that time they have received pensions from the time of the allowance of the pension at the Pension Office.

Mr. COCKRELL. Not from the "time of the allowance," but from the date of application.

Mr. ALLISON. I should have said date of application.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is a great deal of difference between the "date of allowance" and the "date of application."

Mr. ALLISON. The average is nine months. So it is ascertained that there are about $717,000 required to pay the widows pensioned since 1880, and for the next year 7,000 more claims will be allowed, so that the total increase of appropriation is less than $800,000.

Mr. HARRIS. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa a question. If I understand this amendment, it gives arrears of pension certainly from the date of the husband's death to all widows who have been pensioned under the general pension laws. I did not hear the questions asked before, and perhaps the same question has been asked, but has the Senator an estimate of the probable amount that it will take to pay the arrears consequent upon this amendment to this bill?

Mr. ALLISON. The Commissioner of Pensions states that it will take $756,000.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But in another place you say more.

Mr. ALLISON. That is as the Senate committee's amendment proposes.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But if the Senate conferees recede, as it is said they generally do, it will take a great deal more.

Mr. ALLISON. That was the statement of my friend from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER], who is not very familiar with Senate conference committees.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that the report may be read and printed in the RECORD, and I hope that after that this bill will go over until morning. There are some points in the matter that I want to look further into.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Missouri desire to have the entire report printed in the RECORD?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Without reading?

Mr. COCKRELL. Without reading.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations, in reporting to the Senate H. R. 5115, "An act making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the

United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes," submit the following communications relating to the bill and the amendments recommended by the committee thereto:

No. 1.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1888.

SIR: I am in receipt of House bill No. 5445, making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, which passed the House of Representatives on the 20th instant.

I observe that said bill contains a number of provisions, concerning which I have some suggestions to make for your consideration.

The first proposition is that "in all pensions to widows, payments shall be made from the date of death of the husband."

I have the honor to submit that the proposition is somewhat indefinite, and that it is susceptible of two distinct constructions. It is doubtful whether the House intends to grant pension from the date of the death of the husband in the case of those widows only whose claims are hereafter allowed, or means to extend the benefits of this section to all widows against whose rights the limitation contained in the arrears acts of 1879 has run. This is a very important difference and would involve the expenditure of a very large amount if the latter construction be accepted

If the benefit contained in this section will apply only to claims hereafter allowed, it is estimated that the additional cost to the Government will be an average period of nine months, at $12 per month, or a total of $108 in each case.

It is estimated that not less than 7,000 claims of widows will be allowed during the next fiscal year whose right will be favorably affected by this section, so that the additional cost to the Government during the next fiscal year by reason of this section will be $756,000. If the bill should pass the Senate with this provision retained in it, this additional sum ($756,000) should be added to the $79,000,000 appropriated for the payment of Army and Navy pensions.

If the intention be to extend the provisions of this section to the claims of all widows against whom the limitation of the arrears acts has run, a much larger sum will be needed.

A close estimate, recently made in this bureau, is that 9,959 claims of widows have been allowed since June 30, 1880, in which pension has been granted from the date of filing the application instead of from the date of death. It has also been shown that an average period of nine months elapses between the date of the death of a soldier and the date on which his widow makes application for pension. The amount required to pay arrears under this construction of the section referred to will therefore be for an average period of nine months, at $8 per month, or $72 in each of 9,959 cases, or a total of $717,048. (It should be explained that in this latter class the rate per month will be $8 per month, for the reason that the period for which the arrears will be paid will in the large majority of cases terminate prior to March 19, 1886, on which date the rate of pension to widows and others was increased from $8 to $12 per month.)

Adding this total ($717,048) to the total ($756,000) cost in claims which will be allowed during the next fiscal year, there will be a total additional cost of $1,473,048, which will be expended during the fiscal year 1889, as a result of the enactment of this proposed section, and which amount should therefore be added to the $79,000,000 appropriated in said bill for the payment of Army and Navy pensions.

I observe that the sum of $15,000 only is appropriated for stationery and other necessary expenses for the next year. The estimate for this item was $20,000, in the expectation that two new agencies would be provided for. Inasmuch as it appears that no provision is made in this bill for the establishment of the two additional agencies desired, I do not believe that this item should be for a sum less than $18,000.

The amount appropriated under this item for the present fiscal year was $12,000, and though the expenditures have been carefully scrutinized and the most rigid economy enforced, $10,142 have already been expended, leaving but $1,853 of the amount appropriated and three months still remaining of the present fiscal year. To make this showing the agents have been denied many things which have been actually necessary for the proper conduct of their agencies, so that at the close of the year there will be no balance of the appropriation and no supply on hand at the agencies of stationery and other necessary articles for the proper conduct of their agencies. It will consequently be necessary as soon as the appropriation for the next year becomes available to approve the expenditure of a large sum chargeable to this item of appropriation.

It is estimated that 56,000 new pensioners will be added to the roll during the present fiscal year, and without much doubt, nearly as many during the next fiscal year. This will involve a constantly increasing cost to the Government, including the purchase of additional office furniture, to provide for new clerks, additional printing, a greater number of official envelopes, a larger number of blanks of all kinds, and a greater cost in every respect pertaining to the work at these agencies. I earnestly request that this sum be increased to $18,000.

The amounts proposed to be appropriated for the salaries of agents, clerk-hire, fuel, lights, and rents, though low, are thought to be sufficient for the purposes named.

Your attention is respectfully invited to the provision in this bill requiring that the Secretary of the Treasury cause suitable rooms to be set apart in cities where pension agencies are located which shall be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior for the use and occupancy of said agencies respectively.

The appropriation bill for the present fiscal year contains a provision somewhat similar to this, but qualifies it by providing that it shall be done where possible, while the provision in the bill under consideration gives no discretion to the Secretary in the matter, but it is mandatory in its terms.

While the appropriation bill for the service of the present fiscal year was under consideration by your committee in January, 1887, the Commissioner brought this matter to the attention of the Secretary of the Treasury, who, after a careful consideration of the whole matter, communicated to the Commissioner his conclusions, that it was impossible to accommodate in a Government building any one of the twelve pension agencies which were then situated in rented quarters. His communication to the Commissioner and tracings of the public buildings, showing that such accommodations were not possible, were transmitted to you by the Commissioner, with a proper letter addressed to you January 13, 1887.

I am satisfied that the same inability to accommodate these pension agencies still exists, and that this provision should be either stricken out of the bill or that some discretion should be given in the matter.

Another objectionable provision in this bill is that requiring the Secretary of the Interior to designate and provide suitable rooms in the Pension Building for the use of the pension agency in this city, and requiring that the office of said agent shall be removed therein.

There is an existing law (the sundry civil bill, approved March 3, 1887) which requires that not later than the 1st day of December, 1888, the Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be removed to the Pension Building the General Land Office, the Bureau of Education, the office of the Commissioner of Railroads, and Bureau of Labor. It will be readily seen that with the large force not only of this bureau, but also of the bureaus which said law requires shall be removed to the Pension Building, it will be absolutely impossible to provide accommodations therein for the pension agency.

Aside, however, from the question of accommodations, I am of opinion that the pension agency should not, under any circumstances, be moved to the Pension Building. It was at one time located in the same building with the Pension Bureau, at the corner of Twelfth street and Pennsylvania avenue, northwest. This was in 1877, and its location there soon became exceedingly objectionable on account of the annoyance to the regular Pension Bureau force by reason of the constant stream of pensioners and their witnesses who visited the agency to secure their regular pensions. And this was true, though access to the pension agency was not had through the Pension Bureau. How much more annoying would it therefore be when the pension agency, if moved to the Pension Building, can only be reached through the regular entrances to the building.

When it is known that the pension agent at Washington, D. C., makes some 3,200 personal payments at each regular quarterly payment, and that 900 of them have each to be accompanied by at least two witnesses, some idea will be had of the large number of people who visit this agency periodically, and of the great annoyance which their coming and going would occasion to the regular office force of this bureau.

I would therefore respectfully, but earnestly, urge that this provision be stricken from the bill.

If the committee desire to hear further on any of the points referred to in this letter or upon any other points germane to the bill under consideration, I will be glad to appear before them myself at their convenience, or to send Mr. H. C. Bell, chief agents' division, who is thoroughly conversant with the requirements of this service and with my views on the subject.

Very respectfully,

WM. E. MCLEAN,
Acting Commissioner.

Hon. W. B. ALLISON,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

No. 2.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 28, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the communication of the 26th instant, in which, by your direction, Mr. Thomas P. Cleaves, clerk of your committee, asks for an explanation of the increase in the amount ($79,000,000) appropriated in House bill No. 5445 for the payment of pensions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, over the amount ($75,000,000) as submitted for that purpose in the Book of Estimates.

In response, I have to state that for the current fiscal year the sum of $75,000,000 was appropriated for the payment of all pensions excepting those granted by the Mexican war pension act of January 29, 1887, for which the act of March 3, 1887, provided the sum of $6,900,000, which amount was made available by said act for the payment of this latter class of pensions during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, and that ending June 30, 1888.

At the beginning of the present fiscal year, out of the amount appropriated for the payment of Mexican pensions, there was available a sum slightly in excess of $6,000,000.

While this bill was under consideration by the House committee, at their request the Commissioner of Pensions appeared before them, and upon his representation that the $75,000,000 asked for would be insufficient for the payment during the fiscal year 1889 of all classes of pensions, including Mexican pensions, and that $4,000,000 additional would be required for that purpose, said committee increased the amount to $79,000,000 to provide for the payment of said pensions.

I have the honor to request that your committee will give favorable consideration to this item of the bill, as passed by the House of Representatives.

Very respectfully,

WM. E. MCLEAN,
Acting Commissioner.

Hon. WILLIAM B. ALLISON,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

No. 3.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your inquiry of this date relative to certain points in the statutes relative to pensions.

Your first question is, have the widows who are pensioned on account of the disability and death therefrom of their husbands, which disability was contracted prior to March 4, 1861, received pensions from the date of death or application. In response I have to state that the existing law applicable to this class of cases is section 4713 of the Revised Statutes, which provides that when the cause of disability or death originated in the service prior to the 4th day of March, 1861, and an application for pension shall not have been filed within three years from the discharge or death of the person on whose account the claim was made, or within three years of the termination of a pension previously granted on account of the service and death of the same person, the pension shall commence from the date of filing by the party prosecuting the claim the last paper requisite to establish the same.

It is proper to state in this connection that the acts of January 25 and March 3, 1879, commonly known as the arrears acts, removed the limitation only in cases in which the disability or death resulted from a cause which originated in the service subsequent to March 4, 1861.

The law (section 4713, R. S.) just quoted is still in force, and all cases which have been allowed by this bureau since its passage have been settled in conformity with it if the cause of disability or death originated prior to March 4, 1861.

On the subject of the provision in the House bill No. 5445, that in all pensions to widows payments shall be made from the date of death of the husband, I am of opinion that if said provision is meant to apply to all cases which have been heretofore allowed widows pensioned by special acts would certainly be included in its operation.

In reply to your inquiry relative to the number of persons who have been pensioned under the Mexican war act of January 29, 1887, I have to state that there have been 15,331 allowances to survivors of that war, and 4,443 allowances to widows of those who served in that war and have since died. This total is from January 29, 1887, to April 30, 1888, inclusive.

Recurring to the provision in the bill which grants pension to widows from the date of death, I think the language used is too obscure to determine how far it will be applicable. If it be the intention of your committee to limit the additional rights to widows of those who have died from a cause contracted in the war of the rebellion and to include not only those hereafter pensioned, but all those against whom the limitation in the arrears act of 1879 has run on account of their failure to apply before the 1st day of July, 1880, I would suggest that the proviso be amended so as to read as follows:

"*And provided further*, That all pensions which have been, or which may hereafter be, granted under the general laws regulating pensions to widows in consequence of death occurring from a cause which originated in the service since the 4th day of March, 1861, shall commence from the death of the husband."

The language employed in this suggested proviso, "under the general laws

regulating pensions," will exclude widows pensioned by special acts, and I understand that this is your intention in the premises.

If the committee desires that this provision shall be made applicable to all cases wherein pension is granted to widows on account of death resulting from a cause contracted in the military or naval service, either before or after March 4, 1861, I would suggest that this end can be accomplished by merely omitting the words "since the 4th day of March, 1861," from the above proviso.

I have nothing to add to my letter of the 24th ultimo relative to additional funds which will be required for pensions and other purposes, provided by the bill under consideration.

Very respectfully,

WM. E. McLEAN,
Acting Commissioner.

Hon. WILLIAM B. ALLISON,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

No. 14.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your further reference, dated the 4th instant, to the proposition now pending before your committee to repeal the limitation now imposed by existing law as to date of commencement of pension in the claims of widows alone.

You ask what number of persons would be benefited if the repeal of said limitations were extended to widows whose pensions have been or will hereafter be granted for a death-cause which originated in the service and line of duty prior to March 4, 1861.

In respone, I have to advise you that a careful comparison of all accessible data and an examination of the claims on file in this bureau seem to warrant the conclusion that 1,702 widow pensioners of the Mexican, Florida, and Black Hawk Indian and other wars prior to March 4, 1861, are now alive, and would be entitled should the suggested proposition become a law. There are on file about 150 claims of this class now pending, but the claimants are presumably all dead.

It is estimated from the same careful examination of the cases referred to that the average period for which arrears would be due in said 1,702 cases will be five years.

There would therefore result upon the passage of this provision a total expenditure of $96 per year for five years in each of the 1,702 cases, or a total of $816,960.

It should be noted that this amount will be required in addition to any amount which may be appropriated to pay claims of widows in which the death-cause originated subsequent to March 4, 1861, should the limitation as to them be repealed also.

It is not improper in this connection to suggest that if the limitation be repealed as to both or either of these classes of widows, the amount necessary to pay their claims should be added to the amount proposed already to be appropriated for the payment of Army and Navy pensions for the next fiscal year.

Very respectfully,

JOHN C. BLACK,
Commissioner.

Hon. W. B. ALLISON,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

No. 5.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., May 3, 1888.

SIR: In response to your letter of the 25th ultimo, transmitting a copy of the pension appropriation bill (H. R. 5445) and calling attention to the provision on page 3, lines 49 to 54 inclusive, directing that "the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause suitable rooms to be set apart in the buildings under his control in cities where pension agencies are located, which shall be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior, for the use and occupancy of said agencies respectively," and inquiring "if there are any objections by this Department to this provision," I have the honor to inclose herewith copy of a communication to the Hon. SAMUEL J. RANDALL, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, in reply to a similar inquiry on the same subject.

Respectfully, yours,

C. S. FAIRCHILD,
Secretary.

Hon. WILLIAM B. ALLISON,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., March 2, 1888.

SIR: In reply to your letter of 29th ultimo, asking whether, in pursuance of pension appropriation act for the fiscal year 1888, rooms in Government buildings have been assigned to the pension agents located in the cities of Augusta, Me., Columbus, Ohio, Concord, N. H., Des Moines, Iowa, Detroit, Mich., Indianapolis, Ind., Milwaukee, Wis., New York, N. Y., Pittsburgh, Pa., San Francisco, Cal., and Syracuse, N. Y., I have the honor to advise you that the buildings in Augusta, Me., Concord, N. H., Des Moines, Iowa, and Syracuse, N. Y., are as yet unfinished, but rooms will be assigned in pursuance of said act when the same are completed.

Rooms in the building in Columbus, Ohio, are now occupied by the pension agent, but no such assignment has been made in the buildings in Detroit, Mich., Indianapolis, Ind., Milwaukee, Wis., New York, N. Y., Pittsburgh, Pa., or San Francisco, Cal., as they were already overcrowded, as will be shown by the statement of space allotted in each, which is in course of preparation and will be forwarded at the earliest possible date.

Respectfully, yours,

HUGH S. THOMPSON,
Acting Secretary.

Hon. SAMUEL J. RANDALL,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives.

UNITED STATES PENSION AGENCY FOR PAYMENT OF PENSIONS,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Referring to the provisions for the removal of the agency for the payment of pensions to the new Pension building contained in the bill making appropriations for the payment of pensions passed by the House, I desire to invite your attention to the following:

Before the agency was removed to its present quarters it occupied rooms in the Le Droit Building, which, with the growth of the business of the office, became too limited in space for its needs, but for which a rental of $2,700 per annum was paid. The sum of $1,800 is now paid for quarters much more conveniently arranged, and with double the amount of room, and located near the Pension building, making it convenient for the officers of the bureau and this office, and for pensioners as well. This rental of $1,800 per annum includes certain furniture, carpeting, and a large iron safe, the office being fitted up by the lessor in accordance with its requirements at an expense of over $1,000.

This agency disburses over $5,000,000 annually to about 28,000 pensioners. More than 1,800 pensioners are frequently paid in person in a single day, making, with the witnesses necessary in certain cases, about 2,500 persons who come into the office in a day; and probably not less than 20,000 persons enter the office annually.

To wait on these persons requires that the rooms shall be specially adapted to the purpose, as otherwise it would be impossible. To make the change of location contemplated in the bill would necessitate changing and fitting up rooms in the new Pension building, at an expense of not less than $2,500, and for the uses of the agency at least six of the most desirable rooms in the building would be required.

Further, the responsibility involved in the disbursement of so large an amount of money makes it desirable, on the ground of the safety of the business of the agency, that it should remain in its present quarters, occupying the entire building, separate from any other business, and under the exclusive control of the agent.

I inclose an extract from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, giving the remarks made in the Senate upon this subject last year.

Very respectfully,

S. L. WILLSON,
United States Pension Agent.

Hon. WILLIAM B. ALLISON,
Chairman Committee on Appropriations, United States Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am opposed to the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations, and I am opposed to the provision in the House bill. I hope that the motion to strike out and insert will not be sustained, that that will be disagreed to; and if that is disagreed to, I shall then move to strike out the House clause, which motion will be in order, and then we shall leave the bill simply a naked appropriation bill.

I do not think the estimates here made will cover one-tenth part of the amount that will be taken out of the Treasury under this bill. I do not think there has been any pretense of an estimate here in regard to the clause in the House bill as it came from the House. I do not believe any one could calculate what that would be in regard to all pension cases of widows who have been pensioned, receiving service pensions as widows of soldiers of the war of 1812, or anything of the kind. I do not think any estimate of that can be made. I think it will involve many, many millions of dollars.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator why he says that an estimate can not be made? Does he not know that they have on the files of the Interior Department a full list of all pensions that have been paid under the act of 1880? It is a matter of a very few minutes of computation in that Department, in my judgment.

Mr. COCKRELL. That would be only one class. It would not affect any of those who apply hereafter, and no man living can tell the number who have not yet applied. It is mere guesswork. I remember very distinctly the estimates that were given on the floor of the Senate when the question of arrears was brought up, and they did not come within one-tenth part, about one-twentieth part of what was the actual expenditure under that bill. The highest estimate that was made when that provision was under discussion here was about one-twentieth of what was actually expended.

The statements in this report have not been analyzed, and it is for that reason that I have asked the Senator from Iowa to allow the bill to lie over until we can be able to make some calculations. When we had this bill up before the committee I was not a member of the subcommittee and did not have the data before me, and I have not had the printed report of the committee in my hands until just now. Therefore I have had no opportunity of making a calculation and seeing exactly what will be the effect of it, and seeing to what classes of pensons it will extend.

I find that we have on the pension-roll to-day 44,961 widows without children, and we have 8,135 widows on the pension-roll with children. That makes a total of 53,096 widows. That includes all on the roll. Of this number 895 are the widows of the soldiers of the Mexican war. Under the House clause I do not think there can be any doubt that they would draw their pensions from the death of their husbands. For how many years they would draw them would depend on the date of the death of their husbands. They may have died immediately after the Mexican war. The widows have since that time become sixty-one years old, and they are entitled to pensions, and they would draw them from the date of the death of the husband, somewhere from thirty-five to forty years.

Then we come to the widows of the war of 1812. While the widows of the Mexican war are only 895 in number, the widows of the war of 1812 are 11,831. The further we get from the war the more numerous the widows become. [Laughter.] The husbands have all died, and I do not see why the same rule should not apply to the wives.

Mr. President, we then have the question which will come up here under the act passed in 1886, which increased the pension of widows to $12 per month.

In connection with these statements made by the Commissioner of Pensions and contained in this report, of which I have not had an opportunity of making an examination, I desire that this question shall lie over until morning, and then we can take it up and dispose of it in a short time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the further consideration of the pending bill be postponed until to-morrow.

Mr. HARRIS. Before that question is put I wish to call the atten-

tion of the Senator from Missouri and the Senate to the fact that at an earlier hour of to-day's session the Senate, by unanimous consent, agreed that immediately after the routine business to-morrow morning it would proceed to the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII, and continue it to-morrow and the next day, and I hope that there will be no unanimous consent that will conflict with the rule already agreed to.

Mr. KENNA. Let this go over until the other order is completed.

Mr. HARRIS. I have no objection to that.

Mr. ALLISON. Do I understand the Senator from Missouri to desire a postponement?

Mr. COCKRELL. I want to make an examination of this report. It has just been printed, as the Senator well knows, and I never got the report until a few moments ago, and did not have time to analyze it in the committee. It was not printed by the committee, and I want time to analyze and make a statement and make my objections in a concise and exact form.

Mr. ALLISON. Very well.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on the 9th instant the bill (S. 566) making an appropriation for a final survey and estimates for and the commencement of the construction of a boat-railway around the obstructions to navigation at The Dalles and Celilo Falls, in the Columbia River, was made the special order after the morning business on Wednesday, May 16, which will be to-morrow.

Mr. HARRIS. Special orders always give way to such a rule as the Senate agrees to by unanimous consent, or to the unfinished business, if there be unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Unanimous consent was given for the consideration of this bill at the request of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] to-morrow at the conclusion of the formal morning business, which antedated the agreement to which the Senator from Tennessee refers. The Chair desires to be instructed as to the wish of the Senate upon these conflicting understandings.

Mr. KENNA. I have no doubt that any subsequent unanimous consent would supersede a former unanimous consent; but I notice the Senator from Oregon is not in his seat, and I should dislike by any sort of process in his absence to abrogate an arrangement made at his suggestion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would hold, unless otherwise instructed, that the first agreement should be first executed.

Mr. ALLISON. I do not desire to have the pension appropriation bill interfere with any unanimous consent.

Mr. KENNA. I beg pardon of the Senate. I do not quite understand how the Chair can hold that the first unanimous consent should be first executed. It seems to me a subsequent unanimous consent supersedes it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Under the rule special orders are taken up in the order of time they are made. These would be in the nature of special orders.

Mr. KENNA. Suppose by unanimous consent that a special order made by unanimous consent is laid aside and something else taken up?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That would be a different question.

Mr. KENNA. I presume so.

Mr. ALLISON. If this matter goes over now I give notice that at the earliest convenient moment I shall ask the Senate to take up the appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It has not been assigned to any special hour to-morrow.

Mr. ALLISON. I will try to call it up to-morrow, as I believe I have a right to do.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

Mr. BLAIR. I call for the consideration of the regular order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The consideration of the pension appropriation bill being postponed until to-morrow, the Senate resumes the consideration of House bill 8560.

Mr. BLAIR. Let the bill be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and will be read at length.

The Chief Clerk read the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be at the seat of Government a Department of Labor, the general design and duties of which shall be to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with labor, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and especially upon its relation to capital, the hours of labor, the earnings of laboring men and women, and the means of promoting their material, social, intellectual, and moral prosperity.

SEC. 2. That the Department of Labor shall be under the charge of a Commissioner of Labor, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; he shall hold his office for four years, unless sooner removed, and shall receive a salary of $5,000 per annum.

SEC. 3. That there shall be in the Department of Labor, to be appointed by the Commissioner of Labor, one chief clerk, at a salary of $2,500 per annum; four clerks of class four, all to be statistical experts; five clerks of class three, one of whom may be a stenographer; six clerks of class two, one of whom may be a translator and one of whom may be a stenographer; eight clerks of class one; five clerks at $1,000 per annum; one disbursing clerk, who shall also have charge of accounts, at a salary of $1,800 per annum; two copyists at $900 each per annum; two copyists at $720 each per annum; one messenger; one assistant messenger; one watchman; two assistant watchmen; two skilled laborers, at $660 each per annum; two charwomen, at $240 each per annum; six special agents, at $1,600 each per annum; ten special agents, at $1,400 each per annum; four special agents, at $1,200 each per annum; and an allowance to special agents for traveling expenses not to exceed $3 per day while actually employed in the field and outside of the District of Columbia, exclusive of actual transportation including sleeping-car fares; and such temporary experts, assistants, and other employés as Congress may from time to time provide, with compensation corresponding to that of similar officers and employés in other Departments of the Government.

SEC. 4. That during the necessary absence of the Commissioner, or when the office shall become vacant, the chief clerk shall perform the duties of Commissioner.

SEC. 5. That the disbursing clerk shall, before entering upon his duties, give bond to the Treasurer of the United States in the sum of $20,000, which bond shall be conditioned that the said officer shall render a true and faithful account to the Treasurer, quarter-yearly, of all moneys and properties which shall be by him received by virtue of his office, with sureties to be approved by the Solicitor of the Treasury. Such bond shall be filed in the office of the First Comptroller of the Treasury, to be by him put in suit upon any breach of the conditions thereof.

SEC. 6. That the Commissioner of Labor shall have charge in the building or premises occupied by or appropriated to the Department of Labor, of the library, furniture, fixtures, records, and other property pertaining to it, or hereafter acquired for use in its business, and he shall be allowed to expend for periodicals and the purposes of the library, and for the rental of appropriate quarters for the accommodation of the Department of Labor within the District of Columbia, and for all other incidental expenses, such sums as Congress may provide from time to time.

SEC. 7. That the Commissioner of Labor, in accordance with the general design and duties referred to in section 1 of this act, is specially charged to ascertain, at as early a date as possible, and whenever industrial changes shall make it essential, the cost of producing articles at the time dutiable in the United States, in leading countries where such articles are produced, by fully specified units of production, and under a classification showing the different elements of cost, or approximate cost, of such articles of production, including the wages paid in such industries per day, week, month, or year, or by the piece; and hours employed per day; and the profits of the manufacturers and producers of such articles; and the comparative cost of living, and the kind of living. It shall be the duty of the commissioner also to ascertain and report as to the effect of the tariff, and the effect thereon of the state of the currency, in the United States, on the agricultural industry, especially as to its effect on mortgage indebtedness of farmers; and what articles are now controlled by trusts, and what effect said trusts have had on limiting production and keeping up prices. He shall also establish a system of reports by which, at intervals of not less than two years, he can report the general condition, so far as production is concerned, of the leading industries of the country. The Commissioner of Labor is also specially charged to investigate the causes of and facts relating to all controversies and disputes between employers and employés as they may occur, and which may tend to interfere with the welfare of the people of the different States, and report thereon to Congress. The Commissioner of Labor shall also obtain such information upon the various subjects committed to him as he may deem desirable from different foreign nations, and what, if any, convict-made goods are imported into this country, and if so, from whence.

SEC. 8. That the Commissioner of Labor shall annually make a report in writing to the President and Congress of the information collected and collated by him, and containing such recommendations as he may deem calculated to promote the efficiency of the Department. He is also authorized to make special reports on particular subjects whenever required to do so by the President or either house of Congress, or when he shall think the subject in his charge requires it. He shall, on or before the 15th day of December in each year, make a report in detail to Congress of all moneys expended under his direction during the preceding fiscal year.

SEC. 9 That all laws and parts of laws relating to the Bureau of Labor created under the act of Congress approved June 27, 1884, so far as the same are applicable and not in conflict with this act, and only so far, are continued in full force and effect, and the Commissioner of Labor appointed under said act, approved June 27, 1884, and all clerks and employés in the Bureau of Labor authorized to be appointed by said act or subsequent acts, shall continue in office and employment as if appointed under the provisions of this act, and until a Commissioner of Labor, other officer, clerks, and employés are appointed and qualified as herein required and provided; and the Bureau of Labor, as now organized and existing, shall continue its work as the department of labor until the department of labor shall be organized in accordance with this act; and the library, records, and all property now in use by the said Bureau of Labor are hereby transferred to the custody of the department of labor hereby created, and on the organization of the department of labor on the basis of this act the functions of the Bureau of Labor shall cease.

SEC. 10. That on the passage of this act the Commissioner of Labor shall at once submit estimates for the expenses of the department of labor for the next fiscal year, giving in detail the number and salaries of officers and employés therein.

Passed the House of Representatives April 18, 1888.

Attest: JNO. B. CLARK, *Clerk*.

Mr. BLAIR. I present in this connection a letter from the Commissioner of Labor, written in response to an inquiry on this subject, which I ask may be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF LABOR,
Washington, D. C., May 4, 1888.

DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of yours of May 1, making inquiries as to the present cost of the Bureau of Labor as now constituted, and of the Department of Labor as proposed in House bill 8560.

The total cost of the Bureau of Labor as now constituted is about $108,000 per annum, the salary list being $52,960, the miscellaneous list $39,230, while between $15,000 and $16,000 is borne on the miscellaneous appropriations of the Department of the Interior for printing, stationery, incidental expenses, rent, etc. The expense under the proposed bill, as near as I can estimate it, would be $152,760 per annum. It might run over or fall a little short of this, as miscellaneous expenses might demand. This would be made up of salary list—$84,660, according to the equipment specified in the bill—while the miscellaneous expenses, for subsistence, transportation of agents, experts, etc., printing and stationery, necessary incidental expenses, rent, library and periodicals, etc., would be $68,100. The expense, therefore, of the Department of Labor as proposed would be between $41,000 and $42,000 more than the expense of the present bureau. This additional expense, however, will in a large measure be quite necessary to be added to the present expense of the Bureau of Labor, should it continue. This necessity arises from the character of the work performed.

The force provided in the pending bill is a practical increase of 9 persons in the office force and 2 in the field. We have employed in the office 20 persons on the regular classified list, and 5 unclassified, making a total of 25 in office. The new bill calls for 40 office force. The bureau has employed 18 regular

agents and 6 temporary agents, on the average, making a total field force, on the average, of 24, or, with the present office force, 24 plus 25, a total of 49 persons. The pending bill calls for 20 field agents, which added to the proposed office force of 40, would make 60 persons employed in all, or a total increase of 11. The pending bill would make the office force regular instead of irregular, as at present, and would balance the forces in a proper way. The present forces are not well balanced. The experience of three years emphasizes the fact that the composition of the force, as called for by the pending bill, would be far more adequate to the work of the bureau.

The demands of Congress and the public on the time of the bureau are increasing, and in order to carry out the intention of Congress in the establishment of this bureau, as I have already intimated, the force must be increased. I therefore feel that I can assure you that the pending bill makes no increase in the necessary expenses of Government that ought not to be added to the expense of the present bureau. Further, while there is nothing proposed in the pending bill in the way of duties which could not be legitimately performed under the law establishing the Bureau of Labor, the pending bill to create a Department of Labor makes certain duties specific, and these duties are of such a nature that much expense must naturally be incurred. You will recognize at once that a considerable portion of the increase is already borne by appropriations made for the Department of the Interior and its bureaus which, under the new bill, would be made directly for the Department of Labor.

Trusting I have met your inquiries fully, I am,

Very respectfully, yours,

CARROLL D. WRIGHT,
Commissioner.

Hon. HENRY W. BLAIR,
United States Senate.

Mr. BLAIR. I have no desire to make any remarks further than to say that I think the bill is entirely correct, and I hope it will be passed.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, I see no earthly necessity for the passage of this bill to establish a department of labor. I hold in my hand the act of June 27, 1884, which is certainly all that is required on this question. It is entitled "An act to establish a Bureau of Labor." I call the attention of the Senators to the provisions of this law:

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there shall be established in the Department of the Interior a Bureau of Labor—

This bill proposes a department of labor—

which shall be under the charge of a Commissioner of Labor, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The Commissioner of Labor shall hold his office for four years, and until his successor shall be appointed and qualified, unless sooner removed, and shall receive a salary of $3,000 a year. The Commissioner shall collect information upon the subject of labor, its relation to capital, the hours of labor, and the earnings of laboring men and women, and the means of promoting their material, social, intellectual, and moral prosperity.

The Secretary of the Interior upon the recommendation of said Commissioner, shall appoint a chief clerk, who shall receive a salary of $2,000 per annum, and such other employés as may be necessary for the said bureau: *Provided*, That the total expense shall not exceed $25,000 per annum. During the necessary absence of the Commissioner, or when the office shall become vacant, the chief clerk shall perform the duties of Commissioner. The Commissioner shall annually make a report in writing to the Secretary of the Interior of the information collected and collated by him, and containing such recommendations as he may deem calculated to promote the efficiency of the bureau.

This act was approved the 27th of June, 1884, and under it Carroll D. Wright was appointed Chief of the Bureau of Labor. I hold in my hand the first annual report of the Commissioner of Labor, 1886, entitled on the back, "Industrial Depressions." It is the first report made by the Commissioner of Labor and seems to be quite full on many points. It contains:

Letter of transmittal.
Introduction.
Chapter I.—Modern industrial depressions.
  Great Britain, 1837–86.
  France, 1837–86.
  Belgium, 1837–86.
  Germany, 1837–86.
  The United States, 1837–78.
Chapter II.—The industrial depression in the United States, 1882–86.
  The extent of the depression.
  Alleged causes of the present depression.
  Falling prices.
  Machinery and overproduction.
  The variation in the cost of production.
  The variation in the rates of wages.
  Speculative railroad building.
  Crippled consuming power, or underconsumption.
  Tariff inequalities.
  Miscellaneous.
Chapter III.—The manufacturing nations considered as a group in relation to the present depression.
Chapter IV.—Suggested remedies for depressions.
  The restriction of land grants to corporations.
  The restriction of immigration.
  The enactment of laws to stop speculation.
  The establishment of boards of arbitration to settle industrial difficulties.
  The contraction of credit.
  A sound currency.
  Commercial and mercantile conditions.
  The distribution of products.
  Profit-sharing.
  The organization of workmen; of employers.
Chapter V.—Summary:
  Contemporaneousness and severity of depressions.
  Causes.
  Remedies.
Appendix A.—Occupations, with number and wages of employés by industries.
Appendix B.—Earnings and expenses of wage receivers in Europe.
Appendix C.—Synopsis of labor legislation in the United states.

That seems to be a very comprehensive and useful report. The second report is the report for 1887, and it is dated February 28, 1887, and submitted to the Secretary of the Interior. It contains these items:

Letter of transmittal.

PART I.

Convict labor in the United States.
Introduction.
Chapter I.—General tables:
  Table I.—Convicts by States and Territories.
  Table II.—Convicts by classes of institutions.
  Table III.—Convicts by systems of work.
  Table IV.—Convicts by classes of industries.
  Table V.—Goods made or work done by States and Territories.
  Table VI.—Goods made or work done by classes of institutions.
  Table VII.—Goods made or work done by systems of work.
  Table VIII.—Goods made or work done by classes of industries.
  Table IX.—Selected prison industries, 1886, and free industries, 1880 (Tenth United States Census), compared.
  Table X.—Average daily price for convict and free labor by States and Territories.
  Table XI.—Average daily price for convict and free labor by classes of industries.
  Table XII.—Income and expenses by States and Territories.
  Table XIII.—Income and expenses by classes of institutions.
  Table XIV.—Income and expenses of systems of work.
  Table XV.—Ages and sentences by States and Territories.
  Table XVI.—Ages and sentences by classes of institutions.
Chapter II.—Analysis of tables.
Chapter III.—State investigations:
  New York.
  Ohio.
  Pennsylvania.
  Massachusetts.
  New Jersey.
  Connecticut.
  Michigan.
  California.
  Iowa.
  Wisconsin.
  Illinois.
Chapter IV.—Advantages and disadvantages of various systems and plans:
  The contract system.
  The piece-price system.
  The public-account system.
  The lease system.
  The entire abolition of convict labor.
  The establishment of a penal colony by the Federal Government.
  The employment of prisoners upon public works and ways.
  The employment of convicts in manufacturing goods for Government.
  The exportation of the products of convict labor.
  The prohibition of the sale of convict-made goods outside of the State in which manufactured.
  Convict-made goods to be stamped "prison-made."
  The payment of wages to convicts.
  The reduction of hours of labor in prisons.
Chapter IV—Continued.
  Diversified industries.
  The substitution of industries not now carried on in this country.
  The utilization of convicts upon farms.
  Hand-labor under the public-account system.

PART II.

Historical notes:
  The early nations.
  Italy.
  Spain.
  France.
  Holland.
  Belgium.
  Germany.
  Russia.
  Great Britain.
  Mexico.
  Guatemala.
  Columbia.
  Peru.
  Argentine Republic.
  Brazil.
  The United States.
Convict-labor laws in the United States.

Mr. President, it does seem to me that the Bureau of Labor already existing meets every want that is required in behalf of the laboring people of this great country, and I believe the law creating the Bureau of Labor is almost in the language of this bill. About the only difference I see between the real provisions of the existing law and of this proposed law will be found in the third section, and that is—

That there shall be in the department of labor, to be appointed by the Commissioner of Labor—

Not to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, as now, but by the Commissioner of Labor—

One chief clerk, at a salary of $2,500 per annum; four clerks of class 4, all to be statistical experts; five clerks of class 3, one of whom may be a stenographer; six clerks of class 2, one of whom may be a translator and one of whom may be a stenographer; eight clerks of class 1; five clerks, at $1,000 per annum; one disbursing clerk, who shall also have charge of accounts, at a salary of $1,800 per annum; two copyists, at $900 each per annum; two copyists, at $720 each per annum; one messenger; one assistant messenger; one watchman; two assistant watchmen; two skilled laborers, at $600 each per annum; two charwomen, at $240 each per annum; six special agents, at $1,600 each per annum; ten special agents, at $1,400 each per annum; four special agents, at $1,200 each per annum; and an allowance to special agents for traveling expenses not to exceed $3 per day while actually employed in the field and outside of the District of Columbia, exclusive of actual transportation including sleeping-car fares; and such temporary experts, assistants, and other employés as Congress may from time to time provide, with compensation corresponding to that of similar officers and employés in other Departments of the Government.

That seems to be about the only substantial difference—an increase of the number of officers and giving the appointment to the Commissioner of Labor.

Mr. BLAIR. That is the substance of the difference between the existing bureau and what it is proposed to make it. It is proposed that this department of labor shall correspond in its scope and work with the same unlimited freedom of exercise of its powers that is now possessed by the Department of Agriculture, that the great laboring interests of the country may be under a department in the same way that the agricultural interest of the country is already provided for; and I may say that it is modeled substantially after the organization of the Agricultural Department. It is not, of course, with any contemplation of a Cabinet position for the head of it. So far as the increased expense is concerned, it is, as the Senator will observe—I think he was out when the letter of the Commissioner was read, sent in response to inquiries made by the Senate committee—that the present expenditure is in part under the Secretary of the Interior, and it is so mixed up that it is impossible to eliminate it and apply it to the expenses of the Bureau of Labor proper. The expense now, I think, is about $125,000. Under this bill it will be about $150,000. Some addition of clerical force is necessary, in order to make the bureau or department correspond to its growing wants. The bill is one about which there has been no controversy or dispute. It is based on previous legislation, and comes to us from the House of Representatives, unanimously passed by that body, unanimously reported by the Committee on Labor of theHouse, and passed after discussion without a dissenting voice from any party or any individual whatever.

I have nothing further to say, but hope the Senate will dispose of the bill at present.

Mr. REAGAN. Before the bill is disposed of I desire to call attention to the ninth section, beginning at line 6, which reads:

> The Commissioner of Labor appointed under said act, approved June 27, 1884, and all clerks and employés in the Bureau of Labor authorized to be appointed by said act or subsequent acts, shall continue in office and employment as if appointed under the provisions of this act, and until a Commissioner of Labor, other officer, clerks, and employés are appointed and qualified as herein required and provided.

Mr. BLAIR. That is in order that there may be no interruption of work, that the existing bureau may continue until gradually it is merged and in fact is entirely merged in the proposed department. There have been some additions made to the department, and this *personnel* will carry on the work until changes are subsequently made and additional appointments——

Mr. REAGAN. But what strikes me is that the power of appointment is by the Constitution vested in the President, heads of Departments, or courts of law. It has not been the custom heretofore to appoint officers by act of Congress.

Mr. BLAIR. The bureau is simply merged and the name changed to a department.

Mr. REAGAN. I should like to have the bill go over until morning. I must think that the Commissioner of Labor has underestimated the increased expense involved in this bill, and I should like an opportunity to look into it. He makes out that there is an increase of $30,000. There are twenty agents here authorized to be appointed by the Department with salaries, and with an allowance for traveling expenses, not exceeding $3 a day, "exclusive of actual transportation, including sleeping-car fare." If twenty agents should be put in the field for half the year, getting $3 a day and the expense of transportation, with sleeping-car fare, I apprehend it would make a very serious difference in the amount estimated for this purpose.

Besides that, it seems to me that under the act of 1884, with the power given to the Commissioner of Labor and under the organization of the Bureau of Statistics, all the possible information is obtained that we could obtain under this act; that we gain nothing by it; we do nothing by it except to multiply officers and increase salaries. No man can watch the progress of the Government without feeling apprehensive that we are making an alarming increase of officers. We should not go further in that direction unless the increase proposed produces to the country some substantial good.

Of course I understand that this will be claimed as a great benefit to labor. How does it benefit labor? We have officers collecting all the information that can be collected under this act through the Bureau of Labor under the Secretary of the Interior, and through the Bureau of Statistics under the Secretary of the Treasury. We can get all the information that this bill will give us without increasing the number of officers and increasing the expenditures as provided for in this bill.

I know there is a sort of habit now that when labor is mentioned men are required almost to stand on their heads. I do not propose to be one of that class, and I feel that I have a right to speak upon the subject, because I was born and raised in the ranks of labor and not in the ranks of demagogues, not in the ranks of those who appeal to class prejudices. I believe it our duty to legislate for the welfare of this country, and not to legislate with reference to foolish prejudices where no good can result, but only an increase of burdens upon labor by the increase of officers and the multiplication of expenses.

The bill has come up suddenly to me, and I should be glad to have it go over till morning, so that further time can be given for its examination.

Mr. BLAIR. I should be very glad to complete the consideration of the bill to-night. I did not anticipate any opposition to it. I never heard of any before. I know it is generally approved and great anxiety felt for the enactment of the bill into a law by those whose interests (whether supported by demagogues or others) are supposed to be served by the bill.

The Senator from Missouri has read to us *in extenso* the statement of the contents of the reports of the present bureau, and has been so gracious as to say that they indicated excellent labor on the part of the bureau; but that is no argument against this bill, which changes the form of the existing organization to make it more efficient at a slight increased expense—nothing beyond what seems to be the actual necessity of the bureau under the changed form; and it is to be called a Department.

If the Senator from Texas insists on a postponement that he may discuss the bill further, I have nothing to say, but I should be glad if he would allow final action to be taken to-night.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to ask the Senator from New Hampshire a question. Has the Senator from New Hampshire information authorizing him to say that the laboring men of this country are in favor of the bill?

Mr. BLAIR. I understand they favor it universally. Their great organizations indorse it.

Mr. VOORHEES. If the Senator from New Hampshire will yield to me I will move an adjournment. It is perfectly manifest that we shall not get a vote to-night, and there is not a quorum here either.

Mr. BLAIR. I will ask that the bill be disposed of to-morrow, notwithstanding any special assignment which has been made for the consideration of the Calendar, beginning early. I shall ask that, because I think it important to dispose of the bill promptly.

Mr. HARRIS. I give notice to the Senator from New Hampshire that I shall insist upon carrying out the consent rule that was entered into this morning.

Mr. BLAIR. This bill was taken up on motion.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] will allow me, I will move an executive session.

Mr. VOORHEES. I withdraw my motion for that purpose.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that the pending bill remains the unfinished business. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After eight minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 16, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15, 1888.

ASSAYER.

Frank Nicholson, of Missouri, to be assayer of the United States assay office at St. Louis, Mo.

MELTER OF MINT.

John W. Browning, of Colorado, to be melter of the mint of the United States at Denver, Colo.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *May* 15, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PERRY, for seven days, beginning this day.

To Mr. BACON, indefinitely, on account of important business.

CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION, OHIO VALLEY.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. HENDERSON of Iowa, Mr. CLEMENTS, and Mr. BUTTERWORTH as managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government and the Bureau of Agriculture and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the Centennial Exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, from July 4 to October 27, 1888.

CORRECTION OF A BILL.

The SPEAKER. In House bill No. 7111, granting a pension to Caroline Pautel, the name of the beneficiary is spelled in two different

ways in the body of the bill. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. CASWELL] asks unanimous consent that the spelling of the name where it last occurs in the bill be corrected.

There was no objection and it was so ordered.

BRANCH SOLDIERS' HOME, GRANT COUNTY, INDIANA.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up and put upon its passage the bill (H. R. 8391) to authorize the location of a branch home for volunteer disabled soldiers in Grant County, Indiana, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I must object, Mr. Speaker.

WASHINGTON AND IDAHO RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. SHIVELY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up and put upon its passage the bill (S. 38) granting to the Washington and Idaho Railroad Company the right of way through the Cœur d'Alene Indian reservation.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the right of way is hereby granted, as hereinafter set forth, to the Washington and Idaho Railroad Company, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the Territory of Washington, for the extension of its railroad through the lands in Idaho Territory set apart for the use of the Cœur d'Alene Indians by executive order, commonly known as the Cœur d'Alene Indian reservation, beginning at a point on the westerly line of said reservation, near the junction of the Washington and Idaho Railroad with the Idaho Branch of said road, near Lone Pine, in Washington Territory, and running thence in a northerly direction across the Cœur d'Alene Indian reservation to a point in Washington Territory, and running thence in a northerly direction across the Cœur d'Alene Indian reservation to a point near the mouth of the St. Joseph's River, on the Cœur d'Alene Lake, thence in a northeasterly direction along the east side of the Cœur d'Alene Lake to the Cœur d'Alene River, and thence in a generally easterly direction, by the Cœur d'Alene Mission, to the east line of the reservation.

SEC. 2. That the right of way hereby granted to said company shall be 75 feet in width on each side of the central line of said railroad as aforesaid; and said company shall also have the right to take from said lands adjacent to the line of said road material, stone, earth, and timber necessary for the construction of said railroad; also, ground adjacent to such right of way for station-buildings, depots, machine-shops, side-tracks, turnouts, and water-stations, not to exceed in amount 300 feet in width and 3,000 feet in length for each station, to the extent of one station for each 10 miles of road.

SEC. 3. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to fix the amount of compensation to be paid the Indians for such right of way, and provide the time and manner for the payment thereof, and also to ascertain and fix the amount of compensation to be made individual members of the tribe for damages sustained by them by reason of the construction of said road; but no right of any kind shall vest in said railway company in or to any part of the right of way herein provided for until plats thereof, made upon actual survey for the definite location of such railroad, and including the points for station-buildings, depots, machine shops, side tracks, turnouts, and water stations, shall be filed with and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, which approval shall be made in writing and be open for the inspection of any party interested therein, and until the compensation aforesaid has been fixed and paid; and the surveys, construction, and operation of such railroad, including charges of transportation, shall be conducted with due regard for the rights of the Indians, and in accordance with such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may make to carry out this provision: *Provided*, That the consent of the Indians to said right of way shall be obtained by said railroad company in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe, before any right under this act shall accrue to said company.

SEC. 4. That said company shall not assign or transfer or mortgage this right of way for any purpose whatever until said road shall be completed: *Provided*, That the company may mortgage said franchise, together with the rolling-stock, for money to construct and complete said road: *And provided further*, That the right granted herein shall be lost and forfeited by said company unless the road is constructed and in running order across said reservation within two years from the passage of this act.

SEC. 5. That said railway company shall accept this right of way upon the expressed condition, binding upon itself, its successors and assigns, that they will neither aid, advise, nor assist in any effort looking towards the changing or extinguishing the present tenure of the Indians in their land, and will not attempt to secure from the Indian tribes any further grant of land or its occupancy than is hereinbefore provided: *Provided*, That any violation of the condition mentioned in this section shall operate as a forfeiture of all the rights and privileges of said railway company under this act.

SEC. 6. That Congress may at any time amend, add to, alter, or repeal this act.

SEC. 7. That this act shall be in force from its passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHIVELY moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JESSE COE.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. HUNTER] had a bill before the House when the hour of adjournment arrived yesterday. The bill has been read, but the Clerk will again report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Jesse Coe, of Monroe County, Kentucky, the sum of $450, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for horses taken from him by the United States Army and used by the same during the war of the rebellion.

The committee recommended an amendment striking out "four hundred and fifty" before the word "dollars" and inserting "three hundred and seventy-five."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUNTER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MAP OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. MANSUR, by unanimous consent, introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 168) to authorize the printing of 15,000 copies of the Map of the United States, edition of 1887; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed.

SANDY HOOK SHIP-CHANNEL.

Mr. SPINOLA. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present a privileged report from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ask unanimous consent for the immediate adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SPINOLA] is not a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Mr. SPINOLA. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Rivers and Harbors have authorized me to present the report.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not understand, Mr. Speaker, how the gentleman from New York can present a report from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has just called the gentleman's attention to the fact that he is not a member of the committee.

Mr. SPINOLA. But the members of the committee have authorized me to present the report.

The SPEAKER. But a report from a committee must be made at least in the name of some member of the committee and by authority of the committee.

Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the House Calendar and put upon its passage House bill 8843.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, what becomes of the report from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors?

The SPEAKER. There is no report.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. By an order of the House heretofore made, this day was set apart for the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, in such order as that committee might indicate. Of course, if the committee indicate no bills which they desire to have considered, the regular order will be the call of committees for reports.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I move that it be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. It can not be dispensed with.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent——

The SPEAKER. Of course, the special order will not be called unless the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds ask for it. The regular order is insisted upon. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] moves that the morning hour for the presentation of reports of committees be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I now ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to make be allowed to hand them in at the Clerk's desk for reference to the appropriate Calendars.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the leave asked by the gentleman from Kentucky will be granted. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

FILING OF REPORTS.

The following reports were filed by being handed in at the clerk's desk.

F. VARIN.

Mr. BLISS, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back the bill (H. R. 6607) for the relief of F. Varin; which was laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9801) to refer the claims against the United States of F. Varin to the Court of Claims; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

METHODIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH, HUNTSVILLE, ALA.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back the bill (H. R. 5734) to reimburse the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Huntsville, Ala.; which was laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, reported back a bill (H. R. 5735) to refer the claim against the United States of the Methodist Episcopal Church at Huntsville, Ala., to the Court of Claims; which was read a

first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 8105) for the relief of Joseph E. Montgomery; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

WARREN MITCHELL.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 327) for the relief of Warren Mitchell; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF LEWIS W. WASHINGTON.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1725) for the relief of the legal representatives of Lewis W. Washington, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PENNSYLVANIA WAR CLAIM.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2329) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to re-examine and reaudit the claim of the State of Pennsylvania for advances made and money borrowed by said State to pay the militia called into the military service by the governor under the proclamation of the President of June 15, 1863; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. FORD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 762) for the relief of William Crouse; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

MILWAUKEE, LAKE SHORE AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. HUDD, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9958) granting to the Milwaukee, Lake Shore and Western Railway Company the right of way through the Lac de Flambeau Indian reservation, in the State of Wisconsin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORT.

Mr. STEELE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 6556) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the muster and pay the military officers and enlisted men of the volunteer forces," approved June 3, 1884, and further amended February 3, 1887; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

FORT RUSSELL MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. MAISH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1804) to authorize the Cheyenne Street Railroad Company to build its road on and across the Fort D. A. Russell military reservation; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

FORT LEAVENWORTH MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. MAISH also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1747) to authorize the sale of a tract of land in the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth, in the State of Kansas; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LUCY A. JORDAN.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 9463) granting a pension to Lucy Jordan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. HELEN B. BROWN.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9697) granting a pension to Mrs. Helen B. Brown; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GETTYSBURGH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported joint resolution (H. Res. 169) to appropriate $25,000 for a celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the battle of Gettysburgh; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. TOWNSHEND, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1959) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue to the governor of the Territory of Montana military stores for the use of the regularly-enlisted, organized, and uniformed active militia; and the same was referred to the Committee on the Militia.

On motion of Mr. TOWNSHEND, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the petition of Robert W. Dunbar, for payment of his claim against the United States; and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

C. I. NOURSE.

Mr. MANSUR, from the Committee on Claims, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 5784) for the relief of C. I. Nourse; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADDIE BELL.

Mr. MANSUR also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1506) for the relief of Addie Bell; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LABAN HEATH & CO.

Mr. MANSUR also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (S. 903) for the relief of Laban Heath & Co., of Boston, Mass.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL CEMETERY, HAMPTON.

Mr. MAISH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9442) to provide for widening the entrance to the national cemetery at Hampton; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN REILLY.

Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 6299) directing the Secretary of War to issue an honorable discharge to John Reilly; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

TARIFF.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of bills raising revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the tariff bill.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Mr. Chairman, no member of this House need apologize for asking and insisting upon being heard upon a question which is of such vital concern to all his constituents.

All the other bills before this body taken together dwarf into insignificance when compared with this in immediate results and far-reaching consequence.

This is the only bill pending here that reaches to every home in the country in a measure, which will make its influence immediately felt. It relates to taxation—not merely to the rate of tax which may be imposed upon the citizen, but at the same time deals with his ability to pay the rate when fixed.

We are, it is hoped, at the close of the consideration of this bill, by our votes to indicate clearly—if we do not in fact absolutely determine—what, in a most important particular, the economic policy of the Government shall be. And the people in November next will approve or condemn our action; either they will commit our economic policy to the control and care of the Democratic party or restore the Republicans to power in the nation. Truth, justice, and the highest interests of the country demand that there shall be no paltering in a double sense, "keeping the word of promise to the ear to break it to the hope."

That the people may not be misled, let the issue joined between the majority, the Democratic side of the House, and the minority, the Republican side of the House, be fully and fairly stated.

We can not deceive ourselves if we try. We may attempt to deceive the country by presenting a Janus face in the tariff plank of a party platform. But, sir, the end to be attained, which is admittedly the good of the whole country, needs not the aid of agencies of such doubtful honesty, and more than doubtful propriety.

Let us hope, in the interest of the great cause we would serve, that the issue joined in the tariff planks of the national platforms will be so distinctly stated as to indicate that the resolution was drawn by patriotic statesmen, and not by time-serving and juggling politicians.

Whether the tariff needs revision is not the issue joined between us. Upon that point there is no controlling difference of opinion. Whether the duty is too high upon this article or too low upon that is not the

line upon which we divide. Whether a rate of duty yielding a much less revenue might be so adjusted as to afford all needful protection to our industries is not the question upon which we are in antagonism. These are matters of detail, and concerning which there might be wide diversity of opinion, not only between the political parties but among the members of each. These issues would naturally grow out of conditions which affect the application of an economic policy, admitting the wisdom of the policy itself.

The controversy arises out of an irreconcilable difference of opinion between the political organizations represented upon this floor as to the wisdom and justice of the protective system. You assail it as being unsound in principle and iniquitous in its operation. We defend it as being alike wise in theory and beneficent in its results.

You assert (and each speaker who has addressed the House from the Democratic standpoint has endeavored to maintain) that to levy a duty on imports, except for the purpose of raising needed revenue, is at once unconstitutional, unwise, unjust, and indefensible, while we assert the exact reverse, insisting that not only may duties be levied with reference to revenue, but with reference to the protection of our home industries as well, and beyond that, that such duties are indispensable to the development of our national resources.

You assert, and have endeavored to prove, that the direct and inevitable result of a tariff levied for the purpose of protection, and to the extent that it is so levied, is to exact tribute of the many for the benefit of the few; that the direct tendency of the system is to found and foster monopoly, to make the rich richer and the poor poorer; that all these evil results are the legitimate outgrowth of the system, and that being so, it is the irresistible logic of the situation that if you are honest, as you are, your end, aim, and deliberate purpose must be to destroy this system.

What we account a blessing in the present system our Democratic friends condemn as a curse. It follows, therefore, that the political parties divide on the wisdom of protection as an economic policy.

We can not deceive ourselves if we try, and I doubt if we can deceive the country if we make the effort, as to the real obstacle which stands in the way of a proper and needed revision of the tariff.

It will not be found in the inability of this House to revise it in conformity with the just and reasonable requirements of the protective system, if that was in truth your end and aim. Nor would it be found in any unwillingness on our part to aid you in so doing. But that is not the prime object of your endeavor. The obstacle is found in the fact that you, while revising, are seeking to destroy.

The logic of your position (and you stand by it) is that you should, if possible, while providing for needed revenue, destroy a policy which you regard as unequal, unjust, and iniquitous, and which is, you assert, the founder and cherisher of monopolies.

With your convictions upon this subject you would be untrue to the obligations of your oaths, false to the duty devolving upon you as the representatives of the people, if you did not, even as you are doing, endeavor to tear up the iniquity by the roots, and the country may rest assured if you do not succeed it will not be your fault.

It is not my purpose, Mr. Chairman, to discuss the details of the pending bill (that can be done when we come to consider it under the five-minute rule), but to address myself to the main question, which involves the maintenance or overthrow of the protective system.

The people of the country do not possess the discernment for which I give them credit if they fail to appreciate the precise situation presented here. They will not be misled by the cry of our friends upon the Democratic side of the House that they are anxious to revise the tariff, but that the Republicans are a stumbling block and rock of offense in the way.

The first question the intelligent voter will ask himself is, "How do I stand on the main proposition? Do I desire the maintenance or the destruction of the protective system?"

He will answer that question by his vote next November. He will say if the protective policy is beneficent it should be under Republican care, and not within Democratic control. Let no one mistake the issue. Let no one on this side suppose for a moment that our battle with the Democratic party is over the mere matter of adjusting the tariff with reference to the protection needed. This is a matter of detail. Our contest is to maintain the system against their studied efforts to destroy it. The details we will settle afterwards.

It is interesting to note with what adroitness our friends on the other side endeavor to divert the attention of the country from the real purpose which underlies and is the mainspring of their effort; as if the political ways parted when we come to consider the duty on rice, the duty upon sugar, or upon glass.

This pretended revision is the Trojan horse by means of which you hope to gain admission to our camp.

I ask you, I ask the country, if it is in the logic of the situation that you can revise, except to destroy. Will you seek to make strong or preserve in health that which you say should not exist at all?

If it should be destroyed, the work of so-called revision has been committed to those who will rejoice in the service, the Democratic party. If it is to be maintained and revised with reference to the performance of its legitimate and proper functions, this nation should place (and, in my judgment, will place) the system in the care and keeping of the Republican party.

I am conscious of the fact that we are discussing a dry subject. But we can not be forgetful of another fact. There is not a hearthstone in the United States that will not be affected for good or ill by the passage of the Mills bill. Its passage will be a direct condemnation of the protective system. Its defeat will indicate not that the tariff is perfect, but that the Democratic party is not a fit instrument to remove its imperfections.

Let us inquire what the proper functions of the protective system are, for they should not be misapprehended.

First, let it be borne in mind that it deals with conditions and not with boundary lines, except as the latter mark the presence of the former. The just measure of its usefulness will not be found in the weight of shekels it has secured to those engaged and employed in the various industries of our country.

Desirable as the accumulation of wealth was, and is, the protective system had, and has, a nobler mission than the development of the mere physical resources of this nation. That development might have been possible under a monarchical form of government controlling and employing a race of slaves.

In the course of this argument I desire to notice the points made against the policy of protection by the advocates of the Mills bill. First, whether in its mission it tends to establish monopoly. Whether it does, in fact, levy tribute upon the many for the benefit of the few. Whether it does make the burden of taxation unequal. Whether it tends to increase the price of commodities in the market. And then seek to learn whether its influence has been, as we claim, to multiply and diversify industries. Whether the result has been, as we assert, to build up a home market and to continue it, and in the same connection inquire into the relation of the agricultural industries to those of the manufacturer, and see how far the assertion that farmers are bearing more than their share of the public burdens are borne out by the facts.

I wish to consider also the influences which have tended to cause disturbance in the ranks of wage-workers and set capital and labor by the ears. In connection with these inquiries I will call attention to the influence of the two systems in the States where any such bear sway, and determine the value of the philosophy by the results of adherence to the practice it enjoins.

What gave rise to the protective system?

This House and the country need not be told that it was the purpose of our fathers, in the establishment of the government we enjoy, to lay the foundation here of a new order of things, which looked not alone to the development of the material resources of this country, but to the moral and intellectual growth of each individual citizen; in this latter growth, rather than in the development of the material resources of the country, our fathers recognized the true foundation upon which to build a nation's greatness, and permanently secure the freedom and prosperity of all our people. And as a logical result it was their active concern to provide the opportunity for the head of each family to bring to his home prosperity, comfort, and happiness, the legitimate offspring of intelligent effort guided by virtue. I will adopt in brief language used by me in speaking at another place and on another occasion.

In this work the fathers built even better than they knew.

The maxims of the English law—the spirit of the English constitution wherein it was a bulwark of freedom—they adopted. But in their effort they kept steadily in view the fundamental idea of establishing a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people." They were conscious that the homes of a country are the source of its greatness and power; that as we multiply the number of homes where virtue and intelligence exert controlling influence we increase the happiness of our people, and make sure and fast the pillars which uphold the state.

Our fathers realized that a philosopher placed in the midst of poverty and squalor will gravitate toward vice and corruption. They knew, and we realize in as full a sense, that as needful comforts and conveniences abound in a home, so are the inmates of that home elevated and refined, dignified and ennobled.

Our system of Government has no higher or nobler mission than to multiply the number of happy homes in the United States. Can laws perform a better work than to place the wage-worker of my country above and out of the influence of those conditions in the Old World which in a large degree tend to make men and women mere beasts of burden? Can a system of political economy be justly condemned which seeks to enable the man who produces the wealth of a nation to become, with his wife and children, the sharer in and partaker of the fruits of his toil? This is the mission of the protective system.

I contend that the preservation of that system as an economic governmental policy is to-day and must be for years indispensable to the national prosperity; and that it must be preserved as a system.

Now, does it perform the service we claim for it?

You say it imposes burdens in that it increases taxation without corresponding benefit. We answer that it imposes the shadow of taxation that we may enjoy the substance of substantial prosperity.

Mr. Chairman, a careful examination of the circumstances which

give rise to imposition of so-called tax as an incident of the protective policy, and the resulting increased ability of the citizens to pay it, will satisfy even my honored friend, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means (and that would seem to reach the case and condition of my other friends from Kentucky, Tennessee, and Arkansas) of the wisdom and justice of the protective system.

With great respect I submit to those honorable gentlemen that they stop their investigation when they have viewed what they regard as the burden of tax imposed by the tariff.

They seem not to consider the increased ability to pay, which results from the influence of the trade regulation of which the alleged tax is an incident.

If it is admitted, as claimed, that the system imposes taxes, the answer is that it is in the nature of an investment, the resulting profit being such as each year to repay with usury the capital invested.

If I am right in this, can you successfully deny the wisdom and justice of the policy which in the last analysis is but a governmental business venture in the interests of all our people? The issue joined between us is as to whether we shall change our business method. An inseparable attendant on our present governmental business policy involves the imposition of duties levied for protection. And I repeat that under our system these duties are levied as plain business investment and with confidence that the capital will be returned to each citizen with usury.

But is it true to say that in maintaining a protective duty we lay a tax upon our people? We do not, in strictness, do any such thing. The exact business proposition resolves itself into this: In the interests of our people we have adopted certain regulations in restraint of import trade with foreign nations. If our citizens trade with the citizens of those nations they do it under and in accordance with the regulations prescribed. These laws of trade and commerce in their operation have two objects in view: one, to raise the revenue to defray the expenses of the Government; the other, to so regulate the admission of foreign products to our home markets as to secure our citizens against the disastrous influence of that foreign competition which unrestrained would greatly hinder if not absolutely prevent the establishment and maintenance of industrial plants in the United States.

We say that whatever, if any, of temporary inconvenience our people may suffer from these trade restrictions is more than compensated in the direct advantages which will result from their influence in the encouragement of productive effort among our people. We assert, and the proof of the correctness of the assertion is ample, that under the influence of this restraint of trade with foreign nations our own resources will be rapidly developed, our industries multiplied and diversified, and that the comforts and conveniences of life will more abound; and, concurrently with all this, wages will be advanced, while the cost of things needful in life will be reduced. A home market, confessedly the most desirable, will be created, the industrial independence of the Republic secured, and prosperity and happiness come and abide with us.

Although the results have conclusively justified every hope and expectation of the champions of protection, yet we have to-day, as if the experiment were new and untried, to stand here and defend it. They (I refer to these misguided Democratic brethren on the other side) insist that our prosperity has not been the result of the protective system, but has come to us in spite of it. We are asked the question a thousand times each campaign, and it has been in substance repeatedly asked during this debate: Does protection protect? I propose to add my answer to those of my honored friends on this side who have preceded me.

First, let us agree on certain business propositions which are so self-evident as to be properly ranked among the axioms which guide the business world in the prosecution of its various ventures.

I am now dealing with our own country and with our own people.

Manufacturing plants could not be established without capital. Capital will not seek investment without reasonable hope of adequate return.

Both capital and plants were essential to the procurement and employment of skilled workmen, and all these are together the foundation upon which must rest prosperous trade and commerce, since they furnish the source and supply of that which is the subject-matter of both.

Capital will protect itself, even if it has to leave the workmen in idleness and consequent destitution.

In a contest with workmen, capital has the advantage. This is certain, and for the reason that capital can wait longer for a dividend than labor can for a breakfast.

I want to supplement these cold business maxims by a few others that are leavened with the humane and Christian spirit of our free institutions. One is that labor should have its full and equal distributive share in the profit resulting from its joint effort with capital.

To authorize or permit a condition or system which would compel capital either to withdraw from the field of competition or withhold from labor its due is alike inhuman and directly at war with sound public policy. I shall maintain that the protective system is designed to, and in its operation does, avoid the evils we would shun and multiply the blessings to which we would attain.

Does protection protect? Palpably it so regulates trade and commerce with foreign nations as to shield our industrial enterprises from the destructive influence of conditions beyond the sea, in the presence of which the healthful growth of the industrial arts in our midst would have been impossible, and for reasons so obvious and so frequently cited on this floor that to repeat them would seem needless.

Does protection multiply our industries? No, not directly; but its influence is the parent of conditions which give rise to the multiplication of our industries. It is the immediate cause and source of multiplication and diversification of industry.

By multiplication of industries we mean the creation of those that are new; such as the creation of a new method of performing a given labor, as in making horseshoes by machinery instead of by hand; printing by the use of the power-press instead of by hand; in the use of cyclones to reduce and pulverize substances instead of using a mortar of stone or iron crushers. In these and other instances we manufacture the machines to do the work instead of doing the work itself with our hands. And these instrumentalities are the product of new industries in all the mechanical arts.

And in the invention and production in the arts of these new machines and devices our industries are multiplied and diversified indefinitely, and, as a result, employment is given to vast numbers of men, women, and youths, who at once create and supply a home market.

All this Mr. Calhoun, in 1816, standing in his place upon this floor as the champion of the protective system, with prophetic vision saw and distinctly pointed out to the House and the country. I shall refer to his evidence later on in my remarks.

Now, I want the attention of my distinguished friend from Texas, with whom I have had many interesting talks as to the source of the multiplication of our industries.

I have on previous occasions called the attention of this House and the country to the influence of the inventive genius of our people upon its industrial development.

I have said, and do still maintain, that in that inventive genius will be found the germ of our unequaled industrial prosperity. And just at this point I anticipate the question of my friend, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] who has in his bill placed the ax at the root of the tree of protection. He will ask me if the multiplication of our industries is so largely due to the genius of invention. "Why do you give protection the credit for it and continue the policy?" The idea being that since invention multiplies and diversifies our industries, and the letters patent which for a term of years vest in the inventor and his assigns the exclusive ownership of the thing invented, and so preserve to him the exclusive right to manufacture, use, and sell the invention covered by the letters patent, a protective tariff is needless.

On its face the point seems strong, and in the argument is well taken, if the scope and influence of the patent system is as broad and full as is supposed.

But I assure the gentleman that a more careful investigation of the character of our industrial growth as it rests upon the development of the mechanical arts will tend to greatly modify his views, if it does not radically change them.

I beg to call attention to the fact that these patents granted to inventors are for improvements in the arts to which they attain.

An improvement in the shuttle used in a sewing machine, valuable and useful as it may be when used in the machine, is of little consequence to a manufacturer if he finds it impossible to make the machine itself.

An improvement in the device for working a sickle on a mowing machine is unimportant to a manufacturer if he can not make the machine of which the improvement is but a supplemental adjunct.

There are in one sense few new industrial arts. There are many new and useful improved devices used in the arts—improvements of greater or less consequence in the machines and implements which form the base of a particular art.

It follows that to protect the improvements in a given art you must protect our manufacturers in the production of the implement, machine, or device in connection with which such improvements are used. These improvements are in many, I may say in most, instances compared to the importance of the machine itself in large measure inconsequential, but still mark desirable and substantial progressive development, and supply better and more ample facilities in the conduct of human affairs, and their improvements and agencies have placed innumerable articles on the free-list. Thus the conditions to which our friends on the other side would attain will be soonest reached by pursuing the even tenor of our way along the highway of protection.

The protective system upholds the art, the inventive genius—perfects and completes it. Its influence is in a measure hidden, but it is none the less potent and far-reaching. It may be said of it, "*Causa latet, vis est notissima*"—the cause is hidden, but the effect is notorious. Destroy the protective system and you destroy that which depends upon it. "You take my house when you take the prop that doth sustain my house; you take my life when you do take the means whereby I live."

But let us turn and scan the results which should approve or con-

demn the protective system. It is familiar to us all that when the fathers were seeking to determine what the economic policy of the Government should be, then, as to-day, free trade and protection, as a distinct system, were struggling for supremacy. With reference to the protracted contest, I assert that if there was reason at any time during the history of this Republic which justified the levying of a duty for protection, so long as that reason exists so long is the system itself defensible. That is logical and the soundness of the proposition will not be questioned.

Can any intelligent mortal entertain a doubt that a protective tariff was indispensable to the establishment and growth of our industries and the development of the resources of the nation in all that was essential to the freedom, independence, prosperity, and the happiness of our people? If there is a doubter in the face of the testimony and experience of the fathers, supplemented by our own, he suffers from a weakness that is congenital, and no argument submitted here can influence his action.

Stating the proposition in another form, let me assert that which can not be gainsaid: that if for reasons sufficient in the early history of the Republic a protective policy was judicious and humane the same system must be equally wise, just, and humane to-day if the reasons still obtain which approved it a century ago. There is no escape from this. If our fathers, for good reason, found it necessary, as confessedly they did, during the earlier period of the existence of the Republic, to invoke the aid and shield of the protective system, unless the reason no longer exists, the system which rests upon that reason, or upon the same or like conditions, should still be maintained.

I shall have occasion to print, for I will not have time to read them, the opinions expressed by men of all parties as to the indispensable necessity of a protective tariff in the early history of our Government. I shall refer to, though the time will not permit me to quote at length, what those whom we are accustomed to account wise in their day and generation have said upon this subject, and the reasons they gave for the faith that was in them. I shall insert in my printed remarks the testimony they bore, but will not have time to read them to the House.

Now let me recur to the conditions which gave rise to this system of protection, not because it is essential to the argument addressed to you, but because it may be useful to the larger audience I hope to reach outside of this Capitol.

Our fathers found our country possessed of abundance of material exhaustless in quantity, excellent in quality, and infinite in variety. Then, as now, even in our own markets, we had the world for competitors. In the face of competition then the young Republic lacked established plants, lacked the capital to establish them, was wanting in skilled workmen. They found also that American freemen must enter the field as competitors of toilers on the other side, the result of whose efforts barely enabled them to exist.

At that time, in the midst of hard lines, this latter factor in the problem (I refer to wages), which has become since the controlling one, was not so thoroughly considered; not because our ancestors were less humane or less considerate of the rights and claims of the skilled artisans, mechanics, and workmen of their own country, but the question itself was not so important and controlling then as now. The wage was the smaller factor in the problem of competition then; it is the largest and the controlling factor in the economic problem to-day.

But against the hard conditions I have mentioned the young nation entered the lists to compete for the poor favor of selling in our own markets and to our own people. Men then, as now, would exercise their right to buy where they could cheapest and sell where they could realize the largest price. There is no sentiment in trade. We will buy an English or a German coat for $10 in preference to paying $12 or $15 to our own countrymen for the same article, though our industries perish. Buying and selling is not matter of sentiment, but matter of business.

It was clear that the result must be that if the Old World, with its countless laborers, with its established plants and boundless resources in capital, its skilled and cunning workmen, could enter the markets of the United States without the restraint of a duty imposed to regulate trade, our people would be unable to compete with the producers on the other side, even in our home market. That this was so, and is so to-day, is too clear to need argument. It was the experience of the United States immediately after the war of 1812, when England flooded our markets with goods of every kind, and to such an extent and at such low prices that the mills, shops, and factories upon this side stood idle. In the presence of such competition it could not be otherwise.

The necessity for providing against the baneful influence of this competition which paralyzed our industries, and at last tended to impoverish and humiliate our workmen, and left us helpless and prostrate in the field of industrial effort, was apparent to the men of that day who controlled the affairs of this nation. It was then that Mr. Calhoun, the representative of South Carolina, appeared upon this floor as the earnest and able champion of the protective system. He found the agricultural interests of his own State suffering in competition with India, and the fact was cited by a gentleman speaking of that competition, that it was in vain for our country to successfully grow cotton and weave cotton fabrics in competition with India where the raw material was 4 pence a pound and the wages of the laborer in weaving 4 pence a day.

It will be remembered that not many years prior to that time Whitney had invented the cotton-gin, and upon the other side the spinning-jenny and the power-loom had been given to the world by the genius of English operatives, and these agencies, going hand in hand, gave a new impetus to the growth of cotton, and under the influence of that new impetus all the Southern fields became white with the harvest.

Against the destructive influence of competition with India, Mr. Calhoun, standing in his place in the House of Representatives, advocated the imposition of a protective tariff; and a protective tariff was levied upon goods imported from the other side.

One item in that schedule levied a duty of 3 cents a pound on cotton, which was about 75 per cent. of the cost of its production by their Indian competitor.

I call the attention of my honorable friend from South Carolina, the worthy successor of Mr. Calhoun, to the language of the latter, when he stood as one of the foremost champions of the policy which his successors upon this floor so earnestly condemn and seek so eagerly to destroy.

Then Mr. Calhoun was not dealing with abstract philosophy, but was evolving a system for himself from existing conditions and facts, which refused to be ignored.

Speaking upon the tariff bill in 1816, Mr. Calhoun, deprecating the evils which would attend upon its defeat, said:

> When our manufactories are grown to a certain perfection, as they soon will be under the fostering care of the Government, we will no longer experience these evils. [Evils resulting from this unequal competition.] The farmer will find a ready market for his surplus, and what is of equal consequence, a certain and cheap supply of all his wants.

It is interesting to observe that South Carolina, which leads the van in opposition to the protective system, did not always adopt this view. As I have before said, her leading statesmen in 1816 recognized the importance of protecting, in a radical manner, the industries of South Carolina.

The few struggling cotton-mills of New England in the early part of this century found it cheaper to buy India cotton than to buy that produced in the Carolinas, and under the operation of that law which our friends upon the other side so constantly invoke—the right to buy where we can buy cheapest—the mill-owners of New England bought India cotton, and our merchants purchased India cotton fabrics.

There could hardly be a complaint in the Carolinas that they did not have cheap labor; but cheap as their labor was, the labor of India was still cheaper. The result was that New England merchantmen and English vessels brought from India cotton to supply New England mills and cotton goods to supply the American market. At that time certain Representatives from New England talked persuasively against an import duty, but placed their opposition on the ground of its injurious effects upon the India shipping interest, in which New England then employed forty ships. It was but a few years until our friends from south of the Potomac had gained and held the coign of vantage against the producers of cotton throughout the nations of the world, and strangely enough, after having first enjoyed the blessings of a protective system and in the midst of their own flourishing condition, turned to deny to the struggling industries of the other States the protection indispensable to their establishment and growth.

The cultivation of cotton becoming independent of all competition, the Southern statesmen turned from the championship of that industry to defend the peculiar system of labor employed in its prosecution, and from that day slavery and free trade established and maintained an offensive and defensive alliance and waged relentless war upon the protective policy. They were enabled to—as indeed they did in a large degree—dominate the country, and our economic policy oscillated between free trade and protection, and our industries had a desperate struggle for existence; and every spurt of success which came to them under the influence of war or newly-discovered gold mines was, by our free-trade friends, accounted to be the direct result of progress in the direction of free trade.

I am aware that it will be said that if conditions warranted a protective tariff in 1798 or 1816, it can not be made to appear that such conditions exist to-day, and, the reason ceasing, the rule should cease with it.

I challenge the correctness of the assertion that there has been such change in our condition as to render the protective system of to-day defenseless.

And now I desire to consider for a moment the changed conditions to the extent that there has been change, so as to determine whether in point of fact, admitting that a protective tariff was desirable in the early history of the Republic, it, on account of the alleged changed conditions, should be condemned to-day.

Without reviewing the history of our progress, we admit that we no longer are at the disadvantage of lacking established plants, nor do we lack capital; and it is but justice to my countrymen to say that as artisans, mechanics, and skilled workmen they are unsurpassed in the world. These three factors are eliminated from the industrial problem, but there remains still the fourth, the most important and controlling factor to-day; one that was inconsequential then. The plants are here, the capital is here, the skilled workmen are here, but the starvation wages are not here and in God's providence never will be here if the Republican party shall write the laws of the land. [Applause.]

The difference in wages at the beginning of the century was unimportant. The rates of duty were relatively higher than they are now. The difference in wages paid in the Old World and upon this side was not radically different at the organization of our Government, and for some years afterwards; nor would they have been different to-day if the economic policy which controlled for a term of years, and which is seeking to control in this House to-day, had continued to bear sway.

In the prosperity upon the other side, the wage-worker—the producer, if you please—was not permitted adequately to share.

In most of the countries there during the years that have elapsed, notwithstanding his larger contribution in producing results, his wages have not been materially advanced; and it is proper to say just here that he was not and is not yet a part and parcel of the government. He had not the political power to redress his wrongs and vindicate his rights. Revolution was his only remedy.

Now mark the difference. Under the beneficent influence of our Government, of which every citizen is a part, the progress made in industrial development attests the presence in the homes of the workmen of the land better conditions and influences that are ennobling and refining.

They find opportunity for increased comforts in the fact that the prices of things needful in life have been constantly reduced, while the rate of wages paid has been constantly advanced, mounting up 25, 50, 75, 100, and in many instances 300 per cent. above what it was when the economic philosophy of our Democratic friends held sway in the Government.

And, I repeat, capital, established plants, and skilled workmanship are not to-day the controlling factors in the industrial problem.

With us the paramount question is, shall those who contribute to our prosperity by their labor, the wage-workers, be remitted to the condition of those upon the other side of the water, or shall they continue to share, as now, in the profits resulting from a union of capital with labor in the field of productive effort?

Doubtless nine out of ten of the communications received by gentlemen upon this floor from their constituents protesting against the assault in the Mills bill upon the industries in which those constituents are employed, refer to the difference in cost of production between their shops, mills, or factories and the cost of similar articles imported from foreign countries as due to the increased wages paid in the United States. In the production of the greater part of the output of our manufacturing establishments labor contributes the larger share; such contribution ranging from 10 to over 99 per cent.

There are industries which employ many skilled workmen in which 40 cents' worth of material, after being manipulated by the skilled mechanic and passes from his hands a finished product, sells in the market for as much as $80. This is, of course, an exceptional case, but not so exceptional or extreme as many suppose. But I use it as an illustration, because it marks so palpably the point I wish to make touching the influence of foreign competition with our own skilled labor. The industry I referred to is the manufacture of the small screws and springs used in making watches.

In that industry upon the other side the wages paid range below 40 per cent. of what is paid the skilled mechanic in the United States engaged in the same employment.

It would hardly be claimed in the instance cited that a duty of 10, 20, 30, or 50 per cent. would correct the inequality between our home manufactures and their foreign competitors.

I have studied with care to ascertain the per cent. that labor contributes in the production of the articles supplied by our leading industries, and am satisfied that the difference which obtains between the per cent. apportioned to labor here is so much greater than that which is accorded to labor upon the other side that a carefully devised protective tariff is indispensable to the preservation of our industrial enterprises if the rights of workmen here are fairly considered and honestly provided for.

It is clear that we can not prevent employers in foreign countries from levying unjust and cruel exactions upon their employés. They may, if they will, coin money of the bone and muscle of those who labor for them; but we can provide against the destructive influence of such competition upon our own workmen by excluding foreign goods from our market, except upon terms which shall keep far from us the conditions which are the curse that rests upon the industrial classes of the Old World.

The various objections to the protective system urged by our friends upon the other side have been fully met by gentlemen who have preceded me. The proposition that the cost to the consumer in the United States is increased in exact proportion to the duty levied has been shown over and over again by my associates to be alike untrue in fact and absurd. There is still less justice and truth in claiming that the amount levied for the purpose of protection is so much taken from the consumer and placed in the pocket of the manufacturer.

If an article costs a dollar in Italy, and by reason of a higher rate of wages here it costs a dollar and twenty-five cents, and the expense of placing the Italian article upon our market is 5 cents, and the duty imposed by our Government is 20 cents, is it not something worse than folly to claim that that duty of 20 cents goes into the pocket of the manufacturer as profit? It does go directly into the pocket of the wage-worker, and represents the difference in compensation between the amount paid the workmen here and in Italy.

Does the protective duty increase the cost to the consumer? And if so, for how long? In the first instance the cost of an article may be temporarily increased. It is not always so, but that is the philosophy of the situation. Granting, for the sake of the argument, that the cost is temporarily increased, does the end justify the means? Is it exceptional to practice self-denial and rigid economy this year in order that prosperity may abound the next? Is it not the practice of every-day life when in hard lines to suffer inconvenience to-day to secure the better condition to-morrow? Following swiftly on the heels of this inconvenience of to-day we have, as compensation, permanently reduced prices and increased prosperity as lasting as the influence to which it is due.

The experience of this nation abundantly attests that the temporary disadvantage resulting from the self-denial practiced, and which is self-imposed, compared with the consequent advantage which is born of that self-denial, is absolutely inconsequential.

There has been during this debate an earnest endeavor to link the creation of trusts, syndicates, and combines to the protective policy and make it responsible for the existence of these ulcers upon the body-politic. They have no proper relation to each other, nor is either dependent upon the other.

No man upon this floor shall be before me in condemnation of these organizations. I do not hesitate for one moment to assert that the most serious menace to republican institutions in this country will be found in the power and influence of aggregated capital and the pretentious insolence of overgrown wealth. And I am not alone upon this floor in the conviction that unless they are speedily throttled they will have upon the throat of the Republic so firm a grip that nothing short of revolution will compel them to relax their hold. This is strong language, but I mean every word of it. I do not stand here to condemn as moral monsters the individuals engaged in these various enterprises or organizations, for I recognize the fact that there is a vast deal of human nature in utilizing opportunities and conditions to better one's condition, increase his wealth, and extend his influence; but they are none the less dangerous to the well-being of my country that the men interested therein are reputable citizens and have not violated the letter of the law of the land.

When the bill that deals with them comes before this House, if the committee having it in charge can muster courage to report it, I shall bear witness of no doubtful import as to our duty.

Recurring again to the influence of the industrial system we are building up, it was urged, in an earlier day, and latterly as well, that the growth of our manufacturing industries tended to dwarf the manhood of those employed in them. I dissent from that proposition. I speak now of my own country.

Let it be remembered that, with the growth of our industries the opportunities for increased convenience and comforts grow with equal pace. Let it not be forgotten that the men who work in the mills, factories, and shops are potent factors in this Government, and have a voice in declaring the law which regulates the conditions under which they labor. Their children go to school and become familiar with the duties and obligations of the citizen, and learn what the proper functions of the civil government are.

What is said as to the influence of certain employment may indeed apply to the condition of operatives upon the other side, but it can have no application to our own fellow-citizens.

The city of Cincinnati which, with my honored colleague, General BROWN, I have the honor to represent, is known to you as a hive of industry. One or two wards in my district have within their limits a greater number of skilled artisans and mechanics than can be found elsewhere in this country upon the same amount of territory. I challenge any State or city on earth to produce rarer mechanical skill or a more intelligent and prosperous people.

Mr. Chairman, these conditions are not evidenced alone in the skill and cunning shown in their several callings. It is shown in those adornments of mind and character which are inseparable from the prosperity and happiness that abound in their homes.

I will engage to go with you, Mr. Chairman, into any shop or factory in my district where the workmen I have alluded to are employed and select a man at random, and you will not find one who can not read the Constitution of his country in one or two languages, or who does not understand the rights it secures and the obligations it imposes. Go with him to his home. In that home you will find not merely the ordinary comforts and conveniences of life, but also the incontestible evidence of education and refinement. Books and music will be found there. The daughter of that household will be found not only equal to the discharge of the duties which pertain to housewifery, but taking her place at the piano she will discourse the rarest music from Wagner, Beethoven, and other masters in that science. Upon the walls you will find paintings which are the handiwork of members of that family. There will be found worthy example upon the part of the parents, and filial piety upon the part of the children.

One other thing you will find: that the head of that family and the

boys who come after him are intelligent and earnest advocates of the protective system.

I am not willing to exchange scenes and conditions such as I have described for any that can be found where the philosophy of free trade bears sway and shapes the industrial policy of the people.

Sir, I need not cross the water for the purpose of pointing out the influence of the policy of free trade and all that appertains thereto, and that of the protective system. Our own country furnishes abundant evidence by which we can re ach a correct and just conclusion.

I propose, sir, in no invidious spirit, but in simple justice to the people I represent, and in justice to the people of this whole country, to present to the House and to them some comparisons as to the progress made in the several States in everything that goes to make up an enlightened and progressive civilization.

There are certain States which make relentless war upon the protective policy, and certain other States which as constantly defend it, and are seeking to defeat the wrecking policy proposed in the Mills bill.

Mr. Chairman, it has been plainly intimated time and again upon this floor that those employed in the mills, factories, and shops of the manufacturing States, and especially in New England, are in a measure robbed. That is not the language used, but is the logic of what is said. I propose to ascertain how far the facts sustain the assertion and find where the most conclusive evidence of prosperity and happiness is to be found.

I shall not stop to examine merely the manufacturing interests of the country, but will look into the condition of every industry and calling which has relation to the prosperity of the section where it is carried on.

Our friends upon the other side have appeared especially anxious in regard to per cent. of wages paid.

I hope I may be pardoned for occasionally referring to the "Buckeye" State, and certainly no gentleman upon this floor should feel less pride than I do in that Commonwealth.

We can say to the East and South, "We are your children; our parents brought with them to Ohio the characteristics of your people. If we have achieved a measure of success you can rejoice at it, for we are your children."

We turn to the West, and there we find the sons and daughters of Ohio, the brothers and sisters of our people. Our prosperity is but an evidence of the greatness and strength of the whole country.

I recur again to the matter of wages, and call attention of my friends upon the other side to the startling fact that the "Buckeye" State alone pays in wages to the workmen employed in the manufacturing industries prosecuted within her border $6,000,000 more than is paid to all the wage-workers employed in the thirteen States, Delaware, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Tennessee, Kentucky, and Virginia. Yet these States have an aggregate population of nearly 15,000,000, while Ohio has a population of 3,193,000. A fact not less important is this: that while those States pay to those employed but $270 per capita, Ohio pays $333.

The following is the showing in detail of the total wages paid in the States named:

States.	Wages paid.	Population.
Delaware	$4,267,000	146,608
West Virginia	4,313,000	618,457
North Carolina	2,741,000	1,399,750
South Carolina	2,836,000	995,577
Georgia	5,266,000	1,546,180
Florida	1,271,000	269,493
Alabama	2,501,000	1,262,505
Mississippi	1,193,000	1,131,597
Louisiana	4,360,000	939,946
Texas	3,343,000	1,591,749
Tennessee	5,255,000	1,542,359
Kentucky	11,658,000	1,648,690
Virginia	7,425,000	1,512,565
Total	56,419,000	14,591,475
Ohio	62,104,000	3,198,062

Ohio, $333+ per capita of persons employed.

The thirteen States employ 223,707, mostly men; per capita $270 +.

I am aware that honorable gentlemen will answer, "But the States you mention are not manufacturing States." So it would seem from the showing, but whose fault is it that they are not manufacturing States? Can you give any good and sufficient reason why the iron has slept in your mountains undisturbed during the last century?

Why does your coal remain in the hills undug?

Why is it that the water in your rivers runs listlessly to the sea, bearing upon its bosom little commerce and turning no wheel of industry?

Is it our fault that the waters of the James, the Alabama, the Cumberland, and the Kentucky do not turn as many wheels of industry as the waters of the Connecticut and the Merrimac, and those which flow the rivers of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and the West? [Applause.]

Sir, it is not because nature has not been prodigal in giving to you all the resources in raw material essential to great industrial progress. The reason must be found in your adherence to that philosophy which is evolved from ideal conditions and hypothetical facts, and shuts its eyes to accomplished results.

Sir, the object-lessons I place before you to-day should be conclusive alike against your philosophy and your practice. [Applause.]

I call attention now to the cities of the Union where various industries are carried on, and also to the States as a whole, to ascertain the ratio of persons employed and the rate of wages paid per capita. Here is the exhibit.

The comparison is between several cities to which I now call attention:

CINCINNATI.

Population	256,000
Total number of persons employed in manufacturing industries	54,530
Males	39,000
Females	10,495
Youths	5,035
Total wages paid	$19,554,000.00
Per capita	$358.50

Ratio of population, 1 in every 4.

CHARLESTON.

Population	49,984
Total number of persons employed in manufacturing industries	2,146
Males	1,788
Females	130
Youths	228
Total wages paid	$669,000.00
Per capita	$311.03

Ratio of population, 1 in 23 employed.

LYNN, MASS.

Population	
Total number employed	12,439
Males	8,891
Females	3,489
Youths	57
Total wages paid	$5,833,000.00
Per capita	$469.00

Ratio of employed to population, 1 out of every 2½.

LOWELL, MASS.

Population	59,475
Total number employed	20,039
Males	9,218
Females	9,503
Youths	1,318
Total wages paid	$5,907,000.00
Per capita	$294.20

Ratio of employed to population, a little over 1 in 3.

CHICAGO, ILL.

Population	503,000
Total number employed	79,414
Males	62,431
Females	12,185
Youths	4,798
Total wages paid	$34,653,462.00
Per capita	$436.30

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 6.

ST. LOUIS, MO.

Population	351,000
Total number employed	41,825
Males	37,980
Females	4,761
Youths	3,084
Total wages paid	$17,743,532.00
Per capita	$424.45

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 8.

BOSTON, MASS.

Population	363,000
Total number employed	59,213
Males	39,810
Females	18,150
Youths	1,253
Total wages paid	$24,024,000.00
Per capita	$421.75

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 6.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

Population	868,000
Total number employed	185,527
Males	113,025
Females	56,818
Youths	15,684
Total wages paid	$64,265,000.00
Per capita	$340.75

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 4.

LAWRENCE, MASS.

Population	59,151
Total number of persons employed	16,719
Males	7,819
Females	7,988
Youths	902
Total wages paid	$5,549,000.00
Per capita	$331.75

Ratio of employed to population, every 2½.

NEW ORLEANS, LA.

Population	216,000
Total number of persons employed	8,894
Males	7,668
Females	1,226

Youths	552
Total wages paid	$3,718,000.00
Per capita	$391.00

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 22.

PROVIDENCE, R. I.

Population	104,857
Total number of persons employed	22,891
Males	16,500
Females	5,125
Youths	1,716
Total wages paid	$9,464,110.00
Per capita	$413.50

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 4.

RICHMOND, VA.

Population	63,600
Total number employed	13,047
Males	9,218
Females	2,872
Youths	1,957
Total wages paid	$3,206,456.00
Per capita	$214.00

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in 4½.

AUGUSTA, GA.

Population	21,891
Total number employed	1,680
Males	867
Females	511
Youths	302
Total wages paid	$448,825.00
Per capita	$267.75

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in every 13.

DUBUQUE, IOWA.

Population	22,254
Total number employed	2,903
Males	2,619
Females	292
Youths	92
Total wages paid	$1,339,730.00
Per capita	$461.50

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in every 7.

LOUISVILLE, KY.

Population	123,758
Total number of persons employed	17,448
Males	13,480
Females	2,829
Youths	1,139
Total wages paid	$5,835,545.00
Per capita	$334.55

Ratio of employed to population, 1 in every 7.

It will be observed that the ratio of women and youths in the cities in the States advocating the protective system is greater than in the free-trade States, showing a wider range of opportunity; but what is still more significant, the ratio of those employed to the whole population is still greater. For instance, Cincinnati employs 1 in every 4; Charleston, 1 in 23; Boston, 1 in 6; St. Louis, 1 in 8; Philadelphia, 1 in 4; New Orleans, 1 in 22; Lowell, Mass., more than 1 in 3; Richmond, Va., 1 in 4½.

Passing from the cities to the States, the showing is more palpable against our free-trade friends. The showing is as follows:

Compare Wisconsin with North Carolina:

NORTH CAROLINA.

Population	1,400,000
Product of manufactories	$20,095,000.00
Per capita	$14.00

WISCONSIN.

Population	1,315,000
Product of manufactories	$128,255,000.00
Per capita	$97.00

MISSOURI AND ILLINOIS.

Missouri:	
Population	2,168,000
Product of manufactories	$165,386,000.00
Per capita	$73.00
Illinois:	
Population	3,078,000
Product of manufactories	$414,865,000.00
Per capita	$131.00

VIRGINIA AND MICHIGAN.

Virginia:	
Population	1,512,500
Product of manufactories	$51,781,000.00
Per capita	$34.00
Michigan:	
Population	1,637,000
Product of manufactories	$150,715,000.00
Per capita	$92.00

OHIO AND GEORGIA.

Georgia:	
Population	1,542,000
Product of factories	$36,440,000.00
Per capita	$23.00
Ohio:	
Population	3,198,000
Product of manufactories	$348,298,000.00
Per capita	$108.00

NEW JERSEY AND MARYLAND.

Maryland:	
Population	935,000
Product of factories	$106,800,000.00
Per capita	$114.00
New Jersey:	
Population	1,131,000
Product of factories	$254,380,000.00
Per capita	$224.00

IOWA AND MISSISSIPPI.

Mississippi:	
Population	1,132,000
Product of factories	$7,518,000.00
Per capita	$6.62
Iowa:	
Population	1,625,000
Product of factories	$71,045,000.00
Per capita	$43.00

But to make the showing more complete, and, as you doubtless claim, and possibly with justice, to equalize matters, we will turn to agriculture; but, unfortunately for tariff-reform philosophy, the showing is no better. Take Ohio and Georgia:

OHIO.

Number employed in agriculture, in round number	357,500
Product of farms, exclusive of live-stock and farming implements	$156,777,000.00
Population	3,198,000
Per capita	$304.00

It is proper to add that there are 247,200 farms, which will indicate that there are employed as wage-workers or renters 150,300.

GEORGIA.

Population	1,542,180
Number employed in agriculture	402,400
Value of farm product, exclusive of live-stock and farm implements	$95,913,000
Per capita	$155.00

Take Missouri and Illinois:

ILLINOIS

Population	3,077,871
Number employed in agriculture	406,370
Value of product exclusive of live-stock and farm implements	$203,989,000.00
Per capita	$476.00

MISSOURI.

Population	2,168,380
Number employed in agriculture	355,300
Value of product of farms exclusive of live-stock and farming implements.	$95,913,000.00
Per capita	$270.00

Take Alabama and Wisconsin.

ALABAMA.

Population	1,262,505
Number engaged in agriculture	380,630
Value of farm products, exclusive of live-stock and farm implements	$56,873,000.00
Per capita	$142.00
Number of farms	135,964
Number of acres tilled	18,855,324

WISCONSIN.

Population	1,315,497
Number of persons engaged in agriculture	195,000
Value of product, exclusive of live-stock and farm implements	$72,780,000.00
Per capita	$870.00
Number of farms	134,222
Acres tilled	15,253,118

But possibly our free-trade philosophers can show better results in live-stock and farming implements and machinery. These are evidence of progressive development as they may appear ample or otherwise.

Here is the showing. Take Georgia and Michigan, the population of which is about the same.

GEORGIA.

Population	1,542,000
Value of farming implements and machinery	$5,317,000.00
Live-stock	26,000,000.00
Total value	31,317,000.00
Per capita	$20.00

MICHIGAN.

Population	1,637,000
Value of farming implements and machinery	$19,422,000.00
Live-stock	55,720,000.00
Total value	75,140,000.00
Per capita	$46.00

IOWA AND VIRGINIA.

Virginia:	
Population	1,512,500
Value of farming implements and machinery	$5,495,000.00
Live-stock	25,953,000.00
Total value	31,448,000.00
Per capita	21.00
Iowa:	
Population	1,624,615
Value of farming implements and machinery	$20,372,000.00
Live-stock	124,715,000.00
Total value	154,087,000.00
Per capita	94.00

NORTH CAROLINA AND WISCONSIN.

North Carolina:	
Population	1,400,000
Value of farming implements and machinery	$6,078,000.00
Live-stock	22,415,000.00
Total value	28,493,000.00
Per capita	20.00

Wisconsin:	
Population	1,315,497
Value of farming implements and machinery	$15,647,000.00
Live-stock	46,508,000.00
Total value	62,155,000.00
Per capita	55.00

WEST VIRGINIA AND NEBRASKA.

West Virginia:	
Population	618,457
Value of farming implements and machinery	$2,700,000.00
Live-stock	17,742,000.00
Total value	20,442,000.00
Per capita	15.00
Nebraska:	
Population	452,402
Value of farming implements and machinery	$7,821,000.00
Live-stock	33,444,000.00
Total value	41,265,000.00
Per capita	91.00

ARKANSAS AND CALIFORNIA.

Arkansas:	
Population	802,525
Value of farm implements and machinery	$4,637,000.00
Live-stock	20,472,000.00
Total value	25,109,000.00
Per capita	31.00
California:	
Population	804,696
Value of farm implements and machinery	$8,448,000.00
Live-stock	35,500,000.00
Total value	43,948,000.00
Per capita	54.00

Among the very important artisans and mechanics and workmen in every well-ordered community are the carpenters and blacksmiths. Business activity with them indicates the presence of those comforts and conveniences which are inseparable from healthful progress. For the edification of our friends, in order to evolve all the philosophy possible from known facts and existing conditions, I present the work done in the several States by these useful members of the community. The showing in the several States is as follows:

Northern States.

State.	Product per capita.	
	Carpentering.	Blacksmithing.
Kansas	$1.81	$0.82
Maine	.62	1.82
Illinois	1.92	.98
Michigan	1.07	.94
Minnesota	2.21	.98
Nebraska	2.14	.87
New Hampshire	2.47	1.37
New Jersey	3.53	1.07
New York	3.82	1.23
Ohio	1.51	.95
Pennsylvania	1.90	1.01
Vermont	.48	1.57
Wisconsin	1.13	.99
Connecticut	4.98	1.17
Indiana	1.01	.98
Iowa	1.40	.96

Anti-protection States.

States.	Product per capita.	
	Carpentering.	Blacksmithing.
Alabama	$0.27	$0.18
Arkansas	.25	.26
Delaware	2.14	1.01
Florida	.33	.21
Georgia	.53	.31
Kentucky	.93	.67
Louisiana	.49	.36
Maryland	3.88	1.01
Mississippi	.15	.15
Missouri	2.32	.98
North Carolina	.16	.16
South Carolina	.33	.19
Tennessee	.42	.45
Texas	.41	.46
Virginia	.56	.40
West Virginia	.34	.42

But let us search again for evidence that the influence of your philosophy has been beneficent in results.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that there is no higher or better evidence of an enlightened and progressive people than is found in the product of their inventive genius. Our fathers wisely provided for the encouragement of scientific research and progress in the mechanical arts, by giving to authors and inventors for a term of years the exclusive ownership of the new and useful products of their hands and brains. No other source has been more fruitful in valuable contributions to our present prosperous and happy condition. How has the seed sown where your philosophy has had the ascendancy borne fruit? Is it rich in authors or inventors? What is the grand total of results in these two fields of labor?

Again, I call the "Buckeye" State forward. Let her record disclose what the genius of her people has supplied to the national growth in the industrial arts. Here is the record for the fourteen years immediately preceding January 1, 1885: Number of improvements in the arts, etc., by Ohio, as evidenced by patents issued, 15,065. Now, place by Ohio's side Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia, fourteen sovereign States. Altogether, during the same period, they have contributed in new and useful inventions only 14,887.

What is the matter, gentlemen? Do not those who adopt your philosophy desire the better ways and happier conditions? Or does its presence stifle the genius of invention, even as it retards your progressive development in the fields of enterprise to which we have called attention?

But let us continue our search to find some justification for your abiding in the faith which is so palpably condemned by the works which are the evidence of its influence. Possibly in the field of literature and journalism you will fare better. We shall see.

Mr. Chairman, if it will not be deemed utterly immodest, I will call Ohio forward again, bringing with her Illinois, a younger sister, and they together shall show you what they have done in the direction of distributing intelligence among the people. The comparison is instructive, and may in part, at least, explain why Ohio and Illinois have stood by the protective system, and why the States with which they stand in comparison have opposed it.

Under the caption "Number of newspapers mailed to subscribers or news agents by publishers and news agents" we have the following exhibit:

Alabama	4,037,332
Arkansas	3,606,356
Delaware	1,141,348
Florida	1,141,452
Georgia	15,355,288
Kentucky	17,443,296
Louisiana	6,645,152
Maryland	9,670,232
Mississippi	3,334,604
North Carolina	6,275,372
South Carolina	4,376,480
Tennessee	12,620,712
Texas	12,095,756
Missouri	45,128,784
Virginia	8,639,384
West Virginia	3,762,980
Total of the sixteen free-trade States	156,263,516

Now Ohio and Illinois:

Ohio	72,125,560
Illinois	87,128,444
Total	159,254,004

Showing difference in favor of these two protection States, Ohio and Illinois, of 3,050,488.

But peradventure publications of a higher order, which evidence more recondite learning and philosophical research, have flourished better. Let us examine.

Under the classification "Number of magazines and other periodicals mailed to subscribers or news agents by publishers and news agents" we have the following exhibit.

Ohio is so closely identified with all the other States, being bound to them by all the ties of consanguinity and common interest, that I feel that with characteristic reserve she may stand up again for comparison.

Here is the showing:

Alabama	26,709	South Carolina	8,820
Arkansas	23,352	Tennessee	553,008
Delaware	19,260	Texas	21,818
Florida	420	Virginia	361,056
Georgia	651,336	West Virginia	6,948
Kentucky	100,656	Total number	3,890,352
Louisiana	24,888	Total number issued in Ohio	6,498,216
Maryland	193,512	Difference in favor of Ohio	2,607,864
Mississippi	1,932		
Missouri	1,865,784		
North Carolina	20,864		

It is written, "Show me thy faith without thy works and I will show thee my faith by my works." I have presented to you and to the coun-

try the works which are evidence of your faith, being born of it; and have likewise testified to our faith, proving it by the works we have shown. "By their fruits ye shall know them." You walk in the letter of your faith; we in the spirit of ours. "Verily the letter killeth, but the spirit giveth life." [Applause.]

I was interested to hear my honorable friend from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] talk about sheep. He seemed to derive great satisfaction from the number of sheep he found to the square mile in the countries of the Old World.

It is a peculiarity of his philosophy that it takes more satisfaction in the condition of the sheep than in the prosperity of the shepherd. His concern is about the sheep, ours about the shepherd that tends the sheep. [Laughter and applause.]

In the nations that challenge his special admiration the sheep wear the fine coats. Here it is our purpose to clothe the shepherd, if need be, at the expense of the sheep. But protective philosophy cares for the flock-tender, and, per consequence of that, for the flock.

The statement, however, shows that the progress made here under the influence of the Democratic system does not compare favorably with the later period when Republican policy maintained the ascendency. Let us see.

The increase of wool under the tariff compared to increase during the preceding years:

Between 1850 and 1860 increase 14.7 per cent.
Between 1860 and 1870 increase 66 per cent.
Between 1860 and 1880 increase 147 per cent.

Nor is this increase in aggregate pounds of wool alone to be considered, but the further fact that the weight of fleeces increased as follows:

In 1850 average 2.3 pounds.
In 1860 average 2.7 pounds.
In 1870 average 3.5 pounds.
In 1880 average 4.4 pounds.

And the showing is equally satisfactory in regard to the development of woolen manufactures. Here is the exhibit:

	1850.	1860.	1870.
Establishments	1,817	1,260	2,891
Hands	34,895	28,050	80,053
Capital	$26,671,000	$30,862,000	$98,824,000
Wages	7,168,000	9,808,000	26,778,000
Materials	24,912,000	36,587,000	96,433,000
Product	43,542,000	61,895,000	155,405,000

A showing that should set at rest the clamorous cry that from 1850 to 1860 were the years of our country's greatest prosperity.

Now I turn to the pig-iron industry, and I apologize for seeming, for a single moment, to usurp the throne of my honored friend from Pennsylvania [Mr KELLEY].

From 1810, when the yield was 54,000 tons, to 1860—fifty years, during which time you were endeavoring to put your hands upon the throat of the protective system, and had it there most of the time—the product grew only to 821,000 tons. While from 1860 to 1880—only twenty-five years—it grew to 3,855,000 tons.

One would naturally suppose from the assaults made upon the protective policy that its influence had been to restrict our commerce, international and interstate; that our exports and our imports had fallen off, and that domestic interchange of commodities was oppressed and dwarfed. The exact reverse is true. They have both grown with unexampled rapidity.

In the period of pronounced protectien, dating from a time when the system was recoguized and established as an economic policy to be maintained, our exports and imports have grown beyond anything of which the country had knowledge before, except that our exports of specie have been reduced, and that because we have paid our debts abroad with the products of our factories and fields, keeping the gold and silver in the pockets of our people.

This is true of our foreign commerce and true of our local and interstate commerce. Gentlemen speak of the necessity for free interchange of products—that our protective system has impaired that freedom. This was uttered time and again by my honored friend, Mr. Wheeler, of New York, in our discussion in Tremont Temple, in Boston—opening his eyes to what would result from his abstract philosophy and closing them to the real facts that were under his nose; the real fact being that never in the history of the world was there such unrestricted and such enlarged commerce; never were there so many articles which were the subject-matter of commerce, nor so many instrumentalities and agencies for their free interchange as are to be found in the United States to-day as the result of the protective system.

And I say "as the result of the protective system" because the figures show that I am right and that under the old quasi free-trade regime progressive development was handicapped, and, when not paralyzed, moved at a sluggish pace.

I here insert the figures which vindicate the correctness of my assertions and utterly discredit the statements of my friends upon the other side to the effect that we are a suffering people by reason of the system that they are attempting to destroy.

The House and the country will observe that from the foundation of our Government up to and after the passage of what was known as the "Statute of Abominations," which was a distinctly protective tariff as contradistinguished from a tariff for revenue, the balance of trade, in spite of the best efforts of the producers of this country, was against us until 1836, when the balance was in our favor some sixty-two millions; but it will be observed also that Democracy made all possible haste to again turn the tide in favor of foreign nations, so that on down to 1860 the balance was against us. We neither had a great home market nor did we supply the wants of our people as now; but after Republican ascendency in the nation and the overthrow of free-trade philosophy prosperity came back to us in every shape and in every form which could suggest civilized and enlightened development.

In 1860 our exports were, in round numbers, $335,000,000, and our imports but $373,000,000.

From 1860 to 1870, notwithstanding the great war which occupied half the decade, our exports had grown to $420,000,000, the imports being $432,000,000.

And in 1880 our exports were $841,000,000 and imports $741,000,000; excess of imports $100,000,000.

A more important and controlling fact in this connection is that both the supply and the home market of the United States had been more than doubled during this period, nominally twenty years; in fact, considering the war, fifteen years.

The per capita of exports and imports for 1860 and 1880 is as follows:

		Per capita.
1860.	Imports	$1.00
	Exports	1.11
1880.	Imports	1.67
	Exports	1.66

It is interesting in the presence of the showing submitted to this House, which so utterly condemns the philosophy of the Mills bill and so eloquently pleads the cause of the protective system, to hear my honored friend from West Virginia [Mr. WILSON] felicitate himself on the fact that the column he leads is moving forward, lance in rest, to put to route the hosts of protection.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad there is some evidence on that side of the House of a forward movement. The statistics I have submitted do not indicate anything of that character.

I have no fear, however, that our adversaries will make substantial progress, but if they do, be assured it will be amid ruined industries and a bankrupt and idle populace.

My friend said, cheerfully, "We shall go forward. The people are behind us." If he alludes to the people of the sixteen States in which he musters his free-trade army, I agree to the correctness of the statement; and speaking of them, I too can say, "The people are behind us, from fifty to seventy-five years." [Laughter and applause.] And I may add that I shall rejoice if, under some happy influence, they shall come up abreast of us, so that we can march forward together to glorious industrial achievement, as suggested by my honored friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS].

And, Mr. Chairman, I have the sincerest pleasure in showing to my friends from south of the Ohio that the influence of the protective system, pushing aside their philosophy, has demonstrated to them and to the world what is possible with them under the economic policy they would destroy.

Let me show you what you have accomplished since 1880. Let me point you to the gigantic growth which you would retard and the prosperity you would destroy.

Here is the comparison between 1880 and 1888 of the progress made in the Southern States:

		1880.	1888.
Miles of railroad		19,431	30,738
Bales of cotton		5,755,359	6,800,000
Grain	bushels	431,074,630	*626,305,000
Farm animals		28,754,243	44,850,972
Value of live-stock		$391,312,254	$573,666,550
Value of agricultural products		$571,098,454	*$742,066,400
Pig-iron	tons	397,301	*929,435
Coal	tons mined	6,049,471	*16,476,785
Number of cotton-mills		179	294
Number of spindles		713,989	1,456,145
Looms		15,222	34,000
Value of cotton goods		$21,000,000	*$43,000,000

*1887.

Gentlemen, is there a period in your history when you made a better showing? Is there an economic policy under which you made more substantial progress? The record discloses that there is not. One gentleman upon the other side, speaking of the progress made in industrial development in certain portions of the West and South, said to New England: "It may not be long until you will be crying for protection against the competition of the great West and South." I say to my friend, he need not be apprehensive on that score. If he will study carefully the history of his country's development and

the philosophy it teaches, he will find that under our Government, situated as we are with relation to each other, one section of this country has not, and never will suffer by reason of the development of the resources, and the utilization of opportunity by another section. If it were so, and the danger to which he calls the attention of New England was even possible, long since the industries of New England and the States east of the Alleghanies would have been paralyzed, their factories and mills idle, and the home deserted.

Why, sir, it was only about thirty years ago that the two young States of the West, Ohio and Illinois, entered the arena as active competitors of the old States of the East. They sprang, however, at one bound into the lists, and in 1880 the two States mentioned, Ohio and Illinois, put upon the market a greater amount in value of manufactured product than all the New England States and New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Delaware included did in 1850. It is proper to add that the other States of the West, together with Kentucky, Missouri, Tennessee, were developing with marvelous rapidity and pouring a vast volume into the reservoir of supply.

But notwithstanding all this New England, New York, Pennsylvania and the other States mentioned pursued the even tenor of their way every one of them enjoying unexampled prosperity in the field of productive effort. And they have in no wise complained of injury sustained by reason of Western competition.

You ask, "What becomes of this vast supply?" I call my friend's attention to the fact that the American citizen lives better than he did; has from 100 to 300 per cent. more of the necessities, comforts, conveniences, and luxuries of life.

I have but a moment to refer to the relation of capital and labor, and can only say in that brief moment that the trouble results largely from the oft-recurring necessity for a redistribution of labor, owing to the fact that from abroad several hundred thousand persons annually find their way into the ranks of labor in the United States; sometimes they come as contract laborers. It is clear that no other nation upon earth could admit such an army to the ranks of its wage workers without bringing on not only temporary disturbance, but riot and possibly revolution. So we have the peculiar spectacle of prohibiting the importation of the product of cheap labor while admitting without restraint or limit the cheap labor itself.

But, sir, our country will find no advantage in shutting the door against any person who brings with him good moral character and habits of industry. He becomes at once a source of wealth and strength. But against those who represent merely a combination of stomach, appetite, alimentary canal, and bad morals it is the duty of Congress to shut the door.

So, now, I submit the question to this House and to my countrymen whether the protective system as advocated by this side of the House should be sustained. You have arraigned against it the Representatives from sixteen States, who advocate the destruction of the system and ask to be placed in charge of your industries and to dictate your economic policy.

I ask whether, in view of the ability they display in developing their own resources and founding and encouraging manufacturing, they are well fitted to perform the office of guardian of those interests which are vital to you. Take away or withdraw from the support of the Mills bill the vote of those States that make the showing alike of indisposition and incapacity to either found or encourage industry of any character, and there will not be left enough votes in favor of the bill to pay for counting them.

I can not close without complimenting the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] for standing up almost alone in the midst of his brethren to defend the interests of Pennsylvania and the whole country, and I want to pay at the same time a tribute due to my honored colleague [Mr. FORAN] and my friend from New Jersey [Mr. MCADOO], and some other Irish-Americans, who while in the Democratic ranks (where they have no business to be) refuse to become the allies and servants of English manufacturers in doing for the United States what England has done for the island where sleep the bones of their ancestors.

If there is any one man beneath our flag who has less excuse than another for voting the Democratic ticket it is the Irish-American.

A few years ago I read in the London Times these words, in speaking of the Irish people: "The only time that England can use the Celt is when he emigrates to America and votes for free trade" [laughter and applause], which, I may add, he has been accustomed to do, in that he has voted the Democratic ticket. But I trust that day has passed, and that Irish-Americans will not, while striking English power down with one hand, uphold it with the other.

One word and I have done. In instituting the comparisons between the different States of this Union, no gentleman upon the other side can fairly or truthfully say that my course is prompted by any possible spirit of sectionalism.

I shall be glad when every State south of the Ohio and the Potomac shall give evidence of the material prosperity which blesses the State that gave me birth. That patriotism is indeed narrow which fails to rejoice in the prosperity of the whole country.

And I say to my honored friends from the Southern States, the time is fast coming, and indeed now is, when the iron in your mountains shall awake, and, throwing off its earthy shroudings, shall find its way to the furnaces and mills, to the haunts of trade and commerce, and the fields and shops of industry, and the prosperity which your philosophy has kept far from you, will, under a different system, come to bless you beyond your fondest dreams. God speed the day! [Long-continued applause.]

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota, during the delivery of Mr. BUTTERWORTH's remarks, said: I know how embarrassing it is for any gentleman to speak on a subject like this when he is restricted as to time, and with the permission of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] I will ask unanimous consent for an understanding now that his time shall be extended until the conclusion of his remarks, without reference to the expiration of the hour.

Several MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. No, I do not ask that privilege. I recognize the courtesy of my honorable friend from Minnesota [Mr. WILSON], but it would not be just for me to avail myself of such an extension, as there are so many gentlemen here interested in all these matters who wish to give expression to their views and those of their constituents.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH then resumed and concluded his remarks as already given.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. After consultation among members of the committee I ask, Mr. Chairman—I presume it is not necessary to move that the Committee of the Whole rise for the purpose of making this order—that on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week, for the purpose of continuing the debate on this question the sessions of the House begin at 10 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. That order can not be made in Committee of the Whole, but the gentleman can give notice of his intention to ask such an order in the House.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. For the purpose of asking that such an order be made, I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. HATCH having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the tariff bill had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask that on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week the House meet at 10 o'clock instead of 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the order requested by the gentleman from Kentucky, that on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday of this week the House meet at 10 o'clock instead of 11 o'clock, will be made. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

TARIFF.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I now move that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of revenue measures.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the tariff bill.

[Mr. BUCKALEW withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I confess that I am a believer in the principle of protection to our industries; and that, notwithstanding the doctrine has been so frequently denounced during the discussion of the bill under consideration, as a system of "legalized robbery," I believe it to be the true policy of every nation and every people to develop their own resources, to encourage and maintain their own industries, and thereby establish their independence, as far as possible, of other nations. This was certainly the opinion of the fathers who established our republican form of government. And accordingly, in the adoption of the Constitution the power to lay and collect duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, was conferred upon Congress. And one of the first acts of Congress under the Constitution was "An act for laying a duty on goods, wares, and merchandises imported into the United States," the preamble of which reads as follows:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures, that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandises: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc.

And this act was approved by George Washington on the 4th day of July, 1789.

Washington also declared in one of his messages that—

the safety and interest of the people require that they should promote such manufactures as tend to render them independent of others for essential, particularly for military, supplies.

Benjamin Franklin said:

It seems the interest of all our farmers and owners of land to encourage our young manufacturers in preference to foreign ones.

Alexander Hamilton, in a report to Congress, said:

That the independence and security of a country appear to be materially connected with the prosperity of manufactures.

Andrew Jackson declared:

That we should become a little more Americanized, and instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of England feed our own.

And how can this be done, if not by protecting the products of American labor against the products of the pauper labor of England and other countries, by tariff laws? That is certainly what Jackson meant. He favored the encouragement of manufacturers and wanted them placed by the side of the agriculturists.

Daniel Webster said—

That the protection of American as against foreign labor ought never to be surrendered or compromised in any degree.

I might multiply these quotations from Clay and Lincoln and Grant and other eminent men of the country who believed in the encouragement of home industries, and in the beneficent effects of protective duties on the products of labor in other countries, imported here to compete with the labor of our own land. And yet speech after speech has been made here since this discussion began in which it has been asserted that the tariff is a "robber tariff." That the system adopted by the founders of the Government and pursued in all our history as the best mode of raising revenue, is a system of "legalized robbery." We have been told that for every dollar collected in the way of duties, which goes into the Treasury, $4 go into the pockets of the manufacturer, taken out of the pockets of the people, and that without any benefit to labor or to the wage-worker. And if gentlemen who make these assertions can prove them to be true, then I for one will not only vote to reduce duties on imports, but I will vote to abolish them altogether. But is it true, Mr. Chairman, that the consumer of an article upon which a duty is levied and collected, pays the same, whether the article is imported or is manufactured in the country?

In other words, is the effect of our tariff laws to raise the price to all consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties, as stated by the President in his message of December 6? I answer, Mr. Chairman, that in my opinion that depends upon whether we produce the dutiable article in our own country in sufficient quantity to supply the home demand or not. If we do, then whatever is imported only adds to an already sufficient supply to meet the wants of the country, and the natural effect, it seems to me, must be to reduce rather than increase the price of the article. If we do not produce the article at all in the country, then I should think the amount of the duty would be added to the price until, at least, we do produce the article in such quantity as to compete with the imported article. If we do not produce a sufficient supply of an article to meet the wants of the country the duty may add more or less to the cost, according to the supply and demand.

To illustrate, we manufacture, I believe, a sufficient supply of lumber to meet the demands of the home market, and even export lumber in some forms; that is, we produce more than a sufficient supply of lumber to meet the wants of our people, and have imposed an import duty of from one to two dollars per thousand feet, board measure, on lumber brought into the country. Now, I can not believe that the imposition of that duty is added to the price of lumber consumed in the country, and that every man who purchases lumber is compelled to pay just that much more for it on account of the duty. On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, whatever lumber is imported adds to an already sufficient, and more than sufficient, supply to meet the demands of the home market, and the effect, it seems to me, is to reduce and not increase the price. I know it can be said that but for the duty the importer of lumber could sell for that much less, and then by competition the home manufacturer would be compelled to sell at reduced prices. But would the importer, if the duty was taken off, sell for that much less? Sellers are not anxious to reduce the price of articles they wish to sell. It is those who are consumers and purchasers of articles who desire lower prices. Hence the importer of lumber, if the duty was taken off, would still sell for all he could get, and the price of lumber would be but very little, if any, reduced, as I am inclined to believe.

Take wheat as another illustration. Under the present tariff there is a duty of 20 cents on every bushel of wheat imported, and a small quantity of wheat is imported every year, and much more would be, perhaps, but for the duty, and the fact, it seems, that wheat under a "Treasury regulation" can be ground in transit at Minneapolis. But the duty does not add 20 cents when it is paid to the price of wheat, nor does it in fact add anything to the price. And why? Some say because the price of wheat is fixed in Liverpool, and because we export wheat. But is that the true reason? I answer, the true reason is that we produce more wheat than we need for consumption at home and have a surplus to export, and therefore every bushel imported but adds to that surplus, and the effect is to lower and not increase the price of wheat. And the importer pays the 20 cents duty, and not the man who consumes the wheat. And this I believe to be true of every other article produced in the country in sufficient quantities to supply the home demand.

If such articles are imported into the country and duties are levied and collected on them, the duty can not be added to the cost, because the supply of the home product is already equal to the demand, and the articles imported increase the supply, and therefore lessen rather than increase the price. If this is not true I confess I can not understand the reason why.

And now a few words, Mr. Chairman, as to the oft-repeated assertion that the price of the farmer's wheat is fixed in Liverpool, and that the price fixed in Liverpool governs the price of all that is sold and consumed in the United States. This statement has been made here on the floor of the House. It has been repeated in free-trade and "revenue-reform" papers throughout the country, and now farmers are beginning to repeat it themselves. But is it true? If it is I would like to know what power it is that sits enthroned in Liverpool and dictates to the people of the United States the price of wheat as the years go by. I confess I do not believe there is any such power there.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that England, having destroyed to a great extent her own agriculture in her ambition to control the manufactures and the commerce of the world, is largely dependent on other countries for her bread supply. She wants wheat—low-priced wheat—and must obtain it from the surplus of other countries, from the Black Sea, from India, from the United States, or any other part of the world where there is a surplus. But the price of wheat is not fixed in Liverpool, any more than it is in Chicago, Minneapolis, or Calcutta. The surplus it is said fixes the price, and that depends upon many conditions and circumstances. Good or bad crops help to fix the price of wheat, because the surplus depends upon them, and even the chinch-bug may have something to do with the surplus, and therefore with the price. Outside, therefore, of corners and combinations by speculators and grain gamblers, who manipulate the markets, or try to do so, in their own interest, the law of supply and demand fixes the price of wheat.

But it is said if the duty is not added to the cost of the article on which it is levied and collected, and does not increase prices, then there is no protection in it; and why not reduce the duty or remove it altogether? I reply that there may be protection in the duty, even if it does not increase prices. If there was no duty the importer or foreign manufacturer might put the price of the imported article so low as to drive the home manufacturer out of the market and into bankruptcy, and in that way turn our own people out of employment. Then, when that is accomplished, up goes the price of the imported article, for there is no home product to compete with it.

Mr. Chairman, I have said I believed in the principle of protection. Under our tariff laws, made necessary by the late war, we have so adjusted duties on imports as to encourage home products, give employment to labor, and develop the resources of the country. And while it is said here that our system of protection has enriched a few at the expense of the masses of the people, I do not believe the statement. I know that some manufacturers have got rich, and so some in every occupation and calling in life have got rich. I have no doubt but that some who began as factory hands, working by the day for wages, have by skill, industry, and economy become owners and operators of factories, while some who were the owners of factories have failed, and are now in poverty. I know a man who was carting dirt in the grading of a railroad in the county where I now live, thirty-odd years ago, for daily wages, and I have been told that he is now receiving a salary of $12,000 a year. I know a farmer residing in the county where I have my home, who began life in the county as a farm hand working for $13 a month, and to-day he owns all the land which his employer then owned and many thousands of acres besides, and is worth, it is said, more than a half million of dollars.

I only mention these instances to show that other people get rich as well as some manufacturers, but of course do not claim that the tariff had anything to do with their accumulations, only so far as it has given encouragement to home labor, diversified and built up the industries of the country, and thereby added to the advancement and general prosperity of the whole people. I deplore, Mr. Chairman, as much as any one can, the accumulation of large wealth in the hands of a few individuals. But Jay Gould and Vanderbilt, and many others who have accumulated mammoth fortunes, have not done so through tariff laws. Some inventors, protected and made monopolists by our patent laws, have amassed great fortunes; and so have some manufacturers made fortunes. But, Mr. Chairman, capital is necessary. No nation can be great without capital. You cannot open up mines, build factories and workshops, construct railroads, and carry on great and important enterprises without capital, which is said to be labor saved. Therefore it should not be a crime to accumulate capital. And I submit, if capital is to be accumulated, whether it is not better to have it in our own country rather than in England.

The policy of the Democratic party has been under low tariffs and revenue reform tariffs so called to enrich English manufacturers, to build up English capitalists, not American manufacturers and American capitalists. If it be true, as claimed, that the price of wheat is fixed in England, I believe the policy of the Democratic party has been to give England the power to control the commerce and markets of the world whether it was so intended or not. And she certainly under Democratic administrations controlled our markets from the time "cotton became king" and the South a great cotton-field for Great Britain.

I have read in revenue reform papers and speeches how the country prospered under the "revenue reform" tariff of 1846. I have some recollection, Mr. Chairman, of that period of our history, and the actual truth of history as to the period from 1846 to 1860 furnishes no consolation, in my opinion, to "revenue reformers" and low-tariff advocates.

It was contended then, as it is now, that farmers would be greatly benefited by low duties on imports; that it would increase the demand and raise the price of agricultural products in foreign markets. This same story is being told to the farmers of the country to-day.

Well, the tariff of 1846, "reducing the duties on imports," was passed, and in the annual message of President Polk, of December 7, 1847, he said:

During the past year the most gratifying proofs are presented that our country has been blessed with widespread and universal prosperity. There has been no period since the Government was founded when all the industrial pursuits of our people have been more successful, or when labor in all branches of business has received a fairer or better reward.

And then goes on to say:

The act of the 30th of July, 1846, "reducing the duties on imports," has been in force since the 1st of December last (1846), and I am gratified to state that all the beneficial effects which were anticipated from its operation have been fully realized. The public revenue derived from customs during the year ending on the 1st day of December, 1847, exceeds by more than $8,000,000 the amount received in the preceding year under the operation of the act of 1842, which was superseded and repealed by it.

Now there was a glowing picture presented to the country. But President Polk wholly overlooked the fact that during that year we were having a war with Mexico, and that many thousands of able-bodied men, laborers from the fields and the workshops, were enlisted as soldiers to fill up our regiments engaged in that war, and who became consumers of our farm products, not producers. And then a little while afterwards, when the war with Mexico was over and we had acquired California, there was a large number of people who went to that newly-acquired territory in search of gold, and for a time, at least, became consumers of farm products and ceased to be producers. All of which helped the farmers and the laborers who had remained at home. But, notwithstanding this, we were told by President Polk in his annual message of the very next year, December 5, 1848—and to this I invite special attention—that—

Severe commercial revulsions abroad have always heretofore operated to depress, and often to affect disastrously, almost every branch of American industry.

Of course, no free-trader could see how the eight millions of increased revenue, derived from reduced duties, but greatly increased importations, had anything to do with affecting disastrously almost every branch of American industry, and so President Polk takes consolation in saying, in the same message:

The temporary depression of a portion of our manufacturing interests is the effect of foreign causes, and is far less severe than has prevailed on all former similar occasions.

But the "temporary depression of a portion of our manufacturing interests" was a reality, and acknowledged by Mr. Polk to be so.

Now, let us come down a little later and see what President Fillmore, who succeeded Mr. Polk as President, said. In his first annual message, of December 2, 1850, he said to Congress:

I strongly recommend a modification of the present tariff, which has prostrated some of our most important and necessary manufactures, and that specific duties be imposed sufficient to raise the requisite revenue, and making such discrimination in favor of the industrial pursuits of our own country as to encourage home production, without excluding foreign competition.

It is also important that an unfortunate provision in the present tariff, which imposes a much higher duty upon the raw material that enters into our manufactures than upon the manufactured article should be remedied.

A duty laid upon an article which can not be produced in this country, such as tea and coffee, adds to the cost of the article, and is chiefly or wholly paid by the consumer.

But a duty laid upon an article which may be produced here stimulates the skill and industry of our country and to produce the same article, which is brought into the market in competition with the foreign article, and the importer is thus compelled to reduce his price to that at which the domestic article can be sold, thereby throwing a part of the duty upon the producer of the foreign article. The continuance of this process creates the skill and invites the capital which finally enables us to produce the article much cheaper than it could have been produced from abroad, thereby benefiting both the producer and the consumer at home. The consequence of this is the artisan and the agriculturist are brought together, each affords a ready market for the produce of the other, and the whole country becomes prosperous; and the ability to produce every necessary of life renders us independent in war as well as in peace.

In this message we find a recommendation for a modification of the revenue-reform tariff of 1846, which President Fillmore declared had prostrated some of the most important and necessary manufactures of the country. But the recommendation and the sound statesmanship of President Fillmore were disregarded, and in his next annual message of December 2, 1851, he said to Congress:

The values of our domestic exports for the last fiscal year exhibit an increase of $43,646,322. At first view, this condition of our trade with foreign nations would seem to present the most flattering hopes of its future prosperity.

An examination of the details of our exports, however, will show that the increased value of our exports for the last fiscal year is to be found in the high price of cotton which prevailed during the first half of that year, which has since declined about one-half.

The value of our exports of breadstuffs and provisions, which it was supposed the incentive of a low tariff and large importations from abroad would have greatly augmented, has fallen from $68,701,921 in 1847, to $26,051,373 in 1850, and to $21,848,653 in 1851, with a strong probability, amounting almost to a certainty, of a still further reduction in the current year.

The aggregate values of rice exported during the last fiscal year, as compared with the previous year, also exhibit a decrease amounting to $460,917, which, with a decline in the values of the exports of tobacco for the same period, make an aggregate decrease in these two articles of $1,156,751.

The policy which dictated a low rate of duties of foreign merchandise, it was thought by those who promoted and established it, would tend to benefit the farming population of this country by increasing the demand and raising the price of agricultural products in foreign markets.

The foregoing facts, however, seem to show incontestably that no such result has followed the adoption of this policy.

On the contrary, notwithstanding the repeal of the restrictive corn laws in England, the foreign demand for the products of the American farmer has steadily declined, since the short crops and consequent famine in a portion of Europe have been happily replaced by full crops and comparative abundance of food.

The exports of specie to liquidate our foreign debt during the past fiscal year have been $24,263,979 over the amount of specie imported.

The export of specie during the first quarter of the present fiscal year have been $14,651,827. Should specie continue to be exported at this rate for the remaining three-quarters of this year, it will drain from our metallic currency during the year ending 30th June, 1852, the enormous amount of $58,607,308.

Now, I invite the attention of not only members of the House, but the people of the entire country, and especially the farmers, to that part of President Fillmore's message just read. He was addressing Congress under the Constitution and his official oath as President, giving to Congress information as to the condition of the country, and he showed that the low tariff of 1846 had not augmented the value of our exports of breadstuffs and provisions, as was anticipated; but that such exports had declined from $68,701,981 in 1847, to $26,051,373 in 1850, and to $21,848,653 in 1851, with a strong probability, amounting almost to a certainty, of a still further reduction in the then current year. And he further said that the policy which dictated a low rate of duties on foreign merchandise, and which it was thought by those who promoted and established it would tend to benefit the farming population by increasing the demand and raising the price of agricultural products in foreign markets had not followed the adoption of such policy. And that notwithstanding the repeal of the restrictive corn laws in England and low tariff duties the foreign demand for the products of the American farmer had steadily declined since the short crops and consequent famine in Europe had been replaced by full crops and comparative abundance of food.

I also invite attention to what he said about the export of specie over the amount imported, and which was draining the country of an enormous amount of our metallic currency.

But let us pursue this subject further; and I now invite your attention to the following extract from President Fillmore's third annual message, delivered to Congress December 6, 1852.

In that message he said:

Without repeating the arguments contained in my former message in favor of discriminating protective duties, I deem it my duty to call your attention to one or two other considerations affecting this subject. The first is, the effect of large importations of foreign goods upon our currency. Most of the gold of California, as fast as it is coined, finds its way directly to Europe in payment of goods purchased. In the second place, as our manufacturing establishments are broken down by competition with foreigners, the capital invested in them is lost, thousands of honest and industrious citizens are thrown out of employment, and the farmer, to that extent, is deprived of a home market for the sale of his surplus produce. In the third place, the destruction of our manufactures leaves the foreigner without competition in our market, and he consequently raises the price of the article sent here for sale, as is now seen in the increased cost of iron imported from England. The prosperity and wealth of every nation must depend upon its productive industry.

The farmer is stimulated to exertion by finding a ready market for his surplus products, and benefited by being able to exchange them, without loss of time or expense of transportation, for the manufactures which his comfort or convenience requires.

This is always done to the best advantage where a portion of the community in which he lives is engaged in other pursuits.

But most manufactures require an amount of capital and a practical skill which can not be commanded unless they be protected for a time from ruinous competition from abroad. Hence the necessity of laying those duties upon imported goods which the Constitution authorizes for revenue in such a manner as to protect and encourage the labor of our own citizens. This policy would place the mechanic by the side of the farmer, create a mutual interchange of their respective commodities, and thus stimulate the industry of the whole country, and render us independent of foreign nations for the supplies required by the habits or necessities of the people.

And this shows how the "revenue-reform tariff" of 1846 was accomplishing its work in its effect upon the currency of the country, and in prostrating its industries.

Passing over the administration of Pierce, in which there was no change of policy, unless by a closer adherence to the doctrine of free trade, for in the third annual message of President Pierce, December 8, 1855, he seemed to think that the whole country had come over to the free-trade doctrine, and said in that message:

It is now generally conceded that the purpose of revenue alone can justify the imposition of duties on imports; that in readjusting the impost tables and schedules, which unquestionably require essential modification, a departure from the principles of the present tariff is not anticipated.

Oh, no! But while there was no change of policy it can be safely said, I think, that there was no change in the effect of the policy on the industries of the country. For in the first annual message of James Buchanan, December 8, 1857, he declared that, "in the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture and in all the elements of national wealth," our manufactures were suspended, our public works were retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers were thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

But I will read from his message just what he said:

The earth has yielded her fruits abundantly, and has bountifully rewarded the toil of the husbandman. Our great staples have commanded high prices, and, up till within a brief period, our manufacturing, mineral, and mechanical occupations have largely partaken of the general prosperity. We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country, in its monetary interests, is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture and in all the elements of national wealth we find our manufactures suspended, our public work retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

The revenue of the Government, which is chiefly derived from duties on imports from abroad, has been greatly reduced, while the appropriations made by Congress at its last session for the current fiscal year are very large in amount.

Under these circumstances a loan may be required before the close of your present session; but this, although deeply to be regretted, would prove it to be a slight misfortune when compared with the suffering and distress prevailing among our people. With this the Government can not fail to deeply sympathize, though it may be without the power to afford relief.

A year later there seems to have been no change for the better; in fact, the condition of the country was getting worse and worse all the time. Hear what Buchanan said in his second annual message of December 6, 1858:

When Congress met in December last the business of the country had just been crushed by one of those periodical revulsions, which are the inevitable consequence of our unsound and extravagant system of bank credits and inflated currency.

With all the elements of national wealth in abundance, our manufactures were suspended, our useful public and private enterprises were arrested, and thousands of laborers were thrown out of employment and reduced to want. Universal distress prevailed among the commercial, manufacturing, and mechanical classes. Our manufacturers everywhere suffered severely, not because of the recent reduction of the tariff of duties on imports, but because there was no demand at any price for their productions. The people were obliged to restrict themselves in their purchases to articles of prime necessity.

In the general prostration of business the iron manufacturers in different States probably suffered more than any other class, and much destitution was the inevitable consequence among the great number of workmen who had been employed in this useful branch of industry. There could be no supply where there was no demand. The same consequences have resulted from similar causes to many other branches of useful manufactures. It is self-evident that where there is no ability to purchase manufactured articles, these can not be sold, and consequently must cease to be produced.

Now, what a picture we have in these extracts from the messages of Polk, Fillmore, and Buchanan of the condition of the country under low tariffs from 1847 to 1860, in which last year Mr. Buchanan says, in his annual message of December 9, 1860:

It is now quite evident that the financial necessities of the Government will require a modification of the tariff during your present session for the purpose of increasing the revenue. In this aspect I desire to reiterate the recommendation contained in my last two annual messages in favor of imposing specific instead of ad valorem duties on all imported articles to which these can properly be applied. From long observation and experience I am convinced that specific duties are necessary, both to protect the revenue and to secure to our manufacturing interests that amount of incidental encouragement which unavoidably results from a revenue tariff.

Now, here we have a period of say sixteen years of our history under a low tariff or tariff for revenue only, beginning in 1846 and ending in 1860, and I submit to gentlemen of the committee and to the country whether these extracts from the messages of Polk, Fillmore, and Buchanan do not show a deplorable condition of the country with slight intervals due to other causes during nearly all of that period of low tariff. Wars, such as the Crimean war from 1853 to 1855, and occasional failures of crops in Europe created a demand for breadstuffs and may have given better prices. And that reminds me, Mr. Chairman, that in the winter of 1845–'46 I was attending school in Iowa City, then the capital of the Territory of Iowa, and during the winter the Territorial Legislature was in session, and some of the distinguished citizens of the Territory, visiting the capitol during the session of the Legislature, and perhaps of the supreme court, organized the "Third House" and elected a gentleman by the name of Johnston, or Johnson, governor. I remember the beginning of his most witty and humorous inaugural address, although, after the lapse of so many years, I may not be able to use his language.

As I remember he began by thanking God for the good health and prosperity of the people (this was under the protective tariff, you know, of 1842); "that the toil of the husbandman had been richly rewarded by bountiful harvests and a failure of crops in Europe, and that henceforth it should be the duty of all good, patriotic American citizens to pray, not only that our own fields may be fruitful and yield abundant harvests, but that there shall also be a failure of crops in Europe."

And so, Mr. Chairman, it is, I believe, true that our exportations of farm products, and the prices obtained for them, depend too much upon disturbances of the peace in Europe, and upon a failure of their crops. It is far wiser and better, in my judgment, for the people of Europe so to regulate their industries as to supply their own necessities as far as they can; and I am sure it is better for the people of our own land to do the same.

I know, Mr. Chairman, that President Polk attributed the "temporary depression of a portion of our manufacturing interests," which he admitted prevailed in 1848, to "foreign causes," and, by way of apology, it would seem, for such depression, he suggested, as I have already quoted, that severe commercial convulsions abroad always operated to depress, and often disastrously, almost every branch of American industry; and, I may add, always will, except so far as we can maintain our industrial and business interests, independent of the people abroad.

But this depression of a portion of our manufacturing interests did not turn out to be temporary, after all. In fact it rather became chronic, with some slight intervals, and continued to grow worse until in 1858, when there was, according to Buchanan's message of that year, a "general prostration of business," and in December, 1860, when he delivered his last annual message, the national Treasury, and you may say the country generally, were about bankrupt. President Buchanan, of course, denied, while communicating the distressed condition of the country to Congress, that it was because of the then recent reduction of duties on imports. Oh, no! It was, he says, because there was no demand at any price for the productions of our manufacturers, who had everywhere suffered severely, as he said: "The people were obliged to restrict themselves in their purchases to articles of prime necessity," as Mr. Buchanan admitted, and why? I know he said the business of the country had been crushed by one of those periodical revulsions which was the inevitable consequence of our unsound and extravagant system of bank credits and inflated currency. But it does not require, it seems to me, a vast amount of intelligence to see that the cause began further back than the reduction of duties on imports in 1857, of which Mr. Buchanan spoke in his message of December, 1858. It was, Mr. Chairman, the earlier reduction under the tariff of 1846, which went into effect on the 1st of December, 1846, which was the primary cause. President Fillmore was wise enough to see the effect which the low duties under the tariff of 1846 was having upon the industries and upon the currency of the country.

I have quoted what he said upon the subject in his messages of 1851 and 1852. In the message of 1851 he informed Congress that $24,203,979 of specie had been exported during the preceding fiscal year over the amount of specie imported, to liquidate our foreign debt; and that during the first quarter of the then present fiscal year the exports of specie had been $14,651,887, and that if specie continued to be exported at the same rate for the remaining three-quarters of the fiscal year it would drain from our metallic currency during the year ending June 30, 1852, the enormous amount of $58,607,308. And in his message of 1852, the drain of our metallic currency continuing, President Fillmore again called the attention of Congress to the effect of large importations of foreign goods upon our currency, and said that most of the gold of California as soon as it was coined found its way directly to Europe in payment of goods purchased. But none are so blind as those who will not see, and the importation of foreign goods continued, as did the exportation of our specie to pay for them—the first to the prostration of our manufacturing interests and the second to the destruction of our currency.

We were sending our gold to Great Britain largely to enrich her and give her commercial and financial supremacy, and we were doing business on a worthless paper currency that had no sound basis on which to rest, and which collapsed in 1857 and left the industries and the business interests of every sort of our country completely prostrated.

From 1850 to 1860, inclusive, as I remember, we exported more than three hundred and fifty millions of specie to pay the balance of trade against us, most of which might have been far better employed at home in developing our own vast resources, in building up the manufacturing interests and the industries of our own country, and in establishing, by proper legislation, a sound and reliable currency. By doing that we would have given employment to our own people, and no such financial revulsion as that of 1857 could have occurred to have brought "universal distress upon the commercial, manufacturing, and mechanical classes of the people."

I have dwelt at some length upon this period of our history, from 1846 to 1860, to show that a tariff for revenue only brought no real prosperity to the country, and ended in a total collapse of all our industrial and business interests.

I have said I had some recollection of those days myself. I lived then in a section of country devoted almost exclusively to agriculture, and it was unsurpassed for that purpose by any other section of country I have ever known. I was very familiar with the farming population and with the farmer's life, for I worked on a farm until I was twenty-one years of age, and I know how poor the farmers of Illinois were during that period. The price of corn, wheat, pork, eggs, chickens, and butter, and everything they had to sell was extremely low, while the merchandise they had to buy was extremely high—so high that, as President Buchanan said, they were unable to pay for it, and consequently, as a rule, farmers were almost universally in debt. If I know anything in the world, it does seem to me that the farmers in Illinois, if not throughout the entire country, are infinitely in better condition to-day and have been from year to year during the twenty-five years or more we have been living under tariff laws, discriminating in favor of our own industries, than ever before in all our history.

There has been no twenty years in all our history when farmers have, in my opinion, got better prices for all the products of the farm than in the last twenty years under a system of protection, and at the same time everything they have to purchase can be purchased, not only cheaper than in any other twenty years, but what they purchase is of a finer and much superior quality to the coarser fabrics of twenty-five, thirty, and forty years ago.

Democrats say of the Republicans just as they used to say of the Whigs, when I was a boy, that the policy of the party is to make the

"rich richer, and the poor poorer." But this I deny. Under the policy of the Republican party, which has been to develop the resources, encourage and build up the industries, and give employment to both the capital and labor of our own country, there has been a general lifting up of the masses of our people. Not only manufacturers, but farmers, merchants, professional men, mechanics, artisans, laborers, all classes of people, have been benefited, for the prosperity of one class is necessary to the prosperity of the other classes. And the people as a whole are occupying a higher plane to-day than they did before the policy of the Republican party was inaugurated of protecting our own industries and giving employment to our own people. And I assert what I believe to be absolutely true, that under that policy the laboring classes of our people have uniformly received a better reward for their labor, and have lived better and enjoyed more of the comforts and necessaries of life than they could possibly have done under any other policy.

It is not true, Mr. Chairman, that the policy of the Republican party is and has been to "make the rich richer and the poor poorer;" but it is true, I think, that the policy of the Democratic party has been to make the rich poor and the poor paupers. They came as near doing that from 1846 to 1860 under a low tariff as it was perhaps possible in such a magnificent country as ours to do. And now, after going through a great war, which cost thousands of millions of dollars, when the policy of the Republican party has enabled the Government to meet all its obligations, to advance the national credit to the highest standard, to pay all expenses of the Government, ordinary and extraordinary, to erect public buildings, to improve rivers and harbors, to pay the pensions and bounties due our soldiers, to pay the interest promptly on the public debt, and at the same time reduce the principal of the debt fourteen or fifteen hundred millions of dollars, Democrats and "revenue reformers" so called, are denouncing the policy as a system of "legalized robbery" because there is a surplus of a few millions of dollars in the Treasury. And while all that I have said has been done under the policy of the Republican party the material prosperity of the people has never been greater in all our history.

But a surplus in the Treasury is a great crime in the Republican party. And yet, Mr. Chairman, the present Administration kept on increasing the surplus instead of paying it out in liquidation of the public debt as it ought to have done. The Administration had just as much authority to do that three years ago as it has now. And it must not be forgotten that a resolution known as the Morrison resolution, for which I voted, passed Congress requiring the Administration to apply the surplus when excessive in payment of the public debt. This would have kept the surplus down to a reasonable amount. But the President pocketed the resolution; did not even return it to the House in which it originated with his objections to give Congress an opportunity to pass it over his veto, and went on piling up the surplus in the Treasury until it got so large that he seemed suddenly to get alarmed at its magnitude, so much so that he did not take time to write the ordinary message communicating to Congress the state of the country generally, but confined his message almost entirely to a reduction of the surplus by a reduction of customs duties.

Well, no one in my judgment ought to be much alarmed at a surplus of even eighty millions in the Treasury, if it is that much, if those who have it in charge would only go on and pay it out in reducing the public debt, especially when the interest-bearing debt of the country exceeds to-day a thousand millions of dollars. I, for one, am not. Mr. Chairman, I am anxious to see the public debt extinguished to the last dollar, and at the earliest day when it can reasonably be paid off. I desire to see the day when that class so often spoken of as "bloated bondholders"—men who pay no taxes—shall be no more. And so, Mr. Chairman, as one of my constituents recently wrote to me, if we would go to work and pay off the public debt and talk less about the surplus it would be better for the country.

But I must not be understood as being opposed to a just revision of the tariff. I am not. But if you come at me in opposition to the principle of protection, I take issue with you; and I undertake to show from the actual experience of the country under low tariffs and revenue tariffs, and under protective tariffs, that our greatest prosperity has been achieved under protective tariffs.

But whether duties on imports are burdens upon the people or benefits, I believe they should be adjusted in such manner as to distribute them as equally as possible among the different branches of industry, and the different classes of the people and sections of the country, so as not to build up one at the expense of another.

Acting upon this principle, why should wool be placed on the free-list and a duty retained on woolens? It does seem that wool is an indispensable necessity in the manufacture of woolen goods, just as much so as the capital which builds the factory and the laborers who spin and weave the wool into cloth, and if there is any benefit in the incidental protection given by the duty, why should not the man who feeds his flocks share in it as well as the manufacturer who spins and weaves his wool into cloth? If the manufacturer is allowed a duty because he must compete with the cheaper manufactures of woolens imported from other countries, why should not the producer of wool be allowed a duty to give him some protection against the cheaper wool imported from other countries? But why should wool be put on the free-list any more than coal and rice and sugar? I confess I am unable to see any good reason why. Nor can I see any good reason why salt, any more than sugar, should be placed on the free-list.

But I confess I am not, for the reasons stated, very partial to the free-list. If duties are burdens, let them be borne as equally as possible; if they are benefits, let them be shared as equally as possible by the people generally. But I confess I have been confused and perplexed by the free-wool proposition. Woolen goods are a necessity, and we must have wool to manufacture them. The industry ought, in my judgment, to be maintained. We ought to be able to supply the demand for raw wool in our own country, and it seems to me to be clearly established, even by revenue reformers themselves, that we have cheaper wool under high tariff duties than we do under low duties. And if that be so, and manufacturers want cheap wool to make for the farmers cheap woolens, and to be able to manufacture woolens so as to compete with other countries, what is the objection to high duties? I have cut out of revenue-reform papers, so called, published in my own district, tables of prices from 1824 down to 1887, showing that the lowest prices of wool have been under high tariffs and the highest prices under low tariffs.

And this reminds me that some four years since a Democratic anti-protection paper, published in my own district, published an interview with some woolen manufacturer, in which interview the manufacturer was asked what would be the effect of putting wool on the free-list. He replied in substance that it would enable woolen manufacturers to compete with the world, and right at once went on to say that it was strange the wool-producers of Ohio, Illinois, and Texas did not see that the effect of the duty on wool was to stimulate the raising of sheep and reduce the price of wool; and I certainly wondered, if cheap wool was what he wanted, why he objected to the duty. I have before me now an extract from the Philadelphia Record of January 7, 1888, on this subject of a duty on wool, from which it appears that there was a decline in the price of every grade of wool for several years after the heavy duty of 1867 on wool was imposed, and the Record says in this article—

That the low prices of "protected" wool have driven the sheep industry to the cheap lands of the sparsely settled States and Territories.

Now, this would seem to show that protection on wool had resulted in low prices of wool, and as woolen manufacturers would naturally desire cheap wool, it is not so strange that they favor a duty on wool as it has sometimes appeared to me to be. And it is passing strange if, as the Record says, "the wool manufacturer is not prosperous," and that the cause of it is "the taxing of foreign grades of wool, which woolen manufacturers must have," and which I infer can not be produced in this country, in the opinion of the Record, that the woolen manufacturer does not urge the abolition of such taxation on such foreign grades of wool.

But this is not all upon this subject. I have here, in a newspaper, a report of a speech made by the honorable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, made at Providence, R. I., at a banquet of the Commercial Club, February 18, 1888, in which that distinguished gentleman confirms the views to which I have referred. It is to me so remarkable that I will read what he says and insert it in my remarks. It is as follows:

Now let us go back and look at this wool question. From the foundation of the Government to 1824 we had free wool. But in 1824 the wool-growers were not happy. A high duty was put upon it to raise the price of wool, but, strange to tell, wool began to fall. In 1828 the wool duty was increased, and wool went down and continued to go down. In what was known as the compromise tariff of 1833 the duties were to be scaled down every two years 10 per cent. until they reached the horizontal basis. In 1840 or 1842, just as the duty was going off, the price of wool grew higher and continued to increase, and again they were not satisfied with that, and in 1842 the duty was raised again on wool, and wool commenced to go down. In 1846 a duty of 30 per cent. was laid on wool and 35 per cent. on woolen manufactures. The result was that wool kept going down and the manufactured goods lowering in price all the time. In 1860 they wanted more tariff, and they were successful in retaining it, and wool commenced going down. In 1867 was made the celebrated tariff which excluded all wool from the country except low carpet wools, and it has been going down lower and lower, and that is what the high tariff has done, making a lower price for wool.

Now, it will be noticed that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means shows in this speech that as duties went up on wool the price went down; and that as duties went down, or off, the price of wool went up, with as much certainty as the law of gravitation, and he says:

In 1846 a duty of 30 per cent. was laid on wool and 35 per cent. on woolen manufactures. The result was that wool kept going down and the manufactured goods lowering in price all the time.

If that be true, and it seems to be confirmed by so many witnesses that we can not well doubt, then we would naturally say, as high duties give us cheap wool and cheap wool gives us cheap woolens, then give us high duties. Is there anything illogical in that?

Well, Mr. Chairman, there never was much in the cry of the "poor man's blanket," and the poor woman's woolen shawl stories, which are being circulated so freely.

In a "revenue-reform" paper in my district I read some time ago the following article, which I will read:

How's this? If a workingman wants to buy his wife a woolen shawl the tariff tax is 86 cents on the dollar. If, on the other hand, the millionaire buys his wife an India shawl, the tariff tax is just 41 cents on the dollar. Then there are stockings, and everybody wears them. The rich pay 50 cents tax on the dollar on silk

hose, while the poor pay 73 cents on the dollar on worsted stockings. It is a fine deal to put the burden of taxation on the necessaries that the poor must have—fine for the wealthy. Blaine says, take the tax off tobacco and let the tax on other articles remain. The people can go without shawls and stockings, but they must have shoes.

Now, this is the kind of literature which is being sent into the homes of the poor and into the homes of the farmers of the West to mislead the people and to increase discontent. I was sorry to see that the gentleman from Wisconsin had inserted the same thing in substance in his speech, with a modification, using a "seal sacque" for an "India shawl," etc.

Admitting what is said to be true, what is there in the story? Why, simply that, as the poor man can purchase an excellent woolen shawl for $5, he would pay $1.30 war tax on his wife's woolen shawl, while the rich man, the millionaire, would pay from $41 to $410 on his wife's India shawl. That does not look so bad when a little light is let in on it, does it? And then, when I read that story to a lady, she said, "What! Seventy-three cents war tax on the dollar for worsted stockings? I do not understand how that can be, for I have not paid more than 50 cents for a pair of worsted stockings for some years."

And does not every intelligent man see how absurd it is to say that a poor man pays $1.30 war tax on a woolen shawl which he purchases for $5? Does any man believe that if the war tax or tariff duty was off, a poor man could purchase a woolen shawl, selling for $5 to-day, for 70 cents; or a pair of woolen blankets, selling for the same price, $5 say, if we are taxed 70 cents on the dollar, for $1.50? No one believes that, Mr. Chairman, and to state these propositions only shows the absurdity of this cry about war taxes on "poor men's blankets" and poor men's wives' shawls.

Mr. Chairman, just now the sympathy of the free-trader and the "revenue reformer" is greatly excited over the deplorable condition of the farmers of the West, and in expressing their sympathy they are daily pouring into their ears stories of their wrongs and outrages, how they are robbed, and how mortgages are being piled up on Western farmers. I have never known such an amount of misrepresentation and falsehood in my life.

I do not know in how many speeches a table has been published showing the amount of farm mortgages on Western farms, which is so enormous that I wonder gentlemen of the House gave currency to the monstrous falsehood by inserting it in their speeches. I was sorry to see that my friend and colleague [Mr. TOWNSHEND] republished in his speech this table, from which it appears that the farms of Illinois are mortgaged to the amount of $620,000,000. Now, this story is a most absurd falsehood and has been exposed, but still the misrepresentation goes on, and the other day a friend and constituent of mine sent me a letter, written by a Democrat whom I have known for many years, and which was published in a paper in my district, to be read by the farmers. The writer is a very honest man, and he repeats this story, and says, "We also find that the farm mortgages in the State of Illinois represent an indebtedness of $620,000,000." There are, Mr. Chairman, but about 35,000,000 acres of land, all told, in the State of Illinois, and if every acre of land in the State was farm land, it would show a mortgage indebtedness of some $17 on each and every acre of land in the State, and as only a portion of the State is farm lands, the story is too absurd to be believed by anybody.

I will read and insert an article here from a "revenue-reform" paper, published in my own town, on this subject, in which the editor says he does not believe the farms in Illinois are mortgaged for even one-tenth of $620,000,000, and neither do I.

The article is as follows:

[Bureau County News, by News Publishing Company, Jacob Miller, manager.]

PRINCETON, ILL., *February* 21, 1888.

The New York Times has prepared a table showing the amount of mortgages on farms in ten Western States. Illinois farms in this table are put down debted with mortgages aggregating $620,000,000. A writer in the Chicago News takes exception with the Times, stating that, as Illinois has a superficial area of 55,531 square miles, or a total of 35,539,840 acres of land, an incumbrance of $620,000,000 would mean $17.44 on each and every acre within the State lines. As it is estimated that only about 26,000,000 acres are included in farms, and this would include what is in pasture and grass, as well as what is plowed, this estimate would be an incumbrance of $24 per acre. Could any statement be more ridiculous? We do not believe the farms are mortgaged in this State for even one-tenth of $620,000,000.

And whatever may be said as to the number of farm mortgages in the State of Illinois, I am sure that in that part of the State where I reside more suits were instituted to foreclose mortgages and collect notes at a single term of court under the low tariff between 1850 and 1860 than have been instituted in any ten years since the close of the war under a high tariff. This may not be correct, but I believe it to be, and make the statement from my connection with the courts as an attorney.

But it is astonishing to me, Mr. Chairman, how figures are being made, if not to lie, to mislead and deceive farmers. In the same letter written by my Democratic friend of Henry County, Illinois, already referred to, he is made to repeat this statement, which shows how figures can be made to deceive:

The census shows that the value of the products of agriculture for 1880 was $2,213,000,000, while the value of manufactured products was $5,369,000,000. Yet the farm capital was $10,197,000,000 and the manufacturing capital only $2,790,000,000. The manufacturers, with less than one-third the capital invested, made two and one-half times as much money as all the farmers of the country put together.

Now, my old friend was misled by somebody else into making this statement, for, with some variations, it seems to be going the rounds. For instance, a distinguished citizen of the county in which I live, in an interview with him by the representative of a Chicago paper—"revenue reform," of course—said:

Mr. Dudley said to the men carrying gold-headed canes that 9,000,000 of our population were engaged in agriculture and 5,000,000 in manufactures. He stated that the 9,000,000 of farmers produced annually $3,000,000,000 of products, and the 5,000,000 of manufactures made annually $7,000,000,000 of goods.

And then he adds:

This statement confirms the farmers in the belief that the manufacturers can submit to a large reduction of tariff bounties and then be quite as prosperous as are the farmers.

Now, it does not seem to have occurred to either of these gentlemen that manufactured products are largely composed of farm products. Wool is a product of the farm, but when spun and woven into cloth it becomes a manufactured product and contains all the value of the wool. The same may be said of cotton. Wheat is a product of the farm, but when ground into flour becomes a manufactured product. There are many products of agriculture, such as cotton, wool, hemp, hides, etc., which enter into the products of manufactures in some instances several times, I am informed, duplicating values. The census of 1880 to eliminate such duplication, takes out the value of these materials and leaves the net values as follows:

Years.	Gross value.	Net value.
1850	$1,019,109,616	$463,935,296
1860	1,885,861,676	854,256,584
1870	3,385,860,354	1,743,808,200
1880	5,369,579,191	1,972,755,642

This table has been furnished me at my request, and I believe it to be true; and so the farmer can see that what was made to appear to him as an enormous amount in value of manufactured products is really largely composed of the products of the farms. Farmers, therefore, not only have a home market for their products to feed the millions who are employed in manufactures, but in supplying them with the materials used in such manufactures; and yet the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] declared in his remarks the other day that the cry of a "home market" was a delusion and a fraud.

But there is much said about "trusts" and "strikes," as if they were the result of the tariff. But this I do not believe, Mr. Chairman; nor do I believe that a reduction of duties can in the slightest degree prevent strikes to increase the price of labor. It will rather have a tendency to augment them. If we throw open the doors to our markets for foreign goods, it is as certain to my mind that we can not compete with foreign manufactures, unless there be a reduction of wages in this country, as it is that the sun ever shines. I know that some "revenue reformers" in the West insist that wage-workers employed in manufactures are getting higher wages than those employed in agriculture. But strikes occur to increase wages, and if they are to be reduced strikes will multiply without doubt. But strikes occur on railroads and in coal mines, where the tariff can in no sense be responsible for them.

And so are combinations or "trusts" formed to control the markets and prices of wheat, pork, lard, coffee, and many other things when the tariff can not possibly have anything to do with their formation. No honest man can or will defend combinations and trusts formed to control the markets and put up prices, and I believe the severest laws possible should be enacted to prevent them. The reduction or repeal of duties might in some cases contribute somewhat to defeat their purposes, but could not prevent their formation, and it would not be difficult to include in their organization the importers. But "trusts" exist and are formed for purposes outside of the tariff, and they should be prohibited and punished by severe enactments.

But, Mr. Chairman, the deplorable condition of the farmers and other industrial classes of the country under the wrongs and outrages of the "robber tariff," has been portrayed by numerous speakers since this discussion began; and we have been told in glowing language what free trade would do for us. Now, while the gentleman from Texas, the honorable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, was making the opening speech in this discussion some time since, I read in a New York daily at my desk the following extract from a letter of Mr. Howard Vincent, M. P., to the London Times. I insert in my remarks the entire extract, as showing the condition of England under free trade:

HOWARD VINCENT, M. P., WRITES A STARTLING LETTER TO THE LONDON TIMES.

The following is an extract from a letter of Mr. Howard Vincent, M. P., to the London Times:

"No national party could possibly ignore the serious state of affairs now prevailing. It is detailed from day to day in your columns. Land worth from 25 to 75 per cent. less than forty years ago, and almost unsalable. Arable land thrown into pasture, yet fewer animals in the fields. Agricultural distress very similar to that described by Lord Shaftesbury as prevailing about 1844. In the towns hundreds starving, owing to factories being closed or working only half time. Deputations to local authorities praying for relief works. In the metropolis hungry men at every corner. Pauperism increasing. Discontent rising. Employment everywhere scarcer, while the population is rapidly multiplying.

"There is no class, no profession, no avocation, no calling unaffected in some degree. Distress must always be felt more in some places and in some communities than in others. But the general fact is undeniable. The commis-

sioner of police of the metropolis, the vestries, the guardians of the poor, as well as philanthropic societies and statesmen may open registers for the unemployed, but that will not provide the employment, for little or none is to be found in town or country. Temporary remedies may be applied, but they will not be more effectual than palliatives to a malignant cancer.

"Fifty-two chambers of commerce have officially declared that 'foreign tariffs and bounties and foreign competition' are 'most injurious to British trade,' and 'at the bottom of all our troubles.' The royal commission on the depression of trade and industry indorsed this declaration. Take the bills of lading at any port in the kingdom, stand with the unemployed at the gates of any railway station, and the fact is apparent."

When you talk of "strikes," Mr. Chairman, we also must remember that it is not many months since we saw that 20,000 special policemen had been detailed in London to preserve the peace, and suppress a threatened mob of idle, unemployed people.

Now, in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that I have no interest in this controversy in the world, except to do as my poor judgment may lead me to do, exactly that which is for the highest and best interests of the people, and of all classes and conditions of the people. I have known what it is to toil, and have since I was twenty-one years of age worked with my hands for $13 a month. There is not a pulsation of my heart which does not beat in sympathy with the men who toil for their daily bread, and that whether they are at work on the farm or in the factory. I desire to see their condition improved in every way it can be.

I feel deeply sensible under our form of government, where every citizen is a part of the Government, that we must have an intelligent and contented, if not a happy and prosperous people, or otherwise our republican form of government will fail. It should therefore be the study of every patriot and of every statesman to so conduct the legislation of the country as to bring about that end as far as possible. And instead of arraying capital against labor, which can do neither any good, and instead of arraying the poor against the rich, let us strive to give employment to the masses of our own people to educate, elevate, and make them contented, prosperous, and happy, so far as legislation can contribute to that end. In that way we will advance the greatness and glory of the country, and the material prosperity of the people.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. MAISH in the chair). The gentleman has twelve minutes remaining.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois. I reserve them.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, after careful consideration and much earnest study from a position of quasi hostility to the bill now under consideration, I have come to the conclusion that it does if not all, nearly all, that can for the present be done in the way of tariff revision, and, with slight amendments, should pass.

It is well understood that the people of North Carolina, whom I have the honor in part to represent on this floor, are intensely opposed to the present internal-revenue system, and that their plan of revenue reduction is to begin with the repeal of that system.

Time and again the Legislature of that State has passed resolutions denouncing this system, and instructing the members of Congress from that State to advocate its repeal.

Similar resolutions have been passed by at least two Democratic State conventions. There is therefore no doubt that the Democratic part of the people of that State are heartily tired of this system, and anxious to be rid of it. With this feeling I confess myself to be in entire and cordial sympathy. I do not, however, think this opposition arises out of any very decided objections to taxing whisky and tobacco, *per se;* on the contrary, I am convinced that their chief objection and grievance against this method of taxation comes almost exclusively from the harshness of the machinery provided for the collection of these taxes, and the enforcement of the vexatious provisions of these laws.

This machinery is exceedingly harsh. Those who are not acquainted with the petty annoyances and frivolous prosecutions to which the manufacturers and producers of tobacco and the distillers of whisky are subjected can not understand the many bitter things which they have to endure at the hands of revenue officers and Federal courts.

A system which arraigns a man for trial without the intervention of a grand jury, upon the mere information of a district attorney, and which practically denies him the right of appeal; which seizes his property without process of law and destroys it or confiscates and sells it without trial or judicial decree; which places the keys of his registered warehouse in the hands of a United States gauger and sets him a guard over his integrity; which encourages by every inducement of interest frivolous prosecutions and false witnesses, and which places a premium upon espionage and treachery, can not be popular or acceptable to a people who have been accustomed to the privileges of freemen.

But, Mr. Chairman, after a close examination into the source of these just complaints against the internal-revenue system, I am satisfied that by far the larger part of the wrongs which it inflicts upon the producers and dealers in tobacco and whisky spring out of those provisions and regulations of the present law which this bill either modifies or repeals right out.

I would, however, be lacking in frankness if I should say or pretend that this bill in its present shape is wholly acceptable to me, or, in my opinion, to the people of North Carolina.

The Democratic part of the Ways and Means Committee, who have framed and reported this bill, in placing the knife of reform so deeply into the vitals of this monster of wrong and oppression, have no doubt won the gratitude of those interested in the production of tobacco and whisky; but, Mr. Chairman, there is to my mind no good and sufficient reason why the tax upon cigars, cigarettes, and cheroots should not be removed along with that upon manufactured tobacco.

If the tax upon plug-tobacco is removed, and that upon cigarettes, cigars, and cheroots is retained, the effect will be to establish a discrimination in favor of the producer of the tobacco from which the plug is made and against the producer of the tobacco from which the cigarettes, cigars, and cheroots are made. Of course there is no discrimination between the producers of these two grades of tobacco in the sense that they compete with each other, for they do not compete.

But if this tax is retained there will be a discrimination in the sense that the producer of one grade of tobacco will be given by law an advantage over the producer of another grade.

I know it is a tax upon consumption, but it is nevertheless a tax, and, like every other tax, tends to limit, circumscribe, and repress the production of the article taxed. The producers of these different grades of tobacco frequently live side by side, on adjoining farms, and if this discrimination is made it will be a prolific source of trouble, strife, and irritation.

When we consider the other features of this bill—I refer especially to its license tax features—there is not sufficient force in the sentimental arguments made in the interest of the boys to support this discrimination.

The tax on fruit brandy ought also to go. The distillers of fruit brandy are in the main poor people, and dependent upon their little orchards for the money with which to buy the few luxuries of life which they have.

Under present requirements the cost of distillation of apples and peaches, even upon the smallest scale, is so great these poor people are compelled to stand idly and helplessly by and see the fruits of their care and toil waste and decay under their very eyes. The committee have not removed this tax, if I am correctly informed, upon the ground that it will open the door to frauds against legitimate whisky.

Now, Mr. Chairman, frauds of this kind are committed for the tax saved by the fraud, and the inducement to commit fraud against legitimate whisky by illegal distillation is as great, yea, greater, than by falsely substituting whisky for brandy, and the detection of the fraud is easier in the latter than the former case. It may not be easy for a revenue officer to tell whether a barrel labeled whisky contains the product of a registered or a moonshine still; but it will be easy, or at least it ought to be easy, for such officer to say whether such barrel in fact contained whisky or brandy, or a mixture of the two. The revenue realized by the Government from fruit brandy during the last fiscal year amounted to only about $1,500,000, and can be dispensed with without any embarrassment to the fiscal policy advocated by the Democratic party and sought to be accomplished through the instrumentality of this bill. To this extent the bill in its present shape is not satisfactory, and while I shall vote for its consideration with the greatest pleasure, I shall do so with the understanding that when it is considered in detail I shall offer or support amendments covering the general scope of these objections.

I believe I am safe in asserting that the history of the Democratic party is one of opposition to internal-revenue taxes and that its continuance in power means the ultimate overthrow of that system. I believe I am also authorized to say that the Democratic party will not delay the repeal of this system one day or one hour beyond the time demanded by fiscal conditions.

At the beginning of this Congress it was my purpose to advocate the present repeal of the tax upon whisky as well as upon tobacco and fruit brandy to the end that this whole system might once for all be done with and the people emancipated from its burdens; but a better understanding of the situation causes me to fear that the tax upon whisky can not at this time be repealed without denying to the farmers, mechanics, and laborers of this country relief from the unjust and burdensome taxes now imposed upon the food they eat, the clothes they wear, and the tools with which they toil and earn their bread.

Humanity as well as patriotism requires that the necessaries of life should be made cheaper, and I believe that the people of North Carolina and all similarly interested will gladly consent to hold their convictions upon the subject of the repeal of the whisky tax in abeyance until this great and paramount object can be accomplished.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Without wishing to interrupt the gentleman from North Carolina, will he permit me right there to state, in addition to what he said on the subject of the necessity of reducing taxation on the necessaries of life, that a total repeal of the internal-revenue system will leave a deficiency of about $60,000,000?

Mr. SIMMONS. I will refer to that by and by.

I am familiar with the argument, so earnestly insisted upon by some, that the reduction of duties contemplated by this bill will increase rather than lessen the revenues of the Government by increasing dutiable importations, and that the tax on whisky may be abolished without interfering with reductions upon necessaries. If the argument were sound it would furnish some solution of the difficulties presented by

the situation; but the argument is not sound. Our experience in lowering and elevating duties shows the contrary to be true.

Contradictory as it may seem, statistics clearly prove that low duties increase exports, while high duties increase imports.

These facts are exemplified by our iron and steel and wool and manufactured-cotton trade. These are our largest manufacturing industries, and also the best protected so far as a high tariff schedule can protect them. Iron and steel and manufactured cotton are protected by an ad valorem duty of 40 per cent. and wool by an ad valorem duty of 67 per cent. Yet during the last fiscal year there was imported into this country $50,000,000 worth of iron and steel against fifteen millions sent out; during the same period we bought from foreign countries $29,000,000 worth of manufactured cotton goods and only sold them fifteen millions of the same; of manufactured wool we received last year from other countries $44,000,000 worth, while we sold to the outside world but a little over a half million dollars' worth.

The argument is not sound, and it will not do for one who is both an advocate of the repeal of the whisky tax and a reduction of the tax on necessaries to rely upon it.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, there is but one way to rid ourselves of this tax on whisky and the obnoxious system which it makes necessary and at the same time get rid of that other and more important tax upon the bread and meat and clothes of our laboring masses. That way is to substitute economy for taxation. If the people should wisely continue the Democratic party in power, and if that party shall continue honestly and faithfully to keep and perform its pledges of retrenchment, the time is not distant when the expenses of the Government will have dwindled to that point where the sixty-odd millions of dollars represented by the whisky tax may be remitted to the people and the galling yoke of the internal-revenue system taken from their neck without adding to the cost of the poor man's food or blanket, without increasing the hours of his toil or the sweat of his brow, and without stinting his meager comforts.

For these reasons, Mr. Chairman, earnestly as I have in the past advocated the repeal of this tax, and as anxiously as I now look for that consummation, I shall hold both my views and wishes upon this subject in suspense for the present, relying upon the intelligence of my constituents to understand the true status of the situation, and assuring them that in season their grievances will find fitting remedy at the hands of the Democratic party.

There is no man in North Carolina or elsewhere who is more sincerely and honestly in favor of the repeal of the whisky tax than I am, and if I see an opportunity during this Congress to accomplish this object without defeating all reductions upon the necessaries of life, I shall gladly avail myself of such an opportunity.

But I do not believe I am called upon or that my constituents desire me to do a vain and foolish thing. I distrust the motives of certain gentlemen on the other side of this floor who profess to be in favor of the repeal of this tax, and I want to say that I will not join them, or any one else, in a movement which has for its object the obstruction of the beneficent legislation proposed by this bill, and which gives no reasonable promise of fruition in any other direction. As we can not give to the people now the full measure of the relief which they demand, and to which they are entitled, I would give to those oppressed by internal-revenue laws all that the situation will permit, and I would likewise give to those laboring under the burdens of excessive tariff taxation upon the necessaries of life all that the situation will allow; but it would be unjust to give to either of these classes all that they want and to which they are entitled if by so doing we shall have to deny to the other class all and every part of what they demand and are entitled to. Divide, says the proverb, is fair play.

TARIFF REDUCTION.

The tariff legislation proposed by this bill is in the line of the relief demanded by the people and promised to them by both of the great political parties. The national Democratic convention of 1884, in its platform, pledged that party "to revise the tariff in a spirit of fairness to all."

During the same year the Republican party, in national convention at Chicago, also pledged itself "to correct the irregularities of the tariff."

The bill now under discussion, as its distinguished author has said, and as its plain provisions show, does not attempt to establish a new system of tariff taxation, but deals only with the existing system, seeking to correct its inequalities, and to revise and to readjust it wherein it is discriminating or unjust.

Putting these three facts together it is hard to see why there should be any difference of opinion between the two parties upon the question of the passage of this bill. They have both promised the people substantially the same thing, and the bill simply proposes to honor and fulfill the promises. Yet the Republican party, unmindful of its plighted faith, will neither accept this bill nor offer another. When we remind them of their pledge to the people, when we show them the "inequalities" which that pledge guarantied to correct, and point them to the evil consequences which have resulted to the people from them and call upon them in the name of patriotism to keep their compact, they not only flatly refuse but they give us bad names, call us free-traders, conspiring to destroy the industries and degrade the labor of the country.

There must be some excuse, some overpowering reason for this strange conduct on the part of this intelligent and honorable political organization. What is it? It is not to be supposed that the distinguished men who framed the platform and controlled the Republican convention of 1884 did not understand the meaning of the terms employed in that instrument; it is not to be supposed that it was not intended at that time to commit that party to the plain purport of the declaration then made, nor is it to be supposed that this declaration was put forth as a false pretense to mislead the people. Neither stupidity nor duplicity can or will be urged as an explanation of this behavior.

The explanation is simple, and it is this: The system of tariff taxation which that party twenty-six years ago established in this country and which it has steadfastly maintained has gradually withdrawn the wealth of the country from the hands of the masses among whom it was distributed and gathered it together into the hands of a few men, the beneficiaries of this system. These men, although few in number, are powerful in worldly wisdom; powerful in the ways and means by which the masses are controlled, manipulated, and played to subserve their interests.

By cunning, by intrigue, by all the quickening energies of great interests these men have made themselves dictators to the Republican party; have acquired as complete a control over its organization as ever master had over his slave, and have bound it as securely to their interests as Prometheus was bound to the rock. For twenty-six years this great political organization has been the chain which has bound the laboring millions of this country to the rock of protection, and as each recurring harvest has brought them renewed vitality and material strength these vultures of protection have come with relentless greed to fill their never satiate maw. It is these great barons and lords of the purse, these nabob princes of the Republican party who have called the halt.

With their never failing, unerring discernment, where their own interests are concerned, they clearly saw that the correction of the inequalities of these laws in a spirit of fairness to all interests as the Republican party had promised would unloose the people and estop this annual gathering into their plethoric coffers of the fruits of their labor.

It is these, inspired by the considerations named, who have forced the Republican party *nolens volens* to come into court and enter a retraxit of their pledge so solemnly made to the people.

It is in deference to the wishes and interest of this class that the Republican party to-day refuses to recognize any "inequalities of the tariff" requiring "correction," and through its representatives on this floor declares to the country that this part of our fiscal system must not be disturbed.

It is a mistake to suppose that the issue thus presented to the American people is made by the Republican party. It finds public expression through that party, but it is made and it derives its strength and inspiration from the nabob wards of that party.

The chief slogan of these beneficiaries, speaking through the Republican party, their chosen organ, is that the Democratic party through this bill is seeking to degrade American labor by bringing it in competition with the cheap labor of Europe.

This proposition I flatly deny, and I charge that under the war tariff, which the Republican party has maintained in this country for more than a quarter of a century, more than half of the laboring people in this country are to-day, and have been during this time, compelled to sell the bulk of the surplus products of their labor in the open markets of the world in competition with the cheapest labor of the world, and have been and are forced to pay for the necessaries of life which they do not produce, prices made unnaturally high by the discriminations of this offspring of the Republican party. In discussing this proposition it is well that we have a clear understanding of who are included in the general classification of American laborers.

If I am advised correctly, the protectionist, when he refers to American labor, only includes in that category those of our laborers who are employed in our mines, our furnaces, our mills, and our factories. If he is aware of the existence of any other laborers in this country he evidently either overlooks them or does not regard them as worthy of his kindly consideration.

Now, sir, the hands employed in our mines and factories form a very worthy part of our working people, and their interests should not be overlooked in any laws passed or proposed to be passed; but they do not constitute the whole of our laboring people. Whether our millionaire protectionists, who seem to think legislation should be conducted as trusts and pools are, formed upon principles of exclusive interests, know it or not, there are other interests in this country besides manufacturing and mining, in which a very respectable part of our people are engaged.

From the census report of 1880 it will be discovered that out of the 17,392,099 of our population engaged in that year in industrial pursuits of all kinds 7,670,493 were employed in agriculture, against 3,837,112 who worked in our factories and mines.

From the same source it is made to appear that in that year there was exported from this country and sold in foreign countries merchandise to the value of $823,946,353. Of this large sum only $42,700,000 consisted of the products of our factories and mines. Now subtract this sum from the total, and we have a balance of $781,246,353.

Inasmuch as in that year, in round numbers, 4,000,000 of our industrial population were engaged in professional and personal service, 3,000,000 as domestic servants and laborers, and 2,000,000 in trade and transportation, and as such did not contribute to our export trade, it is fair to assume that the whole or nearly the whole of this enormous balance of $781,000,000 was produced by the 7,670,493 persons who in that year followed the pursuit of agriculture; that is to say, every man employed in agriculture in this country in that year, after contributing his share in supplying the home market, sent across the seas to be sold in the open markets of the world about $100 worth of the product of his labor. About one-half of it went to Great Britain, the reputed home of pauper labor, and a country open to the free introduction of the products of the pauper labor of the rest of the world. One-twelfth of it went to France, one-twelfth to Germany, and about one-twentieth of it to Belgium, the other three pest-holes, according to protectionists, of starvation wages, and here was sold in open market for such prices as could be obtained.

Do the advocates of protection in the face of these facts still insist that competition with the laborer of Europe degrades American labor? Then, sir, may I ask the Republican allies of protection why that party, during the twenty-three years of its supremacy in this country, suffered this degradation of my poor countrymen, toiling away in the corn and cotton fields of the South, and offered no balm or solace?

Does protection save our labor from competition with foreign labor? Then, sir, may I be permitted to ask why eight million of American workingmen in 1880 were forced to travel by land and sea, by sail and steam, to the uttermost parts of the earth in search of a market for their surplus products?

Are there no inequalities in the present tariff laws which ought to be corrected? Then, sir, may I ask why, when the farmer of the great West and the rejuvenated South has received his scanty returns from the distant market, into which he has been forced to sell the surplus of his labor, has to pay to our domestic manufacturer two prices for such articles of our manufacture as he may have to consume?

Are there no discriminations in these laws calling for remedy?

Then, sir, may I be permitted to ask how it is that under and through them a single manufacturing establishment in the State of Pennsylvania employing 7,500 hands makes a profit in one year of $5,000,000, while the 1,600,000 laborers employed in our cotton fields made last year only a profit of $97,000,000; that is to say, while one hand employed by a Pennsylvania manufacturer makes him an annual profit of about $600, a hand employed by a Southern planter makes him a profit of only about $60?

Mr. Chairman, when the great, good Father made this continent and gave it to the children of men, He blessed it with a fertile soil and a salubrious climate. It yields to the touch of man as bounteous a return as does any land under the sun. Our people have inherited from their fathers the virtues of industry, of frugality, and undaunted pluck. Equipped with these natural and acquired advantages, we ought not to be afraid to meet in competition the products of the rest of mankind. But, sir, it is not competition with foreign labor which has loaded our farmers with debts and mortgages. It is not competition with foreign labor which is producing strikes and violence and insurrection in our mines and factories. It is rather a lack of competition both at home and abroad.

Let him turn what way he will our farmer is confronted by this wretched system of protection, standing out like a mighty wall against his progress. Trusts, syndicates, and pools formed, and rumors of trusts, syndicates, and pools to be formed—the atmosphere is full of them. These are the latest inventions of a protected oligarchy to further enslave him. The object and effect of them is to reduce the price of what the farmer has to sell below the natural line of supply and demand, and to raise what he has to buy above the natural line of supply and demand.

In the coming campaign, in the great struggle for political ascendency in this country now about to begin, the farmers and the laboring masses are going to take a greater interest than ever before. They are going to demand to know from whence the originators of these combinations and trusts have received their right and power to suspend the natural laws. They are going to demand to know from whence these men have received their right and power to thus confiscate, for it is nothing but confiscation, of their property to their private use, and when they discover, as they will discover, as they are already discovering, that these hostile organizations and the outrages which they are perpetrating upon the people are the direct outgrowth of protection and that they would be impossible, as a rule, but for the restraints which that system imposes upon free and fair competition, they will rise in their sovereignty against the men and the fiscal policy which has thus delivered them into the hands of their enemies.

When the reduction of tariff duties shall have made these trusts and combinations impossible; when free competition shall have brought the prices of the necessaries of life down to the natural line of supply and demand; when this cheapening of the necessaries of life and the free introduction of raw materials shall have reduced the price of our manufactures and thereby open to them the doors of the markets of the world, the laborers in our mines and factories and fields will become the happiest, the most contented, and the most prosperous in the world.

Mr. Chairman, despite the pretense and vauntings of its friends, the protective policy which has obtained in this country since 1861 has been fatal to the growth and development of our manufacturing industries. No doubt in the majority of instances the individual owners of these industries have grown rich through the bounties of this system, but the industries themselves, in their national and international relations, have not prospered. A comparison of our manufactures during the first decade of protection with that of the last ten years of low tariff will show the truth of this statement.

In 1850 the total value of our manufactures was $1,019,300,000. In 1860 it had run up to $1,686,000,000; in 1870 it had advanced to $4,232,000,000.

Upon its face it must be admitted this is a good showing for protection, the apparent increase being in its favor in the proportion of 85 per cent. to 125 per cent. But on account of the greater purchasing capacity of money in 1860 than in 1870 these figures are misleading.

It is estimated by one who has given careful study to the subject that protection and cheap money during the ten years between 1860 and 1870 increased prices fully 60 per cent. The table which I hold in my hand, and which I ask to make a part of my remarks, fully sustains, I think, this estimate:

Pig-iron (cost):	
1860	$16.50
1870	30.00
Coal (cargo):	
1860	3.40
1870	4.40
4–4 shirting, bleached (retail):	
1860	.10
1868	.20
Cotton flannel (retail):	
1860	.15
1868	.21
Boots (retail):	
1860	3.40
1868	5.00
Flour (retail):	
1860	6.87
1868	15.00
1872	11.50

Deducting this inflation from the money value of the aggregate product of manufactures for, the year 1870 it will be found that the increase in the productiveness of our manufactures in the last ten years of low tariff was 85 per cent. against 40 per cent. of increase during the first ten years of protection.

But, sir, a surer index to the relative growth of these industries during these two decades will be furnished by the number of hands employed in them respectively.

The census report shows that in the year 1860, a year of low tariff, there was employed in the production of eleven of the leading products of our factories 475,300 hands. The same authority shows that in the year 1870, a year of high tariff, there was employed in the production of the same articles 582,000 hands, or an increase in ten years of only 106,000, while our population had increased from 31,183,744 to 38,115,641.

No comment upon these facts are necessary to show the baleful and repressive influence of protection upon the growth of these industries. A mere statement of them is sufficient and ought to put to shame the loud-mouthed pretensions of protectionists.

The effect of protection upon these industries in their relation to our foreign commerce has been even more fatal. In this field there has been an almost total failure of duty to the State. The wealth and greatness of a nation consist, in a large measure, in its foreign commerce. No nation is better located by nature than we for traffic with the rest of mankind, yet our external trade bears no sort of relation to our great resources. Indeed, if it were not for the products of our agriculture, we would be to-day practically without foreign commerce and our merchant marine would be, not almost, but altogether, driven from the high seas. Of the $800,000,000 worth of merchandise which we sold the outside world in 1880 our protected industries supplied the insignificant sum of $42,000,000 worth.

Right beyond the warm currents of the Gulf lie the great South American and Central American Republics doing an immense foreign trade.

By reason of climate and the habits of their people they follow almost exclusively the pursuit of agriculture, buying their manufactures where they can get them at the best advantage.

In 1880, we bought from these sister republics products to the value of $176,000,000, and we sold them from our manufacturies goods to the trifling value of only about $17,000,000.

In 1880 England sold to these republics $51,000,000 of manufactured cotton, while we sold them less than $4,000,000 worth of the

same goods. Yet we raise raw cotton and England does not. We sell raw cotton and England buys it.

Who, sir, is to blame for this fatal restriction—the manufacturer? Alas! protected by law from competition abroad, and secured by combinations from rivalry at home, they are, as is natural, contented to reap the large profits of the domestic market and to leave the quicker sales and smaller profits of foreign traffic to their brethren whom wiser laws have made more enterprising and self-reliant.

No, sir, it is not our manufacturers who are to blame, but the repressiveness of our fiscal policy which has thus circumscribed the operations of our industries and denied us those rich markets which might have given employment to millions of laborers, motion to thousands of spindles, and kindled the fires of hundreds of furnaces.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the legislation proposed by this bill is justified upon the ground that the people are entitled to be released from the payment of taxes not needed for the economical administration of the Government; it is justified upon the ground that it is contrary to the spirit of our institutions that taxes should be imposed for private purposes; above all, and beyond all, it is justified upon the broad ground that the present rates of tariff taxation adopted in the interest of a few against the many has for twenty-odd years held the great majority of our people in bondage to the minority.

Its adoption will do no hurt to our manufacturing industries, but on the contrary will give them an opportunity of producing at a less cost by cheapening raw materials. It will secure to our laborers better wages and more regular employment by enlarging both our foreign and domestic markets, and finally it will lighten the burden of the whole mass of our people by lessening the cost of living.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the power of the Government to raise money for its support by imposing taxes on the people is the highest power granted by the source from which all the powers of the Government are derived. It is the power to compel the citizen to yield up a sufficient amount of his earnings to defray his proportionate share of the expenses of the Government administered with strict economy. Being the highest power it ought the more surely to be exercised with caution and equality to all. Every citizen should be required to pay his just share and no more. This being done no one could complain, but recognizing that there were no favored classes harmony would prevail and success attend the efforts of the people. Because this careful and judicious manner of administering the taxing power of the Government has not been observed is the reason we are found here discussing the bill now pending.

The power to lay duties on imports has been abused, and abused in the name of that human force that develops all countries and makes them great. That force is labor. By labor is meant all effort at production, both mental and physical, but as used in the usual form of expression means physical toil. Heavy duties have been laid on almost every conceivable thing needed or desired by man, not only as it is claimed to raise revenue but in addition thereto to protect labor. But the present situation of affairs in this country shows plainly that labor is not protected, but that labor is robbed systematically and criminally by the operation of the present taxing laws of the country. Where did the surplus millions in the Treasury come from? They came out of the pockets of the laboring people of America. Where did the vast fortunes of the manufacturing monopolists of this country come from? Every dollar of it has ingrained into it some of the sweat, muscle, and brain of the laboring people of the country.

This vast surplus and these lordly monopolies have been created by the unjust and unfair exercise of the taxing power. Labor demands no protection except that guarantied to every citizen by the Constitution—to be protected in "life, liberty, and property." [Applause.] At first the cry was, "Protection to infant industries," but now that the industries are no longer infants, "Protection to labor" has been substituted. So long have the protected industries fed and feasted and fattened on the necessities of the people that they can not be persuaded to any other doctrine, or to believe anything but that they have a divine right to collect from the people at large all that greed and avarice may dictate. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Massachusetts the other day asserted that the Committee on Ways and Means had received no petitions from farmers asking a reduction of the present rate of tariff taxation, but that hundreds and thousands of names of mill operatives had been sent to them asking that no reduction be made. Mr. Chairman, that question or assertion brings out the whole case. It tells us plainly who is demanding that this present rate be continued. The farmers of this country are ill-prepared to furnish petitions to Congress on any subject. They live isolated from each other, and the securing of a thousand names of farmers to a petition would require days of labor at a great sacrifice of time and considerable expense that would necessarily have to be borne by persons unable to make the sacrifice, whereas mill operatives can be reached by the score and by the hundred in a few minutes, or hours at most, without any cost or sacrifice to any one, for the reason that they always live in closely-settled communities and have leisure hours after the day's work is over.

Farmers have no leisure hours, for they must work incessantly from "early morn till dewy eve" each day in the week in order to make sufficient money to buy the scantiest necessaries of life and pay tribute to manufacturing monopolists. It is not the mechanical laborer that is the recipient of this tribute paid by the American farmer, but it is the owners of the factories. The only evidence necessary to prove this true is the fact, patent to all, that the owners of the protected industries have grown enormously rich, while the laborers in these industries find themselves so poorly paid and hard pressed to support themselves and families that strikes have been resorted to in every manufacturing center in the East. American farmers are not and can not be protected, because they produce more of every one of the staple products than can be consumed in America. They must go abroad to find a market for the surplus. That surplus is large enough to fix the price of the whole amount produced. It is sold in foreign markets in direct competition with the much-dreaded "pauper labor" of Europe. But the protectionists say, "Build more factories, bring more people to work in them, and thus create a market for the farmer's produce."

Pray tell me where you will sell the manufactured goods. You must sell the product of the factory or it can not run. Already we have more manufacturing capacity than we have people to consume the product; and when the markets will take no more the mill shuts down, and the operatives are discharged or locked out. But we are told we must find other markets for our manufactured articles besides American markets. Already our reaping-machines, sewing-machines, and many other things are finding sale in other countries, and, strange as it may seem, are being sold to European farmers for less money than to American farmers. European farmers have their capacity for producing increased in the same ratio that the American farmer does; but his profit on his wheat sold at the same price is fully double that of the American farmer, leaving labor out of the question, because he has bought his American manufactured plows, harrows, drills, reapers, mowers, and thrashing-machines for less money than the American farmer, and then he is near the market, while the American must pay railroad freights across the continent and ocean freights to Europe.

Farmers can not strike for higher prices, because constant, unremitting toil is necessary to prepare the land, plant and cultivate and harvest and market their crops. Failing in any one of these means failure in all and consequent suffering and want. Not so with the manufacturer. He can shut off his power, discharge his labor, and let his mill stand still for six months, and when he is ready to resume operations has only to hire the necessary people, turn on the power, and begin where he left off, with everything in working order. If protection has benefited labor why is it that during the last ten years, in which we have had the highest protective tariff ever known to this country, that greater dissatisfaction has manifested itself among all classes of laborers than ever before? Why is that labor has been compelled to organize to protect itself from want and poverty?

Why is it that farmers have grown less prosperous than in the past? I well remember, and I know it is within the memory of every member of this Congress who has lived out of a city, when farmers in every community were money-lenders, and furnished money at reasonable rates to the young men of the country to enable them to embark in business. All of you know that state of things, as a rule, exists no longer, but farmers have become large borrowers of money, giving mortgages on their real estate to secure the loan. They are not less industrious; they are not less frugal; they are not less enterprising than in the past. But, Mr. Chairman, after all their efforts they are forced to see at the end of each year their incomes reduced and their labor less rewarded.

Then away with this deluding cry of protection to American labor. It has been used and is still being used to deceive, hoodwink, and blind labor to the real situation. Protection is only furnished to capital. The product of the factory is protected against the importation of like articles from foreign countries, but the importation of labor is free. No duties are imposed on labor that comes to compete with American labor, but on the contrary bounties in the way of free transportation are paid to foreigners to come to America to swell the army of those who are seeking labor. Notwithstanding the strikes, lockouts, and other evidences of the depression of the labor market, almost every railroad corporation, every State and Territory, has its immigration bureau, filling all the world with highly colored pictures and graphic descriptions of the prosperous condition of labor in America.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of protecting American labor by striking from its hands the unnecessary burdens imposed on it. [Applause.] It is the labor of this country that makes it prosper. Then why make labor's burdens heavy? Why require those upon whose shoulders rest all the burdens of maintaining the Government to contribute unnecessary sums to the Treasury of the country? It has been proven beyond cavil that for every dollar that goes into the Treasury from tariff taxation four dollars go into the coffers of the manufacturer of this country on account of the tariff. No man in this country objects to paying his just proportion toward defraying the necessary expenses of government, but the people do complain at taxation that accumulates a surplus. Nor would the accumulation of a surplus be so objectionable if the

channels of commerce were not disturbed, but every dollar locked up in the Treasury is taken from circulation, thus increasing the purchasing power of money and reducing the price of the products of labor.

But the hardest burden of all for labor to bear is the tribute it pays on account of the present tariff laws, which never reaches the Treasury. But take it for granted that the tariff as it now exists does protect the labor employed in manufacturing enterprises, is it right or in any manner defensible to tax one class of laborers to support another class? Does it accord with the spirit of our institutions? Is it carrying out that great principle upon which our system of government must rest, "equal rights and exact justice to all?" Most surely it is not. But the labor engaged in manufacturing industries is not protected, for other reasons than those already stated. Manufacturing has been unnecessarily stimulated until the mills and factories can not be run constantly and the operatives must be idle much of the time.

Trusts, pools, and combines are formed to prevent more goods being manufactured than can be sold at great profits, and the custom-house officials stand at our ports with our tariff schedule in their hands to hinder anybody from interfering with the prices fixed by the combine. So with tariff laws, framed professedly to protect labor, and the legitimate offspring of those laws, to wit, trusts, pools, and combines, the laborer is fleeced while capital is being protected. But, Mr. Chairman, there is a class of persons in this country whose energy, enterprise, muscle, and brain furnish all the sinews of the contest. That class is composed of the American farmers.

The farmers of America are the mainstay of the Government. Their labor furnishes the material out of which comes all the taxes, just or unjust, that are collected. Their labor furnishes the articles of commerce that make it profitable to build railroads and steam-boats, and to build factories and machine shops. It is the toil of the farmer that makes it possible for all the industries of the country to exist and sell their products, protected by a tariff rate of 47 per cent. As I look at the beautiful cities of America and our wonderful transportation facilities, our banking institutions, and, in fact, all of the magnificent evidences of prosperity in our land, I realize the fact that the foundation stone upon which it all rests and makes it at all possible is the brain and brawn of the people who till the soil, blessed by the Giver of all good with bright sunshine and gentle showers.

Strike down the farmer, and ruin to all our interests and enterprises follows. It seems, though, as if every other interest has adopted or is desirous of adopting the sentiment expressed a few years ago by a leading railroad corporation in defining its rule as to rates on wheat and corn from the West to New York, which was "all that the traffic will bear." The farmers are getting their eyes opened to the true situation. They realize that they are being made "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for all mankind. They have borne for long years uncomplainingly all the impositions put on them, and whatever of prosperity has attended them has been in spite of and not by any tariff law. Two reasons have operated to keep them quiet. The first is that farmers have had but little time to spare from arduous labor to organize and keep up their organizations. The second is that, living separated from each other, an exchange of ideas has been limited and infrequent. But at last there seems to have arisen a spirit of determination among them. Pools, trusts, combines, and monopolies have become too common and effective.

In many sections of the country the Farmers' Alliance, the Grange, the Agricultural Wheel, and various other organizations of farmers have organized for mutual protection against the rapid encroachments of the powers that are sapping their life-blood. What are they demanding? They demand a reduction of taxes, economy in the administration of governmental affairs, and that pools, trusts, and monopolistic power be broken up; that the shackles of burdensome taxation be taken off and their earnings be left with them; that useless squandering of the people's lands and money be stopped; believing that all a man's earnings over and above just and economical Government expenditures are his own, and that while laws may be made to take more from them the laws are criminally unjust and burdensome. These demands may now seem as the passing breeze to the country, but I warn you now that they will be heard in tone of thunder in the legislative halls of this country before many more administrations shall come and go.

Farmers are not anarchists. They do not propose by force to remedy these evils, but the political party that fails to heed their demands will not long receive their votes. But in advocacy of protection we are told that farm wages are higher in some sections than others. But these *doctrinaires* fail to tell you that taxes are higher, rents higher, and therefore living higher than in other places. It has also been shown that in the protected industries wages are higher for the very same work in New York than in Maine. Protection for protection is heralded as the "American idea." It is not an American idea. It is wholly un-American; so much so that it had become a fixed institution in the Old World before this Government was established. Much has been said about the "Cobden Club" and "free trade." I have heard no one advocating free trade.

The Democratic party is not a free-trade party. You can only tell what the principles of a party are by its published declarations in its party platforms and its votes. The Democratic party has announced time and again, in the plainest terms, its adhesion to the idea of tariff taxation, but only for revenue, with such incidental protection as that would afford. That is the principle of the party to-day, as is plainly shown by the bill under consideration. This bill also shows that the Democratic party is opposed to making a reduction of the tariff a purely revenue basis at one blow, but is willing that reduction shall take place gradually, so that the various industries may adjust themselves to the changed schedule. Since this bill has been under consideration about every protected industry in the land has appealed by circulars to the members of this House to vote to exempt that particular industry from the operation of the provisions of the bill, and predicting utter ruin and disaster to the business and the depriving of hundreds of people of work.

Only this morning the National Iron Roofing Association, of Cincinnati, has placed on our desks protests against the placing of tin-plates on the free-list, and I find one of the names signed to that circular to be J. D. TAYLOR, of Cambridge, Ohio, now a member of this House. But that circular is unfortunate in its language, in that it defeats its own argument by acknowledging in the following words that the advocates of tariff reform are correct in asserting that the consumer pays the tax:

> After Mr. Shaw had told us of the cleanliness, economy, and other advantages of hermetically sealed cans, which has never been disputed, he goes on and refers to the burden that falls on his constituency in the annual payment of $171,000 duties on tin-plates made into cans, but gives no tangible reason why it is so. In what manner does this matter burden his people when it costs them nothing?
>
> Every dollar and more is returned to them by the consumer. There is no special hardships nor vicissitudes caused by this. It is nothing more nor less than the ordinary business expenditure. All shippers require packages. It is a necessary part of their domestic economy. The consideration of packages is not vital to the conduct of a business, and success or failure are not influenced thereby. When and where has the consumer complained of this excess of one-fourth of a cent on the can caused by duties? He is not mentioned, but the canner to whom he returns the duty without objection, laments the "heavy burden."

Some years ago Hon. James A. McKenzie, of Kentucky, secured the passage of a bill taking the duty off quinine. The manufacturers of quinine howled and predicted disaster for the industry and an increase of the price of quinine to the people of America. What is the result? The price is one-sixth what it was then. So that in this case the decrease in price and consequent increase in consumption has created a demand that has vastly multiplied the factories and people employed in its production. Taking this as an example, would it not be the wisest kind of statesmanship to reduce duties, decrease price, thus increasing consumption, thus making greater production necessary, so that the thousands of people who are idle or working only part of the time can find employment?

I have heard no one attempt to defend the surplus. But when complaint is made of the accumulation of a surplus in the Treasury the protectionists say "if you reduce the tariff the increased importations will increase the surplus." Very well; suppose it does bring more money to the Treasury, it will take less to the coffers of the monopolist, and will be a long step in the solution of this question, for that will show that with more of their earnings left in their hands the people will become more prosperous and will purchase more, and consequently require greater production. Excessive taxation brings excessive revenues, and the surplus thus created brings schemes for excessive and extravagant appropriations, as everybody knows. Of the hundreds of extravagant propositions made to this Congress for the useless expenditure of money not one of them but what has been urged on the ground that the Treasury had a large surplus and the Government could afford it.

This excessive taxation and useless locking up of the money of the people in the Treasury and piling up fortunes for the few as against the many is the cause of this persistent demand on the part of the people for a reduction of the revenues. It is in direct opposition to the principles on which our Government was founded to collect more money than is needed for defraying the expenses of the Government. The Republican party boasts that it is the friend of free labor, and points to the abolition of negro slavery. Give that party full credit for striking down that institution by which four millions of colored people were made free, but do not let the shouts raised by them over that fact blind you to the fact that protection has made slaves of twenty millions of laborers in America by requiring them to pay an unjust and unwilling tribute to monopoly.

Let us no longer persist in keeping on our statute-books laws that make unjust discriminations between the people. Let us strike from the hands of labor every single hindrance to its complete success. Let us, indeed, make every man or woman who toils free to enjoy to the fullest extent every cent of their earnings. [Applause.] Let us no longer keep them bound by this unreasonable load of taxation, but follow with willing step the suggestion of that brave-hearted, noble champion of the people's rights, Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, and remove all unnecessary burdens from the shoulders of the

people, so that the race for prosperity and happiness may be unimpeded and equal to all.

As the South was wedded to slavery so now is the Republican party wedded to this phantom of protection. The South clung to the one till it went out in blood and sorrow and gloom, but it is gone and the South has risen like a young giant from her desolation. The North yet worships at the shrine of protection, but the handwriting is on the wall and that idea is doomed to pass out of the list of American idols, not as the other did, but peacefully and quietly by the votes of the people. Then with labor free and hands unfettered the North and the South, the East and the West united in one common bond of brotherhood, and all striving for the greatest prosperity, will move on to success beyond the dream of the extremest enthusiasts. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, as I listened a few days ago to the impassioned eloquence of the gentleman from Michigan in his peroration, in which he spoke so tenderly and beautifully of the South, it seemed as if one could see that grand section of the country like a trained racer, with eyes flashing with intelligence and anxiety, muscles well developed and ready for action, conscious of its own power and fleetness, eagerly, nervously waiting to have the clogs and weights removed, the rein slackened, and word given for the real work to begin. Indeed, the South does feel a thrill of possibilities beneath her feet. Strike off the clogs and weights of useless taxation and burdensome tribute that bind the hands and cramp the efforts of her people, and her achievements and success in all that goes to make a people and a country great will challenge the admiration of the world.

Kentucky has been so forcibly and eloquently defended from the aspersions of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that it seems useless to say more in her praise. My colleague, who has been her honored governor, has shown how that in the great race for prosperity her colors float very near the head of the column, but he fails to call your attention to the fact that, surrounding circumstances considered, no State in this Union has equaled her during the twenty years just passed.

From 1861 to 1865 Kentucky was a camping-ground for hostile armies. Her homes gave up her gallant sons to both armies; her horses and mules, for which she had grown famous, were taken to mount the cavalryman and draw the artillery and wagon trains; her flocks and herds were taken to feed the contending forces; her system of labor was entirely destroyed; her shops were silent; her farms were devastated; her implements of agriculture stood idle, and desolation reigned supreme. During all this time the States that are now paraded here as examples of greatest prosperity were enjoying unprecedented success to all their industries. The supplies needed for army purposes were bought by the Government and paid for at prices that were enormous.

These machine-shops and factories were actively at work day and night turning out supplies and munitions of war. Far removed from the theater of battle, no devastation was wrought, but instead vast fortunes were accumulated and prosperity came to them like magic. So that at the close of the war the States now in advance of Kentucky in general prosperity were already rich and fully equipped for the march of progress. Kentucky, with all her industrial appliances destroyed her fields devastated, her bins and granaries empty, and with bereavement and sorrow in almost every household for loved ones who had laid down their lives in the bloody conflict, stood desolate and sad. Her sons from both armies had returned to begin the battle of life over again, but to all the outlook was gloomy.

Fierce passion commenced to swell in the breasts of many non-combatants, and it looked for awhile as if bitterness, ill-feeling, and feuds were to be the ruling order. Then it was that Kentucky's true chivalry was shown in its best light. A Legislature sitting while war was flagrant had passed an act depriving all Kentuckians who had entered the Confederate army of their rights as citizens. But the governor of the State, who had been a gallant officer in the Federal Army, manifested such a disposition toward reconciliation and peace that at the first session of the Legislature convened after the war closed that law was repealed.

Then the ex-Federal and ex-Confederate joined hands and entered earnestly and manfully on the work of rehabilitating their State and rebuilding their ruined homes. With heads erect and aspirations high, forgetting the past except to profit by the lessons it taught, they began the march to prosperity. How they have succeeded the facts presented by my colleague [Mr. MCCREARY] tell. Kentucky a laggard? Never! Her sons have made the pages of history blaze with glory. Her soldiers have written her name in the highest niches of fame. Her agricultural productions have challenged the admiration of the world. Her cattle have gone to England—the home of their ancestors—and been given the highest awards for superiority of their kind.

From poverty twenty years ago Kentucky is rapidly advancing towards the front of the column of States in general prosperity. But her advance has been hindered and delayed by the fact that, as an agricultural State, she has been compelled during all these years to pay tribute to the manufacturing States and cities of the East. Strike the shackles from her hands, require her to pay only so much as may be her share of the necessary expenses of government, so that the earnings of her people may be left with them for use in business and supplying their needs, and leave them free in deed as they are in name, and she will demonstrate the fact that her past success has not been by the aid of but in spite of the tariff. [Great applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the hammer fell.

Mr. MCCREARY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of my colleague be extended for fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that that extension can be granted without interfering, as the Chair is informed, with the arrangements of gentlemen upon the other side who are to follow.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

[Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, resumed and concluded his remarks as above.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

An act (H. R. 1325) providing for the purchase of additional ground in the city of Indianapolis, Ind., adjoining the post-office site, and for the improvement of the building thereon, and providing $150,000 therefor; and

An act (H. R. 7218) for the erection of a public building in the city of Duluth, State of Minnesota.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LANE having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, a message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, House bills of the following titles, namely:

A bill (H. R. 1275) for the erection of a public building at Columbus, Ga., and appropriating money therefor;

A bill (H. R. 1645) to limit the hours that letter-carriers in cities shall be employed per day;

A bill (H. R. 2928) granting a pension to William Lemon; and

A bill (H. R. 4358) to increase the limit of cost for the public building in course of erection at Charleston, S. C.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, namely:

A bill (S. 437) for the relief of Claude H. Mastin, surviving partner of the firm of Le Vert & Mastin, of Mobile, Ala.; and

A bill (S. 2039) for the relief of the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal Company.

THE TARIFF.

The Committee of the Whole resumed its session.

Mr. GROUT Mr. Chairman, the question involved in this debate is, how shall we deal with the surplus, and how shall taxation be reduced?

The surplus which accumulated in the United States Treasury for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, was $55,567,849.54, the receipts having been $371,403,277.66, and the expenditures $315,835,428.12.

The estimated surplus for the fiscal year to end June 30, 1888, is $60,128,214.42, the estimated receipts being $383,000,000, and the estimated expenditures $316,817,185.48.

There is already a large amount of money in the Treasury not required by law to be there, and the Secretary in his last annual report says "that a careful estimate shows that the surplus will be $140,000,000 at the close of the present fiscal year."

None of the national debt will fall due till 1891, when $230,000,000 of 4½ per cent. bonds will mature. Notwithstanding that none of the debt is now due, the Secretary ought not to have allowed this immense surplus to accumulate and lie idle while business enterprises are languishing for the want of money. He should have used it under the law of March 3, 1881, to purchase and cancel the outstanding bonds of the Government, and thus have stopped interest thereon and at the same time kept the money in the channels of trade. This law is as follows, and is so plain that he who runs may read:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury may at any time apply the surplus money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, or so much thereof as he may consider proper, to the purchase or redemption of United States bonds: *Provided*, That the bonds so purchased or redeemed shall constitute no part of the sinking fund, but shall be canceled.

Approved March 3, 1881.

Under this law previous administrations have purchased and canceled bonds to the amount of $183,241,750; and it is perfectly clear that every dollar of the present surplus might have been so employed, and that should disaster come to the business of the country, because of the withdrawal of this immense sum of money from the circulation, upon the administration must rest the responsibility, though it seems that, after having been spoken to twice upon the subject by Congress, it has at last entered upon the purchase of bonds. But while it is clear that we need have no surplus at this time, it is also equally clear that the revenues are in excess of our current expenditures and should be reduced.

This is admitted by all. The only question is, how shall the reduction be made, and to what extent?

The average surplus for the last two fiscal years was a little over $60,000,000. But the surplus for the fiscal year to end June 30, 1889, as estimated by the Secretary of the Treasury, will be $56,469,206. This would leave the average for these three years a little less than $60,000,000, and I assume that to be about the sum in excess of the present rate of current expenditure. But here let me say that could I have my way this annual surplus would be less. I would appropriate $10,000,000 annually for the next ten years for the defense of our great seaboard cities, and no longer leave them at the mercy of whatever power may send a gunboat against them. I would also appropriate $10,000,000 annually for the next eight years for the education of the 6,239,958 American citizens who can neither read nor write, but in whose hands is the future of the Republic. I would also increase the appropriations for pensions at least $10,000,000 annually, by passing the dependent-pension bill and taking from the poor-houses of the country the brave but unfortunate defenders of the Union, and by passing, also, the bill for the relief of those who endured the horrors of Southern prisons. And, if not now, at the latest, when a quarter of a century shall have elapsed from the close of the war, a time now near at hand, I would give every Union soldier a service-pension of $8 per month.

These several items would amount to at least $30,000,000, and there would then be an annual surplus of only $30,000,000, which I would obviate by cutting that amount from the internal-revenue taxes.

The tobacco tax for 1887 amounted to $30,108,607.13. Repeal this tax and make the appropriations above specified, every one of which is demanded by the public welfare, and the problem presented by the surplus is solved. Then let the tariff be revised in the interest of American industries and the whole subject is disposed of.

REPUBLICAN POSITION.

Now, while there has been no formal programme agreed upon on the Republican side of the House, it may be fairly claimed that this is the Republican plan for disposing of this great financial and industrial question which now agitates the country. But the Democratic majority do not approve this plan. In the last Congress the Republican Senate put an amendment on the fortifications bill appropriating $6,000,000 for coast defenses, but the Democratic House struck it out. Three times has a Republican Senate passed the Blair educational bill with a view of lifting into intelligent citizenship the illiterates of the country, and twice has it been strangled in a Democratic House; and this third time it lies chloroformed in a Democratic committee, and if reported will never be allowed consideration, for should it come to a vote it would pass. The dependent-pension bill of the last Congress received every Republican vote in both House and Senate, but enough Democrats in the House agreed with the President's veto to defeat it.

The Republicans tried in the last Congress to repeal the tobacco tax, and have introduced bills for that purpose in this, on the ground that a reduction must be made somewhere, and that though the world might be better off without it, as some think of tea and coffee, "the cups that cheer but not inebriate," yet tobacco is a comfort and by habit equally with tea and coffee a necessity, and to no one more than to him who lives by daily toil. But the Democratic majority in the House stand in the way of all these measures, and through their Committee on Ways and Means, composed of eight Democrats to five Republicans, bring in a bill which reduces the duties on imports to the amount of $53,720,447.22, dealing with almost every article of merchandise known in the markets, thereby affecting for the time the value of every one of them, and throwing the business of the country into a state of excitement and alarm on account of threatened evil, only a little less confusing and disastrous than the evil itself.

And this is among the first fruits of the Mills bill. The business of the country to-day stands paralyzed with fear at this proposition to give foreign merchandise brought into our markets an advantage of $54,000,000 annually in round numbers over what it now enjoys; and every mail from every quarter of the country brings to the members of this House remonstrances and protests from almost every industry in the country, from manufacturers and artisans and agriculturists and laborers, against this surrender of our markets, the best in the world, to the half-paid, half-starved labor of Europe. And whether this shall be done is really the question presented by this bill; not that it proposes a complete surrender at this time, but it is the initial step in the work of overthrowing the principle of industrial protection which came in as the national policy with Lincoln's administration, and under which the country has increased in wealth and population as never before, and the substitution therefor of free trade.

Now I do not say this because all but two of the majority of the committee who reported this bill are from the late Confederate States, whose constitution declared for free trade, nor alone because these gentlemen were all ardent adherents and valiant defenders of that constitution and still believe in the superior excellence of free trade as an economic policy, though these are indeed suspicious circumstances, but because the bill itself discloses its hostility to the protective principle from the fact that it takes away $54,000,000 protection annually from American products, when the reduction could be made from revenues which in no way protect American industries, but are an absolute tax upon the American people and upon them alone. I refer, of course, to the internal-revenue taxes. I have already shown that were certain much-needed appropriations made and the tobacco tax repealed no further reduction would be necessary, and before I close I will indicate other methods still for solving the problem before us, and such, too, as shall in no way disturb our industries.

ATTENTION TO THE ISSUE.

But just now, for a moment, I want to hold the attention of the House and the country to the fact that the contest precipitated by this bill is between our present protective system and its insidious foe, free trade, or tariff for revenue only, which is the same thing, for there is no such thing as absolute free trade. All free-trade nations, so called, lay tariff duties on imports, free-trade England raising almost $100,000,000 annually, and free-trade Norway and Sweden each about one-third of their revenues from that source. The distinguishing feature of the free-trade or revenue-tariff policy is to lay duties on foreign goods without any reference whatever to the protection of domestic industries, but solely for revenue, and this, in contradistinction from a protective tariff, which, while it raises revenue, protects domestic products, is called free trade. Hence a tariff for revenue only, a revenue tariff, and free trade are equivalent terms.

Nowhere in the literature of this subject is there a better statement of what is meant by this kind of tariff than that found in Article II, section 8, of the constitution of the late Confederate States. It is as follows:

The Congress shall have power:

To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, for revenue necessary to pay the debts, provide for the common defense, and carry on the government of the Confederate States; but no bounties shall be granted from the treasury, nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid, to promote or foster any branch of industry; and all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the Confederate States.

A revenue tariff has long been a favorite dogma of the Democratic party. It was contended for by that party before the war, when the old Whig party, led by Clay and Webster, stood for protection, and since the war tariff reduction has been the constant cry of that party, who have told us in seductive phrase of the advantage of buying and selling in the markets of the world, and this is the burden of their song to-day.

They have also frequently told us what is meant by a revenue tariff, but nothing can tell us better than this clause in the Confederate constitution. By forbidding the protection of domestic industries it expresses the very sublimation of the doctrine of free trade. Now, if instead of free trade and as the result, two or three great agricultural products, the South had believed in protection and had diversified her industries by the manufacture of iron and woolen and cotton and other goods, so that from her own resources, known to be immense, she could have provided herself with arms and the supplies and munitions of war and at the same time with all the necessaries and comforts of life, who will say what might have been the fortune of the Confederacy, for a braver set of men never shouldered muskets?

Thus provided the blockade would have done them no harm, for they could have lived within themselves.

Who will say that it would have been possible to have conquered and brought into obedience to the laws 11,000,000 of people on their own ground, and as united and determined and capable as they were, had they possessed a full line of manufacturing industries, the legitimate result of protection?

But they believed in a revenue tariff. They despised protection, and thought they had no use for manufactures. And as the result their iron and coal lay undisturbed in the mountains. Their rivers, utilized by no industrial wheel, swept on unvexed to the sea. They believed cotton was king; but when shut in from the rest of the world they soon found that raw cotton left them both naked and hungry, and as the result in a capitulating frame of mind. Like Samson, they were shorn of their strength by the Delilah of free trade, and finally yielded, no more to superior numbers than to a superior economic and industrial system.

EFFECT OF THE PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

At the same time that the Confederate States planted themselves upon this delusive and enfeebling doctrine of free trade the United States raised the banner of protection. Relieved for a time of the bulk of these free-trade advocates the Republican party was left free to do its perfect work, and within thirty days from the inauguration of Abraham Lincoln the Morrill tariff was a law—a high-protective tariff which, with increased protection added from time to time, carried us triumphantly through the war, and, in spite of all its havoc and waste, left us at its close a far richer people than at its beginning. Now, without stopping to ask what might have been the outcome of the rebellion had the United States, instead of building their financial system upon the rock, like the Confederacy, built upon the sand, let us for a moment see what this system has done for the American people. It took the country in the midst of civil war with an empty Treasury, made such by a Democratic revenue tariff, and with the national credit so low that in the last year of Buchanan's administration a 6 per cent. United States bond, sold to meet the current expenses of the Government—think of it; not money enough from the public revenues, and sold to meet the current expenses of the Government—brought only 89¼ cents on the dollar.

This is a fair indication of the financial condition, not only of the Government but of the people as well, especially manufacturers and laborers. I suppose the friends of this bill, like the Pharisees of old, will refuse to "be persuaded though one rose from the dead."

But here is the testimony of such an one, and it ought to be received by them, for he was of their household of faith. James Buchanan in his first message, in 1857, said:

The earth has yielded her fruits abundantly and has bountifully rewarded the toil of the husbandman. Our great staples have commanded high prices, and until within a brief period our manufacturing, mineral, and mechanical occupations have largely partaken of the general prosperity. We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country in its monetary interests is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions, and in all the elements of natural wealth, we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want.

Remember, this was among the early results of the free-trade tariff of 1846, under which we are constantly told the country was so prosperous. And it was in this state of affairs, with—

the monetary interests of the Government in a deplorable condition, with manufactures suspended, and thousands of useful laborers out of employment and reduced to want—

that the era of protection was ushered in.

The stress of circumstances at once placed us under a high protective tariff, and, as if by magic, our industries revived. The young men went down to the field of strife, but the old and the middle-aged relighted the fires of furnace and forge, which had been put out by the tariff of 1846.

Everywhere was heard the sound of hammer and spindle and loom, and labor was no longer "out of employment and reduced to want." Heavy duties on imports sent streams of money into the Treasury, ury, and the cold corpse of our national credit was slowly but surely brought back to life. Thus did the Morrill tariff, supplemented, of course, by internal taxes—but protection was all the while the "head of the corner"—put the country on the high road to prosperity at the same time that it furnished the sinews for a war that grew into enormous proportions. It has since provided thousands of millions of dollars in payment of principal and interest upon the public debt, and has at last brought the national credit to such a pitch of health and vigor that nearly $1,000,000,000 of 4 per cent. bonds are to-day worth 125 cents on the dollar and capitalists the world over want them.

Now place right alongside this fact the further fact that those 6 per cent. bonds that sold for 89 cents on the dollar in Buchanan's time were only $7,146,875 in amount, and you have a fair view of the comparative credit of the Government then and now. Then, after fourteen years under a revenue tariff, and now, after twenty-seven years under protection. And which picture fills most with pride the American heart? [Applause.] Nor is this all.

BALANCE OF TRADE.

In 1860 there was a balance of trade of $20,060,062 against us, which took out of the country that amount of gold and silver; for, remember, our foreign exchange is always in coin. In 1880, after twenty years of protection, the balance of trade was $167,683,912 in our favor, thereby bringing that amount of coin from foreign countries into our own. More than anything else the balance of trade indicates the general prosperity of a country. As with an individual so it is with the whole people, with the nation.

It is a very simple proposition. If the American people buy of foreign nations $20,000,000 more than they sell, it is quite plain that at the end of the year they are owing that amount and must part with the money, in this case hard cash, to settle the account. Now, if instead of this they sell to foreign countries $167,000,000 more than they buy, they then not only not have to part with the $20,000,000, but they will receive from outside themselves $167,000,000, and thus will be $187,000,000 better off; will have that amount more of circulation, thereby making money easier, the rate of interest lower, and the whole country richer by that amount. But this only represents the result for a single year; and for a fuller comparative view of the workings of these two systems take the last ten years under the tariff of 1846, from 1850 to 1860, in every one of which but one the balance of trade was against us. The total balance against us for those years was $327,547,695, thereby taking that amount of money out of the circulation of the country.

The reason for this is obvious. Manufacturers, as Buchanan tells us, "were suspended," and as the result we had to buy our textile fabrics and our implements and utensils of iron also abroad, and not sending enough of our agricultural products, the only thing we had to sell, to equal our large purchases we were compelled to send this immense sum in gold to square the account.

Only for one thing this constant drain upon the gold of the country must have been disastrous in the extreme. That one thing was the discovery of gold in California in 1848, early in the era of free trade. From her mines came a supply, between 1850 and 1860, of $526,000,000, and this enabled us to meet this constant demand and avert wide-spread disaster.

Only for this, more serious still, not only to manufacturers but to every American industry, would have been the revenue tariff of 1846.

Now, over against this sum of $327,447,695 of coin which went out of the country in ten years under free trade, let us set the result for the last ten years, from 1876 to 1886. The balance was every year in our favor, and amounted to the grand total of $1,578,996,786.

This is an average of over $150,000,000 annually, and explains in part how the mismanagement of the present administration has allowed $140,000,000 to accumulate in the Treasury and yet work no serious disaster to business. To those who think our currency too restricted, let me say, here is a perfectly legitimate way of inflating it.

Continue to add $150,000,000 annually of foreign coin to our circulating media, as has been done for the last ten years under our protective system, and the present prosperity of the country will be continued also.

Not only is the balance of trade thus immensely in our favor, but the volume has been more than doubled.

From the foregoing it will be seen that the advantage to the United States in the matter of the foreign trade for the last ten years under the present protective system over that for the last ten years under the tariff of 1846 amounts to the immense sum of $1,905,654,491, for to the balance in our favor from 1876 to 1886 should be added the balance against us from 1850 to 1860. This is surely a startling conclusion, but it is inevitable from the figures themselves. Here they are, taken from the statistical abstract of 1886:

Value of merchandise imported into, and exported from, the United States; also annual excess of imports or of exports.—Specific values.

FROM 1850 TO 1860, INCLUSIVE.

Year ending—	Exports.	Imports.	Total exports and imports.	Excess of exports over imports.	Excess of imports over exports.
Sept. 30—					
1850	$144,375,726	$173,509,526	$317,885,252		$29,133,800
1851	188,915,259	210,771,429	399,686,688		21,856,170
1852	166,984,231	207,440,398	374,424,629		40,456,167
1853	203,489,282	263,777,265	467,266,547		60,287,983
1854	236,959,560	297,623,039	534,582,599		60,663,479
1855	218,909,503	257,808,708	476,718,211		38,899,205
1856	281,219,423	310,432,310	591,651,733		29,212,887
1857	293,823,760	348,428,342	642,252,102		54,604,582
1858	272,011,274	263,338,654	535,349,928	8,672,620	
1859	292,902,051	331,333,341	624,235,392		38,431,290
1860	333,576,057	353,616,119	687,192,176		20,040,062

FROM 1876 TO 1886.

1876	540,384,671	460,741,190	1,001,125,861	79,643,481	
1877	602,475,220	451,323,126	1,053,798,346	151,152,094	
1878	694,865,766	437,051,532	1,131,917,298	257,814,234	
1879	710,439,441	445,777,775	1,156,217,216	264,661,666	
1880	835,638,658	667,954,746	1,503,593,404	167,683,912	
1881	902,377,346	642,664,628	1,545,041,974	259,712,718	
1882	750,542,257	724,639,574	1,475,181,831	25,902,683	
1883	823,839,402	723,180,914	1,547,020,316	100,658,488	
1884	740,513,609	667,697,693	1,408,211,302	72,815,916	
1885	742,189,755	577,527,329	1,319,717,084	164,662,426	
1886	679,524,830	635,436,136	1,314,960,966	44,088,694	

INCREASE OF WEALTH GREATER FROM 1860 TO 1880 THAN DURING OUR WHOLE PREVIOUS EXISTENCE.

This comparative view is truly astonishing, but let us take another from a different standpoint. It has been said that increase of population is one of the surest indications of the general prosperity of a people. It certainly is of a town, city, or State, and why not of a nation? The Tenth Census discloses the remarkable fact that for the twenty years from 1860 to 1880 the increase of population was actually greater than for the thirty years previous. From 1830 to 1860 the gain was 18,547,301. From 1860 to 1880 it was 18,712,462, a difference of 165,161 in favor of the twenty years from 1860 to 1880, and remember this twenty years covers the whole period of the war, and that war always works a serious interruption to population, much beyond the number of deaths occasioned by it. Not only does this period outmatch all others in increase of population, but also in the development of industrial enterprises and the advance of values. Look into the census again and you will find that in 1860 the total value of our manufactures was $1,885,861,676. In 1880 the value was $5,369,579,191, an increase of $3,483,517,515. The census of 1830 does not show the value of manufactures, and in fact but little else besides population; but for the sake of the comparison we will not be limited to thirty years back of 1860, but will take the whole period of our previous history. The value in 1860 represents, of course, the whole gain in manufactures from our earliest colonization to that date; and yet the astonishing fact appears that the gain from 1860 to 1880 was nearly twice as much.

In agriculture the comparison is only a little less striking. In 1860 the estimated value of farms was $6,685,045,607. In 1880 it was $10,197,096,776, the gain in these twenty years being nearly as much as in our whole previous history.

The reason why the gain in farm values is not as great as in manu-

factures is because in a new country agriculture comes first and manufactures later. About the same gain as in farms is shown also in livestock. Take farm products. In 1860 we produced 173,104,924 bushels of wheat; in 1880, 459,483,137 bushels, a gain of 286,478,213 bushels; much larger than during our whole previous existence. In 1860 we harvested only 838,729,742 bushels of corn. In 1880 it was 1,754,591,676, a gain of 916,862,933; actually greater than during our whole previous existence.

Another fact should appear in this connection, and that is, that under the tariff of 1846, our export of breadstuffs, which it was claimed that tariff would particularly help, declined from $68,701,921, in 1847, to $24,472,310, in 1860; but under protection rose from that low figure to $228,036,835, in 1880.

Further comparative statistics could be given, all telling the same story, but one more must suffice. In 1860 our estimated aggregate national wealth was $16,159,616,063. In 1880 it was $43,642,000,000, a gain in these twenty years of $27,482,393,932, thereby showing that the American people under twenty years of protection made greater development in material wealth and greater acquisition of money and values than was made by them in their whole career previous to that time; and when the census for 1890 shall have been taken it will reveal for the present decade a corresponding development of every element of material greatness, and yet our Democratic tariff-reduction friends are sighing for what they call the "halcyon days" of the Republic, under the revenue tariff, of 1846. How strange it is that some people are never satisfied!

THE AMERICAN SYSTEM THE SECRET OF THIS GREAT PROSPERITY.

Now, who fails to see that under the present protective tariff the country has advanced in material growth as never before, and that every industry and every department of wealth has shared in the general prosperity? But gentlemen tell us that this period of great prosperity is not due to our financial policy, but to the enterprise of our people, to the fertility of our soil, the richness of our mines, and the inventive genius which has been stimulated by our patent laws. But was not the same soil, the same mineral wealth, the same patent laws, and the same sturdy Anglo-Saxon stock here before 1860 as since? The fact is, the inventive genius of the American people has received its chief stimulus from the interest created in manufactures as the result of protection, while the patent laws have only furnished the inventor the same protection in the benefits of his invention that the tariff does the American producer in the benefits of American markets. The invention belongs to the inventor and American markets to the American people, and both the inventor and the American people should be protected in what belongs to them. But still the marvelous thrift of the country in these twenty years and its wonderful financial record, absolutely without parallel in the history of the world, and made more notable still by the fact that during these twenty years at least 4,000,000 of our able-bodied workers were withdrawn for a period of four years from among producers, and not only became consumers of the national wealth, but distroyers of untold millions of property and values in a war the most stupendous and destructive in modern times, must in some way be accounted for.

And when the fact stands out in bold relief that notwithstanding this interruption of the war and the incalculable destruction of property on both sides, yet as an entire people, during the twenty years covering the war and all its losses, we actually made greater progress in every department of material greatness than during all the years of our previous existence, the inquiring mind wants to know the reason for it. We have seen that it is not because of our soil, or mines, or patent laws; but credit something to them if you will. Credit something to the improved means of intercourse on account of railways built; and something, also, to the great change in our Constitution which has made us a nation of freemen with no crouching slave in all the land. I say credit something to all these causes, if you will, but the political economist, the man of affairs will demand something more satisfactory; something that shall take a stronger hold upon the substance of things.

But tell him that during these twenty years in which such wonders were performed, the Government was without interruption under a high protective tariff such as was never known before in the history of the country, a tariff under which every American interest was carefully cared for; one in which American products had the benefit of American markets, thereby stimulating production of every kind, especially manufactures, and that as the result the money paid by our people for manufactured goods was paid to themselves and kept at home. Tell him how these manufactures attracted to them the surplus labor of the world; how they built up towns and cities, thereby creating an active home market for the products of the farm, upon which labor also found profitable employment, and better still, found homes; not a few, but millions.

Tell him, too, that, having supplied ourselves with our own manufactured goods and so not owing for them abroad, we have been able from our surplus productions sold to foreign countries to bring into our own circulation over $150,000,000 annually for the last ten years, thereby furnishing capital for new enterprises and new industries; for the building of railways and other public improvements. Tell him, also, that foreign merchandise, except articles not produced by us and so upon the free-list, has to pay before it can enter our markets about $228,000,000 annually now, formerly more, first for revenue, and then for the protection of our own merchandise against articles of the same kind produced by labor paid one-half as much as American labor receives, and he will see for one thing why the American workingman believes in the protective tariff, under which he is so well fed and clothed and housed; under which he has deposits in the savings-bank, and under which the greasy operative of the afternoon is the gentleman in slippers and wrapper by his own fireside in the evening. In short, tell the political economist that since 1860 the financial system of the Government has been what Henry Clay called the "American system;" one in which the American people have taken care of their own interests, and have let England and the rest of the world take care of theirs; and he will then understand how this policy carried us through the war, and has enabled us since January 1, 1866, to pay $1,452,527,701 of principal and more than $2,000,000,000 of interest on the public debt, thus reducing it more than one-half, while the debt of every other first-class power on the face of the earth is constantly increasing.

He will then understand why we are able to pay $80,000,000 annually in pensions, and for current expenditures about $160,000,000 more. In short, he will see why it is that we have been able to handle successfully these bewildering problems in finance and pay these vast sums of money, and at the same time make such mighty strides in the development of the national resources and in the creation of national wealth. It is simply because for those twenty years the national housekeeping was on the American plan, of protection to every American interest; and first of all that of keeping American markets for American products. Like the old housekeeper up in Vermont, we have not let everybody fry in our fat; and as the result we have had fat enough for American doughnuts all the time. [Applause.]

Who will say in view of this unexampled, this almost incredible prosperity of the country under the present protective system that it is not a good one? Who will say that as a national policy it is not a wise one? And who can be so wild as to desire its overthrow? In answer to these questions here are a few declarations from the other side of the Chamber, which, I think, explain the Democratic views and disclose the Democratic purpose in respect of the tariff.

DEMOCRATIC HOSTILITY TO PROTECTION.

The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL], in his speech the other day, said:

> Under the scheme of tariff taxation, however, private property is daily and hourly taken, not for public but for private uses, without any compensation and without any excuse or pretext, except such as excites the derision and contempt of every disinterested, unprejudiced man.
>
> This plan as it is now and has been for years administered in this country is a monstrous perversion of every just principle of taxation.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> But against the perversion of this power of taxation to the unholy and unhallowed scheme erroneously called "protection" I do complain, and shall endeavor to show its illegality and injustice, and, if I can, some of the hollow pretenses on which it is founded and has been so long maintained.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> In fact, protection is founded on injustice, and unless it produces inequality it fails of its purpose, deceives its friends, and belies its very existence.

The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER] said:

> I follow my party upon this great issue, the issue of the hour; and I have no right, sir, to look to any industry in your district or in my district or in the district of any other man in this country when the great fundamental question before the whole country is, whether or not the systematized plan of robbery and plunder which has been in existence so long shall be kept up against the rights of the whole American people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Shall we meet the issue, or shall we keep on plundering the people and pocketing the funds? I say the time is past for the discussion of questions of political economy. The people at large are now taking very little interest in abstract controversies upon free trade and protection. The thing that they demand is that the Government shall stop robbing them, and then they will argue the proposition whether the Government has the right to rob them.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> But, Mr. Chairman, I appeal to the Democracy here to stand true to their colors. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I appeal to them to stand up to the traditions of our party. A tariff for anything else than revenue is outside the traditions and principles of our party and at war with its pledges and history. It is foreign to our platform. We have given to the people the assurances of our intention to do this. Let us prove our faith by our works. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let us engrave upon the imperishable tablets of the law the truth of the doctrine we have proclaimed.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LANDES] considers it only a mild assault on protection.

He says:

> A tariff for protection is indeed a piece of *finesse* to persuade men into slavery. I have been taught that the interests of the few should be subservient to the interests of the many. But a tariff for protection has brought about a condition in which the millions own nothing and the few own millions. Millionaires are in "purple and fine linen," while the millions are in fluttering rags. This is the result of protection.
>
> * * * * * * * *
>
> The bill under consideration is a mild assault on this system of taxation. It proposes to so modify the law as to reduce the revenue to be raised under it about $54,000,000. If it had no other effect than to relieve the people annually of the burden of paying $54,000,000 unnecessarily into the Treasury, it would be a boon of great value, and every Republican on this floor would join us and pass the bill in an hour.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> Mr. Chairman, I have always been opposed to the protective system.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] said in the Forty-seventh Congress:

The first prejudice to be overcome is that so often answered. It is verbal. It relates to the phrase "free trade." "God save us," said an eminent man, "from the evil spirit and from metaphors!" It is idle to explain that freedom and trade in themselves, together or separately, are not obnoxious to any one. No one champions slavery and isolation. Free-traders have but one object: to be rid of that state of affairs which forbids nations to exchange with each other their various products, untrammeled by hostile and prohibitory tariffs. Free trade would remove hinderances. It would do it, while affording proper support, by custom dues, to the Government. All agree that if free trade were universal it would confer great blessings on mankind. It is therefore worth approximating to it, if we can not reach it. Our trade is only free as to exports; on our imports the exactions are laid, and as a consequence their prices are raised.

If, as I claim, free trade thus considered would achieve the greatest production at the least cost, who ought to complain? France, Germany, Russia, and the United States are the victims of the opposite idea, with what results as to population and wealth in comparison with Great Britain the statistics amply demonstrate. Free trade enables a country to obtain commodities which it can not produce at all, or at a disadvantage. It is the most productive employment of the forces of the world. It would have every country produce that which will bring the greatest quantity of commodities. The amount of our losses by protection is to be measured by the excess of the price at which commodities are produced over that at which they can be imported. This can be proved by bills of lading and the expenses and percentages until the consumer receives the article, through many media, from the producer abroad.

* * * * * * *

In 1880, at Cincinnati, the Democracy reaffirmed all the specifications of 1876. They are for revenue only. Upon this, whether my party fail or not, I stand.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH] said:

Mr. Chairman, if I properly understand the derivation of the word "tariff," its origin is not such as to commend it to the admiration of man. At Tarifa the Moors levied their duty and collected their customs from those whose ships, driven by adverse winds, were forced, in order to escape destruction at sea, to suffer robbery ashore. If, as has been charged, this "bantling" brought forth in secrecy and darkness, which has been carried into this House in the arms of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, is of unknown parentage, it can be said in its favor that it can not have so base an origin nor be of so foul an extraction as the robber-born idol which our protectionist friends on the other side of the House hug to their breasts and worship with a devotion like that which the sin-cursed Israelites fell down to and adored, the golden calf their hands had made.

This tariff is a most insidious enemy. It works in silence and under cover; and whilst it pretends to be giving us "protection" it is really stealing our substance and destroying our lives. It is not the highwayman who boldly gallops up on the public road and demands "your money or your life," but the sneak-thief who in an unconscious moment filches your purse, or the burglar who robs you of your possessions in sleep's unconscious hour.

* * * * * * *

I think it does not require a student of political economy to know that a "tariff" is a tax, and when we strip the question of the useless garments of show in which it is clad; when we take off the purple and the fine linen, the silks and the satins; when we strip it of the domino in which it has been masquerading there is seen the horrid features which we have been taught to tolerate only on the ground of necessity, but which we can never be taught to court or adore.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS], chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, said:

I repel it, sir; it is not American. It is the reverse of American. That policy is American which clings most closely to the fundamental idea that underlies our institutions and upon which the whole superstructure of our Government is erected, and that idea is freedom—freedom secured by the guaranties of government; freedom to think, to speak, to write; freedom to go where we please, select our own occupations; freedom to labor when we please and where we please; freedom to receive and enjoy all the results of our labor; freedom to sell our products, and freedom to buy the products of others, and freedom to markets for the products of our labor, without which the freedom of labor is restricted and denied. Freedom from restraints in working and marketing the products of our toil, except such as may be necessary in the interest of the Government.

* * * * * * *

We should lay taxes to obtain revenue, but not restrict importation.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MACDONALD] quotes approvingly this expression: "A high tariff is legalized robbery."

Speaker CARLISLE, in the Forty-seventh Congress, said:

If the gentleman means to ask whether I recognize a principle that would impose a duty above the revenue point merely for the purpose of giving what is called protection my answer is in the negative.

If we were called upon now for the first time to declare a principle or inaugurate a policy upon this subject I should not hesitate to announce my adherence to that creed which demands the largest liberty in law; that doctrine which opens the channels of commerce in all parts of the world, and invites the producer and consumer to meet on equal terms in a free market for the exchange of their commodities, for I sincerely believe that all commercial restrictions are in the end injurious to the interests of the people.

Another gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] said, in the same debate:

But I assert that a tariff for revenue is a tax, and I assert that a tariff for protection is pillage and robbery.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] denounced the present protective system as "iniquitous," and the President declares it to be "vicious, inequitable, and illogical." As one reads these unmeasured denunciations of the protective system the question naturally arises, how under such "vicious, inequitable, and illogical" laws could the country have been so prosperous? Surely this prosperity must be a fiction or these men be false prophets. There is, however, nothing new in these utterances. They but voice the traditional opposition of Democracy to the principle of protection, and only too plainly show how soon if left to itself it would go back to the husks of a revenue tariff. "Can the leopard change his spots or the Ethiopian his skin?" Why, in 1856 the National Democratic convention said:

The time has come for the people of these United States to declare themselves in favor of free seas and progressive free trade throughout the world.

In 1876 the platform contained this language:

We demand that all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue.

In 1880 the platform was "for a tariff for revenue only."

ANGLING FOR THE LABOR VOTE.

Now, this was square Democratic doctrine, but the American people notified the Democracy in these two last elections that it was not their doctrine. And in 1884 they threw this bait to the laboring men of America. They said:

The necessary reduction in taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country.

By this device they caught enough laboring men to put the Democratic party in power. And surely labor had a right to feel that when the reduction of taxation came, it would come in a way not to injure the man of toil. The declaration is plain:

The reduction in taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor.

And here, in passing, take notice that the Democratic party recognize that a difference exists between the wages of American and foreign labor. Hence no tables are necessary to prove it. But what of this pledge? How does this bill redeem it? Can the artisan and laborer be made to understand that a reduction of more than one-fourth the total, present amount of customs duties will in no way affect the price of his labor, when the products of foreign cheap labor can then come into our markets relieved from their present burden by that amount and at once go into competition with the products of his own labor? The inevitable result would be, first, to reduce American labor $54,000,000 annually, for every article of merchandise represents a certain amount of labor. Not only is there "no excellence without labor," but there is no value without labor. Everything which makes us comfortable in life, the food we eat, the clothes we wear, the houses in which we live, and the beds on which we sleep, are all the creation of labor, and their value depends upon the amount of labor necessary to produce them.

Now, remember that the cost of ocean freight is but a trifle, especially on vessels in ballast, and when any of these commodities or any part of them produced by the cheap labor of Europe are put into our markets in competition with the products of American labor, relieved of $54,000,000 duties which they now have to pay, does American labor fail to see that it must be reduced that amount to meet this changed condition? Surely this, or the American manufacturer must shut down altogether and leave labor with no employment. I say this will inevitably be the first result, and it will be immediate; and the second stage will be worse than the first.

Our markets thus thrown open will be glutted with foreign products, and there will no longer be a ready American market for American goods, which, as the only alternative, must go abroad "into the markets of the world," as gentlemen sonorously tell us, and there be sold, of course, at the price of the pauper-made products of Europe; and to meet this situation, there must be a further reduction of American wages, even to the European standard. But this the American laborer would never consent to. Labor disturbances would follow, and manufacturing establishments would be broken up and sold under the hammer, as under the tariff of 1846. We should, in short, find ourselves struggling in the mire of free trade, with a constant stream of gold going out of the country to pay for our purchases of manufactured goods "in the markets of the world."

HOSTILITY OF THE BILL TO AGRICULTURE AND LABOR.

This bill is a direct attack upon the nobility of labor, which the present tariff recognizes and protects. It is a clean departure in favor of free trade, which can never become successful as an American policy except by the degradation of American labor, and not of the wage-earner alone, but of all who win their bread by daily toil, and of none more than of him who toils in the field beneath a burning sun—I mean the hard-working, poorly-paid farmer, who feeds and clothes us all. The advocates of this bill tell us that the farmer is least protected of all under the present law; that he deserves better treatment, and yet, strange enough, the bill takes away a large share of the protection he now has. It puts more than thirty articles, the product of agriculture, on the free-list, beginning with wool. Now, that free wool would occasion a great loss to the farmers of the country does not require proof. It is self-evident. The amount, however, is not generally understood. One writer estimates it at $355,000,000, giving great prominence to depreciation in the value of lands now devoted to sheep husbandry, and adapted to but little else. Here would undoubtedly be a great loss, for the industry would be practically destroyed.

This is shown by the slight reduction in the tariff on wool in 1883, since which the number of sheep has fallen from 50,626,626 in 1884 to 44,759,314 in 1887. There would also be a great loss in the reduced

sales of fat sheep. But these items are somewhat uncertain, only in amount, however, for it is certain they would exist in some degree. But there are two items capable of quite close estimation. One is the depreciation in the value of sheep now on hand, which could not be less than 50 cents per head, and would amount to $22,379,657. The other is for decreased price of wool, which at 10 cents per pound on 350,000,000 pounds, the annual product, would amount to $35,000,000.

Now, saying nothing of the other large losses, here is the snug sum of $57,376,657 out of the farmers' pockets at once, and the same amount annually thereafter. But the mischief would not stop here. The number of sheep would be speedily reduced. If the slight tariff reduction of 1883 reduced the number of sheep 6,000,000 in three years and raised the quantity of imported wool from 78,000,000 pounds in 1884 to 114,000,000 pounds in 1887, what would be the result of free wool? The average last year's price was 22 cents per pound. The immediate result, if this bill were law, would be to reduce the price 10 cents, which would leave the farmer but 12 cents per pound; and all for the sake of giving the American people a chance to buy wool in "the markets of the world."

For a time they would get it cheaper, but when the American farmer, discouraged and broken down, ceases to produce wool, how easy for a syndicate to raise the price, even above the present figure. Then we would have dear wool and dear mutton; but the American farmer would have neither to sell. Nor is this all.

Instead of the $77,000,000 now paid American farmers for the annual American wool-clip, that amount would go out of the country every year into the free-traders' paradise, "the markets of the world." Thus do we see how free wool would affect unfavorably the general prosperity of the country, but most of all the American farmer; and what does this bill propose to give him in place of the wool industry and the profit of it? It proposes to give him

FREE SALT

There is now a duty on coarse salt of 8 cents per 100 pounds, or $1.60 per ton. The farmer, if a large one, may use 500 pounds, and here would be a saving of 40 cents. The duty on fine salt, used for dairying purposes, is 12 cents per 100 pounds. One pound of salt is usually added to 16 pounds of butter, so the duty on the salt in one pound is one-sixteenth of a cent. If the farmer makes a ton of butter he will use 125 pounds of salt, on which the duty would be 7$\frac{3}{4}$ cents. So the farmer would save on his salt the princely sum of 47$\frac{1}{2}$ cents annually.

PRESIDENTIAL PHILOSOPHY.

But, say the free-traders, under this bill he will get cheaper clothing; and the President, in his message, solemnly tells the American Congress that the farmer who has a flock of fifty sheep which yield 300 pounds of wool on which the duty, if of the best quality, would be $36—this is the President's sum—when he comes to "clothe himself and family for the winter finds more than this tariff profit, swept away as the result of the tariff scheme."

The total annual consumption of wool in the United States for all purposes does not average quite 7 pounds per capita; and if the duty at 12 cents per pound be added to the price it would make 84 cents for each person; and if to that amount be added as much more per pound as duty on the manufactured article, it would make $1.68 tax for each person. At this rate $36 would furnish on an average of our whole population 20 persons with woolen goods of every description, including blankets and everything, for a full year.

But here is the statement of the President, and it can only be accounted for in this way, that when he made that point he had in his eye a very large family. He must have been thinking of a Mormon family. This is rather more than an average free-trade argument, but I expect will not serve to "pull the wool over the eyes" of the American farmer who reads the papers, and, though not given to much talking will tell you next November what he thinks about free wool and "the markets of the world." [Applause.]

FURTHER HOSTILITY TO THE FARMER.

I wish I had time to show still further in detail the hostility of this bill to the great industry of agriculture. How it not only takes away present protection, but fails to make any provision in cases where increased protection ought to be given. Take barley for instance. Last year there were imported into this country 10,000,000 bushels, which Americans ought themselves to have produced. But this bill does not raise the duty on barley to 20 cents per bushel as it ought. In four days in January last, at the port of New York, 149,000 bushels of potatoes were landed from foreign countries. But this bill instead of raising the duty from 15 to 25 cents per bushel, under the head of vegetables, puts potatoes on the free-list. During the last fiscal year about 1,000,000 bushels of beans and peas and 18,000,000 dozens eggs were imported. On all these articles and many others the duties ought to be increased, and thus give protection to the very best representative of American labor, the farmer.

But instead of this the bill opens our markets to foreign agricultural products, on which as entered from Canada alone $1,800,193 duties were paid last year, thereby compelling the American farmer to compete in his own markets with the products of Canadian labor, which is from one fourth to one-third less than in the United States. And this is the way the Democratic party is taking care of the American farmer! This is the way it is taking care of labor and redeeming its pledge that—

Reduction of taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete with foreign labor.

Some one may want to know how the Democratic party came by this Republican doctrine in its platform of 1884. It was borrowed by it to meet the emergencies of the last campaign; but, being found inconsistent with free-trade philosophy, it has been allowed to fall into "innocuous desuetude." The nobility and dignity of labor always has been and is now the battle-cry of the Republican party.

This side of the House claim that taxation "can and must be reduced" in a way not to affect unfavorably American labor or any other American interest. In the beginning of these remarks I indicated a plan for doing this, and will now outline another, upon the ground that the Democratic party will not consent to the appropriations already spoken of.

WHICH SYSTEM SHALL GO?

First, then, we now have two distinct systems of taxation, two sets of officials, and two distinct sources of revenue. One system is by duties on imports, from which we receive about $228,000,000 annually. The other is by an excise tax on alcoholic and fermented liquors and tobacco, from which we collect about $118,000,000 annually. To collect the internal revenue it takes nearly four thousand persons at a cost of $4,065,148.87 in 1887. About the same number are employed in collecting customs duties and at about the same expense.

Now, the economical business man will at once say, unless impracticable, one or the other of these distinct systems should be abolished and one or the other of these vast armies of officials should be disbanded. The only question is, which shall it be?

Gentlemen give as a reason for reducing present tariff duties that they are a war tax. They are only so in degree, for customs duties have been laid since the foundation of the Government. The First Congress, on July 4, 1789, passed—

An act for laying duties on goods, wares, and merchandise.

The preamble of that act was as follows:

Whereas it is necessary for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement and protection of manufactures that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported.

Now, in passing, let me ask my free-trade friends to notice that here is a declaration by the fathers in favor of a protective tariff which they now denounce as "pillage and robbery."

Washington approved that bill, and Madison and many others who framed the Constitution were members. This was an act worthy of Independence day. It announced a principle, the principle of protection, which shall be as imperishable in the American system as the Declaration of Independence itself. Thus early was custom-house taxation established, and it has been the settled policy of the Government since. No one pretends, not even the free-trader, that this system can be wholly dispensed with. If, in this day of peace, war taxes should be reduced, as they should, then, first of all, reduction should be made of excise taxes, for they are in every sense war taxes.

THE INTERNAL-REVENUE SYSTEM TEMPORARY.

The creation of the present internal-revenue system was a war measure to meet the extraordinary demands of the Government for money, and was understood at the time to be temporary in character, precisely as was the internal-revenue act passed to meet the emergencies of the war of 1812, and that also of 1792, to meet the unpaid expenses of the Revolutionary war. Neither of these old acts were retained a moment longer than the necessity lasted. So should we now hold to the same policy of treating the present internal-revenue system as temporary, and as rapidly as possible dispense with it, and return to productive employment the four thousand men who now feed at the "public crib," and thus save in the expenses of the Government $1,000,000 annually.

This would be conducting the Government on business principles. But to the question of reduction, we must cut off from present revenues $60,000,000. I have already given some reasons for the repeal of the tobacco tax, and others might be given, the principle of which is that it is a home product and consequently a direct tax upon one of our industries. This is $30,000,000 and would reduce the internal revenue force about one-third, and the expense of it probably over $1,000,000 annually.

But what of the other $30,000,000? The tax on distilled spirits and fermented liquors was $87,509,200 in 1887. If this tax were only about $30,000,000 I would make the reduction here.

THE WHISKY RING.

"What," says some one, "take the tax off from whisky?" "Yes." "And have free whisky?" "No; I would have prohibition." But why take the tax off from whisky? Because it has produced a powerful combination, known as the "whisky ring," which has done and is doing more to debauch public sentiment and corrupt political action than all other causes combined. This ring makes enormous profits out of the business, which are prostituted to the worst of purposes. It has a way of strangling temperance and other wholesome legislation, not only here at the national capital, but in the States where it is most

powerful. The report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue shows 969 distilleries in operation, which produced, in 1887, 75,974,376 gallons of whisky. This would be an average of 78,404 gallons to each distillery. It is susceptible of perfect demonstration that at least $1 profit is made on each gallon by the distiller. This would give each one $78,404 net profit on an average—some more and some less. This amount of money makes the "whisky baron" capable of much good or evil. On each gallon of whisky the distiller pays to the Government a tax of 90 cents, but not when it is made nor on the amount then made. It is first put into a bonded warehouse owned by the Government, and kept three years at the expense of the Government, guarded by Government officers; and on every barrel of 40 gallons 7½ gallons are deducted for leakage, whether there is any in fact or not, and on the balance, then ripe and mellow for the market, the tax is paid, but not if in the mean time the whisky is destroyed by fire or other casualty. In that case the tax is wholly remitted. All these privileges have been granted at the dictation of the "whisky ring," which has its sentinels on constant duty here at the Capitol to see that no harm comes to its interests. I would have this tax repealed at the first practicable moment, because I do not believe the American people can afford to remain in copartnership with these 969 "whisky barons" in this nefarious business and divide the profits by taking 90 cents as often as the "barons" take $1. The terms is not the point of my objection; it is the character of the business. I am for its repeal, also, because of its neutralizing effect upon prohibitory laws in prohibition States, by granting in these States licenses; thus giving moral support, in fact legal sanction, to license as against prohibition. This is illustrated by the fact that in the State of Vermont, a prohibition State, the United States has 498 licensed retail dealers in spirituous and fermented liquors, and nine wholesale dealers, and collects from them a revenue of $13,150 annually. The effect of this can not be otherwise than demoralizing upon local prohibitory legislation. For these reasons and others that might be given I can not look with favor upon the whisky tax or any part of it, and can tolerate it only so long as absolutely necessary.

But it is suggested by some that this tax on whisky makes it so expensive that less is drank, and to some extent this may be true. It is also apparent that we can not now spare from our revenues the whole of this $87,000,000, and to cut off the necessary $30,000,000 would neither reduce the expense of the system nor mitigate its evils. When touched at all it should be torn up root and branch, and public opinion should be educated up to this point as against the time when it can be done. The fact, also, that whisky is a luxury, and as such a proper object of taxation, naturally raises the question, whether this reduction can not be made on some of the necessaries of life? And this leads up to the sugar question.

THE SUGAR QUESTION.

In 1887 we imported 2,377,729,920 pounds of sugar and 36,817,636 gallons of molasses, which cost us $74,242,279.20. On this we paid $58,016,686.37 duties.

Here is an instance where it is fair to say that to the consumer the duty is added to the cost of the article, for the reason that there is not sufficient production of sugar in the United States to reduce the price, our product in 1887 having been 269,533,920 pounds of sugar and 21,508,734 gallons of molasses.

If to the cost of this importation the duty be added, it presents the sum of $122,258,965.54, which the people of the United States paid for foreign sugars in 1887. The Government does not need that portion of this sum paid into the Treasury, and, if possible without injury to the sugar industry, the people should be relieved of this heavy tax on a food product.

But worse still for the American people is the fact that we send $74,242,279.20 every year out of the country for sugar when we ought to produce every pound ourselves. The development of this industry has been very slow, although all the time protected by a high duty. But the truth is the plant for the manufacture of sugar from cane or sorghum or beets is very expensive. The American people have paid during the last ten years almost $500,000,000 duties on this necessary article of food; and though sugar is quite cheap, because of greatly increased production in France and Germany, yet they justly complain of this heavy tax. And I declare that it is the only duty through the whole tariff schedule of which the people have any right to complain or of which they do in fact complain. Now what shall be done? Shall the duty be removed and the industry be abandoned? I say no; the industry must not be abandoned. It was said on this floor the other day that sugar voted the Democratic ticket. I am sorry for that, it ought to know better; but must be protected just the same. Louisiana has 3,000,000, acres of land suited to cane growing, but now has only 100,000 under cultivation for that crop. Sugar from sorghum is being profitably produced in New Jersey and Kansas, and there are millions of acres in these States and others adapted to the growth of sorghum.

In California the Alvarado Company has already turned out 6,884,336 pounds of refined sugar from the beet at a fair profit, and other similar enterprises are in contemplation in that State, and only await the action of Congress on the tariff. We seem to be on the very point of rapidly advancing to the production of our own sugar. The prospect is indeed flattering, and such as to inspire courage to try the effect, for a season, of more vigorous protection still. The value of American sugar in 1887 was $16,172,834.20. This is an item not to be despised. Yes, the sugar industry must be protected. The question is, how shall it be done with the least possible burden upon the people? And here may it not be possible to learn something from the history of the sugar industry in France and Germany? The discovery of the process of making sugar from the beet was in the time of Napoleon I. The story is an interesting one, but too long to be given here. Its growth from the first was stimulated by heavy bounties. In 1830 4,000 tons only were made, but under liberal bounties its product was doubled every ten years, reaching 448,300 tons in 1886. The bounty now paid is 2 cents per pound on exports, and imports are prohibited. Along with the production of sugar went also the culture of wheat and the fattening of cattle.

In 1870, when Louis Napoleon visited the fair at Valenciennes, a triumphial arch was erected with this incription:

SUGAR MANUFACTURE.

Napoleon I, who created it.	*Napoleon III, who protected it.*
Before the manufacture of beet sugar the arrondissement of Valenciennes produced 695,750 bushels of wheat and fattened 700 oxen.	Since the manufacture of beet sugar was introduced the arrondissement of Valenciennes produces 1,157,750 bushels of wheat and fattens 11,500 oxen.

In Germany under similar bounties and the prohibition of imports the product rose from 346,664 tons in 1875 to 997,962 tons in 1886. But, says some one, bounties are un-American, and the practice of granting special protection in this way must not be entered upon. I must admit that I share this prejudice against granting bounties out of the Treasury, and believe that as a rule all necessary protection can be given in the simplest and best way by duties on imports. But there are exceptions to all rules. Indeed, it has been said that the exceptions are the best proof of the rule.

The sugar question is exceptional in many particulars. It is exceptional in the large amount of sugar imported; in the great total of duties paid upon importations; in the great expense of the plant for its manufacture; and in the failure of the present duty to stimulate production; and it is the province of real wisdom to recognize these facts and act accordingly. I would consent to bounties only in exceptional cases and to serve a temporary purpose, and not as a permanent policy.

PLAN OF REDUCTION.

Now then, I would dispose of the sugar question and with it the surplus, by taking $25,000,000 off the duties on sugar, and would pay out of the Treasury a bounty of 2 cents per pound on the production of all domestic sugars in quantities not less than 100 pounds, which would amount to about $5,000,000. This, added to the $25,000,000 taken off would reduce the revenues $30,000,000, and would save to the American people $20,000,000 in the price of sugar.

It would give sugar considerably more protection than it now enjoys, and ought to give the industry a start. This bounty could be paid through the present internal revenue bureau without additional expense, and, if granted, I predict it would so stimulate production that within five years we should produce every pound we consume and have sugar to sell. Then, with the industry once established, this bounty could be withdrawn and suitable protection given by customs duties without the present heavy burden upon the people, for then our importations, if any, would be light. Meanwhile I should hope public opinion would gradually, but surely, crystallize into a demand for the overthrow of the "whisky ring" by the repeal of the whisky tax, and we could then return to the settled peace policy of the Government, by raising revenue from customs duties only; and this is how I would reduce taxation and at the same time protect every American interest.

VERMONT AND KENTUCKY.

And here, just a word before I sit down, in reply to my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky, Governor MCCREARY, who, to show the good standing of his State, compared her to the little State which I have the honor in part to represent. How so large a boy as Kentucky could expect any very great credit by pitching into such a little fellow as Vermont I could not then understand and shall have still to leave to the gentleman from Kentucky to decide for himself. The point he made was that Vermont came a little first into the Union, had been a protection State, and now had but two members on this floor, while Kentucky had eleven. And hence, if Kentucky had been a laggard, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Judge KELLEY, charged, Vermont was another, and a worse one.

To begin with, let me say, as accounting in part for Kentucky's superior numbers in this body, that it will be seen that with less than five times the population of Vermont she has one more than five times the members. This is because Vermont has a large unrepresented remnant, while the remnants of Kentucky are all here. The question raised by the gentleman as to the comparative standing of these two States can not be confined to area and population alone. If that were all, it would be disposed of by saying: Behold! Forty thousand square miles is more than 9,135, and 1,648,690 population is a greater number than 332,268. This in itself would carry but little information. The real question is, according to her area and population, is Kentucky more or less of a

State than Vermont? Certain figures from the Tenth Census are full of instruction on this point. They may be found in the subjoined table.

From them it appears, among other things, that with four and one-third times the area of Vermont, Kentucky has only three and one-half times as many acres of farm lands, which are worth only two and eight-tenths times as much. In other words, Vermont farm lands are valued at $33 per acre, while Kentucky farm lands are valued at only $27 per acre. It also appears that Vermont is greater, not relatively, but actually greater in grass than this blue-grass State of Kentucky, for in 1880 she cut five times as many tons of hay, and considering the great fame of the blue-grass lands of Kentucky, this ought to speak fairly well for the hillsides of Vermont.

Not only is Vermont ahead in grass, but she is a long way ahead in the production per acre of corn, wheat, and oats. The average, as shown from the ten years from 1876 to 1886, is as follows:

1880.	Vermont.	Kentucky.
Bushels of wheat per acre	14.8	9.6
Average home price per bushel	$1.10	.72
Average value per acre	$20.91	8.03
Bushels of corn per acre	35.5	26.7
Average home price per bushel	.66	.34
Average value per acre	$21.66	$8.58
Bushels of oats per acre	34.5	20.2
Average home price per bushel	.37	.32
Average value per acre	13.34	6.72

In passing, let us hastily draw one or two conclusions from these figures: Moral No. 1 is that Kentucky and every other free-trade State should profit by this better style of farming in a State where the people believe in protection. That they should develop their resources and create for themselves home markets for the sale of their agricultural products. Moral No. 2 is that Vermont farmers should understand that they are doing better than is done in States the fame of which is far greater; that they have a right to be proud of Vermont, and, to save her from the reproach of a small delegation in Congress, should stick by her and help swell her population.

Mr. McCREARY. Will the gentleman from Vermont allow me——

Mr. GROUT. I can not yield, because my time has almost expired, but will listen to a question.

Mr. McCREARY. I wanted to make a single statement in justice to myself. On the 1st of May I was replying to the speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]——

Mr. GROUT. I can not yield to the gentleman to interject a speech into mine, but will yield for a question.

Mr. McCREARY. Will the gentleman inform me whether you have any public fund for education in Vermont, and whether you have any institution for the deaf and dumb? I assert you have none.

Mr. GROUT. I can not yield, but will say Vermont has a school fund, but needs no institution for the deaf and dumb. Her people all talk and frequently hear more than they want to.

Mr. McCREARY. Or whether you had an insane asylum in Vermont until 1836?

Mr. GROUT. There is no better asylum for the insane any where in the United States than at Brattleboro, Vt. It has patrons from all over the country, and I presume some are there from Kentucky. It would be a good place for free-traders.

Mr. McCREARY. I want to ask the gentleman from Vermont one more question.

Mr. GROUT. Very well; I yield for a single question.

Mr. McCREARY. If the population of Vermont at the beginning of the century was 152,000 and that of Kentucky 158,000, and if now the population of Vermont is 332,000 and that of Kenuckty 1,648,000, do you not concede that those figures show greater progress in Kentucky than Vermont?

Mr. GROUT. It shows, perhaps, that the people are more prolific in Kentucky, though I am hardly willing to admit that. The true ground, aside from area, on which to account for this difference in population is that large numbers of our people go West. We have, in fact, a larger population outside of Vermont than in it, and I have constituents all over the West. Only yesterday I was called on by two gentlemen, one a Vermonter in Illinois, another in Wisconsin, who, though strangers to me, have not lost their interest in Vermont.

Mr. McCREARY. I want to ask the gentleman from Vermont a very short question. It is this: Does not protection reach Kentucky as well as Vermont?

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Vermont has expired.

Mr. GROUT. I want only a few minutes more, and will then answer any questions.

Mr. McCREARY. I ask that the gentleman have additional time.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCREARY. Now, if the gentleman will permit me to repeat my question, I ask him if that protection he speaks of, and which he says has done so much for Vermont, does not prevail in Kentucky and all over the United States?

Mr. GROUT. Certainly, only you do not believe in it; do not improve your opportunities. But I am only giving you facts and figures, and on your own ground, too, for you said Vermont had all the time been a protection State, but was behind. All I have to say is that these figures show what a people who believe in protection and practice its economy can do.

Mr. McCREARY. But we believe we have prospered so well with protection that without the robbery which protection brings we would be more prosperous. But I deny that your figures and comparisons are correct.

Mr. GROUT. The figures are taken from the Tenth Census. Those relating to the relative corn, wheat, and oat crop came from the Agricultural Department, and those relating to the late war from the War Department There is no escape from the figures.

Another noticeable thing in the table below is, that though Kentucky has instead of one and one-half times as many, say, almost twice as many, milch cows, yet Vermont actually makes the most butter and cheese—one and a half times as much butter and twenty-seven times as much cheese. In Vermont 115 pounds of butter are made from each cow, in Kentucky 60 pounds. This shows the difference between a people who believe in protection and one that believes in free trade. As explaining this in part, the table shows that Kentucky has one hundred and ninety-five dealers in oleomargarine, while Vermont has none.

Instead of stripping her cows and making butter and cheese, Kentucky eats oleomargarine and grows eloquent over "the markets of the world." [Laughter.]

Not only do Vermont fields wave with grass and grain and the cows give down their milk in that protection State, but the sheep also know their friends, and yield 5¾ pounds per head of wool in Vermont, but only 4 pounds per head in Kentucky, whose statesmen think the place for wool is on the free-list. Thus far Vermont is ahead, but candor compels me to admit that there are three things in which Kentucky takes the lead, namely: illiterates, saloons, and mules and asses. [Laughter.]

Vermont's per cent. of illiterates is 8.68; Kentucky's, 36.79. In Vermont there is one saloon for every 667 population; in Kentucky one for every 445. Vermont has 283 mules and asses; Kentucky, 116,153. [Laughter and applause.]

These figures also show that with one-fifth the population Vermont has more than one-half the capital in manufactures. And yet she is an inland, mountain State, with neither coal nor iron. Give her the one-hundredth part of the coal and iron of Kentucky and she would show what could be done with it. Think of it! Ten thousand square miles in one coal field. A larger area than all Vermont, and 4,000 in another. This ought to make Kentucky mistress of the Southwest. Some one has said that coal is empire, and on this formula, that coal is heat, heat is power, and power is empire. Let but Kentucky set herself about the development of her iron and coal and the creation of home markets for the sale of her agricultural products, and a more than regal crown awaits her in the day of her industrial activity, now near at hand. Indeed, the light is already breaking on her hilltops and she is stirring herself for the morning. She already has three Republican members on this floor who are staunch believers in the doctrine of protection as taught by that great Kentuckian, Henry Clay, and the returns are still coming in. [Applause.] Another thing shown by this table is that the per capita wealth is $270 in Vermont and only $213 in Kentucky.

Thus far do these comparative figures show for Vermont superior results and superior quality, and quality is often a far better test of merit than quantity. These figures, however, only relate to the material side of things.

But attention might be called to other fields, in which Vermont would not suffer in comparison with Kentucky. Take, for instance, the other end of the Capitol, where the little State of Vermont, in the persons of her Senators, is at the head of the two great committees of the Senate. The one, Finance, presided over by the distinguished author of the Morrill tariff, by which his name has become imperishably set in history, and who, full of years and full of honors, can look back through a third of a century of honorable service at this Capitol, the last twenty-seven years of which, under the tariff of his name, presents the very brightest chapter in all our history. The other, the Judiciary, first in importance in that judicial body, presided over by the first lawyer in this great country, whose great ability, great learning, and great good sense easily make him the admitted chief, the noblest Roman of them all. So much for Vermont in the United States Senate. In a scale of one hundred Vermont claims 100 points. How many does Kentucky claim? Here again the test is one of quality, not of quantity.

Mention might also be made of another great Vermont lawyer, whose great name so recently brought him dangerously close to the highest judicial honor in the land. And the only hope of Vermont is that the one selected may bring to that high seat the learning and culture and judicial sense which so distinguishes the gifted Vermonter, whose only fault is that he is a Democrat. But the motto of Vermont is to do even

a bad job well, and so she turns out first-class Democrats, and the minister at the court of St. James is first of his class. [Applause.] If not going back too far, I would give the gentleman from Kentucky the name of Ethan Allen, whose statue Vermont has placed in Memorial Hall, and who, with a handful of Vermonters, to the surprise of military men the world over as to how it could have been done, as well as to the garrison, captured from the British, in 1775, Fort Ticonderoga, demanding its surrender in the darkness of night by the light of a burning taper "in the name of the great Jehovah and the Continental Congress."

Here again it was quality and not quantity. I would also give him the name of Stannard, who, with his brigade of Green Mountain boys, in the very nick of time fell upon the flank of Pickett's charging column at Gettysburgh and turned the tide of that great and decisive battle in the late terrible struggle for the preservation of the Union, over the blessings of which all tongues are now eloquent. [Applause.] Let me also here call attention to another fact, namely, that in that bloody contest for the supremacy of the old flag, Vermont laid upon the altar of her country a larger sacrifice than any other State of those killed in action, which is the supreme test of devotion in that supreme moment when battles are lost or won. In other words, the per cent. of her troops killed in action was greater than that of any other State. The per cent. between Vermont and Kentucky is as follows: Vermont had one killed for every thirty-two and two-thirds men in the service; Kentucky had one killed for every fifty-four men in service. But this estimate includes colored troops. If white troops alone are taken Kentucky's per cent. would be one for every thirty-seven, which leaves Vermont four and one-third points ahead. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to pursue this comparison further, and will leave with my friend, the gentleman from Kentucky, who is a good judge of facts and figures, to say whether he thinks Vermont is, after all, very much behind Kentucky. [Applause.]

1880.	Vermont.	Kentucky.
Population	332,286	1,648,690
Square miles	9,135	40,000
Assessed valuation	$86,806,775	$350,563,971
Acres of land in farms	3,286,461	10,731,683
Farm values	$109,336,010	$299,298,631
Value of farm implements	$4,879,285	$9,734,654
Tons of hay	1,051,183	218,739
Milch cows	217,033	301,882
Pounds of butter	25,240,826	18,211,904
Pounds of butter per cow	115	60
Pounds of cheese	1,545,789	58,468
Sheep	438,870	1,000,269
Wool	2,551,113	4,592,576
Capital in manufactures	$23,265,224	$45,813,039
Illiterates	28.674	607,578
Per cent	8.68	36.79
Saloons	498	3,702
Number of population to each saloon	667	445
Mules and asses	283	116,153
Number of men in late war:		
White	33,168	52,057
Colored	120	23,703
Total	33,288	75,760
Number killed in action	997	1,390
Number of men to each one killed:		
White	32¼	37
White and colored	32¼	54

Mr. SEYMOUR. Mr. Chairman, protection with us is in a large sense a political term. When the colonies organized themselves into a government, the fundamental idea upon which such organization was based was stated to be the protection of life, liberty, and property. When the Constitution was framed the means provided for its maintenance was through the collection of taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and to provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States, with which was added the clause to regulate commerce with foreign nations. In the practical collection of duties was embraced the principle of so adjusting them as to afford protection to agricultural and manufacturing interests. On January 11, 1790, George Washington, in a speech to Congress, declared that—

> The safety and interests of a free people require that Congress should promote such manufactures as tend to render them independent of others for essential, particularly military, supplies. The advancement of agriculture, commerce, and manufactures will not, I trust, need recommendation.

The preamble of the first tariff bill declared that it was for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and encouragement and protection of manufactures. The principle of protection was deduced from the Constitution, approved by the fathers and embraced in the legislation of the First Congress, alternately increased and diminished of its protective character until 1861, when the bill known as the Morrill act was adopted, and became thereafter, with modifications, the fixed policy of the Government. Until the passage of the Morrill bill the tariff legislation of the country was so uncertain in its continuance, and so often the foot-ball of parties, marked by a lack of steadiness essential to the establishment and development of great industries, that capital, timid and cautious, would not largely hazard in uncertain profits its own loss.

The Morrill bill was the result of the nation's judgment and necessities released from the opposition of the representatives of those who, living under a system of forced labor, were not interested in the protection of free labor. In the Southern section cotton was king; not cotton manufactured, not cotton using skilled labor to make it into articles of apparel and use, but cotton unmanufactured, requiring only the crudest, most unskilled, and uneducated labor to place it in the market where skilled, educated, and free labor should weave and work it. The climatic condition of the South was favorable to the cultivation and growth of cotton, and with forced labor prevented by law from education, with a market demanding its entire production, with its own supply limited by the simple increase of its forced laborers, it needed none if any protection, and was restive under the restraint of a protective policy which the interest of free labor was continually demanding of representatives in the American Congress. Subsequently given a fair experiment through the exigencies of war, nursed by a growing favorable sentiment and practical results, the protective system succeeding a depleted Treasury, and kept in operation through phenomenal governmental expenditures until an extraordinary credit, based upon growth and prosperity, had funded at low interest our unpaid debt, so that when the party inaugurating the system had transferred the Government to its successor, one of the first questions presenting itself to the incoming administration as propounded by it was, what shall we do with the surplus?

True to the instincts of an earlier policy, the leader of the party and Executive of the nation proposed to impair by repeal and unnecessary reduction the very system which caused the surplus. Other methods were suggested, other means could be employed to reduce the revenue within the limits of governmental expenditure without destroying the principle through which prosperity had come. Whatever inequality existed might be corrected without impairing its vitality and a sufficient reduction effected by removing burdens of taxation which are individually burdensome and universally borne as measures almost entirely of revenue. The misleading statement that a duty is a tax under all circumstances and conditions is the sophistry by which revenue reform through tariff reduction and repeal is sought to be effected. The customs duty is a barrier against the introduction and sale of foreign merchandise or products within the limits of the territory where the duty is operative. The foreign manufacturer or producer is thus compelled to add the amount of duty to the cost, including his profits, in order to sell his merchandise or products within the protected territory.

The home manufacturer or producer adds to the cost of manufacture or production his profit, and through this addition fixes his price. If the price of the foreign seller is below that of the home seller, then the latter must reduce or omit a profit in order to compete with the former. Naturally if the home seller by a small profit can drive the foreign seller from the market he will pursue this course, and by larger sales equal or increase the sum of his profit. By large sales and increased production the manufacturer or producer will decrease the cost of making or producing, and so it comes to pass that invention enters as a factor, constructs improved machinery, business becomes divided by competition and increased production within the home market, so that cost and price fall below the lowest amount which the article or product could be purchased in the outside market when the duty was laid. The best improved machinery constructed by the foreign and home manufacturer comes to be used by both, and the outside and inside price of each is decreased and oftentimes equalized irrespective of duty.

The duty acts as a barrier in times of depression, preventing the home market from being glutted with auction or bankrupt goods. It thus serves to steady prices and prevents foreign syndicates or trusts from depressing prices below the cost of manufacturing or production in any country, and through such depression in the home market ruin home manufactures, with the expectation of occupying or controlling such market in the future at increased prices. Syndicates and trusts may and do operate as well in a free-trade country as in a protected one. They are not of American origin. They are as old as the history of trade and commerce, and though existing by different names or in different forms, the effect of control, increase of price, or agrandizement is the same. It is a system of profiting without labor, excepting so much as is needed to operate on the necessities, hopes or fears of men; it bore its fruit under the feudal system; it lives beneath the favor of absolutism. Its aggregated wealth seeks out and fattens upon the needs of communities or individuals. It can divine and anticipate a famine or a panic with the keen scent of an expert. Familiar with statistics, it corners a short supply and anticipates an active demand by making the supply shorter. In a country exporting annually over a hundred million bushels of wheat it purchases the surplus and works the hog product in the market for all it is worth. Organizations and unions seek to control capital and labor in free-trade as well as protection countries. Larger profits and less or little capital, less hours and greater pay is the watchword of all in free-trade as well as in protection states. Each taking its own risk, making its own profit,

or suffering its own loss, ultimately, through the leveling process of experience, arrive at the common-sense principle of fair equivalents. Behind the ægis of protection small interests are built up, until demand makes them large, cheapening cost until active and threatened ruinous competition makes them combine for mutual protection, and, as they suppose, to ward off destruction or bankruptcy. Such combinations generally prove of short duration, and self-preservation compels each to enter again the arena of competition.

Americans are too earnest and enterprising to remain idle unless absolute disaster threatens. Such production, stimulated and increased by a protective tariff, is a net gain to the nation, and is expressed in the formula: "That the whole price of any article is ultimately resolvable into rent, profit, or wages. Rent, profit, and wages are national net income, and create markets where they are spent;" or, more tersely stated, "the gross value of every product of industry is national net income." When the aggregated or national income is increased by production individual wealth is greater, individual needs are multiplied, and the demand for labor increased. When all these are active and in just proportion, labor is well cared for and paid; for prosperity has come, and in this condition of things the divine precept applicable to labor is complied with: "Thou shalt not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn." Were I to give an example of an article cheapened under protection and increased manufacture, I should cite steel rails, the yearly average of the price of which was $158.50 in 1868 per gross ton in this country, and in 1884 was $30.75, and during the month of April, 1885, was $26, and were selling in England in December last at $22 to $23 per ton. The price here is $31 to $32, while the duty is $17 per ton, showing that the difference of price in the two countries is not the difference of duty. It results from the higher price of labor, which begins in the mining of the ore and continues until it ceases with the production of steel rails.

The production of steel rails in Great Britain in 1887 was 1,021,847 tons, and in the United States was 2,101,904 tons. The excess of production of over 1,000,000 tons in the United States over that of Great Britain in a single year would be impossible except under the system of protection. Greater improvements in manufacture, lower internal freights, larger demand, and cheaper labor must be had before the price can be equalized in the two countries. The reduction in price has continued under the Morrill tariff and its modifications till in exceptional cases steel rails have been sold for $26 per ton as stated, which is less than the duty of $28 per ton imposed in 1860.

The affairs of the Jackson Mining Company of Michigan, which are said to have been disclosed through suit, have been instanced in this debate as showing the enormous profits of the iron trade. The business of this company embraced the mining of ore and the smelting of this material in two furnaces. The Jackson Iron Mountain was the site of the first discovery of iron in the upper peninsula of Michigan; easy of development and rich in product, the mine was one of those which, surviving failure, remunerated its subsequent owners.

Exceptional cases of profit do not establish the average rule of gain. The Calumet and Hecla, said to be the largest and richest mine in this country or the world, stands phenomenal amidst deserted claims, abandoned villages, and the waste of fortunes seeking similar profits in the mining of copper. Such examples have lured, in many cases, the investment of capital only to end in bankruptcy. In regard to that entire region, in testimony before the Ways and Means Committee, in 1886, in reply to a question by Mr. Hewitt, "But has not the mining of Lake Superior ore as a whole been profitable to the owners?" Mr. Ely, of Cleveland, replied, "No, sir; not as a whole. I think that more money has been sunk in Lake Superior mines than ever came out of them. I have put more money into that region than I ever got out."

Mr. McMILLIN. I want to ask the gentleman whether it is not true that copper all over the world is controlled by a trust.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The same as whisky.

Mr. McMILLIN. Worse than whisky.

Mr. SEYMOUR. I have not time to yield for interruptions.

Lumber in the Mills bill has been placed on the free-list. Would such action be fair to the people of Washington and Oregon and the Territories of the Pacific Slope, if it is true, as the advocates of free-trade affirm, that lumber would be cheaper by the removal of the duty, to open these markets to the supply of Canadian lumber when the competition between our citizens living amidst vast forests will afford only a reasonable compensation to the labor and capital employed? I do not believe if the duty were removed the price of lumber to the producer in our Eastern and Middle States would be reduced, but the amount which is now paid to the Government as a duty would inure to the benefit of Canadian sellers, inducing the advance of Canadian stumpage and increasing the amount of Canadian business.

Take the article of salt, which is sold in Saginaw at 60 cents for 280 pounds, including the barrel, which is worth 20 cents, leaving 40 cents for the salt. If the President is correct when he says the duty is a tax, or, to use his own words, those who buy domestic articles of the same class pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to our home manufacturers, then if the duty is deducted, being at the rate of 12 cents per 100 pounds, over 33⅓ cents, the salt could be produced for 6⅔ cents for 280 pounds. Who would believe that so low a measure of cost could be obtained, but will not rather wonder that salt can now be produced at that price with the duty added, that is, for 40 cents? Let us examine further. The census of 1870 shows the production of 17,606,105 bushels of salt, valued at $4,818,229, while the census of 1880 fixes the production at 29,800,298 bushels, with a less total value, but of the amount of $4,817,630. If such results as these happen, why is it necessary to put salt on the free-list, opening our market to the foreign product, tending to produce unsteadiness in value, with no certainty of producing any result but uncertainty? The price is now sufficiently low, if not below the price of remunerative wages and fair dealing. Prosperity comes through fair wages and reasonable profit on invested capital.

Statistics show that the amount of our manufactured products are increasing, while prices are decreasing. The aggregate value of manufactures produced in 1860 was $1,885,861,676, while in 1880 it was $5,369,579,191. Our customs duties indicating annual variations through different conditions of business and modifications of the tariff yet show, in 1870, a revenue of $194,538,374, and in 1886 $192,905,023, with an average revenue between and including the years named of $174,243,104. This statement indicates as much steadiness in revenue without an excessive average as could be expected from changing conditions of business, increasing population, and occasional modifications of tariff during a period of seventeen years. The ostensible reason given for the attack now made upon our protective system is because, as is stated, we are confronted with a condition, not a theory, "and the necessity stated that"—

the simple and plain duty which we owe the people is to reduce taxation to the necessary expenses of an economical operation of the Government, and to restore to the business of the country the money which we hold in the Treasury through the perversion of governmental powers.

The condition referred to is the surplus, and the duty the reduction of taxation to prevent an accruing surplus. Exactly what the "perversion of governmental powers" may mean may be strongly inferred, if not absolutely declared, by the labored argument on the theory and against the protective system, instancing wool and not sugar, and at the same time advising the retention of internal-revenue taxes, which have always been levied as extraordinary or war taxes, and have hitherto been repealed when the occasion for their imposition ceased.

A reduction of these internal-revenue taxes, if not their repeal, would reduce the accumulating surplus, and such action so far as may be necessary would be in accord with the previous policy of the Government, and would leave the question of internal taxation to be adjusted, if desired, by the States.

The repeal of the duty on sugar, which amounts to over $56,000,000, while, if a reasonable bounty were paid on that produced in this country, a saving would occur of over $50,000,000, and, as it is almost entirely a revenue tax, the total repeal of the duty on this article would go very far towards reducing the surplus. Sugar is consumed by every citizen, and the repeal of the duty would be felt by every individual. It might happen that foreign governments would impose an export tax equal to the duty repealed; if this should be done by Congress, and in that case our Government would lose the duty, as in the case of coffee, and the citizen would still pay it. The way is open to reduce the revenues of the Government to the limit of governmental expenditures without impairing the protective system. Whatever irregularities and inequalities may exist in the law should be corrected, but the prohibition by the Ways and Means Committee of any hearing of citizens interested and affected by the changes which the bill proposes, in contravention to the wishes of the minority, would seem to indicate the disposition of the majority of the committee to revise and amend our present tariff laws, the so-called "vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation," in accordance with a "theory."

These latter are strong words and attack a condition, not a theory, charged with a surplus. Would not that condition under lower duties receive greater revenue, and would not less revenue be derived through this bill only by acting on the theory of enlarging the free-list? The reduced duties of the bill will increase the surplus; the free-list or absolute free-trade portion of it will alone decrease the revenue. If this revision should pass it will be in order to inquire how many more of a similar kind will be necessary in order to reach absolute free trade. English sentiment through the English press answered when the London Times said:

This operation may not establish free trade in the strict sense of the term, but it will to a great extent make trade free.

The issue is thus declared joined by foreign public opinion, which desires the destruction of the protective system. Listen to the warning of Blanqui, one of the free-trade economists of France:

Experience has already taught us that a people ought never to deliver over to the chances of foreign trade the fate of its manufactures.

Said Alexander Hamilton—

Though it were true that the immediate and certain effect of regulations controlling the competition of foreign with domestic fabrics was an increase of price, it is universally true that the contrary is the ultimate effect of any successful manufacture. When a domestic manufacture has attained to perfection, and has engaged in the prosecution of it a sufficient number of persons, it invariably becomes cheaper, and accordingly seldom or never fails to be afforded cheaper in process of time than was the foreign article for which it is the substitute.

The experience of the nation during the past twenty-seven years proves the truth of the proposition—greater production and cheaper product.

The nation, largely through the efforts of American labor, repudiating the principle that you should buy or procure where you can buy or procure the cheapest, prohibited the introduction of cheap Chinese labor as destructive to the interests of our industrial classes and antagonistic to the genius of our civilization. The Chinese must go; "cheap labor is not our shilboleth or belief" was the sentiment which chrystallized into a statute, and has become a settled principle in our laws. Humanity has heart and soul in its movements, and the decree went forth that the cold and unfeeling rule of trade, buy labor or goods where you can buy the cheapest, should be moderated by that more humane and Christian rule, "live and let live." Wealth under any conditions of government will not come to all, but comfortable living should be within the reach of each and the reward of reasonable and continued toil.

To promote the general welfare was not an idle or unmeaning phrase in a Constitution so short, concise, and expressive as ours. Through the beneficent workings of that Constitution and the laws made in pursuance of its powers and interpretations our land has become the home of the free and the asylum of the oppressed. It has drawn to its protection all who were willing to be molded by its civilization and assimilated by its citizenship. The Irishman from his bog, the Scottish crofter from his native heather, the English toiler of the same kith and kin of London's vast body of unemployed who but lately advertised their idleness and suffering in Trafalgar Square, have bid adieu to the shadow of the blessings of free-trade England to partake of the substance of American protection, and joined the grand procession which has since 1880, at the rate of half a million of people annually, sought homes within our limits. The term "vicious" can not justly be applied to a system which labor so largely seeks and men in such numbers come to for betterment. Labor believes in the Scripture adage, "By their fruits ye shall know them," and continually comes.

The immediate cause for thrusting the question of the reduction of the tariff so pointedly and strongly upon the attention of Congress to the exclusion of other business was stated to be the necessity for the reduction of the surplus. This condition arose from a policy inaugurated by the party which championed the Morrill bill in 1861. During the years which intervened the triumph of American arms, the success of American financial policy, the increase of American population, the growth of American wealth, the rapid development of American manufactures have been the wonder and astonishment of the world. The deference with which Europeans treat Americans abroad is the highest acknowledgment of their respect and fear. It is the tribute of the oppressed and oppressors of Europe to the integrity and ability of the American people, and the genius and glory of American institutions.

Patrick Henry said:

I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience. I know of no way of judging of the future but by the past.

Scrutinized by that light, judged by that standard, the American Government, in all that gives strength, and tone, and character to national life, during the past twenty-seven years of its protective policy stands unrivaled and unexcelled in any other portion of its own or the world's history. Inflexible in the maintenance of its laws, lenient to the disturbers of its peace, just to its creditors, bountiful to its defenders, progressive in the direction and breadth of its policy, protective in the spirit of its internal regulations for the development of its immense national resources, it towers above the nations of the past in the nobility of its aspirations and the grandeur of its achievements.

Cutting out the canker which was gnawing at the vitals of the body-politic, obliterating the element of weakness and decay from its Constitution, the nation whose courage and intelligent action had grappled with the disease and compelled a remedy is now met with the attempt to reverse the policy through which triumph and prosperity came, under the guise of a condition, what shall we do with the surplus? If the solution was sought on the principle of revenue reduction alone it might ere this have been settled by an overwhelming majority in this House. If the method of its solution had not been prescribed in the message which presented the question an agreement of counsel and action might have been more easily secured. But the way was indicated, the course of action was pre-determined.

"The perversion of governmental powers" is a distinct charge. The wool argument is a certain indicator, and the "vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation" is a phrase easily understood. No doubt can exist as to the details of the contest or the nature of the issue presented. If adopted as part of the organic law it would strike with paralysis the growing industries in different sections of this sparsely settled Republic. Beyond the Mississippi the hum of manufacturing industry is but little heard. Capital and enterprise in the future will completely cover, as they have already dotted, it with prosperous settlements and comfortable homes. That largely unoccupied domain needs the fostering influence of the protective system to secure markets for its products, develop its resources, induce rapidity of settlement, and ample means of communication to connect and cement its interests in the indissoluble bonds of commercial and national unity.

May we not turn to that other section lying to the south and east of the territory described, whose representatives upon this floor with their ancient solidity are combating the principle of protection and calling it revenue reform? Was it too much to expect that the people of those States would turn aside from their accustomed solidarity, dividing their strength on the great question of industrial protection, since they are now seeking to develop their natural resources, induce manufacturing, and entering with confident hope in the national lists of industrial and manufacturing prosperity? It is recorded that the growth of the iron interests of the South during the past few years has been the marvel of the age. It is stated, in 1880 the South made 397,301 tons of pig-iron; in 1887, 712,835 tons, and it is estimated that in 1888 the output will be 1,500,000 tons. The immense mountain of solid ore in North Carolina will furnish an almost inexhaustible supply of fine Bessemer ore.

It is enthusiastically predicted that the iron-producing center of the continent will move south of the Ohio. The entire coal area of Great Britain covers only 11,900 square miles, while West Virginia alone has 16,000; Kentucky, 13,000; Alabama, 10,680, and Texas over 30,000 square miles. Twelve years ago the total coal product of Alabama was 10,000 tons, while in 1885 2,225,000 tons were produced, and it is estimated in ten years her output will be 10,000,000 tons. According to Poor's Railroad Manual the actual cost of railroads now in the South, and their equipment, is over $1,300,000,000, against $679,804,000 in 1880. The amount of pine standing in the South in 1880 was 237,141,500,000 feet. The manufactures of Georgia increased from $31,196,105 in 1870 to $41,162,811 in 1880, or an increase of over 30 per cent. With resources like these, only partially stated, the South but lately emerged from the incubus of forced labor, with the results of the triumph and production of free labor so vividly seen, living under a protective policy which has borne the nation during twenty-seven years on the high tide of prosperity, it passes comprehension that the leading opponents of the protective system are the representatives of the South.

Let us trust when these efforts shall fail, when the same power which inaugurated shall in the throes of a terrible struggle again assert supremacy, rising in confident majesty to the support of a system which has produced a condition terrible only in a resulting surplus, and shall brush away by the combined votes of the producer and toiler the theory which would impair and destroy. Then and not till then shall the angel of peace hovering hitherto over the discordant elements of civil, social, and industrial wars spread her white wings over a nation unified through the beneficent results of a protective industrial policy, and welded in the indissoluble bonds of reciprocal interest and social prosperity, until everywhere throughout our broad domain sectional lines and social hate shall fade in fraternal regard for the imperishable union of the sisterhood of States.

Mr. MILLS. I move the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. MCCREARY reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the law in relation to the collection of the revenue, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS moved that the House take a recess till 8 o'clock, but by request withdrew the motion.

SANDY HOOK SHIP-CHANNEL.

Mr. WISE, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, to which the accompanying resolution was referred, recommend that the accompanying substitute therefor be adopted and that said resolution lie on the table:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to the House of Representatives a detailed statement of the work being done in deepening the Sandy Hook ship-channel, giving the terms of the present contract, the facilities of the contractors for doing the work, the amount of material removed by the said contractors to date, and the estimated amount of material yet to be removed under the contract, and also, at the present rate of progress, what length of time will be required to exhaust the present appropriation of $750,000, and why the work has not been pushed forward more rapidly.

Mr. SPINOLA. I move the resolution reported by the committee be adopted.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SPINOLA moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider lie on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

UNITED STATES COURTS, MARTINSBURGH, W. VA.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia. I ask by unanimous consent to take up from the House Calendar the bill (S. 1204) to provide for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States at Martinsburgh, W. Va., and put it upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in addition to the terms of the circuit and district courts of the United States now held in the district of West Virginia, there shall be held, in each year, one term of each of said courts, at Martinsburgh, in said district, on the first Tuesday in August.

There was no objection, and the bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WILSON, of West Virginia, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

W. S. CARPENTER.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask by unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2088) for the relief of W. S. Carpenter, and put it upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is, authorized and directed to pay to W. S. Carpenter, late an employé in the Railway Mail Service, $126.65, the amount of his salary from the 3d day of October, 1882, until the 20th day of November, 1882, for services actually performed; and an amount sufficient to make said payment is hereby appropriated.

There was no objection, and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CANNON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

CHARLES L. BRADWELL.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Speaker, I move by unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5092) for the relief of Charles L. Bradwell, and put it upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Charles L. Bradwell, late of the county of Chatham and State of Georgia, and now a resident of the county of Bartow, in said State, the sum of $3,750, the value of cotton belonging to said Bradwell and delivered by him to the Federal authorities in the winter of 1864 and 1865, under orders issued by General W. T. Sherman; and the amount of money necessary to pay said claim is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, said sum to be in full settlement and payment of said claim.

There was no objection, and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CLEMENTS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

SHEPARD & MORSE LUMBER COMPANY.

Mr. MOFFITT. Mr. Speaker, I move by unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7618) for the relief of the Shepard & Morse Lumber Company, of Burlington, Vt.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $120.43, being the amount of customs duties improperly collected from said Shepard & Morse Lumber Company at the custom-house at Rouse's Point, N. Y.

There was no objection, and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MOFFITT moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

DR. F. O. ST. CLAIR.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask by unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 109) for the relief of Dr. F. O. St. Clair, and that the bill be now put upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to refund to Dr. F. O. St. Clair the sum of $97.80, the same being the amount of money paid by him November 24, 1880, for duties and charges on certain cases containing a monument to the memory of Francis J. Townshend, late an apothecary in the United States Navy, and who died on board the United States steamer Enterprise, while in the discharge of his duty, on the Mediterranean station; the said monument having been purchased by contributions from the officers and crew of the said steamer, the shipmates of said deceased.

There was no objection, and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPRINGER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

LOWMAN & CO.

Mr. YOST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6191) for the relief of Lowman & Co., and to put it on its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Lowman & Co., of Long Glade, Augusta County, Virginia, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $271.80, in full for internal-revenue tax collected from them on certain stamps for distilled spirits on or about the 15th day of October, 1878, said spirits having been destroyed by fire before the proper stamps had been affixed.

There was no objection; and the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. YOST moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of half past 5 having arrived, the House takes a recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., and was called to order by Mr. MCMILLIN, as Speaker *pro tempore*, who directed the reading of the following:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *May* 15, 1888.

I hereby designate Hon. BENTON MCMILLIN to preside as Speaker *pro tempore* at this evening's session.

JOHN G. CARLISLE, *Speaker.*

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK,
Clerk House of Representatives.

TARIFF.

Mr. LYMAN. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of revenue measures.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair, and resumed consideration of the tariff bill.

Mr. ABBOTT. Mr. Chairman, the main object sought to be accomplished by the passage of this bill is to relieve the people of the country from the heavy burdens of taxation now laid upon them by the protective-tariff laws of the Government, and to prevent in future the withdrawal from trade and commerce of vasts amounts of money not required for the support of the Government.

Article I, section 8, of the Constitution of the United States, declares that—

Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

This is a plain declaration of the Constitution conferring on Congress the power to raise a sufficient revenue to support the Government and pay its debts, either by a tariff on foreign importations or by an excise or internal tax, or both, with this limitation only, that imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States. This limitation of power has never been construed to mean that Congress might not levy a higher rate of duty on one class of imported goods than on another. But I believe that it would be more consistent with the spirit of the Constitution if the duty on all classes of imported goods were made as nearly uniform on the basis of value as can be done, considering the nature and character of the imports. But in case any distinction is made, common sense and justice suggest that the higher duty should be laid on those classes of goods which are used by people who are able to pay the same without inconvenience to themselves and not upon those used by the great body of the people who depend upon their labor and that of their families for support. This just method of laying taxes was not observed by the framers of existing tariff laws.

Instead of laying the burden of taxation lightly upon those who labor for their bread, discrimination has been made in favor of those whom fortune has favored. A familiar example of this is the tariff on the manufactures of wool and silk. The duty on such manufactures of wool as blankets, wool hats, balmorals, flannels, and men's, women's, and children's ready-made clothing and wearing apparel, whether composed wholly or in part of wool, averages about 70 per cent., while the duty on silks is only 50 per cent. A still greater discrimination is made between the manufactures of fine wools and the coarser or mixed goods. For instance, the duty on broadcloth and fine worsted trousering is from 50 to 54 per cent., while the duty on reversible diagonal (cotton warp) and reversible nap (cotton warp) is from 167 to 179 per cent.

By the bill now under consideration it is intended to reduce the taxes and correct these inequalities by requiring a uniform percentage on all these classes of goods, and to compel the wealthy who use the finer goods to pay at least the same per cent. on their cost that the poor pay on the coarser. Certainly the rich man, if he chooses to wear fine clothes, has no just ground to complain if the law requires him to pay in proportion to their value the same per cent. it requires his poor neighbor to pay on his less costly garments. The following table is taken from the first annual report of the Commissioner of Labor, page 251, and copied in the majority report of the Committee on Ways and Means:

Price per yard of Leeds (England) woolen and mixed goods, duties, etc.

[From report of Commissioner of Labor.]

Name.	Description.		Price at factory.	Duty.						Cost in New York, not including packing, carriage to port, ocean freight, and insurance.
				Rate.		Amount.			Per cent. of price at factory.	
	Width (inches).	Weight (ounces).		Per pound.	Ad valorem (per cent).	Per pound.	Ad valorem.	Total.		
West of England broadcloth	60	17	$3.60	$0.35	40	$0.372	$1.440	$1.812	50.3	$5.412
Fine worsted trousering	28	11	1.62	.35	40	.241	.648	.889	54.9	2.509
Imitation sealskin (mohair and cotton)	50	31	4.50	.35	40	.678	1.800	2.478	55.0	6.978
West of England beaver	58	25	3.36	.35	40	.547	1.344	1.891	56.3	5.251
West of England all-wool Moscow	58	29	3.60	.35	40	.634	1.440	2.074	57.6	5.674
Fine worsted coating	56	24	2.88	.35	40	.525	1.152	1.677	58.2	4.557
Fine worsted trousering	28	12	1.42	.35	40	.263	.568	.831	58.5	2.251
Indigo-blue Cheviot coating	58	28	2.40	.35	40	.612	.960	1.572	65.5	3.972
Low worsted coating (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp)	50	24	.82	.18	35	.270	.287	.557	68.0	1.377
Low worsted trousering (woolen back)	28	11	.48	.24	35	.165	.168	.333	69.4	.813
Ottoman (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp)	50	27	.82	.18	35	.304	.287	.591	72.0	1.411
Matelasse (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp)	50	28	.84	.18	35	.315	.294	.609	72.5	1.449
Mantle cloth (worsted face, woolen back, cotton warp)	50	24	.68	.18	35	.270	.238	.508	74.7	1.188
Wool, fancy suiting	54	25	.94	.35	35	.547	.329	.876	93.2	1.816
Cotton-warp cloth	50	15	.54	.35	35	.328	.189	.517	95.7	1.057
Fancy coating	54	23	.78	.35	35	.503	.273	.776	99.5	1.556
Fancy cheviot	54	25	.82	.35	35	.547	.287	.834	101.7	1.654
Wool, fancy suiting	54	22	.70	.35	35	.481	.245	.726	103.7	1.426
Diagonal cheviot	54	25	.76	.35	35	.547	.266	.813	107.0	1.573
Common blue cheviot coating	52	25	.72	.35	35	.547	.252	.799	111.0	1.519
Cotton-warp Moscow	52	35	.96	.35	35	.766	.336	1.102	114.8	2.002
Cotton-warp cloth	52	25	.64	.35	35	.547	.224	.771	120.5	1.411
Cotton-warp twilled Melton	50	16½	.42	.35	35	.361	.147	.508	121.0	.928
Cotton-warp Moscow	52	30	.74	.35	35	.656	.259	.915	123.6	1.655
Cotton-warp cloth	50	13	.32	.35	35	.284	.112	.396	123.7	.716
Fancy overcoating (cotton warp)	50	34	.82	.35	35	.744	.287	1.031	125.7	1.891
Cotton-warp reversible	50	31	.74	.35	35	.678	.259	.937	126.6	1.677
Fancy overcoating (cotton warp)	50	32	.76	.35	35	.700	.266	.966	127.0	1.726
Cotton-warp coating	50	17	.40	.35	35	.372	.140	.512	128.0	.912
Imitation sealskin (calf hair mixed with wool, cotton warp)	50	28	.56	.35	35	.612	.196	.808	144.3	1.368
Cotton-warp coating	50	23	.46	.35	35	.503	.161	.664	144.3	1.124
Cotton-warp Melton	50	13	.24	.35	35	.284	.084	.368	153.3	.608
Cotton-warp serge Melton	50	15½	.26	.35	35	.339	.091	.430	165.4	.690
Reversible diagonal (cotton warp)	50	29	.48	.35	35	.634	.168	.802	167.1	1.282
Reversible nap (cotton warp)	50	29	.44	.35	35	.634	.154	.788	179.1	1.298
Cotton-warp reversible	50	30	.45	.35	35	.656	.157	.813	180.7	1.293

This table is well worthy of careful study. In examining the figures given in the column headed "price at factory" and the column headed "per cent. of price at factory," which the total duty amounts to, the startling inequalities in the rate of duty to be paid in this country becomes apparent. The highest priced goods named in the table is West of England broadcloth, worth $3.60 per yard in Leeds, the specific duty being 35 cents per pound and the ad valorem duty 40 per cent., making a total of duty of 50.3 per cent. on the value at the factory. This is on a high grade of goods. In looking at the bottom of the table the last entry is for cotton-warp reversible cloth, made in imitation of a better kind. It is worth but 45 cents per yard at the factory. The specific duty is the same as on the West of England broadcloth, 35 cents per pound, the ad valorem duty is 35 per cent., but the specific duty and the ad valorem duty together make the rate on the price at the factory 180.7 per cent. That is to say, the cheaper the goods at the factory the greater is the proportional increment of duty. The column headed "per cent. of price at factory," which shows the percentage that the duty is of the factory price, brings this out clearly.

An inspection of this table will show that a yard of broadcloth that costs $3.60 per yard at the factory in England pays a duty of $1.81, while a yard of reversible nap (cotton warp), which costs at the factory only 44 cents, pays a duty of over 78½ cents. Under the provisions of the bill now being considered the yard of broadcloth will pay a duty of $1.44, while the yard of reversible nap will pay a duty of only 18½ cents, leaving a clear gain to the consumer of 60 cents a yard. Similar inequalities exist all through the present tariff laws, and it is noticeable that the discriminations are, with a few exceptions, made against those classes of goods which constitute the clothing of the laboring masses. These inequalities are to a great extent produced by the system of laying specific duties on certain classes of goods.

An illustration of the operation of the specific-duty system, its injustice, and the hardships it imposes on the consumers of cheap cotton goods is given in the report of Mr. Manning, late Secretary of the Treasury, on the revision of the tariff, February 16, 1886, pages 86 and 87.

It is here shown that cotton goods of low qualities manufactured in Scotland from American cotton pay a duty of from 75 to 200 per cent., while the finer qualities of the same goods pay only about 40 per cent.

It is well known that the value of foreign merchandise depends on many conditions, and that it is subject to frequent and oftentimes unexpected fluctuations in price, which of course affect the per cent. of the duty to be paid under the specific system. For instance, if a yard of tarlatan costs to-day 8 cents, and the specific duty be 4 cents per yard, the tax is equal to an ad valorem of 50 per cent. If, from any cause, the cost should run down to 5 cents per yard, the specific duty remaining the same, the tax would be equivalent to an ad valorem of 80 per cent.

The bill under consideration not only corrects the inequalities of the tariff before mentioned, but fixes a duty on imported goods according to their value, without discrimination.

From the date of the passage of the first tariff act, July 4, 1789, to the date of the present tariff law, March 3, 1883, many changes and modifications took place, not only in the amount of duty laid upon imports but in the methods adopted for levying duties.

After a careful examination of the various tariff acts, and of their practical operations on different classes and occupations, I am confirmed in the belief that an ad valorem tax on imports is the only just and equitable way that this class of taxes can be levied.

Our people will not complain, but will willingly submit to the payment of such taxes as are needed for the support of the Government if they are so levied as to distribute the burden among them as equally as possible. But to tax the necessaries of life, or that class of articles that is in general use among the masses, 100 per cent., and tax luxuries and high-priced articles only 50 per cent., as is done in many instances under the present specific-duty system, is not only a moral wrong, but is a legal robbery; but this is no greater moral wrong than the protective features of the present tariff system, of which I will speak more fully hereafter.

Mr. Chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], who is recognized as one of the ablest and most eloquent advocates of protection on this floor, in his speech the other day sought to leave the impression that the country had been in a greatly embarrassed condition for several years prior to the tariff act of 1824, and that this embarrassment was due to a want of protection to our manufacturing industries, and that the prosperity of the country which followed the passage of said act was the result of the protection given by that act to our manufactures, and he appeals to the truth of history to bear him out in the assertion that the—

periods of protection in this coun try have been periods of prosperity, and that eras of free trade or a revenue tariff have been eras of depression and disaster.

A comparison of the tariff act of 1816, under which the revenues of the Government were collected until 1824, with the tariff act of the latter date will show whether history sustains the gentleman's conclusions or not. I select only a few leading articles.

Articles.		1816.	1824.
Sugar	per pound	$0.03	$0.03
Coffee	do	.05	.05
Tea	do	.25	.25
Salt	do	.20	.20
Pig-iron	per cent	20	$30.00
Bar-iron	per ton	$30.00	* 33
Glass manufactures	per cent	20	25
Cotton manufactures	do	25	30
Woolen manufactures	do	25	

*And 3 cents per pound.

It will be seen from the foregoing table that the only increase of duty on the leading articles of imports named was on glass manufactures, and 5 per cent. additional on woolen manufactures, and yet the gentleman eloquently refers to the period of time when the act of 1816 was in force as one of great depression and disaster, and to the period following the passage of the act of 1824 as one of great prosperity and happiness, and ascribes the depression of the former period to a want of protection to our manufacturing industries which "went down before a flood of foreign importations," and the "marvelous prosperity" of the latter period to protection.

The gentleman certainly has not forgotten that this country had been engaged from 1812 to 1815 in a second struggle for independence with Great Britain. Our little fleet had been swept from the seas. Our national capital had been sacked and burned. The war with the Creek Indians was in progress. Our long line of frontier was infested with hostile Indians which required an army in the field to beat them back. As a consequence, heavy drains upon the resources of the country had to be made.

Peace came, but found the country with a depleted Treasury and burdened with a heavy debt. Agriculture, commerce, and manufactures alike had suffered. These misfortunes were not the result of free trade or protection. The tariff had nothing to do with bringing them about. "Grim-visaged war" brought the evils, which for a time paralyzed all the industries of the country, and which required time for the recuperative energies of the country to remove.

In his message of December 3, 1822, President Monroe said:

From the best information that I have been able to obtain it appears that our manufactures, though depressed immediately after peace, have considerably increased, and are still increasing, under the encouragement given them by the tariff of 1816 and by subsequent laws.

And in his last annual message, December 7, 1824, soon after the passage of the act of 1824, and before any perceptible change in the amount of revenue derived therefrom could have been made, he said:

Our revenue under the mild system of import and tonnage continues to be adequate to all the purposes of the Government. Our agriculture, commerce, manufactures, and navigation flourish.

John Quincy Adams said two years later, in his message of December 9, 1826:

In adverting to the present condition of our fiscal concerns and to the prospects of our revenue, the first remark that calls our attention is that they are less exuberantly prosperous than they were at the corresponding period of last year. The severe shock so extensively sustained by the commercial and manufacturing interests in Great Britain has not been without a perceptible recoil upon ourselves. Reduced importation from abroad is necessarily succeeded by a reduced return to the Treasury at home. The net revenue of the present year will not equal that of the last, and the receipts of that which is to come will fall short of those of the current year.

Mr. Chairman, I have drawn a comparison between the tariff act of 1816 and that of 1824, and have quoted the official communications of the Chief Executives of the Government, to show that there is not the slightest foundation for the often-repeated declarations of Republican protectionists that whatever calamities befell the country prior to 1824, that whatever retarded its growth and development, were the results of free trade or a tariff for revenue only, and that the protective-tariff act of 1824 was the grand panacea for all the evils that then existed.

The truth is, Mr. Chairman, that the act of 1816 was the first high protective-tariff act that ever passed the Congress of the United States, and it has been so denominated by all political writers, and the additional duties that were imposed on foreign importations by the act of 1824 were a mere bagatelle, as already shown, and if any depression or disaster resulted from the tariff act of 1816 it was because of the high duties imposed by said act on the necessaries of life. The fact that Great Britain flooded the country in 1815 with importations of her old stocks of goods that had accumulated during the war, and which were out of fashion and salable only at prices far below cost of production, did not affect the manufacturing industries of the country any more than it would have done if the importations had been made in 1825.

Another protective-tariff act was passed in May, 1828, which increased the duties on iron and woolen manufactures. Speaking of said act in December, 1828, President Adams said:

The tariff of the last session was in its details not acceptable to the great interests of any portion of the Union, not even to the interests which it was specially intended to subserve. * * *

In his first message, December, 1829, President Jackson said:

No very considerable change has occurred during the recess of Congress in the condition of either our agriculture, commerce, or manufactures. The operation of the tariff has not proved so injurious to the two former, or as beneficial to the latter, as was anticipated. Importations of foreign goods have not sensibly diminished, while domestic competition under an illusive excitement has increased the production much beyond the demand for home consumption. The consequences have been low prices, temporary embarrassment, and partial loss. That such of our manufacturing establishments as are based upon capital, and are prudently managed, will survive the shock, and be ultimately profitable, there is no good reason to doubt.

On December 7, 1830, the President said:

The present tariff taxes on some of the comforts of life are unnecessarily high.

This was the era of which the gentleman from Michigan so eloquently speaks when he says, in substance, that the protective tariff acts of 1824 and 1828 enthused new life into our languishing manufactures and brought to the country a period of "marvelous prosperity." What industry will not prosper when all other industries are taxed to foster it? While it is undoubtedly true that manufacturing establishments which were based on actual capital and were prudently managed did prosper and accumulate wealth from the protection afforded them, not only by the acts of 1824 and 1828, but by the act of 1816, yet the great agricultural industries of the country, upon which all other interests had to depend, suffered a corresponding depression in the prices of their products; and this fact was so apparent, and so well understood by President Jackson, that in his message of December 4, 1832, which recommended a gradual reduction of tariffs, he said:

Those who take an enlarged view of the condition of our country must be satisfied that the policy of protection must be ultimately limited to those articles of domestic manufacture which are indispensable to our safety in time of war.

It will be perfectly evident to every one who will take the pains to study the political history of the country that nearly all the earlier Presidents regarded it as unjust and inequitable to tax one class of our industries for the benefit of another, and whenever such legislation was recommended it was justified on the grounds of necessity, or to give temporary, not permanent, encouragement to such of our "infant industries" as were not able to compete with foreign manufactures.

But to return, Mr. Chairman, to the bill under consideration, there is one feature of it which should commend it to the favorable consideration of the country. I refer to the fact that it not only reduces taxation on the necessaries of life, but it levies a tax on most articles according to their cost or value, thus removing the unjust discrimination and inequalities of the present law. And I wish to call attention to the fact that this feature of the bill is the one that seems to meet with the united opposition of protectionists.

President Polk, in his first annual message to Congress, December 2, 1845, in recommending a revision and modification of the protective tariff act of August, 1842, said:

I recommend to Congress the abolition of the minimum principle, or assumed, arbitrary, and false values, and of specific duties, and the substitution in their place of ad valorem duties, as the fairest and most equitable indirect tax which can be imposed. By the ad valorem principle all articles are taxed according to their cost or value, and those which are of inferior quality, or of small cost, bear only the just proportion of the tax with those which are of superior quality or greater cost. The articles consumed by all are taxed at the same rate. A system of ad valorem revenue duties, with proper discriminations and proper guards against frauds in collecting them, it is not doubted will afford ample incidental advantages to the manufacturers and enable them to derive as great profits as can be derived from any other regular business. It is believed that such a system strictly within the revenue standard will place the manufacturing interests on a stable footing and inure to their permanent advantage, while it will as nearly as may be practicable extend to all the great interests of the country the incidental protection which can be afforded by our revenue laws. Such a system, when once firmly established, would be permanent and not subject to the constant complaints, agitations, and changes which must ever occur when duties are not laid for revenue, but for the "protection merely" of a favored interest.

In pursuance of the President's recommendations, Congress passed the act "reducing the duties on imports," in July or August, 1846. Under this act an ad valorem duty of 30 per cent. was levied on sugar, 20 per cent. on salt, 30 per cent. on pig-iron, 30 per cent. on bar-iron, 40 per cent. on glass manufactures, 25 per cent. on cotton, and 30 per cent. on woolen manufactures, and a similar rate on other leading articles.

The President in his third annual message, referring to the operations of the act of 1846, said:

The net revenue from customs during the year ending on the 1st of December, 1846, being the last year under the operation of the tariff act of 1842, was $22,971,403.10, and the net revenue from customs during the year ending on the 1st of December, 1847, being the first year under the operation of the tariff act of 1846, was about $31,500,000, being an increase of revenue for the first year under the tariff of 1846 of more than $8,500,000 over that of the last year under the tariff of 1842.

Further on in the same message the President, speaking of the benefits accruing to all classes and pursuits under the equitable system of raising revenue under the act of 1846, said:

The act of the 30th of July, 1846, "reducing the duties on imports," has been in force since the 1st of December last, and I am gratified to state that all the beneficial effects which were anticipated from its operation have been fully realized. The public revenue derived from customs during the year ending on the 1st of December, 1847, exceeds by more than $8,000,000 the amount received in the preceding year under the operation of the act of 1842, which was superseded and repealed by it. Its effects are visible in the great and almost unexampled prosperity which prevails in every branch of business. While the repeal of the prohibitory and restrictive duties of the act of 1842, and the substitution in their place of reasonable revenue rates levied on articles imported according to their actual value, have increased the revenue and augmented our foreign trade, all the great interests of the country have been advanced and promoted. The great and important interests of agriculture, which had been not only too much neglected, but actually taxed under the protective policy for the benefit of other interests, have been relieved of the burdens which that policy imposed on them, and our farmers and planters, under a more just and liberal policy, are finding new and profitable markets abroad for their augmented products.

Our commerce is rapidly increasing, and is extending more widely the circle of international exchanges. Great as has been the increase of our imports during the past year, our exports of domestic products sold in foreign markets have been still greater. Our navigating interest is eminently prosperous. The number of vessels built in the United States has been greater than during any preceding period of equal length. Large profits have been derived by those who have constructed, as well as by those who have navigated them. Should the ratio of increase in the number of our merchant vessels be progressive and be as great for the future as during the past year, the time is not distant when our tonnage and commercial marine will be larger than that of any other nation in

the world. While the interests of agriculture, of commerce, and of navigation have been enlarged and invigorated, it is highly gratifying to observe that our manufactures are also in a prosperous condition.

None of the ruinous effects upon this interest which were apprehended by some as the result of the operation of the revenue system established by the act of 1846 have been experienced. On the contrary, the number of manufactories and the amount of capital invested in them is steadily and rapidly increasing, affording gratifying proofs that American enterprise and skill employed in this branch of domestic industry, with no other advantages than those fairly and incidentally accruing from a just system of revenue duties, are abundantly able to meet successfully all competition from abroad and still derive fair and remunerating profits. While capital invested in manufactures is yielding adequate and fair profits under the new system, the wages of labor, whether employed in manufactures, agriculture, commerce, or navigation, have been augmented.

The toiling millions whose daily labor furnishes the supply of food and raiment and all the necessaries and comforts of life are receiving higher wages and more steady and permanent employment than in any other country, or at any previous period of our own history. So successful have been all branches of our industry that a foreign war, which generally diminishes the resources of a nation, has in no essential degree retarded our onward progress or checked our general prosperity. With such gratifying evidences of prosperity and of the successful operation of the revenue act of 1846, every consideration of public policy recommends that it shall remain unchanged. It is hoped that the system of import duties which it established may be regarded as the permanent policy of the country, and that the great interests affected by it may not again be subject to be injuriously disturbed, as they have heretofore been, by frequent and sometimes sudden changes.

During a period of ten years that followed the passage of this act the Government under its operations derived sufficient revenue, not only to meet the current expenses of the Government, but to liquidate over $50,000,000 of the debt created by the war with Mexico. Referring to the general prosperity of the country, and to the necessity of reducing taxation, President Pierce, in his message to Congress, in December, 1855, said:

Derived as our public revenue is in chief part from duties on imports, its magnitude affords gratifying evidence of the prosperity not only of our commerce, but of the other great interests upon which that depends.

The principle that all moneys not required for the current expenses of the Government should remain for active employment in the hands of the people, and the conspicuous fact that the annual revenue from all sources exceeds by many millions of dollars the amount needed for a prudent and economical administration of public affairs, can not fail to suggest the propriety of an early revision and reduction of the tariff of duties on imports. It is now so generally conceded that the purpose of revenue alone can justify the imposition of duties on imports, that in readjusting the impost tables and schedules which unquestionably require essential modifications, a departure from the principles of the present tariff is not anticipated.

Acting on these suggestions and the recommendations contained in his message to Congress one year later, Congress passed the act of March 3, 1857, by which the tax on sugar was reduced to 24 per cent., on salt to 15 per cent., on pig-iron to 24 per cent., on bar iron to 24 per cent., on glass manufactures to 30 per cent., on cotton goods to 19 per cent., and on woolen fabrics to 24 per cent., and a corresponding reduction on other dutiable articles.

Subsequent to the passage of this act came the financial crisis of that year, and it is referred to by the gentleman from Michigan and others as the direct result of the reduction of the tariff duties. This position is not sustained by the history of the times. President Buchanan, in his annual message of December 6, 1858, in referring to the cause which led to the financial crash, said:

When Congress met in December last, the business of the country had just been crushed by one of those periodical revulsions which are the inevitable consequence of our unsound and extravagant system of bank credits and inflated currency. With all the elements of national wealth in abundance, our manufactures were suspended, our useful public and private enterprises were arrested, and thousands of laborers were deprived of employment and reduced to want.

Universal distress prevailed among the commercial, manufacturing, and mechanical classes. This revulsion was felt the more severely in the United States, because similar causes had produced the like deplorable effects throughout the commercial nations of Europe. All were experiencing sad reverses at the same moment. Our manufacturers everywhere suffered severely, not because of the recent reduction in the tariff of duties on imports, but because there was no demand at any price for their productions.

* * * * * * *

No government, and especially a government of such limited powers as that of the United States, could have prevented the late revulsion. The whole commercial world seemed for years to have been rushing to this catastrophe. The same ruinous consequences would have followed in the United States, whether the duties upon foreign imports had remained as they were under the tariff of 1846 or had been raised to a much higher standard. The tariff of 1857 had no agency in the result. The general causes existing throughout the world could not have been controlled by the legislation of any particular country.

The periodical revulsions which have existed in our past history must continue to return at intervals so long as our present unbounded system of bank credits shall prevail.

Mr. Chairman, the same causes which produced financial distress in Europe so reduced the amount of foreign importations into this country that in 1858 the whole amount received from customs was a little less than $42,000,000. And although the country had not yet fully recovered from the effects of the revulsion in trade, the custom receipts two years later, 1860, increased under the low ad valorem tariff act of 1857 to over $53,000,000.

In 1856, when the estimated population of the United States was a little less than 30,000,000 of people, about one-half of what it is now, the custom receipts under the act of 1846, which levied a less tax than the bill now under consideration, amounted to over $64,000,000, about $14,000,000 more than were then necessary to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government and to pay the interest on the public debt.

Mr. Chairman, during the period of ten years following the passage of the act of 1846, agriculture, commerce, and navigation were never more prosperous, and although many of the principal states of Europe were, during this period, involved in disastrous wars, and struggling under the influences of unprecedented commercial revulsions which destroyed the industries and paralyzed the credit of many nations of Europe, the manufacturing interests of this country were not seriously affected thereby until the depressing effects of these disturbances abroad began to diminish our foreign trade by a reduction of imports and exports, which, coupled with the unsettled condition of our own currency, led to the financial collapse of 1857. In no just sense can the condition of the country at that time be attributed to the operation of the low tariff of that year, as has already been shown. You had just as well say that the war between the States was the result of tariff legislation as to say the financial crash of 1857 resulted from it.

Mr. Chairman, I will not undertake to follow the history of the tariff legislation of the country through that period when one section of our country was arrayed in hostilities against the other, as that legislation may have been necessary to meet the demands of the Government occasioned by the exigencies of the times, and to provide the necessary means for the successful prosecution of the war.

I will pass over this period of tariff legislation, and that which followed the close of the war, with the remark that Congress had levied taxes on domestic manufactures, on incomes, on the receipts of railroad companies, on insurance and express companies, on bank capital, bank deposits, and bank checks, which yielded the Government a revenue of more than $250,000,000 per annum; yet with an interest-bearing national debt that amounted to over $2,000,000,000, and which required over $140,000,000 annually to pay the interest, all of these taxes were swept away, while the taxes on clothing, on food, and implements of labor were left to pay this enormous debt and its interest, as well as to meet the current expenses of the Government. This is the character of legislation that has been enacted under the auspices of the Republican party for the protection of labor.

Mr. Chairman, every speech from the other side of this Hall but one which I have heard has been in opposition to the reduction of duties on imports, and this opposition is based on the alleged ground that such reduction as proposed by this bill will destroy our manufacturing industries, impoverish labor, and bring widespread ruin and desolation upon the country. And yet the distinguished gentleman from Michigan tells us that a duty is not a tax on the consumer; that it adds nothing to the cost of the article; and further says:

There are many things the market value of which is lower than the duty, and how idle, therefore, to say that the duty is added to the cost.

This statement is true as to the cost of many articles in the foreign markets. If such is the case as to these articles in the home market, why not reduce the tariff or remove it altogether?

Again he says:

You can not touch a manufactured article on the farm or in the home, the product of a protected American industry, that has not been made cheaper by reason of protection.

This is indeed a remarkable statement; remarkable for the same reason he gives for disagreeing with the statement of the President that a duty adds to the cost of an article, that "it is not true."

His statement is based on the fact that steel-rails and blankets and other articles cost more in 1867 and in 1870 than they do now. He ought to have told you also that tariffs were higher then than now. Why, sir, it has been repeatedly shown by gentlemen on this side of the House, since this debate began, that by reason of the improved machinery now in use the labor cost of production of steel and iron has been reduced at least 50 per cent. It has also been shown that the labor cost of production of cotton and woolen fabrics for the same reason has been reduced to less than one-sixth of what they formerly cost. Now, sir, tariff did not make these reductions. It was genius and skill.

Would it not, sir, be absurd to say that because steel-nails, which at some factories are turned out by the tons per day, are cheaper than when they were made by hand at the forge, that the reduction in price is due to the protective tariff? To assert this as a fact is no more unreasonable than the proposition of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, one of the great wonders of this age is the readiness and ease with which American genius adapts and models machinery to the wants and purposes of manufacture, and as a result the power of production is many times multiplied, and as a further result the cost of production is correspondingly decreased and prices lowered. It seems, however, that protectionists can not or will not credit the advance and progress made in the manufacturing industries of the country to any other cause or causes than the influence of a high protective tariff.

It is shown by the first annual report of the Commissioner of Labor that cost of production often varies in the same State as well as in the different States. For instance, the labor cost in one establishment in Ohio of men's first-class machine-sewed domestic calf boots is $1.25 per pair, while in another establishment in the same State the labor cost is 92 cents per pair of same quality. Similar variations exist in the

labor cost of cotton and woolen goods, as illustrated in the following table:

States.	Description.	Labor, cost per yard.
		Cents. *Mills.*
Georgia	Sheeting, 36 inches wide, 40 by 40, 3.24 yards to the pound.	00 8½
New York	Sheeting, 36 inches wide, 44 by 43, 4.5 yards to the pound.	00 9
Massachusetts	Print cloth, 28 inches wide, 64 by 64, 7 yards to the pound.	1 0
New Hampshire	Print cloth, 28 inches wide, 64 by 64, 7 yards to the pound.	00 9
Kentucky	1 yard best quality jeans	1 0
Indiana	do	00 8
Massachusetts	1 yard flannel, 27 inches wide, 4 ounces	00 3
Missouri	1 yard flannel, 27 inches wide, 8 ounces	1 3

Now, sir, with the low labor cost of these articles the existing tariff laws levy a duty on goods of the quality above named as follows:

On sheeting ..... 2½ cents per yard.
On print cloth ..... 5 cents per yard.
On woolen and cotton mixed cloth ..... about 67 per cent.
On flannel ..... about 66 per cent.

And yet we are told by protectionists that a protective tariff does not add anything to the price of the articles.

The Chief of the Bureau of Statistics shows in his last annual report that for the year ending June 30, 1887, the value of manufactured cotton goods imported from foreign countries into the United States for immediate consumption, including withdrawals from warehouse for consumption, amounted in round numbers to $29,150,000, upon which an average ad valorem duty of 40.17 per cent. was paid, amounting in round numbers to $11,720,000, which added to the first cost of the goods gives the sum of $40,870,000, which must be paid by the importers, besides ocean transportation, before the goods are marketable in this country. The importer, of course, charges his per centum of profit on the money employed to pay the duty as on the first cost of the goods, and thus the consumer pays a double duty. Yet we are told by our Republican friends that a protective tariff brings cheaper clothing to the farmer and laborer!

Again, the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics reports that the value of the manufactures of wool imported into the United States for immediate consumption, including withdrawals from warehouses for consumption, for the year ending June 30, 1887, was, in round numbers, $44,235,000, upon which an average rate of ad valorem duty of 67.21 per cent. was paid, amounting to $29,774,000, which, added to the cost of the merchandise, to say nothing of the cost of transportation, produced the sum of $74,009,000, the actual cost to importers, upon which they charge their per cent. of profit.

Now, from what has been said it is apparent that the foreign cost of the cotton and woolen goods imported to this country for consumption for the year named was $73,385,000, and the duty paid thereon $41,494,000, which, added to the first cost, not including transportation, makes the goods cost $114,879,000 in the hands of the importers.

The same authority shows that during the same period the value of iron and steel and the manufactures thereof imported into this country amounted, in round numbers, to $50,618,000, upon which duties to the amount of $20,715,000, or an ad valorem rate of duty of 40.92 per cent., was collected by the Government. These iron and steel goods in the hands of the importers cost $71,333,000, which, added to the cost of cotton and woolen imports, makes $186,212,000.

I have selected these three classes of imports because they embrace a vast number of articles of necessity that are in general use among farmers and all laboring classes.

When I consider, Mr. Chairman, the vast variety of goods embraced within these three classes which are distributed throughout this broad land, and by retail dealers again distributed among the farmers and laborers of this country, and when I further consider that the Government collects from these three classes alone the enormous sum of $62,209,000, I am astounded at the temerity of gentlemen on the other side of the House who boldly assert that the payment of this sum to the Government cheapens the cost of the goods to the consumer.

During the last fiscal year, in round numbers, $450,325,000 worth of dutiable merchandise, including all classes, was imported into this country, upon which the Government collected $212,032,000, and yet this vast amount of goods, burdened as they were with this immense tax, came in competition with our domestic manufactures and found a market among our people, and still we are told that farmers and laborers are benefited by this sort of protection!

But, Mr. Chairman, when their subtle and ingenious arguments fail to convince the common-sense people of the country, when their sophistries are detected and exposed, they raise the cry that the advocates of a tariff for revenue only are seeking to crush the manufacturing industries of our own country and to bring American labor in competition with the "pauper labor" of Europe.

It has been several times admitted on this side of the House that American labor receives better wages than the same class of labor in Europe, though labor is much better paid in free-trade England than in the tariff countries of Germany and France; but while this is so, it has been as often shown that it is not the result of a protective tariff, not one tithe of which ever reaches the pockets of the laborer, but that it is due to the intelligence and skill of our labor, as compared with most of the European labor, and to our improved machinery, which enables labor to produce more. One further fact may be admitted, and that is that protection has built up some of the most powerful and oppressive monopolies that ever cursed the people of any country. With ruthless hands they have laid heavy duties and exactions upon every other industry to fill their pockets. They oppress the poor man because he is helpless, and through combinations and trusts they even defy the Government. They are not willing to bear their proportion of the burden of supporting the Government which gives them protection, and every attempt to tax capital or to compel it to bear its equal share of taxation is met with bold opposition.

The Government, under the tariff act of 1883, practically places it within the power of every manufacturer of wool to tax the people, the farmers and laborers, who consume his goods 67 per cent. above their cost of production, and within the power of every manufacturer of cotton or iron to levy a tax of 40 per cent. upon his goods. When we consider that the estimated value of all domestic manufactures approximates $7,000,000,000, and that it is within the power of the manufacturers to levy a tax on consumers of these goods to an amount equal to the duties on foreign goods, which average 47 per cent., we can form some idea of the vast sums of money that annually flow into the pockets of this protected and privileged class, and it is neither unjust nor unkind to say that the mammoth fortunes that have grown up under this system attest the truth of the statement that they have not been slow to avail themselves of this privilege.

It has been estimated by some of our profoundest political economists that for every dollar that the Government collects under the tariff laws, the manufacturer collects five; and Professor A. L. Perry, of Williams College, who is regarded as one of the closest and most accurate economic thinkers, declares that it is his deliberate opinion and conviction that out of every $5 that is collected from the consumers of foreign and domestic manufactures under the operation of the tariff act of 1883 only $1 reaches the Treasury.

But, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that our Republican friends are not altogether consistent. While they tell us that American products are cheapened by protection they tell us it greatly enhances the price of labor. This would be a paradox if true, but it is not true. Now, for argument's sake, and this alone, let it be admitted that the laborers employed in the factories get all the benefits that flow from protection. Then, sir, is it right in principle or in morals that the great farming population of the Western and Southern States shall be taxed upon articles of necessity for the purpose of paying high wages to the factory hands of a few mining and manufacturing States?

I read a paragraph or two from the President's message:

> By the last census it is made to appear that of the 17,392,099 of our population engaged in all kinds of industries 7,670,493 are employed in agriculture, 4,074,238 in professional and personal service (2,934,876 of whom are domestic servants and laborers), while 1,810,256 are employed in trade and transportation, and 3,837,112 are classed as employed in manufacturing and mining.
>
> For present purposes, however, the last number given should be considerably reduced. Without attempting to enumerate all, it will be conceded that there should be deducted from those which it includes 375,143 carpenters and joiners, 285,401 milliners, dressmakers, and seamstresses, 172,726 blacksmiths, 133,756 tailors and tailoresses, 102,473 masons, 76,241 butchers, 41,309 bakers, 22,083 plasterers, and 4,891 engaged in manufacturing agricultural implements, amounting in the aggregate to 1,214,023, leaving 2,623,089 persons employed in such manufacturing industries as are claimed to be benefited by a high tariff.

Now, sir, will gentlemen on the other side tell me that it is right or in the interest of American labor that the 7,670,493 farmers and 7,098,517 persons engaged in trade and in other occupations and professions shall be taxed many millions of dollars in order that high wages may be paid to the 2,623,089 persons engaged in such industries as are claimed to be benefited by a high tariff? Now, sir, I have as kind feelings and as much respect for the foreign laborer who comes to this country with the bona fide intention of becoming a citizen as any gentleman on this floor; but, sir, I earnestly protest against that policy which gives him opportunities and advantages not enjoyed by American citizens. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COX], in a speech on this floor some years ago, said that 64 per cent. of all the persons employed in the mining and manufacturing industries of the country are of foreign birth or parentage, while only 5 per cent. of the farm labor are of foreign birth or parentage. I have not quoted his exact language, but its substance.

If this be true, and I have no reason to doubt it, then, sir, we are taxing the American farmer to pay high wages, not to American labor, but to imported foreign labor. Sir, it is a fact well known to every one that a few years ago labor strikes were numerous. It is estimated by the Commissioner of Labor that during the year ending July 1, 1885, over 19,000 establishments, including factories and mines, were closed, and over 168,000 hands thrown out of employment. During this time, and for years before, protectionists, who now so loudly and vigorously cry out for protection of American labor, were importing vast numbers of this "pauper labor" from Europe, and the evil grew to such an extent that Congress was compelled to interpose by interdicting the im-

portation of foreigners under the contract or agreement system by which they were to perform labor in the United States, and laborers all over the country are now demanding the enforcement of these laws.

These facts will show, Mr. Chairman, how empty the pretensions of those who claim that protection is intended for the benefit of American labor. It has ever been insisted that the farmer is benefited by the tariff, but I have heard no argument to sustain this position. On the other hand, the facts show that after supplying the home markets he is forced to ship the products of his farm to European countries, some of which levy a tariff thereon, which lessens the price he would otherwise receive.

The Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, in his last statement of exports, embracing the period from July 1, 1887, to March 31, 1888, only nine months, shows exports of farm products as follows:

Animals, valued at (round numbers)	$8,679,000
Breadstuffs, valued at (round numbers)	103,259,000
Cotton (unmanufactured)	190,708,000
Meat and dairy products, valued at (round numbers)	70,180,000
Seeds	1,385,000
Sugar and molasses	2,236,000
Tobacco (unmanufactured)	18,855,000
Total	396,002,000

The above list does not by any means embrace all the products of the farm and ranch which are forced too seek a market in a foreign land, but it shows enough to convince any reasonable mind that these products have no protection at home.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is needless to pursue this subject further. The financial condition of the country is such that immediate relief is needed.

The balance in the Treasury on the 30th of April of the present year aggregated $136,143,563.53 over and above all liabilities, and it is estimated that by the 1st of July next the surplus will have reached $150,000,000. This does not include the $100,000,000 reserve fund.

Now the problems which confront us are, first, what shall be done with the vast surplus that is now hoarded in the Treasury, and, second, what shall be done to prevent a similar accumulation in the future?

If I understand the sentiment of this side of the House, it is that the surplus should be expended in paying the matured debts and in the purchase of such unmatured interest-bearing obligations as can be done without too great a sacrifice, thus relieving the Treasury and returning the money to the people through the channels of trade; and to accomplish this purpose the bill of my distinguished colleague [Mr. MILLS] was introduced and passed this House.

Now, in reference to the other question. While it is admitted by all parties that there must be a reduction in the amount of the taxes to prevent a continued increase of the surplus, as to how it shall be done has given rise to all this discussion.

Republicans and a few high-tariff Democrats propose to reduce taxation by the repeal of the internal taxes on tobacco and distilled and malt liquors. For a quarter of a century the Republican party was in power, and during that time called into existence the income, the railroad, and bank taxes; also the internal tax, all of which were claimed to be war taxes. The first-mentioned taxes were repealed while a war debt of over $2,000,000,000 was hanging over the country, and now it is proposed to repeal the internal taxes while a war debt of one billion and forty millions yet remains unpaid. A pension-roll requiring about eighty-six millions annually to pay, a result of the war, is upon us, and though it has been twenty-three years since the war closed, the roll is daily increasing. Notwithstanding these enormous war debts are hanging over the country, and by their ponderous weight crushing the energies of the people, the Republican party is endeavoring to wipe from the statute-books every vestige of the war taxes. As long as war debts exist war taxes should be continued.

These internal taxes oppress no one. Tobacco and cigars, whisky and beer are not necessaries. They are classed as luxuries. Persons who use them do so voluntarily. The producers of corn, rye, and barley, from which whisky is manufactured, realize about as much for their grain as they did when there was no tax on whisky. The tax is simply added to the value of the manufactured article, and according to protection theorists ought to reduce the price of whisky; but the truth is, as is apparent, it is paid, as all other taxes are, by the consumers of the article. Such is the case with the tobacco tax. The Democrats on this floor prefer to give the people cheap clothing rather than give them cheap whisky and tobacco.

But why, Mr. Chairman, are protectionists so much concerned about the repeal of the internal-revenue taxes? They did not try to do so when they were in power. They find, however, that under an honest Democratic administration of this Government a surplus has accumulated and the amount thereof has been increased to such proportions that some relief must be given. They see that high tariff is in danger. They see the means by which they can levy many hundred millions of dollars upon the clothing and articles of necessity of the farmers, mechanics, and laborers of the country for their own use and benefit are about to be swept away by a reduction of the tariff tax, and therefore they are much concerned about the internal tax. They want the latter repealed to save the former, and not only to save the former, but to bring about a necessity for increasing the tariff taxes. They see from the report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue that there were collected for the year ending June 30, 1887, from the—

Whisky tax (in round numbers)	$65,829,000
Tobacco tax (in round numbers)	30,108,000
Fermented liquors	21,922,000
Total	117,859,000

The oleomargarine tax, which protectionists do not seek to repeal, is not included in the above. To repeal the internal taxes above named will reduce the revenues of the Government $60,000,000 below current expenses, including the pension-roll. How do protectionists propose to supply the deficit? The question has been asked them several times, but I have heard no response. I presume they want greater protection.

Mr. Chairman, the bill now under consideration is not, in my opinion, the best tariff measure that could be framed, but as might be reasonably expected in a body as numerous as this, there exist conflicting opinions, which can be reconciled only by mutual concessions and compromises; and it was in this spirit, as I am assured, that the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee met to consider measures for the relief of the financially depressed condition of the people of the country; and as a result of many weeks of arduous labor, this bill was presented, and while it may not meet with the approval of every Democrat, it is admitted that it will afford some measure of relief to a tax-burdened people if it can be passed.

One other objection urged against this bill by protectionists is that it places wool on the free-list. I can not believe that the dire calamities predicted, if wool be put on the free-list, will befall the wool-growers of the country, many of whom reside in the district I have the honor to represent, and are among the warmest personal and political friends I have.

For the information of those who are interested, I present a brief history of the tariff legislation on wool:

The tariff act of 1816 imposed a duty on unmanufactured wool of 15 per cent. ad valorem.

The act of 1824 fixed the duty at 25 per cent. ad valorem after June, 1825, and after June 1, 1826, at 30 per cent. ad valorem.

The act of 1828 imposed a duty of 4 cents a pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem.

The act of 1832 admitted free all the wool under 8 cents a pound, and all wool over 8 cents was dutiable at 4 cents per pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem.

The act of 1833 did not substantially change the tariff on wool; it reduced it a little.

The act of 1842 taxed wool of the value of 7 cents per pound or under 5 cents ad valorem; over 7 cents, 3 cents per pound and 30 per cent. ad valorem.

The act of 1846 imposed a tax on all wools, without regard to quality, of 30 per cent. ad valorem.

The act of 1857 admitted all wool under the value of 20 cents per pound free of duty, and all wools above that value were taxed 24 per cent. ad valorem. I omit the war period.

The act of 1867 classified wool into three classes, and imposed a tax on wool of the first class of the value of 32 cents or less per pound of 10 cents per pound and 11 cents ad valorem; exceeding 32 cents in value, 12 cents per pound. The same on second-class wool. On third-class wool, valued at 12 cents per pound or under, 3 cents per pound; exceeding 12 cents, 6 cents per pound.

The act of 1872 made a horizontal reduction of 10 per cent. on all wools, but this act was repealed in March, 1875. The act of 1883, the present tariff act, imposed on wools of the first class, valued at 30 cents per pound, 10 cents per pound; exceeding 30 cents, 12 cents per pound. The rate is the same on second-class wools. On third class, of value of 12 cents per pound, 2½ cents per pound, and on wool exceeding 12 cents, 5 cents per pound.

The following table, taken from the report of Secretary Manning on the Revision of the Tariff, page 249, will not be uninteresting if studied in connection with the rates of duty on wool under the various tariff acts as above given:

Statement showing the average prices of domestic, fine, medium, and coarse washed fleece wool, for the months of January, April, July, and October, and the total average during each year from 1824 *to* 1884, *inclusive.*

Year.	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.	Average.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1824	63	45	33	47
1825	55	42	33	43
1826	47	39	34	40
1827	40	37	27	35
1828	45	36	30	37
1829	45	36	32	38
1830	55	46	37	46
1831	71	61	50	61
1832	56	50	36	47
1833	61	51	39	50
1834	65	54	33	52

tatement showing the average prices of domestic, fine, medium, and coarse washed fleece wool—Continued.

Year.	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.	Average.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1835	64	54	46	55
1836	68	58	50	59
1837	60	53	45	53
1838	51	42	34	42
1839	57	49	40	49
1840	48	41	35	41
1841	51	44	35	43
1842	44	38	31	37
1843	35	30	23	29
1844	44	36	30	37
1845	42	37	30	36
1846	38	32	27	32
1847	46	40	30	39
1848	40	34	28	34
1849	39	34	28	34
1850	46	39	32	39
1851	47	42	35	41
1852	45	39	34	39
1853	59	54	47	53
1854	49	46	38	44
1855	46	38	33	39
1856	56	45	39	47
1857	53	47	38	46
1858	45	36	31	37

Year.	Fine.		Medium.		Coarse.		Average.	
	Cents.		*Cents.*		*Cents.*		*Cents.*	
1859	59		47		40		49	
1860	55		48		41		48	
1861	43		39		35		39	
	Currency.	Gold.	Currency.	Gold.	Currency.	Gold.	Currency.	Gold.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1862	51	46	50	45	50	45	50	45
1863	79	54	76	52	73	50	76	52
1864	90	44	88	43	85	42	87	43
1865	83	53	82	52	75	48	80	51
1866	67	47	63	45	54	38	61	43
1867	58	42	51	37	46	33	52	37
1868	48	34	46	33	43	31	46	33
1869	49	37	49	37	47	36	48	37
1870	48	41	47	40	44	38	46	40
1871	56	50	55	49	51	45	54	48
1872	72	65	68	61	66	59	68	62
1873	58	51	56	49	49	43	54	48
1874	55	50	54	49	47	42	52	47
1875	52	45	52	44	45	39	47	43
1876	44	40	44	40	37	31	41	37
1877	47	45	43	40	37	34	42	40

	Fine.	Medium.	Coarse.	Average.
	Cents.	*Cents.*	*Cents.*	*Cents.*
1878	39	40	34	38
1879	37	38	34	36
1880	49	52	46	49
1881	43	46	38	42
1882	43	45	37	42
1883	41	42	34	39
1884	40	37	32	33

J. R. DODGE,
Statistician, Department of Agriculture.

It will be seen from the foregoing table that wool was higher while the tariff acts of 1832 and 1833 were in force—which protectionists call low-tariff acts—than it has been at any period since, except the war period, and that wool commanded a higher price during the time the low-tariff act of 1846 was in force than it has at any time since the passage of the high-tariff act of 1883. These facts should convince the wool-growers of the country that the price of their clips does not depend upon a high tariff.

Testimony from many sources shows that fine foreign wools, which are used to mix with our coarser wools in the manufacture of certain fabrics, are practically excluded from the country by high tariff, and as a result many mills are idle. Remove the tariff, start the mills to work, and there will be an increased demand for the home production.

But so much has been said on this subject and it has been so ably and eloquently discussed by my colleague [Mr. LANHAM] I will not take up further time on this branch of the discussion.

Mr. Chairman, there are a few facts which I desire to call to the attention of the House which I omitted to do at the proper time and in the right connection, but which I do not want to pass by without notice, as they tend to show that when the distinguished gentleman from Michigan appealed to history to confirm the assertion "that the periods of protection in this country have been periods of prosperity, and that the eras of free trade or a revenue tariff have been eras of depression and disaster," he had entirely forgotten the two greatest industries of this country, the growing of cotton and wheat.

He paints in glowing colors the prosperity which he alleges followed the tariffs of 1824 and 1828, and eloquently depicts the "widespread desolation" that followed the low tariff of 1833. Now, sir, I appeal to statistical history to show that the gentleman's love for protection is greater than his love for truth of history. Upland cotton in New York in 1825 sold from 13 to 27 cents per pound. It gradually went down under high tariff each year until it sold for the low price of 7 to 12 cents in 1832. In 1833, under low tariff, prices advanced to 9 and 17 cents. In 1835 they were from 15 to 20 cents per pound; declined in 1836, and sold at 12 to 20 cents. There was further decline, under the high-tariff acts of 1842, which received its mead of praise from the gentleman. Cotton sold that year in New York from 7 to 9 cents, and in the following year from 5 to 8 cents; 5 to 9 in 1844, and 4 to 9 in 1845, the lowest price that cotton ever reached in this country.

Under the low-tariff acts of 1846 and 1857, which the gentleman alleges in substance brought eras of industrial depression, culminating in the panic of 1857 and in universal bankruptcy, history shows that cotton gradually advanced from 1846 until 1850, when it sold from 11 to 14 cents; in 1853, from 10 to 11 cents; and in 1857, the year when "universal bankruptcy overtook the people," according to the gentleman, cotton sold in New York from 13 to 15 cents per pound. Substantially the same fluctuations occured in the price of wheat and other farm products. The foregoing figures were taken from the American Almanac, the statistics of which were compiled from official sources by Mr. Spofford, the Librarian of Congress. Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems that when the gentleman was speaking of the panics of 1837 and 1857 he forgot that great class of laborers whose farm products commanded high prices under low tariff and were sacrificed at low prices under high tariff. He forgot to tell us that the Commissioner of Labor, who has collected all the information obtainable on this subject, says that these panics, including that of 1873, were the results of speculation, extension of credits, and inflated currency. But why has not the gentleman told us the cause of the great distress brought upon the country by the financial crash of 1873. Was it free trade or a revenue tariff only? If I remember correctly there, never was a period in the history of this country when the tariffs were higher. Why did he not tell us the causes which led to the financial depression that continued from 1882 to 1885? And why did he not tell us the causes which have produced existing depressions in monetary affairs and the general discontent that exists all over this land? I will answer the last question in short. High tariff, which robs the farmer, the mechanic, and the laborer of their hard earnings under the guise of protection to build up and sustain vast moneyed monopolies and trusts that are ruled over by the lordliest set of plunderers that ever feasted and fattened on the misfortunes of their countrymen by sanction of law, is one of the principal causes that has produced present depression and existing discontent.

It has been several times shown by gentlemen on this side of the House that these trusts, such as the salt trust, steel trust, iron trust, zinc, copper, lead, and tin trusts, and many others, under a protective tariff, enjoy a bonus of $30 on every $100 worth of their products, while the whole cost for labor is only $24. Now, sir, these soulless entities called trusts, which have sprung into existence of high-tariff parentage within the last few years, are earless to the wails of suffering of the laboring men, women, and children for whose labor $24 are paid, while above ordinary profits high tariff allows them a bonus of $30. How can they expect the country to remain quiet and passive under such circumstances? How can they expect to keep down strikes when they come with all their money power and influence to defeat all legislation looking to a fair adjustment and settlement of existing evils?

Mr. Chairman, these trusts destroy all competition at home, and high tariff prevents competition from abroad. Break down these trusts by a reduction of the tariff, and competition will spring into life again at home and abroad, labor will be better paid, and farm products will advance.

And I wish here to repeat, that I have shown that the proposition made by the gentleman from Michigan has not been sustained by history; and I want further to say that if history proves anything it proves that the periods of protection, which the gentleman calls periods of "marvelous prosperity," have been periods of "marvelous prosperity" for corporate monopolies, for moneyed combinations, for trusts, for syndicates, and all the evils that follow in the train of money domination.

These have been the periods when our commerce with foreign nations ceased, when our ships rotted in the docks for want of a cargo, when our flag was not—and it is not now—seen in the commercial ports of the world, when our cotton sold in New York from 4 to 9 cents a pound, and now from 7 to 13, when our wheat sold in New York from 75 to 100 cents per bushel, and little better now. The present time, I suppose, is one of the gentleman's periods of "marvelous prosperity," when the farmer, mechanic, laborer, and all kinds of occupations and professions are taxed in order to get cheap farming implements, clothing, and other necessaries of life. During the last year nearly $2,000,000 worth of agricultural implements were exported from this to for-

eign countries, coming in competition with what protectionists call the cheap wood and iron of other countries, and yet the farmer at home must be taxed on the wood and iron that are used in the manufacture of his wagon, his plow, hoe, and rake, and on the bolts, screws, and nails, and everything else he uses. And he as well as his neighbors of every other calling must be taxed on every article of clothing used by himself, wife, and children, and all this not for the benefit of the government under which he lives, but to protect manufacturers, holders of stocks in trusts, combinations, and other moneyed associations, that they may live in luxurious ease at home, and "clothed in purple and fine linen" may display the magnificence of their wealth abroad.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I prefer to see a return of another one of those periods which the gentleman denominates, "eras of depression and disaster," when we will have a tariff for revenue only, when cotton will sell as it sold in 1835, from 15 to 20 cents per pound—11 to 14 in 1850, and 13 to 15 in 1857—when wheat will sell, as it did in 1836, from $1.37 to $2.12, in 1850 from $1.09 to $1.50, and in 1855 from $1.96 to $2.80. These were years of depression, according to the gentleman, as low tariffs then existed. What would the farmers that grew cotton and wheat in those days say? And what will the farmers of to-day, whose products are sold in the gambling houses of the great cities in the form of futures at nominal prices months before they are gathered, say?

Mr. Chairman, no fact is better known to the people of this country than the fact that the prices of our products are determined by the prices of such products in foreign markets. If cotton declines a half penny in Liverpool it goes down 1 cent in New York as quickly as the electric flash can convey the news. So also with all our farm products. No one has ever heard a protectionist object to foreign dealers fixing the prices of the products of the farm, ranche, or dairy; but when it is proposed to add a tariff for revenue only to the price of foreign manufactures, such as clothing and other necessaries, consternation is at once produced in protection camps, and the cry is raised that our home industries will be destroyed.

They want a wall of protection as high and as thick as the walls that surrounded ancient Babylon to keep out "the pauper and demoralized labor of the Old World" and the manufactured product of that labor from this country, yet they want a gateway left open broad enough and high enough for the farm products of the country to pass out to the markets of the world, to compete with the products of the hungry and half-clad labor of Egypt, Australia, and India. But when the manufacturers of wood, iron, wool, cotton, or any foreign commodity is sought to be brought to this country in exchange for our exports this gateway is closed by protectionists who tell us that such manufactures can not enter, because they are the products of the "pauper and demoralized labor of the Old World!" Such is the philosophy of the protectionists.

Mr. Chairman, as my time is about to expire, I only wish to mention another fact or two which, in my opinion, have much to do with the discontent that exists throughout the country. I refer to our financial policy and to our banking system. While I have no time to enter into details, I will state that on the 31st of October last there were two hundred and twenty depositories, all of which, I believe, are national banks, in which there were deposited something over $31,000,000 of Government funds. It is true that this money is secured by the deposit of the bonds of the Government with the Treasurer, and is perfectly safe as far as the Government is concerned. But the fact to which I desire to call your attention is that these banks, which are organized for private purposes, that is, for the benefit of the stockholders, are by law made the financial agents of the Government, and in this way become the managers and directors of the finances of the Government.

The large capital owned and controlled by these banks, supplemented by this immense sum of Government money, practically places the finances of the country in their hands, and enables them to regulate and control the amount of the circulation which enters into the trade and business of the country. In these days of combines and trusts it is not unreasonable to suppose that the banks, like all other moneyed organizations and powers, co-operate for the purpose of securing for themselves the largest possible profits. In fact, we know that the representatives of these institutions meet annually at Saratoga for the purpose of outlining their future policy and of suggesting such legislation as will insure a continuance of their mastery over the finances of the country.

Mr. Chairman, the policy of the banks in withdrawing their circulation, coupled with the heavy drains daily made upon the country through high-tariff taxation, came nigh producing another great panic a short time ago. The fact is, sir, we were on the verge of another crisis, to avoid which the Government was forced into the market of the country to buy unmatured bonds at high premiums. This policy gave temporary relief, by turning into the channels of trade a portion of our surplus and thereby preventing what seemed to be the deliberate purpose of some of forcing a crisis. Unless some remedial legislation is adopted there is nothing to prevent a recurrence of the past. The Comptroller of the Currency, in his last annual report, shows that on October 31, 1883, there were national-bank notes outstanding, less the amount secured by a deposit of lawful money, in round numbers, $316,020,000.

On the 31st of October, 1887, national-bank notes outstanding, less the amount secured by a deposit of lawful money, amounted to $169,215,000; showing a decrease in the amount of their circulation during the four years of $146,785,000, notwithstanding the fact that within the same period of time over seven hundred new banks were organized. Fifty million dollars of the sum before named was withdrawn from circulation during the last year of the period named. Under the acts of 1874 and 1882 national banks may continue to withdraw their circulation by a deposit of lawful money, and at the same time withdraw their bonds deposited to secure their circulation and speculate on them in the market, where they now sell at $126.50 for every $100.

The disposition of our people to organize new national banks in all of our prosperous towns and cities in the South and West tends to enhance their value by creating a demand for these bonds, which are held almost exclusively by capitalists and rich bankers in the money centers, who can place whatever price thereon they see proper. While large banks are withdrawing their bonds from deposit, which secures their circulation by depositing lawful money, dollar for dollar, to pay off their outstanding notes, they sell the bonds thus withdrawn to the organizers of new banks at $126.50 for every $100, thus speculating on the organizers of new banks as well as the Government, which must also pay their prices.

It must be evident to every one that the present price of 4 per cent. bonds is merely speculative. These bonds do not mature until 1907, and are therefore generally used by national banks to secure their circulation. While these bonds only draw 4 per cent. per annum they are now worth in the market 126½, while the 4½ per cent. bonds, which mature in 1891, only command 106½ in the market. It is apparent, therefore, that it is not the matter of interest the bonds draw that affects the price of bonds, but the time they have to run. The 4½ bonds can be called in at maturity three years hence, and therefore the opportunities for speculation are not afforded as in the case of 4 per cent. bonds, which have nineteen years to run.

The Comptroller of the Currency further shows that the national banks now in existence, if they held only the minimum of bonds, can reduce the bank circulation to (round numbers) $80,921,000, while the maximum of circulation can be increased to $520,616,000.

Now, Mr. Chairman, such a power as this should never be left in the hands of the banks. They ought not to have the ability to increase or diminish the volume of currency at their will and pleasure.

As long as this is the case we may expect financial depressions and panics. Take this power away by proper legislation, furnish a sufficient amount of gold and silver, and paper based on the precious metals to supply the demands of business and trade, strike down protection, pass the pending bill, which is a tariff measure for revenue only and which will save to the farmers and laborers of this country $78,000,000 annually, and then peace, happiness, and prosperity will bless our entire country. [Applause.]

Mr. JACKSON obtained the floor and said: Mr. Chairman, I yield a portion of my time to my colleague [Mr. DARLINGTON].

Mr. DARLINGTON. Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made on both sides of this Chamber that the tariff is a business question. If a business question, it should be treated as such—that is, in accordance with the rules which govern in corporations, large or small. The stockholders manage a corporation in proportion to the number of shares held by each. Applying this principle, let us see how the present tariff bill originated.

The Ninth district of Texas, the Second district of Arkansas, the Fourth district of Tennessee, and the Second district of Georgia are represented on the Committee of Ways and Means, the committee that originated this bill. According to the census report for 1880, the manufacturing and agricultural products for the year 1879 in these four Congressional districts were $33,209,333. The Sixth district of Pennsylvania, which I have the honor to represent on this floor, according to the same census report, produced for the same year manufacturing and agricultural products amounting to $38,514,217.

Mr. HERBERT. Does the gentleman think that the districts he mentions as being deficient in manufacturing interests have therefore no right to say anything as to the amount of taxes they shall pay?

Mr. DARLINGTON. Oh, no; not at all. I merely want to show that I have larger interests to represent so far as manufactures are concerned.

Let us apply the test to wages. The four Congressional districts paid out during 1879 $576,539. The wages paid during the same year in the Sixth Congressional district of Pennsylvania were $5,589,188.

The number of hands employed in manufacturing in those four districts was 3,697. The number employed in the Sixth district was 16,103.

Judging, then, by the tests of production, wages, and the number of hands employed, the Congressional district I represent should have five times the weight in framing a tariff it now has; in other words, the great interests at stake have not adequate protection, so far as representation is concerned, by votes or speeches. The four Congressional districts having less production, less men employed, and paying out less wages, are able to destroy by legislation the industries in another district. Will they do it, or, rather, should they?

Living in sections which produce comparatively nothing, while they are very excellent gentlemen, good lawyers, and shrewd politicians, they are hardly the best qualified to legislate upon subjects in which they have had no practical experience and in which their districts have very little interest.

Much fault is found with the New England and Middle States for building railroads in the West, and for holding mortgages on farms in the same section. This kind of talk does not properly belong to the discussion of a tariff question. The indebtedness is incurred by the parties interested, is a voluntary transaction on both sides, and needs no consideration whatever on the floor of this House.

If Western and Southern people do not want railroads or do not want to mortgage their farms the remedy is in their own hands. I would mildly suggest less politics and more business, more industry and more thrift would soon obviate the necessity of borrowing so much money of Eastern capitalists.

Establish manufactories, have diversified industries, a home market for the farmer's products, and soon there will be a surplus of capital in every section of our country. The West and South have natural advantages over the East and North, but no nation can grow rich by agriculture alone. Farmers to prosper must live contiguous to large cities, and these will not grow unless manufactures are fostered.

I am here to legislate for the whole country, but especially to look after the interests of my own people. Now, if protection is withdrawn, even to a partial extent, its effects will be felt immediately. The 16,000 men engaged in manufacturing in the Sixth district will either be thrown out of employment or their wages will be reduced. If they quit the business with which they are acquainted, what would you do with them? The farmers of Chester and Delaware Counties do not need their services; you do not need them in the West or South for agriculture; why disturb their present prosperous condition? If they leave their present location the farmers lose their home market, and there is stagnation in every industry, and who will be benefited? The foreign manufacturer perhaps, but I am not here to legislate for Europe, Asia, or Africa, but for America. I would build an industrial wall around this country so high that not an article should come into it that could be profitably produced here, trusting to competition to place prices of manufactured goods on an equitable basis.

The protective policy has been in force in this country since 1842, with a few exceptions, and its results have been marvelous. It was so successful in my section that when the Democratic party nominated James K. Polk for President in 1844, on a free-trade platform, it was necessary to inscribe on its banners "Polk, Dallas, and the tariff of '42," to carry Pennsylvania.

The history of the protective policy from that time to this has been so often given on this floor that I shall not detain you with an account of its triumphs.

It is said the manufacturer has grown too rich. I deny it. I have had some experience with that class. Taking everything into account, they have not received more than an adequate recompense for the risks involved.

William Penn, with his frugal and thrifty Quakers, coming from the farming districts of England, first landed at the city of Chester, now a flourishing town in the southern portion of my district. After purchasing the land from the Indians they and their descendants gradually spread over the hills and valleys of Chester and Delaware Counties, and by honest toil and economy for two hundred years, mainly by farming, have acquired a surplus, and to-day they are the people who furnish the money to invest in Western mortgages, county, city, and township loans.

Mr. HERBERT. Does the gentleman say that the money so invested is the money of the farmers?

Mr. DARLINGTON. Of the farmers alone. The manufacturers need all the capital they possess to keep in motion their enterprises. It is the farmers of the East, not the manufacturers, who are furnishing the West with capital.

Mr. HERBERT. Does the gentleman mean to say that the industries of his district are altogether agricultural industries?

Mr. DARLINGTON. No, sir; the industries of my district are both farming and manufacturing. We produce from twenty-five to thirty million dollars' worth of manufactured products annually.

The constant parade on this floor of the indebtedness of the West to the East is both silly and unbusinesslike. If you alarm the Eastern investors, you cut off the supply of capital that is necessary to the opening up of a new country, and then you are at the mercy of the Western banker. I trust for your own interests, this part of your assertions, calculated to inflame one section against another, will cease. Without credit Western lands are comparatively valueless to the poor man. In order to carry out your mad schemes of free trade in this country you are ready to rob him, first of his credit, then of the fruits of his labor, reducing him to a level with the peasantry of France, Russia, Germany, and Ireland.

A widow of a missionary to India, returning to her native land, on the death of her husband, informed me that her three servants, on bended knee, begged her to take them with her to America. The wages she had paid them for years were 3 cents per day. Destroy the protective policy, and then as a necessary consequence these cheap laborers must be obtained or our manufacturing interests will be destroyed.

Mr. HERBERT. Will the gentleman tell us whether the lady he speaks of was cruel enough to leave those servants behind her in India?

Mr. DARLINGTON. She was a missionary's widow, with five children, and probably without means of paying the passage of those servants; so if she was unwilling to undertake to bring them to this country it is not to be wondered at. But other persons of larger means will bring people of that class here if we open the doors.

Labor in this country is at present organized and asserting its rights; but what would organization effect against labor in India at 3 cents a day?

May the day be far distant when American laborers will have no other aspirations than a bare competency! The education of their children, the prospect of a home of their own, all these crushed out, and that, too, under the name of Democracy.

Less than a third of a century ago the dominant section of the Democratic party conceived the bold idea of extending the dominion of slavery over the fertile Territories of the West. To succeed in that enterprise it was necessary to have an intimation from the Supreme Court of the United States to aid them in their work. A Chief-Justice traveled out of his way to declare that a black man had no rights which a white man was bound to respect. This opinion shocked the civilized world, and brought upon this country the wrath of Almighty God.

Mr. HERBERT. Does not the gentleman from Pennsylvania know that Chief-Justice Taney never said anything of that sort?

Mr. DARLINGTON. No, sir; I do not know it.

Mr. HERBERT. I say he did not. There is nothing of that kind in the Dred-Scott decision.

Mr. DARLINGTON. The history of the country will show whether my statement is correct. I am trespassing on the time of my colleague [Mr. JACKSON], and I must hurry on.

To establish the idea of slavery as a permanent institution on this continent, the Southern people fought with unparalleled bravery, and for four years held in check the mighty armies of the Republic. Their devotion to their ideas and their personal bravery and self-sacrifice must, and did, command our admiration; but they failed. Their dream of a landed aristocracy and a roll-call of slaves has been dispelled. Slavery is gone forever; but in its place they would establish another aristocracy, composed of land-owners and manufacturers, with poorly-paid labor and a half-starving peasantry, if protection is discarded and labor placed on an equality throughout the world.

Less then one month ago two-thirds of this House favored a bill to equalize taxation by returning the taxes paid by a portion of the States, releasing the remainder from all claims the Government had upon them—a just and equitable bill.

Forth stepped a Democrat from the South, and cried "Halt!" Immediately filibustering began; a caucus was held; the Democratic party became solid; the dead-lock was broken.

A Democratic caucus, at some stage of the tariff proceedings, may say the Mills bill must go through, and the Northern Democracy, pliable as it has always been, may bow the knee, and there will be rejoicing—outside of America, throughout the world. The Cobden Club will have a banquet; foreign articles will be thrown into our markets; for the time-being goods may be cheaper. When our manufactures are destroyed prices will advance, and then we will again return to the idea of protection.

The country awaits with anxiety the verdict of the House on the Mills tariff bill. [Loud applause.]

[Mr. JACKSON withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

[Mr. OWEN withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. NELSON, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation tot he collection of the revenue, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. CHEADLE. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Pensions yesterday submitted a number of adverse reports, among them a bill (H. R. 3544) granting a pension to Joseph W. McConnell. I ask unanimous consent that that bill be placed upon the Calendar with the adverse report.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is inclined to think that that is hardly in order now, the session this evening being for debate only; but the gentleman will be recognized to make the request to-morrow.

Mr. KILGORE. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) adjourned until 10 a. m. to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. C. R. BRECKINRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 9984) granting a pension to Frank Caughman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 9985) to pay certain soldiers of the Union armies—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9986) for the relief of Carolina Seiler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9987) for the relief of Robert Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ENLOE: A bill (H. R. 9988) for the relief of James B. Guthrie—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9989) for the relief of Irwin McAdams—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9990) for the relief of James W. Reid—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 9991) for the relief of Thomas M. Bybee—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 9992) granting a pension to Henry H. Gupp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYES: A bill (H. R. 9993) granting a pension to George R. Wells—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PIDCOCK: A bill (H. R. 9994) granting a pension to John W. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: A bill (H. R. 9995) for the relief of W. W. Kerbagh—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. J. R. WHITING: A bill (H. R. 9996) for the relief of David Sarsfield—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition for reducing tax on alcohol used in the arts—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COMPTON: Petition of Marion J. Langley, widow of J. H. Langley, of St. Mary's County, Maryland, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ENLOE: Papers in the claim of Irwin McAdams, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FORD: Remonstrance of Cody, Ball & Co. and other merchants of Grand Rapids, Mich., against any bill proposing to brand or tax the lard manufactured by N. K. Fairbanks & Co.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GALLINGER: Petition of C. M. and A. W. Rolfe, of Penacook, N. H., for quick mail transit between New York and the West and the New England States—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GEAR: Memorial of the Board of Trade of Burlington, Iowa, for reduction of letter postage to 1 cent—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. J. T. JOHNSTON: Petition of J. N. Couchman and 13 others, of L. S. Kenneley and 21 others, of T. H. B. McCain and 35 others, and of J. H. Simpson and 35 others, citizens and soldiers of Montgomery County; of D. L. Bauldridge and 14 others, soldiers and citizens of Parke County; of J. A. Weaver and 34 others, soldiers and citizens of Jackson County; and of H. W. McNamar and 17 others, soldiers and citizens of Clay County, Indiana, for the establishment of a soldiers' home in Indiana—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of J. S. Bennett and others, soldiers of Montgomery County, Indiana, asking for the passage of a general pension bill before the passage of the Mills bill—to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. McCLAMMY: Petition of W. N. Rose, of Wayne County, North Carolina, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY: Petition of citizens of Clay and Jackson Counties, Kentucky, requesting that a pension be granted to Alfred Robinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, papers in the case of Wellington Warren, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORRILL: Petition of Lankford P. Evans, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NICHOLS: Petition of L. P. Sorrell, administrator of Jacob Sorrell, Wake County, North Carolina, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of J. E. Parham and others, citizens of North Carolina, and of Local Assembly No. 9076, Knights of Labor, of Fayetteville, N. C., to protect free labor from convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PEEL: Petition of 89 citizens of Siloam Springs, Ark., favoring the National Tribune pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SEYMOUR: Petition of George A. Priest, of Menominee, Mich., and 89 others, soldiers and sailors of the Union Army—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENRY SMITH: Remonstrance of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., against an amendment to the interstate commerce act relating to customs duties interfering with Canadian railways in the American freight traffic—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SPINOLA: Petition of John F. Hagan, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of Elizabeth G. Mahon, widow of Mathew Mahon, of Morgan Country, Alabama, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. R. WHITING: Petition of J. W. Ennest and 18 others, citizens of Clinton County, Michigan, in favor of pure food—to the Committee on Agriculture.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. BOUND: Of W. G. Wenck and other druggists, of Northumberland, Pa.

By Mr. LONG: Of the Massachusetts State Pharmaceutical Association.

By Mr. McCORMICK: Of George M. Spalding and others, of Wellsborough, Pa.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. KEAN: Petition of J. K. Tyson and others, citizens of Elizabeth, N. J.

By Mr. McCREARY: Of citizens of Laurel County, Kentucky.

By Mr. PERKINS: Of H. F. Higgie and others, citizens of Girard, Kans.

By Mr. CHARLES STEWART: Of citizens of Walker County, Texas

By Mr. J. R. WHITING: Of E. F. Haight and 29 others, citizens of Brockway Centre, Mich.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. GALLINGER: Of Daniel Merrill and 46 others, citizens of Pittsburgh, N. H.

By Mr. GOFF: Of citizens of Grassland and of Dobbins, W. Va.

By Mr. REED: Of citizens of Saco and of Freeport, Me.

By Mr. SPOONER: Of W. S. Shearman and other farmers of Rhode Island.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. BOUND: Of citizens of Shamokin, Pa.

By Mr. JACKSON: Of 2,300 soldiers and citizens of Beaver County, and of 807 soldiers of Lawrence County, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. HUDD: Of 29 citizens of Brown County, Wisconsin.

By Mr. JACKSON: Of 236 citizens of Washington and Beaver Counties, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. LYMAN: Of 58 citizens of Montgomery County, Iowa.

By Mr. MANSUR: Of 50 citizens of Livingston County, Missouri.

The following petition for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. MAISH: Of citizens of Mount Rock, Cumberland County, Pennsylvania.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *May* 16, 1888.

Prayer by Rev. J. E. RANKIN, D. D., of Orange, N. J.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of January 17, 1888, certain information relative to railroad grants to the State of Kansas by acts of Congress of March 3, 1863, and July 26, 1866. This communication is accompanied by a large number of exhibits, including maps, and perhaps it had better be referred to the Committee on Printing for examination before further action is taken. That order will be made, if there be no objection.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented the memorial of L. P. Wilson and others, citizens of the United States, remonstrating against the convict-labor system of the States; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Kansas, praying for legislation providing protection for game in the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table..

Mr. VEST presented a memorial of the Butchers' National Protective Association, remonstrating against the passage of the Palmer bill for the extirpation of pleuro-pneumonia among cattle; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BLODGETT presented the petition of H. E. Bowles and 26 other citizens of New Jersey, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PALMER presented the petition of John A. Neville and 21 other surviving Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Charlevoix and vicinity, in the State of Michigan, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Detroit, Mich., signed by J. C. McDonald, president, and George M. Lane, secretary, praying for the passage of the bill providing for the construction of a winter bridge across the Detroit River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. VOORHEES presented two petitions of ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Indiana, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of citizens of New Jersey and Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of Senate bill 283, providing for the better protection of the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. QUAY presented the petition of Chenango Grange, No. 221, Patrons of Husbandry, of Chenango, Pa., and the petition of George T. Mackey and 28 other citizens of Lathrop, Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania, praying that the work of the eradication of pleuro-pneumonia shall be continued under the Bureau of Animal Industry as at present organized, etc.; which were ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the petition of Rev. W. H. E. Platt, of Carbondale, Pa., praying to be allowed a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of physicians and druggists, citizens of Sewickley, Pa.; and a petition of physicians and druggists, citizens of Great Bend, Pa., praying for the repeal of the law classifying druggists as liquor-dealers, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DOLPH presented a petition of the representatives of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Oregon, praying that an appropriation be made for headstones to mark the graves of Union soldiers; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. EVARTS presented a petition of the Produce Exchange of New York City, praying for the purchase of a certain site for the use of the new custom-house building in that city; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7222) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish agricultural stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto," reported it without amendment.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, from the Committee on Claims, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2882) to pay Aaron Friedheim the rebate due him under the act of March 3, 1883; and

A bill (S. 2883) for the relief of S. H. Pearce.

Mr. EVARTS. A petition of Hiram Berdan, praying that an appropriation be made for the erection of a monument at Gettysburgh, was presented by my colleague [Mr. HISCOCK] on the 7th of May, and referred to the Committee on the Library. I am instructed by that committee to report it back and ask to be discharged from the further consideration of the subject, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The report was agreed to.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report a resolution, which I ask may be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator desire the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SHERMAN. By the rule it has to go to the Committee on Printing.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That 5,000 copies of the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations (Miscellaneous Document No. 109, first session Fiftieth Congress), being the report relating to the fisheries treaty, be printed for the use of the Senate in connection with the message of the President, dated February 20, 1888, and the proposed treaty with Great Britain, and the map of the fishing limits prepared at the Hydrographic Office.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Before the resolution is referred, there is in it a verbal inaccuracy, or rather an omission that ought to be supplied. The understanding was that, of course, the views of the minority would be printed with the report, as I supposed.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, the views of the minority were to be printed with the report proper.

Mr. SHERMAN. That was the intention.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Then the resolution ought to be amended by saying "together with the views of the minority." We do not want to send out half of a document.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will report the proposed amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to amend the resolution so as to read:

Resolved, That 5,000 copies of the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations (Miscellaneous Document No. 109, first session Fiftieth Congress), being the report relating to the fisheries treaty, together with the views of the minority, be printed for the use of the Senate, etc.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be referred under the rule to the Committee on Printing.

ALLOTMENT OF LANDS IN SEVERALTY TO INDIANS.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] May 3, 1888, to report it favorably without amendment. I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was considered, by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed in document form 1,000 copies of the act of February 8, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes."

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2956) for the relief of Samuel T. Dunlap; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SPOONER introduced a bill (S. 2957) granting a pension to Maryeta McGuire, widow of Francis McGuire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2958) granting a pension to Francis M. Spears; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 2959) authorizing the President to appoint and retire James Weir Graydon, of Indianapolis, Ind., with the rank and grade of lieutenant in the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2960) granting a pension to John Speace, late a private in Company K, Thirteenth Regiment of Kentucky Cavalry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 2961) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary A. Black; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PADDOCK introduced a bill (S. 2962) for the relief of George L. Turner; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2963) for the relief of William H. Harlow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 2964) authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to issue to all enlisted men discharged from the United States Navy a certificate of honorable service, where the original discharge has been lost or destroyed; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 2965) for the relief of certain settlers in the Wind River Valley, Wyoming Territory; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. EVARTS introduced a bill (S. 2966) for the relief of William Henry Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. VOORHEES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, fixing the salary of the Commissioner of the General Land Office at $5,000 per annum; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRYE, Mr. BUTLER, and Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the

river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORRILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him as a substitute for the bill (S. 2919) to define the routes of steam railroads in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed

GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. EDMUNDS submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

Resolved, That paragraph 3 of Rule XVI be amended by adding thereto the following:

"Whenever any general appropriation bill originating in the House of Representatives shall be under consideration, it shall be the duty of the Presiding Officer to cause to be stricken out of such bill all provisions therein of a general legislative character other than such as relate to the disposition of the moneys appropriated therein; but such order of the Presiding Officer shall be subject to an appeal to the Senate as in other cases of questions of order."

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON POST-OFFICES AND POST-ROADS.

Mr. SAWYER submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads is hereby authorized to employ a stenographer to report proceedings before said committee regarding House bill No. 4910.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 109) to refund to Dr. F. O. Saint Clair $97.80, duties on a monument to the memory of Francis J. Townshend, late of the United States Navy;

A bill (H. R. 2088) for the relief of W. S. Carpenter;

A bill (H. R. 4775) for the relief of Abbie Sharp, formerly Abbie Gardner;

A bill (H. R. 5092) for the relief of Charles L. Bradwell;

A bill (H. R. 6491) for the relief of Lowman & Co.;

A bill (H. R. 7618) for the relief of the Shepard & Morse Lumber Company of Burlington, Vt.; and

A bill (H. R. 8391) to authorize the location of a branch home for volunteer disabled soldiers in Grant County, Indiana, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1204) to provide for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States at Martinsburgh, in the district of West Virginia.

THE MEAT PRODUCT.

Mr. VEST. I desire to call up the resolution I offered day before yesterday. I intended to call it up yesterday, but on the request of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL], I let it lie over until to-day.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted by Mr. VEST, May 14, 1888, as follows:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators shall be appointed by the President of the Senate, whose duty it shall be to examine fully all questions touching the meat product of the United States, and especially as to the transportation of beef and beef cattle, and the sale of the same in the cattle markets, stock-yards, and cities, and whether there exists or has existed any combination of any kind by reason of which the price of beef and beef cattle have been so controlled or affected as to diminish the prices paid the producer without lessening the cost of meat to the consumer; that said committee may hold its sessions during the recess of the Senate at such times and places as it may determine, and shall have power to send for persons and papers, and also to employ a stenographer and a sergeant-at-arms, all the necessary expenses of said committee to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and said committee shall make report to the Senate at its next session by bill or otherwise.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution is before the Senate if there be no objection; and the question is on agreeing to it.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I shall make no apology for saying a very few words in regard to this resolution.

It is not intended to create any junketing committee or to invade the province of any standing or regular committee of the Senate. If it concerned only the question of the transportation of beef and beef cattle I should have asked its reference to the Committee on Interstate Commerce or the Committee on Commerce generally, but the intention of the resolution is to reach beyond the subject of transportation.

This question of the meat product of the United States is by no means local or sectional. It affects every portion of the country and almost every individual. It is not a question of the sustenance of human or physical life only; it is a question of vitality, of enterprise, of civilization, of empire. The history of the whole world shows that the beef-eating peoples of the world are foremost in peace and war, in art and science. That has been the history of our race, and will be to the end of recorded time.

It is a singular fact, sir, how strikingly this truth is illustrated in statistics as well as in general and national results. I have before me a table accurately prepared and adopted by the highest authority in England and the United States in regard to the consumption of beef in 1884 in all the leading countries of the world.

In Great Britain the average consumption of each individual was 105 pounds per annum; in France 74 pounds; in Germany 69 pounds; in Russia 48 pounds; in Italy 23 pounds; in Austria 64 pounds; in Spain 49 pounds; in Scandinavia 67 pounds; and in the United States 120 pounds.

In Great Britain the consumption annually was 105 pounds, and in the United States 120 pounds, so that the two great English speaking peoples of the world, the foremost to-day in empire and civilization, Great Britain and the United States, are the largest beef consumers of all the nations upon the face of the earth.

In Great Britain there has been by decades the following increase in the consumption of meat: In 1850 the average consumption to the person per annum was 76 pounds; in 1860, 86 pounds; in 1870, 94 pounds; in 1880, 101 pounds, and in 1884, 105 pounds. And yet, sir, with this increased consumption abroad amongst the people with whom we have the closest commercial intercourse, and with the additional fact that during the last terrible winter 500,000 head of cattle perished in the Territory of Montana alone, the price of beef paid the producer is steadily declining in the market.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator means wholesale, not retail.

Mr. VEST. I mean, of course, wholesale; I will come to retail in a moment. I am glad the Senator suggested it, because that is a portion of this remarkable exhibit. It is the fact that whilst the price has decreased to the producer of beef it has increased to the consumer, and this wonderful state of affairs exists and has existed ever since 1872. The purpose of my resolution is to find why this is so, why beef and cattle constitute an exception to the general rule of supply and demand and all commercial rules.

Mr. CULLOM. I believe the Senator's resolution is up for consideration and is the subject of the discussion on the part of the Senator.

Mr. VEST. Yes, sir.

Mr. CULLOM. I wish to suggest an amendment to his resolution, after which I shall have no objection to it.

Mr. VEST. Certainly. Let the proposed amendment be read.

Mr. CULLOM. I will send to the desk the proposed amendment, to come in where I have marked.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment will be read.

Mr. SHERMAN. I appreciate the importance of this resolution, but I think it ought to take the course of all resolutions of this kind proposing to create new committees, involving considerable expense and having a very broad jurisdiction, and which is to continue during the recess of the Senate. Therefore I ask the Senator from Missouri who offered it to refer it to any appropriate committee, I do not care what committee. There are several committees that may be named as having charge of this subject.

Mr. VEST. I am perfectly willing to discuss the disposition of the resolution after I have made a few remarks upon it. I yielded to allow the amendment of the Senator from Illinois to be read.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thought the Senator was through; I beg pardon.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment of the Senator from Illinois will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 6, after the word "kind," insert the words:

Either on the part of the Trunk Line Association, or the Central Traffic Association, or on the part of those engaged in buying and shipping meat products.

So as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That a special committee of five Senators shall be appointed by the President of the Senate, whose duty it shall be to examine fully all questions touching the meat product of the United States; and especially as to the transportation of beef and beef cattle, and the sale of the same in the cattle markets, stock-yards, and cities; and whether there exists or has existed any combination of any kind, either on the part of the Trunk Line Association, or the Central Traffic Association, or on the part of those engaged in buying and shipping meat products, by reason of which the prices of beef and beef cattle have been so controlled or affected as to diminish the price paid the producer without lessening the cost of meat to the consumer. That said committee may hold its sessions during the recess of the Senate, at such times and places as it may determine, and shall have power to send for persons and papers, and also to employ a stenographer and a sergeant-at-arms; all necessary expenses of said committee to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and said committee shall make report to the Senate at its next session by bill or otherwise.

Mr. VEST. I have not the slighest objection to that amendment. My object in offering the resolution was to make it as comprehensive as possible. I am anxious, and honestly so, to ascertain what is the cause of the anomalous condition of affairs in regard to this interest in the United States.

It is very natural, aside from the fact that I am an American Senator, that I should be anxious in regard to this question. The State of Missouri is one of the largest cattle-producing States in the Union, and I say here now to-day, as a matter of personal observation and knowledge, that the cattle interest of the West, of the State in which I live, has been stricken down and is prostrate to-day.

The cattle-growers of the great West seem to be dazed, they seem to be dumbfounded by the present condition of things. They hold conventions and meetings, but they can not ascertain why it is that with an increased population and a decreased amount of beef cattle being produced, the price still goes down in the market to the producer, but does not go down one single cent to the consumer.

Mr. President, a few years ago the cattle interest was one of the most prosperous in the United States. Millions and millions of dollars

were taken from the Eastern States and invested in the ranges of the great West.

I hold in my hand an absolutely and positively correct report of the sales in the Chicago market, the greatest cattle market in the world, showing how the price of cattle has gone down steadily to the producer notwithstanding the fact that there was an immense decrease in the number of cattle, notwithstanding the fact, which goes without saying, that the population of the country is increasing in a ratio hitherto unknown in the history of nations.

This report, which I hold in my hand, is taken from sales made in the stock-yards in Chicago in the year 1887. Take the State of Kansas, which heads the list. The weight of cattle for Kansas was 1,300 pounds per head; price per hundred $4.65; gross value of the 1,300 class of cattle at $4.65, $60.45. Charges: Railroad freight, $4 a head; yard charges, 25 cents; feed charges, 25 cents; commission, 50 cents; making $5; the net value, then, of Kansas cattle being $55.45. Of course these were fed cattle and not from the ranges.

This is a very interesting exhibit, Mr. President. It shows that we are the greatest cattle-producing people in the world, and it shows at the same time, as I shall further on demonstrate mathematically, it seems to me, that nothing but artificial oppression has brought the calamitous state of things that now exists upon the whole country in regard to this interest.

Here is Nebraska. The weight of cattle averages 1,200 pounds for 1887 sold in Chicago. Price per 100, $4.65; gross value, 1,300 at $4.65, $55.80; charges, without specifying particularly in the aggregate, $5; net value in Chicago, $50.80.

Minnesota: Weight, 1,100 pounds; price per hundred, $4.40. Gross value, 1,100 pounds at $4.40, $48.40. Taking off the charges the net cash value was $43.40.

In Dakota the weight was 1,150 pounds; price per hundred, $2.85; gross value, 1,300 pounds at $2.85, $32.77. Taking off the charges, which I will not read, the net value at Chicago to the producer was $27.05.

Now I come to ranch cattle, and this represents by far the greatest interest, the cattle that come from the vast plains of the West, and upon which we must rely eventually for the food product of this country, so far as meat is concerned. Of course there never will be a time in which the cattle from my own State of Missouri, from Iowa, Kentucky, and Tennessee, saying nothing of the production of the cattle in Eastern States, will not be in the market, but it is upon the range cattle that we must depend to the very largest extent for the meat product of the entire country.

In Colorado, the weight at Chicago was 1,050 pounds; the price per hundred in Chicago, $2.65; the gross value, 1,050 pounds at $2.65, $27.82; charges, $5.60; leaving net value to the producer, $22.22.

Now, take the case of a Colorado cattle-raiser who has paid from $15 to $18 for his cattle and kept them upon his range for three years. What is his profit at Chicago? It is the difference between, say, $16 or $17 and $22, so that he gets for his three years' grazing, herding, and attention the paltry sum of $4 or $5 as his net profit.

Mr. MANDERSON. I found it difficult to hear the Senator in the first part of his remarks. Are the figures that he is giving to the Senate the average for the year 1887 as to weight of cattle of the different States, and the average of price?

Mr. VEST. Yes; taken from the report of the stock-yards and the sales. Take, now, the Territory of Wyoming. The weight at Chicago per head was 1,100 pounds. The price at Chicago per hundred, $2.75. The gross value at that price was $30.25. Charges, $5.85, leaving for each steer, $24.40 to the producer, and if they cost him $15 or $18 a head the difference between that and $24 was paid him for two or three years' grazing and herding and attention in order to get them to market, to say nothing of a per cent. on the investment.

No interest in this country has suffered to this extent, Mr. President. Nothing in the whole range of American production has been butchered (and it is an apt word in regard to cattle) like the cattle interest of the United States since 1873.

Take Montana, which produces the best range cattle in the United States. The weight at Chicago is 1,150 pounds. Price per hundred, $2.85. Gross value, $32.77. Net value, deducting charges, $24.62.

Take Iowa, and without tiring myself or the Senate by reading the specifications, I will state that the Iowa cattle average per head $40.20, the Missouri cattle average $40.20, and the Illinois cattle average $44.06⅔. I will simply publish this table in the RECORD without wearying myself by reading the specifications:

Average weights, prices, charges, and net value of cattle from States and Territories named, at Chicago, 1887.

KANSAS.		Per head.
Weight		1,300
Price per 100		$4.65
Gross value, 1,300 at $4.65		$60.45
Charges:		
Railroad freight	$4.00	
Yard charges	.25	
Feed charges	.25	
Commissions	.50	
		5.00
Net value		55.45

NEBRASKA.		Per head.
Weight		1,200
Price per 100		$4.65
Gross value, 1,300 at $4.65		$55.80
Charges:		
Railroad freight	$4.00	
Yard charges	.25	
Feed charges	.25	
Commissions	.50	
		5.00
Net value		50.80

MINNESOTA.		
Weight		1,100
Price per 100		$4.40
Gross value, 1,100 at $4.40		$48.40
Charges:		
Railroad freight	$4.00	
Yard charges	.25	
Feed charges	.25	
Commissions	.50	
		5.00
Net cash value		43.40

DAKOTA.		
Weight		1,150
Price per 100		$2.85
Gross value 1,300 at $2.85		$32.77
Charges:		
Railroad freight	$4.37	
Yard charges	.25	
Feed charges	.75	
Commissions	.35	
		5.72
Net value		27.05

COLORADO.		
Weight at Chicago		1,050
Price per 100 in Chicago		$2.65
Gross value 1,050 at $2.65		$27.82
Charges:		
Railroad freight	$4.50	
Yard charges	.25	
Feed charges	.50	
Commissions	.35	
		5.50
Net value		22.22

WYOMING.		
Weight at Chicago		1,100
Price per 100 at Chicago		$2.75
Gross value at $2.75		$30.25
Charges:		
Railroad freight	$4.50	
Yard charges	.25	
Feed charges	.75	
Commission	.35	
		5.85
Net value at Chicago		24.40

IDAHO.		
Weight		1,157
Price per 100 at Chicago		$2.85
Gross value, 1,150 at $2.85		$32.77
Charges:		
Railroad freight	$9.12	
Yard charges	.25	
Feed charges	1.25	
Commission	.35	
		10.97
Net value		21.80

MONTANA.		
Weight at Chicago		1,150
Price per 100		$2.85
Gross value, 1,150 at $2.85		$32.77
Charges:		
Railroad freight	$6.80	
Yard charges	.25	
Feed charges	.75	
Commissions	.35	
		8.15
Net value		24.62

IOWA—AT CHICAGO.		
Average weight, 1,200 to 1,400, estimated to comprise one-sixth of the shipments:		
Average price of same, $4.40		$57.20
Less charges		3.47
Net value		53.73
Average weight, 1,000 to 1,100, estimated to comprise two-thirds of the shipments:		
Average price $4		42.00
Less charges		3.47
Net value		38.53
Average weight, 700 to 900, estimated to comprise one-sixth of the shipments.		
Average price $2		16.00
Less charges		3.47
Net value		13.53
General average per head combined		40.20
Charges:		
Railroad freight		2.62
Yard charges		.25
Feed charges		.10
Commissions		.50
Total charges		3.47

MISSOURI.	Per head.
Assuming same weights and divisions as Iowa. Average weight, 1,200 to 1,400, estimated to comprise one-sixth of the shipments:	
Average price, $4.40	$57.20
Less charges	3.35
Net value	53.85
Average weight, 1,000 to 1,100, estimated to comprise two-thirds of shipments:	
Average price, $4	42.00
Less charges	3.35
Net value	38.65
Average weight, 700 to 900, estimated to comprise one-sixth of the shipments:	
Average price, $2	16.00
Less charges	3.35
Net value	12.65
General average of all weights and prices	40.20
Charges:	
Railroad freight	2.50
Yard charges	.25
Feed charges	.10
Commissions	.50
Total charges	3.35
ILLINOIS.	
Average weight, 1,300 to 1,500, estimated to comprise one-sixth of the shipments to Chicago:	
Average price, $4.60	64.40
Less charges	2.32
Average net value	62.08
Average weight, 1,100 to 1,200, estimated to comprise two-thirds of the shipments:	
Average price, $4	46.00
Less charges	2.32
Net value	33.48
Average weight, 700 to 900, estimated to comprise one-sixth of the shipments:	
Average price, $2	16.00
Less charges	2.32
Net value	13.68
Average value of all combined	44.06⅓
Charges:	
Railroad charges	1.50
Yard charges	.25
Feed charges	.07½
Commissions	.50
Total charges	2.32½

Now, Mr. President, what is the cause of this decline? I have alluded to the increase in population; I have alluded to the decrease in the number of cattle. It is not overproduction. There must be some artificial reason for this terrible loss in the cattle interest of the United States, and that is the principal point to which I propose to direct my remarks and the attention of the committee which I have asked may be created under this resolution.

In a recent convention of the cattle-growers of the United States, held at Kansas City, my place of residence, a paper was read by a very accurate cattle-grower, a man of education, whose life has been largely devoted to it, in which he used the remarks which I shall make no apology for reading.

I will say, however, in a prefatory sort of way, that a great many of the newspapers of the United States have undertaken to ascribe the great decline in the prices of cattle to the producer, with the extraordinary fact that the price has not declined to the consumer, to the oleomargarine law.

I opposed that bill with all my ability. I have never seen any reason to change my opinion in regard to it. I will say here to-day, although it may be considered unnecessary, that I regard it as the most monstrous piece of legislation that ever passed the American Congress. It was unconstitutional; it was ill-advised; it has done no good in my judgment, and it has done a great deal of harm. The oleomargarine law, however, according to the estimates of the cattle-growers, and of this gentleman whose paper I hold in my hand, only puts the loss on beef cattle at $3 a head. That does not account for this decline. It has gone on steadily since 1873.

Mr. PLUMB. The Senator ought to state in that connection, to be entirely fair, that there has been no reduction in the price of cattle since the passage of the oleomargarine law.

Mr. VEST. I know there has not been.

Mr. PLUMB. So that may be eliminated entirely from the consideration of this question of the decline in price.

Mr. VEST. I am firmly of that opinion. I do not think the oleomargarine law created this extraordinary state of things, but I allude to the assertion because it has been current throughout the country and has been made in the conventions of cattle-growers. However much I was opposed to that bill, and I never could be more opposed to any piece of legislation than I was to that, I do not think it has produced the extraordinary state of things which I am now discussing. But I proceed to read from this paper.

Some careless thinkers—

Said this gentleman—

Some careless thinkers attribute the troubles of the stockman in the near-by Western States to the rise in land values, but those who use the cheap or nearly free lands of the West are apparently as much distressed as those occupying the higher-priced land east of the Missouri River. What, then, is the cause of distress? Better breeds and better methods of feeding and sheltering have come into use; blue-grass pastures and large crops of corn which had no existence fifty years ago, and which were not very abundant even thirty years ago, are not yielding the profits to the trade which native cattle and wild grass formerly yielded.

There were and still are producers in the States named whose first purchase of land was a single quarter-section, to which they added many thousands of acres, all paid for from profits in growing and marketing cattle under the practice of primitive methods, who can not now, with the many modern appliances, transportation included, show any profits in the trade. It seems clear that producers have neglected some essential duty, or left out some important factor once regarded, and that they have allowed some element of cost that had no existence in the early stages to come in unchallenged, and that it has long since grown into proportions which they do not appreciate and which they can not control or eliminate.

First, as to neglect, it has been in regard to transportation; naturally and not at all as being in any way indicative of lack of intelligence, the early stock-grower paid no attention to it. There was no reason why he should, as the cattle could only be taken to market on foot. His energy and intelligence was fully occupied in other directions, the selection of breeds, looking for the best locations, and many other details of management and process. Secondly, and perhaps of most importance of all, the producer has allowed a large item of expense to come in in the marketing. Neglecting to give this his personal attention, he has allowed a class of buyers and those performing various kinds of services to come in between him and the consumer.

We do not deny the right of any man to buy cattle or anything else that he can pay for; we do not indulge in any nonsense of this kind. We are simply stating what has occurred and its effect upon the producer. It seems strange that the half million or more growers of cattle should have let things drift into the prevailing condition which now rules; that is, the allowing of a limited number of buyers to buy so large a portion of the whole production and so nearly all of it in one market. There is not a single staple product of the country which if brought under the same conditions—that is, bought by as few as now buy the largest portion of the cattle—that would not be depressed in price, and that unnaturally, as cattle now are.

The result during fifteen years past has been the transfer of the privilege of allowing a very limited number of buyers to arrange for the transportation of cattle from the largest shipping points in the West to the interior, Eastern, and seaboard markets. The growers have, for the period mentioned, virtually abandoned the ample facilities of our great railroad system and have had no benefit from any of the competition that existed between the various lines. They may at times have had a slight incidental benefit by or from any competition that existed between buyers, but there has been next to nothing of this. The party of buyers is so small that each can get all they can handle without indulging in any competitive strife.

Apparently these are the reasons for the unnaturally low price of cattle; nor is there any other apparent or real reason for the steady and unprecedented decline. We think this opinion will bear investigation without disclosing any other predominating cause. So far as cattle-growers are concerned, and for some time past, the railroads might as well never have been constructed. Not that competition has not largely prevailed; it has been excessive at times, and for periods of considerable duration, but its benefits have rarely reached the producer. It has been mainly confined to the roads and a very limited number of buyers and shippers.

There are causes for the concentration of purchase of so large a proportion of the production by a limited number of buyers that will not at this time be alluded to; that is, unless it becomes necessary to demonstrate the soundness of the opinion as expressed. Should this exigency arise, then it will be shown that the producers, or at least the majority of them, were absolutely powerless after a certain period to defend themselves. We do not wish to make it appear that the producers are entirely responsible for all the misfortunes that have befallen the trade. A few may have been, but the masses were not.

Now, Mr. President, I have wearied myself and possibly the Senate in reading this extract in order to read the latter portion of it. The gentleman who delivered this address, without entering into particulars, intimates that there has been some sort of combination, some sort of conspiracy, which has brought about the condition of things as to the production and sale of cattle in the United States.

I dislike, in the discussion of a great question like this, for it is a great question, to say anything that has the least appearance of a local interest, but I am compelled to allude to the fact that the largest city in my State, the city of St. Louis, which ought geographically to have been at least the equal of Chicago in the sale and purchase and shipment of cattle, is to-day so far behind Chicago and inferior to it in this matter of purchasing and shipping cattle that a comparison is hardly worthy of being instituted between the two cities. St. Louis is the great city of the Mississippi Valley, and geographically it ought to be the shipping point for Texas, the Indian Territory, and the large ranges of the Southwest, but for some reason which I propose now to investigate the cattle interest of St. Louis has been stricken down.

The city in which I live, Kansas City, is to-day in close alliance, so far as the cattle interest is concerned, with Chicago; but Chicago is the heart, blood, brain, liver of the cattle trade throughout this country and throughout the world. It is the largest cattle market in the world. As great as that city is, and no one admires its prosperity, enterprise, and activity more than myself, it has not been natural reasons that have brought this about. It has been a combination, a selfish combination of interests, as a matter of trade and commerce, which now that it has affected the price of cattle to the consumer becomes a matter of the greatest importance to every man who thinks it his duty as an American citizen or legislator to investigate the present condition of affairs.

This gentleman in this paper alludes indistinctly to such a combination; he charges that it has existed, and we know that to-day five firms in the city of Chicago control the price of beef throughout the whole United States. There is not a butcher in the city of Washington who is not subservient to that combination in Chicago; not one from Boston to Charleston but who feels the effect of this combination. The great railroads of the country running into Chicago are in the interest of this combination. They are in sympathy with these five firms, and to-day

every bunch of cattle that goes from any portion of the West, and all go to Chicago, the moment they are shipped these gentlemen at Chicago are apprised of the quality, the number, when they will arrive, and are prepared with a price. The prices are fixed every week. I said on a former occasion every day, but they are fixed practically so that every morning the price is agreed upon between the purchasers; and the shippers who bring cattle to that market must take those prices or let the cattle die, or ship them back to the places from which they were brought.

What was stated indistinctly in this paper I now proceed to make plain. I am responsible for it. I will prove it if this committee is created. I will prove the charges, which I now make, that this combination between the purchasers in Chicago and the great railroads of the country has brought about a phenomenal condition of things that with the smaller supply of cattle the price does not go up to the producer, but still goes up to the butchers and to all consumers of the country.

I will not give the names of gentlemen who furnish me this information. I am responsible for it, and I will prove it.

From about 1859 until 1873 there had been at times great fluctuations in the rates of freight on live-stock from Chicago to New York. In the last-mentioned year, 1873, an arrangement was made by the managers of the New York Central, the New York and Erie, and the Pennsylvania Railroad (the Baltimore and Ohio protesting and not joining) with a small number, less than one dozen, of cattle shippers at Chicago, who were styled eveners. Under the arrangement made these eveners, as they were called, were to divide and did divide the shipments from Chicago, as had been agreed upon by the several railroads parties to the agreement. When this arrangement took effect rates were restored and reductions from printed published tariffs ceased.

The terms of the agreement were so extraordinary that I do not expect you will believe what I state them to have been unless you call on the reference I have given.

And I have been given the names of several of the most respectable men at that time engaged in railroading in the United States. I will not give their names here.

These terms were as follows, and they were most extraordinary as the Senate will see: The trunk lines mentioned, agreed to refund to the eveners $15 per car on all cattle shipped by all shippers from any point west of Pittsburgh, Salamanca, Dunkirk, and Buffalo. Understand, this payment was made not only on cattle owned, bought, or shipped by the eveners, but by all other shippers; of course the latter under the system began to at once lessen, and soon became extinct, that is, as a body or class.

To give you a fair idea of the enormous advantage these favorites had I will state that assuming that they were shipping one-third of the whole shipments from the West before the arrangement was made, which they were not (they were perhaps shipping more than one-half from Chicago, but probably not more than one-fourth from all points); but assuming that their shipments were one-third, it in reality made their rebate $45 per car on their own shipments.

I regret that I have not at hand the receipts of cattle at New York for the years 1874, 1875, 1876, and 1877, during which this arrangement was in effect, but they are easily attained if you wish to go into the matter, which I do.

They did not vary much from 700,000 head per year; at least they were not less, probably more. Not much of anything of a definite character was known about the eveners' arrangement until the trunk lines began to charge up to the Western roads their pro rata proportion. This was resisted by most of the Western roads, notably among which were the Wabash, Chicago and Alton, and the Illinois Central. No attempt was made to charge any of the roads west of the Mississippi River or west of Chicago, but only to those east of Chicago, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Indianapolis, and eastward up to the western termini of the trunk lines.

The roads between Buffalo, Salamanca, and Pittsburgh, in which the trunk lines had a proprietary interest, came in and paid without resistance. The Cleveland, Columbus, Cincinnati and Indianapolis resisted for a time, but they and others were forced into compliance under the threat that if they did not pay, that business would be diverted, and it was diverted from St. Louis, Indianapolis, and Cincinnati by the eveners confining their purchases to Chicago.

Please bear in mind that by the time the eveners had enjoyed the $45 per car rebate, only one year, all former regular buyers of any strength had been wiped out. They were as extinct as is the mastodon.

As before stated, the Wabash, Chicago and Alton, and the Illinois Central resisted, but at the cost of persecution and damage by diversion of business from St. Louis. To such an extent was this carried that these three roads did respond for their proportion from November, 1877, for a few months, under a promise from the eveners that they would buy at St. Louis, and thus increase receipts at that place from the West. But St. Louis had been so damaged, that is, as an increasing or growing cattle market, that the eveners could not, at least they did not, fulfill their promise.

The eveners arrangement had become so notoriously scandalous that it died during 1878; but it had done its dreadful work against growers, ordinary buyers, and the city of St. Louis, as the reports of the receipts amply show; and had also, as the receipts show, built up Chicago and made the opportunity for the few packers and shippers of dressed meat. The tables I shall present show the receipts at both cities, the total receipts and shipments of stock for twenty-two years, from 1865 up to 1887 from the city of Chicago; and they show that from the time that arrangement was made in 1873 up to 1878, the shipments of cattle from Chicago marvelously and miraculously increased year by year, whilst the shipments from St. Louis, which had before been very large, just as steadily decreased, until St. Louis ceased to be a rival market with Chicago in regard to the sale and shipment of cattle.

The tables are as follows:

Total receipts and shipments of cattle, Chicago, Ill., for twenty-two years.

Years.	Receipts.	Shipments.
1865 (five days)	613	.....
1866	393,007	253,693
1867	329,188	203,580
1868	324,524	215,987
1869	403,102	294,717
1870	522,964	391,709
1871	543,050	491,927
1872	684,075	510,025
1873	761,428	574,181
1874	843,966	622,929
1875	920,843	696,534
1876	1,096,745	797,724
1877	1,033,151	703,402
1878	1,083,068	699,108
1879	1,215,732	726,903
1880	1,382,477	866,814
1881	1,498,550	938,712
1882	1,582,530	921,009
1883	1,878,944	966,758
1884	1,817,518	791,884
1885	1,905,518	744,093
1886	1,963,900	704,675
1887	2,382,008	791,483
Total	24,577,080	13,847,647

This table is made from the Chicago Union Stock Yard Company's twenty second annual report, years 1865 to 1887, inclusive.

Total receipts and shipments of cattle, St. Louis, Mo., for twenty-one years.

Year.	Receipts.	Shipments.
1865	94,307	46,712
1866	103,259	24,462
1867	74,146	25,799
1868	115,352	37,277
1869	124,565	59,867
1870	201,422	129,748
1871	190,527	130,018
1872	263,404	164,870
1873	279,678	180,662
1874	360,925	226,678
1875	335,742	216,701
1876	349,043	220,430
1877	411,969	251,566
1878	406,235	261,723
1879	420,654	226,225
1880	424,720	228,879
1881	503,862	293,092
1882	443,169	188,486
1883	405,090	219,523
1884	450,717	315,433
1885	380,320	239,249
1886	377,550	212,958

This table is made from the annual statement of the trade and commerce of St. Louis for the year 1886.

Now, Mr. President, my object in offering the resolution for the appointment of a special committee has been stated. I do not mean to reflect upon the Committee on Interstate Commerce; I do not mean to question the ability or good faith or efficiency of any committee of this body; but I will be perfectly frank in stating that if this select committee is created it will be no junketing committee. It means a committee of hard work and steady employment in regard to this great interest. My idea is to put upon it five Senators from the great cattle States of the Union whose constituents are interested.

I have sought to point out the evils of the present system. The suggestion of the Senator from Ohio to refer this resolution to a standing committee seems to me to have no force and should not prevail. When a Senator of the United States presents here documentary evidence of the existence of great abuses such as I have indicated to-day in a feeble and unpremeditated fashion, that should be sufficient for the creation of a special committee. There will be no additional expense, because if this inquiry was delegated to a standing committee of the Senate the contingent expenses would be the same as if a special committee were created. Personally I have no desire to serve on it. If I have simply indicated the abuse, if I have simply been true to those of my

constituents whose entire capital is invested in this great interest of producing and raising cattle, my duty will have been discharged, feebly, but I know most honestly.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, representing as I do in part one of the great cattle-producing States of this Republic, I feel very deep interest in the resolution that has been introduced by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. I am in hearty sympathy with the desire of that Senator to thoroughly investigate this important matter. I think the investigation should be speedy and it should be thorough. That the facts exist as stated by the Senator from Missouri no one will attempt to gainsay. There has been a steady decrease in the price of cattle paid to the producers of cattle living in the West and in the Southwest, and there has been no proportionate decrease in the amount paid by the consumers of beef in this country. I am inclined to question somewhat, however, the correctness of the table presented by the Senator from Missouri, although it may be, as I heard it read in part only, finding it difficult to hear the Senator, that upon further examination I may find it to be correct.

Mr. VEST. The Senator will find it correct.

Mr. MANDERSON. I lately received a communication from an intelligent gentleman of long experience in the raising of cattle, having a large and productive cattle ranch that he has conducted for the past twelve or thirteen years in the northern part of the Territory of Wyoming. In his very interesting letter he calls attention to some of the facts that have been narrated by the Senator from Missouri, and gives to me certain tables prepared by himself, showing, according to his estimate, the monthly average price paid for beeves in the Chicago market for the year 1887. He gives me three different tables, and I will insert them at length without reading them, simply calling attention to their general statements, and will print them in the RECORD. They may be compared with the statements of the Senator from Missouri. It may be they will be found to agree with his.

The monthly average price for 1200 to 1500 pound beeves in the Chicago market for 1887 was $4.40 per hundred pounds in January, $4.25 in February, the lowest price being $3.85 in July, and $4.10 being paid in December, making an average of $4.19 for the year, and making the average cost of a 1200-pound native steer for the year $50.28.

The monthly average prices for 1200 to 1500 pound beeves for 1887 was:

January	$4.40
February	4.25
March	4.40
April	4.65
May	4.50
June	4.15
July	3.85
August	4.10
September	4.00
October	$4.00
November	3.90
December	4.10

An average of $4.19 for the year.

Average cost of a 1200-pound native steer for year, $50.28.

These cattle are the best of those that are marketed, being not direct from the range, but usually those that have been fed on corn and are usually described as fat cattle.

Another table (marked B) that he sends me shows the monthly average price for Western range cattle, being natives and half-breeds, for the year 1887, and these cattle, I might say, are marketed in the Chicago market only during the last six months of each year, there being no shipment of such cattle from January until the first day of July. So the average is to be had by ascertaining what the average price per pound was for the last six months of the year 1887. These range cattle brought in July but $2.90 per 100 pounds; in August, $3.20; in September, $3.20; in October, $3.15; in November, $2.90; in December, $3; being an average of $3.06 for the year.

B.—*Monthly average prices for Western rangers (natives and half-breeds) for* 1887.

July	$2.90
August	3.20
September	3.20
October	3.15
November	2.90
December	3.00

An average of $3.06 for the year.

Range cattle are only marketed in the six months from July, and are entirely grass cattle.

Average cost of 1,200-pound range steer for year, $36.72.

Mr. BUTLER. What is the average weight? Does that table state?

Mr. MANDERSON. The average weight of these cattle he does not give, but I believe they run from 1,000 to 1,100 pounds when taken from Northern ranges.

Mr. TELLER. The range cattle where they live are not near the weight stated.

Mr. MANDERSON. Their weight depends a little on the location of the range they come from. I think the range cattle of Montana and Wyoming will weigh more than the range cattle of New Mexico and Lower Colorado.

Mr. TELLER. Perhaps 100 pounds difference.

Mr. MANDERSON. Perhaps 100 pounds more in the North than in the South.

Mr. TELLER. The statement as to Montana and Wyoming, I think, would not be too high; but for Texas, Colorado, Arizona, and New Mexico it would be too high.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think it would. It is, perhaps, a fair statement of the fact to say that the range grass fed cattle of Wyoming and Montana will probably average 1,000 pounds to the head, and probably 850 to 900 in New Mexico and in Texas.

Mr. VEST. If the Senator will permit me a word in regard to the accuracy of the table I presented, I will state that the table I read was prepared with very great care and read at the meeting of the National Stock Growers' Association at Kansas City. All the different States and Territories were represented there, all the stock-growers' associations were there represented, and that table was adopted as accurate and criticised.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think it will be found that the two statements are substantially the same.

Mr. BUTLER. The tables do not differ materially.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think they do not, although I could not hear what the Senator from Missouri read. Thus the average cost of a 1,200-pound steer brought to the market from the various ranges was $36.72 for the year 1887.

Then my correspondent sends me another table, marked C, which shows the monthly average price paid for Texas and Indian cattle for the year 1887, ranging from $3.25 per hundred pounds in January to $2.40 in December, making an average of $3.16 for the year; the first six months leading in price and the cattle sent to market during the first six months of the year being fed cattle as distinguished from grass-fed cattle, or "grassers," as they are called by the cattle men, making an average of these cattle, calling their weight 1,200 pounds, thus putting them on the same basis with those in the other tables, $37.92, making an average for the first six months of $43.50 and for the last six months $32.16.

C.—*Monthly average prices for Texas and Indian cattle for* 1887.

January	$3.25
February	3.45
March	3.65
April	3.85
May	3.90
June	3.70
July	3.10
August	2.85
September	2.65
October	2.60
November	2.50
December	2.40

An average of $3.16 for the year.

The first six months represent "fed" cattle and the last six months mainly grassers.

Average of 1,200 steer for year	$37.92
Average for first six months	43.50
Average for last six months	32.16

Mr. President, I give these tables that there may be as full light as can be obtained prior to investigation of this subject; and if the price received as shown by these tables is less than that shown by the tables introduced by the Senator from Missouri, it simply aggravates the evil of which he complains. The price is certainly not sufficiently greater to make any difference that is material in the consideration of the subject.

I have been at a loss after some little investigation of this subject, as the writer of this letter seems to be at a loss, to understand how it is that the evils which are complained of can exist. It is a little difficult to conceive that with a product such as beef cattle there can be a corner such as we might have in the corn or the wheat or grain product of the country. You can not store cattle as you can corn or grain. Cattle are not only a perishable product, but a product that need constant care and constant feeding. Their holding is too expensive because of their nature to permit any one to produce a corner in the market. So it is hard to explain the results which we all realize and the evil we all deplore by any such reasoning as that. But that there is some sort of a combination, some artificial, unnatural, forced, and objectionable organization, whatever may be its character, I think no one can question for a moment.

It is instructive to look for a moment at the number of cattle in the year 1887 killed and sold by a few of the large operators in the city of Chicago. There are there five great dealers in cattle. Mr. Nelson Morris is one, Swift & Co. another, Armour & Co. another. Hammond & Co. another, and the great canning establishment of Libby, McNeil & Libby another.

The Senator from Missouri suggests that for some reason—and I think he attempts to give the reason, and it may be a good one—the city of St. Louis in competition in this business for some years past has lost its position as a great cattle-dealing and cattle-canning and packing city. It may be that it is because there have been rates by railroads given in favor of Chicago against other localities. I am inclined to think that this is in part the reason for that fact.

Within a few years, however, a new condition of things has arisen in

the cattle-producing States of the West. Under the pressure of the homesteader and the pre-emption filer seeking the arable lands of the States of Kansas, Missouri, Colorado, and the great Territories for farm purposes, there has been an inroad, a very great inroad, upon the grazing lands of the West, and this has produced certain important effects. A large number of cattle that would not perhaps have been placed upon the market were it not for the fact that these grazing lands have been and are now being sought by those who would devote them to the uses of the farmer have been forced upon the market, and as the result of this taking of Western lands by farmers immense herds of cattle have been thrown into the market during the last three or four years. This has produced what has seemed to be an overproduction, but I doubt very much if it is such in fact.

Another statement might be made here of interest to those studying the subject.

A great many of the cattle of the character that formerly were sent direct from the ranges to Chicago and St. Louis and the other cattle markets of the country are now sent to the corn-producing sections of Kansas and Nebraska, and are there fed before they are sent to market, the demand for the last few years being for better beef. Many of the great cattle-growers of the plains no longer send their cattle from the range to the nearest point on the railroad and there ship them to Chicago and to other markets, but, instead, they buy large bodies of land in Kansas and Nebraska and there have their feeding ranches and bring down the grass-fed beeves that they may be fed upon corn and placed in a condition to bring a better price in the market because of this demand for better beef. It is well enough, perhaps, to consider these facts in connection with this inquiry.

But let me return to the consideration of what is being done by these immense firms that now practically control the beef industry of this country.

These great cattle-dealers in Chicago killed during the year 1887 the enormous number that I will read:

	Heads of beef.
Mr. Morris killed and sold	432,507
Mr. Swift	557,468
Armour & Co	477,000
Hammond & Co	210,320
Libby, McNeil & Libby (canners)	126,112
Making a total of	1,821,407

head of beeves killed and sold by these five firms alone.

I agree, Mr. President, that if the natural order of things were permitted to obtain in this cattle trade there would have been in the last two or three years and there would be in the future a very great decrease in the number of cattle killed and sold in the market of Chicago to the advantage of far Western communities. I submit that the natural places for the cattle markets of the country are the great cities; perhaps that is too strong a word to use with reference to the city in which I reside, but it is not too strong a word to use with reference to Kansas City, but the cities of Omaha, Kansas City, Sioux City, Atchison, and others that I might name that are close to the present cattle-producing country are the legitimate and proper markets for the purchase, the killing, the canning, the packing, and the sale of the beef product of this country, and it is something artificial and objectionable that continues to maintain Chicago as the great cattle market of this country. It is true that Kansas City now stands second and Omaha third in this great industry, and with good chances for great increase to both.

Mr. BECK. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he has endeavored to ascertain by investigation how far the cattle market has been affected by the closing of the principal markets of Europe on account of pleuro-pneumonia and other things alleged to exist with our cattle, and how far the orders in England requiring them to be killed on the wharf on arrival there have affected our power to export.

Mr. MANDERSON. That matter has not been looked into particularly by me. It is a matter to which I have given some little thought, and I believe it to be one of the reasons causing the present depreciation.

Mr. BECK. Our foreign trade has been very much embarrassed and very much annoyed, I think, under false pretenses of diseased cattle going abroad, and I have heard that strenuous efforts were being made now to divert the trade in our cattle from the West to Canada, because then the English authorities would accept clean bills of health from their own officers, while similar bills would not, under some pretense or other, be received from our officers at New York or Boston.

Mr. MANDERSON. I believe it will be found that there has been a great falling off for the reason stated by the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BECK. I know the exportations of cattle have fallen off.

Mr. MANDERSON. What he suggests has affected the sales of our American cattle in foreign markets.

Mr. BECK. I did not know how far the Senator had looked into that branch of the subject; and that was the reason I asked the question.

Mr. MANDERSON. There is this to say in regard to that suggestion, that if that cause has been instrumental in bringing down the price of cattle to the cattle producer it should have had the other legitimate effect and have brought down the price of cattle to the consumer of beef. But it has not had that result, and apparently no cause, that can be suggested, either that suggested by the Senator from Kentucky or these attempted explanations that I have given, are sufficient to produce the result of which we now complain; that is to say, that with the lessening of the price of beef to the producer there is no lessening of the price of beef to the consumer. Usually when the wholesale price of an article is reduced the retail price falls proportionately, but this cattle business seems to be an exception to this natural law of trade. The reason for this exception is the object of this inquiry.

Mr. BECK. I hope the Senate will not assume that I am at all disposed to resist the investigation. I agree very much with what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] have said. I have no doubt that a great many evils can be developed by this committee, which I hope will be raised; but whether they can be rectified or not is another question. I thought the Senator from Nebraska had perhaps looked into the branch of the subject to which I called his attention.

Mr. MANDERSON. I did not misunderstand the Senator from Kentucky. I believe him to be in favor of this investigation, and I do not believe there is a man in the Senate who will oppose the investigation. What I am seeking to do is simply to throw in advance of the investigation what little light I may have upon this very important subject-matter.

Mr. President, I have another statement here that I think it well to read in connection with those which I have given as to the vast number of cattle killed and sold in the Chicago cattle market. It may be said, I think, that the average price of a steer in 1887, take them of all weights, whether derived from the table presented by the Senator from Missouri or from that presented by myself, is about $25 a head to the producer. I do not believe it will exceed that very greatly.

Now, let us see whether we can ascertain what is the product of that same average steer when he comes to be sold by the butcher to the consumer of the meat. I have here a table that I think was first printed in what is known as the Butchers' Journal, although I find it in the Dry Goods Chronicle of a late date, in which is given what can be realized for a steer of, say, 1,200 pounds:

46 pounds of porterhouse steak, at 18 cents	$8.28
60 pounds of sirloin steak, at 15 cents	9.00
96 pounds of round steak, at 12½ cents	11.00
50 pounds of best rib, at 14 cents	7.00
118 pounds of chuck rib, at 6 cents	7.08
14 pounds of rump, at 6 cents	.84
110 pounds of soup-meat, at 4 cents	4.40
10 pounds of fat, at 2½ cents	.25
4 pounds of bones, at ½ cent	.02
40 pounds of corn-beef, at 4 cents	1.60

Making 548 pounds of the beef available for what are the usual purposes of the butcher; that is to say, sale to his customers at retail.

The tongue, liver, and heart bring $1. What is known as the "fifth quarter," being the head, tallow, horns, hoofs, and offal, brings $12.50, making the amount received for the whole beeve $63.11. If we are correct in our idea that the average cost of the beeve in the Chicago market is $25, it leaves a profit to some one or to all who intervene between the cattle-producer and the consumer of $38.11 for each steer bought and sold. Deducting for freight allowance to the retailer $8.11, leaves a net profit on each head of cattle of $30.

If it so be that this entire profit of $30 a head is received by these great packers that not only kill and pack and can, but who also in all the beef markets of this country maintain not only wholesale but retail establishments, and if this entire profit of $30 a head goes to them, it makes the enormous sum of $54,642,210 as divisible profits for these five concerns for the year 1887, rather a snug sum for their profit I should think when one considers their investment.

I do not want to be understood, Mr. President, as saying that I have any proof or any testimony of any kind that there is a combination, corrupt or otherwise, among these five great cattle dealers. If there is no combination of the character stated, if this country is not suffering because of the existence of a cattle trust, it is due to these gentlemen, and it is due to others who are concerned in the cattle business with them that that fact should be known.

Whatever the fact may be can, it seems to me, very properly, very thoroughly, and very completely be ascertained by the committee suggested by the Senator from Missouri. I simply want to say that I am in very hearty sympathy with him in his effort and propose to give him full co-operation in that regard.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President, when this resolution was introduced a few days ago it occurred to me that it ought to be broadened in its scope in order to secure all the information necessary to the development of the facts affecting the price of beef and cattle. Hence it was that I proposed an amendment which is now pending and which I believe the Senator from Missouri has very promptly accepted or suggested that he had no opposition to.

I do not know whether or not there is any reason that is not observable to the public why the price of beef has been running down, and not knowing, I am perfectly willing and, so far as I am concerned, am anxious that the most thorough investigation shall be made for the ascertainment of all the facts pertaining to this traffic, so that it may result in benefit to the masses of the people of this country.

I do not rise to oppose the adoption of the resolution, but I desire

rather upon the other hand to second its adoption, especially if the amendment is agreed to as suggested by me, and which the Senator from Missouri, I believe, does not object to.

It has seemed to me, however, that in the preliminary discussion showing the importance of the resolution, there has been an animus manifested on the part of the Senator from Missouri to ascribe whatever evils may exist to the fact that Chicago has seemed to get away with the business of the cattle trade, and, in the Senator's judgment, there is some mysterious reason that is behind it and which Chicago is responsible for, and perhaps nobody else.

Now, sir, while I have no possible ill-will toward St. Louis, and certainly none toward the city which the Senator especially represents, being a resident there, I want to say in behalf of Chicago that, not only in controlling the beef market of the country, but in almost every other business that is carried on in the West, Chicago's success has not depended upon legislation, has not depended upon trusts, but it has been the result of the enterprise and energy and force of the people of Chicago in carrying on the business of that great city.

While I have nothing to say against St. Louis, that city, while Chicago has been going forward, has apparently seemed to be going to sleep and losing the trade that the Senator talks about within the last year or two. I am perfectly willing to have the firms referred to by the Senator from Nebraska investigated and have their operations fully laid bare to the public, and if they have been doing wrong and have been interfering unlawfully with the great body of the people of this country getting in the first instance the price that they ought to for their cattle, and in the second place the consumers getting beef at the lowest possible rate—if there is anything that we can do to protect the people, either the seller or the buyer, I am anxious to do it; and hence it was that I desired this resolution amended so that we could not only inquire into the conduct of these great firms in Chicago and elsewhere and see whether there is a trust anywhere that is robbing the people, but I desire also that the great trunk lines, the associations involved in the trunk lines, the traffic association, and all these combinations which are responsible for the transportation of beef shall also be inquired into, so as to see whether they are in any way responsible, while we are investigating the general subject.

But I protest that until we have the facts developed by testimony before the proposed investigating committee, whatever it may be, there shall not be an assault upon the great city of the State I have the honor in part to represent, placing it before the country in advance of an investigation in the attitude of having been responsible for all the wrong that is supposed to exist in this country in connection with the beef traffic that the people are interested in.

This is all I have to say about it. I am perfectly willing and anxious that this investigation shall be made, but I am not willing that there should be manufactured evidence, by reading letters or whatever else in the Senate in advance of an investigation, so that the people will get to believe that three or four firms in Chicago are responsible for all the wrong that may be supposed to exist.

I want to go into the investigation. I want it conducted thoroughly and promptly, and the facts, whatever they may be, reported, and whatever legislation may be necessary within the purview of our constitutional power that will cure the evils which are supposed to exist, if it shall be found that they do exist after investigation. But, before that, let the people of the country stand all alike. Let us find out who the guilty parties are by an investigation, and not condemn them first and investigate them afterwards.

Mr. President, I hope the amendment I offered will be adopted, and then that the resolution will be adopted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HARRIS in the chair). The Chair understands that the Senator from Missouri accepts the amendment.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to say one word further.

So far as the rebates are concerned, referred to by the Senator from Missouri, I believe his statement of rebates, secretly allowed by the common carriers of the country, related entirely to years before the passage of the interstate-commerce act. So I have nothing to say about that point further than this: It has been my purpose, and I have engaged in it ever since I have been in the Senate of the United States, to prevent all that sort of thing, and I believe that the records will show that since the passage and the enforcement of the interstate-commerce act, in a very great degree, at least, and I hope entirely so, the rebate system has been abolished, and has been abandoned by the common carriers of the country.

I am ready to say further that in my judgment the common carriers of the country—and it is one of the causes of the high price of beef to the consumer and the low price to the producer—are yet charging more than they ought to charge for the transportation of beef, either in the form of live-stock or dressed beef, from the Senator's city, or from any portion of the West, to the East, where it is in large degree consumed.

That is one of the reasons why I want this resolution amended and passed. If it turns out that the seller of cattle is not able to get the price he thinks he ought to have because the cost of transportation is too great, let us ascertain that fact, and let it be made known to the Interstate Commerce Commission, so that they may regulate the railroads in that regard and compel them to reduce their rates of transportation.

I was going to say a word in regard to what ought to be done with the resolution itself, whether it should go to a select committee or a standing committee. The provisions of the resolution would not make it exactly fit for the Interstate Commerce Committee to consider unless it was charged specifically with the investigation of the subject, because it does not pertain entirely to the question of transportation. Then, again, it does not quite fit the Agricultural Committee, for the reason that the element of transportation is involved in the investigation. So, then, as far as I am concerned I have no kind of objection to a select committee being created, because I want a thorough investigation of both branches of the subject, and they do not both belong to either of the standing committees that are now created by the rules of the Senate. Therefore I am willing myself to vote for the resolution creating a select committee for this investigation.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President, there does not seem to be any difference of opinion about the existence of a very serious evil, one so great and comprehensive in its results that it may well be a subject of investigation by the Senate. The only difference of opinion is as to the occasion of this evil.

I am inclined to think as the Senator from Illinois does about the proposition to charge all things to Chicago. If the great city of St. Louis had done its duty perhaps we should not be in the condition we are now. If it had availed itself of its opportunities and had made St. Louis an independent market in fact as it is in name there would have been that competition which would have maintained prices at a legitimate level and undoubtedly would have relieved us from the complaints which now exist, and would have prevented the accumulation of this great business in the hands of a few persons at Chicago. But St. Louis has been willing to play second fiddle. It has abrogated its claim to metropolitan functions as a great trade center and has been willing to be the echo of the operations of the Chicago market both in regard to cattle and in regard to grain. This is a very great misfortune. The markets of St. Louis are regulated to-day by those of Chicago, and practically the same persons purchase the meat in St. Louis that purchase it in Chicago. The same influences control the business of the two places, and it is just as true of St. Louis as it is of Chicago that it dare not lift up its voice against or do anything to the detriment of the combination that controls this great business.

This is not the result of a year or two's operations; it is the result of the operations of certain forces which have been going on for many years. In the first place there has been the drift of population and capital to the great cities. The railroads of the United States have contributed to this. They have discriminated in favor of the business of the great cities against the business of inferior places. There is no packing-house between Kansas City and Chicago, not one. The reason is that no packing-house can exist at any point between these two places. There is such control over the interests of transportation between those places that after the slaughtering is done in Kansas City there are two, three, or five hundred cars ready to transport the meat to Chicago in order to reach the market there, whether for home consumption or for foreign supply; and the goods are transported by the railroad companies at a price generally not more than 25 per cent., I venture to say, of that which has to be paid for the transportation of live-stock between the two places, and at a price probably not more than 25 per cent. of what the rate is from any intermediate point to Chicago. So when the butchering season is over in Kansas City the packers at that place make up their meats, what portion of their product they want at Eastern points, and enter into arrangements with the railroad companies which result in cheap transportation, and this destroys the possibility of the successful operation of any packing-house on the 600 miles of territory lying between these two great cities.

Thus practically by the co-operation of these great interests the control of the live-stock business of the United States is centered in the hands of a few men. Of course this grows by what it feeds on. As these men have accumulated wealth they have been able to go more completely into the markets of the entire world, and by combinations and by operations with which we are familiar enough, to break down the small dealers, and therefore to break down from time to time every single shadow of competition.

They not only combine, as has been said here, in fixing the price of cattle that they buy in market, but they combine to fix the price at which the cattle shall be sold in the state in which they put them on the market, and they do that by parceling out the territory among themselves, one great dealer taking one section of country, another another, and so on, upon an agreement that there shall be no competition by any of his fellows within the territory thus allotted to him. Thus it is while they buy at the lowest price, at a price that is ruinous to the cattle producer, they sell at a high price to the cattle consumer, and so it has happened that they have actually put in their own pockets every single penny of the profit on every steer sold in Chicago during the past five years or more, and as cattle have gone down their profits have been increased by just that much.

Something has been said about the foreign trade. Undoubtedly that has been interrupted from the cause stated, but not interrupted to an extent which makes up the difference between the diminution in number of the cattle of the country as compared with the increase of

population compared with, say, ten years ago or five years ago. The foreign trade in cattle has been controlled in the city of New York, in combination with operators in the city of Chicago, not upon the basis of the foreign demand, but upon the basis of the maintenance of a certain price for the home supply. Cattle have only been shipped from the city of New York when there was an oversupply beyond local consumption. A thousand cattle put on the market in New York any day beyond the amount ordinarily sold would break the price three or four cents a pound; and therefore when there has been from any cause an overshipment of cattle to New York, such as the local market would not readily take up, instead of giving the people the benefit of the oversupply by a reduction of price it has been shipped to England regardless of results.

In this combination not only the butchers and the shippers, but the railroads have been united, because, of course, the railroads saw in that one of the ways whereby they could maintain high prices of beef to the consumer. There has been, consciously or unconsciously, directly or indirectly, formally or informally, a combination between not only these great cattle firms of which I have spoken, but all the railroads and all the other agencies which have to do with the handling of cattle, with the shipping thereof, from the time they leave the range until they finally go on the table of the consumer.

It may be said that no investigation will develop a remedy. Many of these things do not result from actual written contracts or agreements. As I said, they are the accumulation of tendencies and of operations that have been going on for many years. The accumulation of wealth, the development of enormous activities in this business, the control of certain channels of trade abroad, the use of combinations of different kinds—all these, with that instinct with which great wealthy men moving in the same lines come together, have brought out in effect the combinations; and I have no doubt, if the truth were known, they have almost taken such shape and form as to make them illegal and punishable by law; and yet, after all, investigation may not do more than determine the actual existence of this condition of things, and may not be able to suggest a remedy.

But I have great faith that when public opinion has been thoroughly aroused and when producer and consumer are made to see that these men, who have nothing to do with production and are only the agencies by which the cattle are taken from the producer and turned into the hands of the consumer, have robbed both sides alike, a condition of things will result which will ameliorate the present situation. For that reason I am in favor of this resolution. While I would not object to its going to a standing committee, if that is deemed advisable for the purpose of perfection, unless there be some suggestion as to its scope or form that has not yet been made, I think it would be as well to have it adopted as it is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will suggest to the Senator from Missouri that under the rule this resolution creating a charge upon the contingent fund of the Senate should be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope by unanimous consent that will be dispensed with.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Of course by unanimous consent it can be dispensed with if such consent is obtained.

Mr. CULLOM. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be acted on now without such a reference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Illinois that the resolution be acted on without a reference to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate? The Chair hears no objection. The resolution is before the Senate for its action without a reference.

Mr. VEST. I hope the resolution will now be adopted. I wish to make one single observation——

Mr. CULLOM. The resolution is before the Senate. The request is that it shall be acted on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The statement of the Chair was that the resolution was before the Senate for its action without a reference, the rule requiring a reference.

Mr. VEST. I wish to submit only one or two additional remarks. I hope the Senator from Illinois will understand me distinctly as not imputing any improper motive to the great city of his State. I spoke of it simply as a matter of commerce and as to the effect which I thought had been produced by the action of certain great railroads in connection with certain firms in Chicago. I do not know that the citizens of the city of St. Louis would not have availed themselves of the same privileges if they could have been obtained. I know very well that business men make money out of these trusts and combinations and consider it entirely legitimate. At the same time as a legislator I consider it my duty, and I suppose that every Senator present will consider it his duty, if he can by any sort of legislation in the interest of the consumers of the country do away with these combinations.

Mr. COKE. Will the Senator from Missouri allow me to suggest to him in regard to his remark that certain things were considered perfectly legitimate, that in so far as the railroads are concerned the interstate-commerce act prevents discriminations in favor of or against particular places.

Mr. VEST. That is very true under the operations of the interstate-commerce law, yet as the author of that law himself has stated, the evils arising from this source to a large extent exist now, and I suppose will exist no matter what law is passed.

Mr. CULLOM. The purpose of my amendment is to ascertain in connection with this investigation whether the railroads are obeying the law known as the interstate-commerce law or not. I thought it was a good opportunity to aid the Interstate Commerce Commission to ascertain the fact whether the railroads were abiding by the law, or whether they were not doing so.

Mr. VEST. I am entirely in accord with that object. The combination that I have spoken about and of which I read is called the evening combination, existing from 1873 to 1878. That was before the passage of the interstate-commerce law, of course.

As I said in my few remarks before, it has been considered perfectly legitimate by the speculators and railroad corporations to make this kind of combinations; but they have been ruinous in their effects upon localities, and the merchants of the city of St. Louis are not to blame because they lost their cattle trade. They were in the grasp of a giant system of monopolies that they could no more escape from than a child could escape from the embrace of an octopus—the Pennsylvania, the New York Central, and the Erie Railroad Companies, three monstrous corporations with pecuniary power larger than this Government, because better organized.

Mr. CULLOM. May I ask the Senator whether the trade was lost before the interstate-commerce act took effect or after?

Mr. VEST. It was lost before the passage of the interstate-commerce law, because the evening combination existed from 1873 to 1878. St. Louis was a great cattle market until that arrangement was made. The merchants of St. Louis never have understood why they lost that trade. That trade which belonged to them geographically was taken away from them under that combination of these great railroad corporations. As a matter of course, the Pennsylvania road and the Erie road and the New York Central wanted the cattle shipped from Chicago because then they came over their roads, and therefore they diverted the trade from the roads that ran into St. Louis and forced shipments of cattle to Chicago and from Chicago east upon their lines.

As a matter of course, to use a Western phrase, "they cinched St. Louis" and crushed out the life of the cattle trade there. These corporations had them in their grasp. In 1878, not from any good motive, but because the roads that were subsidiary, the connecting roads, refused to pay their part of the pro rata rebate of $15 a car, this combination broke up or came to an end. When that took place the mischief was done and St. Louis was prostrate, and never has been able to make any fight in the cattle trade since.

I do not say this because St. Louis is in my State. I live in a city which is the second cattle market in the world, a new Western town, and I am proud of it—Kansas City. It is to-day the second cattle market in the world, and I am not talking against Chicago. All I ask is that all legislation should be based upon an equal, fair, honest chance to every citizen of the United States, without legislation or discrimination that gives an advantage to one citizen over another.

Mr. CULLOM. The very purpose and life of the interstate-commerce act is to give to all persons and places a fair and equal chance.

Mr. VEST. I know it; and I voted for the act, and I hope it will have that effect, although it has not had it yet as much as I should like.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no disposition to reflect upon the city of St. Louis, but I want to say further that I have no doubt myself that Chicago will go on and will, in a very large measure, control this trade because it has the capital and the energy.

Mr. VEST. That is all right if it can do it, but I want an equal chance for the rest of the country. I ask for a vote on the resolution.

Mr. PLUMB. I suggest an amendment. I see the amendment of the Senator from Illinois refers to two traffic associations. These may or may not embrace all the railroads of the United States, but they may be succeeded by others, or they may break up, so that I would suggest an amendment, adding "or other agencies of transportation."

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection in the world to that.

Mr. VEST. I have no objection to the suggestion.

Mr. CULLOM. So far as I can I accept the suggestion of the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, in the chair). The question, then, is on the motion to amend, proposed by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator from Missouri has accepted it and modified his resolution.

Mr. VEST. I accepted it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Then the question is on the adoption of the resolution of the Senator from Missouri as modified. Will the Senator from Kansas indicate his amendment?

Mr. PLUMB. After the word "association" insert "or other agencies of transportation."

Mr. CULLOM. To come in at the end of the amendment I proposed.

The SECRETARY. After the word "association" it is proposed to add the words:

Or other agencies of transportation.

Mr. CULLOM. That is right.

Mr. VEST. I accept the modification.

The resolution as modified was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills, received from the House of Representatives, were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (H. R. 4775) for the relief of Abbie Sharp, formerly Abbie Gardner;

A bill (H. R. 5092) for the relief of Charles L. Bradwell;

A bill (H. R. 6491) for the relief of Lowman & Co.; and

A bill (H. R. 7618) for the relief of the Shepard & Morse Lumber Company, of Burlington, Vt.

The bill (H. R. 109) to refund to Dr. F. O. Saint Clair $97.80 duties on a monument to the memory of Francis J. Townshend, late of the United States Navy, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The bill (H. R. 2088) for the relief of W. S. Carpenter was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The bill (H. R. 8391) to authorize the location of a branch home for volunteer disabled soldiers in Grant County, Indiana, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Mr. President, on the 2d instant the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] as chairman of the Committee on Interstate Commerce reported favorably the bill (S. 2851) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and at the same time reported several other bills adversely. Of the number so reported was the bill (S. 291) to amend the second and fourth sections of "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and it was indefinitely postponed. I ask that the order indefinitely postponing that bill be rescinded and that the bill be placed upon the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the bill (S. 291) to amend the second and fourth sections of an act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, may be reconsidered, and the bill with the adverse report placed upon the Calendar.

Mr. CULLOM. I hope unanimous consent will be given to place that bill on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the request of the Senator from Iowa will be granted.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 9793) authorizing a loan of arms and equipments to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MITCHELL. What is the business before the Senate?

Mr. BLAIR. The regular order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business, that order is closed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move the consideration of what I understand to be the special order, Senate bill 566.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, being the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate agreed by unanimous consent at the conclusion of routine morning business to-day and to-morrow to proceed to the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII. I understand that on a previous day, perhaps also by unanimous consent, the Senate agreed to proceed with the consideration of the bill referred to by the Senator from Oregon immediately upon the conclusion of the routine morning business to-day. I have no doubt myself that the subsequent agreement by unanimous consent vacates the former, but being advised and recognizing the fact that when the subsequent agreement was made the Senator from Oregon was not in his seat, so far as I am personally concerned I am not inclined to take advantage, if indeed I have that advantage, of the subsequent agreement unless I can get the consent of the Senator from Oregon that we proceed to the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII according to the subsequent agreement, with the further understanding that immediately upon the execution of that order the bill to which he refers shall come up for consideration and be considered.

Mr. REAGAN. I submit an amendment to the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor, intended as a substitute for that bill. I ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment will be received and printed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I thank the Senator from Tennessee for his courtesy. At the same time I think he is laboring under a misapprehension as to which special order has precedence. I understand the rule to be that the two special orders made by the Senate stand in their order. It does not follow that a later unanimous consent displaces a former order fixed by unanimous consent, but that the two orders stand in their order and the prior order has precedence. I appeal to the Senator from Tennessee to permit me to go on unless the regular order is to be urged. I also appeal to the Senator from New Hampshire, who has charge of the unfinished business, to permit it to be laid aside for to-day. I have considerable hope that I may be able to get action on my bill in a very short time. I shall not take more than a few minutes myself, and I think we might get through with it early to-day and then go on with the regular order.

Mr. BLAIR. The unfinished business should be disposed of. The Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN], however, has proposed an amendment to it. I have no objection that both these special orders be accommodated, the bill now the unfinished business retaining its place on the Calendar. I suppose when the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] and the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] have concluded the execution of their respective orders the unfinished business can be acted on, so I have no objection; but I desire that the unfinished business shall retain its place and be taken up immediately after.

Mr. HARRIS. I have no objection.

Mr. BECK. I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] indicated to me a very important amendment, perhaps in the nature of a substitute, that he desires to offer to the bill the Senator from Oregon has in charge. The Senator from Alabama is not now in his seat, and I know his amendment is important and radical, and it will probably take some time in its consideration. Therefore would it not be well to allow the amendment of the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] and the amendment of the Senator from Alabama]Mr. MORGAN] to be printed?

Mr. HARRIS. The amendment of the Senator from Texas is to the bill of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR].

Mr. BECK. But I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Alabama is to the bill of the Senator from Oregon, and I supposed that of the Senator from Texas was to the same bill, but it seems not.

Mr. REAGAN. My amendment is to the bill under the charge of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BECK. The Senator from Alabama called my attention to his amendment.

Mr. MITCHELL. This is the first intimation I have had that the Senator from Alabama had any amendment to this bill. I can only say that the special order was made by unanimous consent of the Senate one week ago to-day, on the 9th instant. The Senator from Alabama was here this morning and I do not feel disposed to give way so as to run the chance of having the bill displaced, as it would likely be in the rush of business at the beginning of next week.

Mr. BECK. I think now the amendment of the Senator from Alabama is to the bill which is in charge of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MITCHELL. That being the case, as the morning business this morning has been very much drawn out and it is now 2 o'clock, the Senator from Tennessee will allow me to call up this bill, have it discussed very briefly by myself, and see if we can not get a vote. It is reported unanimously by the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard.

Mr. BLAIR. I understand the request is that the regular order be temporarily laid aside.

Mr. HARRIS. There is no objection to the regular order remaining the unfinished business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Whatever be the disposition of the question between the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Tennessee as to the execution of the order, the Chair will hold that the Senate resumes the consideration of the bill in charge of the Senator from New Hampshire as the unfinished business.

Mr. HARRIS. While I have no doubt that the consent agreement of yesterday takes precedence of the unfinished business and vacates the preceding order, I am not inclined to antagonize the wish of the Senator from Oregon in respect to his bill, because he was not present when the last order was made; but I should like to have the unanimous consent of the Senate, if we proceed with the consideration of the bill indicated by the Senator from Oregon at this time, that immediately upon the conclusion of that bill we proceed to the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII; and that the next two legislative days be devoted to the Calendar under that rule, unless we shall have sooner concluded the consideration of the Calendar that remains under Rule VIII.

Mr. BLAIR. I understand the Senator desires all that to be subject to the unfinished business retaining its place.

Mr. HARRIS. The Chair has announced that when this order is executed he will lay that bill before the Senate as the unfinished business.

Mr. BLAIR. I beg the Senator's pardon. The announcement of

the Chair was that on the termination of the consideration of the bill of the Senator from Oregon he would lay the unfinished business before the Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. I understood him to include both orders.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands that whenever the unfinished business is informally laid aside by unanimous consent, on the execution of the order or the conclusion of that business the unfinished business resumes its place by operation of parliamentary law.

BALTIMORE AND POTOMAC RAILROAD.

Mr. FARWELL. I desire to give notice at this time that I shall ask to bring up Order of Business 938, being the bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia, on Tuesday next.

Mr. SPOONER. I desire to say to the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] gave notice yesterday that he would desire the postponement of the bill to which the Senator from Illinois refers until a week from next Tuesday.

Mr. FARWELL. I suppose I have the right to give the notice. That is all I desire to do. I will endeavor to get the sense of the Senate on that day after the morning business is concluded.

THE CALENDAR.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Senate bill No. 566 will now be proceeded with.

Mr. HARRIS. Before that bill is proceeded with, I desire to ask unanimous consent of the Senate—for I want to have no misunderstanding of this matter—that immediately on the conclusion of the consideration of that bill the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII, and that the next two legislative days shall be devoted to the consideration of the Calendar on the conclusion of the routine morning business each day.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that after the conclusion of the consideration of Senate bill 566 the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII, and continue the same for two entire legislative days thereafter.

Mr. HARRIS. After to-day.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. After the day on which the consideration of the bill is concluded?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. TURPIE. I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Indiana objects.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 566) making an appropriation for a final survey and estimates for and the commencement of the construction of a boat-railway around the obstructions to navigation at The Dalles and Celilo Falls, in the Columbia River.

Mr. HARRIS. I now repeat the request I made a few moments since. After an explanation of the matter to the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE] he consents to withdraw his objection, I understand.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the consideration of the bill just read the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills upon the Calendar of General Orders under Rule VIII, and continue the same for two consecutive days thereafter.

Mr. CULLOM. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. CULLOM. I object until I can say a word. I desired to-morrow to bring up the bill reported by the Interstate Commerce Committee if I could do so.

Mr COCKRELL. Put it over until the next day.

Mr. HARRIS. Put it over until we get through with this order.

Mr. CULLOM. The trouble about it is that we shall probably adjourn Thursday evening until Monday, and on Monday other business, as the Senate very well knows, is going to come up which may take all of next week; and I wish to get the bill to which I refer through.

Mr. HARRIS. I think I am about as much interested in the interstate-commerce bill as the Senator from Illinois, and I do hope he will not object upon that ground. Let it go over until we devote these two days and a piece of to-day to the consideration of general orders on the Calendar.

Mr. CULLOM. We had better be sure of the consideration of the bill to which I refer.

Mr. HARRIS. No, let us try to get through with the Calendar. It gives everybody a fair and equal chance.

Mr. CULLOM. I do not know how it will be.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the proposition of the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. CULLOM. I hope that if unanimous consent is given, and if the Calendar is not pressing very much in the mean time, I may be allowed to bring up the bill which I have mentioned.

Mr. HARRIS. So far as I am concerned, I should go very far out of my way to accommodate the views of the Senator from Illinois; but if this unanimous consent is granted, I wish to say that I shall insist upon its execution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. CULLOM. I will waive the objection, as it seems to be the desire to proceed with the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

COLUMBIA RIVER BOAT-RAILWAY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 566) making an appropriation for a final survey and estimates for the commencement of the construction of a boat-railway around the obstructions to navigation at The Dalles and Celilo Falls in the Columbia River.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That there be, and hereby is, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000, for the purpose of making final surveys and estimates for and the commencement of the work of construction of a boat-railway either in the State of Oregon or Washington Territory around the obstructions to navigation in the Columbia at The Dalles and Celilo Falls; and for the purpose of blasting open the contracted water ways at Ten and Three Mile Rapids, near said falls, to a navigable status for large river tonnage boats; or such other structure or structures for overcoming the obstructions to navigation at such points as may be recommended by the Board of Engineers hereinafter provided for.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to appoint a board of three engineers from the United States Army, whose duty it shall be to thoroughly examine the obstructions to navigation in the Columbia River at The Dalles and Celilo Falls, and at Three and Ten Mile Rapids, and to report to the Secretary of War, on or before the first Monday in December next, as to the feasibility and advisability of overcoming such obstructions by means of a boat-railway at The Dalles and Celilo Falls, and by widening, to a navigable status, for large tonnage river boats, the channel of said river at Three and Ten Mile Rapids, accompanied by careful and detailed plans, with estimates of the cost and a statement as to the usefulness of such improvements to navigation and of their relations and value to commerce; and said board shall also report, at the same time, as to any other plan or project for overcoming said obstructions at said points, whereby said obstructions to navigation may be removed, which in the judgment of said board may be deemed either more desirable than the above or worthy of consideration by the Secretary of War and Congress, and shall report detailed plans, with estimates of the cost of such proposed improvement or improvements, and as to their relations to commerce and usefulness to navigation; and said board shall report which of said projects is by it deemed most advisable. And the Secretary of War shall transmit said report to Congress at its next session, with his own views and those of the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army thereon; and the sum of $15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary of the above amount, may be used in defraying the cost of making said examination and survey and the expenses of said board.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard as a substitute for the bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, it is not my intention to detain the Senate by any lengthy remarks.

The bill just read is the conclusion reached, and the unanimous recommendation made by one of the standing committees of the Senate after a more than ordinary investigation of the subject to which it relates. It is not merely the recommendation of a committee on a bill introduced by a Senator and referred for consideration in the ordinary way, but is the deliberate and well-considered judgment of the committee after a careful investigation made in pursuance of an order of the Senate. This being the case, I trust I may with a degree of confidence hope for early and favorable action by the Senate. The order to which I refer may be found recorded in its proceedings of date January 5, 1886. On that date I presented to the Senate the preamble and resolution which I now send to the desk and ask that the Secretary may read, and which preamble and resolution were on that date agreed to by the Senate without a dissenting vote.

The Secretary read as follows:

Whereas the Columbia River is, with the exception of obstructions at the Cascades, distant from its mouth 160 miles, for a distance of about 5 miles, and further obstructions at The Dalles, distant from its mouth 220 miles, for a still greater distance, navigable for large-draught steamers from the sea to a point inland distant 1,032 miles, with tributaries aggregating over 300 additional miles of navigable waters; and

Whereas a canal and locks are now under process of construction by the United States Government around such obstructions at the Cascades; and

Whereas said Columbia River and its navigable tributaries drain an extent of country unsurpassed in agricultural, grazing, and mineral productiveness, capable of producing from 60,000,000 to 80,000,000 bushels of wheat annually, an area of country in geographical extent equal to one-twentieth of the entire area of the United States, as large as Germany or France, and over one-fourth of the area of South America; and

Whereas the commerce of that vast and fertile region is increasing with marvelous rapidity, the custom-house statistics showing that in the year 1884, 403 vessels passed out of the mouth of the Columbia River for foreign and domestic ports with cargoes valued at $15,600,000, as against 63 vessels in the year 1880 with cargoes valued at $4,181,352, while the tonnage over the bar at the mouth of the Columbia for the year ending September 30, 1885, was 869,943 tons; and

Whereas it is alleged that freight charges on wheat from The Dalles to Portland, Oregon, a distance of 88 miles, are now 12 cents per bushel of 60 pounds, and from Wallula, Wash., to Portland, Oregon, a distance of 214 miles, 18 cents per bushel, and all other freight charges, it is alleged, are in equal enormous proportions; and

Whereas it is alleged such freight charges are exorbitant and ruinous to the producer, and as it is further alleged that the real remedy for this evil is in freeing the Columbia River and its navigable tributaries from obstructions to navigation, and that this work is essentially national in its character: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard

be, and it is hereby, instructed to inquire into these alleged grievances, both as to their existence and the proper measures of relief, and also as to the importance of the speedy completion of the canal and locks at the Cascades of the Columbia and the means proper to be adopted to overcome the obstructions to navigation at The Dalles of the Columbia, and to report by bill or otherwise at the earliest practicable period.

Mr. MITCHELL. In pursuance of this order of the Senate the inquiry directed was made during the last Congress, and on February 1, 1887, the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard intrusted with this investigation reported a bill substantially similar to the one now under consideration and recommended its passage, and accompanied the same with an elaborate report, showing fully and in detail, not only the thorough character of the investigation made, but also the facts and conclusions upon which the committee based their recommendation. This report was signed by the following-named Senators: Mr. CULLOM of Illinois, Mr. PALMER of Michigan, Mr. Williams of California, Mr. BUTLER of South Carolina, Mr. CALL of Florida, Mr. VEST of Missouri, Mr. GIBSON of Louisiana, and myself.

The report is Senate No. 1773, second session Forty-ninth Congress, and with the permission of the Senate I will, without stopping now to read it unless desired, incorporate it in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The report is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 1773, Forty-ninth Congress, second session.]

On January 5, 1886, an important duty was imposed on your committee, in the adoption by the Senate, unanimously, on that date, of the following preamble and resolution:

"Whereas the Columbia River is, with the exception of obstructions at the Cascades, distant from its mouth 160 miles, for a distance of about 5 miles, and further obstructions at The Dalles, distant from its mouth 220 miles, for a still greater distance, navigable for large-draught steamers from the sea to a point inland distant 1,032 miles, with tributaries aggregating over 300 additional miles of navigable waters; and

"Whereas a canal and locks are now under process of construction by the United States Government around such obstructions at the Cascades; and

"Whereas said Columbia River and its navigable tributaries drain an extent of country unsurpassed in agricultural, grazing, and mineral productiveness, capable of producing from 60,000,000 to 80,000,000 bushels of wheat annually, an area of country in geographical extent equal to one-twentieth of the entire area of the United States, as large as Germany or France, and over one-fourth of the area of South America; and

"Whereas the commerce of that vast and fertile region is increasing with marvelous rapidity, the custom-house statistics showing that in the year 1884, 403 vessels passed out of the mouth of the Columbia River for foreign and domestic ports, with cargoes valued at $15,600,000, as against 63 vessels in the year 1880, with cargoes valued at $4,181,352, while the tonnage over the bar at the mouth of the Columbia for the year ending September 30, 1885, was 869,943 tons; and

"Whereas it is alleged that freight charges on wheat from The Dalles to Portland, Oregon, a distance of 88 miles, are now 12 cents per bushel of 60 pounds, and from Wallula, Washington, to Portland, Oregon, a distance of 214 miles, 18 cents per bushel, and all other freight charges, it is alleged, are in equal enormous proportions; and

"Whereas it is alleged such freight charges are exorbitant and ruinous to the producer; and as it is further alleged that the real remedy for this evil is in freeing the Columbia River and its navigable tributaries from obstructions to navigation, and that this work is essentially national in its character: Therefore,

"*Be it resolved*, That the Committee on Transportation Routes to the Seaboard be, and it is hereby, instructed to inquire into these alleged grievances, both as to their existence and the proper measures of relief, and also as to the importance of the speedy completion of the canal and locks at the Cascades of the Columbia and the means proper to be adopted to overcome the obstructions to navigation at The Dalles of the Columbia, and to report by bill or otherwise at the earliest practicable period."

In the performance of the trust reposed in your committee by this resolution, and of its duty in the premises, diligence and care have been exercised in ascertaining, so far as possible, the facts relative to the existence of the grievances alleged in the preamble and resolution to exist; and also have diligently and carefully investigated as to the proper measures of relief, as to the importance of the speedy completion of the canal and locks at the Cascades of the Columbia River, and have also thoroughly inquired as to the proper means to be adopted for the purpose of overcoming the obstructions to navigation at The Dalles of the Columbia.

For this purpose the investigation ordered by the foregoing resolution was, in the first instance, committed to a subcommittee of three, consisting of MITCHELL, of Oregon, chairman; CULLOM, of Illinois, and BUTLER, of South Carolina; and the chairman of which, under direction of the committee, visited the valley of the Columbia in Oregon and Washington Territory during the recent vacation, and collected statistics and other information bearing upon the question involved, all of which has been laid before your full committee.

From the investigation made by your committee it has been made entirely plain that the grievances, including lack of transportation facilities, exorbitant transportation charges, and unreasonable and unjust discriminations, set out in the preamble to the resolution, actually exist in and along the valley of the Columbia, in what is known as the great inland empire of the Pacific Northwest, including the State of Oregon and most of the Territories of Washington and Idaho, to the full extent and in all the aggravated forms as in such preamble alleged.

Your committee also find as true the allegations of such preamble in reference to the vastness, fertility, and present and prospective productive capacity in the matter of cereals, wool, stock, minerals, fruits, and grazing facilities of the empire of country drained by the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries; the exorbitant character of the transportation charges and unjust discriminations on and along the Columbia River and on the lines of railroad owned, controlled, and operated by the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company (such corporation also owning and controlling the only line of steamers on the Columbia River and its tributaries above the mouth of the Willamettel) and also the alleged paramount importance, in the interest of cheaper and more reasonable transportation facilities throughout the valley of the Columbia, of the early completion of the canal and locks at the Cascades of the Columbia, and the pressing necessity for the speedy adoption of some suitable means to overcome the obstructions to navigation at what are known as The Dalles of the Columbia.

Your committee, in executing the order of the Senate above quoted, have given special consideration to the four following subjects of inquiry:

1. The character and extent of the country to be benefited, and the commercial, agricultural, pastoral, mineral, and other interests to be promoted and subserved by the opening to free navigation of the Columbia River; and the importance, national and international, as well as local, of such improvement, and its probable resulting benefits to commerce and otherwise.

2. What are the present transportation facilities, advantages, and disadvantages possessed by the people of the Columbia Valley and of the Pacific Northwest generally? Are they such as to encourage the growth and development of that empire? Are the burdens they impose in connection with the advantages they afford reasonable and just, or are they extravagantly exorbitant and inequitable in the matter of excessive charges and unjust discriminations, and grievous oppressions on the producers and shippers, and how far and to what extent, and in what manner, are these oppressions made possible or aggravated by reason of these obstructions to navigation in the waters of the Columbia?

3. What are the benefits, national, international, and local, commercial and otherwise, that would be expected naturally to flow from the opening up of this river to free navigation; and especially by the establishment of some engineering work, such as canal and locks, or boat-railway, to overcome these obstructions at The Dalles of the Columbia?

4. In the event a conclusion should be reached—and from the facts presented there could, in the judgment of your committee, be no other conclusion—to the effect that the true interests of the commerce not only of the Pacific Northwest but of the nation at large imperatively demand the speedy opening of this river to free navigation and unobstructed commerce through the medium of the General Government, by the removal of or surmounting these obstructions, then what are, in view of all the adverse circumstances, the exigencies of the case, the magnitude of the interests involved, and of economic considerations, both as to time and money, the best means to be devised and adopted to accomplish this great and desired end?

First, then, as to the character and extent of country to be developed and benefited and the magnitude of the diverse interests to be subserved by the opening up to free navigation of the Columbia River, and this irrespective of the still greater advantages in a national and international point of view in opening to free navigation and competitive transportation for so great a distance across the continent a line for the passage of the internal commerce of the country, including trans-continental and trans-oceanic freight.

THE PACIFIC NORTHWEST, INCLUDING THE BASIN OF THE COLUMBIA AND ISLAND EMPIRE.

The area drained by the Columbia River, we are told by the report of the Chief of Engineers, is estimated at 245,000 square miles—an area, he correctly states, larger than all the New England and Middle States, with Maryland, Virginia, and West Virginia thrown in—all these States combined having an area of but 244,260 square miles. The area drained by the Columbia River and its tributaries is twice as large as Great Britain and Ireland, more than twice the size of Italy, half as large again as Spain, and many thousand square miles greater than either France, Germany, or Austria-Hungary, and greater than all the islands of the seas combined.

Snake River alone, a tributary of the Columbia, flowing into it over 300 miles from the sea, drains an area of nearly 105,000 square miles, and its valleys are among the most fertile and productive on earth; while the Upper Columbia, above the junction with the Snake, drains an area of 97,155 square miles, and the main stream of the Columbia, below the Snake junction, 43,200 square miles. The engineer in charge of the works of the Columbia, in speaking of this vast area, uses the following language:

"It has been demonstrated that nearly the whole of this great plain is a magnificent grain-producing country, as the statistics submitted herewith will show. Furthermore, the soil is not only fertile, but of extraordinary endurance. In the Willamette Valley the fields that have been continually cropped with wheat for twenty years are now yielding from 30 to 35 bushels per acre of winter wheat.

"When it is considered that, in addition to its grain-producing capacity, this region has ample resources in precious metals, coal, iron, and most of the various products that go to make up that interweaving of a great variety of industries which always insures the development of wealth and prosperity, it becomes evident that the mountain gorge that commands the whole trade of such a country is worthy of considerable attention from Congress. The development of this region will add so rapidly to the material wealth of the nation, and add so largely to its revenues, it is thought, that every dollar expended will come back many fold into the public Treasury.

"The obstructions to navigation through this gorge occur at The Dalles and at the Cascades. At the latter place the works for improvement are approaching completion."

But coming to speak more properly of what is known as the Columbia River Basin or inland empire, as separate and apart and distinguished from the still larger area drained by the waters of the Columbia and its tributaries—we refer to that area of most remarkably fertile and marvelously productive country located between the Cascade range of mountains on the west and the Coeur d'Alene and Bitter Root Mountains on the east, with the Blue Mountains to the south and the Colville Mountains to the north—we find an area, the very large proportion of which is magnificent arable land, of over 25,000 square miles in extent, or about 25,000,000 acres, all susceptible of a high degree of cultivation. And the products, present and prospective, of this great area must find their way to the seaboard along the waters of the Columbia River.

At least must this be so until the completion of the Northern Pacific Railroad across the Cascade Mountains to Puget Sound, or the completion of the Oregon Pacific, connecting the Columbia Basin with the Pacific Ocean at Yaquina Bay. But even when this is done, in order that combinations between the two or three or more railroad companies—the Northern Pacific, the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company, the Oregon Pacific, and Oregon Short Line or Union Pacific—for the purpose of maintaining freight rates at high figures and controlling the transportation of that country, may be rendered impossible, it becomes a matter of the first importance to the people of the inland empire that the waters of the Columbia River and its tributaries should be free from obstructions from their mouths to their source at the earliest possible date and opened to free navigation. This done, and the power of any one railroad company or any two or more corporations to dictate freight charges to the producer of that country will be forever at an end. The great importance of these improvements and the value of free navigation on the Columbia and its tributaries will be emphasized when it is stated that by these we have a total inland navigation for vessels of various classes for a distance of about 1,686 miles, as follows:

By the main Columbia River, 1,032 miles, 752 miles of which are within the United States; Pend d'Oreille River, 180 miles; Clear Water, 40 miles; Kootenay, 100 miles; Willamette, 172 miles; and Snake River, 162 miles. And while at present much less than one-tenth of the cultivable soil of this great inland empire is under cultivation, and while the population of the basin of the Columbia does not exceed at present more than two human souls to the square mile, or only about one-ninth of the average population to the square mile in the United States, the product of this area for the year 1885 in the matter of cereals alone (wheat, oats, and barley, but principally wheat) amounts to about 14,000,000 bushels, the ground producing on an average over 30 bushels per acre of winter wheat, and from 20 to 25 bushels per acre of spring wheat, or considerably more than double the average product per acre of the United States or the world, while in some instances, even on tracts of considerable magnitude, the yield has been from 50 to 60 and even 75 bushels per acre and even more, and your committee are credibly informed as much as 100 bushels have been

raised in more than one instance on choice spots under exceptionably favorable circumstances.

It is estimated that the area generally referred to as the Columbia Basin or inland empire is capable of producing, when properly cultivated, over 100,000,000 bushels of wheat per annum.

But to the magnitude of the area of this fertile field, and the prolific character of its productions, the vastness of its undeveloped resources, must be added the fact of the extraordinary endurance of its soil. It is of that peculiar character and depth of formation as to cause it to retain through an indefinite number of years, although subjected to constant annual drains from successive crops of the same character, that *vis vitæ* essential to continued healthful and prolific production. The soil averages from 12 inches to 40, 50, 60, and even hundreds of feet in depth; and by actual experiment soil taken from a depth of 40 feet and placed on the surface and exposed to the climatic action of the sun and atmosphere has produced an abundant crop of wheat. Fertilizing the soil of this region by artificial means is as unheard of in the Great Basin of the Columbia as it is unnecessary and useless; and this is true of irrigation as to the greater portion of it.

Giving the field over to rest, clover, and lime, or other fertilizing influences every two or three years, as is the custom in the East, finds no recognition in the life and practice of the farmer in the wheat-producing empire of the Columbia. The great fact to be impressed and the lesson sought to be imparted by these statements may receive proper support and emphasis by a quotation from an interesting report made some three years since on the character and resources of the Great Plain of the Columbia by Lieutenant (now Captain) Symons of the United States Engineer Corps. We quote from his report. He says:

"Over nearly the whole of this Great Plain of the Columbia there is now spread a rich and fertile soil, varying in depth from a few inches to hundreds of feet. This soil has been the product of the grinding action of the ice and drift of the Glacial epoch, by the water-wearing of the Champlain epoch, and from the disintegration of the rocks during the last and present existing Terrace epoch, by the action of summer's rain and heat, winter's frost and cold, and the chemical decomposition arising from exposure to the atmosphere."

Maj. William A. Jones, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, now in charge of improvements on the Columbia River, in his recent interesting and able report (Senate Executive Document No. 114, Forty-ninth Congress, first session), after reciting the above from Lieutenant Symons' report, says:

"Since the date of this report it has been demonstrated that nearly the whole of this great plain is a magnificent grain-producing country, as the statistics submitted herewith will show. Furthermore, the soil is not only fertile, but of extraordinary endurance. In the Willamette Valley fields that have been continually cropped with wheat for twenty years are now yielding from 30 to 35 bushels per acre of winter wheat.

"When it is considered that in addition to its grain-producing capacity, this region has ample resources in precious metals, coal, iron, and most of the various products that go to make up that interweaving of the great variety of industries which always insures the development of wealth and prosperity, it becomes evident that the mountain gorge that commands the whole trade of such a country is worthy of considerable attention from Congress. The development of this region will add so rapidly to the material wealth of the nation, and add so largely to its revenues that every dollar expended will come back many fold into the public Treasury."

While General Nimmo, late Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department, in discussing this subject in his annual report of May 6, 1885, on the internal commerce of the United States, on page —, says:

"Several years ago the soil of this region was subjected to chemical analysis and it was found to be possessed of properties which have rendered the soil of the island of Sicily susceptible to wheat culture for more than two thousand years."

But the immense wealth of this grand area is not limited by any means to the production of cereals. It is unsurpassed in the matter of stock production, and in the products of beef and wool; and butter and other dairy products, and fruits, to say nothing of its stores of mineral wealth, of coal and the precious metals, which are rapidly swelling the volume of exports that must find their way to the seaboard. The rapid increase of sheep-raising and wool-production in the State of Oregon in the last few years has been marvelous. Eleven years ago, on January 1, 1875, the total number of sheep in the State of Oregon was but 631,400, while on the 1st of January, 1885, ten years afterward, they numbered 2,519,950, or an increase in one decade of nearly 400 per cent., while in the same period oxen and other cattle and milch cows had increased from 205,000 to 620,565. These are the estimates contained in the annual reports of the Department of Agriculture.

While the wheat product of Oregon twenty-five years ago did not exceed 900,000 bushels, in 1884 it had, notwithstanding all the disadvantages of high rates of transportation, high wages, and other obstructions and embarrassments incident to the frontier State, reached the marvelous amount of 15,462,000 bushels, or an increase in that time of over 1,500 per cent.

Bearing upon the question of the extent and fertility of the region in what is known as the great valley of the Columbia, the following is quoted from the very elaborate and able report of Lieut. (now Capt.) T. W. Symons, Corps of Engineers, of April 3, 1882 (Senate Ex. Doc. No. 186, first session Forty-seventh Congress, pages 113, 114, 115):

"In order to show the extraordinary fertility of this region of the Columbia River, I give below the statistics from the United States Census Office of the average yield per acre of the cereals grown in 1879 in the State of Oregon, and Territories of Washington, Idaho, and Montana, comprising those regions drained largely by the Columbia River and its tributaries. Montana is included in this region for the reason that, while most of the Territory is drained by the Missouri, a large proportion of the cultivated land is on the headwater streams of the Columbia in the Missoula Basin."

Cereals of the United States; average yield per crop of 1879.

States and Territories.	Barley.	Buckwheat.	Indian corn.	Oats.	Rye.	Wheat.
Oregon	31	17	22	29	16	17
Washington	39	24	19	41	14	24
Idaho	33		29	35	12	24
Montana	30	13	29	36	29	27
Average for whole region: mean for above	33	18	25	35	18	23
Average whole United States	22	14	28	25	11	13

"From this it is seen that the average yield of barley per acre in this Columbia country is 50 per cent. greater than the average yield in the whole United States, including this region; the average yield of buckwheat is 29 per cent. greater; the average yield of Indian corn is 11 per cent. less; the average yield of oats is 40 per cent. greater; of rye is 64 per cent. greater, and the average yield of the most important cereal of all, wheat, is 77 per cent. greater than the average of the United States.

"I give below the average yield of the cereals per acre of the cereal crops of 1879 for the principal agricultural States of the Union and those whose averages are the largest:

States.	Barley.	Buckwheat.	Indian corn.	Oats.	Rye.	Wheat.
Arkansas	12	6	19	13	7	6
California	21	22	28	27	9	16
Dakota	17	8	22	28	10	11
Illinois	22	11	36	32	16	16
Indiana	23	10	31	25	12	18
Iowa	20	10	42	34	15	10
Kansas	13	10	31	19	12	9
Kentucky	24	10	24	11	7	10
Massachusetts	25	12	34	31	16	16
Michigan	22	12	35	34	13	19
Minnesota	26	11	34	38	16	11
Missouri	19	11	36	21	12	12
Nebraska	15	11	40	26	12	9
New York	22	15	33	30	11	16
North Carolina	11	8	12	8	5	5
Ohio	30	13	34	21	13	18
Pennsylvania	19	15	33	27	9	13
Texas	13	11	12	21	8	7
Virginia	17	8	16	9	7	9
Wisconsin	25	9	34	34	14	13

"The statistics regarding the production of Irish potatoes in the States and Territories where they are principally raised are given in the following table:

States.	Acres.	Bushels.	Yield per acre.
Washington	6,823	1,035,177	152
Oregon	11,106	1,359,930	122
California	55,471	4,550,565	82
Connecticut	32,375	2,584,262	80
Illinois	151,126	10,365,707	69
Indiana	91,985	6,232,246	68
Iowa	121,358	9,962,537	82
Maine	71,416	7,999,625	112
Massachusetts	32,660	3,070,389	94
Michigan	134,274	10,923,060	81
Minnesota	51,419	5,184,676	101
Nebraska	28,347	2,150,873	76
New Hampshire	29,659	3,358,828	113
New Jersey	41,683	3,563,766	85
New York	349,963	33,612,313	96
Ohio	173,321	12,719,215	73
Pennsylvania	185,429	16,284,819	88
Rhode Island	5,988	606,793	101
Vermont	38,855	4,438,172	114
Wisconsin	99,266	8,569,161	86
Dakota	6,960	664,086	95

"These statistics are only given to show the great fertility of the soil in this country drained by the Columbia, its adaptability to support a large population engaged in agricultural pursuits, and the enormous crops which its immense acreage must yield as soon as a population sufficient for their cultivation is attained and means of transportation provided. This country is far away from the seat of Government and is very little known, but is bound soon to force itself on the attention of the country as one of the grandest portions of our domain, unexcelled by any in the productions of the earth, in the beauty, extent, and yield of its waters, in its mountains clothed with splendid forests and enfolding mines of the useful and precious metals, and in its climate.

"In consequence of its great and sure promise our legislators should look upon it with liberal eyes and grant abundant aid to all desirable works of public improvement which may be undertaken to facilitate transportation, sure of a prompt and rich return in the increased prosperity and loyalty of the people.

"From the interior water ways, the Columbia and Snake Rivers, should be removed, as far as practicable, all the rocky fetters which prevent and hinder full and free navigation. Commerce will require it, the people will demand it, and it must be done sooner or later."

But in discussing the question of the improvement of the navigation of the Columbia River at its mouth and throughout its length and with all its mighty tributaries, we must not fail to remember the varied interests and productions and the vast undeveloped resources of the whole State and of the adjacent Territories, the rapid and complete development of which depends so largely on a free river. In addition to the 15,000,000 bushels of wheat produced in Oregon in 1875, of the value of nearly $10,000,000, she produced 5,798,000 bushels of oats during the same season, of the value of $2,145,260; 164,000 bushels of corn, 1,239,084 bushels of barley, 22,260 bushels of rye, and 9,128 bushels of buckwheat. Her wool crop, which in 1870 was but 2,000,000 pounds, and in 1874 but 4,000,000 pounds, had increased in 1884 to 12,000,000 pounds, and in 1885 to more than 15,000,000 pounds. The value of the clip in 1884 was $2,400,000, at an average market price of 20 cents per pound; while its value in 1885 was over $3,000,000. While the wheat exports from Oregon in 1870 were only 115,747 bushels, of the value of but $119,139, they had risen in 1884 to 5,384,315 bushels, of the value of $5,396,450.

PORTLAND'S COMMERCE.

Aid may be derived in obtaining some adequate conception of the great importance and rapidly growing commerce of the Pacific Northwest by a reference to the trade of Portland, Oregon, the chief commercial city of that great region. The wholesale business of Portland increased in 1886 20 per cent. over that of 1885, and reached the sum of $50,400,000; and it is estimated by her leading merchants that it will increase in 1887 at least 30 per cent. over that of 1886, or over $30,000,000 more than in 1884. In 1884 it was $35,000,000; in 1885, $42,000,000; in 1886, $50,400,000; and the estimate for 1887 is at least $65,520,000. Equally rapid also has been the increase in trade and commerce of the cities of Astoria, near the mouth of the Columbia, and The Dalles, 200 miles from its mouth, as the records of the commercial representative bodies and Government and other reliable statistics will abundantly show; while struggling in honorable and by no means unsuccessful competition for the trade of this empire, and reaching out also across the broad waters of Puget Sound, the Straits of Juan de Fuca, and the Pacific Ocean for the commerce of the world, is the rapidly expanding city of Tacoma, at the sound terminus of the Northern Pacific Railroad on Puget Sound, and her energetic rival, Seattle, still further down the sound.

THE SALMON FISHERIES OF THE COLUMBIA RIVER.

These were established twenty years ago, in 1866. In that year the product was 4,000 cases, which, at the then cash price of $16 a case, made a total value of $64,000. Ten years later, in 1876, the catch was 450,000 cases, or an increase in that decade of nearly 11,250 per cent., and then worth $4.50 per case, and of a total value of $2,025,000. Seven years later, in 1883, the product had increased to 630,000 cases, of the value of $5 per case, making a total value for that year's catch of $3,150,000.

That we may comprehend better the magnitude of this great industry, it must be remembered that the average weight of each case, including the cans, is about 72 pounds, as the ordinary size can holds 1 pound net of prepared fish, there being forty-eight cans in each case. So the catch of 1883, taking that year for an illustration, was about 22,680 tons of prepared salmon, or enough to load two hundred and twenty-six trains of cars of ten cars each, each car containing 10 tons of salmon, or twenty-three ship cargoes of 1,000 tons each.

In this industry over 40 canneries are in operation, over $2,000,000 of permanent capital is invested, 1,548 boats, including 10 or 12 steam-tenders, are employed, and employment is given during each month of the fishing season to several thousand men, the number of men employed in 1886 being 7,596; of these 4,200 were white persons and 3,396 Chinese.

The above relates only to the catch by gill-nets alone on the Columbia River, while about one-third more, it is estimated, are taken by seines, traps, and wheels. The number of fish caught by gill-nets alone in 1886 was 1,315,800.

The following, taken from an article recently published in the Daily Astorian, at Astoria, Oregon, will give information as to the amount of money expended annually in carrying on this important industry, in purchasing material, and in payment of labor:

"The importance of the salmon industry to Astoria, Clatsop County, and the Lower Columbia generally, is tersely illustrated by the following figures, being a close estimate of the amount of money expended for the season of 1886:

COST OF MATERIAL.

Tin-plate, 74,000 boxes, at $5.25	$388,500
Salmon twine	205,200
Cotton twine	25,000
Lines	26,600
Lead for lines	7,500
Floats	4,000
Boats, wear and tear, paint, repair, etc	38,000
Tan-bark for nets	1,900
Pig-tin for making solder	50,122
Lead for making solder	10,450
Salt, Liverpool and coarse	2,000
Lacquer	8,550
Turpentine	6,460
Cordwood	19,760
Hard coal	1,862
Charcoal	15,200
Acid and zinc	4,000
Oils of various kinds	4,000
Improvements and necessary repairs	38,000
Copper and making up	2,000
Insurance	32,376
Hauling	12,540
Freight	5,000
Labels	32,400
Boxes	67,500
Taxes	11,400
Total	1,020,320

COST OF LABOR.

Knitting nets, 228,000 fathoms, at 22½ cents	128,250
Catching salmon with cannery nets	400,000
Catching salmon with private nets	300,000
Salvage and hire of detectives	5,700
White labor outside of fishing	93,956
Other labor outside of fishing	142,000
Total	1,069,906

PAID TO UNCLE SAM.

Duty on 74,000 boxes tin-plate, 7,992,000 pounds, at 1¼ cents	99,900
Duty on amount of salmon twine	20,520
Total	120,429

"Here we have an aggregate of annual disbursements to the amount of $2,210,646. Including every detail of the work it is a safe estimate to say that the Lower Columbia salmon canneries expend annually $2,500,000, the greatest part of which goes into circulation in this immediate vicinity."

WHAT ARE THE OBSTRUCTIONS TO NAVIGATION IN THE COLUMBIA RIVER TO BE OVERCOME, AND IN WHAT MANNER AND TO WHAT EXTENT DO THESE OBSTRUCTIONS MAKE IT POSSIBLE FOR ONE CORPORATION TO ABSOLUTELY CONTROL THE TRANSPORTATION OF THE INLAND EMPIRE AND OPPRESS THE PEOPLE?

Your committee, in the investigation of this subject, have become profoundly impressed with the pressing necessity and great importance, in the interest of the producers and shippers and general commerce of the Pacific Northwest, for some speedy, energetic, and effectual effort upon the part of the General Government in providing some wise and suitable means of surmounting the obstructions to navigation on and along the waters of the Columbia River, and especially at the point known as The Dalles of the Columbia.

The obstructions here, commencing near the eastern boundary of the city of The Dalles, 200 miles from the mouth of the Columbia, and extending with more or less irregularity and massiveness for a distance of about 13 miles up the river, are of the most formidable and stupendous character. Here nature has with unmerciful and unsparing hand for this distance placed an absolute embargo on the navigation of the waters of this, the second river on the continent. Here this great water way, which with but a single other obstruction of any magnitude, that at The Cascades, where a canal and locks are well under way of construction, drains an empire possessed of those natural elements that unite in producing wealth, invincibility, and power, when vitalized by proper development, is compressed between the rocky ribs, and stalwart sides, and uplifting foundations of gigantic mountains.

Here the waters of this grand river, over 6 miles wide more than 10 miles from its mouth, and more than a mile wide at various points 100 miles above its mouth, with a mighty volume of water, deep and broad, navigable for steamboats of heavy tonnage, excepting for the short distance of these obstructions, from the sea inland a distance of 1,032 miles, with navigable tributaries coursing their way over 300 additional miles, and suddenly compressed in a manner almost beyond the comprehension of man, until for a distance of nearly a mile and a half the passage is, to use the language of Maj. W. A. Jones, United States engineer, "so narrow that the river is polarized, as it were, and set on edge." And while the width of the river varies at different points within this distance from as low as 125 feet to 140 and 150 feet, the average width for these 8,000 feet, or nearly 1½ miles, is only 250 feet. Through this narrow chasm the mighty volume of this great river, whose discharge, according to the report of engineers, varies between 4,620,000 cubic feet per minute at low water to 15,420,000 cubic feet per minute at high water, is forced. When it is further remembered that the extreme difference between high and low water at the head of The Dalles is 87 feet, some proper conception of the character of obstructions to be overcome may be realized.

It will be very readily understood, and it has been made plain to your committee, that by reason of the obstructions to navigation at the Cascades of the Columbia and The Dalles of the Columbia, as hereinbefore indicated, the Columbia River being the only real pass through which the productions of the Great Columbia basin or inland empire can find their way to the seaboard, it has been made possible for one corporation engaged in the business of transportation to intrench itself as a powerful tax-gatherer and collector of tribute at these gates of commerce on this grand river, and thus absolutely control the navigation of the waters of the Columbia and its tributaries from their source to the sea, and dictate the terms of its commerce. Nor were business genius and capital slow to comprehend the commercial and strategic importance of these passes in the mountains and obtain absolute and undisputed possession of this "key-point," to use the descriptive language of the United States engineer in charge of the improvements of the Columbia River, "in the commercial strategy of the Pacific Northwest."

It has been made clear to your committee, furthermore, that for years, and from the earliest period of the establishment of civilization in the far West, a corporation, the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company, and its immediate predecessor, the Oregon Steam Navigation Company, have held undisputed sway over the waters of the Columbia and its tributaries, with no restraint or restriction whatever on their power, discretion, or disposition in the establishment of rates of transportation to which the producers and shippers are subjected, save and except one, the ability and willingness of the producer or shipper to respond to their demand.

That this corporation has provided most important and valuable facilities for transportation both by boats and rail at a great expenditure of money is admitted by all; that this money, however, has in the main come from the producers of that region is equally true; that their facilities, notwithstanding their substantial nature, are insufficient to move in proper season the products of the inland empire, failing in 1884 to the extent of 35,000 tons, is admitted by all; that their freight rates, moreover, now and for years past have been such as to amount to a sum annually far beyond any reasonable, fair, or just, or even an extravagant interest on every dollar expended after meeting every proper charge and keeping their transportation lines in good condition, is a fact open to absolute and positive demonstration by indisputable evidence. That the people of an empire, located on the banks of one of the grandest rivers of the world, should in the matter of transportation of their products and supplies be held subject to the will of one corporation is contrary to every principle of fair play, justice, and right that should find countenance, respect, or toleration among intelligent and civilized men.

That the waters of any one river on God's green earth, much less one grandly magnificent in volume, length, and every other respect as the Columbia endowed with all those elements of greatness and grandeur and moral and physical power that constitute and characterize the greatest of the great internal water ways of the world, should be dominated and controlled by any one man or any set of men or corporation or company is a standing reproach to the people or nation that tolerates or permits it, and all this must be said and is said without casting any personal reflection upon the men engaged in the business of transportation along this great river or who compose the stockholders and managers of this corporation, and who have been so fortunate as to obtain control at an early day of this most important key to the commerce of the Pacific Northwest.

To change this order of things, and to more nearly equalize the rights, interests, and profits of the producer, consumer, shipper, and transporter in the great valley of the Columbia, to open up the waters of this great river to honorable competition, healthy commerce, and business rivalry in the matter of transportation, and of free and untrammeled navigation, are great purposes to which the Congress may not only constitutionally, and with entire propriety, but in the proper discharge of a most important and pressing duty give its earnest consideration.

THE EXORBITANT NATURE OF TRANSPORTATION TARIFFS ON THE PRODUCTS OF THE COLUMBIA BASIN.

In order that the Senate may have some proper conception of the enormous freight charges on the Columbia River and on the line of the railroad coursing the banks of that river and operated by the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company and the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, attention is attracted to the rates on a few of the distances on these lines, and they are not very short hauls, and compare them for a moment with transportation charges on other lines in different sections of the country. For instance, from Wallula Junction, Wash., to Portland, in the State of Oregon, a distance of 214 miles, a charge of $6 per ton for wheat was exacted. This is at the rate of 18 cents per bushel for this distance, or at the rate of nearly 3 cents per ton per mile.

Again, from Portland to Alkali, or Arlington, as it is now called, on the Columbia River, in Gilliam County, Oregon, a distance of 142 miles, a charge of 65 cents per 100 pounds on first-class freight is imposed, being at the rate of $13 per ton for that distance, or about 9½ cents per ton per mile; while from Portland to Castle Rock, on the same line, a distance of 162 miles, or about 20 miles farther than to Arlington, the same class of freight on the same line is charged 90 cents per 100 pounds, or at the rate of $18 per ton for this distance, or at the rate of 11¼ cents per ton per mile; or, in other words, for the additional distance of 20 miles between Arlington and Castle Rock an additional charge of $5 per ton is exacted for first-class freight, or at the rate for this distance of 25 cents per ton per mile.

Again, from Dalles City to Portland, Oregon, a distance of 88 miles, a charge of 12 cents per bushel is made for transporting wheat, being at the rate of $4 per ton for this distance, or at the rate of 4½ cents per ton per mile.

It will be observed there have been here selected for illustrations the rates between Portland, Oregon, and four several, separate, and distinct points located on and along the Columbia River, east of the Cascade range of mountains, in the basin of the Columbia River; that is so say, Dalles City, 88 miles east from Portland; Alkali (or Arlington), 142 miles east from Portland; Castle Rock, 162 miles east from Portland, and Wallula Junction, Wash., 214 miles east from Portland. From these instances a fair knowledge may be obtained of freight charges generally on the lines of rail and steamers connecting the head of ship navigation at Portland, Oregon, with the Great Columbia Basin, or what is commonly known and called in that section the great inland empire.

But still further let us inquire into the position in which the farmers in the Walla Walla and portions of Eastern Washington and Oregon are placed who might desire to ship their grain to Minneapolis and the East. While the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company will take their wheat, barley, and oats to Portland over their line, a distance of say 250 miles, at $6 per ton, they will charge them if they wish to ship to Minneapolis, via Wallula and the Northern Pacific Railroad, $2.40 per ton for the 30 miles from Walla Walla to Wallula, or at the rate of 7½ cents per bushel, or at the rate of 8 cents per ton per mile.

Can, your committee inquire, such enormous transportation charges or such unreasonable and unjust discriminations be found to exist in any other part

the United States? Compare these even with the freight charges in the State of California, of which we have heard so much complaint in regard to alleged exorbitant exactions, and what do we find? Take the matter of the transportation of freight, for instance, from the valley of the Sacramento to San Francisco. The distance from Marysville, Cal., to San Francisco is, via Benicia, 142 miles, or precisely the same distance it is from Portland, Oregon, to Alkali or Arlington, or via Stockton and Niles, 192 miles, and via Stockton and Port Costa, 203 miles. The principal portion of the freight (cereals) goes via Benicia, as it is much the shorter route. The rate has been generally heretofore (we are not advised as to the present time) from Marysville via Benicia, a distance of 142 miles, $2.90 per ton, or equivalent to about 2 cents per ton per mile, while via Stockton it is about $3.30 per ton, or about 1½ cents per ton per mile.

While it is true these seem somewhat extravagant charges, and are such compared with rates in most parts of the United States by rail or water, yet they are less than one-half on an average those to which the producers of the Columbia River are subjected. But taking a longer haul we find the average charge by rail from San Francisco to New Orleans, a distance of about 2,500 miles, $10 per ton, or only about 4 mills, or forty hundredths of a cent per ton per mile, or only about the one twenty-eighth part per ton per mile charged for freights between Portland and Castle Rock on the Columbia River. The cost of transporting grain from San Francisco to Liverpool via New Orleans in 1884 was $12 per ton, a distance of over 6,000 miles, while the producers of the Columbia Basin are compelled to pay half that amount per ton for transporting their wheat a distance of about 200 miles.

The Northern Pacific Railroad Company transports wheat from Wallula Junction to Duluth, a distance of 1,674 miles, for $8 per ton, but little less than 5 mills per ton per mile, while from Wallula Junction to Portland, Oregon, a distance of 214 miles over the same line of road, a charge of 3 cents per ton per mile, or a rate six times greater per ton per mile, is exacted by the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company, and also by the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, running its trains over the same line. From Duluth to Liverpool via Montreal wheat was in 1884 transported at $5.61 per ton, and from Portland by way of Cape Horn to Liverpool, a distance of nearly 17,000 miles, at $8 per ton, while a much greater sum than the former and a fraction less than the latter is charged for a distance of 200 miles in and along the valley of the Columbia.

A comparison of these various transportation charges demonstrates beyond the power of controversy the exorbitant nature of transportation charges imposed to-day by the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company and the Northern Pacific Railroad Company upon the producers and shippers interested in transportation to and from the great valley of the Columbia. It is not to be wondered at that the earnings of the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company were for the year ending June 30, 1884, $5,364,906.52, derived chiefly from local traffic, or that their earnings since then have been still greater.

But a few more comparisons will illustrate in a marked degree the extravagant freight charges that rule to-day in the valley of the Columbia. The average freight charges per bushel for the transportation of wheat from Chicago to New York, a distance of 963 miles, by all water—that is by the lakes, the Erie Canal, and the Hudson River; by part water and part rail—that is by lake to Buffalo and by rail to New York; and by all rail during the years 1876 to 1883, inclusive, were, on an average, as follows, and they are much less now: By all water, 10 cents per bushel; by lakes and rail, 12.4 cents, and by all rail, 17.1 cents. Making no allowance for difference between a long and a short haul, the charges on and along the Columbia River are on an average of from five to eight times higher per bushel than from Chicago to New York. At the rates ruling along the Columbia River on hauls of two to three hundred miles it would cost from 85 to 90 cents a bushel to transport a bushel of wheat from Chicago to New York, or at the rate of from $28.33⅓ to $30 per ton.

But coming down later, we find the present transportation rates ruling on transportation lines between Chicago and New York as follows:

By all water, 6 cents a bushel for wheat, or at the rate of $2 per ton for a distance of 963 miles, or at the rate of 2⅑ mills per ton per mile, or, making no allowance for difference in length of hauls, a rate of over fourteen times less per ton per mile or per bushel per mile than is charged on wheat from the Columbia Basin to Portland, Oregon, while by all rail the present cost (1886) of transporting wheat from Chicago to New York, 963 miles, is 15 cents a bushel, or $5 per ton for that distance, or at the rate of 5⅛ mills per ton per mile, or, making no allowance for difference in length of hauls, a rate less than one-sixth of that charged in the Columbia River Valley per bushel per mile.

And this illustration shows, moreover, the superiority of a water route over a railroad for the transportation of wheat and other produce of the country, as it will be seen from this that to-day it costs only two-fifths as much to transport a bushel of wheat from Chicago to New York by all water as it does by all rail.

SOME OF THE FEARFUL DISCRIMINATIONS PRACTICED ON THE PRODUCERS AND SHIPPERS IN THE VALLEY OF THE COLUMBIA.

But the fearfully unjust and paralyzing discriminations in transportation charges on and along the Columbia River may be further illustrated by a comparison of the rates on through traffic to and from Eastern cities each way, and terminal points on the waters of the Columbia, with such rates on through traffic to and from such Eastern cities and non-competitive shipping points on and along the Columbia River in Eastern Oregon and Washington Territory, such as Dalles City, Arlington, Castle Rock, Umatilla, Pendleton, La Grande, Union and Baker City, in Oregon, and Wallula, Walla Walla, and other points in Washington Territory.

The following letter serves to present the facts, and serves as a most conclusive illustration of the unjustifiable and oppressive character of these discriminations against the producers and shippers of the inland empire:

"THE DALLES, OREGON, *December* 29, 1886.

"SIR: On behalf of the Board of Trade of Dalles City we desire to call your attention to the situation of the merchants of this city and other cities in Eastern Oregon and Washington on the line of the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company's Railway respecting freight rates to and from eastern points.

"The schedule of rates to these way points upon all classes of freights from the East is made up by adding to the through rate to Portland the local rate back from Portland to the way point. This additional local back charge is an arbitrary charge, and is in no way connected with the through rate.

"For example: A car-load of merchandise to any of these way points from Chicago is delivered at the way point without going through to Portland, and the freight charges thereon consist of the full through rate to Portland plus the local rate on merchandise from Portland to the way point. In the case of our own city this local rate from Portland is, on the average, from 70 per cent. to 80 per cent. of what is charged for hauling the same merchandise from Chicago to Portland. The distance from Portland to this city is 88 miles. The local rate from Portland to this point, on the average, is 45 cents per 100 pounds. The through rate from Chicago to Portland on the same class of freight is 65 cents per 100 pounds, making the actual charge from Chicago to this point $1.10 per 100 pounds; and yet we are 88 miles nearer Chicago than is Portland, and are on the direct line between those two points.

"In the case of merchants east of us the situation is worse. Thus at Arlington, a point 141 miles east of Portland, the local back rate is, on the average, 70 cents per 100 pounds; that is, 5 cents more than the through rate from Chicago to Portland; making the actual charge to that point from Chicago $1.35 per 100 pounds. In the case of Walla Walla, Wash., Baker City and Huntington, Oregon, the local back rate is double the through rate to Portland. Yet the actual haul in each of the cases referred to falls considerably short of the haul for which is paid the through rate alone. Concerning this through rate no complaint is made, and merchants at the way points are entirely willing to pay the same rates as are charged for the haul to Portland. But the arbitrary local back-rate charge is deemed a most unjust and burdensome exaction, falling little short of systematic robbery.

"In like manner merchants at these way points are compelled to pay on shipments to Chicago, in addition to the through rate from Portland to Chicago, the local rate from the way point to Portland. Thus the railway company exacts from dealers at these way points on all shipments to and from all eastern points a charge equal to what they would be entitled to charge if they were compelled to haul the freight first to Portland. But no such necessity exists, and for this excessive arbitrary charge no service whatever is rendered.

"If the bill now pending before Congress known as the interstate-commerce bill gives us relief from this unjust and burdensome discrimination, we would respectively request you to co-operate with our other Representatives in Congress in securing its passage. If not, we earnestly hope you will endeavor to procure such other legislation as will relieve us.

"We call the attention of Hons. J. N. DOLPH and BINGER HERMANN to the same matter by similar communications.

"Yours, very respectfully,

"E. B. MCFARLAND,
"A. S. MACALLISTER,
"B. S. HUNTINGTON,
Committee for Board of Trade of Dalles City, Oregon.

"Hon. J. H. MITCHELL,
"*United States Senator, Washington, D. C.*"

THE PEOPLE'S INTERESTS LIE IN THE DIRECTION OF CAPACIOUS HARBORS AND FREE RIVERS.

It is clearly evident the producers, shippers, and consumers of this country, if they would guard their own interests and protect themselves against the rapacity of formidable combinations of aggregated capital, must look to the improvement of the great natural water ways of the country and the construction of artificial ship and steam-boat canals and ship and boat railways for relief from exorbitant transportation charges.

A free water way to the boats of all comers is of itself not only the cheapest and best means, although not quite so rapid as by rail, for the transportation of heavy freight, but is also an absolute check upon the grasping tendencies of railway corporations.

It has been demonstrated beyond all question by the history of the past and by the practices of the present that railways can not and do not compete in the carrying of heavy freight with free and untrammeled water ways, natural or artificial. Take for illustration the New York Central, with all the grand facilities it affords with a four-track railroad, and compare it and its transportation business with the parallel line of water transportation composed in parts of the Erie Canal and Hudson River, and what do we find, even before the tolls were taken off the canal?

According to the report of the New York State engineer, the average actual cost of transporting freight (wheat) on the New York Central is fifty-four hundredths of a cent per ton per mile, not counting anything for interest on capital invested, and the average charge on that road is eighty-eight hundredths of a cent per ton per mile; whereas the transportation charges on wheat from Buffalo to New York via the Erie Canal and Hudson River is but twenty-one hundredths of a cent per ton per mile, or thirty-three hundredths of a cent per ton per mile less than it costs the New York Central to transport it; and this according to the report of the State engineer appointed under the railway laws of the State of New York; and hence we find the railway charges eighty-eight hundredths of a cent per ton per mile, or sixty-seven hundredths of a cent per ton per mile more than is charged on the water-transportation route.

And were the Erie Canal and Hudson River wiped out of existence to-day how long, in the judgment of any reasonable man, would the present transportation rates on the New York Central remain as low as they are? The conceded profit of to-day of thirty-four hundredths of a cent per ton per mile would in all probability be increased to five times that amount, or, perhaps, much more, especially as the parallel line to Buffalo of the West Shore road is now controlled by the New York Central.

But as it is now the canal and river, as might be reasonably expected, do the great bulk of the business, and the people get the benefit of the competition.

The statistics show that during the past year the Erie Canal was the conduit through which 37,500,000 bushels of wheat were delivered at the port of New York, while the sum total that came through the almost countless railroad lines that center there, including the four-track New York Central, was only about 28,000,000 bushels, or 4,750,000 bushels less than one-half of the whole amount, while the total amount of tonnage (in bushels) of flour, corn-meal, wheat, corn, oats, barley, peas, and malt which arrived in New York from the 1st day of January, 1883, to the 31st day of December, 1883, was 124,336,237 bushels, and was delivered at that port by the following routes:

	Bushels.
New York Central and Hudson River Railroad	32,125,615
New York, Lake Erie and Western Railroad	28,765,288
Pennsylvania Central Railroad	13,060,494
Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad	4,581,770
Various routes	856,924
By river and coast	3,725,238
By canal (seven months)	41,220,908
	124,336,237

Of the entire amount of grain thus received at the port of New York during the year it will be observed that—

	Per cent.
The New York Central Railroad carried	25.84
The Erie Railway carried	23.13
The Pennsylvania Central Railroad carried	10.50
The Delaware, Lackawanna and Western Railroad carried	3.69
Various small routes carried	0.69
River and coast	3.00
The Erie canal in seven months carried	33.15

Numerous other instances might be cited to the same effect did time justify. For instance, the railroad commissioners of the State of Illinois the past year fixed the maximum rates on wheat in car-load lots for 130 miles 7.21 cents per bushel, while the charges for the same distance for wheat from Henry to Chicago by the Illinois and Michigan Canal, including the State tolls, is but 3 cents per bushel, or 1.21 cents per bushel less than one-half the charge by rail.

In our recent history we have a monumental and most commendable example of the manner in which internal and external commerce may be promoted by the improvement of important lines of water ways. Where did New Orleans stand even twelve years ago as a seaport and in respect of its relations to foreign commerce? Since the completion of the Eads jetties what has she in these respects become? In 1883, as shown by the statistics, she was the second port in the United States in the value of her exports (New York, of course, being first), and ranked third in total foreign commerce.

PLAN OF IMPROVEMENT PROPOSED BY COMMITTEE FOR OVERCOMING OBSTRUCTIONS AT THE DALLES OF THE COLUMBIA.

Your committee have carefully considered the various projects heretofore suggested by United States engineers in charge of surveys and other Government works on the Columbia River as a means of overcoming these obstructions at The Dalles, or, as more accurately and specifically stated in the reports of engineers, at "Celilo Falls, Ten-Mile Rapids, The Dalles, and Three-Mile Rapids."

The two principal plans heretofore proposed are:

First. By dodging these obstructions by a canal and a series of locks.

Second. By a boat railway in part, or, to be specific, by flanking The Dalles and Celilo Falls with railway inclines, over which laden boats and river craft may be hauled by means of stationary engines at the summits, and by blasting open the contracted water ways at Ten and Three Mile Rapids to a width of 300 feet, so as to reduce the velocities to a navigable status.

In view of the enormous expense required to dodge these gigantic obstructions by means of a canal and locks, and the well known disposition of the Congress to limit appropriations for river and harbor improvements to the lowest possible minimum, and the indisposition to concentrate such appropriations on a few specific works of manifest and unquestioned national importance, and the tendency to distribute the amounts annually appropriated among a great variety of works, thus giving but a small proportion of the whole to any one, however important, your committee are of the opinion that if it is desired to overcome these obstructions to navigation in any practical and effective manner, so as to be of any real benefit to the present or even the next generation, it would be unwise at present to enter on the construction of canal and locks, provided always that other means can be devised and put into effectual operation within some reasonable time, and at much less expense, so that speedy relief may be brought to the producers and shippers of the great Columbia Valley and of the North Pacific coast generally. That this can be done by means of a boat-railway around The Dalles and Celilo Falls and by widening the channels by blasting at Ten and Three Mile Rapids to a width of 300 feet, so as to render the water navigable at these points, your committee, after careful investigation, have no kind of doubt.

That some proper conception of the cost and time likely to be required, and hence the consequent great delay in bringing relief to the people, to construct a canal and locks around these obstructions, your committee quote the following from the annual report of Maj. William A. Jones, Corps of Engineers, of date July 25, 1885:

"Estimates have been made and submitted for building a canal to flank Celilo Falls with blasting operations for making the river good at Ten-Mile Rapids, The Dalles, and at Three-Mile Rapids. This project is estimated to cost, in round numbers, $11,000,000. If we apply to this enormous sum the rate at which funds have been provided for the Cascades Canal, it will appear that over one hundred years would be required before navigation could be opened through these obstructions."

Your committee turn, therefore, reluctantly to the consideration of the alternative, a boat railway and widening of the channel as above indicated.

While this plan is somewhat out of the usual groove in which the more conservative and unprogressive portion of the United States Engineer Corps have been accustomed to operate, it is by no means impracticable or novel; nor are your committee left by any means to grope unintelligently in the dark as to its application and entire feasibility as a means of overcoming the obstructions at The Dalles of the Columbia; nor yet in reference to the matter of expense are we left to conjecture.

Various preliminary surveys have heretofore been made for proposed improvements at The Dalles. A survey at these obstructions, with plan and specifications for a canal and locks, was required by act of Congress of March 3, 1879, which reads as follows:

"That the Secretary of War is hereby directed, at his discretion, to cause examinations or surveys, or both, and estimates of cost of improvements proper, to be made at the following points, namely:

* * * * * * *

"The Columbia River at The Dalles in Oregon, including plan and specifications for locks and canal around said point."

* * * * * * *

This requirement of Congress was complied with between October, 1879, and January, 1880, by direction of Maj. G. L. Gillespie, Corps of Engineers, officer in charge, under the supervision of Capt. Charles F. Powell, Corps of Engineers. The latter, in his annual report to the Chief of Engineers of date May 30, 1882, and which includes his survey and estimates, refers to these different examinations, and says:

"Subsequently and at various times additional surveys and examinations were made of special localities, to furnish results more detailed than those obtained by the main party, and also for studying the variable phases of the river during its widely different stages.

"An excellent instrumental examination had been made in 1874, by Assistant Engineer R. A. Habersham, and under the orders of Maj. N. Michler, Corps of Engineers, a map on a scale of 1:7200 was plotted from this examination. * * * The obstacles to be overcome were briefly described in a report, and some plans were suggested.

* * * * * * *

"The examination paved the way for a detailed survey, and the map of the former furnished a good groundwork on which to arrange the latter.

"One month preceding the commencement of the survey permanent water-gauges were established, and from that time read daily, as a rule, until June, 1881."

On these prior examinations, tests, surveys, etc., Captain Powell based his interesting and elaborate report of May 30, 1882, to the Chief of Engineers as to the character of the obstructions at The Dalles, and the means necessary to overcome them. In this report Captain Powell gives elaborate details concerning the character of these obstructions, including full river descriptions, width, depth, volume, and velocity of the water; character of the channel; fall of the water at high, mean, and low stages; extent and character of the country drained; its fertility and productiveness; importance of a free river, and full and complete information upon all points from which plans and estimates of any character of importance can conveniently be made, and which report he concluded with an estimate of the cost of constructing a canal and locks at said points.

But not only so. Lieut. (now Capt.) T. W. Symons, in his able and exhaustive report of date April 3, 1882, speaking of the navigable waters of the Upper Columbia River and its tributaries, strongly recommended boat-railways as a suitable and proper means of overcoming the obstructions in that river, and made estimates of the cost. (See Senate Executive Document No. 114, first session Forty-ninth Congress.)

But as conclusive upon the whole subject, as it seems to your committee, not only as to the entire feasibility of the proposed boat-railway, or as to that, in view of all the circumstances, being the plan which in preference to all others should under existing circumstances be adopted by Congress, and this, too, without the delay necessary for further preliminary surveys and examinations, which your committee deem unnecessary and inexpedient in view of all the surveys, examinations, and estimates heretofore made, the very exhaustive and interesting report of Maj. W. A. Jones, Corps of Engineers, of date July 27, 1885, in which he recommends a boat-railway in part, and the widening of the channel in part, as above indicated, and submits carefully prepared and elaborate plans and specifications and estimates for the same, is herewith submitted and made part of this report; this being a part of his annual report on river improvements in Oregon and Washington Territory for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1885. (See Senate Executive Document No. 114, first session Forty-ninth Congress.)

"REPORT OF MAJ. W. A. JONES, CORPS OF ENGINEERS, OF DATE JULY 27, 1885, MAKING SURVEY AND ESTIMATES AND SUBMITTING PLANS AND SPECIFICATIONS FOR A BOAT-RAILWAY AT THE DALLES OF THE COLUMBIA.

"*The Dalles.*—For a distance of about 13 miles, commencing a little above the city of The Dalles, Oregon, the Columbia River is obstructed in a gigantic manner that is perfectly unique in the history of river improvements. The whole water way is choked, apparently by an intrusion of lava, through which the river has with difficulty cut a passage. At one point, over a distance of 8,000 feet, the passage is so narrow that the river is polarized, as it were, and set on edge. The chasm has in places such widths as 75, 147, and 150 feet, and its average width is about 250 feet. Except at high-water stages, the whole volume of this great river, whose discharge varies between 77,000 cubic feet per second at low water, and 257,000 cubic feet per second at high water approximately, is forced through this narrow, precipitous gorge.

"In order that it shall get through the waters are dammed up at the head until the slope becomes such as to produce an enormous velocity. Throughout the whole distance of 13 miles the water way of the river is very much contracted at two places, Ten-Mile Rapids and Three-Mile Rapids, the minimum widths at low water are 210 feet and 190 feet, respectively. The serious obstructions to navigation over the whole reach occur in order, commencing at Celilo, at the head, at Celilo Falls, Ten-Mile Rapids, The Dalles, and Three-Mile Rapids. At Celilo Falls there is a considerable fall at low water, which, however, becomes nearly obliterated at high water by the waters dammed back by The Dalles. At this point a portage of 4,500 feet will carry from good water above the falls to the same below.

"Thence down to Ten-Mile Rapids the river is suitable for navigation. At this point the channel can be widened sufficiently by removing about 270,000 cubic yards of rock.

"From thence to The Dalles the river again becomes suitable for navigation. At The Dalles the river might be widened to 300 feet by the removal of about 700,000 cubic yards of rock. The portage here is about 9,000 feet between good water above and below.

"At Three-Mile Rapids the channel can be sufficiently widened by rock removal, and from thence no further serious obstructions exist.

"For a very thorough and accurate description, see Captain Powell's report of survey, published in Senate Executive Document No. 184, Forty-seventh Congress, first session. The following data, taken from this report, are quite interesting:

Distance from Celilo (gauge No. 1) to The Dalles City (gauge No. 5)	miles.	11.6
Total fall in water-surface:		
At high water	feet.	55.5
At low water	do.	81.0

It is interesting to note here the damming effect at high water of the Cascades, 45 miles below:

Distance between gauge 1 (Celilo) and gauge 2 (foot of Celilo Falls), feet		6,600.0
Total fall in water surface:		
At high water	feet.	3.2
At low water	do.	47.2
Celilo Falls:		
Fall at low water	feet.	20.0
Fall at high water	do.	0.0
Distance between gauge 2 (Celilo Falls) and gauge 3 (head of The Dalles)	feet.	32,000.0
Total fall in water surface:		
At high water	feet.	21.6
At low water	do.	11.2
At mean high water	do.	35.0
Distance between gauge 4 (The Dalles Rapids) and gauge 5 (The Dalles City)	feet.	23,520.0
Total fall in water surface:		
At high water	feet.	14.7
At low water	do.	1.5
Differences between high and low water:		
At Celilo	feet.	26.5
Foot of Celilo Falls	do.	72.4
Head of The Dalles	do.	87.0
Foot of The Dalles	do.	65.6
The Dalles City	do.	55.2

The magnitude of this great problem in engineering will appear when the foregoing is considered in the light of the fact that the great annual flood occurs with precision in June of each year, and the water-levels are constantly and rapidly changing.

"PROJECT FOR IMPROVEMENT.

"The obvious mode of improving navigation here is to dodge these mighty obstacles by means of canals and locks; but when one considers the extensive excavations in solid basalt rock, and walls and gates of unprecedented heights that will be required to accommodate the extraordinary variations in the level of the water, the element of uncertainty combines with that of extraordinary cost and length of time required for construction, and demands a pause. Estimates have been made and submitted for building a canal to flank Celilo Falls, with blasting operations for making the river good at Ten-Mile Rapids, The Dalles, and at Three-Mile Rapids. This project is estimated to cost in round numbers $11,000,000.

"If we apply to this enormous sum the rate at which funds have been provided for the Cascade Canal, it will appear that over one hundred years would be required before navigation could be opened through these obstructions. Now, there is but little doubt in my mind that ultimately the solution of this problem will be by means of these operations, but I am very strongly impressed with the conviction that the day of their construction ought to be postponed until a system of making appropriations has been adopted which will permit of their construction within a reasonable length of time, and when the resources of the country will justify the expenditure. In the mean time, if the plan I shall now propose should prove to be a sufficient solution, there will result a great saving to the public Treasury.

"BOAT-RAILWAY.

"I propose to flank The Dalles and Celilo Falls with railway inclines, over which laden boats and river craft may be hauled by means of stationary engines at the summits, and to blast open the contracted water ways at Ten and Three Mile Rapids to a width of 300 feet, which will be sufficient to reduce the velocities to a navigable status.

"The proposition is not novel. It is a common thing to haul boats out of the water upon inclined railways, and the fact of their being laden will not materially affect the operation. Furthermore, its application at this same place has been advocated by engineers for many years. Lieut. T. W. Symons, Corps of Engineers, in 1881 recommended it, and makes estimates of cost in his published

report upon the Columbia River. Furthermore, the development of steam-boat construction for the swift waters of the Upper Columbia and Snake Rivers has resulted in a boat with no keel and a perfectly flat bottom, but with good lines at stem and stern. This very much simplifies the question of a car for carrying the boats, as will be seen from the designs submitted herewith. Plans for Celilo Falls only are submitted, and on these the estimates for both The Dalles and Celilo are based.

"The maximum grade of the track is 213.84 feet per mile. The summit is passed by a gentle curve, quite within the limits of longitudinal flexure that will result from passing over the summit curve. The car is made up of cross-girders supported by longitudinal built beams, which in turn are carried by the wheel-axles, the whole suitably braced, and having sufficient iron introduced to prevent floating when completely submerged. It will be handled by cables from the stationary engine at the summit. It will have twenty-one wheels on each side, with independent axles, forty-two in all, running on a two-rail track 25 feet 6 inches wide. The maximum load on a single wheel will be about 17 tons. Length and width over all, 190 feet and 48 feet, respectively. For the present only a single line of track is proposed. Should the traffic develop a necessity for it another can be laid alongside. The following is a detailed estimate of cost, from which it appears that an expense of a little more than one and a quarter million dollars navigation can be opened through this obstruction at all stages of the river, except when it is closed by ice."

Estimated amount required to improve the Columbia River at Celilo Falls by the construction of a boat-railway on the right bank of said river, Washington Territory.

Roadway.	Quantities.	Price.	Amount.
Excavation and embankment, namely:			
Hauled a distance of 900 feet...cubic yds...	22,000	$1.50	$33,000
Hauled a distance of 4,000 feet.....do.....	23,000	2.30	66,700
Hauled a distance of 75 feet .....do.....	19,000	1.40	27,000
Concrete under rails, at $9 per cubic yard.....cubic yards...	2,800	9.00	25,200
Bridge 60 feet over all, cut stones in place, at $30 per cubic yard.....cubic yards...	520	30.00	15,600
Timber, under rails in place, per thousand.....feet, B. M.....	88,000	15.00	1,320
Iron:			
Rails, and plates under rails, in place, pounds.....	547,000	05½	30,112
Spikes, bolts, fish-plates, etc... pounds ..	15,800	06	948
Data are insufficient * to determine the cost of guard wall. Assumed probable cost....	.....	.....	60,000
Total	.....	.....	259,880
Adding 10 per cent. for contingencies.....	.....	.....	25,988
Engineering and superintendence	.....	.....	20,000
Total cost (estimated) for roadway.....	.....	.....	305,868
CAR.			
Cast-steel wheels, boxes, and angle-washers.....pounds....	55,000	10	5,500
Bronzed journal-bearings.....do.....	6,700	30	2,010
Rolled iron:			
Beams and large pieces .....do.....	125,450	5½	6,900
Bolts and small pieces.....do.....	21,500	6	1,290
Timber, large and small pieces, all in place, per thousand.....feet, B. M...	52,000	20.00	1,040
Total.....	.....	.....	16,740
Adding 10 per cent. for contingencies.....	.....	.....	1,674
Profit of contractor.....	.....	.....	3,000
Total estimate for car.....	.....	.....	21,414

RECAPITULATION.

Roadway.....	$305,868
Car.....	21,414
Total.....	327,282

Power required to carry a boat over the Celilo Falls.

	Tons.
Total weight of car.....	170
Estimated weight of boat.....	100
Estimated weight of load.....	500
Total	770

Or 1,724,800 pounds.

The weight has to be raised to the height of 80 feet, giving in foot-pounds 1,724,800 by 80 = 137,984,000 foot pounds.

To develop 137,840,000 foot-pounds of energy requires an engine of the following power capacity, namely:

Time allowed for development of full power.	Time required for the load to go from one to the other end of road.	Capacity required from the engine doing the haul.	Approximate cost of engine and boiler.†
Minutes.	*Minutes.*	*Horse-power.*	
15	30	280	$8,000
20	40	210	6,500
25	50	167	6,200
30	60	140	5,900
35	70	120	5,300
40	80	105	4,000

*There is no record of heights of water in the vicinity of proposed bridge corresponding to heights at Gauge No. 1.

†The prices here are for engines of the simplest model complete with boiler.

REMARK.—The price of boiler is very nearly equal to the price of engines; thus if one change of boiler be desired the total price would be about 50 per cent. more than prices in this list.

Gross estimate.

Roadway.....	$305,000
Car.....	25,000
Engines, machinery, cable, etc., engine-house	25,000
Total for Celilo Falls, length 4,500 feet.....	356,000
Cost per running foot for roadway	68
The Dalles:	
9,000 feet of roadway, at $68.....	612,000
Car machinery, etc.....	50,000
Total for Dalles	662,000
Total for Dalles and Celilo Falls.....	1,018,000
River improvement:	
355,000 cubic yards rock excavation, at $1.....	355,000
Railways.....	1,018,000
Total	1,373,000

THE TRAFFIC, PRESENT AND PROSPECTIVE, ON AND ALONG THE COLUMBIA RIVER, AND THE SAVING TO THE PEOPLE BY A FREE RIVER.

The wheat traffic alone along the Columbia River is over 600,000 tons per year. Taken with all other freight it is safe to estimate within the next two years a two-way traffic of over 1,000,000 tons of freight will pass along this river by boat and rail. This traffic is now subject to a freight tax of over 3 cents per ton per mile, which, on an average haul of 200 miles, is a tax on the producer and shipper of $6,000,000 annually, while on an average haul of 300 miles between Portland, Oregon, Eastern Oregon, Eastern Washington Territory, and Western Idaho the freight tax annually on the producers and shippers will be about $9,000,000.

With the completion of the canal and locks at the Cascades, and the completion of the proposed boat-railway and accompanying improvements at The Dalles, it is safe to predict that freight charges would be reduced at once at least to one-half of 1 per cent. per ton per mile. On an average haul, therefore, of about 200 miles, this would, on the estimate of the amount of freight as hereinbefore given, relieve the country, the producer, and shipper of a freight tax of $5,000,000 annually; but should the reduction in freight charges by these improvements prove not to be so great as above indicated, should the rates not go below 1 per cent. per ton per mile, it would still be extravagantly high compared with rates in States and Territories east of the Rocky Mountains. The saving to the people even in that case would be $4,000,000 annually on an average haul of 200 miles, or a saving of $6,000,000 annually on an average haul of 300 miles.

As we have seen, the estimated cost of the entire improvement proposed to overcome these obstructions of 13 miles at The Dalles is but $1,373,000, or less than one-fifth the amount of freight tax that will be saved to the people of Oregon and Washington Territory, to say nothing of other traffic in a single year. Why the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company should protest in every conceivable manner, and in that manner most likely to be effective, against these improvements, is not, in view of the patent facts in the case, difficult of comprehension. Why, upon the other hand, the people of the inland empire should demand of their Representatives and of the Congress the speedy opening of the Columbia River to free navigation and unfettered commerce is equally easy of comprehension. It is a demand in every sense reasonable and just, based on incontrovertible facts, and should in justice and equity and good conscience be met with a resolute, cheerful, speedy, and effective response.

THE COMMITTEE'S RECOMMENDATION.

In the opinion of your committee, therefore, the interests of the people of the Pacific Northwest imperatively demand, first, the speedy completion of the works at the mouth of the Columbia, and the canal and locks at the Cascades of the Columbia River, and it is recommended that liberal annual appropriations be made therefor; and, second, that the work of constructing a boat-railway around The Dalles and Celilo Falls of the Columbia River, and of blasting open the contracted water ways at Ten and Three Mile Rapids to a width of 300 feet, so as to secure navigable water, should be entered upon without delay by the United States Government; and your committee therefore recommend that it be done without further preliminary survey or report, and that an appropriation of $500,000 be made at the present session of Congress for such purpose; provided a final survey and estimates, based on the general plan proposed by Maj. W. A. Jones in his report herein quoted, and covering the entire improvement as therein indicated, which final report, survey, and estimates should be directed at once, to be paid for out of this appropriation, be first made and submitted to the Secretary of War and approved by him. And your committee report back the following bill, and recommend its passage:

"A bill making an appropriation for a final survey and estimates for and the commencement of the construction of a boat-railway around the obstructions to navigation at The Dalles and Celilo Falls in the Columbia River.

"*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That there be, and hereby is, appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500,000, for the purpose of making final surveys and estimates for, and the commencement of the work of construction of a boat-railway either in the State of Oregon or Washington Territory around the obstructions to navigation in the Columbia River at The Dalles and Celilo Falls; and for the purpose of blasting open the contracted water ways at Ten and Three Mile Rapids, near said falls, to a navigable status for large river tonnage boats.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is hereby directed, at his earliest convenience after the passage of this act, to cause a final survey and estimates to be made of the plan and cost of a boat-railway and the widening of the channel of such river at such points, in accordance as near as practicable with the general plan and suggestions for such improvements contained in the annual report of Maj. William A. Jones, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, date of July 27, 1885, on river improvements in Oregon and Washington Territory, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1885; and upon the approval of such final survey, plan, and estimates by the Secretary of War, he is hereby authorized and directed to proceed with the construction of such boat-railway and the widening of such channels in accordance with such final survey and plan."

JOHN H. MITCHELL.
S. M. CULLOM.
T. W. PALMER.
A. P. WILLIAMS.
M. C. BUTLER.
WILKINSON CALL.
G. G. VEST.
R. L. GIBSON.

Mr. MITCHELL. Owing to the shortness of the last session and the great press of business this bill was not reached for consideration as a separate proposition. It was, however, in a somewhat modified form,

but against the protest of many who thought it ought to be treated as a separate and independent proposition, away from and outside of the general bill of appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors, incorporated into the river and harbor bill by the Senate; was rejected by the House, but finally retained in conference, and included in the bill as finally passed both Houses.

This bill, as we all know, failed to receive the signature of the President, and consequently all appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors, including this and some other appropriations for making connections between two or more navigable waters, and which by many, including the Executive, as I am advised, are regarded as not belonging properly to a river and harbor bill, failed. Hence at the beginning of the present session I reintroduced the bill reported to the last Congress, and which, with slight modification, has been reported favorably in the substitute just read. The committee at the present session accompanies their favorable recommendation of the pending bill with a report (Senate Report No. 859, first session Fiftieth Congress) submitted by myself, in which they reaffirm in full the report of last session which has been quoted at length, and by way of supplement added the following, which I send to the desk to be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

Your committee, after further and mature deliberation, adopt the foregoing as its present report, in connection with the following supplementary, supporting, and modifying suggestions.

The facts as stated in said report, in reference to the present production of the region designated as the "Inland Empire, or Great Valley of the Columbia," and the oppressive freight rates on the transportation lines referred to, are true now as then and as therein stated, except as they are modified in the one case by largely augmented production and extended area of cultivation, and to some extent in the other case, that having reference to burdensome freight rates, by virtue of the good effects of the practical operation in a certain respect and in a moderate measure of the workings of the interstate-commerce act, entitled "An act to regulate commerce," and through which freight charges have been slightly reduced in part by the voluntary action of the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company, and in part by the orders of the Interstate Commerce Commission.

But, notwithstanding these slight modifications in the situation, your committee find that the transportation rates throughout the great valley of the Columbia are still of a nature ruinously oppressive to the producer and shipper, unreasonable and indefensible on any ground; and the interests of the people so engaged, as well as the proper development of that vast and fertile region, call loudly and emphatically upon Congress for heroic measures looking to speedy relief; and the reasons for the recommendations of your committee, made one year ago in the following language, "that the interests of the people of the Pacific Northwest imperatively demand, first, the speedy completion of the works at the mouth of the Columbia and the canal and locks at the Cascades of the Columbia, and that liberal appropriations be made therefor; and, second, that the work of constructing a boat-railway around The Dalles and Celilo Falls of the Columbia River, and of blasting open the contracted water ways at Ten and Three-mile Rapids to a width of 300 feet, so as to secure navigable water, should be entered upon without delay by the United States Government," exist to-day in full force but with stronger emphasis the same as when the former report was made.

Your committee therefore respectfully report back the accompanying bill as a substitute for bill S. 566, and recommend its passage.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. President, as I said, it is not my purpose to occupy the attention of the Senate with any extended remarks. What I desire is *action*. What the transportation-stricken people of the great Pacific Northwest desire, and have a right to expect of their representatives here, is *legislative action* in their interest on this important question, legislation which will speedily and effectively tend to loosen the bonds with which their industry, energy, and enterprise are fettered, and not long buncombe speeches. What the producers and shippers of Oregon, Washington, and Idaho, and of the great Pacific Northwest generally desire and have the right to expect, not only of their immediate representatives, but of Congress, is *performance* of promises they have had quite an abundance.

I have heretofore at different times and on various occasions sought by extended remarks to attract the attention of the Senate to the exceptional condition of affairs in the Pacific Northwest in reference not only to the territorial extent and unparalleled productiveness of that magnificent region, its richness of soil, its salubrity of climate, its great pastoral ranges, its invaluable forests, its extended wheat and other agriculture areas, its rapidly developing and fabulously rich mines, not alone of the precious metals, but of iron, coal, cinnabar, lead, limestone, marble, granite; the peculiar adaptation of its immense areas to the production of fruits of nearly every variety, including prunes, grapes, cherries, and berries of choicest character; its immense fields of the best hop-producing soil, swept by the finest hop-producing climate in the world. Not alone to all these have I on various occasions sought to attract public and legislative attention, but to the other yet more important and lamentable fact, that by reason mainly of certain exceptional and abnormal natural obstructions to navigation in the Columbia River, and the yet meager railroad facilities, and hence absence of anything like successful competition in the means of transportation, the productions of every struggling industry in that great infant empire, as well also as every article of machinery, and every pound of the necessaries of life essential to the development of these industries, and the sustenance of the people engaged therein, are burdened with a transportation charge that is unreasonable, burdensome, oppressive, and discouraging, not to say in some instances of a nature absolutely prohibitory.

To aid in a most important matter in making this state of things longer impossible, is the purpose of the pending bill. And in this connection I desire briefly to remark that exceptional cases in all departments of legislation demand, not infrequently, exceptional remedies. It is submitted furthermore that the difficulties sought to be overcome by the pending bill in connection with other important improvements now under way by the General Government at the mouth of the Columbia River, and at the Cascades of the Columbia, and the results that are expected to follow are of a nature, it is believed, wholly different from any other condition of affairs within the limits of the United States. Nor can it be said that the legislation proposed by the pending bill is not national in its scope and general purposes and effects. Why, then, do I state this to be an exceptional case and of such supreme importance and vast influence in the far-reaching benefits which it is believed will follow from this proposed legislation as to demand that it be dealt with separately and in a manner not generally followed by Congress in making appropriations for the improvement of rivers and harbors?

I will answer. The Columbia River, one of the grandest in many respects of the rivers of the world, being, with the exceptions I shall name, majestic, wide, and deep, being over 6 miles in width at many points far inland from the sea, is, as shown by the report accompanying this bill, divided, in so far as the great purposes of navigation are concerned, into three great rivers by two obstructive formations—the one extending a distance of about 5 miles, distant from its mouth 160 miles, known as the Cascades of the Columbia; the other at The Dalles, 60 miles farther up the river, or distant about 220 miles from its mouth, where the obstructions extend for a distance of nearly 13 miles.

I can best give an idea of the character of this obstruction by reading from the report of the engineer in charge. He describes it as follows. I read from a report made by Maj. W. A. Jones, of the United States Engineer Corps:

For a distance of about 13 miles, commencing a little above the city of The Dalles, Oregon, the Columbia River is obstructed in a gigantic manner that is perfectly unique in the history of river improvements. The whole water way is choked, apparently by an intrusion of lava, through which the river has with difficulty cut a passage. At one point, over a distance of 8,000 feet, the passage is so narrow that the river is polarized, as it were, and set on edge.

The chasm has in places such widths as 125, 147, and 150 feet, and its average width is about 250 feet. Except at high-water stages, the whole volume of this great river, whose discharge varies between 77,000 cubic feet per second at low water and 257,000 cubic feet per second at high water, approximately, is forced through this narrow, precipitous gorge. In order that it shall get through, the waters are dammed up at the head until the slope becomes such as to produce an enormous velocity. Throughout the whole distance of 13 miles the water way of the river is very much contracted; at two places, Ten-Mile Rapids and Three-Mile Rapids, the minimum widths at low water are 210 feet and 190 feet, respectively.

The serious obstructions to navigation over the whole reach occur in order commencing at Celilo at the head, at Celilo Falls, Ten-Mile Rapids, The Dalles, and Three-Mile Rapids. At Celilo Falls there is a considerable fall at low water, which, however, becomes nearly obliterated at high water by the waters dammed back by The Dalles. At this point a portage of 4,500 feet will carry from good water above the falls to the same below.

Thence down to Ten-Mile Rapids the river is suitable for navigation. At this point the channel can be widened sufficiently by removing about 270,000 cubic yards of rock.

From thence to The Dalles the river again becomes suitable for navigation. At The Dalles the river might be widened to 300 feet by the removal of about 700,000 cubic yards of rock. The portage here is about 9,000 feet between good water above and below.

At Three-Mile Rapids the channel can be sufficiently widened by rock removal, and from thence no further serious obstructions exist.

With the exception of these two obstructions, the Columbia River is navigable for large-draught vessels from the sea to a point inland 1,032 miles. It also has tributaries of navigable waters for large-draught vessels a distance of over 300 miles additional, but by reason of these two obstructions, the one at the Cascades, where the General Government is now constructing a canal and locks, and the other at The Dalles of the Columbia, this great river is, in fact, divided into three great rivers, and in order to open up the Columbia River to successful and unimpeded navigation so that the products of the great inland empire of Eastern Oregon, Eastern Washington, and Idaho Territory may find their way to the sea at reasonable rates, it becomes absolutely necessary that Congress should take some proper measures to overcome the obstructions at The Dalles of the Columbia.

Various estimates have been made in pursuance of acts of Congress, and surveys have been made with a view of constructing a canal and locks, and to ascertain what other means might properly be adopted to overcome these obstructions within a reasonable time and at a reasonable cost. The result is that it is demonstrated that to construct a canal and locks around these 13 miles would involve an expenditure of over $15,000,000, most likely a much vaster sum. Eleven million dollars is, I believe, the lowest estimate that has been made.

According to the report of the engineer, taking his own words for it, it would require about one hundred years, the way appropriations are now being made for river and harbor improvements, to construct a canal and locks at The Dalles of the Columbia River. It would take three generations, and then the work perhaps would not be completed.

That being the case, the attention of the Engineer Department and of Congress as well, and also of the people directly interested, was drawn in another direction and a very elaborate and interesting report was made three years ago, in 1885, by Major Jones, of the Engineer Department, in which, after discussing the absolute impossibility, the way appropriations are made for rivers and harbors, of constructing a

canal and locks at that point, he recommends a boat-railway. I will read, however, a few lines in his report before I come to that. He states in regard to a canal and locks the following:

The obvious mode of improving navigation here is to dodge these mighty obstacles by means of canals and locks; but when one considers the extensive excavations in solid basalt rock, and walls and gates of unprecedented heights that will be required to accommodate the extraordinary variations in the level of the water, the element of uncertainty combines with that of extraordinary cost and length of time required for construction, and demands a pause. Estimates have been made and submitted for building a canal to flank Celilo Falls, with blasting operations for making the river good at Ten-Mile Rapids, The Dalles, and at Three-Mile Rapids. This project is estimated to cost in round numbers $11,000,000.

If we apply to this enormous sum the rate at which funds have been provided for the Cascades Canal, it will appear that over one hundred years would be required before navigation could be opened through these obstructions. Now, there is but little doubt in my mind that ultimately the solution of this problem will be by means of these operations; but I am very strongly impressed with the conviction that the day of their construction ought to be postponed until a system of making appropriations has been adopted which will permit of their construction within a reasonable length of time, and when the resources of the country will justify the expenditure. In the mean time, if the plan I shall now propose should prove to be a sufficient solution, there will result a great saving to the public Treasury.

A BOAT RAILWAY.

This is his plan, which has, in a measure, been adopted by the pending bill:

I propose—

Says he—

to flank The Dalles and Celilo Falls with railway inclines, over which laden boats and river craft may be hauled by means of stationary engines at the summits, and to blast open the contracted water ways at Ten and Three-Mile Rapids to a width of 300 feet, which will be sufficient to reduce the velocities to a navigable status.

The proposition is not novel. It is a common thing to haul boats out of the water upon inclined railways, and the fact of their being laden will not materially affect the operation. Furthermore, its application at this same place has been advocated by engineers for many years. Lieut. T. W. Symons, Corps of Engineers, in 1881 recommended it, and makes estimates of cost in his published report upon the Columbia River.

Then he gives a detailed estimate of the cost of this proposed improvement, the sum total of which is $1,373,000, and over which it is proposed to carry boats, the total weight of the car being 170 tons, the estimated weight of the boat 100 tons, and the estimated weight of the load 500 tons.

When I call the attention of the Senate to the fact of the great difference between high and low water mark at The Dalles of the Columbia, and at Celilo, the upper end of this obstruction, the great difficulty in overcoming this obstruction will be appreciated. The difference between high and low water mark at The Dalles is 87 feet—that is at the head of The Dalles. At Celilo it is 28.3 feet; at the foot of Celilo Falls it is 72.3 feet; at the head of The Dalles it is 87 feet; at the foot of The Dalles it is 66.6 feet; at Dalles City it is 53.2 feet.

Mr. President, all these things have been carefully considered by the committee under the instructions of the Senate, and this bill is the result of their investigation. I could talk at length as to the necessity of this improvement. I could point out the enormous freight charges on that river and on the railroad on its banks, but I shall not detain the Senate. This is all fully set out in the report accompanying this bill. I could point to the immense area of the country that is to be benefited locally, to say nothing of the immense advantages in a national point of view.

The wheat traffic alone along the Columbia River now is over 600,000 tons per year. This great wheat area that must be reached by this improvement, where twelve years ago there were not 100,000 bushels of wheat raised, produced for shipment the past year over 400,000 tons of wheat; and yet not one-tenth of the cultivable land is under cultivation. Yet that vast country has a population of less than 2 persons to each square mile, whereas in Massachusetts I believe the population is two hundred and some odd to the square mile—230 perhaps—while the average population to the square mile in the United States is 9 or 10.

This traffic is now subject to a freight tax of about 3 cents per ton per mile, which on an average haul of 200 miles is a tax on the producer and shipper of $6,000,000 annually on the present product, while on an average haul of 300 miles between Portland, Oregon, Eastern Oregon, Eastern Washington Territory, and Western Idaho the freight tax annually on producers and shippers will be about $9,000,000.

By the completion of a canal and locks at the Cascades and the completion of the proposed boat railway and accompanying improvements at The Dalles, it is safe to predict that the freight charges will be reduced to at least one-half of 1 per cent. per ton per mile. On an average haul, therefore, of about 200 miles, on the estimate of freight I have just stated, to say nothing of through shipments, it would relieve the shippers of freight in Eastern Oregon, Eastern Washington, and Idaho of a tax of about $5,000,000 annually.

The reduction in freight charges by these improvements would not be so great as I have indicated if the rates should not go below 1 per cent. per ton per mile; but even then the rates would be extravagantly high compared with the rates in States and Territories east of the Rocky Mountains. The saving to the people even in that case would be about $4,000,000 annually on an average haul of 200 miles, or a saving of $6,000,000 annually on an average haul of 300 miles.

Mr. President, I promised not to take up the time of the Senate at any length. I have heretofore elaborated this subject. To do justice to the people I in part represent, to do justice to the people of the great Pacific Northwest, who have felt but lightly so far the help of the beneficent hand of the General Government, I should perhaps occupy the attention of the Senate for hours, but I shall not do so. I feel that after the investigation which has been made, and the unanimous report which has been submitted by this committee, the bill will meet with favor at the hands of the Senate, and therefore I shall not take up the time of the Senate further, and hope we may have a vote on the passage of the pending bill, which appropriates one-half a million dollars to be used in making a final and permanent survey for and the commencement of the work of constructing a boat railway around the obstructions to navigation at The Dalles and Celilo Falls of the Columbia River. The amendment reported by the committee was agreed to, and the bill as amended, appropriating $500,000, was passed.

Mr. DOLPH. Mr. President, this bill has the unanimous indorsement of the committee from which it was reported, and I do not feel like taking up the time of the Senate in discussing it. During the last Congress I addressed the Senate at some length in regard to this measure, or at least the proposition to improve the Dalles and Celilo Rapids with a boat railway. I shall not repeat what I then said.

I merely desire to say now that I indorse all that has been said by my colleague in regard to the importance and urgency of this improvement and as to the practicability of the plan of improvement which is foreshadowed in the bill. There is no more important improvement to-day demanding the attention of Congress upon any of the rivers or navigable waters of the United States. There is, in my judgment, no other improvement in the United States of a navigable water way which will be of so great advantage to so many people and so large an area of country as the proposed improvement of the Columbia River.

As I said before, I shall not take up the time of the Senate by making any remarks.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the substitute proposed by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLORIDA KENNERLY.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Senate bill 1078 is the first bill in order on the Calendar under Rule VIII.

The bill (S. 1078) for the relief of Florida Kennerly was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to Mrs. Florida Kennerly $126.60.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PORT OF DULUTH.

The bill (S. 1625) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to amend section 7 of the act of June 10, 1880, by inserting immediately before the proviso of the section and immediately after the word "Florida," where the same occurs in the section, the words "Duluth, in Minnesota."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS A. OSBORN.

Mr. SPOONER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2216) for the relief of Thomas A. Osborn having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate.

JOHN C. SPOONER,
GEORGE F. HOAR,
CHARLES J. FAULKNER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

W. P. TAULBEE,
C. H. MANSUR,
DANIEL KERR,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was concurred in.

PORT OF TRENTON.

The bill (H. R. 1640) changing the name of the port of Lamberton, in the district of Burlington, N. J., to the port of Trenton, in said district, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

MARINE-HOSPITAL SERVICE.

The bill (S. 1786) to regulate appointments in the Marine-Hospital Service of the United States was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to know what changes the bill proposes to make in the existing law.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill was reported by the chairman of the Committee on Commerce, the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE], who is now absent by leave of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it retain its place on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT CLINTON, IOWA.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1882) to authorize the construction of a railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, after the word "river" at the end of line 15, to strike out "beyond what is necessary in order to carry into effect the rights and privileges hereby granted;" in line 20, after the words "district in," to strike out "which" and insert "whose jurisdiction;" and in line 20, after the word "obstruction," to strike out "touches" and insert "may be;" so as to make the section read:

That the Clinton and Illinois Bridge Company, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Iowa, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct and maintain, if in the opinion of the Secretary of War the same be a public necessity, a railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Mississippi River at a place suitable to the interests of navigation, at a point at or near the city of Clinton, Iowa, and to lay on or over said bridge a track or tracks for the more perfect connection of any railroad or railroads that are or shall be constructed to said river, on either or both sides thereof, at or opposite said point, under the limitations and conditions hereinafter provided; that said bridge shall not interfere with the free navigation of said river, and in case of any litigation arising from any obstruction or alleged obstruction to the free navigation of said river, the cause may be tried before the circuit court of the United States in and for any district in whose jurisdiction any portion of said bridge or obstruction may be. Said bridge shall be constructed to provide for the passage of railroad trains, and for the safe and convenient passage of wagons and vehicles of all kinds, animals, and foot-passengers, for such reasonable rates of toll as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the proviso regarding wagons, animals, foot-passengers, etc., shall not influence the location of said bridge in its relation to the interests of navigation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 5, after the word "shall," to strike out the words:

Give clear head-room of not less, in any case, than 55½ feet above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, nor shall the spans of said bridge give a clear width of water way of less than 250 feet, and the piers of said bridge shall be parallel with the current of said river, and the main span shall be over the main channel of the river and give a clear width of water way of not less than 300 feet.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Have one or more channel spans, each having not less than 350 feet clear channel-way, and not less than 55 feet clear head-room above high-water mark, and the clear head-room under other than channel spans may be less than 55 feet: *Provided*, That no part of the superstructure of such spans shall give a less head-room than 10 feet above high-water mark: *And provided further*, That the interests of navigation be not injured by such reduction in height; and the piers of said bridge shall be parallel with the current and the bridge itself at right angles thereto.

So as to make the section read:

That any bridge built under the provisions of this act may, at the option of the company building the same, be built as a ponton draw-bridge or with unbroken and continuous spans: *Provided*, That if the said bridge shall be made with unbroken and continuous spans, it shall have one or more channel spans, each having not less than 350 feet clear channel-way, and not less than 55 feet clear head-room above high-water mark, and the clear head-room under other than channel spans may be less than 55 feet: *Provided*, That no part of the superstructure of such spans shall give a less head-room than 10 feet above high-water mark: *And provided further*, That the interests of navigation be not injured by such reduction in height; and the piers of said bridge shall be parallel with the current and the bridge itself at right-angles thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 25, after the word "draw-bridge," to strike out the words:

The same shall be constructed as a pivot draw-bridge, with a draw over the main channel of the river at an accessible and navigable point, and with spans giving a clear width of water way of not less than 200 feet on each side of the central or pivot pier of the draw, and the next adjoining span or spans to the draw shall give a clear width of water way of not less than 250 feet: *Provided*, That if the pivot-pier of said bridge shall be constructed within less than 410 feet of the west shore of said river the span constructed west of said pivot pier may be less than 250 feet, and said span shall give a clear head room of not less than 10 feet above extreme high-water mark; and the piers of said bridge shall be parallel with the current of the river where said bridge shall be erected.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

And shall have two or more draw-openings, each having not less than 200 feet clear channel-way; and in addition to said draw-openings shall have one or more fixed channel spans, each having not less than 350 feet clear channel-way; and every part of the superstructure shall have a clear head-room of not less than 10 feet above high-water mark: *Provided*, That all spans of both high and low bridges shall be so located as to afford the greatest possible accommodation to the river traffic, and a draw-opening of low bridges shall, if practicable, be located next or near shore: *Provided also*, That in case of a low bridge, if the physical characteristics of the locality so require and the interests of navigation be not injured thereby, the lengths of fixed spans or the number of draw-openings may be reduced: *Provided also*, That for any two adjacent draw-openings of 200 feet each, one draw-opening of 300 feet may be substituted if the interests of navigation be not injured thereby.

So as to make the clause read:

And provided further, That if any bridge built under the provisions of this act shall be constructed as a draw-bridge, and shall have two or more draw-openings, each having not less than 200 feet clear channel-way; and in addition to said draw-openings shall have one or more fixed channel spans, each having not less than 350 feet clear channel-way; and every part of the superstructure shall have a clear head-room of not less than 10 feet above high-water mark: *Provided*, That all spans of both high and low bridges shall be so located as to afford the greatest possible accommodation to the river traffic, and a draw-opening of low bridges shall, if practicable, be located next or near shore: *Provided also*, That in case of a low bridge, if the physical characteristics of the locality so require and the interests of navigation be not injured thereby, the lengths of fixed spans or the number of draw-openings may be reduced: *Provided also*, That for any two adjacent draw-openings of 200 feet each, one draw-opening of 300 feet may be substituted if the interests of navigation be not injured thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 63, after the word "subject," to strike out "except as herein modified;" and in line 68, after the date "1874," to strike out "so far as they may be applicable thereto;" so as to read:

And provided further, That if any bridge built under the provisions of this act shall be constructed as a ponton bridge, it shall be built subject to all the terms, requirements, and limitations contained in the act entitled "An act to legalize and establish a ponton railway bridge across the Mississippi River at Prairie du Chien, and to authorize the construction of a similar bridge at or near Clinton, Iowa," approved June 6, 1874.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after the words "*And provided also*," in line 69 of section 2, to strike out the words:

That it shall be constructed with one suitable ponton draw of not less than 500 feet in width, located over the main channel of the river, which shall be opened promptly upon reasonable signal for the passage of boats, and as herein provided for a draw-bridge.

And insert:

Such bridge may be provided with a ponton draw giving not less than 400 feet clear channel-way for each navigable channel of the river, and such other openings for the passage of rafts and logs as, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, may be necessary: *And provided further*, That the pile and ponton bridge shall be subject to all restrictions as regards plans, location, and accessories provided for in case of high and low bridges so far as they are applicable to such kind of bridge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, line 35, after the words "prescribed by the," to strike out "Secretary of War" and insert "Light-House Board;" after the word "changed," at the end of line 36, to strike out "or removed;" in line 38, after the word "time," to insert "or entirely removed;" in the same line, after the word "as," to strike out "Congress" and insert "the Secretary of War;" in line 42, after the word "good," to strike out "shall;" after the words "judgment of," at the end of the same line, to strike out "Congress" and insert "the Secretary of War;" and in line 43, after the word "so," to strike out "require" and insert "requires;" so as to read:

And for the safety of vessels passing at night there shall be displayed on said bridge, from the hours of sunset to sunrise, such lights as may be prescribed by the Light-House Board; and the said structure shall be changed at the cost and expense of the owners thereof, from time to time, or entirely removed, as the Secretary of War may direct, so as to preserve the free and convenient navigation of said river; and the authority to erect and continue said bridge shall be subject to revocation and modification by law, when the public good, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, so requires, without any expense or charge to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, line 2, after the word "with," to strike out "two years" and insert "one year;" and in line 3, before the word "years," to strike out "four" and insert "three;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 6. That if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized shall not be commenced within one year from the passage of this act, and be completed in three years from the same date, the rights and privileges hereby granted shall cease and be determined.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF WILLIAM KENDALL.

The bill (S. 1242) for the relief of the legal representatives of Maj. William Kendall was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the accounting officers of the Treasury to settle the account of William Kendall, deceased, as a sutler at Fort Columbus, New York Harbor, for articles furnished by him to soldiers there recruited or stationed during the period from the 1st of January, 1867, to the 31st of December, 1868, inclusive.

Mr. COCKRELL. I was under the impression before reading the report just now that this bill was simply to pay to this sutler the amount that the Government deducted from the pay of the recruits. I find from the copy of the report which was made in the Forty-ninth Congress that the office of sutler had been abolished, but this man was remaining on duty by consent or agreement of the officers and gave credit to recruits, and the amounts were never charged to the soldiers on their muster-rolls.

Mr. STEWART. That was true in regard to——

Mr. COCKRELL. The Government never received a cent, and this is to make the Government responsible for the debts of recruits because the officers did not charge them up against the recruits and pay the sutler.

Mr. STEWART. My recollection is that a part of it is as the Senator has stated. Some goods were furnished to the soldiers under a regulation of the Department.

Mr. COCKRELL. That was up to July 1, 1867.

Mr. STEWART. A part of the time the goods were furnished that way, and after that time, by order of the commanding officer, the sutler was allowed to continue the same practice for some months. Then the soldiers were taken away. The amounts had been charged to them on the descriptive roll, but when they were transferred to companies the sums were not deducted from their pay. The Government did not receive the money, and if it is paid it must be paid out of the Treasury on the ground that under the circumstances the officers ought to have transferred the amounts from the descriptive roll to the muster-roll. It is certain that the beneficiaries of the bill should be paid up to the time the law was changed.

Mr. COCKRELL. That would be up to the 1st of July, 1867.

Mr. STEWART. It was done by order of the officer, and as the sutler appeared to be acting in good faith the committee thought his estate ought to have the whole amount due. These are the facts, and the Senate can act on them.

Mr. COCKRELL. The bill seems to be going beyond what ought to be done. The office of sutler was abolished July 1, 1867, and I see the text of the bill proposes to give not only from the 1st of January, 1867, up to the 1st of July of that year, but also to give eighteen months beyond that time, up to the 31st day of December, 1868. That is going a little too far. I do not know what the amount would be.

Mr. STEWART. The amount is small. I do not know exactly what it is, but I know it is small. Under the circumstances, the sutler having been permitted to do this by the officers, it having been the established practice at that station so long, and as he had been there a long time and was a very honest, correct man, the committee thought that it was not the fair thing to cut off the accounts after the sutler had invested his money and furnished the supplies. Those are the simple facts. I have nothing further to say. I think that the bill proposes to give a proper allowance.

Mr. COCKRELL. It strikes me that we ought to limit it to the time when he was a lawful sutler and not after that. He was a mere trader after that time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection and no amendment, the bill will be reported to the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be reported to the Senate.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill is open to amendment in the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. In lines 8 and 9 of section 1, after the words "to the," I move to strike out "31st day of December, 1868," and insert "first day of July, 1867;" so as to read:

For articles furnished by him to soldiers there recruited or stationed during the period from the first day of January, 1867, to the first day of July, 1867, inclusive.

Mr. STEWART. I do not think that is quite fair. I shall vote against the amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is upon agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time, and passed.

WARREN C. ALDEN.

The bill (S. 1871) to perfect the military record of Warren C. Alden was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and required to enter on the rolls of Company C, Fourth Independent Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, the name of Warren C. Alden, with a statement of the fact that he entered the United States service as a private on the 10th day of July, 1863, and performed faithful and patriotic services as such private in Company C, Fourth Independent Battalion Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, until October 10th of said year, and was then compelled to leave the Army because he was under the age that entitled him to be mustered into the United States service.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2030) in relation to bridge of Forest City and Watertown Railroad Company.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 2, line 3, after the word "river," to strike out "beyond what is necessary to carry into effect the rights and privileges hereby granted;" so as to read:

That said bridge shall be constructed and built without interference with the security and convenience of navigation of said river; and in order to secure that object the said corporation shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawings of the bridge, and a map of the location, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 24, after the word "river," to insert "and the bridge itself at right angles thereto;" so as to read:

Provided, That if the said bridge shall be made with unbroken and continuous spans it shall not be of less elevation in any case than 50 feet above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, to be the lowest part of the structure of the bridge, nor shall the spans of said bridge be less than 300 feet in length, and the piers of said bridge be parallel with the current of said river, and the bridge itself at right angles thereto, and the main span shall be over the main channel of the river and not less than 300 feet in length.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, line 8, before the words "said bridge," to strike out "an erection of" and insert "erect;" so as to read:

And upon receiving such notification the said company may proceed to erect said bridge, conforming strictly to the approved plan and location.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, line 11, after the word "and," to strike out "Congress reserves the right at any time to regulate, by appropriate legislation," and insert "the Secretary of War may, if he thinks proper, establish;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That the said bridge and accessory works, when built and constructed under this act and according to the terms and limitations thereof, shall be lawful structures; and said bridge shall be recognized and known as a post-route, upon which also no higher charge shall be made for the transmission over the same of the mails, the troops, and the munitions of war of the United States than the rate per mile paid for the transportation over the railroads or public highways leading to such bridge, and said bridge shall enjoy the rights and privileges of other post-routes in the United States; and the Secretary of War may, if he thinks proper, establish the charges for freight and passengers over said bridge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert as a new section:

SEC. 7. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at Forest City, Dakota, by the Forest City and Watertown Railway Company."

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT MUSCATINE, IOWA.

The bill (S. 1883) to authorize the construction of a railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Muscatine, Iowa, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 5, after the word "maintain," to strike out "if in the opinion of the Secretary of War the same be a public necessity;" in line 7, after the word "Mississippi," to insert "River;" in line 15, after the word "necessary," to strike out "in order to carry into effect the rights and privileges hereby granted;" in line 19, after the words "district in," to strike out "which" and insert "whose jurisdiction," and after the word "obstruction," at the end of line 20, to strike out "touches" and insert "may be;" so as to make the section read:

That the Muscatine Bridge Company, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct and maintain a railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Mississippi River at a place suitable to the interests of navigation, at a point at or near the city of Muscatine, Iowa, and to lay on or over said bridge a track or tracks for the more perfect connection of any railroad or railroads that are or shall be constructed to said river, on either or both sides thereof, at or opposite said point, under the limitations and conditions hereinafter provided; that said bridge shall not interfere with the free navigation of said river beyond what is necessary, and in case of any litigation arising from any obstruction or alleged obstruction to the free navigation of said river, the cause may be tried before the circuit court of the United States in and for any district in whose jurisdiction any portion of said bridge or obstruction may be.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 27, after the word "not," to strike out "influence" and insert "affect;" so as to read:

Said bridge shall be constructed to provide for the passage of railroad trains, and for the safe and convenient passage of wagons and vehicles of all kinds, animals, and foot passengers, for such reasonable rates of toll as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary of War: *Provided*, That the proviso regarding wagons, animals, foot passengers, etc., shall not affect the location of said bridge in its relation to the interests of navigation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 5, after the word "shall," to strike out the words:

Give clear head-room of not less, in any case, than 55½ feet above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, nor shall the spans of said bridge give a clear width of water way of less than 250 feet, and the piers of said bridge shall be parallel with the current of said river, and the main span shall be over the main channel of the river and give a clear width of water way of not less than 300 feet.

And insert in lieu thereof:

Have one or more channel spans, each having not less than 350 feet clear channel-way, and not less than 55 feet clear head-room above high-water mark, and the clear head-room under other than channel spans may be less than 55 feet: *Provided*, That no part of the superstructure of such spans shall give a less head-room than 10 feet above high-water mark: *And provided further*, That the interests of navigation be not injured by such reduction in height.

So as to read:

That any bridge built under the provisions of this act may, at the option of the company building the same, be built as a draw-bridge or with unbroken and continuous spans: *Provided*, That if the said bridge shall be made with unbroken and continuous spans, it shall have one or more channel spans, each having not less than 350 feet clear channel-way, and not less than 55 feet clear head-room above high-water mark, and the clear head-room under other than channel spans may be less than 55 feet: *Provided*, That no part of the superstructure of such spans shall give a less head-room than 10 feet above high-water mark: *And provided further*, That the interests of navigation be not injured by such reduction in height.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 24, after the word "draw-bridge," to strike out the words:

With a draw over the main channel of the river at an accessible and navigable point and with spans giving a clear width of water way of not less than 200 feet on each side of the central or pivot pier of the draw, and the next adjoining span or spans to the draw shall give a clear width of water way of not less than 250 feet: *Provided*, That if the pivot pier of said bridge shall be constructed within less than 410 feet of the west shore of said river the span constructed west of said pivot pier may be less than 250 feet, and said spans shall give a clear head-room of not less than 10 feet above extreme high-water mark.

And insert in lieu thereof:

Which shall have two or more draw-openings, each having not less than 200 feet clear channel-way, and in addition to said draw-openings, shall have one or more fixed channel-spans, each having not less than 350 clear channel-way; and every part of the superstructure of said low bridge shall give a clear head-room of not less than 10 feet above high-water mark: *Provided*, That all spans of both high and low bridges shall be so located as to afford the greatest possible accommodation to the river traffic, and a draw-opening of the low bridge shall, if practicable, be located next or near the shore: *Provided also*, That in case of a low bridge, if the physical characteristics of the locality so require, and the interests of navigation be not injured thereby, the lengths of the fixed spans, or the number of draw-openings, may be reduced: *Provided also*, That for any two adjacent draw-openings of 200 feet one draw-opening of 300 feet may be substituted, if the interests of navigation be not injured thereby.

So as to read:

And provided further, That if any bridge built under the provisions of this act shall be constructed as a draw-bridge, the same shall be constructed as a pivot draw-bridge which shall have two or more draw-openings, each having not less than 200 feet clear channel-way, and in addition to said draw-openings shall have one or more fixed channel-spans, each having not less than 350 feet clear channel-way; and every part of the superstructure of said low bridge shall give a clear head-room of not less than 10 feet above high-water mark: *Provided*, That all spans of both high and low bridges shall be so located as to afford the greatest possible accommodation to the river traffic, and a draw-opening of the low bridge shall, if practicable, be located next or near the shore: *Provided also*, That in case of a low bridge, if the physical characteristics of the locality so require, and the interests of navigation be not injured thereby, the lengths of the fixed spans, or the number of draw-openings, may be reduced: *Provided also*, That for any two adjacent draw-openings of 200 feet one draw-opening of 300 feet may be substituted, if the interests of navigation be not injured thereby.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 55, after the word "erected," to insert "and the bridge itself at right-angles thereto;" so as to read:

And the piers of said bridge shall be parallel with the current of the river where said bridge shall be erected, and the bridge itself at right-angles thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, line 35, after the words "by the," to strike out "Secretary of War" and insert "Light-House Board;" in line 38, after the word "as," to strike out "Congress" and insert "the Secretary of War;" in line 41, after the word "modification," to strike out "by law;" in line 42, after the word "good," to strike out "shall;" in the same line, after the words "judgment of," to strike out "Congress" and insert "Secretary of War;" and in line 43, after the word "so," to strike out "require" and insert "requires;" so as to read:

And the said structure shall be at all times so kept and managed as to offer reasonable and proper means for the passage of vessels through or under said structure; and for the safety of vessels passing at night there shall be displayed on said bridge, from the hours of sunset to sunrise, such lights as may be prescribed by the Light-House Board; and the said structure shall be changed or removed at the cost and expense of the owners thereof from time to time, as the Secretary of War may direct, so as to preserve the free and convenient navigation of said river; and the authority to erect and continue said bridge shall be subject to revocation and modification when the public good, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, so requires, without any expense or charge to the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, line 2, after the word "within," to strike out "two years" and insert "one year;" and in line 3, after the words "completed in," to strike out "four" and insert "three;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 6. That if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized shall not be commenced within one year from the passage of this act, and be completed in three years from the same date, the rights and privileges hereby granted shall cease and be determined.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE OVER RED RIVER OF THE NORTH.

The bill (H. R. 2528) authorizing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Red River of the North by the North Dakota and Pacific Railway Company was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments: In section 5, line 2, after the word "all," to strike out "materials" and insert "material;" in line 5, after the word "by," to strike out "Congress" and insert "the Secretary of War;" and in line 7, after the word "act," to insert "or its entire removal when completed;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act, so as to prevent or remove all material and substantial obstructions to the navigation of said river by the construction of the said bridge, is hereby expressly reserved; and any alterations or changes that may be required by the Secretary of War in the bridge constructed under this act, or its entire removal when completed, shall be made by the corporation owning or controlling the same at its own expense; and if said bridge shall not be commenced in one year and be finished within three years from the passage of this act, the rights and privileges hereby granted shall be null and void.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

W. W. AVERELL.

The bill (S. 1650) for the relief of Maj. Gen. W. W. Averell was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 10, to strike out the word "colonel" and insert "captain;" so as to make the bill read:

That in view of the long and faithful services of Bvt. Maj. Gen. William W. Averell, United States Army, before and during the late war, and of severe wounds received by him in battle, the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint William W. Averell, brevet major-general United States Army and late brigadier-general United States Volunteers, to the position of captain in the Army of the United States, and to place him on the retired-list of the Army as of that grade, the retired-list being thereby increased in number to that extent; and all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are suspended for this purpose only.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add to the bill the following proviso:

Provided, That from and after the passage of this act no pension shall be paid to the said William W. Averell, nor shall any compensation be paid to him for any period prior to his appointment under this act; but this proviso shall be no bar to any claims for pension that the widow or children or other heirs of the said William W. Averell may have after his decease.

Mr. BUTLER. I shall want to submit an amendment to the bill. I see that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] who made the report is not in his seat. I therefore ask that the bill may go over without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. BUTLER. I am in favor of the bill, but I wish to suggest an amendment.

Mr. HAWLEY. May I ask the nature of the amendment? It is possible we may agree on it.

Mr. BUTLER. I propose to non-concur in the amendments of the Committee on Military Affairs and to take the bill as it was introduced and referred to the committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. In other words, to retire him with the rank of colonel instead of captain?

Mr. BUTLER. Yes, that is my object; but I do not desire to move that amendment in the absence of the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. HAWLEY. I certainly personally have no objection, but the Military Committee came to the conclusion that he had better be placed on the retired-list with the rank that the officer held at the time of retirement. It is true Congress did pass such a bill once, and it failed to receive the President's approval, because he had committed himself in the Fitz-John Porter case to a principle that required him not to sign the bill. Both Houses passed a bill giving this gentleman the rank of brigadier-general on the retired-list because he held the command of brigadier-general and brevet major-general in the volunteer service.

If the Senator from South Carolina desires to make that amendment, however, I think it may be better that the bill lie over to-day, so that the Senator who has it particularly in charge may be present.

Mr. BUTLER. That is all I desire. Let the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

VOLUNTEER SIGNAL SERVICE OBSERVERS.

The bill (S. 2377) providing for the issue gratuitously of certain meteorological instruments to voluntary observers at present recognized in the Signal Service was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Chief Signal Officer of the Army to issue gratuitously to reliable voluntary observers one set of thermometers, one rain-gauge, and measuring-stick. But the number of such issues shall not exceed one to each county where such observations are not obtainable, and

these instruments shall be issued only to such observers as agree to make, free of expense to the United States, monthly reports of observations for at least one year to the Chief Signal Officer of the Army.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INSPECTORS OF HULLS AND BOILERS.

The bill (S. 2393) to fix the compensation of inspectors of hulls and boilers in certain districts of the United States was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to fix the annual salary of the inspectors of hulls and the inspectors of boilers for the districts of Albany, Michigan, and Superior at $1,500 each; and of the inspector of hulls and the inspector of boilers for the district of Apalachicola at $1,200 each.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN POWERS.

The bill (H. R. 6800) for the relief of John Powers was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, in line 7, after the word "discharge," to strike out the words "subject to the laws and regulations of the War Department," and to insert "as of date November 19, 1862;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove from the record of John Powers, late a member of Elgin Battery, Illinois Light Artillery, any charge of desertion that may exist against him as a member of said Elgin Battery and issue to him an honorable discharge as of date November 19, 1862.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CHICAGO, KANSAS AND WESTERN RAILWAY.

The bill (S. 1903) granting the right of way through the Fort Riley military reservation, Kansas, to the Chicago, Kansas and Western Railway Company was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JUNCTION CITY AND FORT RILEY STREET RAILWAY COMPANY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1969) granting right of way to the Junction City and Fort Riley Street Railway Company into and upon the Fort Riley military reservation, in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments in section 2, line 3, after the word "War," to strike out "or such person or persons as he may designate;" in line 6, before the word "exclusive," to insert the words "have the;" in the same line, after the word "use," to insert "of the same;" and in line 7, after the word "War," to strike out "or such person or persons as he may designate;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That the location and terminus of this railway within said reservation shall be made with, and subject to, the approval of the Secretary of War, and authority is hereby granted said street railway company to construct a bridge for this purpose and have the exclusive use of the same over said Republican River, at a point to be selected by said Secretary of War, and to land the north end of this said bridge on said reservation and within 500 feet west of said Union Pacific Railroad bridge.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES O'ROURKE.

The bill (S. 1599) correcting the military record of Lieut. James O'Rourke was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That in view of the recommendation of the general court-martial in the case of James O'Rourke, late first lieutenant of the Fourth Regiment of New York Heavy Artillery Volunteers, to executive clemency, and of his former very excellent character as an officer and a gentleman, during a service of over seven years both in the regular and volunteer service, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to issue to James O'Rourke a certificate of honorable discharge as first lieutenant of said Fourth Regiment of New York Heavy Artillery Volunteers, as of the date of September 22, 1865, notwithstanding the sentence of said court-martial.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUMMONS IN DISTRICT TENANCY CASES.

The bill (H. R. 3290) to amend section 685 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, in line 14, before the word "years," to strike out "twelve" and insert "sixteen;" so as to make the bill read:

That section numbered 685 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"SEC. 685. The summons shall be served like other writs of summons at least seven days before the appearance of the party complained of, but in case such party has left the District of Columbia, or can not be found, said summons may be served by delivering a written or printed, or partly written and partly printed copy thereof to the tenant, or to the agent or attorney of the defendant if he be known, or leaving the same with some person of suitable discretion above the age of sixteen years residing on or in possession of the premises; and in case no one is in actual possession of said premises or residing thereon, then by posting a copy of said summons on the premises where it may be conveniently read."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES MURPHY.

The bill (S. 661) for the relief of Charles Murphy was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the claim of Charles Murphy be remanded to the Court of Claims for a further hearing upon the testimony and papers formerly heard in said court, and upon such further testimony, including the claimant's evidence, as either party may file, pursuant to the rules of the court; and said court, in addition to the authority conferred upon it by existing laws, shall have equitable jurisdiction of all matters presented by the claimant in a new petition, to be filed within sixty days from the approval of this act; and said court is authorized and directed to render judgment for such amount as right and justice may demand, without reference to any statutes of limitation: *Provided*, That an appeal shall lie from such judgment to the Supreme Court of the United States, by either party, upon the entire record of law and fact considered by the Court of Claims.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS C. DICKEY.

The bill (H. R. 484) for the relief of Thomas C. Dickey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Thomas C. Dickey, late postmaster at Murphy, N. C., $275.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM CLIFT.

The bill (S. 90) for the relief of William Clift was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to William Clift, of Hamilton County, Tennessee, $3,000, for wood taken and used by the Army of the United States during the late war.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

L. A. DAVIS.

The bill (S. 2410) for the relief of L. A. Davis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It refers to the Court of Claims the petition and papers of L. A. Davis, of Chehalis, Wash., in which he claims $14,844 for services in carrying the English mails both ways over mail route No. 15406, between Olympia and Monticello, in Washington Territory, from about August 1, 1868, to June 30, 1870, and the court is given jurisdiction to hear and determine the claim and render judgment for such sum as the claimant may be reasonably and equitably entitled to for and on account of extra services rendered by him on this mail route in transporting the English mails. No statute of limitations or other legal defense is to be available in the case.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL LIFE-SAVING STATIONS.

The bill (S. 705) to establish additional life-saving stations was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair is informed that the provisions of this bill are incorporated in a bill that has passed the House of Representatives, and has already passed the Senate. If there be no objection, this bill will be passed over without prejudice.

ARBITRATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND TEXAS.

The bill (H. R. 4375) to create a board of arbitration to settle and determine the controversy between the United States and the State of Texas relating to certain territory by them respectively claimed was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments. The first amendment was, after the word "Texas," in the second line of the preamble, to strike out the word "over" and

insert "concerning;" in the same line, after the word "that," to strike out "territory" and insert "tract of land;" and in the sixth line, after the word "county," to insert "and on the National Atlas by Gray (1879) as part of the Indian Territory;" so as to make the clause read:

Whereas a controversy exists between the United States and the State of Texas concerning the title to that tract of land lying between the North and South Forks of Red River, east of the one hundredth degree of longitude, the same being designated on the maps of Texas as Greer County and on the National Atlas by Gray (1879) as part of the Indian Territory.

Mr. REAGAN. I ask that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT FORTRESS MONROE.

The bill (S. 1177) for the erection of a public building at Fortress Monroe was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SACRAMENTO, CAL.

The bill (S. 1554) to increase the appropriation for the erection of the public building at Sacramento, Cal., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 6, before the word "hundred," to strike out "two" and insert "one;" so as to make the section read:

That the amount heretofore fixed as the limit of cost for the erection of a public building, by the United States Government, at Sacramento, Cal., be, and the same is hereby, increased to $150,000, and that sum is hereby fixed as the limit of cost for the erection of said building, including site.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, line 1, before the word "sum," to insert "additional;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That the additional sum of $50,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be used and expended for the purposes provided in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POSTAL CRIMES.

The bill (H. R. 7052) relating to postal crimes, and amendatory of the statutes therein mentioned, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported by the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads with an amendment, at the end of section 2 to insert:

And all matter otherwise mailable by law upon the envelope or outside cover or wrapper of which, or postal card, upon which indecent, lewd, lascivious, obscene, libelous, scurrilous, or threatening delineations, epithets, terms, or language, or reflecting injuriously upon the character or conduct of another, may be written or printed, are hereby declared to be non-mailable matter, and shall not be conveyed in the mails, nor delivered from any post-office nor by any letter-carrier; and any person who shall knowingly deposit, or cause to be deposited, for mailing or delivery anything declared by this section to be non-mailable matter, and any person who shall knowingly take the same or cause the same to be taken from the mails, for the purpose of circulating or disposing of or of aiding in the circulation or disposition of the same, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall, for each and every offense, be fined not less than $100 nor more than $5,000, or imprisoned at hard labor not less than one year nor more than ten years, or both, at the discretion of the court.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

C. A. WILLIAMS AND OTHERS.

The bill (S. 2411) for the relief of C. A. Williams and others was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Navy to inquire into the loss and damage caused to C. A. Williams & Co., owners of the schooners Roswell King and Era, by reason of the rescue and support of the crew of the schooner Isabella, shipwrecked in the Arctic seas in the year 1884, and provides for the payment of the amount so found, not exceeding $13,506.33, to C. A. Williams & Co., on the certificate of the Secretary of the Navy.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE GREELY EXPEDITION.

The bill (S. 961) for the presentation of badges to the officers and men of the Greely relief expedition was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Navy to procure and present to Commander Winfield Scott Schley and his officers and men, respectively, suitable badges to be worn by them as an expression of the high estimation in which Congress holds their services upon the expedition for the relief of Lieut. A. W. Greely and his party, in the year 1884, and appropriates a sufficient sum for that purpose.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, the officers and men of this expedition deserve some notice from Congress. That they have not hitherto received it is due to the fact that a bill was introduced granting the thanks of Congress to the officers and men of the expedition. As is well known to Senators, a resolution of thanks of Congress carries with it certain results in the way of exemption from retirement, which it has not been thought advisable to give to the officers and men of this expedition. Moreover, it has been customary to reserve the thanks of Congress for naval and military heroes who have distinguished themselves in battle with the enemy. The proposition to give the thanks of Congress to the officers and men of this expedition, therefore, was dropped, and there has been substituted for it this simple proposition to grant badges to the officers and men without discrimination.

On the return of this expedition, on the 4th day of August, 1884, at Portsmouth, I gave a brief narrative of the expedition, which I desire to incorporate in my remarks, if there be no objection, and also to print the order of the Navy Department issued on the 5th day of August, 1884, announcing the return, commending the officers and men, and giving a list of their names.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. CHANDLER. This is what I said on the occasion referred to:

In August, 1881, a United States signal station for Arctic observation and exploration was established at Lady Franklin Bay in Grinnell Land by a party carried and left there by the steam-sealer Proteus, composed of Lieut. A. W. Greely, of the Fifth United States Cavalry; Lieut. Frederick F. Kislingbury, of the Eleventh Infantry, Lieut. James B. Lockwood, of the Twenty-third Infantry; Acting Ass. Surg. Octave Pavy, and twenty-one non-commissioned officers and privates of the command, including two Eskimo.

It was promised by the Government that a vessel should visit the station during the summer of 1882, and that, if she failed to reach it, a relief ship should again be sent in 1883.

The instructions of the Chief Signal Officer, dated June 17, 1881, directed Lieutenant Greely, if not visited in 1882, "to abandon his station not later than September 1, 1883," and to "retreat southward by boat, following closely the east coast of Grinnell Land, until the relieving vessel is met or Littleton Island is reached."

A letter from Lieutenant Greely, written August 17, 1881, and brought by the Proteus from Lady Franklin Bay, specified the depots of supplies which he wished the relief ships to attempt to make, and stated that the relief party of 1883 "should then proceed to establish a winter station at Polaris winter quarters, Life Boat Cove (at Littleton Island), where their main duty would be to keep their telescopes on Cape Sabine and the land to the northward."

Between July 28 and September 2, 1882, the steamer Neptune, under Mr. William M. Beebe, jr., of the Signal Service, proceeded into Smith's Sound, but the ice failed to sufficiently open into Kennedy Channel, and the vessel returned, having left a few provisions at Cape Sabine and Littleton Island.

In 1883 the Proteus was again employed by the Chief Signal Officer for the voyage to Lady Franklin Bay, and placed in charge of Lieut. E. A. Garlington, of the Seventh United States Cavalry, and the steamer Yantic, of the United States Navy, commanded by Commander Frank Wildes, was detailed as a tender to accompany the Proteus as far as Littleton Island.

Lieutenant Garlington was informed by letter of the Chief Signal Officer of June 4, 1883, of the extreme peril of Lieutenant Greely and his party, was enjoined to spare no effort to push his vessel through to Lady Franklin Bay, and was also instructed as follows:

If it should become clearly apparent that the vessel can not be pushed through, you will retreat from your advanced position and land your party and stores at or near Life Boat Cove (at Littleton Island), discharge the relief vessel with orders to return to St. John's, Newfoundland, and prepare for remaining with your party until relieved next year.

Lieutenant Garlington was further instructed, as soon as possible, from this station at Littleton Island, to endeavor to communicate with Lieutenant Greely by sledge parties; the men not so employed to lose no time in preparing a house for the whole party and in securing the stores preparatory to the arrival of Lieutenant Greely.

The Proteus and Yantic were together at St. John's on June 27, and an agreement was made between Lieutenant Garlington and Commander Wildes contemplating their separation until August 25, but that the Yantic should go to Littleton Island, which should be the "headquarters," and should not leave there before that day. The Proteus preceded the Yantic to Disco Island, but the Yantic rejoined her, and they were together there from July 12 to July 15, at which latter date the Proteus once more left her tender, which, after waiting until the 26th, again sailed northward.

Instead of proceeding directly in the track of the Proteus, however, she diverged to Upernavik; was detained there by fogs from July 27 to 31, when she sailed, and was easily able to reach Littleton Island August 3. She there found, from records left, that the Proteus, on July 23, had been crushed in the ice and had sunk just north of Cape Sabine; that Lieutenant Garlington and his whole party had crossed to Littleton Island, and on July 28 had gone south, along the Greenland coast,

in open boats. The Yantic thereupon turned southward, searching the coast of Cape York, and finding no traces of the Proteus people, went on to Upernavik, reaching there August 12. She left this place August 22 and reached Disco Island August 28, where she was overtaken August 31 by Lieut. J. C. Colwell, of the United States Navy, who had left at Cape York the Proteus party, to which he had been attached, and had reached Upernavik in an open boat August 23, and had on the same day, in a similar boat, kept up the pursuit of the Yantic. The Yantic then returned to Upernavik, found that the whole Proteus party had saved themselves and arrived, took them on board, and reached St. John's on September 12.

With the exception that it left a few rations and some clothing at Cape Sabine, the expedition of 1883, as well as that of 1882, wa failure. No attempt was made by either Lieutenant Garlington or Commander Wildes to establish a relief party at Littleton Island, for which point Lieutenant Greely was under orders to start not later than September 1.

The Army court of inquiry, under date of January 15, 1884, reported:

It may here be stated roughly that from July, 1882, to August, 1883, not less than 50,000 rations were taken in the steamers Neptune, Yantic, and Proteus up to or beyond Littleton Island, and of that number only about 1,000 were left in that vicinity, the remainder being returned to the United States or sunk with the Proteus.

The desperate condition in which Lieutenant Greely had thus been left led to careful and zealous preparation for the relief expedition of 1884. A board of Army and Navy officers recommended that it should be solely a naval enterprise, and suggested the method of organizing it. Congress was asked to grant to the President unlimited appropriations for fitting it out. The House committee, of which Hon. SAMUEL J. RANDALL was chairman, reported in favor of such appropriations, and Mr. RANDALL was energetic in urging forward the passage of the bill, and persistent in opposing any restrictions or limitations upon the power of the President, while Senator HALE, of the Senate committee, took successful charge of the measure in that body and most judiciously and indefatigably conducted it to a passage.

The steam-sealer Thetis was purchased in London by the United States minister, Mr. Lowell, aided by Lieut. Commander French E. Chadwick, of the United States Navy, an attaché of the legation; the Bear was bought at St. John's by the United States consul, Thomas N. Molloy, esq., who was unremitting in his labors in behalf of all the expeditions; the Alert was thoughtfully and generously donated by the British Government; and all were fitted and equipped for conflict with the ice and for a three years' stay if necessary in the Arctic regions. President Arthur took a lively interest in the work of preparation and in the selection of officers for the duty. The Secretary of War, Mr. Lincoln, gave time and labor and shared the responsibilities of the enterprise. The chiefs of the bureaus of the Navy Department gave personal attention to all details; and the ships sailed on the appointed days under the command of as efficient and brave naval officers as any country can claim—Commander Winfield Scott Schley, Commander George W. Coffin, and Lieut. William H. Emory.

The details of the rescue are too fresh in all minds to need repetition. The three relief vessels and the coaling-steamer Loch Garry boldly entered upon the navigation of Davis Straits and pushed across Melville Bay. The commanders of the Thetis and the Bear, watching their opportunities with untiring care, coolly and courageously thrust their ships into the ice and reached Littleton Island on the 22d of June, a fortnight earlier than any vessel had attained that point before. Finding there no record of the unfortunate explorers, on the same day they pressed over to Cape Sabine.

Their haste was necessary. Lieutenant Greely and his party had left Lady Franklin Bay on the 9th of August, ten months before, and after pushing on in boats, and drifting on ice-floes, vainly looking for help from the relief party which should have been at Littleton Island, "keeping its telescopes on Cape Sabine and the land to the northward," they had fixed their winter quarters at the latter point.

The provisions at Cape Sabine and Cape Isabella had lasted them until March, when they hoped to cross to Littleton Island and obtain the two hundred and fifty rations left there by the Neptune. But during all this time the ice of the entrance to Smith's Sound never closed, while the boats were lost or consumed for fuel, and meantime starvation and cold did their deadly work. One by one the feeble sufferers died, until only seven remained, and these had but a few hours to live. But help was now near at hand. On the evening of the 22d of June, when their fate seemed hopeless, the shrill whistle of the Thetis, the signal of rescue, was heard above the winds and waves. A relief party hurried forward and found them. Careful and tender hands bore them gently off. The ships turned their heads homeward, and on the 17th of July the American people, the whole civilized world, rejoiced at the telegraphic announcement that Lieutenant Greely had been found and saved.

To the rescuers and the rescued of this expedition of 1884 the receptions of Friday and of to-day have been most fitly given, and we are here assembled to do them honor.

But our first duty is to pay our tribute of praise and of mourning to those devoted men who, having completed their two years of fruitful labor, came southward to Cape Sabine, and after months of suffering and starvation, borne with heroic fortitude and patience, perished as truly on the field of duty as if they had met their fate at the cannon's mouth.

Lieutenant Lockwood died April 9, Lieutenant Kislingbury June 1, and Doctor Pavy June 6. The remains of George W. Rice, Nicholas Sailor, Jacob Bender, Doctor Pavy, and Hampton S. Gardner were buried in the ice-foot, and were swept away into the great deep. The Eskimo, Jens Edward, was drowned while sealing, and Frederic Thorlay Christiansen was buried at Disco. The bodies of Lockwood and Kislingbury, of Edward Israel, Winfield S. Jewell, David C. Ralston, William H. Cross, David Linn, Charles B. Henry, William Whisler, William A. Ellis, R. R. Schneider, and also of Joseph Elison, who died after being rescued, we now have with us, saved for the sacred rites of burial at home.

The people of the United States look back upon their record with a just though mournful pride, and wherever throughout the world the story of their heroic endeavor and suffering is told the memory of these martyrs to duty will forever be cherished and held in honor.

With special tenderness we turn to Lieutenant Greely and his rescued comrades, Sergt. David L. Brainard, Sergt. Julius Fredericks, Sergt. Francis Long, Steward Henry Biederbeck, and Private Maurice Connell. They are the only survivors of an American Arctic exploration party which reached out farther toward the pole than any previous explorers, and whose observations were extended into the Polar Ocean. Their coast and land journeys were extensive, and have mapped out with increased exactness the shore line of Greenland and the interior of Grinnell Land.

Their scientific observations, made at fearful cost, have resulted in valuable additions to our knowledge of the lands within the Arctic Circle. For their labors and their endurance we honor them, for their sufferings we give them our pity and sympathy, and to comfort, cheer, and encourage them we promise them the gratitude of their Government and their countrymen, as the sole survivors of a polar expedition which will always illustrate American enterprise and American heroism.

It is with a feeling of peculiar pride and satisfaction that I fulfill the welcome duty of commending and congratulating the officers and men of the relief expedition upon the brilliant success of their efforts. It was early decided that the force should be wholly naval, and the result showed the wisdom of the decision. The arduous responsibility could have fallen into no better hands. Every officer and man, from his first connection with the undertaking, has given it his best and most untiring effort. The preparations were carried out with zeal and promptness, and each ship was ready at the fixed hour of departure. In the perilous advance from Upernavik, with incessant vigilance and unwearied exertion, every lead was followed, every circumstance was utilized that could speed the ships forward on their way; nor could more have been done had the relief officers known what all now know, that every hour of delay was thinning the weakened band of survivors.

To the energetic commanding officer of the expedition, Commander Schley, of the Thetis, and to Lieutenant Emory, the efficient commander of the Bear, who share the credit of conducting their difficult and dangerous enterprise to a successful close, the Navy Department gives its warmest and most earnest thanks, and their brother officers throughout the service join in heartfelt greeting to those for whom a new chapter must be written in the long and noble record of naval achievement.

Nor must a due share of praise be omitted to Commander Coffin, of the Alert, to whom was intrusted the charge of the reserve, and who performed his duty with fidelity and skill. To each and all of you, officers and men of the expedition, your country extends a cordial welcome upon your safe return. The dangers you encountered and the success you accomplished in bringing succor to your countrymen and comrades of the Army, perishing one by one upon the Arctic shores, have aroused a glow of pride and satisfaction in the breast of every American, and the nation will always dwell with fond remembrance upon those who shared in the danger and the crowning success of the Greely Relief Expedition of 1884.

ORDER OF THE NAVY DEPARTMENT ON THE RETURN OF THE EXPEDITION.

[General Order No. 321.]

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, August 5, 1884.*

The Navy Department announces to the service the safe arrival at Portsmouth, N. H., on the 1st of August, of the Thetis, Bear, and Alert, composing the Arctic Relief Squadron, after having successfully accomplished the object of their mission, in the rescue of Lieutenant Greely of the Army, and the other survivors of his party.

The Department extends its cordial and earnest congratulations to Commander Schley, commanding the expedition, and to the officers and men of his command, upon the distinguished success of their efforts, and takes this occasion of publicly commending the courage, zeal, and judgment with which they executed their difficult and dangerous duty.

The names of the officers and men of the vessels of the Relief Squadron form a part of this order.

WILLIAM E. CHANDLER,
Secretary of the Navy.

List of officers attached to the United States steamer Thetis, 1884.

Name.	Rank.
W. S. Schley	Commander, commanding Greely relief expedition.
U. Sebree	Lieutenant.
E. H. Taunt	Lieutenant.
S. C. Lemly	Lieutenant (junior grade).
W. I. Chambers	Ensign, on board the steamer Loch Garry.
C. H. Harlow	Ensign.
G. W. Melville	Chief engineer.
E. H. Green	Passed assistant surgeon.

List of men attached to the United States steamer Thetis, 1884.

Name.	Rate.
James W. Norman	Ice master.
John W. Powers	Yoeman (acting captain of hold and paymaster's yoeman).
W. A. Coffin	Ship's cook (acting boatswain's mate).
George Harvey	Boatswain's mate.
E. W. Walker	Boatswain's mate (acting quartermaster).
Joseph Mitre	Captain of top.
John Manin	Captain of top and quartermaster.
John Cross	Quartermaster.
John McLeod	Quartermaster.
Christian Polson	Carpenter's mate.
Walter Booth	First-class machinist.
James Francis	First-class machinist.
Adam Stitt	Blacksmith.
George von Spreckelson	Third-class machinist (enlisted at St. Johns, Newfoundland, for cruise).
W. J. Fisher	First-class fireman.
William Griffin	First-class fireman.
F. F. Taylor	Seaman.
P. W. Johnson	Seaman.
Michael Hickey	Seaman.
Bartley Cook	Seaman.
F. F. Baggerson	Seaman.
John McDonald	Seaman.
George E. Yewell	Seaman.
Thomas Maloney	Seaman (acting ship's cook).
Carl Wasdon	Seaman (acting sailmaker's mate).
Charles Tong Sing	Cabin steward.
Max Tyron	Cabin cook.
C. Nilson	Seaman, on board the steamer Loch Garry.
J. B. Larson	Seaman, on board the steamer Loch Garry.

List of officers attached to the United States steamer Bear, 1884.

Name.	Rank.
W. H. Emory, jr	Lieutenant, commanding.
F. H. Crosby	Lieutenant.
J. C. Colwell	Lieutenant.
N. R. Usher	Lieutenant.
L. K. Reynolds	Ensign.
John Lowe	Chief engineer.
H. E. Ames	Passed assistant surgeon.

List of men attached to the United States steamer Bear, 1884.

Name.	Rate.
F. Ash	Ice master.
John Quevedo	Boatswain's mate.
Arthur Lloyd	Boatswain's mate.
Hugh Brock	Quartermaster.
D. H. Keenan	Quartermaster.
James F. Burke	Captain of top.
C. J. Carlson	Captain of top.
J. C. Evans	Yeoman.
Joseph B. Fletcher	Carpenter's mate.
John Roberts	Seaman.
John Johnson (1)	Seaman.
John Johnson (2)	Seaman.
Jacob Johnson	Seaman.
Albert Jason	Seaman.
D. M. Didrikse	Seaman.
H. Krusberg	Seaman.
J. J. Campbell	Seaman.
John Lindquist	Seaman.
Fred. Law	Ship's cook.
George Savo	Cabin steward.
Otto Schwarz	Cabin cook.
J. M. Beau	First-class machinist.
Henry Thomas	Do.
T. J. Morton	Blacksmith.
Archie Currie	First-class fireman.
Lewis C. Smith	Do.
James Rogan	Do.

List of officers attached to the United States steamer Alert, 1884.

Name.	Rank.
George W. Coffin	Commander.
Charles J. Badger	Lieutenant.
H. J. Hunt	Lieutenant.
C. S. McClain	Ensign.
A. A. Ackerman	Ensign.
William H. Nauman	Passed assistant engineer.
F. S. Nash	Passed assistant surgeon.

List of men attached to the United States steamer Alert, 1884.

Name.	Rate.
David L. Gifford	Ice master.
Joseph Doyle	Boatswain's mate.
Philip Shantz	Quartermaster.
Albert Jones	Captain of top.
Ed. White	Carpenter's mate.
Frank Blokus	Seaman.
P. C. Hansen	Seaman.
John Degen	Seaman.
William Bloom	Seeman.
Adam Weissel	Ship's cook.
Olaf Anderson	Cabin cook.
M. C. Boi	Seaman.
J. F. Green	Machinist.
William Haas	First class fireman.
Thomas Wilson	First class fireman.
John Watts	First class fireman.
Thomas Bragger	Boatswain's mate.
Salvator Tordagoer	Quartermaster.
Charles Anderson	Captain of top.
Thomas Beswetheric	Yeoman.
Christian Guyken	Seaman.
Amund Olsen	Seaman.
J. Lukshewitz	Seaman.
Charles Tristram	Seaman.
Alexander Watson	Seaman.
Herman Lara	Seaman.
W. Wettergren	Cabin steward.
William J. Powell	Machinist.
John Wachter	First-class fireman.
John Sullivan	First-class fireman.
T. S. Roberts	First-class fireman.
A. H. Kemble	Blacksmith.
C. Baxter	Seaman.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 344) to relieve the Treasurer of the United States from the amount now charged to him and deposited with the several States, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HARRIS. Perhaps that had better be passed over without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

The bill (S. 1156) to encourage the holding of a national industrial exposition of the arts, mechanics, and products of the colored race throughout the United States of America, to be held in the years 1888 and 1889, was announced as next in order.

Mr. GEORGE. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

The bill (S. 163) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to apply the surplus money in the Treasury to the purchase of United States bonds or to prepayment of interest on the public debt was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. This bill will be passed over without prejudice on the suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES].

The bill (S. 2381) to so amend section 9646 of the Revised States as to allow the pensions of officers of the Army and Navy, their widows and dependent parents to be rated as of the rank held by such officers at the date of discharge, was announced as next in order.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that that be passed over without losing its place.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is not a complicated bill at all, but let it go over.

PENSIONS FOR LOSS OF SIGHT.

The bill (S. 2446) granting an increase of pensions in certain cases therein mentioned was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

It proposes to amend section 4698 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to allow to all persons who are now paid, or may hereafter be found entitled to, a pension for the loss of one eye or the sight thereof under existing laws for such disability, a pension of $16 per month in lieu of any lesser sum now by law provided therefor, the increase herein provided to take effect only from the passage of the act.

Nothing herein contained is to deprive a pensioner of the right to a higher rating by reason of his rating for total disability, as is now provided for by existing laws.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM P. THORNE.

The bill (H. R. 2365) for the relief of William P. Thorne was considered as in Committee of the Whole. The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, directed to pay to William P. Thorne, of Henry County, Kentucky, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500.

Mr. HARRIS. Is that all of that bill?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read again.

The bill was read.

Mr. HARRIS. It is a remarkable bill.

Mr. BECK. It is a House bill. The report shows what it is for. Perhaps the report had better be read.

Mr. HARRIS. It is not necessary to read the report if it shows what the $500 is for. The report can be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. BECK. The case is fully proved.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be printed in the RECORD in connection with the bill, if there be no objection,

The report submitted by Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, March 19, 1888, is as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred bill (H. R. 2365), entitled "A bill for the relief of William P. Thorne," have examined the same, and beg leave to report as follows:

The Committee on Claims of the present House of Representatives, to whom the said House bill 2365 was referred, have reported the same favorably, and have adopted the statement of facts and the views thereon which had been presented to the House of Representatives by its Committee on Claims during the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress, when such last committee had this case under consideration, and favorably reported the same. In our view, such statement of facts and views of the case are fully sustained by the evidence. We, therefore, report back such bill with a recommendation that it do pass, and do hereto subjoin the report of the House Committee of the Forty-ninth Congress as the basis of such recommendation.

"[House Report, Forty-ninth Congress.]

"It appears from the papers transmitted to the committee by the Attorney-General that William P. Thorne, a lawyer, residing in Henry County, Kentucky, was employed to defend a civil action instituted in the circuit court of Henry County against one A. J. Harrington, a deputy United States marshal, and also a criminal indictment against Harrington; that the services were able, successful, and reasonably worth $1,000; that they were rendered in the face of public odium, and at the risk of personal popularity.

"The case was: Harrington levied an execution, issued from the clerk's office of the Federal court against one Rowland H. Thomas, on a drove of cattle which was claimed by Cynthia Thomas; Cynthia Thomas sued Harrington for trespass, and he was also indicted. Mr. Thorne successfully defended both actions, in one of which there were three trials and a change of venue.

"His employment, his services, and their value are clearly established. But his claim was rejected by the Department as was explained by Attorney-General Brewster in a letter of December 29, 1884, from which we insert this extract:

"You were not commissioned by the Department. There is no evidence that you took the oath as special counsel. Sections 365 and 366 of the Revised Statutes require the commission to issue, the oath to be taken, and subsequently that the Department shall certify that the appointment was made, the oath taken, and that the services performed would not have been performed by an officer of this Department or the district attorney. Without such certificate from the Attorney-General, the accounting officers of the Treasury will not state your account and consider it.

"Very respectfully,

"BENJAMIN HARRIS BREWSTER,
"*Attorney-General.*

"These are purely technical reasons, which do not affect the real merits of the claim. It is a just claim, and ought to be paid.

"We append hereto the letter of Judge Bland Ballard, who has since died, and the affidavits of General Murray and Colonel Burns:

"LOUISVILLE, *April*, 2, 1873.

"WILLIAM P. THORNE,
"*Eminence, Ky.:*

"A. J. Harrington, one of the officers of my court, is in some trouble in your county for an alleged seizure and sale of some property they claim was not subject. Please make such proper legal defense for him as you think best, and I will see that the United States pays you for your services.

"Mr. Harrington will be there in person and give you a full history of the case. From what he tells me I am apprehensive the stock sold by him was not liable for the debt.

"But we desire you to make such defense as in your judgment will uphold the dignity and process of the court A judgment against the United States marshal in your county at this particular time, when they are being intimidated by a class of lawless people, would be prejudicial to the usefulness of this tribunal in Kentucky, and I enjoin it upon you to make a bold defense for him, and when you come to the city call and see Colonel Wharton, the United States attorney, who will take great pleasure in giving you such aid and counsel as you may require upon the point of a removal of the case from the State to United States court.

"Sincerely,

"BLAND BALLARD."

"STATE OF KENTUCKY, *County of Jefferson, ss:*

"Personally appeared Eli H. Murray, ex-United States marshal of Kentucky, and Col. Thomas C. Burns, present marshal, and each say that from what we know of said cases against the deputy marshal, in the Henry circuit court, and the defense made for him, and towards upholding the dignity and process of the United States court by W. P. Thorne, his attorney, we believe a fee of $500 reasonable and just; we further say that such services were necessary and were all that the United States could have expected or wished, and rendered at a time when it was not safe for an officer of this court to go out into the country to attend any sort of official business.

"ELI H. MURRAY,
"*Ex-United States Marshal of Kentucky.*
"THOMAS C. BURNS, *Marshal.*

"Sworn and subscribed to before me this 19th day of December, 1879.

"AUSTIN BALLARD,
"*Clerk United States Court.*
"By SAMUEL CRAILLE,
"*Deputy Clerk.*"

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CERTAIN NAVAL RECORDS.

The bill (H. R. 4601) to amend the naval record of Nickolas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, and Loth Possum was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The Committee on Naval Affairs reported an amendment to the second paragraph of the preamble, in line 5, before the word "Congressional," to strike out "Thirteenth" and insert "Thirtieth;" so as to read:

Whereas they were taken to Buffalo, in the State of New York, and there, without their knowledge or consent, sold as substitutes, so that their names now appear on the records of the Bureau of Equipment and Recruiting as substitutes, credited as such to the Thirtieth Congressional district, in the State of New York, instead of as volunteers from the Twenty-seventh Congressional district, in the State of Pennsylvania; and.

The preamble was agreed to.

The preamble as amended was agreed to.

J. HENRY RIVES.

The bill (S. 517) for the relief of J. Henry Rives was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to J. Henry Rives, of Lynchburgh, Virginia, $293.90, being the amount of expenses necessarily incurred by him in the arrest of John C. Henry, deputy collector, for embezzlement.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEWART & CO.

The next business on the Calendar was the resolution reported by Mr. MITCHELL March 21, 1888, from the Committee on Claims, relative to the bill (S. 800) for the relief of Stewart & Co., as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 800) entitled "A bill for the relief of Stewart & Co.," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of the fourteenth section of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of said section of such act, and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be passed over without prejudice.

JOHN L. BROOME.

The bill (S. 1463) to authorize an additional appointment on the retired-list of the Marine Corps was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized to place Lieut. Col. John L. Broome on the retired-list of the Marine Corps, with the rank and pay of a colonel retired.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that be passed over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

JAMES H. BACON.

The bill (S. 1959) for the relief of James H. Bacon was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to the language of this bill. It says:

That the proceedings and sentence of the court-martial in the case of Private James H. Bacon, late of Company A, Second Maine Volunteers, be, and the same are hereby, suspended and declared null and void, and that he be granted an honorable discharge from the service; and that the Secretary of War be, and is hereby, directed to pay, or cause to be paid, said James H. Bacon, all pay and allowances forfeited by the proceedings of said court-martial.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think I was not in the committee at the time the bill was considered and can not speak of the motives that actuated it. The Senator who has it in charge [Mr. DAVIS] is not here. Let it lie over.

Mr. COCKRELL. I simply wanted to call attention to the language of it.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think I was not present when it was acted on.

Mr. COCKRELL. I wanted to know if a majority of the Committee on Military Affairs wanted to indorse the doctrine stated in the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

H. A. MYERS.

The bill (S. 975) for the relief of H. A. Myers was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to require the Paymaster-General of the Army to cause to be paid to H. A. Myers, late a private in the Eleventh Kansas Volunteers, a sum that shall be equal to the pay of a private soldier from the 17th of September, 1862, to July 7, 1864, the date of his discharge from the service of the United States, deducting therefrom any amount that may have been paid to him as such private soldier, and any amount that may be due from him to the Government.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY LANDS IN WYOMING.

The bill (S. 1782) to authorize the leasing of the school and university lands in the Territory of Wyoming, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 5, after the word "lands,"

to insert "devoid of timber and known mineral deposits;" so as to read:

That the county commissioners of each of the counties organized or hereafter organized in the Territory of Wyoming are hereby authorized to lease the lands devoid of timber and known mineral deposits heretofore reserved or that may hereafter be reserved for school purposes in their respective counties, in such manner as may be provided by the laws of the said Territory.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 6 in the following words:

SEC. 6. That whenever the sixteenth or thirty-sixth section in each township within the Territory of Wyoming has been or may hereafter be found to be otherwise claimed or appropriated prior to survey, or to be deficient in quantity from any cause whatsoever, or worthless for agricultural purposes, as provided in section 2275 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, or to be mineral in character, other lands may be selected in lieu thereof from the surveyed public lands within said Territory not otherwise claimed or appropriated at the time of said selection, in accordance with the principles of adjustment prescribed by section 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. That said lands shall be so selected by an agent appointed by the governor of the Territory of Wyoming, who shall certify the fact of such selection to the Secretary of the Interior, with a statement of the land in the sixteenth and thirty-sixth section in lieu of which such selection is made.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 6. That where lands in the sixteenth and thirty-sixth sections, in the Territory of Wyoming, are found upon survey to be in the occupancy, and covered by the improvements of an actual pre-emption or homestead settler, or where either of them are fractional in quantity, in whole or in part, or wanting because the townships are fractional, or have been or shall hereafter be reserved for public purposes, or found to be mineral in character, other lands may be selected by an agent appointed by the govonor of the Territory in lieu thereof, from the surveyed public lands within the Territory not otherwise legally claimed or appropriated at the time of selection, in accordance with the principles of adjustment prescribed by section 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and upon a determination by the Interior Department that a portion of the smallest legal subdivision in a section numbered 16 or 36, in Wyoming, is mineral land, such smallest legal subdivision shall be excepted from the reservation for schools, and indemnity allowed for it in its entirety, and such subdivisions, or the portions of them remaining after segregation of the mineral lands or claims, shall be treated as other public lands or claims.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RESPONSIBILITY OF SIGNAL-CORPS MEN.

The bill (S. 2519) to make enlisted men of the Signal Corps responsible for public property was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADMISSION OF NEW STATES.

The next business on the Calendar was the resolution reported by Mr. CULLOM from the Committee on Territories, March 27, 1888, relative to the admission of new States.

Mr. HARRIS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be passed over without prejudice.

STATE SOLDIERS' HOMES.

The bill (S. 2116) to provide aid to State homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States and their widows and orphans was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 6, after the word "war," to insert, "who are disabled by age, disease, or otherwise, and by reason of such disability are incapable of earning a living, provided such disability was not incurred in service against the United States;" in line 10, after the word "sailor," to strike out "and widow or orphan thereof;" in line 11, after the word "home," to strike out "for one year the sum," and insert "at the rate," and in line 12, after the word "dollars," to insert "per annum;" so as to read:

That all States which have established, or which shall hereafter establish, State homes for disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States who served in the war of the rebellion or any previous war, and who are disabled by age, disease, or otherwise, and by reason of such disability are incapable of earning a living, providing such disability was not incurred in service against the United States, shall be paid for every such disabled soldier or sailor who may be admitted and cared for in such home at the rate of $100 per annum.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide aid to State homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States."

PEREZ DICKINSON.

The bill (S. 94) for the relief of Perez Dickinson, surviving partner of the late firm of Cowan & Dickinson, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides for the payment to Perez Dickinson, surviving partner of the late firm of Cowan & Dickinson, of Knoxville, Tenn., of $96,192, being the amount found due him by the Court of Claims for two hundred and fifty-six bales of cotton taken by General Burnside and used in the construction of fortifications about Knoxville, in November, 1863.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. L. CAIN AND OTHERS.

The bill (S. 97) for the relief of I. L. Cain and others, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Claims reported the bill with amendments, in line 10, to change the name of "I. L. Cain" to "J. L. Cain;" in line 22, to strike out "seventy-seven" and insert "seventy-five;" and after the word "dollars," to strike out "25 cents;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the respective sums of money as hereinafter provided to the respective persons named herein, or to their heirs or legal representatives, to wit, for cotton taken by order of General A. E. Burnside to strengthen the fortifications at Knoxville, Tenn., November 17 and 18, 1863, to wit, J. L. Cain, six bales, 2,399 pounds, at 75 cents per pound, $1,701.75; Hugh G. Kyle, administrator of A. A. Kyle, deceased, 7 bales 3,500 pounds, at 75 cents per pound, $2,625; Alexander Kennedy, 10 bales, 4,500 pounds, at 75 cents per pound, $3,375; W. C. Hazen, surviving partner of G. M. Hazen, deceased, 31 bales, 17,393 pounds, at 75 cents per pound, $12,975.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of J. L. Cain and others."

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF GEORGE M'DOUGALL.

The bill (S. 1171) for the relief of the legal representatives of George McDougall, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, in line 8, after the word "administrator," to insert "to wit, $81,250," and in line 11, after "United States," to insert "but without interest or costs;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay to the legal representative of the estate of George McDougall the sum appropriated in the general deficiency bill of August 4, 1886, to pay the judgment of the Court of Claims in favor of John Paul Jones, administrator, to wit, $81,250, in the same manner as though said judgment had been affirmed on appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States, but without interest or costs.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM M. BRYANT.

The bill (S. 2501) for the relief of William M. Bryant was announced as next in order.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

HENRY BROCK.

The bill (H. R. 6887) for the relief of Henry Brock was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides for paying to Henry Brock $387 for rent of his house, numbered 200 New Jersey avenue, Washington, D. C., and damage to the same while it was being occupied under authority of the House of Representatives.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BREVET PROMOTIONS.

The bill (S. 1323) to confer brevet promotion on officers of the United States Army particularly distinguished by heroic action in Indian warfare, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported by the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was to strike out section 1, as follows:

That section 1209 of the Revised Statutes shall, on and after the passage of this act, be made applicable to every officer of the Army below the actual rank of brigadier-general, and who has not been previously brevetted to that rank, and who may be recommended by the commanding officer of the expedition for brevet promotion to the grade next above that in which he is actually commissioned, on account of heroic conduct in battle against hostile Indians, either on or outside of the territory of the United States.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered, at his discretion, to nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate to appoint to brevet rank all officers of the United States Army, now on the active or retired list, who by their department commander and with the concurrence of the commanding General of the Army have been or may be recommended for gallant service in action against hostile Indians since January 1, 1867.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the beginning of section 2, to strike out:

That the foregoing section shall comprehend every officer of the Army still on the active-list who has particularly distinguished himself in action with Indians since the abrogation of the brevet privilege: *Provided, however.*

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 5, before the word "brevet," to strike out "his" and insert "such;" after "brevet," to strike out "commission when issued" and insert "commissions as may be issued under the provisions of this act;" in line 7, before the word "*Provided*," to strike out "and;" after "*Provided*" to strike out "however;" and after the word "which," at the end of line 8, to strike out "he" and insert "the officer;" so as to make the section read:

That such brevet commissions as may be issued under the provisions of this act shall bear date only from the passage of this act: *Provided, however*, That the date of the particular heroic act for which the officer is promoted shall appear in his commission.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 4, as follows:

SEC. 4. That non-commissioned officers and privates of the Army who, on and after the passage of this act, may distinguish themselves by extraordinary bravery in Indian battles, shall, on recommendation of their ranking commanding officer present in the field, be entitled to the maximum of pay allowed for length of service in their respective grades; and further, shall be entitled to compete for commissions in the Army before a board of officers, when, if they should pass a successful examination, they shall be considered in the line of promotion next after the cadets who have graduated at the United States Military Academy.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BECK. I hope the chairman or some member of the Committee on Military Affairs will tell us something about this bill. I suppose everybody is brave and everybody is to be promoted. This is to promote everybody apparently. What is the scope of the bill?

Mr. MANDERSON. It has no such scope as is intimated by the Senator from Kentucky. If it did, I should certainly not be in favor of it. This bill is one that grows out of this condition of facts: Up to a certain time, about 1874 perhaps, brevet appointment, for gallant service in Indian campaigns being conferred by the President of the United States were usually confirmed by the Senate. At that time new light seems to have come to the Senate, and it held that because of the language of the law which said that there must be a state of warfare, and that the act of gallantry must have been with one of the enemies of the United States, that could not mean Indian warfare, and that Indians could not be considered within the general term "enemies of the United States."

So the failure to confirm as to these nominations seemed to be because of that construction of the law rather than from a desire on the part of the Senate not to confirm for such acts of gallantry.

If the Senator from Kentucky will glance over this bill as it is amended, he will see that it is very carefully guarded. It is not when an officer of the Army distinguishes himself in Indian service and receives the recommendation of his regimental commander or his district commander, but it is only when the act of gallantry is of such a character as to challenge the attention and secure the approbation and recommendation of his department commander, and after that the concurrence of the Commanding General of the Army, that the President is authorized to make a brevet appointment and the Senate to confirm it.

The bill is very carefully guarded to prevent any abuse and to prevent the indiscriminate throwing about of brevet commissions to cheapen them and make them of no value whatever. It carries no rank; it carries no precedence; it carries no pay. It is simply, in the opinion of the Committee on Military Affairs, a proper recognition of the distinguished services of many officers of the Army of the United States who have done as great deeds of heroism in Indian wars as ever were done in any war with a foreign power.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Nebraska to the fact that the law under which brevet appointments were stopped was passed in March, 1869, very soon after the close of the war. There have been no brevet appointments since the passage of the act of March 1, 1869, instead of 1874.

Mr. MANDERSON. I may have been mistaken in the date; I speke from recollection only.

Mr. COCKRELL. A large number of brevet appointments have been attempted to be made since that time, but the Senate has uniformly rejected all such nominations on the ground stated by the Senator, that Indian tribes were not within the meaning of the law as enacted on the 1st of March, 1869.

Mr. MANDERSON. I will say further with reference to this bill that it has been very materially changed by the Committee on Military Affairs from the original draught; it has received the approval of General Sheridan and of the Secretary of War, and many of the changes that have been made in the bill have been at their instance. The report in this case is a brief one, and presents so succinctly the reasons that governed the Committee on Military Affairs that I ask that without reading it be printed in the RECORD, as fully explanatory of the changes made in the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The printing of the report in the RECORD will be ordered, if there be no objection.

The report is as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1323) entitled "A bill to confer brevet promotions on officers of the United States Army particularly distinguished by heroic action in Indian warfare, and for other purposes," have had the same under consideration, in connection with two other bills (S. 2021 and 2028) on the same subject, and herewith report back the bill S. 1323 amended, and recommend its passage.

By section 1230 of the Revised Statutes (not approved March 1, 1869) it is provided that the President, "by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may, in time of war, confer commissions by brevet * * * for distinguished conduct and public services in presence of the enemy," etc.

The Senate has refused to construe this provision as authorizing brevet rank to be conferred on officers who for "distinguished conduct and public services" in Indian wars would seem to be justly entitled to receive the benefits (honorary) of the law of 1859. The War Department and the Attorney-General have held that officers in Indian wars could be brevetted during the existence of Indian hostilities, and the reason assigned by the Senate for refusal to confirm has been that the Indian was not an "enemy," and that a conflict with Indians could not be termed "a time of war."

Assuming this construction of the act of 1869 to be sound, your committee are of the opinion that the construction measures the extent of the reason why it should be extended to include officers who have distinguished themselves as aforesaid in Indian campaigns. In 1869 a number of brevets for services in Indian wars were submitted to the Senate, some of which were confirmed; but there have been no confirmations of this character since.

In 1874 and in 1875 nominations for brevet appointments, based on services rendered in the Modoc and Arizona Indian campaigns, were submitted to the Senate, but were not confirmed.

In January, 1876, all these nominations were resubmitted, but the Senate again adjourned without action.

No further nominations have been made, save in one instance, that of Lieut. E. S. Farrow, Twenty-first Infantry, made in April, 1880, and not confirmed.

In 1878 the President requested the views of the Secretary of War as to the propriety of again submitting to the Senate nominations for brevets for service in Indian campaigns.

On the general proposition, that of conferring brevet rank for distinguished services or heroic action in Indian wars, your committee can conceive of no good reason that would be valid in any war which would not apply with equal force in granting brevets in Indian wars, and concur with General W. T. Sherman, who says:

"If brevet commissions are right, and should be conferred for any wars whatever, they should be for Indian wars, because these wars call for the largest measures of risk, exposure, and toil, and every possible stimulus of honor and profit should be held out to encourage officers to struggle for success."

A favorable report was made on this subject from this committee in the last Congress, at which time the committee was in receipt of numerous letters from Army officers of all grades urging that this brevet recognition be awarded; one of the documents, numerously signed by officers, contained the following:

"The measure, as reported, authorizes the President to nominate and, with the consent of the Senate, to appoint to brevet rank all officers, active or retired, who have been recommended to this distinction for gallant service in action against hostile Indians since January 1, 1867. The rank thus proposed is entirely honorary, carrying no additional pay; the aim is simply to reward special deeds of heroism. In any other country the gallant exploits of the last twenty years in border warfare would have been acknowledged not only by awarding increased rank but increased pay.

"During the war for the Union brevet rank was constantly conferred; and a distinguished general officer once said, brevet commissions certainly belong to Indian wars, if any, inasmuch as they call for the largest measure of risk exposure, and toil; and every possible stimulus of honor and profit should be held out to encourage officers to struggle for success. In war with civilized nations the soldier has an opportunity to make a name that will be remembered in history; whereas the minor character of Indian operations prevents them from attracting as great attention and from securing permanent distinction to the participants.

"Yet the labor and the peril are as great in these small operations as in larger ones. The responsibility, courage, endurance, and good judgment required are also as great in Indian warfare; while over it hangs the terrible consciousness that capture often means death by torture with all the fiendish atrocities that savagery can invent. Even were this danger of a horrible death taken away, there is no more reason for depriving heroism of its just reward when displayed in the lonely cañons of the Sierra Madre than when shown in storming the defenses of Petersburgh.

"There is still another reason why the pending measure ought to be enacted. There now exists a statute which authorizes the conferring of brevet rank upon commissioned officers 'for distinguished conduct and public service in presence of the enemy.' Why, then, is not this sufficient? Simply because certain jurists of the Senate have in past years successfully called in question whether a Geronimo or a Sitting Bull is an 'enemy' in the sense meant by the statute.

"It may seem incredible that for twenty years, in the matter of interpretation, the doubt has always been against officers nominated for brevets on account of splendid acts of heroism. This, however, is the case, and in one instance of adverse action on such nominations the Senate Military Committee expressely said that it had no doubt of the meritorious character of the services rendered. Thus a score or more of officers have been deprived of the reward they would otherwise have received, and many of them are now with the dead."

These views accord with those expressed by a House committee which considered this subject in the last Congress:

"In other campaigns there is a certain glory or distinction to be won, and an opportunity for promotion and reward, which, owing to the limited theater of operations and the peculiar nature of wars against savages, does not and can not exist in these campaigns. And yet every highest attribute of a good soldier and officer is called for in these wars. Courage, skill, vigilance, endurance, wisdom, judgment, and unflagging energy, while usually remote from and beyond communication with officers of high rank, are all demanded in these disagreeable and thankless campaigns to protect our remote frontiers."

And with those expressed by General Crook, who said:

"OMAHA, *February* 11, 1887.

"MY DEAR GENERAL: I see by the papers that the bill allowing brevets for Indian service has passed the House. I do hope you will do all you can to have it pass the Senate, as it is a righteous and just bill. Gallant service should be recognized without reference to the kind of foe engaged. You are well aware of the onerous and dangerous nature of this Indian service, and as brevets is all that is asked, I hope they will not be withheld longer from the persons who so richly deserve them.

"Yours, sincerely,

"GEORGE CROOK.

"To CHARLES F. MANDERSON."

Capt. E. A. Snow gives quite a graphic account of the heroism and valor displayed by men upon whom it is proposed to confer this brevet rank. He says:

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *January* 19, 1888.

"DEAR SIR: I have the honor to very respectfully submit to you the following, which are but a few from among many of the instances of personal valor on the battle-field that have come to my notice in Indian warfare:

"Captain Bourke distinguished himself on the field so frequently in the Apache campaigns from 1870 to 1873 as to be four times mentioned in general orders for

his gallant and heroic conduct, and in other campaigns has frequently been the recipient of honorable and praiseworthy mention for his valor and services in the field, and he has been several times recommended for brevet promotion; but under existing laws, being unable to confer this recognition for valor, the officers ceased to ask for it, or there would be a larger number of instances which I could refer to.

"To omit many instances, I will observe that he distinguished himself by leading a charge, on the 17th of March, 1876, on Powder River, and in several charges on the Rosebud, on the 17th of June, 1876, in an engagement with the same Indians who massacred General Custer's command, and eight days before that fight. In this engagement, at the Rosebud, Captain Bourke saved my life after I was shot in the right elbow and left wrist joints, causing total disability. He rode into the very midst of the Indians and rescued me, although the nearest skirmish line was at least a thousand yards away. I could give other instances, but it would make this letter too long.

"Major Henry, of the Tenth Cavalry, distinguished himself in this engagement, and so did Major Mills, of the Ninth Cavalry; and Major Mills whipped the Indians and won the first victory after the Custer massacre, and it was one of the most brilliant ones of the campaign. Colonel Hatch, of the Ninth Cavalry, distinguished at a more recent date, and many others. But it will occur that from the frequent and constant Indian warfare that the instances of valor are numerous, and your bill will enable the President and Senate to recognize it by a nominal promotion.

"I have the honor to remain, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"E. A. SNOW.

"Hon. CHARLES F. MANDERSON,
"*United States Senator for Nebraska.*"

After full consideration of the subject-matter your committee have struck out the preamble of the bill (S. 1323) and have amended the title and the bill so as to allow brevet rank to be conferred on "all officers of the Army now on the active or retired lists, who, by their department commander and with the concurrence of the commanding general of the Army, have been or may be recommended for gallant service in action against hostile Indians since January 1, 1867," the brevet commissions to bear date only from the passage of this act; the date of the heroic action for which the brevet rank is conferred to appear in the commission, such rank to be only honorary, without privilege of precedence or command not already provided for by the statutes which embody the rules and articles governing the Army.

As amended the measure has the approval of Lieutenant-General Sheridan, under date of March 29, 1888.

Your committee accordingly report the bill (S. 1323) back favorably, amended as heretofore stated, and recommend its passage.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the President to confer brevet rank on officers of the United States Army for gallant services in Indian campaigns."

The preamble was stricken out.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. REAGAN submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2851) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887; which were ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, and Mr. BUTLER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to interfere with the desire of any Senator to proceed with legislative business; but it is necessary to have a brief executive session, and unless there be some objection I will now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Before submitting that question the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, being the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 17, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 15, 1888.

FOR PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Corps of Engineers.

Capt. Charles E. L. B. Davis, to be major, April 7, 1888, *vice* Smith, promoted.

First Lieut. George McC. Derby, to be captain, April 7, 1888, *vice* Davis, promoted.

Second Lieut. William L. Sibert, to be first lieutenant, April 7, 1888, *vice* Derby, promoted.

FOR APPOINTMENT BY TRANSFER IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Eugene W. Van C. Lucas, First Artillery, to be second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers, May 14, 1888, *vice* Sibert, promoted.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 15, 1888.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES.

Robert L. Tidrick, of Des Moines, Iowa, to be register of the land office at Des Moines, Iowa.

William H. Steele, of Montrose, Colo., to be register of the land office at Montrose, Colo.

RECEIVER OF PUBLIC MONEYS.

Henry Charles Fink, of Lake City, Colo., to be receiver of public moneys at Montrose, Colo.

MEMBER OF MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION.

Major Oswala H. Ernst, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, *vice* Gillmore, deceased.

INDIAN AGENT.

John Blair, of Netawka, Kans., to be agent for the Indians of the Pottawatomie and Great Nemaha agency in Kansas.

CONSUL.

Thomas Browne, of Montana Territory, to be consul of the United States at Paramaribo.

POSTMASTERS.

Henry L. Phillips, at Seaford, Sussex County, Delaware.
James McLaughlin, at Gloucester City, Camden County, New Jersey.
John H. Middleton, at West Hoboken, Hudson County, New Jersey.
Thomas L. Crosland, at Bennettsville, Marlborough County, South Carolina.
William A. Moore, at Yorkville, York County, South Carolina.
William F. Boyle, at Freeland, Luzerne County, Pennsylvania.
John S. Bryan, at Newton, Bucks County, Pennsylvania.
Charles B. Crawford, at Mifflintown, Juniata County, Pennsylvania.
A. B. Herd, at Phillipsburgh, Centre County, Pennsylvania.
C. Y. White, at Eldred, McKean County, Pennsylvania.
Sherman T. Pell, at City Island, Westchester County, New York.
William E. Huttman, at Ellinwood, Barton County, Kansas.
Alexander C. Hickman, at La Junta, Bent County, Colorado.
Joseph P. Macey, at Las Animas, Bent County, Colorado.
James C. Onthouse, at Lamar, Bent County, Colorado.
Charles F. Howe, at Greenleaf, Washington County, Kansas.
Charles J. Kerndt, at Bird City, Cheyenne County, Kansas.
Taylor W. Scott, at Stafford, Stafford County, Kansas.
Matthew Thomson, at Alma, Wabaunsee County, Kansas.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 16, 1888.

POLICE COURT JUDGE.

Thomas F. Miller, of the District of Columbia, to be a judge of the police court of the District of Columbia.

MINISTER RESIDENT.

Robert B. Roosevelt, of New York, to be minister resident of the United States to the Netherlands.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *May* 16, 1888.

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

HEIRS OF SOLOMON SPITZER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President:

To the House of Representatives:

In compliance with a resolution originating in the House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate, I return herewith the bill (H. R. 2699) entitled "An act for the relief of the heirs of the late Solomon Spitzer."

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 15, 1888.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the communication just read will be laid on the table for the present until the House shall determine what disposition shall be made of the bill to which it relates.

BRANCH SOLDIERS' HOME, GRANT COUNTY, INDIANA.

Mr. STEELE. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] has withdrawn his objection to the bill which I called up yesterday, and I now ask unanimous consent that it be taken up and put upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] asks unanimous consent to take up for present consideration a bill (H. R. 8391) to authorize the location of a branch home for volunteer disabled soldiers in Grant County, Indiana, and for other purposes. Is the reading of the bill demanded?

Mr. McMILLIN. Reserving the right to object, I should like to hear a statement from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] as to the necessity for this home.

Mr. STEELE. The Committee on Military Affairs authorized me to report this bill, there being a necessity for additional homes. The Superintendent of the National Home reports that there are over nine thousand soldiers in the poor-houses, and that every single home now existing is not only full, but that soldiers are sleeping on the floors, and that there is an actual necessity for additional accommodations. In pursuance of that statement this bill has been reported from the Com-

mittee on Military Affairs. It is proposed by the citizens of the place where the home is to be located to furnish fuel and light free for all time to come. The fuel and light at the Dayton home cost last year over $58,000, to say nothing about the cost of the cartage of ashes and débris away from the home. It is thought to be in the interest of economy that there should be a home of this character established, and established in the center of the region whence most of the soldiers came during the late war. I hope there will be no objection to the passage of this bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. The point that I was anxious to have a statement about was as to the necessity for the home. Of course, if there is a necessity for it no patriotic citizen will object, but, with a diminishing demand for such homes, which is inevitable either now or in the near future, I want to ask the gentleman whether it is certain that the creation of this new home is a necessity.

Mr. STEELE. The board of managers report that so far from there being a decreasing demand it is constantly increasing, and increasing in a very large ratio. They so state in their annual report dated the 2d of January last.

Mr. McMILLIN. Is there any other home in Indiana?

Mr. STEELE. No, sir.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. FARQUHAR. I desire to ask the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] whether this bill provides for the erection of a home under the auspices of the national Board of Managers; that is, will it receive soldiers from other States than Indiana?

Mr. STEELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think it would be well to have the bill read.

Mr. FARQUHAR. There is no question at all about its propriety if it contains that provision. I wish to say to the House, in answer to the question of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN], that the State of New York, through the Grand Army of the Republic, has built homes for its own soldiers, and yet there are now nearly four hundred soldiers that can not find room at the home at Bath.

Mr. STEELE. That is the condition of affairs throughout the country.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I know that is the case in my own State.

Mr. SPRINGER. Has Indiana built any soldiers' homes of its own?

Mr. STEELE. It has built a soldiers' orphans' home, which is more than full now.

Mr. McMILLIN. What is the appropriation which this bill contains?

Mr. STEELE. Only $200,000.

Mr. McMILLIN. Is there a provision limiting it to that amount?

Mr. STEELE. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPRINGER. The State of Illinois has built a soldiers' home at Springfield, a large and well-appointed institution, and is paying all the expenses of it out of the State treasury.

Mr. STEELE. So I understand.

Mr. SPRINGER. And I do not know but that if this bill passes I shall ask to have that Illinois institution turned over to the General Government.

Mr. BIGGS. I would like to have the bill read.

Mr. BURROWS. It was read yesterday.

Mr. SPINOLA. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Military Affairs gave this measure very careful consideration before theyd ecided to report it favorably. There can be no reasonable objection to the bill and it ought to pass.

Mr. BIGGS. I withdraw the demand for the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER. There are several amendments, which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Section 1, line 7, strike out "three hundred and twenty" and insert "two hundred" [meaning acres of land].

Section 3, line 9, after the word "building," insert "and shall supply an adequate quantity of such gas free of cost to the Government."

Section 4, line 1, strike out "and fifty;" making the sum $200,000, instead of $250,000.

The amendments were severally agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. STEELE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ABBIE SHARP.

Mr. RICE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 4775) for the relief of Abbie Sharp, formerly Abbie Gardner, be taken from the Private Calendar and put on its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay the sum of $2,500 out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to Abbie Sharp, formerly Abbie Gardner, who was captured and whose family was killed by the Sioux Indians at Spirit Lake, in the State of Iowa, on the 8th day of March, A. D. 1857.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill, which was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RICE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

FREEDMEN OF THE CHOCTAW NATION.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with accompanying paper, a report from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs on the present condition of freedmen of the Choctaw Nation, Indian Territory, and submitting a draught of a proposed bill for their relief; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting an amended estimate from the Secretary of State of the appropriation for expenses of obtaining and searching for records in French spoliation claims; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

DAMAGES TO SCHOONER SARAH C. WHARF.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the United States Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries of appropriation to pay damages sustained by the schooner Sarah C. Wharf by collision with the Fish Commission steamer Fish Hawk; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House Senate bills of the following titles; which were read a first and second time, and referred as indicated:

The bill (S. 2039) for the relief of the Albemarle and Chesapeake Canal Company—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 437) for the relief of Claude H. Mastin, surviving partner of the firm of Le Vert & Mastin, of Mobile, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 9793) authorizing a loan of arms and equipments to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company; when the Speaker signed the same.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McMILLIN. I call for the regular order. I move that the morning hour for the call of committees be dispensed with, and that gentlemen desiring to make reports may file them with the Clerk for reference to the appropriate Calendars.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that to-day, immediately after the reading of the Journal, was by special order set apart for the consideration of bills and resolutions reported from the Committee on Labor. I wish to ask the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] whether any arrangement has been made or is contemplated by which the business of the Labor Committee may be assigned to some other day. I make this inquiry in the absence of the chairman of the Committee on Labor, and because I am unable to communicate with him.

Mr. McMILLIN. As the chairman of the committee is absent, I can not communicate with him. All I can say to the gentleman from New Jersey is that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. O'NEILL], the chairman of the Labor Committee, introduced a day or two ago a resolution, which was properly referred, looking to the assignment of a future day for the business of the committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does the gentleman recollect the date fixed in that resolution?

Mr. McMILLIN. I do not.

The SPEAKER. The resolution was introduced on last Monday, and according to the recollection of the Chair it provides for the assignment of some day during next week. The Chair thinks it is the understanding that such assignment shall be made.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Would it be in order, then, for me to ask unanimous consent now that the execution of this special order be deferred for one week?

The SPEAKER. It will be in order, if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] yields for the motion.

Mr. McMILLIN. The chairman of the Committee on Labor has already taken steps looking to the accomplishment of the object which the gentleman from New Jersey seeks. The resolution introduced by the chairman of the committee has been regularly referred. I sympathize with the desire of the gentleman from New Jersey in regard to an assignment for that business, but I think the resolution on the subject ought to take the regular course.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The regular course, Mr. Speaker, is for the House now to proceed with the execution of the order already made; and under the regular order the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee would be

out of order, because under the special order there is no morning hour to-day.

The SPEAKER. If the Committee on Labor should call up any bill, there would be no morning hour; and unless some arrangement should be made, the only way to prevent the consideration of measures from that committee to-day would be to raise the question of consideration against each bill as called up.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have no desire to prolong this discussion or to interpose any difficulty. In the absence of the chairman of the committee I simply desired to know the situation.

The SPEAKER. The question is, then, on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] ask unanimous consent that the order with reference to business of the Labor Committee be postponed for one week?

The SPEAKER. The Chair stated, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from New Jersey, that there was a motion pending. The gentleman can make his request for unanimous consent if action on the pending motion be suspended.

Mr. DINGLEY. It seems to me there ought to be some arrangement about this matter.

Mr. MCMILLIN. There will be no difficulty about it. There was an understanding that a future day would be assigned. That understanding, I infer from all that has occurred, is satisfactory to the chairman of the Committee on Labor; and therefore I have made this motion.

Mr. DINGLEY. If that is the understanding, I am perfectly satisfied.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is the information I desired to elicit.

Mr. TARSNEY. The chairman of the committee [Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri] is here now. Let us hear from him.

The SPEAKER. The Chair ascertains that May 22 is the day designated in the resolution offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. The understanding between the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS] and myself was that the day for the consideration of reports from the Committee on Labor should be deferred until Tuesday next.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am perfectly content.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. That was the understanding.

Mr. DINGLEY. Why not ask unanimous consent now that the day which has been suggested be fixed?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I will ask unanimous consent——

Mr. MCMILLIN. The resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules; why not let the matter rest in that shape?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. It was the understanding that they would report the resolution back and give us that day.

Mr. TAULBEE. Does the committee agree to report it back?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. We understand from members of the Committee on Rules that there will be no difficulty about it.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. MCMILLIN, that the morning hour for the consideration of reports be dispensed with, and that leave be granted to file reports with the Clerk, it was agreed to.

TARIFF.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of bills raising revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the tariff bill.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Mr. Chairman, a prominent question is now agitating the public mind, which largely affects both labor and capital. Its ramifications penetrate into all the varied industries of the country, which make up the bulk of our prosperity. That one question may be summed up in the proposition that if MILLS of Texas does not shut up, most of the other mills of the country will have to. If this mention of the name of the honorable chairman of the Ways and Means Committee should be considered offensive or unparliamentary, I apologize for it in advance.

That the industries of the nation during the deluge of debate upon the tariff question have been much disturbed is thoroughly well known; and the interests involved are to-day anxiously looking for the course of legislation in Congress upon this momentous question, whether the over-swollen Treasury shall be relieved by a reduction of the tariff which at the same time will tend to paralyze the manufacturing industries, and thus produce more financial disasters than would exist were the present surplus to be maintained or increased, or whether the surplus should be reduced by a reduction in internal-revenue taxation or by the purchase and retirement of national bonds, or by a wise distribution of the surplus funds in internal improvements. This subject is well worthy the consideration of every patriotic and thoughtful man.

That the present tariff system is by no means perfect will be admitted by every one acquainted with its practical operations. Its so-called iniquities have recently been embalmed in quotations of prose and poetry by more than a score of able speakers, while another score have contended that the protective system which underlies the present tariff, inaugurated more than a century ago, under which our aggregate national wealth has increased from $13,000,000,000 in 1860 to over $43,000,000,000 in 1880, is not to be rudely overthrown by any party or power not in sympathy with that system by which our country has been so largely benefited.

This is the issue now presented before this Congress and the country and upon which the next Presidential election will undoubtedly turn, for the Democratic party which presents this tariff bill before this House and before the country have, by the message of the President elected by that party and otherwise, practically declared itself against the protective system and in favor of a modified system which they call "fair trade," but which is the opening wedge to what may properly be called free trade.

That question not only affects the manufacturing industries of the country, but it also largely affects its agricultural interests.

It is my privilege, Mr. Chairman, to represent in this Congress a district composed of one county in the State of New York, named after that honored Democrat, James Monroe, and which is the second county in the United States in point of agricultural importance, having an area of nearly 350,000 acres, and divided into nearly 6,000 farms. All the agricultural products incident to that section of the country are included in the crops of these farms, and among the live-stock are to-day nearly 60,000 sheep. While it may be true that in certain sections of our country, in the far West, that are wholly agricultural, a less active interest is felt in a protective tariff than exists in the East, this can not be said of the section which I have the honor to represent, because of its nearness to the Canadian border, where large quantities of agricultural products are raised, which under any system approximating to free trade would come directly in conflict with like products raised in Western New York.

In addition to the importance of our agricultural products our manufacturing establishments number nearly twelve hundred, affording employment to about twenty-five thousand men, to whom is paid annually about $6,000,000 in wages, while the capital invested in our manufacturing concerns amounts to about $30,000,000. The value of our farm products during the year preceding the census of 1880 was nearly $6,400,000, while the products of our manufacturing establishments aggregated but a little less than $30,000,000, and the annual consumption of material therein was about $20,000,000.

The population of Monroe County to-day is full 200,000, and is estimated to be nearer 225,000, so that it needs no argument to show that the interests of my constituency are deeply concerned in any measure proposing a change in the tariff system.

"The timidity of capital is proverbial," "Wealth is but consolidated labor." No more striking illustration of the truth of these proverbs can be had than in the fact so widely known and which has been chronicled far and wide in the press of both parties, that capital and labor throughout our country are to-day seriously agitated upon the tariff question. Men fear to embark in any new enterprise which this question affects, or even to expand enterprises already established, for fear that pending legislation may affect the security of the one or the welfare and prosperity of the other.

My district is a hive of industry, embracing the manufactures of much the larger part of all things created by the hand of man that are necessary to the comfort of mankind. In that district is consumed large quantities of the wool of Ohio, Texas, and other States, the cotton of the South, the iron and coal of Pennsylvania, the silver of the mines of New Mexico and Nevada, and the gold of California, while from our harbor, ranking second upon the south shore of Lake Ontario, is shipped immense quantities of coal from the mines of Pennsylvania and vast amounts of the products of our soil and manufactories.

We produce the choicest nursery stock, and the seeds of the rarest flowers; we compete with Europe in the finest of optical works, and in the production of some of the finer fabrics, while the clothing and shoes of the city of Rochester may be found in every city and State in our country, and upon the persons of both the rich and the poor.

I maintain, Mr. Chairman, that these interests, which are but a type of those found in other cities throughout the land, demand a continuance of our established policy of protection, and their past prosperity and present welfare is a loud protest against the recently developed free-trade policy of the Cobden Club as exemplified by the present position of the Democratic party. We believe that a policy which has insured the success and prosperity which has made the city of Rochester famous throughout our country is good enough for the whole country and should be maintained.

There is no doubt that the inventive genius of the American nation, which gives it its foremost rank to-day among the nations of the world in all labor-saving appliances employed in manufactures, has been largely stimulated by the protective system. The Centennial Exposition of 1876, held in the city of Philadelphia, opened the eyes of many people from abroad to the wonderful resources of the United States in regard to their inventive genius, and this led to the introduction abroad of samples of many of the classes of labor-saving inventions which have there been copied and put into active use, and this has led to a large development in European countries of their manufacturing industries

and to a cheapening of labor, which has largely reduced the price of European products. So that now we are face to face with the cheap products of Europe which have been practically brought about by the protected labor and genius of the United States. The importance of this fact ought to be well understood in considering whether the protective system should be further maintained.

Free wool appears to be the corner-stone of this Democratic edifice of free-trade, with a protective tariff of 40 per cent. upon the manufactured products; but this would destroy the wool-growing industry of the United States, including the large wool interests of the State which has for one of its Representatives the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. His responsibility for this action he must settle with his constituents.

The duty on clothing wool of the cheaper class, valued at not exceeding 30 cents a pound, is 10 cents a pound; which, at the maximum value, is 33⅓ per cent. ad valorem.

The duty on manufactures of wool not specially enumerated, valued at not exceeding 80 cents a pound, is 35 cents a pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem. Those rates, at the value stated, of 80 cents a pound, amount to 78 per cent. ad valorem. Deducting the duties of 33 per cent. on the wool leaves a net duty on the goods of 45 per cent. ad valorem. On clothing, ready-made, the duty is 5 per cent. more, or 50 per cent. ad valorem.

The duty proposed by the Mills bill (with free wool) on woolen goods not enumerated is 40 per cent. ad valorem. The value of the pretense that this proposed tariff will give cheaper clothing to the poor and the laboring class can therefore be fairly estimated, especially when it is borne in mind that the average rate of duty proposed by that bill is about 41 per cent. ad valorem.

Free wool under these circumstances means a destruction of our wool-growing interests, a reduction of duty on woolen goods not sufficient to destroy the manufacturers and entirely too small to be of any practical benefit to the laboring class. Neither the manufacturers nor the wool growers are found here clamoring for the proposed change. They are content to let well enough alone, and I have been informed by reliable sources that on some classes of goods with a duty of 40 per cent. ad valorem and free wool the duty would be entirely prohibitory, because the goods can be made in the United States at a less cost than they can be made in Europe with a 40 per cent. duty added. The proposition of free wool under these circumstances is base hypocrisy so far as concerns the cheaper clothing of the laboring classes.

I have heard it stated that my distinguished and honored friend from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, once on a time in a city within the Republican State of Rhode Island, said that such a thing as a seamless sock has not been made in the United States, and they were only made in Europe by a secret process, the secret being carefully guarded, and that they could not possibly be made in this county, and that it is foolish to maintain the duty upon them, etc. I beg at this point to read a letter which I have received, and it is introduced to be followed by an object-lesson to my friend and to those who have been misled by his false teachings. Here is the letter, and here is the object-lesson:

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *May* 14, 1888.

DEAR SIR: We take the liberty of writing you, as the member of Congress from our district to direct your attention to the effect the Mills tariff bill, if passed in its present form, would have upon the industry in which we are engaged. We employ about two hundred and fifty persons in the manufacture of seamless hosiery, and should this bill become a law would be obliged either to force our operatives to accept much less wages, or close our factory. At present prices our operatives make only a fair living, but should we be compelled to compete with the factories of Europe manufacturing similar goods, with their poorly paid labor, we can not see how they could earn enough to keep body and soul together.

We understand Mr. Mills at a meeting held on the 19th of February last at Providence, R. I., stated that seamless hosiery was not made in this country, but manufactured entirely in Europe by a secret process. To disabuse your mind of this erroneous statement should it have come to your ears, we herewith send you a few pairs of the hose made in our factory. There are about five hundred factories in this country engaged in making these goods. All of these factories, we believe, would be seriously crippled, if not compelled to close their doors by the passage of this bill. Trusting you will use your utmost efforts to effect the defeat of this pernicious measure, we remain,

Yours, very respectfully,

ROCHESTER HOSIERY COMPANY,
By E. W. OSBURN, *President*.

Hon. CHARLES S. BAKER, *Washington, D. C.*

These goods now exhibited are of wool, protected wool, loyal wool, and are manufactured in my city. They display the colors of the American flag—red, white, and blue. If my friend will visit my city during the coming campaign I will take pleasure in making his stay pleasant in a social way, and introduce him to the factory and to the fair hands that daily turn out these goods by the thousand. The larger ones may be sufficient in size to meet the needs of any gentleman from Texas, or from any part of that warm section of our country which is so potential in the management of affairs, and which is so largely represented on the Committee on Ways and Means. [Laughter.] If the bill now under consideration should by any unforeseen calamity become a law, the larger ones would be sufficient to hold the scant surplus left in the Treasury after a brief operation of the law if his anticipations shall be realized and he be not mistaken in the effect of his own bill, while the smaller ones would be far too ample for the scant remembrances of affection likely to be bestowed upon him at next Christmas tide by the industries he is endeavoring in his peculiar way to "assist." [Renewed laughter.] I have the honor to present these to my good friend from Texas. They will prove to him to be the only samples of free wool upon which his eyes will ever feast. [Laughter.] If he chooses he may divide these samples, sending the red ones to the President, the white ones to the Speaker, and the blue ones he may retain for himself, as typical of his feelings at the end of the session when he beholds the defeat of the measure on which he has staked the fortunes of his party. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

In a speech made by the honorable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] in my city during the last Presidential canvass he had much to say about the protective policy of the political party with which he was then affiliated. He attempted to convince my people that the party to which he then belonged was not a free-trade party. I hope he will visit our city again this fall, and if he will tell the people the truth as to his former political associates (which he no doubt sadly regrets he did not do then), I assure him that the majority of 5,076 then given for the Republican ticket will be swollen to 7,500, especially if our candidate shall be able to steer clear of alliterating divines during his canvass. I but voice the sentiments of my people when advising a repeal or a material modification of internal-revenue taxes at the very earliest day practicable. They are inquisitorial in their nature, fetter the products of our own country, are antagonistic to the principles of both of the great political parties as they existed at the time of their adoption, and were only created to meet the necessities of the war—a necessity which no longer exists. [Applause.]

We would be glad to have the inequalities of the tariff revised, but it looks as if any such action will have to wait for the Fifty-first Congress to have it wisely done, as at that time I confidently expect that the party with which I have the honor to be identified will administer the reins of Government, and so shape the course of legislation. Meanwhile we may observe the entire lack of a wise and statesmanlike course pursued by our Democratic friends in upholding their professions presented to the country in other lines than those of tariff as a justification of our lack of confidence in any revision of the tariff which they could possibly make. Their so-called civil-service reform has become the laughing-stock of the country. Their administration of the postal laws and regulations, both as concerns our domestic intercourse and those affecting our intercourse with Canada, have been the subject of loud complaints from many quarters. It would seem as if that party were the lineal descendants of the gentleman who stood on the corner of one of the streets in Jerusalem and thanked God that he was not as other men were, and then went off and exemplified by his life and actions that he was below the level of his fellow-men.

The nearness of my district to the Canadian border necessarily makes intimate relations between the interests of my constituents and those of our neighbors residing upon the other side of our boundary. On the 2d day of last month I introduced a resolution into this House calling attention to the situation at that date of the breach of faith of the Canadian Government in exacting duties upon nursery stock and seeds, which were put upon our free-list in 1883. That resolution is as follows:

Whereas "Her Majesty, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate and House of Commons of Canada," did by due statutory enactment, assented to May 15, 1879, provide that "any or all of the following articles, that is to say, animals of all kinds, green fruit, hay, straw, bran, seeds of all kinds, vegetables, including potatoes and other roots; plants, trees, and shrubs, coal and coke, salt, hops, wheat, peas and beans, barley, rye, oats, Indian corn, buckwheat, and all other grain; flour of wheat and flour of rye, Indian meal and oatmeal, and flour or meal of any other grain; butter, cheese, fish (salted or smoked), lard, tallow, meats (fresh, salted, or smoked), and lumber, may be imported into Canada free of duty, or at a less rate of duty than is provided by this act, upon proclamation of the governor in council, which may be issued whenever it appears to his satisfaction that similar articles from Canada may be imported into the United States free of duty, or at a rate of duty not exceeding that payable on the same under such proclamation when imported into Canada;" and

Whereas the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled did, by act approved March 3, 1883, duly provide that plants, trees, shrubs, and vines of all kinds, and seeds of all kinds, fresh fish, fruits, green, ripe, or dried, eggs, and a large number of articles specifically named should be admitted into the United States free of duty; in consequence whereof it appears that large quantities of plants, trees, shrubs, vines, and seeds, eggs, aggregating in value in the year 1885 $1,831,000; in the year 1886, $1,728,000; in the year 1887, $1,827,000, and great quantities of fish and other products of the Dominion of Canada have been imported into the United States duty free, while that government has neglected, failed, and refused to keep or observe Her Majesty's standing offer of reciprocity in respect of the articles specified, or of many of them, and have, as is alleged, exacted large sums by way of duty upon many of the articles specified, which have been imported into Canada from the United States; and have, as is alleged, levied and assessed ad valorem duties upon American goods at the actual retail price or value at which such goods are sold for home consumption even when shipped, imported, and sold in large quantities at wholesale prices, notwithstanding and in disregard and violation of the spirit and letter of the Canadian statutes; and

Whereas it is claimed on the part of Canadian officials that the citizens of the United States can avail themselves of the privileges of reciprocity under the act first above quoted only after all the articles therein specified shall be admitted free of duty by United States laws: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to report as speedily as practicable to this House the kinds and quantities of goods and products imported into the United States from Canada free of duty during the past five years, and also the quantities of similar goods and products exported from the United States into Canada during the same period, together with a statement in detail, showing the amount of duties, specific and ad valorem, paid thereon, to the end and purpose of ultimate recovery thereof, and of an ad-

justment of the differences resulting from such breach of faith on the part of the Canadian Government.

Resolved, further, That the Committee on Ways and Means report to the House within ten days a bill providing:

First. For an ad valorem duty of 25 per cent. upon all plants, trees, shrubs, and vines of all kinds imported into the United States from the Dominion of Canada.

Second. For a specific duty of 5 cents per dozen upon eggs so imported.

Third. For a specific duty of 1 cent a pound upon all fish so imported.

Fourth. That in all cases a duty shall be imposed upon all goods and products now on the free-list whenever similar goods and products are subject to duty under the laws of Canada, at a rate equal to that imposed thereunder.

Fifth. That ad valorem duties imposed by the laws of the United States on goods, wares, and merchandise imported from foreign countries shall be assessed upon the actual retail price or value at which such goods are sold for home consumption in the country of production or export, whenever in the country of such production or export ad valorem duties upon goods, wares, and merchandise imported into such country from the United States are assessed upon the retail price or value at which such goods are sold for home consumption in the United States.

This resolution was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and, under the rules of the House, should have been reported within seven days, but thus far no report has been made; but, in common with the many petitions and communications that have been sent to that committee in behalf of American industries, it has, I fear, slept the sleep that knows no waking. Despairing of any action of the committee, I addressed the Canadian authorities upon the subject, and deem it but fair to state that they have since, somewhat reluctantly, declared nursery stock free, and, by a later proclamation, have also put seeds on their free-list.

Nevertheless, I am assured that there has been inaugurated in the Canadian House of Commons a measure to restore the duty upon some or all of those articles of commerce, while the people of the Dominion continue to avail themselves, and, with confidence of uninterruption, of the privileges accorded by the measures adopted by our Congress for their benefit.

During the three years last past we have paid for eggs from Canada $5,386,000, while the products of the great American hen have gone entirely unprotected.

"Can these things be, and overcome us like a summer cloud, without our special wonder?"

Early in the present session I introduced a bill to correct the injustice under which two large industries in my city suffer under the present tariff, which bill was referred to the Ways and Means Committee. The merits of the case were made plain in a letter which I had printed and presented to the committee, which letter I will read, because it gives facts which should be understood by this House and by the country.

ROCHESTER, N. Y., *January* 26, 1888.

Hon. C. S. BAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: As constituents of yours doing business at Rochester, N. Y., we desire to submit for your consideration, and through you to call the attention of Congress to certain facts and statements in support of the bill (H. R. 5660) introduced by you into the House of Representatives on January 23, 1888, to regulate the admission into the United States of photographic print-paper, which bill was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Our business consists in the preparation of this class of paper by special treatment for the use of photographers. The plain paper of this grade is all made at two mills, one situated near Lyons, France, and the other one at Malmedy, Germany. The difficulties attendant upon its manufacture have been so great, and the consumption of the paper so comparatively small, that the two mills specified have for the past ten or fifteen years practically monopolized its manufacture and, no doubt, will continue to do so. Some efforts have been made to manufacture it in the United States, but because of the small quantity of it used and the difficulties connected with its manufacture these efforts have not been crowned with success.

From 1861 to 1883 the duty on this class of paper was 35 per cent. ad valorem, and under the tariff of 1883, now in force, it is 25 per cent., it being included under the provision for "paper not otherwise provided for," so that for over twenty-five years there has been a substantial protective duty on this class of paper, sufficient to develop its production in this country if there was any likelihood of its being made a profitable branch of industry. It is of a peculiar character, readily distinguishable from any other grade or class of paper by any expert in paper, quite as much so as "printing-paper, unsized, used for books and newspapers exclusively," or "paper sized or glued, suitable only for printing-paper," for each of which classes special provision is made in the tariff at rates of duty far below those fixed on the general class of paper not specially named in the tariff.

Photographic print paper commands a very high price, costing, delivered in New York without duty, from 50 to 55 cents per pound. When imported in sheets the name of the manufacturer is impressed in a water-mark on each sheet, and when imported in rolls the water-mark appears on every 3 feet of the roll. Aside, however, from its distinguishing characteristics, its price is so high as to make it unsuitable for any other use than its legitimate one of printing pictures from negatives taken by photographers. There would, therefore, be no danger to the revenue in giving this grade of paper a separate classification under the tariff, no more so than in the case of paper for books and newspapers and printing-paper, and the special provisions made in the tariff for these classes of paper have been attended with no difficulties in the way of their execution, the character of the paper being found to be a sufficient test to determine its classification. This statement will apply with equal force to photographic print paper.

II. Before the paper is available for the uses to which it is to be applied, it must undergo several processes. One is called albumenizing, which consists in coating the paper with the white of eggs. Another is in coating the paper with a mixture of gelatine and bromide of silver. This process is called sensitizing. The paper is imported in three conditions, namely, plain, abumenized, and sensitized. It is sold to photographers only in two conditions: first, sensitized, in which condition it is ready for use; and, second, albumenized. When sold in the latter condition the photographer himself performs the work of sensitizing. The business of albuminizing and sensitizing paper in the United States was commenced only a few years since, but has already become an important branch of industry, and with proper encouragement can be enlarged both for our own and foreign markets.

Messrs. D. Hovey's Sons, one of the firms whose names are attached hereto, are engaged in the business of albumenizing the paper, and in this work they have been accustomed to use from six hundred to a thousand dozen of eggs per day, the whites of the eggs only being used for this purpose, the yelks being barreled and shipped to Gloversville, N. Y., to be used in dressing leather for the manufacture of gloves. This gives a large market to the poultry products of that region, and is a material help to the farming interests. In their business they have been accustomed to employ as many as 100 hands, and about the same number are employed by the Eastman Company, the other firm signing this memorial. The latter firm, in their business of sensitizing paper, use about $5,000 worth of silver per month, or $60,000 per year.

The machinery they use is intricate and expensive, and it has been invented and patented by persons connected with the company. It is only by their superior processes, aided by their machinery, that they have at all been able to compete with the foreign product, the foreigners having the great advantage of cheap materials and cheap labor. In addition to supplying the home market, the Eastman Company are large exporters of coated paper, and if they could have their raw paper free and a reasonable duty on their finished product, they could command a very much larger trade abroad. They paid duty last year amounting to some $2,000 on paper which they had coated and which was exported to foreign countries, which duty was not returned to them by way of drawback.

III. The duty on both the plain paper and the coated article was originally held to be, under the tariff act of 1883, 25 per cent. ad valorem, the article, whether coated or plain, being regarded only as paper, dutiable under the provisions for "paper not otherwise provided for." This arrangement still gave the foreigner an advantage, because it enabled him to import his finished product at the same rate of duty as was imposed on the plain paper, and it was then only by our improved processes and machinery, developed at a great expenditure of time and money, that we were enabled to compete with the foreign article and thereby control a part of the home trade.

But last year the Treasury Department put in force a ruling founded on the verdict of a jury in a case brought before a United States court, that the albumenized and sensitized paper was no longer paper, but was an article which, by the distinct and additional processes it had undergone, was to be regarded as "a manufacture of paper," dutiable under the act of 1883 at only 15 per cent. ad valorem, and that ruling is still in force. This presents the anomalous condition of the finished product paying a less rate of duty than the raw material or plain paper from which it is made, and reverses all ordinary and well-established principles of tariff legislation.

It was a serious blow to an industry which, under the former condition of affairs, was already struggling for existence, and we believe that no argument is necessary to convince you or any other member of Congress that the present condition of the tariff in this respect should not be permitted to continue, but that a duty sufficient to encourage the domestic manufacturer should be placed on the coated paper, leaving the plain paper to be placed on the free-list or to bear a very low rate of duty. We do not seek to have the duty on the finished article placed so high as to increase the cost to the ultimate consumer; but we do ask that we may be placed in a position where we can furnish the article to the consumer somewhere near as cheaply as the foreigner does.

As the tariff now stands, the foreign albumenized paper can be delivered here at a cost of $5 less than the article coated in the United States. If the plain paper is put at the same rate of duty as the albumenized, the foreign article could be delivered here for $4 a ream less than the paper coated here. If the plain paper is made free of duty and the coated article is put at 15 per cent. ad valorem the cost of the foreign article would be $2.50 per ream less than that made here. If the plain paper is put at 15 per cent. ad valorem and the coated article at 25 per cent. ad valorem the foreign article can be delivered here for $2 per ream less than the home product. If the plain paper is made free of duty and the coated paper 25 per cent. ad valorem the foreign article can still be delivered here for 60 cents less than the article coated in the United States. Grouping these statements and numbering them for ready reference we have:

No. 1. (Same as now) $5 against American industry.
No. 2. (Both at 15 per cent.) $4 against.
No. 3. (Plain free, coated 15 per cent.) $2.50 against.
No. 4. (Plain 15 per cent., coated 25 per cent.) $2 against.
No. 5. (Plain free, coated 25 per cent.) 60 cents against.

The propositions that we favor the most, and which should be adopted as a matter of fairness and justice to domestic interests, are those marked three and five, in both of which the plain paper is made free and the coated paper is put at 15 or 25 per cent. ad valorem. A duty of 15 per cent. on the coated paper, with plain paper free of duty, would be a substantial benefit to us; but the only change which would really meet the situation and establish both branches of our business on a positive basis would be the admission of the plain paper free of duty, and a duty of 25 per cent. ad valorem on the coated article.

We respectfully ask that you urge upon the Committee on Ways and Means, and upon the other members of Congress, that a provision of the character last named be embodied in any tariff bill which may be adopted by Congress.

Respectfully, yours,

D. HOVEY SONS, AND
THE EASTMAN DRY-PLATE AND FILM CO.,
Of Rochester, New York.

This communication, as well as the bill introduced by me to correct that manifest injustice, like the resolution before mentioned, are both enjoying that endless sleep in the committee-room so fatal to many other remonstrances of like character. The Mills bill takes no notice of the proposed measure, nor does it propose to interfere with the foreign productions of which my friends are competitors, though one of the firms signing the petition uses one thousand dozen of eggs a week in the process of albumenizing photographic paper, and the other uses $5,000 worth of silver a month in sensitizing paper for use in photography.

Is it good policy to allow such industries to languish and die, employing as they do about two hundred hands, on which some seven hundred or more people are dependent for their daily bread? I say, and with a reverential spirit, that the prayer taught us by our Divine Master is, "Give us this day our daily bread," but that is subject to the caution that the Lord helps those who help themselves, and to the further command that charity, which is the greatest of all virtues, begins at home.

I do not intend to fail in impressing upon this House, even at the hazard of repetition, the importance of the relations which exist between Western New York and Canada. And on that point it will be well to observe the recent master stroke of diplomacy by which our Postmaster-General, coming as he does from that State where rural and backwoods simplicity not wholly Jeffersonian is supposed to prevail,

has secured an amendment to the recent postal treaty between our Government and the Dominion of Canada, by which the rates of postage on merchandise both ways are largely increased, and for which the people of both countries will undoubtedly bless their respective but not respected Postmasters-General. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Executive Document 293, of May 3, is respectfully recommended to the House and the country for consideration in this connection. Nor must I fail to mention the policy our Canadian friends have seen fit to pursue in the matter of their valuation of our imports. I have caused to be examined the various tariffs of the nations of the world, and, so far as they make distinct mention of the subject, they are in accord with our own, which fixes the ad valorem duties upon the wholesale price of the commodity in the markets of the country of production. This rule is in accordance with the laws of trade, as all commercial transactions of any moment are based on that rule. But Canada has seen fit to make a very harassing exception to this rule, and imposes her duties upon the retail value at which the goods are sold for consumption in the countries of production, and as the United States in the great bulk of her common necessities is the only country she has to deal with, it means an assessment of duty upon the retail value, the value at which goods enter into daily consumption in the homes, and not in the markets, of the United States.

The New York Tribune of Monday, May 14, instant, contained an able letter by Mr. Joseph Nimmo, jr., upon the subject of our commercial relations with Canada, which should be read by every one. In his comments upon that letter the editor, in the same issue, said:

OUR NORTHERN NEIGHBOR.

Mr. Nimmo's letter published on another page contains information that is greatly needed by Congress and the country. It treats of the relations of the Dominion of Canada to Great Britain and the United States, and of various violations of treaty law and covenanted reciprocity. Senator FRYE late in January sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations resolutions of inquiry respecting these abuses, and this letter virtually supplies the information which was then called for. It also refers in detail to the grievances which Representatives DINGLEY, NUTTING, and BAKER have brought to light in the House. Mr. Nimmo is not only master of the subject, but also of his temper. The relations of the Dominion to the United States are discussed with as much dignity as intelligence, and his statements of fact are not vitiated by a single unfriendly expression or the faintest reference to the subject of annexation.

Some of the specific counts in the indictment against Canada may be briefly mentioned. By an order of council a rebate of 18 cents per ton has been allowed on the tolls on grain passing through the Welland and St. Lawrence canals, if shipment be made to Montreal. This is a premium offered for the diversion of American commerce from American seaports and transportation lines. This is an open infraction of article 27 of the treaty of Washington, and should be met by the immediate imposition of a tonnage tax on all Canadian vessels passing through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal. In like manner the international arrangements relating to the transit trade, which is of immense value to Canadian corporations, are violated in Manitoba, where the Dominion Government refuses to allow grain to be shipped in bond over American railroads to Montreal. For five years Canada has failed to place on the free-list various articles from which duty was entirely taken off in the United States when the tariff was revised; and this neglect is in direct violation of an act passed by the Dominion Parliament in 1879 providing for reciprocity in this respect whenever the same articles should be admitted from Canada without payment of duty. Other instances of bad faith are given in connection with a brief summary of the denial of commercial privileges to American fishermen in Canadian harbors.

The conclusion of the whole matter is this: Canada has been allowed to impose upon the forbearance and good nature of the United States. The restraints of international law and the engagements of reciprocal compacts do not interfere with sharp practice by which temporary advantages may be secured for the commerce of the Dominion. The ambitious designs of Canada have been pursued in a particularly aggressive spirit since the present Administration has been in power in Washington. Its Government and railway corporations have acted on the principle that any favor that might be wanted would readily be granted by the State and Treasury Departments, and that no indignities or outrages offered to fishermen would be resented, and that no commercial privileges withheld in violation of positive engagements would be demanded under menace of retaliation. The time is rapidly approaching when retaliation must be the answer to every act of injustice and every infringement upon the principles of international comity. Canada, by persisting in taking advantage of American tolerance and magnanimity, must in the end exhaust the patience of the powerful nation which freely and generously shares with it all the advantages of its geographical position.

I take pleasure, Mr. Chairman, in commending to this House and to the country these matters, believing that if the people's Representatives much longer neglect their duty in respect of these things, the people will in thunder tones be heard in condemnation of all those who by vote and voice shall strike down our American industries for the benefit of those of Canada or of any other Government.

Let me ask, Mr. Chairman, are we as a nation ready to admit the people and the industries of Canada or of any other country to all the rights, benefits, and privileges of our country; to the enjoyment without let or hinderance of our markets upon the thin pretext that we must needs have a free foreign market for our surplus products, and without imposing any of the duties and obligations under which every American citizen rests?

It has been stated that England's labor produces in twelve days all that is required for a year's consumption. If that be true, what wonder, then, that England, backed by her Cobden Club and her American allies, should engage in the great effort now being made to command the markets of the New World for the surplus of her cheap and underpaid labor? The debate upon this all-absorbing topic, able, exhaustive, destined, in my judgment, to rank as the greatest of modern times, has impressed me as calling for but one of two results. While the pending bill professes to be only a modification of the existing tariff the logic of all the arguments in favor of it is irresistably towards free trade by the shortest route possible under existing circumstances.

While the voice of the great masses who unfortunately are represented by the minority upon this floor is overwhelmingly opposed to the bill "as tending to break down the barriers which defend American labor from competition with the pauper labor of Europe and Asia, and to reduce the families of the American workingmen to the foreign level of cheapness and poverty," I may be permitted at this point to introduce tables (for which I am indebted to our worthy Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, Col. W. F. Switzler) illustrating the comparative weight of influence of those now asserting the right to control the future of our American industries as against the great North, the West, and the East, where the bulk of our industries are located. If the gentlemen now engaged in this "great rebellion" against the prosperity of our industrial interests would display equal zeal in inviting the industry and enterprise that have combined to make us great as a nation to locate in and spread over the "Sunny South," we should see in less than a decade a new order of things there, and the Cobden Club would look in vain for recruits upon the floors of Congress.

Observe these tables. They are freighted with interesting and suggestive figures.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., May 15, 1888.

SIR: In compliance with your request, I have the honor to transmit to you herewith the following tables, compiled from the census of 1880, to wit:

Table A, showing the value of farm products in each State and Territory of the United States.

Table B, showing the capital invested, number of employés, amount of wages paid, and value of the products of manufactures in each State and Territory of the United States.

Respectfully, yours,

WM. F. SWITZLER,
Chief of Bureau.

Hon. CHARLES S. BAKER, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

A.—*Table showing the value of farm productions in each State and Territory of the United States according to the census of 1880.*

States and Territories.	Estimated value of all farm productions.
Alabama	$56,872,994
Arkansas	43,796,261
Delaware	6,320,345
Florida	7,439,392
Georgia	67,028,929
Kentucky	63,850,155
Louisiana	42,883,522
Maryland	28,839,281
Mississippi	63,701,844
Missouri	95,912,660
North Carolina	51,72[illegible],611
South Carolina	41,108,112
Tennessee	62,076,311
Texas	65,204,329
Virginia	45,726,221
West Virginia	19,360,049
Total Southern	761,850,016
Connecticut	18,010,075
Maine	21,945,489
Massachusetts	24,160,881
New Hampshire	13,474,330
Rhode Island	3,670,135
Vermont	22,082,656
Total New England	103,343,566
Arizona	614,327
California	59,721,425
Colorado	5,035,228
Dakota	5,648,814
District of Columbia	514,441
Idaho	1,515,314
Illinois	203,980,137
Indiana	114,707,082
Iowa	136,103,473
Kansas	52,240,361
Michigan	91,159,858
Minnesota	49,468,951
Montana	2,024,923
Nebraska	31,708,914
Nevada	2,855,449
New Jersey	29,650,756
New Mexico	1,807,974
New York	178,025,695
Ohio	156,777,152
Oregon	13,234,548
Pennsylvania	129,760,476
Utah	3,337,410
Washington	4,212,750
Wisconsin	72,779,496
Wyoming	372,391
Total all other	1,347,347,345
Total United States	2,212,540,927

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, *May 15, 1888.*

B.—*Table showing the capital invested, the number of employés, the amount of wages paid, and the value of the products of manufactures in each State and Territory of the United States, according to the census of 1880.*

States and Territories.	Capital invested.	Number of employés.	Amount of wages paid.	Value of products.	Population.
Alabama	$9,668,008	10,019	$2,500,504	$13,565,504	1,262,505
Arkansas	2,953,130	4,557	925,358	6,756,159	802,525
Delaware	15,655,822	12,638	4,267,349	20,514,438	146,608
Florida	3,210,680	5,504	1,270,875	5,546,448	269,493
Georgia	20,672,410	24,875	5,266,152	36,440,938	1,542,180
Kentucky	45,813,039	37,391	11,657,844	75,483,377	1,648,690
Louisiana	11,462,468	12,167	4,360,371	24,205,183	939,946
Maryland	58,742,384	74,945	18,904,965	106,708,563	934,943
Mississippi	4,727,600	5,827	1,192,645	7,518,302	1,131,597
Missouri	72,507,844	63,995	24,309,716	165,366,205	2,168,380
North Carolina	13,045,639	18,109	2,740,768	20,695,937	1,399,750
South Carolina	11,205,804	22,128	2,836,289	16,738,008	995,577
Tennessee	20,092,845	22,445	5,254,775	37,074,886	1,542,359
Texas	9,245,561	12,159	3,343,087	20,719,928	1,591,749
Virginia	26,968,990	40,184	7,425,261	51,780,992	1,512,565
West Virginia	13,883,390	14,311	4,313,965	22,857,126	618,457
Total Southern States	339,855,704	381,254	100,569,924	631,473,104	18,507,324
Connecticut	120,480,275	112,915	43,501,518	185,697,211	622,700
Maine	49,988,171	52,954	13,623,318	79,829,793	648,936
Massachusetts	393,806,185	352,235	128,315,362	631,135,284	1,783,085
New Hampshire	51,112,263	48,831	14,814,793	73,978,028	346,991
Rhode Island	75,575,943	62,878	21,355,619	104,163,621	276,531
Vermont	23,265,224	17,540	5,164,479	31,354,366	332,286
Total New England States	624,228,061	647,373	226,775,089	1,106,158,303	4,010,529
Arizona	272,600	220	111,180	618,365	40,440
California	61,243,784	43,693	21,065,905	116,218,973	864,694
Colorado	4,511,714	5,074	2,314,427	14,260,159	194,327
Dakota	771,428	868	339,375	2,373,970	135,177
District of Columbia	5,552,526	7,146	3,924,612	11,882,316	177,624
Idaho	677,215	388	136,326	1,271,317	32,610
Illinois	140,652,066	144,727	57,429,085	414,864,673	3,077,871
Indiana	65,442,962	69,508	21,960,888	148,006,411	1,978,301
Iowa	33,987,886	28,372	9,725,962	71,045,926	1,624,615
Kansas	11,192,315	12,062	3,995,010	30,843,777	996,096
Michigan	92,930,959	77,591	25,313,682	150,715,025	1,636,937
Minnesota	21,604,811	21,247	8,613,094	76,065,198	780,773
Montana	899,390	578	318,759	1,835,867	39,159
Nebraska	4,881,150	4,793	1,742,311	12,627,336	452,402
Nevada	1,323,300	577	461,807	2,179,626	62,266
New Jersey	106,226,593	126,038	46,083,045	254,380,236	1,131,116
New Mexico	463,275	557	218,731	1,284,846	119,565
New York	514,246,575	531,533	198,634,029	1,080,696,596	5,082,871
Ohio	188,939,614	183,609	62,103,800	348,298,390	3,198,062
Oregon	6,312,056	3,473	1,667,046	10,931,232	174,768
Pennsylvania	474,510,993	387,072	134,055,904	744,818,445	4,282,891
Utah	2,656,657	2,435	858,863	4,324,992	143,963
Washington	3,202,497	1,147	532,226	3,250,134	75,116
Wisconsin	73,821,802	57,109	18,814,917	128,255,489	1,315,497
Wyoming	364,673	391	187,798	898,494	20,789
Total all other States	2,526,188,811	1,710,269	620,608,782	3,631,947,784	27,637,930
Total United States	2,790,272,606	2,738,895	947,953,795	5,369,579,191	50,155,783

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, *May* 15, 1883.

Therefore, whenever the tariff is properly revised, whether in its rates of duty or in its administrative provisions, it should be revised by its friends, it should be done carefully and discreetly and with a reference to the wants of our people rather than to those of foreign nations, who, however they may supply us with their surplus of population, have no identity of interest with us and have no right to absorb our surplus of wealth by methods of legalized injustice.

That the bill now before us is not an honest bill will, I think, be apparent to any unprejudiced mind that gives it proper consideration. It covers only a portion of the tariff and laps over on to the tariff of 1883, and so will produce perplexing questions for the Department and the courts as to what commodities are dutiable under the old tariff and what under the new.

It would undoubtedly place ores not specified, in the free-list, because the provision for "mineral substances in a crude state and metals unwrought" at lines 130 and 131 of the free-list are amply sufficient to cover all ores not specified, even though such ores may be mentioned in the prior tariff, as it is a familiar principle of law that where a statute covers the same ground as that previously in existence and which is repugnant thereto the former statute is repealed. If this action was intended, why not come out and declare iron and other ores on the free-list; if it was not so intended, why not make it so plain that even a Democrat appointed to sit at the receipt of custom by this severely honest Administration may not administer it without dispute?

Many features of the bill seem to indicate a series of "strikes and trades." First, strike either by omission or commission some prominent branch of industry. Then wait and see what support can be gathered to the other part of the bill by correcting what was inserted or by supplying what was omitted.

The sugar of Louisiana was prominently attacked in the bill first produced, as well as the sugar-refining industry, by a "strike" against the drawback on refined sugar, and then when the proper "trade" has been had the "strike" was struck out, and the sugar schedule was amended to meet the wants of those whose votes were desired.

The sunny section of the South was thus largely favored, as were also the interests of that section, by placing cotton-ties for the baling of cotton on the free-list, and enhancing the duty on rice, which is produced exclusively below the now happily obliterated line which formerly marked the "sections" of this country.

Fair play is a jewel, but no such glittering gem appears to have adorned the breast of our Democratic neighbors when defining their position on this great question. [Applause.]

[During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the hammer fell.]

Mr. SPINOLA. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York may be extended for fifteen minutes.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Considering only the facts and the necessities surrounding us, I shall most regretfully be compelled to object.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I am very much obliged to the gentleman for making the request, but I had about concluded what I desired to say.

Mr. BOUND. Mr. Chairman, during the past two weeks of tariff discussion in the House I have been confined to my home by a very severe inflammation of one of my eyes, in consequence of which I have not only been prevented from attending the regular sessions of Congress, but also deprived of the pleasure of perusing the debates on the tariff, as reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of about $5,000 to $8,000 a day to our heavily burdened tax-payers! Whether I am to be congratulated or commiserated with on this account I leave entirely to the judgment of my more fortunate brethren who were able to be present. Permit me to say, however, in this connection, that I do not believe that anything that has been said, or that may hereafter be uttered upon this floor, will have the slightest effect in changing or altering the vote of a single member in regard to the Mills tariff bill! King Caucus has laid down the programme to be followed by the majority, and if the party lash can effect it—if the power and patronage of the Executive can accomplish it—no change nor alteration in any important provision of this bill will be allowed by the majority.

Thus believing, it would seem to be the part of wisdom to remain silent and content myself with voting against this iniquitous tariff bill as a whole, and every part thereof. But, sir, coming as I do from one of the largest mining and manufacturing districts in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and feeling a deep interest in the prosperity, happiness, and permanent welfare of a generous constituency, I would consider myself false and recreant to every obligation devolving upon me as their representative if I failed to denounce this pro-British, free-trade tariff bill as it deserves. This bill is a long stride in the direction of free trade, and is the inauguration of a tariff policy that must eventually prove ruinous and disastrous to many important industries in which my people are largely interested!

Sir, the President of the United States has boldly demanded tariff reduction in his annual message, and, no matter how seriously the business interests of the country may be affected thereby, commands his Democratic followers to see that his wishes are complied with. He informs them that there is a large and a largely increasing surplus of money in the Treasury, and that it must be reduced. Sir, it may be a great misfortune to be blessed with too much money! But, sir, is this our only danger as a people? Would it not be a far greater evil to close up our rolling-mills, furnaces, forges, factories, and workshops? Would it not be far more terrible to stop the busy hum of industry in our mines, our factories and workshops, and turn thousands and tens of thousands of honest workmen out of remunerative employment? That, in my opinion, would be a very poor way to reduce the surplus—stop the factories and open the poor-houses!

Sir, I am glad of one thing, and thank the President for tearing the mask from the faces of his Democratic free-trade followers. One thing is absolutely certain; we will have no such cries nor banners in Pennsylvania emblazoned with a living lie at next election as "Polk, Dallas, Shunk, and the tariff of '42; we dare the Whigs to repeal it!" We will have no "favorite son of Pennsylvania" deceiving our honest laboring men, mechanics, and artisans with the shameless cry that "James K. Polk is a better tariff man than Henry Clay!" And our people will see to it that no other recreant son of Pennsylvania, nor of any other State in the Union, will give a casting vote in the United States Senate by which free trade is established as the law of the land and ruin and desolation brought to our firesides and hearth-stones in the great Keystone State.

Our esteemed colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] will hardly have the effrontery to parade this free-trade banner in the great manufacturing States of New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut before the workingmen as the gonfalon of protection to American industry. He can not again with any consistency, nor without belying his past record, even try to save those States to the Democratic party next fall, as he did four years ago! If the Democratic party intends to com-

mit political hari-kari by passing the Mills tariff bill, I feel very sure that brother RANDALL will hardly be one of the chief mourners at the sad obsequies!

Mr. Chairman, I am a protectionist from principle. I was born and raised in a State that is wedded to the protective policy. We have witnessed, enjoyed, and greatly profited by reason of protection to American industry. We have grown great and powerful and wealthy through the fostering care of the National Government. Our infant industries have grown to a stalwart manhood, and to-day—I say it with pride—there is no State in the Union that is so thoroughly independent and self-reliant, and none that can so well withstand the assaults upon American industry, American laboring men, and American mechanics and artisans as the grand old Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. And as we owe so much to wise legislation on the part of the National Government, we of the Keystone State wish to see our sister Commonwealths, through the same beneficent policy of protection, in like manner grow great and powerful and wealthy by continuing in the same line of policy.

Mr. Chairman, only a few short years ago we in Pennsylvania looked with some apprehension upon the giant strides made by Alabama in developing her great iron industries. With her vast mineral deposits developed, with her coal and iron ore and limestone lying together in such close proximity, with her cheap labor and her cheap food, her hospitable climate, enabling her mechanics and artisans and laboring men to toil in the open air all the year round, requiring but little shelter and less clothing than we of the inhospitable North, it became a serious problem just how soon Selma, and Bessemer, and Birmingham would become the Pittsburghs and Johnstowns of Pennsylvania. And, sir, but for the discovery of natural gas and its adaptability to manufacturing purposes the problem would not long have remained unsolved. Natural gas has revolutionized the iron industry in Pennsylvania to such an extent that the manufacture of flat, and bar, and round iron east of the Alleghanies has ceased to be profitable unless the works are favorably located.

Mr. Chairman, I live in one of the great mining and manufacturing districts of Pennsylvania. Hundreds of millions of dollars are invested in mining and manufacturing. In the counties of Northumberland and Dauphin we have vast deposits of anthracite coal, in the county of Lebanon, the other county composing my Congressional district, we have mountains of iron ore, the Cornwall iron mines, near the city of Lebanon, alone having turned out over 8,000,000 tons of iron ore since they were opened, and the supply is simply inexhaustible.

I was born and raised in the county of Northumberland and can speak from actual knowledge and experience of the coal and iron industries in that county, and that kind of knowledge is of far more practical importance than all the diaphanous theories of free-trade dreamers. Over fifty years of knowledge and experience in the coal and iron trade of my district entitle me to speak with some degree of assurance. And this brings me to the consideration of the Mills tariff bill, the President's message, and the question of wages, and the rights of labor likely to be affected thereby.

Mr. Chairman, almost my sole interest in this tariff question consists in its effects and relations to labor and the rights of the laboring man as affected thereby. I have been a laboring man all my life, and this makes me stand close beside the toiling millions in all their efforts to elevate the dignity of labor, and share in its just rewards. And here let me add that in every struggle betwixt capital and labor all my sympathies and all my yearnings are with the laboring classes. I care but little for the capitalist in this struggle, for capital is always able to take care of itself. But just in so far as the interests of capital and labor are closely identified I am the friend of both. There ought not to be any real antagonism between capital and labor, and there is none except when purse-proud avarice would rob labor of her rights and refuses to share with labor her rightful earnings. You may do as you please and vote as you please and legislate as you choose, but if your legislation is not in the interests of labor and for higher wages and better pay for the laboring man my voice and vote will be unalterably against you.

The President of the United States, in his annual message to Congress, talks very glibly about the reduced price of goods compensating for any reduction in wages which might be brought about by his tariff policy. And this is to a great extent the stock in trade of the free-trade theorists. With a million men to-day standing idle in the labor market begging for employment, with their wives and children begging for bread, the Chief Magistrate of this great Republic, with an annual salary of $50,000 at his back, coldly reasons about cheaper food and cheaper clothing making up for cheap wages, or even no wages at all. Why, sir, if a man is penniless and brown-stone fronts were selling for a farthing apiece, a poor starving devil could not raise money enough to buy a door-knob!

Others of these tariff reformers, who wish to equalize the wages of labor throughout the world by free trade, are eloquent in their praises of the farmer and planter; that they alone are the real producers of all wealth. They are full of Horace Greeley's gush about "going West, young man." This is all very nice; but if the young man has not money enough to buy a loaf of bread, what is the use of taunting him and his family of children, if he has any, with the delusive advice to go West? Why, sir, so many of them have gone there in this plight, that after working hard for years they find their farms embellished with a first-class mortgage and all their hard earnings in the hands of money-sharks.

Oh, yes, cheap goods and cheap products of the workshop and the farm are the things to make men happy and contented with their lot in life. I deny it utterly. Adults, with no one dependent upon them, may be satisfied with a bare living. But, sir, the wage-worker, the toiler in summer's lassitude and winter's frosts and snows, wants more than a living. He wants something for old age—something for his children. Besides being fed and clothed they want books to read, and pens and ink and paper and pencil; they want an education with which to fight life's battle. No matter how poor a man or a woman is, he does not live for himself alone. This is a land of great opportunities. The beggar on the dung-hill to-day may be the man of destiny to-morrow. God-given genius is our only patent of nobility in this land of equal sovereigns. A man may be great in spite of all obstacles, a child may rise to power and place from the almshouse, and in progress of time "fill the sounding trump of fame" with the record of his grand achievements; but, sir, without money, without friends, without education, he is far more likely to fill a felon's cell or a pauper's grave, than to rise to power and station and fame.

Sir, go talk to the toilers in the iron hills and coal mountains of Pennsylvania and Virginia, or the bituminous-coal deposits of the great West about the advantages of cheap food, and cheap clothing, and cheap commodities of every description, and they will tell you very quickly that what they want is steady employment and good wages and they will take care of the food and clothing part of this whole business.

For myself, I say to you very frankly that I am opposed to cheap goods and cheap agricultural products. Cheap goods and cheap products mean cheap labor—starvation wages for toiling slaves, without hope and without ambition for the future. Huts, and hovels, and nakedness, and pauperism, and crime follow sadly after the procession of cheap labor.

Need I point to downtrodden Ireland in proof of this—stripped bare and naked by the accursed greed and avarice of free-trade England? Need I further point to the grain fields of Egypt, and the cotton and rice fields of India, where the miserable coolies at the point of English bayonets and the mouths of English cannon are compelled to labor for unpaid toil? And this is the kind of labor and the kind of toil that you farmers of the great West are compelled to compete with in the markets of the world! Laborers who toil from sun, to sun, with breechclouts for raiment, with mud hovels and bamboo huts for dwelling-places, and a handful of rice for their daily food; such is the banquet that free-trade England invites you to sit down to, farmers of America!

No, sir; give the laboring man, the mechanic, and the artisan steady employment at decent wages, and he will find a pleasant home for his wife and children, decent clothing for their bodies, wholesome food for their stomachs, and all the necessaries and many of the luxuries of life. With good wages, you may hold your souls in patience, for the laboring man will neither starve himself nor allow his family to want as long as he is blessed with health and strength to work.

Yes, you may prate about cheap imported goods manufactured in the noisome factories of Leeds, and Sheffield and Birmingham. You may talk about the cheap products of foreign paupers and of convict laborers, and how they will compensate for the reduced wages of honest American mechanics brought into competition in their production and thrown upon the American markets by a low tariff or no tariff at all; but you can not fool intelligent American workingmen by any such stuff. They understand just as well as you do that $500,000,000 or $1,000,000,000 worth of such goods thrown upon the American market takes the place of just that many million dollars' worth of American fabrics and robs the American mechanic and artisan of the profit of just that amount of labor. And the million of American laborers standing idle to-day, waiting for employment, know that their chances are lessened just the amount of labor necessary to make those goods in foreign countries.

More than this, they know full well that the beggarly daily pittance paid the hands to fabricate those goods—less than half of what American mechanics would work for in this country—is paid for a day's work of twelve, fourteen, and sixteen hours! Some gentleman on the other side of this Chamber likened the protective policy to a Chinese wall. A Chinese wall, indeed! Why, sir, rather than see the wheat of India brought into the port of New York to compete with the products of the American farmers, rather than see this country flooded with foreign goods, wares, and merchandise and the wages of American mechanics and workingmen brought down to the level of Continental Europe, Asia, Africa, and China and Japan, instead of a Chinese wall I would rather see the great Atlantic Ocean turned into a sea of fire. What do we care for the trade of Europe? What do our farmers care for it? There is not a tenth of our agricultural products shipped abroad.

Oh, yes, our friends on the other side have become great admirers of our merchant marine. They want to see the flag of the Republic float upon every sea and ocean. They are always ballooning, struggling after the unattainable. Oh, yes, build up a grand merchant marine that will command the markets of the world! Why, sir, if it was left to those gentleman from the South on the Ways and Means Committee

to build a merchant fleet, if it was left to the States which they represent, with their great lines of seacoast in Arkansas, Kentucky, and Tennessee, and their wonderful harbors and ports of entry, judging of the future by the past, it would take them about a thousand years to fit up an ordinary canal-boat! What is the use of all this fooling; whenever we want a foreign merchant marine we will build it.

Whenever it is made apparent that foreign trade and commerce are more profitable than our coastwise trade, whenever it is made manifest that our capital can be better and more profitably employed in constructing a merchant marine to engage in foreign trade, just that soon, and no sooner, will ships be built for the purpose, just that soon will every sea and lake and ocean in foreign lands be whitened with the sails of American commerce! Whenever the foreign carrying trade becomes sufficiently profitable to challenge American enterprise the ship-yards of all New England will resound with the busy hum of industry.

Do not misunderstand me. I am by no means opposed to the putting forth of every effort to acquire foreign trade, and especially in Central and South America. Indeed, it is a reproach to this great Republic that we do not to-day control that valuable trade. We are their best customers, and every year the balance of trade is steadily against us; whilst England, 3,000 miles farther removed from us, by reason of a liberal and enlightened trade policy, not only controls that trade, but always has a balance of trade in her favor. Sir, had that matchless statesman and thorough American, James G. Blaine, been elected to the Presidency instead of Grover Cleveland, four years ago, that valuable trade would now have been assured to us by wise treaty and close commercial intercourse so irrevocably that all of our surplus manufactures would have found a ready and profitable market, to the great advantage of American mechanics, artisans, and capitalists.

But I am diverging. I want to tell you why I am in favor of a protective tariff. In my native county, thirty years ago, the Shamokin coal region was almost a barren waste, a region of stunted timber growing on the sides of rugged hills and mountains, so destitute of soil that the wonder was how the trees and shrubs managed to exist amidst the rocks and stones. The land was so poor and barren that it would have bankrupted any ordinary man to pay the taxes! Indeed, year after year the lands were disposed of at treasurer's sales for default in payment of taxes, and to-day many of the most valuable coal tracts are held by tax-titles. Had you traveled through that region forty years ago you would hardly have taken the lands as a gift. To-day they are worth the wealth of empires!

We have coal enough to warm all our friends, and iron enough to welcome all our enemies "with bloody hands to hospitable graves," as witness the heights of Gettysburgh and the bloody plains of Antietam. To-day large towns and cities cover those stony hillsides filled with a thrifty, industrious, enterprising population. Towns of ten and twelve thousand inhabitants. In fact the whole region is a succession of towns and villages from Shamokin on the north to Port Clinton and Pottsville on the south and east. The region is literally gridironed with railroads, bearing to Eastern markets the black diamonds from the Shamokin and Schuylkill coal basins. Sir, without a protective tariff that whole region, whose wealth is reckoned in hundreds of millions, would still be a comparative wilderness.

What has accomplished this wonderful transformation? Labor, and capital, and enterprise. Sir, the glare from workshops, furnaces, and rolling-mills makes the darkest night almost as light as the noon-day sun. And the wierd forms of the stalwart men with lanterns on their hats who go down into the coal mines seeking dusky diamonds—and the gleam from the rolling-mills, furnaces, and factories illuminate the workman's manly forms stripped to the waist as they toil at the puddling furnaces looking more like gnomes and genii than things of flesh and blood. Every town and city in that vast region, every railroad train, every breaker and colliery filled with busy workmen, every house and business place, every school, and college, and hospital, and cathedral speaks in eloquent praise of the doctrine of protection to American industry.

Sir, visionary theorists may crack their throats in proclaiming the beauties of free trade, every scribbler and babbler may rant about robber tariffs, but it takes capital, and labor, and enterprise to transmute the yellow ore into iron bars. Our mechanics and miners and artisans understand these things well, and our farmers understand them well in the greatly enhanced value of their farm products.

My home is in the northern part of Northumberland County, in the beautiful valley of the Susquehanna, as rich and fertile in agricultural resources as the Shamokin region is in mineral wealth. There and in the Lackawanna region our farmers find a home market for all their surplus wheat and small grains, their fruits and butter and eggs and poultry. We ship little or nothing to the great Eastern cities, because at less cost of transportation we find a better market in the coal regions.

Why, sir, before these regions were opened up and railroads constructed I remember well that butter used to sell the year round for from 8 to 10 cents a pound, and eggs for 3 to 8 cents a dozen, chickens and ducks for 25 cents a pair, hay for from $6 to $8 a ton, and oats and corn in like proportion; potatoes for 25 cents a bushel, and no sale for these products at any price. To-day and for years past eggs average 25 cents a dozen, butter 30 to 40 cents a pound the year round, and potatoes 50 cents a bushel, and our farmers have a ready market for all they can raise; and during all this time farm lands have more than doubled and trebled in value.

More than this, twenty-odd years ago we in the agricultural portions of our county were obliged to bear the burden of taxation. The truth was that the undeveloped coal region was too poor to pay any considerable portion of the county rates and levies. To-day and for years that region of country pays much the largest share of our county taxes. And just so it is throughout the length and breadth of our great Commonwealth; the coal regions and the iron regions, and the great manufacturing towns and cities, beside furnishing our farmers with a good home market for their products, bear far the largest share of all local taxation. Our railroads and canals and our great corporations pay the largest share of our public burdens, and in another year we mean to make them pay all the expenses of our State government. And but for a protective tariff these great carrying companies would never even have had an existence.

Mr. Chairman, in the neighborhood of all our great manufacturing centers, such as Lebanon, Harrisburg, and Steelton, in my district, farm lands have appreciated in value from 100 to 500 per cent. Why, sir, not many years ago the town site of the borough of Steelton was a quagmire and swamp; to-day you will find raw material and manufactured products lying stacked upon the ground worth in money millions of dollars, and you could not buy a town lot in the heart of the city for what you could have purchased the whole town site for thirty years ago. All this phenomenal growth is due to protection. And so it is throughout our entire State.

Facts like these speak far more eloquently than all the gauzy theories of free-trade dreamers. And so it is, and so it will be throughout all this broad land of ours, in the neighborhood of all great manufacturing centers. And so it will be in the great South with all her agricultural sylvan, and mineral wealth. As it is at Selma and Bessemer and Birmingham so will it be throughout all the Southern and Western States.

On Saturday last I heard the eccentric gentleman from Mississippi complaining that our robber protective tariff made the cotton planters of his State pay 47 per cent. to New England, and to old England also, in order to have her cotton crop manufactured.

Did it never occur to the gentleman that by establishing cotton factories in his State convenient to the great cotton fields that he could not only save this 47 per cent. to his own people, to say nothing of the cost of transporting the cotton crop from Mississippi to either New England or old England? And in such case they could skin the New England Yankees instead of being skinned by them! I know croaking and complaining will never do it; but capital and thrift, and energy and enterprise, will do it just as it is done in New England, or in Liverpool, or Birmingham. But you can never do it as long as you belittle and degrade labor. You can never do it as long as you lie on your backs and dream as to whether or not it is better to own labor or hire labor.

You will never get skilled mechanics and artisans, either from New England or old England, to work in the cotton fields or cotton factories of Mississippi for unpaid toil. You will not get free white labor from the North to work fourteen or sixteen hours a day for 50 cents a day. The truth of the matter is you are a quarter of a century behind the age; you have never gotten over the idea of the cheap labor of your pro-slavery days, and you will never see genuine prosperity dawn upon you in the South until you do. Indolence and cheap labor are the curse of the planting States of the South, and the delusion of cheap goods and free trade are the bane of your existence as a people. Elevate the dignity of labor, pay the toiler an honest price for his toil, and prosperity and happiness will be your reward.

The New South, thank God! is just awakening to a true realization of all her grand possibilities. There is no room for croakers and fault-finders there. You must get out of the way or be ground to powder under the wheels of progress! Quit brooding and worrying over the dead past, and try to realize the fact that this is an age of wonderful business activity. Try to catch on as the train of progress passes by, or you will surely be left behind. Stop bothering about how much of the robber-tariff money the poor laboring men have laid up in the Massachusetts savings-banks. Get your laboring men to follow their example; and if you will only pay them decent wages, they will have good bank accounts too.

The truth of the matter is there is little or none of your money in their savings! Why, the mass of your people do not buy enough nor consume enough to furnish New England nor Old England much profit either. You hardly import enough goods into the port of Charleston to pay the salaries of the customs officers! The Northern, Eastern, Middle, and Western States pay the great bulk of the robber-tariff duties, and they are not complaining about it either. Start up cotton and woolen and iron mills, pay your mechanics living wages, keep your money at home, and you will find large balances to labor's credit in Southern savings-banks!

Mr. Chairman, if the protective features of the existing tariff are not striken down, as proposed in the Mills bill, by this House and our

ports thrown open to unlimited importations of foreign merchandise, the New South to-day is just standing upon the threshold of her greatest prosperity. Before her are just now opening vistas of wealth and prosperity such as were never dreamed of in the dark days of slavery and sloth and indolence. Strike down the protective system and how soon all your bright hopes will be clouded and dissipated. Capital, which is now eagerly seeking investment in your midst—always cowardly—will leave you as if fleeing from a pestilence. Northern capital and Northern brains and genius and enterprise will forsake you as if pursued by the demon of destruction.

Sir, with protection guarantied, the States of Virginia, and Georgia, and Tennessee, and Alabama will increase in wealth and power and population at a ratio that will cause the bleak hills and rugged mountains of my native State to hide their diminished heads in shame. You have a soil and a climate such as we of the North may well envy. You have your virgin forests, your rich agricultural lands, and your vast deposits of mineral wealth, and all you want is energy and capital to develop them. With all these natural advantages in your favor you have retrograded in the past and allowed your less-favored sister States to far outstrip you in all that constitutes the true grandeur and greatness and wealth of trade and commerce.

You know that all this is true just as well as I do. The late terrible civil strife ought to have demonstrated to you the vital importance of diversified industries in the South, and the utter folly of depending upon New England or Old England for what you are so abundantly able to produce yourselves. To be truly great, every State, like every nation, ought to be truly independent. With factories, and furnaces, and rolling-mills, and machine-shops in the South twenty-odd years ago it would have been as utterly impossible for the North to have overcome you as it would be to-day for the world in arms to destroy this great Republic!

I implore you, therefore, to stand by the policy under which this great Republic has prospered beyond anything in the history of civilized governments.

Let us not be beguiled by the voice of the free-trade charmer, "charm she never so sweetly!" Let us remain true to the policy of the fathers of the Republic under and by reason of which we have grown so great, so wealthy, so powerful and strong! Blessed with every variety of soil and climate—nearly every State an empire within herself, capable of manufacturing within herself nearly everything, from a needle to an anchor, from a pleasure-yacht to the grandest iron-clads that ever defied the fury of old Neptune—why should we be in any way dependent upon any nation or all the nations of the world combined for anything?

Proud, lofty America! Standing alone in the matchless grandeur of her imperial power and greatness, with her matchless mechanics and artisans, her fair women and noble men, let the civilized world learn wisdom from our example in mechanism as well as in the science of true government! And let us be grand and free as a people from any dependence upon foreign workshops, foreign mechanics, and foreign artisans, as we are free and great in the principles of enlightened liberty! [Applause.]

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Chairman, the bill under consideration, named by compliment the "Mills bill," proposes a total reduction in our national revenue of $53,720,447, based on importations of 1887. The value of these importations was $79,879,108 on the free-list and $178,329,048 on the dutiable-list, or a total of $258,208,157. The bill also proposes an internal-revenue tax reduction of $24,455,607, which, added to the reduction of import duties, gives a total proposed reduction of $78,176,054.

A majority of the Ways and Means Committee of this House assume the sponsorship of the bill, namely, Mr. MILLS of Texas, Mr. MCMILLIN of Tennessee, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Arkansas, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE of Kentucky, Mr. TURNER of Georgia, Mr. WILSON of West Virginia, Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania, and Mr. BYNUM of Indiana—all Democrats. Six of them represent Southern and two of them Northern States. The minority members of the committee—Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWNE of Indiana, Mr. REED of Maine, Mr. MCKINLEY of Ohio, and Mr. BURROWS of Michigan—all Republicans and all representing Northern States—declare that when the measure was completed by the majority and presented to the full committee, the majority refused to enter into consideration of its provisions or to disclose any data upon which their action was based, and allowed no modification of the bill unless it was suggested by the majority. So the bill is distinctively a partisan measure—more exclusively partisan than any measure presented to any United States Congress.

The bill is also sectional in its character. It is framed in the interest of the South and Southwest as against the North and Northeast. In addition to its sectionalism, it raids the manufacturing sections of the country to divide booty with the purely agricultural. It is legalized communism in the form of national legislation.

And before I proceed further in my remarks, I desire to call the attention of the House to the professional make-up of our present Ways and Means Committee. In its membership are found eleven lawyers, one cotton planter, and one railroad manager. They are all gentlemen of more than ordinary legislative experience, of high political standing in their several States, and yet were the title of the committee changed from Ways and Means to Judiciary, it would seem natural and appropriate. I hope the eleven lawyers, the cotton-planter, and the railroad manager will not take it as a breach of good manners on my part nor an infraction of the courtesies of the House when I thus publicly call the attention of the farmers, the manufacturers, the product-distributers, the product-carriers, the mechanics, the laborers, and the bankers to the anomalous, or rather abnormal, make-up of a committee charged with the regulation of the nation's commercial, financial, industrial, and social economic interests. The great State of New York—the Empire State of the nation—with more than $650,000,000 of capital invested in manufacturing, with over $1,000,000,000 of product annually turned out of her mills and shops, and with 600,000 wage-earners within her borders, has no representative on this committee, Democrat or Republican; but the States of Texas, Arkansas, Kentucky, Tennessee and Georgia, which, as shown by the census of 1880, had only $98,776,985 of capital invested in manufacturing, and all together employing 81,426 hands, have each a representative on the committee. What a farce!

FREE-TRADE LEGISLATION.

Of course we all know the reason for this abnormal constitution of the Ways and Means Committee. Mind you, I am not condemning the practice of forming our committees with the benefiting of party politics in view; I am deprecating the fact that current political opinion can or should tolerate it. And I will not remain silent, as a New York Representative, when the interests of our great State are ignored in preparatory legislation, let the offending party be Democratic or Republican. Mind you I am making no direct criticism on the able Speaker of this House, who is popularly supposed to be "the author and finisher" of our committees. It has been my privilege to know, and in some cases intimately, every Speaker who has occupied that chair since the days of James L. Orr, and I am free to say here before Democratic and Republican Representatives, that no fairer or abler parliamentarian has presided over the deliberations of this body than Mr. JOHN G. CARLISLE. But this vital business question has passed beyond the impartial judgment of a Speaker; it has become a partisan question.

With a Democratic Executive in the Presidential chair and a Democratic majority in the House it is natural, when tariff legislation is uppermost in Congress, that our committees should be constituted in the interests of free trade. It is also natural that the South, where free-trade opinion rules almost supreme, should hold the majority of and control the action of our important committees, especially those of Ways and Means and the Merchant Marine, for the South demands free trade in British ships as well as British manufactures.

During all the years of chattel slavery within the old Union, when King Cotton sat upon the free-trade throne, the political battle against Northern civilization raged almost incessantly in these Halls; and when secession abortively attempted a confederacy of its own and ordained a written constitution, the eighth section of article 1 declared:

> The congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, etc., but no bounties shall be granted, etc., nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry.

Can it fairly be presumed that the lapse of twenty-five years, however advantaged for a change of policies or principles, would mark the dissolution or subversion of free-trade conceptions and prejudices imprinted on the Southern mind by iteration through a century? As the dominant power in the party, the Southern free-trader vaults into the saddle, and the Northern Democrat submissively goes afoot.

WHO PAYS THE TAX?

As general debate on this question is very near its close, and the House has been supplied with matter and argument approaching surfeit, I will content myself with some observations on a few features of the labor and wages questions as they are now or may be affected by tariff revision on the free-trade plan.

A Democratic speech on the tariff would be an inane partisan effort if it did not saddle the consumer with the tariff tax on the imported article he buys, or, by severer logic, prove that even the home-produced article is enhanced in price by the addition of the duty. The cue for Democratic effort in this line may be found in the following paragraph in President Cleveland's late message:

> Our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles. Many of these things, however, are raised or manufactured in our own country, and the duties now levied upon foreign goods and products are called protection to these home manufactures, because they render it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers to make these taxed articles and sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid customs duty.

Now, I grant this is a conceivable theory, and it has been adopted generally by the tariff orators on the other side of the House, who are always loyal followers of a leader, if not logical reasoners.

Sixty years ago, when our industries were weak and undiversified, there was considerable reason for the President's assumption; thirty years ago there was less reason, and now there is hardly any. The ordinary object of protection is not to give any such enhancement of the profit of any particular production over the average rate, but merely

to sustain it during the temporary stage of its domestication. Great Britain owes her industrial greatness to her adherence to this policy, for five centuries ago she was little more than an agricultural nation, dependent on continental manufactures for even the clothing worn by her subjects, although they raised the "raw material" at home. And she accomplished her industrial supremacy, not by higgling over 40 per cent., 80 per cent., or 100 per cent. imposts, but by doubling or trebling duties; and when that would not yield the desired protection she enacted prohibitory and penal laws for the protection of her growing industries.

As bearing directly on the question of duties for revenue and duties for protection, I quote the following paragraph from Professor Robert Ellis Thompson's standard work on Political Economy:

Protective duties yield for a considerable period a large revenue to the State, but that is not the object of their imposition. Duties for revenue—*i. e.*, too low to be protective—in spite of their appearance of moderation are highly unjust. They inflict all the hardships of indirect and unequal taxation without even the purpose of benefiting the consumer. Duties for protection, while they bring large revenues, have another purpose, and benefit the consumer to a far greater extent than they tax him, while their amount is equally available for public uses. Their object is their own abolition, for they aim at such a development of the national industry as shall render impossible the importation of the dutiable articles. To impose revenue duties is to accept indirect taxation as a permanent method of finance; to impose protective duties is not.

But let us return to the question. Who pays the tax or duty? Well, that depends upon, first, the quality, price, and supply of the home product against which the imported product must compete, and, second, upon the trade relations existing between the consignor and consignee. Then, possibly, no one in fact pays the duty as a tax, for a careful examination of the interesting report of the Secretary of the Treasury on the revision of the tariff (February 16, 1886) demonstrates the fact that foreign manufacturers often invoice their products for this market through special agencies at a much greater discount from price-lists than those allowed in their home markets, therefore placing their goods here, upon which duty is paid, far below the market value there.

Setting aside the troublesome question of undervaluations, let me present the views of an impartial gentleman (impartial at least as regards the policy dividing Democrats and Republicans), Mr. H. J. Pettifer, secretary of the Workman's Association for Defense of British Industry. Discussing lately this very question, he says:

Take the case of a manufacturer who is trying to compete in a country in which industry is defended with an article also produced in that country. Suppose, for instance, the Americans can produce a certain article for 1 shilling, while we in England can produce and deliver it for 10 pence, we could, if we had free trade with America, undersell them in their own market by 2 pence; but the American is not so foolish as to allow us to do this, so he puts 50 per cent. duty on the article. Now, 50 per cent. on 10 pence is 5 pence, which brings the English article up to 1 shilling, 3 pence, and as it would be absurd for us to offer it for 1 shilling 3 pence when the American can make and sell it for 1 shilling, what we have to do, if we are to sell it in that country at all, is to reduce profits and cut down wages and deliver it at 8 pence, when the 50 per cent. brings it up to the American level. But who has paid the duty? Why, certainly we lose 2 pence, and the American buyer loses 2 pence, but the American Treasury gets the whole of the 4 pence duty toward paying the taxation of the country.

But look at it from another point of view. Suppose we, in England, getting fair profits and paying fair wages, can turn out an article for 1 shilling, and the Germans can deliver it here for 10 pence, what do we do then? Do "we" level up? Certainly not; we level down; we have to reduce profits and cut down wages, in this case just as we did in the other, until we can produce at the German price, without making the German pay the slightest amount toward the taxation of this country, in which he has a free and open market. Is it not time we asked ourselves the question: Which system is best for the workingman, the American, which keeps wages up, or the English, which brings wages down?

Another illustration, one at President Cleveland's old home. Suppose wheat is selling in the Buffalo market at $1 a bushel. The tariff for the protection of the American farmer is 20 cents a bushel. An Erie County farmer drives into town, sells his wheat, and pockets his dollar. A Canadian farmer crosses the Niagara River, pays 20 cents duty, sells his wheat, and pockets 80 cents. Who pays the duty? Ask the Canadian.

But, high duty or low duty, do not let us quarrel over non-essentials. As long as we make foreigners pay a large share of our governmental expenses, and our sixty millions of people do not care enough about the matter to go to the trouble of signing a respectably-sized petition, or even hold a neighborhood mass-meeting in the way of caution or protest against the present method and purpose of collecting impost revenue, we are safe in lowering taxation and shutting off the accumulation of surplus revenue in some other manner, and I hope that is the way all this tariff discussion and legislation will end. Leastwise, if through partisan prejudice and pressure we can not or do not settle this question of fair, patriotic, and business-like principles while we have the opportunity, the people will determine it for us and themselves at the polls within a few months. [Applause.]

STEAM-POWER AND LABOR-SAVING MACHINERY.

I have searched in vain through all the speeches delivered in this House during the past fortnight for some solution of the wages problem involved in the present question. The regular readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD have been lately furnished by industrious wielders of the paste-pot and scissors with "tabulated statements" sufficient in diversity and quantity to keep the mathematically inclined busy until election time. These tables prove little or nothing; for any expert journalist knows that percentages can be juggled to prove either side of an argument, and notably in this line of falsification are the tariff arithmetical wonders performed by that free-trade propagandist who signs himself "A Parsee Merchant;" he takes the sweepstakes.

Before giving an opinion upon the probable effect a lowering of the tariff may have upon work and wages I wish to call the attention of the House to some forces and tendencies which have within the past eighty years wrought revolution in the labor world.

Since the time of the adoption of our national Constitution the civilized nations of the earth have successively passed through sudden transitions in their industrial economy, chiefly on account of changes from hand to steam power, and, adding to the power of steam, the invention and use of labor-saving machinery.

During that period or since, James Watt devised the condensing steam-engine; Hargreaves, the spinning-jenny; Arkwright, the spinning-frame and the factory system; Crompton, the mule-jenny; Cartwright, the power-loom; Whitney, the cotton-gin; Fitch, the steam-ship; Oliver Evans, the high-pressure engine; Stephenson, the locomotive; Morse, the telegraph; Howe, the sewing-machine; Bell, the telephone; Hoe, Bullock, and Scott, the lightning printing-presses; in short, the whole century has been agitated and crowded by inventions in the whole field of applied mechanics and science. And during all this time the workingman, skilled or unskilled, has been forced to adapt himself to unexpected and rapidly-changed conditions. Especially within the past fifty years the conflicts between muscle and brains, the man and the machine, capital and labor, the employer and employé, have been waged unceasingly in Great Britain, continental Europe, and America, and, I am sorry to say, the beginning of the end is not visible.

Allow me to direct your attention to Commissioner Carroll D. Wright's first annual report (1886), and especially to the chapter on "Machinery and overproduction." There you will find the controlling cause of strikes lockouts, and labor disorganization. Think of the hundreds of thousands of American workmen who have been forced to adjust themselves to the changes, generally disadvantageous, wrought by labor-saving machinery and its powerful ally, steam. In the school-book of our fathers it was said that "it takes ten men to make a pin." Now we have a machine that only needs to be fed with wire, oiled and supplied with steam-power, to turn out complete pins, sort them, and even thrust them into the papers in the right numbers and in straight rows. What has become of the ten pin-makers? One probably runs the new machine, and the other nine swell the ranks of unemployed labor, ultimately dropping into the unskilled class below them.

Out of the many illustrations relative to the displacement of labor furnished by Commissioner Wright, I have time only to select a few. In the manufacture of agricultural implements new machinery during the past fifteen or twenty years has displaced fully 50 per cent. of the muscular labor formerly employed. In one establishment cited 600 employés are doing the work which under former conditions would have required 2,145 employés, a displacement of 1,545. In brick-making, improved devices displace 10 per cent. of the labor, and in manufacturing fire-brick 40 per cent. has been displaced. In the manufacture of boots and shoes, the Commissioner gives some very astonishing results. He says:

In one large and long-established manufactory in one of the Eastern States the proprietors testify that it would require five hundred persons working by hand processes to make as many women's boots and shoes as one hundred persons now make with the aid of machinery—a displacement of 80 per cent. In another class of the same industry the number of men required to produce a given quantity of boots and shoes has been reduced one-half. In another locality, and on another quality of boots, being entirely for women's wear, where formerly a first-class workman could turn out six pairs in one week he will now turn out eighteen pairs.

A well-known firm, engaged in manufacturing boots and shoes in the West states that in the grade of goods manufactured by it, it would take 120 persons working by hand to produce the amount of work done in its factory by 60 employés, and the hand-work would not compare in workmanship and appearance, as expressed by the concern, by 50 per cent. Goodyear's sewing-machine for turned shoes, with 1 man, will sew 250 pairs in one day. It would require 8 men working by hand to sew the same number. By the use of King's heel-shaver or trimmer 1 man will trim 300 pairs of shoes a day, where it formerly took 3 men to do the same.

One man, with the McKay machine, can handle 300 pairs of shoes per day, while, without the machine, he could handle but 5 pairs in the same time. In nailing on heels, by the use of machinery, 1 man and a boy can heel 300 pairs of shoes per day. It would require 5 men to do this by hand. In finishing the bottoms of shoes, 1 man with a sand-papering machine can handle 300 pairs, while it would require 4 men to do the same by hand. A large Philadelphia firm, engaged in the manufacture of boys' and children's shoes, states—and the foreman of the establishment corroborates the evidence—that the introduction of new machinery within the past thirty years has displaced about six times the amount of hand labor required, and that the cost of the product has been reduced one-half. On another grade of goods, manufactured in Maine, the facts collected by the agents of the bureau show that 1 man can now do the work which twenty years ago required 10 men.

In the manufacture of carpets the improvement in machinery in the past thirty years, taking weaving, spinning, and all the processes together, have displaced from ten to twenty times the number of persons now necessary.

In the manufacture of clothing, a cutting-machine will do six times the amount of work formerly done by one man in the old way. In the manufacture of soft and stiff hats there has been a displacement in the proportion of 9 to 1.

In the olden time, in the cotton-goods industry, an adult hand-loom weaver wove from 42 to 48 yards of common shirting per week. A

weaver tending six power-looms in a cotton factory of to-day would produce 1,500 yards a week.

In the manufacture of furniture, from one-half to three-fourths only of the old number of persons is now required.

In the lumber business 12 co-laborers with a Bucker machine will dress 12,000 staves; the same number of men by hand process would dress but 2,500. One boy running a planing-machine in turning woodwork for musical instruments and materials does the work of 25 men.

In manufactures of railroad supplies, rubber boots and shoes, silk, and soap the displacement is 50 per cent. in each.

But there is another factor in the displacement of hand and muscular processes, partially taken into account in the above statistics, which trebles man's productive force. It is stated by the bureau of statistics in Berlin that four-fifths of the engines now working in the world have been constructed during the past twenty-five years. The force equivalent to the working steam-engines represents—in the United States, 7,500,000 horse-power; in England, 7,000,000 horse-power; in Germany, 4,500,000 horse-power; in France, 3,000,000, and in Austria, 1,500,000. Add the horse-power represented by locomotives, 3,000,000, and the total is 46,000,000 horse-power. A steam horse-power is equal to three actual horses' power, and a living horse is equal to seven men. The steam-engines of the world represent, therefore, the work of 1,000,000,000 men.

Recent calculations by Hon. Edward Appleton, of Massachusetts, place the number of locomotives in the United States at 28,600. Commissioner Wright thus summarizes Mr. Appleton's data:

To do the work of these locomotives upon the existing common roads of the country and the equivalent of that which has been done upon the railroads the past year (1885) would require, in round numbers, 54,000,000 horses and 13,500,000 men. The work is now done, so far as men are concerned, by 250,000. The present cost of operating the railroads of the country with steam power is, in round numbers, $502,600,000 per annum; but to carry on the same amount of work with men and horses would cost the country $11,308,500,000.

REFORM THE REFORMERS.

Now, gentlemen, many of you are ready to ask, what connection has this wonderful array of statistical information to do with the tariff or the Mills bill? Well, frankly, I know of no better way to enlist the regard of the Ways and Means Committee or arouse the attention of this House to the amount of our machinery power and the magnitude of our industries, or to the vicious partisan policy which has projected a crude measure, in my opinion, into a Congress imperfectly prepared to fairly consider it. My best judgment is against dragging tariff revision into politics. Our capitalists, manufacturers, and bread-winners in general are of all shades of political opinion, and why half the industrial interests of the country should be brought into a game of battledoor and shuttlecock by politicians who have nothing at stake except transient honors and temporary spoils, must seem to every right-thinking citizen a blundering and vicious proceeding. An enactment covering not over four pages of bill-paper could dispose of the present surplus and provide a just measure of revenue for the future.

Our manufacturers and workingmen will not be deceived by the free-trade cries of "monopolies," "trusts," "cotton lords," "robber barons," and so forth. Three hundred and twenty-five men in any given industry know more about just wage rates, hours of labor, profits of their employers, and justice between man and man, than the three hundred and twenty-five Congressmen here assembled give them credit for.

REGULATION OF WAGES.

How are wages in the trades in this country established and regulated? Are wage schedules mere matters of chance or caprice? Do the "robber barons" or "monopolists" pay such rates as they please? Go into any trades union, Knights of Labor assembly, labor union, or workingmen's association and you will get the correct answer. In these halls of organized labor rates of wages and rules governing trades are proposed, discussed, passed upon, promulgated, and sustained. They are the workingmen's legislatures, where wage, social, arbitrative, and economic questions are settled. What an immense industrial army the united ranks of the Unionists and Knights aggregate, over one million by actual count; and not a member of the Cobden Club, honorary or active, carried on their muster-rolls. [Applause.]

It is safe to assert that these two great bodies of organized labor regulate and uphold directly one-third of the wage scales paid in this country and Canada. Indirectly, but surely, the other two-thirds feel and acknowledge this supreme power in wage regulation, craft discipline, and industrial well-being. It is only during the abnormal period of a "strike" that the attention of the general public is called to these great organizations of skilled and unskilled labor, yet every day in the year witnesses and records the assembling and legislative action of thousands upon thousands of these unions and assemblies. In the very nature of things these men associate for the protection of American labor, and in this connection I would direct the attention of members on both sides of this House to the remarks made by Mr. FORAN, of Ohio, a week ago.

Mr. FORAN and myself are generally far apart on political questions, but on the labor problem, on the wages question, and especially in our views on the Mills bill, we agree. Why? Because as representatives of organized skilled labor we see disorganization of and disaster to the well-being of the wage-earners in the possible passage of an act which subordinates every interest of the workingman to the attainment of cheap products through cheapened labor. The bill strikes at the producer, whether capitalist or workingman. By its ramshackle provisions, lawyers, doctors, *commissionaires*, *doctrinaires*, office-holders, speculators, coupon-clippers, middlemen, and the whole army of do-nothings—people who create nothing and try to control everything—are to be benefited at the expense of the American toilers who earn their living by exertion of brain or muscle, or both. The 5,000,000 workers of America are to be pitted against the 30,000,000 workers of Europe.

The free-list, which has steadily grown of late years, is to be further enlarged. In 1870 it aggregated one-ninth of the dutiable list; to-day it is about one-half; so that one-third of all imported goods now come in free of duty. All this talk about the "international comity of trade" and "the fixed economic principles which regulate trade and commerce between nations" has no interest to the American workingman. The truth is, he believes that the $240,000,000 worth of foreign goods which annually come into this market from abroad ought to be made here. He reasons the whole question of "the surplus" and "protection" in this way: If the locking up of $100,000,000 of our currency in our national Treasury, collected (he may admit) in the shape of taxes, causes congestion, contraction, and premonitory symptoms of a national panic, what would be the condition of our country if the balance of trade to the same amount went against us for only four years of free trade, and in that time $400,000,000 of our gold left our shores, never to return, to swell the coffers of our commercial rivals? No arguments of Cobden Club parasites or free-trade professors drawing fixed incomes from college funds can argue the American workman into any policy which exports American wages. He believes in keeping the wage-earning power here; he wants the field of labor enlarged, not contracted, and to secure the enlargement of that field he advocates diversity of production and expansion of development.

I want to say just here that while it may be possible to pass this bill in whole or emasculated, as a party measure, there are revising committees in all labor assemblies which will pass upon its merits independent of politics; and these great bodies of intelligent wage-earners will stand like a wall of iron against the proposed free-list and the cutting of wages foreshadowed in the impaired duties named in the dutiable list. American workmen have battled too long and sacrificed too much in gaining the position they now hold, to now tamely submit to any partisan demand. During this and the last Congress their power has been felt in this hall; a power which has both persuaded and constrained legislation for a more equal distribution of privileges, and unmasked the wrongs committed by monopoly and stall-fed avarice. [Applause.]

But suppose we let some of these workingmen speak for themselves. On the 8th of the present month a workingmen's mass-meeting was held in the large hall of Cooper Union, New York City. Its officers—Michael Breslin, president, and Jesse G. Miller, secretary—have sent me the following official copy of the resolutions adopted at the meeting:

Whereas, the so-called Mills tariff bill, now under discussion in the House, of Representatives, by placing on the free-list many articles that come into competition with the products of American labor, and by sweeping reductions in the duties upon others, menaces the ruin of many of our industries, and would if enacted into a law, entail great loss of employment and widespread suffering, among working people; and

Whereas, the workingmen of this country have been contemptuously denied a hearing by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, which framed the bill; and

Whereas, it is now apparent to every workingman that the prevailing agitation of the tariff question and the proposed reduction of duties are destroying confidence in business, reducing wages in some occupations and stopping altogether the wages in others;

Therefore, we, the workingmen of the city of New York, in mass meeting assembled, earnestly protesting against the passage of the Mills tariff bill and against any and all measures of a similar character which threaten the labor and industry of our country and propose to lower the American standard of wages, do hereby declare and proclaim the following resolutions:

Resolved, That we demand of the Representatives in Congress from this city that they not only vote against this most recent attack on the prosperity of American labor, but that they use their utmost endeavors to secure its defeat.

Resolved, That we protest against a bill which puts raw material on the free-list when that so-called raw material is the product of American labor.

Resolved, That we protest against a bill which would break down the barrier which defends American labor from competition with the pauper labor of Europe and Asia, and aims to reduce our families to the foreign level of cheapness and poverty.

Resolved, That we demand that the internal-revenue war taxes be repealed, and that protection to American labor be maintained and made more effective.

Resolved, That we call upon our fellow-workingmen in all parts of the land to rise up and denounce the Mills tariff bill as a menace to our welfare and to our rights as citizens, which threatens to deprive us of the opportunities of education afforded by the American system of high wages, and we denounce as a fraud the free-trade argument that the cost of living in this country is increased in proportion to the rates of duty on imports, except as we choose and are able to live better here than our unfortunate rivals in foreign countries.

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President and every member of Congress.

COMPETITION AND CHEAPNESS.

The chief end of the Democratic tariff argument is universal competition and cheap goods. Sir Edward Sullivan, an authority seldom quoted by Cobdenites, says that—

free trade means untaxed foreign competition; that foreign competition means competition in cheapness; competition in cheapness means competition in cheap labor; competition in cheap labor means competition in flesh and blood; and competition in flesh and blood is slavery.

Facilis est descensus Averni.

I say again, it has cost the American workmen millions of dollars in wages and lost time to reach the vantage-ground which they now occupy. The capitalist and the wage-earner, the employer and the employé, after fierce years of struggle and misunderstanding, now generally respect and consult each other's interests. What benefits one benefits the other. Arbitration is supplanting strikes; co-operative production will succeed arbitration, as co-operation is the child of confidence. He is a mean workman who begrudges his employer fair remuneration for his capital, and he is a mean employer who does not pay a fair day's wage for a fair day's work; for good labor at good wages is cheaper than poor labor at poor wages. Professor Thompson says:

The lowest wages that you can get a man to live on will not get the best work out of him. Put a whole people on such wages, and keep them there, if you can, for two our three generations, and you will have crushed the energy, the spirit, the heart out of that people, and made them a very inferior and unprofitable class of workmen. On the other hand, wages that put heart and hope into a man, that make him feel that his personal efforts and his best work are needed to keep them at present rates, that offer him the prospect of becoming his own master by frugality, that enable him to educate his children to fill a place like his own intelligently, or perhaps to rise to a higher place, such wages are in the long run the best of investments.

The President and his party profess sympathy for and protection to the interests of labor. How that can be done by taking thirty or forty fairly established American industries from the dutiable list and consigning them to a free-list grave is more than I can comprehend. I believe—and my belief is shared by every intelligent workingman in this country—that the only safe policy for the protection and promotion of American labor is to compel every European manufacturer to pay into the Treasury of the United States the difference in wages he has saved by not paying his workmen as much as American workmen receive, before he is allowed to sell his goods in this country.

A tariff revised on such a principle would meet the views of every fair-minded citizen, would allay alarm, give stability to industry, satisfy the employer and employé, equalize the consumer's taxes, prevent destructive competition, encourage new industries, and keep this nation, as it is confessedly now, in the front rank of the nations of the earth in material progress and Christian civilization. [Applause.]

Mr. J. H. Walker, in an address delivered before the Massachusetts Club a short time ago, said:

In view of the difficulty of individual investigation and agreement, it is only fair that all disputants accept the rate of wages given in the United States or Massachusetts reports for the different countries. I have taken the highest rate for each country given by either report, and I find the following yearly earnings. A family of four persons average to furnish two wage-workers. The total possible earnings of a man and woman in each country, in eight occupations, are as follows:

Trades.	America.	England.	France.	Belgium.	Germany.
Carpenters:					
Man	$700.00	$383.00	$310.00	$203.50	$205.50
Woman	300.00	153.20	124.00	81.40	82.20
	1,000.00	536.20	434.00	284.90	287.70
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	784.00	330.20	228.00	78.90	81.70
Laborers (common):					
Man	450.00	235.00	188.50	150.00	155.50
Woman	300.00	94.00	75.40	60.00	62.20
	750.00	329.00	263.90	210.00	217.70
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	534.00	123.00	57.90	4.00	11.70
Blacksmiths:					
Man	650.00	368.50	290.00	269.00	200.00
Woman	300.00	147.40	116.20	107.60	80.00
	950.00	515.90	406.20	376.60	280.00
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	734.00	309.90	200.20	170.60	74.00
Locomotive engineers:					
Man	1,250.00	456.00	516.00	460.00	468.81
Woman	300.00	182.40	206.40	184.00	187.52
	1,550.00	638.40	722.40	644.00	656.33
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	1,334.00	432.40	516.40	438.00	450.33
Locomotive firemen:					
Man	750.00	255.00	342.00	317.50	321.35
Woman	300.00	102.00	136.80	127.00	128.54
	1,050.00	357.00	478.80	444.50	449.89
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	834.00	151.00	272.80	238.50	243.89
Tinsmiths:					
Man	$550.00	$325.00	$273.00	$220.00	$177.50
Woman	300.00	139.00	109.20	88.00	71.00
	850.00	455.00	382.20	308.00	248.50
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	634.00	249.00	176.20	102.00	42.50
Tanners:					
Man	450.00	350.00	347.00	258.00	210.50
Woman	300.00	140.00	138.80	103.20	84.20
	750.00	490.00	485.80	361.20	294.70
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	534.00	284.00	279.80	155.20	88.70
Weavers:					
Man	500.00	350.00	250.00	197.50	139.50
Woman	300.00	140.00	100.00	79.00	55.80
	800.00	490.00	350.00	276.50	195.30
Supplies	216.00	206.00	206.00	206.00	206.00
Possible savings	584.00	284.00	144.00	70.50	Minus.

[During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the gentleman from New York may be allowed to proceed, if he wishes to do so.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I am very grateful for the request, but shall not occupy further time as other gentlemen desire to occupy the floor.

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Chairman, the platforms of the political organizations in this country adopted in their great national conventions, presumably at least, represent their sentiments and convictions on public affairs and the policies of the parties adopting them. The Democratic party has year after year adopted platforms in the various States, and every four years has adopted a national platform expressive of what it thinks would catch votes. In 1856, upon this all-engrossing and commanding issue of the tariff, the Democrati Ncational Convention resolved—

That justice and sound policy forbid the Federal Government to foster one branch of industry to the detriment of another; or to cherish the interests of one portion to the injury of another portion of our common country.

Its platform of 1856 reaffirmed the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798, which averred among other things in substance that the power of the Federal Government to levy taxes for the purpose of protecting the industries of the country did not exist; and the substance of that provision of those resolutions was incorporated into the Confederate constitution when it forbade the levying of taxes for the protection of American industries.

The platforms of 1860 of both the Douglas and the Breckinridge conventions were silent upon the subject of the tariff. The Douglas contingent of the Democratic party at that time had, I presume, no very pronounced ideas upon the subject, represented, perhaps, a variety of opinions upon the question of protection, and did not seek to embody them in any platform.

The Breckinridge contingent of the Democratic party at the same time had in view, beyond all doubt, the establishment of the Southern Confederacy; and its views of the policy that should obtain were expressed in the Confederate constitution in the way I have spoken of.

The Democratic platform of 1864 was also silent upon the subject of the tariff. In the convention of 1864 only the tail of the Democratic party was represented; the dog had not been admitted, and the delegates who had been chosen in the States that were represented in that convention saw fit to give no expression of opinion upon this subject.

The Democratic platform of 1868 favored incidental protection in this language:

A tariff for revenue upon foreign imports and such equal taxation under the internal-revenue laws as will afford protection to domestic manufacturers, and as will, without impairing the revenue, impose the least burden upon and best promote and encourage the great industrial interests of the country.

That platform was more nearly the assertion of the theory of protection than any other which the national conventions of the Democratic party have ever adopted. The Democratic platform of 1872 averred:

That there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade; and we remit the decision of the subject to the people, to their Congressional districts, and to the decision of Congress thereof, wholly free from executive interference and dictation.

It semed to be the leading idea of the Democratic party at that time that for an Executive to dictate the policy of the party was more than a violation of the amenities and courtesies of politics. It amounted perhaps to an infringement of the theory of our Government, that legislation upon this subject should originate in the House of Representatives. With the proposition embodied that the Congressional dis-

tricts should for themselves regulate the subject I am not disposed to quarrel.

The platform of 1876 demanded:

That all custom-house taxation shall be only for revenue.

The Democratic party at that juncture of its history had gone back to its original view asserted in the Kentucky and Virginia resolutions of 1798.

The Democratic platform of 1880 also favored the tariff for revenue only; but the Democratic platform of 1884, upon which Grover Cleveland was elected, straddled the subject. It declared:

We therefore denounce the abuses of the existing tariff, and subject to the preceding limitations, which are, first, that taxation shall be limited to the requirements of economical government; second, that the reduction of taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with the foreign labor, and without imposing lower rates of duty than will amply cover any increased cost in production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages prevailing in this country; we demand that the Federal taxation shall be exclusively for public purposes, and shall not exceed the needs of the Government economically administered.

That is the platform upon which President Cleveland was elected.

President Cleveland in view of that declaration would have done well, it seems to me, if he had permitted the subject of tariff revision to have been managed exclusively and solely by the House of Representatives, which has really control of the subject. But instead of doing that, President Cleveland sent to the House of Representatives at the opening of this session of Congress a message upon the subject of tariff revision which is without a parallel in the history of the American Republic. No other President in any emergency of the country at any other time has sent to the House of Representatives a message so positively and clearly indicating a line of policy upon an economic question as has President Cleveland in this case.

Having done that, it is said that through the influence of the Administration exerted in various ways Democratic nominations in various Congressional districts of the country have been controlled by the Administration in the interest of free trade or in the interest of the President's policy as indicated in his message. The Administration has not only done that, but it is reported in the newspapers that Democrats of good standing and of influential position who have heretofore been looked upon as leaders of the party have been denied the benefit of patronage, have been denied access to the President in consultations, have been refused an opportunity of presenting their views and insisting upon them, and have been driven by every expedient at the command of the Administration from the ranks of the Democratic party. It is even asserted, with what truth I do not pretend to say, that public measures involving the public interest have been denied the Executive sanction because of the attitude of Representatives in Congress upon the subject of tariff legislation. And it has been shown that the Administration, by an approval of the most charming and beautiful character, has commended the attitude of a recalcitrant Pennsylvanian when he espoused the cause of the Mills bill upon the floor of the House of Representatives to the detriment of his State and the injury of the whole country. [Applause.]

Without parallel I have said is the action of the Administration on the question of tariff legislation in the House of Representatives. At no time in the history of the whole country has an administration or a President undertaken to influence so directly and so compulsorily the legislation of the House of Representatives as has been evinced and as is being daily evinced by this Administration upon this economic problem which the House is now considering.

Mr. REED. The next thing to it was in the case of the Kansas-Nebraska bill.

Mr. BAYNE. Yes; there was a similar effort at that time by a Democratic administration in behalf of the extension of slavery.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in view of this platform of 1884, which manifestly straddled the subject of protection, which was of such tenor and import that my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] could go into the State of New York and the State of New Jersey and explain to the people of those States that protection was safe in the hands of the Democratic party; in view of the fact that representatives could go into the free-trade States of this country and represent that the platform of 1884 was in favor of a revision of the tariff and in favor of free trade, is it fair, is is fair play that a President elected on that platform should influence the House of Representatives with a view to the enforcement of his policy? Is it fair to the people of the country that the House of Representatives, elected on that platform, many of whose members appear to be subject to coercion, should enact tariff legislation looking toward free trade when that platform of 1884 was susceptible of a construction looking towards protection? My conclusion is that it is not right, that fair play requires that the voters of the United States, Democrats and Republicans, should have an opportunity of voting on this subject before any action is taken by the House of Representatives. That chance should be given to the voters of this country before we enact tariff legislation.

But, Mr. Chairman, in view of the duplex Democratic declaration of 1884, in view of the explanation given it in New York and New Jersey by Mr. RANDALL and other Democrats, what shall be said of the appointment of a Ways and Means Committee, embracing six members from free-trade States, who absolutely represent almost nothing of the economic interests of this country as compared with the great Northern States? It is true there is a representative upon that committee from the State of Pennsylvania, and there is a member on that committee from the State of Indiana, but those gentlemen, distinguished as they are, are but the tail, and can be wagged *ad libitum* by the Democratic dog. I mean this in no disrespectful sense. I mean it simply in the sense of outvoting the representatives from the Northern States. The six representatives on the Ways and Means Committee from the Southern States and the two Democratic members of that committee from the Northern States formulated the Mills bill from beginning to end. The Republican members of the committee had nothing to do with it—they were not permitted to have anything to do with it. So the six Southern Democrats on that committee could do as they pleased, and there was nothing left for the two Northern Democrats to do but to fall into line, which they appear to have done, gracefully.

Why should these gentleman, forsooth, formulate and prepare a measure on the subject of tariff revision, which involves not only the prosperity of capital, but the employment of labor also? They are not business men. Tariff revision deals with a business problem. They are not interested in the objects sought by protection. Protection is specially solicitous about the welfare of labor. Now, judge these gentleman by what their States represent in this respect.

According to the census of 1880 the amount of wages paid in Arkansas was, in round numbers, $925,000; in Georgia, $5,266,000; in Kentucky, $11,670,000; in Tennessee, $5,254,000; in Texas, $3,343,000; and in West Virginia, $4,313,000; an aggregate of about $30,750,000. Now, in my own little county of Allegheny, represented by my colleague on my right [Mr. DALZELL] and myself, there were paid in wages that year $22,371,000. Thus the one county of Allegheny paid within eight millions as much wages as the entire amount paid by those States represented by a majority of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. ADAMS. What is that aggregate?

Mr. BAYNE. Thirty million seven hundred and fifty thousand dollars was the amount paid by all the six States represented by the Southern members of the Committee on Ways and Means who formulated the tariff bill under discussion.

Mr. ADAMS. My own county in Illinois paid $37,000,000 in 1880, and last year paid $74,000,000 in wages.

Mr. BAYNE. And the city of Philadelphia paid $64,000,000 in 1880, and the State of Pennsylvania $134,000,000, and the great city of New York, not represented on the committee at all, paid $198,000,000.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Will the gentleman permit me to ask a question?

Mr. BAYNE. I have not the time. I have only a half hour. I will yield for a question if my time be extended.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I have no power to do that, but I should like to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Chairman, as it is in the aggregate so it is in detail with these States. Take the wool statistics.

Wool statistics.

States.	Number of spindles.	Foreign wool in condition, purchased.	Domestic wool purchased.	Scoured wool (not including waste or shoddy) purchased.
		Pounds.	*Pounds.*	*Pounds.*
Arkansas	1,360	.....	189,000	174,000
Georgia	2,224	.....	366,274	310,074
Kentucky	14,110	.....	1,230,075	1,230,075
Tennessee	6,860	.....	883,338	805,836
Texas	600	.....	175,000	770,000
Total	25,154	.....	2,843,687	.....
Vermont	46,264	161,404	3,441,787	1,719,580
Rhode Island	160,524	2,198,726	17,151,957	9,520,553
Massachusetts	461,776	7,391,993	48,748,041	28,034,931

This table shows that the little State of Vermont has more spindles and purchased more wool than all the States represented by the gentlemen who controlled the formulation of this bill. The little State of Rhode Island, with but two Representatives in the House, exceeded all those States fivefold, and the State of Massachusetts did fifteen times the amount of business.

Now, take the boot and shoe industry—I select that article to please my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL]. Here is a table which shows the number of establishments and the amount of wages paid in 1880:

TABLE B.

States.	Number of establishments.	Wages paid in year.
Arkansas		
Georgia	4	$11,445
Kentucky	15	159,587
Tennessee	3	9,905
Texas		
West Virginia	1	3,500
Total	22	185,437
Massachusetts	982	24,875,106

And by this it is shown that the six States honored with representatives on the Committee of Ways and Means had but 22 establishments, and paid in wages but $185,437, while the State of Massachusetts had 982 establishments and paid nearly $25,000,000 in wages.

Here is a table with reference to iron and steel:

Iron and steel.

States.	Number of establishments.	Total wages paid in year.
Arkansas		
Georgia	14	$185,489
Kentucky	29	1,344,400
Tennessee	43	659,773
Texas	1	27,720
West Virginia	29	1,541,816
Total	116	3,759,198
Pennsylvania	366	25,095,850
New York	89	4,099,451

Now, here is a table which makes a like exhibit and tells a like story. Take leather, tanned, and this is what is shown:

TABLE D.—*Leather, tanned.*

States.	Number of establishments.	Total wages paid.
Arkansas	4	$942
Georgia	79	18,040
Kentucky	46	33,263
Tennessee	113	27,700
Texas	21	3,924
West Virginia	93	99,338
Total	356	184,207
California	63	132,629
New Jersey	56	762,697

I have tried hard to find out something that they do down there, something they manufacture. I have looked over the long list with that object in view, and I have found that they do some leather tanning. They have 356 leather-tanning establishments, and they paid in wages $184,207. California, having but 63 establishments, paid out $132,000; and New Jersey, with but 56, paid over $762,000 a year in wages. It required but $319 to run an establishment in the States that have a majority of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, while in New Jersey and California it required over $7,000. No wonder they have no strikes down there. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mixed textiles make a like showing:

States.	Number of establishments.	Total wages paid.
Arkansas		
Georgia		
Kentucky	5	$135,948
Tennessee	1	7,500
Texas		
West Virginia		
Total	6	143,448
Connecticut	43	888,843
Pennsylvania	126	11,536,813

Now, an examination of this table shows that the little State of Connecticut paid nearly a million dollars in wages, while all the States of the Ways and Means Committee south of Mason and Dixon's line paid but $143,000, and the great State of Pennsylvania paid eleven and a half millions.

Next I have selected the glass establishments, and I have taken the number of establishments and the capital employed, and the total wages paid as shown by the census of 1880. Here is the exhibit:

States.	Number of glass establishments.	Capital.	Total wages paid in year.
Arkansas			
Georgia			
Kentucky	5	$795,000	$150,322
Tennessee			
Texas			
West Virginia	1		700
Total	6	795,000	151,022
New Jersey	27	2,728,021	1,309,638
Pennsylvania	78	7,639,706	3,807,306

All the States of the South having representatives on the Ways and Means Committee had but 6 establishments, with a total capital of $725,000, and they paid but $151,000 in wages, while New Jersey had 27 establishments and Pennsylvania 78, and the gentlemen who represent States largely devoid of this industry undertake to legislate upon it, as if they were quite capable of understanding the subject, and with a confidence which few men would dare to arrogate.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why should a committee representing no more business enterprise than that, knowing no more about the economic problem which is presented by this bill than these figures imply—why should such a committee undertake to formulate legislation for the control of the business interests of this country? This is a business matter and business men should look into it and manage it. But, sir, I aver, and I challenge contradiction, that while we of the North are in favor of high wages to workingmen, you of the South are in favor of low wages. You want to keep wages down. I aver that you want to keep them down and that you mean to keep them down, and I know the reason you want to keep wages down. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] was honest enough to admit it the other day. You want to keep wages low because the few own the property in the Southern States, and if you raise wages you will put the wage-workers in competition with the few. Those wage-workers will gradually pick up little bodies of land and take to growing cotton and sugar and other things in competition with you, and I aver that the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means want low wages, and do not want any legislation that will maintain or raise the wages of the workingmen of this country.

Mr. HOOKER. I say to the gentleman that the negroes of the South, in my region at least, are the best paid laborers in this country or anywhere else.

Mr. FUNSTON. Yes; they get $8 a month.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. No; they do not get $8 on an average.

Mr. BLAND (to Mr. BAYNE). How about your coal region in Pennsylvania and the Carnegie works, and your fights and your strikes?

Mr. BAYNE. I have given the reason why they have no strikes down South. It is because they have nobody to strike and nothing to strike for. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I endeavored to show in the first place by the declaration of the Democratic party in its national conventions, and by the course pursued by that party in States like New York, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania that it was not fair to revise the tariff at this session of Congress, because the issue had not been fairly and squarely made in the campaign of 1884, or since that time; and my next endeavor has been to show that the gentlemen from the six Southern States on the Ways and Means Committee have the power to control their two Democratic associates from the Northern States, and that those gentlemen are wholly unfit to revise the tariff in a business-like way and according to practical business principles, because they are utterly lacking in that business knowledge which is requisite to such an undertaking.

While I have thus, however, endeavored to show that the consideration of the question should be postponed until a Congress shall have been elected upon the square issue presented by the President's message, there is no sort of doubt that the Democratic majority will persist in its endeavor to foist upon the country the product of its theoretical knowledge of economical questions, because that party has always placed its dependence upon theories rather then upon facts, and looks with more favor upon the *à priori* method of reaching conclusions than it does upon the practical course of deriving conclusions from actual experience.

The Democratic party in the past, whenever it came into power, has reduced tariff duties. During the ninety-nine years of our national existence under the present Constitution there have been over one hundred

and thirty-five acts of Congress relating to tariff. The history of the country presents periods of alternation between protection and tariff for revenue. Every period of tariff for revenue was the result of Democratic ascendancy, and every period of protection was the result of the success of the Whig or Republican party. During the progress of this great debate—a debate I believe to be unequaled in the history of the country for learning, versatility, and the citation of facts—during the progress, I say, of this debate, one great and important feature of the system of protection has not been elaborated anything like as fully as its importance would seem to require. I refer to the effect which tariff legislation would have upon our financial system.

The student of our history and the clerk capable of single-entry bookkeeping will alike come to the conclusion that our financial system depends largely upon practical protection. The student of history will ascertain by an examination of our past that in every period of low tariff the precious metals were drained out of the country. The precious metals were sent abroad to purchase the products of foreign countries. The panic of 1837 and the panic of 1857 occurred after and in consequence of the tariff of 1833 and after and in consequence of the tariff of 1846. The gold and silver had been drained out of the country. The banks were unable to redeem their paper. By many persons who have not thought upon the subject the conclusion is arrived at that bad management was solely responsible for that. The truth is, that in nearly all cases it was the interest of the State banks to preserve their integrity and their solvency and to redeem their paper and to maintain themselves as respectable, solvent institutions.

The men who were interested in those banks had put their money in them; they had the pride of success, and the misfortunes of the banks meant losses to them, but they could not help it. The misfortunes to the banks were the results of national legislation which caused the precious metals to go abroad, and which thus disabled the banks so that they could not redeem their paper. Up to 1860 the United States mints had coined over six hundred millions of dollars of gold, and yet at that time there was but about one hundred and fifty or one hundred and sixty millions of gold in the United States. Four hundred and fifty million dollars of this sum and all the gold we had obtained in the years preceding that time had gone abroad. Now, the presence of gold and silver coin, and the paper of the banks and of the Government redeeming paper currency with gold and silver coin, make the paper currency of the country equally as good as coin. We have now a paper currency which is just as good as gold. It is just as good as gold, because it can be converted into gold at any moment of time.

Now, I want you to think for a moment about what the tariff of 1861 has done in this behalf. The balance of trade in all the history of the country before 1861 was against us, excepting an occasional year now and then, but the high tariff of 1861, notwithstanding the great war, notwithstanding the fact that we purchased largely from abroad, and notwithstanding the fact that we borrowed great sums of money from foreign countries, enabled us to redeem all our bonds held abroad, to pay for products which were purchased abroad, and so early as 1868 or 1870 the balance of trade began to turn in our favor, and from that time on each succeeding year brought gold and silver into our country from foreign countries to pay for what we sold to foreign countries in excess of what we bought from them, and to such an extent has this trade been in our favor that the vast aggregate is not less now than one thousand four hundred millions of dollars.

Now, anybody who would theorize about this would conclude that we ought to have in the United States a large quantity of gold and silver; and what is the fact? Why the fact is we have an immense quantity of gold and silver—a greater quantity than we have ever had at any former period of our history. It is estimated that there is now in the United States between eight and nine hundred millions of dollars of gold bullion and gold coin, and we have over three hundred millions, including fractional currency, of silver coin. There are more than two coined dollars back of every paper dollar, and every paper dollar is consequently as good as a coined dollar. It was the Republican policy of protection that brought about this condition of things.

Now, suppose you supplant the Republican policy of protection with the Democratic plan. What is the result going to be? Simply a vast increase of imports without a corresponding increase of exports. Our exports are absolutely regulated by the law of supply and demand. We cannot sell one bushel more of wheat in London under a free-trade policy than we can sell under the protection policy.

It has been asserted over and over again in this debate that the value of wheat is fixed by the quantity offered at Mark Lane. That proposition ignores the important factor of home consumption as if Mark Lane came over here and fixed our price, while in truth the price fixed here is owing to the home supply and the home demand, and that those two regulate the quantity which we offer in Europe. Now, while it is true that Mark Lane fixes the value of wheat over there, wheat is made neither higher nor lower by protection or free trade supposing the present conditions to continue. But if the policy of free trade shall obtain the value of wheat and of all other farm products is likely to become much less both in this country and in Europe, and for this simple reason: If the operatives and capital now engaged in manufacturing interests should be driven to other employments many of them would turn their attention to agriculture, and while the number of home consumers would not be increased, the number of producers would be augmented.

Now, how any sensible people having such resources as we have in this country, having such a home market as ours is, and having the power by reason of our great resources to make the United States the gold treasury of the world—why any sensible people should abandon a policy which secured beyond all doubt these great advantages to us, is a mystery to me, and it seems to me it should be a mystery to every patriotic citizen of the country. It is without justification or excuse. It is a bad time to make the change, for in the calendar year of 1887 our domestic exports were about $703,000,000, while our imports were $708,000,000, and for the first time in fifteen or sixteen years has the balance of trade turned against us. If the Mills bill should become a law the balance of trade would become still greater and greater against us. History would repeat itself. The Democratic policy, which has always heretofore driven from the country our precious metals and drawn into the country the products of foreign countries, would drive our vast accumulation of precious metals abroad and would draw in the products of foreign manufacturers.

When our gold and silver should have gone abroad and our paper should not be convertible into coin, and commercial credits should be brought to the test which the absence of good money always brings about, we should have a repetition of the experience of 1837 and of 1857. That is the outlook which the Democratic majority of the Ways and Means Committee, and the Democratic majority in the House of Representatives, and the Democratic President of the United States invite. They do not invite it, perhaps, intentionally; they do it unwittingly. Some do it, perhaps, through motives of jealousy; there may be real envy here and there. It is not difficult to discern that most of the Southern Democrats would just as leave buy what they want from Old England as from New England. On memorial occasions, or when an appropriation is wanted for some public exhibition at New Orleans or at some other point, sectional lines seem to be obliterated and the gush of fraternal regard seems to fill the lips and hearts of our Southern friends to overflowing. But when it comes to a practical test of friendship, when it comes to a question whether a few cents more shall be paid for the blanket manufactured in Iowa or in New England over the price demanded for such a blanket by Old England, then the gush subsides and the fraternal spirit takes a rest.

We want no tariff legislation at this session of Congress. When the tariff shall be revised we want it revised by its friends. The Republicans, however, are perfectly willing to reduce the revenue of the Government. They are willing to take the tax off domestic tobacco, which will reduce the revenue $30,000,000. They are willing to take the duties off raw sugar and to place a small duty on refined sugar, and to pay a bounty equivalent to the present rate of duty on the home production of sugar. They are willing to release from duty the spirits used in the arts and to discontinue special liquor licenses. There they want to stop. This simple proposition will reduce the revenue between $80,000,000 and $90,000,000, as much as and probably more than it should be reduced. The Republicans feel it to be their duty to remember the soldiers of the Republic, most of whom are now a good way past the meridian of life and many of them needing that assistance which the Government should not hesitate to freely give. It is therefore the aim of the Republican party to maintain a sufficient income by the Government to provide for such as these.

The cry of the President and the Democratic party as to the great danger resulting from the vast surplus in the Treasury is the invention of the politician, and not the outgiving of the statesman. The President knows that the national banks all over the country have deposits of money belonging to the Government, and he knows that the money thus deposited is being used for commercial purposes. The list of banks obtained from the Secretary of the Treasury by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] shows that there are about three hundred of them having deposits. The President and the Secretary of the Treasury know it now if they did not know it before, that they have the power to purchase United States bonds with the money that comes into the Treasury, and it is obviously within their power to reduce the surplus by the purchase of bonds to whatever extent they may deem advisable. In the face of these two facts, the distribution of the money throughout the country to the national banks, and the power of the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase Government bonds, to raise a hue and cry about the danger of the surplus interfering with the business of the country is sheer nonsense. The business of the country is threatened with infinitely greater disaster by the legislation proposed in the Mills bill, and next November, when the people of the country will have an opportunity of deciding whether the Republicans be right or the Democrats be right, if I am not greatly mistaken the verdict will be decisively in favor of the Republicans.

Mr. LAIRD was recognized.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, as I am to follow the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LAIRD], it may as well be understood now by the

Chair and by the House that I have agreed to yield him ten minutes of my time, to begin at the end of his own time.

Mr. LAIRD. Mr. Chairman, the financial condition of this country to-day is such as to alarm thinking men into reflection.

Speaking of this condition, the President of the United States, in his message of December 6, 1887, uses the following language:

> You are confronted at the threshold of your legislative duties with a condition of the national finances which imperatively demands immediate and careful consideration.
>
> This condition of our Treasury is not altogether new; and it has more than once of late been submitted to the people's representatives in the Congress, who alone can apply a remedy. And yet the situation still continues, with aggravated incidents, more than ever presaging financial convulsion and wide-spread disaster.
>
> It will not do to neglect this situation because its dangers are not now palpably imminent and apparent. They exist none the less certainly, and await the unforeseen and unexpected occasion when suddenly they will be precipitated upon us.

Proceeding, he says that the accumulations by the 30th of June, 1888, will swell the surplus to $140,000,000. This is the condition as confessed to by this officer, and I accompany it by a statement made by a leading banking concern of New York, which shows that the amount of money now withdrawn from the circulation and at present available for the redemption of the debt of the United States is not, as stated by Mr. Cleveland, $140,000,000, but, on the contrary, reaches the enormous sum of $330,000,000. Here is the statement:

> The following figures are from the official statement of James W. Hyatt, Treasurer United States, issued March 31, 1888: Gross amount of cash in his hands as Treasurer, $673,158,371.60; against which has been issued in gold, silver, and legal-tender-note certificates, $292,395,394; leaving net money in his hands as Treasurer, $380,762,977.60, out of which the Treasurer has $61,231,647.36 lying in the national banks, secured by deposit with him of Government bonds.
>
> Of this vast sum now out of use, $100,000,000 is retained as a reserve against the legal-tender notes; $37,249,253.08 is retained to cover various appropriations; $99,192,622.15 is the actual net amount retained to cover redemptions of national-bank notes, leaving $130,326,758.54 as the actual surplus at that date. Of this amount $25,752,828.20 is fractional silver.
>
> The spirit of all laws of Congress is that only $100,000,000 shall be kept idle, but from this statement we see $230,326,758.54 is kept idle, and with the nearly $100,000,000 also idle awaiting the slow process of redeeming national-bank notes, we have a grand total of idle money of upwards of $330,000,000, or sufficient to redeem on a 2 per cent. basis all the outstanding 4½ per cent. bonds due in 1891, and with the additional accumulation of surplus up to end of the fiscal year June 30, 1888—say $56,000,000—would then leave the $100,000,000 reserve against legal tenders intact and some $25,000,000 besides.
>
> If the remedy for the "trouble" depends on "Congress" it should awake at once.

In the light of this statement of the business men, taken from the report of his Treasurer, Mr. Cleveland conceals the true situation by minifying the amount of available surplus $200,000,000. Not much of a difference to the Executive, perhaps, but a difference to the shrunken volume of currency, which weighs every hour of its continuance with untold peril.

In my judgment all that is here said by the Executive and by the bankers concerning the evil consequences of the sequestration of the enormous sums of money represented by the Treasury surplus is true, and more.

Nor are the evils of the situation hidden in the prospective; they are now "palpably imminent and apparent."

The demoralizing effect of the withdrawal and withholding of the money of the people from the great business enterprises recently entered upon or projected can be seen by any careful observer of affairs.

When all securities, stocks, and bonds, Government as well as others, are going down and interest is going up; when wheat and the great staples of the West, when iron and its manifold products are declining; when wages are falling and strikes are choking the great lines of transportation and threatening general revolt and the stoppage of internal carriage and the commerce dependent thereon, and others still have but recently released their hands from the vital supply of coal; when trusts are springing up on every side inspired to unholy activity by the example of the Government, and are on every side combining with evil fortune and hard times to further depress universal trade and defeat individual endeavor; while these trusts, the monsters of traffic, defying lawful methods, are with one hand crushing out contracts, and with the other sowing the seed of desperation that soon may ripen into anarchy, the President of the United States confronts the situation by saying in his message that there is no authority for the application of these funds to the purchase of bonds not now due, except that—

> found in an appropriation bill passed a number of years ago, and it is subject to the suspicion that it was intended as temporary and limited in its application.

Here, Mr. Chairman, is the law referred to by the Executive as "subject to suspicion" and supposed to be "temporary:"

> Act of March 3, 1881, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase United States bonds with his surplus money.
>
> *Be it enacted, etc.*
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury may at any time apply the surplus money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, or so much thereof as he may consider proper, to the purchase or redemption of United States bonds: *Provided*, That the bonds so purchased or redeemed shall constitute no part of the sinking fund, but shall be canceled.
>
> Approved March 3, 1881.

It has stood upon the statute-books unchallenged until now, and under it subsequent administrations without question bought up and redeemed $182,241,750 of the bonds of the United States, and under which, as the only and sufficient authority, his own Secretary of the Treasury has already purchased not only the 4½ per cent. bonds due in 1891, but also the 4 per cents. due in 1907, paying for the former 108 cents on the dollar and for the latter 127 cents on the dollar, expending in the purchase of $18,088,000 of such bonds $21,665,500 of the surplus under this authority repudiated by the President.

Mr. Chairman, does not the President go to desperate lengths to relieve himself and his administration of the responsibilities of the situation when he says that because the law of 1881 is "subject to suspicion" he therefore refuses to proceed under it? What is this but repudiation of the laws? Who is "suspicious" of the law? Who has said it was temporary? Has the court said so? Has the Congress repealed it? And if not where does he obtain the power to set aside at will a law passed and approved four years before he came to power?

From whence does he obtain the authority to nullify the acts of Congress? We supposed we had a servant committed by his oath to the execution of the laws. We awake to find we have a master before whose imperial will the laws must bend or yield.

Thus far this Administration has furnished the country much food for reflection, but none so startling as this.

There was one of the subordinate officers of the Government who, intoxicated with power, undertook the suspension of the laws "upon suspicion," and this same President placidly broke his official neck, to the entire satisfaction of all well-wishers of good government. It is unnecessary, sir, to say that I refer to the late unlamented Mr. William Andrew Jackson Sparks.

Will His Excellency make his own significant commentary and restrain his exuberant impetuosity when he is tempted to use the imperial veto on laws he can only obey, or disobeying, take the consequences.

But, sir, supposing the President sincere in his reference to the law of 1881, how will he or his champions explain the fact that he refused his approval to exactly such a law as he says the situation now needs, and if now has always during his term of office needed?

The Forty-ninth Congress passed what is known as the "Morrison surplus resolution" July 30, and sent it on that day to the President. He did not return it, and Congress adjourned August 7, 1885, and the resolution was killed by the deliberate act of the man who now lays all the evils of the surplus to want of authority to buy bonds, which he is buying, or, in other words, to Congress.

And, Mr. Chairman, if the situation is so perilous and the demand for relief so imperative, why is it that the bill to provide for the purchase of bonds, which passed the House February 29, 1888, went to the Senate, was amended, returned to the House, and referred to the Committee on Finance March 1, and reported back to the House March 6, has not been called up, considered, and passed? Who is responsible for this?

Is it not the duty of the majority to save the industries of the country from death by financial inanition, to the end that they may try the effects of tariff reform on them, for the benefit of science, if nothing else?

Mr. Chairman, one of the objections of the President to the law of 1881, directing the application of the surplus to the purchase of undue bonds, is that it is found in an appropriation bill. This is not without a precedent other than that furnished by a Republican administration.

In Polk's message of December, 1847, he said:

> It is recommended that as soon as the war shall be over (with Mexico), all the surplus in the Treasury not needed for other indispensable objects shall constitute a sinking fund, and be applied to the purchase of the funded debt, and that authority be conferred by law for that purpose.

In accordance therewith came the tardy act, section 9 of the appropriation bill of March 3, 1853, whereby the Secretary of the Treasury was authorized "to purchase at the current market rate any of the outstanding bonds of the United States that he may deem most advisable from any 'surplus' funds in the Treasury," but the surplus must not be reduced below six millions (Statutes at Large, volume 10, page 212).

Under this act of 1853 the Democratic administration paid as high as 21 per cent. premium for bonds due in twenty years. Here is the statement:

Statement showing when debt of United States was redeemable, rate of interest, and rate of premium paid.

Loan.	Rate of interest.	When redeemable.	Premium paid.				
			July 30 to Dec. 25, 1853.	Jan. 1 to Aug. 25, 1854.	Aug. 26, 1854, to Jan. 2, 1855.	Jan. 3, 1855, to Mar. 3, 1857.	Mar. 4 to Oct. 17, 1857.
	Per cent.		*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*	*Per cent.*
1842.....	6	Dec. 31, 1862	16	15½	11	10	10
1846.....	6	Nov. 12, 1856	8½	6	3	2½ to 1½	.....
1847.....	6	Jan. 1, 1868	21	21	16	16	16
1848.....	6	July 1, 1868	21	21	16	16	16
Texas indemnity.....	5	Jan. 1, 1865	.....	10	6	6	6

In from three to four years the Secretary of the Treasury, under the act of 1853, had paid in premiums over $4,600,000, and claimed he had saved in interest $14,600,000.

Mr. Chairman, before the hoarded treasures of the Government had reached their present dangerous sum the prosperity of the country west of the Missouri River was never greater. The amount of internal improvement during the years 1886–'87 was unparalleled, and yet to-day hundreds of miles of graded railroad line through Kansas, Nebraska, Dakota, and Wyoming lie tieless and unironed, waiting for the will and power of the great corporate owners and projectors to give the "touch of life" to their work and deliverance to the country they penetrate, which is now hopelessly cut off from the commercial world.

You ask the managers of great Western systems, which a year ago began work that was to end on the shores of the Pacific, why it is that they have suspended, and they will answer you it is because they can not profitably get the means with which to proceed, that they dare not take the risks, that capitalists and stockholders are stricken with a sudden dismay, and that they are halting between hope and fear until the millions in the Treasury are unlocked and the surplus ceases to menace the country with ruin.

The shadow of caution, distrust, and fear has fallen upon the business of the country, and the nation seems to have wakened suddenly to the fact that its very life-blood is congested; that its medium of exchange, its money, its gold, all that which circulating through the peaceful channels of business constitutes the calm health of nations, is being "pooled," "cornered," and "combined" in the "dead-lock" of the Treasury, from whence its influence issues like a malediction, paralyzing credit and capital into conservative inactivity.

In view of this condition of the country and its business, incident to the condition of the Treasury, it is truly time to call a halt, and not only ask but know what is the trouble and who is responsible for it; what is the remedy, and apply it.

The remedy and responsibility, sir, under existing laws, rest with the Secretary of the Treasury and the executive head of the Government, and if those responsible will at once undertake the purchase and redemption of the two hundred and thirty millions of 4½ per cent. bonds due in 1891, which can be bought at a premium of 8 per cent., and an annual saving of 2 or 2½ per cent. on the entire interest, then the burden which is weighing the country down will be lifted and the great work of development now standing at a halt can go forward.

The theory of the Democratic majority is that the tariff is at fault, and that all the evils of the times are to be laid upon it. I will not stop at this moment to discuss a theory which may remotely affect the situation. Whether the surplus sprang from the tariff or not, it is still true that in either event the Democratic party is responsible, for it alone had the power to lower the taxes and stop the accumulations. Whether good or evil, the surplus is a fact, and as such demanded the attention of the majority party and its Executive, and that attention they have stubbornly or ignorantly refused to give. And so I appeal from their theory to this fact: Suppose the Secretary of the Treasury should to-morrow call in the sixty-one millions of money of the Government loaned without interest to the national banks of the country, and they in turn should call on their customers who are carrying on vast undertakings based upon this credit, would not this contraction produce a crash that would involve the commercial world in ruin? This, I take it, would give us a result for which we would not be indebted to theory, and which would be so dire and complete that no man on this floor cares to invoke the test.

Mr. Chairman, the mismanagement of the surplus was not the first mistake of this political Moses. Has the country forgotten that the first act of Mr. Cleveland's Administration was to advertise in his annual message of 1885 for a panic? He asked the world to furnish him a panic to prove that his theory that silver was the enemy of gold and would drive the latter across the seas was true.

The President had borrowed this prediction from the financial prophets of the Administration in Wall street—from gentlemen who inherit their disinterested ability to shape the financial course of this nation in a direct line of transmission from the money-changers that Christ recommended should be scourged from the temple.

There was no panic. The prediction failed. The much-conjured devil of destruction was too decent to come forth. The loaded dice of the Administration, thrown in conspiracy with the proposed Wall-street gold corner, failed to produce the expected, if not the desired, result. Not fate and chance, but the laws of business, incapable of corruption or the influence of man, defended us.

Take it all in all, Mr. Chairman, the result of the financial policy of the Administration has not been happy upon the West. Whether that policy had its origin in ignorance, indifference, or mendacity, its culmination has produced results costing us millions in additional interest charges upon our loans, and renewals of the same; millions snatched, by the Government "corner" on the money, from the toil-stained hands of the farmers of the West, whose life is a patient struggle waged with unpretending courage against "a sea of troubles."

It was a cruel blow to a class of men numbering all told over 7,000,000, and including directly or indirectly one-third of the entire population of the United States. And they are a class that deserve well of the Republic. They are neither socialists, anarchists, nor grumblers. Under all the terrible temptations of impending ruin they are still the living promise of the country's peace, prosperity, and stability. They are as fundamental as the Andes or the Rockies, and constitute the backbone of both our system of business and of government. And so long as they can live I have no fear for the Republic.

Mr. Chairman, here is a verification of the disastrous effects of the surplus policy of this Administration on the farm products of this country—nor is its full loss to the country west of the Missouri computed here, nor can it be with any just degree of certainty, because of the additional loss to the far West on account of transportation.

Average export prices of certain commodities for the fiscal years from 1854 to 1861 compared with 1885, 1886, and 1887.

Years.	Corn, per bushel.	Wheat, per bushel.	Cotton, per pound.	Butter, per pound.	Cheese, per pound.
1854 to 1861	$0.75	$1.33	$0.10⅝	$0.17½	$0.09⅜
1885, 1886, 1887	.50⅝	.87⅞	.10	.16⅛	.09
Difference	.24⅛	.45⅛	.00⅝	.01⅝	.00⅜

Comparative yearly loss to American farmers on said crops between above periods.

On corn	$366,000,000
On wheat	205,580,000
On cotton	22,000,000
On dairy products	56,290,000
Total yearly loss	649,870,000

From the first table it appears that the total average yearly loss to agriculture during the years 1885, 1886, 1887, as compared with the years from 1854 to 1861, is $649,870,000, or a total loss for the three years of the monstrous sum of $1,949,610,000. And this loss is contemporaneous with the policy of "cornering" the money of the country in the United States Treasury commenced with his own administration, and now, by his own admission, about to culminate in ruin.

I omit, Mr. Chairman, any special reference to the tables comparing the years from 1860 to 1869 and from 1868 to 1878 with the three years of Mr. Cleveland's surplus policy for the obvious reason that the condition of values during that time was so unsettled that it might and would be said that the startling disclosures made by the figures were chargeable to that and not to the policy under consideration.

Average export prices for the fiscal years from 1876 to 1885, compared with 1885, 1886, and 1887.

	Corn per bushel.	Wheat per bushel.	Cotton per pound.	Butter per pound.	Cheese per pound.
1876 to 1885	$0.58⅛	$1.16⅛	$0.11	$0.18⅛	$0.10⅛
1885, 1886, 1887	.50⅝	.87⅞	.10	.16⅛	.09
Decline	.07½	.29⅜	.01	.02⅛	.01⅛

Comparative yearly loss to American farmers on said crops between above periods:

On corn	$112,500,000
On wheat	130,500,000
On cotton	27,000,000
On dairy products	98,000,000
Total yearly loss	468,000,000

The table showing the comparative loss to agriculture for the years 1885, 1886, and 1887, as contrasted with the period from 1876 to 1885, is not open to that objection, and the total yearly loss on corn, wheat, cotton, and dairy products for this period of $468,000,000 is not explainable otherwise than by reference to the condition of the currency. The aggregate for the three years, 1885, 1886, and 1887, of the comparative losses thus established is $1,404,000,000, from which I deduct the comparative loss on the cotton crop of the Southern planter, and find the net comparative loss on corn, wheat, and dairy products to have been $1,323,000,000, most of which fell upon the country west of the Mississippi.

It can not be answered that these results are chargeable to overproduction of wheat, for, as appears by the following table, the production of Europe in the three years next preceding, 1885, 1886, and 1887, was 69,000,000 bushels less than for those years.

[See table on next page.]

Wheat crops in this country, according to United States Agricultural Department reports.

Years.	Acres.	Bushels.	Average yearly price in Chicago.
1877	26,177,546	365,000,000	$1.25⅞
1878	32,109,560	420,122,400	.96⅛
1879	32,545,950	448,756,630	.99⅛
1880	37,986,717	498,549,868	1.05⅛

Wheat crops in this country, according to United States Agricultural Department reports.—Continued.

Years.	Acres.	Bushels.	Average yearly price in Chicago.
1881	37,709,020	380,280,090	$1.15½
1882	37,067,194	504,185,470	1.18
1883	36,455,593	421,086,160	1.01½
1884	39,474,885	512,763,900	.82½
Total	279,526,465	3,550,741,518	
Average per year	34,940,808	443,843,064½	1.05⅞
1885	34,189,246	357,112,000	.82½
1886	36,557,000	457,218,000	.76½
1887	37,076,000	456,329,000	.75½
Total	107,822,246	1,270,659,080	
Average per year	35,940,748½	423,553,000	.78½

And a comparison of the wheat crop in this country for the three years of 1885, 1886, and 1887 with the three years previous shows an annual average decrease for 1885, 1886, and 1887 of 55,812,176 bushels, or a total decrease of this product for the three years of 167,436,528 bushels.

Leaving this branch of the subject, Mr. Chairman, I repeat that the losses of the farmers of this country, aggregating millions per year, are chargeable to the reduction of the volume of the currency by the policy of the present Administration, a policy which, ignorantly or intelligently, makes the Government the principal factor in the combinations of capital which compel the producers to sell their products at such prices as renders the business of bread-raising a practical failure.

Mr. Chairman, the estimated expenses of the Government for the next fiscal year, June 30, 1888, to June 30, 1889, are placed at $325,000,000. Its incomes from all sources are placed at $383,000,000, derived as follows:

From sales of public lands	$10,000,000.00
From national banks	2,000,000.00
From interest and sinking fund, Pacific railways	2,000,000.00
From customs fees, fines, penalties, etc	1,150,000.00
From fees consular, letters patent, and lands	3,500,000.00
From sales of public property	300,000.00
From profits on coinage, assays, etc	9,000,000.00
From deposits for surveying public lands	150,000.00
From revenues of the District of Columbia	2,400,000.00
From miscellaneous sources	4,500,000.00
Internal-revenue sources	120,000,000.00
Customs	228,000,000.00
Aggregating the sum of	383,000,000.00

Assuming, as we may, that the estimates will be cut at least $15,000,000, the gross amount appropriated for the conduct of the Government for the period named will stand at $310,000,000, which, deducted from the gross incomes, leaves $73,000,000 as the excess of the incomes over the expenses of the Government for the period named.

This, if the present surplus be not reduced by its application to the purchase of the $230,000,000 of 4½ per cent. bonds, would make the aggregate available cash in the Treasury June 30, 1889, according to Mr. Cleveland's estimate, $213,000,000, or, according to the calculation of the New York bankers, based on the Treasurer's statement for March 31, 1888, $403,000,000.

I see nothing but danger in the surplus, and therefore am opposed to its further accumulation and am in favor of attacking it at both ends. Pay the debts with what is already piled up, and stop the useless accumulation of more by a reduction of customs duties and internal taxes.

Something might be said of the necessity of a navy, but since I listened to the speech of my eloquent friend from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] in the Forty-eighth Congress on that subject, I have lost all hope. It will be remembered that that gentleman declared that all the navy we needed, in order to become the terror of the seas, could be built out of "two hemlock logs lashed together, and an American flag." And this sublime suggestion for the national defense met with the enthusiastic approval of his party.

Something might be said of the need of ordnance and defensive works for the protection of our 15,000 miles of undefended rivers, coasts, and harbors, and the cities that in the event of war would become the sport of destruction, and it has been said here by over-sanguine gentlemen, who did not think on whose bottom the Democratic tub was standing, and what was said here was long ago better said than here by the dead sage of Gramercy Park, but all in vain, for the ability of his party to appreciate a wisdom sounding in patriotism and progress is deader than the venerated dust of their forgotten idol.

Something might be said of the need of plants for the manufacture, and places for the assemblage of modern ordnance, to the end that when, under the operation of the policy of free trade, we are compelled to abandon the ancient and honored doctrine of non-intervention in the affairs of Europe, and to accept as one of the blessings of good government her intervention in the affairs of this continent, we might respond in kind, when England sends her fleet to levy for debt on the United States, with fire and iron, as she did on Egypt.

But I refrain, for I remember that in the course of debate on the question of the continuance of a patent in the Forty-ninth Congress it was held by the honored and progressive gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN] that invention was a curse and progress a pitfall; that but for the untimely miracles of printing and gunpowder the land of Arkansas would still have been like the happy valley of the Abyssinian prince, and that the inhabitants thereof, instead of "listening with credulity to the whispers of fancy, following with eagerness the phantoms of hope," instead of "expecting that age would perform the promises of youth, and to-morrow would cure the deficiencies of to-day," would still be plowing the timber-strewn beaver clearing with a crooked stick, and shooting the succulent alligator with a club.

Since I learned these things, sir, and many more like them, from the gentleman in question, I abandoned the hope of appropriations for the benefit of that which is scientific in arms, and following the inevitable course of Democratic empire back across the conquered fields of science toward the dark ages, I agree that it will be bettter and cheaper, particularly cheaper, for you to put out the electric light, the undying spark of American genius, banish the electric spirit that speaks to us across continents and under oceans like the still small voice of Omniscience, break the great wheels that roll the billions of American commerce across a tideless continent and unite the eastern and western seas by the twin miracles of fire and iron, break up for us the great presses that print for us each day an intellectual picture of the world and "give its lettered pomp to tooth of time," and, folding our tents like the Arabs, quietly steal away, pausing, perhaps, in our backward march to ask why the monument at Bunker Hill and why the graves at Lexington.

Since I learned these things, sir, so eloquently inculcated by the advocate of that lofty proposition, that all that is is wrong, I have come to

Production of wheat in Europe from 1881 *to* 1888.

[In the absence of official figures, latest estimates are given.]

Countries.	1887.	1886.	1885.	1884.	1883.	1882.
	Bushels.	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*	*Bushels.*
Austria	40,000,000	38,800,000	39,725,000	43,814,746	37,871,261	44,548,146
Hungary	114,000,000	110,500,000	114,638,868	107,208,499	90,515,616	135,481,283
Belgium	20,000,000	18,250,000	19,573,926	22,700,000	16,645,666	24,900,000
Denmark	5,000,000	4,800,000	5,000,000	4,969,739	4,682,130	4,554,284
France	303,000,000	275,000,000	312,912,137	324,130,397	294,400,346	346,616,624
Germany	108,000,000	80,000,000	106,973,750	91,082,424	86,379,000	93,823,048
Great Britain and Ireland	79,000,000	68,500,000	82,145,888	84,653,715	72,768,921	91,581,500
Greece	4,000,000	4,800,000	5,102,894	5,102,894	5,102,894	5,102,894
Italy	124,000,000	130,000,000	118,244,589	115,500,000	124,411,748	155,012,168
Netherlands	10,000,000	5,000,000	4,965,625	5,892,079	5,628,643	5,439,488
Portugal	8,000,000	7,500,000	7,561,250	7,093,780	8,512,500	7,200,000
Roumania	20,000,000	20,000,000	22,629,063	36,887,000	20,000,000	30,000,000
Russia	295,000,000	190,000,000	209,192,256	266,711,972	218,816,360	202,907,738
Servia	3,000,000	2,750,000	4,681,875	6,242,500	4,500,000	6,810,768
Spain	114,000,000	112,000,000	113,500,000	99,312,500	120,000,000	85,134,600
Sweden and Norway	3,000,000	2,500,000	2,837,500	3,822,857	3,107,304	3,792,884
Switzerland	2,500,000	2,000,000	2,057,188	2,128,125	2,128,125	2,128,125
Turkey	44,000,000	45,000,000	45,400,000	42,562,500	36,887,500	40,867,200
Other countries	1,000,000	500,000	567,500	567,500	567,500	567,500
Total	1,297,500,000	1,117,300,000	1,217,809,309	1,270,383,227	1,152,925,514	1,287,332,254

Aggregate:	*Bushels.*
1882, 1883, and 1884	3,709,641,000
1885, 1886, and 1887	2,631,000,000

believe that there was no way for us to prepare for the unhappy contingency of future war than to abandon the repeating rifle, abolish the Krupp gun, and arm our future champions in combat with a tough club adorned with alligator's teeth, and when defending the coast let them carry in addition a bag of sand, for then sand will be cheap—very cheap.

In respect to these improvements, demanded in the name of good government, the ways of our Democratic friends are like the ways of Providence, and there the likeness ceases—they are mysterious and past finding out.

Mr. Chairman, I am for the reduction of the income of the Government. It is in my judgment obviously unjust and illogical to continue to strip the people of the country of seventy-odd millions of money per year, only to see it added to the other worse than useless millions already locked up in the Treasury.

And particularly is it necessary that this be done at once, when we see and admit that neither will the Executive recommend nor the majority in Congress pass laws that will apply what is in the Treasury, or is to be, to the manifest needs of the people.

Under this state of things not to advocate reduction, and accomplish it if we can, is, in my judgment, for us to become partakers in the evil of a policy denounced alike by the friends and foes of the Administration.

I wish to see the incomes reduced to the expenses. Not necessarily to the expenses narrowed down to the narrowest possible limit of the needs of the Government, but reduced as far as is consistent with liberal provisions for the conduct of its affairs, including provisions for the payment of the maturing public debts and the making of needed public improvements.

And I am for this being done by the Republican party, or if it can not be done by them, they being in the minority here, I am still in favor of an intelligent, determined, and fearless attempt to do it.

I am tired of that policy that asks us of the West to stand upon nothing but the neutral defense of a negative, of a denial of the efficacy of proposed remedial legislation. In the Forty-eighth Congress we stood upon our objection that the case made by the Morrison bill did not state facts sufficient to constitute a cause of action. Evidently the court of public opinion sustained us, as may be claimed by the significant loss of seats in this House then held by Democrats. But notwithstanding the qualified success of the negative policy of the Republican party in that contest, for one, I did not then approve it, and do not now wish to see it applied in the trial of this case, neither here nor to the people. We are entitled to a judgment on the merits in this controversy, and not to a judgment by default.

I am not indifferent to the difficulties of the situation, nor unmindful that it becomes me to be subordinate, and I hope that when I ask for affirmative action by the Republican party it will not be taken as treason to, or lack of faith in, the Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means, upon whom must fall the initial labor of preparing, digesting, and presenting a measure to be opposed to the measure presented by the majority of that committee and now pending before the House.

In the old time we drew power and honor from the fact of what we did, and not from the fact of what we objected to others doing. Suppose it be conceded in advance that we can not pass a bill for the reform of the duty and tax laws, does that excuse us from the trial, and a trial in which measure shall be opposed to measure? Do we not hold a better place in the coming controversy if we can say that we were defeated in an effort to modify those laws, than we would if we could only say that we defeated an effort, however crude, sectional, and dangerous, of our political adversaries to modify them?

The people can comprehend an effort to do something; can they as well comprehend an effort to prevent that something from being done? The people realize that they are between two dangers, one from the accumulation of unneeded taxes, the other from an ill-advised effort to reduce those taxes, so ill-advised that it amounts to a selfish, sectional, and cowardly blow at the American policy of protection.

It is our duty to protect them from both evils if we can, and I am for the effort. Let us do justice to the South and compel the South to do justice to the North and West, thus sustaining the confidence of the great Northern and Western constituencies in our willingness to defend all sections and all interests; and whether victorious or defeated we will reap our reward in a return to power of the only party with a policy big enough to comprehend the good of all.

And in this connection, Mr. Chairman, the appeal to history satisfies me that the only practical hope the country has for substantial relief is in the Republican party. That party has had control of the House of Representatives where, under the Constitution, all bills affecting taxes must originate, from 1866 down to March 4, 1875, and thereafter from March 4, 1881, to March 4, 1883, eleven years. The Democrats have had control from 1875 to 1881, and from 1883 to the present time, also eleven years.

During the eleven years of Republican control the revenues were reduced $362,000,000, as follows:

1. Acts of July 13, 1866, and March 2, 1867	$103,380,000
2. Acts of March 1868, and February, 1868	54,800,000
3. Acts of July, 1870	81,320,000
4. Acts of December, 1871	14,430,000
5. Acts of May, 1872, tea and coffee (free-list)	15,900,000
6. Acts of June, 1872	31,000,000
7. Acts of March 3, 1883 (estimated)	61,200,000
Grand total under Republican rule	362,000,000

During the eleven years of control the Democratic party has reduced the revenues $6,370,000. This was at the rate of something over $500,000 a year.

This reduction was made by taking the internal-revenue taxes off of whisky, tobacco, and snuff. It may be imagined that this reduction, particularly that on snuff, was a great relief to American labor, particularly that portion of the American laborers who gain their living by sneezing.

This comparison of the achievments of the two parties will cast some light on the question of which party has favored and maintained war taxes.

The advocates of the Mills bill are claiming now, and have always claimed, that all the crimes against industry are concentrated in what they call the "war taxes." If so, what a pitiful lack of conscience and courage, and what fertility of incapacity, has that party displayed during its eleven years of control.

The West, or at least that section with which I am familiar, asks for free coal, free salt, free lumber, and free sugar, and for the removal or reduction of the duties on other articles of necessary daily consumption where not in conflict with like articles of American manufacture or production, and for the modification of duties on necessaries wherever it can be done without injury to American labor.

In addition to this we would like to see taxes taken from alcohol when used in the arts and sciences, and from tobacco until such a reduction is made as will reduce the incomes to the legitimate needs of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, the Mills bill is offered as a means of relief against the further collection of unnecessary duties and taxes. If current history can be trusted, there are certain things connected with this measure which dishonor it at the start.

It is said that this bill was conceived in secret; that the Democratic majority were not aided in its formulation by their Republican colleagues; that they did not sit in the place appointed by law for their sessions, but in a place unknown to their colleagues and the public; that they thereby defeated the effort of the industries of the country to be heard, and denied the right of petition. If this be true, then the Congress is asked to honor with its confidence and give consideration to a measure born in defiance of the rule that the only adequate protection to private interest, as well as public honor, is to be found in the open and public consideration by the committee of the House of the matters intrusted to them by Congress.

The merit of this measure is that it puts salt and lumber on the free-list, and its disgrace is that it does not put coal and sugar there also; and it falls, so far as I am concerned, before this one overwhelming objection. It strikes the tax off these staples of the North and West—salt, lumber, and wool—and it does not strike the same tax off of the sugar, coal, iron, or rice of the South. It does not go as far as it ought to go as to coal and sugar, and the reason why it does not appears to be clearly and entirely political and sectional.

It comes to us of the West declaring that we, in respect to our interests, are not entitled to the same consideration that they of the South are. It strikes duties from imports that may disadvantageously affect Michigan and Wisconsin lumber and salt and Western wool, but it continues them upon Virginia coal, Louisiana sugar, and Georgia and Alabama iron.

Coal is an absolute necessity of life, and sugar is as indispensable to the comfort of the home of the poor as to that of the rich. They are not less demanded than lumber and salt. Put them all on an equality. We ask in this nothing sectional; the West has coal, so have the East, the North, and the South. Put them all upon an equality. We ask in this no sectional advantage, and we will submit to none.

As this bill stands under the old schedule you collect $59,000,000 of duty to protect $17,000,000 of sugar produced in Louisiana, and you take all protection from 265,000,000 pounds of American wool for the benefit of the 114,000,000 pounds of foreign wool imported into this country during the last fiscal year. You put the raw wool of the farmer on the free-list, and you leave the duty on the grade of woolen goods which he must buy. Thus, according to your theory of the operation of the laws of trade, on the one hand you rob him of the advantage of the tariff on his product, and, on the other, to borrow your own language, you allow the manufacturer to "rob" him again by adding the duty on his goods, which duty you refuse to remove, to the price which the farmer must pay for them as necessaries.

You strike duties from salt, and you refuse to take them from coal. You make lumber free, and you protect iron. Are not these things all equally necessary to the comfort of men? And if so, why are they not treated as such as a matter of principle? To do otherwise is a trick, and your bill is nothing but an intrigue—a bribe paid to a section you fear. Your bill confesses that you have broken the great principle of equality, fundamental to good Government, in the interest of a party, to

conciliate a section. With your hands full of power you dare not do justice; you are frightened at the omnipotence of a principle.

Mr. Chairman, while on the sectional aspect of the proposed legislation, allow me to present two tables taken from the Census report, which present the facts as they are as to the relative interest in and possible benefits derived from the system of protection as between the North and South.

The protection on articles of import competing in the American market against like products of the West and North, is as follows:

Farm imports, dutiable.

	Quantity.	Amount.	Duty.
Animals (page 791):			
Cattle	72,665	$979,696	20 per cent. ad valorem.
Horses	38,725	2,464,303	Do.
Sheep	451,253	1,187,847	Do.
Total		4,631,846	
Breadstuffs (page 791):			
Barley.....bushels	10,355,594	6,173,208	10 cents per bushel.
Corn.....do	30,536	16,636	Do.
Oats.....do	87,380	29,579	Do.
Oatmeal.....pounds	939,502	37,857	¼ cent per pound.
Rye.....bushels	18,469	10,720	10 cents per bushel.
Wheat.....do	277,842	218,867	20 cents per bushel.
Wheat flour..barrels	1,013	3,302	20 per cent. ad valorem.
All other		150,059	
Total		6,640,228	
Hay (page 795).....tons	78,368	790,394	$2 per ton.
Hops (page 795)..pounds	18,538,049	3,404,669	8 cents per pound.
Malt barley (page 796), bushels	209,960	153,363	20 cents per bushel.
Provisions (page 797):			
Meat products, extracts		272,651	20 per cent. ad valorem.
All other		162,202	1 to 2 cents per pound.
Dairy:			
Butter.....pounds	236,100	38,125	4 cents per pound.
Cheese.....do	6,592,192	874,261	Do.
Milk, condensed		459,000	20 per cent. ad valorem.
Total		1,806,239	
Vegetables (page 799):			
Beans, peas..bushels	648,388	607,853	10 per cent. ad valorem.
Potatoes.....do	1,432,490	543,091	15 per cent. per bushel.
Pickles, etc.		387,177	35 per cent.
All other, natural		516,319	10 per cent. ad valorem.
All other, preserved		295,911	35 per cent. ad valorem.
Total		2,350,351	
Wool (page 800):			
Clothing wools..lbs	17,963,982	3,431,567	2½ to 12 cents per pound.
Combing wools..do	10,721,753	2,528,560	Do.
Carpet, etc.....do	85,352,295	10,464,352	Do.
Total	114,038,030	16,424,479	
Flax, etc. (page 794):			
Flax.....tons	7,140	1,922,182	$5 to $40 per ton.

RECAPITULATION.

Animals	$4,631,846	Vegetables	2,350,351
Breadstuffs	6,640,228	Wool, raw	16,424,479
Hay	790,394	Flax	1,922,182
Hops	3,404,669		
Barley, malt	153,363	Total	38,123,751
Provisions	1,806,239		

So much for the Northern farmer. The Southern farmer and planter is protected as follows:

Farm imports, dutiable.

	Quantity.	Amount.	Duty.
Hemp, etc. (page 794):			
Hemp.....tons	32,739	$4,041,522	$25 per ton.
Jute.....do	88,514	2,616,128	20 per cent. ad valorem.
Sisal grass, etc..do	36,355	3,733,001	$15 per ton.
Total		10,390,651	
Fruits (pages 794, 795):			
Figs.....pounds	8,724,583	487,692	2 cents.
Lemons		3,835,147	30 cents per box, 16 cents per half box, $2 per 1,000.
Oranges		2,408,140	25 cents per box, 13 cents per half box, $1.60 per 1,000.
Prunes.....pounds	92,032,625	2,999,648	
Raisins.....do	40,673,288	2,281,981	2 cents.
Preserved fruit		748,493	20 per cent. ad valorem.
All other		1,799,462	35 per cent. ad valorem.
Almonds	5,482,362	597,476	5 cents per pound, 7 cents per pound shelled.
All others		682,878	2 cents per pound.
Total		15,840,827	

Farm imports, dutiable—Continued.

	Quantity.	Amount.	Duty.
Rice (page 798):			
In grain.....pounds	46,765,394	$922,305	1¼ to 2½ cents per pound.
Granulated.....do	47,921,263	754,089	Do.
Total	94,686,659	1,674,394	
Sugar, molasses, etc. (page 799):			
Molasses.....gallons	37,894,126	5,340,763	4 to 8 cents per gallon.
Sugar, to No. 13, pounds	2,918,103,240	69,153,830	1.4 cents per pound.
Sugar, Nos. 13 to 20, pounds	25,043	1,017	3 cents.
Sugar, above No. 20, pounds	24,122	1,026	3.5.
Candy		22,971	5 cents per pound.
Total		74,519,607	
Tobacco (page 799):			
Leaf wrappers	54,939	49,430	75 cents to $1 per pound.
All other	17,464,255	8,655,520	35 cents per pound.
Total	17,519,104	8,704,950	
Total		111,130,429	

The balance of protection in favor of Southern interests as against Northern and Western, as shown by this table, is $73,006,678—only a trifle, but such a trifle as this will open the eyes of the West if it can not waken the conscience of the majority of this House.

It will be observed from this table that the principal advantage to Northern agriculturists comes from the duty laid on imported wool, which is $16,424,479, and that this is now proposed to be taken from the Western farmer and presented to the foreign growers of wool. It will be observed also that the principal item of protection to the Southern planter is that on sugar and cane products, to wit, $74,519,607, and this is to be maintained with slight modification. And this is done by a party that says that it is not the enemy of American manufacturers, laborers, and producers; that it has come to power like the Holy One of old, to prepare the way of redemption of these same laborers and producers from the bondage of war taxes. Sugar is protected to the extent of $56,000,000 a year, or $1 per head of the entire population of the United States, paid into the Treasury as duty on the imported sugar consumed by the country.

The purpose for which this vast levy is made is the protection of the Louisiana and other Southern planters who produce $17,000,000 worth of the sugar consumed by the people. That is, the general consumers pay enough in duty on the supply of sugar, over and above the home product, to buy that home product more than three times over.

And notwithstanding this enormous tax of $1 per head on the population of the United States, the industry of sugar-growing in the South, it is said, has steadily decreased. And still a party flying the banners of reform, pledged to tariff reduction to the level of the revenue needs of the Government, such tariff when reduced to be so adjusted as to protect American industry and cheapen imported necessaries, proceeds to reform the tariff by letting alone an outrage which robs the tax-ridden people (Democratic stereotype) of at least fifty millions of money for nothing.

I would not refuse protection to the sugar interests of the South, but would levy only such a duty on imported sugar as would pay a reasonable bounty to the growers of American sugar. The effect of raising sixty millions of revenue from sugar, an imported necessary of life, will be seen in the removal or reduction of duties on other imports, which duties are necessary to protect American producers; and, sir, here is an example of it.

The following table shows the effect of Democratic tariff reform on certain Western farm products:

Products.	Canadian rate.	United States rate.	Mills rate.
Potatoes	10 cts. per bushel	15 cts. per bushel	Free.
Beans	15 cts. per bushel	10 per cent.	Free.
Peas	10 cts. per bushel	10 and 20 per cent.	Free.
Tomatoes	30 cts. per bushel	10 per cent.	Free.
All other vegetables, including sweet potatoes.	20 per cent.	10 per cent.	Free.
Plums	1 cent per pound	1 cent per pound	Free.
Currants	1 cent per pound	1 cent per pound	Free.
Peppermint and other essential oils.	20 per cent.	25 per cent.	Free.
Blacking	25 per cent.	25 per cent.	20 per cent.
Bricks	20 per cent.	20 per cent.	Free.
Brooms	25 per cent.	25 per cent.	20 per cent.
Brushes	25 per cent.	25 per cent.	20 per cent.
Flax (raw)	$20 per ton	$20 per ton	Free.
Flax (hackled)	$40 per ton	$40 per ton	Free.
Tow	$10 per ton	$10 per ton	Free.
Meats, game, and poultry			Free.

At present the tariff on agricultural products is:

Products.	Duty.	Nebraska raises.
		Bushels.
Barley	10 cents per bushel.	2,612,000
Corn	do	127,852,000
Corn-meal	do	
Oats	do	20,674,000
Rye	do	1,774,500
Wheat	20 cents per bushel.	13,895,000
Flour	20 per cent.	
Flax-seed	20 cents per bushel	387,490
Potatoes	15 cents per bushel.	4,100,000
Linseed-oil	25 cents per gallon.	
Beer (grain)	20 to 35 per cent	
Bologna sausage (beef)	3 cents per pound.	
Beef and pork	1 cent per pound.	
Butter	4 cents per pound.	15,620,000
Cheese	do	
Hams	2 cents per pound.	
Hay	$2 per ton.	
Honey	20 cents per gallon.	191,260

And the ultimate effect of the "free-list" on American agriculture can be better estimated when it is understood that, notwithstanding protection, there was imported into this country during the year ending June 30, 1887, $197,308,240 of foreign agricultural products, of which only 46,678,443 paid no duty.

Having so adjusted the "reform" of the tariff as to put the great staples of the North and West on the free-list and leave those of the South on the protected list, having reformed us down and them up, what becomes of the promise to protect American labor so far as the same could be done by a tariff for revenue? In the light of these sectional discriminations where is America anyway? Will not some one hand the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means a map of the United States? Is the North and the West to be wiped from the map so as to make the way clear for this conspiracy in favor of sectional reform?

Before I leave this subject, Mr. Chairman, there is still another reason why the commodities I have named, to wit, lumber, salt, coal, and sugar, should go on the free-list, and that is that they have in a large measure fallen into the hands of trusts and combinations against trade; and these monster conspiracies are abusing privileges granted to the commodities, but not granted to operators in such commodities. The ability of these trusts to coerce or crush individual operators and drive all competition from the field is aided, if not made possible, alone by the Cleveland "corner" and "trust" on the money of the nation. The scarcity of money caused by the Treasury "lock-up" makes the vast sums held by the "combines" almost omnipotent. Between the Government "combine" and the "trusts" fair dealing trembles for its life, and the time has come for heroic remedies. And so I say to this extent let in the world and let its coal, lumber, salt, and sugar combat with these iniquities that have fastened themselves to our vital resources, and will, if not checked or killed, yet lay us under tribute for our own earth, air, and water, laying their impious hands upon the very gifts of God.

In the course of this debate some of the gentlemen speaking for the bill have seen fit to assail the present prosperity of the West and to libel its future prospects, hoping to gain its support for this measure by arming its prejudice against its reason and its interest.

The West will be able to discover that its immediate ills are not chargeable to a system under which for twenty-five years of Republican rule it enjoyed a phenomenal growth, and under which system, with certain modifications, it still expects to repeat the results of the past.

It will understand the motive which has withheld the money of the country from circulation in order to create in the surplus an argument to crush the system of American protection. They will use the errors of the enemies of this system, not to destroy themselves, but to punish those who committed the error, counting upon their inability to discover the motive and assign the cause.

I submit herewith a showing that will convince our solicitous friends that Nebraska is not likely to make an assignment at once for the benefit of either the Administration or the Mills bill, and also that there is no immediate danger of our being sold out from inability to pay either the interest or principal of our debts.

NEBRASKA UNDER PROTECTION.

Population:	
1880	452,000
1885	740,000
1888, probably	1,300,000

An increase in between 1880 and 1885 of 62 per cent., and in eight years of 187 per cent.

Farms:	
1880	63,387
1885	99,857

An increase of 56 per cent. in five years.

Manufactories:	
1880	1,403
1885	2,861

An increase of 100 per cent.

Employed in all occupations	154,000
Employed in agriculture	90,507

Or about 60 per cent.; but the 40 per cent. is a large minority, and also deserves attention.

1889—In trade and transportation	15,100

Or about 10 per cent.

In manufacturing, mechanical, and mining	18,200

Or, say, 12 per cent.

In other industries	28,700

Or about 17 per cent.

These figures do not show a tax-ridden, cursed section of country, nor a population beggared by the American policy of protection; quite the contrary.

Take the wool industry of Nebraska:

1880, number of sheep	199,453
1885, number of sheep	444,013

An increase of 120 per cent.

1880, wool sold, pounds	1,282,656
1885, wool sold, do	2,060,483

An increase of 60 per cent.

1880, value of farms	$105,932,000
1885, value of farms	285,946,000

An increase of 175 per cent.

1880, value of products	$31,708,000
1885, value of products	52,035,000

An increase of 65 per cent.

The great basis for the conclusions drawn, and sought to be drawn, against the protective system in this country by those advocating the passage of the Mills bill is that the duties levied upon imports are so high as to amount to a practical embargo upon such imports, and that this embargo is dual in its operation, not only excluding (foreign) imports from this country, but in its reactionary effects excluding domestic products, whether manufactured or unmanufactured, from profitable export, thus producing as a secondary result a demoralizing condition of the home market, a glut which threatens to crush both capital and labor in a common ruin.

Whether the conditions described by the advocates of the bill in question exist at all or not, it is not now my purpose, further than I already have, to consider. If the objection here urged to the tariff is true, then it constitutes a reason for its reduction, but not for its destruction. Let it be reduced, but let the reduction be non-sectional, and so far as consistent with the admitted necessity of reduction let it protect American labor and the home market of American producers.

The mistake is in assuming that these laws have produced these conditions. The reverse is rather the truth. Certain conditions have produced these laws, or rather certain conditions in which American labor and property found itself have produced them. They sprang from the knowledge which American toil and property has that it owns this country, and owns also the power to govern it by law, and to make the laws by which it shall be governed, and to so make the laws as to hold the natural advantages of its own country for its own use.

These laws have a deeper meaning to me than mere dollars and cents. On the surface they seem to deal with questions of daily economy and finance; on a profounder view they deal with the great questions of whether a government founded on the abstract right of the absolute equality of men, rooted in a new soil, can maintain itself at any cost in a combat with the forms, laws, and conditions of old governments, based upon the denial of the fundamental truths that we hold sacred. Our adversaries in trade, as in war, represent a social and trade condition based upon the self-imposed authority of the few and the benighted submission of the many. Their product is the output of millions who bow their necks to the yoke of toil, patient as the brute, held in order by the transmitted degradation of ancestors whose vassal lives, rooted tree-like to the soil, passed body and soul with the feudal fee. Our laws, representing conditions of man and matter, never like those of England, proclaim it to be the policy of American labor and capital that those conditions shall remain eternally different.

If a dollar is the only object of government, then the American Revolution was a failure. Submission to England would have been a commercial success. We should have saved the tea in Boston Harbor—and sold it. You can not organize a board of trade to-day on the business principles of the Declaration of Independence. If the only measure for the aspirations of man is a yard-stick or a gold-piece, then free government might as well go out of business. If what is wanted in the world is cheap men, then the proclamation of emancipation was an outrage, and the blood shed to free the slaves was infamous.

If we must meet Europe on her own ground, we must find men to do it with—our own men will not. They can be carried up, but not down; they have power and can not be cheated out of its use or its rights. You say, let us trade. With whom—with Europe? To what end—that Europe may become like us, or we like it? You say, give

us a market, and, looking abroad, you blind your eyes to a continent. What would you trade? Civilizations, systems, destinies? No; no. The Republic born of revolutions exists to demonstrate that in one extreme the heights of a free man's destiny can not be measured by a monarch's scepter, nor in another by the daily price and condition of a practical bondman, enslaved by traditions and class conditions which American labor, armed in its own defense, put under its feet a hundred years ago.

These laws and conditions in which this country finds itself, and of which the gentlemen complain, are not conditions imposed by the mere *ipse dixit* of the legislator. They are conditions fixed in the very nature of things, and one of the things in which they are fixed is the heart and soul of a free man who has a country and purposes to keep it; and our laws and limitations upon imports are laws and limitations imposed in the effort of labor to protect itself, to retain the advantage which belongs to it as the discoverer and owner of a continent, and the owner of the right and power to govern the same by a vote which belongs to it. It is in its last analysis the application to the business of government of the first law of nature by the man who holds as his own divine right the power to make laws, Congresses, Presidents, and to shape policies for the conduct of that government; and whether right or wrong it is made by the man who is responsible in this exercise of original power to his own conscience and judgment alone.

These men may err, but in my judgment they do not.

The logic of the tendency of the argument in support of the bill under discussion asks a nation, where all are masters, to enter a business battle to the death with a nation or nations whose laws and policies are shaped by and almost of necessity made in the interest of classes—governing classes—headed by a crowned or sceptered potentate, supported by hereditary aristocracy, and based, not upon the consent, but the submission of the people.

The answer that the policy of the existing laws makes, it seems to me is the only answer that a policy based upon the votes of a free and self-governing people can make to the policies of a nation whose laws of trade spring from persons holding power by privilege, and not by right, and whose benefits are absorbed by the few and not by the many.

The protective policy speaks of the fact that no American has lived who has had to think of the difference in the condition of the people of a nation that govern themselves and one where they do not. Prince Bismarck, speaking in the German Parliament, exclaimed, "the German has not lived who has not had to arm himself against the Gaul." And so it is here. Freedom, based upon the homes of the people, the self-respecting independence of its masses, the rooted intelligence radiated from vast systems of free schools and colleges, has no choice but to guard her home against oppression and all that it produces, for if we must meet Europe upon her plane it must be at the peril of institutions and conditions existing here necessary to our existence which do not exist there, and can not. And the perpetual appeal which is raised from this side of the House is not in any right sense alone an appeal for American labor. It is an appeal for what rests upon, is defended by, and made possible by it, and that is the American system, the Government itself.

And so, whatever modifications either party or all parties may make—and there are many that should, and I trust will, be made—let it be remembered that so far as I can speak for one section of this country, as nearly disinterested as any section can be, let it be remembered, I repeat, that the West has wheat for sale, and corn, and cattle, and all the products of the earth. But her interest in American protection as a policy, as a bulwark of American liberty, sacred to all mankind, and especially to American labor, is not for sale.

And that party does not now live, nor shall it ever live, which, call it what you will, shall be able to draw the deed for its deliverance over to our one-time British masters, except upon terms dictated by American labor, for to this we all stand committed by obligations that are national and not personal, patriotic if not profitable, an obligation more sacred than an oath subscribed, as sacred as the blood that in the heroic days washed the stain off English pollution from off the virgin continent and drove the Hessians out, that come what will, be it weal or woe, be it the cowardice of the weak, the mistakes of the wise, the insolence of the strong, the treason of one section or the revolt of another, the fall or rise of fortune, the power of pools, the combinations of trusts that with one hand crushes contracts and with the other raises the red flag of anarchy, the mad appeal of the demagogue, the bloody cry of the commune, the desperate appeal of the strike, the wreck of fortune and the crash of commerce, come all the evils that government is heir to, only so they be American and they shall be conquered in the interest of the Republic, whose destiny it is to demonstrate in its own political personality not only the eternal worth of freedom to man, but the eternal possibility of that freedom preserved through government.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the oral discussion of this measure with great interest, and after the publication of the speeches in the RECORD I have read many of them over with care in the quietude of my room. The result with me is an overwhelming conviction that this is a fair and liberal bill, and that it is my duty to support it. I believe it to be an honest effort on the part of the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means to relieve the people. The framers of this bill have, as I shall show, manifested a fairness and liberality towards the protected industries which those industries and the lines of business connected with them utterly refuse to extend to the great body of the people who use and consume their wares and products.

It is conceded by all that the revenues now derived from import duties, internal taxes, and miscellaneous sources are annually about $60,000,000 in excess of necessary expenditures. It is agreed, even under the method of Treasury book-keeping, that there are $100,000,000 now in the Treasury in excess of current demands, and that the daily receipts are swelling this amount rapidly and constantly. With an individual this would afford evidence of unusual prosperity, but to the nation it is a danger signal that can not be passed by unheeded. Now, what shall be done? The question is of the highest importance, and calls for practical business solution. If the money of the country continues to filter through the custom-houses and the internal-revenue offices into the great reservoir of the Treasury and remains there, enterprise must inevitably succumb.

If the sea should refuse to give back the floods which empty into it the plains would soon become parched, the rivers would cease to flow, and all life would perish. Nature in her wise economy forbids this. Now our Treasury surplus, present and prospective, is not the result of sound and prudent financiering. It is the effect of unwise and improvident legislation. How the authors of our present embarrassed situation can have the effrontery to claim that they alone are worthy of being intrusted with the revision of our revenue laws is more than I can understand. The difficulties at present surrounding us are the result of their folly. The situation is certainly not the result of wise forecast. Was it wise and prudent to provide by law for the annual collection from the people of $60,000,000 more than is necessary to meet every anticipated demand, and then provide no method of speedily and profitably returning this money to the channels of trade?

Our present revenue laws were enacted with full knowledge of the certain increase of population and expansion of business. The extent of our foreign trade, of immigration, the sums total of exports and imports, all these factors were taken into account, and must have been substantially foreseen. Instead of prudently reserving the right to annually redeem at par an amount of interest-bearing bonds equal to any surplus money that might from time to time accumulate, instead of a wise reservation like this, you in effect enacted that there should be a surplus and then clothed the holder of public securities with power to extort blood-money in the shape of unconscionable premiums. After this stupendous blunder—to use no harsher term—after you have poisoned the body-politic, by what authority and upon what grounds do you claim the exclusive privilege of treating the patient? [Applause.] The conditions which embarrass us at the present session of Congress are not new. Your attention has for years been called to the congested condition of the Treasury, and to the depletion going on elsewhere.

The honorable gentlemen who oppose this bill are traveling a rough and thorny road. Their eyes are open to the fact that the people are overtaxed, that they are deprived of their circulating medium, more and more of which is daily being locked up in the Treasury. They are aware that this surplus must rapidly increase under existing laws. They are aware that unless the causes which produce these results are removed or promptly modified the business health of the country must continue to steadily decline. The majority of the Committee on Ways and Means have united in presenting to the House and to the country a scheme for tax reduction.

Gentlemen of the Republican side of the House, have you met it with a bill of your own? No; the gentlemen composing the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means in the views which they submitted, say they will seek to amend and modify the bill in the Committee of the Whole House, but they do not state the character of the amendments and modifications which they will offer. Failing in this they declare they will offer a substitute for the bill, but they append no draft of such substitute. That, too, is kept in the dark and excluded from this discussion. No opportunity has been given, gentlemen, to compare the proposed substitute with the pending bill, nor has it been given to the country. Indeed, it is clear that you have not agreed upon a substitute, and you can not agree upon one among yourselves. A majority of you agree upon one thing, and one only—that you are opposed to this bill. So far as any substantive proposition is concerned you are as wide apart as the poles.

In the Republican national platform for 1884 you inserted the following plank:

> The Republican party pledges itself to correct the inequalities of the tariff, and to reduce the surplus.

Now, this is the whole party speaking with authority. It is both a declaration and an admission which should estop any member of that party from denying that our present tariff laws are unjust in their operation and need correcting. Here is another declaration made by the Republican party of my own State. In the Iowa platform the party declares:

> We believe the tariff should be revised and reduced.

It will be observed that this declaration relates to the tariff as a whole, and declares that it ought to be reduced. We on this side of

the House agree with them, and because we have undertaken to make the reduction, and prevent surplus accumulations in the Treasury, we are denounced as free-traders, and accused of trying to unsettle the business prosperity of the country.

But how has the Republican party kept the pledge which it made in the platform of 1884? They violated it outright in the Forty-eighth Congress by voting solidly to strike out the enacting clause of the bill then before the House—a bill to correct the inequalities of the tariff and prevent surplus accumulation.

In the Forty-ninth Congress, standing in the presence of all their pledges, State and national, to reduce the tariff, and with full knowledge that the surplus was accumulating, and that under present laws it would continue to accumulate, by a solid Republican vote in this Hall you refused even to consider the question. And to-day, instead of presenting to the country a candid and plain proposition of relief, your attitude is one of obstruction. No longer strong enough to prevent consideration, you are now really on the retreat, and are putting in the time burning bridges, tearing up culverts, and felling trees across the road along which we must advance in our work of relief. [Applause.]

A Republican Senator from my own State, Hon. JAMES F. WILSON, in his speech delivered on the floor of the Senate April 5, 1888 (RECORD, page 2871, first session Fiftieth Congress), says:

> Mr. President, we are still confronted with our annual surplus revenue of about $60,000,000. Is there no way by which we can get rid of it without disturbing our true industrial condition? It seems to me there is a way which is both short and clear. We have one public tax the gross yield per annum of which more than equals the reduction of revenue we are called on to make. The tax on intoxicating liquors is the one to which I refer. This is where I would make the reduction.

This gentleman has the right to speak for his party in the State of Iowa, as he has just been re-elected to a seat in the Senate of the United States. In view of the fact that he would now make the reduction on internal-revenue taxes solely, and on the one article alone of intoxicating liquors, I would like to know what has become of the pledges made by his party in national convention and in his own State to "revise and reduce" the tariff? He utterly ignores them, spits upon them, and tramples them under his feet. We in Iowa accept the issue thus tendered. We say the reduction shall be made on the necessaries of life; on the lumber that shelters our people, and out of which our houses and barns and granaries must be constructed. It shall be made on the clothing our people wear, the food they eat, the salt that seasons their frugal meals, the implements they use in their daily toil, upon the blankets that keep us and our little ones warm when the mercury is below zero, and upon steel rails, the cost of which enters so materially into the cost of transporting our produce to market, and we will go before our people and ask them to decide between us. [Applause.]

But the honorable Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] has made a new departure. He has not always been in favor of making the reduction on whisky. In the year 1866, in the Thirty-ninth Congress, he voted to fix the duty on railroad iron at 50 cents per hundred pounds, and so did his colleague, Senator ALLISON. (See Globe, volume 59, page 2723, first session Thirty-ninth Congress.) It is the long ton of 2,240 pounds that is meant here, which would make the duty $11.20 per ton—only 20 cents per ton, less than 1 cent per 100 pounds, above the rate fixed by the Mills bill. Now, if fixing the duty on steel and iron rails in this bill at $11 per ton makes its author and those who support it free-traders, then Mr. WILSON in 1866 had a very narrow escape. All he lacked at that early day of being an abominable free-trader was 20 cents to the long ton. Saved as by fire!

But let us look at his record some fourteen years later. This will give ample time for both his judgment and his experience to ripen. In the year 1880 we find him before the Ways and Means Committee of this House, and, strange to say, still urging a reduction on steel rails. The honorable gentleman made an elaborate argument in favor of reduction, and at the conclusion of his remarks was cross-examined by the committee. I read from page 44 of a pamphlet containing the notes of a hearing had before the Ways and Means Committee on the 3d, 4th, and 5th days of February, 1880:

> Mr. KELLEY. What rate of duty would you indicate on steel rails?
> Mr. WILSON. I have left that somewhat to the consideration of the committee, but I should judge that the steel-rail interest of the country would be abundantly promoted at a duty of $14 a ton.
> Mr. KELLEY. And what is the sum that you would name?
> Mr. WILSON. I think it could stand a less duty than that.
> Mr. TUCKER. What do you think of $10 a ton?
> Mr. WILSON. I think it could stand a duty of $10 a ton.

Here you have it! Why, the honorable chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means [Mr. MILLS] puts it in the present bill at $11 per ton. That makes him a better protectionist than the honorable Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON], and establishes the fact that Mr. WILSON exceeds the honorable gentleman from Texas as a free-trader to the extent of $1 per long ton. [Applause.]

I call attention to the fact that the honorable Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] did not appear before the Ways and Means Committee in 1880 to urge a reduction of the tax on intoxicating liquors, although the tax was raging at that time. His point of attack at that date was the steel-rail monopoly, and this is where he would then have made the reduction.

And at the conclusion of Mr. WILSON's remarks before the committee Mr. Morrison said:

> You have made but one mistake, and that is in claiming to be a protectionist. I claim you on the other side.

[Laughter.]

But let us see how my Republican colleagues in the present House view the situation. The honorable gentleman from the Fifth district [Mr. KERR], in a speech upon the pending bill, delivered from his seat on this floor April 28, 1888, speaking of the position taken by Senator WILSON, declares that he has no hesitation in giving in his adhesion to the doctrine that the reduction should be made from the tax on intoxicating liquors. He says he unhesitatingly made this declaration early in the session of the present Congress. The honorable Senator is thus re-enforced by another Republican leader of our State. (See page 3641, first session Fiftieth Congress.)

My colleague, Colonel HENDERSON, would make the reduction solely on sugar. (See RECORD, page 3679, first session Fiftieth Congress.) Is this reduction on a single article the revision of the tariff which was promised in the Republican platforms above quoted? If the position taken by the gentleman in other parts of his speech be correct, namely, that American industry will perish unless protected from foreign competition, what will be the effect upon our American sugar plantations when the fostering care of protection is entirely withdrawn? Upon the gentleman's theory I convict him of intending to destroy the American sugar industry.

My colleague and friend of protection, Governor GEAR, from the First district, also has some evil design upon the sugar industry of America, for he, too, declares that he would make the reduction on sugar. That is his interpretation of Republican pledges, State and national. He, too, strikes at a single industry. Now, here we have two honorable Representatives from Iowa declaring that the reduction shall be made on sugar, and two, Mr. KERR and Senator WILSON, that it shall be made on whisky. Both can not be accommodated. The pending bill makes a reduction of 22 per cent. on sugar, but none on whisky. Would it not be advisable for these gentlemen to compromise for the sake of harmony? Take part of the tax from whisky and part from sugar and then mix them? [Laughter and applause.] That great necessary of life, raw whisky, could then be sweetened to suit the taste of the consumer. [Laughter.]

But when my colleague [Mr. GEAR], in his speech the other day, spread his pair of blankets before the House—blankets manufactured by my old personal friend, Isaiah Meek, at his establishment at Bonaparte, in the county adjoining to where I live—I felt alarmed, and greatly so when I heard him make the following statement:

> Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of this House to the fact that the passage of the pending tariff bill will not only seriously injure the wool-grower of my State, but it will also close up the mill where that blanket was made, and put out of employment the labor engaged in its manufacture.

When I heard this statement I flew around lively, for I am acquainted with Isaiah Meek, and if this bill was to have the effect of closing his woolen factory I desired to know about it. So straightway I turned to page 28 of the bill to see what it said about the tariff on blankets; and lo! and behold, I found the rate of duty in the present bill on blankets is 40 per cent. ad valorem. [Laughter.]

Is not that enough? This bill, if it becomes a law, will give Isaiah Meek cheaper raw material; it will give him wool at less cost than he is now paying for it; the wool-grower will be more than compensated in the reduced cost of the manufactured goods, the people can buy cheaper blankets, and Mr. Meek will still be protected by a 40 per cent. duty on the imported blanket. How then will this bill close up Isaiah Meek's establishment? I have written Mr. Meek and expect a reply soon; and I now predict that Isaiah Meek is in favor of the Mills bill. [Applause.] When I hear from him I shall make use of what he says under the five-minutes debate.

But my friend and colleague from the First district of Iowa [Mr. GEAR] has not always entertained the idea that a tax on sugar was the sole thing that is threatening the prosperity of this country; for in his inaugural address as governor of the State of Iowa, delivered before the Legislature of that State January 16, 1880, he said:

> To a State whose products are in the main agricultural, as are those of Iowa, anything which enhances the cost of railways, thereby even incidentally in the least degree increasing the expense of the transportation of her products to the seaboard, which is her great market, is a question of great interest to all. In view of their greater strength and durability, which lessened the cost of replacement, all the great trunk railway lines of the country are adopting Bessemer steel rails. The manufacturers of this class of rails in the United States are controlled by a combination of not exceeding, I think, ten firms in number.
> This combination is protected by a high and specific tariff, which prevents the importation of foreign rails to any extent, thereby increasing the cost of the railways of the country. Without discussing the tariff question in all its bearings it may well be considered whether it is wise legislation, by a tariff exceptional in its character, to put immense profits into the pockets of a monopoly composed of but few persons at the expense, indirectly, not only of Iowa farmers, but of the whole West. It would therefore be well to instruct our Senators and Representatives in Congress to examine into this subject with a view to removing by Congressional legislation any discriminations which may be found to exist in the tariff on steel rails against the interests of Iowa producers.

I call attention to the fact that the present bill makes a reduction of $6 per ton in the duty on steel rails. Reckoning 100 tons to the mile, and remembering the fact that we have in Iowa 5,000 miles of railway,

this would be a saving of $3,000,000 in the cost of replacing the rails now used upon the railways of my State; and the 8 per cent. which these corporations require as the return for capital invested would make an annual saving of $240,000 to the people of the State of Iowa for all time to come.

Mr. BRUMM. Will the gentleman allow me——

Mr. WEAVER. No, sir; I am limited as to time, and I can not yield.

The number of miles of railway constructed last year was over 12,000. This bill, had it been the law, as it should have been, would have reduced the cost of construction $600 to the mile, a reduction of over $7,200,000 to the people of the United States, and a saving of 8 per cent upon that would be $576,000 annually. [Applause.]

Mr. BRUMM. I would like to call the attention of my friend to one matter.

Mr. WEAVER. Well, I yield for a moment.

Mr. BRUMM. The gentleman makes his statement upon the hypothesis that the protective duty enhances the price of the rail while free trade will lower it, does he not?

Mr. WEAVER. Certainly; and if it does not——

Mr. BRUMM. I only wish to say——

Mr. WEAVER. No, I can not yield further. If the protective duty does not enhance the price of the rail, what do you want it for? [Laughter and applause.] In your cogitations in your room please brood over that question, and at some future time give the House an elaborate answer.

Mr. BRUMM. I will answer now in a minute if you will yield to me.

Mr. WEAVER. But I promised to show that the protected industries were unwilling to treat their customers with the same liberality with which they themselves are treated by our revenue laws.

The law of competition is a natural and humane provision, running through all human industries. It was given to man to curb his avarice, to make him kind, and to keep alive the brotherhood of the race. The maxim "live and let live" came from the golden rule. It is a wise provision of the Great Lawgiver growing out of the very existence of the human family upon the earth and of their business relations with one another. It is dangerous to interfere with its operation.

But our American manufacturers say they can not compete with manufacturers of older countries who employ cheap labor. "Protect us against the cheap labor of the Old World," they say, "and we will not interfere with home competition." "We can compete with our neighbors who are upon an equal footing with ourselves and pay their employés the same wage that we do." Now, these are the equities of the contract. The Government takes them at their word and tells the foreigner to stand off. We speak to him with authority, and tell him that he shall not place his foreign wares on the market in free competition with our home manufactures unless he is willing first to pay a heavy tax for such privilege.

We not only say this to the foreigner, but we make the same stern declaration to our own citizens, and say to them also, "You shall not buy abroad; you shall buy of the home manufacturer, unless you are willing to pay a penalty in the shape of a tax for making your purchases abroad." And then we say to both the foreigner and the citizen, "Look well to it that you obey the law. We will place patrols along every mile of our territorial boundary; we will build, arm, and equip revenue-cutters to guard every mile of our seacoast, and do so at your expense, to see that you obey the laws." This is right, you say. I agree with you. But are not the manufacturers thus protected under some moral obligation to deal fairly with the Government and the people who have dealt so kindly with them? How have they met this obligation?

Having secured protection from foreign competition, they straightway entered into the free-trade markets of the world to buy their labor. I prove this by reading from the testimony of Gilbert B. Whitman, agent of the Amory Manufacturing Company of Manchester, N. H., an establishment engaged extensively in the manufacture of cotton cloth. These works, at the time the testimony was given, in 1883, had only been running three years. This was started as a protected industry. Let me read from the examination as contained in the report entitled Labor and Capital:

Q. What is the character of your employés?

A. About one-third of our help are Canadians; the remainder are of mixed nationalities, the Irish element preponderating. Then come the English, the Scotch, and the German.

Q. What proportion of them are Americans?

A. Out of eight hundred operatives, probably we have eighty Americans.—*Labor and Capital*, volume 3, page 28.

That is the kind of return these manufacturing establishments give to the people for the protection the Government extends to them against foreign "pauper labor." They enter the free-trade market of the world, purchase foreign labor and bring it here, to exclude American labor. Is that good faith?

On this same point we have the testimony of Mr. Charles L. Harding, on page 296 of the same volume. Speaking of the woolen manufacture at Dedham, Mass., he says:

A large portion of the help we have in our mills now is foreign.

These are specimen manufacturing establishments. How is it in Pennsylvania, the great protected State of this Union? The laws of that Commonwealth give to mill-owners and factory managers and corporations the right to go to the governor of that State and demand that he shall commission as many corporation police as the owners of those establishments may deem necessary. They are commissioned in the name of the State, with power to arrest and detain; and it is made the duty of all sheriffs and prison-keepers to receive the persons arrested by them, and to confine them in prison. These corporation police are under the control, management, and authority of the corporation, and are required by law to wear the corporation badge. Thus the State is made the policeman of the protected industries, with the corporation as commander-in-chief. This is the kind of protection that labor gets in Pennsylvania.

I called the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] to Brightly's Purdon's Digest, page 1338, of the Laws of Pennsylvania, and asked him whether that was not the law of his State. He said that he did not know whether it was the law of Pennsylvania or not. I was greatly astonished at the gentleman's answer. When the committee of this House which was authorized to investigate the labor strikes visited the coal region of Pennsylvania they found one hundred of these corporation policemen wearing the badge of their employers and drawing $2 per day for keeping their starving brethren in subjection. Thus the united power of the corporations and the Commonwealth were hurled against the people. Is this the happy condition to which we are all tending under protection? [Applause.]

This amounts to an alliance, offensive and defensive, between the powerful barons and the State—with the baron, however, as commander-in-chief.

Mr. BRUMM. Are not these same policemen under the employment of Mr. SCOTT?

Mr. WEAVER. I can not say whether they are or not. Mr. SCOTT can answer for himself.

Mr. BRUMM. Well, I will say to the gentleman that I know they are.

Mr. WEAVER. I do not see how that makes my point less forcible.

Mr. BRUMM. It only shows that human nature is very much alike, whether a man is a free-trader or a protectionist.

Mr. WEAVER. But, sir, you are standing up here opposing the reduction of the duty on steel rails and on all Pennsylvania manufactures, when you must know that it is the capitalist alone who gets the benefit of protection, and that your laborers are growing poorer from year to year. [Applause.]

Now, while these corporations are protected before foreign competition, how are they treating the American laborer? Why, they have simply ignored the equities of their contract, and have gone with the free-trade market of the world and bought their labor where they could buy it the cheapest.

But, sir, they are not satisfied with this. Secure from foreign competition, they are now unwilling to endure competition among themselves, and so the "trust" is resorted to, which is the very refinement of monopoly and the destruction of competition. Sir John Culpepper, in a speech in the Long Parliament, said of the brood of monopolies then infesting England:

They are a nest of wasps—a swarm of vermin which have overcrept the land. Like the frogs of Egypt, they have gotten possession of our dwellings and we have scarce a room free from them. They sup in our cup, they dip in our dish, they sit by our fire. We find them in the dye-pot, wash-bowl, and powdering-tub. They share with the butter in his box. They will not bate us a pin. We may not buy our clothes without their brokage. These are the leeches that have sucked the commonwealth so hard that it is almost hectical.

I will name a few of the protected industries and connected lines of business which are controlled by trusts: Linseed-oil, watches and watch-cases, rope and cordage, salt, nails, screws, envelopes, iron beams for houses, bridges, etc.; terra-cotta goods, wall-paper and paperhangings, candy, bagging, the manufacture of steel, barbed wire, plated ware, upholsterer's goods, galvanized sheet-iron, castor-oil, gutta-percha goods, tacks, wrenches and hinges, boiler-flues, glass, lumber, writing-paper, wrapping-paper, wooden-ware, oil-cloth, carpets, silver plate.

This exhibit is taken from standard authorities. I refer to an article by Henry D. Lloyd in the North American Review for June, 1884, and from a recent work on "Trusts," by William W. Cook, of the New York bar.

I could extend this list almost indefinitely. There is scarcely a protected industry in America to-day—or unprotected, for that matter—that has not resorted to combination and to the trust; and for what purpose? For the purpose of destroying home competition. [Applause.] The Government says to the foreigner: "Stand off! You shall not come in competition with our home manufacturers," and as soon as this is accomplished then the home manufacturers combine and destroy all competition; and yet they have the hardihood to come into this house, they have the audacity, when these facts are known to the American people, to stand up here and cry out that we are about to destroy their industries! [Applause.] Whose industries are they destroying? [Applause.] "Don't take the duty off the fleece," say they; but the protected "trusts" seem to be free to "fleece" the public.

Sir, they have not kept faith with the American people, and this bill deals in a spirit of liberality wholly unknown to these protected industries, a liberality which they are unwilling to practice themselves. [Applause.]

It is a fraud and a pretense to claim that labor is getting the benefit of protection. Our tariff laws pour a golden stream into the pockets of the manufacturers, but it never returns to bless and enrich the children of toil.

Mr. Chairman, the strikes which have occurred within the past two years, and particularly those occurring during the past year, establish the melancholy fact beyond question, that capital is master of the situation in this country. Every important strike has failed. The great anthracite coal strike, the railroad strikes, and even the strike of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, the strongest single labor organization within the United States; a strike occurring among a class of workmen where long experience and familiarity with their important and hazardous business was supposed to be necessary—even with this organization the strike is a failure.

It is a lamentable fact that they have been practically driven to the wall. Labor must look to some other remedy, and must look quickly. What labor needs now is protection, not so much from the competition of foreign manufacturers as from the cruel exactions of corporations, syndicates, and trusts. And I mean by labor to include every branch of American industry from the day laborer and wage-worker of the East to that great body of farmers in the West; from the wheat-raiser of the North to the cotton-planter of the South. Here is my analysis of the situation in this country: When the capitalists and the laborers were both without organization capital had greatly the advantage. This has been true in all ages of the world. Now that capitalists and workingmen are both organized, the situation is practically unchanged. Capital still has the advantage. It possesses endurance and ability to stand a siege. Capitalists possess one thing which labor does not—ready money. Labor is in possession of one thing which capital has not—the ballot. My advice to the industrial people of America is to avail themselves of this advantage, and to do it quickly. If labor would remain the servant of capital, pay no heed to what I say. If you wish capital to take its legitimate place as the servant of mankind, if you would avoid serfdom for yourselves and your posterity, you must immediately throw about the people such safeguards as will insure that result. You must erect anew the barriers which our fathers erected, but which have been trodden down.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, the great fundamental principle of our Government is equality—equality of citizens, equality of States—and any tax or law that violates this principle is not in accord with the spirit and genius of our institutions. No government like this, based on such a grand principle, ought to aid private business by tariffs not laid for legitimate taxation; nor has it the right to grant special privileges to some and build up monopolies at the expense of others. This sacred principle was so just, so potent, and so dear to the American heart that it tore, *vi et armis*, from the great charter of our rights all that was in conflict with it.

If, then, Mr. Chairman, the injustice and inequality of slavery could not exist when guarantied and protected by the Constitution because wrong in principle, can protection, which is wrong both in principle and practice, and which means a worse form of slavery to both the black and white of those States where it did exist, live in conflict with it?

The tariff, considered either from the standpoint of protection or for revenue only, is a subject of great difficulty to those who lay it and of much greater concern to those who pay it. The committee and the country have been treated to a very able and exhaustive debate. I am glad we have had it, and it is to be hoped much good will come from it. While I am not one of those who believe that all knowledge of this important question is derived, like Falstaff's knowledge of the real prince, from instinct, but think it should be studied carefully, I do not intend on this occasion to lecture on political economy, nor to harass the committee with long tables. I hope by the use of a few cold facts to point out some of the evils existing in our revenue and currency laws, and to fix the responsibility for such, if possible.

The war is over and the questions arising out of it have been settled. The time has come when every man should speak and vote his honest convictions upon economic questions without reference to the issues of the past. A great responsibility rests upon this House, and particularly this side of it. Let us meet the question with courage and faith in the people. Let us summon all our intelligence, integrity, fairness, forbearance, and patriotism, and in a spirit of mutual concessions agree upon some bill that will reduce the surplus and at the same time lessen the burdens of the tax-ridden people of our country. The Democrat who fails to do his duty in this contest between those who pay and those who receive bounties dishonors the traditions of his party and the sacred trust committed to him.

The bill under consideration is by no means perfect. It is not what I would like to have, but I am prepared to support it as the best that can be had at present. We stand face to face with an increasing surplus of hundreds of millions of dollars. We hear the cry of "hard times" from all classes of people and all kinds of business. While call-loans are cheap and banker's balances are large, people who want money can not get it. The cry comes up for more money, a larger circulating medium. Profits are growing less, values are shrinking. Business men as well as farmers and mechanics find it difficult to make buckle and tongue meet. Mills are running on short time. Traffic is dull, and strikes are on. Pools are made; trusts and combinations of every character are formed to control production and prices. The wealth of the country is passing from the pockets of the many to the coffers of the few. The young men are leaving the country for cities and towns. Such is the condition of the grandest, freest, and best Government, composed of the most intelligent and patriotic people the world ever saw, at a time when it has an outstanding circulation of over $1,600,000,000—more than $25 per capita, and a public credit unequaled by any country at any time.

This is our condition after we have become the greatest manufacturing, mining, and agricultural nation in the world. What is the cause? To my mind there is but one answer, and that is bad financiering and our system of unequal and unnecessary taxation. Our Government has by its own acts taken an overdose of tariff, which threatens financial congestion to the body politic. Some speedy remedy must be applied that will restore to actual circulation the millions now partly held in the Treasury and partly deposited in the national banks and used without interest, and at the same time prevent a repetition of such a condition of business. That such a state of affairs is possible under our form of government is almost incredible, and yet, Mr. Chairman, we know that it does exist, and there is no one bold enough to deny it. If so, let him speak.

The present Administration is in no way responsible for this. It has done all that could be done under the law to prevent it, and has, perhaps, in one or two instances exceeded the power conferred, but it was an honest effort to keep in circulation the money of the people. It called and paid off all of the 3 per cent. bonds that were subject to payment at the option of the Government more than a year ago. Prior to that, in obedience to the known wishes of the President and platform pledges, the Democratic party in this House, under tthe lead of the able, honest, and courageous Morrison, made an effor to reduce the revenues to the actual and necessary expenses of the Government, expecting to absorb the surplus in the payment of such bonds as were subject to call. That was the proper thing to do, and was what the President and nearly all Democrats wanted done, but the Republican party has almost to a man, with a few protectionists on this side, opposed and defeated such measures. But, since the bonds have all been paid there is no way to prevent an increase of the surplus, now too large, without legislative action, except to purchase the unmatured bonds, as the Secretary is now doing.

To prevent any further surplus accumulations in the Treasury bonds are being purchased at a premium of over 26 per cent. For the privilege of paying a coin bond issued for depreciated currency, after paying interest for nearly twenty years, we are required to pay for every dollar thereof $1.26, and the Republican party, whose legislation makes this necessary by a stubborn opposition to the pending bill, declares in effect that this is what it wants. The bondholders are not content with payment according to the contract while we have the money, but insist that we must let the surplus remain idle or pay the premium. Having deliberately adopted a financial policy by which the currency was contracted and the volume in a large measure subjected to the control of the banks, and a large part of the debt funded at high interest for a long time without the option of payment, and having fastened upon the people, under the plea of protection to labor, a system of taxation which requires them to pay indirectly to the manufacturers $3 for every dollar that reaches the Treasury through the custom-houses, the Republican party says to the country that it will consent to no change that will in the least interfere with the profits and tribute of the manufacturing corporations and trusts now sapping the very life of our institutions.

While the favored industries get a tribute of over $500,000,000 annually it will be difficult to get a change until we have a clear majority of Democrats in both ends of the Capitol who will reflect the wishes of the people and respect the Constitution and the common and just principle of equal taxation, according to the wants of the Government. Such legislation, Mr. Chairman, is a crime against humanity and posterity, for which there is nothing that can be said in palliation. For less crimes revolutions have been resorted to and crowned heads brought to the block. For want of a leader bold enough and an organization strong enough to successfully antagonize the corporations and monopolists, who have so long controlled the legislation of the country, the people have been compelled to submit to the wrong; but the President, with the courage of Jackson and the clearness of Jefferson, by his late message, has espoused the cause of the people in the struggle, and has staked the success of his party on the issue tendered by him and accepted by the opposition. Those who are not for him are against him. There is no middle ground in this great fight for reform.

The people, who are nearly always right, are rallying around him. Thousands of voters are changing from opposition to support since his tariff reform message. His party is united as never before, and the result of the next election will determine whether that plain, simple Government, organized by equal citizens, who fled from the op-

pressions and burdens of the Old World in the hope that they could maintain the new institutions at little cost and without injustice, leaving the bulk of the earnings in the pockets of the people, shall be preserved or not. I was glad a short time since to hear the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] express his alarm at the reduction in the value of farm products, and his desire to investigate the cause and correct the wrong, "whether the reduction comes from the tariff law, or whether it comes from the state of the currency." Thae was a patriotic, statesman-like utterance, and I believe that it is the spirit with which we should conduct this discussion. Let us look for the cause and stand ready to apply the remedy in the interest of the whole people.

The currency and the taxes are so often the same thing, and are in so many ways connected, especially when the latter is laid so as to create a surplus, that they may very appropriately be discussed in the same connection, since one object of the pending bill is to reduce that surplus. Without stopping to discuss our present financial policy, I will say that a reduction of taxes and revenue is the first important step in any reform in the currency, and the sooner it is done and the more complete the better for those who wish changes in the currency law. It must be admitted by all who will reflect for a moment, that the actual circulating medium can not be increased, except by the free coinage of silver, until we have reduced the receipts of the Government to less than we spend. As long as our system brings in more than we pay out there is no way to force a circulation of Government currency.

The Government may purchase silver bullion and coin silver or issue Treasury notes or certificates, but it will give but little relief, as it or some other dollars of equal amounts must be kept in the Treasury or used in the purchase of the outstanding bonds. So we see, Mr. Chairman, that the surest way to begin a currency reform is to reduce the tariff and the revenues. Turn into the channels of business what is in the Treasury, and take care hereafter not to exact any more from the people than the Government needs. Let free silver follow the passage of the tariff bill and you will see a return of prosperity. I trust we may have the co-operation of the distinguished gentleman in both of these measures.

Mr. Chairman, but for the vicious legislation of the Republican party since the war our Government would be about out of debt. By contraction of the currency, funding and refunding of the debt, a large part of it has been pushed onto another generation for payment. Without stopping to enumerate at length the financial legislation for which the Republican party is responsible, I charge it with the passage of every bad law that has tended to make times hard and money scarce, and with resisting every act for the relief of the people proposed by the Democrats. In proof of this charge I now call attention to the votes of the two great parties on these financial questions. For the record up to June, 1878, I will read an extract from a speech made by Hon. JOHN E. KENNA, of West Virginia, now a United States Senator from that State:

TAXATION OF THE BONDS.

On the 28th day of June, 1862, the question of concurring in Senate amendments to an act creating bonds, etc., was before the House. Mr. HOLMAN, a Democrat, offered the following provision:

"*Provided*, That nothing in this act shall impair the right of the States to tax the bonds, notes, and other obligations issued under this act."

Sixty-three Democrats voted for this righteous amendment and not one voted against it. Of the Republicans, only 8 voted "ay" and 77 voted "no." Thus the Republican party defeated in the House the proposition to tax the bonds.

THE NATIONAL-BANK SYSTEM.

In February, 1863, the bill was pending for the charter of the national banks. The vote was taken in the Senate on the 12th and in the House on the 20th of that month. The bill involved the inauguration of a system which is as cordially hated by the masses of our people as ever was a measure hostile to their interests. On its passage in the Senate the Democrats voted "ay" 2 and "no" 12, which was six to one against the system. In the House the Democrats voted "ay" 3 and "no" 42, making fourteen to one against it. But who passed this bill and created the national banks? In the Senate the Republicans voted "no" 9, "ay" 21, constituting a majority of more than two to one in its favor. In the House the Republicans voted "no" 22 and "ay" 75, making over three to one in its favor. Thus the Republican party foisted upon the country the national-bank system.

THE SUPPLEMENTAL BANK BILL.

On April 18, 1864, what is known as the supplemental national-bank bill was before Congress. It was a repetition of the evils of the charter act, and was intended to foster and perpetuate the national-bank system. The Democrats voted in the House, 65 solid "no." The Republicans voted "ay" 80 and "no" only 1. In the Senate the Democrats voted, 7 solid "no." The Republicans voted "no" 2 and "ay" 30. Thus the Republican party passed this objectionable act. On the same day, when Mr. Arnold offered in the House a resolution to provide for taxing State banks, Mr. RANDALL, a Democrat, offered to amend by providing for the

TAXATION OF NATIONAL BANKS.

Notwithstanding that SAMUEL J. RANDALL, who is now Speaker of this House, stands and stood then among the first parliamentarians on the continent, on this resolution to tax national banks, a Republican Speaker, in the interests of the money power, arbitrarily ruled him "out of order." Every member familiar with the history of this body knows how potent is the voice of the Speaker for weal or for woe. On this occasion it was invoked for the defeat of a righteous measure, and thus the Republican party, through its Republican Speaker, denied even a hearing of the cause.

In March, 1869, when the "act to strengthen the public credit," which ought to have been entitled

AN ACT TO SWINDLE THE PEOPLE,

came up for consideration, debate was cut off. Although it declared the currency indebtedness of the country to be payable in coin, and added $300,000,000 to the public debt, it was passed under the "previous question"—the "gag law"—and debate was denied. It was a gigantic fraud. On its passage in the House only 1 Democrat voted "ay," while 34 voted "no." Only 12 Republicans voted "no" and 96 voted "ay." In the Senate the Republicans voted, "no" 7, "ay" 42. The Democrats voted solid "no." While this measure was pending in the Senate, Mr. Thurman, a Democrat, moved to add that—

"Nothing herein contained shall apply to what is commonly called 5-20 bonds."

These bonds were payable in greenbacks, and this act was to make them payable in coin. It was to avoid the consummation of that outrage upon the people that Mr. Thurman offered his amendment. The Democrats voted solid for it. The Republicans voted "ay," only 6, and "no" 31. Thus without amendment, in all its original injustice, the Republican party passed this odious act. On March 29, 1869, Mr. Morgan, a Democrat, offered a resolution to exempt salt, tea, coffee, sugar, matches, and tobacco, and

TO TAX THE BONDS.

This resolution was defeated. The Democrats voted "ay" solid 39; the Republicans voted solid "no," 104. Thus the Republican party in the House, by unanimous vote, again defeated an effort to tax the bonds.

In 1870 the act was pending which provided for funding the greenback bonds into coin bonds, and which

ROBBED THE PEOPLE OF $500,000,000.

The Democrats of the House voted solid "no," 54. The Republicans voted "no" only 2, and "ay" 139! In the Senate the Democrats voted solid "no." The Republicans carried it, and thus the Republican party is responsible for the wrong which resulted from this iniquitous measure; and when the Houses divided and a conference committee was appointed to consider the differences upon this bill, Mr. Brooks arose in his seat and told the Republican Speaker, Mr. Blaine, that the conferees were

"ALL ON ONE SIDE"

and that the minority was not represented. Having "set up" the committee, the Republican Speaker contemptuously replied "it is not essential that it should be." In July, 1870, when SHERMAN'S proposition was pending

TO INCREASE THE NATIONAL-BANK CIRCULATION

$54,000,000, as usual in all these aggressive measures the previous question was demanded and debate refused. While the Democrats voted "ay" only 4, and "no" 44, the Republican party passed this bill. On June 14, when that same bill was pending, Mr. RANDALL, a Democrat, offered a substitute which proposed to take up the national-bank notes, and,

ISSUE $300,000,000 IN GREENBACKS

in their stead. On this measure the Democrats voted "no" only 6, and "ay" 41. The Republicans voted "ay" only 10, and "no" 105. Thus this proposed issue of greenbacks was defeated in the House by the Republican party.

At the same time Mr. Morgan, a Democrat, offered a substitute which provided for

REPEALING THE NATIONAL-BANK ACT.

and the substitution of $400,000,000 in green acks, with full legal-tender qualities, for the national-bank notes. The Democrats voted "no" 11, "ay" 34, or over 3 to 1 for the substitute. The Republicans voted "ay" only 3, and "no" 116. Thus the Republican party in the House defeated also this proposed financial reform.

On the 31st of January, 1870, Mr. McNeely, a Democrat, offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the national debt should be paid in strict compliance with the contract, whether it is made payable in gold or greenbacks; that the 5.20 bonds are payable in greenbacks or their equivalent, and we condemn the policy of the administration which is squandering millions of money by buying such bonds at a high rate of premium when the Government had the clear right to redeem them at par."

To this honest, fair interpretation of a contract in behalf of a people who were already overcast with the shadow of impending financial panic only 3 Democrats could be found to vote in opposition, while 34 voted in its favor. Of the Republicans only 1 voted for it and 119 members of the Republican party laid it in its grave!

On the 17th day of January, 1870, Mr. McNeeley made

ANOTHER EFFORT IN BEHALF OF GREENBACKS.

He offered the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Banking and Currency be, and they are hereby, instructed to report at an early day a bill providing for withdrawal from circulation the national-bank currency and for issuing instead of such currency Treasury notes usually known as greenbacks."

On this resolution looking to financial reform the Democrats voted "no" only 2 and "ay" 53. The Republicans voted "ay" 1 and "no" 112. Thus the Republican party in the House slaughtered this further attempt at honest currency.

In 1872, after the policy of the Treasury had been well defined, when the Secretary was day after day

ALLOWING THE BONDHOLDERS TO ROB THE PEOPLE,

by treating the 5.20 bonds as coin bonds and negotiating them in defiance of the contract of their creation, which made them payable in currency, the following resolution was presented:

"*Resolved*, That in the opinion of this House the Secretary of the Treasury in negotiating the loan authorized by the act of July 14, 1870, has neither increased the bonded debt nor incurred an expenditure contrary to law."

At the time this resolution was offered the policy of the Treasury Department was daily augmenting our national debt. It was daily fastening upon us that system which has since so cursed the country. This resolution gave emphatic approval to this whole ruinous policy, and invited and approved in advance the mischievous course which has since been pursued. It passed the House by a strict party vote. The Democrats voted solid 86 "no." The Republicans voted "ay" 110, and thus the Republican party gave formal and official sanction to a line of policy which has scattered business calamity broadcast over the land.

In 1873 the

ACT DEMONETIZING SILVER

was passed. The country has been made aware of the manner in which this nefarious measure was smuggled and bulldozed through without even being read. Its contents were not known, the yeas and nays were not called on its passage, and hence the vote of members is not entered on the Journal. The RECORD does show, however, that Mr. Hooper, a Republican, moved to suspend the rules and pass the bill. He had it in charge. He knew its contents. He knew it struck silver down and destroyed the double standard of our fathers. The RECORD therefore shows that a Republican had charge of the bill, and by a motion to suspend the rules, cut off debate and forced it to a vote. But the RECORD shows more. It shows that this giant swindle had been submitted to the Republican Secretary of the Treasury, the Republican director and controller of finances, and was by him approved. The RECORD on this point is as follows:

"Mr. MERRIAM. Has this bill been submitted to the Secretary of the Treasury; and, if so, does it meet his approval?"

"Mr. HOOPER, of Massachusetts. It has been submitted to him, and he not only approves it, but strongly urges its passage."

Thus, Mr. Speaker, this monstrosity, this unmitigated villainy which struck down silver when it was higher in the market than gold, simply to make "money scarce" and increase the burdens of the country, was manipulated and carried through by a Republican member of the House, under the full sanction and support of the Republican Secretary of the Treasury. Passed as the bill was, under suspension of the rules, without debate, and not even read, there is no evidence on earth that any living man knew it demonetized silver except the Secretary and member I have named.

We come now to that

PRINCE OF DESTROYERS,

the resumption act of 1875. Like other similar acts it was passed without debate. Discussion was cut off. The vote in the Senate stood Republican—"ay" 32, "no" only 1. The Democrats voted solid "no." In the House the Republicans voted only 24 "no," and "ay" 136, making more than five to one in favor of this great crime against the prosperity and happiness of the country. The Democrats voted solid 74 to defeat it. In the Senate even Carl Schurz complained that he had "found the bill on his table to-day for the first time, and had not had time to read it or inform himself intelligently of its contents." In answer to this appeal for opportunity to understand this important measure John Sherman, the present Republican Secretary of the Treasury, rose in his place in the Senate and boldly declared that he would "press the bill to its passage from that hour forward." Evidences that he kept that promise faithfully and too well are found in the blasted homes and fortunes and hungry women and children from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean.

These, Mr. Speaker, are the leading financial issues upon which the two great parties have divided. They mark the line between the money sharks on the one side and the people on the other. The Republican party had the President and both branches of Congress during all that time. At the very threshold of the system Mr. Stevens declared to his Republican associates on the floor of the House:

"We are introducing new practices all around. We are making one currency for the people and another for other purposes."

And, sir, that policy was pursued from 1862 to 1875. The Republican party pursued it. With a determined purpose, with unrelenting vigor, with a singleness of object that no human appeal could divert and no human misery deter, the Republican party went madly on in this desperate financial career and never did it call a halt until

CONFRONTED BY A DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY

in the House of Representatives of the Forty-fourth Congress! It is a part of the financial history of the country, demonstrated by the record, that all the wicked legislation which has racked this country to the very verge of revolution—the whole of it—every act and deed, was consummated when the Republican party had control of every department of the Government. It is also true that not one single act of which the people complain was ever passed after the Democrats acquired control of the House. It is equally true that not one single act of relief was ever enacted until the popular uprising of 1874 gave to the Democrats control of the House of Representatives. And, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter to be remembered to the everlasting credit of the Democratic party that it encountered and vanquished at the first onslaught that gigantic money power to which the Republican party has been for years as the plaything to a child! The first Democratic House in August, 1876, raised the banner of financial reform by the passage of a bill

TO REPEAL THE RESUMPTION ACT.

The Republican vote on the passage of that bill stood "ay" only 9 and "no" 56, or over six to one against the repeal. The Democrats voted "no" 29 and "ay" 97; more than three to one in its favor. The bill passed the House by Democratic votes, and thus the first battle against the Shylocks was left to be turned against the people by the Republican Senate which failed to pass the bill. There the matter stood when the great political contest of 1876 came on. The result of that election returned a Democratic majority to the House of Representatives, while the Senate is still Republican. Those who have observed the proceedings since we assembled here will bear witness to the earnestness of the warfare that has been waged for financial relief. As early as November 5, 1877, we passed the bill

TO REMONETIZE SILVER.

The Republicans, driven at last by a public sentiment which had twice routed them at the polls, yielded to this measure a fair support. They voted—"no" 24, and "ay" 67; not quite three to one. The Democrats voted—"no" 10, and "ay" 97, or nearly ten to one in its favor. But when this measure to restore the dollar of our fathers was sent by a Democratic House to a Republican Senate it was there amended and emasculated until its value was well-nigh destroyed, and finally vetoed by a Republican President. On the 23d of the same month the

BILL TO REPEAL THE RESUMPTION ACT

passed the House. On this repeal the Republicans voted—"ay" 28 and "no" 92, more than three to one against it. The Democrats voted—"no" 29 and "ay" 104, more than three to one in its favor. This act was sent to the Republican Senate, and there a Rip Van Winkle sleep of seven long months has held it fast.

On the 29th day of April the bill was passed.

FORBIDDING FURTHER RETIREMENT OF GREENBACKS.

The Democrats voted on this measure—"no" 7, and "ay" 104; the Republicans voted—"ay" 73, and "no" 28. Many of them voted with the avowed reason that it would not interfere with the resumption act, and it is equally understood in well-informed circles that the Republicans who favored the bill in the Senate did so upon the same ground. Add to what I have enumerated the bills which have been favorably reported at this session by a Democratic committee, the bill to authorize the issuing of certificates for silver bullion, and the bill to

SUBSTITUTE GREENBACKS FOR BANK NOTES,

and you have a fair epitomized history of the financial legislation of the last sixteen years. In giving the status of the political parties, I have given the result of my own individual researches; I have investigated the subject; I have examined the record, and I speak what I know.

* * * * * * *

Mr. Chairman, in addition to what Mr. KENNA has said I desire to refer to the record of other votes later than the period covered by him, and I will state that I have carefully gone over these votes and believe the analysis I have made is correct. In disposing of the Independents, Nationals, or Greenbackers I have counted them as Democrats or Republicans just as they may have voted on the questions under consideration at the time.

CRAPO EXTENSION BILL.

When this bill was under consideration, Mr. Buckner, a Democrat, moved to fix the time for the payment of the bonds at ten instead or twenty as recommended by the Republican committee, and on a yea-and-nay vote it was lost. The yeas were 91, nays 116. Of the yeas 79 were Democrats and 12 Republicans. Nays, 98 Republicans and 18 Democrats.

Mr. BLAND, a Democrat, and now the able chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, moved a substitute for the committee bill which provided for issuing Treasury notes for bank notes. This would have given the country a better currency without the aid or intervention of the banks, but would have deprived the bank corporations of their power over the currency, and so the substitute was not agreed to, by a vote of 71 yeas to 138 nays. Of the yeas there were 68 Democrats and 3 Republicans; nays, 119 Republicans and 19 Democrats. Afterwards, on the 10th day of July, 1882, the bill passed the House by a vote of 110 yeas and 79 nays. Of the yeas there were 99 Republicans and 11 Democrats; nays, 76 Democrats and 3 Republicans.

LEGAL-TENDER QUALITY OF SILVER DOLLAR.

Mr. Fort, on the 9th of December, 1878, moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill declaring the standard silver dollar a legal-tender and preventing any discrimination against it, and failing to get two-thirds it failed by the following vote: Yeas 151, nays 89. Of the yeas there were 106 Democrats and 45 Republicans; nays, 73 Republicans and 16 Democrats.

GREENBACKS RECEIVABLE FOR DUTIES.

Mr. Wood, a Democrat, January 15, 1879, moved to pass a bill making United States notes receivable for duties on imports, and it passed—yeas 153, nays 43. Of the yeas there were 108 Democrats and 46 Republicans; nays, Republicans 31, Democrats 12.

INTERCHANGEABILITY OF GOLD AND SILVER COINS.

On February 3, 1879, Mr. WHITTHORNE, the distinguished and faithful Democrat, who is now chairman of the Committee on Indian Depredations, moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill to provide for the interchange of gold and silver and to prevent discrimination against either, and it was disagreed to; yeas 101, nays 136. Of the yeas there were 89 Democrats and 12 Republicans; nays 100 Republicans and 36 Democrats.

GREENBACKS AND REFUNDING.

On April 5, 1880, my good Democratic friend General WEAVER, who sits just to my left, moved to suspend the rules and pass the following resolutions:

Resolved, That it is the sense of this House that all currency, whether metallic or paper, necessary for use and convenience of the people, should be issued and its volume controlled by the Government, and not by or through the bank corporations of the country; and when so issued should be a full legal tender in payment of all debts, public and private.

Resolved, That in the judgment of this House that portion of the interest-bearing debt of the United States which shall become redeemable in the year 1881, or prior thereto, being in amount about $782,000,000, should not be refunded beyond the power of the Government to call in said obligations and pay them at any time, but should be paid as rapidly as possible, and according to contract. To enable the Government to meet these obligations the mints of the United States should be operated to their full capacity in the coinage of standard silver dollars and such other coinage as the business interest of the country may require.

This motion was lost by a vote of 85 yeas to 117 nays. Of the yeas there were 84 Democrats and 1 Republican; nays 90 Republicans and 27 Democrats.

FREE COINAGE OF SILVER AND SUSPENSION.

April 8, 1886, when the bill for the free coinage of silver was under consideration the following amendment was offered:

That unless meantime, through concurrent action of the nations of Europe with the United States, silver be remonetized prior to July 1, 1889, that then and thereafter so much of the act of February 28, 1878, entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of the standard silver dollar and to restore its legal-tender character," as authorizes and directs the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase silver bullion and cause the same to be coined, shall be suspended until further action by Congress.

The amendment was lost by a vote of 84 yeas to 201 nays; of those voting yea there were 52 Republicans and 32 Democrats; nays, 136 Democrats and 65 Republicans.

The bill for free coinage was then rejected by a vote of 126 yeas, nays 163. Of those voting yea there were 101 Democrats and 25 Republicans; nays, 95 Republicans and 68 Democrats. But, Mr. Chairman, this is only a part of one chapter of the legalized crimes of the Republican party against the people. On the financial issues we see that the Democratic party has stood by the people in opposition to all those measures of the Republican party that have brought so much suffering to the poor and so much wealth to the rich.

We see how the record has been made step by step, and see how by degrees the wealth has gone from the masses who create it to the few cunning manipulators of Wall street and tariff barons of New England. The Democratic party has, as is shown by this record, been instrumental in restoring the silver dollar, stopping the further retirement of the greenbacks that the Republicans had said by solemn statute should go; providing for gold and silver certificates; the one and two dollar greenback bills, and during this Congress in passing through the House a bill for fractional currency. There is much in this record to make Democrats feel proud of their party; but there is still more in the record it has made in the fight for a reduction of tariff taxes and bounties.

And as a second count in the indictment in and for the body of the American people, I charge that the Republican party is not only responsible to the country for the tariff laws as they now exist with all their inequalities and injustice, but that it has on all occasions resisted all reductions that were proposed in the interest of the great body of the consumers, and has supported only such as would relieve the corporations and capitalists; and in order that I may make good this charge, I ask you to go with me to the records that stand as mute but eternal witness against their acts. We can only examine the most important votes on these questions of tariff and internal revenue.

MILLS RESOLUTION.

December 1, 1877, a motion was made by Mr. MILLS, a Democrat, and who is now the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, to suspend the rules and pass the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Committee on Ways and Means be instructed to revise the tariff so as to make it purely and solely a tariff for revenue and not for protecting one class of citizens by plundering another.

The motion was lost. The yeas were 67, nays 76. Of the yeas there were 60 Democrats and 7 Republicans, and of the nays there were 64 Republicans and 13 Democrats. A vote against this was in effect saying that they would plunder one class of citizens for the benefit of another, or that the protective tariff could not be so arranged as to prevent such plundering.

THE WOOD TARIFF BILL.

This was a bill to reduce taxes proposed by a Democratic committee. On the 5th day of June, 1878, a motion to strike out the enacting clause was agreed to by a vote of 134 yeas, 120 nays. Of the yeas there were 115 Republicans and 19 Democrats; nays, 113 Democrats and 7 Republicans.

FREE QUININE.

On the 30th day of June, 1879, Mr. Covert, a Democrat, moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill placing quinine on the free-list, and it was agreed to by a vote of yeas 125, nays 33. Of the yeas there were 103 Democrats and 22 Republicans, and of the nays there were 31 Republicans and 2 Democrats. This bill became a law, Mr. Chairman, but not without the usual protest from the manufacturers, who always keep their weather eye on "the home market," and who are always very much concerned about the consumer if they manufacture what he is compelled to have and can not get anywhere else. Here is the protest they made, and our Republican friends believed it:

Why should objection be made to a duty of 20 per cent.? Why should the chemical industry be singled out to be ruined?

Will the consumer be benefited? We assert most emphatically he will not. Prices will fluctuate; average rates will be as high or higher than they have been during the existence of the protective tariff. But even should the wholesale price be as low as now at times, a consumer using it in small quantities will get no benefit from it. In whose interest, then, is the duty to be reduced?

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE], who spoke this morning, I believe voted against this bill to save the manufacturing protesters from ruin. If he was so far off in his guess about what would happen to the industries then, what he says now should count for but little, and yet he pretends to know all about it.

In spite of the protests of the manufacturers that it would ruin them, break up their business, and place the people of this country at the mercy of the foreign manufactures, the Democrats passed the bill and took the risk. This was a trial and test of this much-talked of "home-market" idea that we now hear so much about, and it was interesting to see the crash come. If the predictions of our Republican friends had come true then they could have come to us with some standing as prophets, but time has shown that it was all speculation with them. We have more men engaged in this ruined industry now than we had then, and the price of quinine has been reduced from $3.50 per ounce to 50 cents. Nobody is hurt, and if you wish to know who is benefited by this small piece of legislation, ask the millions of people who use this great medicine. In some parts of the country it is almost a necessity.

FREE SALT.

On the 12th January, 1880, Mr. HATCH, a true friend to the farmers, and the present able and faithful chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill for free salt, which was not agreed to; yeas 115, nays 116. Of the yeas there were 104 Democrats and 11 Republicans; nays, 103 Republicans and 13 Democrats.

FREE PAPER AND SALT.

And again on the 14th May, 1880, pending the consideration of a resolution for final adjournment, Mr. MILLS moved to recommit with instructions to report a bill for free printing-paper and free salt before they report the resolution to adjourn, which was disagreed to; yeas 90, nays 116. Of the yeas, 84 were Democrats and 6 Republicans; nays, 94 were Republicans, and 22 were Democrats.

THE TARIFF COMMISSION.

Pending the consideration of this bill on the 6th day of May, 1882, Mr. MILLS, who was then as he is now ready to seize every opportunity to relieve the people, moved to recommit, with the following instructions:

First. That no more money shall be collected than is necessary for the wants of the Government, economically administered.

Second. That no duty be imposed on any article above the lowest rate that will yield the largest amount of revenue.

Third. That below such rate discrimination may be made, descending in the scale of duties, or for imperative reasons the articles may be placed on the list of those free from all duty.

Fourth. That the maximum revenue duty should be imposed on all luxuries.

Fifth. That all specific duties should be abolished and "ad valorem" duties substituted in their place, care being taken to guard against fraudulent invoices and undervaluation, and to assess the duty upon the actual market value.

Sixth. That the duty should be so imposed as to operate as equally as possible throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section.

The motion was disagreed to—yeas 75, nays 152. The yeas were all Democrats; the nays were 130 Republicans and 22 Democrats. Not a single Republican could be found who was willing to say by his vote that taxes should be so imposed as to operate equally throughout the Union, discriminating neither for nor against any class or section. They stood then as they stand now, for class legislation and against equality and justice to all sections. The bill providing for the commission, which was only another means of getting a continuance for the "protected industries," was then passed by the House by a vote of 151 yeas to 83 nays. Of the yeas there were 123 Republicans and 28 Democrats; nays, 75 Democrats and 8 Republicans.

The bill passed the Senate May 9, 1882—yeas 35, nays 19. Of the yeas there were 29 Republicans and 6 Democrats; nays, 17 Democrats and 2 Republicans.

FREE TRACE-CHAINS.

A motion made by Mr. TURNER, a Democrat, and now a member of the Ways and Means Committee, from which the bill now under consideration came, in the House June 6, 1882, to suspend the rules and pass a bill for free trace-chains was lost—yeas 73, nays 109. Of the yeas 70 were Democrats and 3 Republicans; nays, 104 Republicans and 5 Democrats.

KNIT GOODS.

July 3, 1882, on the motion of Mr. KELLEY, a Republican, the rules were suspended and a bill increasing the tariff on woolen knit goods was passed by a vote of 134 yeas to 49 nays. One hundred and twelve Republicans and 22 Democrats voted yea and 47 Democrats and 2 Republicans voted nay. This was done against the earnest protest of Mr. CARLISLE, the present able Speaker.

SHIP MATERIALS.

On July 23, 1887, when the House had under consideration a bill allowing a rebate on materials imported and used in building ships on foreign account, Mr. Tucker, a distinguished and worthy Democrat, moved to so amend as to allow our own citizens to build or purchase ships in our own ship-yards on equal terms with foreigners. The yeas were 95 and the nays 12. Of the yeas there were 75 Democrats and 20 Republicans. The Republicans refused to vote and made the point of no quorum. On a motion to recommit with instructions to so amend the bill the yeas were 84 and nays 96. Of the yeas there were 78 Democrats and 6 Republicans; nays 95 Republicans and 1 Democrat. And yet we are told that this is the American policy. God save us from such Americanism!

THE TARIFF ACT OF 1883.

On the 27th of June, 1882, the bill passed by a vote of 127 yeas, 79 nays. Of the yeas there were 23 Democrats and 104 Republicans; nays, 71 Democrats and 8 Republicans. In the following session, on the 26th day of February, 1883, after amendments in the Senate under a new rule, Mr. KELLEY moved to suspend the rules and take up the bill and Senate amendments, declare a disagreement, and ask a conference thereon; which was agreed to—yeas 147, nays 111. Of the yeas 135 were Republicans, 12 were Democrats; nays, 102 Democrats and 9 Republicans.

The Speaker appointed Messrs. KELLEY, MCKINLEY, Haskell, CARLISLE, and Speer conferees, the Senate conferees being Messrs. MORRILL, SHERMAN, ALDRICH, McDill, and Mahone. On the 3d of March, 1883, the conference report was concurred in by the Senate, and subsequently was agreed to by the House—yeas 152, nays 122. Of the yeas 132 were Republicans and 20 Democrats; nays, 107 Democrats and 17 Republicans.

TARIFF ON WOOL.

April 7, 1884, Mr. Converse moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill restoring the duty on wool as it was prior to the act of March 3, 1883, but it was not agreed to—yeas 119, nays 126. Of the yeas 84 were Republicans and 35 Democrats; nays, 124 were Democrats and 12 Republicans.

MORRISON TARIFF OF 1884.

April 15, 1884, the House being in the committee on revenue bills, and the tariff bill having been reached, Judge KELLEY objected to its consideration. The House, by a vote of 140 yeas to 138 nays, directed the committee to consider it. Of those voting yea, there were 136 Democrats and 4 Republicans. The enacting clause was stricken out by a vote of 159 yeas to 155 nays. Of the yeas, there were 119 Republicans and 40 Democrats; nays, 152 Democrats and 3 Republicans.

THE MORRISON BILL, 1886.

On the 17th of June, 1886, the motion of Mr. Morrison that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole to consider the general tariff bill, was rejected by a vote of 140 yeas to 157 nays. Of the yeas, 136 were Democrats and 4 Republicans; nays, 122 were Republicans and 35 Democrats.

Only four of the Republicans of the House would even vote to consider the demands of the people for a reduction of taxes.

INTERNAL REVENUE—HOUSE.

On the 6th day of June, 1878, Mr. Covert, a Democrat, moved an independent section to the internal-revenue bill then under consideration, to reduce the tax on tobacco from 30 and 40 cents per pound to 20, and certain other reductions as to cigars.

Mr. Tucker, another Democrat, moved to amend by making the tax 16 cents per pound, and the amendment was agreed to by a vote of 126 yeas to 80 nays. Of the yeas there were 108 Democrats and 18 Republicans; nays, 73 Republicans, 7 Democrats. The section as thus amended was adopted—yeas 137, nays 103. The yeas were 120 Democrats and 17 Republicans; the nays were 92 Republicans and 11 Democrats.

On the 28th day of June, 1882, the House passed an internal-revenue bill, reported by a Republican committee, to repeal the stamp tax on bank checks, drafts, orders, and vouchers; the tax on capital and deposits of national banks, matches, perfumery, and patent medicines, which yielded an annual revenue of $16,892,880, nearly all of which was paid by the banks, by a vote of 127 yeas to 79 nays. Of the yeas there were 105 Republicans, 22 Democrats; nays, 69 Democrats and 10 Republicans.

In the Senate, on the 19th day of July, 1882, Senator BECK offered an amendment to the bill then pending, to reduce the tax on manufactured tobacco at 12 cents per pound, and it was adopted by a vote of 29 yeas to 26 nays. The yeas were 27 Democrats and 2 Republicans, and the nays were all Republicans.

Senator BECK moved to strike out "perfumery, medicinal preparations, and other articles," and it was lost by a vote of 26 yeas (Democrats) to 29 nays (Republicans).

Senator VANCE moved to amend by retaining the tax on playing cards, and it was lost by 28 yeas (Democrats) to 29 nays (Republicans).

Senator VEST moved to amend so as to allow farmers to sell their tobacco products, but not to peddle, and it was lost by a vote of 23 yeas, Democrats, to 28 nays, Republicans. On the motion of Senator BECK, the following proviso to the bill was adopted by a vote of 24 yeas, Democrats, to 22 nays, Republicans, and 1 Democrat:

Provided, That farmers and producers of tobacco may sell at the place of production tobacco of their own growth and raising, at retail, directly to the consumer, to an amount not exceeding $100 annually.

INCOME TAX.

The Republicans were swift to repeal this tax soon after the close of the war, although there was a national debt of $2,000,000,000 to be paid. This was done about the same time that the cotton-tax on the Southern cotton-planter was increased from 2 to 3 cents a pound. After the Democrats had elected a majority to the House, in May, 1879, Mr. DIBBLE, a Democrat, and now the able and efficient chairman of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill to restore this tax.

It required two-thirds to suspend the rules, and so the bill failed by the following vote: Yeas 111, nays 94. Of the yeas there were 105 Democrats and 6 Republicans, and of the nays 84 Republicans and 10 Democrats. And thus the wealth-holders escape the burdens that fairly belong to them. And thus the Republican party refused to correct a wrong that it had done the consumers of the country. There was a long list of items in the internal-tax laws, principally upon capital, but they have all been repealed except one important item, whisky, and it has been reduced from $2 a gallon to 90 cents, and a part of the tobacco tax.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee to some extracts from the last report of the late able and distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Manning, which, taken altogether, is to my mind one of the clearest and strongest arguments for a tariff reform that it has been my pleasure to read. It deserves a place as a state paper by the side of the celebrated report of Secretary Walker, as far as it treats of the tariff.

The Clerk read:

THINGS HERE CONSUMED; WITH INLAND AND SEAPORT COLLECTORS OF TAXES.

It is indirect taxes only which the Federal Government now levies, and to which, being thus practically restricted by those provisions of the Constitution, it must look for its revenues, and its remissions when revenue outruns expense. It is out of indirect taxes that arise contentions about protection and free trade, as they arose before the war when our debt was little and our expense so small that many thought Congress might have abolished custom-houses, and no harm.

"Free trade" accurately decribes the internal commerce of our States. It applies to the commerce, one with another, of no other great and sovereign States. It does not apply to our trade with foreign nations. No man now living will ever see "free trade" adopted by these United States in their commerce with foreign nations; for taxes on imports, from the foundation of this Government, have ever been one chief source of Federal revenue, and such they will continue to be.

They are taxes upon consumption, like our internal-revenue taxes; and the true ground of choice among articles suitable for taxation is not the circumstance that they are produced at home or imported from abroad, for neither the producer nor the importer finally pays the tax. The consumer pays it. The place of origin is no criterion. The place of collection is no criterion. The place of consumption is where duties as well as excise are paid at last; seaport taxes and inland taxes are alike in cost of collection (3.3 and 3.6 per cent.) and alike in this, that although the importer and distiller advances the tax, he reimburses himself in the price to the consumer, who alone is taxed.

The true ground of choice is that among all articles thus consumed within our own borders some are better suited for an equitable taxation than others. They are universally consumed, like sugar, or easily identified, like coffee, or their consumption may be safely impeded, like distilled spirits or fermented liquors or tobacco, or they are luxuries, like wines, silks, and diamonds. But of these articles suitable for taxation, foreign production afford as many as home production, or more.

Taxes on imports are levied by all nations. Last year England raised a revenue of $95,978,583 from taxes on imports; France, $68,616,325; Germany, $47,557,160. But no foreign nation taxes raw materials. Such taxes injure home industries, in which those materials are worked up and increased in value by home labor. Such taxes on raw materials, instead of excluding foreign competition from the home market, put our own employers of labor at a great disadvantage in the home market and a greater disadvantage in every foreign market compared with the foreigner employing labor upon untaxed raw materials.

"Protection" is also a misnomer. It implies superiority elsewhere. The superiority over any great industry of ours does not exist upon the globe. It implies infants here and adults elsewhere. Such is not our reputation. It implies that amid competition universal, where the fittest survive, we shall perish. But it is everywhere else believed that whenever we shall release ourselves from bad laws and enter that competition unmanacled, rivals will be distanced, and our primacy established in the markets and commerce of the world.

OUR SUICIDAL TAXES ON RAW MATERIALS.

The total value of our domestic exports for the last fiscal year was almost exactly $666,000,000, of which 86 per cent. were the products of our fields, forests, fisheries, and mines, and 16 per cent. only were the sum total of manufactured products in which American labor was inwrought.

In the last quarter of a century progress in telegraphs, transportation, labor-saving inventions, and the mechanic arts has reduced the profits of capital and the rate of interest by more than one-half; has increased the wages of labor throughout the world; has augmented by at least a third the surplus which our manufacturers can produce beyond domestic needs for sale abroad. Prolonging without necessity our war-tariff taxes on raw materials, we have been undersold and excluded from foreign markets by nations not taxing raw materials.

Despite their low-priced inferior labor, and the high percentage of labor-cost therefore included in their product, our taxed raw materials and their free raw materials have protected the so-called "pauper labor" of Europe against American competition. Our increasing capacity to produce an industrial surplusage has been accompanied by war taxation exactly suited to prevent the sale of that surplusage in foreign markets. Out of our actual abundance this war taxation has forged the instrument of our industrial and commercial mutilation.

Defeating our manufacturers in their endeavor to compete abroad with the manufacturers of untaxed raw materials, it has set them on a ferocious competition at cut-throat prices in our own home market, to which they are shut up, and for which their producing powers are increasingly superabundant. Long periods of glut and so-called overproduction have alternated with brief periods of renewed activity and transient prosperity like the present. These prolonged war-tariff taxes, incompetent and brutal as a scheme of revenue, fatal to the extension of our foreign markets, and disorderly to our domestic trade, have in the last resort acted and reacted with most ruinous injury upon our wage-earners.

As the more numerous part of our population, our wage-earners are of course the first, the last, and the most to be affected by injurious laws. Every Government by true statesmen will watchfully regard their condition and interests. If these are satisfactory, nothing else can be of very momentous importance; but our so-called protective statesmanship has disfavored them altogether. Encumbering with clumsy help a few thousand employers, it has trodden down the millions of wage-earners. It has for twenty-one years denied them.

MORE INCOME FOR WAGE-EARNERS BY DROPPING WORST TAXES.

The taxes to be first remitted are those which prevent or hinder the sale of our surplus products in foreign markets. Their removal will set capital in motion by the promise of better returns, enlarge the steady employment and increase the annual income of many thousand wages-earners, whose prosperity will diffuse prosperity. These taxes are the duties on raw materials, and the most widely injurious of them is the tax upon raw wool.

But the income of all the wage-earners in the United States can be at once enlarged effectively, certainly permanently, by reducing the cost to them of the great necessities of life. Our war-tariff taxes increase needlessly the cost of clothing, shelter, food, to every family. Every wage-earner's expense, every tax-payer's expense, for the clothing of himself and his family is nearly doubled, at least in the Northern, Middle, and Western States, by taxation which can now be remitted, yet leave the Treasury a sufficient revenue.

The duty on raw wool procured for the Treasury last year only $5,126,108. The cost of woolen clothing for our 59,000,000 people was thereby and otherwise enhanced many times more than 90 cents a head, the only cost of our $51,778,948 revenue from sugar. Moreover, any tax on raw wool imported will always make domestic wool-raising a bad business, for in our dry climate some varieties of wool required by the manufacturer are not produced. The tax prevents our manufacturers from competing in foreign markets with all manufacturers who can buy untaxed wool.

The tax prevents our manufacture and export of competing woolens that require the use or admixture of non-American wools, and so restricts the home demand and the growth of the home demand for domestic wool, thus making the export of our domestic woolens impossible, yet involving the enhanced price of foreign and domestic woolens. This petty tax of $5,126,108 on raw wool assists in nearly doubling the actual cost of their clothing to the American people, with no real and no incidental benefit to anybody except the foreign manufacturer.

UNTAX THE CLOTHING OF SIXTY MILLION PEOPLE.

I respectfully recommend to Congress that they confer upon the wage-earners of the United States the boon of untaxed clothing, and in order thereto, the immediate passage of an act simply and solely placing raw wool upon the free-list.

Mr. MCRAE. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us examine this question from the farmer's standpoint and see if the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] is correct in the theory that he has advanced when he says it is a benefit to them. Until within the last century little improvement was made in agriculture. When the United States declared their independence they stood at the foot of the list of nations in point of agricultural

products; but now they lead the world in this as well as almost everything else, and yet less than 20 per cent. of the total area of the land has been improved.

For many centuries prior to the establishment of our Government there was little or no advancement; no thought had been given to either the preservation or improvement of the soil, and but little improvements had been made in farming implements. There were no planters, reapers, or thrashers in use then. For the latter our ancestors used what Burns called the "the thrasher's waery flingin' tree." No care had been given to the breeding and improvement of stock. It is said that the average size of sheep, hogs, and cattle has more than doubled within the last century, and yet our greatest triumph in this industry in the United States is in the numerical increase, as shown by the estimate of the Commissioner of Agriculture for last year which I now call attention to:

Number and value of farm animals January 1, 1888, *as estimated by the Department of Agriculture.*

Stock.	Number.	Value.
Horses	13,172,936	$946,096,154
Mules	2,191,727	174,853,563
Milch cows	14,856,414	366,252,173
Oxen and other cattle	34,378,363	611,750,520
Sheep	43,544,755	89,279,926
Swine	44,346,525	220,811,082

Quantities of certain agricultural products of the United States, as estimated by the Department of Agriculture, for the year 1887, *and for certain products for* 1886.

Corn, 1887	bushels...	1,456,161,000
Wheat, 1887	do.....	456,329,000
Oats, 1887	do.....	659,618,000
Potatoes, 1887	do.....	133,000,000
Hay, 1886	tons...	41,796,499
Cotton, 1886	bales...	6,443,000
Rice (Louisiana*), 1886	pounds...	88,000,000
Tobacco, 1886	do.....	532,537,000
Wool, 1887	do.....	269,000,000
Butter, 1886	do.....	960,000,000
Cheese, 1886	do.....	360,000,000

* About as much more in other States.

J. R. DODGE, *Statistician.*

Now, let us compare the quantity of our grain products with other nations if we wish a clear understanding of them. Here is the showing:

Under grain—	Acres.	Worth.
The United States have	118,000,000	$2,698,000,000
Russia has	158,000,000	1,585,000,000
Germany has	43,000,000	990,000,000
France has	40,000,000	840,000,000

Russia, with 40,000,000 acres more of land in grain, produces but little more than one-half as much in volume as we do. The United States produce about one-third of the cereals of the entire world. This in a large measure is due to the use of improved machinery and farm implements, the absence of any law of primogeniture or entail, and to the fact that the farms are worked largely by the owners, who, while enjoying their freedom, rely upon their own energies and do not look to the Government for aid or bounty. Of the four million farms in the United States in 1880, nearly three million of them were cultivated by their owners, and while the acreage and the number of farms are rapidly increasing, it is gratifying to notice that the average size of the farms has decreased from 203 acres in 1850 to 134 acres in 1880. Our country is secure as long as the lands are divided in small holdings and cultivated by those who own them. At this rate there is little danger of a monopoly of the lands in this country.

I call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] to this fact in answer to the statement he made a few moments ago, to the effect that the wealth in the South is in the hands of the few. His statement is not correct as to any part of the South. In my own State, Arkansas, purely agricultural, the average size of the farms was in 1860, 245 acres; in 1870 the average was reduced to 154; while in 1880 it was only 128 acres, less than what the United States gives for a homestead.

The above exhibit of live stock and farm products is a remarkable showing when taken as a whole, but more remarkable when considered with reference to cotton, the growth of ten Southern States. In 1784, or about that time, when a duty was proposed in the United States Congress on the imports of foreign cotton, it was declared by one of the representatives from South Carolina that the cultivation of cotton was in contemplation by the planters of his State and Georgia, and he thought if good seed could be procured it might succeed. The cotton dealers and manufacturers of Liverpool thought it impossible to grow cotton in this country, and yet in the face of these opinions, within less than one century, these ten States have learned to grow enough for sixty millions of our people, and have four millions and a half bales for export, which is largely shipped to England.

When we remember that this vast increase in the yield of the fleecy staple comes from the States so recently laid waste by the war of the rebellion it ought to be sufficient to make all of us proud alike of the traditions of the old South and the pluck and industry of the new. Many of us have but little idea of the desolation that followed peace in this beloved country. The impoverished condition of the South after the war was a few years ago so truthfully and eloquently described by Kentucky's eloquent Representative [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] that I shall borrow his language in undertaking to give you some idea of it:

> The poverty of the Southern States at the close of the war was appalling; the desolation beyond description. Every form of accumulated capital had been swept away, every corporate institution hopelessly bankrupt, every State deeply in debt, and the amount of private indebtedness beyond all hope of payment.
>
> A beggared people indeed were they. Fences all gone, work-stock nearly so, fields in briars, many houses burnt, no money, no credit, no provisions, no implements of industry, not even seed for harvest. The negro free; the white adult a paroled soldier or an aged man, frequently a disabled and wounded man; and in many families only widows, orphan maidens, and fatherless children; without political privileges, and with the prospect of a chaotic and harsh period of unstable and doubtful rule; the States without recognized governments, and the relations of the races, of the citizens, and of the States to the Federal Government in grave dispute and doubt. It was indeed a sad and desolate picture.
>
> But all was not lost; far from it. God, the future, and manhood remained, and these contain all the possibilities of success.
>
> There was no alternative left to that people but a stern and resolute struggle for bread, and then for the recovery of political liberty. The war had legislated—it had in a new sense made one the United States; in the destiny of the nation was involved the destiny of every section and all citizens; one country, one flag, one destiny was the fiat of this tribunal, and the future of the South was indissolubly interwoven with that of the Union.
>
> In that Union, under that Government, however modified by the events of those years, must these Southern States work out their restoration. Within the limitations imposed by that Government, and by their actual condition, must they make their recovery. Without repining, with no unmanly cringing, no pretense of repentance or remorse—ay, proud of their dead comrades and conscious of their own rectitude and heroism, they turned their faces to the future, put their trust anew in God, and went to work.
>
> It was a pathetic but glorious spectacle, that conquered and beggared people, amid the ruins of their States and the destruction of their hopes, surrounded by the graves of their beloved slain, and in the depths of poverty, intensely at work for daily bread, and resolutely set on doing the best possible under the circumstances encompassing them. The privations, the suffering, the toil of those slow, sad, harsh years when "the bottom rail was on top," and the whole world seemed to have turned from them, need not now be recalled. Let them pass into history.

And notwithstanding this condition, which was at the time known to all, taxation from that day to this has continued to fasten its fangs closer and tighter on this people. If I will be allowed to quote the language of one of our poets I would say of the tariff as applied to the South that—

> It seats itself upon the sepulchre,
> And of the triumphs of its ghastly foe
> Makes its own nourishment.

Coming back, Mr. Chairman, to the facts and figures, we will find much food for reflection if they are considered in the light of the further fact that there is no prospect that the Old World will either be able to extend her territory or improve to any considerable extent the fertility of her soil. Her population is increasing more rapidly than it has for centuries past. She imports about one-third of her food products at present, and this will continue to increase as the population does. She looks to this country for supplies. Through our wise homestead law our Government is increasing our ability to grow and furnish the products by the improvement of about 10,000,000 acres of land per annum. With our vast undeveloped territory and our excellent land system, under a free form of government, the farmers of America will be able to meet any draft that is likely to be drawn upon them for meat and bread at any time within the next century if they are dealt fairly with in the matter of taxation.

But, Mr. Chairman, in the face of the enormous increase in the quantity of the productions of our farms, it appears from the census reports that the rate of increase in value from 1870 to 1880 was less than 10 per cent., while the important manufacturing States for the same time increased their wealth nearly 200 per cent. The planters in 1880 owned one-half the wealth of the country. They owned in 1880 only one-fourth, and yet the total wealth has nearly doubled in this time. This is not the result of misfortune, accident, drought, or want of economy or industry on the part of the people, because I have shown that they have produced the quantity of products.

The half not invested in farms was increased more than twenty billions in value, while the half owned by farmers only increased four billions. Those not engaged in farming made $5, where those who were made 1, as shown by their investment. As 75 per cent. of all exports from the United States are agricultural products, we can safely assume that the profits of the farmers were made off of those to whom they sold the exports, people of foreign countries, and represented so much money brought into the country. Not so with the manufacturer. Under the present policy of the Government he manufactured for home consumption. The consumers of America bought American goods because they could get no others as a rule.

The manufacturer has become rich, while the consumer, if a farmer, has barely saved what he started with. Does any one find any difficulty in telling whose money made the manufacturer rich? It does not

satisfy the farmer to tell him that the money was kept in our own country when he sees that his reasonable profits have by some sort of legerdemain been lost to him and pocketed by others. The policy of protection has the effect of centralizing the wealth of the country in the hands of the favored few, while it impoverishes the great body of the producers, and makes them dissatisfied. It encourages waste and extravagance on the part of those who are made rich, and has a bad effect upon the people generally.

I am not one of those who would make Congress and the Legislature responsible for all the evils that befall man; neither do I think legislation the remedy for many of the troubles of the present times. I believe that there is such a thing as too much legislation. I sometimes think that we have too many laws and are too much governed. But when, as in this case, if I am correct, the trouble is caused by an existing law, the only remedy is either to modify it or repeal it. That freedom of trade necessary to enable the farmer to get full value for his products is at present too much restricted. We must "turn from this constant introspection to the nations of the earth; down with the walls, out to the sea" if we expect to grow and become a rich and prosperous people.

Mr. Turner, of Kentucky, in the Forty-seventh Congress, gave a very graphic portrayal of the unreasonable details of the tariff as illustrated in the every-day experience of the farmer. I quote the following from his speech:

Here is a statement showing a few of the burdens of the farmer: Under this tariff he rises in the morning, puts on his common flannel shirt taxed 95 per cent.; his coat taxed 57 per cent.; shoes taxed 35 per cent.; and hat taxed 92 per cent.; takes the water from a bucket taxed 35 per cent., and washes his face and hands in a tin bowl taxed 35 per cent.; dries them on a cheap cotton towel taxed 45 per cent.

He sits down to his humble meal and eats from a plate taxed 50 per cent., with knife and fork taxed 35 per cent.; drinks his coffee with sugar taxed 68 per cent., seasons his food with salt taxed 69 per cent., pepper taxed 61 per cent. He looks around on his wife and children, all taxed in the same way; takes a chew of tobacco taxed 199 per cent., or lights a cigar taxed 118 per cent. And, sir, even the sunlight from heaven that pours into his humble dwelling must come through window-glass taxed 59 per cent.; and yet he thinks he lives in the freest government under heaven.

Then he starts to work, puts a bridle taxed 35 per cent. on his horse, and takes his horse that has been shod—the nails used in shoeing being taxed 59 per cent., driven by a hammer taxed 20 per cent.—and hitches him to a plow taxed 45 per cent., with chains taxed 58 per cent.; and after the day's labor is closed and his family are all gathered around he reads a chapter from his Bible taxed 25 per cent., and kneels to God on an humble carpet taxed 51 per cent.; and then he rests his weary limbs on a sheet taxed 45 per cent., and covers himself with a blanket that has paid 104 per cent.

Nor do these grasping manufacturers stop here, but even the broom with which his good wife sweeps the floor is taxed 35 per cent., and the cooking vessels used in preparing her husband's frugal meal are taxed 42 per cent., and the soda used to lighten his bread taxed 59 per cent. She sits down to her sewing with a needle taxed 25 per cent. and a spool of thread taxed 74 per cent., to make a calico dress taxed 58 per cent.; or if she wishes to knit warm socks, to protect her husband and children from the bitter cold, she uses yarn taxed 120 per cent.; and thus daily and hourly must the hard earnings of the laborer go to satisfy the manufacturer and add to his ill-gotten wealth.

In this country a protective tariff means the fostering, by indirect bounties, of mines and manufacturers, and no one else. The consumers who must suffer for this are agriculturists, mechanics, business men, and professional people, who constitute about nine-tenths of our population. The farmers and farm laborers are the principal sufferers. And yet, when their representatives on this floor speak for them, they are told, by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] in effect, that farmers have no rights here and no business enterprise, because they have no manufacturing industries. They tell us that we must diversify and stop producing so much.

If the farmers reduce their crops, then to that extent exportation is decreased. Is that what we desire as a nation? Certainly not. The remedy is not in the direction of less work and smaller crops, but in legislation that will give them the right to sell what they raise where they can get the best price, and to purchase what they want and need for the least money, subject to the right of the Government to lay a just and equal tax for the expenses of Government.

We have heard a great deal in this debate about a home market for the farmer. My friend from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] on yesterday very effectually punctured this humbug that the protectionists attempt to palm off on the farmer, but as further illustrating the absurdity of it I make the following quotation from Col. Donn Piatt:

OVERPRODUCTION MEANS UNDERCONSUMPTION.

If for overproduction we read underconsumption we shall be nearer the fact. However, for half a century we have been waiting for two things; one is the time when the infant industries will come of age and be able to stand alone; the other for that home market. We are no nearer either than when we began.

THE SWALLOW OF A HOME MARKET.

Way back in 1848 the writer of this was driven to a little calculation, since widely used, but which is ludicrously unanswerable. A home market means, ofcourse, a consumption of what the farmer and planter have to sell. Very good. Now take from the census the class really protected. From this exclude farmers, merchants, mechanics, laborers, other than of mines and manufactures, and professional people—for they are not protected, nor are they dependent directly or indirectly on mines or manufactures.

Come down strictly to the people in whose behalf the Government interferes. Now select five leading States from the North and South and put to paper their surplus. It will be found that for the protected class to consume that surplus each man, woman, and child will have to eat each day twenty barrels of flour, masticate three hundred bushels of corn, get down twenty hogs, ten beef cattle, chew a hogshead of tobacco, and wear forty suits of woolen and cotton goods. The swallowing capacity of a protectionist is vast, but I hardly think it would accomplish this.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this shows, although in a ludicrous manner, the absurdity of the claim that is made by our friends on the other side of this Chamber, that we now have or can ever have a home market sufficient for the sale of our farm products. It will never be unless we take about one-third of our young farmers and organize a large standing army, who will have nothing to do except to consume our surplus products. Such a proposition would hardly get a single vote in this House. The tariff does give the farmer a market in which to buy his manufactured goods at prices made artificially high by reason of it, and in giving even this it restricts him to it. That is all there is in it. The farmer wants no such market, and wants to be protected against such protection.

On another occasion Colonel Piatt in a more serious manner showed that while the tariff did not and could not help but really injured the farmer, it left him to compete with the lowest paid and worst form of labor. Here is what he said:

BUYING UNDER PROTECTION AND SELLING UNDER FREE TRADE.

You see we sell under free trade, and are left to the mercy of the worst form of pauper labor.

What is our condition when we come to purchase? Why, we are met with protection. All that we buy, from a horseshoe to a mower, all that we wear, all that we build for shelter, all that we use over and above our products, from the cradle we are rocked in to the coffin we rot in—the clothes we wear, the shingle that shuts off the storm, the glass we look through, the blanket we sleep under, to the tombstone that records our supposed virtues, are augmented in price to double their value, so that we sell under free trade and buy under protection.

Now, do you wonder that we work at a disadvantage? If protection is such a good thing, we want it; if free trade is such an evil, we don't want it; and yet we have the one and not the other; we get what we don't want and are denied what we do want, and it is the most barefaced, impudent swindle ever perpetrated on an intelligent people. There is precisely where insult is heaped on injury. We are considered so ignorant and stupid that we may be plundered with impunity. [A voice. They'll slip up on that.] I hope so. [A voice. How about wool, colonel?] Let me tell you. They pretend to protect us on wool. Well, we have lost more on our protected shears than we ever made on our protected wool. If the Government will give us free lumber, free salt, cease its protection to the barbed-wire monopoly, and see that I am charged a reasonable rate for transportation on these public highways, called railroads, I will undertake to undersell at a profit any wool grown in any other part of the earth than that of these United States. [Applause.]

What happens to us in Europe? At Liverpool our wheat comes in competition with the wheat of the Baltic, where the laborer works at $18 a year and a goat-skin coat; with the wheat of Egypt, that is to-day the house of bondage, having slavery in its worst form; with the wheat of India, where labor is in as bad a condition; and worse yet, of Australia, where the shipper takes manufactured articles back home in payment—an exchange denied us by law.

And, Mr. Chairman, what he said about wheat may be said as to cotton and live-stock, and these are the principal items of exports from our farms. In fact, they constitute the great bulk of our exports. Our exports of manufactured cotton goods, with high tariff, and our own cotton was less in 1880 than in 1860.

WAGES.

Another fraudulent pretense by which the votes of some laboring men have been secured to the Republican party is the claim that a high tariff makes high wages, when in fact there is absolutely no connection between the tariff and the price of labor. Wages are subject to the law of supply and demand; but, if they were not, and protection did increase them, it would only benefit the few who are engaged in mining and manufacturing, and not the farm hands and mechanics of the South and West.

I think the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] have demonstrated very clearly that it does not and can not in any way affect wages. I quote the following from Mr. MILLS on this point:

It is said a high tariff makes high wages for labor. It is said if we reduce the tariff wages must be reduced. How is it high tariff makes high wages for labor? How can it be explained? Why, they say, as a matter of course, if you increase the value of the domestic product, the manufacturer is able to pay higher wages. Unquestionably he is, but does he do it? No. Mr. Jay Gould, with his immense income from his railroad property, is able to pay his bootblack $500 a day, but does he do it? Oh, no; he pays the market price of the street. He gets his boots blacked and pays his nickel like a little man. [Laughter.]

Mr. Vanderbilt, from the income arising from the interest on the immense amount of bonds of the Federal Government he has got, can afford to pay his hostler $10,000 a year. He is able to do it; his bonds enable him to do it, but does he do it? Oh, no; he goes out into the market and employs his labor at the market value, and pays the same price that the humblest citizen in New York does.

High tariff does not regulate wages. Wages are regulated by demand and supply and the capacity of the laborer to do the work for which he is employed. If high tariff regulated wages, how is it the wages in the different States of the Union are different while the tariff is all the same from Maine to California? In every part of the territory of the United States the tariff is the same. How is it the wages are not the same? How is it that wages in the different localities in the different States are different? What is the cause? What is it which disturbs the tariff and prevents it from fixing a high rate of wages all over the country for labor?

My able, eloquent, and genial friend from New York [Mr. COX], in a speech in 1884, proved by official figures from the census of 1880 that the average wages paid by the manufacturing industries were only $1.16 a day for three hundred days in the year, while the average profits of the manufacturer were 36 per cent. of the capital. He also proved, what is still true, that by reason of the tariff the purchasing power of wages was reduced 40 per cent.

Our Republican friends must presume a great deal on the credulity of the farmers of this country when they ask them to accept as true the declarations made here that protection cheapens the price of manufact-

ured goods and at the same time furnishes a ready market for and increases the price of farm products. The farmer at once asks what manner of man can the manufacturer be that he wants to maintain a system that reduces the price of what he manufactures for sale and increases the cost of products he must buy. At the same time they tell the laborers that it enables them to get higher wages. So, in short they ask us to believe that protection gives the farmer a ready market and high prices for what he grows, the consumer of manufactured goods a cheap market for all he wants, and the laborer the highest wages for his work. It would appear from this that protection is a very good thing for everybody except the manufacturer, and yet he is the only one who wants protection. "Oh! what fools we mortals are."

Mr. Chairman, I want some protectionist who asserts that protection increases wages to tell me now and here why it is that the railroads of the country, with no protection, can and do pay on an average higher wages than the protected industries? The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] produced receipts to show that laborers in the Edgar Thomson steel works in that State received less than others by the side of these works with no protection. Of course the tariff on iron and steel is the same all over the United States and yet the census shows that the wages in this industry to skilled labor ranged from $1.25 to $4 per day, and that the greatest advancement was made in the sections where the highest wages were paid.

I want some one who is clamoring for protection to our labor against the so-called "pauper labor" of Europe to explain to the country why it is that our imports are principally from Great Britain, where the wages are much higher than any of the other European countries? We import nearly $200,000,000 worth of goods from England and less than one-tenth of that much from Austria, where labor is much cheaper. We need have no fear of the cheap labor. It is the independent, well-paid labor that we must compete with.

If protection is necessary to manufacturing industries, how can England without it export more of manufactured goods than all the balance of the Old World with it? Until these questions are answered I shall not admit that the passage of the pending bill will do anything more than to destroy the monopolies and trusts that have come as the natural outgrowth of protection and a restricted trade. To break these is what I want, above everything else. This bill will injure no industry that naturally and properly belongs with us, and we want no fosterlings.

Frequent reference has been made in this debate to what has been called the free-trade act of 1846, and it has been made to serve both sides. Democrats have ascribed the greatest prosperity to it; Republicans have reversed the inference and charged depression to this and all other periods under low tariff. It will be remembered that England repealed the corn laws that same year. Now let us see how our commerce increased.

Our exports of pork, flour, and corn, to say nothing of cotton, were increased about $30,000,000 worth, and immediately the prices here were almost doubled. The English statistics show that in 1846 there were consumed there per capita only about forty pounds of flour, and that in 1884, the last year that I have been able to get statistics for, this had increased to nearly 200 pounds. In the same time the consumption of other food products that we send her has increased about in the same proportion. This shows what trade between nations does. Why should we be afraid to trade with any nation? In point of physical strength and material greatness we lead them all.

But least of all should we turn from Old England, from whose people we draw our blood and whose language we speak. Linked to her by a submarine cable, we should cultivate the most intimate commercial relations. She wants our products and is bound to have some of them, but will take much more if we will take pay in trade. There is no farmer who does not understand how much easier it is to sell his little produce to his merchant if he will "take it in trade" than to sell for cash. The principle applies to nations as well as individuals.

Mr. Chairman, it was altogether unnecessary for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] to trouble himself to show by comparison and boast of the difference in the wealth of his own grand State and the poor but proud Southern States. He might have accepted that as admitted by this side of the House. The important and paramount question with us is how it happens to be so. He says the protective tariff made Pennsylvania rich. We say that protection has kept the South poor. Because it makes one class in one section rich and another class in another section poor is why we oppose it. We know that our people are as industrious and as economical as the people of Pennsylvania, our soil is as fertile.

While we do not ask any aid or bounty, we do ask justice and fair treatment in the matter of taxation. Give us this, and as far as Arkansas is concerned she will challenge Pennsylvania to a nobler rivalry in the contest for future glory. Pass this bill and commence the race on equal terms. Give Arkansas those "unfettered hands" of which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] spoke so eloquently, and she will indeed "march to grander industrial triumphs." Since the gentleman has made this unjust comparison, I will make a comparison of the condition of the farmers, and the manufacturers of Pennsylvania, and see what protection does for her own people. Each person engaged in farming there has on an average a capital of $3,637, and the labor of each person so employed with the said sums invested realizes annually $431.

Each person engaged in manufacturing in that State has a capital of $1,250 invested and realizes $719. The Pennsylvania farmer works all the year with an investment of $3,637 for $431. The manufacturer, with a capital of only $1,250, realizes $719. With about one-third of the money he makes twice the profits. As our State is strictly agricultural our people get about the same results. There is nothing in the system except loss to the farmer, locate him where you may.

Now, in conclusion, I wish to say this question is in the politics of this country to stay until a reduction is made. There is no possible way to suppress it. The cry of English free trade, Confederate constitution, Cobden Club, will avail nothing. We have reached a point in our history when the fomenting of sectional strife will not win party victories. About two-thirds of the voters now in the Southern States, as well as elsewhere, had nothing to do with the late war and take but little notice of references to it.

As a representative in part of that element and a native of the South, I will say in this connection to those of our Republican friends who have so frequently applied the epithet "rebels" to our people, that it has no terror for them. They are proud of the South and its history, but are prouder still of our common country, and are interested in making it all that our fathers intended it should be. That people who, like yourselves, were born of rebellion and draw their blood and date their birth from the rebel sires of '76, are not ashamed to be called rebels. It is the nature of Americans to rebel against wrong, and I would remind our protection friends that our first great rebellion was against unjust taxes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I approach the discussion of the question before the House with reluctance and diffidence. The debate has already been so protracted as to weary the House and, perhaps, also the country. There is no possible phase of the subject which has not been presented much better than it is possible for me to present it. Yet, as a member of this body, representing a large and interested constituency, it is meet that I give expression to the reasons which move me to oppose the pending measure.

The people must pay the expense of operating the Government and all the national obligations. For these purposes they are necessarily subjected to taxation. To this no good citizen objects. Good citizens, however, disagree as to methods of imposing that tax.

The policy of the Government from the beginning has been to raise the needed revenues by indirect rather than by direct taxation. Both are admittedly authorized by the Constitution. We have always, and often almost exclusively, employed the indirect system; that is, to raise our revenue chiefly by levying duties upon foreign merchandise. The importer of such merchandise is required to pay such duties at the custom-house. Such duties so collected go into the Treasury to meet the current expenses of the Government and pay our national obligations. Whatever of this burden is borne by the citizen is voluntarily borne. He is at liberty to buy or not to buy any part of such foreign goods. If he does he will bear the burden in whole or in part of the duty paid upon the article he purchases. Such may be the home competition, however, that the burden in whole or in part falls upon the foreign producer and not upon the consumer. To that extent, whatever it may be, the foreign producer is made to share our public burden in return for access to our markets.

Duties may be levied, first, for revenue merely; second, for revenue with incidental protection; third, for revenue and protection.

For revenue merely is to levy them on such foreign products as are not produced in this country at all.

The theory of the advocates of this plan is that a duty levied on such foreign products as are produced here operates to raise the price of the home product by the amount of the duty on the foreign product, and that such increase upon the home product goes into the pockets of the manufacturer; but when levied upon such foreign goods as are not produced here at all, though the cost of the article is increased by the amount of the tax, still the whole of such increased cost paid by the consumer goes into the Treasury.

If levied for revenue with incidental protection a uniform ad valorem duty may be imposed upon all imports sufficient to raise the needed amount of revenue, say 20 per cent., and if this shall operate to aid the development of any home industry, such result is merely incidental, and no part of the purpose for which such duty was levied.

If levied with a view to protection, the duty is imposed upon foreign products sufficient to yield the needed amount of revenue, but is laid upon such foreign goods as are produced at home and with the purpose of placing our own producers upon a plane of equal competition with foreign producers in our own markets.

The advocates of the measure before the House, while declaring that it does not seriously impair the protective system, almost without exception denounce protection as the sum of all villainies, and maintain with great zeal and energy that the highest possible good can only be secured to the people by unrestricted commerce with our sister nations.

We are to conclude, therefore, that the bill approximates that policy as nearly as its authors and advocates found it to be practicable.

If the measure here and there preserves the protective principle, we may reasonably infer that it is a necessary concession to secure the votes of gentlemen who can not safely ignore the industrial interests in their districts. Such are dangerous nurses to be intrusted with infant industries even of their own districts. They are the enemies of protection, but their political life depends upon the concessions referred to.

The zeal, vigor, enthusiasm, ability, sophistry, and eloquence with which all of them assail protection, and the warmth with which they advocate unrestricted trade with all the nations of the earth, make it clear that their ultimate object is free trade.

Free trade repeals all customs laws, closes all custom-houses, and opens our ports to the same freedom of commercial intercourse as now exists among the several States. This means direct taxation to raise the revenues now derived from custom duties. This revenue must then come from taxes levied similar to the method of State taxation for State, municipal, school, and other purposes. About one-fourth would be borne by personal property, and the other three-fourths by real property. The farms and farmers would carry the load. Added to the local taxation the Federal burden would be crushing. The people would not submit to it. The farmers could not endure the oppression.

But the pending measure, subject to such necessary concessions as I have already referred to, is presumably framed with reference to revenue exclusively.

Just who the author of it is does not seem to be of much moment. For the present it is anonymous. It is the pet, though not born of the White House. It is not just the creature the President was yearning for in his message. It is too much of a cross with hated breeds for that; yet it is sent forth as the fetich of the power that reigns at the other end of the avenue. It is to be "honored and obeyed" until one of the full blood shall take its place. "Let it be enthroned" is the "fiat" from the reigning dynasty.

You gentlemen on the other side who do not heed, beware! My friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] refuses allegiance, and is pursued with the envenomed fury of offended royalty. "Down with the traitor" comes from the imperial master; "Down with the traitor" echo the organs; and, in the name of civil-service reform, a thousand paid emissaries hunt through the hills and valleys of the old Keystone State, panting for his scalp in their eagerness to hang it upon their master's belt to prove their devotion. [Applause.]

And there is my other friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. SOWDEN]. Oh, rebellious SOWDEN, the Allentown building has gone the way of the disloyal. Look well, my friend; look well to your fortress. Hear you not the organ! Listen:

> The Democratic party has now reached a point where it can not afford to tolerate infidelity to the Democratic creed. And least of all things can it afford to have the Democratic Administration feeding at the public crib men who work in the vineyard of the enemy.
>
> President Cleveland's tariff message is his platform for the Presidential campaign. He is responsible for the fact that loyalty to him and his party is inconsistent with a refusal of loyal support to the pending bill.

And again the organ:

> Monte Cristo Cleveland after the Sowden-Allentown veto. "one."
>
> The others are quite handy, Mr. President—all within easy striking distance—McADOO, FORAN, and all their jolly fellowship. Strike again, Mr. President, and strike hard. McADOO will make a beautiful No. 2.

The whole royal pack are to be turned loose upon the gallant young statesman from New Jersey. Behold his imperial highness as he points the gentlemen from New Jersey to the alternatives: "There is my service; there is the guillotine. Take your choice." [Applause.] May the good Lord shield my young friend.

Was there ever such another petty tyranny? Were ever the powers of the Executive before prostituted to such base purposes? Was ever official patronage so perverted? But pardon the digression.

The revenues for the next fiscal year can be approximately but not accurately estimated. When our people are prosperous they consume more of foreign products; this increases importations and augments the revenues. When there is a general depression among our people they buy less of foreign products; this decreases importations and diminishes the revenues. Hence the revenues will be greater or less according to the degree of prosperity among the people.

It is, however, estimated that the revenues during the next year will exceed the expenditures about $80,000,000. Let it be borne in mind, however, that this estimate contemplates no increase of expenditure for the construction of a navy, no increase of expenditure for coast defense. It is well known that a foreign foe could now put our great seacoast cities under tribute in twelve hours and compel them to hand over to the enemy more money than any foreign war is likely to cost. That estimate does not contemplate any increase in the expenditures for the relief of the country's defenders.

Justice should be done to the men who periled all on the country's battle-fields, and thereby made it possible for the stars and stripes to float over the Capitol. But for them the same flag would long since have been buried in the ruins of the Republic. Even under the present inadequate pension laws the roll is getting larger year by year. For the current year we have been called upon to supply a deficiency of three and one-half millions of dollars.

Robbed of bounties you pledged them by law—robbed by gross misinterpretation of law—they ask for reparation. They ask the equalization of the bounties, a measure absolutely just.

I have, Congress after Congress, introduced such a measure, but it has never found its way back from the committee room.

I have as often introduced a bill to remove the limitation from the arrears act, and although the committee has at least in two recent Congresses and again this session reported the bill back, recommending its passage, the fiat as often went forth that it must die on the Calendar.

Twenty thousand brave men, many of whom fought on nearly every battle-field of the war, have been overtaken by physical and financial misfortunes, some of whom have been obliged to drag their suffering bodies over the hill to the poor-house; others lie suffering in the arms of private charity.

We passed last Congress a bill for their relief. A veto struck it down and hideously illustrated a nation's ingratitude.

Another one is now on the Calendar, offering, not justice, no, but a mean, ungrateful, and niggardly relief. Will you pass it? We shall see.

Beyond all this the time ought to be near at hand when we should provide a general service-pension law.

And still another thing:

Is it proposed to keep the American people forever under the yoke of the bondholder?

In 1891, only three years hence, $230,000,000 of bonds bearing 4½ per cent. interest will be payable. Do you propose to extend them for another series of years, and continue to filch labor to pay coupons?

Only a few years thereafter $730,000,000 of 4 per cent. bonds will mature. Is it to be the policy of the Government to put them in process of extinguishment, or shall we extend them indefinitely that the slavery of labor to the bondholder may be interminable.

The national banks, it is true, may perpetuate their circulation by such indefinite extension of the 4½ per cent. bonds payable three years hence, but national-bank circulation is by no means a public necessity. We can easily replace it by the substitution of greenbacks or coin certificates.

What will be the surplus if these great objects are properly provided for? How much can you reduce the revenues if you contemplate just provision for them? Are they not all worthy of patriotic consideration?

Sir, I am utterly opposed to any such sweeping reduction of the revenues as ignores all these important measures. I am unwilling to so wreck the finances of the Government as to make it impossible to discharge that highest of all national obligations—those, legal and equitable, due to the survivors of the war for the Union; and yet that is exactly the effect of the President's policy.

Who is here protesting that our Federal taxation is oppressive? Is labor here on bended knees asking for this legislation? No; it is protesting against it. Do the manufacturers want it? No; under the influence of its menace they see their business languishing. Do the farmers want it? No; they see in it inevitable destruction to a market that has taken up more than nine-tenths of their surplus products. Who does want it? England. Who else? The importers and jobbers. Who else? Wall street, the bondholders, and the national banks. Who else? Those who would degrade American labor, pauperize it and drive its children from the school-house to the mine and the workshop, and make this, like England, a government of classes. Who else? Politicians in search of a slogan to meet a party exigency. [Applause.]

But the President tells us that the accumulated surplus in the Treasury at the end of this fiscal year will reach the sum of $140,000,000; of which sum about $30,000,000 is the surplus of the last fiscal year.

To suffer that to continue is fatal to all the business interests of the country. Such increasing surplus must sooner or later paralyze all sources of employment, drive labor from the workshops to the streets, shrink values, transfer the property of the poor into the hands of the rich, and wreck the nation in a universal panic.

Yet this is the feast which the President has been deliberately preparing for the American people. He deliberately refused to pay out the surplus in the purchase of our bonded obligations, though Congress had provided by law (the act of 1881) ample authority for that purpose. He chose rather to lock it up and withhold it from the channels of business and thereby push the country to the verge of bankruptcy, that the people might be forced to accept escape from impending ruin by his policy of destruction of the protective system, under which we have in a quarter of a century passed every nation on earth in industrial growth and in national and individual prosperity.

Such a daring assault upon the public welfare the President seemed to realize must be made to appear unavoidable. Absence of lawful authority alone could justify him. Hence he tells us that he doubted the sufficiency of the law, because it was in a general appropriation act. The pretext was frivolous.

In all the discussion of the subject in both Houses no lawyer was

found to express such a doubt. All knew there was no room for doubt. If his position was tenable there is no limitation to the arrears-of-pension law; there is no law authorizing the organization of the consular and diplomatic service; there is no law authorizing the organization of the Treasury Department; there is no law authorizing the mails to be carried by the railways; there is no law authorizing unexpended appropriations to be covered into the Treasury; there is no law authorizing 2-cent postage; there is no law authorizing 1-ounce letters to be carried for 2 cents; there is no law authorizing the Interior Department to contract for Indian supplies; there is no law fixing the strength of the Army at 25,000; there is no law fixing the strength of the Navy at 8,250; there is no law to prohibit payment to land-grant railroads of more than 50 per cent. of their earnings from the Government; there is no law for the classification of mail matter and payment of postmasters; there is no law for the existence of the Geological Survey; there is no law for a commission to supervise the selection of juries in the United States courts; there is no law to limit authority to expedite the mail service to prevent a repetition of Star route swindles; and, finally, there is no law authorizing the salary of the President at $50,000 per annum. [Applause.] All these provisions of law are to be found in general appropriation acts.

It will be difficult to recall a more groundless or illogical pretext for so audacious a violation of public duty. But the emergency is upon us. It will not stay the conflagration to discuss whether or not it was the act of an incendiary. It is the duty of patriotism to avert impending dangers. There must be something done to stop this hoarding in the Treasury of the very life-blood of business. There is to be left but one practicable method of relief, and that is by a reduction of revenue. How shall that be done? Shall we take it chiefly off internal taxes, or shall it be taken chiefly off foreign importations in such a way as to seriously impair our manufactures, reduce American wages, and prejudice agriculture?

Such is the alternative. For myself, I find no difficulty in determining where my duty lies. With such an alternative, let the reduction come chiefly from internal taxation. This will afford direct relief alike to agriculture and to manufactures, but chiefly to agriculture. Consumers will realize the full benefit of such a reduction. But it is said the tariff needs revision. So it does; doubtless a careful and proper revision of the tariff would do good. It is likely on some articles it should be lowered and on others raised to bring them upon a plane of equal competition with the foreign products in our own markets.

But a revision by the avowed enemies of protection, a revision that surrenders our markets to the products of the ill-paid labor of Europe, a revision that wipes out as with a sponge the only ample and stable markets for our agriculture, a revision that drives the products of our own labor from our own markets, a revision that closes the workshops of our own country, a revision that degrades our own labor to the pauperized condition of European labor, a revision that would drive all our people to the soil for a living to glut England with our agricultural products at starvation prices, to enable her to feed her labor cheap that she may pay it even less than now—such a revision should be thwarted if possible. [Applause.]

We have the capital, the inventive genius, the improved machinery, the skilled artisans, and the enterprise to successfully compete with any nation on earth if you will but give us protection equal to the difference of the cost of labor in our own country and the cost of European labor. Upon that basis I stand for a revision of the tariff, and if gentlemen on the other side who are in control here would agree to such a revision they would find this side of the House eagerly assisting them. But that is the very thing they do not want. The laboring man and the farmer are blandly assured by these revenue reformers that the protective system is grinding them into dust, and that the "revenue exclusively" panacea will remove all the ills they now suffer and lift them up to a higher plane of prosperity and happiness.

Do not flatter yourselves that farmers are fools or the wagemen ignorant.

Here is a list of prices paid here and in England, for which I am indebted to Mr. BUTTERWORTH, who had it compiled from reliable sources:

	England.	United States.
Book-binders	$6.00	$15.00 to $18.00
Brush-makers	6.00	15.00 to 20.00
Boiler-makers	7.75	16.50
Brick-makers	3.54	11.86
Brick-layers	8.00	21.00
Blacksmiths	6.00	13.30
Butchers	6.00	12.00
Bakers	6.25	12.75
Blast-furnace keepers	10.00	18.00
Blast-furnace fillers	7.50	14.00
Bolt-makers	6.50	16.50
Bolt-cutters	3.00	10.00
Coal-miners	5.88	13.00
Cotton-mill hands	4.60	6.72
Carpenters	7.50	15.00
Coopers	6.00	13.25
Carriage-makers	6.75	13.00 to 25.00
Cutlery	$6.00	$12.00 to 25.00
Chemicals	4.00 to 6.00	13.00 to 16.00
Clock-makers	7.00	18.00
Cabinet-makers	7.00	18.00
Farm hands	3.00	7.50 to 9.00
Glass-blowers	6.00 to 9.00	25.00 to 30.00
Glass (partly skilled)	6.00 to 7.00	12.00 to 15.00
Glass (unskilled)	2.00 to 4.00	7.00 to 10.00
Glove-makers (girls)	2.00	6.00 to 9.00
Glove-makers (men)	4.50	10.00 to 30.00
Hatters	6.00	12.00 to 24.00
Iron-ore miners	5.50	12.00
Iron molders	7.50	15.00
Iron, per ton (finished)	2.00 to 3.00	5.31 to 8.71
Heaters and rollers	10.00 to 12.00	20.00 to 30.00
Instrument-makers	7.00	18.00 to 20.00
Laborers	4.10	8.00
Long-shoremen	8.00	15.00
Linen and thread (men)	5.00	7.50
Linen and thread (women)	2.35	3.22
Machinists	8.50	18.00
Masons	8.00	21.00
Printers (1,000 ems)	0.20	0.40
Printers, week hands	6.65	15.40
Pattern-makers	7.50	18.00
Painters	7.50	15.00
Plumbers	8.00	18.00
Plasterers	7.50	21.00
Potters	8.67	18.30
Polishers	7.00	18.00
Paper-makers	5.20	12.00 to 21.00
Puddlers, per week	8.00 to 10.00	18.00 to 20.00
Quarrymen	6.00	12.00 to 15.00
Rope-makers	5.25	9.00 to 12.00
Railroad engineers	10.00	21.00
Railroad firemen	5.00	12.00
Shipbuilding—		
Boiler-makers	7.00	14.00
Machinists	7.00	14.35
Coppersmiths	6.50	16.50
Platers	8.00	18.00
Drillers	6.00	12.00
Riveters	8.00	17.40
Riggers	5.50	11.00
Pattern-makers	8.00	24.00
Salt-makers	6.00	9.00 to 10.50
Silk (men)	5.00	10.00
Silk (women)	2.50	6.00
Scarf-makers	1.50 to 2.25	6.00 to 9.00
Servants (month)	5.00	15.00
Shoe-makers	6.00	12.00
Stationary engineers	7.50	15.00 to 18.00
Soap-makers	5.00	10.50
Tanners	5.00	8.00 to 10.00
Teamsters	5.25	12.00 to 15.00
Upholsterers	8.00	18.00
Watch-makers	8.00	18.00
Wire-drawers	11.00	22.00

Go to any laborer employed in these industries and he will tell you that the industry in which he is engaged, unless protected, must cease to exist in this country unless his wages shall be reduced to those paid in the same industry across the sea. You may hurl your fine-spun theories of political science at him until your head aches and you will fail to convince him to the contrary. He is practical. It is not difficult for him to solve the question of whether his condition as a book-binder will be better at $18 per week, paying $3.88 for food, than it would be at $6 per week, paying $3.40 per week for food.

It does not require a very high degree of intelligence to comprehend that books bound at a labor cost of $6 per week can drive from the market books bound at a labor cost of $18 per week. It does not require a very large amount of business wisdom to understand that if A is employing ten thousand men in a given industry at $2 per day, and B is employing ten thousand men at $1.25 per day, A will be driven from the market by B and forced to close his establishment, or reduce the wages of his men to $1.25 per day. These men understand very clearly that $1.25 per day reduces them to the level of the employés in the English factory.

The farmer understands how important it is to him to sell food to A's ten thousand men for cash. He further understands that if A closes his establishment his ten thousand employés must go elsewhere for work, and not being able to get it must go to the soil for a living. He understands how in that case he has lost his customers not only, but they have now become his competitors in the production of agriculture. This reasoning of course applies to every manufacturing industry in the country.

Withdraw protection and substitute a tariff for revenue merely, and one of two things is inevitable: either our manufacturers must reduce the wages of their employés to such as are paid by rival establishments in Europe or go out of business.

If the wages are so reduced the American laborer is leveled to the condition of the European laborer. If he is degraded to that level he can no longer educate his children, and soon he will be found wholly unfit for self-government.

Some idea of the industrial condition of Europe will be conveyed by an examination of a late report of Consular Agent Smith touching the

state of labor in the German Empire. After speaking of the unsatisfactory condition of agriculture and many other industries, he says:

In the manufacture of cloth in the district of Potsdam-Frankfort on the Oder there are said to be about 26,000 hands employed, of whom about 14,000 are women, at a weekly wage of 10 to 12 marks ($2.50 to $3), or 260,000 to 300,000 marks ($65,000 to $75,000) for the whole number, or about 15,000,000 marks ($3,750,000) a year, which is four-and-a-half times as much as is paid by the mines to their hands.

Speaking of the wages in the Dresden district, he says:

The inspector for the Dresden district gives the following as the average wages paid in his district, otherwise is not much said about wages, namely:

		Cents.
Hand workmen	per hour	3½ to 5
Factory operative	do	5 to 7½
Female workers	do	2½ to 3½
Young persons, fourteen to sixteen years old	do	1½ to 2
To a child twelve to fourteen years old	do	½ to 1

At piecework 20 to 25 per cent. more is made.

Speaking of the mines, furnaces, etc., he says:

In the bringing up of iron ore women are used day and night, and principally in tending the windlasses and rolling wheelbarrows. The iron ore is brought to the surface by means of windlasses, to work each of which there are four to six girls, according to the depth of carriage. Where the depth is 20 meters (about 65 feet) four girls in eight-hour turns wind up 80 buckets of iron ore, each of which holds from 1 to 1½ centners of ore (110-165 English pounds). The wages are very low, but the work is preferred by the girls to domestic service, because they are at it but eight hours at a time and can then do as they please. The inspector thinks it is not to be expected that machinery should displace these women, because they are cheaper than machines would be.

In the furnaces and in the iron and steel rolling-mills the regular work of iron forgers is performed only by men. The work done by the women is that of bringing coke, ore, and limestone to the furnaces, pouring water on the glowing coals, and removing the ashes and slag from the puddle-work.

Speaking of the immoral condition that prevails in the factories, he says:

Both men and women use the same wash and dressing rooms and privies in many establishments, but the providing of separate places for the two sexes is increasing, especially in the new buildings. In the old and small establishments much remains to be done, it is said, to remove the dangers to morality to which women are exposed.

The working together of both sexes in rooms where there is a high temperature is said to have a bad effect upon the morals of women. The textile factories come in for a good share of blame in this respect. The Dusseldorf inspector says that the spinning-mills of every branch are bad where there is a mixed employment of the two sexes in the same work-room, and especially those where the time of labor is long, the ventilation poor, the temperature high, and the washing and dressing rooms the same for both sexes; and also similar situated weaving-mills, factories making artificial wool, factories making wearing-apparel, etc. Other inspectors also point to the textile factories.

* * * * * * * *

Many sugar-factories are objectionable from moral considerations, in whose hot rooms the women have to wear little clothing and partly bare the body.

Objection is made to chicory and rubber-goods factories on the same ground as to the sugar-factories, that the women work half naked in hot rooms alongside men.

In some factories, where the men and women sleep at night, complaint is made that the halls or rooms are not properly separated from one another.

The inspector for the Potsdam-Frankfort on the Oder district calls attention to the manner in which women are employed in railroad construction. He says they can be seen, with their legs bare and their dresses tucked high up, pushing wheelbarrows in mud and wet sand. Every spring large numbers of farm hands come from the eastern provinces of Prussia to Brandenburg to take part in the harvesting. In summer, after the harvests are over, they have nothing to do, and as they do not like to make the long journey home—for in the autumn they find an abundance of work when the potato and beet-root crops are gathered in—they undertake any labor until the fall crops are ready, and building work is well paid.

Female work in the brick-kilns is objected to, because it is hard, and because the women have to work with their lower limbs bare.

Such is the degradation of this labor. It is so ill-paid as to be brutalized.

We all know that such of those same people as have come among us readily assimilate with ours, and under the elevating and refining influences of our vastly better paid labor rapidly develop into splendid manhood and womanhood. Their children are here sent to the public schools, educated, and frequently well equipped for any condition of American life.

But it is with their brutal and lamentable condition in Germany, as shown by Consul Smith, an officer of this Administration, that American labor must compete if the products of their toil are to be admitted without restrictions to our markets.

The present Commissioner of Labor made an exhaustive investigation in 1883 into the wages paid in Massachusetts and Great Britain in twenty-four industries. Here they are:

1. Agricultural implements.
2. Artisans' tools.
3. Boots and shoes.
4. Brick.
5. Building trades.
6. Carpetings.
7. Carriages and wagons.
8. Clothing.
9. Cotton goods.
10. Flax and jute goods.
11. Food preparations.
12. Furniture.
13. Glass.
14. Hats: Fur, wool, and silk.
15. Hosiery.
16. Liquors: Malt and distilled.
17. Machines and machinery.
18. Metals and metallic goods.
19. Printing and publishing.
20. Printing, dyeing, bleaching, and finishing cotton textiles.
21. Stone.
22. Wooden goods.
23. Woolen goods.
24. Worsted goods.

I quote from his report:

GRAND RESULT.

1. If Massachusetts is credited with the average wages paid and Great Britain is credited with the high wages paid, the Massachusetts wages are higher in twenty-three out of the twenty-four industries considered, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts, in all the industries, being 48.28.

2. If both Massachusetts and Great Britain are credited with the average wages paid, the wages in Massachusetts are higher in each of the twenty-four industries considered, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts, in all industries, being 75.94.

3. On an industry basis, the average percentage in favor of Massachusetts, in twenty-three industries, is 65.05.

4. Taking the wages paid per hour as the basis, the average in Massachusetts is higher in each of the twenty-four industries, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts, in all the industries, being 70.88.

5. On the basis of establishment pay-rolls, the percentage in favor of Massachusetts is 97.39.

The percentage that will truly and fairly indicate the higher rate of wages paid in Massachusetts in the industries considered, as compared with the wages paid in the same industries in Great Britain, must be found somewhere between the extremes here given, namely: 48.28 per cent. and 97.39 per cent. The results shown in sections 4 and 5 are not based upon as complete data as those shown in sections 1, 2, and 3, and neither percentage can be fairly used in determining the grand result.

The mean of 48.28 per cent. and 75.94 per cent., as we have previously shown, is 62.11 per cent., and this approximates so closely to the general average, 65.05, as shown in section 3, that we state as the grand result of the comparative weekly wages investigation in Massachusetts and Great Britain for the year 1883, that the general average weekly wage of the employés in twenty-four industries in Massachusetts is 62+ per cent. higher than the general average weekly wages of the employés in the same industries in Great Britain.

Our consul, Mr. Lathrop, made a report, 1884–'85, on labor in English factories. I quote:

The average wages of the men in the Trowbridge woolen factories are estimated at $5.44 per week. The average wages paid to 418 women in one leading factory are given as $2.63 per week, and in another at $3.02 per week. These wages, adds the consul, would not support life unaided; but, generally, these women are the wives or daughters of the male operatives; neither could the male wages alone sustain the average English families, and so the children in their turn contribute to the general fund by also working in the factories. Boys and girls, when employed, earn from $2.25 to $2.40 per week. Thus, to enable a Trowbridge family to live, every member—husband, wife, and children—works in the mills.

Consul Shaw says, speaking of labor in Manchester, England:

American work-people, as a whole, would not live under the conditions in force here among operatives, nor could they be induced to adopt the English system. Here whole families live in the mills and are satisfied to do so. Here the children are compelled to help pay the family expense.

Great numbers of houses visited by me contained each only one living room, and this served as kitchen, dining-room, sitting-room, and in some instances also bed-room. Into some of these small houses large families are crowded, and the manner of life is almost necessarily demoralizing and unfortunate.

Of course our wage-people would never submit to such conditions. They would naturally prefer to engage in agriculture. There they would hope at least to be able to subsist their families and educate their children. What does that mean? It means they no longer buy from the farmer. The farmer has lost this market. This is his home market. This is the market for over 90 per cent. of all he raises to sell. I say it is even worse than that. They not only do not buy any longer of the farmer, but those consumers have themselves now become producers of food products. They are now rivals, competitors, in agriculture. Who shall say that this will not make a glut of agriculture? Will it not change the relation of the supply to the demand? Will not the demand be less and the product greater? Will not the price go down accordingly? Why not? Less consumers and more producers. Well, now, you have destroyed the farmer's home market, a market always sufficient and always stable, where do you supply him other markets?

Let me quote here from the excellent speech of my friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]:

Nine million farmers are feeding a nation of 60,000,000 of people. How does this advantage the farmers? The estimated value of the products of our farms, exclusive of cotton and tobacco, is $3,000,000,000 annually, and yet 94 per cent. of this enormous product is taken in our own market and consumed by our own people. The farmers are compelled to export only 6 per cent. of their products. In this connection it is worthy of note that while the value of our manufactures reaches the almost fabulous sum of $7,000,000,000 annually, yet more than 90 per cent. of this is consumed within our borders. It is estimated that the value of our industrial products of farm and factory will aggregate annually $11,000,000,000, and yet nearly $10,000,000,000 of this is disposed of in our own market and consumed by our own people. And yet, with a home market of such absorbing capacity, built up and sustained by a diversification of our industries, the advocates of free trade are constantly holding up the phantom of the markets of the world as the one thing chiefly to be desired.

Of what value to the American farmer are the markets of the world in comparison with his home market? How much of the farmer's surplus products does the world's market require to-day? Before dropping the substance for the shadow it would be well to inquire the extent of the foreign demand for the products of our farm. If a policy is adopted which destroys the home market and forces the American farmers into the markets of the world, when his vessels are laden with the products of his farm, to what ports on the habitable globe will he direct his course? Not to South America, nor Asia, nor Africa, nor Australasia, nor the islands of the sea, for in all these there is practically no demand for our agricultural products, and there is no prospect that there ever will be, for these countries are abundantly supplied with agricultural laborers and surplus lands.

Europe is the only country which does not feed its own people, and even there Russia, Germany, Turkey, Roumania, Servia, and Hungary produce their own food supply, and, excluding Germany, furnish a surplus for the European markets. Outside of Great Britain, therefore, there is practically no demand for our agricultural products, and with the rich fields of India open to her it is not difficult to discern that the time is not far distant when even this demand will cease.

The chairman of the committee, in his recent speech, declared that—

"We are the great agricultural people of the world, and have been feeding the people of Europe, and must receive European goods in exchange or fail to export our surplus, and thus surfeit the home market and reduce prices."

This hallucination of feeding the people of Europe is easily dispelled. As bread is the main staff of European life, let us see where it is obtained. The population of Europe is about 250,000,000, and the consumption of wheat about 3½ bushels per head, of which scarcely more than half a bushel is required from North and South America, Asia, and Australasia. In three-fourths of the entire area of Europe the consumption does not amount to 2 bushels per head, and

nearly every grain of that is produced at home. On about half the area of Europe there is a surplus to spare to the other half. The largest consumer of wheat in the world, France, was also the largest producer less than fifteen years ago, and has now about as large an area and product as ever, and needs of foreign wheat only about 10 per cent. of her supply.

The 80,000,000 people of Russia live mostly on rye, as do the people of Germany and Central Europe, and produce it all themselves. Many of the people of the North of Europe consume a large proportion of maize. Some in the North of Europe subsist largely on oat-meal. The consumption of all cereals in Europe usually averages at least 16 bushels per head, of which 3 pecks per capita come from other continents. Feeding the people of Europe! Four continents combining to supply a per capita deficiency of 3 pecks per capita in the fifth. A failure of one-half peck in this deficiency sends prices rapidly upward; an excess of one-half peck produces an instant and sudden fall in India and Dakota. An additional half bushel would sprout in the bin or be fed to farm animals without a foreign offer. This is so well known that it would be charity to attribute to ignorance the pretense of enlarging the exportation of wheat by low tariffs, or no tariffs, or by any other device short of the creation of a few million more foreign mouths.

If we do so little in feeding Europe with bread, still less do we supply the meat she consumes. Last year we exported 162,000,000 pounds of beef, fresh and salted 138,000,000, or four-fifths of it, went to Great Britain. Very little is ever wanted elsewhere, and Englishmen are now straining every nerve and spending British gold in enterprises to supply their country with frozen and canned beef from Australia and the Argentines. Of 505,000,000 pounds of bacon, pork, and hams exported, 380,000,000 pounds, or three-fourths of it, went to Great Britain and a part of the remainder to Canada. Scarcely a nation in the world, Great Britain excepted, depends upon foreign nations for its meat supply. It is a necessity of their existence that they should supply themselves. It is the same with cheese, the only other food product of which there is an appreciable deficiency in Europe.

Its market is confined chiefly to Great Britain, and exportation can not be enlarged at all without a reduction in price, and any sudden extension is a practical and physical impossibility. The rich there buy all they can eat now, and the poor all they can afford. The requirement is fixed and limited with the least possible element of elasticity, so that the foreign demand can only fluctuate with the annual variations of the home supply. This statement should dispose of the boastful and silly pretense so glibly and frequently made by free-traders, of feeding Europe, and ought to mark the exit of America in the rôle of the world's nurse and caterer to the universe. [Applause.]

Where then on the face of the globe can the American farmer market his surplus? At home or nowhere. This home market, therefore, should be to him the object of his deepest solicitude and protecting care, for upon it the future of agriculture in this country depends.

Well, what other compensation do you offer the farmer for the loss of his home market? Cheaper goods, you say. Why, a quarter of a century of protection has greatly cheapened everything he has to buy. It has given such energy to our own manufacturers that competition has forced inventions, augmented the skill of our artisans, improved our machinery, and stimulated enterprise, thereby reducing prices of manufactured products. It is this competition that has forced down the price of every foreign product. Destroy our home manufactories and what becomes of this competition? What check have you then upon the greed of the foreign producer who is given a monopoly of our markets? What then will there be to prevent the foreign manufacturer from fixing the price the American farmer shall pay?

The farmer is not only greatly interested in diversified industries supplying the greatest possible number employment outside of agriculture, but also in such labor being well paid. The more the wageman gets for his labor the more he buys from the farmer. A man who gets good wages can and will live well. A man who gets poor wages can buy but little; he must live poor. The man who is out of employment is a wretched customer for the farmer. The free-traders delight in telling wagemen how much cheaper they could live under free trade—that everything they buy would be so much cheaper. Well, in the first place, we have seen that is not so. In the second place, if it is so—if they are thrown out of employment by the destruction of our industries, or if their wages are scaled down to the level of European wages—what will they have to buy with?

Unfortunately there are in our country some conditions that work injustice to all the industries, agriculture as well as manufactures, and labor is the pack-horse that bears the burden. The several States, vieing with each other to secure the investment of capital, have opened wide the door to serious evils. With incorporation laws imposing no restrictions or safeguards against abuses we find our lines of commerce doing business on a basis of from 25 to more than 100 per cent. fictitious or "watered" capital. To this the products of every industry are every second of time paying the same tribute as if it were real. This is a species of intolerable robbery. It is a thief whose hand is constantly filching the pockets of labor. Of all the wrongs to labor this is the greatest and the most wicked. The highest attainment of statesmanship will be achieved by providing a remedy for this monstrous wrong. [Applause.]

Millions of acres of the public domain still remain covered by grants to corporations to which such corporations are not legally, equitably, or morally entitled. This should at once be restored to the public domain. Much good in this direction has already been done, for which the country is more indebted to my friend from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON] than to any other member of this body.

Some of the combinations called trusts and pools are daily engaged in open, audacious, and shameless robbery of agriculture and every form of labor.

Elsewhere it has been stated by an eminent and well-informed statesman that the cattle pool of Chicago has in the last five years filched from the people of my State over $40,000,000. I have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the statement. Everybody knows that the tariff on cattle and beef has nothing to do with this combination. It is, however, as true that the tariff makes this combination possible as any other. Would you take the tariff off cattle and meat because of the existence of this trust? Would you take the tariff off wheat and flour because we have a combination of millers? That would be absurd. The tariff has just as much to do with these combines as with any other trusts. They exist in England, and will exist here until suppressed by direct legislation.

The one thing that is true, however, is that these various and wicked combinations are bold bandits gorging themselves upon the fruits of hard toil.

If we shall turn our attention to these abuses we shall merit public approbation and give to labor the fullest benefits resulting from judicious protective legislation.

The bill makes its chief assaults upon the farmer, and curiously enough scarcely one of its advocates has failed to pose as the champion of agriculture.

It takes protection from his wools, his flax, and other products he has to sell, puts them on the free-list, and makes dutiable all he has to buy. It cheapens what the farmer has to sell, but not what he has to buy.

As in all history it is difficult to find tyranny, however brutal; slavery, however wicked; crimes, however revolting; oppression, however hideous, that did not exist and were not maintained in the name of liberty, so now agriculture is to be destroyed, manufactures repressed, labor pauperized in the name of the public welfare. [Applause.]

Manufacturers are told that the absence of protection will be more than compensated by cheap labor and cheap raw material. Labor is told there will be an increased demand for it, cheaper food, cheaper clothing, and cheaper shelter for it, and therefore marvelous advantages to it, even if subjected to free and unrestricted competition with the ill-paid and degraded labor of the Old World.

The farmers are told that they will get more for their breadstuffs, because the markets of the world will be opened to them.

How often have the advocates of this measure in this debate told the non-agricultural people that they had to bear the burden of the wool duty; that every woolen fabric they owned cost them the additional burden of the duty on wool and woolens, and before they had passed from the subject turned to the farmers and told them that the removal of duty from wool would create such a universal demand for it as to rapidly advance the price of it in the markets?

From the earliest days of the Republic during forty years the statesmen of this country maintained almost without division the theory of protection. They themselves had framed the Constitution. They themselves in colonial times had experienced the hardship of the industrial oppression of England, and they made provision at the earliest practicable moment to protect the industries of their own country against the industrial aggressions of Europe, and the very first act that was passed under the Constitution declared that one of its objects was the protection of manufactures.

The act of 1816 followed, enlarging the principle of protection. All the leading men of that day advocated it. The act of 1824 went further and enlarged the principle. The act of 1828 followed and enlarged it still further. And up to that time there was no President, there were no leading statesmen in America who antagonized the principle of protection. They stood where we stand to-day. Many of them went to the point of prohibition, especially regarding products essential to a state of war. I could quote pages from Washington, Adams, Madison, Monroe, Jackson, and nearly every statesman of that period, squarely advocating the protective system.

Therefore, here to-day, I place the Democracy of the first forty years of the Republic against the Democracy of the last forty years. [Applause.] But after the act of 1828, under the influence of which agriculture in the North flourished as never before, factories sprung into activity with marvelous rapidity, and labor enjoyed universal prosperity, Southern statesmen opened a vindictive war against it for the first time, and this they did in the name of agriculture. What they meant by agriculture was cotton and the slave labor that produced it.

To force American labor into agriculture would make the supply of food products so far exceed the demand as to supply the slaves of the South and the labor of England with the cheapest possible living.

That, they reasoned, would enable them to produce cotton cheaper and would enable the manufacturers in England to pay them more for it.

Thus they could produce cotton cheaper and sell it dearer.

So they demanded that the protection laws be repealed, and declared for nullification and secession unless this demand was complied with.

The North surrendered, and the act of 1833 followed. It closed the work-shops of the North, drove labor from the factory to the farm, pauperized Northern agriculture, and finally resulted in driving the party from power and in the enactment of the tariff law of 1842. This opened the Northern factories again, created a demand for labor that drew heavily from the ranks of the farmers to supply labor for the work-shops, created markets for the products of the soil, and gave to agriculture renewed prosperity. But the tariff-for-revenue party was untiring in the South, and violently aggressive. But the North said, unless you pledge us that you will maintain the tariff act of 1842 you

shall not return to power. The pledge was given; the party was returned to power, and at once tore down the hated protection act of 1842 and passed the free-trade act of 1846.

The destructive tendencies of this act were for a time inoperative under the influence of a foreign war, and our war with Mexico, that diminished the ranks of labor, thereby increasing a demand and opening up new and extensive markets for food products.

The treasures of the California gold mines attracted labor from the farms to the mines, and thus opened another new market for agriculture. Millions from those mines begun pouring into the lap of business, and there was corresponding activity. But when those influences were withdrawn the act of 1846 begun its deadly work.

Still Southern statesmen adhered to the policy of free trade or secession; but stagnation, universal bankruptcy, an ever increasing national debt, an empty Treasury, and broken national credit compelled Mr. Buchanan to ask for a revision of the tariff laws in the interest of revenue and protection.

The act of 1861 followed, and Mr. Buchanan approved it. Secession followed, and a war ensued that cost in money and property destroyed probably not less than ten thousand millions of dollars. Yet under protection during the last quarter of a century we have become first in manufactures, first in agriculture, and first in wealth among all the nations of the earth, with our labor better paid, better fed, better clothed, better sheltered, and better educated than elsewhere on the habitable globe, and yet here we are confronted with the same bold, defiant, and aggressive old revenue-reform party. [Applause.]

God, help us! will the time never come when we shall reach a stable industrial policy? Must our industries and labor be forever exposed to the depressing influence of perpetual menace? Well may agriculture, well may manufactures, well may American labor unite with each other against this ever present, ever aggressive public enemy, and cry out, "Let us have peace!"

These free-traders or revenue reformers, as they fondly call themselves, appear to revel in the adversity of our people. Every calamity is an illustration of the wickedness of protection.

If a farmer imprudently contracts a debt and subsequently is unable to pay it, he is told that he is robbed by protection.

If the crops fail and farmers are depressed thereby, they are told but for this robber agriculture would be prosperous.

If there is something of general business depression, the people are told that old Protection did it.

If some scoundrel has plundered his employés and robbed them of their just share of their own earnings, they are told at once that it is the fault of protection.

If there is a labor strike of 20,000 men because some employer has unjustly discharged and refused to reinstate one of them, the air is vocal with curses upon protection. If some manufacturer has enriched himself by not dealing justly with labor, he is held up as a hideous example of the monopoly-breeding tariff. If a section of our country two hundred years old has been engaged in agriculture and manufactures for more than one hundred years, and has thereby become richer than the new agricultural States of the West, the fact is made to do service as proof that the rich section two hundred years old has been made rich by robbing the new Western States through the agency of the iniquitous tariff.

Why, sir, if we shall be permitted to enjoy continuously for another quarter of a century the benign influence of just protection, my own beautiful prairie State will rival Ohio and Illinois in manufactures, and we shall have the workshop and the farm side by side, and the most prosperous people in the world. Only twenty-seven years ago she was born unto the sisterhood of States. Then she was in population the thirty-third State; now she is the fifteenth. Then she had but ten towns of a population each exceeding 500; now she has over one hundred and fifty towns of over 500 each, nearly a hundred of them of over 1,000 each, and some exceeding 30,000. She has within her borders 1,500,000 souls. The value of her farm crops for the five years ending 1885 was $503,485,316. The value of her live-stock swells from $3,332,450 in 1861 to $117,881,699 in 1885. Then she did not have a mile of railway; now she has over 7,000 miles. She has over seven hundred school-houses, of the value of over $7,000,000. Since then she has expended over $30,000,000 for the support of her common schools. She has three thousand churches, of the value of $3,000,000, and not a whisky saloon within her borders. She has six hundred journals, with a circulation of 500,000. [Applause.]

For these facts I am indebted to an address delivered by the present excellent governor of the State, Hon. John A. Martin, from which I beg to further quote:

A PROPHECY FULFILLED.

On the 7th of May, 1856, a great American, learned, sagacious, and confident in his faith that right and justice would at last prevail, said, in a speech delivered in the city of New York:

"In the year of our Lord 1900 there will be 2,000,000 people in Kansas, with cities like Providence and Worcester—perhaps like Chicago and Cincinnati. She will have more miles of railroad than Maryland, Virginia, and both the Carolinas can now boast. Her land will be worth $20 an acre, and her total wealth will be five hundred millions of money. Six hundred thousand children will learn in her schools. What schools, newspapers, libraries, meeting-houses! Yes, what families of educated, happy, and religious men and women! There will be a song of freedom all around the slave States, and in them slavery itself will die.

Read in the light of the present, these eloquent words of Theodore Parker seem touched with prophetic fire. The ideal Kansas he saw, looking through the mists of the future, is the real Kansas of to-day. The marvelous growth, the splendid prosperity, the potent intellectual and moral energies, and the happy and contented life he predicted, are all around us. At the threshold of the year A. D. 1886, fifteen years before the limit of his prophecy, Kansas has cities like Providence and Worcester; has more than double the railway mileage Maryland, Virginia, and both the Carolinas could then boast; has land worth, not twenty, but fifty and a hundred dollars an acre; has wealth far exceeding $500,000,000; has schools, newspapers, libraries, and churches rivaling those of New England; and has 1,300,000 happy, prosperous, and intelligent people.

The prophecy has been fulfilled, but the end is not yet. The foundations of the State, like those of its capitol, have just been completed. The stately building, crowned with its splendid dome, is yet to be reared. Smiling and opulent fields, busy and prosperous cities and towns are still attracting the intelligent, the enterprising, and the ambitious of every State and country. The limits that bound the progress and development of Kansas can not now be gauged or guessed. We have lands, homes, work, and plenty for millions more; and for another quarter of a century, at least, our State will continue to grow. For we are yet at the threshold and in the dawn of it all. We are just beginning to realize what a great people can accomplish, whom "love of country moveth, example teacheth, company comforteth, emulation quickeneth, and glory exalteth."

[Applause.]

That is the way protection has impoverished the agricultural West. [Applause.] If the good Lord shall give us the rains, the sunshine, and the dew, essential to good crops for the next three years, and our markets are not destroyed by free trade, Kansas will be a barren field for a calamity party.

Had free trade prevailed our growth as a State would have been dwarfed from the beginning. Without a market for our products our surplus would have been used for fuel or rotted on the fields Without the conditions to invite population we would still be in our swadling-clothes.

Her growth is without a parallel in all history. Her magnificent climate, rich soil, splendid farms, myriads of cattle, vast network of railways, busy towns, comfortable homes, her public schools, colleges, churches, charitable institutions, liberal and progressive laws, her enterprising, intelligent, energetic men, beautiful women, and healthful children—all, all combine to illustrate the highest prosperity and the most exalted civilization. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, of all the institutions of learning experience is said to be the most expensive. So it is. But its teachings are of the highest order of wisdom. You may tell the child a thousand times that hot iron will burn, but it is sure nevertheless to make the test, and then we have a wiser child.

You may tell the lad that it is highly imprudent to toy with a mule's hind legs, but he is sure to try the experiment, and then we have a wiser lad.

The people were everywhere told three years ago that, its pledges to the contrary notwithstanding, if they placed the Government in the control of the Democratic party it would marshal all the instrumentalities of power against the industries of the country. They tried the experiment nevertheless, and now we have a wiser people. [Applause.]

The twenty-four years of Republican rule had formed an epoch more fruitful of national and individual prosperity, of agriculture, manufactures and commerce, of the arts and sciences, of education and Christianity, of ideal government and human liberty, than any century of other time since the creation of man.

The generations to come will marvel that in the presence of such a glorious record a people distinguished for their intelligence would wrest the powers of government from such a party and hand them over to another whose history was one of violated pledges and shocking misrule. [Applause.]

Sir, the Republican party stands for industrial independence as a high attribute of national power.

It believes that the destruction of our manufactures will leave our people helpless victims of British greed.

It believes the highest happiness of a people can best be attained by the greatest possible diversity of occupations.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican party would have our country independent of all other nations; the workingman own his own home; his table always bountifully supplied with healthful food; his family becomingly clothed; his children educated and equipped for self-government and for every sphere of useful action from the farm to the Presidency. It wishes all nations well; would have peace with the world; but it stands for America and Americans first, last, and forever. [Applause.]

At the conclusion of the foregoing remarks Mr. RYAN yielded the remainder of his time to Mr. DALZELL.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has four minutes of his time remaining, which he yields to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, to be used when that gentleman takes the floor in his own right.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Chairman, it was my ill fortune yesterday afternoon to be absent from the Hall when the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT], whom I regret to find is not in his seat, made his speech. I came into the Hall as he was concluding. I knew that he was speaking upon the need of keeping up our present rate of tariff, and was therefore surprised to hear him engaged in general laudation of Vermont and her

sons, from Ethan Allen down to the heroes of the civil war, and all the distinguished statesmen and jurists that have adorned her history. This was interesting matter, and I should have been in glad agreement with the gentleman had he not ascribed the success and character of the people of Vermont, not to their love of liberty and full enjoyment of free institutions, their means of education and the refinement of society, their invigorating climate, their unrestricted trade with all the States of the Union, and a common possession of the blessings we enjoy under the Constitution, but to the fact that her people are "believers in protection!"

The gentleman also attributed the relative superiority of Vermont to Kentucky to the fact that Kentuckians of this generation do not believe in the doctrine that a people can grow rich from their own taxes.

The gentleman seems to forget that whether Kentucky believes or not she has had the same ratio of taxation and should have the same advantages from it; or is the protection salvation something that depends for its fruition upon faith and not upon works?

The gentleman showed the superiority of the agriculture of Vermont, inasmuch as they raise 14 bushels of wheat to the acre, while in Kentucky they harvest less than 10 bushels; 35 bushels of corn to the acre in Vermont and only 27 bushels bless the toil of the Kentucky farmers; of oats they garner 34 bushels in Vermont and but 20 in Kentucky, and other comparisons favorable to Vermont.

My experience of New England agriculture proves the truth of the statements made by the gentleman from Vermont, but I hold that the results are due to the industry and thrift of the people, their small farms, and intensive methods of cultivation. If the gentleman compares the statistics of Vermont with those of other States that like Vermont are "believers in protection," he will find differences more striking in favor of the mountain Commonwealth.

I have made such comparisons in times past to the same or greater disadvantage of Ohio, Iowa, Illinois, and other States. Sir, there is more in men than in land. I can make the same boasts of Massachusetts, but our agriculture is limited in its scope, and is not improving and advancing as it did in former years; and while I will not go so far as to attribute the unfavorable changes that have taken place gradually since 1860 to the political economy of this generation, I will give some figures from which conclusions may be drawn.

The gentleman from Vermont stated that there had been a constant increase in the value of property in Vermont under the "protective tariff," and he referred to the time previous to 1861 as a free-trade era, as if we had not been under protective tariffs ever since the session of the First Congress. Sir, I will read what the increase in value of farms and products has been in Vermont since 1850 by decades. From 1850 to 1860 the increase of agricultural wealth in Vermont was 44 per cent. That was under what is now called "the free-trade tariff;" from 1860 to 1870, under high tariff, the increase of agricultural wealth was 10.9 per cent.; from 1870 to 1880, and that brings us to the last census which we have to guide us, the increase was less than 4 per cent.

Now, sir, if the State has, as a whole, grown richer, it must have been through her manufacturing, stimulated by the bounties of protection. Let us see. From 1850 to 1860, under the Walker tariff, the per cent. of increase in the manufacturing industries was 90 per cent.; from 1860 to 1870 it was 60 per cent.; from 1870 to 1880 it was but 52 per cent.

Do not the figures show a diminishing volume of prosperity through the whole term of the high tariff, both in agriculture and manufactures?

The sheep husbandry of this fine State, remarkable as its results have been in careful breeding, do not show a relative increase with past times. Will not that husbandry feel the stimulus that is sure to come if wool is placed upon the free-list? I will occupy the remainder of my time in discussing the part of the bill now before the House that relates to wool.

There is a constant and vigorous assertion made several times each day on the other side of this Hall, that if we take the tax off of foreign wools we will destroy our own wool industry. "Destroy" is the word constantly used.

It is asserted that there will not even be sheep enough left from the enforced slaughter to provide mutton for our markets.

Grave protectionists look at us with alarm and declare that unless we "protect" the five or six pounds of wool on the sheep, worth at present prices less than a dollar and half, we will not be able to purchase mutton for money! As sheep can not be raised for wool alone east of the Mississippi and are bred largely for food, the assertion seems paradoxical.

Then there is an equally grave exaggeration in regard to the importance of our wool husbandry. The other day the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN] stated that the number of persons dependent on this industry was about 1,200,000.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Not entirely dependent.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. But still dependent. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], in his opening speech in this debate, claimed one million of dependent people would be ruined if we did not protect them by a tax that falls directly upon our woolen industry. The resolutions of the Pennsylvania Republican convention double Mr. KELLEY's statement and declare that two millions of people live upon the produce of flocks. No doubt they followed the minority report of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] to the last Congress in which he made a similar declaration. The association of Ohio wool-growers two years ago also claimed that the number of people engaged in this industry reaches two millions.

A little book prepared in this interest, which has been sent to every member of the House, not only makes the same general statements, but goes much farther in the declaration which I will read:

A majority of these flock-masters, as well as their employed help, are heads of families. Therefore if you add to their number their wives and children, you will have a population of at least 4,000,000 interested in the growing of wool, or about one-fifteenth of the entire population of the United States. There are no doubt fully 150,000 other farmers who keep sheep, but these could not fairly be classed as wool-growers.

This book further says that if the duty is removed from wool it will reduce the wages of 500,000 men employed in herding flocks, and finally sums up the great total of loss as follows:

Shrinkage in the value of lands	$280,000,000
Shrinkage in the value of labor	25,000,000
Shrinkage in the value of flocks	25,000,000
Shrinkage in the value of wool	25,000,000
	355,000,000

As the wool clip is not worth $80,000,000, and as the sheep of the whole country are not worth $100,000,000, the figures and statements are at once seen to be gross and absurd exaggerations. Reduce the number employed and their families and dependent relatives to the lowest number; say that 2,000,000 of people are supported by wool, live by flocks, and spend their time in their care, and how can they be supported?

The highest estimate of the number of sheep in the country in the last year was much less than 50,000,000, but calling it that it requires 25 sheep to support each person with wool worth about $40 for a year's work.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH], who does me the honor to listen, made a speech in Boston recently before the Home Market Club, and when some one in the audience said, "We want free wool," he replied, "But what are you going to do with the thousands of men who make a living herding sheep?" I think we ought to find them a better business, for if they were supported for one year by their flocks they would have to use all the wool for clothing, and the mutton for food, so that there would not be a sheep left in the country at the end of a year. If there are any facts in the United States census on which we can rely, there have been the most reckless statements current on the floor of this House in the interest mainly of Ohio wool-growers.

My time is so limited that I can not treat this matter in detail, but I will try to make the point that the prosperity of wool-growing is not dependent upon a tax on imported wool.

The wool-grower is dependent for the sale of his wool upon the manufacturers of his own country alone. Wool is the only one of our farm products of considerable value for which there is no foreign demand.

If there is a surplus it must remain on hand. The manufacturers of other nations are not accustomed to our wools, and will not take them.

Like all other things men wish to sell, its price will be governed by the demand for it; that demand will arise from the prosperity of your customers, and that only. Therefore, if the business of the woolen manufacturers is good you will get a fair price for your wool, but if these men are not successful, if their business is hard and waning, your market grows narrow and wool falls, as we have seen it fall during the last ten years.

The wool-grower and the manufacturer can have no divided interest; they must flourish together or they must languish together, and at this time they are equally unhappy. A gentleman on the other side told me this morning that if I could establish the fact that the wool industry would improve with wool on the free-list he would vote for it.

I do not expect to convince him, though I see him listening. It is too near a Presidential election, and the party whip has a sharp lash. [Laughter.]

How, sir, did we get the blessing of a high tax on imported wool? It was the result of a combination between woolmen and manufacturers.

Prior to 1857 we had a nominal duty on wool, and the fortunate experience of the country in every department of industry and enterprise under the tariff of 1846 led to the further reduction of the tariff in 1857. And, as I had the pleasure to remind the House in the debate the other day, the whole delegation from Massachusetts here and at the other end of the Capitol voted for it. In that revision wool under 20 cents a pound was made free.

The effect upon wool was immediate. It went up, and in 1859 it was as high as it has ever been in our history, and the manufacturers of Massachusetts and Rhode Island made more money than they ever did in any year of their business.

They flourished together, because their interests are identical.

When the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] said, "Continue

this tariff and even raise it and we will produce all the wool required in this country," I saw that he did not understand the relation of wool-growers to manufacturers.

No manufacturing people in our day can raise all its own wool. No soil or climate will produce all the various wools that enter into fabrics ranging from coarse carpets to cloths mixed with silk. The wools grown in America are not a complete raw material even for the cloths for men's ordinary wear. We are controlled by fashion. The manufacturer must make what is demanded. He has to make cloths such as people who pay high prices will buy. In order to get material for such clothing the wool-buyer must go to the world's market and select fleeces to mix and blend with American wool. He may require Australian, or African, or South American, or Spanish, or French wools for his purpose, and if he does he will pay from 50 to 75 per cent. duty on them, and that handicaps him in competition with the men who have free wool; he is thus at a disadvantage with the manufacturers of England, France, Belgium, and Germany, the great cloth-exporting countries.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The gentleman speaks only for himself and not for other members of Congress when he says they do not wear domestic goods. The cloth in which I am dressed was made in Maine; the suit was made in Maine. We are not up to the sublimated condition of some gentlemen from Massachusetts.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I hope the establishment that made the gentleman's cloth is prosperous, for there are but few in New England that are so. They are not prosperous because of the tax on their raw material that enables the manufacturers of Europe to send here between forty and fifty million dollars' worth of cloth a year, representing not less than 150,000,000 pounds of wool, which we neither grew, nor sheared, nor wove.

Nor does the gentleman know that his coat is wool at all. Few men in this House have any idea how far substitutes are used for wool. In my district, in the immediate neighborhood where I live, within a radius of 4 or 5 miles from my house, there is turned out a product of about $2,000,000 of woolen cloths—so called. You flatter yourself that they are woolen cloths, and so they are, except so far as cotton is mixed in them; but the wool was worn by previous generations of sheep and may have been worn by two generations of men. These cloths are made from rags, picked to shred and fiber in a shoddy-picker, and then handled like wool. This cloth bears the relation to other cloth that oleomargarine does to butter.

Do you ask what these rags are? They are of all grades, carefully assorted; they are tailor's clippings from fine clothes which make a good "short staple" wool; but in this thrifty age nothing is lost and the shoddy rags come back again. Said one of these manufacturers to me, "I have seen my old shoddy goods come back here time and time again to be picked up and made into new cloth." These shoddies are the woolen cloths boastfully mentioned on the other side of the House that make the cheap suits in which the protected laborer is dressed. Why, sir, the cloth which the gentleman from Maine is wearing may have made a procession down from the really protected magnates of the land and been worn by the commonest beggar shrinking from the sun.

Mr. MILLIKEN. No, sir; this cloth was made in Maine, not in Massachusetts.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. These shoddy clothes are sold cheaply enough perhaps. Men may get their money's worth, for they are sold at prices that would not buy their weight in actual wool.

The American laborer who bears with the farmer the real burden of taxes is not able to buy woolen cloth, but wears the wool that comes from the crop of old clothes. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FARQUHAR. They wear more than the European laborers do.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Perhaps they do. Laborers wear what they can get. I do not believe the gentleman knew until now that our laborers do not wear woolen cloth.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Three-fouths of the cloth worn by the laborers of Europe is cotton and not woolen.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. The subject we are discussing is the duty on wool. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FARQUHAR. I am talking about a practical question.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I will so treat it. There are parts of Europe where men may be comfortable in cotton. If so, they do well to wear it. But in this country we have severe winters, with violent changes; the mercury falls to zero, and men who wear the heaviest woolen goods shiver.

Mr. FARQUHAR. After all, Mr. RUSSELL, the average of cloth worn by the laborers in this country is better in every way than is worn by the laborers of Europe.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. And it should be. Now, that the gentleman has got to Europe, let me say something in regard to foreign policy. We are the only civilized country on the earth to-day that imposes a high duty on wool, except poor old-fashioned Spain, and she is an exporter of wools and we are not. England, Belgium, France, and Germany took the duties off of wool years ago.

It is urged here that our people can not keep their flocks without a protection to wool; it is said our sheep will disappear; one will forget the taste of mutton. That is not the teaching of experience here or abroad.

The high-priced lands of England, open to the competition of all mankind, carry more sheep than in former days. The pastures of France have double the sheep they had when wool was protected.

No vote of mine would ever be given consciously against the interest of the American farmer, but I would take the duty off of wool, for I believe that in less than a year the price of wool would advance because the woolen manufacturer, freed from the tax on two-thirds of his raw material, would be better able to buy the other third. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Sir, I have before said that the tariff of 1867 was the result of a combination of manufacturers and wool-men to shear mankind. Like Cæsar Augustus, they decreed that all the world, their world, should be taxed. There should be a prodigious duty on wool and a compensating duty on cloth. It was an abominable agreement. The Treasury did not need the tax, and both of the contemplated beneficiaries were fairly prosperous. The war was over and no revenue change was ever made upon such slight grounds. It brought its own punishment. It was an Ohio idea; but did flocks increase in Ohio under its action, or in any State east of the Mississippi? The census figures show an immediate and heavy decrease in those States. Your tariff proved a hireling shepherd. Within a year wool began to decline and flocks to shrink, and in five years there was a falling off in the number of sheep in the older States of 20 per cent.

They increased heavily west of the Mississippi River from new and unforeseen causes—the opening of free range by the extension of railroads and the disappearance of the Indian and his game from the new Territories.

That was the only part of the country where sheep increased, and that was from advantages that proved to be temporary.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It is an incorrect statement that the flocks of Ohio decreased under the act of 1867.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman from Ohio deny it?

Mr. GROSVENOR. I certainly do.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Then I repeat it with a full responsibility for the statement that between 1867 and 1871 the flocks of Ohio decreased.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And I say that is not true.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. And that they decreased everywhere east of the Mississippi; and the gentleman can look up the facts and contradict and confute me before the House when he has the figures. I speak from recollection, and I will trust my memory in the matter until the figures are quoted. Tariffs can not help wool on high-priced land. A man who keeps sheep on land worth $100 an acre is a good husbandman; but he does not keep sheep for wool. He would keep them if the wool was worth no more than cow-hair or hen-feathers. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

I say this from an intimate knowledge of the business, for I am perhaps a larger wool-grower than the average in Ohio. In small flocks the wool product is a by-product.

At the wool conference of last winter, in the very shadow of the Capitol, with this great tariff, the Ohio men said they could not raise wool at 30 cents a pound. They surely can not if that is all the return a sheep makes; but there is a difference between sheep handled by an Ohio farmer and an Ohio politician, and we see that when the Ohio and Kentucky and Tennessee lambs come into Boston market and sell for twice as much as the ewes are worth on the farm with the wool on their backs. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Sheep-keeping in the older States is a matter of "mixed farming," and it will never disappear with or without tariff. It began with the twilight dawn of human history on the plains of Asia, the primal, eldest pursuit of men. If you tax-layers had been in Judea in the days of King Herod you might have made it poorer, but still there would have been shepherds watching their flocks by night to hear and proclaim the glad tidings of great joy—peace and good-will to men. [Applause.] If you could devise protection from sheep-killing dogs you would do more good in your day and generation. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FARQUHAR. Will the gentleman allow me to ask a question?

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. You had an hour this morning. I listened to you. You made a good speech. I did not interrupt you.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I am always pleased to hear Mr. RUSSELL, and that I may be better instructed, I wish to ask him a question.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Very well, go on, but do not make a speech at the same time.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I notice the gentleman says he raises sheep not for wool; but is it not possible that he could not raise them for mutton? I take it that the gentleman raises fancy sheep.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I do not like even to make an illustration from my own affairs, but I must reply to the gentleman that my flock is not "fancy." A farmer keeps sheep in "mixed husbandry" for various reasons. His product is lambs, mutton, and wool; it stands in that order. But there is another reason less understood by those not engaged in farming, that is the improvement of land and

restoration of pastures. Sheep make new land, and in that sense we have the old Spanish proverb, "The sheep's foot is shod with gold." [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. How many sheep does the gentleman from Massachusetts keep?

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I have not seen my flock this spring; and we are constantly changing.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Tell us whether you have twenty-five or thirty.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I said I had more than the Ohio average; we may have twice as many as that average, which is not over fifty.

Now, sir, a word about sheep-raising on cheap lands under protection. I paid much attention to the wool-growers' conference last winter, but I did not see any of you there, and I have here a memorandum of the statement made by Mr. Burbank, of Texas, a flockmaster of the ancient type, who ranges over 35,000 acres of land with 5,000 sheep. Think of it; 7 acres to a sheep—as large as a French farm. He rents the land at 6 cents an acre. He paid four herders $21 a month each, out of which they boarded themselves, and yet Ohio only allows one man to 25 sheep. He found it hard to sell his wool at San Antonio at 14 cents, for, though he allowed $1,300 for lambs, he could not get back his cost at the end of the year.

This was an intelligent, accurate man, well placed; his land could not be much cheaper and he had superior sheep with product of wool above the average. What he wants is a better market for his wool, and that can not be had under the present conditions.

This morning I received letters from the city of Lowell, so beautifully described by my colleague [Mr. ALLEN] in his recent speech, where when the day's work is done the rosy-cheeked factory girl trips from the brightly lighted factory hall, her pockets heavy with her day's wages and seeks her vine-embowered cottage. The news was that the Lowell Carpet Company had suspended operations. Of course the cry was raised that it was owing to the consideration of the tariff, the fear of the passage of the pending bill.

The treasurer of the corporation, in a letter to one of the Lowell papers, denies this. He shows that trade is moribund from various causes, and thinks it would be powerfully relieved by taking the duty off of carpet wools!

Mr. PERKINS and others rose to questions.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I will repeat, that it may be fully understood that it appears that carpets can not be made by this strong, skillfully-managed corporation on account, principally, of the duty on carpet wools. An indefensible tax, no such wools being grown in this country.

All the duty collected on such wool is a direct tax on every yard of carpeting made, and there is no way to evade it.

Mr. PERKINS. I understood the gentleman to say that all the woolen manufacturers at the East had gone into bankruptcy without exception in the last few years.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. You misunderstood me. I have not said so.

Mr. PERKINS. What did the gentleman say?

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I have said over and again that the business was not prosperous, and I may say that many large and small manufacturers have become insolvent in the past ten years—some of them not once but two or three times.

Mr. PERKINS. And that was in consequence of this tariff which gives to the wool-grower his protection? I would like to read an extract from the speech of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] answering the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts. I want to put one free-trader against another on that proposition. I want to show from the speech the profits of wool manufacturers, and then ask which is correct, free-trader MILLS or free-trader RUSSELL.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I can not yield my little time for such a purpose.

[Mr. PERKINS and others rising in much confusion and many questions.]

Mr. BLAND. I rise to a question of order. We can not hear; there is too much confusion. Let the Chair call the committee to order.

The Chairman rapped to order, but before order could be restored Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts, Mr. PERKINS, and others made remarks not heard by the Reporter.

Mr. MILLS. This is a violation of our agreement, and I call upon gentlemen on their honor to carry out their agreement.

Mr. BRUMM. Then why do you violate it every time you permit questions to be asked from your side?

Mr. DAVIDSON. But this is not questioning; it is interruption.

Mr. PERKINS. I, of course, recognize the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts has the floor, and without his permission I would not interrupt him.

Mr. COWLES. He gave no permission for such interruption.

Mr. REED. The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means has made an asseveration that our agreement has been violated. As I watched the course of proceedings here I heard the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] request permission of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] to ask a question. The gentleman from Massachusetts continued his remarks and then stopped, turning to the gentleman from Kansas, and permitted his question. What violation of agreement was there there?

Mr. MILLS. It was not the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] alone, but half a dozen gentlemen at once, interrupted the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. REED. He consented to it.

Mr. MILLS. He did not consent to the interruption of but one——

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I have an impression, somewhat shaken by events, that I have the floor; at least I had it. [Laughter.] I think I am more tolerant of interruption than any man in the House, and if my time was not limited I would refuse no gentleman. I yielded to the gentleman from Kansas because he was so persistent that I thought I could get through with him quicker by answering him, but he wished to interject matter into my speech that I think irrelevant, and requested me to reconcile my statement with something another gentleman had said.

Mr. PERKINS. I wanted to know if that gentleman was correct in his statement.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I do not speak for the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. He is able to take care of himself and answer any gentleman on that side of the House [applause on the Democratic side], and if the gentleman from Kansas wants to debate with him he can get plenty of opportunities.

Mr. PERKINS and others. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I must insist on having part of my time. Gentlemen see that I have no notes and evidently seek merely to break me up and prevent me from getting in my speech.

Mr. PERKINS. I am afraid the gentleman has neither notes nor facts to sustain him.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I ask if it is right when a gentleman has the floor and is trying to be heard that he should be continually interrupted by questions and noises hurled at him in this way? It is indecent.

The CHAIRMAN rapped to order.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I am willing to return to the questions of the gentleman from Kansas and explain more in detail what I said about the business of woolen manufacturing in Massachusetts. I said in a speech the gentleman perhaps did not hear last month that there were towns in my district whose business was wool manufacturing that had not built a new mill since the tariff of 1846. When mills are burned they are left unrestored, and I made other statements showing the difficulties of the trade.

As a proof of my statement I will quote Mr. Charles A. Beach, of Connecticut, a manufacturer of wide repute and large experience, who testified before the Committee of Ways and Means in the last Congress that the wool manufactories of the United States—not of Massachusetts, not of New England, but of the United States—would not sell for 25 cents on the dollar of their original cost. I speak, and gentlemen can correct me in their own time if I am wrong. One of the largest woolen corporations in the United States has been sold lately. The plant cost something like two millions, and it brought less than $300,000.

Mr. MORSE. Name it.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. It is the Washington.

Mr. ARNOLD. Was not that mill worn out?

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. No doubt it was worn out, and so were the stockholders worn out. They had not made money enough to keep up the machinery. I could name other broken corporations and mills that are worn out, and their operatives, too. [Laughter on Democratic side.]

I think the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. ARNOLD] knows what it is to buy woolen mills at bankrupt sales. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I see that my time is just expiring and I will conclude. I would not have trespassed so long upon the time of the committee if the gentlemen on the other side had not been so anxious for information. [Laughter.] I thank the committee for their courtesy.

Mr. FITCH obtained the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITCH] was to occupy the remainder of the present hour, of which, however, only ten minutes remain. He desires to ask consent to occupy now thirty minutes, twenty minutes of which shall be taken from the end of the next hour.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. This arrangement will not interfere with the time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ALLEN], nor with that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. The Chair hears no objection. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITCH] will proceed. Mr. FITCH (reading):

THE TARIFF.

Unless the tariff men take heed, unless they consent to a rational and considerate adjustment of the tariff such as only can be made by the full light that a careful statistical study of the subject will bring, I fear from them, more than from any other source, a reaction which will bring us by and by into free trade and all its consequences of evil to the manufacturing interests of the country.

I desire to say that, in my judgment, it is not the best mode of defending a tariff to denounce every man who does not pronounce the shibboleth after our fashion as an enemy of the tariff.—*James A. Garfield*, July 13, 1868.

Mr. Chairman, in the brief remarks which I desire to make on the bill under consideration, in the spirit of the words which I have just read, I do not propose to discuss at length the arguments which gentlemen on both sides of the House have already fully presented, nor shall I attempt to review or to put a new meaning into the great mass of customs figures which have been so carefully prepared and explained by the gentlemen who have preceded me. I do not intend to debate the question whether or not we shall have a tariff, or whether that tariff shall be one for protection or not.

I assume that, whether this bill passes or not, we shall continue to have in this country a protective tariff, and that protective tariff, if it be fairly adjusted, if its burdens be distributed with justice so far as interests of my constituents are concerned, I expect to defend and advocate as long as I live. And as long as I live, whenever I find in the tariff laws or in any other of the laws which affect the people whom I represent anything which seems to me in any degree unfair or unjust, I shall not hesitate to advocate their revision and amendment. [Applause.] I propose here to discuss at this time only what seems to me to be the question before the House, whether or not the present tariff and the free-list which accompanies it should remain unchanged during the existence of the Fiftieth Congress.

In the discussion of this question I shall not attempt to imitate the gentlemen who have with such wonderful patience and industry examined the views of the earlier Presidents and the construction of the tariff of 1789, and who have so carefully reviewed the whole course of legislation on this subject since the foundation of the Republic. They have analyzed for you every fluctuation in the prices of our manufactures, and they have accounted satisfactorily for each financial crisis in the history of the country. Every statesman who has in any way identified himself with this question has been quoted by them, and every text-book and essay on the subject has been examined. Each gentleman has found in the same material the most convincing proof that his particular theory was correct and that of his opponent mistaken.

For my part, and with the utmost deference to the learning and ability of gentlemen who have spoken, I am forced to believe that, owing to the changes in transportation, invention of new machinery, the growth and development of the country, and improvements which have accomplished modern civilization here and all over the world, the problem presented to us is entirely different from that considered by the earlier contestants over these questions. It seems to me that no two countries in Europe are to-day more strikingly different in the manner in which their inhabitants live, their means of communication, and their business customs than are the United States of fifty years ago and the country and people whose interests we are considering here.

I desire therefore to leave to other gentlemen who have done it so well the consideration of all the earlier precedents, and to speak only of what the Republican party in our day and generation has promised to do, and to consider what duties are incumbent on us here and now in connection with that promise. I propose also to speak of what I consider to be the interest of the people in my own district, whose condition and whose wants are naturally better known to me than those of others. It can hardly be denied that the present tariff was largely made up in this way: Different interests in special districts sent information and delegations to Washington, urging the enactment of duties specially favorable to them, and sometimes elected Congressmen especially with a view to obtaining a protection which they deemed necessary for their district. It is not probable that the views of the persons represented in this way were always unselfish, and it is possible that the advocates of these particular interests were not unwilling to profit by taxes which bore unequally upon other sections of the country.

It is easy to say, and everybody says in the abstract, that we should legislate for our whole country and not for sections of it, and that this bill should be considered as to its effect on the people at large and not on particular classes. But how has it in fact been considered in this debate? One eloquent gentleman after another has told of the special needs of his district, and has protested solemnly against some proposed interference with the vested rights of his constituents in the present tariff. First of all, and above all, the gentlemen representing the farming interests have been heard. I have read, for instance, with profit, and almost with conviction, the argument of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] for the continuance of the present tariff in all its parts for the protection of the farmers, who, it seems to him, are now insufficiently protected, and with equal interest have studied the seconding appeal of his colleague and my friend, Mr. BREWER, to the same effect. Nothing could have pleased me more than the touching tribute from the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS] to the virtues of the farming constituency, among which he is fortunate to live, unless it were the kindly offer of my genial and eloquent friend from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER], the guardian of the American infant, to put a duty of 4 cents per dozen on the fourteen million dozens of eggs which are now imported free of duty, and which we in New York eat and are obliged to pay for in order to protect the American hen and her rural owner against the combined poultry of Europe.

I concede willingly the truth of all that the gentlemen say in the praise of their country constituents. We in New York City have an intimate acquaintance with and a real liking for the New York State farmers, and will never willingly suffer them to be injured by any form of legislation if they will only be fair with us. It seems to us often that they hardly appreciate our friendship. It seems to us that they allow their representatives in the State Legislature to treat us unfairly at Albany. From there, in their wisdom, these representatives regulate our docks and control our street openings; they fix the height of our buildings and the depth of our sewers; they manage the quarantine in our harbor and they arrange the rate of fare on our elevated roads. We are relieved by their kindness from any particular responsibility or trouble about our local tax levy, and they improve, as seems to them necessary from time to time, the charter of our city. Above all, our morals and personal habits and the manner of our observance of the Sabbath are their especial care. [Laughter.]

They study with great personal attention the errors of our metropolis, and they prepare yearly new and elaborate schemes for our reformation. They vote enthusiastic indorsements of home rule in Ireland and explain to us at the same time that New York is hardly fitted to govern itself. We recognize the truth of all the praises which have been bestowed on the farmers in this debate by almost every gentleman who has spoken, but we will never let pass any opportunity to ask them to treat their city neighbors and friends more kindly. And while their interests in this bill are so carefully watched and protected, it is perhaps not unfair that one of us from the city should glance over his district and see if there are no people of whom we can say, as my eloquent friend from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON] said of the farmers, that they are "hard-working, earnest, intelligent, frugal, and moral," and whose interests may deserve some degree of consideration in connection with this bill.

The upper part of the city of New York is mainly a residence district. The majority of the people who live there live on fixed incomes paid them as salaries or wages every month, or by the proceeds of professional employment in which their incomes are limited. Some of them are architects, artists, clergymen, clerks in banks, insurance and law offices, journalists, musicians, lawyers, physicians, teachers, book-keepers, railroad employés, drivers, conductors, policemen, firemen, telegraph and telephone operators, salesmen, mechanical engineers, civil engineers, stenographers, printers, and skilled mechanics of all sorts not employed in industries which have protection under the present tariff.

In that district lives, too, an army of deserving women who earn their living by unprotected labor, and often that of others dependent upon them. There is perhaps a necessity within the course of this long debate that somebody should say a word for these people. The farmer has his eloquent advocate trained in the county and State fairs, who is in arms to defend every product of his ground. The workmen in factories and the manufacturers have their special advocates, who lie awake at night to study their interests and whose voices have been heard here every day since the beginning of this session, asking for one measure or another for their protection. Almost every class has had its advocates here, except perhaps the millionaires, whom nobody will own to represent, and who have no friends in this House.

Suppose, as examples of the class of people to whom I refer in the city of New York, we take the policeman, who guards our houses; the fireman, who will risk his life for our children; the reporter and the printer, who spend the night in preparing our morning papers; the carrier, who brings it through all kinds of weather, and the locomotive engineer on the elevated railroad, who takes us up and down town. These classes of workmen have no direct protection. They are not overpaid, nor is their life more luxurious than it ought to be. The money which they draw at the end of every month is not more than they need, and they are often sorely pinched to buy even the taxed doll to fill the taxed Christmas stocking or to pay for the taxed medicine necessary for any member of the family.

Perhaps an impartial examination may show that these people are as intelligent, as patriotic, and as deserving of consideration in the matter now before the House as are the Rhode Island mill operators or the Kansas farmers. Their wishes and views may be even as important to the Republican party. If you are to get any Republican votes in New York City you must get them from these people. These classes gave you under the wise management of Arthur votes enough to keep down the Democratic majority in the city so that a Republican President was elected by the vote of the State of New York. They gave in my district a Republican an election to Congress, largely because his Democratic opponent refused to support any measure of tariff reform, and voted against the consideration of the Morrison bill.

You can hardly afford to pass these voters over in your desire to conciliate the factory operatives and the farmers, unless, indeed, you have decided to elect your candidate without the vote of New York State. I have had it explained to me that this can easily be done. It is a favorite theory apparently of the same gentlemen who have decided that the city workingmen who gave the most outspoken and determined free-trader in this country, Mr. Henry George, 68,000 votes at an election when we could only get 60,000 for so good a candidate as Theodore Roosevelt, are wild with enthusiasm for the absolute maintenance of the present tariff; and of those other wise leaders of the party whose

declared policy is to alienate the German voters who are still true to the Republican party, in order to please the Prohibitionists, who laugh at their concessions and have always sought and always will seek the downfall of that party.

I for one am not willing to accept such theories or acknowledge such leadership. In the interest of the Republican party, and in the interest of common fairness, I propose to ask gentlemen on this side of the House to consider for a moment how the present tariff, which we have promised to revise, now affects the people whom I have described, and to consider what they pay taxes on in the general distribution of the customs taxes now in force.

They pay upon everything. Look for a moment at what they eat. There is a tariff duty on beef, on pork, hams and bacon, butter and lard, cheese, molasses, grapes, wheat flour, oats, corn meal, rye, barley, potatoes, raisins, vinegar, honey, rice and rice meal, sugar, extract of meat, pickles, currants, apples, salt, and condensed milk. The list is substantially an inventory of the stock of the grocery store at which they buy. There is a duty on the coal which warms them, on their cooking and household utensils, on their entire clothing from their hats to their stockings, on the medicines given them when they are sick, and on the roofs over their heads. What the professional men object to pay is shown by a letter which I will ask to have printed as a part of my remarks:

NEW YORK, *May* 15, 1888.

To Hon. ASHBEL P. FITCH, M. C.:

I beg to address you as a member interested in the revision of the tariff. My plea is in behalf of instruments used in scientific medicine, which is the same as saying that they contribute to the exact information of the profession at large, and are without money profit to the possessor.

I can make you understand me by citing my own case.

For six years I have been pathologist to the New York Foundling Asylum, making *post-mortem* examinations for purposes of study upon the children that die, and recording the findings in detail. I have contributed to the professional stock of exact records nearly 1,500 cases. These are available for all time to the profession for reference.

A complete case for purposes of study consists in a carefully-recorded clinical history, with *post-mortem* findings and microscope examination of the structural charges in the tissues of the organs.

Now, it is the expert work of the pathologist to make the examinations, both gross and microscopic, of the ravages of disease, and it is upon this kind of work that medicine is to advance to the dignity of an exact science.

For my microscope I sent to Jena, where are made the best instruments for my work. At the factory it cost $91; to get it out of the custom-house 40 per cent. more.

Later I sent for an oil emersion lens, and paid $80 at the factory, 40 per cent. more at the custom-house.

Hermann Katsch, of Berlin, makes an instrument called microtome, for cutting infinitely thin sections or shavings from the surface of a piece of an organ of the body, hardened in alcohol. Herr Katsch is the only man in the world who makes this particular variety of the instrument. To prepare a section thin enough for careful study under the high powers of the microscope, this mechanism is necessary. To get this microtome from the custom-house I had to wait two weeks and pay a duty of 40 per cent. on its factory price.

The celebrated Dr. Koch, of Berlin, published a report of the cholera commission, conducted under the auspices of the Government. At most twenty men in this country could require this work, and they must needs pay 25 per cent. duty to get it from the custom-house after paying its publisher's price and freight. What use could this report be to these scientists? To aid them in maturing methods of recognizing the disease when it appeared on ship-board in our harbors; to devise means to suppress it; to protect the country.

It was to the expert work of one such scientist that the city of New York must give its gratitude that a certain steam-ship just developing cholera among its steerage passengers was detained at quarantine and the city escaped overwhelming infection.

For Koch's report he paid 25 per cent. duty and never received anything from the city or Government.

When we look up from our laboratory tables, microscopes, microtomes, and alcohol—taxed to suffocation—and read in the papers of the United States Treasury filled to suffocation, we reflect that our scientific work takes much time, brings no money return, increases our outgoes, and has not even the encouragement of the Government nor laity.

Respectfully yours,

DR. WILLIAM PERRY NORTHRUP.

Is it unfair to ask for these people a little consideration? Grant that we are to have a protective tariff; must we have this particular one forever?

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE], whose argument against this bill has interested me greatly, said the other day, "Human wisdom has never devised statutes of taxation or methods of industrial development which are not subject to just criticism." I can not put in any better words my conviction that this tariff is a fair subject of discussion. We had lately a Republican President, under whose able and skillful management the Republican party was an important factor in political affairs in New York City, and who gained for us the last victory which our party has had in the city of New York. Few men knew the people of that city of all classes as well as he did. He had been collector at the port of New York and knew well the practical effect of the tariff, and he said in his message:

> I recommend an enlargement of the free-list so as to include within it the numerous articles which yield inconsiderable revenue, a simplification of the complex and inconsistent schedule of duties upon certain manufactures, particularly those of cotton, iron, and steel, and a substantial reduction of the duties upon those articles, and upon sugar, molasses, wool, and woolen goods.

On such Republican doctrines as that I am satisfied to rest. On such Republican doctrines as that we can ask for votes in the city of New York from the classes I have spoken of, and we will not then be forced to stand and defend, before people whose monthly wages hardly suffice for their necessary expenses, a tariff which imposes 25 per cent. on India-rubber boots and shoes and 10 per cent. on precious stones. [Applause.]

The commerce of New York, where most of the customs duties are collected, while it asks in vain for the money which is necessary to improve the water ways where $147,000,000 of our revenue is collected every year, pays cheerfully taxes which are used to keep up custom-houses where nothing is ever collected, and to carry the mails on routes which use up the great profits of the city offices, to build harbors in Texas, where a sailor who happened to be stranded would be lost and lonesome, to improve rapids in Tennessee which no one but the lumberman ever sees, and to dredge out creeks in Georgia which the Government engineers who are given charge of the work spend a month in trying to find. Just so the people of the city of New York, sooner than object in any way to the protective tariff, which they believe to be, if properly laid and fairly administered, for the good of the whole country, have paid without objection and cheerfully, on everything they use or touch or handle, from the beginning, these customs duties for the benefit of the manufacturer and his employé and the long-suffering farmer. The time has now come when a revision of the tariff has been promised by both parties, and when the present duties yield so large a revenue that its further accumulation has become admittedly dangerous. Is it strange that at this time and under these circumstances they ask that a readjustment, partially at least, in their interest, may take place? And is it unreasonable to ask that a tariff which puts jewelry at 25 per cent. and oil-cloth for tenement-house floors at 40 per cent. ad valorem; which brings in silver-plated harness at 35 per cent. and children's cotton stockings at 40 per cent.; under which India shawls of the finest quality pay 40 per cent. and common woolen shawls 86 per cent., should be modified? On the theory of protecting or pleasing the manufacturing laborer and the farmer the mass of people in my district in the city of New York have paid for many years, each of them, out of money which they can ill spare, more for their meals, their shelter, their clothes, and their medicines than these things ought to cost them.

The appreciation and kindly feelings which exist towards us in return from the most highly protected manufacturers is shown by the remark in this debate of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. O'NEILL, speaking in opposition to this bill, that "New York is in a large measure a foreign city." It is true, of course, that New York has many foreign-born citizens, and among them are a large number who bear the name of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Laughter and applause.] All of us in this country are foreign-born or are the descendants of European immigrants. Whoever speaks deprecatingly of the patriotism of the citizens who came to this country by choice and not by accident throws thereby a doubt on the integrity of that ancestor of his who first took the oath of allegiance to the United States.

I have little regard for the man who contrasts his own patriotism with that of his grandfather, to the disadvantage of the latter. It is true, too, that a visitor from Philadelphia, when he first steps into the busy streets of New York and sees the movement of the commerce of a continent, when he enters first into the life and amusement of a city as interesting as London and as charming as Paris, may easily feel that he has passed a boundary line, and is in another country than his own. [Laughter.] But if the gentleman meant, as he probably did, that New York was a foreign city in the sense of being un-American, he was simply as much mistaken as he would have been if he had said that William Penn was a native American, or that the German settlers in Pennsylvania, and their children, were not as good and patriotic citizens of this country as we are.

Now when we ask of the manufacturers who are represented by our kindly critic, Mr. O'NEILL, a fulfillment of the Republican promise to remedy the admitted irregularities of the tariff, they say that if we touch one article in the present dutiable list, if we add one article to the present free-list the whole protection scheme is in danger. Let me answer them by a quotation again from General Garfield, in the debate on the duty on coal, on March 10, 1871, in this House:

> I was surprised at a remark of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan. He asserted that there is no item in the whole tariff that can stand alone on its own merits, but that all must be taken in a lump in order to stand. That coal must take salt by the hand, and they, too, must take something else by the hand; and thus all interests unite with all forces before they can make a stand before the country. If this remark be true it strikes a blow at the whole tariff system. a blow I am not willing to strike. I am unwilling to admit that bad taxes must be tied to good ones and thus be kept afloat. I think it unwise to continue this duty on coal, and I am therefore in favor of its repeal.

That, gentlemen, was the view of the last Republican President when a member of this House. I quote him always with peculiar pleasure, for he was one of the Republican candidates who could not only excite great enthusiasm in his own party and among his personal friends, but who could get votes enough from the business people who care little for politics to be elected to office. It seems to me that General Garfield fully answered that objection, but the highly protected manufacturers have endless objections. They seem to think that they are to have a monopoly of objections. We must not ask for cheaper vegetables in the city; the farmer objects. We must not want cheaper clothes; the wool-grower objects. We must not ask for cheaper carpets or household utensils; the manufacturer objects. We must not ask for cheaper coal; the mine-owner objects. We must not claim cheaper sugar or rice; the planter objects.

Well, for one, I for my district of consumers, object to this chorus of objection. We do not own sheep; we can not raise rice or vegetables or sugar; we mine no coal in the Thirteenth district of New York. If every interest in this country which is protected is to come here and cry out at any proposed addition to the free-list or reduction of the tariff taxes, in the interest of the great principle of protection, we, in our turn, shall ask that our monthly wages and the limited incomes on which many of us must live shall have the protection promised us by both political platforms, and that not by and by, but now and in the Fiftieth Congress.

We shall ask this courteously and modestly now. If we are met only by selfish and determined refusals the request will have to be made more emphatically. Certainly we are willing to have a protective tariff, but we do not want an unreasonable and an unchangeable tariff. We want a tariff which shall protect where protection is needed, and a free-list which shall give us the necessaries of life on terms that are at least fair to all.

Gentlemen say that the tariff builds up a home market. Very good. In the residence district of New York City we are the home market; we use our monthly pay the whole year around to buy your goods. Now that you have an opportunity, now that you can afford it, now that you have promised it, be fair to your home market. Show us by timely and reasonable concessions that you are not entirely selfish, and we will, as we have heretofore, go on cheerfully paying more for every thing which we use than we think the goods ought to cost us.

The answer to this seemingly reasonable demand on our side of the House seems to be this in substance: It is true that the tariff ought to be revised. The party platform promised it; the last Republican President and his Secretaries advised it; the party conventions in many States have agreed to it; but it must be done only by the Republican party in a House of which that party shall have a majority.

There are two objections to this answer:

First. It is a postponement, an indefinite postponement of something which was promised four years ago, and ought to have been done before now. Whatever hopes gentlemen may have of the future, no one can say when we shall be strong enough to make and carry through by Republican votes alone a revision of the tariff. If you are to read out of the party everybody who reminds you of your promises, or who has any of the old Republican habits of free speech and candid criticism, perhaps you may never be strong enough to control the House. [Applause.] Even if the fall elections should return a majority of Republicans, nearly a year and a half must elapse before the Fifty-first Congress can even meet, and if a tariff debate like this should then ensue, certainly two years must pass before the present tariff can be changed. And it is more than probable that even then the highly protected industries would still find some new reason why action should be postponed for another indefinite period, and that their representatives would vote again as many gems of poetry and prosaic tables of figures as we have heard for the last two weeks to demonstrate that the slightest alteration of the sacred tariff for the relief of the people, on whom some portions of it weigh heavily, would end forever the prosperity of the country.

And it is still more likely that gentlemen who are interested in the preservation intact of the present tariff would claim that the election of a Republican House was a verdict of the people against any revision whatsoever. [Laughter.]

For my part I desire to consider this question now, in the Congress to which I was elected partly for the purpose of considering it. Whether the Fifty-first or Fifty-second or Fifty-third Congresses are to be Republican or Democratic, what their action may be in the changed circumstances under which they may meet, is something which concerns me at present very little. I propose to do what I can—recognizing how very little it is—towards fulfilling the promises of the party on this subject now, when I have an opportunity. [Applause.]

Second. It is an unpatriotic answer to the reasonable demand that our promises to reform the tariff be fulfilled to say that as a condition precedent we must first have a success of our own party. If the revision is right, if it is in the interest of the business and development of the country, as our conventions and our leading statesmen have said it was, I for one am willing to make it, whether there is any political capital in it or not.

It is a business question more than a political question, and it is a business question on which we are committed.

If a revision of the tariff is necessary, it seems to me to be as absurd to vote against it on party grounds as it would be to oppose the admittedly necessary appropriations for the Government because they are prepared in a Democratic committee and proposed to a Democratic House.

I am one of those who were disappointed that we have as yet before us no Republican bill to reform the tariff. I do not forget the excellent bill putting coal, sugar, molasses, rice, wool, and some raw materials on the free-list, introduced by my Republican friend from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], whose 43,000 votes at the last election demonstrate what a hold on his people his fidelity to their interests has given him. I admired his speech and I would gladly vote for his bill. But I mean that I had hoped that before this we would have had submitted to us a bill put forward by authority, framed by gentlemen whose length of service and great ability fitted them for such a task, a bill in regard to which all of us would have been consulted, in which our varying views could have been compromised, a bill in which all of us would have yielded something to reach a common agreement.

For such a bill, framed by such high authority, perfected by such consultation, and giving to the people of our city some of the benefits to which we think they are entitled, even if it did not give us all which we could desire, I would have given my support most heartily. Instead of such a bill, those of us who think that the reform of the tariff is a business question, and who are committed to its support, are given so far only an eloquent denunciation of the manner in which this bill under consideration was made. For myself, I do not know that I care particularly how it was made or who made it. If the gentlemen who denounce its authors and the place where it was constructed will prepare, in a manner in their judgment more suitable for the purpose, a better bill than this one, I shall certainly be glad to give my support to their measure in preference to any other. But if I am asked to oppose this bill, not so much on account of its contents as on account of its history, I must decline to do so, even if I stand alone on this side of the House.

The history of the bill before it came before us is as immaterial to me as was the political history of the voters who sent me here before their appearance at the polls. I did not decline their suffrages on account of their antecedents, and if 6,500 of them could afford to forget their Democracy and give that district to a Republican I can in my turn forget the origin of this bill in the consideration of the question whether it is in the interest of my district and in the line of what I claimed in the canvass to be the belief of my party and my own belief. There is something better than Republicanism or Democracy, and that is common honesty. I have insisted, over and over for years in my district, that the Republican party was committed to tariff reform. I have attacked, in the canvass, my Democratic opponent for doing exactly that which gentlemen here propose that the Republican party should do. If the gentlemen in charge of the party interests on this floor propose to abandon the position which I and others have defended and insisted upon, it is not for me to criticise their wisdom; but I can not recognize their authority to make me give up the convictions which were good Republican doctrine when I adopted them and to break promises which I feel bound in honor to fulfill.

I can not as yet know in what shape this bill will come before us for final action. I believe that it should be amended in many particulars before it is passed, and I have submitted and shall submit some amendments which seem to me necessary. I can not as yet know whether or not a Republican substitute will be offered, or if there be one what it will cover. This much, however, I know now, that whenever I have an opportunity to vote for any measure which seems to offer the relief which I believe my people are entitled to have, and which I have myself for years insisted should be given them, I shall not fail to vote in their interest and for my own convictions, without regard to the consequences of my vote to myself. [Applause.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, when I requested the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] to permit me to interrupt him my object was to make a statement which would have relieved him very greatly from seeming, if not intentional, misrepresentation of a fact to which his statement related. I wanted to say to him, and I now avail myself of the courtesy of the gentleman from Michigan to make the statement, that he who undertakes to make a comparison of figures between 1867 and 1861 as to the sheep flocks of Ohio and then undertakes to apply those figures to a solution of the effect of the tariff revision of 1867 upon that industry errs very greatly in the force of his argument.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I yield the gentleman another minute.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The tariff of 1867 found the sheep flocks of Ohio of a character not fitted for the production of wool; they were killed and sold in various ways. As rapidly as new grades of sheep could be imported and bred the flocks of sheep grew up in Ohio, and steadily improved in numbers until 1883. I have included in the speech which I had the honor to make a table showing the exact number of sheep in Ohio, the steady growth of the flocks up to 1884, and their steady diminution from 1884 to the present time. I place these statements as matters of fact against the mere flippant declaration of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

[Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan, withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. DALZELL. I had no intention to take any part in this discussion. My name is not on the Speaker's list, and I have the floor now only by the courtesy of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RYAN], who yielded to me a portion of his time.

I do not rise to make a speech in defense of the protective system, but to correct some gross misstatements of fact that have been made on the floor of this House in respect to certain of the industries of my district, to expose in their true light the illogical, inconsequential, and

basurd conclusions sought to be drawn from those misstatements, and to resent impertinent intrusion into the private affairs of certain of my constituents and misrepresentations in respect thereto.

I find the text for the few remarks that I propose to make in the very extraordinary screed read on the floor of this House on Friday last by the gentleman who represents the Erie district of Pennsylvania. I call it extraordinary because, for one reason, the gentleman saw fit therein to class himself with statesmen, and at the same time to characterize as a "demagogue with his mouth full of catch-words," and "a Bourbon," every member of that very large and very respectable class that does not believe that political economy is an exact science, or that the gentleman from Erie is a statesman. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I shall not stop to discuss his claims to that lofty title nor to explore with a precision which might prove distasteful so as exactly to locate "a demagogue with his mouth full of catch-words." The American people may very safely be left to pass judgment on that question, and history generally manages to locate public men in their proper places without the use of such men's own yard-sticks.

Nor shall I stop to discuss the learned propositions of constitutional law to which the gentleman holds. I prefer not to measure swords with him in that arena. With respect to the constitutional right to levy a protective tariff I am a Bourbon to the extent that the origin of the Constitution, the practice of the Republic for a hundred years, the opinions of the fathers, and the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States are amply satisfying to my conservative mind.

But I would like to know who it was that told the gentleman that Thomas Jefferson ever said any such thing as he puts into his mouth as having been said in answer to Alexander Hamilton when, as the gentleman states, Hamilton and Washington were engaged in "building up a business aristocracy as an important part of a projected government of corruption and splendor." I say to the gentleman that whoever gave him the information played on his credulity; that Thomas Jefferson, in his sixth annual message to Congress, in 1806, discussing the question of a surplus, put the pertinent inquiry, "Shall we suppress the impost and give the advantage to foreign over domestic manufactures?" And I would be further pleased to be advised in what edition of American history the gentleman found it recorded that the Presidential campaign of 1800 was fought on the issue of protective tariff and settled on the gentleman's side "by the American people in favor of Thomas Jefferson and the Constitution." I fear that somebody again has been playing on his credulity. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

But when the gentleman leaves those departments of statesmanship which involve history and philosophy and quotation and gets down to a description of the present bill, I do not find so much fault with him.

I find that the bill has been framed in the interest of the whole people, and for two purposes.

A MEMBER. Who says that?

Mr. DALZELL. I am reading from the speech of the gentleman from the Erie district.

First, to stay the mounting surplus in the Treasury, and, second, to relieve the overburdened industries of the country from excessive taxation, the proceeds of which do not pass into the Treasury, but go directly to the support of grasping monopolies, which are for the most part combined in utterly indefensible and atrociously oppressive trusts.

We shall find a little later on that the statesman from Erie is the inveterate and unrelenting foe of monopolies and the enthusiastic champion of the wage-worker and of the rights of labor. [Laughter.] Now, the method by which this twofold benign purpose is to be accomplished is also twofold. Our industries are to be relieved and our labor interests advanced by throwing open to the world our markets with respect to certain things to be put upon the free-list, and the revenue is to be decreased by lowering the import duties 7.7 per cent.; so that the imports that are now kept out by the present tariff may come in in an ever-increasing stream under the new. I do not believe that I need discuss that part of the gentleman's position, because I am again Bourbon enough to believe that history repeats itself; and as all experience in the past discloses that lower import duties mean increased revenue, so I believe that all experience in the future will disclose the same thing.

But I come down now to that in which I am particularly interested, and which in all probability prompted my appearance on the floor today. The statesman from Erie asserts that the proposition that protection gives a home market to the farmer is, to use his elegant language, "a fallacy and a fraud," and he illustrates his position by supposing a case, namely, that of a farmer in the neighborhood of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, at Braddock, in my district, and this, as I say, is the point at which I begin to have some interest. As I have lived within sight of Braddock Field for nearly twenty years, and in sight of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works ever since they were erected, I may be permitted to say that the illustration of the gentleman contains not a line or a letter consistent with truth. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The fact is that he could by no possibility have selected an illustration which would more thoroughly and effectually refute his theory. Industrious farmers near the Edgar Thomson Steel Works have been affected as farmers always have been, are now, and always will be, by the planting of a manufacturing establishment in their midst.

They are no longer obliged to raise wheat or to come into competition with Mark Lane, London. The teeming population of the steel-works furnishes to them a market, and a market such as they never had before, and for products that they could never sell before—for all sorts of garden truck, vegetables, milk, butter, and all that sort of thing. If the statesman from Erie did not know that, he was grossly ignorant; if he was not grossly ignorant, his is a bad case of moral strabismus. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

But when he pursues his illustration further, to the extent of picturing the farmer, discouraged but not disheartened, struggling to pay off the mortgage upon his farm which cost him $100 an acre, the ridiculousness of his illustration becomes sublimely grotesque. The men who bought their farms in the neighborhood of Braddock for $100 an acre have long since sold them at $2,000 an acre. The statesman from Erie [laughter], if he wanted to buy an acre there, would find it difficult to buy one anywhere within miles of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, on the banks of the Monongahela River, or in the valley of Turtle Creek, for $2,000 an acre.

But, to pursue the gentleman's illustration, my heart fairly bled for this industrious farmer (who must have been a neighbor of mine) when he found himself obliged to pay 3.3 cents a pound for a steel beam. [Laughter.] What the farmer wanted the steel beam for the statesman from Erie did not explain. [Renewed laughter.] But, thinking it over, I consoled myself with the idea that he probably did not want many pounds and that possibly he had something left out of the $2,000 that he got for the last acre that he sold.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the erection of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works has changed Braddock from a straggling village into a busy town, filled with an intelligent, industrious, cheerful, and prosperous population; a town wherein there are two national banks, handsome stores, paved streets, an opera house, and a public library founded by the munificence of Mr. Andrew Carnegie.

Mr. SCOTT. Out of proceeds plundered from the American people [applause on the Democratic side]; contributed as a part of the plunder to secure the $500,000 that he admitted to me he had put in his pocket in one year.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, I had no idea that I had hurt the gentleman half so badly thus far. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I hope he will try to keep his temper.

Mr. SCOTT. I will answer you if the House will give me the time.

Mr. DALZELL. But the misapprehension of the statesman from Erie as to what he was talking about when he made use of this illustration is mild as compared with his delusion when he talks about the profits of the steel company and the percentage of wages paid to their employés. It is just at this point (and the gentleman has only this moment illustrated it) that his moral strabismus becomes actually pitiable. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

In estimating the cost of manufacture, and therefore the manufacturer's profit, the statesman from Erie ignores altogether $20,000,000 of invested capital. [Laughter.] He omits any allowance for depreciation of plant, for insurance, for taxes, for repairs, for transportation, for commissions. He allows nothing even for the cost of fuel to furnish the steam power, and he omits, according to his own confession, the cost of spiegeleisen, an element necessary to be used in the manufacture of steel rails.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will it interrupt the gentleman if I ask him a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Well, I am not dealing now with anybody but the statesman from Erie; the statesman from Ohio may come further along. [Laughter.]

It must therefore be absolutely and mathematically true that the figures he gives as to cost and profits are deceptive and unreliable. To suit his own purposes he further puts a fancy figure upon steel rails, namely $37.50, when the report of his own committee, which he signs, puts it at $31.50.

Mr. SCOTT. Here are your own figures on the price of steel rails.

Mr. DALZELL. I do hope the gentleman will keep his temper. [Laughter.] Add now to the cost of a ton of steel rails at $26.79, the gentleman's own figures, the omitted items of cost, and take $6 off his selling price, and then, having solved that problem, define for me the difference between a statesman and a demagogue. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] His figures as to the percentage of wages to the cost of production are even wilder, if that were possible, than those he has already given us. He seems to assume that Bessemer pig-iron grows on the trees at the Edgar Thomson furnace, and even then he does not allow anything for the labor of picking it. [Laughter.]

All the figures that relate to labor, beginning with the ore in the mine, its loading and unloading; with the coal in the hills, its mining, its carriage to the coke oven, its transformation into coke, its transportation to the place of consumption—all the various figures that go to make a ton of Bes-emer steel represent very little more than labor, are suppressed; and the absurd conclusion is announced that the percent-

age of labor to the selling price is 10.9 per cent. Why, the first figure in his calculation is $18 for a ton of Bessemer pig; and he knows—I think he knows—that of the $18, $16.50 represent labor; and he deliberately left that out in his calculation when he read his screed in the House.

Mr. SCOTT. There is a duty of $6.72 a ton on pig-iron and $17 on steel rails. Does the gentleman forget that?

Mr. DALZELL. I do not.

Mr. SCOTT. Then he is misstating and misrepresenting the facts. Recollect that there is a duty of $6.72 a ton on pig-iron and $17 on steel rails, making $23.72.

Mr. DALZELL. Yet the statesman from Erie, when he comes to boasting, contradicts himself. He tells us that from his practical experience of a third of a century in coal-mines, labor there gets 70 to 85 per cent. of the selling price of the product. I suppose that must have been coal not mined to be made into coke or to go to steel works. With respect to his figures representing wages of coal-miners, which you will find in his speech in the RECORD, I was told to-day by an intelligent and competent miner that if any such wages were ever paid they were exceptional.

I hope the gentleman is listening to me now, because I affirm that if those wages ever were paid, they were paid at Scott Haven, in Pennsylvania, in store orders upon a truck store, kept in violation of the laws of Pennsylvania, by means of which the employer is enabled to rob his employés.

The gentleman's figures as to the steel beams are just as inaccurate as his other figures, for the reason that he starts to get the final result with the steel-rail figures as a premise, and of course the result must be as incorrect as the premise.

Now, that is about all that the gentleman said with respect to this particular industry in my immediate neighborhood, and having demonstrated that with respect to this industry his figures are wrong, I have accomplished my purpose in rising, and I do not care to pursue him further.

With respect to every other subject that he touched upon, it will be found on examination that his methods were the same; and he even resorts to the flimsy business of disproving the plain conceded facts of history by the percentage method, by which I mean, of course, the method which ignores the fact that a given sum is a larger percentage of a small sum than it is of a larger one. [Laughter.]

But I must not leave my colleague simply with words of criticism. I have words of praise for him, too. My heart bounded as I heard him roll off from his screed words of denunciation of "monopolies" and "base and indefensible trusts." I congratulate him upon becoming the champion of labor; but I congratulate more the great army of labor in this country upon the accession to its ranks of the statesman from Erie. I cry a threatening warning to the hosts of "monopoly" and of "pernicious and indefensible trusts" that their destroyer is in the field. What labor has gained and monopoly lost by the conversion of the statesman from Erie it would be difficult for any one not living, as I do, in Western Pennsylvania adequately to appreciate.

Turn for a moment, if you will, to the autobiography of the statesman of Erie as contained in the Congressional Directory. [Laughter.] I read:

> Engaged, in 1850, in the coal and shipping business, owning and running several vessels on the Lakes; subsequently became largely interested in the manufacture of iron and the mining of coal, as well as in the construction and operation of railroads—

[Laughter.]

I beg your attention to this—

> either as president or director of various lines aggregating over 22,000 miles of completed road, the greatest number of miles of railroad, probably, which any one individual was ever an officer or director of.

[Laughter and applause.]

Think of that for a labor champion [renewed laughter] and for an opponent of monopolies and indefensible trusts? There will be much joy among the miners of Scott Haven; there will be tears of gratitude on many a blanched cheek; the light of hope in many a lack-luster eye; a benediction and the sweet incense of thanksgiving from humble hearthstones in the poverty-stricken huts of Scott Haven, when the news shall arrive that the statesman of Erie is no longer their oppressor, but has become their champion and friend. [Laughter and applause.]

Think of the consternation in the strongholds of monopoly and amongst the naughty partners in indefensible trusts!

If it were given me, Mr. Chairman, to advise the historian of the future, I would have him choose for his most dramatic page the statesman of Erie, when like some mediæval knight clad in armor, with visor down and lance apoise, his pennon flying, its motto, "Death to monopoly," he rides down the cheering line of admiring labor, full tilt in his conquering career of glory. [Laughter and applause.]

But here, Mr. Chairman, I would leave him with only a word of friendly advice, for which I charge him nothing. It is not statesmanlike to discuss the private affairs of your neighbors behind their backs. Besides, this House and the country are no more interested in the question whether Mr. Andrew Carnegie has a summer castle amid the hills of his native Scotland than they are in the question whether the statesman of Erie has a $5,000 clerk and a $10,000 cook. [Great laughter and applause.]

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, yesterday evening I received a letter by special messenger from the member from Pennsylvania who has just taken his seat, as follows:

> HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *Washington, May* 15, 1888.
>
> DEAR SIR: Some time during the session to-morrow, probably in the afternoon, I propose to make some observations with respect to your speech of Friday last. I think you will probably be interested, and hope you may be present.
>
> Yours, truly,
>
> JOHN DALZELL.
>
> Hon. W. L. SCOTT.

A letter so courteous, Mr. Chairman, could not but receive that consideration to which it seemed to be entitled. I have therefore, sir, remained here all day waiting until the member from Pennsylvania might have an opportunity to explain to this House and the country wherein, as has been whispered about, I was mistaken in the facts presented in my speech of Friday last. Sir, I expected the gentleman, as the special representative of the trust interests of this country, to come here prepared at least to say something in rebuttal of the facts I have presented. With those interests, representing $20,000,000, at his back to supply him with the data necessary to refute my statements, with five days to prepare a carefully written speech which he has just delivered, with time unlimited in which to deliver it, I have waited here until this late hour expecting to hear the statements I have made controverted, or at least denied. But, sir, the gentleman from Pennsylvania confines himself to the subject only in a criticism of my historical allusions and ridiculing my illustration of the Braddock farmer. There he stops and devotes the remainder of his speech to a personal vilification of myself.

Mr. DALZELL rose.

Mr. SCOTT. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he has ever heard of the case of the Thomson estate?

Mr. DALZELL. Against whom?

Mr. SCOTT. Against the Pennsylvania Steel Company. I propose to state here facts brought up in a court of justice and which can not be disputed.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh! I know all about that case.

Mr. SCOTT. I paid very close attention to what the gentleman said.

Mr. DALZELL. I am giving you attention.

Mr. SCOTT. I will ask the Clerk simply to read what I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

> At the auditing of the account of the trustees of the estate of Edgar Thomson, the decedent, the following facts appeared:
>
> The testator at his death owned one thousand shares of stock of the Pennsylvania Steel Company. This company being in need of funds, the stock at the time having been somewhat depressed, sold to the Pennsylvania Railway Company six thousand shares, and used the proceeds to improve its plant and carry on a larger business, which proved very remunerative, and in December, 1881, the directors of the Pennsylvania Steel Company authorized their president to repurchase of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company five thousand shares at $265 a share; which was accordingly done and duly paid for. At the purchase it was stipulated that the Pennsylvania Steel Company should immediately offer to its shareholders to take their pro rata proportion of these five thousand shares at par, and that the Pennsylvania Railroad Company should also take and pay for the shares which might be allotted to it on the remaining one thousand shares which had not been resold to the Pennsylvania Steel Company.
>
> On the same day a communication marked "confidential" was sent to each stockholder of the Pennsylvania Steel Company, citing the facts and offering to apportion these shares pro rata and at par among the stockholders of the company. The rate for fractional shares was fixed at $200 a share. At the time of this purchase the undivided profits of the Pennsylvania Steel Company amounted to $3,286,423.51. The net cost to the company of the purchase was $825,000, leaving a surplus of profits which amounted to $2,461,423.51.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, in my remarks of Friday last I only referred to one steel works in our State in connection with their enormous profits under the protective system, and I have merely had read the case which I sent to the Clerk's desk as corroborative evidence of what I stated in connection with the Edgar Thomson Steel Works and their profits, and which the gentleman in his remarks has not attempted to refute. The Pennsylvania Steel Company, with a capital stock of $2,000,000, I think, after the payment of dividends, had surplus earnings amounting to $3,286,423.51, and these large accumulated profits were earned during a period when the iron and steel industries of this country could hardly be called in their most prosperous condition.

But, Mr. Chairman, the member from Pennsylvania appears here as the special attorney of the proprietors of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works and their interests, and he has not had one word to say on behalf of the wage-workers employed in that industry.

Will the member from Pennsylvania rise in his seat and say that he believes Carnegie & Co., in forcing their men by Pinkerton's detectives to go back at 10 per cent. reduction on their wages, considering their enormous profits, can be justified? Does he justify it?

Mr. DALZELL. Do you want me to answer the question?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, I want you to answer it.

Mr. DALZELL. There are two answers. The first is that you are trying to divert this House from the subject that I discussed, and which I would like you to meet. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, answer the question. Do not try to evade it.

Mr. DALZELL. And this is the second, that the statement that

the Edgar Thomson people compelled their employés to go back by detectives is untrue in fact.

Mr. SCOTT. I did not state that, but I stated that they covered their works with Pinkerton detectives and then hired foreign labor to come there and drive their men out. And you are standing here to-day professing to represent an enlightened constituency, and yet advocate the man who would be guilty of such an act as that. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL rose.

Mr. SCOTT. No; just let me proceed now.

Mr. DALZELL. But do you not want me to answer your question?

Mr. SCOTT. I say to the gentleman that he has mistaken his calling.

Mr. DALZELL. That may be; but do you not want me to reply?

Mr. SCOTT. I do; but I have but five minutes left. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Then you ought not to ask any questions.

Mr. BRUMM. We will give an extension of your time.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Will the statesman from Erie allow a question right at this point?

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir; you are a general interrupter, and I will not yield to your questions. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. SCOTT. Now, Mr. Chairman, I admire the patriotism of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the interest of those he represents. But I would like to know how many days' labor he ever furnished to the wage-worker of this country. I would like to know when the week came around how many men have ever been on his pay-rolls.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, I am not a millionaire, and do not pretend to be. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, you are not. You have had the opportunity of being a millionaire, but you have not had the brains to get there. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, no, I had not the opportunity.

Mr. SCOTT. It is just such gentlemen as the member from Pennsylvania whom the Constitution and the laws of this country are intended to protect and whom we are all endeavoring to protect to enable all, whatever their abilities may be, to get an honest living.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, I can take care of myself. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has not denied, or at least he has not submitted any figures or facts denying, the statement I made that $4.09 was the total amount that labor received in the production of a ton of steel rails.

Mr. DALZELL. Why, certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. I can prove right here that what you state is not true.

Mr. DALZELL. Now will the statesman from Erie allow me just a minute?

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir. Here is a contract under seal, as awarded by the board of arbitration between the Edgar Thomson Steel Works and their employés, specifying the number of men employed, the work they were to do, and the percentage each man was to get. I will further state to the gentleman that if he can induce his principals to open up their books, if he will get up on this floor and offer a resolution appointing a select committee to go to the Edgar Thomson Steel Works and ascertain from them what they pay for their labor or what it costs to produce a ton of steel rails, I will open every book I have, every balance-sheet I have. I will take them up to Scott Haven and compare the wage-workers of Scott Haven with those of the industries which the gentleman here is pleading for, and I will abide by the report of that committee, and a majority of it may be gentlemen on the other side if they are only honest and square men.

Mr. BRUMM. Will the gentleman include, also, his anthracite miners?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, the anthracite miners, too.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that a question so important as this to the whole country could have been discussed on this floor without personal attacks upon any gentleman. I made no personal charges against the proprietors of the Edgar Thomson Steel Works. I merely stated facts in connection with that industry as shown by their contracts, and I merely stated what the senior member of that firm had admitted to me in the Committee on Ways and Means, that he had drawn this amount of money which I stated he had drawn, namely, $1,500,000 in one year as his share of the profits, and I made certain illustrations in connection with it. But it appeared to have stuck in the heart of the gentleman who has just preceded me, and in answer to my facts he comes here and makes a personal attack upon me. I can say to him, sir, that I mind it no more than I would the barking of a dog in the street. [Applause on the Democratic side and derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

I will stand upon my record at home and with my people. And if I have ever been the oppressor of labor, if I have ever ejected a man from his home, if I have ever endeavored in my life, although I have been, I may say, a large employer of labor, to put one laborer in the place of another, or to force one man in the place of another; if I have employed a detective—not a Pinkerton detective, merely, but any other kind of a detective—to come and protect my property or to protect it against the men that are working for me, or have worked for me, I, sir, will resign my seat and leave this Hall the day it is proved.

Mr. BRUMM. Does the gentleman not contribute to pay the coal and iron police?

Mr. SCOTT. I never so contributed. I know you made a statement on this floor that I had employed Pinkerton's detectives, which is false.

Mr. BRUMM. And I will prove it.

Mr. SCOTT. I will make you prove it. I am going to bring you before the bar of this House and make you prove that charge.

Mr. BRUMM. All right; I will be there.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's argument in regard to my employing a $10,000 cook has the same foundation for truth that some of his other statements have; and if such were the fact, sir, I could only compare the wages paid my cook with the wages paid by his clients at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works. As to the salaries paid my secretaries, or at least those who assist me in my business, if he refers to the men in my employ, I can tell him that there are a good many of them who get more than $5,000 a year.

Now, I have nothing more to say. I have been identified with the laborers of this country all my life; I have worked and toiled with them; and when I start out to rob anybody or to get anybody's money it will not be the money of the wage-worker of this country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House the committee will now rise.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill H. R. 9051, had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of 5.30 p. m. having arrived the House, pursuant to order, stands in recess until 8 o'clock this evening.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m.

The House was called to order by Mr. MCMILLIN as Speaker *pro tempore*, who directed the reading of the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 16, 1888.

I hereby designate Hon. BENTON MCMILLIN to preside as Speaker *pro tempore* at this evening's session.

JOHN G. CARLISLE, *Speaker.*

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK,
Clerk House of Representatives.

TARIFF.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. WICKHAM. Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in discussing no matter of ordinary legislation. The bill under debate touches upon subjects that affect every hearth-stone in the land. It will reach, if passed, with its invisible hand into the parlor of the rich, and fail not to affect the cabin of the poor. It will not only touch these extremes, by its direct action, but also reach them by its equally as certain indirect effect. It will come home not to one class alone, but to all classes and conditions.

Well may I say, then, that it is no ordinary subject of legislation. It will determine, if adopted, the manner in which, the extent to which, and effect with which, all the vast revenues necessary to support the immense machinery of our Government shall be drawn into the Treasury.

A piece of legislation, having for its end and aim such results, demands our best endeavor and our most patient consideration, and the exercise of our highest patriotism. We may not, each for himself, consider alone the wants and interests of our respective localities, but it becomes our duty to take a broad and comprehensive view of the whole country, with the intent and purpose to do that which will redound most to the welfare of all the people.

If we honestly approach this discussion in this spirit, with our gaze fixed steadily and unswervingly upon this polar sta which should guide all our actions, we can not fail to do that which will commend itself to our conscience and better judgment, and resul in benefits, far reaching and permanent, to all classes and conditions—the high and the low, the rich and the poor—the only legitimate and just object of all general legislation.

OUR SYSTEM.

We have, and for many years have had, a protective system of revenue collection. It is not perhaps in some of its details without imperfections and defects, but it was designed to have and has had the effect

of protecting our industries against the competition of foreign industries of like kinds.

It is in the main a system that sprang into existence through the necessity for a large revenue growing out of the war of the rebellion, and it has been continued with some modifications through the necessity of large revenue, growing out of the results of the war.

War is a curse taken in every view, but in some of the aspects of our late war it was not an unmixed evil. It not only destroyed the worst system of human bondage that ever existed among men; it not only resulted in a restored Union of the States, more firmly cemented than before, but it caused to be demonstrated, in keeping with what protectionists have always contended, that a protective tariff would not only bring prosperity to industries already begun, but would encourage and stimulate the establishment and prosperity of new ones in the land; that such a tariff would not only stimulate and develop manufactures, strictly so-called, but would also protect labor engaged in all other departments as well—in mining, agriculture, stock-raising, wool-growing, and common day labor; that it would drive the blood of prosperity into every artery of the commercial and industrial body; that while it would not decrease the estates of the rich, it would immensely enhance the material prosperity and comfort of the great middling and poorer classes; that from a country comparatively poor and undeveloped it would in less than a quarter of a century develop a mighty empire of prosperous people, and that, too, notwithstanding during the same period a relentless civil war of four years' duration wiped out of existence labor and property to the extent of $5,000,000,000, and destroyed or greatly impaired the energies and producing power of a million of men, equal at least to twenty million years' labor of a strong man; that it would, from a time when the middling class lived in a comparative deprivation of many of the necessaries, bring us to a time when the poor would be living in good houses, well furnished, be wearing good clothing and enjoying many other comforts and even luxuries.

Before the enactment of the tariffs of 1861 and 1867 it is within the memory of very many upon this floor that the homes of the mechanics, laborers, and farmers of our country contained only the barest necessaries; that upon their floors were found no carpets, in their "best rooms" no musical instruments, upon their walls no decorations of art; that their means of transportation, for the most part, consisted of the ox-cart or lumber wagon; while to-day, after twenty-five years of a protective system, upon their floors are found the finest products of the loom, in their parlors are heard the sweet tones of the piano, their walls are covered with exquisite designs in paper or fresco and hung with the productions of the artist, while the owners ride to their devotions or on their pleasure in carriages which in days before the war were rarely used by the rich.

These results of a protective system, an enumeration of which might be greatly enlarged, were, long before the beginning of the tariff system that made them possible, even from the beginning of our government, foretold and promised by our wisest and most patriotic statesmen. What their clear and prophetic vision saw our day has realized.

Yea, more; the establishment of the Union of these States grew out of a necessity felt by the people of the colonies for protection against the importation of foreign-made goods and the consequent destruction of our own manufactures.

During the period between the Revolutionary war and the adoption of the Constitution, a period of six years, the distress and depression and gloom that had settled upon the people as a result of the absolutely free foreign trade under which they were living, which had resulted in the destruction of the manufactures of the land and the drainage of all the specie from the country, drove our fathers to the plan of the formation of a "more perfect union," as a measure by which to secure protection against England, who had become tenfold more formidable by reason of the importations of the products of her factories, in competition with ours, than she had been during the war on the battle-field.

I know that upon this floor, during this debate, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] has contended that there is no warrant in the Constitution for the passage of laws designed to protect labor. He asks, with great emphasis: "But what right have you to protect labor?" Mr. Chairman, at the time of the adoption of the Constitution, and before the Revolution, there was a well-defined and accepted distinction between the two powers of "levying taxes to raise revenue" and "laying duties for the regulation of commerce." The right to regulate commerce by the laying of duties was never denied to the mother country by the colonies, but the right to levy taxes for revenue was denied, because the colonies were without representation.

As early as 1766 Benjamin Franklin, in his famous examination before the House of Commons, recognized the distinction. The questions and his answers were as follows:

Q. What will be the opinion of the Americans on these resolutions? [Asserting the right of Great Britain to tax America.]

A. They will think them unconstitutional and unjust.

Q. Was it an opinion in America before 1763 that the Parliament had no right to lay taxes and duties there?

A. I never heard any objections to the right of laying duties to regulate commerce, but a right to lay internal-revenue taxes was never thought to be in Parliament.

Q. On what do you found your opinion that the people of America make any such distinction?

A. I know that whenever the subject has occurred in conversation it has appeared the opinion of every one that we could not be taxed by a Parliament when we were not represented. But the payment of duties laid as regulations of commerce was never disputed.

In the same year Lord Chatham, in the House of Commons, in his celebrated speech on the "right of taxing America," recognized the distinction when he said:

If the gentleman does not understand the difference between external and internal taxes I can not help it. There is a plain distinction between taxes laid for the purpose of raising revenue and duties imposed for the regulation of trade for the accommodation of the subject, although in the consequences some revenue may incidentally arise from the latter.

On the same occasion he further said:

The commons of America, represented in their general assemblies, have ever been in possession of this constitutional right of giving and granting their own money. They would have been slaves if they had not enjoyed it! At the same time this kingdom, as the supreme governing and legislative power, has always bound the colonies by her laws, by her regulations and restrictions in trade, in navigation, in manufactures, in everything except that of taking their money out of their pockets without their consent.

In the House of Lords, in 1775, we find Lord Chatham using the following language:

Let this distinction, then, remain forever ascertained—taxation is theirs, commercial regulation is ours. As an American, I would recognize to England her supreme right of regulating commerce and navigation; as an Englishman by birth and principle, I recognize to the Americans their supreme, unalienable right in their property—a right which they are justified in the defense of to the last extremity.

Among the earliest proceedings of the Congress of Independence, recorded in its Journals October 14, 1774, may be found the following unanimous declaration with reference to the colonies:

They are entitled to a free and exclusive power of legislation in their several provincial legislatures, where their right of representation can alone be preserved, in all cases of taxation and internal policy, subject only to the negative of the sovereign, in such manner as has been heretofore used and accustomed; but from the necessity of the case, and in regard to the mutual interests of both countries, we cheerfully consent to the operation of such acts of the British Parliament as are bona fide restrained to the regulation of our external commerce, for the purpose of securing the commercial advantages of the whole empire to the mother country, and the commercial benefits of the respective members, excluding every idea of taxation, external or internal, for raising a revenue on the subjects in America without their consent.

In 1778, Lord North, for the purpose of winning back the insurgent American colonies to their allegiance to the British Crown, procured the passage of a bill by Parliament, which contained an offer of unconditional surrender of the original ground of controversy, in these words:

It is expedient to declare that the King and Parliament of Great Britain will not impose any duty or tax for the purpose of raising a revenue in the colonies, except only such duties as may be expedient to impose for the regulation of commerce.

I have quoted these authorities to show that there was previous to and during the Revolutionary war, and down to the adoption of the Constitution, a well-understood and well-defined distinction between "duties imposed for the regulation of commerce" and "duties imposed for raising a revenue." And we find this distinction well preserved in the Constitution, for we find expressed in that instrument not only the power conferred upon Congress—

To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises—

But the further and distinct power—

To regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.

It seems clear, in the light of the language of the men whom I have quoted, that the power to regulate commerce involved the power to restrain and regulate the importation of foreign articles of commerce. But we are not limited to our own opinion. Let us hear what historians, framers of the Constitution, their contemporaries, and the great expounders of its meaning have said. James Madison, one of the framers of the Constitution, and whose qualifications as an expounder of its meaning will not be denied by any one, said in his letter to Joseph C. Cabell under date of September 18, 1828:

It is a simple question, under the Constitution of the United States, whether the power to regulate trade with foreign nations as a distinct and substantive item in the enumerated powers embraces the object of encouraging by duties, restrictions, and prohibitions the manufactures and products of the country. And the affirmative must be inferred from the following considerations:

Which he proceeds at length to enumerate. Bancroft, in speaking of this period, says:

Of the many causes promoting union, four above others exercised a steady and commanding influence. The new Republic as one nation must have power to regulate its foreign commerce, to colonize its large domain, to provide an adequate revenue, and to establish justice in domestic trade, by prohibiting the several States from impairing the obligation of contracts. Each of these causes was of vital importance; but the necessity for regulating commerce gave the immediate impulse to a more perfect Constitution.

It was with the belief impressed upon his mind that the impending ruin hanging over the people of the Confederacy was the result of the unrestrained foreign trade, that Fisher Ames said in this House in 1789, when debating the first tariff bill:

I conceive, sir, that the present Constitution was dictated by commercial necessity more than any other cause. The want of an efficient government to secure the manufacturing interest and to advance our commerce was long seen by men of judgment and pointed out by patriots solicitous to promote general welfare.

Daniel Webster, that giant expositor of the Constitution, and who was thoroughly acquainted with its history and to the causes which led to its adoption, said in 1833:

The protection of American labor against the injurious competition of foreign labor, so far at least as respects general handicraft productions, is known historically to have been one end designed to be obtained by establishing the Constitution.

And in 1844 he said:

I defy the man in any degree conversant with history, in any degree acquainted with the annals of this country from 1787 to the adoption of the Constitution in 1789, to say that this [laying duties for the protection of American labor and industries] was not a leading, I may almost say, the leading motive, South as well as North, for the formation of the new Government. Without that provision in the Constitution it never could have been adopted.

Rufus Choate, another great constitutional lawyer, said in 1842:

A whole people, a whole generation of our fathers, had in view as one great end and purpose of their new Government the acquisition of the means of restraining by governmental action the importation of foreign manufactures for the encouragement of manufactures and of labor at home, and desired and meant to do this by clothing the new Government with this specific power of regulating commerce.

As soon as the First Congress assembled petitions flowed in upon it from every section of the Union, from the South as well as the North, praying for the enactment of a law to protect the manufacturing interests of the country, and Congress, in response to this almost universal desire, met it in the second law it passed, which was an act to secure the coasting trade and protect the mechanic arts by discriminating duties.

Since the enactment of this law many others from time to time have been passed by Congress, more or less protective in their design or effect, according to the political complexion of the Congress at the time.

And it has been our experience during the hundred years that have passed away that our people of all classes have been the most prosperous during the times when we have had the most pronounced protection.

It will be found upon the examination of our history that every period of gloom, despondency, and bankruptcy through which we have passed has followed the abandonment of protective tariffs and a resort to those for revenue only, save one—the last—which clearly was the result of the enormous waste of life, labor, and property caused by the war of the rebellion; and let me say that this one was of comparatively short duration, because of the magnificent recuperative power which we had as a people developed through the fostering effect of our tariff protection.

Upon the truth of what I have just said I call a Democratic witness, the Atlanta Constitution, a paper that has shown its devotion to Democracy for more than a generation. This is what it said in a recent issue:

OUR TARIFF HISTORY.

It was not until some time after the colonies became independent that there were duties placed upon imports. From 1784 to 1790, inclusive, the imports from England exceeded the exports from America in the sum of $52,372,875, and a clamor arose for protection.

The first tariff law passed was approved by the President July 4, 1789. Its preamble recited: "Whereas it is necessary for the support of the Government, the discharge of the debts of the United States, and the encouragement of manufactures that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported."

From the year 1796, when the protective tariff was in full operation, to 1801, a period of seven years, the exports of this country exceeded the imports by $89,374,316, leaving England in debt to America. In 1824, although the revenue was sufficient, a new tariff was adopted with higher duties in order to extend the benefits of protection. This measure had the active support of Presidents Monroe, Jackson, and John Quincy Adams.

In 1833, owing to the demands of South Carolina, then in almost open rebellion, a revised tariff law was passed, lowering the duties to about 20 per cent.

By 1840 this "tariff revision" had so diminished the revenue, and manufactures were so prostrate, that the Government and the people were almost in bankruptcy. This caused a raising of customs duties to the protective point in 1842, under which trade revived and the Government's credit was preserved.

In 1846 a reduction was made in tariff rates, and during the next eleven years, while these reduced rates were in force, the revenues fell short of the expenditures by $21,790,805. In 1860 the Government had to borrow $20,000,000 to maintain its credit.

The duties were increased in March, 1861, and since then, while the war tariff has been reduced to natural proportions, the manufactures of America have flourished as never before.

By the passage of this bill and its enactment into law, we are called upon to enter upon an abandonment of and a departure from the policy established by our fathers, and written by them in our very Constitution; a policy under which we have grown from three millions of people to sixty millions; under which our property has increased from a few millions in value to the enormous aggregate of sixty billions, an average of $1,000 for every man, woman, and child in the land; an amount far outstripping the wealth of free-trade England, which less than a quarter of a century ago largely exceeded ours, and which she had been centuries accumulating; under which our people have not only increased their possessions so largely, but have increased their comforts and luxuries beyond those falling to the lot of any other people on the footstool, and which far exceed the wildest prophecies or dreams of the wildest visionary.

I say we are in this day and generation, after realizing all these benefits, a fitting description of which is beyond, far beyond, the power of my tongue to express, called upon to enter upon an experiment, to say the least of it; to put in peril and hazard all these magnificent and glorious results; all this wealth and consequent power; all this comfort; all this luxury; all this improvement in the condition of the laboring classes, by inaugurating a system that no man upon this floor, or elsewhere, has been able to show will not result in the great impairment, if not entire destruction, of them all.

I do not claim that the passage of this bill alone will cause the ruin of our industrial system; but I do say that if this bill becomes a law the wedge will have been entered that, by the future blows British effort and Democratic subserviency shall strike, will be driven to the complete rending asunder and final destruction of our grand system, from which so many and great blessings have flowed.

While the passage of this bill would not alone entirely ruin our industries, it would result in the destruction of many of them, and the consequent train of dire and far-reaching results in other branches.

I know that the advocates of this bill deny such a result and declaim eloquently of the beauties of free trade, or what they choose to call a revenue tariff, and lament and deploro the ruin that is sure to follow the further continuance of our present tariff. I know that they point to England and what they call her prosperity as an evidence of the beneficent effects of the system. I know that they read advice to us to adopt her policy from Englishmen and English books. But they forget that England's present system, so far as her manufactures are concerned, is one of the most powerfully protected systems in the world; they forget that her statesmen have seemed to think that her manufacturing proprietors were the only class that should have protection, while all other classes of producers and all classes of laborers should be subjected to the grinding and destructive effects of free trade; they forget that by allowing the entry into her ports free of duty of raw materials for her shops, and exempting her manufacturing capital from all direct tax under the excise, she has protected them, and so enabled them to undersell the manufacturers of other countries not protected by tariffs, or in some other way.

I know it is fashionable among so-called tariff reformers to point to England and talk of the advantages which free trade has given her industries, but those who have given study to this subject do not hesitate to say that she is a protective state, so far as her manufacturing proprietors are concerned, and this evidence is afforded by an advocate of free trade, who will not he charged with making such assertions to bolster a preconceived opinion.

David A. Wells, a pronounced free-trader and formerly Special Commissioner of Internal Revenue, and now a member of the Cobden Club, in his report for the year 1868, uses this significant language:

Again, a careful study of the financial systems of the various commercial nations of Europe has led the Commissioner unhesitatingly to the conclusion that whatever may be the state of European public opinion in respect to free trade, and whatever may be the claims preferred for it on the broad grounds of liberality and humanitarianism, the fiscal legislation of Great Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Austria, and Russia is now, and always has been, framed solely and exclusively with reference to one object, namely, the promotion of supposed national self-interest, and has never had the slightest regard to the interest of any other nation, or to any arguments, other than those based upon specific national wants and specific national experiences.

Thus, the policy of Great Britain, which exempts capital employed in manufacturing and banking from all direct taxation under the excise, and all raw materials imported from foreign countries from all taxation under the customs, although not so termed, is undoubtedly protection in its most subtile and effective form, and as such has been recognized and commented on by the French economists.

It will thus be seen that England's fiscal policy is designed, not to favor her laboring poor, not to enable them to draw and receive higher wages, not to enable them to live easier and surround themselves with more comforts, but to enrich her manufacturing princes, to swell their plethoric coffers, and that, too, in disregard of the interests and welfare, not only of the artisans in her shops, but also regardless of the effect upon her farmers and common laborers.

Her legislation in this particular is clearly class legislation, designed to enrich the few and impoverish the many. That this is so, and that it is having the effect upon the laboring classes that might be expected, abundant testimony is at hand.

This is what Mr. Howard Vincent, M. P., says in a letter to the London Times:

No national party could possibly ignore the serious state of affairs now prevailing. It is detailed from day to day in your columns. Land worth from 25 to 75 per cent. less than forty years ago, and almost unsalable. Arable land thrown into pasture, yet fewer animals in the fields. Agricultural distress very similar to that described by Lord Shaftesbury as prevailing about 1844. In the towns hundreds starving, owing to factories being closed or working only half time. Deputations to local authorities praying for relief works. In the metropolis hungry men at every corner. Pauperism increasing. Discontent rising. Employment everywhere scarcer, while the population is rapidly multiplying.

There is no class, no profession, no avocation, no calling unaffected in some degree. Distress must always be felt more in some places and in some communities than in others. But the general fact is undeniable. The commissioner of police of the metropolis, the vestries, the guardians of the poor, as well as philanthropic societies and statesmen, may open registers for the unemployed, but that will not provide the employment, for little or none is to be found in town or country. Temporary remedies may be applied, but they will not be more effectual than palliatives to a malignant cancer.

Mr. Henry Champlain, M. P., recently stated in the House of Commons that the British farmers were losing £50,000,000, or $250,000,000 a year. In other words, England has ruined its farmers that its manufacturers might grow rich, while it has kept the wages of operatives as low as possible for the same reason.

Is it to be wondered at, in view of these acknowledged results of British free-trade class protection that the stalwart young English farmers

are leaving their unprofitable farms and flocking in such numbers to our shores? Or that her poets, that class so quick to respond to the cry of human distress, should, with pens dipped in the gall and bitterness of human want, be writing words like these:

Old England when, by tariffs low,
Protected fair from foreign foe,
Felt everywhere the thrill and glow
Of labor and prosperity.

But England showed another sight,
When Cobden's scheme with killing blight
Fell as the fall of gloomy night
On industry and husbandry.

By selfish greed and fierce tirade,
By class and party feeling swayed,
A "free," a falsely canting Trade
Was throned in pious tyranny.

Then came in cheap, poor foreign skill;
Then grew the rich man richer still,
The while the worker's cup did fill
With idleness and beggary.

But richer yet the few will grow,
And labor yet shall sink more low,
If England's conscience still be slow
To execrate the infamy.

E'en now the curse of Cobden's hand
Lies on our workshops, on our land,
And, wanting food and labor, stand
Our artisans and peasantry.

The misery deepens; what shall save
Our men from sinking to the slave,
But that we doom to deepest grave
Free trade with all its villainy?

False, false to England and her race,
There let it hide its traitor face,
And lasting scorn and dark disgrace
Shall be its fitting sepulchre.

Or words like these:

Clothed all in contradictions I saw this fetich dread,
This hypocrite, free trade, lift high its vaunting head;
If reason to his hearers would any warning bring,
Thus, thought I, to his fellows an Englishman might sing:

"Why starve your workingmen through foreign labor cheap,
The labor of such misery as makes the angels weep?
Why drive them off abroad, your toilers skilled and true,
And open wide the door to a vagrant foreign crew?

"Think you this greed of gold shall add to England's fame?
Know you these foreign slaves shall bring eternal shame?
The hand of Cain is on it, this cheapness that you seek,
The sweat of blood of men, the tears of women weak."

Lines, that if they do not contain so much poetic art, none the less echo the woe that England's humane poet sung in his "Song of the Shirt" forty years ago, when he heard the cry of her who was—

Sewing at once with a double thread,
A shroud as well as a shirt.

And wailing in her anguish—

O God, that bread should be so dear
And flesh and blood so cheap!

The President in his message calls upon Congress to enter upon the same policy that has ruined the farmers of England. He substantially recommends the removal of tariff duties from several of our greatest agricultural staples.

While the comparative unimportance of the agricultural interests of England as compared with her manufacturing interests might in the minds of British statesmen have furnished an excuse for their course, so ruinous to England's farmers, no such excuse can be found for the members of this House.

Agriculture in America, with her breadth of acreage and fertility of soil, holds the most important place among industrial pursuits. In view of the fact that, according to the last census, of 17,392,099 of our population engage in all kinds of industries, 7,670,493, almost nine-twentieths of the whole, are employed in agriculture, of which a very large proportion, if not all, are engaged in the production of one or more of the articles to which the bill under discussion proposes to apply the principle of free trade by removing all duty upon their importation, this House can not say that the interests of the farmers are so small comparatively that their success and prosperity may be sacrificed or greatly impaired for the benefit of those engaged in other pursuits.

This portion of our society is just as much entitled to the protection of the laws as any other. It will be a sorry day for America when her farming industry shall show signs of decay. That portion of our population engaged in agriculture are at once the safety and the glory of our nation.

They are intelligent, conservative, patriotic. They are attached to the land and love their country with intense affection. They draw their substance directly from the bosom of mother earth, and so are most interested in preserving us against invasion or any other evil that may threaten us.

Shall this great and important portion of our population be abandoned in the adjustment of our tariff duties to the remorseless competition of wool-growers and flax-raisers of other lands, where labor or lands or both are cheaper? Or shall we preserve our magnificent markets for their use, and thus enable them to continue to hold their proud place among the toilers of America?

We want in this country no such one-sided monopolistic system as that which curses England, but we want rather to continue that system which encourages and builds up all industries and all labor, whether engaged in manufacturing or in producing the fruits of the field.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS], while conceding that wages are higher in this country than in Europe, and trying to account for their being so, and trying to show that it is in no manner due to the protective tariff, makes a claim which seems to me to be absurd; one which he is not only unable to prove, but which he does not attempt to prove, and concerning which he is content to rely alone upon dogmatic assertion.

He says:

What, then, is it that makes higher wages? It is coal and steam and machinery. It is these three powerful agents that multiply the production of labor and make it more valuable.

He says further that fifty years ago it required five persons to make eight yards of cloth in one day, for which they received 20 cents each, or an aggregate of $1 for the five; that in a year the five persons produced 2,400 yards, but now, when coal, steam, and machinery are used, five persons in a year can produce 140,000 yards; that the result of the labor-saving machinery is an enormous increase in productive capacity, and that the result of that has been a great increase in the rate of wages. Why? How? In his own language, I ask the gentleman, "How can it be explained?" He does not condescend to tell us. Is not the statement ludicrous? A manufacturer employs five persons one day to work for him, for which he pays them $1. The next day, having at great expense to himself and the consequent employment of greatly increased capital, put in steam machinery, he pays the same five persons for one day's labor, which was no harder for them to perform, or any more skillful, than the work they did before, five or ten times as much wages. In other words, he makes a large outlay of capital, and instead of reaping the benefit himself he generously turns it all over to his workmen.

Surely in making this claim the gentleman pays the manufacturer a high compliment as a generous and benevolent man, not quite in keeping with his statement made a few moments before, that although a manufacturer may be able to pay higher wages, he does not do it. He says, "Unquestionably he is [able] but he does not do it." And he further emphasizes and also illustrates the argument by saying, Jay Gould is able to pay his bootblack $500 a day, and Mr. Vanderbilt his hostler $10,000 a year, but neither of them does it; but each goes out into the market and employs his man at the market price.

Neither is his claim that wages are made higher by coal and steam and machinery quite consistent with his other statement, made almost in the same breath, and which is a good deal more nearly correct, that wages are regulated by the "demand and supply and the capacity of the laborer to do the work for which he is employed."

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman, at the risk of being inconsistent, puts the rate of wages on the true ground when he says that it depends upon the demand and supply. And it is because their rate depends upon the demand and supply that the protective tariff is instrumental in increasing them. It increases the demand. It does this by creating a wide diversity of employments. It stimulates the establishment and success of a great variety of manufactures, adapted to the varied talents, tastes, and opportunities of the working people, instead of confining them to one or a few industries to which they must adapt themselves or starve. And this answers, too, his question:

How is it that the wages in the different States of the Union are different, while the tariff is the same from Maine to California?

There is a demand for the employment of labor in a given industry only in that part of the country where that industry is carried on. A cotton factory in New England will not create a demand in Texas for spinners; nor will an iron mill in Alabama create a demand for puddlers in Maine. And right here lies the secret of the difference between wages generally in the South and in the North. In the North attention is paid to manufacturing of all kinds, while in the South in many parts, even where great natural advantages exist, no attention is given to the matter. In the North capital takes advantage of the opportunity afforded by a protective tariff and builds up manufacturing establishments, while in the South, from lack of capital or enterprise or from prejudice, and perhaps from all three, the opportunity afforded by the protection given by the tariff is not seized, and so no new demand for labor is created in that portion of the country, and of course, as a result, there being no new demand, as suggested by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] in his better moments, there is no advance in the price of labor.

But in some parts of the South light is breaking in. Some of her people, seeing the great material prosperity of the North, and seeing, too, the great advantages nature has conferred upon the South, have in some places invested their capital, aided by additional capital from the North, in manufacturing enterprises with great, and in many places, almost marvelous success. In Birmingham and Chattanooga and other places this has been done. Does the gentleman from Texas not believe that there is a greater demand for labor and for more kinds of labor in those cities than there was before such enterprises were established there? Has there not been an increased demand, and therefore an increased price?

It is only a question of time when the South, fully awaking from

her lethargy, will arouse herself, put forth her mighty strength, avail herself of her great advantages, seize the opportunity which the protective system affords her, erect factories, build up the waste places, employ her own raw materials and her vast supply of labor, and exceed in wealth and material prosperity anything that has yet been seen in America, and throw into insignificance by contrast her boasted days of greatness, when cotton was king and slavery was her corner-stone. May God speed the day when thus she will have fulfilled her destiny and the prophetic hopes of her early statesmen, who appreciated and advocated the doctrine of protection to American industries!

The gentleman from Texas includes among the three agents causing higher wages, machinery; but he does not tell us what has produced the machinery. How came the machinery he speaks of to exist? Clearly it came into existence in response to a demand for it. This, of course, everybody will admit. What created the demand for it? Clearly the demand for multiplied and cheapened processes of manufacturing goods for consumption. Why did methods of manufacturing goods need to be cheapened? Why, certainly because of the competition of manufacturers, each and all of whom were striving to possess the market by offering their wares cheaper than others.

How could these manufacturers, while thus competing and inventing machinery to cheapen their products, endure competition with the goods manufactured in Europe by cheaper labor? Surely only because they were protected by a protective tariff. Thus it was that the tariff afforded the inventors and improvers of machinery the opportunity and incentive to bring the same to the high state of perfection to which it has attained. In this manner it was that a protective tariff brought into existence the improved machinery, and so is entitled to the credit at one and the same time of creating the machinery of which the gentleman speaks and also enhancing the rate of wages.

Again, in reply to the claim of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] that wages are higher in this country because of the use of coal and steam and machinery, I call his attention to the fact that in Europe, where low wages are, he will also find coal and steam and machinery, and find them cheaper, too, in many places, if not in all places, than in this country.

It is also an open secret that European manufacturers, especially the English, through agents whom they keep in this country constantly on the alert for anything new, buy up and ship to Europe every new and useful improvement in machinery; so that in the matter of machinery the shops in Europe are as well supplied as those of this country; and there is the best authority for the statement that there is no perceptible difference between the skill and speed with which machinery is operated in the best factories in Europe and America.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have not mentioned the only inconsistencies to be found in the position of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, and the others who with him are advocating this bill. They speak with vehemence and often with bitterness of the manufacturer. They say, in the language of the chairman, that "unquestionably" he is able when the value of his products is increased by protection to pay higher wages, but that he does not do it; that he has no regard for the laborers he employs; that he grinds them down; that he robs them of their fair share of the profits of the business in which he and they are engaged; that he is heartless, selfish, wicked; that while a protective tariff enables him to charge a large price for his products he pockets the entire benefit, and that his laborers get (in the language of the chairman of the committee) "not a dollar of it." And yet, Mr. Chairman, the advocates of this measure have been laboring for weeks to show, and that is the burden of their song, that to allow raw material to be introduced free will cheapen to the consumers the goods made out of such raw material; that if the manufacturer gets raw material cheaper he can afford to and will sell the manufactured product cheaper; and their offered consolation to the wool grower is, that while he will not get so much for his raw material, he will be enabled to buy his clothing enough cheaper to more than make up the difference in price.

What consistency! How is this to be brought about? Why, they tell us that the manufacturer getting his raw materials cheaper, will sell his goods cheaper; that he will be more considerate of the farmers than he will be of his own employés; that while cheaper wool will enable him to make more profit at the same price for the product, he will kindly and generously relinquish that increased profit, and give it to his customer, a stranger, while he will withhold a profit made under a protective tariff from his neighbor, his employé. In other words, that under a protective tariff he is a robber, but under free trade in his raw material he will "presto change" become a benefactor. "To this complexion" are the supporters of this measure come at last. It is an undignified, uncalled-for, and wanton attack upon a worthy class of American citizens. And that policy or system of fiscal legislation that requires a resort to such methods to sustain it and bolster it up, is unworthy of consideration in such a place as this, and unworthy the gentlemen who advocate it.

Oh, no; it is not true that our manufacturers as a class are robbers and extortioners. There may be, doubtless are, among them bad men, as there are in all walks of life, and as there may be even among the manufacturers of free-trade England, who have their raw materials placed at their disposal, in part, at public expense and the cost of the other classes in that country; but as a class they are as generous, as honest, as benevolent as other men. They, as a class, show and feel an interest in their employés, as is evidenced by efforts that they are constantly and voluntarily making in innumerable ways to better their employés' condition morally, intellectually, and physically, and above all, in their willingness, as statistics show, to constantly increase, as fast as able, their wages.

I am not saying, and do not say, that labor, even in America, is sufficiently rewarded. I do not believe that it is, except perhaps in a few branches. I believe that labor here and everywhere is entitled in many branches to a larger share in the results of its own exertions; and I long for the day when laborers from one end of the land to the other shall be rejoicing in higher wages; when they shall be able to enjoy more comforts and a greater degree of luxury even than they now enjoy; when, under the beneficent influence of a protective system, the branches of labor shall be so diversified and multiplied, and the consequent demand for workers shall be so increased throughout the land, South as well as North, that the toiler of whatever degree shall be in the enjoyment of all those good things of the earth that it is possible for him to enjoy and which it is profitable for anybody to enjoy.

I believe that the only system under which this "consummation so devoutly to be wished" can ever be realized is the protective system.

And, Mr. Chairman, at the same time that our tariff is thus enhancing the price of labor it is reducing the cost to our people of manufactured goods. We have the authority of Mr. Dudley, late consul at Liverpool, for this statement:

> Upon investigation it will be found that nine-tenths of the manufactured commodities used by the farmers of our country, including clothing, household goods, furniture, implements of husbandry, tools, etc., are as cheap in this country as they are in England, and in some instances even cheaper.

Again he says:

> An examination will show that there is not a single manufactured commodity, so far as I know, that is not cheaper to-day in the United States under our protective system than it was in 1860 under free trade, and before the present protective tariff went into operation.

But, Mr. Chairman, upon this latter point we do not need the testimony of Mr. Dudley. There are as many witnesses on this floor to the truth of what he says as there are members entitled to be here. Who is so ignorant or forgetful as not to know its truth? Who does not know that there is hardly a manufactured article of common use, of use by the middle classes and those who are poorer, that is not cheaper than before the tariffs of 1861 and 1867? Who is prepared to deny that carpets, furniture, implements of husbandry, the artisan's tools, books, newspapers, linens, woolens, cottons, prints, writing materials, carriages, wagons, hats, shoes, clothing, all things made of iron, plate-glass and all other glass, pottery, and many like articles are cheaper—some several hundred per cent. cheaper than before the war, and that very many of these things are now manufactured in this country which before were produced in foreign lands? And who does not know that while this is so, and notwithstanding the farmer's products are not for the time being bringing as good prices as they were a few years ago, they are for the most part sold for far more than they were before the war? In view of this condition of things, what becomes of all the fine-spun theories about the evils that protection will bring upon us, and of what avail are the distorted percentages in which our friends upon the other side so delight to deal?

These are facts which the common people can understand and appreciate, and which will not be hidden from their view by all the sophistries of all the free-traders or revenue-tariff tinkers in the land.

This cheapness of manufactured goods in this country and advance in the price of farm products must be ascribed to the tariff. How else can it be accounted for? If not to be credited to the tariff, it must at least be admitted that it coexists with the tariff; that the tariff does not militate against it. And if the tariff does not prevent this state of things, what harm in permitting it to remain?

But we are told by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] that the rate of wages is higher in free-trade England than in Germany under her protective system, and then he asks, "Why is this?" But he forgets to say that while Germany has a protective system, she has had it only since 1879, and that since she adopted that system the rate of wages has steadily increased, as shown by the following table, which gives the increase for a period of five years, and which is an official statement carefully prepared by the Iron and Steel Association of the empire:

Items.	Increase per cent. from 1879 to 1882.	Increase per cent. from 1879 to 1883.	Increase per cent. from 1879 to 1884.
All works:			
Number employed	25.2	33.9	32.2
Total wages	42.0	57.2	52.1
Wages per employé	13.4	17.4	14.2
Iron and steel works:			
Number employed	23.5	26.9	26.3
Total wages	39.4	50.4	41.4
Wages per employé	12.9	18.5	11.8
Machine shops:			
Number employed	29.3	50.9	32.9
Total wages	48.3	73.6	82.0
Wages per employé	14.6	15.0	18.2

And as evidence that this desirable condition of things did not cease in 1884, the last year mentioned in the table, I quote the language of Mr. George Strachey, Her Britannic Majesty's chargé d'affaires at Dresden, as found in a recent report made by him to the British Government:

The belief is widely diffused that the tariff reform of 1879 saved Germany from great ruin, and that the empire is now on the road to industrial greatness, perhaps to the succession of that hegemony which Great Britain, it is thought, now with difficulty holds in her hands. Protection is in the national air and it will not be dissipated by foreign arguments, however accurately deduced from the axioms of scientific doctrine.

Mr. Strachey is not a protectionist, but a free-trader, and his testimony is not, therefore, that of a willing witness.

The fact is, that the wages in Germany in some industries have already in nine years of protection advanced from a point considerably below those paid in England to a point of equality with them.

THE ENGLISH SOLICITUDE.

A few years ago, in 1879, it is said by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS], our English friends took alarm about the growth and development of our cotton industry, and sent an expert to the United States to inquire whether their industry was imperiled by ours. "He came, he saw," and returned, with the glad assurance to his people—

Be still, sad heart, and cease repining,
Behind the clouds the sun is still shining.

because, as the gentleman from Texas says, he found that the people of this country, while we could beat them in labor cost, like Ephraim, joined to our idols, and maintaining a high tariff on our raw materials, which would prevent our competing with the English. What raw material it was entering into the manufacture of cotton goods, the high tariff on which prevented our manufacturers from competing with those in England, he does not state; but no matter, it sounds well, and like many other free-trade arguments, being only "sound," "signifies nothing."

Now, will our friends upon the other side tell us why it is, if those experts who have been sent over here from England to "spy out the land" report that, owing to our tariff on raw materials, the English manufacturers are safe, there is so much anxiety in England over the passage of this bill? Will they tell us why it is that in 1880, the next year after the journey of the expert, the London Times said:

It is to the New World that the Cobden Club is chiefly looking, as the most likely sphere for its vigorous foreign policy. It has done what it can in Europe and is now turning its eyes westward and bracing itself for the struggle which is to come. It can not rest while the United States are unsubdued.

If the tariff on raw materials was preventing American manufacturers from competing with British manufacturers why was the Cobden Club, made up largely of those same manufacturers, seeking the repeal of the tariff?

If our tariff on raw materials stands in the way of our competing with the English manufacturers, as reported by this mythical expert, why do we find the following British papers using the following language in commenting upon the message:

[The Statist.]

There is hardly a single industry in the United States that is not interested in maintaining protective duties.

[People's Journal, Dundee.]

The change in the American fiscal policy will be beneficial to this country, and the prospect of it has diffused fresh hope throughout the business circles in the city.

[Haddingtonshire Courier, Scotland.]

We may look to an impetus being given to our home trade that will go far to make up for the depression of late years.

[The Scotchman.]

The free importation of iron, coal, and wool would be a great boon to British producers.

It looks a little, Mr. Chairman, as if imposition upon the credulity of the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means had not been confined to making him believe that seamless stockings could not be manufactured in America.

TRUSTS.

But, Mr. Chairman, many of the gentlemen who have advocated this bill have charged that protection fosters trusts, and that a large majority of that pestiferous brood have been organized to deal in or control so-called protected products. Not one of those who have made this assertion has proved or even assumed to attempt to show how protection is favorable to the formation of trusts. They have all been contented with the bald declaration. This form of argument may do for consumption in the districts or among the people represented by these gentlemen, but hardly goes for much here, where we are engaged in the important and responsible duty of trying to ascertain the truth and of shaping the fiscal legislation of sixty millions of people. If protection brings into existence these formidable combinations we want to know it, and that gentleman who can demonstrate it will earn the everlasting gratitude of an abused and anxious public.

Mr. Chairman, while it is true that not one argument or illustration showing or tending to show that these trusts are the offspring of protection has been brought to our notice, there are many proofs to the contrary. The very fact that there is a single unprotected commodity which is the subject of a trust, demonstrates to my mind that protection is not essential; for if a trust can be formed to manipulate the market in one unprotected production, why may it not be to do the same in another and in all; and where, then, is the connection between its formation and the principle of protection? Why, the most gigantic of all trusts, the pioneer and model for all the others, the one whose success has been the inspiration (if anything so wicked can said to be inspired) of all the others, that consists of fifty or more different partnerships and corporations, of which the Standard Oil Company proper is but one—the one whose success and profits have far outstripped that of the Hudson Bay Fur Company, or the world-famous East India Company—the Standard Oil trust—manufactures, deals in, and substantially controls the market in a commodity upon which no protective tariff duty has ever cast its blight.

And this is not the only unprotected commodity controlled or sought to be controlled by a trust; large numbers of such articles are manipulated by them. And within a few days information has come to us over the wires that in the far West a farmers' trust, with a capital of $20,000,000, has been organized, of course for the purpose of controlling or trying to control the products of their industry—the very class of all who, the free-trade orators say, are not protected by our present tariff, but who are the victims of protection unjustly afforded to other industries at the farmers' expense, and to whom by far the greater part of the appeals of the supporters of this bill are directed.

Far be it from me, following after those who are so expert in making unsupported declarations, to assert that these trusts are the result of free trade in, or insufficient tariff protection of, the commodities in which any of them deal; but it would seem that those who are not, or who may fancy that they are not, sufficiently protected in their business would be the very ones to cast about for protection, and would seek to build up a barrier of some kind, to destroy or break down competition. I do not say that this is so; but I submit that there would be much more reason to expect it to be so than that those who our free-trade friends say are so highly protected by a tariff that they are growing immensely rich, and whom they so flippantly call "robbers" and "swindlers," would resort to it.

Again, Mr. Chairman, if protection is the mother of trusts, how is it that they are found to exist in free-trade England?

Oh, no! Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that it would be less disingenuous to inquire whether trusts are not simply another manifestation of that selfishness which exists, and always will exist, in the human heart; that inclination on the part of men engaged in business of any kind to seek advantage over their competitors; that tendency to overreach and thrive at the expense of others, that has been known, at least in rare cases, to invade even the kind and benevolent precincts of an English trader's heart, and has led him to force his odious fiscal and land laws upon impoverished Ireland and his opium trade upon an unwilling and unhappy people.

Would it not be as well to inquire whether a trust is really anything new under the sun; whether it is anything more than another form for the "combinations," "corners," "pools," and "rings" with which for years, reaching back of the enactment of the present tariff law, we have been familiar?

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that this is all there is of it. And I believe, too, that the remedy for the evil does not lie in the destruction of the protective system, under which the country and the whole country has been so prosperous and under which thousands and millions, not members of a trust and who do not dream of becoming members of one, have prospered.

The remedy is rather to be found in State control. It is competent for the people of the respective States, and probably competent for them alone, to take away from partnerships or corporations organized under their laws the power to enter into such combinations, and thus prevent the evils arising from their creation. Then let this work be left with the authority constitutionally empowered to perform it, and let us perform the duty which devolves upon us—decide whether the country shall enter upon the road to ultimate free trade, or whether it shall continue its grand triumphant march on the highway of protection to American labor.

THE SURPLUS.

The Secretary of the Treasury, in his last annual report, states that on the 1st day of December last there was in the Treasury, after every possible obligation, including the sinking-fund requirements, had been provided for, the sum of $55,258,701.19, which was every day growing larger, and which would, as shown by a careful estimate, be increased on the 30th day of next month to $140,000,000.

We are informed by the same official that there has been each year for twenty-two years a surplus of revenue above current annual expenses, amounting during that time, which ended June 30, 1887, to the grand total of $1,491,845,953.12. What was done with this surplus by former administrations? Why, it was applied, except what was needed for permanent funds in the Treasury, as it should have been, to the reduction of the public debt. It never occurred to any former administration that while we were owing an enormous debt there was anything to be done with the annual surplus except to apply it to the payment of our indebtedness.

It was left to the one now in power to discover that there was great danger in the existence of a "surplus" much smaller than that which had been found to exist in each of several former years, and to make frantic appeals for its reduction by removal of tariff duties and gloomy prognostications of the dire results of a failure to do so.

Why is it that the present Administration has not, like its predecessors, applied its surplus to the payment of the bonded debt? It has had ample authority to do so by express provision of law, so plain that it would seem that he that runs might read, and one which this House has, by a two-thirds vote, declared to contain the authority. Why, then, has it not, without being driven to do so by the inexorable demand of public opinion, and by the voice of many of its supporters in this House, instead of endeavoring to alarm the money market, and so bring on a financial panic, gone about doing what any wise business man would have done—paid its debts with its surplus?

The reason is too evident. Having a pet theory to establish, wishing to bring about the adoption in this country of a free-trade system, it has not hesitated to use the assumed pressure of a plethoric and overburdened Treasury to force its peculiar views upon the people. In other words, it has abandoned its relation of servant of the people and assumed that of their guardian and master.

Mr. Chairman, let the Administration continue in the good work of redeeming the outstanding bonds at a large saving of interest, as it has been compelled to do against its will, and it will not be long before there will be no "surplus" to complain of, and in its place will be found a large decrease in the principal of the public debt, and consequent reduction in the interest burden upon the people.

But, Mr. Chairman, if for any reason this course should not be found practicable, or if unfriendliness to this method shall result in tardy action in this direction, the Democratic majority in this House can find ample ways to prevent the future accumulation of any surplus in the Treasury by wise expenditure of the money that shall come into it.

A bill has already been passed by the Senate of the United States, providing for the expenditure of $77,000,000 in eight years, in the education of the illiterate masses which will, if not enlightened, so dangerously threaten our peace during the coming years; a bill which a large majority of the members of this House would gladly vote for; but which, in obedience to the behest of the free-trade cabal that rules the Democratic majority, sleeps the sleep of death in the committee-room.

The dependent-pension bill, that act of tardy justice to the disabled defenders of the Union, is upon the Union Calendar of this House awaiting action. Pass it, and a large portion, if not all, of the so-called "surplus" will be distributed among the people, and one of our most sacred obligations will be discharged.

A service-pension bill, an act of justice to the survivors of the war, the passage of which the late Democratic convention of Indiana in a catch-vote mood so heartily indorsed, would dispose of a large portion, and perhaps all of the surplus revenue in the Treasury. I say "catch-vote mood," because the representatives of that party on this floor are supporting, and that same convention approved in another resolution, a policy which will make it impossible to pay the pension so indorsed.

Our coast defenses are calling for repairs and improvements, without which we are absolutely at the mercy of foreign nations; and this would require the expenditure of a large sum.

Our Navy is in great need of extension. The same necessity that exists for the erection and repair of coast defenses obtains with respect to the enlargement and increased efficiency of our Navy. In the event of a foreign war our Navy as at present constituted and provided would not be able to cope with those of even third-rate powers. To strengthen and improve our Navy, so that it would be able to enforce our rights on the high seas and protect our coast, would require an expenditure which would greatly reduce the "surplus."

Again, to refund to the States that paid them the direct taxes that were collected from them, and the retaining of which by reason of the refusal and neglect of the other States to pay their share has resulted in such a gross injustice, would take about $17,000,000 from the "surplus" and circulate it among the people.

To refund this money was so apparently an act of justice that three-fifths of the members of this House insisted upon doing it, through an eight days' continuous session, until enough of them, at the crack of the party whip, "took the back track" to indefinitely postpone the justice, and at the same time save the sacred "surplus."

But, Mr. Chairman, if we are not to pay our honest debts and liberal pensions, nor refund the direct tax, nor build and repair our coast defenses, nor increase our Navy, nor instruct our ignorance, and we are to reduce our revenue, the only question remaining is in what manner shall such reduction be accomplished. The President and a majority of the Committee on Ways and Means say it shall be done by a reduction of the duties on imports and the admission of certain articles now paying duties to the free-list.

The amount of the surplus for the current year is estimated at $113,000,000. I have attempted in my feeble way to show why this reduction should not be secured in the manner suggested by these gentlemen. It remains for me as an honest man, upon the responsibility resting in part upon me as a representative of the people, to give my views upon the way in which the flow of this surplus into the Treasury may be prevented.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I would be glad, if we are to reduce the revenues to current expenses, to see the whole internal-revenue system abolished. It is a system of taxation, pure and simple, and direct in its character, and one that has never been resorted to in this country except in emergencies. It is odious in its burdens and odious in the methods of its collection. Under it the tax-gatherer can enter and invade the privacies of homes and have admission to business men's most valued secrets. It accomplishes its end, and in many cases can only do so, by a system of espionage calling to its aid spies and emissaries.

The repeal of this system would dispose at once of the whole question of a supposed surplus. That surplus is estimated at $113,000,000. The income derived from the internal revenue last year was $118,000,000, which, less the expense of its collection, $4,000,000, would leave the reduction almost precisely equal to the surplus. It is to be observed further in this connection that this would also dismiss an army of officials, four thousand in number, and reduce the expenses of the Government $4,000,000 a year. What better way can be devised to settle this vexed question of a surplus than this? But it is said by the supporters of this bill that this would be leaving the burdens upon the necessaries of life and taking it off from the vices. It is interesting to note, in this connection, that this is the first time in the history of the Democratic party that they have been solicitous to keep burdens upon vice and relieve the necessaries. They are so anxious to place burdens upon vice that they are willing to burden the people with four millions of expense to do it. As is sometimes the case with other new converts, their zeal has got the better of their sense. If the Democratic party in its new-born zeal to reduce the cost of the necessaries, wishes to remove the burdens therefrom, why does it not admit sugar, that article of prime necessity that enters into the consumption every day of the poorest in the land, to the free-list? It pretends to be anxious to warm the poor man's body; why not also be anxious to sweeten his cup? The answer is too plain. It is for political reasons that this unjust discrimination is made. No Democrat can, nor has attempted to, explain it. It is not the only respect in which this bill is truckling, dishonest, cowardly, and sectional.

There is another reason why this tax should be removed from spirits and fermented liquors. The matter of taxing the liquor traffic should be left with the States, the only authority that can, under our Constitution, as a police regulation, impose a tax upon the traffic as distinguished from the liquors themselves. The General Government should not in any manner stand nor seem to stand in the way of the proper exercise of this power by the States to eradicate this great evil from the land, except in the event of a dire necessity, like a war or the resulting necessity for large revenue to pay the cost of it.

But, Mr. Chairman, while this would be my way of preventing the accumulation of a surplus, I am not unwilling to vote for any other method upon which a majority can agree that will at the same time continue in force without any impairment the principle of protection to American labor.

I am willing to vote in a spirit of harmony and compromise for the repeal of all the internal revenue derived from the tax on tobacco and cigars and the special taxes on manufacturers of and dealers in those articles, the tax on spirits used in the arts, and the duty upon sugar. This would, less the amount of a sugar bounty, of which I shall speak, reduce the income ninety-five millions which is perhaps as large a reduction as can safely be made.

To repeal the duty on sugar, under the circumstances, would be no violation of the principle of protection to home industries, since the experience of the past demonstrates that there can not be produced in this country from cane above 10 per cent. of our consumption of this article, owing to climatic and other reasons that will continue to exist. When it is impossible, in the nature of things, to produce an amount of any article of common consumption nearly equal to that consumption, that is not one of those articles that should be protected by a tariff, any more than an article which we can not produce in any quantity. There are of late, however, indications that owing to new inventions and discoveries the manufacture of sugar from beets and sorghum may prove successful, and may yet, with proper encouragement, equal the great demand in this country.

I would, therefore, while removing the duty from this article, provide for a bounty which would sufficiently protect the cane-sugar industry, and at the same time stimulate the experiments which are now promising so much in the way of the production of sugar from sorghum and beets.

But, Mr. Chairman, to return to a subject which I have already touched. We have a public debt of nearly twelve hundred millions. When, I ask the gentlemen upon the other side, do they propose to pay that? If there is to be no income beyond current expenses, when can that be paid? More than two hundred millions of the bonded debt fall due in 1891, now close at hand. How shall they be met at maturity? I suppose our friends upon the other side would say, by making a new loan. But are they in favor of indefinitely continuing our debt? Do they believe that "a public debt is a public blessing?" Do

they want to follow in the footsteps of Great Britain and have and forever continue a public loan? The alacrity with which they favor the English idea of free trade may well create the suspicion that they are also willing to continue indefinitely our public debt, because that, too, is "English, you know."

For myself, Mr. Chairman, I have to say that I am in favor of a continuance of the policy of the Republican party, of paying our debts until the last cent of them shall be liquidated; not only those that are bonded, but those other large amounts that are equally as sacred. And the American people, too, are in favor of this policy. They always have been, and have given no sign of a change of opinion. Not a petition has come up to this House during this session of nearly six months' duration asking for any change. A great deal has been said about the burdens of taxation resting upon the people and the necessity for removing them. I call the attention of the American people to a fact which perhaps, owing to the clamor of the Democratic politicians, has escaped their attention, that not a single person has asked this Congress by petition to reduce taxation by a reduction or repeal of tariff duties. Not one. The RECORD will fail to disclose that a single petition has been introduced for that purpose. There could be no stronger evidence that all this talk about the people's groaning under their burdens of taxation has no foundation. It all emanates from the brains of politicians who see the handwriting on the wall that their party has been "weighed in the balance and found wanting," and who are casting about for some issue or party shibboleth with which they may make an attempt to hoodwink the people into intrusting them again with political power.

And, Mr. Chairman, while there is such a dearth of petitions for the passage of the Mills bill, or any similar measure, the record of the proceedings of this House discloses the fact that thousands upon thousands of our people, in all walks of life, but especially those engaged in labor, are, by petitions addressed to us, crying out and protesting against its passage. To all these prayers the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means turn a deaf ear; they give these people no hearing; but, taking counsel alone of the demands of their own political fortunes, they insist upon saying to these people, "You don't know what you want. We alone are able to determine that. What you need is not a continuation of our own American system, but its destruction, and the erection upon its ruins of a foreign system, for which, while it is true you do not ask for it, every English manufacturer and every English ship-owner is devoutly praying; and this being an English administration, to them alone do we give ear."

Mr. Chairman, a vast amount of valuable time has been occupied in the course of this debate by those advocating this bill in the vain attempt to show that the placing of wool upon the free-list will not injure the producers of wool. The same men who say this complain that a duty upon any other manufactured article than wool—and wool is a manufactured article—enhances the profits upon that article to its manufacturer. If it does, why not also to the producer of wool? If a duty will give more profit to one manufacturer, why not to another? To an ordinary mind this question is unanswerable. Even some of those rending the air for free wool admit that the duty does enable the wool-grower to make a better profit; but they say if he will only let them take the duty off he can buy his woolen clothes enough cheaper to make up the difference. If taking the duty off would have the effect thus claimed, how many wool-growers are there raising so small an amount of wool that the difference in the price of their woolen clothing would equal the profits they would lose upon their wool? An exceedingly small number, indeed.

It takes not over 6 pounds of wool to make a suit of heavy clothing for a man. It does not take as much for a woman; but assuming that it does, an average family, say one of five persons, would thus gain at 12 cents, the highest duty per pound upon the 30 pounds of wool required to furnish each of them a good suit of woolen clothing for each year, the sum of $3.60. The President in his remarkable message says that a large proportion of the sheep owned by the farmers are found in small flocks, numbering from twenty-five to fifty. It is my observation that a very small portion of the sheep-owners of the country have only twenty-five. I believe that the average would not be less than seventy-five. But suppose the average to be only fifty. According to the President the enhanced value of their wool would be, because of the tariff, $36. Thus we find that the increased cost of clothing of the farmer, because of the tariff, is $3.60, while his increased profit is $36. In other words, that his profit, by reason of the tariff, is just ten times his loss by it. Now, I have made no allowance for blankets for the family of the sheep-owner. Suppose he bought two blankets a year, weighing 5 pounds each, which would be a liberal estimate, his entire tax, by reason of the wool tariff, would be only $1.80; but to be entirely safe, suppose we double the amount of wool required, we would then have a tax of $9.60, an amount equal to only about one-fourth of the farmer's profit on his wool.

Now, all this is on the theory that the amount of the tariff is added to the cost to the consumer of the article upon which it is levied, while our experience shows that woolens are produced almost as cheaply under the tariff as they can be produced in England, and the President's argument falls to the ground. Even while I am speaking, an all-wool business suit for a man, cut in the latest fashion, elegantly made, and fit for any man to wear, can be bought in the shadow of this Capitol for $10, and coarser styles for proportionately lower sums—prices that certainly refute all argument to the effect that a tariff begets high prices to the consumer.

And when, as has been shown upon this floor without dispute, a pair of blankets of precisely the same weight and quality as those which cost in England $4.45, and upon which tariff duties and charges of $4.90 are levied, making a total of $9.35, are sold in this country at $5.20, it is about time for the President and his co-workers in this House, and for everybody else, to cease making the monstrous claim that the tariff laws "raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties."

Now, if the argument addressed to wool-growers that they can buy their clothing enough cheaper to make up for their loss on the price of their wool is a good one, why is it not equally as good applied to any other producers—to the manufacturers of all the multiplied articles which human ingenuity and industry can produce for the comfort or use of man? Why apply it to wool alone? And if it can be applied to all those industries as well as to wool, why does not the argument result logically in free trade, when all the expenses of the Government shall be raised by a direct tax and the custom-houses shall be abolished? Some of the gentlemen on the other side, not seeing any escape from this logic, accept it as good and boldly avow themselves as in favor of free trade. They are the consistent ones. The argument of the President as certainly ends in ultimate free trade as any conclusion ever resulted from a major and minor premise; and, Mr. Chairman, if the people of this country are ever deluded or driven or persuaded, or dragged by their political leaders into the support of this bill, those leaders will be justified in taking further steps towards free trade, as they can well plead as an excuse that the people have declared in favor of such a policy.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened in vain during the debate for one expression from that portion of the Democratic majority upon the floor of this House who are most vigorously demanding the passage of this bill, to wit, the gentlemen representing the cotton belt, of sympathy for the cause of labor; for the expression of a single desire for the advancement of the cause of labor; for any commendation of this bill because it will enhance the price of labor or better the condition of the laborer. Why is this? The advocates of protection on this floor say that protection will increase the price of labor, and give that as one of the strongest reasons for their support of the system; but the gentlemen from the extreme South, while denying that protection will do what its friends claim, yet sing no peans to labor, speak no good word for it, express no solicitude for its welfare. On the contrary, one of those gentlemen has stated, during this debate, that he wants not only cheap goods, but an opportunity to procure cheap labor; and another, the accomplished and able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], announces and adheres to the exploded doctrine that no warrant can be found in the Constitution for the protection of labor.

Mr. Chairman, do not these gentlemen thus ignore the claims of labor because they mistakingly conceive the cheapening of labor to be in their interest and that of their constituents? Do they not wish to keep the insufficient remuneration of labor at the low ebb where it now stands in the South that they may be able to raise their cotton, rice, and sugar at the lowest possible cost, and thus increase their profits on those commodities? This I believe to be the reason of their ignoring of labor. They stand in the same position that their free-trade predecessors of *ante bellum* days occupied. Their chief object was to procure cheap food and clothing for their slaves who performed their labor. The desire of those who follow them is now, since slavery has been abolished, to procure the labor of their former slaves at the lowest possible figure. Consequently they wish to see no general advance in the price of all kinds of labor, which would surely follow the establishment in the South of manufacturing industries under the beneficent ægis of a protective system.

The funny member from Mississippi [Mr. ALLEN], as a part of his remarks, introduced and presumably indorsed a long screed in the form of part of a letter from one Dr. B. F. Ward, of Mississippi, whoever he is (a near relative, judging from his "amoozing" production, of the late Artemus), in which the assumed virtues and greatness of the South and the shortcomings and unimportance of the North are set forth in terms as glowing as untruthful.

That part of the letter introduced is as follows. I introduce it again that the people of my district and my section may have further opportunity to understand the animus and present attitude of the unreconstructed rebels of the South and their representatives on this floor:

> No careful observer will probably deny that among the wealthy and fashionable classes at the North there is more idleness and extravagance, more folly and arrogance, more dissipation and vice, and a more impassable barrier between rich and poor than ever existed in the most opulent social circle of slave-holders. For however aristocratic they may have been, they were always courteous and refined. In the North the tendency to divide society on financial lines has grown with constantly increasing intensity for more than half a century, until now it is almost definitely established. The very rich and very poor are as widely separated as Dives and Lazarus. In the old South, on the contrary, there were processes constantly at work, effecting a gradual and steady diffusion of wealth, which preserved in a great measure the homogeneity of society.

Prominent among the agencies were the matrimonial alliances so often contracted between the families of the rich and poor. In fact, it was the rule for the active, intellectual, ambitious young men from the poorer families to marry the daughters of wealthy planters. Instead of attempting to restrain these alliances they were generally encouraged by wealthy parents, with a view to preserving the physical and mental vigor of their families without sacrificing their estates. To employ a homely but expressive phrase, "brains and money were constantly combining" to build up and preserve in the old South the finest society in the world, to the exclusion of those twin evils, the millionaire and the tramp.

The fine moral and intellectual organization of Southern children has heretofore been largely due to the fact that their mothers were exempt from the hardships of physical drudgery and the depressing effects of impending want. The poorest man in the South supported his family with comparative ease, because of the gently rising gradations in society and the universal liberality of the stronger toward the weakest. How is it in those countries so long freed from the "curse of slavery," but where mechanical invention is progressively increasing the congestion of wealth and stimulating luxurious living among the rich, while it alarmingly swells the ranks of the hungry laborer, the socialist, and the pauper? Take Massachusetts, the "hub" of free schools, free labor, and boasted intelligence, as a fair representative. The average expenses of laboring men who are the heads of families in Massachusetts amount to $754.42, while their earnings average $558.68. In other words, the workingman falls short of a support for his family $195.74, or 32 per cent. It is wrung from the toil of the mother and children, not through the discharge of the ordinary domestic duties of woman's sphere, but in the wages mill.

One-third of the enterprises of great pith and moment, rather than the nursery of scribblers. She has made history for others to write and sell. She has carved with the sword the pathway of the pen and made America the stronghold of the Anglo-Saxon race. The first resolutions declaring the right of the colonies to be "free and independent" were introduced into a Southern legislature by a Southern man. The first resolutions to the same effect were presented in the Colonial Congress by another Southern man, and took form and consistence in the Declaration of Independence, under the matchless genius of still another Southern man. A Southern man led the patriot armies to victory, and established the possibilities of the proudest nation on the earth. A Southern man was prime mover of the convention that framed the Constitution. When the Government had been created its organic law was still an unexplained book, a ponderous oar in unskilled hands.

It was left for the greatest legal mind of the age, a Southern Chief-Justice, to analyze and stamp upon it the construction which will be accepted as long as the Constitution is respected. A Southern man framed the ordinance for the organization and government of the great Northwestern Territory, an instrument second in importance only to the Constitution of the United States. A Southern man was the author of the republican theory of popular government which prevailed during the sixty years of our greatest prosperity, peace, and happiness. Of the fifteen Presidents of the Continental Congress, eight were from slave States. From 1789 to 1853, a period of sixty-four years, embracing eleven administrations, the slave States furnished eight Presidents, whose terms of service covered fifty-two years.

During the same time the free States furnished three Presidents, whose combined terms covered twelve years. Of twelve Vice-Presidents, four were from slave States. Under these eleven administrations the slave States supplied fourteen Secretaries of State, eleven Secretaries of War, six Secretaries of the Treasury, nine Secretaries of the Navy, and eight Postmaster-Generals. Of fifty-five Presidents *pro tempore* of the Senate, thirty-one Speakers of the House, twenty-two were from slave States. Of five Chief-Justices two, and the only two of great eminence, were from slave States. Of twenty-nine Associate-Justices, seventeen were from slave States. Of twenty-one Attorney-Generals, fourteen were from slave States. Of one hundred and eighty-five public ministers to foreign countries, ninety-nine were from slave States.

Without going further into exhaustive details, for which material is abundant and overwhelming, we affirm, without fear of decent denial, that along the lines of these fifty-two years are ranged all the broad and lofty conceptions of statesmanship, all the bold and fruitful enterprises, all the grand and comprehensive achievements from which have evolved the pride, the power, and the glory of the American people.

The war of 1812 was scarcely less important in its results than the war of independence. The one left us an embryonic nation; the other developed full-grown power, wiping out the results of twenty-five years, planting our flag upon the ocean, and dissolving every doubt in the minds of foreign powers that we were a Government *de facto*, and entitled to a place in the front rank of nations. This war, we are told by a Northern historian, "was a Southern measure for the protection of Northern interests;" yet it was inaugurated and pressed to a triumphant issue under the administration of a Southern slaveholder, supported by a "solid South," in the face of the almost solid opposition of the free States. Who were the master spirits of that struggle? Such men as Clay, Calhoun, Monroe, Grundy, Lowndes, and Crawford; while only five Senators north of the Delaware voted to sustain it.

In the gloomiest and most critical days of the conflict, New England, which "writes all the books," was holding a secession convention, denouncing the war and intriguing with the emissaries of Great Britain. As a consequence, when England sent her powerful fleet to invest our ports, she exempted the coast of New England from the operations of the blockade. When the success of the war had established its popularity in the free States, a Southern man formulated the financial policy which extinguished its immense debt in less than twenty years.

Under these same "slothful and demoralizing" auspices of slavery the great Indian wars were fought, their magnificent country opened to white settlement, the savages removed, and measures adopted for their civilization. Florida was acquired from Spain, and from France that vast domain, the Louisiana Territory, comprising more than one million square miles, greater in extent and richer in resources than the whole territory of the then existing United States, and giving us the sole ownership of the Mississippi River from its sources to the Gulf. This one achievement, conceived and accomplished by a Southern President, through the supreme skill and courage of a Southern diplomatist, overshadows in its stupendous proportions, outweighs in the vastness of its results every national measure presented by Northern statesmanship and secured by Northern enterprise since the landing at Plymouth Rock. It was this far-reaching stroke of Southern diplomacy which elicited from the great Napoleon the prophetic remark that the "acquisition of Louisiana forever strengthens the power of the United States and gives to England a maritime rival that will some day humble her pride."

The war for the independence of Texas and the administration of its government by its Southern Presidents was another manifestation of the "slothful energies" of the "dependent idlers" and "overseers." The war with Mexico and the annexation of Texas were assailed by the free States with the same vehement opposition which they had presented to the last war with England; but a Southern President again held the helm, the pluck and patriotism of the "gentlemen idlers" once more prevailed, and Columbia took in her embrace the giant of whom it has been graphically said: "If Texas were laid on the face of Europe, with the head resting on the mountains of Norway, one palm covering London and the other Warsaw, it would stretch across the kingdom of Denmark, across the empires of Germany and Austria, across Northern Italy, and bathe its feet in the Mediterranean."

It is capable of producing 12,000,000 bales of cotton and will have a cattle range left larger than the whole State of New York. This war, prosecuted by the enervated, non-progressive "overseers," gathered into the national domain also the Territory of New Mexico, itself larger than the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland; extended the national boundary to the Pacific, and opened to the world the Golden Gate of California.

Mr. Tillet, in his haste to elevate the new South by degrading the old, forgets that most of the representative men of the new South, her Senators, Congressmen, Cabinet officers, governors, judges, jurists, leading journalists, college professors, eminent divines, and successful men of business in every line were born and educated under the "curse of slavery." There is no new South. The term is a misnomer and a myth. It is simply a phrase costume in which old prejudices masquerade through modern prints, seeking to pervert the education of Southern children into the conviction that their ancestors, if not criminal, were little more than a race of "idiots," blunderers, blockheads, and failures. But the present or future generations will never find reason to be ashamed of the brainwork of the old South.

He tells us that the wealthy families in the South, with a view to preserving the physical and mental vigor of their families without sacrificing their estates, encouraged matrimonial alliances between their daughters and the sons of the poor. That the vigor, physical and mental, of the wealthy families of the South needed the infusion of new blood from some outside source, I am not prepared to deny, but he fails to tell us what alliances were provided for the sons of the rich. They seem to have been overlooked. Or were their alliances not matrimonial, but contracted outside the pale of that sacred relation, and between them and their bondwomen? The tell-tale bleaching complexions of the African race in the South only too plainly answer this question. Who wonders that the families of the rich in the South needed more mental and physical vigor?

Brains and money were constantly combining, he says, to build up and preserve in the South the finest society in the world "to the exclusion of those twin evils, the millionaire and the tramp." The arrogance of this claim is only equaled by its oblivion of the combination that existed between brains and the greed for money to build up and preserve slavery, that "twin relic of barbarism."

This same reliable gentleman tells us in his remarkable letter that all the brains, all the patriotism, all the moral worth of the country in the early days of the Republic were found in Southern men; but he forgets to point out which one of them all was from the cotton States, that section to which he belongs, and which is attempting, by the passage of this bill, to fasten upon the whole country the infamous labor-impoverishing system of English free trade.

He does not remind us that of all the splendid galaxy of great men who introduced into a Southern Legislature the first resolutions declaring the right of the colonies to be "free and independent," who presented the first resolutions to the same effect in the Colonial Congress, who wrote the Declaration of Independence, who led the patriot armies to victory, who were the prime movers of the convention that formed the Constitution, who stamped upon the Constitution the construction which will be accepted as long as the Constitution is respected, and who framed the ordinance of 1787, not one was from the cotton States of the Union, not one from that portion of the South denominated "solid," where elections are a farce, and where Representatives on this floor are, with few exceptions, recorded as coming with "no opposition," by a vote in many instances less than one-tenth of the legally authorized constituency. He is also careful to omit mention of the glorious part which his own State has taken in all the grand achievements of the country's history.

He does not mention the name of one "illustrious son" of Mississippi who, possessed of that "fine moral and intellectual organization" of which he prates, has shed any luster on our country. Has this Mr. Ward, or has the gentleman from Mississippi, the name of one to give us? Why is it that while the South has been making "history for others to write and sell" the State of Mississippi has received in that history no mention worthy of record, except that she repudiated her honest debts, and was the home of the only president of the only Confederacy ever organized to destroy that Constitution which this braggart in his letter boasts Southern men framed, established, and construed?

But the "apex of audacity," to use the language of another, is reached by this scribbler, when, as a stigma upon the fair fame of the North, he repeats the stale and long ago exploded lie that the Hartford convention was a "secession convention," and when the only "secession conventions" ever held were in those States, including his own, which through him are arrogating to themselves all the virtue and greatness and patriotism in the land.

While recounting the glories of the "old South," as he is pleased to call it, why does he finish his record at 1853? Is he ashamed of the part the "Senators, Congressmen, Cabinet officers, governors, judges, jurists, leading journalists, college professors, and eminent divines," "born and educated under the curse of slavery" have taken in the period since that year? Is he not equally as proud of the glorious part "Southern men" have taken in that period of our glorious history as of that period to which he confines his praise? Is it strange, Mr. Chairman, that a man who thus extols slavery, and the system of society which it created and fostered, should protest against anything "new," and declare that there is no "new South," and that the term is simply a "phrase costume?"

It is just such men as this that have kept and are trying to keep the South in the shadow of the past; who constantly wave the "bloody shirt" and get mad because they can not have a monopoly of the business; who refuse to look forward, but have always their eyes towards the rear of the procession. It is not strange that the South should be so slow to avail herself of the benefits of the American system of protection to labor when men who are capable of writing such stuff are complimented on this floor as "distinguished citizens" and their productions are read and indorsed by honorable representatives from that section.

Mr. Chairman, I deny the imputations implied in the attempt of this letter to belittle the part taken by the men of the North in securing and maintaining our liberties. Her great names come trooping into my memory. Her Adamses, Franklins, Morrises, Schuylers, Shermans, Warrens, Hamiltons, Jays, Livingstons, and a host of others make up the noble array. Their deeds I do not need to recount; they are written on the glorious pages of imperishable history. And I am reminded that while it may be true that men of the South were the first to pass resolutions (and I honor their memory), men of the North were the first to act, and the first to seal their devotion by shedding their blood in defense of American independence.

I have only disgust and contempt for the fulsome twaddle in which this man talks about the "fine moral and intellectual" superiority of the men of the South over those of the North, and the sneers with which he speaks of the "hungry laborer, the socialist, and the paupers" of the North. It smacks of the sentiment so prevalent in the days of the "old South," that the farmers of the North were the "mudsills" of society and the mechanics were "greasy," so often and so defiantly flung into the faces of the patient freemen of the North before the days when it was demonstrated that it took more than one of those Southern cavaliers to whip five "mudsills" and "greasy" mechanics, and when it became necessary for those same "mudsills" and "mechanics," by their prowess and devotion to human liberty, on a thousand fields, to defend that Constitution which only Southern men established and construed, against the deadly assaults of their descendants.

Mr. Chairman, free-trade writers and orators are given to gloomy prognostications of impending ruin. But somehow such forecasts have always proved to be the mistaken utterances of trembling fear, and have never been realized. Many of those who stand high in the councils of the free-traders have been thus unfortunate in their prophecies.

Hon. David A. Wells, in a speech delivered by him in Cooper Institute, in November, 1883, and in which he claimed that protection had so stimulated manufacturing in this country that the home market was overstocked, and until free trade should come to our relief we should go on from bad to worse, said:

> Things will grow worse until, through wreck and disaster, the home domestic manufacturing production is forced down into correspondence with or below the requirements for domestic consumption, unless in the mean time, through a change in our national fiscal policy, other and larger markets and outlets for our present surplus product can be opened, or some special providence, like famine or war in the Old World, comes to temporarily help us out of our dilemma.

Well, neither foreign war nor famine has come to our relief; there has been no change in our fiscal policy, nor has there been any forcing down of production; but, on the contrary, many more manufacturing establishments have been commenced, and the production from shops and farms has been largely increased, and no "wreck and disaster" have come, and we are more prosperous and wages are higher and goods are more in demand than then. The fact is, and one which Mr. Wells in the same speech admits, that at that time there was, as all will remember, a general stagnation in business throughout the civilized world, including even free-trade England, from which our country, owing to the fiscal policy of which Mr. Wells complains, has recovered more rapidly and more surely than the nations of the Old World.

Again, he said in the same speech:

> A continuation of the causes and policy which restricts our American manufacturer merely to the domestic market for the sale of his products and debars him in a great degree from access to foreign markets, inevitably means, therefore, low wages and the degradation and impoverishment of the masses, or insures the very results which it is claimed a high-tariff policy is certain to avert.

Well, nearly five years have elapsed, and while the policy of which he complains has continued we have not had low wages nor degradation and impoverishment of the masses, but, on the contrary, an advance in wages and the opposite of degradation and impoverishment of the masses.

Mr. Chairman, the argument of the free-trader and of the advocates of this bill, it seems to me, is a sordid dollar-and-cent argument. It rises to no great height. It has to do only with the question, How much cheaper can I buy a suit of clothes or a pair of shoes. It does not take a comprehensive and patriotic view of the situation. It does not ask what is the best thing for the country as a whole, but what is best for me as an individual. It does not occupy the standpoint of the country's glory, of its increase in wealth and power, of the multiplication of its industries. It does not take an account of America as standing by herself and for herself. It does not appeal to our patriotism, but to our love of money. It expresses no desire to see the price of labor enhanced, but drivels about cheaper clothing for those who have first to earn their money before they can buy clothing, either cheap or dear.

It does not glory in a system of our own, but has its eye fixed upon the system of a foreign people no more adapted to our situation than is that same people's government to our free Constitution. In short, it looks backwards and not forwards. It would foist upon a young, vigorous, progressive, and free people the old, worn-out, effete, impoverishing, and class-preferring system of a country whose rich are ever growing richer and whose poor are ever growing poorer. It is not the argument that the American people will listen to. It is not the argument that a people who unhesitatingly assumed the expenditure of $10,000,000,000 and the sacrifice of half a million of valuable lives to sustain and enforce a great principle will appreciate. They still love that country they sacrificed so much to save, and are looking forward to her greater and grander glory, when her people, through and by means of her beneficent protective system—her own American system—shall surpass the prosperity and happiness which they have already achieved, and stand unrivaled in the world's history in all that constitutes a people's greatness.

And now, Mr. Chairman, what is our duty as representatives and patriots? Shall we, in response to the demands of *doctrinaires*, and in the face of our experience, abandon a policy under which we have advanced from a third-rate to a first-rate power; under which we have undergone a complete industrial revolution; under which we have emerged from a condition of comparative obscurity to the proud position among the nations typified by the magnificent figure, with torch in hand shining a hundred miles out to sea, of "Liberty Enlightening the World;" under which we quelled the greatest rebellion recorded in history; under which we have more rapidly and more easily paid the enormous debt incurred thereby than could any other nation ever organized among men; under which labor has more liberty, more rights, more comforts, more power than under any other government on the earth; under which religion is freer, truth more untrammeled, freedom more assured, and wealth more diffused than among any other people?

Shall we continue the policy of keeping American markets for American labor, and so foster our own industries and build up our own greatness, or shall we return to our condition before all this greatness and glory came upon us, to that condition always following free-trade legislation, and surrender to England our independence and prosperity?

To these questions for myself I have but one answer. I stand for the toilers of America, their continued and increasing prosperity, and the consequent glory of my country.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, in considering the subject covered by this bill we are addressing ourselves to a duty which in every age has been the most important that has devolved on the representatives of the people. Inherent in the very idea of human government, no matter under what system, no matter how crude or how perfect, is the principle that each individual member must make some contribution to a common fund to be used for the common good.

Every individual who is worthy to become a member of organized society, known as government, will cheerfully make this contribution just so long as he feels that the amount exacted approximates a fair distribution of the common burdens among those to be benefited, and no longer.

The methods by which these contributions are gathered into the common fund, no matter how simple or how complex; no matter how harsh or how insidious in their operation; no matter whether paid in hard cash out of the citizen's pocket, or by the sale of his property by a collector, or concealed in the enhanced price of what he eats, drinks, or wears, constitute taxation.

It certainly goes without saying that under our boasted free government, whose people we are representing in our deliberations on this bill, both the methods and measure of taxation ought to be just and equal to every citizen wherever be his home or whatever be his occupation. However much we may differ on other propositions; however difficult it may be for the member on this side of the House to convince the member on that side that when the consumer has paid $1.47 for an article that it cost only $1 to produce he is poorer than he would have been had he bought it for the $1; and however difficult it may be for the member on that side to convince this side that the man who paid the extra 47 cents received a blessing in disguise; however persistently and vociferously and ingeniously the tax-eater may plead with the taxpayer that both are made richer by the peculiar twist of the wrist by which this operation was performed; however doggedly the tax-payer may insist that the emptiness of his pocket is none the less real because his money was taken by a process which he was led to believe would fill rather than empty his purse! however much we may debate these questions, I venture the assertion that no man in this Hall or out of it will be found to say that the burdens of the Government, like its blessings, ought not to fall equally on all the people.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is fortunately one other proposition upon which we can all agree. Much adverse criticism of the President's bold, fearless, and manly message has been indulged in, both in this and in the other end of the Capitol, and in the press, by the representatives of those whose "business interests," as they style their right under the existing laws to levy contribution on the necessaries of life, they say will be disturbed if this bill passes. At first some were even bold enough to say that there ought to be no reduction of taxation;

that instead of reduction of taxation there ought to be expansion of expenditure to get rid of the surplus; that the representatives of the people ought to be as fertile in expedients to squander the surplus as they had been in expedients to collect it; that they ought to be able to find or invent some new drain by which an overflowing Treasury might be emptied. With them it mattered not how or where the money was expended, so it was expended, and the necessity for tax reduction averted. But this idea was advanced cautiously to ascertain whether the people would submit to having their money thus squandered. An unmistakable negative response from the press and the people has warned the opponents of revenue reform that the people stand guard over this avenue of escape from the duty they owe their constituents, and have promised time and again to discharge—to reduce taxation.

So that now I believe I am justified in saying that no member on that side of the House, however he may hate to see the pruning-knife of revenue reform applied, however much he may resist reduction of taxation, will dare to rise in his seat and say that more money is not collected from the people than ought be collected, or that the remedy for this surplus is not to reduce taxation and leave the money in the pockets of the people, where it belongs. Hence I say that upon this proposition we are all agreed, that the way to prevent a surplus is to reduce taxation. I know that is the unanimous judgment of this side of the House, and if any one of my Republican friends on the other side of the aisle believes now that the surplus ought not be reduced by reducing taxation, I would like to have him announce that fact as part of the platform on which he asks his constitutents to return him to this House.

Then, Mr. Chairman, agreeing that taxes ought to be reduced, how much and on what ought they be reduced? Ought they be reduced so as to relieve the tax-payers of the most possible or of the least possible of the burdens that taxation necessarily brings? Shall the reduction be made in the interest of those who lose by taxation or in the interest of those who gain by taxation? Shall the reduction be made at the dictation of the gentlemen on the other side of this House who represent those who receive largely more of the amount paid by the people than the Government itself, or shall it be made under the direction of gentlemen on this side of the House who represent those who are appealing to have some part of a ruinous and unnecessary burden rolled off their shoulders?

In short, shall we repeal internal-revenue taxes, every dollar of which is levied on luxuries and when collected goes into the Federal Treasury, or shall we reduce tariff taxation, less than one dollar of which out of four paid reaches that Treasury, the other three going into the pockets of the manufacturing capitalists, corporations, and trusts, for whom, attempt to disguise the fact as they may, our Republican friends are making the fight on this floor? I shall not stop now to discuss the question whether this three-fourths of the enormous toll gathered by these manufacturing capitalists, combines, and trusts, while the Government gathers one-fourth, is ever, by a peculiar process of legerdemain which no human being has ever yet been able to understand, voluntarily transferred from the pockets of these charitable capitalists back to the pockets of the laboring men and farmers whence it was taken. I leave that question for the manufacturing laborer, struggling with capital and Pinkerton's armed detectives for enough of his hard earnings to keep want and hunger from the door of his cabin, to answer. I leave the answer to that question to the Western and Southern farmer, competing single handed and unprotected in the markets of the world against the cheapest labor in the world with his wheat and cotton for enough money to pay the annual interest on the mortgages that tariff-fatted capital has fastened on his humble home. But we are asked to believe that capitalists are honest and liberal and magnanimous, and generous, and just. Only get the tribute of protection into their pockets and they will divide liberally with the farmer and the laborer. They must exercise faith in the generosity and liberality of the capitalists. Nobody can see how they get back their share of this tribute which consumption pays to manufacturing production, but they are asked to trust.

For myself, Mr. Chairman, I have come to loathe and despise the word "trust," as applied to wrongs now committed under that name. I believe that if it was within the scope of legislation I would vote for a bill to strike it from the English language.

Mr. Chairman, I have in my short service on this floor heard from this side of the House some of the severest arraignments of trusts. Indeed, I wish to be just and say that through this debate, when driven to the wall, many of our friends on the other side of the House have disclaimed any desire to legislate in the interest of trusts.

But, sir, there is one trust; a legalized trust; a forced trust; a trust by which the farmer and the laborer, the blood, the bone, sinew, and intellect; the sweat and toil that produce wealth, is by law compelled to make, not the natural and voluntary, but an unnatural and unequal combination with capital, which is only wealth already produced. This combine, under the forms of law, compels labor, whether on the farm, or in the shop, or at the loom, to pay to capital as its trustee almost one-third of its hard earnings, 47 cents out of every $1.47, under the guise that in some mysterious way, and after it shall have deducted what it deems its proper share, it will return it to its proper owner.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a constituency of 160,000 people. Fifty thousand of these by their daily toil make for themselves and the 110,000 who constitute their helpless and dependent families such subsistence as is left to a farming community, after paying the tax and tribute exacted by the revenue laws which we are trying to amend. I do not intend to claim that this subsistence is as comfortable as the rich soil and natural advantages of my State ought to afford. Nor do I intend to stop now to argue with the venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], who was so recently Kentucky's guest, and who seems, like the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN], to think it the proper thing for a Republican protectionist who enjoys the hospitality of a Southern State, to seize the first opportunity to misrepresent and belittle his host.

Nor shall I, by comparing his speech in Louisville with his speech on this floor, rob him of the satisfaction it seems to afford him to boast that he not only insults, belittles, and misrepresents my people here, but that he was ill-mannered enough to do the same thing in the very home of his host. Kentucky is not what she ought to be. She is not what she longs to be. She is not what she would have been if my venerable friend from Pennsylvania had not so successfully spent twenty-five years of his mature and vigorous manhood in fastening on the country a system and rate of taxation that have made her industries pay a constant and exorbitant tribute to the industries of his State—that have made her people poor and his people rich.

The gentleman says he has—

devoted the years of his vigorous manhood to the overthrow of the political influence of the slave oligarchy in this country.

If he would only devote his declining years to the emancipation of its political affairs from the fatal embrace of its twin-sister, the high-tariff oligarchy, which fastens the chains of slavery on every human being who eats his bread in the honest sweat of his brow, without regard to race, color, or previous condition, he would outlive the day when even his imagination, distorted as it is by prejudice, could conjure up such a dark picture of Kentucky as to say of her that—

the masses of her people are steeped in poverty and illiteracy, and are strangers not only to the comforts of humble life, but to the commonest and most absolute necessaries of Northern laborers.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the condition of the farming and laboring people of my State, engaged in occupations that pay but receive no protection, occupations that yield but meager returns on the money and labor expended after Pennsylvania has collected her tariff tolls, appeared pitiable in the extreme to the great apostle and representative of the tariff barons of the State of Pennsylvania.

But, Mr. Chairman, it ill becomes this great apostle and leader of that system of high tariff, which has wrought comparative poverty not only among my people but among all the people of the South and West, to taunt the victims his system has wronged.

Compared with his people, who have an equal or even a much less capital invested in manufacturing under the peculiar privileges and bounties the present tariff affords, I am forced to confess that my people are poor. And they will remain poor just so long as other industries have a legal right to levy 47 cents on every dollar that they are compelled to spend for the necessaries and comforts of life. No member on this floor has so far had the hardihood to claim that any farmer engaged in producing the great staples of this country gets directly one dollar of benefit from protection. It is admitted that he is constantly paying out more money on every one of the four thousand articles covered by the tariff schedule which he buys than he would pay if the tariff was reduced.

As a portion, and a very large portion, of the consumers, these farmers paid into the public Treasury last year their portion of $217,000,000 collected on imported goods. It will be admitted that four times as many home-produced goods were bought and consumed as there were of foreign. The tariff put it within the power of home manufacturers and producers to sell these goods for $868,000,000 more than they could have been bought for in the foreign markets if we were allowed to buy our goods where we can buy them the cheapest.

In every case where any foreign goods of a similar class were imported and sold here in competition with similar goods made at home the proof is conclusive that the home manufacturer was adding to his goods the entire tariff the foreigner was required to pay. Whenever and wherever the home manufacturer is selling at a less price than the foreign goods, with freight and tariff added costs, then it is shown conclusively that more tariff is being charged than is necessary to protect the home manufacturer, and he can make no complaint at a fair reduction.

If it be true, as gentlemen on the other side of the aisle in their stress are sometimes led to argue, that goods are made and sold as cheap or cheaper here than we could buy them if there was no tariff duty on them; or, in other words, that the tariff duty is not added to the price and paid by the consumer of home-produced goods, then the tariff is of no benefit to the manufacturer, and all this desperate resistance to tariff reduction by the representatives of protected interests is waste of lung power and valuable time. If it was not added; if it did not go into the pockets of the manufacturers; if the consuming farmers and laborers did not have it to pay, that side of the House would not only lead the van for reduction, but for its entire removal.

Turning again to agricultural Kentucky, which the venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania says is "steeped in poverty and illiteracy," and which, I am bound to admit, is poor when compared with tariff-fatted Pennsylvania, let us see if the gentleman, had he been disposed to deal fairly with this matter, could not have found a better reason for this condition than that she is "the most illustrious victim of" the internal-revenue or the whisky trust. It would have occurred to one who could lift himself above sectional prejudices and mercenary interests, especially when he was searching for statistics to misrepresent our illiteracy, to examine the internal-revenue returns and to ask himself why it is that Ohio and New York, each of which pays more internal revenue than Kentucky, are not "steeped in poverty and illiteracy." Why it is that Illinois, which pays twice as much internal revenue and makes more and meaner whisky than any State in the Union, "is not steeped in poverty and illiteracy." [Applause.] Indeed, he might have come closer to home, even into the precincts of his own wealthy State of Pennsylvania, and found that she was paying two-thirds as much internal revenue as Kentucky, and that she had 19,540 retail whisky shops, more than five times as many as Kentucky, dealing out, as he eloquently expresses it, this—

most fruitful source of poverty, ignorance, vice, crime, disease, insanity, and ignominious death known to the civilization of the nineteenth century.

By looking a little further into the statistics he would have found that there were in the State of Illinois 11,635 and in the State of Ohio 15,540 retail liquor-dealers, the former over three times as many and the latter over four times as many as the 3,598 in the State of Kentucky. Yet the gentleman will not dare rise and say that Illinois, with over three times as many retail whisky-shops and making more mean whisky than Kentucky makes of good, is a victim of the whisky "trust" or is steeped in "ignorance and illiteracy." [Applause.] If he said that of Illinois my usually good-natured friend [Mr. CANNON] of that State, who so cordially indorsed this sentiment when uttered about Kentucky, would draw his Spofford's Almanac and utterly confound him by reading to him and the House all the statistical tables it contained.

But, Mr. Chairman, the explanation of Kentucky's poverty and Pennsylvania's wealth is so plain that he who runs may read. A few words tell the simple story: Kentucky pays 47 cents of tribute on every dollar's worth of tariff-protected goods she buys. Pennsylvania receives 47 cents tribute on every dollar of these goods she sells.

Commerce is nothing but exchange of products through the convenient representative of values known as money. And when the Kentucky farmer comes to exchange, through the process of sale and purchase, his farm products for the manufactured products of Ohio, Illinois, Pennsylvania, and the New England States, he is, under the existing tariff laws, required to give $1.47 of the value of his products, fixed in the markets of world, for $1 in value of those manufactured products fixed in the same market.

Thus for twenty-seven years the hard earnings of the farmers of the South and West have, under this high protective law, poured in a constant stream of 47 cents on every dollar into the coffers of the manufacturing States, with the same unerring certainty with which the waters from the mountains, the hillsides, and the valleys have under the laws of gravitation poured into the bosom of the ocean.

In my State, Mr. Chairman, there were in 1880, as shown by the census, 320,000 persons engaged in farming. The same census shows that for each person who labors there are two helpless women and children dependent on his labor for support.

The census does not show how much of the products of the farm are sold or exchanged for the necessaries of life which are manufactured or produced by our protected friends who say they will be ruined if this bill passes, but I assume that even the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who says the masses of our people "are strangers not only to the comforts of humble life, but to the commonest and most absolute daily necessaries of Northern laborers," will admit that every person engaged in farming spends on an average at least $100 for machinery, farming implements, clothing, sugar, and salt, and other protected articles for himself and the two that are dependent on him.

This is only $33⅓ for each per year, and is certainly poverty enough to satisfy even the distorted imagination of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Kentucky's 320,000 farmers spending $100 each with our manufacturing friends under a tariff averaging 47 per cent. will pay $22,000,000 for the goods they buy and $10,000,000 tariff for the glorious privilege of dealing with our own people.

Ten millions a year is the contribution, not of all these people of my State, "steeped in poverty and illiteracy" to this high-tariff Moloch, but the contribution of the farmers alone. My district contains one-tenth of the farmers of the State. One million dollars is exacted from its farmers, one hundred thousand from each of my ten counties, $100 from each man, woman, and child that from choice or stern necessity wields the hoe, follows the plow, or drives the reaper, whose occupation coming closer than any other to nature and nature's God ought to be as free from unjust human exactions as the air he breathes, which according to the gentleman from Pennsylvania is about the only comfort the poverty-steeped illiterate enjoys.

But some one on the other side of the aisle in his zeal to justify this wrong is ready to say: "I am ready to admit that $33⅓ is less than will buy the tariff-taxed articles consumed even by the pauper in the Kentucky poor-house. But when you say that 47 per cent. is added to all those articles he uses you put the figures too high. The prices of all protected articles are not increased by the amount of the protection given." Then if they are not, why all this fuss about the small reduction asked in this bill? If you are not using the full rate of protection you are getting under the law, how are you to be hurt by striking off what you are not charging?

If you say that under the tariff laws you sell an article cheaper than it could be sold without a tariff, then I say abolish a tariff that does the manufacturer no good. Whenever a tariff does the consumer no harm it can do the manufacturer no possible good, and ought to be promptly abolished. But, if you think my per cent. is too high, name one yourselves. What is the per cent. of protection that we pay and you receive? It must be large or you would not stake your party and close your eyes to all considerations of common justice and honesty, to make the fearful fight that you are making here to retain it.

I will take the lowest per cent. that any honest Republican statistician will say the consumer pays the producer of tariff-taxed articles, and show that in ten years it will impoverish any community of consumers and enrich any community of producers of these articles. Reverse the effect of the tariff laws in Kentucky and Pennsylvania. Let us receive and her pay the same tribute that we are paying and she is receiving now. At the end of ten years Kentucky will bloom like the garden of Eden, and the venturesome crow that should attempt to wing his flight across the once rich and proud and arrogant Republican State of Pennsylvania would either carry his provisions with him or reach civilization again with an emptier stomach than ever went to bed with a Kentuckian "steeped in poverty and illiteracy." [Applause.]

But we are told, Mr. Chairman, that the farmer and laborer ought to pay the present rate of taxation cheerfully because the manufacturer needs it and uses it to pay the farmer better prices for his produce, and the laborer better wages for his service. These propositions seem now to constitute the larger part of the stock arguments for high protection, since the protected industries have been driven from the plea of infancy. To ask if the manufacturers and capitalists have heretofore dealt so generously with the farmer and laborer in return for the enormous sums these beneficent trustees have collected, ought to be a sufficient answer to both of these arguments.

But in view of the readiness with which the representatives of capital and monopoly on the other side of the House, driven from all other grounds of defense, retreat behind these subterfuges and make a piteous appeal for high protection in the interest of the poor laborer and farmer, it becomes us to examine these arguments with more seriousness than they really deserve. Necessity is the mother of invention, and the necessity of the attorneys of tariff-fed capital, in this last ditch, appealing in the interest of the two classes they have fleeced and impoverished since 1861, that their tribute be not disturbed, would merely excite ridicule, if it did not so often deceive.

Do they need the present rate of protection to enable them to pay, not only the wages now paid laborers, but even higher wages than ill-paid and discontented labor has ever demanded? What are they paying labor? Production is the joint earnings of capital and labor, and ought to be divided in proportion to what each puts into the common partnership. If a laborer borrows $1,000 of capital he pays for its use and the risk of its loss 6 per cent., or $60 per year. When the laborer is able thus to form a partnership with $1,000 of capital, by borrowing it and investing it himself, $60 is the amount of the joint profits that $1,000 of capital receives.

If the laborer invests this $1,000 in farming it is the universal experience, and no man who has observed the farming operations or studied the farming statistics of this country will deny the proposition, that as a rule even this interest, this apparently small exaction of capital, will finally consume all the profits of the joint venture. And in three cases out of four the farmer borrowing the capital will finally fail. On the other hand, the capitalist who lends his money at this rate, whether the borrower uses it in farming or other pursuits, will grow gradually but certainly rich. And I undertake to say now, and fear no contradiction, that no man or class of men have any right to invoke the aid of special laws to enable them to realize more than 6 per cent. on capital invested in the production of articles our own people must buy and consume.

And I undertake to say further, that whenever capital employs labor in producing that which the people must buy and consume, it has no right to demand, and especially has no right to invoke, the aid of law to demand more than 6 per cent., which is a fair profit on the capital invested. All the profits beyond that ought either be paid to the laborer by increase of wages or released to the consumer by reduction of prices. Applying these propositions to the manufacturing, farming, and labor statistics of the census of 1880, and what do we have?

The States of Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and Illinois seem to make the most desperate efforts through their high-tariff representatives to keep up tariff taxation, and thereby take care of the farmers and laborers not only of their own States but of the whole country. It is therefore pertinent to inquire what they are doing for the farmers and

laborers for whom they entertain such tender regard. I will not compare the rich manufacturer of these States with the poor farmer and laborer of Kentucky or of the Southern or Western farming States. Nor will I compare the farmer of Massachusetts with the farmer of Illinois, as is done by the St. Louis Republican, against which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] so warmly protested when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WILSON] a few days ago had such a comparison read at the Clerk's desk as part of his remarks.

But I will compare the earnings of the farmers and laborers of Massachusetts with the earnings of the protected manufacturers of Massachusetts; the earnings of the farmers and laborers of Pennsylvania with the earnings of the protected manufacturers of Pennsylvania; the earnings of the farmers and laborers of Ohio with the earnings of the protected manufacturers of Ohio; the earnings of the farmers and laborers of Illinois with the earnings of the protected manufacturers of Illinois. These States are certainly conspicuous examples of the development of the farming and manufacturing industries in the same State, side by side, under the benign influence of the very tariff laws we are trying to reform.

The census shows that in 1880 there was in Massachusetts invested in farming $164,288,956; that there was engaged in farming 64,973 persons; that the value of the total products of the farms of that State for that year was $24,160,881. By simple division we find that to each person engaged in farming there was invested $2,528 of farm capital, made up of the value of the land, farming implements, and stock. We find further that the entire value of the product of the labor of one person using $2,528 of farm capital was $372 for the year. We find further that the entire capital invested in manufacturing in that State was $303,806,185; that the number of persons engaged was 352,255; that the entire product, after deducting the cost of material, was $244,162,629.

It is easy to figure from this that to each person engaged in manufacturing there was invested $863, and the product of each person so employed using $863 capital was $693. A manufacturer, then, joining his labor to an investment of $863 made $693 in Massachusetts, and a farmer in the same State, joining his labor to $2,528, made $372; or the farmer, with nearly three times as much money invested in land, farm implements, and stock as the manufacturer invests in mills and machinery can make a litle over one-half as much profit. This is the beneficent effect of our high protective tariff on the farmer in Massachusetts.

But some Massachusetts Republican is ready to jump up and say that, although more than twice as much money to the hand is made with one-third the capital in manufacturing as in farming, manufacturing capital pays the difference to the manufacturing laborer. Let us see whether this is so. Fortunately, the census statistics settle this, too. Those statistics show that the entire wages paid to the 352,255 persons engaged in manufacturing in Massachusetts was $128,315,362, or $364 to each person. I have found no statistics showing farm wages in that State.

But let us illustrate these statistics. Mr. A has $2,528 and he invests it in a farm, farming implements, and stock, and putting his own hands to the plow-handles works twelve months on this farm. Mr. B has only $863, which he invests in a manufacturing establishment, and hiring Mr. C, who has no money, to do his work, spends the year loafing around the hotel and market place telling the farmers and laborers the great value to them of the protective tariff, and writing me and other Congressmen that not only his special industry, but the entire country will go to the bow-wows if the rate of tariff is reduced.

Here we have the farmer, the manufacturer, and the laborer playing their respective parts in glorious manufacturing Massachusetts under the glorious tariff law which is kept up for the benefit of the farmer and laborer. How do they come out at the end of the year according to the census statistics. A has for the use of his $2,528 and his year's work $372. B receives as the product of his $863 and C's labor, $693. How much of this $693 does he give to C, the laborer, for his year's work? He gives him $364 and keeps $329. Two thousand five hundred and twenty-eight dollars and farmer A's hard year's work bring $372. Laborer C's year's work brings him $364. Eight hundred and sixty-three dollars and the war tariff brings manufacturer B, who has not struck a lick of work, $329.

But turn to Pennsylvania. Capital invested in farming in 1880, $1,095,405,324; number occupied in farming, 361,112; farm products, $129,760,476. To each person engaged in farming $3,637 is invested in land, implements, and stock. And the labor of each person so employed with $3,637 invested yields $431.

In manufacturing there is $474,510,993 invested, 387,072 hands engaged, who received in the year 1880 $134,055,904 in wages, and produced, after deducting raw material, $279,797,882.

To each person engaged this gives $1,252 of manufacturing capital invested, and each person produced $719 and gets $346 in wages. Substantially the same result follows. The farmer for a year's toil and $3,637 invested gets $431. The laborer engaged in manufacturing gets $346, and the tariff-eater, otherwise known as the manufacturing capitalist, can put in $1,252, do nothing, and get $373—$27 more than the laborer gets for his hard year's work, and only $58 less than the farmer gets for his year's work and his investment of nearly three times the money.

But some representative of the Ohio or Illinois protectionist, on the other side of the Hall, is ready to say that the lands in Massachusetts and Pennsylvania are poor; that no such meager returns to the farmer and laborer, as compared with the returns of manufacturing capital, can be found on the rich soil of Ohio or Illinois. Not too fast, my friends. Let us examine this tale-telling census. From the State of Ohio hails the distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee [Mr. MCKINLEY] who writes such an elegant minority report to show that the country will be ruined if even the slightest move is made toward stopping manufacturing capital from robbing the farmer and the laborer.

In Ohio there was in 1880 invested in farming, $1,261,726,263. Of her population 397,495 were laboring in this occupation and the product was $156,777,152. In manufacturing there was invested in that State $188,939,614, and laborers engaged, 183,609, and they received $62,103,800 in wages and produced after deducting material, $132,964,132. This shows that to each person engaged in farming there was invested $3,174; to each person engaged in manufacturing, only $1,029. That each person engaged in farming received for his year's labor and a farm capital of $3,174, products to the amount of $394. That each person engaged in manufacturing received for his year's labor, if he worked himself, and the use of only $1,029 of capital, $724 in products. That the manufacturing laborer received for wages only $338.

So that if the manufacturer invested his $1,029 in mills and machinery and hired a laborer to do his work, and gave himself up to idleness and the enjoyment of fine whisky and the other luxuries which our Republican friends are so anxious to untax, he gets $386—$42 more than the laborer, for whose benefit he has made so many hard fights to maintain the tariff, gets for twelve month's toil; and only $8 less than the farmer, to whom his tariff furnishes such a profitable market, gets for his twelve months' toil and his investment of $3,174.

And this in the great State of Ohio, where Democratic Representatives are expected to vote for high tariff because wool is protected. I can not so much blame her few sheep-farmers for clingling to protection on wool. Impoverished by manufacturing tariff, made beasts of burden for every bounty and subsidy manufacturing capitalists choose to heap upon them, it is but natural that the few who can, by the aid of these manufacturers, saddle part of their burdens on their fellow-farmers by collecting of them tribute on their wool, should hasten to do so. It is only another illustration of the stronger shifting burdens and levying tribute on the weaker.

But let us go farther West, to the great agricultural and manufacturing State of Illinois. If there is anywhere on the continent where it might be supposed that the farmer would hold his own with the manufacturer, tariff or no tariff, it would be on the rich lands of Illinois. In 1880 Illinois had $1,175,772,293 invested in farming, and 436,371 of her population were engaged in the business. Her entire farm products were $203,980,137; or each person engaged in farming invested $2,694 in capital, and with this capital and his labor produced $468. In the same State for the same year there was invested in manufacturing $140,652,066, and 144,727 persons employed. The product, after deducting cost of material, was $125,020,766, and the wages paid amounted to $57,429,085; or each person employed used $972 of capital, produced $864 in value of manufactured articles, after deducting price of material, and received in wages $397, the same results as in Massachusetts, Pennsylvania, and Ohio.

The Illinois protectionist invests $972 in some manufacturing corporation, hires one of the laborers he loves so much to do the work, spends the year in reading the New York Tribune and delivering lectures on the benefits of a high protective tariff to laborers, and his hard-working, horny-fisted neighboring farmer, who has $2,694 invested in his farm and is working twelve hours a day to try "to make buckle and tongue meet" at the end of the year.

And what is the result? How do the three come out? The farmer gets for his hard year's labor and the use of $2,694 invested, $468. The laborer who furnished the year's hard labor to the capitalist, gets $397, and the poor manufacturer who is going to close out his business and be forever ruined, and is not going to make any more cheap goods for the farmers and laborers of this country, and is not going to furnish the farmer a good market for his produce any longer, nor the laborer high wages for his work, if the Mills bill passes, gets $467 for the use of $972 and the hard labor he performs in talking up high tariff and filling the mails with petitions and circulars sents to Congress to assure members that his industry is about to be ruined.

Glorious country this where for a year's toil on a farm costing, with implements and stock, $2,694, the farmer can make only one dollar more than he who "neither toils nor spins" gets on $972 invested in a manufacturing corporation. Where the manufacturer yokes a laborer to $972 of capital, and when this unfair and unequal partnership at the end of the year has made $864, keeps $467 for the part of this small capital, and gives the laborer only $397 for his share. In common decency I would have at least divided equally.

But, Mr. Chairman, whenever a member comes on this floor and lifts his voice in defense of an industrial system that, in its practical results,

treats an intelligent American laborer as worth less in our political economy than $972 of capital and pays such a laborer less than that sum earns, and at the same time raises his hands and rolls his eyes back into the past in holy horror at negro slavery, which never rated human service so low, I involuntarily exclaim "Thou hypocrite." The Pharisee "thanking God that he was not as other men" was a model of humility compared with such an exhibition of offensive self-complacency.

But, Mr. Chairman, when from the same census we compare the condition of the unprotected farmer and laborer with the condition of the protected manufacturer in the entire country, the startling results are still more damning to this iniquitous relic of war legislation.

The 7,670,493 persons engaged in farming in the United States in 1880 had invested $12,104,081,440, or an average of $1,578 to each person. They produced $2,213,402,564 in farm products, only $289 to each person using a farm capital of $1,578. The 2,732,595 laborers engaged in manufacturing used an investment in manufacturing capital of $2,790,272,606, or only $1,021 to each person employed. They produced, after deducting cost of material, $1,972,773,642, or $772 to each person employed.

These 2,732,595 manufacturing laborers received in wages $945,953,795, or only $347 to each person. The manufacturing laborer, for whose wages the manufacturing capitalist has such tender regard, gets only $347 out of $772 earned, while this modern philanthropist pockets $375 for the use of $1,021 capital for one year. For this capital, which ought not to bring him over 6 per cent., he gets 36 per cent. without adding a stroke of his labor. The farmer can get only 18 per cent. on his capital, throwing in his own work for the entire year.

No wonder the protected manufacturer, who invests his capital in manufacturing and yokes one of the laborers, for whom he similates such intense affection, to each $1,021 of his investment and gives the laborer only $347 and keeps $375 of the $772 earned, winces and squirms when the Mills bill proposes to reduce the 36 per cent. he is receiving by reducing the tariff which alone makes such enormous gains possible.

No wonder the wages of farm laborers are low, when the tariff robs the farmer not only of the means with which to pay labor, but of the means to furnish himself and family with the commonest comforts of life. No wonder manufacturing labor is struggling for its rights, when manufacturing capital is demanding and receiving for $1,021 more annual divdends by $28 than it pays the laborer for a year's wages.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, in the face of these figures, furnishing, as they do, the solution to the agricultural prostration as compared with the manufacturing thrift and wealth, of even these most favored States in this Union; in the face of constant strikes and lockouts which mark the fierce struggle of laborers in these States to wrest from capital sufficient of these enormous profits to afford a comfortable subsistence, the representatives of tax-pampered manufacturing capitalists but serve their masters in making their appeals in the name of the farmer and laborer.

Listening to the discussion on this floor one would think it had been conclusively proven that the reduction of the tariff meant reduction of American wages. So far from this being true, it is admitted by its strongest advocates that up to this time all efforts of protectionists to demonstrate this proposition have failed. In the annual report of Mr. Herbert Radclyffe, the secretary of the Home Market Club, of Boston, on the last of April, which each one of you has received among the wagon-loads of high-tariff literature poured in upon you, he, lauding constant agitation of that club in the interest of protection, says:

> I believe that the agitation will yet demonstrate that a reduction of the tariff means a reduction in wages to the American wage-earners.

If after all these years of bold assertion of this proposition, and superhuman effort to establish it, the demonstration is only a thing to be hoped for in the future, had we better not heed the lessons taught by the census statistics and labor strikes and lockouts, and turn our attention to bettering the laborer's condition by reducing the cost of his living?

Mr. Chairman, you can no more reduce the wages of labor engaged in manufacturing in this country by the reduction of the tariff than you can reduce the price of the farmer's wheat, corn, and cotton. Both are fixed in the markets of the world. Every honest student of the labor problem will admit that while the laborer of this country receives more per day, week, month, or year than similar labor is paid in Europe, yet he receives no more, and, indeed, in many cases less, for a fixed amount of work here than is paid for the same amount of work in Europe.

This is because he accomplishes so much more work in the same time on account of his superior intelligence and the superior character of our machinery and methods of production. This has been so fully shown by the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee and by other gentlemen in this debate, and is so fully admitted by protectionists who meet this question fairly, that I shall not stop to discuss it.

Then where will the loss, if any, resulting from the tariff reduction fall? The struggles of capital, organized and unorganized, in this House and out of it, to prevent this reduction answers this question. If there is loss to any one, which I very much doubt, it will be in reduced dividends on capital. And reduced dividends on capital means reduced interest to the borrower. It means one long step towards the emancipation of our debt-ridden cities, counties, townships, and farms from onerous interest charges, that year by year destroy the prosperity and consume the earnings of the people who furnish the labor, the enterprise, and the energy that organize States, build cities, and develop the waste places of this great country. I believe that a proper reduction of the tariff will cheapen capital, break down unlawful trusts, and emancipate the farmer and laborer from the unjust and unnecessary exactions of the manufacturer and capitalist.

I am not surprised that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] should talk differently, even though he knew my views were correct. Like Demetrius of Ephesus, he and his co-workers of like occupation, who by means of protection have fastened themselves like parasites onto the backs and stomachs of the poor who must eat and wear their goods, have made no small gain thereby. Indeed, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. MCKINNEY] so thoroughly photographed that gentleman and the tariff monopolists whom he represents that I can not refrain from quoting a paragraph from his speech delivered in this debate.

> Mr. Chairman, I have read in one of the old histories, written many centuries ago, of a class of people who had a monopoly of a certain industry and made great gain therefrom. And there was a certain man came into the land where these people dwelt and preached against them, and his words were so powerful that those who used curious arts brought their books and burned them before all men, and they counted the price of them and found it fifty thousand pieces of silver. And we are told at—
>
> "The same time there was no small stir about that way, for a certain man named Demetrius, a silversmith, which made silver shrines for Diana, brought no small gain to the craftsmen, whom he called together with the workmen of like occupation and said, 'Sirs, ye know that by this craft we have our wealth; moreover, ye see and hear that not alone at Ephesus but almost throughout all Asia this Paul has persuaded and turned away much people, saying that they be no gods which are made with hands; so that not only this our craft is in danger to be set at naught, but also that the temple of the great goddess Diana should be despised, and her magnificence should be destroyed, whom all Asia and the world worshipeth.' And when they heard these things they were full of wrath and cried out, saying, 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians.'"
>
> Now, like these people of old, Pennsylvania has for a long time had a monopoly in many of these industries which have brought to them great wealth. An apostle has come into their midst who dwells at the other end of this avenue, and has proclaimed to the people against such a monopoly, and many who have heretofore believed in their doctrine are repenting of their sins and proclaiming their conversion before all the people. [Applause.]
>
> And now comes the great apostle of protection and calls together his people and says: Sirs, ye know that by this protection we have our wealth. Moreover, ye see and hear that not only in Pennsylvania, but almost throughout all the nation this apostle of reform hath persuaded and turned away much people, saying that there be no justice in this doctrine of protection, so that not only this our wealth is in danger to be set at naught, but also that the great goddess of protection should be despised, whom Pennsylvania and all the land hath heretofore worshiped. And when they heard these words they were full of wrath, and cried out, Great is the goddess of protection! [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I intend that justice shall be done Demetrius in this comparison. To his credit be it said that history nowhere records that Demetrius ever, either as a guest or otherwise, belittled or misrepresented the people whom he had impoverished in accumulating his ill-gotten gains.

Our friends on the other side of the aisle say that protection stimulates the manufacturing industries. I admit that it does. It has stimulated them as strong drink stimulates the human system. Leaning and relying on this stimulant year by year, they have demanded and received more of it, till now, drunk and debauched by long and excessive indulgence, they make piteous appeals for more copious draughts from the bowl of protection.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a contest between the principles of free trade and protection, no matter how much the blatant demagogue may expect to deceive the people by this cry. It is an attempt to relieve the people from a small portion of unjust and unnecessary taxation. But I wish to close with a word of caution to those arrogant protectionists in and out of this House who denounce every man who desires tariff reform as a free-trader.

Refuse to reduce and reform the tariff; refuse to lift any part of this burden from the shoulders of the toiling millions of this country; defeat this bill as you have defeated all other measures of relief, and a long-suffering people will rise in the majesty and strength of desperation, and sweep from the statute-books a system the abuse of which has wrought such widespread injustice and poverty in a land where honest labor, under just laws, would bring peace and plenty to every home. [Applause.]

[Mr. SHIVELY withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. MCCLAMMY. Mr. Chairman, the questions of revenue, of how to get the necessary funds to bear the expenses of the Government, has at all times been exceedingly interesting. The object of all government is to secure the best interests of the governed. For this have men banded together into societies, organized governments, made constitutions, and framed laws; the object being to promote the general welfare and secure a community in which individual prosperity and happiness would be the basis of governmental strength and durability. And so our forefathers, fleeing from the wrongs and oppressions of the Old World, came to this new continent and settled into communities and colonies, which in due time were formed into counties and States, and one grand Government, the United States of America. And so the Government was formed and framed for the protection and benefit of each individual, as well as for the protection and benefit of the whole.

And thus our fathers started on a grand and mighty career, after a terrible and exhausting struggle of seven long and weary years for independence. It was never their purpose to flee from one oppression to be sufferers and slaves of another. The bloody struggle had united the people in one patrotic brotherhood, and the white-winged messengers of peace found no sectional lines stretching from east to west to divide and mar and checker this glorious country, the fortitude and courage of whose sons had plucked liberty from the hands of the despot, and forced the Kingdom of Great Britain to proclaim the colonies "Free and independent States." And then "in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty," did our fathers "ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America;" "to promote the general welfare," and not create and protect monopolies and trust combinations to enrich the few and enslave and impoverish the many; to protect all, and not enforce a condition in which a few would become the wealthy class and the multitude the poor class. This was not intended to be a government where the word "caste" should line and have a place, but a free government, where the poorest may become rich, and the highest and most distinguished place and office the legitimate ambitions of the sons of toil who follow the plow or drive the jack-plane or wield the trowel. And if the true spirit of the Government is ever destroyed, if liberty is finally lost, it will be because the people will have sold their birthright for a mess of pottage.

I will read with great pleasure the able message of the President of the United States addressed to the two Houses of Congress at the beginning of this session, and sir, I felt a growing interest in my heart and recognized the fact that the country had once more a Chief Executive who felt an interest in the whole country, who recognized himself to be President of the whole country, uninfluenced by sectional ill-will, animated by a patriotic desire to promote the best interests of all the people, and who early calls the attention of Congress and the whole country, not to how best the country may be kept in continued discord, nor how best the strifes and hatreds of sectional animosities may be inflamed and kept burning, but how best peace, prosperity, and happiness may be secured and perpetuated to the people of a glorious and harmonious government after the clouds of civil war have rolled away and the sunshine of peace and kindness once more united friend with friend and section with section. Those dark and bloody and unhappy days are gone, and I hope forever. And as the signs and symbols of the hard strife are fading away from our memories we gladly unite in the hearty wish for the prosperity and continued welfare of the whole country. And for one I shall stand by and sustain that policy which may be best calculated to preserve the peace and secure and promote the happiness and prosperity of the people.

Questions of finance, of political economy and governmental administration confront us, and as lawmakers, representatives of the people, we must address ourselves to these grave and great questions. It may not be expected that partisan spirit has ceased to exist, but hope revives when we witness, as we often do at this Capitol and upon this floor, how Representatives on all sides, if not agreeing in all things, agreeing at least to move steadily on for what is believed to be best for the whole country,

As for myself, Mr. Chairman, I am here with no other purpose in view than to represent my constituents faithfully, and secure for them, so far as my own humble efforts can be effective, the passage of such laws as will enhance the welfare of my constituents, the welfare of my State, and the welfare of the whole country. I have given attention to such matters as I have thought would best secure these results, and if my voice has not been heard upon every question which has challenged the attention of the House, I have felt no less interest and given them no less labor and attention.

But, sir, after all, we have as yet accomplished but little for the relief of the people, and I have thought it were high time we were giving attention to the necessities of the hour. What has yet been done for the relief of the tax-burdened people? What has been done to carry out the recommendations of the President for a relief from the dangers and oppressions of an overflowing Treasury? What has been done to remove from the weary necks of the people the now unnecessary and oppressive war taxes, which to this day, nearly twenty-five years after the close of the war, hang in gloom over the people like a miserable nightmare, attacking labor, destroying the fruits of industry, expanding further the already overflowing and swollen pockets of the rich, and breaking down the hopes of the laboring classes as the rich grow richer and the poor become poorer? Sir, visions of horror rise up before me as I look in the face of the uncertain future, and for one I am here to work and to vote for each and every measure which will restore to the people prosperity at home. And I am ready now to vote for the removal of these high and unreasonable and oppressive taxes, and assist as best I may all efforts, come they from whatever quarter they may, to a return to the times when capital and labor shall be restored to their true relation of twin sisters in this common inheritance of the great Union of our fathers. We acknowledge no authority or claim from any quarter or section of superiority, and I say to Congress and to the Chief Executive, give all the people a fair and equal chance.

Mr. Chairman, time will not serve me to investigate and canvass in a speech at this time all the multifarious questions involved in the bill now before us. But, sir, I have examined the bill in detail, and I shall cheerfully support it. It is a moderate bill. It does not cut down at one lick all the inequalities of the present tariff law. It was thought wise to so legislate that business, now supported and maintained by the kindness and partialities and favoritism of the Government, as seen and felt under the existing law, should have time enough to be warned that the days of their infancy have about expired and they must prepare to walk alone.

Before I enter further the discussion of the injustice and unfairness of a tax upon the necessaries of life generally called the tariff, I wish to consider another species of tax, invented and brought into being by the Republican party, as is said by them, to meet the necessities of immediate war and procure the means of supporting the Government in war between the States, called the "war of the rebellion." To raise a sufficiency of funds to carry on that war it became necessary, in the opinion of those then in control of the Congress, to pass what was called the internal-revenue law. Under this act incomes, and banks, and matches, whisky and brandy, ale, beer, cigars, snuff, tobacco, etc., were taxed and a large amount of revenue was collected, which at that time was of great necessity to meet the exigencies of civil war. These were essentially war taxes, and should have been discontinued as soon as the necessity which created them had passed away.

They were willingly borne, when necessary, because the people recognized the necessities of the Government; but they were never popular, and as the Republican party held on to them after the war was over and used the thousands of internal-revenue officers, who like locusts filled all the land, as instruments in the hands of that party to terrorize the people, to spy upon them and entrap them in all kinds of charges of violations of the law and through and by such influence and prosecutions and persecutions control the elections and perpetuate the continuance of that party in power, the law itself soon become to be despised and hated by the people, and a universal desire was for the repeal of these odious laws. The war was over and the Republicans were in power in every branch of the Government. Did they repeal them? No! In the Forty-seventh Congress the Republicans were in full possession of the Government and controlled every branch of the Government—executive, legislative, and judicial—both Houses of Congress and the President. Mr. Chairman, then they had a fair chance to repeal the internal revenue. Did they do so? Did they introduce one bill to do so? They were in full power; did they take the tax off of brandy and whisky and other distilled spirits? No, sir, no! Did they then take the tax off or make one step to take it off of tobacco? No, sir, no!

What did the Republicans in that Congress do towards lightening the burden of the tax-payers then? Listen, ye oppressed tax-payers; the Republican party then in full power took the tax off of banks and bank capital and incomes, and never said a word about removing the tax on distilled spirits and tobacco. If the Republican party was the friend of the people who suffer from these onerous and disagreeable taxes, why did it not remove them in the Forty-seventh Congress when in full power? There can be but one answer, Mr. Chairman. The Republican party was not in sympathy with the people, not in sympathy with those who had to meet these hard taxes, and only passed such laws as would relieve the wealthy—the banks and those who had large incomes—and gave not a vote to relieve the oppressed or remove these hard laws from the necks of the poor.

But that party now is moving to lift these taxes. Ah! Mr. Chairman, they pretend to be so doing. Following the lead of one who sits on this side of this Chamber, they pretend to be marshaling their forces to repeal these laws, but, sir, judging them by the past, I assert that this is a pure species of political hypocrisy, a mere trick to deceive the people. I charge that at this day they are in favor of keeping up the taxes on spirits and tobacco, and would only vote to take them off in order to keep the tax up on breadstuffs, clothing, and the real necessities of life. I sir, myself, would vote to remove the odious tax and forever abolish it, but I must also vote to relieve the people from an onerous tax on the prime necessities of life, and while I am anxious to remove all these internal-revenue taxes, I must say that I prefer cheap clothes, cheap shoes, cheap hats, cheap blankets, cheap plows, cheap hoes, cheap axes, and cheap necessaries of life to cheap whisky.

A protective tariff is an unjust and unfair discrimination by the Government in favor of one class of citizens against another class of citizens. It is an enforced contribution in which one man is made to contribute to the support of another man's business without a resulting benefit, and contrary to the spirit and letter of our Constitution. The Government has a right to tax people either directly or indirectly to raise money to carry on the Government, but Congress has no right under the Constitution to force A to support B in his business. What right has the Government to show such difference and such partiality as to pass a law to force one man, without value received, to give his money to the assistance of another man in his private business? And yet that is what those who advocate a protective tariff are doing, and that is what has been forced upon the working masses and poor toilers for lo! these many years, until injustice and wrong come up in sighs and

groans from the oppressed poor in a greater grief and deeper woe than escaped from the hearts of the unhappy Jews when they toiled and endured Egyptian bondage.

That this Government of the people and for the people, foremost in the arts and sciences and in free laws, with a Constitution the admiration of the world, declaring equal rights to all and special privileges to none, the handy but immortal work of those immortal heroes who before they would submit to have forced upon them a stamp tariff tax of a few pence on tea, and for the maintenance of that right pledged and offered up their fortunes, their sacred honors, and their lives—I say that we, the descendants of such a people, should come at this day, under the cringing and whining plea of aiding and helping poor infant industries, thereby seeking to grow rich by placing hard burdens, grievous to be borne, upon the necks of the poor, the toilers, the workingmen and workingwomen, and the young and tender children, who, because of this powerful giant-infant, are sent so early to the tread-mills of the machine shops instead of to school, that the vast investments in manufactories of affluent corporations might be sustained and upheld in their already too great influence and power—these crimes, I say, are enough to shock, to startle the people from their lethargy to rise up in mass and drive these would be lords and masters from their already fortified castles.

I have not time, Mr. Chairman, to call the attention of the committee and the country, in detail, to the demands of those who are seeking power and influence from the General Government with which to oppress the people. I can only call attention to a few necessaries, the markets of which are under the control and influence of the protectionists. Such articles as sugar, salt, wool and woolen goods and wearing apparel, blankets, hats, shoes, etc.

Under the plea of aiding infant industries the tools of the workingman are sold at high prices to benefit the corporations which manufacture them.

Spades and shovels and hoes have to pay a tariff rate of about 35 per cent. in order that the same articles made here may be forced upon the men who are compelled to use them. So, also, scythes, sickles, and reaping-hooks are made by the present tariff 35 per cent. higher to the purchaser as the law now stands; screws of iron, called wood-screws, cross-cut saws taxed in 1883 8 cents per lineal foot, and mill pit and drag, over 9 inches wide, 15 cents per lineal foot, and hand-saws over 24 inches in length, $1 per dozen and 30 per cent. additional. Let all the workers in wood hear this. Axes, hatchets, and adzes, a tariff tax of 35 per cent., drawing-knives 24 per cent., squares in iron or steel 6 cents per pound and 30 per cent. additional, and iron squares marked on one side 3 cents per pound and 30 per cent. additional.

I call the attention of the committee and of the people to these high taxes put upon these necessary tools of the mechanics and laboring men. Before a man can start out on his work to support himself and family he must go to a store and purchase these tools of his trade, and pay into the hands of the manufacturers an extra price above what he might get them for, in order that the manufacturer may receive his protected blessings from a one-sided and partial administration of the Government. This, Mr. Chairman, is Republican rule—Republican methods of dealing with the workingman.

If we look to an earlier day, when it was said American manufactories were young and needed assistance, you will see that our earlier statesmen did not make the burdens of the people so hard to be borne.

Wool and woolen goods unmanufactured had no protection from 1789 to 1816, and not until March 3, 1857, did this industry seem to need protection, but was absolutely free up to that time, and then a tariff of 24 per cent. was levied. The act of June 6, 1872, reduced the duty 10 per cent., and the act of March 3, 1875, re-enacted the duties to what they were prior to the act of June 6, 1872, and, Mr. Chairman, as the law now is the people are unmercifully taxed to support these woolen manufactories. Blankets, flannel goods, all goods with wool as part of the texture with as high a tariff as possible, so as to amount to prohibition to the foreign manufacturer with the privilege to the home manufacturers to ask as high a price as these bloated corporations may agree to demand from the consumer. And so the poor consumer has to pay these pets of the Government from the shoes and socks which keep his feet from the ground to the shirts and pants and coats which cover his body, to the hat which shelters his head from the sun and storms. These infant industries are strong. They very nearly own us. They are seeking to be our masters, and we are nearly their slaves.

I call briefly attention to duties on iron, namely:

Cast-iron butts and hinges, 2½ cents per pound.
1883, hoop-iron, $20 per ton.
Iron in rods, $25 per ton, 1¼ cents per pound.
Slit-iron, $25 per ton, 1¼ cents per pound.
Bar-iron, rolled or hammered, comprising flats not less than 1 inch or more than 7 inches wide, nor less than one-quarter inch or more than 2 inches thick. Rounds from one-half inch to 4 inches in diameter, from 1883 1 cent per pound. Bar-iron ditto. Flats less than three-eighths inch. Rounds and squares less than three-quarter inch, 1¼ cents per pound.
Horseshoe nails in 1883, 4 cents per pound.
Cut nails and wrought nails from 1½ to 4 cents per pound. Spikes, 2 cents per pound.
Pig-iron, 1864, $9 per ton.
Pig-iron, 1870, $7 per ton.
Tacks, brads, and sprigs, not including 16 ounces to 1,000, 2½ cents per thousand.
Iron cables and chains, 2½ cents per pound.

We are all, with every interest we have in life, completely dominated by the power and influence of the protectionists.

To show, Mr. Chairman, the enormous amount of tax the people pay, from all sources of taxation, the total amount of receipts of the Government from all directions for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, was $371,403,277.66. To make this sum, this enormous drain from the earnings of the people, there was paid in on customs, or tariff, $217,286,893.13, and on the internal revenue $118,823,391.22, which makes an average duty or tax on goods imported into this country of 47 per cent. And of this immense tax we paid a tax on—

Sugar, molasses, and sugar candy	$58,016,686.00
Iron and steel, and manufactures of	20,713,234.00
Wool	5,729,717.00
Manufactures of wool	29,729,717.20
Silk	15,540,301.00
Glass and glassware	4,510,312.00
Earthenware	2,409,[illegible].16
Hemp, jute, material for cotton bagging, and flax goods	6,[illegible]28,310.41
Cotton and cotton goods	1,233,599.57
Lumber and salt, in round figures	1,700,000.00
Total	145,981,773.14

I might go on for hours and hours enumerating the articles which the protectionists have dominion over, and show how they do place heavy burdens on the people—such articles of prime necessity as sugar and salt and wool and woolen goods and wearing apparel and blankets and hats and shoes and almost every article used as necessaries for life which are produced and manufactured in this country.

Upon what principle of right, I ask, Mr. Chairman, has a man who raises sheep to have the Government use its power to enable him to receive for his wool more than it is worth in an open market? What has he done that he should be protected at the expense of the poor? Will the Government make laws to keep the poor from being clad? Will the Government so legislate that the poor whom, we are told by the great Master, we always have with us, must suffer for ordinary raiment to protect their flesh and skin from the cold rains and snows and blasts of winter winds that creep through the crevices of their poorly thatched homes? Will the Government take sides with the wool-growers in a controversy between them and the poor widow with her orphan children, as to how much they shall exact from her to clothe the little boys and girls, and assist these rich establishments in grinding out of the unhappy widow her last dollar to meet the hard necessities of her unhappy life? I again ask, will the Government take sides with these vast monopolies against the poor widow with her young and tender brood, amongst them, perhaps, boys who are to be the defenders of this country? Will the Government assist in making these boys and girls, the children of the poor, tributary slaves and vassals of these powerful trusts and corporations?

Mr. Chairman, I speak plainly. I use the simplest and plainest words which can express the hardship of the suffering poor, the oppressed and tax-burdened laborers and workingmen of our country; and if perchance I may contribute some good I shall be satisfied that my time at the capital of my country has not been spent in vain.

I want to see Congress engaged in making laws which shall be equal and just to all men. We want no partiality shown by the Government to a favored few. But let all men stand alike, upon their personal merits and worth, and not a few favored at the expense of the many laborers of the land. We can not disguise the fact that a miserable and wretched discontent is now universal with the patriotic workingmen of our country; and while I am opposed to strikes and other combinations of like character, because I believe needed redress of their unjust grievances can not be secured by such methods, yet I do sympathize with the efforts of labor to secure a just reward for toil and sweat, that moves engines, builds houses, tills lands, sows seed, reclaims waste places, and fills barns and smokehouses with corn and meat. And for one, in this great struggle for bread, for life, I say to the Government and to Congress, Hands off! and let the laboring man have a fair and equal chance with the capitalist, with the bondholder, the stock-broker, and the kings of imperial corporations and trusts.

If you would not sap the blood of patriotism which gives vigor and life to the Government; if you would not destroy the love of country now so fresh and pure in the hearts of the yeomanry of our country; if you would put down a mean effort to establish caste in this free country, which like some miserable wire-grass is now clogging the plowshare of labor, we will have no more class or sectional legislation; industry will be encouraged by laws which are equal in their burden and equal in their protection and benefits to all, the rich and the poor, the laboring men, the farmers, the mechanics, the merchants, and the manufacturers. Then real peace will be established and strikes and riots will no more disturb our repose.

The honest working people are tired of supporting and gazing at these lilies of the valley, who toil not, neither do they spin; and yet Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of them.

This is a free Government, and the people want freedom in it—freedom to all, oppression to none; equality before and in the laws to all; special and preferred protection and privileges to none. [Loud and long-continued applause.]

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. BYNUM having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. LANE, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue, and had come to no resolution thereon.

And then, on motion of Mr. SHIVELY (at 10 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 9997) to relieve Eliah Blake from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COMPTON: A bill (H. R. 9998) to amend the law relating to the execution of wills in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GEAR: A bill (H. R. 9999) for the relief of Bellamy S. Hine—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 10000) for the relief of John N. Graves—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 10001) for the relief of D. B. Warren—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10002) for the relief of A. B. Medlan—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10003) for the relief of Joel McKee—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10004) granting a pension to John W. Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAYNER: A bill (H. R. 10005) granting a pension to Miss Mary Hayne, as a nurse in the war of 1861—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. E. B. TAYLOR: A bill (H. R. 10006) to remove the charge of desertion against Edward Whitehouse—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 10007) for the relief of Henry Rose—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAISH: A bill (H. R. 10008) for the relief of the Pennsylvania State Agricultural Society—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FORAN: Joint resolution (H. Res. 170) authorizing the Secretary of War to grant a permit to Frederick Freund to erect a hotel upon the lands of the United States at Fort Washington, Md.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JEHU BAKER: Petition of United States Glue Manufacturing Association, favoring the retention of the present duties on glue, gelatine, and isinglass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. W. C. P. BRECKINRIDGE: Petition of Mrs. Theodoria Hoskins, widow of Maj. Jesse Hoskins, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: Petition of vessel-owners of Detroit, Mich., against winter bridge over Detroit River—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Petition of H. N. Whittle and others, of Mechanic Falls, Me., for reform in the method of employing convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JACKSON: Petition of employés of the Pioneer Twine Mills of New Brighton, Pa., against reduction of duties on hemp and flax and kindred fibers—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of Local Assembly No. 4047, shoe cutters, and of Maggie Jordan and 8 others, of Brockton, Mass., for the bill to limit the sale of convict-made goods—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McKINLEY: Petition of Local Assembly No. 2094, Knights of Labor, of Ohio, against civil pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, memorial of the Board of Transportation of Nebraska, relative to State control of certain railroads—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES O'NEILL: Petition of James B. Roberts, alias James Brown, for removal of charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: Papers and evidence in support of House bill No. 3157, granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Baker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. E. B. TAYLOR: Petition of Edward Whitehouse, for removal of charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILLMAN (by request): Petition of J. H. W. Platts and others for reference of their claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. ATKINSON: Of citizens of Snyder County, and of pharmacists of Mount Union, Pa.

By Mr. BUNNELL: Of druggists of Susquehanna County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. MAISH: Of citizens of Cumberland County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. WISE: Of citizens of West Point, Va.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. C. H. ALLEN: Of Charles H. Ames and others, and of C. W. Swallow and others, of Massachusetts.

By Mr. MORROW: Of citizens of Nevada County, California.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. ATKINSON: Of farmers of Dundore, Pa.

By Mr. BUNNELL: Of Stevensville, Pa.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Of O. D. Potter and others, of Webster, Me.

By Mr. HIESTAND: Of citizens of Hilltown, Bucks County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. PENINGTON: Of citizens of Bridgeville, Del.

By Mr. ROCKWELL: Of citizens of Cheshire, Mass.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. FORD: Of 200 citizens of Fennville, Mich.

By Mr. A. C. THOMPSON: Of 16 ex-soldiers of Eureka, Gallia County, Ohio.

The following petition, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, was referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. ATKINSON: Of citizens of Franklin County, Pennsylvania.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *May* 17, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 5259) to relieve Jacob G. Bostatter from the charge of fraudulent enlistment; and

A bill (H. R. 7398) to subdivide the eastern judicial district of Louisiana, and to fix the time and place for holding terms of court therein.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government and the Bureau of Agriculture and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and the Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, from July 4 to October 27, 1888.

OHIO VALLEY CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. ALLISON. I present the report of the committee of conference on the Cincinnati exposition bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government and the Bureau of Agriculture and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, from July 4, to October 27, 1888, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 8, and 22.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 21, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert the following:

"That there shall be appointed a committee of Congress composed of ten members, five to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Said committee is authorized and directed to visit said exposition and make such report to Congress in that behalf as they may deem needful and proper."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$147,750;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate

numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment, insert the following: "For expenses of the committee of Congress, $2,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"*Provided*, That payment of the expenses incurred by the committee of Congress shall be made on vouchers approved by the chairman of said commitee."

And the Senate agree to the same.

W. B. ALLISON,
H. L. DAWES,
F. M. COCKRELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
D. B. HENDERSON,
J. C. CLEMENTS,
BENJ. BUTTERWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was concurred in.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. CAMERON. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope that motion will not be pressed at this moment. Let us see how far we get on to-day with the business of the session.

Mr. CAMERON. We may as well decide the question now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. ALLISON. I beg pardon of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania insist on the motion?

Mr. CAMERON. I think the question had better be taken now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON].

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CALL presented a petition of certain fourth-class postmasters in Florida, praying that their compensation be increased to $50 a quarter in some cases and $75 a quarter in other cases; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of druggists, citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the repeal of the law classifying druggists as liquor dealers; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I present a petition of 14 postal clerks, praying for the passage of an act for the readjustment of the salaries of postal clerks. Although the petition is addressed to me personally it is undoubtedly intended for the consideration of the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and I move that it be referred to that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DAWES, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments:

A bill (H. R. 8074) to provide for allotment of land in severalty to United Peorias and Miamies in Indian Territory;

A bill (S. 2901) granting to the Milwaukee, Lake Shore and Western Railway Company the right of way through the Lac de Flambeau Indian reservation in the State of Wisconsin;

A bill (S. 2315) granting the right of way to the Yankton and Missouri Valley Railway Company through the Yankton Indian reservation in Dakota; and

A bill (S. 2807) to grant to the Puyallup Valley Railway Company a right of way through the Puyallup Indian reservation in Washington Territory, and for other purposes.

Mr. DAWES, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1331) for the relief of John Fletcher, reported it without amendment.

Mr. HAMPTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2265) for the relief of acting assistant surgeons of the Army, reported it with amendments.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to say that I disagree to the report in that case.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. HAMPTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2730) for the relief of Charles F. Bowers, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1058) to relieve John J. Farnsworth of the charge of desertion, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. PADDOCK submitted a report to accompany the bill (H. R. 7222) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish agricultural stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto," heretofore reported by him.

Mr. PASCO. I am directed by the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 942) for the relief of George F. Brott, to report it adversely. I ask that the bill be placed on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar, with the adverse report of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 2967) to provide for the erection of a monument to the memory of General George Rogers Clark; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2968) granting a pension to Mrs. J. E. Norton; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 2969) to restore to the pension-roll of the United States the name of Elizabeth Reid, formerly Elizabeth Horton, widow of James L. Horton, United States steamship Yantic; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VANCE introduced a bill (S. 2970) for the relief of Calvin J. Cowles and George B. Hanna; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a bill (S. 2971) for the relief of Michael Conlan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

PAPERS WITHDRAWN AND REFERRED.

On motion of Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, it was

Ordered, That the memorial and accompanying papers of J. Goldsborough Bruff be taken from the files of the Senate and referred to the Committee on Printing.

LAND-PATENT SUITS.

Mr. STEWART submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General be, and he is hereby, directed to answer without unnecessary delay the resolution of the Senate of the 26th day of March, 1888, calling for information with regard to suits authorized by the Department of Justice to vacate land patents issued by the United States, so far as said resolution relates to proposed litigation to vacate patents to the Mexican land claims known as the Ranchos Raymundo, Las Pulgas, Corte de Madera del Presidio, Buri-Buri, and Cañada de Guadalupe la Visitacion y Rodeo Viego, situate in the State of California, together with the dates of the several patents for said claims proposed to be vacated; the names of the persons interested in vacating the same, the names of the attorneys employed to prosecute the proposed suits, and by whom they are to be compensated; whether any contracts have been made with private parties to pay the costs of the United States in said proposed suits; whether the Attorney-General has made such an examination of said cases as to determine whether such suits ought to be commenced, how the United States will be benefited thereby; whether the United States is likely to be successful in such litigation; whether the Department of Justice has exact information as to the number of inhabitants residing on said claims; the number of innocent persons whose titles will be clouded by the proposed litigation; and to what extent the Department of Justice proposes to relitigate the private land claims in California which have been adjudicated and patented by tribunals organized by Congress for that purpose.

Mr. STEWART. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution at this time.

Mr. COCKRELL. I think that it had better be printed, so that we may see it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution goes over under the rule on the objection of the Senator from Missouri, and it will be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 5259) to relieve Jacob G. Bostatter from the charge of fraudulent enlistment was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 7398) to subdivide the eastern judicial district of Louisiana, and to fix the time and place for holding terms of court therein, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DES MOINES RIVER LANDS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business that order is closed, and the Senate resumes the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII, beginning at Order of Business 868.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I desire to state that I shall ask the Senate on Monday, the 28th instant, to proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 18, being the bill (S. 287) to quiet title of settlers on the Des Moines River lands, in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes. I wish to give this notice now, and I hope that there will be no objection to the taking up for consideration of the bill at the time indicated, inasmuch as a few days thereafter I shall find it necessary for me to absent myself from the city for some time.

The bill was reported December 20 last, and has been passed over from time to time as it has been reached on the Calendar for the convenience of the Senators from New York; but I hope that at 2 o'clock on the day indicated the Senate will allow me to have the bill taken up for consideration and proceeded with to its conclusion. I do not think it will take long to dispose of it; I certainly do not expect to occupy much of the time of the Senate in remarks concerning it.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not wish to object to any assignment for the accommodation of the Senator from Iowa; I only desire that the unfinished business be not displaced by any arrangement that is made, and that it hold its position as the unfinished business of the Senate.

Mr. PLATT. The 28th is a good way off.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I have put the day pretty late in the month, being the 28th.

Mr. BLAIR. I understood it was next Tuesday.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. No, not until Monday, the 28th instant.

POSTAL CRIMES.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chief Clerk will report the first order of business on the Calendar.

Mr. SAULSBURY. House bill 7052 passed the Senate yesterday with an amendment. I move that the Senate insist upon the amendment and ask for a committee of conference.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The title of the bill will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7052) relating to postal crimes and amendatory of the statutes therein mentioned.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Delaware moves that the Senate insist upon its amendment to the bill, and ask for a conference on the bill and amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, were appointed.

INSPECTORS OF HULLS AND BOILERS.

Mr. FRYE. I was necessarily absent from the Senate yesterday in the room of the Committee on Commerce considering the river and harbor bill, and shall be detained in committee all day to-day. There are two or three small bills on the Calendar that will take comparatively little time, and I ask unanimous consent that I may call them up now, in order that nothing shall prevent my attending to the river and harbor bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope the Senator will not ask for a violation of our understanding.

Mr. FRYE. I can not be here to-day, as the Senator knows, and I could not be here yesterday.

Mr. COCKRELL. If when we reach those bills anybody objects to them, we can send for the Senator.

Mr. FRYE. But there was a bill reached yesterday and passed which ought not to have been passed in its present shape; it ought to have been amended before it was passed; and that was done because I was not here.

Mr. COCKRELL. If the Senator will state what the bill is, I shall move to reconsider the vote by which it was passed, so that it may be amended.

Mr. CULLOM. It seems to me that those Senators who are compelled to be out of the Senate on committee work ought to have a little opportunity to call up bills in which they are interested.

Mr. COCKRELL. How many committees are there that have leave to sit and that are in session now? If we grant the privilege to one and violate the rule, we must grant it to all, and if we do that we may as well abandon what we have agreed to do.

Mr. CULLOM. The Senator knows the river and harbor bill is one which requires continuous consideration by the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Senators will address the Chair.

Mr. FRYE. If the Senator from Missouri objects, I have nothing to say, and I shall ask no further favors of the Senate.

I move to reconsider the vote by which Senate bill 2393 was passed yesterday.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The title of the bill will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2393) to fix the compensation of inspectors of hulls and boilers in certain districts of the United States.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine moves to reconsider the vote by which this bill was passed by the Senate.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The vote by which the bill was ordered to a third reading and read the third time will also be reconsidered, if there be no objection.

Mr. FRYE. I move, in line 4, after the word "Michigan," to insert the words "New London."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 4, after "Michigan," insert "New London;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the inspectors of hulls and the inspectors of boilers for the districts of Albany, Michigan, New London, and Superior shall hereafter be entitled to receive an annual salary of $1,500 each; and that the inspector of hulls and the inspector of boilers for the district of Apalachicola shall hereafter be entitled to receive an annual salary of $1,200 each; and all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Order of Business 866 is the next bill on the Calendar under Rule VIII.

Mr. ALLISON. Pending that, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the pension appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 5445) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The pending question is on an amendment of the Committeee on Appropriations.

Mr. COCKRELL. The pending question is on the proposed amendment of the Senate committee to strike out in lines 15, 16, and 17 the words:

That in all pensions to widows, payments shall be made from the date of death of the husband.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

That all pensions which have been, or which may hereafter be, granted under the general laws regulating pensions to widows in consequence of death occurring from a cause which originated in the service since the 4th day of March, 1861, shall commence from the date of death of the husband.

I desire to know whether——

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator will allow me to suggest that he can accomplish the purpose he has in view by simply striking out of the amendment, as it is in the text, the words "which have been or."

Mr. COCKRELL. In line 17, of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Committee on Appropriations, after the word "pensions," I move to strike out the words "which have been or;" so as to read:

That all pensions which may hereafter be granted under the general laws regulating the pensions to widows in consequence of death occurring from a cause which originated in the service since the 4th day of March, 1861, shall commence from the date of death of the husband.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] to the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. COCKRELL. The amendment which I have proposed is precisely the bill on that question which was reported by the Senate Committee on Pensions, and which was passed by the Senate and is pending in the other House.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to inquire if the Senator means to confine this payment to those who hereafter get pensions?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes. In the bill which was passed by the Senate, known as the dependent-pension bill, there is this proviso—and I propose to insert the same proviso in this bill—

All pensions granted to widows under this or any other general law shall take effect from the date of death of the husband of such widows, respectively, but not dating back of the passage of this act.

That is what was recommended by the Committee on Pensions, and it was passed by the Senate. My amendment simply makes the language of this bill conform to that.

Mr. TELLER. Then that leaves the widows who got pensions between 1880 and the approval of this bill governed by a different rule from that which governs all the payments of pensions to widows prior to 1880, and that will govern them subsequent to the passage of this act, leaving an interregnum of some eight years where one rule is applied and at all other times another rule is applied.

It seems to me that if we propose to make any change at all we ought to put all the widows on an equality and give all the widows of the last war pensions alike. The aim of the amendment of the committee, I understand, is to give the same to all, to give to those who got their pensions between 1880 and the date of the approval of this proposed law and hereafter the same pension. I do not see any reason for leaving the interregnum between 1880 and, say, the 1st of July, 1888, and providing that the widows embraced in that class shall get their pensions on the date of application and the others from the date of the death of the husband. We give pensions to the widows because their husbands were entitled to pensions, and I do not see by what rule we can object to paying the pensions of widows from the date of the husband's death. It seems to me eminently proper, if we are going to pay the pensions in the future as we have paid them largely in the past, that we should apply the same rule to all.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from Missouri will not insist upon this amendment. I think the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations has been very carefully considered, and is a proper provision. It is in practical accord, I will say to the Senator, with the recommendation of the Commissioner of Pensions, as will be seen by his last report. On page 18 of his report the Commissioner of Pensions states:

Under existing law a widow's pension certificate can only bear date from the day on which she files her application. Our knowledge of the sacred relations of husband and wife makes us know that the last thought which often occurs to the widow is that of the pecuniary results of death. Moreover there is a sense of delicacy which prevents a woman from immediately making application to be availed of the results of her husband's death, and so between cares, delicacy, and sometimes ignorance of right, long intervals elapse between the death of the husband and the filing of the application of the widow.

Then it is true he recommends that—

In such cases as may hereafter arise it seems to me that the law should allow the commencement of the pension to date from the death of the husband, where the other conditions required by the law are present.

The reason which actuated the committee in moving this amendment which applies to those cases arising between 1880 and the present time

was that as respects all other widows the pension does begin at the date of the death of the husband. Under section 4713 of the Revised Statutes in the case of every widow applying for a pension, where the cause of death originated prior to March 4, 1861, the widow receives the pension from the date of the death of the husband if the application is filed within three years. The statute of March 3, 1879, applied a different rule to widows of soldiers who served in any war after the 4th of March, 1861. That was a manifest injustice. This provision places all the widows upon an exact equality practically, and therefore, although it is retroactive to the extent of allowing widows who filed their applications between 1880 and 1886, or the time of the passage of this bill, arrears of pension, yet it places them upon an equality with all other widows receiving pensions. So I hope the Senator from Missouri will not insist upon his amendment.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask the Senator from Iowa whether the quotation he has read from the report of the Commissioner of Pensions as to fixing the time when the pension of the widow of a soldier shall begin, to wit, at the date of death of the husband instead of the date of the application, was not looking to the future and not to arrears of pension as understood by the Commissioner of Pensions?

Mr. ALLISON. It is true the Commissioner recommends it as to the future, but his argument applies to the amendment of the committee as well. I quoted his argument, not his recommendation.

Mr. FAULKNER. Does not his argument apply simply to the question of the delicacy that is incident to the fact of the death of the husband which prevents the widow from applying immediately after his death?

Mr. ALLISON. So it does, but in every other case except that of the widows between 1880 and the present moment, who are widows of soldiers in service after March, 1861, the widow does draw her pension from the date of the death of her husband, notwithstanding her application may not have been immediately made.

Mr. BECK. Is it not true that the widows of the soldiers of the Mexican war must arrive at the age of sixty or sixty-two years before they are pensioned at all?

Mr. ALLISON. That is true of service pensions, but the widow of an invalid soldier of the Mexican war draws a pension from the date of the death of her husband if the application is filed within three years, and if it is not filed within three years, under section 4713 of the Revised Statutes, she, of course, then can only draw from the date of the filing of the last paper.

Mr. COCKRELL. In moving this amendment I was simply aiming to have inserted in the bill the recommendation of the Committee on Pensions and the formal act of the Senate in passing the dependent pension bill which has this express provision in it, as I have read. I thought this bill ought to be made to harmonize with that bill. As I said, in the dependent pension bill, which has passed the Senate and is now pending in the other House, we find this provision:

> All pensions granted to widows under this or any other general law shall take effect from the date of death of the husband of such widows respectively, but not dating back of the passage of this act.

There are just two questions involved. The first is in regard to the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations without the adoption of my amendment, and the other is the provision in the bill as it came from the other House. The question is, how much will be the additional cost imposed by the adoption of the committee amendment instead of the House provision. I have made estimates, and they are accurate according to the data upon which they are made; and it is the estimate of the Commissioner of Pensions.

Estimating that 7,000 claims of widows will be allowed during the fiscal year 1889, and that the average period of nine months will cover the arrearage at $12 per month, or $108 for the year, will make the additional cost $756,000 for the fiscal year 1889. This will be the additional cost if the proviso is limited to claims hereafter allowed, which will be the proviso I propose to insert. If the proviso is extended to claims of widows against whom the limitation of arrears act has run, then the estimate is that 9,959 claims of widows have been already allowed since June 30, 1880, wherein pensions have been allowed from date of filing the application instead of from dates of deaths of husbands; and that an average period of nine months elapses between date of death and date of application of widow for pension. Thus, estimating $8 per month for nine months, or $72 for each of the 9,959 claims of widows so already allowed will make the additional cost of $717,048 for this one class alone—that is, for the class of claims against whom the limitation of the arrears act has taken place. If, therefore, the proviso should include only these two classes, and that is what the proposed amendment of the Senate committee includes, to wit, claims of widows hereafter allowed and claims of widows already allowed, subject to the limitation of arrears act, from date of application instead of dates of deaths of husbands, then the additional cost will be $756,000 for the first-named class for the fiscal year 1889 and $717,048 for the last-named class, making a total of $1,473,048, which will be the net additional cost for the fiscal year 1888; and in addition to this additional cost must be considered the claims of widows hereafter—that is, after the end of the fiscal year 1889—allowed each year.

No estimate of the probable number of widows' claims which may be allowed each fiscal year after 1889 has been made by the Pension Office. We can, however, easily make an approximate estimate upon the same data upon which the estimate for 1889 has been made by the Pension Office. Estimating an average period of nine months from date of death of husband to date of application of widow, at $12 per month, we have $108 for each claim of a widow allowed in such fiscal year, and, estimating the number of claims of widows to be allowed after 1889 at 6,000 annually, we have $648,000 as the additional cost each year after 1889 for this class of claims hereafter allowed.

That will be the effect of the amendment proposed by the Senate committee.

If the Senate amendment becomes a law, these estimates will prove rather below than above the actual amounts of the additional costs which will be imposed thereby; but if the Senate amendment is not agreed to and the proviso in the bill as it came from the House shall become a law, and "in all pensions to widows, payments shall be made from the date of death of the husband," then we are at sea without compass or chart, and have no even approximate estimate or supposition from the Pension Office as to the additional cost which will be imposed thereby. We have the estimates for the two classes, which will be included in the proposed Senate amendment which I have already given. To these must be added the claims of 11,831 widows of the war of 1812, and all such claims as may hereafter be allowed; that is, since June 30, 1887.

Mr. ALLISON. May I interrupt the Senator just a moment?

Mr. COCKRELL. It will be no interruption.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator speaks of widows of the war of 1812. The pensions of all those widows are service pensions purely. I wish that to be understood in connection with his statement.

Mr. COCKRELL. As a matter of course the pensions to the widows of that war are service pensions; but the amendment proposed by the committee would give them arrears. That is the point I am making distinctly.

Mr. TELLER. It would give them arrears?

Mr. COCKRELL. Unquestionably, according to my construction of it.

To these must be added, as I said, the claims of 11,831 widows of the war of 1812 and all such claims as may be allowed since June 30, 1887. And the claims of widows of the soldiers of the Mexican war—of which 895 had been allowed up to June 30, 1887, and 4,443 in all had been allowed up to April 30, 1888—and infinite wisdom alone can tell how many will be allowed hereafter, and all such claims as may hereafter be allowed; and in addition to all these must be added all claims of widows allowed by special acts of Congress at the rates specified in each of such acts, many of which are at the rates of $25, $40, $50, and $100 per month. And these widows would take arrearages according to those rates from the date of the death of their husbands, and in many instances the arrearages would run up to many thousands of dollars.

The only estimate made by the Pension Office is as to the number of claims of widows of the soldiers of the Mexican, Florida, and Black Hawk wars, and other wars allowed prior to March 4, 1861, and who are now alive. This number is placed at 1,702, and it is estimated that the average period for which arrears would become due would be five years, and the rate per month would be $8 per month, or $96 per year for each of the 1,702 widows for five years, amounting to $816,960. It must be observed that this estimate only includes 1,702 of the 11,831 widows of the war of 1812 and the 4,443 widows of the Mexican war, whose pensions had been allowed up to April 30, 1888. If we deduct this number of 1,702 widows, for whom the Pension Office made the foregoing estimate, from the whole number of widows of the war of 1812 on the rolls June 30, 1887, being 11,831, and of the widows of the Mexican war on the rolls April 30, 1888, being 4,443, and, together, numbering 16,274, we have left 14,972 widows of the Mexican and prior wars now on the rolls. Estimating the average period of arrears for each of these 14,972 widows at five years each at $8 per month, we have the additional cost of $7,186,560 for these widows, in addition to the $816,960 for the 1,702 widows. In this way the estimate for all the 16,274 widows now on the pension-rolls will be $8,003,520, as the additional cost of the provision in the bill as it came from the other House. This does not include the claims of such widows which may hereafter be allowed.

According to the report of the Commissioner of Pensions for 1887 there were on June 30, 1877, in his office 9,764 claims of widows of the war of 1812, of which 676 were then pending, and 9,088 on the rejected files—that is, rejected, but subject to reconsideration on presentation of proper evidence at any time. And there were 3,095 claims of widows of the Mexican war, of which 3,081 were pending and 14 on the rejected files.

Nearly all, if not all, of these pension claims of the widows of the Mexican war were allowed prior to April 30, 1888, as the large increase in the allowance will show; but how many more have been filed since June 30, 1887, or may hereafter be filed, no one can possibly tell.

It is absolutely impossible for any one to figure or calculate with any accuracy the many millions of dollars which will be taken out of the

Treasury by reason of the provision in this appropriation bill inserted by the House of Representatives. The Mexican war pension bill alone provides:

That every such officer, enlisted man, or widow who is or may become sixty-two years of age, or who is or may become subject to any disability or dependency * * * shall be entitled to the benefits of this act.

There are hundreds of these widows who are not yet sixty-two. They are not yet entitled to their pensions. The pension law as enacted here in March, 1886, gives $12 per month to widows. That law must be taken into the account. Fifteen or twenty or thirty years ago a soldier of the Mexican war died and his widow was not sixty-two years of age, but some ten or fifteen years hence she becomes sixty-two years of age and becomes entitled to a pension under the Mexican war pension law. The House provision gives her arrearages from the date of the death of her husband at $8 per month up to the 19th day of March, 1886, and after March 19, 1886, $12 per month. I say there is no justice, no fair dealing, no equity in this, and the Pension Committee took the correct position in its report on the dependent pension bill in limiting the allowance of arrears to cases hereafter allowed.

Mr. PADDOCK. Will the Senator allow me a moment?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. PADDOCK. I want to say to the Senator that he must not take the report of the Pensions Committee upon the dependent pension bill as a precedent for any other case.

Mr. COCKRELL. I am not taking the report, but the action of the Senate.

Mr. PADDOCK. I understood the Senator to refer to the committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. I referred to the bill reported by the committee, the language of the bill itself as passed by the Senate. It is the action of the committee and of the Senate.

Mr. PADDOCK. I desire to say to the Senator that the committee advised the Senate at the time when that bill was under consideration that it had not reported such a bill as it desired to report, but it reported such a bill as it had reason to believe from the circumstances of the then situation, then fully described, and which I will not now do more than refer to, was the best attainable proposition at the time.

Mr. COCKRELL. I remember that.

Mr. PADDOCK. The committee would have desired, if it had followed its own inclination, to report a much more liberal bill, but it felt itself constrained at the time on account of the peculiar situation to report only such a bill as it did report. And, if the Senator will allow me to say another word as one of the members of that committee, I regret now that the committee had not done what it desired to do, because we find from the action in another place that that bill has been sidetracked and that a pretense has been made to pass a more liberal bill, but probably an action taken with no other design than to obstruct rather than to secure the passage of any bill at all.

Mr. COCKRELL. Mr. President, we have been liberal in these matters; we have been just; we have been generous; we have been magnanimous. On the 19th day of March, 1886, Congress enacted a law entitled "An act to increase the pension of widows and dependent relatives of deceased soldiers and sailors," and under that law widows are allowed $12 a month, while the soldier himself is only allowed $8 per month. We provide in that act—

That no claim agent or attorney shall be recognized in the adjudication of claims under this act.

So that the widows get the entire benefit of that increase of $4 per month, an increase of 50 per cent. over what the pension was before, without any remuneration or claim on the part of the claim agents or pension attorneys.

I think the amendment which I have proposed is fair and just and liberal, and that it is all that ought to be granted. I think the provision in the bill as it came from the House should be stricken out, and that the amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations should be amended to the extent I have indicated, and I hope my amendment will prevail.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, the difference between the proposition of the Senate Committee on Appropriations and that of the Senator from Missouri is that the latter will save to the Government $717,048. We know exactly what the difference is. The uncertainty of the House provision has nothing to do with the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations, and it is a simple question for the Senate to say whether they desire to save $717,048 from a class of very needy people, and leave those people receiving a different pension under different treatment from what all other widows who have received pensions previous to 1880 and those who will receive pensions hereafter. If it is so essential that we should save this amount, and take it from this class of people, the Senate ought promptly to sustain the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. If, on the other hand, it is the purpose to do equal and exact justice, the same justice we are to do to those who apply hereafter, if we are going to do exact justice to all sorts of classes alike, we are bound to give to those who got their pensions between 1880 and the passage of this bill the same that we give the others.

How long does the Senator from Missouri or any body else suppose it will be, if we pass this law in this shape, until we shall be asked to provide for this class of cases? He knows, certainly, that we shall be very apt to do it. If we are to deal with this subject at all, we had better deal with it in a proper manner and deal with it in such a way that there shall be an end of it. If there is any reason why we should give pensions hereafter to date from the date of the soldier's death, the same reason exists why we should do it with those widows who have had their pensions allowed since 1880.

This is but a continuation of the soldier's pension, except that we have added $4 a month extra.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations if, as the bill now stands on the report of the committee, the arrears of pension are denied to the widows of the Mexican war soldiers? I simply wish to know the fact.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes.

Mr. BLAIR. That being the fact, is there any reason for that save that the pension drawn by the soldiers of the Mexican war is a service pension, as a rule, while in the other case it is a pension founded upon disability? Is there any other reason for the distinction?

Mr. ALLISON. The report of the Committee on Appropriations excludes the idea of the widow of a soldier who receives a service pension being included in this provision for arrears.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator permit a suggestion there?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. COCKRELL. What becomes of the widows of the soldiers in the Mexican war who have been granted pensions on account of the death of their husbands from disease or disability connected with the service and incident to it?

Mr. ALLISON. I thank the Senator for calling my attention to that, although of course I should have alluded to it.

The theory of the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations is that these pensions shall apply only to widows of soldiers who themselves received pensions on account of disability, and shall not apply to the widows of soldiers who received a pension merely on account of service in the Mexican war or the war of 1812. The Senator from New Hampshire wants to know why that distinction is made. In the first place, it is made because in many cases there are widows whose claims would run back for fifty years, especially in the case of the war of 1812, and they would in many cases run back thirty years, or twenty-five years at least, in the cases of the Mexican war.

The Committee on Appropriations did not wish to deal with that great question of whether the widows of soldiers of the Mexican war and of the war of 1812, who have been widows for thirty or fifty years, and who have been granted pensions on account of the services of their husbands in the war of 1812 for fourteen days or in the war with Mexico for six days, should come now and receive fifty years arrears of pension. We did not undertake to grapple with that great question. We considered that that question was not one which was properly germane to the provision here, and although this clause as it came from the House of Representatives is capable of being construed as it is construed by the Senator from Missouri, yet it is capable of being construed in a much narrower way. If the Senator will look at the report of the Commissioner of Pensions he will see that that Commissioner would probably decide that under this original provision as it came from the other House arrears would only be granted where applications were made hereafter.

Mr. COCKRELL. Some other Commissioner might take a different view.

Mr. ALLISON. That is true, but the Senator himself stated the injustice of that provision as applied to service pensions, because it is true that a widow of a soldier of the war with Mexico could receive a pension when she arrived at the age of sixty-two years, although her husband may have died in 1848, forty years ago. Therefore it was manifest to the Committee on Appropriations that this provision as it came from the House should not be allowed to pass on account of its injustice to the widows of soldiers of the war of the rebellion, and because it was likely to give to the widows of soldiers of the Mexican war arrears of pensions for from thirty to forty years. The Commissioner states that the average of these would certainly be nine years. Hence the Committee on Appropriations undertook to deal with the narrower question, which they believed was intended by the provision put in this bill by the House of Representatives.

Now, the Senator from New Hampshire asks me why it is that we excluded the widows of the war of 1812 and of the war with Mexico? I will state to the Senator frankly why the committee did so. The committee excluded those because up to 1879 the pension of every widow dated from the death of the husband if application was made within three years. At that time we cut off from that provision the widows of soldiers who were engaged in the war of the rebellion, but we retained it as to the widows of soldiers of the Mexican war. In other words, Mexican-war widows up to this very moment, if they have filed their application within three years, by section 4713 of the Revised Statutes receive a pension back to the date of the death of the husband.

We concluded that this liberal provision for the widows of soldiers of the Mexican war was fair and reasonable, and we did not choose to interfere with it. But if anybody thinks that this report of the committee

deals unjustly with the Mexican-war widows I am not very particular about their insertion or not. The Commissioner of Pensions estimated the cost to be $800,000, and that the average of arrears would be five years. I think that this is a sufficient answer to the Senator from New Hampshire that this average of arrears being so great is a fair indication that it should be considered as a separate question, while the average of the arrears to the widows of soldiers of the war of the rebellion is only nine months. If the distinction is wiped out it will cost $800,000.

Mr. BLAIR. As long as the amount is so small and the basis on which it is given to the widows of the war of the rebellion is precisely the same in nature and merit as that on which it is to be extended to the widow of a soldier of the Mexican war, would it not be more symmetrical and in accordance with principle and worth more than the $700,000 or $800,000 to have the amendment of the committee modified so as to include all? I would much prefer to support it in that way.

While I am up I wish to say that I think the committee failed to appreciate the new light that has dawned on the horizon of this country within a recent period with regard to something like justice, not to say liberality in the matter of pensions to those who have been the defenders of the life of this country. The Senate ought to take notice of the fact that in the other branch of Congress there has been already reported, so far as I know unanimously, certainly with the ardent support of the majority of the committee, that is to say, the Democratic party, an arrears-of-pension bill, and that the $250,000,000 which the first payment is to cost is spoken of in very appropriate terms as a mere bagatelle and as a proper method of absorbing and distributing the surplus at the present time and for a long time to come. All these matters ought to be considered in view of this dawning reason and this promise of justice liable to become a great tree, if not a great forest, overshadowing the whole country. It ought to be considered, I think, in dealing with so comparatively small a question as is involved here, whether we shall not adopt the new policy and all parties be united to illustrate that policy in this instance in the comparatively slight appropriation of $700,000 or $800,000 that is required. It seems to me we ought to do this.

Then we should remember further that not only has the idea of pensions, based upon disability as contracted in the war of the rebellion, become obsolete in the other end of the Capitol, but they have gone so far as to adopt there the notion of a service pension, and to report favorably to it with reference to all who participated in the recent war of the rebellion; and it does really begin to look as though the country was reconstructed and the Union restored, and that the war amounted to something.

I do not think it is becoming in those of us who, during this long, dark struggle of twenty years and more have tried to secure something like justice to the soldiers of the war of the rebellion, now to undertake to draw distinctions between those who served in different wars; and I respectfully suggest, and I would move if it be necessary to make the motion (I think the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations will be able to suggest the language to be inserted himself), to insert what may be necessary to make this provision cover the widows of soldiers of the Mexican war whose pensions depend upon the disability of their dead husbands.

Mr. PADDOCK. I should like to correct one reference made by the Senator from New Hampshire to the committee of the House of Representatives, if it is permissible.

Mr. BLAIR. If I am wrong I desire to be corrected.

Mr. PADDOCK. I understand, in the same way, I suppose, as the Senator gets his information—from the newspapers—that the Democratic members of the Committee on Pensions in the House, all of them except the chairman, are entitled to be absolved from the charge the Senator makes as to the alleged recent action of that committee looking to a new departure in the matter of a more liberal pension policy.

Our friend, the chairman of that committee, if rumor is to be credited, is playing altogether a lone hand in respect to at least one and the most important of the measures to which the Senator from New Hampshire has referred, the per diem rated service-pension proposition, which was reported from that committee to the House. Therefore the Senator must not state that the committee of the House have performed such an act as that to which he refers, and that our Democratic friends of that committee are responsible for it in any extent, except as to the chairman, who at the present time is somewhat peculiarly circumstanced politically.

Mr. BECK. I hope the gentleman will state here what he means by "a lone hand." [Laughter.]

Mr. PADDOCK. If there is any place in the world where that term is perfectly understood it is in Kentucky, where my distinguished interrogator was reared and educated. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLAIR. I am the only Senator on this side of the Chamber who does not understand it, I think. [Laughter.] I am obliged to my friend from Kentucky for asking the question.

I did not mean to be understood as saying that the committee in the opposite end of the Capitol have sanctioned the service-pension idea in full, but so far as I am aware there is no lack of union in the committee in the indorsement of the removal of the arrears-of-pension limitation as to those who participated in the war of the rebellion, no lack of unanimity in the recommendation that the Treasury be called upon to devote its surplus to the amount of $250,000,000 immediately among those who participated in the war of the rebellion and contracted disabilities. God be thanked for that! But as to the other question, the granting of service pensions to those who took part in the war of the rebellion—on the Union side, I mean to say, of course; I wish to guard myself in that particular—I do not understand that there is unanimity.

Mr. BECK. Mr. President, I only desire to say that I believe all that the Senator from New Hampshire predicted is likely to happen; the limitation on the arrears of pension will, I fear, be removed, and $250,000,000, may be double that sum, be given away under patriotic pretenses to pension agents and lobbyists, whereby the old soldiers will be more demoralized than benefited. I fear that many of the representatives of both parties are pandering to what they consider the soldier element of the country. They will find some day that it is really the pension agents and the other patriotic robbers who get the most of it. I agree with the Senator from Nebraska that a man will play a lone hand and a poor one at that when he votes against a pension bill. There seems to be a desire to vote for whatever will squander the most money and give it in such a way that a few pretended soldiers' friends who hang around Washington and call themselves special advocates of the soldier (who are really robbing him and at the same time are robbing the tax-payers of the country) are the principal beneficiaries. But I only rose for the purpose of saying that the bill referred to by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] will be over here very soon, and when it does come I shall most earnestly endeavor to have an income tax imposed on all the incomes of the wealthy men and corporations of the country to meet these great appropriations for pensions, so that the wealth of the country shall in some way contribute to the burdens that are imposed to support the men who are said to have saved the property of the country which these men hold.

Mr. TELLER. But you want to pay the bonds off.

Mr. BECK. I suppose we must pay them off, and pay them off with any premium added that anybody who holds them sees fit to ask. It is because of the high taxation that you Republican gentlemen have imposed on us that it is necessary either to pay extravagant premiums or to lock the money up. So perhaps it is better to pay off the bonds at any premium. Of these two evils we must choose the lesser. Once a tax is imposed on incomes to pay pensions we will have a body of men out of which this money will be exacted, who will hold in check the so-called liberality of the political patriots in both Houses who think they are making capital with the soldier by the vast sums they make the tax-payers contribute for their own advancement. I propose to let them be met by demands for reasonable taxation by the men out of whose pockets the money will have to come when the income tax is imposed. The principle is right. The organized wealth of the country, the capital of the country, ought to pay the pensions that are so lavishly squandered under the pretense that the services were rendered to protect that wealth, which is now in great part exempt from taxation.

The more the proposition for an income tax is examined the more favor the proposition will meet at both ends of the Capitol. I hope when the great arrears bill comes that I can show good reasons why the money should be provided by an income tax sufficient to meet all these extraordinary expenditures, and to pay it out of the accumulated wealth of the men whose property was saved, if not created, and is protected by what is assumed to be the patriotism of the men who, together with their widows and children and relatives and everybody else connected with them, are to be supported hereafter by the people at large, whether they need it or not.

Mr. TELLER. Mr. President, I do not intend to discuss the tariff question on this bill, nor do I intend to discuss the question whether there shall be an income tax. When such a measure comes here it will be time enough to discuss it.

I want to call the attention of the Senate to what was the legislation when these liabilities on the part of the Government were incurred towards the soldier. In 1862, on the 14th of July, we enacted a law in these words:

> That if any officer or other person named in the first section of this act has died since the 4th day of March, 1861, or shall hereafter die, by reason of any wound received or disease contracted while in the service of the United States and in the line of duty, his widow, or, if there be no widow, his child or children under sixteen years of age, shall be entitled to receive the same pension as the husband or father would have been entitled to had he been totally disabled, to commence from the death of the husband or father, and to continue to the widow during her widowhood, or to the child or children until they severally attain to the age of sixteen years, and no longer.

That was a reiteration of the earliest act that ever passed, and was renacted in 1836 and in 1848. I do not mistake when I say that ever since we have had a pension law, that was the law up to 1879. At that time when the arrears-of-pension bill was pending here the rule was changed. I do not suppose that anybody at that time intended to change it in reference to widows. I doubt very much whether Congress intended to say that when a man entitled to a pension died and his widow succeeded him, there should be an interregnum of such time as she might be waiting to overcome her grief or to find out what her

rights were before making her application. At the most it would be but a very brief period; and it can not be possible that anybody connected with national legislation was looking for a little saving of that kind.

Such was the policy of the Government; such was the law of the Government. It entered into the contract when a man went to the war that if he got hurt he should have a pension, and if he died from the effect of his injury his wife should have a pension, and that pension should commence at the date of his death; in other words, the pension should continue right along from the time the soldier got it till his widow died, if he died from the effects of service in the Army.

It does not seem to me that it is wise to attempt to make a little saving of the amount we should have to pay out in this interregnum between 1880 and 1888, which would be the effect of the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. I agree with him that there would be a manifest impropriety in allowing service-pension widows to come in, and that that would swell the amount so that it would be utterly impossible to make a calculation; but we know now exactly what we have to vote for when we adopt the committee's amendment. Shall we give to these widows $717,048, or shall we adopt a rule that all admit is invidious, unfair, and unjust to them for the purpose of saving that amount?

Mr. COCKRELL. Just one word, Mr. President. Having been engaged for twenty years in a fierce conflict with the Republican party in its political contests, I must now do justice to that party and vindicate it from the reflection cast upon it by the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR]. In long past contests we learned to respect and honor each other, and now I can not let this reflection upon the Republican party that it has not done justice to the soldier go unrebuked.

The Republican party had unlimited control of the legislative branch of this Government from the 1st of January, 1866, until the 4th day of March, 1875, and during the administration of President Johnson they had a two-thirds majority in the Senate and House, and could pass any legislation they chose over the President's veto; and from the 4th of March, 1869, up to the 4th day of March, 1875, eight years, the Republican party was in the zenith of its power and glory, and it controlled the legislative and executive branches of the Government, and it had full power and authority to do equal and exact justice to the soldiers of our country, and I repudiate the idea that that great party refused to do justice and equity and fair dealing to the soldiers, their widows, and their orphans.

Mr. PADDOCK. Will the Senator allow me a word?

Mr. COCKRELL. Certainly.

Mr. PADDOCK. The Republican party at that time received no applications from ex-soldiers for pensions. The ex-soldiers were living upon the memory of their glorious achievements, their patriotic services, and they sought no pensions. The widows and the orphans of the fallen were provided for by relatives and friends at home, as were the indigent wounded when they returned; but when the time of their need came the Republican party provided for them as best it could.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then you only do justice and equity and fair dealing when you are compelled to do so by the solicitations of the interested parties. I must reject that insinuation.

Mr. PADDOCK. We did it just as rapidly as our Democratic friends allowed us to do so.

Mr. COCKRELL. "Democratic friends allow you," when you had unlimited control and all power and authority from 1866 to 1875, and talk about the Democratic party permitting you to do it! Why did you not do it then? Why talk about the long hours and the weary years which the Republican party has passed struggling to do the soldier justice, and now there has been a light in another branch of the Government where there is a disposition to do them justice! I am astonished that my Republican friends will sit in their seats and hear the Senator from New Hampshire cast such aspersions and reflections upon their "grand old party."

I say, Mr. President, that it is not a political question that we are discussing here. I say the members of all parties in the United States will do justice and equity and liberality and magnanimity to the soldiers of our country and their widows and orphans. I say that by legislation enacted during the existence of Republican administrations and Democratic administrations, with a Republican Senate and a Republican House, with a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House, we have redeemed every pledge that we made to those gallant defenders of the integrity of the Union. There the law stands. We have done justice; we have done equity; we have done fairly. We have not only done that, but we have dealt liberally; we have dealt generously; we have dealt magnanimously.

Mr. President, I moved the pending amendment simply as a matter which I believed was just, was non-political, was calm and right. Since the expiration of the limitation on arrears we have passed the act that gives widows $12 per month instead of $8. We have increased their pensions by the act of March 19, 1886, 50 per cent. We have added to the pension $4 per month, when before it was only $8 per month; and I say that we have done all that equity and fair dealing, and justice and liberality, and magnanimity and generosity call for at our hands.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, I have cast no aspersions on "the grand old party," as the Senator from Missouri seems to think. I am exceedingly glad at what he now has to say in the direction of the vindication of his party from the charge of any illiberality or hesitation in the past in doing what I call justice, generosity, and liberality to the soldiers of the Union in the war of the rebellion; but I think that if he will examine the records of the last ten or twelve years, since the Democratic party came again to have influence in the Government of the United States, after having absented itself as a body substantially from the affairs of the Government during the earlier part of the last quarter of a century, he will find that every advance in the direction of increased pensions in amount and in the classes included on the pension-roll that has been made has been made against the opposition of the Democratic party, and in recent years every bill that has liberalized or added anything to the pension-roll in money or in the classes which are to be benefited by the contributions of the Government to those who have preserved it has originated in the Republican branch of Congress—in every instance of any consequence at any rate.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does not the Senator remember the arrears act?

Mr. BLAIR. I remember it.

Mr. COCKRELL. Where did it originate?

Mr. BLAIR. It originated with a Republican, and was pressed——

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, no; a Democratic House passed the arrears-of-pension bill.

Mr. BLAIR. Yes; but it was not a Democratic measure. It was long pressed by Republicans in the Republican Senate, and passed under the pressure of political exigencies by a Democratic House. The Senator may make claim that the Democratic party is entitled to the credit or discredit of what is known as the arrears-of-pensions act. The Presiding Officer of the Senate can give his information in regard to that.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Senator, did not that act first pass the House of Representatives?

Mr. BLAIR. I do not undertake to say that it did not first pass the House.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is all.

Mr. BLAIR. But does the Senator know nothing except the mere surface of the outside of legislation? Does he not know the origin of the measure, how it was pressed persistently day after day, session after session, Congress after Congress, by Republican members of both branches of Congress, and finally was extorted from the Democratic party under the dread of political defeat, just exactly as it might be premised that some of its existing liberality so lately developed is attributable to the same class of motive?

Mr. President, I have but to refer to recent legislation to convict the Senator from Missouri, not of any intentional misrepresentation, but of a lapse of memory, which is very unusual with him. He will recollect that at the last Congress we sent to the House of Representatives a measure originating in the Senate designed to give relief to those who are in actual necessity, and many of them in the almshouses of the country, after having preserved their country's capacity to construct even almshouses by their sacrifices on the field of battle and in the vicissitudes of war. We sent that bill to a Democratic House of Representatives, and this same committee, or this same chairman of the committee of a Democratic House of Representatives, pared it down, exfoliated it, eliminated from it all its features of decent liberality even, and that bill went to the President of the United States, after having been concurred in by the Senate as the best that could be done under the circumstances, and it met the veto of a Democratic President.

During the present session of Congress we have passed another measure and sent it to the Democratic House, a measure somewhat less liberal than our legislation in the two last Congresses, and that so far has had no consideration. It has come to the surface, it seems, with an amendment designed for its extermination. So it has been for three Congresses in succession; the Senate of the United States and Republicans in the Senate of the United States (with some Democrats, I admit) have been doing their utmost to make some provision for those who are in the extremity of suffering and want, that extremity of suffering and want resulting from their efforts to preserve this great country—we have, I say, passed a measure of that kind and sent it to the Democratic House, and there it has been consigned to the gulf of oblivion.

The Senator from Missouri knows that, and he knows well that there is not on the pages of the statute-book of this country a single item of pension legislation of any consequence, unless it may be the Mexican war pension legislation lately enacted, that has not originated in the head and in the heart and in the motives of the Republican party. The Senator knows that he will hardly pick out a provision that has been placed on the statute-book but has been extorted and has simply been able to receive the sullen acquiescence of the Democratic party as a party. The Senator knows that, and the country knows it, and the soldiers of the country know it.

Now, Mr. President, I ask the Senator in charge of the bill that he shall modify the terms of this amendment, that he amend it to include the widows of the soldiers of the Mexican war whose husbands died from disability contracted in the service, so that the $700,000, or whatever amount be necessary, may be given to them; that the principle be

applied as it ought to be, and thus uniformity and justice secured in our enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANDERSON in the chair). The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Missouri to amend the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HARRIS. Let it be read.

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. President, I wish to make a few remarks in reference to this amendment.

Mr. SPOONER. Will the Senator allow the amendment to be reported before he proceeds?

Mr. FAULKNER. Certainly.

The Chief Clerk read the amendment of Mr. COCKRELL.

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. President, I regret that the partisan feelings of the people of this country are appealed to whenever a pension measure comes before the Senate. It seems to be the purpose, the object, and the intention of some gentlemen who take part in the discussion of these bills always to bring in a partisan question touching the adoption or rejection of any pension bill presented to the Senate for its action. I do not know what is the purpose or object of this, unless it is to make political capital; but it does not occur to me in what action I deem proper on the floor of the Senate that my honest sentiments as to the propriety of passing any particular bill that may be proposed to the body for its action are to be influenced by such considerations. I look upon it, so far as parties are concerned, that both parties by their platforms, by their past political history, are pledged to do justice, full-handed justice, to those who died or were wounded or contracted disease in the defense of the Union; and, so far as I am concerned, both as a Senator on this floor and as a member of the Pensions Committee, I propose to meet that responsibility and carry out that pledge fully and completely.

But I have only risen now for the purpose of correcting what I conceive to be an erroneous remark made by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK], who is a member of the Pensions Committee, and who, in speaking of the dependent-pension bill reported by that committee, alluded to the fact that it was not as liberal as the committee deemed proper for certain reasons which he indicated.

The remarks of the Senator may be correct and just as to the action of the committee with regard to the second section of the bill, but I do not concur with him that that is a correct representation of the opinion or action of the committee as to the third section of that bill, which embodies the very principle that is embodied in the amendment of the Senate Committee on Appropriations to the bill making appropriations for the payment of pensions for the succeeding fiscal year. That action of the Committee on Pensions, if I understood aright, was the deliberate, considerate judgment of that committee; and so far as an amendment was put on that bill fixing the commencement of the pension at the date of the death of the soldier instead of at the date of the application filed, it was made under the recommendation, as stated by the chairman of the committee, of the Commissioner of Pensions, and it was prospective in its character and not retroactive, as is the present amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. PADDOCK. The Senator will allow me to say that I did not intend, in what I said about the sentiment of the committee as to a stronger measure than that presented, to convey the impression that he—the Senator from West Virginia—entertained that desire. I meant only to refer to the fact that every Republican member of the Committee on Pensions on the floor of the Senate when that bill was under consideration made expressions as to his desire to have done more, but did only what could be done under the circumstances, and they being a majority of the committee reflected the views of the committee as such. I did not mean to speak for or of my friend from West Virginia, nor of the sentiments expressed by any member of the committee when the bill was being considered in the committee-room, but as to the real wishes of the majority as expressed here. I do not in this intend the slightest reflection on the Senator; on the contrary I wish to bear testimony to his perfect fairness, his uniform kindness, liberality, and generosity as a member of that committee in respect to all questions and cases of general as well as special character that have come before it.

Mr. FAULKNER. Mr. President, the Senator from Nebraska seems to have misunderstood the extent and scope of my remarks. I do not question the fact that the general scope of that bill affecting dependent pensions was not as liberal as a majority of that committee desired; but I do mean to say that this clause of that bill in the third section was the deliberate judgment of the committee, so far as I know without a dissenting vote:

> All pensions granted to widows under this or any other general law shall take effect from the date of the death of the husbands of such widows, respectively, but not dating back of the passage of this act.

That clause in the third section of the dependent pension bill, as it is known, as I understood, was the deliberate judgment of the committee. There was a reason outside of the merits of the case why the committee desired to make that limitation. The committee in reporting the bill was looking to taking care of a certain class of persons who had served in the Army and had dependent relatives, meeting an immediate want in order to pass some bill here; but when they found that they had other bills before that committee involving the whole subject of arrears, it was not the purpose of the Committee on Pensions to separate each one of this class and put them in separate bills, but to consider the entire question of arrearages as a whole, and either pass or reject the proposition to remove the bar of the limitation, not only as to widows, but also as to the soldiers themselves. Those matters are now pending before the Pension Committee, and yet before action by the Pensions Committee, before under the rules of the Senate the committee which has jurisdiction of the subject has acted on a question coming expressly within its jurisdiction, we find that another committee, the Appropriations Committee, by reason of some legislation put upon this appropriation bill by the House of Representatives, in violation of its own rules, and, as I conceive, in violation of the rules of the Senate, has taken up this subject (which is peculiarly within the jurisdiction of the Pensions Committee, who have bills now before them involving identically this question) and brought in an amendment, passing upon it without any action of the Pensions Committee.

It strikes me, Mr. President, that that is a mistake on the part of the Appropriations Committee, and it is a mistake on the part of the Senate to consider it and to take action upon it based upon the action of the Appropriations Committee. This subject ought to be remanded where it belongs, to the Pensions Committee, and if the provision is to be brought in it should apply not only to the widows, but certainly the soldiers have the same right to the removal of the bar of the statute of limitations.

It can not be said by any member on this floor, and especially by any upon the other side, who have a majority upon the Committee on Pensions, that he has not confidence sufficient in that committee to trust this matter to their consideration and to their action. That being the case, I claim that this question should not be considered by the Senate on this bill, but the whole amendment should be voted down and the clause of the House bill stricken out, and then let the Pensions Committee consider a widows' bill that shall cover the entire subject, and not be bringing in an amendment only for one particular class. That is the objection which I have to the amendment of the Senate Committee on Appropriations.

I do not commit myself on the question of arrearages of pensions. I have not satisfied my own mind that it is a wise policy in the Government now to remove the bar of the statute which is applied to arrearages of pensions, either as to the soldiers or their widows. Until that bar is removed as to the soldiers, I do not think the widows' claim should be considered, for I do not think the widow of a soldier stands upon a higher or loftier plane than does the man who bared his breast to the storm of bullets and in that way saved the Union.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] in the discussion of this question was mistaken in another respect, and so was the Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER]. They say this involves $717,000 to be expended if this bill passes in addition to the other sum that was mentioned. That is not the end of this question. That amount is very small, inconsiderable compared to what will grow out of the passage of this bill in this form. That would only be the amount to which the widows would be entitled who have received pensions since 1889 up to the present time. But, Senators, if you pass this bill with this clause in it, you will find the same result that followed the passage of the arrearage-of-pension bill, that the annual increase of applications for pensions after the passage of the bill will double and treble. That was the case in regard to the arrearage-of-pensions bill. After its adoption by Congress the applications more than doubled yearly, and so will it be in this case. There are applications now pending in the Pension Bureau for widows' pensions where the husband died fifteen years ago, and there will be a great number of that class induced by the large sum that will come in in the aggregate by this bill who will file applications who otherwise would not have paid any attention to the monthly stipend that is given by the ordinary pension law.

But that is not the question. I say frankly and without any hesitation, that where the obligation is just, where the provision is right in itself, the amount to be expended, unless it should go far beyond the bounds of reason and the resources of this Government to meet it, should not weigh with me in the consideration of the question; but now we are asked to remove the bar of the statute which has resulted from the fact that parties did not avail themselves of their legal rights, and are therefore simply appealing to the equity of Congress to come in and remove the entire bar so that they can do what they neglected to do when they had the power. I understand that in almost all the cases when the bar applied the parties filed their applications within a short period, and have been drawing pensions since, the amount not being very large to any individual one. But this is simply a question of asking for the removal of that bar for the widows, and I say before we take that up we ought to take up the question of whether we shall remove the bar from the soldier himself, and until that is decided we ought not on an appropriation bill to pass this legislation and change the law as it exists to-day in regard to widows.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, of course we all know the power of the Committee on Appropriations, and we sometimes think we realize the extent of that power in a manner inimical to the interests of other committees; but in our struggles before the Senate we find the Committee on Appropriations generally right if success is the true criterion

of what is right and wrong in human affairs. But however that may sometimes be, however poor we may sometimes think the legislation proposed by that committee, nevertheless we have often witnessed the fact on this floor that it is impossible to obtain much of the legislation most essential in this country except through the exercise of the functions of that committee; and when the Committee on Appropriations, either in the House or the Senate, takes up the condition of the soldiers of the country or the widows of the soldiers and their dependent parents, and by reason of a great power in the control of the revenue legislation of the country, or rather the great power which is behind that committee in the necessity that such legislation does bring it to the front when all other committees and all other agencies have failed to put that form of legislation to the front, and by reason of the universal necessity of the country that its bills do secure consideration for legislation of this character, I think the committee in both branches of Congress entitled to the thanks and not to the censure of the House and Senate. So here in this case the Committee on Appropriations has given us the opportunity, probably the only opportunity on this or any other appropriation bill, of doing anything whatever that is practically anything which goes beyond mere talk for the benefit of the soldiers and of their dependents during the present Congress, or, at all events, during the present session.

So I am not inclined to complain of an alleged usurpation which is for the public good or a grasping of jurisdiction by the Committee on Appropriations. I hope that the committee will take advantage of its opportunities and its other opportunities, if it has them during the session, to give us further and more liberal legislation or stop the wheels of government until we can get consideration for these claims.

I want to say just one word further. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER], when he first rose, I thought, spoke in a way that suggested a feeling that some one had remotely censured his own conduct as a member of the Committee on Pensions. I do not know that he meant that, but I desire to say that in anything I may have observed I had no reference to that Senator. I believe that the soldiers of this country get no fairer, no more just, liberal, and careful consideration of their claims from any Senator of any party than from the Senator from West Virginia. It is unnecessary to say that, unless I was misapprehended in what I said first.

But now in regard to the matter of the arrears of pension on which much is said on the floor of the Senate and which is dealt with as though it were a proposition either of a moon-struck fool or a demagogue, I desire to say that that proposition, as I think, is one based simply upon the most naked form of justice. There is no reply to the argument based upon simple, naked justice in favor of the demand of these petitioners for the removal of the limitation. What is it? It is a proposition, after the lapse of twenty-five years, to pay to those men who during those twenty-five years have suffered under pensionable disabilities contracted in the service of their country, men who would have been entitled to pensions had they applied for them twenty-five years ago, who would have been drawing those pensions continuously since and whose payment would have taxed the Treasury of the United States not alone the amount of the original sum paid but, in the interest that would have accrued upon those payments made from time to time four times yearly down to the present, which would in the interest have amounted to vastly more than the first cost.

These men have withheld their applications, some of them from ignorance of their rights, and some of them from other motives; some of them largely from the same patriotic motives which impelled them to enlist in the service of the country originally, from motives of the highest patriotism, and from a sense of independence and a desire that the rendering of their service should be based and allowed to stand simply on the basis of a pure patriotism. They wished to sustain themselves as long as they were able to do so; but after the lapse of many years, dependence coming upon them, failure of health, failure of fortune, and the approaching night of old age, they are induced to prefer their claims under the law after all these years of suspension and of waiver, which have inured wholly to the advantage and not to the disadvantage of the country; which have given to the country, as I said before, in the form of withheld interest, vastly more than the original principal itself. These men under these circumstances, at this late day, after in three instances we have done the same thing, ask for the removal of the limitation so far as they are concerned. Now I say the equities are all on their side. They ask and they have a fair right to a service pension after the lapse of all these years.

If, after this lapse of time, notwithstanding the failure of memory and all those influences which go to make litigation doubtful and expensive and uncertain, they are able to establish their claim and to get a verdict from the Government itself against itself and to get their names placed on the pension-roll, then arises this secondary question, when ought that pension to commence? Ought it not to commence from the date of the disability in such a case as this? What reply can be made to this proposition? What reply ever has been made or attempted to be made on the part of anybody, except to say that it involves considerable money? If the claim had been preferred when it might have been, and when one would think from the nature of the response now made it ought to have been, the draft on the Treasury would have been perhaps treble what it now is. So the Government is in no situation whatever to bring forward this as a defense. The Government is careful to say and to claim that no limitation ever runs against the Government.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will please suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock has arrived, and as the Chair understands the parliamentary state of the business the unfinished business is the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor.

Mr. HARRIS. Under the agreement reached by unanimous consent yesterday that bill is postponed, remaining the unfinished business until after yesterday, and the two successive legislative days have been devoted to the consideration of the Calendar, when the Chair announced that that bill should be laid before the Senate as the unfinished business having the right of way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so understands, and will state that the unfinished business will be laid aside for the consideration of the appropriation bill that now has the right of way, and at the conclusion of the appropriation bill the Calendar will be in order under Rule VIII, the Calendar displacing unfinished business.

Mr. HARRIS. I hope we shall come to a vote on this bill as early as possible, so that we may proceed with the Calendar.

Mr. BECK. I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations whether there is any necessity for pressing this bill now. I was absent from the committee during its consideration. Of course, that was my own fault; but the question of new legislation discussed by the Senator from West Virginia is an important one. I want to look into it, and perhaps the committee may want to look further into it. I am not quite sure of the policy here proposed. I should like very much to have the bill go over until Monday morning.

Mr. HARRIS. Say Tuesday. Monday is to be devoted to the Calendar.

Mr. BECK. If there is any embarrassment to arise from it, I do not wish to press the request I have made.

Mr. ALLISON. Of course it is no embarrassment to me. The Senator knows the condition of the appropriation bills. The whole question of legislation has been very fully considered by the committee and has been debated in the Senate. In addition to that, it was claimed in the House—I think I may state that from reading the RECORD—that this provision was merely a declaration of the existing law, rather in analogy to that provision we had in another bill about the Public Printing Office, and the then chairman of the Committee of the Whole in the House of Representatives decided that this provision did not change existing law. But when the Senate Committee on Appropriations came to look into it, it appeared very clear to us that if the provision passed as it passed the House it would change existing law so as to draw in service pensions and the widows of service pensioners. If it is convenient to the Senator from Kentucky to have this bill go over until Monday, and if that will interfere with nothing else, I do not know how to object; but my impression is that Monday has been set apart for another matter.

Mr. HARRIS. I beg to suggest to the Senator from Iowa that the agreement reached by unanimous consent yesterday devotes both to-day and Monday to the consideration of the Calendar, and I prefer that he should designate Tuesday.

Mr. ALLISON. What will become of another matter, I ask the Senator, fixed for Monday, which perhaps would require us to go into executive session at an early hour on that day? I shall be constrained to move to reconsider the vote by which we agreed to adjourn over to Monday unless I can have a thorough understanding that this bill shall be taken up Monday to the exclusion of everything else.

Mr. HARRIS. I prefer that the Senator should move to reconsider, for I can not consent to vacate the agreement made yesterday by unanimous consent.

Mr. BECK. I do not care to press any suggestion of mine, if it embarrasses going on with the bill now; but I was very much impressed with the importance of the measure as suggested by the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ALLISON. I think the Senator from West Virginia is unjust to the Committee on Appropriations, in the sense that he suggested that we have undertaken to interfere with the proper business of any other committee of this body. We found this provision on the bill, and we found that it went further and much further than the House seemed to believe when it passed upon it, and therefore we concluded to amend it in such a way as to confine it to what we fairly thought it should be, both as to the past and to the future, meaning thereby simply to exclude the idea of service pensions and long arrearages, and only giving arrears in the cases where it was manifest that the law, certainly since 1880, intended that the pension should date from the death of the husband.

Now, I think this bill can be voted on to-day; but if the Senator from Kentucky desires a postponement especially I will consent to the bill going over to Monday.

Mr. BECK. No; I shall not press my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BLAIR. I have but a few more words to say. I was only

calling attention to the somewhat cavalier manner in which the claims for the removal of the limitation on the arrears-of-pensions act had been treated. I am hardly out of the way in saying, particularly to our friends on the Democratic side of the Chamber, that they seem to think that with the changes going on any one who favors the arrears-of-pension bill, as it is called, necessarily intends to enter upon an unjustifiable raid on the Treasury. With a view to that I was making the suggestions which seemed to me pertinent to the fact that those claims are more just than any other in the direction of pensions that are preferred against the Government.

It would be more just for us to strike from the pension-roll every name which is now upon it of a disabled soldier who has preferred his claim and been drawing pension these past years, and who has to that extent been benefited by the Government—I say it would be more nearly an act of justice to strike every name now on the roll from the roll than to withhold arrears from this class of men when under the difficulties to which I have alluded they now finally do establish their claim. And upon that proposition I am willing to stand, and I should be glad to hear any one controvert that proposition.

Why is this so? First, the man who at the present time establishes his claim must have had a stronger claim than the most of those already on the roll, because he secures in the end a verdict, as I said before, oftentimes from an unwilling tribunal, always from a tribunal interested for the Government rather than for the soldier, against the Government, and after all these years and under all these difficulties and circumstances the order is made by the Government to write that man's name on the pension-roll; that is to say, his claim for a pension is as just as that of the very first applicant—the man who has been drawing a pension for a quarter of a century. That man during all this period of time was kept out of his just dues and the Government in its extremity has had the use of his money. The Government had the money when the Government was paying 6 per cent. and 5 per cent. and 4 per cent. The Government had the money in the distresses and exigencies of the war when it was difficult to maintain the public credit under any circumstances. These men went without their pensions; they waived their claim; their money was in the Treasury and it was used in prosecuting the war and in maintaining the existence of the Government for the time being, and it was applied upon the public debt. They gave a part of the reward of the bondholders of whom we hear so much. It went to improve the rivers and harbors of the country; it paid the salaries of Government officials; it sustained our foreign relations; it was the money of these soldiers, these men with just claims against the Government, waived for the time being and loaned to the Government, in the highest conceivable moral sense, that enabled the Government to go on.

Now they come before us at this late period, late in life, approaching death, and they ask us (with the admission of the Government that they should all the time have had their pensions) for the removal of this limitation, and they only ask what Congress in three instances has already done, that is to say, that they shall have the principal of their claims from the beginning, waiving all the matter of interest which would have been theirs by virtue of their having been entitled to the money long ago.

Mr. President, I say that as a matter of justice and of equity between man and man, between the Government and these men, between the Government and the men who have been drawing pensions all this time, it is clearer justice and equity to strike from the pension-roll every name now upon it than it is to deny arrears to those who are pensioned at this late day, being adjudged entitled to what belonged to them all the time. Of course, to strike from the roll the names now upon it would be a crime; nobody has suggested it in the highest flight of imagination of bad men even. No one could think of such a thought as that, and I suggest it only by way of illustration, and I appeal to the Senator from Missouri and to any Senator in this Chamber and anybody in this country if the point which I have stated is not incontestably true, that it is nearer to justice to purge the roll as it stands than to deny arrears to those who from henceforward establish their claims, if it is not nearer justice to do the former than to refuse to do the latter.

It will cost something, it is true; perhaps several millions of dollars, perhaps one-fortieth part of the existing public debt drawing interest; not more than that. We have a surplus fund that will pay a very large portion of it already. We have the means of raising whatever is necessary further. If the tariff legislation proposed in the other end of the Capitol should be enacted into law it is not at all sure that the revenue will be reduced. It is, on the other hand, quite probable that the revenues of the Government will be increased with the incoming tide of foreign commodites which will pay duties, and, although at a lower rate, nevertheless increasing amounts, by reason of increased importations, will pile into the Treasury more money than we are getting today. That will continue until such time as the demoralization of American business shall have destroyed the power of the American consuming public to purchase foreign commodities, and you will get no reduction of the revenues until it comes as a natural consequence of the ruin of the business of the people at home, the destruction of their purchasing power. So we are likely to continue the possession of our present revenue, or for the time being of increased revenue, and I ask you, Mr. President, if that be so, whether we may not safely and justly act in the direction of the removal of this limitation? I think so, and I hope if this matter is to be continued, if it is to go over to receive further consideration from the Committee on Appropriations, that they will take advantage of these little opportunities which come to us as a godsend from the House, and instead of restricting its provisions enlarge them and attach to this bill a recommendation of an amendment removing the limitation on arrears and also providing pensions for the needy soldiers of the war of the rebellion without reference to the origin or the nature of their disability.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] to amend the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. TELLER. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. PADDOCK (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. PAYNE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES].

Mr. PLATT (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. SABIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KENNA]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WILSON]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. BROWN. On this question I am paired with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas (after having voted in the affirmative). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK]. I voted under a misapprehension. I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BUTLER. On this question I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON].

Mr. REAGAN. I desire to say that my colleague [Mr. COKE] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES]. My colleague is absent, attending the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. PAYNE] is paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES].

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the Secretary that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PAYNE] announced a pair with the colleague of the Senator from Texas.

Mr. ALDRICH. My colleague [Mr. CHACE] is absent, paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT].

Mr. TELLER. I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GIBSON], but I understand my colleague [Mr. BOWEN] is not paired, and I therefore transfer the pair to my colleague and I shall vote.

Mr. EVARTS. I am paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN], and therefore can not vote.

Mr. FAULKNER. I am requested by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. COLQUITT] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHACE] to announce their pair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupant of the chair announces that he is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. If the Senator from Kentucky were present the occupant of the chair would vote "nay."

Mr. BECK. I am paired generally with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], who is absent from the Senate Chamber at the moment. I have sent for him. I will transfer my pair to the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] and let my vote stand.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I have heard it stated that somebody is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE].

Mr. BECK. The Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] announced the pair of his colleague [Mr. COKE] with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES]. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. PAYNE] announced the same pair, and thereafter it leaves the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] without a pair, and being paired with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] I was requested by his colleague to make the announcement.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish to state—perhaps it is now unnecessary—that my colleague [Mr. MORRILL] is absent from the Chamber on account of ill-health and is paired with some gentleman; I do not know who it is at this moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PAYNE] to the fact that the Chair understood the Senator from Ohio to announce a pair with the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE].

Mr. PAYNE. No, sir; with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES].

The result was announced—yeas 17, nays 19; as follows:

YEAS—17.

Bate,	Faulkner,	Pugh,	Vest,
Beck,	George,	Ransom,	Walthall.
Berry,	Hampton,	Reagan,	
Call,	Harris,	Saulsbury,	
Cockrell,	Pasco,	Vance,	

NAYS—19.

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Hawley,	Spooner,
Allison,	Dawes,	Mitchell,	Stewart,
Blair,	Dolph,	Palmer,	Stockbridge,
Blodgett,	Edmunds,	Plumb,	Teller.
Chandler,	Frye,	Sawyer,	

ABSENT—40.

Blackburn,	Eustis,	Ingalls,	Platt,
Bowen,	Evarts,	Jones of Arkansas,	Quay,
Brown,	Farwell,	Jones of Nevada,	Riddleberger,
Butler,	Gibson,	Kenna,	Sabin,
Cameron,	Gorman,	McPherson,	Sherman,
Chace,	Gray,	Manderson,	Stanford,
Coke,	Hale,	Morgan,	Turpie,
Colquitt,	Hearst,	Morrill,	Voorhees,
Daniel,	Hiscock,	Paddock,	Wilson of Iowa,
Davis,	Hoar,	Payne,	Wilson of Md.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is not a quorum voting. The Secretary will call the roll of the Senate.

The Secretary called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich,	Dawes,	Manderson,	Saulsbury,
Allison,	Dolph,	Mitchell,	Sawyer,
Bate,	Edmunds,	Morgan,	Sherman,
Beck,	Evarts,	Paddock,	Spooner,
Berry,	Faulkner,	Pasco,	Stewart,
Blair,	Frye,	Payne,	Stockbridge,
Blodgett,	Hale,	Platt,	Teller,
Brown,	Hampton,	Plumb,	Turpie,
Call,	Harris,	Pugh,	Vance,
Chandler,	Hawley,	Ransom,	Vest,
Cockrell,	Hoar,	Reagan,	Walthall,
Cullom,	Jones of Arkansas,	Sabin,	Wilson of Iowa.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-eight Senators having responded to their names, a quorum is present. The Secretary will call the roll for the yea-and-nay vote on the amendment of the Senator from Missouri.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK]. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. By an agreement we have arranged to transfer the pair of Mr. HISCOCK and Mr. BLACKBURN, so that the Senator from Nebraska and I can vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. MANDERSON (when his name was called). On account of the transfer of the pair I vote "nay."

Mr. PADDOCK (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS].

Mr. PLATT (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL].

Mr. SABIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KENNA], but I have transferred that pair to the Senator from Virginia [Mr. RIDDLEBERGER], and vote "yea."

Mr. TELLER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GIBSON], but have transferred the pair to my colleague [Mr. BOWEN]. Therefore I vote "nay."

Mr. TURPIE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS].

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WILSON]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. HARRIS (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. Upon a former occasion a few minutes ago, forgetting it, I voted on the yea-and-nay vote when there was no quorum. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] was paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] a few minutes ago; but the Senator from Maine is now present, and I will transfer my pair with the Senator from Vermont to the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] and let my vote stand.

Mr. REAGAN. My colleague [Mr. COKE] is absent on business of the Committee on Commerce, and paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL]. If here, my colleague would vote "yea."

Mr. BUTLER. I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 20, nays 23; as follows:

YEAS—20.

Bate,	Cockrell,	Jones of Arkansas,	Reagan,
Beck,	Faulkner,	Morgan,	Saulsbury,
Berry,	George,	Pasco,	Vance,
Brown,	Hampton,	Pugh,	Vest,
Call,	Harris,	Ransom,	Walthall.

NAYS—23.

Aldrich,	Dolph,	Hoar,	Sherman,
Allison,	Edmunds,	Ingalls,	Spooner,
Blair,	Evarts,	Manderson,	Stewart,
Blodgett,	Frye,	Mitchell,	Stockbridge,
Chandler,	Hale,	Sabin,	Teller.
Cullom,	Hawley,	Sawyer,	

ABSENT—33.

Blackburn,	Cameron,	Colquitt,	Dawes,
Bowen,	Chace,	Daniel,	Eustis,
Butler,	Coke,	Davis,	Farwell,
Gibson,	Kenna,	Payne,	Stanford,
Gorman,	McPherson,	Platt,	Turpie,
Gray,	Morrill,	Plumb,	Voorhees,
Hearst,	Paddock,	Quay,	Wilson of Iowa,
Hiscock,	Palmer,	Riddleberger,	Wilson of Md.
Jones of Nevada,			

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Committee on Appropriations to strike out and insert.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations, was in line 54, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "eighteen;" so as to make the clause read:

For stationery and other necessary expenses, to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, $18,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 57, after the word "Treasury," to insert "where practicable;" so as to read:

For rents, $18,200. And the Secretary of the Treasury, where practicable, shall cause suitable rooms to be set apart in the public buildings under his control in cities where pension agencies are located, which shall be acceptable to the Secretary of the Interior, for the use and occupancy of said agencies, respectively.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 61, after the word "respectively," to strike out the following clause:

And the Secretary of the Interior shall designate and provide suitable rooms in the Pension building for the use and occupation of the pension agent at Washington, D. C., and the office of said agent shall be removed therein.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendments will be concurred in in gross, unless there be objection. Shall the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole be concurred in in the Senate?

The amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (H. R. 1645) to limit the hours that letter-carriers in cities shall be employed per day;

A bill (H. R. 2928) granting a pension to William Lemons;

A bill (H. R. 4358) to increase the limit of cost for the public building in course of erection at Charleston, S. C.;

A bill (S. 38) granting to the Washington and Idaho Railroad Company the right of way through the Cœur d'Alene Indian reservation;

A bill (S. 39) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Beno;

A bill (S. 269) to grant to the Fort Smith and El Paso Railway Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 316) for the relief of Edward Fitzgerald;

A bill (S. 331) granting a pension to John Kalbfleisch;

A bill (S. 347) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Youngstown, Ohio;

A bill (S. 354) to provide for the survey of certain historic grounds, locations, and military works;

A bill (S. 475) for the relief of the estate of Thomas L. Price, deceased;

A bill (S. 801) for the relief of Basile Champagne;

A bill (S. 805) granting a pension to Melvina Greenwood;

A bill (S. 816) granting a pension to Amastasia Walter;

A bill (S. 820) granting a pension to David A. Servis;

A bill (S. 835) for the relief of Elisha Griswold;

A bill (S. 850) granting certain lands in the Territory of Wyoming for public purposes;

A bill (S. 860) granting a pension to Stephen Singleton;

A bill (S. 1096) granting a pension to James Lucas;

A bill (S. 1204) to provide for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States at Martinsburgh, in the district of West Virginia;

A bill (S. 1237) granting a pension to Anna Mertz;

A bill (S. 1717) granting a pension to Emma Von Bernewitz;

A bill (S. 1795) for the relief of the First National Bank of Marion, Iowa; and

A bill (S. 2419) granting a pension to Lemuel R. Rea.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. EVARTS, Mr. PADDOCK, and Mr. MITCHELL submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

SWORD OF WASHINGTON.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Under the order of the Senate the

Calendar under Rule VIII will now be proceeded with; and the Secretary will report the first order of business under Rule VIII.

The bill (S. 2564) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to purchase from Miss Virginia Tayloe Lewis a sword of Washington was announced as first in order on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over under objection, without prejudice.

FLORIDA LAND TITLES.

The resolution submitted by Mr. CALL March 31, 1888, authorizing a special committee of five Senators to investigate in Florida the question of fraudulent land patents, etc., was announced as the next business in order.

Mr. HARRIS. Let that go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The resolution submitted by Mr. SHERMAN April 3, 1888, relating to the order of business, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SHERMAN. That may be indefinitely postponed. The occasion has passed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be indefinitely postponed, if there be no objection.

DISPOSAL OF THE PUBLIC LANDS.

The bill (S. 2511) to withdraw the public lands of the United States in Mississippi from sale at ordinary private entry and to restrict disposals thereof under general statutes to homestead settlers was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. EDMUNDS. We have passed a bill providing for that subject already, I am advised.

Mr. WALTHALL. No, sir.

Mr. EDMUNDS. In another shape, but covering the same ground?

Mr. WALTHALL. We passed a joint resolution for the temporary disposal of public lands in Mississippi and other States. This is for the purpose of continuing that legislation.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I can not hear.

Mr. WALTHALL. I will state for the information of the Senator from Vermont that this bill has not been acted on, but a joint resolution has been passed temporarily withdrawing these lands from sale until the pending legislation on the subject can be disposed of. This is the pending legislation. There is also a bill looking to the same end pending in the other House.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Was that joint resolution passed at this session of Congress?

Mr. WALTHALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Has the Senator a copy of it at his desk?

Mr. WALTHALL. I have not, but I think I can state the substance of it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us hear the bill read, then.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the bill, which was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments, in line 4, after the words "United States," to strike out the words "in the State of Mississippi shall cease to be subject to disposal by sale at ordinary private entry, and" and insert "now subject to private entry;" in line 6, after the words "disposed of," to strike out "under general statutes in no other manner than" and insert "under and"; and, in line 8, after the word "laws," to insert the word "only;" so as to make the bill read:

That from and after the passage of this act the public lands of the United States now subject to private entry shall be disposed of under and according to the provisions of the homestead laws only.

Mr. STEWART. Is that a general bill now? What is the extent of it?

Mr. COCKRELL. I will explain it in a moment.

Mr. STEWART. Explain its extent.

Mr. COCKRELL. The bill as first introduced restricted its operations to the State of Mississippi. It has been proposed to be amended as reported by the Committee on Public Lands so as to make it a general law applicable to all the States and Territories of the United States. I rose for the purpose of offering an amendment. After the words "that from and after the passage of this act the public lands of the United States," I move to insert "except those situate in the State of Missouri."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I do not think that the Committee on Public Lands are familiar with the subject about which they are proposing to legislate if they have reported such a bill. If it is to be applicable to all the public lands in the United States, it is a prohibition against the use of four-fifths of the public lands under any circumstances. If nothing but the homestead law is to be enforced; if under that law alone titles to public lands are to be acquired, you exclude from settlers the great mass of the public lands of the United States. Four-fifths at least, and perhaps a larger portion, of the public lands require irrigation before they can be settled on. The homestead settlers can not go upon them at all; they can not remain upon them until the preliminary work is done. The result will be that you will stop settlement throughout a vast region of country where settlement can go, and it can go nowhere else.

By this proposed act you would do another thing; you would exclude the miners and the people living in the mountainous region from obtaining any timber or fuel for any purpose—the timber and fuel in the mountains throughout the entire Western country, in the Rocky Mountains, the Sierra Nevada Mountains, the Wahsatch Mountains, and other vast ranges of mountains. The timber is up in those mountains. You can not acquire title to that land by homestead, because it can not be settled on. There is very little timber land in the United States left that is susceptible of habitation at all. It is in the rough, high mountains, where you can not take the land under the homestead law.

Is Congress going to pass a law providing that the timber of the country can not be used under any circumstances, and a law that is entirely inapplicable to all the remaining public lands? It might do in Mississippi. I have no objection to it as a local bill, but when you talk about passing a general bill of this kind, it shows that there has been no investigation whatever of the subject; that there has been no intelligent consideration of this great subject, which demands attention.

We have an empire of land requiring irrigation, and some system ought to be devised whereby it can be occupied by settlers, and by settlers alone. It is a great subject. A resolution has been passed calling upon the Interior Department to make an investigation and report what can be done to promote irrigation, to set aside reservoirs, and what can be done with the waters to fertilize that vast region and make it habitable. But is it proposed that Congress shall stop there and exclude everybody from going upon the land, and that it will not undertake to meet the question?

In the valley lands of the whole country, like the Mississippi Valley, we know now that the homestead law was the only law applicable. All such land ought to have been disposed of under the homestead law. The pre-emption law has been practically a fraud. It was better than what preceded it. What preceded it from the foundation of the Government to 1841 was the surveying of lands in large quantities and offering them at auction, and the middlemen fattened on the purchase of them by again selling them at a vast advance. From 1841 to the present time we have had the pre-emption law in operation. The pre-emption law was better than what preceded it to 1862. In 1862 we passed the homestead law, which was the best law ever passed. The pre-emption law would have been nearly as good as the homestead law (except that it was an unnecessary tax upon the settler to charge him a dollar and a quarter an acre) if it had not been for carrying along with it a part of the old system which provided that after the land had been surveyed for a certain length of time it should be offered at auction and sold at private entry, thus allowing people to buy in advance of settlement.

Under the pre-emption law there were about 90,000,000 acres taken by private entry in advance of settlement. The pre-emption law since 1862 has been an obstruction——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nevada has spoken five minutes.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I hope the Senator will be allowed to go on.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think this is too important a bill, involving the whole land policy of the country, to be passed under the five-minute rule, and I object to its consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio objects.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not desire to interpose if the Senator from Nevada wishes to speak further; but I shall object to the further consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to that.

Mr. STEWART subsequently said: On examining the land bill I find that it only applies to lands that have been offered and are subject to private entry, being none of those in the region of which I spoke. My speech had no application to the terms of the bill, and I withdraw it so far as the bill is concerned, but I want to make it more emphatic as far as the subject-matter is concerned. I understand the Senator from Ohio will withdraw his objection and the bill may be passed. I think there is no objection to it.

Mr. MITCHELL. Do I understand the Senator from Nevada to say that the bill only applies to offered land?

Mr. STEWART. Subject to private entry.

Mr. MITCHELL. I do not think so.

Mr. STEWART. Read it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill has passed from the consideration of the Senate, and is no longer before the body except by unanimous consent.

Mr. SHERMAN. I said I would withdraw my objection, which I made because the Senator from Nevada objected so strenuously to it, but when he told me that it did not contain the provision which he thought it did I was willing to waive my objection.

Mr. ALLISON. It might be well to pass it over until to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa objects to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let it go over.

Mr. MITCHELL. The bill repeals the pre-emption law and applies to all lands——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill goes over.

B. F. ROCKEFELLOW.

The bill (S. 686) for the relief of B. F. Rockefellow was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay $614.11 to B. F. Rockefellow, on his account as postmaster at Cañon City, Colo., or so much of that amount as shall appear to the proper accounting officer of the Government to have been paid by him for necessary clerk-hire in the Cañon City post-office.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us hear the report read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. BOWEN April 4, 1888.

The Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, to whom was referred the bill (S. 686) for the relief of B. F. Rockefellow, have had the same under consideration, and make the following report:

That the claimant, B. F. Rockefellow, was postmaster at Cañon City, Colo., during the years 1877 and 1878, and a portion of the year 1879. At the time of his appointment the office was small and unimportant. On February 24, 1877, it was made a separating office, and a sum of $150 was allowed as clerk hire, commencing on the 1st day of January, 1877. The business of the office increased rapidly, and Mr. Rockefellow was compelled to employ additional clerical assistance. The discovery of the wonderful rich mines of silver at Leadville, Silver Cliff, and other points in Colorado, occasioned a great increase of mail at Cañon City post-office, as all the mail that went to Silver Cliff and Rosita, as well as much of the Leadville mail, was separated at the Cañon City office.

The Leadville mail left Cañon City between 11 and 12 o'clock at night; the Rosita and Silver Cliff, towards morning; and the large amount received and discharged for other places made it necessary for the post-office to be kept open most of the time night and day. The salary of the postmaster was $100 per month, with the addition of $150 for clerk hire; out of this the postmaster was compelled to pay his rent and employ his clerks.

For the quarter ending June 30, 1878, the postmaster paid in excess of what he was allowed	$87.50
For quarter ending September 30, 1878	112.50
For quarter ending December 31, 1878	156.83
For the quarter ending March 31, 1879	257.28
Making a total excess of	614.11

These accounts were all transmitted to the Post-Office Department, with proper vouchers, but not allowed for want of available funds, as it was alleged.

The gross receipts of the office for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1878, were	$2,205.90
For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1879, were	6,698.42
Total during 1878 and 1879	8,874.32

This leaves a net sum of $7,174.32 for the two years. The amount of labor imposed on the postmaster may be seen from the receipts of the office; but in addition to the duties of postmaster for a large and rapidly growing town, he was compelled to distribute large mails for other points, which did not swell the receipts of the office, but did require great labor. The following newspaper items, cut from a Cañon City paper of about the 1st of April, 1879, will in part explain the amount of work performed at that office:

"Sunday morning's mail for Leadville and upper Arkansas points contained nineteen bags and pouches of mail, not less than 1,500 pounds in weight, being 10,000 letters. Our own mail was immense, and Silver Cliff, Rosita, and Ula a full express-wagon load. It was midnight before the mails were distributed and made up for the West. We thought printers did more work for nothing than other mortals, but under the present reign of "economy" we will except postmasters, and shall crow over Postmaster Rockefellow while we have a chance, and, like everybody else, pitch into him for not keeping the office open all hours of the day and night, not giving us a large room with magnificent office furniture and equipments to correspond with the increased importance our town demands. To be sure he is paying every dollar of his $100 per month salary for clerk hire, $40 per month for one assistant and $60 per month to the other, and getting the $12.50 for himself. He and they are continually overworked to get the mails off—which must go—and perform the other duties of the office.

"It should be added to the above that the surplus money over and above the amount paid out on money-orders, remitted weekly from this office, amounts to from $1,500 to $2,000, and there are thirty to sixty-five registered packages daily in transit. When complained to, the Post-Office Department replies that, 'owing to the limited appropriations allowed by Congress, no changes looking to the enlargement of the mail facilities of Cañon City and other places similarly situated can be made.' Congress should make a tour in a body to Colorado this summer and learn something."

In March Mr. Rockefellow, after various efforts to secure an increased allowance for clerk hire, received the following from the Post-Office Department:

"POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
"OFFICE OF THE FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
"*Washington, D. C., March 22, 1879.*

"SIR: In reply to your letter of the 14th instant, referred to this office and recommended by Senator TELLER, I have to say that, owing to the limited appropriation for clerical services in post-offices, it is deemed inadvisable at present to grant any additional allowance for clerical assistance in your office. Your application has been placed upon the files of the Department, and will be further considered as soon as funds will warrant it.

"Very respectfully,

"JAMES H. MARR,
"*For First Assistant Postmaster-General.*

"POSTMASTER, *Cañon City, Fremont County, Colorado.*"

He soon after sent in his resignation, feeling that he could not afford to work night and day and pay his entire salary to his clerks. After the 1st of April, 1879, the Department ordered an additional amount of $750 for clerk hire, making the total amount allowed for clerk hire $900.

During the time Mr. Rockefellow was paying his salary out for clerk hire, he gave his entire time to the business of the office. He applied, through the Senators from Colorado, for an increased allowance for clerk hire; the Senators endeavored to secure such allowance, but were always met with the same statement, that the Department had not the money that could be used in that way. The whole case is presented in the affidavit of Mr. Rockefellow, except as to efforts made by the Senators at Washington for his relief, which affidavit is as follows:

"STATE OF COLORADO, *County of Fremont, ss:*

"B. F. Rockefellow, postmaster at Cañon City, Colo., for about ten years ending May 15, 1879, being duly sworn, deposeth and says that he paid for clerical services in the Cañon City, Colo., post-office, which was absolutely necessary to properly separate and forward the mails, as follows:

April 1 to June 30, 1878	$125.00
July 1 to September 30, 1878	150.00
October to December 31, 1878	194.33
January 1 to March 31, 1879	284.78
	754.11

and that vouchers for amounts so paid accompanied the several quarterly returns to the Post-Office Department; that the Department only allowed for the year $150, leaving a deficiency as above of $614.11; that Cañon City during that time was center of great influx of population, owing to the Grand Cañon war and railroad building; that it was the terminus of the Denver and Rio Grande Railway for that time, and head of daily stage lines to Leadville and other Western points, as also stage lines to Silver Cliff, Rosita, and several other points; that the separating business of this post-office increased so rapidly that towards the last he was obliged to pay the full salary of the office for clerical service, which fact he represented to the Post-Office Department, and received reply that the allowance could not be raised owing to lack of appropriations necessary to meet the expenditure.

"That he was unable to longer carry on the office at such a loss, being obliged, besides, to work most of the time eighteen to twenty-two hours daily in the post-office to get the mails off in time, and that he was forced to resign in consequence, and that immediately afterwards, and based upon the business done in said post-office by him, the salary of the office was raised from $1,200 to $1,800 per year, and clerk-hire allowance from $150 to $900 per annum; and said deponent, from his intimate acquaintance with mail service in Colorado, verily believes that his office was obliged to perform more distributing service for the period mentioned than any other post-office in the State, except Denver, and that the payment of the deficiency of $614.11 aforementioned is justly due him and unpaid. Further deponent saith not.

"B. F. ROCKEFELLOW,
"*Late Postmaster, Cañon City, Colo.*

"Sworn and subscribed to before John Wilson, clerk of district court, this 26th day of December, A. D. 1880.

"JNO. WILSON, *Clerk.*"

The postmaster was compelled to pay the rent of the building used for the post-office, as no allowance was made by the Department for that purpose; and as rent is high in Colorado, the rent and clerk hire very nearly consumed the salary of the postmaster.

The case is an exceptional one. The rapid increase in business is shown by the receipts of the office for 1878–'79. The claimant had given bond for the faithful discharge of his duties as postmaster; the interests of the people and the Government demanded the services rendered, and no good reason can be given why the money advanced for the purpose of paying the employés for labor absolutely indispensable ought not to be refunded. Congress has made appropriations for money paid out by land officials without authority of law whenever it has appeared such payments were necessary and have been beneficial to the Government. In this case the Government was the gainer, having made a large sum of money out of the office, and the claimant worked for a nominal sum, and then paid out nearly every dollar he received for rent and other expenses. Therefore your committee think that the claimant is entitled to receive the money he paid out for clerk-hire, and not allowed, and therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES GALLAGHER.

The bill (S. 1706) for the relief of Charles Gallagher, of New York, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that that bill may be passed over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask leave to make a report from the Committee on Printing in regard to the printing of a matter that is important to be ordered to-day. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report back favorably with an amendment a Senate resolution, and I ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted by Mr. SHERMAN May 16, 1888, as follows:

Resolved, That 5,000 copies of the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations (Miscellaneous Document No. 109, first session Fiftieth Congress), being the report relating to the fisheries treaty, together with the views of the minority, be printed for the use of the Senate in connection with the message of the President, dated February 20, 1888, and the proposed treaty with Great Britain, and the map of the fishing limits prepared at the Hydrographic Office.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment of the Committee on Printing will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 6, after the words "Great Britain," strike out the words:

And the map of the fishing limits prepared at the Hydrographic Office.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There being no objection to the present consideration of the resolution, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Committee on Printing.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like to have the Senator from Nebraska explain why it is not proper that this little map should be printed?

Mr. MANDERSON. We find it to be the fact that the cost of printing additional copies of these reports with the message of the President and the treaty will be but $288 for the 5,000, the matter being already in type. The printing of the map (which we think has already been printed in quite sufficient numbers for the use of the Senate) would increase the cost of printing beyond the $500 limit allowed by the law, and therefore it would make it necessary that the resolution should pass both Houses of Congress.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I think it had better pass both Houses then, because to the proper understanding of the subject among our citizens, for whom this extra printing is done, the desirability of seeing those shores, and the delimitations, and the whole situation, is quite important. I should hope, therefore, that if it is necessary to send a concurrent resolution to the other House, this will be turned into a concurrent resolution and let us ask the other House to agree to it, as I should suppose they doubtless would, rather than to cut out of the document a little map that is extremely necessary and useful to understanding the subject.

Mr. MANDERSON. I think myself that the printing of the map would probably be desirable, and the cost would not be very great. It would, however, extend the cost beyond the limit fixed by the law which one House alone may order. But it seemed to the committee that this document should be immediately printed for the use of the Senate; and fearing the delay which might be incident to making it a concurrent resolution and sending it to the other House, the committee thought it best to present the resolution in the amended form. I feel, however, like being guided very largely by the views of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Nebraska stated to me another consideration which caused me to think that the report of the committee is right. The map belongs to the Hydrographic Office and would have to be printed in a different form. It would have to be printed in colors and that would create some considerable delay. As a matter of course, the printing would have to be done in a different way; it would have to be done on wood, I presume.

Mr. MANDERSON. No, on stone.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It is a lithographed map. It is already printed. It will only be necessary to reproduce a certain number, 5,000 copies.

Mr. MANDERSON. Still the lithographer's stone is not owned by the Government, but it is owned by the lithographer who reduced the map and printed the several hundred copies already ordered. I certainly have no objection to making this a concurrent resolution if the Senate can wait.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Perhaps the better way would be to diminish the number to 3,000. That would bring the cost within $500, would it not?

Mr. MANDERSON. I should doubt it. I can have the calculation made.

Mr. HOAR. If we pass it to-day in the form of a concurrent resolution the Committee on Printing can report it at any time in the other House. They are a privileged committee.

Mr. MANDERSON. It does not seem that much privilege attaches to the committee in the other House. I know a great many matters which have been delayed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I think we had better try it, because it is a matter so useful to the understanding of the treaty and of the reports that this little map ought to go with it, even if it takes a week or two of waiting. I appeal to the chairman of the Committee on Printing not to insist on the amendment, but to turn the resolution into a concurrent one.

Mr. MANDERSON. I certainly have no objection to that course if it is the desire of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Committee on Printing.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 6, after the words "Great Britain," strike out the words—

And the map of the fishing limits prepared at the Hydrographic Office.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MANDERSON. I now ask that the Secretary be instructed to change the form of the resolution to that of a concurrent resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The committee will be understood as reporting the resolution in the form of a concurrent resolution, and the clerical work will be done by the Secretary. As thus amended will the Senate agree to the same?

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

MARY E. HOPKINS.

The bill (S. 1914) for the relief of Mary E. Hopkins was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to Mary E. Hopkins, widow of Alfred Hopkins, late captain in the Navy, $5,156.64, being for the salary of Hopkins, on leave pay, from the 21st of November, 1882, to the 24th of September, 1884.

Mr. HARRIS. I move to amend the bill in line 3, by adding, after the word "Secretary," the words "of the Treasury;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I wish to hear the report read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the report submitted by Mr. BLACKBURN April 4, 1888——

Mr. COCKRELL. That is quite a long report, and the bill involves practically the amendment of the proceedings of a naval court-martial of an officer——

Mr. EDMUNDS. That is what I suspected.

Mr. COCKRELL. It does so by ignoring the sentence of the court-martial and paying the widow the salary from the date of dismissal to the date of death.

Mr. HALE. Let me suggest to the Senator, if opposition arises to the bill, that it go over, retaining its place.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have no objection to that course.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN], who has charge of the bill, is not present.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Yes; that is fair. Let it go over, retaining its place.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANDERSON in the chair). The bill will be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

HOT SPRINGS RESERVATION

The bill (S. 2110) granting the right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Hot Springs reservation, State of Arkansas, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. HOAR. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill being objected to, it will go over.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator will withdraw the objection. It is not a very long bill. It has been pending here quite a while, and I have been watching it a good deal.

Mr. HOAR. Does the Senator desire me to withdraw my objection, for an explanation of the bill?

Mr. BERRY. I can not hear the Senator.

Mr. HOAR. I ask the Senator if he desires to have me withdraw my objection, for an explanation of the bill? I had an idea that this was one of those bills in the interest of railroad corporations and rather against the rights of the people.

Mr. BERRY. I will state to the Senator that the city council of Hot Springs, Ark., together with a large number of citizens there have petitioned for it. The matter was referred to the Secretary of the Interior, referred by him to the superintendent of the reservation, a report made, and the bill was drawn according to the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior. The people at Hot Springs, so far as I know, have no objection to it. They think the proposed railway would be a convenience to visitors. I do not understand to what the Senator from Massachusetts refers—I could not hear him very distinctly—in regard to its being contrary to the interests of the people. If there is anything of that character in the bill and he will suggest it, I shall be glad to have him do so.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator from Arkansas inform the Senate what is the extent of the public reservation at Hot Springs? How large is it and what is the necessity for a railway passing through the reservation, which my recollection leads me to believe is very small? It is not a large reservation. It does not stand in the way of any railroad.

Mr. BERRY. I will state, in answer to the Senator from Maine, that I think there are 261 acres in the reservation.

Mr. HALE. A little more than a half mile square.

Mr. BERRY. The object and purpose of the parties there is to build, not a general railway, but simply a mountain railway, with a view of transporting passengers around the city and over those mountains to visit the places of interest. It is local in its character and not to be a general railway at all, as will be seen by the bill. The bill also provides that the railway company shall erect observatories and eligible locations. It is intended only for a local railway running around the city and crossing part of the reservation. That is the purpose of the bill. I know nothing whatever about it except that a large number of citizens there petitioned for it and the city council of the city of Hot Springs passed a resolution indorsing the proposition. The matter was referred to the Secretary of the Interior, and by him referred to the superintendent. The superintendent made a report recommending various amendments, which have been incorporated in the bill recommended by the Committee on Public Lands. That is all the knowledge I have in reference to the subject. There has been no objection from any source to the bill so far as my knowledge extends. If any persons there, either visitors or residents, object to it, I know nothing about it. I know nothing about the proposed legislation except that it was sent here and took the course I have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Massachusetts insist upon his objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOAR. I will withdraw it so far as to allow the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read.

Mr. HALE. I think the bill had better go over for to-day. I should like to examine it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine objects.

Mr. HALE. Let it retain its place on the Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will retain its place on the Calendar.

INDIAN GRAZING LANDS.

The bill (H. R. 8393) to protect lands belonging to Indians from unlawful grazing, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 7, after the word "tribe," to insert "or occupied by any Indian or tribe of Indians under authority of the United States;" and in line 9, after the word "tribe," to insert "or Indian;" so as to read:

That section 2117 of the United States Statutes at Large be so amended as to read as follows:

"Every person who drives, or otherwise conveys, any stock of horses, mules, or cattle to range, and feed on any land belonging to any Indian or Indian tribe, or occupied by any Indian or tribe of Indians under authority of the United States, without the consent of such tribe or Indian, is liable to a penalty of $1 for each animal of such stock; such penalty to be recovered by civil suit as provided in section 2124 of the said Statutes at Large."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 24, after the words "by the," to strike out "nation or tribe" and insert "Secretary of the Interior;" so as to read:

If a nation or tribe of Indians has no treasurer, then the amount of the penalty shall be paid by said clerk to such person as may be selected by the Secretary of the Interior to receive it, all said payments to be made under orders of court previously made and entered of record.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DAWES subsequently said: During my absence I understand that the bill (H. R. 8393) to protect lands belonging to Indians from unlawful grazing, and for other purposes, was passed. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] and myself have been engaged in the Committee on Appropriations. He had an amendment which he was anxious to propose to the bill. I therefore move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and will let the motion to reconsider lie until he comes in.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The motion to reconsider will be received and entered.

TIMBER DEPREDATIONS.

The bill (H. R. 8006) to amend section 5388 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to timber depredations, was announced as next in order.

Mr. STEWART. I think the bill may as well lie over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands the Senator from Nevada to object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. I object to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

Mr. STEWART subsequently said: I objected to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8006) to amend section 5388 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to timber depredations. I have since compared it with the statute and I find that the only change it makes is to include Indian reservations. Consequently I have no objection to the bill, and I should like to withdraw my objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada withdraws his objection to the bill, and its consideration will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to amend section 5388 of the Revised Statutes of the United States so as to read:

Every person who unlawfully cuts, or aids or is employed in unlawfully cutting, or wantonly destroys or procures to be wantonly destroyed, any timber standing upon the lands of the United States which, in pursuance of law, may be reserved or purchased for military or other purposes, or upon any Indian reservation, or lands belonging to or occupied by any tribe of Indians under authority of the United States, shall pay a fine of not more than $500 or be imprisoned not more than twelve months, or both, in the discretion of the court.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT MILITIA.

The bill (S. 657) to amend the act entitled "An act more effectually to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia," passed March 3, 1803, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is an adverse report.

Mr. COCKRELL. That may be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next order of business is the bill (S. 2432) concerning the militia of the District of Columbia, which is also adversely reported.

Mr. HAWLEY. The substituted bill, though it does not appear technically as a substitute, is Senate bill 2602, the succeeding Order of Business.

The bill (S. 2602) concerning the militia of the District of Columbia was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. In section 32, line 4, I move to strike out the word "all" and insert "the six;" and in line 5, after the words "days of," to strike out "any parade or;" so as to read:

That all officers and employés of the United States and of the District of Columbia who are members of the National Guard shall be entitled to leave of absence from their respective duties, without loss of pay or time, on the six days of encampment ordered or authorized under the provisions of this act.

Mr. HAWLEY. There is no objection to that amendment on the part of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAWLEY. It is customary to place at the end of such acts the clause, "All acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed." I suggest that in this case, because there are upon the statute-book now eleven solid pages of these heavy statutes concerning the militia of the District of Columbia, and of course the greater part of it is antiquated. It is the law of 1803, which has been forgotten long ago, like the general statutes of the United States concerning the militia of the States. This proposed act is much shorter, and substantially takes the place of all of them.

Mr. HARRIS. A repealing clause can certainly do no harm.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Connecticut will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add a new section, as follows:

SEC. 42. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent herewith are hereby repealed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HAWLEY. I do not know how the title appearing on the Calendar came to be there. The proper title of the bill is, "A bill concerning the militia of the District of Columbia." The Calendar says, "A bill to amend sections," etc. I call the attention of the clerks to be sure to give the correct title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut move an amendment to the title?

Mr. HAWLEY. The title is correctly printed in the bill. It is wrong on the Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The correct title will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. "A bill concerning the militia of the District of Columbia."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to know whether it is the desire of the Senate that the bill (S. 657) to amend the act entitled "An act more effectually to provide for the organization of the militia of the District of Columbia," passed March 3, 1803, and the bill (S. 2432) concerning the militia of the District of Columbia shall be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let them be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The two bills will be indefinitely postponed.

BALTIMORE AND POTOMAC RAILROAD.

The bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask that that bill be passed over.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes; let that lie over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

ESTATE OF C. M. BRIGGS.

The bill (H. R. 4909) for the relief of the estate of C. M. Briggs, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to give the Court of Claims like jurisdiction to hear and determine the claim of the legal representatives of C. M. Briggs, deceased, for the proceeds of 455 bales of cotton, now in the Treasury of the United States, alleged to have been owned, in whole or in part, by Briggs, as is given to that court by the acts of March 12, 1863, and July 2, 1864, upon petition to be filed in the court at any time within two years, any statute of limitations to the contrary notwithstanding.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN C. WEAVER.

The bill (H. R. 108) for the relief of John C. Weaver was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to John C. Weaver, of Dennison, Clark County, Illinois, $600, as compensation for a substitute furnished the Union Army during the war.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN HINSMANN.

The bill (S. 304) to correct the military record of John Hinsmann, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Cavalry, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of War to so correct the military record of John Hinsmann, late private in Company G, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Cavalry Volunteers, as to make it read that Hinsmann died March 5, 1864, from services performed while in the line of his duty.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASHER W. FOSTER.

The bill (S. 586) for the relief of Asher W. Foster, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of War to remove from the records of the War Department the charge of desertion now standing thereon against the name of Asher W. Foster, late quartermaster-sergeant of Company G, of the Fourteenth Indiana Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS MILLER.

The bill (S. 66) giving a military record to Thomas Miller was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of War to enter on the rolls of Company M, Eighth Regiment Tennessee Cavalry Volunteers, the name of Thomas Miller, as duly mustered into the United States service on the 27th of August, 1863, and to complete his military record, as follows: "Killed by the enemy November 25, 1863, while in the line of duty."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHRISTIAN FREDERICKSEN.

The bill (S. 587) for the relief of Christian Fredericksen was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of War to issue to Christian Fredericksen, who served under the name of N. T. Wisborg as a private in Company G, Ninth Kansas Volunteers, an honorable discharge from the service of the United States.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move to add to the bill:

Upon the surrender of the discharge issued to Neil T. Wisborg, or of satisfactory proof of its loss, and upon evidence satisfactory to the War Department of the identity of Christian Fredericksen with the said Wisborg.

That amendment is recommended in the report of the Committee on Military Affairs, but by some means it was not inserted in the face of the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC PARK IN SAGUACHE COUNTY, COLORADO.

The bill (S. 2427) to establish a public park to be called and known as the Royal Arch Park was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to add as an additional section:

SEC. 2. In case there exists any valid claim to any of the lands described in section 1 of this act, under the homestead, pre-emption, timber-culture, or mineral laws of the United States, then such lands so claimed are exempted from the provisions of this act: *Provided, however*, That if any or all of such claims have been, or shall be, relinquished or abandoned, or shall lapse, then all parts or parcels of said lands to which such claims had attached shall be considered as included in the grant made by the first section of this act, the same as if no such claim had ever attached.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JESSE A. CORN.

The bill (S. 2316) restoring the right of pre-emption to Jesse A. Corn was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to authorize Jesse A. Corn to pre-empt the land now claimed by him on making the proofs required by the provisions of the pre-emption law.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us hear the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report of the committee will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the following report, submitted by Mr. TELLER April 9, 1888:

The Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2316) restoring the right of pre-emption to Jesse A. Corn, having had the same under consideration, report:

The bill having been submitted to the Secretary of the Interior for a report thereon, he sends to the committee the following letter:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, *Washington, April 4, 1888.*

"SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 30th ultimo, transmitting copy of Senate bill 2316, requesting the views of this Department thereon.

"Said case is now pending before the Department on the appeal of Jesse A. Corn from the decision of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, rejecting his right of pre-emption to the northeast quarter of northeast quarter and northeast quarter of northwest quarter section 30, and southeast quarter of southwest quarter and southwest quarter of southeast quarter section 19, township 51 north, range 10 west, Gunnison, Colo., upon the ground that said claimant had exhausted his pre-emption right.

"It appears from the record that Corn made the prior filing referred to, but pleads by way of excuse the following: That he settled upon and improved 40 acres of land on the Arkansas River, in Fremont County, Colorado, about 12 miles below Cañon City (the tract last above described), in April, 1874, there being no other vacant land then adjoining said tract; that he proceeded to build a ditch for the irrigation of said land to the value of $800, a log house for residence purposes valued at $100, a barn valued at $50, a smoke-house valued at $100, fencing valued at $200, and also did clearing on said land to the value of $300, the total value of said improvements amounting to $1,550; that afterwards, to wit, in July and September, of 1875, the Arkansas River completely flooded said tract of land, covering the same in places to a depth of from 6 inches to 3 feet; that his crop was completely ruined thereby, and his house was in great danger of being washed away, thereby endangering the lives of himself and family; that having been advised by several of his neighbors to remove from said land on account of said overflow, and because of the danger attendant to his living there, on or about January, 1876, he relinquished his pre-emption filing to said tract, and sold his improvements at a great sacrifice.

"Believing, as he states, that he had a right to make a second filing, inasmuch as he had never proved up on the first tract, he filed for his present claim November 6, 1884, alleging settlement May 1, and offered final proof on the same February 12, 1887, showing a continuous residence on the part of his family. He himself lived on the land continuously from date of settlement, with the exception of absences of three months during the thrashing season of each of the years 1884, 1885, and 1886, but returned to his family nearly every week, who continued to reside on the tract.

"The claimant has made valuable improvements on this land, amounting in value to about $2,500, including the buildings, fencing, ditching, leveling, and clearing the land, and has evidently acted in good faith, but in ignorance of the law.

"As the claimant exhausted his pre-emption right under section 2261, Revised Statutes, with his filing in 1874, the Department is powerless to relieve this pre-emptor, but as the equities are so strong in his favor I am of the opinion that the bill should be passed for his relief.

"Action upon this claim will be suspended until Congress disposes of the bill.

"Very respectfully,

"WM. F. VILAS, *Secretary.*

"Hon. P. B. PLUMB,
"*Chairman Committee Public Lands, United States Senate.*"

The committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After ten minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask unanimous consent that, without interfering with the regular order of business, the Senate proceed to consider the unobjected private pension cases on the Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of private pension bills on the Calendar that are unobjected to, the Senate now proceeding, under its former unanimous consent, with the Calendar in its order.

Mr. HARRIS. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will withdraw that request, because he will have no trouble at any hour of any day in securing the consideration of pension bills.

Mr. BLAIR. That is not the point. I only wanted to see some business done.

Mr. HARRIS. If the Senator will not interfere with the standing order we can go on with the Calendar.

Mr. BLAIR. I withdraw my request.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next case on the Calendar under Rule VIII will be reported.

CLOSING OF ALLEYS IN WASHINGTON.

The bill (S. 1612) to provide for the closing of parts of two alleys in square 132, in the city of Washington, District of Columbia, and for the relief of Charles Early and Corbin Warwick, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OFFICERS OF MARINE CORPS.

The bill (S. 2049) to equalize the grades of the Marine Corps was announced as next in order.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

HEIRS OF A. GATES LEE AND B. P. LEE.

The bill (H. R. 4908) for the relief of the heirs of A. Gates Lee and heirs of B. P. Lee, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides for paying to the heirs of A. Gates Lee, deceased, of McCracken County, Kentucky, and the heirs of B. P. Lee, deceased, $675, for use and occupation of their mill property by United States troops during the late war.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DECORATION TO BRIG. GEN. ABSALOM BAIRD.

The joint resolution (S. R. 59) authorizing Brig. Gen. Absalom Baird, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMANDER JOHN W. PHILIP.

The bill (H. R. 639) to authorize Commander John W. Philip, United States Navy, to accept a silver pitcher from the Government of the

United States of Colombia was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BAYOU D'ARBONNE BRIDGE, IN LOUISIANA.

The bill (S. 2199) authorizing the Little Rock and Alexandria Railway Company to maintain and construct a bridge across Bayon D'Arbonne, in Louisiana, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported by the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 4, line 12, before the word "court," to strike out "district" and insert "circuit;" and in line 13, after the words "Louisiana in," to strike out "which" and insert "whose jurisdiction;" so as to read:

And in case of any litigation arising from any obstruction or alleged obstruction to the free navigation of said river, caused or alleged to be caused by said bridge, the case may be brought in the circuit court of the United States of the State of Louisiana in whose jurisdiction any portion of said obstruction or bridge may be located.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add to section 5:

And if the rate of compensation can not be agreed upon by the parties, the same shall be fixed by the Secretary of War.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. That all railroad companies desiring the use of said bridge shall have and be entitled to equal rights and privileges relative to the passage of railway trains over the same, and over the approaches thereto, upon payment of a reasonable compensation for such use. And if the rate of compensation can not be agreed upon by the parties, the same shall be fixed by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 6, line 17, after the words "not be," to insert "commenced or;" so as to read:

And until the said plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War, the bridge shall not be commenced or built, and should any change be made in the plan of said bridge during the progress of construction, such change shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, and said structure shall be changed, at the cost and expense of the owners thereof, from time to time, as Congress may direct, so as to preserve the free and convenient navigation of said bayou.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert as a new section:

SEC. 7. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date of this act being approved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOB BARNARD.

The bill (H. R. 5683) to authorize the commissioners of the District of Columbia to complete a contract for the sale of certain real estate to Job Barnard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the commissioners of the District of Columbia to carry out and complete the contract of sale made by W. Dennison, J. H. Ketcham, and S. L. Phelps, former commissioners, with Job Barnard, dated June 12, 1877, duly acknowledged and recorded in liber 858, at folio 221 of the land records of the District, and on payment by the purchaser of the money therein agreed to be paid the commissioners are to execute and deliver a deed to the purchaser, his heirs or assigns, conveying thereby the title of the District to the real estate described in the contract.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMERICAN GROCER ASSOCIATION.

The bill (S. 577) for the relief of the American Grocer Association of the city of New York was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay, upon the order of the Postmaster-General to the American Grocer Association of the city of New York, $486, or so much thereof as may be found equitably due, for postage erroneously paid by the association.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TEXAS JUDICIAL DISTRICTS.

The bill (H. R. 1874) to change the eastern and northern judicial districts of Texas, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Let that go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

PROTECTION OF OFFICERS IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

The bill (H. R. 4920) for the protection of the officials of the United States in the Indian Territory was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, after the word "murder," at the end of line 11, to insert:

Assault, or assault and battery, or who shall in any manner obstruct by threats or violence any person who is engaged in the service of the United States in the discharge of any of his duties as agent, policeman, or other officer aforesaid.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That any Indian hereafter committing against the person of any Indian agent or policeman appointed under the laws of the United States, or against any Indian United States deputy marshal, posse comitatus, or guard, while lawfully engaged in the execution of any United States process, or lawfully engaged in any other duty imposed upon such agent, policeman, deputy marshal, posse comitatus, or guard by the laws of the United States, any of the following crimes, namely, murder, manslaughter, or assault with intent to murder, assault or assault and battery, or who shall in any manner obstruct by threats or violence any person who is engaged in the service of the United States in the discharge of any of his duties as agent, policeman, or other officer aforesaid, within the Indian Territory, or who shall hereafter commit either of the crimes aforesaid, in said Indian Territory, against any person who, at the time of the commission of said crime, or at any time previous thereto, belonged to either of the classes of officials hereinbefore named, shall be subject to the laws of the United States relating to such crimes, and shall be tried by the district court of the United States exercising criminal jurisdiction where such offense was committed, and shall be subject to the same penalties as are all other persons charged with the commission of said crimes, respectively, and the said courts are hereby given jurisdiction in all such cases.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DAWES. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment and that a committee of conference be appointed.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Presiding Officer was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. DAWES, Mr. JONES of Arkansas, and Mr. STOCKBRIDGE were appointed.

ARRESTS IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

The bill (H. R. 8394) to authorize United States marshals to arrest offenders and fugitives from justice in Indian Territory was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Indian Affairs reported amendments, in line 5, after the word "process," to insert "connected with any criminal proceeding," and in line 10, after the word "execute," to insert "like;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That after the passage of this act any United States marshal is hereby authorized and required, when necessary to execute any process connected with any criminal proceeding issued out of the circuit or district court of the United States for the district of which he is marshal, or by any commissioner of either of said courts, to enter the Indian Territory, and to execute the same therein in the same manner that he is now required by law to execute like processes in his own district.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DAWES. I make the same motion in this case, to insist on the amendments and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Presiding Officer was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. DAWES, Mr. JONES of Arkansas, and Mr. STOCKBRIDGE were appointed.

JOHN M'BEAN.

The bill (S. 2213) for the relief of John McBean, of Umatilla County, Oregon, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments. The first amendment was, in line 4, after the name "John McBean," to strike out "long" and insert "for a long time an;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to allot to John McBean, for a long time an interpreter at the Umatilla Indian reservation, in the State of Oregon, a tract of land, not exceeding in amount 160 acres, out of the lands in the Umatilla reservation, which lands, when so selected by the Secretary of the Interior, shall be patented to the said John McBean on the same terms and conditions as patents are issued to the Indians selecting lands on such reservation in pursuance of existing law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add to the bill the following proviso:

Provided, That the consent of the Umatilla Indians upon said reservation to such allotment shall be first obtained in manner and form satisfactory to the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SEWELL COULSON AND OTHERS.

The bill (S. 1031) for the payment of Sewell Coulson, and Porter, Harrison and Fishback for legal services was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Sewell Coulson $3,950, and to Porter, Harrison and Fishback $2,500, for legal services rendered by them (as recommended and approved by the Judge-Advocate-General and Secretary of War) in defending ex-officers and ex-soldiers for acts done by them in obedience to the orders of a superior officer of the United States Army, in Indiana, during the late war.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. S. B. DUVALL.

The bill (S. 1503) for the relief of Mrs. S. B. Duvall, widow of the late Rev. W. P. Duvall, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, in line 7, to strike out "otherwise" and insert "any other funds belonging to them in the Treasury;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That Mrs. S. B. Duvall, widow of the late Rev. W. P. Duvall, late principal in charge of the Indian boarding-school for the Sac and Fox Indians of Kansas, be allowed and paid, out of any moneys accruing from the sale of their lands, or any other funds belonging to them in the Treasury, the sum of $757, a sum due for the boarding, clothing, and care of the Indian children belonging to that tribe for the years 1863, 1864, and 1865, and this shall be received in full payment of the claim.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INAUGURATION DAY IN THE DISTRICT.

The bill (S. 2551) to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia so as to make Inauguration Day a holiday within said District was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLEMENT A. LOUNSBERRY.

The bill (S. 326) for the relief of Clement A. Lounsberry was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clement A. Lounsberry, postmaster at Bismarck, Dak., the sum of $750, that being the amount expended by said Lounsberry in the payment of clerks necessarily employed in said office from April 1, 1881, to June 30, 1882, and which amount was disallowed in the settlement of his accounts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEIRS OF MAURICE GRIVOT.

The bill (S. 204) for the relief of the heirs of Maurice Grivot was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the payment to Marie Emma Nicholas and Anne Elodie Jaques, heirs of Maurice Grivot, late of New Orleans, La., of $962.85, in satisfaction of money and property taken by the Government, and in full payment of their claim.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The last section of the bill will be stricken out, if there be no objection. The words are "Sec. 2. That this act take effect from and after its passage."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNITED STATES NAVAL HOMES.

The bill (S. 128) for the relief of sailors and marines in the United States naval homes was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the naval asylum located at Philadelphia, Pa., shall hereafter be designated and known as the United States Naval Home.

SEC. 2. That any inmate of the United States Naval Home who is entitled to receive from the Government an invalid pension, or a pension for service in the Mexican war, and who has a child, wife, or parent living, shall, by filing with the proper pension agent a written direction to that effect, approved by the governor of the home, have his pension, or any part of it, paid to such child, wife, or parent. The pensions of all who now are or shall hereafter become inmates of the home, except such as shall be assigned as aforesaid, shall be paid to the pay-officer of the home. The money thus derived shall be held by such pay-officer in trust for the pensioner to whom it would otherwise have been paid, and such part of it as shall not sooner have been paid to him shall be paid to him on his final discharge from the institution. The governor of the home may, from time to time, direct the payment to any inmate of such part of his pension money as he may think best for his interest and consistent with the discipline and good order of the home, but such pensioner shall not be entitled to demand or have the same so long as he remains an inmate of the home. In case of the death of any pensioner, any pension money due him and remaining in the hands of the pay-officer of the home shall be paid to his legal representatives, if demand is made within three years; otherwise the same shall belong to the home.

SEC. 3. That transportation at Government expense may, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, be furnished to such persons authorized to enter the Naval Home as beneficiaries as shall be unable to pay for their transportation to the same.

SEC. 4. That all laws and parts of laws relating to the United States Naval Asylum now in force and not inconsistent with this act are continued in force, and such as are inconsistent herewith are to that extent repealed.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire to call attention to the third section, which authorizes the Secretary of the Navy to pay transportation expenses. I wish to ask the Senator from Connecticut or some other Senator—I believe the Senator from Connecticut has been a manager of a soldiers' home—do we pay the expenses of transporting our soldiers to the volunteer soldiers' homes?

Mr. HAWLEY. My impression is that we do on their first being sent there. I think they get through the proper officer transportation. I know sometimes when they go away, or go off on long furloughs, they pay their own bills; but I think when they are originally sent there they are furnished transportation.

Mr. COCKRELL. I do not so understand the regulations. There is a soldiers' home at Leavenworth, Kans. If a soldier in Missouri wants to go to that home I do not understand that the Government pays his expenses from his home to the institution at Leavenworth.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think at least on his first application the Government pays his transportation. That is my impression, but I may be mistaken. A great many of them could not get there if you did not pay their transportation.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator from Missouri will notice that this payment is only to be made in a case where the sailor beneficiary is unable to pay.

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand that; but there ought to be an equality between the soldiers and sailors.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then the Senator wants the inmates of a naval home treated as well as the inmates of a soldiers' home.

Mr. COCKRELL. Unquestionably, if the inmates of a soldiers' home get it; but if the inmates of a soldiers' home do not get transportation, then the sailors themselves ought not to get it.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am sure I am right about our paying the fare to the soldiers' homes when men first go there.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the clause be read again.

The Chief Clerk read section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. That transportation at Government expense may, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, be furnished to such persons authorized to enter the Naval Home as beneficiaries as shall be unable to pay for their transportation to the same.

Mr. CHANDLER. Does the Senator from Missouri object to that as it stands?

Mr. HARRIS. The Senator has withdrawn the objection.

Mr. COCKRELL. I have never objected to anything. I stated that if the law governing our soldiers' homes did not authorize the payment of expenses of transporting the soldiers applying for admission to the homes from their residences to the homes, then this ought not to be passed. They say it does. Then this ought to pass in order that they shall be on an equality.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment reported by the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the inmates of the United States Naval Home."

EXTRA-TIME PAY TO CHICAGO CUSTOM-HOUSE EMPLOYÉS.

The bill (H. R. 2068) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain citizens of Chicago, employés of the custom-house, for extra-time service, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES E. WALTER.

The bill (S. 773) for the relief of James E. Walter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides for the payment to James E. Walter, late contractor for dredging the harbor of Brunswick, Ga., 23 cents per cubic yard for 12,000 cubic yards of hard excavation, less 13½ cents per cubic yard already paid, amounting to $1,095, the additional payment having been recommended by the Secretary of War as a fair and just compensation for the work.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN C. FRÉMONT.

The bill (S. 2395) authorizing the President to appoint and retire John C. Frémont as a major-general in the United States Army was announced as next in order.

Mr. REAGAN. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Texas objects to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President——

Mr. REAGAN. I will state to the Senator that I have called for some information which I want to use in the consideration of the bill. When I receive the information from the Department, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill. Let it go over without prejudice.

Mr. HALE. The bill has gone over once on the objection of the Senator from Texas. I do not say there was any positive agreement that it would not be objected to again——

Mr. COCKRELL. It was not called up in regular order before.

Mr. HALE. Still I understood that when it came up we should have a vote upon it.

Mr. COCKRELL. It has not, however, been reached on the Calendar in its regular order before. We have never heretofore been this far on the Calendar. The Senator once moved to take it up. The bill will lead to discussion, and we can not possibly pass it this evening. It would simply be a waste of time to take it up without accomplishing anything.

Mr. HALE. I give notice, then, that at some very early day I will move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill, and I hope then it will be disposed of.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar without prejudice.

MILITARY HOME FOR DISABLED VOLUNTEER SOLDIERS.

The bill (S. 2461) appropriating $150,000 for quarters and barracks at the branches of the National Military Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Military Affairs reported an amendment in line 3, after the word "dollars," to insert "the same to be immediately available;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $150,000, the same to be immediately available, is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the board of managers in the construction and equipment of additional quarters and barracks for disabled veterans at the southern, northwestern, and western branches of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, located at Hampton, Milwaukee, and Leavenworth, respectively.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIGHT-SHIP AT BUSH'S BLUFF SHOAL.

The bill (S. 2517) for the establishment of a light-ship at Bush's Bluff Shoal, Elizabeth River, Virginia, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POTEAU RIVER BRIDGE IN ARKANSAS.

The bill (S. 1948) to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River, on the lands of Mrs. M. A. Bower, in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark., was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SAN DIEGO, CAL.

The bill (S. 1864) to provide for the erection of a public building at San Diego, Cal., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds reported the bill with amendments, in line 4, after the word "procure," to insert "by purchase or condemnation proceedings;" and in line 9, after the word "dollars," to insert "which sum is hereby appropriated;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to procure by purchase or condemnation proceedings a site for, and cause to be erected thereon, a suitable building, with fire-proof vaults therein, for the post-office, custom-house, internal-revenue office, and other Government offices, at the city of San Diego, Cal., the cost of which site and building shall not exceed $200,000, which sum is hereby appropriated: *Provided*, That the site shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings, by an open space of not less than 40 feet, including streets and alleys; and no part of the money hereby appropriated shall be expended until a valid title to the site of said building shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of California shall have ceded exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the Government of the United States remains the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of the State and the service of civil process therein.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISTRICT IMPROVEMENT ASSESSMENTS.

The bill (S. 1092) for the relief of St. Vincent's Orphan Asylum, in the District of Columbia, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the provisions of section 1 of the act of the late Legislative Assembly of the District of Columbia, entitled "An act regulating assessments for improvements," approved December 19, 1871, shall be construed to apply to all cases where the work was done after February 21, 1871, and that the commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby directed to make the necessary reductions in assessment for such work.

SEC. 2. That drawback certificates for the amount of such reductions, with interest thereon to the date of the passage of this act, shall be issued to the holders of the liens, the security for which is reduced by the operation of this act, and to such other persons as may be found to have paid in excess of one-third of the cost of such work drawback certificates shall be issued for the amount of such excessive payment. All such drawback certificates shall be receivable for arrears of general taxes due the District of Columbia and unpaid June 30, 1887.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of certain property in the District of Columbia."

POTEAU RIVER BRIDGE IN ARKANSAS.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I objected to the consideration of Calendar number 1074, Senate bill 1948. I withdraw the objection now, as I understand that some amendments have been agreed to, on the adoption of which I am prepared to assent to the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being withdrawn, the bill will now be considered.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1948) to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River, on the lands of Mrs. M. A. Bower, in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 2, line 2, after the words "less than," to strike out "fifty" and insert "seventy;" in line 5, after the word "least," to strike out "twenty" and insert "thirty;" and in line 9, after the word "point," to insert "and give a clear opening of 70 feet in width;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That if said bridge shall be made with unbroken and continuous span, the spans shall not be less than 70 feet in the clear, and the main span shall be over the main channel of the river. The lowest part of the superstructure of said bridge shall be at least 30 feet above extreme high water, as understood at the point of location: *Provided*, That if the same shall be constructed as a draw-bridge, the draw or pivot shall be over the main channel of the river at an accessible navigable point, and give a clear opening of 70 feet in width, and the spans shall not be less than 10 feet above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, to the lowest part of the superstructure of said bridge: *Provided also*, That said draw shall be opened promptly upon reasonable signal for the passing of boats.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 3, as follows:

SEC. 3. That the said company is authorized to have a right of way not exceeding the width of 100 feet for the approaches to said bridge on each side over the lands claimed by individual members of the Choctaw tribe, under the laws and usages of said tribe, and shall obtain the same by contract with said owners or claimants, or in case of a failure to obtain said right of way by contract, then the same may be condemned by proper proceeding in the district court of the United States for the western district of Arkansas, such proceedings to be governed by the laws of the State of Arkansas as now in force respecting the condemnation or right of way for railroads.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. As a substitute for section 3 I offer the following:

SEC. 3. That said corporation is authorized to take and use for all purposes of a bridgeway or approaches to said bridge, and for no other purpose, a right of way not exceeding 50 feet in width on each side of said Poteau River over the lands claimed by individuals under the laws and usages of said tribe of Choctaw Indians, and may contract for and obtain the same from such Indian or Indians by purchase: *Provided*, That no part of the lands herein authorized to be taken be leased or sold by the company, and they shall not be used except in such manner and for such purposes only as shall be necessary for the construction and convenient operation of said bridgeway; and when any portion thereof shall cease to be so used, such portion shall revert to the individual Indian or Indians from which the same shall have been taken.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the committee is to strike out section 3. The motion of the Senator from Arkansas is to strike out the section and insert the words just read. The question is on the motion to strike out and insert.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I now submit what I send to the desk as an additional section to come in after section 3.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert after section 3 the following:

SEC. 4. That before said bridgeway shall be constructed through any lands held by individual occupants according to the laws, customs, and usages of the Choctaw Nation, full compensation shall be made to such occupants for all property to be taken or damage done by reason of the construction of such bridgeway. In case of failure to make amicable settlements with any occupant, such compensation shall be determined by the appraisement of three disinterested referees, to be appointed, one (who shall act as chairman) by the President, one by the chief of the nation to which said occupant belongs, and one by the said bridge company, who, before entering upon the duties of their appraisements, shall take and subscribe before a district judge, clerk of a district court, or United States commissioner an oath that they will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of their appraisement, which oath, duly certified, shall be returned with their award to and filed with the Secretary of the Interior within sixty days from the completion thereof; and a majority of said referees shall be competent to act, in case of the absence of a member, after due notice; and upon the failure of either party to make such appointment within thirty days after the appointment made by the President, the vacancy shall be filled by the district judge of the United States court held at Fort Smith, Ark., upon the application of the other party. The chairman of said board shall appoint the time and place of all hearings within the nation to which such occupant belongs. Each of said referees shall receive for his services the sum of $4 per day for each

day they are engaged in the trial of any cause submitted to them under this act, with mileage at 5 cents per mile. Witnesses shall receive the usual fees allowed by the court of said nation. Costs, including compensation of said referees, shall be made a part of the award, and be paid by such railway company. In case the referees do not agree, then any two of them are authorized to make the award. Either party being dissatisfied with the finding of the referees shall have the right, within ninety days after the making of the award and notice of the same, to appeal by original petition to the district court held at Fort Smith, Ark., which court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the subject-matter of the petition, according to the laws of the State of Arkansas for determining the damage when property is taken for railroad purposes. If, upon the hearing of said appeal, the judgment of the court shall be for a larger sum than the award of the referees, the costs of said appeal shall be adjudged against the railroad company. If the judgment of the court shall be for the same or a less sum than the award made by the referees, then the costs shall be adjudged against the party claiming damages. When proceedings have been commenced in court the bridge company shall pay double the amount of the award into court to abide the judgment thereof, and then have the right to enter upon the property sought to be condemned and proceed with the construction of the railway.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Commerce was to strike out section 6, as follows:

SEC. 6. That the district court of the United States for the western district of Arkansas, or such other court of the United States as may have jurisdiction over the Indian Territory in which said bridge is located, shall have jurisdiction over all controversies arising between the said Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company and the Choctaw tribe of Indians; and said court shall have like jurisdiction, without reference to amount in controversy, over all controversies arising between the inhabitants of said nation or tribe of Indians and said bridge company, and also over all controversies which may arise between the stockholders and the company and among each other; and the civil jurisdiction is hereby extended within the limits of said Indian nation, without distinction of citizenship as to parties, so far as the same may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert as a new section:

SEC. 6. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I think perhaps I was in error in one respect. This bill went to the Committee on Commerce and two sections were recommended to be stricken out by the committee. Subsequently the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] agreed that the sections stricken out might be allowed to retain their place in the bill, it being a local matter and not of very great consequence. The friends of the measure got together and prepared the amendments which I have submitted, which were thought to meet the objections the committee had to the bill and at the same time carry out the purpose the other side had, with the impression that there would be no objection to the bill thus amended. I stated when I got up that the amendments had been submitted to the Senator from Missouri, but I now understand they have not been. If the bill passes, however, and it does not meet with his entire approval, I shall be willing to have it reconsidered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River, in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark.

Mr. TURPIE. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 21, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *May* 17, 1888.

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The House was called to order by Mr. MCMILLIN, who stated that the Speaker was unavoidably absent, and directed the reading of the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 17, 1888.

I hereby designate Hon. BENTON MCMILLIN to preside at the session of the House to-day.

JNO. G. CARLISLE, *Speaker.*

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK,
Clerk House of Representatives.

Prayer was offered by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. JONES, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for ten days, on account of important business.

Mr. CRISP, by unanimous consent, had his leave of absence extended for one week, on account of sickness in his family.

OHIO VALLEY CENTENNIAL EXPOSITION.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a privileged report, which I ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government and the Bureau of Agriculture and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the Centennial Exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, from July 4 to October 27, 1888, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3 and 22.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 5, 6, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 20, and 21, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert the following:

"That there shall be appointed a committee of Congress, composed of ten members, five to be appointed by the President of the Senate and five by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Said committee is authorized and directed to visit said exposition and make such report to Congress in that behalf as they may deem needful and proper."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$147,750;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by said amendment insert the following: "For expenses of the committee of Congress, $2,500;" and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"*Provided*, That payment of the expense incurred by the committee of Congress shall be made on vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee."

And the Senate agree to the same.

D. B. HENDERSON,
J. C. CLEMENTS,
BENJ. BUTTERWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

W. B. ALLISON,
H. L. DAWES,
F. M. COCKRELL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The following is the accompanying statement required by the rules:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the Departments of the Government to participate in the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, submit the following written statement in explanation of the action agreed upon by the conference on the amendments of the Senate:

The Senate made twenty-two amendments to the bill, all but five of which were of a verbal character or to perfect the punctuation in the bill. The conference committee recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of this character.

The other amendments in controversy struck out the provision in the bill for the Congressional committee to constitute an advisory board to confer with the managers of said exposition and the heads of the Executive Departments in reference to the character, extent, and conduct of the Government exhibits and the appropriation of $5,000 for their expenses.

The conference committee recommend as a substitute that a committee of Congress, consisting of five Senators and five Representatives, be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, with power to visit said exposition, and make such report to Congress as they may deem needful and proper, with an appropriation of $2,500 for their expenses.

D. B. HENDERSON,
J. C. CLEMENTS,
BENJ. BUTTERWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I move that the report be adopted.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa, moved to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MILITARY SCHOOL AT FORT LEAVENWORTH, KANS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of War of an appropriation for expenses of an infantry and cavalry school at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., for the fiscal year 1889; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CHARLES CARPENTER, ADMINISTRATOR, VS. THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of findings of fact in the case of Charles Carpenter, administrator, *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

T. N. ALLISON VS. THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of findings of fact in the case of Thomas N. Allison *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

ANNIE E. DAVIS, ADMINISTRATRIX, VS. THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of findings of fact in the case of Annie E. Davis, administratrix, *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

GEORGE MUNGA VS. THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of George Munga *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

EASTERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF LOUISIANA.

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the House Calendar the bill (H. R. 7398) to subdivide the eastern judicial district of Louisiana, and to fix the time and place of holding court therein; and to put the same upon its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all processes from the circuit and district courts for the eastern district of Louisiana against defendants residing in the parishes of Pointe Coupée, West Baton Rouge, Iberville, Ascension, East Feliciana, West Feliciana, East Baton Rouge, St. Helena, Livingston, shall be returned to said courts at Baton Rouge, La., and all processes against defendants residing in the other parishes of the eastern district of Louisiana shall be returned to New Orleans.

SEC. 2. That the terms of court shall be held at New Orleans as now fixed by law. Terms of circuit and district courts shall be held at Baton Rouge semi-annually on the second Mondays of April and November.

SEC. 3. That if there be more than one defendant and they reside in different divisions of the district, the plaintiff may sue in either division, and send duplicate writ or writs to the other defendants; and the said writs, when executed and returned into the court from which they issued, shall constitute one suit and be proceeded in accordingly.

SEC. 4. That all causes triable in either of the courts of said eastern district shall be tried in the division to which the process is returnable under the provisions of this act, unless by consent of all parties the cause be removed to some other division of said district.

SEC. 5. That all prosecutions for crimes or offenses hereafter committed in either division shall be cognizable within such division: *Provided*, That all crimes and offenses heretofore committed within the divisions created by this act shall be prosecuted, tried, and determined in the same manner and with the same effect as if this act had not been passed.

SEC. 6. That all grand and petit jurors summoned for service in each division shall be residents of such division.

SEC. 7. That a deputy clerk of the district court shall be appointed at each place in the two divisions of said eastern district where said court is required to be held, each of whom, in the absence of the clerk, may exercise all the official powers of clerk at the place and within the division for which he is appointed.

SEC. 8. That causes removed from any court of the State of Louisiana in the circuit court of the United States within said eastern district shall be removed to the circuit court in the division in which such State court is held.

The following amendments were recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary:

Section 1, line 7, insert the word "and" between "St. Helena" and "Livingston."

Section 5, line 2, after the word "either," strike out the words "of the."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROBERTSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JACOB G. BOSTATTER.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5259) to relieve Jacob G. Bostatter from the charge of fraudulent enlistment, and that the bill be put upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to remove from the rolls and records of the War Department now in his office, or under his control, any and all charges of fraudulent enlistment now standing on said rolls against Jacob Y. Bostalter, late private in Company H, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and that said Jacob Y. Bostalter be restored to all rights lost or suspended by reason of any such charge.

There was no objection, and the motion was agreed to.

The committee recommended amendments changing the name, wherever it occurred in the bill, so as to read "Jacob G. Bostatter," and making a corresponding change in the title.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BOOTHMAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order, and I now move to dispense with the morning hour.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to present may have leave to send them to the desk and have them duly referred.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

FILING OF REPORTS.

The following reports were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION.

Mr. HOOKER, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, reported back with amendments the bill (S. 2292) to provide for a celebration at the national capital in 1889 in honor of the centennial of the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. TOWNSHEND, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of a petition from citizens of the District of Columbia, protesting against interference with the liberty of the United States Marine band, and the same was referred to the Committee on Labor.

LYDIA CALHOUN.

Mr. YODER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 486) granting a restoration of pension to Lydia Calhoun; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHARLES CARPENTER.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported a bill (H. R. 10009) for the relief of Charles Carpenter, administrator of Celia A. Grove, deceased; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS UNDER BOWMAN ACT.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported a bill (H. R. 10010) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies taken and used by the United States Army, as reported by the Court of Claims, under the provisions of the Bowman act; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. TOWNSHEND, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5052) equalizing the payment and doing justice to the officers, soldiers, and sailors of the United States in the late rebellion who were paid in currency commonly called greenbacks; and the same was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

TARIFF.

Mr. MILLS. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of bills raising revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, denunciation is a harbor of refuge for such oratorical hulks as have been dismasted in the tempest of the forum, or such as have gone to sea on the ocean of free trade without having fully equipped themselves for the voyage. [Laughter.] Any person can declare that protection is robbery. It does not require much genius or ability to make a mere assertion. Such declarations are seldom more than imitations—a parrot can do as much. A simpleton audience, composed of such human parrots, might be induced to believe such declarations, but American intelligence—never.

The man who asserts, that protection is robbery, displays either his ignorance or his demagogism, and perhaps both. I could with as much plausibility declare that free trade is rape. Remarkable as it may seem, during the progress of the debate on the Mills tariff bill in this House, we have time and time again been treated to the declaration, that protection was robbery, and have as often been treated to the twin declaration, that the Democratic party was opposed to free trade.

If the Democratic party is not for free trade, then it must be for protection; if it is for protection, and protection be robbery, then the Democratic party is in favor of robbery, and the only difference between it and its adversary is, that it believes in sectionalizing robbery, and hence supports the Mills tariff bill. If these positions be true, then this Democratic party goes upon the theory, that the manufacturers in New England have had the benefit of the robbery long enough, and determines to withdraw protection from them and let them compete with the manufacturer of British wares made by pauper labor, or close up; that New York, Michigan, and Kansas have had the benefits of the robbery long enough on salt, and hence salt must go on the free-list, and those engaged in its manufacture must compete with pauper labor, or close up; that Pennsylvania and Ohio have had the benefit of the robbery on coal and iron long enough; but because Virginia, West Virginia,

Tennessee, Alabama, and Missouri have not had this benefit sufficiently long, the coal and iron interest may still continue to rob. Might it not be well to place the coal and iron of Pennsylvania and Ohio on the free-list, and continue those articles in West Virginia, Virginia, Tennessee, Alabama, and Missouri under the present tariff? And this kind of a compromise might relieve my friend from Virginia [Mr. O'FERRALL] and my friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] from the dilemma in which they are placed.

But to return. The agriculturist of the North and West have had the benefit of the robbery of protection long enough, and so the framers of the Mills bill put wool, linseed, garden seed, all oil-seed, hemp-seed, beans, peas, milk, poultry, hemp, beeswax, flax, and other products of the farmer on the free-list, but will continue to rob the farmer and all others for the benefit of some Southern States, on rice, sugar, cotton-ties, etc.

If protection is robbery, it is robbery West as well as South, and East as well as North. If it is robbery, why do you rob the bean and pea farmer of the Northwest for the benefit of the rice farmer of the Southeast? If it is robbery, why do you rob the hemp and flax farmer of the North for the benefit of the sugar-planter of the South? If it is robbery, why do you rob the wheat farmer by taxing him on the material out of which the band is made with which he binds his sheaves of wheat, and do not tax the cotton-planter for the band with which he binds his cotton bales?

Robbery, in law, is the forcible and felonious taking from the person of another any money or goods, putting him in fear, or by taking from his person any property by violence, or by menace or threats of death or bodily harm. In an enlarged or general sense it is plundering, pillaging, taking by violence, wrong, or oppression. If protection be robbery, then, to put it in its mildest form, it is plundering the people; it is pillaging from the people; it is taking their property by violence, by wrong, by oppression. If protection is robbery, and Democracy is not in favor of free trade, then every Democrat who supports protection is a robber, a pillager, a plunderer, a wrongdoer, an oppressor.

Every argument made in favor of the Mills bill, with one or two exceptions, has denounced protection, attributed to its baneful influence all the evils that have ever afflicted this country in a commercial or financial way. The agriculturist has been oppressed by it; the laboring man has been plundered by it; the mechanic has been pillaged through its influence; the baby in the cradle has cried because of its oppression, and none but the manufacturer has been the recipient of any of its favors. The manufacturer has been the beneficiary of this pillaging and plundering and wrongdoing and oppression. And yet, in the same speeches, almost in the same sentence, many times in the same declaration, have we heard praises and laudations in favor of the Mills tariff bill.

Who framed the Mills tariff bill? That is a conundrum which no one as yet has solved, to my knowledge. It was charged that many of its provisions were framed by "Parsee" Moore, an agent for large importing firms in New York. When the charge was made, there was a flush of righteous indignation hovering over the features of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], and interrogation after interrogation from him followed fast and followed faster, but there was no denial. By all the rules of evidence, the solution of the conundrum might well be held to be that "Parsee" Moore framed the Mills tariff bill. It matters not, however, who framed it; we know who fathered it and brought it before the House—ROGER Q. MILLS, of Texas; BENTON MCMILLIN, of Tennessee; CLIFTON R. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas; W. C. P. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky; HENRY G. TURNER, of Georgia; WILLIAM L. WILSON, of West Virginia; WILLIAM L. SCOTT, of Pennsylvania, and WILLIAM D. BYNUM, of Indiana. These are the members on the majority side of the Ways and Means Committee by whose action this Mills bill was presented to this House and has been brought up for consideration.

If the Mills bill is not a free-trade bill, then it must be for protection, and if protection is robbery, then it must be for robbery; and if it is robbery, then these gentlemen whose names I have given, are robbers, and in this position must they pose before the American people by all the rules of logic and argument, if the Mills bill is not a free-trade bill. [Laughter.]

It is interesting to quote the language of some of these robbers. My friend from Texas [Mr. MILLS], in speaking on the tariff and in favor of the Mills bill, said:

> We have wool, flax, hemp; our country is full of coal and iron and lumber and yet with all these advantages over all others we have pursued a suicidal policy of protection which has closed the markets of the world against us. Not content with this, we have plundered the great body of our agricultural people out of a large part of their wealth.

And again, in speaking of protection and what is demanded of those who favor the Mills tariff bill, he says among other things:

> Freedom from taxation, levied for the purpose of enriching favored classes by the spoliation and plundering of the people.

He is the captain of this spoliation gang; he is the chief plunderer, by reason of his being at the head of the Ways and Means Committee, and by reason of the Mills tariff bill having been named after him. True, he says in substance, "I am a robber only for revenue. I am a plunderer for revenue only. I am a spoliator for revenue exclusively." [Laughter.] And yet he is for the Mills bill, because he says in closing his speech:

> I hope and trust that the bill which we have presented to you will receive a majority of your votes, a majority of the votes of the Senate, and become a law.

How remarkable that he can support a bill reeking with protection, reeking with robbery, reeking with plunder. The bill, in so far as it does recognize the doctrine of protection, according to the statements that he has made in this public speech, robs the people, is suicidal, is full of spoliation, plunders the laborer and the farmer; but yet, in the face of all this, he says, "I hope it will pass." This may seem like a severe conclusion, but if protection is robbery, and the Mills bill is for protection, how can the conclusion be escaped?

The next plunderer on the Committee on Ways and Means is my friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN]. He is first lieutenant of the robber gang. He says in his speech, page 3592:

> Robbery of them—
>
> Meaning the people—
>
> under the forms of law has been perpetrated, and to-day they stand moneyless, the tax-gatherer staring them in the face, and demand relief at our hands.

Now, what does he propose to do about this robbery? Let us see how grand and magnanimous this first lieutenant of the company is. In his speech, in giving the amount of reduction on dutiable goods, he says:

> Present rate on dutiable goods, 47.10 per cent.

In other words, that is the size of the present robbery under the present robber tariff. Then he says:

> Proposed rate on dutiable goods, 40 per cent.

Meaning that the rate on dutiable goods in the Mills bill is only 40 per cent. He proposes to be generous and reduce the plundering, robbing, and fleecing just 7.10 per cent. He proposes to say to the toiling masses, the toilers on the farm, and at the forge, in the shop, "We have been robbing you on duitable goods at the rate of 47.10 per cent. We have heard your cry for relief; we will be magnanimous and relieve you to the extent of 7.10 per cent., but we must still continue to rob you to the tune of 40 per cent." [Laughter.]

Now, my friend from Tennessee is not one of these robbers for revenue exclusively, for revenue only, or only for revenue. He is one that believes in protection. I suppose that is why he can only stand a 7.10 per cent. reduction of the robbery. [Laughter.] I know many on this side of the House will be surprised to hear that he is a protectionist; but I tell you it is so. He admitted it himself. On the 28th day of April, in reply to my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. O'NEILL], he said:

> Now, I propose we should collect, by a tariff for protection, sufficient money to carry on the Government and to protect American industries. That is what I propose. I propose nothing else.

Now, I submit that out of his own mouth he has established his right to promotion. My friend from Texas should resign, and my friend from Tennessee should be promoted to captain of the robber gang. The gentleman from Texas is a plunderer for revenue only, and the gentleman from Tennessee is more than this—he is a robber for sweet protection's sake.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him right there?

Mr. PETERS. Certainly.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I know the gentleman does not desire to misrepresent me. The remark he has just quoted was credited to me, but it was made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. O'NEILL], and I corrected the RECORD next day.

Mr. PETERS. I took it from the RECORD. I had not noticed the correction. I understand, then, that the gentleman from Tennessee is not in favor of protecting American industries.

Mr. MCMILLIN. You will gather from my action and from my speech what I am in favor of.

Mr. PETERS. I must, then, proceed to say that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] at least should resign and allow my friend from Tennessee to assume the captaincy of the robber gang, for the gentleman from Texas declares he is only a robber for revenue; but my friend from Tennessee will not make that declaration. [Laughter.]

The second lieutenant of this spoliation combination is CLIFTON R. BRECKINRIDGE, the gentleman from Arkansas, a suave, genial, velvet-gloved, kind-hearted, courteous, and elegant bandit. [Laughter.] He has not spoken, so I can not comment on what he may say.

The orderly sergeant of this magnificently equipped combination is my old and distinguished friend, the gray man eloquent, from the classic shades which formerly resounded to the tread of "Harry of the West." Such is his magnificent command of the English language and the fervidness and fascination of his oratory that he can hold a man entranced while he is denouncing him as a rascal, a robber, and a plunderer. He is the one, however, who calls the roll, assigns the members their places in the ranks, and, by his fatherly supervision and parental use of the party birch, maintains decorum, order, and precision in the execution of the various maneuvers when the company is on dress-parade. [Laughter.] He has not yet spoken, so I spare him.

The second sergeant, or, as we might term him in military parlance,

the first file-closer, is my distinguished friend, HENRY G. TURNER, from Georgia. I was sick, confined to my room when he spoke, and have not been able to get a copy of his speech; so I must pass it by without comment.

The third sergeant, or second file-closer, is my bright young friend from West Virginia, W. L. WILSON. His eloquence is "*par excellence.*" It is of that plausible, insidious character, combining the force of reasoning with such beauty of expression that makes you regret all the while the falseness of his premises. In his speech he travels outside the beaten path. Robbery is too harsh a term and is not poetical enough; hence he says:

You have fastened your system of taxation (meaning protection) as a parasite upon that consumption which, for the wage-earner, means nine-tenths, and frequently ten-tenths of his earnings, until you have built up a tariff which is well entitled to say, "Whoever else escapes my exactions, the poor I have always with me.

Is not that elegant? No robbery declaration from him. No plundering denunciation from my learned and accomplished friend; but in a grander way—in a more Oriental style—he declares that protection is a parasite upon consumption. This parasite, according to the logic of the reasoning of my friend from Tennessee, consumes 47.10 per cent., and my friend WILSON, following in the line of his argument, proposes to extract some of its dragon teeth so that it will only consume 40 per cent. In substance, he cries out: "Oh, ye burdened masses, the parasite of protection is upon you; you are alive with it; it is sapping and mining the life out of you. My party's President is in the White House; my party controls the machinery of the House of Representatives; my party has eight of the thirteen members of the Ways and Means Committee. We will come to your relief; we can not kill the parasite, because that might lose us the coming election and the offices, but we will reduce the speed of his ponderous jaws from 47.10 per cent. to 40 per cent." [Laughter.]

The next file-closer, or fourth sergeant, is my unpretentious friend from Pennsylvania, W. L. SCOTT. A casual glance at his style of denunciation indicates that he has some trouble with that portion of the rank and file, marching in his immediate neighborhood. With his commission to the important office of file-closer, apparently, came some special instruction from the commander-in-chief at the other end of the avenue, communicated through the general commanding at this end of the avenue. Rumor has it, that some privates in the rank of the Democratic party in the House have not been keeping step; have failed to obey the command of Captain MILLS to dress up and toe the free-trade mark; have persistently refused to cast their eyes to the right across the water in the direction of British influence. Not only this, but one of the number, more daring than the rest, threw into the tent of the officers, a fire-brand named the Randall tariff bill. [Laughter.]

This and other acts of insubordination could not go unnoticed. They were called to the attention of the commander-in-chief. He began a course of discipline. He first reduced the rations of patronage to all of these malcontents. They were stiff-necked still. Then, as a further act of discipline, only rations of bread and water were ordered. This severe ordeal brought many recalcitrants to terms. A little bread they could stand, but water—never. [Great laughter.] A few of the more daring, with strong convictions, however, refused to bow the knee, even in response to this severe discipline. One of the number was then scourged with the cat-o'-nine-tails of the veto power. After all had failed, then the fourth sergeant was commanded to close up the ranks and compel obedience to the orders of his chief. The gallant namesake of the great Scott of former times, remembered who it was who cast the firebrand into the tent, but discretion, he knew, was the better part of valor, and so, with terrific, blood-curdling denunciation, in speaking of the Randall bill on May 11, he said:

From whatever point you look at it, it is a misbegotten, ill-shapen, pretentious monster, with no excuse for existence and no purpose in life but to obstruct the Democratic party and to delay the justice which the country demands.

The shock of this thunderbolt was terrific. The "beauty of the White House" fled from the galleries, and as soon as the applause on the Democratic side had subsided, the Randall bill continued its sweet repose in the room of the Committee on Ways and Means. [Laughter.]

The last file-closer is my tall and good-natured friend from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM]. His denunciation is of the combination order, combining declaration with implication, the whole being a prelude to a sort of a musical extravaganza. In his speech on the 26th of April he concentrated and combined the pillage, plunder, and robbery theory in the highest style of art. He says:

To show how American labor has been pillaged and plundered by this masked robber of protection, I have obtained, etc.

And then follow the dulcet notes of a table obtained from the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics, showing our imports and exports of cotton and woolen goods for the last ten years. He then goes on to say, after a brief comment on this table of cotton and woolen exports and imports, that—

There is, however, a still more striking illustration of the effects of present duties upon American industries and American labor. We have not only burdened them—

That is, American industries and American labor—

in order to increase the production of materials where there is a deficiency in the home product, giving to European manufacturers and European labor cheaper materials to work up, but we have robbed them—

That is, American industries and American labor—

by placing a higher rate of duty upon that class of materials of which we produce a surplus, thereby giving the American producer a monopoly of the home market which he supplies at the foreign prices with the duty added, and then sells the surplus for exportation at free-trade price. Take copper ore. We have the finest quality and the largest supply of copper in the world.

His mind has become so imbued with the manner in which the masked robber of protection pillages and plunders American labor in the consumption of cotton and woolen goods, that he naturally concludes, that labor also consumes copper, and that the great copper trust of the world is robbing the horny-handed son of toil, because we have more American copper than can be consumed by Americans.

This robbery of labor in the copper business led me to examine how much the Mills bill proposed to reduce the robbery. Investigation discloses the fact that the plundering business was to be reduced from 2½ cents per pound to 2 cents per pound on certain kinds of copper ore and upon certain other kinds from 35 per cent. ad valorem to 30 per cent. ad valorem. My friend from Indiana is therefore willing, to be consistent with his great protestations in behalf of American industry and American labor, to reduce the robbery 5 mills per pound on certain copper materials and 5 per cent. ad valorem on certain other copper materials. How thankful and grateful American labor will be for this magnificent concession. How much more easily will it be for the toiling massess to stand the wear and tear upon their cotton and woolen consumption, with the robbery and plundering upon copper reduced in these magnificent proportions. [Laughter.]

This also led me to examine somewhat, the extent of the robbery that was being perpetrated in relation to woolen goods, and it has been stated by careful statisticians that, conceding the tariff on woolen goods to be a tax added to the cost of the article, it would amount to the immense and exorbitant sum of 29 cents per capita. With what tears of joy and swelling emotion the people of this country will receive the news, that the robber gang propose to reduce this enormous tax, now amounting to 29 cents per capita, to 27 cents per capita! The poor and downtrodden agriculturist, monopolist, laboring man, and all of the sixty millions of people beneath the Stars and Stripes, will thus be saved the first year, a sufficient sum of money to buy a 2-cent postage stamp. My estimates of the reduction of this wonderful robbery may be somewhat in excess of the facts, but I will give to this plundering combination, so anxious to relieve the down-trodden and distressed, the benefit of the doubt, and will therefore let the figures stand so as to save a full 2-cent postage-stamp. [Laughter.]

These illustrations are sufficient to show the absurdity of this cry of oppression and plunder and wrong and robbery from this system of protection. It is enough to make the wooden savage standing in front of a cigar store, smile out loud. [Laughter.]

This robber tariff is collected only on a portion of the articles imported from foreign countries. About $233,000,000 was imported last year upon which there was no duty. About $425,000,000 paid duties amounting to about $214,000,000. We have 60,000,000 of people, and this gives an average of $3.56 for each person; but this includes duties on a large number of articles which the farmer and laboring man does not use. The devotees of fashion who imitate the English snob, and punish the body for dear fashion's sake, rather than comfort it, who wear diamonds, and silks, and broadcloth, who smoke imported cigars and drink imported bourbon and fancy wines, who own tapestried carpets, and who adorn themselves with fine laces, kid gloves, and flashy jewelry. These are the ones who pay over $100,000,000 of this $214,000,000. Take off $60,000,000 on account of sugar and molasses and $4,000,000 on account of rice, all of which the Mills bill proposes to continue to tax, and it leaves but $50,000,000 to be divided among 60,000,000 people, or about 83 cents for each person. If, then, tariff be a tax, and adds the amount of the duty to the cost of the article, the masses of the people pay at the rate of 83 cents per annum each, to the support of this great and magnificent Government of ours. And this is the extent of the robbery over which so many crocodile tears have been poured out in high and low places. This is the pretended cause of the lachrymal exudations, that have deluged White House and Capitol.

One day's abstention by Democratic gullets, from the consumption of Democratic whisky alone, would more than cancel the annual charge. [Laughter.]

I have thus far assumed that the tariff is a tax, but by the logic of facts, this assumption is shown to be incorrect. These facts may for convenience be grouped into three classes:

First. Every article the manufacture of which has been developed under protection in the United States, can be purchased for a less price to-day, than ever before in our history.

Second. Such articles can be purchased as cheap, or cheaper, in this country, than they can be in any civilized country where protection is not the rule.

Third. Many articles sell in this country for an amount equal to, or nearly equal to, the amount of the duty charged.

The first proposition is so clearly established by an incident which occurred in a Western town and so well detailed in a Western newspaper, that I quote the article entire:

A farmer in good circumstances walked into a general store, such as are usually found in small country towns, accompanied by his son, a young man aged

twenty-four years. The farmer said to the merchant, "I want to buy a set of crockery ware for my son, who is just married and about to commence housekeeing. Give me a plain white set."

The merchant promptly set out the articles, and, on being asked, stated the price, and made out the bill. The old farmer pulled out his long leather pocketbook, and taking out an old yellow paper said, "Here is the bill of crockery I bought from you in 1859, when I was first married. There are the same number of pieces; these are better than I got, and the price is less than half as much. Where did mine come from, and where are these made?

The merchant answered, "Yours came from England; these are made in this country." "Is there a duty levied on crockeryware?" said the farmer. "Oh, yes," replied the merchant, "the duty on this kind of ware is 40 per cent. of the value."

"But," said the farmer, "I have just read the President's message; here it is. He says:

"'But our present tariff laws—the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation—ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws have the primary and plain effect of raising the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles.'

"And then he adds:

"'Those who buy imports pay the duty charged thereon into the public Treasury, but the great majority of our citizens who buy domestic articles of the same class pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to the home manufacturer.'

"This does not seem to be so as to crockeryware. The President must be mistaken in that conclusion.

"Besides that," said the farmer, "here are the bills I paid you for window-glass and paints for my house and for the one I have just built for my boy, and I find that I did not have to pay half as much now as I did in 1859, and I see there is a very heavy duty on these articles. What makes them so much cheaper, when the President says the duty is a tax?"

The merchant replied, "It does look like the President had made a mistake in that statement, don't it?"

I assert that a tariff is not a tax, unless the purchaser of the protected article pays more for it, in consequence of the duty imposed, than he would if the duty was not imposed. I need not go into detail. Every one conversant with history as well as with the contrast between prices in the past and present, admits that every article of common consumption in the country to-day, unless it be some of the products of the farm, can be obtained for a less price, than they could under the Walker tariff of 1846. Any farmer in the West who goes to the country store to-day to buy crockeryware, and who remembers what he paid for the same kind of crockeryware in 1850, will be convinced that the prices of to-day are but little in excess of half what they were in 1850.

It is safe to say that crockery ware is 37 per cent. cheaper than in 1860; that all kinds of cotton and woolen goods are 25 per cent. cheaper; that boots and shoes are 25 per cent. cheaper; that iron and steel products are 25 per cent. cheaper than they were in 1860. The fact of it is, and a careful purchase of the various articles will establish it, that not a single article the manufacture of which has been developed in the United States by protection, but what can be purchased at a less price to-day, than it ever could before in the history of the country, and it can be purchased at a less price to-day, than it could possibly have been purchased, if the manufactures of that article had not been developed in this country under the protection system.

Mr. HEARD. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. PETERS. I will yield for a question only.

Mr. HEARD. I desire to ask the gentleman if any of the manufacturer's profits were to be paid for in agricultural products—if these things could be bought to-day cheaper than at the time he mentions?

Mr. PETERS. Yes, sir; and the figures will show it.

Mr. HEARD. I deny that proposition *in toto*.

Mr. PETERS. I repeat, the figures will show it; that less bushels of wheat, less bushels of corn, less pounds of bacon, would be needed; less days labor, and less sweat. But if you apply the other test, namely, that articles can be purchased cheaper in a country where protection is the rule, than they can be in a country where protection is not the rule, then do the facts sustain the assertion, that the tariff is not a tax, because the articles under the tariff can be purchased cheaper than they possibly could if the tariff did not exist.

A large number of articles in which the farmer is interested, which are manufactured in this country, retail cheaper in New York City to-day than they do in Liverpool, London, Paris, Berlin, or St. Petersburg. I will name some of these articles, and I defy contradiction. Among them are augurs, axes, butcher-knives, chisels, coffee-mills, drawing-knives, garden-shears, guns, hay-knives, horse-clippers, iron bolts, grass-scythes, steel shovels, sickles, spades, squares, kettles, locks, mop-sticks, fire-brick, mouse-traps, bird-cages, planes, plows, pulleys, punches, scissors, sheep-shears, sieves, springs, table knives, tongs, barrels, crosscut-saws, mill-saws, needles, pins, and I might continue the list so as to include pitchforks, rakes, harrows, wind-mills, thrashing-machines, wagons, and, in fact, almost all farm implements.

The same is true of many things which the farmer consumes. Sugar and molasses are sold almost as cheap to-day over the retail counters in our Western cities as they are sold in Liverpool or London. There is scarcely an article that goes upon the farmer's table that is not supplied and can not be purchased for less money in America, than it can in Europe, and particularly in England, which is the European representative of all that is antagonistic to protection, as has been stated time and again during this debate.

Mr. DOCKERY. Let me ask the gentleman this question: While I have no desire to interrupt him, I wish to know if I understood him correctly to assert that the articles he has been enumerating are sold cheaper here than they are in Europe?

Mr. PETERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is all I wanted; I just wished to know the gentleman's position on that subject.

Mr. PETERS. I can not close my discussion of this proposition better than by quoting from a speech made by Hon. Thomas H. Dudley at the Farmers' Convention, at Chicago, last November. He said:

By our present protective tariff on the lowest grades of unbleached cotton cloths there is a duty of 2½ cents per square yard; on bleached, 3½ cents; and on colored prints, 4½ cents, with a corresponding higher rate on the higher grades of cotton goods. Will any one assert that these duties have increased the price or in any way added one cent to the cost of cotton goods in the United States? In none of these cases has the duty increased the price: on the contrary, it has not only lowered the price, but it has also forced the English manufacturer to reduce his price as well—a step he would never have taken so long as he had the monopoly of our market and could fix his own price for his commodities. This reduction did not take place until our home competition came in and forced him to put down his prices.

Now let any American farmer reflect for one moment on the extent of the use of cotton goods in his house. All the underclothing of himself and the members of his family, and often the calico dresses his wife and children wear, the sheets between which he sleeps, the ticking on his bed, and, it may be, the cloth on his table, as well as the towels and napkins he uses, and the curtains at the windows, are all manufactured from cotton, and the manufacture of these goods gives employment to thousands of American workmen, who, to a great extent, form the farmer's home market.

Something over three years ago I attended the national agricultural exhibition of France. It was held in Paris, and a grand exhibition it was, quite worthy of the great nation it represented. I spent four days at the exhibition. There were 14 or 15 acres of ground covered with farming implements, tools, machinery, etc. All the exhibitors had their price-lists upon their exhibits, and I was careful to obtain copies of them. The lowest-priced horse-rake was 250 franes, or $50 of our money. You can buy one just as good in any town in the United States for $27. The lowest-priced mower was $102 in our money, and was no better than we sell for $60, if as good. The lowest-priced reaper, without the binder, was $185; no better than ours for $110. The plows, harrows, and cultivators were 20 per cent. above the price they are selling for in the United States. There was not a hoe, fork, shovel, spade, or rake on the ground but was dearer in price and inferior in quality to ours.

The third proposition is supported by so many instances that I have time only to give the most striking as well as the most easily understood illustrations. Mr. DINGLEY, of Maine, in his admirable speech, gave a good practical illustration. He said:

I have before me two samples of cotton prints, identical in quality and character—the one made in a British, the other in an American mill. If the British manufacturer sends a square yard of his print into our markets he is required to pay a duty of 5 cents thereon—a hundred per cent. The price of the British print at retail in Manchester is 5 cents per square yard. If the fundamental theory of the President and of the gentleman from Texas, and all others who have spoken against protection, is correct, then the cost of all prints of this quality of prints in American markets is 10 cents per yard at retail, for that is the English price plus the duty. But it so happens that any one can go into any retail store in our commercial centers and buy this print at 5 cents per yard—the same as the duty.

Mr. BURROWS, of Michigan, in his exhaustive speech upon the tariff, said:

Take as an illustration our steel-rail industry, and let us see if the theory of the President is correct. The first Bessemer-steel rail made in this country was in 1865. At that time there was a duty of 45 per cent. on the foreign product, which continued until January 1, 1871, when the act of Congress went into effect which imposed a specific duty of $28 a ton. In 1867 steel rails were selling in the American market for $166 a ton in currency, or $138 in gold. In 1870 the price had fallen to $106.75, when the duty of $28 was imposed. Now, if the theory of the President be correct, the imposition of the duty of $28 would have had the effect of advancing the price by the amount of such duty from $106.75 a ton to $134.75. But what in fact was the result? Under the stimulating effect of this protection the product of our steel-rail mills rose from 2,277 tons in 1867 to 2,101,-101 tons in 1887, giving investment to millions of capital and employment to thousands of laborers, while the price went down from $166 a ton in 1867 to $31.50 in March, 1888.

His second illustration was equally forcible:

Take the case of "blankets," to which the chairman alluded. A pair of 5-pound blankets were recently imported at the lowest possible cost. The statement of the cost, duty paid, is as follows:

Cost in England at wholesale	$4.45
Duty	4.25
Custom fees	.65
Total	9.35

If the theory is true, these blankets ought to sell for $9.35 a pair; but, as a matter of fact, American blankets of precisely the same weight and quality were selling at that time for $5.20.

Continuing, he said:

But a more forcible illustration, if possible, of the unsoundness of the President's theory is found in the history of a recently established industry in his own State. Previous to 1884 there was not a pound of soda-ash manufactured in the United States. We consume annually 175,000 tons in the manufacture of glass and other American products. Previous to 1884 we imported every pound of it at an average cost of $48 a ton. A duty of $5 was imposed, and the Solvay Process Company was organized at Syracuse, the only one on this hemisphere, at a cost of $1,500,000, with a capacity of 50,000 tons annually. It commenced manufacturing soda-ash in January, 1884. How has it affected the price of this commodity? Was the duty of $5 added to the $48, advancing the cost to $53 a ton? On the contrary, it fell in the American market as low as $28 a ton in three years, a saving to the people annually of $20 a ton on the entire consumption of the 175,000 tons, or $3,500,000.

I can hardly refrain from quoting a letter sent to the New York Tribune by a lady from North Carolina. It is as follows:

Editor Tribune:

SIR: I can not understand this high and low tariff that I hear the men talking so much about. The inclosed I take from a newspaper published here, which copied it from the Philadelphia Record:

"When a sewing woman slips on her thimble (taxed 25 per cent.) and threads her needle (taxed 26 per cent.) with thread (taxed 25 per cent.) and snips it off with scissors (taxed 25 per cent.) and sews a button (taxed 25 per cent.) on her husband's winter flannel shirt (taxed 68 per cent.) she is quite unconscious in her effort to get on in the world how the blessed tariff bears her down. Probably not one woman in the land ever thinks of it; but it is high time she should think of it, and make her husband, who is clothed with the right to vote, act upon it. High taxation is the blight of labor."

It does seem that we poor women are very much imposed upon to have 25, 26, and 68 per cent. put upon everything we use. It is true when we had low tariff the needles that now cost 5 cents a paper we had to pay 10 for, and the thimble that we now buy for 2 cents we got for 10 cents, and the thread that we now get for 5 cents we had to pay 10 for, and the scissors that we now get for 10 cents we had to pay 25 for, and the flannel shirt that we now pay 50 cents for we had to pay $1.25 for. There must be something done to lower the tariff or we will starve to death. Can not you do something to help us poor women? We are needing all the help we can get. Make the President and Congress take off all the tariff and let us go back to old times, "before the war" prices. We are tired of this 25 per cent. business. There is no sense in it, and you men must do better or we women will take the ballot in our own little hands and vote.

Yours truly,

JANE M. McFADDEN,
A Sewing Woman.

ASHEVILLE, N. C., *February* 11, 1888.

Another strong illustration is to be found in the development of the salt industry in this country. Twenty-five years ago we had but a limited supply of salt, but under the system of protection, new fields were opened, new plants established, and then the price began to fall.

I quote the prices per barrel from 1867 to 1886, as follows:

1867	$1.77	1877	$0.85
1868	1.85	1878	.85
1869	1.58	1879	1.02
1870	1.32	1880	.75
1871	1.46	1881	.85
1872	1.46	1882	.75
1873	1.37	1883	.81
1874	1.19	1884	.73
1875	1.10	1885	.70
1876	1.05	1886	.61

My friend from Michigan [Mr. SEYMOUR], in his speech on the 16th, said that salt sold now at Saginaw, in his State, at 60 cents per barrel of 280 pounds, the barrel itself costing 20 cents, the cost of the 280 pounds of salt, therefore, being 40 cents, or at the rate of 7 pounds for 1 cent.

Will some one kindly explain how it can be sold at this rate if the duty is a tax and increases the cost of the original article? The duty on salt is about 85 per cent.

This is but another illustration of the absurdity of the charge that tariff is robbery. The original cost of the salt is a mere trifle. It is the transportation from the manufacturer to the consumer that may be oppressive. It is not the tariff; but concede that the tariff does add something, did you ever hear a sensible, well-posted farmer complain of this tariff? No. Why not? Because he knows that he buys at a nominal sum from 5 to 7 pounds for a cent. He turns it into beef or pork for which he gets 3 cents per pound, or by adding 1 pound of salt to 14 pounds of butter, he is able to sell the salt again at from 25 to 35 cents per pound. [Applause.]

The charge has been made time and time again in this debate, that only a small portion of our people are benefited by a protective tariff; that only those who are engaged in manufacturing and in working in manufacturing establishments are interested in a protective tariff. What I have shown in the reduction of the prices of the articles of consumption is an answer to such a declaration, but every agriculturist and every mechanic and every laboring man has a further interest. These classes especially, must bow to the imperial decree of the law of demand and supply.

Imagine a city of 10,000 people in which all the adult males were carpenters and dependent upon their trade for a living. No carpenter from abroad could get any work in that city. So far as that city is concerned, there would be no rate of wages or pay for a carpenter. Why not? Because every carpenter would do his own work, and every man being a carpenter there would be no employment for such a mechanic in that place. There would be no demand for such labor.

These mechanics could not earn any money by following their occupations in such a city, and as a result could get no employment, no money, no credit. What matters it to them if each one lives in a fine house which he has built? It would shelter him from the storm, but his cupboard, made by his own hands, would be empty, his wife and children would be crying for bread, and as starvation came on apace, dethroning reason, he would give all he has to appease the hunger of himself and those dependent upon him. His fine house, the product of his skill, the labor of his hands, would be sacrificed to avert starvation's death. Has he no interest, then, in such a diversified system of ndustries as would give to him employment at his trade, for a fair compensation, with which he could purchase the necessaries of life?

What is true of the carpenter is true of every other mechanic. What does he care for the sum of 83 cents per annum, his proportion of the robber tariff, if he can by means of that system get employment at the rate of from $2 to $5 per day? If we were a nation of "boot-blacks" we could earn no money at our trade. If we were a nation of miners we could earn no money at mining. The supply of miners would be so great that all wages would be destroyed, and it would be a struggle with each other for a mere subsistence; a struggle, too, in which but a few could even subsist, and the rest must starve.

Whatever, therefore, diversifies our industries enlarges the demand for labor of all kinds. The policy of revenue reform, which is free trade, is to close up our manufacturing industries because, forsooth, it is claimed, we can buy these articles cheaper in the open markets of the world; to close up our coal and iron mines because we can buy coal and iron cheaper in the markets of the world, to close up our sugar and salt and lumber industries because we can then buy sugar and salt and lumber cheaper in the markets of the world. But what then becomes of the labor employed in all of these industries? The supply for labor in other avocations is even now equal to the demand. Add these millions to this oversupply and it means a destruction of wages in all manual employments. Has the farmer no interest in the diversification of industries? Every one who is not a farmer or a member of a farmer's family, is a customer of the farmer. The farmer produces the absolute necessaries of life. He does not sell these to his brother farmer. He must sell to some one who does not produce them. Why does Liverpool regulate the price of wheat in the world? Because it is the commercial center of a vast area of country, which does not produce as much wheat as it consumes. The producer pays the cost of the transportation of wheat from his field to Liverpool, and he must compete in that market with wheat from India and Russia and every other country that has a surplus.

Suppose instead of consuming only 90 per cent. of our wheat in the United States, we consumed 10 per cent. more than we produced. What would be the result? Chicago would fix the price of wheat for our country, instead of Liverpool. The farmer then would not have to pay the cost of transportation to Liverpool, but only to Chicago, which would average only half as much.

The foreign producer would not only have to meet our tariff of 20 cents on each bushel, but he would also have to pay the cost of the transportation of his wheat from India or Russia. What then does the farmer of Kansas need? He needs more customers in the United States. He wants the consumption of farm products of all kinds to exceed the production.

He does not want the ten million of customers he now has, engaged in the mines and manufacturing establishments of the country, to be thrown out of employment. If such a result was reached, then a large number would become his competitors; would add to the production and decrease the consumption of farm products. I have the honor to represent a district that contains more farmers and more farms than any other district in the United States. They are protectionists because they want more customers. It is not the tariff that troubles them. It is occasional bad crops, and a lack of consumers in the United States. They do not believe that old John Bull has any love for an American farmer. They do not believe that the English manufacturer, through the Cobden Club, is spending millions of dollars, to have free-trade established in this country, because of any love he has for the American farmer. They are anxious to diversify industry, even in Kansas, with its miles of waving grain. They want manufacturing establishments in every town. They hail the coming of these industries with joy. They know these industries will increase consumption and will bring a market nearer to their farms. They are a reading, thinking, reasoning class of farmers. There are more newspapers in my district than in any other in the United States. There are more school-houses, more churches, and more post-offices.

I will quote an article taken from one of the leading daily papers in my district, because it explains the interest of the farmer in manufacturing establishments more clearly and more succinctly than I can:

It is hardly needful to produce figures to show that the farmer prospers most when he is in the midst of a manufacturing population. But let us take the figures compiled from our last census. Classifying the States into four groups, putting into the first group those where less than 30 per cent. of their people are engaged in agriculture, in the second group all between 30 and 50 per cent., in the third between 50 and 70 per cent., and in the fourth all above 70 per cent., and we have as a result:

Engaged in agriculture.	Number States and Territories.	Acres.	Total value.	Value per acre.
Below 30 per cent	15	77,250,742	$2,985,641,197	$38.65
Between 30 and 50 per cent	13	112,321,257	3,430,915,767	30.55
Between 50 and 70 per cent	13	237,873,040	3,212,108,970	13.50
Above 70 per cent	6	108,636,796	562,430,841	5.18

Again take the same States and see in which groups the best prices are procured for their products, and we have another result, as follows:

Engaged in agriculture.	Number so engaged.	Total value farm products.	Value per capita.	Population of workers in agriculture.
				Per cent.
Less than 30 per cent	1,060,681	$404,770,779	$457	18
Between 30 and 50 per cent	1,566,875	616,850,959	394	42
Between 50 and 70 per cent	3,017,971	786,681,420	261	58
Above 70 per cent	2,024,966	324,237,751	160	77

There are more than twice as many agricultural products in the fourth class as in the first, yet the crops of the 1,000,000 in the first class are worth per capita nearly three times as much as the crops of the 2,000,000 in the fourth class. Yet there are free-traders who will argue that the cheapest market in which our farmers should both buy and sell is beyond the seas.

If our farmers were surrounded with manufacturers and their attendants, a large consuming population, better prices could be obtained for every farm product. Is any one so foolish as to argue that this would make the farmer poorer? Is any one so foolish as to insist that the New England farmer would be better off if he were compelled to take what the Western farmer gets for his products?

The value of lands in manufacturing States is far higher than in those listed as agricultural States. To illustrate, take a few States:

States.	Acres in farms.	Average value per acre.	Workers in agriculture.
			Per cent.
Connecticut	2,453,541	$49.34	18
Pennsylvania	19,791,341	49.30	21
Delaware	1,090,245	33.74	33
Kansas	21,417,468	10.98	64
Kentucky	21,495,249	13.92	62
Alabama	18,855,334	4.19	77

Or take these States by counties, and it is made still clearer that it is to the interest of the farmer to have his market close to his door.

States.	Manufacturing counties.		Other counties.	
	Acres.	Value per acre.	Acres.	Value per acre.
Connecticut	967,946	$71.84	1,485,595	$34.68
Pennsylvania	3,930,549	86.73	15,860,792	40.02
Delaware	253,939	73.87	836,306	21.56
Kansas	1,006,965	24.53	20,410,503	10.31
Kentucky	1,571,585	36.48	19,923,655	12.14
Alabama	481,484	6.55	18,373,850	4.13

Andrew Jackson said:

Plant your manufactories by the side of your farms and you will crown your country with blessings.

Ben Franklin said:

It is well understood that whenever a manufacture is established which employs a number of hands it raises the value of lands in the neighboring country all around it, partly by the greater demand near at hand for the produce of the lands and partly from the plenty of money drawn by the manufactures to that part of the country. It is therefore the interest of all our farmers and owners of lands to encourage our young manufactures in preference to foreign ones imported among us from distant countries.

Read now what a British official said in the House of Commons the other day. If free trade is such a grand thing for the farmers, why this condition of the British farmer? This official said—

That the prolonged depression of agriculture in England is a matter that surpasses the Irish problem in interest and danger. The loss in values for the last year is put at nearly $250,000,000, an amount equal to a reduction of one-fourth of the export trade of the country. Thousands of acres of land have gone out of cultivation, and there has been a concurrent decrease in all kinds of live-stock. Furthermore, there is a steady increase of unemployed persons who formerly earned a living as farmers, the present number being estimated at 700,000, while those who are able to find employment have to work at greatly reduced wages.

Now I want to read a few extracts from British sources to show why the Britisher is so interested in having us adopt free trade or reduce our tariffs. Hon. Alfred Morris, connected as an official with the Manchester British Union, says.

A reduction of tariffs in America will most undoubtedly lead to an augmentation of the mass of imports into the States. The effect of abolition or of reduction of the tariff respectively on the mass of imports is only a matter of degree. In either case an enormous amount of internal production in the States will be displaced. Tampering with the tariff must flood the American market with foreign manufactures, to the displacement of her labor and impoverishment of the community at large.

There is the honest truth. How do the revenue reformers like it? The utterance was not a politic one, and a word of caution became necessary, and so the London Pall Mall Gazette issued this admonition:

England free-traders would be well advised if they moderate the ecstacy of their jubilation over President Cleveland's message. Every word which they say in its favor will be used as a powerful argument against the adoption of its recommendations.

In 1884 we had up the Morrison horizontal bill, providing for a reduction of 20 per cent. After this House refused to consider that measure, the London Telegraph said:

A bill to establish in America what the English call free trade has just been defeated in the House by the narrow majority of 4. The measure was of enormous importance for English manufacturers, as it would have enabled them to export goods to the States without the crushing tariff now imposed, and its fate was watched with intense interest by Englishmen. Were it passed, it would have been worth £100,000,000 per annum to British manufactures.

Now, a few words about that bugbear, the surplus, and I must close, for my time is up.

The idea that has been croaked from the White House, and echoed by almost every Democratic throat, that we have too much revenue, is a false pretense and a fraud. Cut down the revenues now so that you will have no surplus, and how do you expect to pay the $230,000,000 of 4½ per cent. bonds which fall due in 1891? If the surplus is increasing at the rate of $60,000,000 per annum, it will only provide $180,000,000 to meet this obligation.

The holders of these 4½ per cent. bonds do not want them paid at maturity. They are good investments. The national banks do not want them paid, because many of them are deposited as the basis of their circulation. Wall street does not want these bonds paid, because they are a part of the speculative stock in trade of that financial parasite. These interests are anxious to see the Treasury depleted so that when 1891 rolls around, these bonds can not be paid. They first started the cry about too much surplus and it was repeated and echoed and re-echoed at this end of the line by the President and his subordinates, until hundreds of business interests trembled upon the brink of a financial panic.

Upon this condition of uncertainty and doubt, Wall street thrived, and if the President had been a partner in the scheme, he could not have more efficiently contributed his part to this unholy enhancement of the gamblers' interest; but aside from all these considerations, if we had no debt to meet in 1891, the revenues are not too great. What loyal heart can say, they are too great, while more than 20,000 old soldiers are either in the poor-houses of the country, or are supported by charity? What loyal heart can say, they are too great, while hundreds of thousands of the old soldiers who saved the country, have obligations due them from these revenues, which have not been canceled?

No; these revenues are not too great, and will not be, until all of these obligations have been discharged, not by the death of the creditor, as Democracy fondly hopes, but by such payment and recognition, as will comfort the needy, lighten the infirmities of age, and inspire that patriotism that shall summon another army in the hour of national peril. [Great applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the present bill, two controlling questions arise at the very outset. They are, first, the necessity requiring the passage of the present bill, and, second, the effect the passage of it will have upon the business of the country. These are not to be answered by political prejudice, but from the standpoint of national interest. The necessity for such a revision of the tariff law might be established by such authorities as the messages of Presidents Arthur and Cleveland; by the recommendations of Secretaries Folger, McCulloch, Manning, and Fairchild; by the findings of the Tariff Commission of 1882, and by the declarations of both of the great political parties in their national conventions in 1884. To these opinions both parties have been committed, and ought to be estopped from further questioning the necessity of revising the present tariff law. Still, as they are but advices and opinions, we prefer to find the substantial reasons requiring action upon this bill.

These reasons arise from two causes, first, an idle surplus, and, second, the inequalities of the law. We are told that there is an enormous sum of money, reaching into the millions, constantly pouring into the Treasury vaults, that will be held there as an idle surplus. At the end of the present fiscal year this surplus will have reached the enormous sum of $140,000,000. If this is continued, in time our money, instead of flowing in the channels of business, where it is needed, will be held in uselessness as a monument to our financial folly, and as a temptation for waste and extravagance. Then one of two policies must be adopted—that of getting the surplus back into business circulation, or that of stopping its accumulation. I can think of but three ways of accomplishing the first. These are, increased appropriations, the payment of the public debt, or some plan of national improvements and defenses. Inasmuch as our appropriations are already liberal and ample, no sound policy could warrant any material increase; and unnecessary extravagance under all circumstances is inexcusable and to be condemned. It is true that an overflowing Treasury invites and produces waste and extravagance and reckless expenditures. We have but to look at the Calendar of this Congress to see the effect of our surplus in the revival of rejected claims, stale demands, and in the various schemes brought forward to extract money from the Treasury.

The maintenance of a government at best is expensive, and inasmuch as the great mass of our people are not burdened with a surplus of their own, every expenditure and the administration of every branch of our Government should be controlled by economy. If our public debt were due, or could be paid off upon any terms of fairness or equity, we might find temporary relief in unloosing our money by taking up our bonds. But believing as I do that our bondholders have been the recipients of too many favors by past Congressional legislation, I can not believe that just legislation, or statesmanship, or fairness to the people who bear the burdens of taxation will permit us to pay the enormous premiums that are being demanded. Certainly something more than the necessity of collecting an unnecessary tax is needed to justify the payment of an undue obligation at the premiums asked. Besides, if this policy were followed it could only be temporary at best. As to the system of national improvements I have heard no specific plan suggested. There are some internal improvements that tend to cheapen the transportation, and even the improvement of our Navy that might be judiciously followed. But these can be done at a very small sum as compared to the millions of surplus.

The necessity for any system of defenses against foreign countries or

foreign foes has no more substance to it than the shadow of this Capitol. If we pass just laws bearing alike upon all people, exacting no tax from one class for the benefit of another, stay the possibility of one man accumulating millions from the small tributes laid upon the masses, recognize neither class, section, nor individual interests in legislation, we need have no fear of any foe, foreign or domestic. Every fireside and hearthstone will furnish muscle and courage and patriotism that will be ample protection at all times against all invasions and all countries. Then, if there can be no expenditure brought forward by sound public policy, suggested by liberal appropriations and controlled by economy, by which our money vaults may be relieved and their holdings returned to commerce, our only relief must rest in checking the accumulation of the surplus. If there can be no proper or legitimate avenue through which to return the surplus, there must be some way of keeping our money in the hands of business by decreasing our revenue to the necessities or wants of the Government when economically administered. How can this be done? Either by repealing our internal-revenue laws or by a reduction of customs duties.

If there can be found no better way of checking the surplus than by the repeal of the internal-revenue laws, I certainly prefer that plan to an unnecessary extravagance of expenditure, because I do not think the Government should collect one cent for any other purpose than the economical needs of the country. On the other hand, by extending the free-list and making such reductions as suggested in the present bill, the surplus will be reduced between seventy and eighty millions. The first method will give us cheaper whisky, beer, and tobacco. The other will give us cheaper material with which to build our houses and to furnish them, cheaper implements with which to work, and cheaper clothing for our families. Whisky and tobacco are not used by our wives and children, are not necessary to the personal comfort of the individual or the happiness of the family, and are voluntarily used as a matter of extravagance and luxury and may be voluntarily discontinued with benefit to person, business, home, and community. On the other hand, the lumber, paint, glass, bolts, hinges, and nails in our houses, the blankets and furniture in our bed-rooms, the cooking-stove, pots, kettles, and pans in the kitchen, even the tableware and our clothing—in a word, every one of the four thousand articles that bear a tariff tax—are necessary in business or to personal or home comfort, and every dollar of tax paid upon them that is not needed by the Government or collected for the wants of the Government is an inexcusable folly and a burden as wrongful and unjust as was ever legislated upon a free and intelligent people.

Again, the tax on whisky and tobacco goes to the Government, while only about one-fifth of the tariff tax reaches the Government, and the other four-fifths go to the protected industries. In the first case the tax is paid to support the Government, and in the other case it goes to the support of the protected industries. Unless, then, there is some compensation to those who help to support these industries, some returned benefit or gain, our sense of fairness, of just and equal laws, our belief that our laws should fall fairly and evenly on all alike, force us to declare for this bill against a repeal of the internal-revenue law.

This leads us to the second question. What effect will the passage of this bill have upon the country at large? Or, in other words, is a tax for protection or a tax for revenue the true and sound policy of our Government?

A protective policy indicates that there are two interests in the country—the one that receives the protection and the one that pays for it. In this free land, where self-reliance and independence are inhaled in the very air we breathe, there should be some sound reason for requiring by legislative act that those who are engaged in the hundreds of enterprises and businesses that are not protected should contribute to the support of the few who are engaged in the protected industries by paying them a royalty for their goods in the shape of a tariff. There are various reasons assigned. One says our infant industries can not be developed without protection. Another says it helps our capital to pay better wages. Another says it keeps out foreign goods that represent cheap or pauper labor of Europe. Another says it has enriched the protected industries, and thereby the manufacturing States. Another says it gives us a home market. In a word, all our prosperity, our improvements, our civilization, our inventions, and genius are the outcroppings of a protective system.

But, for the sake of argument, we may reduce all these claims to three general propositions that are claimed by our Republicans. They claim—

First. It helps capital invested in these industries that are protected to develop and increase their business;

Second. It assists the manufacturer in paying better wages; and

Third. It indirectly helps everybody else by giving us a home market.

Whatever reason there may have been for aiding infant industries when our country was new and unpeopled, there certainly can be none at the present day founded on the needs capital has for protection.

We have but to read the speech recently delivered by the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. GALLINGER] to satisfy us on that point. He boasted that New England, with but one-thirteenth of the population of the country, had one-eighth of the wealth; that protection had brought her $650,000,000 that she had invested in manufactories; that she has $575,000,000 in her savings-banks, or more than one-half of all in the country; and in addition to all this—

has millions of capital invested in loans on property in Western cities, in Western, Southern, and trans-continental railways.

And he might have added that she has nineteen of the forty-three trust companies. This magnificent showing, it is claimed, is due to the benign influence of a protective tariff. As to just how many millions of wealth it has made for them we are not told; but may we not inquire, if it brought you millions of dollars, from whence came it? The answer must be "from the millions of other people engaged in the other avocations of life; from every person who has paid 30, 40, 50, and 60 per cent. of tariff on the goods they used." If protection has added one million or one hundred millions to their wealth, it has as certainly taken that amount from the earnings of the rest of the country.

Who are the people who have paid this? The farmers and the mechanics, the carpenters and the blacksmiths, the butchers and the bakers, the tailors and the seamstresses, the laborers and servant girls, those making agricultural implements, every person who uses the protected articles. Do they boast of their possessions by the millions? Work to them at best is hard. By the sweat of their brows they are willing to earn their living, but when they are required to work extra time to pay tariff prices for all they buy from those who already boast their millions, work indeed becomes bitter, and especially so when they see that this same money is loaned back to them at 8, 9, and 10 per cent., invested in their State, county, and city bonds, and controlling their railroads and freights.

I do not care to challenge the gentleman's boast. New England is as much to me as to himself. Her rocks and hills are as dear to me as the fields of Illinois. The murmur of the ocean upon her shores is as musical as the ripple of the Mississippi. Her Webster and Hancock and Adams are held in as much veneration as a Lincoln or a Douglas. In our prattling infancy we were taught to love the historic fields and heroes of New England. While our love and patriotism are confined to no locality or range, but to every section as one country, we would like to know why New England should be blessed at our expense and disadvantage?

Strip us of unequal laws and legislative disadvantages and put us on the footing of self-reliance and independence, and how will any of the New England States compare with Illinois? Has nature spread out the blessings of her hands more abundantly anywhere than in Illinois? Rivers and lakes second to none wash her banks. A soil in richness beyond compare, one vast garden blooming with its products, and yet you boast we are poor as compared to the manufacturing States. You boast of the millions that have been filched from us by the system of tariff and put into your enterprises and savings-banks. You boast of owning our mortgages, of buying our city and county bonds, of controlling our railroads, and yet you ask us to continue to pay the burdens of a tariff to add to your already incalculable wealth.

We are ready and willing to pay all the necessary expenses of Government, but every dollar that is collected unnecessarily or exacted of us to give to you as a favor or bounty is as unjust as if it were collected by the hand of tyranny to support an idle and haughty aristocracy.

The silent and speechless pyramids of Egypt, that for fifty centuries have been a living and visible monument to the world of the tyranny that filched and forced labor and money from the slaves and unfortunate subjects of Cheops, are but one degree removed from the effect of that policy which, to give millions of aid to one enterprise by extracting it from another, withdraws from business its capital and piles up that other monument of folly, $140,000,000 of idle surplus. Abuses in taxation and the raising of revenue have ever been a favorite way of exercising tyranny.

It has been the peculiar boast of the English-speaking people that they have ever guarded themselves from such abuses. There has been more than one John Hampden to oppose unjust taxation. Every chapter of history has furnished its Hampden. The very harrow that prepared our country for freedom and independence was England's protective policy that required the western colonies to pay a tax upon the various articles they used. And the very spirit that opposed the stamp act and the tea tax rises in the West to-day and challenges the wisdom of a protective policy that lays a 47 per cent. tax on what the West buys and thereby increases the already enormous wealth of the East.

I am not a strong believer in millionaires. It means poverty somewhere. It is too powerful. It crushes independence, enslaves labor, and sets at defiance law. If, instead of advocating a protective policy that starts the little streams from the pockets of the millions into the treasury of the millionaire, you could find some measure to reverse the current and empty his millions into the pockets of the masses, you would indeed be called blessed.

Bishop Spaulding says, in a recent article in the Forum:

A democracy where the millions own nothing and the few own millions must fall a prey to socialistic, communistic, and anarchic turbulences, and though so far there is no proper soil here for such germs to sprout in, the policy which uses all the powers of government to build nests for paupers, who like unfledged birds shall eat only when capitalists drop food into their mouths, will soon supply the lacking conditions.

But we are told if we reduce the duties, the importation of foreign

goods will stop our manufactories, will throw out of employment the workmen of those industries, or reduce their wages. I will answer this by quoting from the excellent speech of the Chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. He says:

It will do nothing of the sort. What will we import, and what did we import when prices rose and the duties fell in 1880? We imported more of the same articles which we were importing before the prices rose. We will import more of the things we can not produce or which can be produced cheaper in other countries than at home. If we look to our table of imports in 1880, we will see that over sixty millions of the increase was of articles in the free-list and about one hundred and twenty-five millions in the dutiable list. The increase of imports free of duty will not hurt the manufacturer or the laborer.

We always import more coffee, more tea, more of everything that is required to meet the wants of the people when prices are high, because when prices are high the country is more prosperous and the people are better able to buy and pay for what they want, and the tariff is then lower and dutiable articles are more largely imported to compete for sale with the home products. In looking through our consumption statement we see that a certain line of articles are imported from year to year; then observing the periods when prices are high and the tariff low you will see that the same articles are imported in larger quantities.

Our manufacturers do not then stop. They go on with increased activity. They did not stop in 1880 when the large importation set in. It gave them renewed life; their wheels flew faster, their machinery worked more constantly, and their operatives were all employed.

The same was claimed when a bill was brought into this House to repeal the tax on quinine. In 1878 it bore a heavy duty, and there were five firms, employing five hundred men at $1.50 per diem, engaged in its manufacture, and it sold at an average of $3.50 an ounce. It was virtually a tax on health and considered a hardship on account of its universal use. The same objections were used then as now—importation of foreign goods, closed manufactories, and idle workmen. The duty was removed, and what was the result? We have, in the ten years since, twelve instead of five firms, more than twice the number of workmen, quinine selling at 50 cents instead of $3.50 an ounce, and thousands of dollars worth sold in Paris and London, the very home of the competition that was feared.

Whatever is imported has no need of protection, and whenever our goods leave our shores for foreign markets protection should cease. Go through the list and you will find a large number of the protected industries that are exporting their goods and competing with "pauper" made goods at the "pauper's" home. We find our coal is selling from England to Venezuela, our lumber shipped even to China, and our cutlery sold all over Europe. Even the Pittsburgh Gazette, which is not only a high-tariff paper, but is published at the home of the protected industries, boasts that the Pittsburgh steel works have established a number of branch houses in Europe, India, and Australia.

Wherever our goods go, wherever we are compelled to seek a market for our produce, there ought to be some exchange of trade. Commerce can not be one-sided. If we wish to sell our goods and produce to foreign countries, we must be willing to take whatever they have to exchange for them.

But, says the protectionist, if we exchange the goods and produce which we are compelled to send abroad to find a market for foreign goods, will that not lessen the consumption of our home manufactures and thereby injure our own industries and the labor they employ?

In this country labor is honorable in all our various industries, and its interest should be consulted whenever legislation may affect it. There are, according to the last census, over 17,000,000 of persons in the various industrial pursuits. Of these, 7,670,497 are employed in agriculture; 2,934,876 are domestic servants and laborers; 1,139,362 are in professional service; 1,810,256 are employed in trade and transportation; 1,214,023 are carpenters, blacksmiths, masons, butchers, bakers, tailors, seamstresses, plasterers, etc., leaving 2,623,089 persons engaged in those manufacturing industries that claim to be benefited by protection.

We would not answer that because these are in so small a minority their interest must yield to that of the majority.

We assert, first, that the price of labor is not controlled by a tariff law further than what demand is thereby made for it. No one measures the wages by the profits he makes. It makes no difference whether a man is making 10 or 100 per cent. profit, he no more pays the employé more than he is compelled to pay in the market at the place of hiring than he pays the farmer more for his wheat and pork than it commands in the market. He is not in business for that purpose and does not do business in that way. He gets his labor in the market and at the market price, the same as he does the various material and product that he uses. The hail-storms of statistics that have been showered upon the House to prove that labor is benefited by protection prove nothing of the sort.

It is no argument to compare the wages of this country with free-trade England. The difference is in advantages. The great West, that has been furnishing homes for Europe's millions furnishes a check to starving wages. Compare Germany and France, with their protection, to free-trade England if you want a true comparison, and you will find England pays much better wages. From what countries do our great flood of immigrants come—from free-trade England or the high-tariff countries? You might as well compare England with China as our country with England to establish the question of the policy of government that will better the laboring classes. But did not the gentleman from Texas prove conclusively that while the American gets much better wages for a day's work than the Englishman he turns out so much more finished work in a day that he really receives less wages on the articles made? It is simply the superiority of every branch of industry in this country over that of Europe. If the tariff could be so collected as to be paid or distributed to the workmen in whose interest it is now asked the burden might be borne with less complaint.

But does not each of these 2,600,000 workmen in protected industries bear some of the burdens of the tariff? Does he not see his earnings go in the 47 per cent. tariff on all that he buys for himself and family? And how about the other fourteen and one-half millions of other people in the various industrial pursuits from whom the tax is continually taken and to whom no benefit comes?

Are not the thousands of servant girls who work fourteen and fifteen hours a day to be allowed to complain when they see their small earnings melting away under the 47 per cent. tariff which they pay upon the dresses, and shoes, and underwear, and everything else that they buy?

The laboring man in the most humble walk of life is taxed to help capital, and if he asks for protection, who heeds his cry? Does not capital, that is so afraid of the pauper labor of Europe, without even a tinge of remorse or pity fill his place with the very labor it so much fears?

Do the thousands of seamstresses that work all day and borrow daylight from the candle to support themselves and families get protection from our Government? Do they amass fortunes, own stone fronts, buy our bonds or hold our mortgages, and yet they must pay their mite on all they buy to support capital.

Several gentlemen in their ecstacy over the innumerable blessings which they seem to think comes from a protective policy, have grown eloquent over our Western industries.

These industries manufacture agricultural implements. From the Tenth Census we find that there were, in 1880, in the State of Illinois, 220 establishments making agricultural implements. The total amount of capital invested in these manufactories was $11,306,955. They employed 7,300 persons, to whom they paid in wages $3,186,999. They paid for their lumber $1,332,201 and for their iron and steel $3,498,414. Lumber has an average duty of 16 per cent. and iron and steel an average duty of 40 per cent. At the above rate of duty the manufacturers paid on their lumber over $180,000 and on their iron and steel $1,097,000. This would make a total tariff tax of $1,277,000 paid on the lumber, iron, and steel, or more than one-third of the amount of all the wages paid by those establishments. How these industries, their employés, or those to whom their goods are sold are benefited I can not understand.

Mr. Buford, a manufacturer of Rock Island, Ill., says:

There is not one article that we make that is in the least benefited by the tariff. On the contrary almost everything that we buy is enhanced by the tariff, and of course our customers in turn have to pay more for what they buy of us. Almost every manufacturer in the West labors under this disadvantage. We ship a large amount of our products abroad where we have to compete with foreign makers.

The manager of the Deere & Co. Plow Works, at Moline, Ill., which turned out one hundred thousand plows in 1881, says—

That the cost of every implement turned out by his house is enhanced 15 to 25 per cent. by the present tariff, with no compensating benefit.

Our Western industries are establishments that make plows, cultivators, corn-planters, hay-presses, wagons, mowers, reapers, harvesters, the various agricultural implements, stoves, boilers, engines, etc. Tell me how they are protected?

Does not the lumber which they use, the iron and steel and paint, every article that enters into the manufacture of their goods, except that of brain and muscle, come to their doors loaded with a tariff duty, which they must pay? They have grown and flourished not by reason of a tariff, but in spite of it.

If they could get their material, whether you call it raw or not, free of duty could they not pay better wages, put more money into their pockets, and sell their goods cheaper to the farmer? With no protection for their business, and paying a protection on all the material they use, they have made the greatest advancement in all industries in the country. With the whole world as a competitor they have no competition. You might as well claim that the satellites of Jupiter, the changes of the moon, the ebb and flow of the tide, or even the Christian salvation are the result of protection as that the success of the agricultural-implement industry of the West is due to such a cause.

But the protectionist says, "We supply you with a home market." "Home market" is a phrase as seductive as "protective." Our 60,000,000 people are to be fed and clothed whether we have protection or not. Let us see where the farmer's market is. From the census report of 1880 the total sum of farm products was about $2,500,000,000. Of this sum $586,000,000 were sold abroad, leaving $1,914,000,000 that were consumed at home. As the 2,623,009 of persons employed in those industries that are protected are less than one-sixth of the persons engaged in all other kinds of industries and business, it is fair to suppose that only one-sixth of the home consumption was used by them. This would make $319,000,000 of home market as against $586,000,000 of foreign market. How does this furnish a home market?

Do the Western people consult the quotations of produce in New England when they are seeking a market? One gentleman spoke of how the establishment of one industry furnished a better local market for the farmer. A better market for what? Garden produce and such things that have only a local market. The great staples of the farm, her wheat and corn and oats, her pork and cattle, are not affected by local markets. The New Englander buys the Illinois and Kansas wheat for the same price that he pays for New England wheat.

The whole world is the market for these staples of the farm, and if a large amount of them are sold abroad does not that foreign market ultimately control the home market? Now, when you send the farmer abroad with his $586,000,000 of produce to sell in a foreign market why not permit him to exchange it for the goods he needs? Suppose he does, and when he has returned, after paying his freight both ways, and enters his own country, what does he find? That he must sell from one-third to one-half of his goods to pay the duty on the balance. If he be told, on inquiring why this is done, that it is to support the Government, to bear its necessary expense, you will hear no complaint. The farmers are as patriotic and respond as readily to the demands of the Government as any class of people. But when you tell him that it is not needed by the Government, that it is not collected for that purpose, but it is a tribute laid to protect and sustain those infant industries whose presidents and directors and stockholders number their possessions by the hundreds of thousands and millions, he does complain, and is justified in complaining.

From reliable statistics I find that from 1860 to 1883 the agriculturists have sold in European markets breadstuffs, provisions, and cotton to the value of $8,000,000,000. What became of this enormous sum? If the farmer will examine the tariff list he will find where a large portion of it has gone; he will find that he has paid a tariff—

	Per cent.
On the iron in his stove of	45
On pots and kettles in the kitchen	53
On copper and brass utensils	45
Crockery	55
Glassware	45
Spoons and cutlery	45
Salted fish	25
Salt	36
Sugar	48
Rice	123
Furniture	35
Looking-glass	90
Carpets	68
Wall-paper	25
Men's clothing (wool)	48
Woolen undershirts	75
Cotton undershirts	45
Hats	75
Gloves and blankets	60
Dresses for his wife	60 to 70
Paint	54
Nails	31
Sacks	40
Tinware	42
Boards for fencing ..... per thousand	$2
Pine boards	20
Posts	30
Barbed wire	55

And so on through the list of all the things he buys. Even the farming utensils with which he raises his crops bear their average burden of the 47 per cent. tariff, while the twine with which he binds his wheat costs him one cent a bushel for the blessings of tariff. When he commences to complain tell him the truth if you dare. Explain to him that but one-fifth of those various sums goes to the Government and the other four-fifths go to those who make the protected goods.

If he is not surprised at this, tell him further that the Government does not need all or even the fractional part that it receives, but is holding it in idleness when he and his neighbors are needing it in their business. Will he not say, "Why am I unnecessarily taxed?" You answer him, "To develop the various industries of the country." Will he not reply, "Who helped me to clear my farm, build my fences, and break up the prairie sod? I came here when it was a frontier and with but few advantages, little market, and few of the necessaries of life, and by my own industry tamed and improved this farm." Let the developments of the country rest with American energy, enterprise, and brains without being trammeled by forced development. We boast of our free schools, free speech, free institutions; and add to the freedom we now have free commerce, and our industries will develop themselves. Blessed as our country is by nature, our thousand hills stored with mineral, our forests of magnificent timber, our broad lakes and extensive rivers for transportation, with the richest soil beneath the sky, we need no other incentive to possess these riches and develop this country than the ambition and energy and enterprise of the American people.

Some of our protectionists have seen fit to lecture our Irish friends for adhering to what they style an English policy. I would say to them, it is never safe to enact laws from prejudice; but if I mistake not the references were more unfortunate than that. What is our position on this side of the House? We ask that the inequalities of law shall be remedied; that favoritism shall stop, class legislation be wiped out and all our people put on equal footing, and the race of life left to merit, energy, and ability. In this free land of ours, blessed by all the riches that a bountiful Providence could bestow, no power, country, or people can frighten us by competition in any field.

Is not this what Ireland has asked for, what she has demanded and fought for for five centuries? It is not free trade that she complains of, but free people she demands; that an Irishman and an Englishman shall stand on equal footing before the law. She asks to have the tariff of English landlords removed, to wipe out the laws that draw tribute from her people to support a favored class in England, when there is no benefit returned to them. It is home rule she demands. These are the questions that Ireland, weak, depopulated, and butchered, has fought for for five hundred years. Ireland, that has graced and adorned every branch of English history, furnished England her greatest statesmen, most brilliant orators, her poets, historians, and even her master soldier, the great Wellington, single and alone has fought England step by step; England, almost all-powerful on land and sea; England, that knew no master in the Levant; that alone could stay the imperial march of the mighty Napoleon, Ireland has fought her for five hundred years to strike down the hated high tariff of England's landlords, and to-day, with the aid of that incomparable Gladstone, bids fair to win her victory.

Do not chide the Irishman for opposing unjust and unequal laws, they are his enemy everywhere. The spirit born in him at his birth; moving in every fiber of his existence, and ceasing only at his death, is opposed to them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair intended at this point to recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. NUTTING] for fifteen minutes, but does not see him in the Hall. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] is now entitled to the floor.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I would prefer that the debate should alternate, if any gentleman on the other side is ready to address the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. NUTTING] is not present on account of illness.

Mr. MILLS. Before the gentleman from Arkansas proceeds I ask that he may be allowed to speak without limit of time—a courtesy which has been accorded to all other members of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. MASON. What is the request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Arkansas may be permitted to speak without limitation as to time. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLS. This courtesy has been extended to every other member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. MASON. I simply wanted to ask——

Mr. MCKINLEY. I hope the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] will not object.

Mr. MASON. I have not objected; I only wanted to know how long a time the gentleman from Arkansas would occupy. There are some of us who have been waiting some time for an opportunity to speak.

Mr. MILLS. We have extended every courtesy to the other side of the House in extending time and in lengthening sessions, etc., in order that everybody might be accommodated.

The CHAIRMAN. If the gentleman from Arkansas should speak two hours, it would not interfere with the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON].

Mr. MASON. I only wanted to know whether the gentleman would have the privilege of speaking all day.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? The Chair hears none.

[MR. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. Mr. Chairman, in response to the gentleman who has just taken his seat, I take the liberty of saying, in behalf of gentlemen on this floor who are the friends of the protective system, that while many of us are ready to admit that some revision of the present tariff system may be desirable, we are not willing to entrust that revision to gentlemen who avow themselves as hostile to the principle of protection. We fear the Greeks even when bearing gifts; and we can not but distrust the professions of friendship which our friends on the other side are making in favor of the principle of protection.

The national Treasury is congested. Our income is greater than our needs. This is an admitted evil, and its arrest is the burning question of the hour. How shall it be done? This is the practical problem given for our solution. The way to its speedy determination is open, easy, and certain. A dozen lines cutting down internal-revenue taxation $75,000,000 would bring instant relief. This method, or the free-list, or both, to the extent employed will work exact arithmetical results. Nothing else can or will. Reduction of imposts will enhance the evil, bringing only increased importation and increase of revenue. Men may deny this, but it is a truth proved by experience and recorded in our recent history.

To illustrate. During the three years from 1881 to 1883, inclusive,

we imported 2,939,226 pounds of worsted cloth, on which we collected duties amounting to $2,456,548.03; while in the succeeding three years, under the operation of the act of 1883, which reduced the tariff on these and all woolen goods, we imported 12,966,493 pounds of worsted cloth, and collected as duties thereon during the same period, $7,367,411.65, an increase of revenue on that one item, over the three preceding years, of $4,910,863.62. And during the same period, under the tariff amendment of 1883 alluded to, the aggregate increase on all the woolens imported was $11,465,503.27. It goes without saying that if you reduce duties, by as much as they are reduced, by so much do you open the flood-gates of foreign importation, and the foreign manufacturer, ever alert and watchful for an opening to our market, pours his surplus upon us in threefold volume.

The instance cited, one of many, of the effect of a recent reduction of duties upon a single class of articles, should be instructive. In the face of such and so recent an experience touching the very pivotal point of the pending controversy, who dares to affirm, with the confidence which is born of reason and experience, that the proposed reduction in the bill before the House will diminish the aggregate customs revenue under existing law? Will the honorable chairman of the committee venture to predict with any remote degree of approximation to accuracy, how or to what extent these reductions will affect importations of the v ari ous articles enumerated?

If he should make candid reply, and I am sure he would make no other, he would doubtless admit that importations would increase. If pressed further with the question—to what probable extent?—I feel quite sure that the same candor would extort confession of absolute ignorance. Let us not forget the precise point at issue, to wit: By what method shall we relieve the Treasury of its congestion? I take the President at his word. I emphasize the evil "condition" which he condemns, and which he has made the subject of his annual message, to the exclusion of every other national interest, domestic and foreign.

Whatever we do or attempt in the premises must therefore be regarded as a means to that one great end. Will the method of reduction proposed by the Mills bill reduce the aggregate revenue now desired from the enumerated articles to the extent of such aggregate reduction? Certainly not; for there will be large increase of importation. But to what extent? *Quien sabe?* Nobody knows. There is an uncertain factor in the problem, indeterminable in value. We are thrown into the realm of pure conjecture. To the extent of the amount covered by the free-list as proposed, twenty-two millions, and the proposed internal-revenue reduction, twenty-four millions, the bill meets the point; but how about the thirty-odd millions of surplus remaining, and what if increased importations add as much more? For I beg to assure my friends on the other side that the ebb and flow of trade are under laws as inexorable as the law of gravity.

You can not lessen by the smallest degree the barriers to foreign importation and avoid the full measure of inflow your opening affords. If you could cut duties and at the same time hold the inflow at its present volume, you could compute arithmetical results. But the moment your artificial barrier is lessened or removed, a law, not of your making and beyond your control, comes into play, and your prophecies will fail, and the grizzly monster, the surplus, will grin mockingly in the scared faces of your successors in office.

But is this the real object its author, or authors (for its paternity is somewhat nebulous), and its promoters and friends in this country and in England have in view?

The existing surplus is only a stalking horse. It is made the pretext and occasion of a general assault all along the Democratic line upon the protective system. The President leads the charge. The distinguished gentleman from Texas, the eloquent member from Kentucky, the able and accomplished Speaker of the House, with all their Southern allies, still clinging to traditions born of a vanished system, have struck hands with the theorists and *doctrinaires* and importers and the disciples of Cobden on both sides of the sea, and declared unrelenting war upon the great American system of protection.

The air is resonant with furious declamation in denunciation of its enormities. Savage phrases and unsavory similes are unsparingly flung at it. It is robbery, it is fraud, it is unjust, it builds up monopolies, it defrauds the laborer of his hire, it swells the coffers of the rich, it carries desolation and misery and scatters the seeds of poverty and pauperism. The brilliant Kentucky editor, always honest in his utterances, styles it a "painted harlot." From the plains of Texas, from the wilds of Arkansas, from the recesses of Tennessee, from the savannahs of Carolina, and from the swamps of Mississippi we hear the same doleful wail over the wrongs and oppressions which the tariff inflicts upon the free, intelligent, energetic, prosperous, self-supporting, well-fed, and well-paid laboring men of the great industrious North. And when our eloquent friends on the other side tire of the rhetorical display of these imaginary evils they turn to prophecy and unfold visions of material glory and prosperity under the banner of free trade such as "eye hath not seen," nor hath entered into the imagination of any other than a free-trader to conceive.

Mr. Chairman, we have been sailing these many days on a sea of rhetorical free-trade assumption.

It has been assumed that the present tariff imposes an unjust and oppressive burden of taxation upon the people.

It has been assumed that an import duty enhances to its extent the cost to the consumer.

It has been assumed that protection does not increase wages, nor prevent their reduction.

It has been assumed that with free raw material we can compete with the low-priced labor of other countries in the markets of the world.

It has been assumed that the effect of protection has been to make the rich richer and the poor poorer.

It has been assumed that the agricultural classes are not its beneficiaries.

It has been assumed that the proposed reduction of duties would not injuriously affect the great cluster of industries concerned.

It has been assumed that the people of the country demand the changes proposed.

It has been assumed that the Mills bill will reduce income to the measure of our needs.

Now, Mr. Chairman, every one of these assumptions rests in pure assertion, has not only been unproved, but is demonstrably without foundation in fact or experience.

Who complains of burdensome taxation? Where are the petitions of the farmers, the manufacturers, and the great hosts of wage-workers in mine, and forge, and mill, and field asking relief? Whence comes this plaint? I hear the voice of Mr. MILLS and his conferees on the committee and on the floor. It is echoed from the classic shades of Harvard and Yale. The Mugwump press takes up the refrain. The Democratic press dare not break with their only possible candidate on the eve of the election. I see, too, the hand of a foreigner resident in the city of New York, a very intelligent and enthusiastic apostle of free trade. No; Mr. Chairman, no voice nor sign comes from the people in favor of this measure.

The door of the committee room swung free and on willing hinges to the representatives of free trade. It was shut to the people and their representatives. The laboring men, whose oppressions these gentlemen so bewail, vainly sought to enter their protest. The inventors and manufacturers, the creators and masters of great industries, who build cities and towns and promote great enterprises, who give remunerative employment to hundreds of thousands of men, masters of their craft and capable of wise suggestion even to the learned members of the committee who turned their backs upon them, were denied access to the secret conclave. Farmers all over the land have showered petitions upon this body praying for better protection to their products, and yet gentlemen stand here in their places day after day and assume to represent the people as excessively taxed by the tariff and clamorous for relief. We are unable to trace the complaint beyond the mouth of the free-trader.

Without intending the slightest discourtesy to any gentleman who has no doubt honestly persuaded himself of the truth of his belief, I must say the audacious effrontry of this assumption is almost sublime.

A many times millionaire stood in his place here the other day and flung opprobrious names at the advocates of protection. He styled them "Bourbons of the densest kind," whatever that may mean. He said protective duties are "artificial restraints imposed upon the natural energies of the mass of men by ignorance, rapacity, and tyranny for the benefit of the few," etc.

He spoke of "the overburdened industry of the country from excessive taxation, the proceeds of which do not pass into the Treasury, but go to the support of grasping monopolies," etc.

In view of this gentleman's business career these utterances would seem to be intensely ironical. He is a citizen of the great State of Pennsylvania. No candid student of the history of her magnificent industrial growth and development can justly deny her obligation therefor to the system the gentleman so bitterly assails.

The accumulation of his own colossal fortune was made possible only under the conditions which protection afforded, and his own case is an illustration of the possibilities open to all of like gifts and enterprise through a system which fosters, encourages, stimulates, and rewards intelligent American thrift and labor in every field of human activity.

But lest the gentleman may turn upon himself and charge himself as being a melancholy example of the disastrous effect of this "semi-civilized," "Bourbon," "ignorant," "plundering," "rapacious," "tyrannical" (I quote his phrases) policy of protection, let us see how this so-called "excessive taxation," "the proceeds of which," he says, "go to the support of grasping monopolies," affects the people of his State.

In the year 1886–'87 the average amount of deposits of savings banks in Pennsylvania was $42,219,099, by 156,722 depositors, an average to each depositor of $269.39. This vast sum represents the wage-money accumulation of the people, and this is the pernicious result of protection to the laboring people of Pennsylvania. This is not rhetoric, nor assumption, nor prophecy—it is fact.

Example is better than assumption; the facts of experience afford sound premises for wise conclusion. Gorgeous rhetoric and impassioned oratory are admirable; they have full swing in the realm of fancy and imagination. Our friends on the other side, cutting loose from the restraints of fact, revel and cavort in the airy fields of conjecture.

Here is the great State of Pennsylvania crowned with all the visible evidences of affluent prosperity. Her thriving cities and towns are thronged with busy multitudes; her agricultural products feed the hou-

est workers at remunerative prices. Her colleges, schools, lyceums, libraries, churches, and her charitable institutions are witnesses of the intelligence and Christian civilization of her people; and her laboring classes have more than forty-two millions cash deposit in her savings institutions. But to make refutation more complete, let us take a broader illustration: In eighteen States, including Maryland, Delaware, North Carolina, and the District of Columbia, embracing in 1880 a population of 28,500,000, the aggregate amount of deposits in their savings-banks in the year 1886–'87 was $1,235,247,371, credited to 3,418,013 depositors, being an average to each depositor of $361.39.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the fruitage of the protective system. It is no fancy-drawn sketch. It is not rhetorical rot. It is the solid, proved, tangible, computable, arithmetically demonstrated object-lesson which the industrious laboring men of this country of every craft and pursuit bring to this Congress in refutation of the fallacious assumptions of the free-trade theorists. How aptly this tremendous accumulation of wage earnings, unparalleled in history and impossible in any other country or under any other system, illustrates the words of a New England poet—not Lowell:

> After all your golden dreams'
> Of golden fountains and golden streams,
> The sweat of patient labor seems
> The true Pactolian water.

Mr. Chairman, the rich, the corporations, the monopolists, the trusts do not deposit their money in the savings-banks, and I point to the financial exhibit referred to as a refutation of the assertion so stoutly affirmed by the distinguished gentleman from Texas and so often reiterated by others on that side, that protective duties benefit only the employer. And I point to it as a triumphant vindication of the protective system.

The message of the President, so much commended by the British press as being in their interest, is a very curious document. Its ostensible excuse was the surplus which the President coolly charges to the tariff side of the revenue. His argument reduced to terms is this: Here is a surplus of, say, eighty millions annually beyond the needs of the Government; to that extent taxation is excessive, therefore tariff duties are excessive. The conclusion is forced, and its motive is hostility to protection and its purpose its destruction; and so he proceeds to assail the tariff, and while professing friendly regard for imperiled industries, he recommends legislation which even his free-trade followers dare not approve. He would take nothing from the one hundred and nineteen millions of internal revenue; he would not disturb the whisky ring—that bulwark of Democracy and the mightiest organized foe of temperance in existence to-day in this country.

Oh, no! There is a sentiment abroad cherished by many good people, greatly respected and encouraged, especially by the whisky ring, that whisky is a luxury and therefore should be taxed; and so it has come to pass that Uncle Sam is set to house and protect about $300,000,000 worth of whisky for the benefit of the ring. This monstrous monopoly is entrenched in the very citadel of the Government, protected by law and the sleepless vigilance of a powerful lobby.

The Presidential scheme was utterly impracticable, without enlargement of the free-list to the point of general industrial destruction. Besides, the free-trade contingent, who had planned this raid, began to hear from the tobacco-growing districts, and the much-bepraised scheme was modified to meet the double exigency.

The President accepts the situation, and now the Mills bill is the Democratic shibboleth. Notice is posted on the doors of the White House: "No recalcitrant Democrat need apply here." [Laughter and applause.] And this is modern Democracy. Fear of Executive disapproval confronts every Representative who feels constrained to follow the dictates of his own judgment upon an economic question and to represent the interests of the constituency which elected him. The President assumes the rôle of dictator. He may and should give Congress information; he may recommend. It is not his province to dictate, even by indirection, what Congress shall do, or how any member shall vote.

We are not surprised, however, to see a distinguished Democrat who just now basks in the sunshine of Executive favor stand in his place here and proclaim that the bill which formulates the protective opinion of a brother Democrat still more distinguished than himself, but who does not bask, "is a misbegotten, ill-shapen, portentous, unjustifiable monster, with no excuse for its existence and no purpose in its life but to obstruct the Democratic party." And here all the other baskers applaud. [Laughter.] A monster entitled to such a picturesque group of descriptive adjectives would adorn the "greatest show on earth." It may be and doubtless is "portentous," but if, as the gentleman says, its "purpose in life" and its "excuse for existence" is to instruct the Democratic party, then may its existence be prolonged until its righteous purpose is fully accomplished.

Should this bill become a law, Mr. Chairman, it would paralyze every industry in my State.

The flock-masters of Vermont, after more than half a century of careful and intelligent breeding from importations of Merino sheep originally selected from the best flocks in Europe, have reached a standard of excellence in their product never yet surpassed in any country.

These sheep have been sought and purchased by breeders in every State from Maine to California. The masters of vast flocks in Australia have come for them, and to-day a cargo of them, gathered in my own county, is on the sea bound for that distant colony, while still another is on its way to the Argentine Republic.

This has become a great industry, beneficial alike to the breeders and to the wool producers, the standard of whose wool product is thus advanced and by renewals from time to time kept at a high point as to quality and quantity. Years of patient study and labor and large expenditure of money have been necessary to work out this result, which has proved of inestimable value to the people at large of this country. If wool is put on the free-list this industry ceases to exist, for let me assure the advocates of this measure that in this field, as in every other of American industry, the home market is the best, and is the great dependence of the breeder of fine sheep. When the home market is destroyed the motive for production ceases. It has been asserted here that this radical change will not seriously injure the farmers engaged in wool growing. This was especially asserted by my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL], who, I believe, keeps a lot of fancy, long-wooled sheep, but not a great many of them at that.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. How many do you call "a great many?"

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. When I speak of "a great many" I refer to thousands.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Is there a farmer in your State who has a thousand sheep?

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. Oh, yes; many of them. And the gentleman's sheep, as I understand, are not what we call in my part of the country wool-growing sheep. They have wool, to be sure, but the gentleman says himself that he puts mutton first and wool last. The gentleman does not look like a farmer and does not talk like a farmer, nor does he talk like a sheep-raiser.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Allow me to remark that under the present tariff the wool producers of this country have all gone largely into the mutton business, and killed a great part of their sheep, as we learn from the speeches delivered in this House. Under the present tariff we are all in the mutton business.

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. How many sheep has the gentleman?

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. As I stated to the gentleman from Maine yesterday, it is difficult for a man to tell in the spring of the year how many sheep he has [laughter]; but I will say that from recent reports I have from 130 to 140.

A MEMBER. Is that all?

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. That is a much larger flock than the average of those in the State of Ohio for which gentlemen plead so earnestly in this House.

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. The gentleman has a peculiar way of making up evidence.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. The average flocks of Ohio are somewhere between thirty and forty sheep to a wool-grower. The wool of such a flock would be worth as much as the average of hen's eggs on an Ohio farm. I will add that if all the wool of all the sheep in this country—and the flocks besides—were to be sold, they would not support the number of people who with their families are represented on the other side as being engaged in wool-growing.

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. I am very sorry, Mr. Chairman, that the great body of sheep-growers in this country, who, I think, might probably compare in intelligence on this subject with my friend from Massachusetts, do not agree with him on this point. He is in a very sad minority. It is a little singular that the wool-growers of this country do not entertain any such opinions as my friend announces here. We have heard his views on this subject and his reasons for them. I am inclined to doubt altogether the accuracy of his statistics. He does not "speak by the card." He speaks a great deal from his "inner consciousness." His statistics seem to flow forth without any particular previous examination. [Laughter.]

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I wish the gentleman would speak louder, so that I could hear what he is saying.

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. It is difficult, Mr. Chairman, to credit gentlemen with sincerity when they assert this. The only compensation offered is a cheaper blanket. When a farmer can buy a good suit of woolen clothes, ready-made, for $10; when under this abused system clothes and every article put to human use has been cheapened; When the farmers do not ask this change, when the manufacturers in whose interest professedly this action is proposed enter their united protest against it, when the laboring men do not ask it and do not want it, when in short nobody wants it, except the gentlemen on this floor who represent the traditions of another age and another system, the free-traders and the British manufacturers, it certainly seems passing strange that any sane man in the light of this undeniable situation can seriously claim that the destruction of a great industry, involving hundreds of millions of dollars, the property of more than a million of farmers, should be sacrificed at a blow upon a mere conjecture that if this is done he will get his clothes at less cost, and the manufacturer can export clothes to England and Germany in competition with the low-priced labor in those countries.

Those gentlemen who refuse to listen to the advice of the manufacturer and would open to him the markets of the world, are wise only in their own conceit.

Says Mr. Phillips, jr., a large woolen manufacturer of Massachusetts, opposed to free wool, "The world's market is the great free-trade shadow-dance." And the whole case is tersely stated in the quotation from the Commercial Bulletin, of Boston, January 14, 1888, which I find in the views of the minority:

> In brief, with the removal of all duties on wool, * * * we should not gain a cent's worth of foreign trade, for the other woolen-using countries, France, England, and Germany, could still undersell us in foreign markets with the help of their cheap labor. We should lose the fine-wool industry, which would be transferred to South America and Australia, and we should also lose cheap mutton.

My friends from Massachusetts does not deal in cheap mutton, I believe. He sellss his mutton, I understand, at Young's Hotel, Boston.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman allow me to have read a telegram which I have just received?

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. It can be read after I close.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I am much obliged to the gentleman. After he closes I will have it read.

Mr. STEWART, of Vermont. If the ratio of increase of sheep in the United States prior to 1883, which was arrested by the reduction of the duty on wool in that year had continued, the number of sheep in 1887 should have been 64,000,000, but it steadily declined to 45,000,000—a loss of about 6,000,000 in two years. In 1883 50,000,000 of sheep yielded 300,000,000 pounds of wool and 12,000,000 carcasses for food, and the total annual production was estimated at $120,000,000. The national organization of wool-growers represents 400,000 farmers. Their vast investment in this interest was made under the promise of protection. Will you, gentleman of the South, deny to the wool-grower what you gave to the rice-planter and the sugar-planter of your own region? Are sugar and rice less daily necessaries of the poor than the clothes he wears? Food is first in the list of necessaries.

By a new classification you increase the duty on rice, you maintain the duty on sugar, which increases the cost of every meal to every family in this country, and you deal your free-trade blows at every Northern industry. You come to the rescue of the Southern tobacco-grower. Coal and iron ore are dear to some of your Southern confreres, who will not sud port your bill if it slights their interests. So you say coal and ore are not raw material; but, coming a little farther North, you say wool and salt and lumber are raw material.

You also class as raw material marble, which my State largely produces, and of which there are rich deposits in Georgia, Tennessee, and many other States of this Union, still undeveloped or partially developed. Northern enterprise has recently gone into Georgia and is opening quarries there. I saw a representative here the other day trying to get access to some member of this Committee on Ways and Means, to represent the injury which this proposed measure would do to these interests, which Northern capital is now endeavoring to develop so greatly to the benefit of the Southern people. You say that marble is raw material, although it costs more than twice the labor to cut a block of marble and put it into the mill that it does to saw it into slabs and fit for market; but then, gentlemen of the committee, how could you know this fact when you would not hear ex-Governor Proctor, of my State, who stands at the head of the interest in this country, and who has visited the quarries of Italy and carefully studied the whole problem? Nor could I appear before you and represent the case of my constituents. Your inner consciousness could evolve raw material; so down goes marble on the free-list. Millions are invested in its production. Thriving towns and thrifty peoples cluster about its scenes of operation. It pays wages averaging $1.75 per diem. For similar labor in Italy wages average from 20 to 75 cents per day, the latter sum for skilled labor. It employs more than twenty thousand men. The value of machinery used in quarrying marble alone is estimated at $1,200,000, and the aggregate value of the product was in 1883 over $31,000,000.

As for everything else, ours is the best market for marble.

The competition, however, is in the higher grade of marble, so that if it is put on the free-list production of high-grade marble will practically cease, and the price of the lower-grade marble, which is that in general use, will increase because of limited production.

So also wood-pulp is classed as raw material. Here is another great modern industry created by protection. Mills have been erected, expensive machinery invented and manufactured, employment furnished to many thousands of laborers, and paper is cheaper than ever before. It is the same story so oft repeated in this country. Every protected industry ultimately cheapens the product.

Nor does the Northern farmer, whose lot is cast along the Canadian border, escape your attention. On the Canadian side of the line land is cheaper, houses are poorer, the scale of living is much lower, and the rate of wages correspondingly lower. It is only because of our higher wages that the constant flow of emigration sets to our side from Canada, of which they make such complaint, and yet you propose to reduce our border farmers to the level of the Canadian standard by placing a considerable list of products common to both countries upon the free schedule. Is this fair and just? Is it wise or expedient?

A protective tariff which guards American labor, which holds the duty squarely to the point of difference between our labor and that of any and all foreign countries, which maintains the principle that we should give preference to the employment of our own people, which encourages industry in all diversified forms, has proved beneficent in every period of American history when on trial. It is a system, and must be judged as such by its general scope and effects. It was not conceived in any class interest, and while its friends must admit that absolute justice in the adjustment of all details is a work of great difficulty, yet, if upon the whole, it is so framed as to secure and advance the great general interests of the country and the people, it should deserve the support and commendation of the people. Under this system the great interests, farming and manufacturing, of employers and employed are interdependent and mutually helpful.

The conflicts between labor and capital, which have been referred to in this debate, are not the result of starvation wages, nor even in many, perhaps a majority of cases, of low wages. They are born of a quickened intelligence and a clearer understanding of the just law of right which should govern the economic relations of men everywhere. The early methods may be clumsy and often faulty, as I think they have been, but these conflicts are the visible signs of life, and the steps and instrumentalities of better adjustments. They are signs of life. Organization, debate, the platform, and the newspaper will enlist attention, excite interest, induce reflection, and wise action will follow considerate deliberation. If only our Southern friends will forbear to throttle the laborer by giving his employment to other people, or by cutting his wages to their beggarly standard, he will be—as the Labor delegates who vainly sought a hearing before the committee said—abundantly able to take care of himself and to secure his just share of the employer's profit, whether under the tariff or otherwise. Our Southern friends, who have arrayed themselves in very nearly solid phalanx against Northern industry and enterprise, need not concern themselves about the unrest of the laboring classes in the North. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FORAN], who is well entitled to represent that class of Northern men, has voiced their sentiments on this floor far more truly than any gentleman on that side of the House, as the next report from the ballot-boxes of this country will show.

The laborer is coming to know his power, and that his power to command the service of capital increases each succeeding year. He is learning that there is no necessary conflict between labor and capital. Mr. Atkinson reports that between 1830 and 1884 the amount of cotton cloth made by an operative increased sevenfold, the wages of the operative rose from $164 in gold to $290, and the profit on each yard of cloth decreased sixfold.

Wages increase while profits diminish. It seems a paradox, but it is fact. The association of capital in industries which superficial thinkers count an evil enables capital to utilize on a grand scale the accumulated results of past labor, and so, while the profit on the single pound or yard diminishes, the aggregate profit of the vastly increased business insures to the employed advanced wages.

So capital and labor are both working consciously or unconsciously in line with a beneficent law of equalization. This law can have its perfect work only in our favored land under a tried system which secures diversity of remunerative employment; which gives, as is proved, the wage-earner an ever increasing interest in the earnings of capital; which stimulates labor-saving invention; which encourages every form of industry; which guards our laborers against the evils of unrestricted competition with impoverished foreign labor, and which insures to our country that pre-eminence in growth and substantial prosperity which challenges the admiration of the world. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee of the Whole will rise in order that the House may receive a report from the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. ROGERS having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the tariff bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, informed the House that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 90) for the relief of William Clift;

A bill (S. 94) for the relief of Perez Dickinson, surviving partner of the late firm of Cowan & Dickinson;

A bill (S. 97) for the relief of J. L. Cain and others;

A bill (S. 517) for the relief of J. Henry Rives;

A bill (S. 566) making an appropriation for a final survey and estimates for and the commencement of the construction of a boat-railway around the obstructions to navigation at The Dalles and Celilo Falls, in the Columbia River;

A bill (S. 661) for the relief of Charles Murphy;

A bill (S. 961) for the presentation of badges to the officers and men of the Greely relief expedition;

A bill (S. 975) for the relief of H. A. Myers;

A bill (S. 1078) for the relief of Florida Kennerly;

A bill (S. 1171) for the relief of the legal representatives of George McDougall, deceased;
A bill (S. 1177) for the erection of a public building at Fortress Monroe;
A bill (S. 1242) for the relief of the legal representatives of Maj. William Kendall;
A bill (S. 1323) to authorize the President to confer brevet rank on officers of the United States Army for gallant services in Indian campaigns;
A bill (S. 1554) to increase the appropriation for the erection of the public building at Sacramento, Cal.;
A bill (S. 1599) correcting the military record of James O'Rourke;
A bill (S. 1625) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880;
A bill (S. 1782) to authorize the leasing of the school and university lands in the Territory of Wyoming, and for other purposes;
A bill (S. 1871) to perfect the military record of Warren C. Alden;
A bill (S. 1882) to authorize the construction of a railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Mississippi River, at or near Clinton, Iowa;
A bill (S. 1883) to authorize the construction of a railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Muscatine, Iowa;
A bill (S. 1903) granting the right of way through the Fort Riley military reservation, Kansas, to the Chicago, Kansas and Western Railway Company;
A bill (S. 1969) granting right of way to the Junction City and Fort Riley Street Railway Company into and upon the Fort Riley military reservation in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes;
A bill (S. 2030) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River, at Forest City, Dak., by the Forest City and Watertown Railway Company;
A bill (S. 2116) to provide aid for State homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States;
A bill (S. 2377) providing for the issue gratuitously of certain meteorological instruments to voluntary observers at present recognized in the Signal Service;
A bill (S. 2393) to fix the compensation of inspectors of hulls and boilers in certain districts of the United States;
A bill (S. 2410) for the relief of L. A. Davis;
A bill (S. 2411) for the relief of C. A. Williams and others;
A bill (S. 2446) granting an increase of pension in certain cases therein mentioned; and
A bill (S. 2519) to make enlisted men of the Signal Corps responsible for public property.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 2528) authorizing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Red River of the North by the North Dakota and Pacific Railway Company;
A bill (H. R. 3290) to amend section 685 of the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia;
A bill (H. R. 4601) to amend the naval record of Nickolas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, and Loth Possum; and
A bill (H. R. 6800) for the relief of John Powers.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 7052) relating to postal crimes and amendatory of the statutes therein mentioned, requested a conference with the House on said bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. SAULSBURY, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9711) making appropriations to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government and the Bureau of Agriculture and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and the Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, from July 4 to October 7, 1888.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2216) for the relief of Thomas A. Osborn.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 484) for the relief of Thomas C. Dickey;
A bill (H. R. 1640) changing the name of the port of Lamberton, in the district of Burlington, N. J., to the name of Trenton, in said district;
A bill (H. R. 2365) for the relief of William P. Thorne; and
A bill (H. R. 6887) for the relief of Henry Brock.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; which were signed by the Speaker:

A bill (S. 38) granting to the Washington and Idaho Railroad Company the right of way through the Coeur d'Alene Indian reservation;
A bill (S. 39) to grant an increase of pension to Frederick Beno;
A bill (S. 269) to grant the Fort Smith and El Paso Railway Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes;
A bill (S. 326) for the relief of Edward Fitzgerald;
A bill (S. 331) granting a pension to John Kalbfleisch;
A bill (S. 347) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Youngstown, Ohio;
A bill (S. 354) to provide for the survey of certain historic grounds, locations, and military works;
A bill (S. 475) for the relief of the estate of Thomas L. Price, deceased;
A bill (S. 801) for the relief of Basile Champagne;
A bill (S. 805) granting a pension to Melvina Greenwood;
A bill (S. 816) granting a pension to Amastasia Walter;
A bill (S. 820) granting a pension to David A. Servis;
A bill (S. 835) for the relief of Elisha Griswold;
A bill (S. 850) granting certain lands in the Territory of Wyoming for public purposes;
A bill (S. 860) granting a pension to Stephen Singleton;
A bill (S. 1096) granting a pension to James Lucas;
A bill (S. 1204) to provide for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States at Martinsburgh, in the district of West Virginia;
A bill (S. 1237) granting a pension to Anna Mertz;
A bill (S. 1717) granting a pension to Emma Von Bernewitz;
A bill (S. 1795) for the relief of the First National Bank of Marion, Iowa;
A bill (S. 2419) granting a pension to Lemuel R. Rea;
A bill (H. R. 1275) for the erection of a public building at Columbus, Ga., and appropriating money therefor;
A bill (H. R. 1645) to limit the hours that letter-carriers in cities shall be employed per day;
A bill (H. R. 2928) granting a pension to William Lemons; and
A bill (H. R. 4358) to increase the limit of cost for the public building in course of erection at Charleston, S. C.

SESSIONS OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the House a request, which the Clerk will read, from the Committee on Agriculture:

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture asks leave to sit during the sessions of the House for the transaction of important business.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. COGSWELL] asks unanimous consent that the letter from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting an estimate from the United States Commissioner of Fish and Fisheries may be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, instead of the Committee on Claims, the latter reference having been made on the 16th instant. The change of reference will be made if there be no objection. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

TARIFF.

The Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union resumed its session, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to take part in the general debate upon the tariff. I intended to reserve what thoughts were pertinent to its details when it came up for amendment in the committee. But for certain references of a personal nature to myself I would have refrained.

For my own choice I have in charge the Census and Apportionment, matters which are of more importance, and I may say dignity, than any mere temporizing with our fiscal or economic system. The reports of the census form the basis not only of all argumentation, but of all just legislation in connection with our finances and economies; and therefore my time and strength have been devoted to laying the foundation of those returns because they are authentic, and have reference to our entire country. Properly to deduce conclusions on these topics, our lawmakers should build upon these foundations. In the long and exhaustive debates which have occurred during the past few weeks, members have not been loth to draw upon the census of 1880, which for completeness and pertinency has no comparison with any former census, or the census of any other land. According to reliable estimates the next census of the United States will show 64,500,000 inhabitants. It will reveal an immense increase over former decennial periods, certainly much greater than that between 1860 and 1870, when it was only 22½ per cent.

TARIFF A BUSINESS QUESTION.

As I remarked on the first day of this session, in response to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], the regulation of our system of taxation, whether internal or by customs duty, is a matter of business. It is not a fit subject for mere party discussion, much less for personal recrimination. It does not depend upon the platforms of parties nor the

utterances of our statesmen so much as on sound business judgment, based on facts collected with careful heed by the officers of the Government.

The member who approaches the subject of the tariff with a view to making party capital will have more or less of bias, and can not reach conclusions satisfactory to the general interest.

BUSINESS: LABOR, CAPITAL, AND LAND.

What is business? It is the adaptation of means to an end, the employment of three factors for the general and individual welfare of the people. These factors are labor, capital, and land. Legislation that shackles in any way these wealth-producing forces is, in its very nature, tyrannical and unjust, because it is the result of discriminations and combinations in which the interests of the people suffer.

Of these factors, the first to be reckoned is capital. We do not lack capital. But it may well be considered whether capital, in later years, has had equitable and contented distribution, and how far our taxing system has contributed to this end.

As to the land, have we not a larger territory than any European state except Russia? We have one and a half million square miles of arable land, scarcely one-quarter of which is in cultivation. Three hundred and twelve thousand five hundred square miles produce all our grain, hay, cotton, sugar, rice, and garden vegetables. We are enlarging our proportion of cultivable and pasture lands rapidly, not only by our natural growth, but by immigration. Our mines of gold, silver, copper, and coal are only the auxiliaries of our boundless and varied acreage. It must, indeed, be a comprehensive system, depending upon a wise adjustment, that would deal with a so richly-endowed landed inheritance.

In spite of certain sorts of monopoly which are fixing themselves upon our land in the shape of cattle kings, railroad grants, and absentee landlordism, we are comparatively free from the feudality, primogenitive succession, and other aristocratic and exclusive privileges of older countries.

ENLARGED MARKET INDISPENSABLE.

With such an outgrowth as we obtained in the last century are we not rapidly becoming dependent upon a market beyond the limitation of our tariff laws? In fact, is not restriction to the home market a barrier against the supply to and the demand of other nations? Why should this flood of good things be dammed against passage to other countries with whom we might exchange? Why should it be flung back upon us to destroy and be destroyed?

These are questions which press upon every farmer in the land, and upon every manufacturer who has not the fortune to be combined in a "trust."

ENLARGED MARKET FOR OUR CRUDE MATERIALS.

Our crude products form the bulk of our exports, but should we not be warned by the increasing land products of other countries—Russia and India and South America—that any restrictions against foreign trade becomes a self-imposed restriction upon our own.

SURPLUS, THE PRESSING QUESTION.

The Ways and Means Committee have responded to the urgent message of the President with as much wisdom as is possible under the circumstances of our industrial system. All the philippics hurled at the President return upon his revilers. What he said in his pointed and emphatic message was imperatively demanded because of the extortions which filled the Treasury. The wrong that he exposed was multiplying, in his judgment, into a brood of wrongs. The Treasury had become a hoarding-place for money needlessly drawn from the people. Its withdrawal from the people was bad then, in December, 1887; it is worse now. It menaces industry and business. It invites public scandal. It stimulates public plunder.

One of our Ohio Democratic statesmen, Governor William Allen, used to say that it was "as hard to run a powder-house in hell as an honest government with a plethoric treasury." [Applause and laughter.]

RELIEF.

Where is the relief? Five ways are proposed:

1. To keep on hoarding? This is not only a continuance but an aggravation of the peril.

2. To spend? This is the remedy of my friend from Indiana [Mr. BROWNE], who points out many good and many wild schemes and largesses for a spendthrift Congress. To this I am opposed.

3. To pay the public debt? This is being tried with the undue bonds; but with what result? The last purchases which have so much enhanced those bonds show. The President warned us of this remedy as inviting the payment by the Government of an increased premium; and the facts already more than justify his apprehension.

4. To deposit the money in banks for use by the people? Against this, too, he warned, and wisely so. I never will consent to foster "any fateful alliance between the banks and the Treasury," or any "reliance in private business upon public funds." It is of the very essence of Jacksonian principle to divorce the Federal fisc from private enterprise.

5. To substitute for the 4 per cent. bonds due in 1907 a bond bearing less interest, say 2½ per cent., and pay to the holders money equal to the present value of the difference in interest, or rather to exchange bonds at a fixed premium? It is a safe investment for a man or a government to invest in his or its own notes or bonds. Perhaps this plan is the best next after reducing taxation.

6. The last proposition is the one before us. It is the reduction of taxation, internal or otherwise.

REDUCTION OF TAXATION.

Who can be harmed by the reduction of a burden? It may be a necessary burden, in so far as it pays for our security under government; but still is it not a burden? Its relief should be sought, and it should be consistent with the only proper object—revenue, not for hoarding or extravagance, but for economical expenses.

I do not design to argue at length the nature of this burden. I am now, as ever, convinced that such a tariff as we have not only brings about serious conflicts between labor and capital but is responsible for the high prices of manufactured goods; that it depresses the labor market; and that it fosters trusts and combinations. In fact, every tariff from 1789 down to the present time, in so far as it was protective, injured both farmer and laborer by making farming less profitable in order to make the cost of labor to the factory cheaper.

INTERNAL REVENUE.

In remarking upon the tariff in 1882 I was very frank to contend that I would forego the opposition which I made to the resolution of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] for the abolishment of the excise system. I was willing then to forego that opposition on the basis of a resolution which I offered in the House, and which is there quoted. But I desired to abolish the internal-revenue system only as a system or mode of collection, not as to the taxation of certain articles. I was willing to see the tax collected by the States. I think now, as I said then, that it would have worked like a charm. The protectionists were not, however, in favor of reducing taxation in the tariff, but they were in favor of a hasty riddance of the whole internal-revenue system and its Federal mode of collection. I regarded the tariff which we sought to revise as a monument of war necessity and of subsequent treachery. It was promised that it would be reformed after the war when the internal taxes were reduced on home manufactures.

I then inveighed against the Federal administration of the internal-revenue law and favored its abolition, because of its cumbrous, corrupt, and spying system. Its officers were then in the habit of pursuing the offender into cigar and tobacco shops, and into stills, breweries and factories with threats and promises, in order to influence the voter in favor of the administration. Thanks to Democratic economy, that army of five thousand has since been many times decimated. Worse than the janizary or the mameluke, it undertook by its occult machinery to intimidate and defraud; and I was willing to do away with it in the Federal system, as every speck of it on our body-politic was then a cancer.

There has been no time since the discussion of the tariff of 1861 when economic measures were before Congress that I have not protested against their excesses, and given the reason, which has been verified; and that is that the excesses would engender a surplus, which was corrupting to legislation and administration. At all times I have been willing to cut down the taxation to avoid this peril. I was willing to welcome relief from this surplus. And since we could not tear away the octopus which was preying upon the people in the indirect form of taxation, I was even willing to take the direct form and thrust it one side; and the more so because it was in the hands of the Republican party, which was using its emissaries and officers for espionage not only in New York City, but elsewhere, for sustaining their corrupt practices and perpetuating their supremacy.

But, sir, this bill is before us. It concerns more a surplus than it does a tariff reform. The surplus is now the principal object with me; the tax but the incident. If I can not apply the reduction at one point, I will hereafter to another. But for the present I believe that the committee that reports this bill, considering all the varied industries of this country, have done the best that was perhaps possible with a view to the successful accomplishment of the great object—the reduction of taxation—so as to avert future accumulations and avoid the paralysis of business.

THE BILL NOT A RADICAL MEASURE.

Why, at best, this bill proposes very little. The wonder is that so much noise has been made because of what it does propose. In round numbers it takes off but about $78,000,000—$54,000,000 from the tariff, and $24,000,000 from internal taxes. It adds to the free-list some articles of necessity, so as to reduce the cost of their manufacture and that of the commodity itself.

The present average of the tariff on dutiable goods is 47.10 per cent. This bill, if passed, would leave it 40 per cent., and is not the latter still an enormous burden on production?

NOT A FREE-TRADE MEASURE.

Call this bill a free-trade measure! Why, it leaves the average duty higher by 10 per cent. than it was under the law of 1862, which was a thorough war measure. Before the recommendation of the Tariff Commission it should hide its head, for that commission recommended 20 per cent. reduction, which would have left the average less than will be left if this bill becomes a law

If this bill be not passed and the matter is committed to the discussions of the forum, where the people can hear homely and plain discussion, no one can tell the result when next it comes before a renovated Congress. [Applause.]

OPPORTUNITIES AND ARTICLES TO REVISE.

There are various articles from which a revenue could be wholly or partially dispensed that would benefit the whole community, and with the least injury to our manufacturing interests on the protection theory.

The amount collected from these for the year ending June 30, 1887, are as follows:

Sugar	$50,000,000
Tobacco	30,000,000
Alcohol used in the arts	12,000,000
Tin-plates	5,700,000
Low-grade wools	5,000,000
Chemicals, etc	4,000,000
Flax, unmanufactured	2,400,000
Lumber	1,000,000
Salt	700,000
Coal and coke	600,000
Iron ores	700,000
Clays	85 000

I should have been very willing, were there no other alternative, of taking off from this list the revenue proportionably, or almost in any way, to prevent the menacing accumulations in the Treasury. From any of these articles, especially sugar, tobacco, lumber, wool, coal, and salt, which are used by the masses more than almost any other, I would, in an emergent condition of our business, be willing to make reductions. Salt is a necessity for our dairymen, and is used largely by our meat and fish packers. Sugar is as necessary to a family as bread. Coal is indispensable to our homes and factories. Lumber should be free for building purposes, and we should as a sanitary and economic measure save our forests. Chemicals should be free—as free as the raw material of our woolen fabrics. Besides, the relief of chemicals would benefit our soap and other manufacturers. And alcohol should be free, when used in the arts and manufactures. Relief here would be a boon to many of our lesser industries. A great relief would be given also in the matter of clothing; because at least 50 per cent. more for clothing and blankets is paid in this country than in other countries.

Here, too, are the percentages of taxation on several articles which are necessaries, and from which some selections for relief might be made:

	Per cent.
Tax on sugar	80
Tax on rice	112
Tax on salt	83
Tax on corn-starch	93
Tax on potatoes	45
Tax on woolen dress goods costing 22 cents a yard	71
Tax on common cloth	91
Tax on woolen hosiery	70
Tax on flannels	72
Tax on common woolen shawls	87
Tax on cotton hosiery	45
Tax on cotton bagging	54
Tax on plain earthenware	55
Tax on window-glass	86
Tax on plate-glass	147
Tax on steel rails	80

Doubtless, in the finality of this bill, when it comes to a conference, considerations of this nature may be paramount; but for the present, whether this bill is amended or not to suit my views or those of my constituency, I will give my vote, heart, and mind to its passage.

MAXIMS OF TAXATION.

Writers on political economy have laid down for the accomplishment of taxation maxims which are almost classical. These are developed by John Stuart Mill, in his Fifth Book and second chapter, to be:

First. That the subjects of every State ought to contribute to the support of the Government as nearly as possible in proportion to their respective abilities. Otherwise it is inequality.

Second. Adjust the time and manner of the payment, and the amount of the tax with certainty, so that the tax-gatherer should not become insolent or corrupt.

Third. The convenience of the tax-payer.

On this head is reckoned taxation paid by the consumer of an article, little by little, as he has occasion to buy the goods. He should be at liberty either to buy or not to buy, as he pleases. In this he pictures our own tariff system.

And fourth—which is more to our purpose in this discussion—that every tax ought to be so contrived as to take out and to keep out of the pockets of the people as little as possible over and above what is needed for the Treasury.

Under this head is discussed the diversion of a portion of the labor and capital of the community from a more to a less productive employment; and in this, too, he speaks appropriately as to our own system.

But above all there should be equality as the rule in taxation as in all other affairs of government. [Applause.] The sacrifices which taxation requires should be made to bear as nearly as possible with the same relative pressure upon each and all. It is equality of sacrifice. It means the apportionment of the contribution of each person toward the expenses of the Government. This standard is one of perfection. It can not be completely realized, but it is necessary in discussion to know what perfection is. In other words, if we can not in a debate of this kind find out the absolute truth and the perfect theory, we can do as the mariner does at sea when he loses his compass or his reckoning—he can sail by a star, if he can not sail into a star. [Applause.]

These maxims, Mr. Chairman, may seem abstract. They may be placed within the category of doctrine; but I hold now, as I have ever held here, that there can be no wise, practical legislation unless we deduce it from, or find it crystallized in, correct theory. The sneer against scholastics and *doctrinaires* comes from ignorance of the philosophy of economy and legislation.

The same law of induction by which Lord Bacon, after experiment, generalized, applies as well to political as to physical science. It has been said that Lord Bacon in his Novum Organum, made possible the discovery of the circulation of the blood, the steam-engine, electric motors, and all those forms and forces of invention which have changed the industries of the world, and given to civilization its advancement. It is only when the fixed laws are violated that man retrogrades, or if he does not retrograde, that he simply marks time, and does not march.

It is not worth while, Mr. Chairman, for me to go over the platitudes connected with the debates on protection. I have labored in that line since I first entered Congress.

CONSISTENT OPPOSITION.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] the other day referred to the tariff known as the "Morrill tariff bill," as though that distinguished gentleman [Mr. MORRILL] had not produced many bills, any one of which might well bear his name. In referring to the bill of 1861 the gentleman from Ohio remarked that I was not here to vote against it, although I was one of the two members now in this Congress (Judge HOLMAN being the other) who were then members of this House. I wondered at the statement at the time, for I thought that I had never missed an opportunity of vindicating the liberalities of trade against the demands and exactions of class legislation. But I find in my remarks made in 1884 in this House that I said:

> On the 25th of February, 1861, I came into this House from a sick bed to protest against the tariff bill then pending. I denounced it as a great fiscal tyranny, a mountainous burden on the West. While favoring a revenue tariff to meet our then small expenditures, I opposed all bounties, special advantages, and class legislation. I showed that the bill as then designed raised bounties from the consumers of the West and South, to be paid to the iron-masters of Pennsylvania and the manufacturers of New England.

I have none of the vanity of consistency [laughter], but I will not be charged with inconsistency when I repeat further that in August, 1864, when another Morrill bill came up, I said "that the West could take care of itself"—for I then represented in part the State of Ohio, now so well represented by my friend [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] who honors me by his close proximity and attention—that "it is rich by nature in its resources; and if the people of Pennsylvania can not live by working their forges, with their own natural resources, and if the people of New England can not live by working their spindles, with their natural ingenuity, without the aid of other classes of industry and the bounty of the Government, let them move to the West, and there the God of Nature will protect them in the cultivation of the soil, if they have the industry to work and the frugality to save."

Indeed, sir, before 1861, in some remarks which I made on an appropriation bill, I vindicated the same idea. My record on this topic has not changed. It is as clear as a "fountain in July, when we see each grain of gravel."

PRACTICAL MODE TO ASCERTAIN BOUNTIES.

But the speech to which I made reference especially when I interrupted the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] was that made in 1864. I said it was the most elaborate speech I had ever made upon the subject, amid a score of speeches. It was necessarily more or less elaborate and exhaustive, because at that time there was a depreciation of American paper, as compared with American gold, of 60 per cent., and that was of course added to the cost of the article bought abroad. Moreover, in all commercial transactions between two foreign countries the basis of exchange must be specie, as the currency of the countries is reduced to par values. So that then, when a man brought a hundred dollars' worth of goods into this country he had to sell them at that time for $174 of our currency, with freight and duties superadded. That amount I ascertained by taking the cost of American gold as compared with English gold.

This state of things no longer exists. Nevertheless, by the same mode of demonstration you can find out precisely the moneyed element that enters into this tariff tax and the proportion which never goes into the Treasury of the United States. The elements of cost upon merchandise imported from foreign countries are, first, cost abroad; second, the difference of exchange; third, the duty; fourth, freight, insurance, and other charges of importation; and fifth, the importer's profits, which we reckon at 10 per cent., and all the preceding items.

Now, it is precisely at this point of cost that the imported article comes in competition with the corresponding article of the home manufacturer. The aggregate of all the items above mentioned constitutes the protection bounty which the tariff system gives to the American manufacturer. The consumer of the domestic article, of course, pays

this bounty, in addition to the duty, to the manufacturer. No man familiar with political economy pretends to dispute this axiom. No man pretends to dispute the proposition that the object of a tariff for protection is to increase the price of the article; else who would care for protected bounties? Not the manufacturer, certainly. If not he, who, then? Certainly not the consumer.

In order to verify *a posteriori* from the facts the cost of the taxed articles in addition to the tariff, I obtained the bills of lading at our custom-houses on pig-iron, bar-iron, cotton, and woolen manufactures, etc., which will be found in the Globe of June 2, 1864.

I was almost afraid in that debate to show what the cost and bounty of these articles were when they reached the consumer. It was almost incredible, especially when aggravated by a depreciated money system.

Of eleven principal articles imported from abroad and reckoned upon the basis of standard gold currency of the United States, I could not resist a conclusion that there was an average of over 60 per cent. in the shape of a bounty to home manufactures. And I deduced this conclusion:

Think of it! For the iron which we use in all its varieties of adaptation; for the cotton we wear, whether printed or plain, in the calico dress or the shirting; for the wool in blanket, carpet, or clothing; for the newspaper, book, and pamphlet; for the leather we use when tanned or manufactured into boots and shoes; for the clothing we buy already made up; for the soap and candles and India-rubber goods; for these only under our tariff of 1862, and not counting our recent increase or the proposed increase of this bill, we pay as gratuity to one class of persons the enormous sum of $750,250,252.

Will any one pretend that all this is for revenue? What! when the tariff does not raise one-tenth of that sum on all articles of importation? What, then, is this $750,250,252 paid for? Not for war, not for debts, not for expenses. Is it possible that we have to pay on some ten articles only, in paper money, $750,000,000 to get less than $50,000,000 of revenue from them?

I use these figures simply to show the method under the tariff of 1862, and not for the purpose of showing what the present tariff with its 47 per cent. duty levies upon the people; but to show the immense sums paid by the consumer which never gets to the Treasury of the United States, but goes as bounty to the home manufacturer.

Deducting the 60 per cent. for depreciated paper money, on the amount then ciphered as bounty on the articles named, and you have, in order to get $50,000,000 into the Treasury, paid a bounty of $300,000,000. This was a stupendous outrage. [Applause.]

Is not the President correct, therefore, as an economist and wise in his foresight as a statesman when he says:

That the tariff renders it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers of certain articles which are protected and taxed to sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid the customs duty? So that it happens that while comparatively a few use the imported articles, millions of our people who never used and never saw any of the foreign products purchase and use the things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles.

But how small is his reckoning of the amount that never sees the Treasury and is the heavy part of the tax upon the consumer. He says that those who buy the domestic article pay a sum at least approximately equal to the duty to the home manufacturer. If I am correct, the sum thus paid is five or six times the amount of the duty. [Applause.]

He is re-enforced in this statement by that of Robert J. Walker, in a letter I have before me, dated November 30, 1867. I quote from it:

Our present tariff is also most unequal, oppressive, and unjust. It is grievously onerous upon agriculture, commerce, navigation, ship-building, the mines, and fisheries, whilst even manufactures, in connection with our present wretched excise system, are languishing under its inflictions. The present tariff, besides the tax of $150,000,000 a year upon imports, the duties on which are paid by the people into the Treasury in gold, exacts another tax of at least $350,000,000 a year in the enhanced prices of rival protected domestic articles. This can be readily proved by comparing the prices current in gold of such domestic articles with the prices of similar articles produced in other countries. Thus the tariff taxes the people of the United States to the extent of $500,000,000 a year, of which only $150,000,000 go into the Treasury, and the remaining $350,000,000 go into the pockets of the protected classes. And yet even they are not prosperous, on account of the diminished demand for their products, and because they are also burdened, with the rest of the people, by the weight of intolerable taxation.

The annual taxes now paid by our people as the result of the tariff, we have seen, are at least $500,000,000 a year. Add to this another $500,000,000 a year as the result, directly and indirectly, of our internal system of taxation, including the stupendous and atrocious whisky and other frauds, and our national taxation, in time of profound peace, amounts to $1,000,000,000 a year. Less than half of this goes into the Treasury. This is independent of State, county, city, and municipal taxation, which is enormous. This billion of dollars a year, as the census shows, is about one-seventh of the gross values of our present annual products, and can be borne by no people on earth. Repudiation is the necessary result of the continuance of such a system.

CHEATING BY STATUTE.

It will not be doubted that it is an under statement, that to get $200,000,000 into the Treasury it costs a thousand million! If this be not accepted as true, then go to the custom-houses and inquire for the bills of lading. When you find out the fact as I did, you will not wonder at the diabolism of the tariff; you will not wonder that the father of all sin and lies is the father of the tariff. [Laughter.] Members grow indignant at the percentages levied on our necessaries and the comparative immunity of luxuries; but they grow reconciled when it is known that these sums go to carry on government. They are reasonably content with them, even though they create a surplus and endanger values and credits. But this is not the head deviltry in the business. Our tariff makes "horns and hoofs" free, while it taxes the Word of God! The devil is in that, but only a little devil. It is when our laws adds to the tax that goes to the Treasury the robberies outside that the worst begins. Do you deny this result? I give you a touchstone to test it.

We import, say, $400,000,000 a year of the protected goods, and pay an average of 47.10 per cent. on them. Alongside in the merchant's store are the competing American goods. They are 47.10 per cent. higher than they would be sold outside of the United States. And since they are five times the value of the foreign goods, in dollars, we must pay $5 tax to the protected manufacturer where we pay $1 to the Government. Any woman who buys Irish linen in Cork, or a shawl in Paris, when she brings it in will know the unhappy fact. It is sometimes true, as this debate develops, that American goods are cheaper over our own borders. They have to be sold in foreign markets and to compete they must be undersold.

The devil is never dressed up so elegantly as when he appears as a protectionist.

Oh! how is the devil dressed?
He is dressed in his Sunday best,
With his scarlet coat and breeches of blue,
But there is a hole for the tail to come through.

[Laughter.]

It is said that when the devil walked the earth in full dress he took most delight in seeing a cunning old lawyer "cheating by statute." [Laughter.] If he had only known the complicated machinery of the tariff, ad valorem and specific, mixed in his own dress, by the square inch and by the threads, he would have enjoyed far more the legislative cheat. [Laughter.]

A FORM OF TYRANNY.

And now, I ask, where, under our Constitution; where, by the laws of nature; where, by the laws of Providence, is the warrant thus to violate the rights of property? Governments may seize property, the property of individuals, by mere arbitrary act. This, says Dr. Wayland, is a form of tyranny with which all the nations of Europe of old were too well acquainted.

But—

He says—

the same thing is done by unjust legislation. That is, when legislators, how wellsoever chosen, enact unjust laws, by which the property of the part, or the whole, is unjustly taken away, or unjustly subjected to an oppressive taxation.

Frequently since 1864, Mr. Chairman, I have had occasion to pursue the same methods of argumentation in relation to these peculiar modes of public oppression. I have learned these principles in connection with economy, not from slave-owners, or Southern statesmen, or members of the Cobden Club, but from a teacher whom I reverence and who belonged to New England. I need not say to the reverend gentlemen now in yonder gallery—who represent the Baptists of this country—what emphasis belongs to the teaching of Dr. Francis Wayland, our most distinguished moralist and Christian. [Applause.] He warned us in our college days to beware when the antidote to evil became the source of evil; when society itself set the example of peculation; when public injustice became the prolific parent of private violence. He told us the result as he had gleaned it from history, to which he applied his analytical code of morality. That result was, that capital, immigration, and production ceased, and a nation either sinks down in hopeless dependence, or else the people, harassed beyond endurance, believing that their condition can not be made worse by any change, rush into all the horrors of civil war. The social elements are dissolved, the sword enters into every house, the home ties which bind men together are severed, and no prophet can predict at the beginning what will be the end.

ILLUSTRATIONS FROM BAD TRANSPORTATION.

Let me make a homely illustration. I heard it in the class-room, from Dr. Wayland; and to it Mr. David A. Wells has added his own piquant observation. It refers to the interchange of commodities and to transportation. If transportation be difficult, it adds to the cost of the article to the consumer, just as a tariff or tax. Whenever you diminish the abundance of things which minister to our necessities, it is like interposing a desert, swamp, an unbridged stream, or a bad road between producer and consumer. No road at all; it is a prohibitory duty. Twenty per cent. duty is like a bad road; 30 per cent. is a corduroy road [laughter]; 40 per cent. like a broad, deep, and rapid unbridged river, and 50 per cent. like a swamp flanking the river on both sides, while 80 or 100 per cent., such as is levied upon steel rails, blankets, and window-glass, is a band of brigands who strip the merchant of nearly all he possesses. He should be grateful to God that he escapes with his life. [Laughter and applause.]

LOCAL INTERESTS.

I do not complain of gentlemen desiring to help their local interests. Truly it requires a little sacrifice to vote for the general weal when it causes a particular reduction of profit at home. Local color in art gives grace to picturesqueness. Our polity has as a presiding genius, autonomy. Let us respect it, but let us not carry it to such excess as to make the removal of general wrongs impossible. Statesmanship should study how best to reconcile the jarring and diverse industries of our extensive land.

May I quote, with proper modesty, the sentiment upon which I have

acted in respect to these local interests? I can not do better than quote from a debate in the Globe (page 2683, volume 52, first session, Thirty-eighth Congress) in which the eminent gentleman from Maine, Mr. Blaine, complained of my remarks about Maine and lumber.

Mr. COX. I beg leave to correct the gentleman. He could not have made these remarks if he had listened attentively to my speech. I referred to the lumber interest only to show that it was unprotected. My remark, therefore, was in favor of the gentleman's State. I said the lumber interest of the West by the census of 1860 amounted to over $33,000,000, while that of New England was only about $12,000,000. Hence lumber was unprotected.

Mr. BLAINE. The gentleman arraigned the New England States, and I did not hear him make any exception.

Mr. COX. I did arraign New England as a whole, but not in regard to the lumber interest.

Mr. BLAINE. I would like to know in regard to what interests the gentleman arraigns my State?

Mr. COX. I named ten articles on which they have special protection.

Mr. BLAINE. Will the gentleman name one article on which the State of Maine has especial protection, only one? That is all I ask for.

Mr. COX. I will say to the gentleman that I made no reference particularly to the State of Maine.

Mr. BLAINE. But the State of Maine is in New England, and the gentleman's sweeping charges were against New England as a whole.

Mr. COX. I gave the statistics of cotton, woolen, and iron manufactures, clothing, etc. If any of these are in Maine, my remarks will apply. Maine generally sustains the rest of New England in her exactions.

Mr. BLAINE. Why, sir, your own State is protected in iron to the amount of millions of dollars more on that single article than Maine ever received on all her products together.

Mr. COX. It does not necessarily follow that I am to stand up for one particular interest in my State if I deem it against the general interests of the whole State, or militates a just principle of taxation.

These views of public duty on these difficult subjects I commend to younger members. They did not embarrass me either as a member from agricultural Ohio or commercial New York. Indeed, I believe they sent me to Congress again and again from the great metropolis. [Applause.]

Some members here are unequal to the effort, or are reluctant to attempt to make local sacrifices for the general good. My commission is as a Representative of the United States from New York and not for New York. [Applause.]

Members admit that there are certain productions which upon principle should not have protection; but they declare that they will make reprisals for the clamors and exactions of the tariff in other matters where they are unprotected. I have inveighed against this system as mutual brigandage and the reciprocity of robbery. [Applause and laughter.]

Our tariffs illustrate this in every paragraph. Kentucky wants cheap copper stills for her whisky. She gets even with the Michigan robber by demanding a tariff on hemp. Now hemp is to be on the free-list, and why not copper? Maine steals on lumber to make up for the Massachusetts roguery on fabrics. Massachusetts howls for cheap coal; Pennsylvania says, no; and so Massachusetts goes out with a Home Market Club and knocks down the West and South, to rifle them of half their gains on corn and raw cotton. Tennessee, Virginia, and North Carolina, being fleeced all round in clothing, sugar, and what not, go for "goobers" at a cent a pound. [Laughter.] California demands a large reprisal for her olives and vines, because she is fleeced on salt by New York, West Virginia, Ohio, and Michigan. The Gulf States form a band of brigands, and march forth with precious little hope for any steal worth the powder; but being reduced to extremities, they call on Fra Diavalo from Louisiana to lead against the robber gang of cut-throats on cotton-ties and trace-chains. Pennsylvania, the Robert Macaire of the lot, steals boldly on all articles from a plate glass to a locomotive; and to make up for the general loss, the Northwest masks herself behind her forests and demands timber reprisals; and so on. Nothing is sacred. Even the corsets of Connecticut, around which hover so many happy associations [laughter], or the brier-wood pipes of Father Knickerbocker are not safe from the interchangeable piracies of the tariff. [Laughter and applause.] Oh, the beauty of reciprocal rascality! [Laughter.]

IS IT ROBBERY, OR COMMUNISM?

Gentlemen seem to take umbrage because we call these tariffs which take from one class to give to another, robbery. But I have the best ethics for the statement that the right of property is violated by cheating, stealing, robbery, or violation of contract; and universally, just as these crimes prevail, production languishes, industry diminishes, the richest soil fails the impoverished inhabitants. But when Government lays its powerful grasp on the property of the citizen to bestow that property on favored enterprises, it is none the less robbery and communism because done under the forms of law.

Oh, but the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] says it is not a tax, only a "trade regulation." [Laughter.] In this he differs rom every writer upon political science. I am inclined, notwithstanding the euphemism, to call it,—otherwise. [Laughter.] The suave expression "trade regulation" sounds pretty, but it is all the same a tax and something worse.

IS IT BURGLARY?

But stop! Mr. Chairman, I should apologize. I must be decorous. [Laughter.] It is not robbery. Since the tariff forces taxes from one person to give to another by indirection, by a sleight-of-hand manipulation, is it not merciful to call it by another name than robbery? Ah, sir, it is done in the night season. [Laughter.] It is done against the defenseless victims when asleep and in their homes. Some folks would call it burglary. [Laughter and cheers.] But I must be parliamentary. [Laughter.] Therefore I call it a trade regulation. [Laughter.] I have read a volume by M. Huc, a Catholic priest, who, dressed in the yellow robes, traveled through Thibet. He made many graphic descriptions of the then strange land of the Grand Llama. Among other descriptions (I quote from memory) is that of an adventure in the Thibetan mountains:

AN EUPHEMISM—"TRADE REGULATIONS."

A brigand meets the priest upon the road. The brigand does not point a pistol at his breast nor draw a knife. He says with perfect courtesy:

"Venerable elder brother! It is cold to-day in the mountains. I would like the loan of thy cloak."

And again:

"Beloved friend, dost thou not see that I am tired with walking? Thy horse, if thou pleasest."

This is a "trade regulation" in the land of the Grand Llama! [Great laughter.]

But the great bulk of our tariff larcenies is done in the night season; and if Dr. Wayland and other writers be correct beyond a cavil, these unequal, unlawful, and outrageous taxes are flat burglary. I beg pardon—I will use again the language of my friend from Ohio, used in this House, and not in Canada—it is not taxation. It is a little "trade regulation" by which Ohio is made magnificent and prosperous at the expense of our Southern brethren.

SUN AND COAL.

Gentlemen complain that this is a radical bill to ruin our industries. How can this be so? Why, the sun and his kindred elements are regarded as aliens against which we must have protection and prohibition. Coal is left off of the free-list, although ready to drop into our ships from the cliffs of Nova Scotia, to give caloric to the factories of New England.

Mr. Chairman, I once had occasion here to improve upon one of Bastiat's fables so as to apply it to our country, but I did not then know that the story had a basis in fact. M. Rouviére, late prime minister of France, in a speech in 1882, I think, said that the tallow chandlers of France—good, kind, simple protectionists—petitioned the chamber of deputies to suppress gas. Why? Because it would ruin their business.

With this new light I beg to repeat the analogue, with my own comments, and to print Bastiat's petition as an addendum to my remarks.

M. Bastiat's petitioners desired to suppress sunlight. They were protectionists of the genuine type. They demanded that the authorities should close all windows and sky-lights, inside and outside, all shutters, curtains, blinds, bulls'-eyes, openings, chinks, clefts, and fissures whereby the sun enters to the disadvantage of the manufacturers of wicks, snuffers, street-lamps, extinguishers, and the producers of oil, tallow, resin, and alcohol. [Great laughter.]

"No cheap and plentiful light from abroad for us," they cried. [Laughter.] "Let us have petroleum against the external competition of daylight. Light is an uppish, solar foreigner, and should not rival the coal-gas from the sunless retorts of the earth. [Laughter.] Light is alien. It is cheap, pauper labor. [Laughter.] It inundates us half the time. Your Joshua is a protectionist. [Laughter.] He would have the sun stand still that coal and gas be high-priced. [Laughter.] The market for gas, candlesticks, and gas-burners should not be disturbed. Oh, no! For is not light a secret enemy, purchased with foreign gold? [Laughter.] Quench it, and artificial light will be gorgeous and bountiful, though dear. How many domestic industries does not the prism destroy?"

Surely, the sun saps the foundations of agriculture, for is not tallow from the sheepfolds of my friend from Vermont [Mr. STEWART]? [Laughter.] It destroys the oil market, plugs the gushing wells, and interferes with transportation. It throws out of employment workmen innumerable; it reduces the wages of such as are left. Under this policy of free light, what becomes of what is left of the whaling industries of New England? Who protects the heroes of the harpoon? The very bronzes, gildings, crystals, lamps, and spacious saloons of the rich are useless half the time because illumined by the proximity of the sun.

Let us build an opaque roof, ribbed with steel, over the land. [Applause and laughter.] What matter the expense? Every American coal-bunk and mine will furnish the material for an American-made gas-retort. No gratuities of nature, no natural wealth. Give labor a chance. [Laughter.] Let manufacture thrive. Down with the sun! Imprison electricity! Up with old chaos and darkness! And while cheap foreign labor is forbidden in its products at the custom-house forget not also to bar out from Castle Garden the cheap foreign laborer who comes thither with light in his eye and iron in his blood; for is not his light and iron an alien to the protectionist? [Applause and laughter.]

PEANUT INDUSTRY AND THE SON OF AFRICA.

The raiser of peanuts, by a parity of reasoning, protests against the free importation of that article. It is consumed by my little Arab constituency of the Bowery. [Laughter.] I must regard them. Because the same article is raised by those whose cheap labor is evidenced by its clotheless condition under Africa's burning sun—let peanuts be protected! Why not?

The same philosophy applies to the salt made abroad by solar radiance and evaporation. The sun is a cheap laborer, and although we have a sun shining over our own Onondaga in New York, it has not the calorific properties and chronic results of other suns, in other skies, which have laid away vast mines of saline crystals in the bosom of the earth.

There is coal, too. Why should it not be protected or restricted from abroad? Is it not the product of the sun and nature?

THE SUN, CARBON, AND LOCOMOTION.

One Sabbath George Stephenson—the inventor of our multitubular locomotive—sees a train flashing by with its long white plume of steam. Turning to his friend, he asks:

"Can you tell me what is the power driving that train?"

"Well, is it not one of your big engines?"

"Aye, but what drives the engine?"

"Oh, very likely a canny Newcastle driver."

"What do you say to the light of the sun?"

"How?" asked the friend.

"It is nothing else," said the engineer. "It is light bottled up in the earth for tens of thousands of years—light absorbed by plants and vegetables—being necessary for the condensation of carbon during the process of their growth if it be not carbon in another form; and now after being buried in the earth for long ages, in fields of coal, that latent light is again brought forth and liberated. It is made to work as in that locomotive for great human purposes."

Was there not poetic beauty in the reality of this conception? Think of it. This sun power, equal to billions of horses, is not only every day providing fuel for some great locomotive emergency of the future, but it lifts up fabulous weights of watery vapor into the clouds, which returns to bless the earth by giving form and color, fiber and juices, scent and strength to tree and flower.

These same sunbeams were pressed into coal by the centuries and ponderosities, and when mined and fired become incentives to fabrication and motions, that outstrip Apollo's coursers of the sun. They move the fast-flying shuttles of manufacture and interchange to create the tapestry of a better civilization. [Applause.]

Why should these natural and cheap workers for human happiness be laid under embargo and prohibited to our people?

THE FRUITS OF THE EARTH—ARE THEY FREE?

The same cogency of reasoning, the same patriotic love of a home market, and independence of foreign supply, especially in case of war, are illustrated in a petition sent to this House by a Connecticut gardener from Glastonbury. Almost in sight of the Charter oak his strawberry beds give their succulent rubies to the sun; and the sun, through coal and Stephenson, harness a force to bear them to my constituents. But the Connecticut gardener is not satisfied with this nearness to the New York market. He demands that a heavy if not prohibitive duty be placed upon all foreign fresh fruits; oranges now taxed 25 cents a box; grapes now 20 per cent. ad valorem, and bananas—and why? Because the consumer being satisfied with cheap foreign fruits fresh from the West Indies would discourage his strawberries. [Laughter.] He would embargo the ships of all lands, where currants grow, and figs and dates are sugared by the sun, in order to leave a larger yearning in the human esophagus for the strawberries and huckleberries of the Nutmeg State. [Laughter.]

By a parity of reasoning the anchovies and sardines of France and the raisins of Turkey should be prohibé in order to protect the suckers of Illinois and the grapes of California. [Laughter.]

Truly, when we do begin our attacks upon nature and her processes it is hard to stop. It is the little end of the wedge for a potato, and then the result is a whole catalogue, including the gramniverous animals, the rhinoceros, hippopotamus, and elephant, by which we teach children natural history. [Laughter.]

The present bill proposes to repeal the 10 per cent. ad valorem on barks, beans, berries, balsams, birds, and bulbs. Who opposes this alliterative benefaction? On barks? Some quack who has found a root that may be ruined in the market for medicinal use. On beans? Some maker of castor-oil intended to relieve the infant industry of the home market. [Laughter.] On berrries? Some batrachian of the swamp who croaks for protection to his cranberries. Balsams? But why go on? The *argumentum ad absurdum* has no limit for opposing the revision of such a tariff as we have. Let foreign nuts, and seeds, and weeds, and "dried insects not edible," be prohibited or restricted, for is not the country rich in hazels and hickories, garden seeds, and jimson weeds, and who knows what industries chemistry may evoke out of these—our natural resources!

INFANT SUCTION POWER.

Mr. Chairman, I am confused by the tabular opulence of our tariff speeches. We have tables on wages, tables on the home market, tables on iron and lumber, tables on cotton and copper, tables on salt and wood-screws—tables on everything. I am afraid we do not study them heedfully. I will not make many tables; but I am studying statistics. I have made a calculation about our infant industries, and their power of suction from a maternal government. [Laughter.] Skipping the era from 1846 to 1860, during the existence of a good Democratic tariff, I beg to develop some statistics. That suction power amounted to 10,441,000 horse-power. [Great laughter.] I prove it by showing the power of the fly in mechanics as a provocative to force. [Laughter.] Taking the unit of power, which is 1 pound weight raised a foot, and the weight which a horse raises is 33,000 pounds a foot in a minute, I thus get the one-horse power. My friend from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] late Commissioner of Patents will note my accuracy. [Laughter.] These are statistics. [Laughter.] Then after the manner of our protectionists, I seek the census of 1880. [Laughter.] I desire the number of horses, oxen, milk cows, mules, asses, and other cattle. [Laughter.] The number in the aggregate is 48,095,807, from Alabama to Wyoming, all within our borders. I give a period of three months of the year for fly time. [Laughter.] Then, sir, I demonstrate irrefragibly that these live stock for about ten hours of the day keep their tails in motion. [Laughter.] I deduct as an uncertain factor the Texican steer, who uses his foot to kick vagrant flies from his ear [great laughter], and then I find that the forces thus expended and utilized, omitting the Texican steer, give me the premise which I have seen somewhere in the speeches of the gentlemen on the other side, from which I deduce the untold suction power of our infant industries! [Laughter and applause.]

Through this enormous and well-ascertained horse-power in fly time I am enabled to gauge the amount of milk which Michigan suckles through copper, Pennsylvania through iron tubes, Massachusetts on cotton, New Jersey on spool-thread, Louisiana on sugar, Maryland on coal, New York on salt, California on blankets, Ohio on wool, and so on. Of course there is more or less struggling as to which infant should have the right of way [laughter] or the first pull at the pap. [Applause and laughter.]

It is said, sir, of the infant Hercules that when he was suckled by his mother he pulled so hard that he spilled the lacteal fluid and produced the milky way in the heavens. Hercules is Pennsylvania. [Applause and laughter.]

WAGES—SYLLOGISMS.

I do not affect elaborate tables. They are so common as hardly to be read, especially when they refer to wages under the tariff. A table may show a low scale of wages for England, and a high scale for the United States. But what does it prove? Let me reproduce here, in syllogistic form, these logical sleights of hand or mouth.

Thus argues the protectionist:

England has free trade; England has low wages. *Ergo*, free trade produces low wages.

Again: The United States has protection; the United States has high wages. Therefore protection produces high wages. [Laughter.]

Now, one may very easily parody such chop-logic, thus:

England has a House of Lords. England has low wages. Conclusion: the Lords make wages low. [Laughter.]

Or, the United States is infested with tramps. The United States has high wages. Therefore tramps make wages high. [Laughter.]

Ireland has no snakes. Ireland has low wages. *Argal:* Snakes make wages high. [Laughter.]

Apply the same argument to Russia. Russia has high protection. Russia has low wages. Therefore protection makes wages low.

Turkey—will gentlemen excuse me for my reference? [Laughter.] Well, Turkey has a low tariff—8 per cent. Turkey has the Koran. Therefore the Koran makes wages low. [Laughter.]

The truth is, as has been frequently stated on this floor, and proven, that wages are a matter entirely irrelevant to the discussion of tariff, depending upon the law of supply and demand, and the circumstances, situation, and resources of the country. [Applause.]

I have discussed, Mr. Chairman, very often here the relation between the tariff and wages. I will not enter upon that further now, except to say that by the reports of our consuls, and notably the consul at Birmingham, Mr. Schoenhof, and by a comparison of tariffs and wages in other countries, it is safe to conclude that the tariff does not affect wages in the sense in which the Republicans claim it does. No man can argue, solely from these relations between wages and prices and tariffs, as to the beneficial results to the people.

INVENTIONS, STANDING ARMIES, CONSUMERS, ETC.

A country like ours, which has 250,000 inventions protected by the patent law, as my friend [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] so well recognizes, and with her artisans and laborers replete with intelligence and ability, need not fear competition from nations which have withdrawn, at great cost, millions of their productive citizens for standing armies. The nations who compete with us have 1 man for every 24 of the population in the soldiery; in the United States we have but 1 man in 1,610 of the population.

HOME MARKET.

When protectionists clamor for a home market they forget that there is no standing army of consumers, and that nearly all of our people are producers. They say: "We must have a home market; we must consume all we produce at home, and produce only as much as we consume."

We do produce more agricultural products than we consume by five hundred millions' worth a year. How can we consume these products at home—in our country? It would require several millions more people who would consume only and produce nothing. But if more people do come in there will be more products still and a greater surplus. The pro-

posed remedy only increases the surplus, and can not diminish it, unless, indeed, we follow European example and keep a standing army of two millions of idle soldiery. [Applause.]

A liberal Englishman statesman—not a Tory—Sir Lyon Playfair, speaking of this condition of our country, points to the United States as the great industrial nation of the future, and exclaims: "Luckily her protection policy is an incubus upon her industry, and gives us in England breathing time to prepare for the coming struggle."

NON-PROTECTED CLASSES.

It has often been repeated here that the last census shows that of the 17,392,099 of our population engaged in industries, 7,670,493 were employed in agriculture; and, in round numbers, about 4,000,000 in professional and personal services, nearly 2,000,000 in trade and transportation, and nearly 4,000,000 in manufacturing and mining. At least 1,214,023 were engaged in pursuits which were not benefited but rather injured by a high tariff. They were injured, I say, because the protective tariff, which is alleged to make high wages for others, did not benefit these. The pattern-makers, the bricklayers, the molders, the house carpenters, and many workers in other branches of business which are absolutely unprotected, command higher wages than those working on protected articles.

There are nearly 400,000 carpenters and joiners, 300,000 milliners and dressmakers and seamstresses, nearly 200,000 blacksmiths, 133,000 tailors and tailoresses, 102,000 masons, 76,000 butchers, 41,000 bakers, 22,000 plasterers, and others engaged in unprotected pursuits, who bear the burden without receiving the supposed benefit of the favored class.

Counting out the number of unprotected farmers—and over one-half of our entire population are dependent upon farms—I have before me a list of trades and employments. It includes over one hundred classes, from the architect to the wood-chopper, who derive no sort of reward, but whose business is crucified between the two thieves—ad valorem and specific duties, levied upon all they consume.

Here is a list of the number of our population engaged in 1880 in non-protected industries:

Architects	3,375
Artists and teachers of art	9,104
Auctioneers	2,331
Barbers and hair-dressers	44,851
Boarding-house keepers	19,058
Clergymen	64,698
Clerks and copyists	25,467
Clerks in hotels	10,916
Dentists	12,314
Domestic servants	1,075,655
Employés of hotels	77,413
Civil engineers	8,261
Hostlers	31,697
Hotel-keepers	32,453
Journalists	12,308
Laborers	1,859,223
Laundresses	121,942
Lawyers	64,137
Livery-stable keepers	14,213
Messengers	13,985
Musicians	30,477
Nurses	13,483
Physicians and surgeons	85,671
Restaurant keepers	13,074
Sextons	2,449
Teachers and scientific persons	227,710
Veterinary surgeons	2,130
Private watchmen	13,384
Whitewashers	3,316
Boatmen and watermen	20,368
Book-keepers in stores	59,790
Canal men	4,328
Clerks in stores	353,444
Commercial travelers	28,158
Clerks in railroad offices	12,331
Clerks in insurance offices	2,830
Clerks in express companies	1,856
Draymen and teamsters	177,586
Employés in warehouses	5,022
Employés of railroad companies	236,058
Peddlers	53,491
Milk men and women	9,242
Newspaper carriers	3,374
Street-railroad employés	11,925
Telegraph employés	22,809
Telephone employés	1,196
Packers	4,176
Pilots	3,770
Porters and laborers	32,192
Sailors	60,070
Salesmen and saleswomen	32,279
Steam-boat men and women	12,305
Stewards and stewardesses	2,285
Tollgate-keepers	2,203
Traders	114,839
Dealers in books and stationery	4,982
Traders in boots and shoes	9,993
Traders in wood and coal	10,871
Traders in cotton and tobacco	22,000
Undertakers	5,113
Weighers and gaugers	3,302
Druggists	27,700
Dealers in real estate	11,253
Dealers in provisions	35,129
Dealers in dry goods	45,831
Dealers in groceries	101,849
Dealers in iron and tin	15,076
Dealers in hides	2,382
Dealers in lumber and marble	12,668
Dealers in newspapers	2,729
Dealers in paints and oils	1,940
Dealers in paper	1,892
Blacksmiths	41,309
Brick and tile makers	172,726
Bridge builders	26,652
House builders	2,587
Butchers	10,904
Carpenters and joiners	76,241
Car-makers	373,143
Charcoal and lime burners	4,708
Coopers	5,851
Engineers and firemen	49,138
Engravers	79,628
Fishermen and oystermen	4,777
Brick and stone masons	41,352
Millers	102,473
Miners	53,440
Oil-well laborers	204,228
Painters	7,340
Paper-hangers	128,556
Photographers	5,013
Plasterers	9,900
Printers and stereotypers	22,087
Quarrymen	72,738
Quartz-slaters	15,169
Stave-makers	4,026
Wood-choppers	4,661
	12,731

It is this class of people that I have the honor in large part to represent. They live in our cities, and though they may be largely engaged in manufacturing according to our census returns, they are not manufacturing those articles which have the special favor of our tariff.

DO NOT TAX WAGES. OH, NO!

Gentlemen may tell us that they do not tax the wages of these men, whether high or low, by their tariff.

I know that they do not tax their wages; but they tax all that their wages buy. They thus reduce the purchasing power of the little money that is left at the end of the week or month; for every article that enters into their expenditure, from the potatoes, taxed specifically 15 cents a bushel, to the salt, at over 80 per cent. ad valorem, and from the rent of their houses, which is enhanced by the tax on lumber and iron, etc., to the blankets that give them comfort in the winter nights.

INSECTS IN THE TARIFF.

We have reports made by our Commissioner of Agriculture about every imaginable insect that preys upon our crops: The Hessian fly, the army-worm, the weevil, and that latest pest called *Hemiptera*, or the family of *Lygæidæ*. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] understands this family. They have "trade regulations" of their own. [Laughter.] I may say that they are familiarly known as the "chinch-bug." Efforts are being made to dislodge these pests that destroy our grasses and our grains. Much money is expended out of our surplus for that purpose. Would it not be much better for the farmer, if the same amount of skill in the treatment of certain little tariff *insectivora* were investigated so as to destroy them? Where our game laws do not suffice, or our birds do not answer the purpose of destroying these pests, our reports tell us that a solution of common soap added to boiling water or kerosene will have that effect upon chinch-bugs. Let us not be particular as to the nature or quantity of the remedy.

LUXURIES AND NECESSARIES.

Allow me, Mr. Chairman, to place in parallel columns a statement of a number of these *insectivora*. One column will show some of the luxuries of life, which come in free, or nearly so, under the present tariff, and the other the duties on the articles of necessity. And yet, for years and years in this House, gentlemen have refused even to consider the advisability of reducing the one or raising the other of these taxes and harmonizing their discordant elements:

Duty on articles of luxury.	*Duty on articles of necessity.*
Ottar of roses, free.	Castor-oil, 180 per cent.
Neroli, or orange-flower oil, free.	Linseed-oil, 62 per cent.
Diamonds, 10 per cent.	Common window-glass, 87 per cent.
Raw silk, free.	Raw wool, 45 per cent.
Jewelry, 25 per cent.	Steel rails, 85 per cent.
Gold studs, 25 per cent.	Horseshoe nails, 116 per cent.
Finest still wines, in bottles, 29 per cent.	Cheapest mixed woolen goods, costing abroad 24 cents per yard, 77 per cent.
Finest thread lace, 30 per cent.	Spool thread, 51 per cent.
Fine Aubusson and Axminster carpets, costing abroad $2.77 a yard, 46 per cent.	Common druggets, costing abroad 26 cents a yard, 86 per cent.
Finest India shawls, costing abroad, say $20 a pound weight, 35 cents a pound and 40 per cent. ad valorem, or say 40½ per cent.	Common woolen shawls, costing abroad 68 cents a pound, 86 per cent.
Silk stockings, 50 per cent.	Common worsted stockings, costing 26 cents a pound abroad, 73 per cent.
Finest broadcloth, costing $5 a pound abroad, 35 cents a pound, and 40 per cent., equal to about 41 per cent.	Common cloth, costing 65 cents a pound abroad, duty 35 cents a pound, and 35 per cent. ad valorem, equal to 89 per cent.
Pâte de foie gras, 25 per cent.	Rice, 106 per cent.
Musical instruments, of all kinds, 25 per cent.	Galvanized wire smaller than No. 16 and not smaller than No. 26 wire gauge, 132 per cent.; smaller than No. 26, 155 per cent.
Duty on a quart bottle of champagne, costing abroad $1 a bottle, 58 cents.	Duty on a dollar's worth of bleached cotton fabric, costing abroad 5½ cents a square yard, 66⅔ cents.
Curry and curry powder, free.	Potatoes, 15 cents duty per bushel.
Olives, green or prepared, free.	Corn starch, 85½ per cent. duty.
Spices of all kinds, free.	Salt, 85 per cent. duty.

AMERICAN IDEAS, NOT FOREIGN.

Our American statesmen from the earliest days to the present who have been wise in econony have been accustomed to swear in the words of no masters from abroad:

In the "Principles of Trade," which appeared in 1774, two years before Adam Smith wrote his Wealth of Nations, it was asserted that commerce should be as free between all nations of the world as it was between the several counties of England.

Franklin's letters of 1778 were of the same tenor, namely, that our tariff should be for revenue only. Jefferson, as minister to France, was then advocating free trade. He recommended that commerce be relieved of its shackles in all parts of the world. Gallatin opposed protection very soon afterwards in Congress.

HONEST DEFINITION OF FREE TRADE.

As early as 1831, William C. Bryant argued for the liberties of interchange. The agitation went on up to the final triumph, in 1846, when the tariff, in the language of Senator ALLISON, was made as "perfect a tariff as any we ever had." [Applause.] Protection had no more strenuous opposers than the men who, like Emerson, in the very midst of the war, spoke of free interchange as in the interest of all nations.

These men did not undertake to convey the idea that free trade was the abolition of custom-houses, nor the substitution of direct for indirect taxation. In the language of a representative protectionist paper, the Philadelphia American of the 7th August, 1884, they held that it meant such an adjustment of taxes on imports that the entire revenue of the country should be thus collected, and so long as it did not lay its duties in such a way as to lead any one to undertake any employment or make any investment he could avoid in the absence of such duties.

NEVADA TO THE RESCUE—THE IRISH VOTE.

The gentleman from Nevada [Mr. WOODBURN] undertook, as he said, to fill up a gap. He filled one. [Laughter.] He thought that the President's message was a British document, but not having the testimony on that head complete from the internal evidence of the document itself, he rushes to London and invokes the Cobden Club to his assistance. He makes many apocryphal statements in relation to it, and quotes that enemy of Ireland and America—the Tory organ—the London Times, as evidence that the Democratic leaders of this country are horrible free-traders. He revamps the old story of British gold which is to be used in America for the Democratic party and its success. He finds in the membership of the club an army of dukes, and the Lord knows who, and drew the inference that with their "three guineas apiece" they are going to subdue America and overturn the Republican party [laughter] and things generally! Goodness, gracious! Whole ocean into tempest tossed to waft a feather and to drown a fly! [Laughter.] He was careful to omit the names of the distinguished Republican leaders, who are, of course, in the conspiracy against themselves! He became so confused as to the name of the Secretary of War that his mistake naturally produced "great laughter and applause," which should have been reconsidered on the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. COGSWELL] that it was quite another Endicott!

Among others whom he should have named as members of the Cobden Club were some of the most liberal men in American politics upon both sides, including the Speaker of this House and several Senators.

Now, sir, what was the objective point of all this logical debate on the Mills bill? It was the Irish vote. [Laughter.]

The gentleman was careful to let the House know that he was born in Ireland. Our Congressional Directory had already indicated that. But if I should pursue the method pointed out by a scientist of Dublin, Dr. McElheran, I think I could denationalize the gentleman. [Laughter.] That distinguished doctor showed that the way to test a true Celt was not by the place of his nativity, but by his features and name. You may recognize the genuine Celt by his eye or by his hair. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. VANCE] smiles and points to his own ruddy poll. [Laughter.] I look around for a white charger [laughter]; but there is no fear of the coincidence, as the gentleman is not of the gentler sex. [Laughter.] The Celt has a handsome eye and a graceful figure, while the Angles and Saxons—as Defoe held—were the mud of all the races. Of course I would not apply such a remark by the author of Robinson Crusoe to the gentleman from Nevada, although perhaps he deserves it for his baseless attack upon Mayor Hewitt. Of course, since the statement as to our mayor has been refuted, he will make the *amende*. We will give him time. [Laughter.]

The gentleman may have been born in Ireland. I once heard an Irishman say, "Because a baby is born in a stable it does not follow that he is a horse." [Laughter.] It is well understood by physiologists that such men as Shakespeare and Sir Isaac Newton are ascertained by their lineaments to be Celtic in their origin. Cromwell and his confiscators left quite a spawn of aliens in Ireland; and some of them have claimed to be of the pure stock. But they are not. They are not the O'Callaghans, the Murphys, the O'Conners, the O'Shaunesseys, the Sullivans [laughter], or the O'Neills, whose royal lineage is honorably upheld by my friend from Missouri who sits near me. [Laughter.]

When a member makes *profert* of himself, in order to reproach others, he must take the consequences, even if they be both philological and physiological. "Wood-burn"—what does it mean and where did it come from? There never was a better Saxon word than *wode* or *wudu;* it is a wood. It signifies, when an adjective, "mad," "furious" [laughter], because wild animals lived in the woods of Denmark or Friesland. *Burn* is thoroughly Saxon. It is from *biernan*. I surmise that the gentle defender of Tories from Nevada was descended, most honorably of course, either from some lordly Saxon charcoal burner, or that the name came from some of the Cromwell soldiery, who burned all the woods they could not confiscate when they invaded Ireland.

Names are not much in a debate, but as the gentleman has spread my middle name—Sullivan—on the record, I must analyze that also a little in return, by saying that Sullivan is from the Latin, "Sol" and "Levant." Sun Rise! [Laughter.] My ancestor came from the East. I went back as his reflux wave. [Laughter.] I may mention confidentially that one of my ancestors carried a hod at the building of Solomon's Temple. [Laughter.] All I know of the family is that a recent ancestor came over from Ireland with Lord Baltimore. He was in "noble" company.

There is another test of Celtic blood to which I may refer, as it is so pertinent to the Mills bill. The gentleman from Nevada will be pleased to know that his championship of the Tory protectionists of England indicates that he leans toward, if he does not belong to, the bluest blood of the landed aristocracy of England. [Laughter.]

Evidently the speech of the gentleman was made for the purpose of prejudicing the Irish against the Democracy, by reason of their dislike to their English oppressors. But his arrow falls far short of the mark.

The gentleman was pleased to say something complimentary of myself as a member of the Democratic party, and referred to me as a representative of a cosmopolitan constituency in a cosmopolitan city. He spelled my name at full, and more than intimated that I became a member of the Cobden Club, because it was a "nobleman's foreign association."

This remark of the gentleman from Nevada seems to have been well received by the House. To be more exact, let me quote his language:

> At the same time, to my utter astonishment, I find one of the foremost men of the Democratic party, a distinguished author, wit, and humorist, a Representative of a cosmopolitan constituency in a cosmopolitan city, SAMUEL SULLIVAN COX, became a member of the noblemen's foreign association.

By the brackets I notice, though I did not hear the speech, that this was received with laughter and applause.

I am at a loss how to discriminate. I have no special vanity, but I suppose the applause was intended for myself as a foremost Democrat, author, wit, humorist, and Representative [laughter], and that the laughter was at the gentleman's expense for associating me with noblemen—as such people run nowadays in and out of divorce courts in England.

Mr. Chairman, I am not altogether certain that the gentleman should be laughed at for calling me a nobleman. I have had some sort of a decoration given to me by the successor of the Caliphs and the Sultans. But the nobility which I most admire is not that of mere title. I had almost forgotten my honors abroad. I did dearly yearn for the society of you gentlemen. [Laughter.] All the pride I have is to be a Commoner along with other common folks here. [Applause and laughter.]

I do not care even for the courteous "Honorable" in this House. I have an ambition to be considered a good man and a faithful member. I have no special desire to be considered either witty, humorous, or a littérateur. Whatever the House or the gentleman may have meant by their laughter and applause, I would commend to him the verse of Tennyson, where he says:

> How e'er it be, it seems to me,
> 'Tis only noble to be good;
> Kind hearts are more than coronets,
> And simple faith than Norman blood.

[Cheers.]

And certainly no one ever merited this tribute of the laureate of England more than Richard Cobden, the yeoman's son, the friend of America, and the defender of just economic laws. [Cheers.]

When the gentleman prints my name SAMUEL SULLIVAN COX in the RECORD, he indicates something of my Celtic blood, but he indicates something better than my thought and service.

I beg to say that I accept my middle name with considerable pride; for among the best men of the Revolution from New Hampshire were the two Sullivans, one of whom was governor of Massachusetts and the other a general in our Army. Both were the friends of Washington. The general was not only the first to wrest Fort William and Henry from the tory Government of England, but, after the Revolution was over, he signalized his bravery and skill by suppressing the Indians in Central New York, when they were allied with the tories with which the gentleman is pleased to be allied.

I am not so proud of my middle name as I was; for when I reflect that Boston culture has produced another kind of Sullivan [laughter], and that he ingloriously retreated from the beautiful land of France before a Tory British slugger, I am not so vain of my name parted in the middle.

The gentleman from Nevada represents a little rotten borough which is held by a lot of silver lords. From his standpoint he chooses to defame the men who made the "cheap loaf" for the poor Englishmen, and who, as O'Connell expressed it, were engaged in the same sad work toward Ireland. The attempt is as futile as the attack of a microbe against the shaggy frontlets and pachydermatous hide of the American bison recently brought to this capital. [Laughter.] The gentleman's State is supposed to be in the Union. With its forty-odd thousand inhabitants it has as much power in the Senate as New York with its six millions. Still, should he not cultivate something of the modesty which belongs to littleness, of which I am a commendable specimen, and not be too forward in attacking men who, like Cobden and his corn-law repealers, and as Macaulay said of the Puritans, were the noblemen of nature by the imposition of a mightier hand?

If the gentleman would produce the impression that those who have been named as members of the Cobden Club in their catalogue are unfaithful to Ireland or to America, he had better correct the RECORD; at least so far as my name is concerned, for not only have I defended her sons and had resolutions passed of sympathy and of succor for the cause of Ireland and Irishmen who were imprisoned wrongfully, as the RECORD of this House will show, but I had the honor of making the motion, before a Democratic Speaker [Mr. RANDALL], by which Mr. Parnell was accorded the privileges of this House for an address upon the wrongs of Ireland.

It would take more misrepresentation and innuendo than the Tory member from this rotten borough has shown, to produce any impression upon the cosmopolitan constituency which I have the honor to represent.

By ancestry, by inclination, by virtue of long service here, running through nearly thirty years, I never had one thought for or sympathy with the Tory leaders who sought to drive England to desperation by their protective policies.

The Tories of New Jersey, from which State came my folk, were in alliance with the Hessian and the red-coat to drive the patriots of the revolution into ignoble humiliation. They failed; but had they succeeded, and had the Liberals of England, whom the gentleman stigmatizes, failed, we might still have been an English dependency, and the gentleman, if he had lived at all, might have been engaged in the constabulary force in Ireland to-day endeavoring to suppress, under the orders of Tory Balfour, the enfranchisement of the people of his native isle who are seeking for home rule.

In picking out my name, had he looked over the list of the Cobden Club a little more closely he would have seen the name of Governor Jacob D. Cox, a Republican gentleman and soldier. He was an honest statesman. This he illustrated in this House, and as Secretary of the Interior. In association with such a man one can welcome such pitiful assaults as those of the Tory member from Nevada.

Governor Jacob D. Cox was the friend and associate of General Garfield. They were both sympathetic with liberalities of all kind. I do not charge that either of them accepted all the tenets of the Cobden Club.

I do not understand General Garfield's relations in that way, and certainly I had no such idea. I do not know how I became a member. It was tendered to me, I suppose, for my persistency in vindicating the liberalities of thought which belong to economic study and the observations which I made of the working of our tariff system. The Cobden Club has other objects beside freedom of trade. It sends out pamphlets in relation to the tenure of land. It favors the removal of primogeniture. It would improve the tenure of title to land in England as well as elsewhere. It would stop the great pension-lists and other excesses of English economic administration. Publications on these themes are sent to its members. I have received my share and such instruction from them as I could glean. But it does not follow that I am bound by all its tenets, for I, too, swear in the words of no master, and no platform, and no party on this subject.

While in a foreign country I was elected a member of a society which, being translated, means Phil-Hellenic. In my diploma these Greeks spelled my last name with a K, a capital K. [Laughter.] The K was at both ends of the name [laughter]—Koks. [Laughter.] The object of this association is the study and diffusion of knowledge of ancient Greek archæology, history, language, and literature. It may have its peculiar theories about Grecian art and philosophy; but did it follow that though I accepted such an election, honorably tendered, I was bound to any particular philosophy of ancient Greece, whether that of Plato or Aristotle? Must I become a cynic or a stoic, revel in the sty of Epicurus, or my soul become transmigratory with Pythagoras? Must I accept a peculiar theory of the dative case, or adhere to the pre-Periclean or post-Periclean school of art? I was never called on to eat fish or drink cold champagne in the seat of Byzantine Empire; but if I had been I should have drank to the Illiad and the Odyssey and to the swelling of the voiceful sea, which is the vehicle and symbol of liberty! I do not know what this honorable society of Greeks may do on the Bosphorus, at the seat of their ancient empire and glory, but I hope that they will do nothing that will ever be brought up in Congress to the disadvantage of myself, my party, or patriotic associations. [Applause.]

This little esprit of the gentleman, according to the brackets in the RECORD, produced "laughter and applause."

It is well that the gentleman got in his laughter first. The incident reminds me of another Irishman. He was in a meadow with a little bovine. The bovine began to paw the earth and tear up the ground with his horns, and the Irishman laughed and laughed at the unique performance. [Laughter.] But soon the little bull pitched him over a fence. The Irishman got up, and said, "Isn't it lucky I got in my laugh first?" [Laughter.]

Before I finish with the history of this club and its opponents and members the gentleman will be, perhaps, not a little astonished to know where the laugh comes in; and that he has made himself the advocate of the meanest and worst of all the aristocratic and titled gentry that ever rackrented and stole the land or harassed and oppressed the people of any country. [Cheers.]

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

In this connection it is but just that we should recognize the efforts in and out of this country made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] to reciprocate without restrictions with the Dominion of Canada. Boldly, in spite of the objurgations of his party, he casts protection to the winds, moved on Canada, and took a toboggan slide into free trade. [Laughter.] I perused his admirable speeches with eagerness to find the re-enforcement of a policy which I have here advocated. Alas! He was himself one of the lost sheep to which he referred so felicitously. Doubtless he made the Canadian protected wilderness resonant with his bleating.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], in "peeping" around for the one sheep he had lost and loved more than the ninety-nine who had not gone astray, must have been astonished to find that by leaving him alone he soon came home—with his little protection tail behind him. [Laughter.]

But what will gentleman do for the lost Norse lamb from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON]? He is still wandering. No one is looking for him. He has the range of the Northwestern pastures, and I think we need not mourn over him. [Laughter.] He belongs to the hardy race who are not afraid to syllable the words and ideas of commercial liberty. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Ohio is not ignorant of the elements of reciprocity; he knows their value; and he has upheld its banner. I am proud of his efforts. He applauds the zollverein of our own Union. He would extend it not merely by interchanges with Canada, but to the other Americas. But the moment he mounts his reciprocal charger and makes our continent the scene of his chivalric endeavor, he turns his back upon other continents.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Will my friend from New York yield to me for a moment?

Mr. COX. With much pleasure.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. If my friend had read my speech he would have found that my argument went to the effect that the protection system deals with conditions and not with boundary lines. It deals with the philosophy of economic politics without any reference whatever to geographical lines.

Mr. COX. Then, of course, if that is the definition, my friend is in favor of his philosophy being extended. It means to be reciprocal with Canada. If it be good philosophy for Canada, it is good philosophy to apply to Central America and South America and Mexico.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Undoubtedly, and wherever the conditions are the same. It is against the false conditions that destroy, where restrictions should apply and not against the locality. The gentleman will see——

Mr. COX. I get your idea.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. It is a good one, is it not? [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. Yes; but it is a little remote and nebulous. [Laughter and applause.] But I think I get it.

Mr. Chairman, I have not much charity for my friend from Ohio. I have for my friend from Nevada, for he does not know as much as my friend from Ohio. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Ohio is not ignorant of the conditions in regard to reciprocity. The same conditions would bring European countries here by the aid of the vapor of water and by the telegraph.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. If my friend will permit another interruption, I will ask that his time be extended.

Mr. COX. Well, do it now, so that I can be certain, so as to be courteous. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I will ask an extension of the time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended without limit, as I want to interrupt him for a moment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. I want to call my friend's attention——

Mr. BOOTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, while I would like to listen to the gentleman from New York all day, I must interpose an objection, as it is not just to other gentlemen in the limited time remaining.

Mr. COX. That settles it.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I beg my friend's pardon; the time has been extended, as I understand it.

In 1848 a measure for complete reciprocity passed this House without a dissenting voice, being voted for and supported both by Democrats and Republicans alike, the understanding being then that it in no wise trenched upon the protective system.

Mr. COX. I would like to be permitted to answer the gentleman.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I beg my friend's pardon. I did not know that there had been objection. [Cries of "Go on!".]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair of opinion that the objection came too late.

Mr. COX. I do not desire to continue if there is an objection. I dislike very much to take the time of other gentlemen.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Now permit me a moment.

Of course in this matter, and a part of my proposition was that, the tariff fence should be extended around Canada and extend the system along and around the border, they adopting the same tariff system as against the world, where different conditions prevail, should we not extend a hand to them?

Mr. COX. I give you my hand on that. [The gentlemen shook hands.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Then we are making progress at last.

Mr. COX. I am with the gentleman, and by the doctrine of Richard Cobden and his club, and the same doctrine of John Stuart Mill, and the same doctrine of Robert J. Walker and his tariff, I would advocate for Canada the liberality of our exchanges. I congratulate and welcome the honorable gentleman within the bosom of the good old reciprocity and revenue-reform party. [Applause.] And I will give out for him, before I get through, a hymn to sing that will warm his heart so as to make us thoroughly harmonious.

The gentleman from Ohio, who is a most erudite and eloquent gentleman, joined with the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SYMES], who is also both eloquent and learned—and, by the way, Colorado is a sort of English colony—in deprecating the Anglomania which leads members here to oppose the Tory protection party of England and Canada. I hope to see my friends' efforts bring fruit in reciprocity with Canada, and thus aid Ohio and Colorado and all of us; and such fruit that will give wealth, content, and cordiality for both countries, as Cobden and Chevalier did for England and France, and as Cobden and Robert J. Walker did for England and America when they shook hands across the Atlantic, the one by the tariff of 1846, and the other by the repeal of the corn laws. They thus gave a splendid aggrandizement to their respective countries.

OHIO AND THE SOUTH.

The picture the gentleman from Ohio drew from my native State is a proud record of the achievements of her people. During this centennial season it was peculiarly appropriate; but when it is considered that her prosperity is due in part to unequal laws, there is not so much pride in the comparison which he institutes between Ohio and the South. Why, let me ask, if these laws be equal—as tax laws should be in a common union—should these results be so diverse? Why boast of results which are the results of Federal disfavor to one section and favor to another? Is it fair that strength should forever aid the strong? Shall wrong hold sway forever? No, no; the gentleman following the vaticinations of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] sees the iron that is sleeping in the sunless chambers of the southern earth, awake, and through its agencies will yet bless the South beyond its fondest dreams.

The attempt of the gentleman from Ohio to excite indignation against Democrats who were in sympathy with the corn laws, of which Cobden was the leading champion, shows that he is not yet altogether in sympathy with the men who favored that repeal.

TORIES AND PROTECTIONISTS RUINED IRELAND.

That class of men for five centuries held England in its thrall, and, what was worse, mercilessly persecuted Ireland. They were protectionists of the most intense and grasping sort. It was while these Tories ruled that they destroyed the labor of Ireland by exactions and persecutions only equaled by the myrmidons of Cromwell. They not only confiscated like Cromwell, but they did worse. Their protection, like that of the wolf to the lamb, struck down the woolen and other industries of Ireland.

The gentleman therefore places himself in line with the spoilers of Ireland in the past centuries and with the Salisburys and the Balfours of the present. He is in sympathy with the long list of Tory ministers, from Lord North down, who harassed and plundered that "saddest isle of the sea." [Applause.]

He places himself in so far as he can in sympathy with a party of aristocrats who, under the reign of the Georges, and the worst of the Georges—George the Third—produced the revolution which gave us independence, and who, with allies like our Indians—those hell-hounds of savage war—and the mercenary Hessian, made the early struggles of our fathers a long conflict against all the barbaric cruelty of the Tory protectionists and landlords. He arrays himself against that Liberal party, from whom the Whigs of our Revolution received their name. That party was led by Chatham, Barré, and Burke in the defense of our colonies against Tory trade restrictions, taxation and tyranny. The old Federal party was recruited, after our Revolution, from the Tories. During the war of 1812 that same Federal element sustained England against the Madisonian Democracy. To-day, the present Tory administration is fighting the Liberals of England and Ireland, who have Gladstone and Parnell at their head. The Tories are protectionists. They drove the English people in 1846 as they are now driving the Irish by every menace to their freedom and their prosperity—to the very point of starvation and insurrection. [Applause.]

LESSONS OF THE CORN-LAW REPEAL.

There are lessons here quite pertinent to the pending bill and debate. I crave your indulgence for dwelling on them.

For five centuries England blundered in fostering industry by restricting exports and forbidding imports. Her statesmen, like the Lotus-eaters of Tennyson, listened listlessly to the—

> Chant of an ill-used race that cleave the soil,
> Storing their yearly little dues of wheat and wine and oil.

Her arousal came with a terrific revolution, producing clamors for bread and protests against starvation.

Up until 1846, when she began to reciprocate with us, the history of her corn laws is the history of a desperate struggle unexampled in our world.

Her first effort was to restrict the imports of foreign wheat, rye, barley, oats, and maize—different species of so-called "Corn"—so that she might have abundance and cheapness at home.

These early restrictions, from 1360 to 1688, were well intended. She was, during that period, an agricultural rather than a manufacturing country. She raised all the corn she consumed, and had a surplus. At that time any law against the importation of corn would have been inoperative. She was not then so foolish as to enact such laws.

We have upon our statutes some similar sops, quite as unsubstantial as they are insulting to our farmers.

But even with such legislation, she was hampering the natural force of her industry and trade. She was forming the habit of meddling and tinkering, by Parliamentary action, with the growth of her industries. She was raising up a favored class. Of course, it was done on the pretext of protection and patriotism, but it was done really for the aggrandizement of the rich landed proprietors. She built up great families and self-seeking monopolists; and this, sir, is our first lesson growing out of the corn laws. Strike out the words "agricultural monopolists," and insert "manufacturing monopolists," and leave the word "protection" stand, and you have the same combination here that throttled both commerce and agriculture there. It compelled the people to pay tribute to the lords of the land. [Applause.] In other words, it put money into the pockets of the few by crippling and destroying the industries of the many.

Then came another era of class government. It was that of an internal protective system. It was a system of bounties and penalties—bounties to the rich and penalties upon the poor, forbidding the purchase of corn in one market in order to dispose of it in another. It crowded out the middle men. The only result was one which ever follows the intermeddling of law with the natural course of trade—stagnation and decay.

More than one hundred years ago, contemporaneous with our own struggle for independence, these internal restrictions were effaced from English law. The protective system failed and free trade was established, but only within the circuit of the country's borders. In our Union we copied something from this example. Bounties were simply the price which the people paid for the lush growth of unremunerative labor. What the operatives of England paid for so many years to agriculture and its "splendid paupers," agriculture in this country has paid to the lords of the loom and the forge, who have been inspired with the same grasping avarice in their demand for enormous duties on manufactured articles.

It is not necessary, in drawing these lessons from English legislation, that I should discuss the justice of giving a bounty to one person or one class for encouragement and not to another. Absolute justice requires a bounty or a subsidy to every one, and when that paradisical epoch arrives there is a bounty to no one! If my neighbor pay a bounty to me equal to that which I pay to him, there is no benefit to any one, except to the tax-gatherer.

PROHIBITION OF CORN IN ENGLAND.

A hundred years ago the manufacturing and commercial interests of England began to arise with greater strength. New avenues of wealth opened from the colonies. The nation received an impulse of prosperity. The consumption of corn increased and prices rose correspondingly. Then began the prohibition of grain importation. The agricultural monopolists fancied that they were floating serenely upon the bosom of a Pactolus whose very sands were gold. They were deceived, just as the protectionists in this age and country deceive themselves. Corn laws began to appear in all the variety of their manipulations to outwit the natural laws of trade. Food became dear, but dear food did not bring high wages. Riots became common. Labor was ground down between the upper and nether mill-stone of protection. Then began a most terrific era in England. It had all the agonies of a tragedy.

Gaunt famine, like a skeleton, invaded laborers and tenants, even upon the very farms whence came the rich livings of the titled landlords. Wages declined, rents advanced, and wealth became more and more inequitably distributed. The rich grew richer and the poor poorer. Then came on the struggle which gave presage of relief. The landed interests were still dominant. The hungry population resented their exactions with a fury born of despair and death. Parliament was menaced. Cordons of the military surrounded St. Stephen's

CORN-LAW REPEALERS.

During this night of British gloom the protectionists of England were callous to every appeal and every interest of human life. Starvation has a wild logic of its own. Brave men arose. They questioned with stern and pitiless inquisition the legislation which taxed bread. The scales fell from their long-abused sight. Little legislative makeshifts were used to palliate the consummate evil and postpone the dreaded crisis. In vain the great families, led by the Duke of Wellington, who, like Brennus, threw his sword into the scale, attempted to withstand the current.

LEADERS OF THE PEOPLE AGAINST TORIES, ARISTOCRATS, AND PROTECTIONISTS.

Who led this warfare for the poor against the rich? Who gave it oratory, and dialectics, and song? Who voiced the disasters and cried aloud for the reform, for the repeal of these cruel laws? Chief among those who vindicated the rights of the poor against monopoly in this legislative war, in which he never rested for years, was Mr. Villiers, of Wolverhampton. He is an old, old man now. They have erected a monument to his memory, even in his life. I place his name before that of others, not less brave but more laggard, under whose leadership the repeal was consummated.

When that distinguished statesman, Sir Robert Peel, was denounced by his party in the Commons for the act of repeal he cried out defiantly, and yet how tenderly and proudly:

I shall leave a name execrated by every monopolist who, from less honorable motives, clamors for protection because it conduces to his own individual benefit; but it may be that I shall leave a name sometimes remembered with expressions of good-will in the abodes of those whose lot it is to labor, and to earn their daily bread by the sweat of their brow, when they shall recruit their exhausted strength with abundant and untaxed food, the sweeter because it is no longer leavened by the sense of injustice.

There were other men who championed the demand of the people for the "cheap loaf," and whose names are handed down honorably among the poor of England, whose "untaxed food was all the sweeter because it was no longer leavened by the sense of injustice."

OTHER CHAMPIONS IN AMERICA AND ENGLAND.

In the long roll of these worthies, champions too of anti-slavery in America as well as England, are Cobbett, Prentice, W. J. Fox, Hume, Potter, Dr. Bowring, Sumner, Beecher, Garrison, Phillips, and others. But why make the catalogue? That night of English wrong was set thick with stars—a whole constellation. Cobden among them was shining resplendently as a star of the first magnitude. [Applause.] Cobden was not a nobleman. He was not an hereditary legislator. He was born of the people. He was the son of a yeoman. He was brought up to trade. It was his business training, together with observation abroad, while a partner in a Manchester cotton-mill, that made him so cogent in debate and so simple and earnest in his devotion to the cause of the people and to the "cheap loaf." [Applause.]

EULOGY OF COBDEN, FRIEND OF AMERICA.

Mr. Chairman, I should be derelict as a member of Congress, or as a citizen of the United States, if I did not, even in this feeble way, vindicate the splendid fame of Richard Cobden. He was not merely a friend of the poor when they needed friends, but he was a distinguished economist when economy was thundered from the hustings for the relief of the starving. More than all these, by his speeches, writings, diplomacy, and parliamentary efforts, he has done more than any other Englishman to hold up the institutions of our own country, not merely for the indulgence of mankind, but for their imitation and admiration. Nor were the encomiums which he bestowed upon our country born of a mercenary or trading spirit. He had a genuine love for America. He twice visited us. He denounced those who had depreciated our character and slandered our people.

In a volume of his writings, which I have in my hand, there is a comparison between Great Britain and America. With what fervor he turns to the industrial, economical, and foreign peaceful policies of America, while with the live coal of a seer on his lip he bids at distance our future, Hail! He does this with a pride which knows no selfishness and with a humanity that regards no isolation. England and America were, in his view, bound together in peaceful fetters with the strongest of all ligatures that can bind two nations—commercial interests and the destiny of representative governments. [Applause.] He took pride in the discharge of our public debt. Though he found in America a rival with his own country and analyzed the disadvantages of the position of England in comparison with America, he saw in the unlimited extent of our unsettled territory a means of employing capital and labor with which the little isles of Great Britain would in vain strive to compete.

He was not insensible to the fact that the Englishman was a born aristocrat, with an insatiable love of caste, which he said pervaded every degree from the highest to the lowest; but he believed that in the course of time such changes would come through education and suffrage as to bring England upon the roster of genuine republican states. Every reform that England has made in the interests of her people, and for her colonial advancement, found Richard Cobden its friend and his gifted speech its ally. And it comes with an ill grace from an American, whether native or adopted, to blur the escutcheon of this champion of America and this honest friend of the people. [Applause.]

I had the honor of being on the committee which welcomed Cobden to America. He visited this Hall. He was received with as much if not more welcome from the Republican than from the Democratic side of the Chamber. No one made his name a reproach, for he had been the friend of our Union. He had been the companion of John Bright, the Quaker manufacturer of Birmingham, in denouncing with resonant eloquence and virile logic the infamies of protection.

I must beg my Irish friends to remember that Daniel O'Connell spoke for the repeal as the friend of the English and Irish people. Speaking at Manchester, he demanded to know "why, if the corn laws are good to rescue a people from wretchedness, they do not rescue the people of Ireland? If these protective laws give employment and high wages," said he, "why do they not give them in agricultural Ireland?" Subsequently, in demanding to know what the corn laws were for, he answered his own question by saying, "to put money into the pockets of the landlords—not the money of the Russians, the Danes, or the Swedes, but that of their fellow-countrymen."

POETRY OF THE REPEALERS.

Seconding these efforts of the tribunes of the people came the blacksmith poet, Ebenezer Elliott, and the "Voices from the Crowd," by Charles Mackay. These corn-law rhymes not only denounced the exactions by which bread was made dear to the people, but they looked forward to that influx of grain from the new hemisphere—America—by which the loaf would be cheapened and the people saved from starvation.

These men disdained any compromise. They moved on to victory; they found the realm of England in discrowned and hunger-ridden anarchy. The time was "ripe, and rotten-ripe," for change.

RESULTS OF THE REPEAL.

They gave it comparative quiet and prosperity, and progress followed the victory. More than that, so far as America was concerned they gave us lessons by which we were mutually bound and by which our values were immensely enhanced. The Democracy of the United States reciprocated. In the interest of the people of both nations a great benefaction fell like manna in a wilderness of selfishness. [Applause.] The event justifies the truth that nature, in her overflowing goodness, had provision against scarcity and famine; so that when crops fail in a small area like Great Britain, or are insufficient to supply her needs, there is lavish abundance and a surplus in other lands, in the valleys of the Mississippi and its tributary streams. The law to which Virgil referred two thousand years ago as the "eternal federation" by which Rome grew great, is the same law in modern days. Progress has given to the phrase a miraculous meaning, for it multiplied the loaf for the multitude. The result here was not merely a home market for home product, but the widest extent of surface for production in our own land, causing less danger of scarcity and an abundance of the necessaries and conveniences of life for importation abroad.

The repeal of the corn laws and the tariff of 1846 was the consecrated protest of benevolent legislation. They vindicated the providence of the All-loving Father, whereby the excess of one land and its opulent harvests, and the diversified labor of the people of all countries compensate for the deficiencies of each other.

The same arguments which are used to-day by the protectionists here were used by the protectionists in England to prevent the repeal of the corn laws. The old story of the home market, and especially in the contingency of foreign war and the dependence upon another country for supplies was used in the Parliament of England just as now in the Congress of the United States. They were used in vain. England could no more be independent of foreign supply for her bread than America could be independent of England in the sale of her grain and cotton.

The fruitfulness of labor was increased, toil itself was mitigated, misfortunes were avoided, and the benefits of the repeal, through international dependence and reciprocity, gave a new impulse to both countries. It opened a market for English goods here, while it enlarged our market for our product abroad. It did not injure either country. It aided both beyond all the dreams of avarice.

During the twenty years preceding 1849 the exports of British and Irish productions had increased 33½ per cent. for each decade. From 1849 to 1859 the increase was 105 per cent. It is fair to presume that by 1859 English industry had become adjusted to the new conditions. Nevertheless, for the period up to the Franco-Prussian war there was an increase of exports of 45 per cent. The value of the exports per capita in 1849 was $10.93; in 1859 it had more than doubled, being $22.11. In 1869 it had risen to $29.79. In 1878, under a high tariff, while we Americans were making great boasts of our exports, their

value per capita was only $12. Nor have the working people of England been routed out of the mills by foreign pauper labor. In cotton manufacture the number of hands employed increased from 330,924 in 1850 to 479,512 in 1874. The woolen trade for the same period nearly doubled its force. So also the flax industry.

INTERDEPENDENCY OF NATIONS.

God never made an independent man nor allowed an independent nation. Men and nations must lean upon each other. The very variety of the growth of nations with the staple of every soil make it the duty of legislators to exclude monopoly from the family of nations as selfishness from the family of individuals.

BENEFICENCE OF THE TARIFF OF 1846.

There never was a tariff during whose continuance there was so much advancement in all that makes up the wealth of nations as our low tariff of 1846. Under its provisions farmers got better prices for wheat, grain, wool, etc., than they have averaged under the present tariff. Manufactures multiplied more rapidly, farm values increased much faster, and all of our people had full employment. During that period, from 1850 to 1860–'61, a tramp was as unknown as a "trust," a strike had no place in our political lexicon, the word "lockout" was infrequent, and the word "boycott" was not known. There were no conflicts between capital and labor. The country became harmonious so far as its policy was concerned, because it was just.

It has been said, ignorantly, that Robert J. Walker changed his views before he died as to the policy of the tariff measure so honorably associated with his name. I knew Governor Walker when he was Secretary of the Treasury, and intimately. As our Globe-RECORD shows, when he was made governor of Kansas, I followed his judgment in the crisis of Kansas and the Lecompton constitution. He was a man of remarkable genius for administration. His mind was in inverse proportion to his body. I had occasion to know that he never deviated from the doctrine of his great report on revenues of 1846. To make this assurance of record here I refer to a pamphlet letter of his handed to me by his son, General Duncan S. Walker, dated November 30, 1867, after the war, and after comparison could be made between his system of 1846 and the high tariffs of 1861 and subsequently. This pamphlet was a defense of our resources to enhance our credit; a plea for the reduction of our taxes and the disbanding of our army of tax-gatherers. He would have reduced our revenue to $244,000,000 a year, and have derived it from three sources—a tariff for revenue, an excise on wines, malt and spirituous liquors, and tobacco, and a tax on our national banks.

I print here what I may hereafter allude to more at length, namely, his résumé of our experience with his tariff for revenue:

> Under the tariff of 1846, as shown by the census, our wealth increased from 1850 to 1860, 126.45 per cent., whereas, from 1840 to 1850, the increase was only 64 per cent.; from 1830 to 1840, 42 per cent.; and from 1820 to 1830, 41 per cent. So also, from 1850 to 1860 our agricultural products increased 95 per cent., and our manufactures 87 per cent., being in both cases nearly double any preceding ratio of increase. So also, our exports, imports, and revenue nearly tripled in the same period of time, and our domestic trade rose nearly in the same ratio. This augmented ratio is not the result of increase of population, which, from 1850 to 1860, was less than 36 per cent. The Irish famine was supposed by my opponents to account for the increase the first year, although the decreased price paid abroad that year for our cotton nearly equaled the additional sum paid by England for our breadstuffs and provisions. But the next year and the next, before any gold had reached here from California, our exports and revenue went on augmenting in a corresponding ratio, rising in eight years from $22,000,000, under the tariff of 1842, to $64,000,000 under the tariff of 1846.

These results were wonderful, and our Committee on Ways and Means have considered under these lights this remarkable policy, ad valorem and all, in the framing of their measure. It was a novelty to kings and oligarchies. It exacted the largest duty from capital and the least from labor, and therefore it should have remained, at least in principle, for all the emergencies of our Republic.

A SCOTCHMAN'S HOROSCOPE—OUR FINANCIAL SUICIDE.

In glancing at the cold statement in McCulloch's Commercial Dictionary, under the head of "New York," I find from that frigid Scotchman and statist thus summing up of the effect of the great commercial reform during the administration of Sir Robert Peel:

> He says that the last and greatest of all changes was the change in the corn laws. It had a powerful influence in the United States. Mr. Polk's Government having free trade by these and other circumstances succeeded in carrying a comparatively liberal tariff, to take effect from first of December, 1846; and this tariff kept its ground until 1857, when it was superseded by a still more liberal one. But the downfall of the tariff by which it was carried was quickly followed by a reimposition of high duties by the act of Congress of March 2, 1861, and this again by the outbreak of the civil war.

But—

Adds the great Scotchman—

> the bulk of the American people have never been supposed to be blind or indifferent to their own necessities; and these they may be assured will be best promoted by reverting to, as soon as possible, and maintaining a system which enables them to sell in the dearest and to buy in the cheapest markets. If they retain high duties, *they will fall wholly on themselves and on no one else, and the less they buy from foreigners the less they will be able to export to them.*

In other words, as I have often preached in this House, we can not continue to sell our surplus, which is growing every day by reason of our increasing army of labor, unless we buy from others. A one-sided arrangement leads to impoverishment, overproduction for home needs, and consequent mortgages and bankruptcy.

Mark the words which I cite from this cold statistician. He warns us that to retain high duties they will fall wholly upon ourselves, and on no one else.

Or, since gentlemen prefer figures of poetry to figures of arithmetic, I might well apply the metaphor of Byron about the struck eagle stretched upon the plain, who viewed his own feather on the fatal dart, winged against the shaft that quivered in his heart. [Applause.]

Indeed, sir, we are already feeling the pangs of the wound that we ourselves have made; but it is all the keener to feel them when we reflect that we have furnished the pinion which impelled the steel, and that the very plumage which had warmed our eagle's nest drinks the life drop of his bleeding breast.

RECIPROCAL PROSPERITY.

England grew rich and America prospered by reciprocity. And when this reciprocity was broken on our part by inordinate tariffs, we failed proportionately, and the history of our tariff, shown in this debate, illustrates the fact that our tariffs, when they are low, give advantages and advancement. When they are high it is otherwise.

Patriotism and economy are not convertible terms. Economy means the law of the house, the law of supply and demand. It means cash and credit, not a banner nor a border.

Every people must trade abroad. Every individual is dependent upon some other. If he be a luxurious man, he must have jewels from Golconda polished in Amsterdam. His delicate neckerchief must tie him to the loom of Jacquard. The spices to stimulate his appetite come from the ancient seats of Oriental power. His cigar is from Cuba and Manila; his coffee from Arabia, Java, and Brazil. China gives him tea, and Cuba sugar. He will have his clothes, in spite of laws, out of the broadcloth of France and England, and his wife her dresses, of silk and satin, from Lyons, provided always they are offered on better terms; while for the man who is not a *bon vivant* or a rich man, the sail and steam of traffic is in perpetual unrest to relieve his burdens, cheapen his comforts, and provide his necessaries.

Therefore liberal policies as to trade, while in our country always contemplating a revenue for an economic administration of the Government, should enlarge the area of trade and stimulate labor unto richer harvests.

No man with a particle of reasoning in his composition can say that abundance with a large market is a curse, or scarcity with a narrow market a blessing.

The elements of England which overcame the willful obstinacy of Anglo-Saxon legislators brought mankind together and gave to the producer of corn in America his splendid market and its quick returns by steam and telegraph, and to the daily toilers of England it answered our Lord's prayer for their "daily bread."

Great Britain was forced to abandon her extreme protective policy only when the country was brought to the verge of bankruptcy, starvation, and revolution. Her protectionists, as early as 1842, made the same arguments as those made in this House by our protectionists. They predicted that the reduction of the British tariff would shake the social relations of the country to their very foundations, subvert the whole system of society, lower wages, throw great quantities of land out of cultivation, render it impossible for the government to raise taxes, and reduce the laborer to a lower scale in life. Nothing of the kind happened.

THE ENGLISH FLAG ON THE SEA.

Among other predictions were those of Disraeli and other Tories that the ship-building of Great Britain would vanish, but never in all history has there been seen such a stupendous result as that which followed the repeal of restrictions on her ships. Her shipping rose from 3,400,000 tons in 1848 to over 8,000,000 tons in 1883, and it is still rising, while we have lost all of our foreign shipping.

OUR OCEAN TONNAGE LOST.

It is the saddest of our experiences as a nation that our flag under navigation laws that will not let us buy, and our tariff laws that will not let us build, has ceased to kiss the breezes of other than our inland and coasting trades.

> Dies iræ, dies illa,
> Solvet sæclum in favilla.

The degradation of our commerce is like the obscuration of a star in the sky. It is not a partial, but a total eclipse, a lost Pleiad without even the phantasy of a nebulous cloud to reassure us of the return of our days of commercial glory on the sea.

A PICTURE OF PROSPERITY.

In 1841, when Sir Robert Peel took office, there was no interest, manufacturing or otherwise, that was not depressed, no property that was not depreciated, no seaport in which ships were not rotting at the wharf, no agricultural labor that was not working on starvation wages and parochial relief; the revenue was insufficient to meet the national expenses and bankruptcy menaced the country. All at once, as by some enchanter's wand, agriculture became prosperous, rents were increased, manufactures and employment were extended, wages were raised, the revenue was enhanced, property was improved, and taxation was lessened. Every successive movement in the ameliora-

tion of the tariff of Great Britain up to and after the repealing act of 1846 showed advancement in all the elements that make up the happiness and wealth of nations. [Applause.]

THE FARMING INTERESTS.

It is easily shown that not more than 5 per cent. of the labor of the country is affected by our present tariff in the way of protection. Other members have shown the relation which the agriculturist bears to the tariff, and they have shown that he is not protected at all. But, on the other hand, he is at the mercy of other countries, with their cheap forms of labor. He must sell his crops at prices fixed by the pauper labor, not only of Europe, but of Asia and Africa, since the price of wheat in this country is regulated by the price in the European markets. The whole world contributes its supplies to those markets, and the peasants of Russia, Hungary, and India, with their cheaper labor, are rivals of our farmers. Therefore, our farmers are in direct competition with the cheapest labor in the world.

The Indian fellah, with his 6 pence a day for his labor, and the Russian serf, with something less, compete with our farmer, whose product is subject, in addition to a charge for transportation through inland to seaboard and three thousand miles of water besides, to the markets which fix the prices of his stuffs. When you consider that, in addition to all this, he has to pay the tariff-increased price for every protected article he buys, you can well understand what the protective system does for him. It throttles him. It paralyzes the four million of farmers who are and should be the mainstay of the country. It is no exaggeration, perhaps, when one of our humorists in Georgia wags his funny tongue about the infant industry that gets its slice of bounty, and "takes a powerful long time to get grown." [Laughter.]

When a man—

Says he—

goes to one of these manufacturing cities he finds everybody strutting around, and the banks full of money, and the land worth $200 a front foot; but just let Congress talk about reducing the tariff, and they scrouge up and pull a small bottle from under their coat tails and cry out, "I am an infant—a poor little infant! Ain't you gwine to protect me? Are you gwine to take away my pap and leave me an orfen?"

[Laughter.]

Another one of our humorists in writing of and from the great West intimates that the farmer has the priceless boon of liberty. But it is liberty to pay war prices for everything he wants, and to sell his crops for less and less year after year; liberty to pay big prices for machinery, help, clothing, and everything else he buys, and to ride into town on a December day, accompanied by the cold remains of an assassinated hog, and then to be told that pork had gone down to 4 cents! He properly regarded such a ride, in the society of a hog that died by one's own hand, as depressing. And yet it was that same animal that had been loved so well in infancy, hid down in the cellar so you could not hear him squeal when he was killed, and which the farmer afterwards helped to scrape with a case-knife, so that even in death he would be a source of pride. He *is* depressed by the thought that all of that hog is swallowed up by the price of the protected frock he hoped to carry home to his wife.

Mr. Chairman, I am not yet alarmed at the India competition in wheat, with which we are threatened. Our Department of Agriculture in its Report No. 46, November, 1887, has a paper which is calculated to allay any present alarm on this subject, even in spite of the increased importation. Nor do I care to discuss at the present time the varying prices of our wheat and other grain stuffs, or the ample surplus that under every circumstance and condition we have for exportation. Our prices have been remunerative and the quantities enormous.

A table which I have before me will show that from 1872 to 1886 the United States has furnished in grain and flour 51.10 per cent. more than one-half of the whole of the wheat surplus of the world, that is absorbed by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.

The largest national product since 1874 is annually harvested in our country. France stands in the second rank, but imports more than she exports. India comes third, and Russia occupies the fourth rank The table will show the various relative proportions.

My chief object in referring to these matters now is to show the impulse which was given to the accrued product of our soil by the repeal of the corn laws and the enactment of the tariff of 1846.

EXPORTS OF CORN AND COTTON BEFORE AND AFTER RECIPROCITY.

In a table which I have prepared I have taken the exports of wheat and corn alone, including flour and meal. I have tabulated them in five-year periods.

In 1830, at the end of the five years, we exported over 23,000,000 bushels of wheat, and more than 6,500,000 bushels of corn.

These exports grew in half-decennial periods, until in 1845, preceding the great reciprocity treaty between Great Britain and the United States, when the wheat export was over 34,000,000, and the corn about 8,000,000.

Now mark, sir, the marvelous increase which, in spite of the Tories of England and their allies here, resulted from the liberalities of Cobden and his allies of the Corn Law League.

The five years ending in 1850 show our wheat export at over 71,500,000 bushels, and our corn nearly 54,000,000. So that almost at once, compared with the five years ending in 1845, we more than doubled our wheat exportation and had more than six times as much of corn exportation. Since 1850 the figures are still more marvelous. So that at the end of the five years ending in 1885 our exported wheat amounted to 608,000,000 bushels and our corn to nearly 279,000,000 of bushels. And since that time the stupendous energy of our soil and enterprise of our farmers can be traced directly to the liberalities of interchange championed by the Cobdens of England. Is it for this great benefaction to the teeming West, with its fat glebe and stalwart farmers, that these men of 1846 are reproached by their Tory allies in America?

It is also as true with respect to the production and export of cotton as with respect to the exportation of grain. A grand impulse was given to that staple by the reciprocal laws of 1846.

Going back to 1830, when our annual production was only 1,000,000 bales and our exportation 772,000, we find that after 1848–'49 we had 2,808,000 production and 2,226,000 exportation, while during the last year our production was 6,500,000 bales and our exportation 4,500,000!

Here is to be found the wealth of our magnificent soil, whose surplus has enabled us not only to pay off our great indebtedness, but, under hampered conditions and in spite of the restrictions of our tariffs, most unnaturally exacting and cruel, to assume among the powers of the earth the station that we to-day occupy.

It would seem that there is no argument that can be made from our authentic statistics cogent enough to persuade the selfishness of some men even into the indulgence of self-love. Self-love has been defined as that which would lead a man to eat his own dinner and allow his neighbor to eat his, while selfishness is defined to be the appetite of a man for his own dinner and a desire to eat that of his neighbor.

THE AD ABSURDUM.

It would be a very difficult task to persuade men who are selfish to indulge in self-love, much less in disinterestedness. Perhaps the most cogent reasoning upon this subject would be after the manner of our humorists, known as the *ad absurdam*, which Aristotle ranks among the best rudiments of logic.

We have a humorist known as "Bill Nye." I was about to read for your relief his description, exaggerated somewhat, of the farmer's life out West. I forbear.

A MEMBER. Give it to us.

Mr. COX. I will print it, as good reading on a dry topic. This clever writer has been acting as a rural gentleman. He has ideas of stock-growing, garden-sauce, and other home-spun matters about farming in the West. I quote:

"Well, farmin' is like runnin' a paper in regards to some things. Every feller in the world will take and turn in and tell you how to do it, even if he don't know a blame thing about it. There ain't a man in the United States to-day that don't secretly think he could run airy one if his other business busted on him, whether he knows the difference between a new milch cow and a horse hay-rake or not. We had one of these embroidered night-shirt farmers come from town better'n three years ago. Been a toilet-soap man and done well, and so he came out and bought a farm that had nothing to it but a fancy house and barn, a lot of medder in the front yard, and a southern aspect. The farm was no good. You couldn't raise a disturbance on it. Well, what does he do? Goes and gits a passle of slim-tailed yeller cows from New Jersey, and aims to handle cream and diversified farming. Last year the cuss sent a load of cream over and tried to sell it at the new crematory while the funeral and hollercost was goin' on. I may be a sort of a chump myself, but I read my paper and don't get left like that."

"What are the prospects for farmers in your State?"

"Well, they are pore. Never was so pore, in fact, sence I've been there. Folks wonder why boys leaves the farm. My boys left so as to get protected, they said, and so they went into a clothing store, one of 'em, and one went into hardware, and one is talkin' protection in the Legislature this winter. They said that farmin' was gittin' to be like fishin' and huntin', well enough for a man that has means and leisure, but they couldn't make a livin' at it, they said. Another boy is in a drug store, and the man that hires him says he is a royal feller."

"Kind of a castor royal feller," I said, with a shriek of laughter.

He waited until I had laughed all I wanted to, and then he said:

"I've always hollered for high tariff in order to hyst the public debt, but now that we've got the national debt coopered, I wish they'd take a little back at mine. I've put in fifty years farmin'. I never drank licker in any form. I've worked from ten to eighteen hours a day; been economical in cloze and never went to a show more'n a dozen times in my life; raised a family and learned upwards of two hundred calves to drink out of a tin pail without blowing all their vittles up my sleeve. My wife worked alongside o' me sewin' new seats on the boys' pants, skimmin' milk, and even helpin' me load hay.

"For forty years we toiled along together and hardly got time to look into each other's faces or dared to stop and get acquainted with each other. Then her health ailed. Ketched cold in the spring-house, prob'ly skimmin' milk and washin' pans and scaldin' pails and spankin' butter. Anyhow, she took in a long breath one day while the doctor and me was watchin' her, and she says to me, 'Henry,' says she, 'I've got a chance to rest,' and she put one tired, wore-out hand on top of the other tired, wore-out hand, and I knew she'd gone where they don't work all day and do chores all night.

"I took time to kiss her then. I'd been too busy for a good while previous to that, and then I called in the boys. After the funeral it was too much for them to stay around and eat the kind of cookin' we had to put up with, and nobody spoke up around the house as we used to. The boys quit whistlin' around the barn and talked kind of low by themselves about going' to town and gettin' a job.

"They're all gone now, and the snow is four feet deep on mother's grave up there in the old berryin' ground."

Then both of us looked out of the car window quite a long time without saying anything.

"I don't blame the boys for going into something else, long's other things pays better; but I say—and I say what I know—that the man who holds the prosperity of this country in his hands, the man that actually makes money for other people to spend, the man that eats three good, simple, square meals a day and goes to bed at 9 o'clock, so that future generations with good blood and

cool brains can go from his farm to the Senate and Congress and the White House—he is the man that gets left at last to run his farm, with nobody to help him but a hired man and a high protective tariff.

"The farms in our State are mortgaged for over $700,000,000. Ten of our Western States—I see by the papers—have got about three billion and a half mortgages on their farms, and that don't count the chattel mortgages filed with town clerks on farm machinery, stock, wagons, and even crops, by gosh! that ain't two inches high under the snow. That's what the prospects is for farms now. The Government is rich, but the men that made it, the men that fought perarie fires and perarie wolves and Injuns and potato-bugs and blizzards, and has paid the war debt and pensions and everything else, and hollered for the Union and Republican party and high tariff and anything else that they was told to, is left high and dry this cold winter with a mortgage of $7,500,000,000 on the farms they have carned and saved a thousand times over."

Yes; but look at the glory of sending from the farm the future President, the future Senator, and the future member of Congress.

That looks well on paper, but what does it really amount to? Soon as a farmer boy gits in a place like that he forgets the soil that produced him and holds his head as high as a hollyhock. He bellers for protection to everybody but the farmer, and while he sails round in a highty-tighty room with a fire in it night and day, his father on the farm has to kindle his own fire in the morning with elm slivers and has to wear his son's lawn-tennis suit next to him or freeze to death, and he has to milk in an old gray shawl that has held that member of Congress when he was a baby, by gorry! and the old lady has to sojourn through the winter in the flannels that Silas wore at the riggatter before he went to Congress.

So I say, and I think that Congress agrees with me, Damn a farmer, anyhow!

Suppose, Mr. Chairman, we should strike out all after the enacting clause of this bill and pass an amendment to tax all that the farmer produces. Would it not compel our manufacturer to pay the foreign price of it, and the tariff of 40 or 50 per cent. besides? Perhaps this would benefit the farmer. But how would it operate as to the manufacturer and the rest of the people? And where is the difference between such a tariff and the present one, except this, that the farmer's ox is now gored, and in the other case it would be the ox of the manufacturer? [Applause.]

CORN-LAW REPEAL POETRY.

I am sure the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH], who joined his eloquent voice in the denunciation of the Cobdenites and the Democracy, must have observed how Tory protection was impoverishing and decimating the Canadian Dominion for the lack of reciprocity. He must have observed the need of just such poetry for the North as the gentleman from Michigan quoted so exultantly in the conclusion of his speech for the South.

By way of reciprocity, also, I would give the gentleman from Ohio a little gem which he can quote with reference to protection anent the fish question, that he saw illustrated in Canada, and which is but a faint copy of what we have in this country.

One of our own native singers, known as the "Sweet Singer of Michigan," has given us a touching ode about the alligator. I commend it to the gentleman from Ohio, who has been studying the fish question in Canada:

How cheerfully he seems to grin,
How neatly spreads his claws,
And welcomes little fishes in
With gently smiling jaws!

[Laughter.]

CORDEN AND HIS CLUB SYMPATHIZERS WITH OUR UNION.

It must not be forgotten that the men who founded the Cobden Club were the men who, through the darkest hours of our own civil conflict were, in and out of Parliament, devoted to our Union. It was this "School of Manchester" that prevented the English cabinet from joining with the French Emperor in recognizing the Southern Confederacy and breaking the blockade. What ingrates, therefore, are these Republican lovers of the Union who join the Tories to attack the Cobden Club. These Cobden promoters of interchanges, by which both countries were benefited and neither injured, or who, in the language of General Garfield in this House, desired a point of stable equilibrium upon our tariff, with a rate not so high as to keep foreign producers altogether out of our markets or to stimulate the unnatural growth of manufactures, but who, protective step by step, reach forward to the goal of free trade—these are the men who are the object of these tirades, in order to prejudice the ignorant against the liberal tariff reformers of our country.

LEADING REPUBLICANS; REVENUE REFORMERS.

Why should you Republican gentlemen be so indignant that members upon this side are members of the Cobden Club? If Cobden and his club favor a tariff for revenue, without the burdens which belong to a protective system, it only shows how sensible Cobden and the club were and are. Have not some of your best men favored such ideas? Has it not been proven in this debate that such Republican leaders as President Garfield, Mr. Blaine, and others who were their lieutenants and subordinates, were marching in the same direction? It matters not whether they belonged to an English club or not. It matters more what their sentiments were upon this theme. It proves nothing; but it is an *ad hominem*, and an estoppel upon your bravado. I challenge the other side to deny what I assert to be the truth, that the Forty-second Congress, which elected Mr. Blaine its Speaker, was organized on a liberal and not upon a protective basis. It ill becomes those who sustained Garfield and Blaine to call us to an account for the same ideas to which those Republican leaders gave their adhesion.

I now assert that Blaine virtually made a bargain with the revenue reformers shortly before his second election to the Speakership. It was to this effect: that if they would not interfere with him in that election he would give them a majority of the Committee on Ways and Means of the Forty-second Congress. [Applause.]

This compact was made—

Writes a gentleman who knows the fact—

and entered into at the Fifth Avenue Hotel during one of our revenue-reform meetings. Mr. Blaine—

He says—

was not at the meeting, but he was at the hotel, and he came there because the meeting was to be held there, as he told me at the time. He said, further, that he came expressly to see us. We wer all good Republicans then. It was in our power to make "Jordan a hard road to travel" for any candidate for Speaker against whom we should unite. We had not thought of uniting against Mr. Blaine, but we had thought of taking steps to give revenue reform a push in the House, and naturally the Speakership was the place to begin. Mr. Blaine knew that the meeting was to be held, and he came or "happened in" just at the right time, but, as I have said, did not come to the meeting.

He sent for me and asked us what we wanted. I told him that we wanted some tariff-reform legislation, and to that end we wanted a Committee on Ways and Means that could be depended upon. He said that he had always treated us fairly—

[Laughter]—

and that he would do so still, but he could not give us the chairman. He did not say in so many words that he would give us a majority of the committee, but since the only way to get any reform legislation was by having a majority, we understood that "treating us fairly" meant that precise thing, but that the other side would have the chairman. Otherwise we should have carried out our original intention of selecting a Western candidate for Speaker and supporting him with all the votes and influence we could command.

When Congress met Mr. Blaine was chosen without opposition. A few days later, and long before the committees were appointed, EUGENE HALE introduced his bills to repeal the duty on salt and coal. The latter was, I believe, turned over to General Farnsworth, HALE agreeing to support it. The debate and the vote you remember very well, because you took a lively hand in it. Both bills passed by two-thirds majority, as I recollect.

This was at the short (first) session of the Forty-second Congress, beginning March 4, 1871. At the beginning of the second session the committees were announced, and, sure enough, Mr. Blaine had given us a majority, five of our men to four of the other side. Mr. Burchard, of Illinois, was put on, at my suggestion, as a Republican revenue-reformer who could be relied upon. Mr. Finkelnburg, of Missouri, was put on at Mr. GROSVENOR'S suggestion.

When the protectionists began to complain that they had been betrayed, Mr. Blaine's answer was, that he was the organ of the House and not of his own private views, whatever they might be; that the House had voted by very large majorities for the repeal of duties on coal and salt, and that he considered that an instruction to him to make the Committee of Ways and Means in harmony with those votes. This was really unanswerable, but if Mr. KELLEY and his following in the House had known what had gone before, what had taken place at the Fifth Avenue Hotel, they would not have been so easily appeased.

[Laughter.]

We, who knew about the Fifth Avenue Hotel conference, always believed that Mr. Blaine put Mr. HALE forward to introduce the salt and coal bills in order that he might afterwards say to Mr. KELLEY and the high-tariff, that the House had instructed him, etc. It is certain that Blaine helped all he could to get the bills passed. General John F. Farnsworth can testify fully on that point.

That distinguished statesman and soldier I saw here a moment ago.

A MEMBER. He is here.

Mr. COX. I am happy to have his presence to set at rest this matter. I doubt not he will confirm my statement and that of the other gentleman, my correspondent. [General Farnsworth bows acquiescence.] [Applause.] The gentleman bows his assent. The committee as constituted at that time had a liberal chairman, whose speeches indicate his tendency. But outside of the chairman, Mr. DAWES, of Massachusetts, there were three Democrats, Brooks, Kerr, and BECK, and two Republicans—Burchard and Finkelnburg, who gave a majority in favor of the reduction of the tariff according to the policy laid down by such advanced thinkers as Garfield, ALLISON, Logan, and others.

Now, sir, with what sort of grace and with what abundant arrogance these gentlemen, who are now arraying themselves with the relict feathers of the "Plumed Knight," sent from Paris and Florence, and saluting him as the great vindicator of protection against the heresies of President Cleveland—can these gentlemen from Maine and other States thrust any foreign club, even when it comes in the form of an Irish shillelah, under our eyes? [Laughter.] Let them deny the statement I make and I will produce the proof. The proof will show that their trusted leaders, if not all members of the Cobden Club, were as nearly associated in principle with it as any of the gentlemen who have been so trucnlently arraigned by the Tory protectionists of this House. [Applause.]

INVOCATIONS FOR THE DAWN.

I listened with rapturous delight to the murmurous river of breath which flowed so sweetly from the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]. I am sorry I do not see him here.

A MEMBER. Here he is.

Mr. COX. I am happy to see his roseate face. He made a gallant plea for American industry, capital, and labor against the whole world. That is the title of his pamphlet. It is a superb orchestra for a grand opera. His quiet style, his polished periods and musical tone enraptured his side of the House, but it did not listen to his speech as I did. It has not read it since, as I have, between the lines.

It convinced me of the futilities of placing shackles upon freedom. It confirmed my belief that a home market, when good at home, would be still better when extended. It was intended to show, although he did not seem to say so, that the bill which has been introduced by the Committee of Ways and Means was but a little thing, and, as he hinted, miscellaneously begotten in the dark. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Michigan never intended, as I judge by his conclusion—and I hope the House will bear with me until I reach it—to give forth the impression that we should be restricted in our markets, and that abundance was not a benefaction, and the deprivation of food and shelter and clothing not a curse. Oh, no! But in the conclusion of his speech truth crept in on his natural oratory, and lo! like Silas Wegg, he dropped into poetry. [Laughter.] As a devoted friend of freedom he could not conclude his eloquent speech without something ostensibly in favor of freedom. [Laughter.] What an invocation it was when he quoted the free-trade poetry of Charles Mackay! I applaud him for it; so did the Republican side applaud him, without knowing the covert and exquisite satire of his performance.

The gentleman saw in the limited relief of this bill "untoward circumstances to retard the South in her material progress." He rallied the South, and bid "her march forth unimpeded to a splendid industrial future." Rising to a splendid climax he sounded the advance for the South. He rejoiced in the "New South, a new industrial South, born of the throes of war, but full of hope and full of courage." Indeed, it was the consummate flower of oratory. He saw the South standing "with uplifted brow facing the dawn of a mighty future; her loins girt for a new race. With unfettered hands," and, ah! here, sir, came out the grand peroration of his splendid speech: "With unfettered hand she smites the earth! The fountains of unmeasured wealth gush forth! Beneath her feet she feels the stir of a marvelous life. Her pathway is already illumed with the light of blazing furnaces. Her heavens are aglow with the break of a new day! All hail its oncoming!"

And then, with one grand, magnificent bound he leaps upon his Bellerophon and rides the winged steed of his imperial fancy.

> Aid the dawning, tongue and pen;
> Aid it, hopes of honest men;
> Aid it, paper; aid it type;
> Aid it, for the hour is ripe,
> And our earnest must not slacken into play.

Then he calls on the "men of thought and the men of action" on every side to "clear the way." What way? The way which the muse of Mackay pointed out; the very way which Cobden had blazed out. "Clear the way," so that "when the sun shall reach the zenith of that glorious day" of British free trade, "the North and the South, cemented in the indissoluble bonds of commercial and fraternal unity," will march together for "grander industrial triumphs."

What a splendid burst of free-trade eloquence is this! Like the palm of Zealand, when it puts forth its flower, its sheaf bursts with a report that echoes through the forest like thunder! Even so, through the lumber regions of Michigan let this dawn of Cobden free-trade light up the bosky recesses and give cheer to the lumberman as he toils through wintry privations. Not satisfied with his own glowing sentences, the gentleman summons the poet of the Cobden Club, the friend of Cobden, the companion of Ebenezer Elliott, the co-worker with John Bright, the co-laborer with Sir Robert Peel, who sang the song of the cheap loaf, free trade, and a regenerated Great Britain!

I never dreamed till I heard my friend give forth his trumpet-sound for free trade how ennobling was the cause! You will say that perhaps he only adopted the words without meaning. But I will not believe it of so intelligent, cultivated, and liberal a member as the accomplished gentleman.

It reminded me of a story. May I relieve the discussion by its relation?

Several MEMBERS. Go on! [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. It is about a boy down in Virginia who desired to join the Baptist Church and be immersed. Perhaps the Baptist clergymen who fill yonder gallery may recall the circumstance. [Laughter.] The boy was named Jim. He is called to give in his experience before the deacons. They desire to know how he got religion. He told them: "I dreamed that I saw Jacob's ladder and Jacob a-wrastling with the angels, and I heard a voice saying, 'Jim, climb dat ladder;' and I clumb [laughter], and I clumb; then another voice from de clouds came down, saying, 'Jim, climb on;' and I clomb on, and I clomb on, till I got to the last round of de ladder. Den I hear the voice of de angels out of the crystal gates, saying, 'Climb on!' and I say, 'Good Lord, I can't climb no mo'.' Den a voice ring out and say, 'Jump, Jim; jump!' an' I jump; an' dis chile got the damndest fall since de fall of Adam." [Long-continued laughter.]

Was this invocation to free trade limited to my distinguished friend from Michigan? By no means. Other gentlemen hearing him, arose. They also cried out to aid the dawn!—the same old dawn! But we gentlemen on this side of the House are content simply with a reform which relieves us of 7 per cent. out of the 47 burden, and for purposes of business to prevent the accumulations in the Treasury of the moneys of the people. This reform is hardly a twilight, much less a dawn.

Now I propose, Mr. Chairman, to signalize this conversion of my friend from Michigan and his brethren who have echoed this song of the dawn of British free trade. I do not propose to be harsh toward them. I would like to see my friend not only assist but assisted in clearing out the way. He will have his troubles by the way. The dawn may be clouded and the paper and type too heavily laden with tax to be useful in a clearing.

It would be a glorious consummation of this debate could we only have gentlemen on the other side join in this invocation to paper and type and to the hearts of honest men to clear the way for British-Cobden free trade. And what part in this clearance would be taken by the gentleman who represents the little State of Nevada, with its 41 per cent. of foreign-born people and its 45,000 inhabitants? Will he join in the hymn when my friend from Michigan lines it out? And what will our other brethren of the Republican party do when Brother BURROWS raises his "Ebenezer." [Laughter.] I would like to line out the inspiring verse. [Laughter.]

Gentlemen need not rise to sing. If the tariff were not so high I would have purchased a tuning-fork for the occasion: "Aid the dawning!" Sing! But, gentlemen, you do not sing. [Laughter.] Surely such an ecstacy as that produced by Mackay's verse, so well recited by the gentleman, must have stirred your hearts to music. [Laughter.] Or perhaps we had better have a prayer meeting. [Laughter.]

LYRICS FOR FREE TRADE AND FREE BREAD.

It would be indecorous on my part to say that gentlemen on the other side who have been quoting the poetry of free trade with such wild enthusiasm were ignorant of the source from which their inspiration came. I fear I am responsible for this gushing lyric, for I used it in our caucus to break the dead-lock so as to aid the dawning of our reform. [Laughter.] My friend from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] somehow got into our caucus. I think it was not intentional, for I have seen no signs of repentance and conversion. [Laughter.] He may have carried the burden of Mackay's song to the accomplished gentleman from Michigan, and hence—the dawn.

I recall another verse of this poet of the people, Mackay. In it he pleads earnestly that the operative of England should have leave to earn his daily bread by his skill and to buy it where he would.

> What do we want? Our daily bread;
> And trade untrammel'd as the wind;
> And from our ranks shall spirits start,
> To aid the progress of mankind.

It was for the dawning of that day that he sang the song so eloquently quoted by the gentleman from Michigan. It was not a British song. It was the song of a lover of his kind. When this distinguished poet came to America he again celebrated that same economic liberty which had been secured in England. I commend his verse to my friends on the other side:

> To the West, to the West, to the land of the free,
> Where mighty Missouri rolls down to the sea,
> Where a man is a man if he is willing to toil
> And the humblest may gather the fruits of the soil.

THE LIBERTY OF LABOR.

Why should not men who were anti-slavery propagandists and prophets have favored the principles of Cobden in the interest of liberty? Does not slavery, like the restriction of exchanges, prohibit the producer from using the products of his own labor according to his own pleasure and advantage? Does not slavery deprive the individual of at least a portion of the results of his labor without return? There was no warrant in England, there is no warrant here, either by natural laws, or state laws, or constitutional requirement to restrict such freedom of exchange to the personal or class interests of any one, any more than there is a warrant for a state religion or the abridgment of speech, press, and suffrage. [Applause.]

Why should the United States with its elements of prosperity and power and its institutions of equality and freedom isolate itself as if it were Japan or Corea? Nay, why should it, at a time when these Oriental countries are opening their ports to the world, be laggard in the race of commercial advancement? The history of mankind during all the ages displays no such fatuity.

LOW TARIFFS OF HISTORY.

Why, in Athens two thousand years ago a 10 per cent. revenue duty was regarded as an outrage. Five per cent. was the highest. In ancient Rome from 2½ to 5 per cent. was the highest maximum. In Turkey, may I refer to my friend again [laughter], 8 per cent. is the tax on all foreign importations.

Our First Congress made some showing of protective duties, but the average was only 8½ per cent., and the duties we have now on cottons, woolens, and iron that run above 50 per cent. were then only 5.

Why, sir, we have had forty changes in the tariff since our first enactment. It was protective until 1846, when it was liberalized; so that by 1860 it reached an average as low as 17 per cent. Then the war came on, which was exceptional. We then began to tinker with the tariff over and over again, until we have our present enactment.

It is the habit of gentlemen to minimize the amount of taxation by showing how small per capita each particular tax is upon our people. Thus they infer that since it only takes 3 cents on one thing, 5 cents on another, and 10 on another, that we ought not to complain. But many a mickle makes a muckle, and the day of small things is large in legislation and ought not to be despised.

THE LITTLENESS OF TARIFF RESTRICTIONS.

Why, sir, when we think of it, the Earth itself is but a little thing in space compared with the glories of our planetary and other systems. It is hardly a grain of sand amid the stellar spaces.

Professor Langley, secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, concludes his volume on The New Astronomy by a story which he relates of a race of ephemeral insects who live but an hour. Born at break of day,

they die of old age just after the sun rises. Their descendants may live on till mid-day, while it is another race that sees the glory of sunset.

Imagine such a scene as sunset—

Says the Professor—

when the whole nation of mites gather under the shadow of some mushroom to hear what their wisest philosopher has to say of the gloomy prospect. He tells them of the time when the mushroom itself was young, and when the sun was in another portion of the sky; then that the sun had changed its course, and that all nature was about to be resolved into a fleeting nebulous mist. What the hearers of such a philosophic mite would think of his philosophy the infinite God only knows.

But it seems to me that the philosophers of our time who undertake to limit the comforts and happiness and means of living of a few mites under one portion of our American mushroom, and to that portion only, are very much in the position of the ephemera, who talk about the laws of nature, as if they could constrain them to their own selfish will. [Applause.]

THE AMERICAN QUADRICENTENNIAL.

Four hundred years ago Columbus set in the forehead of his time the jewels of Elizabeth the Catholic by the discovery of America. We are preparing for the celebration of that remarkable event. The people of the three Americas will be called together to give gratulation over this marvelous fact in the history of our star.

Four hundred years ago the red man held undisputed and barbaric sway over the vast region now embraced within our limits. Out of this wilderness has arisen from the loins of the old world a nation who rejoice and boast of their liberties.

OUR ADVANCEMENT AND HOROSCOPE.

Have we not a right to rejoice and boast? Has not our greatness expanded like the oak, bole upon bole, ring upon ring, and spread its branches from sea to sea, from Gulf to Lake? Our benevolence, and learning, and wealth, and splendor, and commerce have become the cynosure of all eyes, even as our country is the refuge of all peoples. We need not repair to the urns of other skies or to the policies of other lands to illumine the light of liberty in our own. We have what Rufus Choate called a youthful, exultant, and defiant freedom, enshrined and consecrated, and we are now happily united with one sentiment and under one Constitution. [Applause.]

LABOR AND LIBERTY SHACKLED.

With all this wonderful experience and accomplishment, beyond the wildest dreams of that classic genius which pictured a new Atlantis and an ideal commonwealth beyond the Hesperian star—shall our country be shackled by a wrongful constraint? Shall Economy, which ever walks white-handed along with her sister—Liberty—fail of that guiding effulgence which makes glad the heart of our people? Why should not our struggling millions aspire to a better future? Why should they lay up the treasures of their enterprises, if, indeed, the spirit of freedom be wanting? Freedom not only to work as we please, but to dispose of the product of our work as we please; freedom to spend our means where we can get the most for them; freedom to invest our means without the ignominy of enslaving statutes, and freedom to symbolize with our enstarred ensign, that beauty and unity with which nature has glorified our beloved land, and to inspire other nations with the same constitutional order wherewithal that we have been made free.

What avail the plow and sail,
Or land or life, if freedom fail!

[Long continued applause.]

EXHIBIT No. 1.—*Bastiat's famous petition.*

Petition of the manufacturers of candles, wax-lights, lamps, candlesticks, street-lamps, snuffers, extinguishers, and of the producers of oil, tallow, rosin, alcohol, and generally of everything connected with lighting.

To Messieurs the members of the Chamber of Deputies:

GENTLEMEN: You are on the right road. You reject abstract theories and have little consideration for cheapness and plenty. Your chief care is the interest of the producer. You desire to emancipate him from external competition and reserve the national market for national industry.

We are about to offer you an admirable opportunity for applying your—what shall we call it? your theory? No; nothing is more deceptive than theory. Your doctrine? your system? your principle?—but you dislike doctrines, you abhor systems, and as for principles, you deny that there are any in social economy; we shall say, then, your practice, your practice without theory and without principle.

We are suffering from the intolerable competition of a foreign rival, placed, it would seem, in a condition so far superior to ours for the production of light, that he absolutely inundates our national market with it at a price fabulously reduced. The moment he shows himself, our trade leaves us—all consumers apply to him; and a branch of native industry, having countless ramifications, is all at once rendered completely stagnant. This rival, who is no other than the sun, wages war to the knife against us, and we suspect he has been raised up by perfidious Albion (good policy as times go); inasmuch as he displays towards that haughty island a circumspection with which he dispenses in our case.

What we pray for is, that it may please you to pass a law ordering the shutting up of all windows, sky-lights, dormer windows, outside and inside shutters, curtains, blinds, bull's eyes, in a word, of all openings, holes, chinks, clefts, and fissures, by or through which the light of the sun has been allowed to enter houses, to the prejudice of the meritorious manufactures with which we flatter ourselves we have accommodated our country, a country which, in gratitude, ought not to abandon us now to a strife so unequal.

We trust, gentlemen, that you will not regard this our request as a satire or refuse it without at least previously hearing the reasons which we have to urge in its support.

And, first, if you shut up as much as possible all access to natural light, and create a demand for artificial light, which of our French manufactures will not be encouraged by it?

If more tallow is consumed, then there must be more oxen and sheep; and, consequently, we shall behold the increase of artificial meadows, meat, wool, hides, and, above all, manure, which is the basis and foundation of all agricultural wealth.

If more oil is consumed, then we shall have an extended cultivation of the poppy, of the olive, and of colewort. These rich and exhausting plants will come at the right time to enable us to avail ourselves of the increased fertility which the rearing of additional cattle will impart to our lands.

Our heaths will be covered with resinous trees. Numerous swarms of bees will on the mountains gather perfumed treasures, now wasting their fragrance on the desert air, like the flowers from which they are derived. No branch of agriculture but will then exhibit a cheering development.

The same remark applies to navigation. Thousands of vessels will proceed to the whale fishery; and, in a short time, we shall possess a navy capable of maintaining the honor of France, and gratifying the patriotic aspirations of your petitioners, the undersigned candlemakers and others.

But what shall we say of the manufacture of *articles de Paris*? Henceforth you will behold gildings, bronzes, crystals, in candlesticks, in lamps, in lusters, in candelabra, shining forth in spacious warerooms, compared with which those of the present day can be regarded but as mere shops.

No poor *Resinier* from his heights on the seacoast, no coal-miner from the depth of his sable gallery but will rejoice in higher wages and increased prosperity.

Only have the goodness to reflect, gentlemen, and you will be convinced that there is, perhaps, no Frenchman, from the wealthy coal-master to the humblest vender of lucifer matches, whose lot will not be ameliorated by the success of this our petition.

We foresee your objections, gentlemen, but we know that you can oppose to us none but such as you have picked up from the effete works of the partisans of free trade. We defy you to utter a single word against us which will not instantly rebound against yourselves and your entire policy.

You will tell us that if we gain by the protection which we seek the country will lose by it, because the consumer must bear the loss.

We answer:

You have ceased to have any right to invoke the interest of the consumer; for, whenever his interest is found opposed to that of the producer you sacrifice the former. You have done so for the purpose of encouraging labor and increasing employment. For the same reason you should do so again.

You have yourselves obviated this objection. When you are told that the consumer is interested in the free importation of iron, coal, corn, textile fabrics—yes, you reply, but the producer is interested in their exclusion. Well, be it so. If the consumers are interested in the free admission of natural light, the producers of artificial light are equally interested in its prohibition.

But, again, you may say that the producer and consumer are identical. If the manufacturer gain by protection he will make the agriculturist also a gainer, and if agriculture prospers it will open a vent to manufactures. Very well; if you confer upon us the monopoly of furnishing light during the day, first of all we shall purchase quantities of tallow, coals, oils, resinous substances, wax, alcohol, besides silver, iron, bronze, crystal, to carry on our manufactures; and then we and those who furnish us with such commodities, having become rich, will consume a great deal and impart prosperity to all the other branches of our national industry.

If you urge that the light of the sun is a gratuitous gift of nature, and that to reject such gifts is to reject wealth itself under pretense of encouraging the means of acquiring it, we would caution you against giving a death-blow to your own policy. Remember that hitherto you have always repelled foreign products, because they approximate more nearly than home products to the character of gratuitous gifts. To comply with the exactions of other monopolists, you have only half a motive; and to repulse us simply because we stand on a stronger vantage ground than others would be to adopt the equation, $+\times+=-$; in other words, it would be to heap absurdity upon absurdity.

Nature and human labor co-operate in various proportions (depending on countries and climates) in the production of commodities. The part which nature executes is always gratuitous; it is the part executed by human labor which constitutes value, and is paid for.

If a Lisbon orange sells for half the price of a Paris orange, it is because natural, and consequently gratuitous, heat does for the one what artificial, and therefore expensive, heat must do for the other.

When an orange comes to us from Portugal, we may conclude that it is furnished in part gratuitously, in part for an onerous consideration; in other words, it comes to us at half-price as compared with those of Paris.

Now, it is precisely the gratuitous half (pardon the word) which we contend should be excluded. You say, how can national labor sustain competition with foreign labor, when the former has all the work to do, and the latter only does one-half—the sun supplying the remainder? But if this half, being gratuitous, determines you to exclude competition, how should the whole, being gratuitous, induce you to admit competition? If you were consistent, you would, while excluding as hurtful to native industry what is half gratuitous, exclude, *a fortiori* and with double zeal, that which is altogether gratuitous.

Once more, when products such as coal, iron, corn, or textile fabrics are sent us from abroad, and we can acquire them with less labor than if we made them ourselves, the difference is a free gift conferred upon us. The gift is more or less considerable in proportion as the difference is more or less great. It amounts to a quarter, a half, or three-quarters of the value of the product, when the foreigner only asks us for three-fourths, a half, or a quarter of the price we should otherwise pay.

It is as perfect and complete as it can be, when the donor (like the sun in furnishing us with light) asks us for nothing. The question, and we ask it formally, is this, Do you desire for our country the benefit of gratuitous consumption, or the pretended advantages of onerous production? Make your choice, but be logical; for as long as you exclude, as you do, coal, iron, corn, foreign fabrics, in proportion as their price approximates to zero, what inconsistency would it be to admit the light of the sun, the price of which is already at zero during the entire day!

EXHIBIT No. 2.—*Exports of wheat and corn (including flour and meal) from the United States in five-year periods, each ended in the years named.*

Years.	Wheat.	Corn.
	Bushels.	*Bushels.*
1830	23,385,247	6,664,342
1835	26,823,955	5,838,478
1840	22,907,501	4,560,693
1845	34,320,346	8,605,105
1850	71,608,785	53,796,953
1855	82,194,545	28,391,020
1860	117,699,913	32,763,264
1865	237,666,572	87,318,456
1870	139,682,289	53,413,572
1875	307,897,584	152,569,127
1880	546,314,817	398,212,474
1885	608,374,048	278,779,545

EXHIBIT No. 3.—*Production and export of cotton.*

Since 1874 the statement of production is that of the cotton movement by the National Cotton Exchange. The earlier statements, both product and export, are from Dana's "Cotton from Seed to Loom."

Years.	Production.	Exportation.
	Bales.	*Bales.*
1826–'27	957,281	853,798
1827–'28	720,593	600,000
1828–'29	857,744	749,000
1829–'30	976,845	838,194
1830–'31	1,038,847	772,177
1831–'32	987,477	891,501
1832–'33	1,070,438	867,169
1833–'34	1,205,394	1,027,569
1834–'35	1,254,328	1,023,013
1835–'36	1,360,725	1,116,044
1836–'37	1,425,575	1,167,805
1837–'38	1,804,797	1,575,348
1838–'39	1,363,403	1,072,935
1839–'40	2,181,749	1,873,408
1840–'41	1,639,353	1,311,785
1841–'42	1,688,675	1,459,957
1842–'43	2,394,203	2,005,395
1843–'44	2,108,579	1,625,965
1844–'45	2,484,662	2,079,721
1845–'46	2,170,537	1,666,443
1846–'47	1,860,479	1,240,869
1847–'48	2,424,113	1,857,889
1848–'49	2,808,596	2,226,722
1849–'50	2,171,706	1,588,814
1850–'51	2,415,257	1,987,633
1851–'52	3,000,029	2,443,103
1852–'53	3,352,882	2,526,545
1853–'54	3,035,027	2,317,583
1854–'55	2,932,339	2,243,318
1855–'56	3,645,345	2,953,771
1856–'57	3,056,519	2,251,496
1857–'58	3,238,962	2,589,732
1858–'59	3,994,481	3,020,519
1859–'60	4,823,770	3,773,256
1860–'61	3,826,086	3,126,867
1865–'66	2,228,987	1,552,457
1866–'67	2,059,271	1,552,761
1867–'68	2,498,895	1,657,015
1868–'69	2,439,039	1,448,020
1869–'70	3,154,946	2,178,917
1870–'71	3,352,317	3,166,742
1871–'72	2,974,351	1,957,314
1872–'73	2,930,508	2,679,986
1873–'74	4,170,388	2,838,172
1874–'75	3,827,845	2,714,863
1875–'76	4,632,313	3,214,632
1876–'77	4,474,069	3,120,472
1877–'78	4,773,865	3,391,795
1878–'79	4,074,155	3,462,741
1879–'80	5,761,252	3,810,133
1880–'81	6,605,750	4,549,743
1881–'82	5,456,048	3,694,706
1882–'83	6,949,756	4,626,808
1883–'84	5,713,200	3,884,233
1884–'85	5,706,165	3,909,568
1885–'86	6,575,691	4,283,723
1886–'87	6,505,087	4,449,579

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman, I was much pleased but not surprised at the knowledge of the gentleman from New York who just took his seat [Mr. COX] of the wardrobe of the devil. [Laughter.]

His scarlet pants and coat of blue,
And a little hole for his tail to come through—

were very beautiful; but if the devil was half as patriotic as I suspect him of being he bought his garments, of whatever color, hole and all, in the recesses of hell. [Laughter.] I can imagine from the acquaintance the gentleman shows with his satanic majesty that when his earthly career is closed he will approach the gate, and, after having been refused admittance by Peter, he will approach that other warmer spot and give his name, "SAMUEL SULLIVAN COX, late of New York." The devil will say: "Why, Mr. COX, could you not make it up there?" "No." The devil: "F. T. ?" "Yes; free-trader; couldn't make it." Whereupon his majesty says: "Walk right in, Mr. SAMUEL SULLIVAN COX; we take everything that comes to this shore; it is the only free-trade corner in the universe." [Applause and laughter.]

A farmer once having left home received the following letter from a fox: "My dear Mr. Farmer: I am informed and believe that your hen and chickens are not well, and I desire to tender you my most earnest solicitude and my attention as their physician. Please have your man leave the hen-house open nights, that I may treat them. Your true friend, A. Fox." To which the farmer modestly replied: "My dear Mr. Fox: Your kind and neighborly letter has just been received. Your relations with me and my chickens in the past have not been such as would warrant me in employing you as their physician. The doctor should be the friend of his patient. I expect to be at home after the 4th of March next, and I will look out for my own chickens. Respectfully yours, A. Farmer."

So you understand, after the manner of Æsop, we do not want him to doctor our chickens. The tariff chicken belongs to the Republican party, and your anxiety to doctor it leads us to suspect you are more interested as an undertaker than as a physician. [Applause.]

I represent a Republican district, a district in favor of tariff reform, and I stand ready to vote for any bill to reform the inconsistencies of the tariff consistent with the best interests of the industries of this country.

I charge that the Democratic party, or a majority of that party, is in favor of free trade. The Republican party is in favor of protection; and while many of us believe there should be are form of the tariff, as I have suggested, still the great underlying difference between the two parties is there to stay.

To prove that the Democrats are free-traders I make a very few extracts of the many that could be cited to prove my position.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARE] said:

I believe that a tariff for protection is the foundation and principal cause of all the complaints and unrest that has either threatened or actually disturbed the public peace and quiet for years, because it fosters one industry at the expense of another, it transfers the labor and production of one class and gives it to another, thereby building up a small class of great wealth and impoverishing the great body of our people.

I am opposed to any tariff whatever for protection simply.

If we did not require money to defray the expenses of Government, I would be an absolute and uncompromising free-trader.

The argument of those who favor protection is (among other things) that such tariff is necessary to protect labor and production, and, to prove it, it is shown that the laborer is paid higher wages in America than anywhere else on the globe.

Admitting the fact that in dollars and cents the United States pays higher wages than England; that England pays more than other countries in Europe, and that Europe pays higher than India, yet it is also an established fact that the laborer in the United States can not, as a general rule, save anything from the result of his toil at the end of each year; nor can he do so in England, nor elsewhere in Europe, nor in India. It is equally as well established that in all those countries the laborer does eat and wear clothes adapted to his country and climate. Then what is the difference between earning $1 per day or 10 cents per day, if the result is the same, namely, sufficient to eat to preserve life and sufficient to wear to protect the body?

Think of it! "Sufficient to eat to preserve life." Is the average Democratic heart not too kind to the laborer? Life can be "preserved" on 20 cents per day or less. Is he afraid our laborers if they get $1.50 per day they would die of the gout? Will even a free-trader say the workingmen are to have nothing but a bare sufficiency for the stomach and back? Is there to be no home and home-life for him? No food and clothes and books for his children; no pictures to light his wall and no music or ray of refinement in his home? God pity this nation when such despair shall settle upon the hearts of those who labor.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LANE] says "the nations of the earth are striving to draw near to each other." Yes, every nation in the world employing pauper and cheap labor are trying to draw near to us. Every tramp he meets on the street will try to draw near to him. The filth and vermin on the tramp will try and draw near to him in order to indulge in free trade. But why does my colleague draw back from the festive tramp? Why erect a Chinese wall between yourself and the tramp? Oh! he says, I am on a different plane of life; I do not need him. But my country should get down and trade freely with any other country in the world.

Do you not know and can you not see that in this country every citizen, however humble his trade or calling, is his own master, and that our country, therefore, as compared with most others, was built under the Providence of God by brave ancestors upon a more certain foundation, and a higher plane?

Mr. MILLS, chairman of committee, and the acknowledged leader of the Democratic party, says:

We will increase wealth if we lower the duties and let importations come in of those things which can be produced cheaper in other countries than our own.

There is not a manufactured article on this earth wherein the raw materials are common and wherein labor creates a part that can not be produced cheaper in any other country in the world than in our own. Why? Simply because the labor is cheaper. No man can live in this country on the wages paid in other countries; not because he can not "exist," but he must clothe and educate his children or violate the public sentiment of his country, which sentiment is our chief honor and glory.

This proposition of Mr. MILLS, carried to its legitimate results, would do one of two things. It would either close every manufacturing and labor-employing establishment in this country or reduce those employed there to the cheap wages of other countries. This would drive the children of the laborer from the school-house to the factories and mines, and may the Great Father of nations long delay the day when the American youth (the foundation stones of our future glory) shall be dwarfed in mind and body by this free-trade process.

The wealth of a nation does not consist of its surplus in money, its railroads, its factories, nor its farms, but rather in that great wealth of humanity, educated and loyal, which is the sure guaranty that our future will be greater than our past.

Mr. MILLS further pleads for "freedom to buy the products of others" where we please, while the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL] asks for the same thing when he asks the right to purchase labor where it can be purchased the cheapest.

I have quoted enough to show my proposition to be true that the Democratic party is in favor of free trade.

The Northern Democrats say, "Oh, no; we are not free-traders; we believe in tariff reform, and tariff for revenue only." Gentlemen, you

know as well as I do that "the tail goes with the hide." You remember a few days ago when we were in the deadlock, and you Northern Democrats walked up and down with a feather in your hat and a chip on your shoulder, and said you did not propose to be bossed by the brigadiers. King Caucus tapped the bell, and you went in like good boys and laid down your bundles.

The brigadier rings the caucus bell;
The dough-face cries "For shame!
I'll not be bossed by the brigadier;"
But he gets there just the same.

[Laughter.]

And when the great Democratic party shall have assumed control of the Senate and of the White House and of this House of Congress and of the Supreme Court, and the edict goes forth that free trade shall be the policy of the party, you Northern Democrats, being but the caudal appendage, the mere tail of the great Democratic dog, will meekly and modestly enfold yourselves between the hind legs of your owner and wait patiently for information from the business end of that dog whether to wag for free trade or for protection. [Great laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I have never been in favor of sending a man to the penitentiary for preaching free trade. I do not think that is a good cause; but when a man like the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of this House stands up here and talks by the hour in favor of free trade, and then tells us that it is all for the benefit of the laboring men in this country, it makes me tired. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Here comes an American shoemaker who says to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. "Mr. MILLS, I understand you are in favor of buying your shoes where you can buy them cheapest?" "Oh, yes!" "Why do you want to buy them where you can buy them cheapest?" "Why, just to help you poor American shoemakers." [Laughter.] The next man is a spinner of yarn or a weaver of cloth, and he says: "Mr. MILLS, you say we ought to have free trade; that we ought to be permitted to buy our clothes wherever we want to and wherever we can get them cheapest. You can buy your clothing cheaper in England, I believe." "Oh, yes," says Mr. MILLS. "Won't you tell me," says the American clothman, "why you want to buy your clothing in England?" "Oh, yes; it is to help you poor American clothiers," says Mr. MILLS. [Renewed laughter.] And here comes a man with swarthy brow and horny hand, an iron-worker, who says: "I understand, Mr. MILLS, you want to buy your shovels and your hoes and all your ironware in England, where you can get them cheap." "Oh, yes," says Mr. MILLS, "but it is all for the benefit of you poor American iron-workers."

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said before, while I do not believe in sending a man to the penitentiary for preaching free trade, yet when a man stands up here and talks free trade, and says that he does it all for the benefit of American workingmen, I do think he ought to be sent down for six months twice a year for fifty years for hypocrisy. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

And, Mr. Chairman, the workingmen are going into convention, and are going to adopt a preamble and a resolution somewhat like this:

Whereas the Democratic party, or rather the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, believes that he should have the right to purchase the products of labor wherever he can buy them the cheapest;

And whereas he also says that he wants that right for the benefit of the working people of this country:

Therefore resolved, That the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee for elasticity of conscience, for monumental gall, and magnificent patriotism takes the whole bakery. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, occasionally you will find a retired business man who is a free-trader, but always you will find the college professor who has competed for the prize of the Cobden Club; and always the dude: "Aw, dawn't ye knaw, its a blawsted shame, ye knaw, ye cawn't buy these gloves and neck-ties in New York for less than twice what they would cost in dear old Paree." All these are free-traders, and also that other class of gentlemen, who are not to blame for it, because they have been brought up in a country which a few years ago adopted a constitution which was cited here lately by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS], containing as two of its fundamental principles absolute free trade with all the world and the right of capital to own its labor.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to devote a few moments to the question of trusts. The favorite peroration of the Democratic orators here is to charge the trusts to the tariff. Now, for the sake of the argument we will admit that the sugar trust is fostered by the tariff. We will accept your proposition upon that question for the moment. But if that is true, why do you not take that trust and throttle it with the Mills bill? Is not that a simple proposition? I had the honor, as a Republican and a protectionist, of introducing a resolution upon that subject, reciting that it was alleged that the tariff fostered the sugar trust and asking for information and legislation, but I understand from members of the committee investigating the general subject that although they have employed an attorney and taken a great deal of evidence, not a word has been put before the witnesses to show to the country what effect, if any, the tariff has upon the trusts.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. The gentleman is entirely mistaken upon that point. I am a member of that committee and I know that that question has been gone into quite thoroughly.

Mr. MASON. I received my information from another member of the committee. I am glad that you have learned something upon the subject, and I hope that some result will come out of that committee which will be of benefit to the people of this country.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I merely wished to correct the gentleman.

Mr. MASON. That is right. You know very well that if the controllers of the Mills bill should protect the producers of sugars in this country, and should at the same time uncover the refiners, those who have organized the "sugar trust," and force them into the markets of the world, you would kill that "trust" in twenty-four hours; but you have not the courage to do it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. If the gentleman had done me the honor——

Mr. MASON. "What are the wild waves saying?" [Laughter.] If I can have two or three minutes' extension of my time, I have no objection to yielding to the gentleman.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. If the gentleman had listened to my remarks this morning he would have found that in our dealings with the sugar schedule we not only make a reduction of $11,000,000 on the sugar tax, but, superadded to that, we make a reduction of $11,000,000 additional that the "trust" can charge the people for refined sugar.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman will pardon me if I could not, while sitting in my seat, hear his remarks distinctly. But I suppose the gentleman will admit that the committee still leaves the tariff on the kinds of sugar produced and sold by the sugar trust; is not that so?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Certainly; but——

Mr. MASON. If you would uncover them would they not have to corner the markets of the world? But are you not afraid to uncover them?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. If we should "uncover" the refined sugars and at the same time keep the tax on raw sugar, we should thereby not merely destroy the "trust," but destroy also the refining industry.

Mr. MASON. Why could you not protect the raw material by a bounty? You have brains enough; but you have not the courage.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I admire the courage of the gentleman in so distinctly avowing the doctrine of "bounty." That is the "true inwardness" and essence of your whole protective policy.

Mr. WILKINSON rose.

Mr. MASON. I can not yield. If I can have my time extended I am willing to yield to all these gentlemen.

The gentleman from Mississippi the other day said he wanted to "cook" this sugar trust; but he did not; he wanted to feed it, and he started into comic opera. But I would suggest to him and the gentleman from New York, inasmuch as they are poets, and as they propose by this bill to protect the sugar trust, that they try the old-fashioned lullaby:

Rock-a-by, Sugar Trust, you're on the tree top
And while we're in power your cradle will rock;
But if the duty on sugar should tumble and fall,
Down comes the Sugar Trust, Mills bill and all.

[Laughter.]

Or if poetical genius should inspire them to rise to the heights of Mother Goose I would suggest:

Little boy blue, come blow your horn nice,
Blow hell out of mutton, but do not touch rice.

[Laughter.]

In fancy I see the gentleman from Mississippi holding the infant "Sugar Trust" in his arms, and saying, "Ah, there, stay there! [Laughter.] I wanted to cook the little tootsey-wootsey the other day, but I did not mean to cook you. Oh, no, that was a bluff." And he passes the infant "Trust" to the gentleman from Texas, who says, "Tootsey-wootsey, little Sugar Trust, don't cry; you shall have all the sugar in the United States; the Cobden boys can have everything else their way, but dear little Sugar Trust should not be hurt, oh, no." And the gentleman from New York fondles and coddles it, and says, "If poor little tootsey-wootsey was to die we would not have anything left to throw at the Republican party."

The gentleman from Mississippi also said that the cows in his State did not give as much milk as those in New England, and his hens do not lay as many eggs. I want to say to him now that if there is anything under God's heavens that will dry up a good cow, and stop a hen from laying, it is being brought up in a free-trade country.

I was pleased when he boasted of the beautiful women of the South; everybody knows that all the ladies are pretty—some better looking than others; but it surprised me somewhat when the gentleman from Mississippi said that they had brainy men. I said to myself, "Possibly that is true; but it is another illustration of the old saying, that you can never tell the kind of goods a man keeps by the sample he puts on the road." [Laughter.]

The remarks of my friend from Missouri pleased me very much. After laboring like a mountain he finally proved that all the States of the Union that had taken advantage of the existing tariff laws had become prosperous; and when the gentleman from Maine asked him whether he proposed to stop this progress, he appealed to the clock. I find that clock is the most popular thing to appeal to on the Democratic side when members there are asked questions that they can not answer. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Missouri closed his speech by a prayer that the American flag should be seen in all the harbors of the world. That is a very pretty but a very soft sentiment. I never want to see the American flag masquerading on an English mast. I stood with many of my colleagues a few days ago and saw that magnificent vessel, the Yorktown, as she slipped from the cradle that had held her since her first rib was set down to the mighty waters, and one thing that made me proud was the fact that every pound of iron in her magnificent sides sprang from American soil in response to the blows of American citizens. And when, on the ship setting sail, every pound of iron, every foot of timber, every bolt and spar and rope comes from the labor and genius of American citizens, she speaks not only of the power and wealth of this country, but is a floating monument to the industries of the country. Then, and not till then, should the colors of our country be nailed to her mast. [Applause.]

The most popular party to-day in England is the Democratic party of the United States. [Laughter and applause.] The most popular individual to-day in England is the President of the United States of America, for he recommends to this body legislation in the interests of every country under God's heaven but our own. [Renewed laughter and applause].

I heard a gentleman on the other side of the House, and I heard that great Democratic Senator from Indiana—that is, what is left of him, [laughter]—I heard them ask, "When was the American workman more degraded and poorer paid than now?" That is, what we have heard. I will tell you when; why, every day the Democratic party was in power in this country. [Laughter and applause.]

I remember in 1857, when my own father, who was a skilled mechanic and a builder of wagons, worked for seventy-five cents a day.

You remember the carpenter who went South and applied for a situation as a carpenter, about that time, of a planter, and the planter said, "I am sorry I can not give you employment; just bought two carpenters yesterday." [Applause and laughter.]

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Are we to judge of his father's skill by the gentleman himself as one of his products?

Mr. MASON. Is this the same gentleman? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for interruption?

Mr. MASON. Yes, if it does not come out of my time. Anybody who does not like my style of architecture knows where he can find me when I am not busy. I am busy now. [Laughter and applause.]

I was about to say when interrupted by a gentleman who represents a brainy district [laughter] that if his party had continued in power every man who earns his living by the sweat of his brow would stand to-day not only with the products of other countries of the world brought to our doors, but in direct competition with slave labor upon his own soil. Yet they say they are the friends of the laboring man and want to buy the products of labor in other markets for the benefit of the laboring people here! [Laughter and applause.]

One more thing. There has been a great deal of talk in this country amongst the best people that there should be some commercial union with Canada. There has been an honest difference of opinion about it. But everything we had to trade on in that direction is absolutely frittered away by the Mills bill. [Applause.]

It has been a great pleasure of the Democracy, and words that they have rolled under their tongue as a sweet morsel, that the Republican party was in favor of free whisky. I am here to answer simply for myself, responsible to no one but my conscience and to my constituents, and say that I never have been, and am not now, in favor of free whisky. I am in favor of whisky helping to support the poor-houses and prisons which it fills, and next to being a breeder of paupers it is the greatest producer of Democrats known to modern man. I am in favor and will vote to take off the tax on all alcohol used in the manufactories, and there are thousands and thousands of dollars of it used in manufacturing soaps, which would help somewhat to reduce the surplus, and would be of benefit to those manufacturers who use it and to the consumers of soap. I do not expect the Democrats to vote for this proposition. No Democrat can consistently vote to reduce the price of soap.

I wish to call the attention of the House to this fact, that, while it is true that but a small percentage of the laborers of this country are employed in industries that are protected by the tariff, yet every unskilled laborer engaged in any kind of work is in the market in competition with every other unskilled laborer in the country, and it is impossible to benefit even a small percentage of our unskilled laborers without benefiting every other unskilled laborer in the country. Some one must labor. The old Democratic idea that to labor was degrading is passing away, and this country to-day, which is the greatest known to history, points with pride and joy to the men who have gone from the tow-path and from rail-splitting and from the humblest walks of life to the highest office within the gift of her people.

The real trouble is here, Mr. Chairman: The gentlemen who compose the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means come six out of eight from those States lately in rebellion, who have been taught from infancy that free trade is right. Now, gentlemen, when you came here first after the war the prodigal-son racket worked well, but it is getting old. [Laughter and applause.] You used to talk about the prodigal son, who is represented in the Bible as coming in and telling his father, "I have been off in a far country; I have lost all I had; I am not fit to be your son; make me your servant." But that is not the kind of a prodigal son you are. [Laughter.] You came in the front door; you wiped your feet on the carpet, and we have been told some of you drink out of the fire-extinguisher in the hotels, and others of you set your watches by the street-car enunciators! [Laughter and applause.] You do not sit down and wait for the fatted calf. You put your feet on the best table and say, "Pap, what we want is veal." [Great laughter and applause.] But the people are getting tired of that sort of thing, and next fall they are going to take the prodigal son by the nape of his neck and the seat of his government and set him out among the husks of a defeated Democracy [laughter], and your great leader, your Moses, His Accidency, His One-termitiveness Grover Cleveland, will be promoted to the highest office known to the world, an American citizen in private life. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, this bill as it stands ought not to pass. It is a step backward. Let me give you a few samples of its consistency. Take the article of soap manufactured in this country. They place that upon the free-list. Thousands of men are employed in the business here, and millions of capital invested in small and large soap factories. There are eight or ten different chemicals used in the manufacture of soap which cannot be supplied here, which the soap-makers have to import and pay a duty upon. The duties upon these chemicals are not removed, and yet, so far as the manufacturers of soap are concerned, they are the raw material. A man who manufactures soap outside of this country pays no duty. If he shipped them to us in this country he would have to pay a duty, but if he manufactures them into some article to compete with some American manufactured article he can ship them in free. "Consistency, thou art a jewel." Take the article of brushes. The manufacturers in this country have to pay a duty on the raw material used. This bill proposes to reduce the duty, and substantially puts brushes upon the free-list, and yet leaves the American manufacturer to pay a duty upon the bristles—an invitation to the brush factories of this country to move. This bill is substantially the same in jute and flax, and every part of it, so far as the industries in my district are concerned, is an invitation to those factories to go where they can get labor and raw material cheaper and import them free.

I have seen it charged that the Committee on Ways and Means have been running around loose with representatives of the English manufacturers.

I have seen it stated editorially, in responsible papers, that the agent of the English manufacturers has wined and dined the majority end of our Ways and Means Committee, and has in turn been wined and dined by them, and that he has had constant access to the committee. One paper offers to prove, if it is denied, that this man is the agent of English manufacturers, and that he has materially assisted in forming this bill. After that publication I expected to hear it denied by some member of the committee. I knew they had refused to hear American manufacturers on the bill in which they are so deeply interested, and did not think the committee would like to rest under the imputation that they were allowing foreign manufacturers privileges not allowed our own citizens. That denial, so far as I can learn, has not been made.

How far that English influence has gone I do not know, but from some of the features I find in this bill I suspect an English parentage. [Renewed laughter.] And I say to you gentlemen on that side (I represent a district largely composed of working people) that if one item of that bill is there by the suggestion of a representative of the English manufacturers, the man who consented to it is as mean and contemptible a traitor to the industrial interests of this Government as his predecessors were twenty-five years ago when they tried to destroy it. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.] Yes, that is what I say; that is what I mean. It lacks what your fathers had—the element of bravery. But the man who refuses a hearing to an American citizen and consents to be advised by an English manufacturer in a great measure of public policy in this country is a betrayer of public trust and is unfit to occupy a seat in this House or in any other legislative body, except it be the British Parliament. I am responsible for what I say, and if my language is not parliamentary the gentleman can make the most of it.

Why, Mr. Chairman, if every man in the State of New York was a millionaire this country would be that much richer and stronger for it. Illinois and Missouri would be richer and stronger. There are no State lines except upon the map and in the heart of a Democrat. The wealth of one State is the wealth of all, and when I eat or drink or put on my coat or buy any of the things that I have to buy, rather than give one cent profit to any man in any country but our own I would give one dollar profit to that man who stands with me under the same flag, under the same government, who is bound by the same laws, who is bound to fight as I am for the defense of the honor and integrity of our common country.

I am like the boy who hired his sister to make his shirts. Some one said, "You could have taken those shirts to the factory and had them made and saved $2." "Yes," said the boy protectionist, "Sister Sally got a pretty fair price. She always pays me well for what I do for her. That two-dollar bill is still under the same roof with me, and if sickness or trouble or hard luck comes to any of our family that money is there in the house."

The free-trade boy calls his sister a New England tariff robber.

Every dollar of wealth in New England is there to stand levy in times of peace or war for our common good. Yet the average Democratic orator holds her in no closer bond than he does any foreign country. We are taunted daily by her growth and wealth. She is great and strong. I thank God for it, for therein lies a part of the strength of our common country.

I hail not from New England, and can speak without prejudice. The history of our country has neither beginning nor end with the history of New England left out. Her great statesmen, soldiers, and poets fill the brightest pages of our history, and we would prosper more if we spent less time finding fault with her, and more time in imitating her habits of industry and frugality.

The South finds fault because other sections of the country have taken advantage of the tariff laws, while she has left her natural resources undeveloped. And this committee of Southern gentlemen seek by this bill to protect every article of manufacture or agriculture produced in the South, and if in the protection to the South any Northern enterprise shall be accidentally protected we are welcome to it.

But the gentlemen say that I am drawing sectional lines. Mr. Chairman, I am not. I draw attention only to the sectional lines that they have already drawn. This bill and every other bill coming from the majority of the Ways and Means Committee has been a direct attempt on the part of the majority to protect the interests lying in the South, regardless of the interests of the North, the East, and the West; and when I go through my district and see laboring men and manufacturers there and know that under protection there is better promise than ever for the future, it grinds me to know that their affairs and their business are in the hands of such men. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I am not drawing sectional lines; you are drawing them. I am calling attention to history.

This bill is a standing monument to the incapacity of the committee—a standing menace to the best interests of this country.

And in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would say again, we believe that protection protects the laboring man; and I call upon history to bear witness that every nation under the sun has prospered just in proportion as they have reached down to the struggling and laboring classes and lifted them to a higher and more dignified citizenship. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that in the early dawn of creation, when the waters and the earth were divided, and that great smiling valley of the Mississippi looked into the face of its Creator, He blessed it, and said that at some time there should spring up a race upon its fertile soil which should stand as a monument of self-government, chief among the nations of the world. And I believe that when our infant nation took its first uncertain and tottering steps on the untried shore of self-government and our life was assailed, that same power gave us a Washington and a Continental army. And when the foul stain of slavery, that gave the lie to our boast of freedom, was to be stricken, with secession and treason, forever from our soil, the same Great Keeper of the destinies of the world gave us a Lincoln, a Grant, and a Grand Army of the Republic. [Applause.]

And now, Mr. Chairman, in this Fiftieth Congress, when the industries of the country are assailed by a foreign foe, I believe that somehow something will be stirred in the hearts of the American people, something that will move them to action that will awake the giant of the Republican party, which has been sleeping for four years, and again place it in power; and standing in every harbor and port of entry in the land, it will say to the foreign invader offering labor products produced by cheap and pauper labor from abroad, "Thus far and no farther." [Renewed applause.] And under the influence of Republican doctrines the country, with new assurances of safety and protection, will have new life and new hopes and make greater strides in the march of civilization and progress than has ever heretofore been accomplished in the history of the world. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, this prolonged debate upon the revenue policy of the Government is invited by the recent message of the President of the United States submitted to this Congress. In it he announces that—

> the amount of money annually received through the operation of the present laws, from the industries and necessities of the people, largely exceeds the sum necessary to meet the expenses of the Government.

This surplus revenue, he says, has continued to accumulate, until it—

> is estimated to reach the sum of $113,000,000 on the 30th of June next, at which date it is expected that this sum added to prior accumulations will swell the surplus in the Treasury to $140,000,000.

With this condition confronting us he tells us that—

> an opportunity for safe, careful, and deliberate reform is now offered.

He then suggests a remedy for this disordered condition of the body-politic, which he informs us is produced by—

> a tariff or duty levied upon importations from abroad and internal-revenue taxes levied upon the consumption of tobacco and spirituous and malt liquors—

in excess of the legitimate demands of the Government.

The remedy proposed is in the revision of these tariff laws.

> These laws—

He says—

> raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subjected to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties.

Then, while he admits that "comparatively a few use the imported articles," yet he claims that millions of our people pay for the same kind made in this country "nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles." A reduction of duties on raw material used in manufactures or its free importation is recommended.

These form the basis and this is the reasoning for the proposed revision of the existing duty. Pursuant to these recommendations the Ways and Means Committee have submitted to this Congress a measure to secure this legislation.

That there should be a revision of the tariff none deny. This far it is not a party issue. Differences occur as to the manner and extent of this revision, and herein arises two distinct theories, involving principles which underlie the prosperity, if not the perpetuity, of our Governmental system.

HOW TO REDUCE THE SURPLUS.

Preceding this, however, and that which inspired the President to address this body, is the immediate question as to the disposal of the surplus revenues of the Government, and the necessity for the pending legislation to reach this end.

Upon this we at once take issue. Not as to the disposal of this revenue, for this the country has been demanding in thunder-tones, but it is as to the means employed and the principle involved that we differ.

This legislation is not necessary to reduce the existing surplus. The surplus is a mere pretext. Concealed within this pretended necessity is the initial movement of the policy and practice of free trade.

A nation like an individual should expend its idle surplus in the betterment of its affairs, in the repair of its establishments, in the payment of its debts, or in generous remembrance of past obligations.

CHEAPEN WATER-WAY TRANSPORTATION.

In the marvelous advance of this Republic, in its grand march to empire, experience has demonstrated that much of our material prosperity is due to the water ways of the country. The inland commerce of the United States is the wonder of the world. The highest interests of state and the sound application of ordinary business principles all appeal to us to have a care to the judicious improvement of our rivers and harbors. The necessity of such control and development is concurred in by the engineers who are in charge of these interests. For the present year these officers estimate that there can be profitably expended $160,000,000 for this purpose.

Had the President manifested the same zeal in the study of the problem of cheap transportation for our own people as he does to the admission by another people of their foreign imports free, his services might result in substantial benefit. We have our own great home markets. To reach these from our widely-extended parts, in the least possible time and with the least possible cost is a matter of vast moment to the industries of the whole nation.

The more numerous the avenues of transit the greater the competition for traffic, and the greater the competition the cheaper the rate. While this may not always be the result as to land transportation, and indeed often finds competition producing combination, yet as to the navigable water ways of the nation we can always rely upon them to offer us a secure refuge against the extortion of monopolies and of unjust discrimination in transportation.

By so much as these exceed just and reasonable charges the producer is impoverished, the consumer is taxed, the laborer is deprived. The producing regions of this nation lie parallel with the great rivers and lakes. No exclusive transit on these waters can ever be secured. These are the highways of all the people. The flat-boat, the skiff, and the barge of the poor man find the same welcome tide and the same propelling current as those which float the yacht of the rich man or the mammoth freight-carriers of the corporation. No combination, no trusts, no rebates, no discrimination can reverse the currents or blow a stronger wind for the rich than the poor. Here, then, is "an opportunity for safe, careful, and deliberate reform." Let us have more free trade and more fair trade on our own waters. Let us reach the farm of the farmer, the mill of the miller, the product of the factory on cheaper highways. We hear much elocution over the "poor man's coat" and the "cheap blanket" as they shall come from the hands of the foreign workman, but little is said as to the monopoly of carriage of the poor man's bread. He pays a far greater tribute on home transportation than he does

through custom-houses. We had far better improve and cheapen the ways to our rich home markets.

What can more appeal to the sympathy of the nation on the one hand, or excite its just indignation on the other than the oppressive tax on transportation which is levied on the products of labor on the wide and fertile domain of the Pacific Northwest? There we behold a river, the third on the continent, and which drains an area equal to one-fifth of the nation, excluding Alaska; a river which carries on its own bosom the deep-draught ships of the ocean further inland than any other of the Republic, and yet not one bushel of grain, not one pound of wool can find a way to our own markets until it has surrendered one-fourth of its own value in freight tariff to the imperial "custom-house" of railway monopoly. Every bushel of grain carried 87 miles by rail, from The Dalles to Portland, is taxed 12 cents a bushel. Along almost the entire distance, and parallel with the rail, often washing its bridges and culverts, flow the deep and majestic waters of the proud Columbia.

This exceeds the freight rate from Chicago to New York by water, 1,000 miles in distance.

Let me beg the attention of the representatives of the Illinois, Iowa, and Minnesota farmers to their happy condition in contrast with the farmers of the Columbia River basin.

And when it is said foreign import duties should be abolished or revised in order that our producers may reach a foreign market to buy as well as to sell, is it forgotten that of the 17,000,000 bushels of wheat awaiting export from the tributaries of the Columbia every bushel is charged a greater tax for its transit of 87 miles along the Columbia by rail than it costs to ship it 4,000 miles by water from New York to Liverpool?

Could the distinguished President not here see "an opportunity for safe, careful, and deliberate reform?"

The representatives of the people in Congress assembled, under their constitutional right to "regulate commerce among the several States," voted liberal appropriations of the immense surplus in the Treasury to improve the water ways of the country and thus to relieve our people from the burdens imposed by excessive charges on land transportation. Twelve million dollars were voted. This would have reduced the idle surplus and "restored it to its place among the people," and 90 per cent. would have found its way to the wage-earner in labor, and he could have received an honest day's wages for an honest day's toil. Consumption would have been increased, production stimulated through the expenditures, and incalculable benefits conferred on the whole people. But the President prevented this reduction of the surplus. He did not question the constitutionality of the appropriation. He did not assert the impolicy nor the extravagance of the proposed expenditure, nor did he deny that it could be profitably expended.

He says in his message:

> This condition of our Treasury is not altogether new, and it has more than once of late been submitted to the people's representatives in the Congress, who alone can supply a remedy.

And yet when they "supply a remedy," he vetoes it! This he does in the face of a condition which he warns us "is more than ever presaging financial convulsion and widespread disaster." Who, we can well ask, is more responsible than himself for the continuance of this very disaster which we are all so anxious to remedy?

RELIEVE THE OLD SOLDIERS OF THE REPUBLIC.

The people's representatives would also supply a remedy in the payment of a just and sacred obligation to the old soldiers of the Republic, for now is a time to be remindful of those brave men who preserved us in war. Several hundred thousand of them still survive, with a few of other wars, including those against the hostile savages of our own frontiers.

Age and infirmity have already reached most of them, while poverty and pain are the companions of many. Thousands of them, penniless and in want, have at last sought an asylum in the almshouses of the country when relief was denied them by the Government which they saved. We instinctively revolt at the thought that it is possible that one of that noble throng who volunteered their lives for the Republic should now, in its hour of supreme prosperity, suffer them to become subjects of neglect and ingratitude.

They can well recall the day when they went forth to battle, that the Treasury had no surplus to trouble the nation. They saw it in debt, and paying ruinous interest to maintain its sinking credit.

Their work sustained the integrity and unity of the Republic. As the old Emperor said of Rome—that he found it of brick and left it of marble—so the old soldiers may say of their Government, that they found it a bankrupt, but will leave it the richest, the most prosperous, and the most powerful on earth.

Let us, then, while they live, be generous to these faithful guardians of the nation. Whatever we may do in their behalf let it not be forgotten we shall still owe them a debt—the debt—which we shall never, never be rich enough to pay. When they are gone let us remember in liberality their widows and orphans. Let us single out the few survivors of those who endured the agonies of prison life—whose systems will ever remain poisoned with the virus absorbed amid the vapors and disease of their dungeon exile.

Let us remember in particular the one who was a private in the ranks and who may not have epaulets and distinction to commend him. Let us equalize the pay of the soldier who received his compensation in depreciated greenbacks, while the banker and bondholder received theirs in appreciated gold. Mere justice—common honesty—will dictate the payment at least of the difference. The soldier's dollar should be equal to the bondholder's dollar. One offered his life to save the Republic, the other his money. Let us be just. Then repeal, what I conceive to be the unjust distinction made in the arrearage act. This erects a bar depriving those applying after a certain date for arrears, while allowing its benefits to those vigilant enough to apply before, although the merits are equal. Besides this, the bounties should be equalized. Let us be honest and pay the old pioneers of the West who furnished supplies and services to the Government in her Indian wars, and who have been begging for years for compensation for their homes and property destroyed by hostile Indians. Keeping in remembrance the numerous Presidential vetoes of measures in relief of those old veterans, it seems almost vain to hope that any portion of the surplus will be permitted in appropriation for these noble objects with executive approval.

IN TIME OF PEACE PREPARE FOR WAR.

The people's representatives would supply other remedies for reduction. We have as a nation a long line of defenseless seacoast, which in time of war will permit dangerous inroads for the enemy; while at the same time the towns and cities within reach must at once be abandoned or suffer destruction without the least attempt in self-protection. The entrances to our bays and rivers are without guard, garrison, or fortification, and the inshore may be laid waste with no timely retaliation. No other nation on the globe is so perfectly indifferent or thoroughly defenseless in this respect. The wise admonition of the great Washington appeals to us now with earnest significance, "In time of peace prepare for war." Experience has taught us that national defense is self-defense, and self-defense is the first law of nature.

LET US PAY OUR DEBTS.

But should there still be a disinclination to reduce the surplus for either of the objects mentioned there should be no hesitancy to apply it, and every dollar of it, in payment of the indebtedness of the Government. In three years hence there will mature $230,000,000, bearing 4½ per cent. interest. That these bonds might be purchased and retired gradually before maturity to the extent of the accumulated surplus, the President was expressly authorized by act of March 3, 1881, in the following language to so use the surplus:

> That the Secretary of the Treasury may at any time apply the surplus money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, or so much thereof as he may consider proper, to the purchase or redemption of United States bonds.

But he did not do it. The law was ignored. He permitted the surplus to accumulate. Every effort to reduce it by appropriations failed. The dependent pension bill passed Congress appropriating $20,000,000. This he vetoed. The river and harbor bill passed Congress appropriating $12,000,000. This he vetoed. Still the surplus remained locked up and retained from circulation among the people. It continued to increase.

On January 1, 1891, as I have before shown, our bonded indebtedness of $230,000,000 will fall due. Had the surplus money in the Treasury been paid to our creditors and the bonds taken up, but little of the debt would have remained at maturity. We could well afford to have paid the premium upon the bonds, and been a great gainer, than to have permitted the interest to grow while the surplus millions were accumulating in the vaults of the Treasury. A government should be at least as prudent as an ordinary business man. What would he have done with his notes outstanding and not yet due, and money accumulating in his business for which he had no use? He would have met his creditors and proposed to call in his notes to the extent of his surplus money, paying principal and interest and a reasonable premium. This would afford an inducement to the creditor, and largely so to the debtor.

WHY WAS THE SURPLUS NOT REDUCED?

When this law of Congress was so entirely ignored and the surplus still retained, a widespread impression was at once created that this mountain of gold and silver was purposely and persistently allowed to accumulate, so that the country might be alarmed, and that it could be said, as the President at last said, that the situation was "more than ever presaging financial convulsion and widespread disaster," and then by a combined attack on the protective policy of the country assume that the crisis was due to the unnecessary continuance of the duties on foreign imports. Had the surplus been reduced in expenditures on river and harbor improvements, on dependent pensions, on sea-coast defenses, on the rebuilding of our Navy, or in the redemption of the bonded indebtedness, it can readily be seen that no surplus would exist, and hence that the chief argument now urged for so sweeping a reduction of the tariff could likewise not exist.

The President, when the country became aroused at his decided refusal to obey the law and thus reduce the surplus, at last explains that the law was—

> subject to the supposition that it was intended as temporary and limited in its application, instead of conferring a continuing discretion and authority.

This is his own language.

The law says:

May at any time apply the supply money in the Treasury * * * to the purchase or redemption of United States bonds.

Can any one misinterpret the full scope and meaning of this? Can language be more comprehensible? Can any limitation in its application here be implied? Who could "suppose" that it was intended as temporary? But he bases his supposition on the fact that the law is found in an appropriation bill. This gave rise to a scruple as to its permanent character. But it has been well observed that the President evidently does not entertain the same supposition and doubt when it comes to the President's increased salary, which was provided for in a law in an appropriation bill. Has he refused to receive any of this increased salary? Other laws are passed in appropriation bills and obeyed and enforced. This Congress is continually enacting such, and they are approved by the Executive.

But this authority was ordained in 1881. If he had the doubt and supposition now relied on, why is it that this doubt was not communicated to Congress and a recommendation submitted that more clearly-defined authority by special act be conferred upon him? The law having passed Congress, it became a mandate of the people; it was their instruction to him; and whether he approved of the policy or not he should, in deference to their sovereign will, have requested a construction of the act or a more specific enactment, and not have waited since his election to express this doubt and until the surplus had accumulated to $60,000,000, and then raise the alarm of "financialconvulsion and widespread disaster," and then admonish us that the surplus will amount to $140,000,000 in June, 1888.

OUR NATION STILL LARGELY IN DEBT.

But what of the indebtedness of the nation? Not one word is found in the entire message as to our entire outstanding obligations. It would not have answered the purpose of the President to have brought these facts into prominent notice. That would have exposed the fallacy of his reasoning. It would have shown at once that no surplus could exist if our debts were paid. Nor does he explain how this indebtedness is to be paid if the revenues are reduced to the minimum proposed by him and the Ways and Means Committee.

OUR PUBLIC DEBT.

Let us examine our condition in this respect.

Amount of public debt outstanding, as per public debt statement for month of June, 1887	$1,688,229,630
Present outstanding interest-bearing debt	1,260,000,000

Has this been forgotten? How shall we provide for that with tariff for ordinary expenses only? In 1891 there will mature the funded loan of $250,000,000; in 1907 there will mature the funded loan of $737,800,600.

OUR REVENUES AND OUR EXPENDITURES.

For a more satisfactory study of this great subject, it is well to view the great balance-sheet of our country, and there find from whence our revenues are derived and for what purpose expended, and this is seen in the following:

The ordinary revenues of the Government from all sources for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1887, were:

From customs	$217,286,893.13
From internal revenue	118,823,391.22
From sales of public lands	9,254,286.42
From profits on coinage, bullion deposits, and assays	8,929,252.83
From tax on national banks	2,385,851.18
From fees—consular, letters patent, and land	3,301,647.16
From customs fees, fines, penalties, etc	1,053,037.86
From sales of Indian lands	1,479,028.81
From Soldiers' Home, permanent fund	1,226,259.47
From sinking-fund for Pacific railways	1,364,435.87
From repayment of interest by Pacific railways	914,793.13
From sales of old public buildings	624,882.20
From sales of Government property	262,832.32
From immigrant-fund	258,402.50
From tax on seal-skins	317,452.75
From deposits by individuals for surveying public lands	94,289.76
From revenues of the District of Columbia	2,367,869.01
From miscellaneous sources	1,458,672.04
Total ordinary receipts	371,403,277.66

The ordinary expenditures for the same period were:

For civil expenses	22,072,436.27
For foreign intercourse	7,104,490.47
For Indian service	6,194,522.69
For pensions	75,029,101.79
For the military establishment, including rivers and harbors and arsenals	38,561,025.85
For the naval establishment, including vessels, machinery, and improvements at navy-yards	15,141,126.80
For miscellaneous expenditures, including public buildings, lighthouses, and collecting the revenue	52,002,647.46
For expenditures on account of the District of Columbia	4,085,251.39
For interest on the public debt	47,741,577.25
For the sinking fund	47,903,248.15
Total ordinary expenditures	315,835,428.12
Leaving a surplus of	55,567,849.54

On the 1st of December last there was in the Treasury of available funds after every ordinary obligation had been provided for $55,258,701.19. On the 1st day of February last this had increased to $85,230,746.09. If the will of the people as expressed in the act of March 3, 1881, had been obeyed, not one dollar of this money would remain in the Treasury. While the reductions proposed by the representatives of sixty millions of people have either been vetoed or studiously ignored, still the necessity exists for some action. This is admitted by all parties. But how will the President agree to dispose of the surplus in the Treasury? If we have any intimation at all, it is through the suggestions of his Secretary of the Treasury. He advises that the money lie in banks, and as by diminished taxation the annual revenues will be less than the appropriations, to this extent this surplus then in the banks could be used for the ordinary expenses of the Government.

By the time this money could be so spent "the revenues would have so increased as to be equal to proper annual expenses." And this again explains why it is that every effort to expend this money directly among the people for public improvements, for the relief of the old soldiers of the Republic, or in the redemption of Government bonds has met the sturdy resistance of the Administration. The banks could not obtain the benefit of it! Here we see the all-pervading influence of Wall street. The voice of the people as against such inspirations is a myth!

As thus it is proposed to retain the present surplus our consideration is next invited to the great scheme of preventing any further revenues beyond the actual and ordinary expenditures of the Government, and to do this the destruction of that policy which has nursed this nation in its hour of affliction and bankruptcy and raised it to its present proud eminence among all the nations of the earth.

For one, I believe in removing various tariff inequalities. Some duties, as I view them, are entirely unnecessary. I am, sir, this far a revenue reformer, but not for the mere purpose of reducing the present surplus nor preventing future surplus revenue beyond ordinary governmental expenditures.

I am a believer in the "general welfare" clause in the Constitution of the United States, and in that other clause therein, "To regulate commerce between the States," and to this end the liberal expenditure of public money in the improvement of the water ways of the nation and the various other requirements to which I have referred.

THE TWO CHIEF REVENUES.

We find the two chief sources of revenue to be:

From customs	$217,286,893.13
From internal revenue	118,823,391.22

The first is that which is imposed as a duty or tax on all imports, and is not borne directly by the people, but is collected through the custom-houses of the nation. It may be said to be a tax on foreign production, paid by the foreign producer, except where like articles are not largely produced here, when the consumer pays it in the added cost. The second is that direct tax upon certain objects within the country, and is at present derived as follows:

Internal-revenue taxes for the year ending June 30, 1887.

Spirits	$65,829,321.71
Tobacco	30,108,067.13
Fermented liquors	21,922,187.49
Oleomargarine	723,948.04
Bank circulation	4,288.37
Penalties, etc	220,204.83
Collections under repealed laws	15,373.65
	118,823,391.22

THE MAJORITY FAVOR A TARIFF FOR REVENUE ONLY.

The greater portion of the majority of this House propose a revision of the former class largely to the extent of a tariff for revenue only, and where incidental protection is permitted it is only as a compromise. Ultimately this party will favor a duty on only such foreign imports as are not produced here, excepting, with discreditable partiality, such staples in the South as sugar, rice, tobacco, etc., as is done in the pending bill. Under this system we relieve the foreigner of taxation, and American consumers pay all the duties.

The foreign production in other respects will find here an open market and unrestricted competition with American products and American labor. Many of these advocates deny with much warmth the imputation that they are "free-traders." "Incidental protection" can not save them, for this is no protection at all, and is practical free trade.

What are we to understand by "protection?" That imposition of a duty on all such objects imported as are produced here, and just so much as will equal the difference in foreign and American labor. This is protection.

Remove this difference and you have free trade. As labor in almost everything in traffic constitutes the chief value in the article, so it is labor virtually which is made subject to either protection or free trade. If the article in one country is the product of cheap labor, it must, with free trade, supplant that of the other country where labor is not cheap. We say we shall have "cheap goods," "cheap wool," and "cheap lumber," but it would be more appropriate to say we should have cheaper labor in these articles.

Well may we sympathize with that misguided man who is a toiler with his hands, when he boasts that under free trade we shall have cheap goods. When he raises the gate of protection and allows ingress

to the Trojan horse of free trade, it will open its flanks and overwhelm him in his own citadel with its armed conquerors.

He is forging a chain with which to manacle his own limbs. The most conclusive arguments, however, are results. It is to these we turn to resolve our doubts as to the superior virtue of protection or free trade.

A COMPARISON OF WAGES.

As wages is the price of labor, and labor is the capital of the workman, is it not natural that he should prefer that policy or that market that pays him the most on his capital? As the merchant takes his wares, so the workman takes his labor to the market of greatest profit.

Under our present system the laborer is much better off than is his competitor on free-trade shores. He obtains superior wages, and pays but a small advance in price for his necessaries.

A few instances will suffice:

Occupation.	England.	United States.
Brick-makers.....per week...	$8.00	$21.00
Blacksmiths.....do.....	6.00	13.00
Butchers.....do.....	6.00	12.00
Carpenters.....do.....	7.50	15.00
Farm-hands.....do.....	3.00	7.50 to 9.00
Laborers.....do.....	4.10	8.00
Machinists.....do.....	8.50	18.00
Masons.....do.....	8.00	21.00
Printers.....1,000 ems...	.20	.40
Printers.....per week...	6.65	13.40
Painters.....do.....	7.50	15.00
Teamsters.....do.....	5.25	12.00
Tinners.....do.....	5.00	8.00 to 0.00

Carroll D. Wright, chief of the Massachusetts bureau of labor statistics in 1882, made a comparison of the difference in wages and living between a weaver and his two children in Massachusetts and a like number in Lancashire, England. The former earns per week $10.30, the latter earns $6.96—an excess of $3.34 to the Massachusetts weaver.

COMPARISON OF LIVING.

The same statistician presents the expenses of a family in England and one in Massachusetts.

Prices and quantities consumed per week.	Retail cost at Blackburn, England.	Retail cost in Massachusetts.
Bread, 8 four-pound loaves	$1.20	$1.28
Corn-meal, ½ peck	.22	.22
Flour, 6 pounds	.26	.27
Fresh meat, 5 pounds	.95	.80
Bacon, 2 pounds	.36	.40
Potatoes, 40 pounds	.40	.84
Milk, 7 quarts	.42	.42
Vegetables	.12	.12
Coffee, Java, ½ pound	.16	.16
Tea, ½ pound	.12½	.15
Sugar, 3 pounds	.24	.30
Rice, 2 pounds	.08	.20
Butter, 1 pound	.30	.35
Molasses, 1 quart	.12	.16
Soap, 1½ pounds	.10	.10
Coal	.36	.62½
Oil	.12	.10
Rent, 5 rooms	1.20	1.50
Total per week	6.73½	7.99½

It is thus shown that wages are better and living but a trifle greater under protection America than in free-trade England. But it is said by the free-trader, "We pay dearly for this enhanced price on American labor in being deprived of buying in a cheaper market." And then the poor man is appealed to and eloquent perorations are uttered and many feigned tears shed in defense of this oppressed victim of the robber manufacturer. The cost of a blanket or a suit of clothes is the most common illustration. The price in England is quoted and to this they add the import duty, and then defiantly remind the American laborer that for similar manufacture in the United States he must pay this sum and thus pay tribute to the robber tariff. With this they then proclaim that the duty becomes a tax. "If it is not what is it for?" they ask.

PROTECTION BEGETS CHEAP PRICES.

To refute this absurd and misleading impression that a duty is a tax it has been shown in this Chamber, in the case of the "poor man's blanket" recently imported from England, that a similar article, a five-pound American blanket, was selling here for $5.20, whereas, if the free-trader's theory is correct, the account would stand:

Cost in England at wholesale	$4.45
Duty	4.25
Customs fees	.65
Total	9.35

The protectionist answers in this wise:

Cost of blanket in England at wholesale	$4.45
Higher price paid American labor	.75
Wholesale price of American blanket	5.20

The duty on calico is 5 cents a yard, and yet its retail price is that now. When this class of industry was in its infancy in this country, machinery crude, operatives unskillful, and the custom patronizing its old foreign markets, the free-trader's present statement contained truth, for in that period of the struggling industry even a higher duty than the present added to the English cost could not breathe into it the life of competition.

But protection nursed it, fed it, and guarded it from attacks by the full-grown, skillful, and vigorous wolf of "free trade," until at last it has lived to manhood, and now in its consciousness of acquired skill it promises in a brief period to meet "free trade" at its very doors and compete for the mastery of its own markets.

Many other American industries have already reached this proud vantage ground.

Cutlery, hardware, tools, reapers, mowers, drills, harness, trace-chains, American saws, shovels, forks, are all exported to England to-day and sell in that market.

American watches and clocks are found in every portion of Europe, as well as American boots and shoes and American cotton fabrics. The American laborer can also buy his furniture, his carpet, and his nails cheaper here than in England. The farmer can buy his wagons cheaper here than an Englishman can make them, together with his mowers and thrashers. With a little more encouragement and a little more of our intense spirit of rivalry and competition among ourselves, and soon not a product of American manufacture can be made cheaper in Europe, and with improved skill and improved machinery and our fertile inventive genius, we shall become the cheapest and best as we are now the greatest manufacturing nation on the earth.

COMPETITION DID THE REST.

All must concede that prices have gone steadily down as the American home manufacturers have increased in skill and obtained home patronage. Twenty years ago the farm wife paid $1.50 for a calico dress of 10 yards, while now our manufactures have so improved and their trade so increased that 60 cents will buy the same article. Twenty years ago protection was in its infancy, and see how it has cheapened prices since. But contrast the prices under rigorous free trade before 1860. A calico dress would cost then $2.50, and thus with everything else. But now these articles are, many of them, sold cheaper than in free-trade England. To compete with us the foreign import must be sold as cheap. What then becomes of the President's philosophy when he tells us that the price is raised to consumers by "precisely the sum paid for such duties?" Let us always remember that the great secret of the continued advance in cheap prices with us is due to our own competition. Among ourselves we have free trade, but as against the foreigner we have protection. It is internal competition on the one hand and external competition on the other.

Protection has already secured the one and will soon secure the other, as it has in many instances. Here is where our situation is unlike that of any other nation. We are many nations in one. We have every diversified industry and every known resource. The States engage in reciprocal traffic. They have everything within themselves. They are dependent on none. They have their own market. They find here an exclusive sale for those perishable articles of production which can not bear export. It is this new problem which the professors fail to comprehend.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF PROTECTION.

The whole philosophy of protection and ultimate cheap prices may be resolved into an axiom: Protection begets production, production begets competition, and competition begets cheap prices. This is demonstrated by experience. It is even illustrated in the cross-roads store. It is the pioneer of the country, and protected by the conditions which surround it. Prices are high. Soon population increases and the demand increases, and competition is the result and an opposition store is induced to come. Prices cheapen. This invariable result demonstrates the absurdity that the manufacturers of the country are becoming millionaires by reason of their immense profits. Does it not stand to reason that if such inducements were held out to capital that still more would embark in the business? Why is it that at a moment's notice this Government could borrow millions of dollars at 3 per cent. and less of interest? Is it reasonable to assume that this could happen so long as opportunities existed to realize from 8 to 15 per cent. in manufacturing?

The more we buy from England the more she must manufacture for us and the less we shall manufacture for ourselves, and soon we shall have little to sell. We shall then buy more than we sell. The balance of trade will be against us. Our surplus money will go to England. Scarcity of money at home cripples trade, diminishes labor, lowers wages, increases interest, reduces consumption, and lessens the demand. In this condition a nation soon becomes a slave to a foreign market. We had far better sell in a highly protected market where we can have something with which to buy than to buy in a free-trade market where we shall have nothing to sell. When we surrender our diversified and protected home market to the cheap producer of foreign lands we surrender our best resources for buying.

It is much easier to-day for a poor man to purchase a suit of clothes with a saving of ten days' labor than to have purchased a like suit in

the days of free trade with a saving of twenty days' labor. It is not so much that clothing is cheaper now as that wages are much higher. If our manufacturing, our wool-growing, our lumbering, etc., is to be done in foreign countries it is there, and not here, the wages will be paid. To us it will be the killing of the goose that lays the golden egg.

In that contingency it is possible that some things may be cheaper, but let it always be remembered that nothing is cheap to him who has nothing with which to buy.

An old settler was known to be very fond of boasting to those later in the country, when everything had advanced and prospered with civilization and enterprise, how once he could have bought there so cheaply. Pointing out vast farms of rolling meadows and golden grain he would say that he knew the time when he could have bought them for a pair of old boots. When asked to explain why he did not purchase on such inviting terms, he would reply, "Well, I did not have the old boots."

OUR LUMBER RESOURCES.

An immense industry both on land and water, in external and inland commerce, is our vast lumber business. This is among those to be placed under the free-trade guillotine. Our rich lumber market is offered to the foreign lumber merchant. The effect of this legislation will perhaps prove more disastrous to the Pacific coast than to any other portion of the Union.

THE PACIFIC COAST.

The extent and increase of this business on the Pacific are shown in the output for 1880 and 1887, as follows:

	Feet.
California	304,795,000
Oregon	177,171,000
Washington	160,176,000
Idaho	18,204,000
Nevada	21,545,000
Arizona	10,715,000
Total in 1880	692,606,000

There were employed to manufacture this 4,784 men. The feet of lumber cut in 1887 may be thus given:

Washington	600,000,000
Oregon	300,000,000
California	400,000,000
Miscellaneous	70,000,000
Total	1,370,000,000

THE TIMBER BELT OF THE PACIFIC.

The varieties as well as quantity of the Pacific coast lumber for commercial purposes are far famed. The hard-woods, such as maple, ash, and myrtle, are found on the Coquille River and other streams as well. The unrivaled Port Orford cedar, the fir (Oregon pine), spruce, and sugar pine on Coos Bay, Puget Sound, Umpqua, Columbia River, Gray's Harbor, Shoalwater Bay, Tillamook, Siuslaw, and on Humboldt Bay and other points lower down, with the world-renowned redwoods of California, embrace an area on the Coast Range not less than 25 miles in width, and lie between 44° and 52° north latitude, 8 degrees or 560 miles in length. On the Cascades and Sierras is found in greatest abundance the sugar pine.

In Alaska are extensive forests of yellow pine covering an area almost as large as the rest of the coast west of Nevada. Like the forests of Norway, those along the Pacific, owing to the humid atmosphere, are reproductive, and when denuded soon recover a new and rapid growth of the parent species. Not only is manufactured lumber here of value for local export, but millions of feet are now shipped by rail to points as far east as Chicago, and already over one-twelfth of the annual product is exported to foreign countries, as the following statistics show:

Exports of lumber.

Destination.	Feet.	Value.
Australia	2,181,742	$122,061
Asiatic Russia	154,631	3,787
Apia	995,412	22,204
Chili	5,000	100
Fanning Islands	4,568	116
British Columbia	34,405	2,596
China	4,051	140
Central America	66,923	18,263
England	1,054,000	20,420
Gilbert Islands	23,423	425
Ireland	2,414,560	41,820
Hawaiian Islands	428,664	10,110
Mexico	2,531,679	55,457
Marquesas Islands	42,118	832
New York	201,234	5,032
Marshall Islands	20,007	531
Mangareva	75,000	1,731
Tahiti	660,848	14,929
United States of Colombia	620,638	16,744
Peru	19,500	300
New Zealand	6,007	165
Total	12,166,350	337,763

PROSPERITY EXISTS.

Wherever you find a lumber manufacture you find prosperity within a wide radius of it. The forests of the Pacific afford one of the most majestic sights of the world. Often they seem like immense parks, and as if regulated and selected by the foresight of man. Trees of an ever varying foliage exist. Some tower so high as to reach a height of 200 to 300 feet. The diameter of many will average 8 feet, and of most from 3 to 5, while some remarkable red woods are known to have so huge a trunk as when sawed through will permit the passage of a wagon and team through the standing tree. Some acres are often found to yield 2,000,000 feet, board measure.

These great parks are merry with the music of the mills, the ring of the ax, the fall of the tree, and the moving of the timber. A constant demand for well paid labor exists. A home market is at hand to the small farmers and settlers. Here they sell at remunerative prices their flour, butter, milk, eggs, lard, bacon, fruits, berries, vegetables, hay, and barley. Many of these products, and indeed the most profitable of them, could not reach a foreign market, because of their perishable nature. For 300 miles on the Oregon coast this excellent home market exists for the farmer. The merchant, the blacksmith, the cattle dealer, the butcher, the gardener, and the farmers are all invited to partake of the revenues supplied by these lumber industries. They create a demand. A reciprocity of trade exists. All are protected by our existing tariff.

There are on our coast over 35,000 people engaged in the lumber business, and over 400 American vessels, aggregating 175,000 tons, and most of them moving up and down the coast, entering even the smallest rivers and bays and bringing business to communities which have no other commerce or any outlet to market; for these coasters in addition to lumber transport the farmers' produce. But how is it elsewhere? Nearly every State has large lumbering interests. In 1880 there were 147,956 men employed; wages paid, $31,845,974. The nation's lumber product value was $232,268,729. It exceeds that of the iron, cotton, or woolen trades of the nation. Our timber resources, protected, are so abundant that local competition will always keep the prices at a minimum.

THESE INDUSTRIES IMPERILLED.

Sir, I admonish gentlemen of the serious results which must follow to the great and active business of the lumbermen on the Pacific coast and elsewhere in the nation should the proposed repeal of the duty on lumber be effected. As to the region of the Great Lakes and in the New England States, as well as on the Pacific, our situation is peculiar. There they lie adjacent to a foreign country. We behold the inexhaustible forests of the Dominion of Canada. Shut out largely at present by our present tariff, we have fortunately had no occasion to realize the effect of competition of free lumber. By water, as well as by land, the avenues will open. Already, so cheap is their labor, they can overcome the duty and enter our rich markets with many products. The Dominion lands may be purchased for $1 per acre, and as high as 640 acres to any one person. They also have a homestead and pre-emption law.

Of their occupied lands in 1881, 21,899,982 acres were returned as improved, of which 15,112,284 acres were under crops and 6,385,562 acres were in pasture. In that year they produced 150,000,000 bushels of oats, wheat, rye, and barley, with immense yield of other products; but immeasurably greater in resources is their lumber. In their eastern forests already extensive mills are in operation. On their British Columbia shores we find forests next to our own in quality and inexhaustible in quantity, stretching northward from Victoria and Vancouver and Burrow's Inlet to the Alaskan boundary. Remove the duty from their lumber exports and at once you remove the margin of labor profit from our own lumberman. You drive him either to compete with cheap competing labor or to retire from business; and Americans can not and will not endure this most laborious and often dangerous occupation for less wages and less profit than at present. As it is now, but few loggers realize much more than a comfortable livelihood, and during the recent depreciation in the lumber market it was a struggle for many mill companies to escape bankruptcy. With this repeal they must retire, their mills they must close, their camps abandon, and all operations cease. As if by magic an air of desolation will pervade our forests and mills. Other industries will feel the decline.

But in the Canadian and British Columbia forests active operations will at once commence. Progress will be great and rapid. There will be cheap lumber on cheap lands and by cheap labor. To those discouraged and long-waiting Canadian people it will be the dawn of a new day. At once the stimulus of trade and traffic and labor so recently ours will be transferred to these foreign shores. Our home market this far will vanish. Their great prize will be the American markets. Our farmers can not follow our industries. Cheap farm labor and Canadian tariffs will shut them out.

CHINESE IN MILLS AND LUMBER CAMPS.

We shall also find there an element in the transferred industry we did not expect. Cheap Chinese laborers peering across from their innumerable Asiatic throngs will welcome an invitation to this new field of labor. Here will be a haven for this degraded class. But what shall be said of us? Tell me, you defenders of American labor with whom I have associated and united in this Congress for just and neo-

essary legislation in behalf of the toiling masses, what say you who vote to tear down the wall of protection to American lumbering interests to the effect you produce in bringing this cheap, starving labor of China to compete with American citizens—the honest laborers of our own country?

Can you vindicate your inconsistency? By our restrictive anti-Chinese legislation we drive these Mongolian slaves from our shores and thus protect American workmen against competition from the cheap labor of a degraded class. Yet, in the face of this, and by free-trade legislation, you make it possible—aye, desirable—that these same people may manufacture and labor and produce on Canadian soil and enter their products in our American markets in defiant and exultant competition with our own labor then unprotected. If we are the friends of labor, let us demonstrate it. Let us be sincere. Let us look to results more than to theories.

For these reasons we assert that the repeal of the buty on lumber is a mischievous, unwarrantable, and grossly-injurious measure.

American labor, American capital, and American home markets will all suffer a common fate in an unavoidable disaster.

Another industry, next in value, but more extended among the people, is that of wool-growing. This has been singled out and denounced in the Executive message. The President complains that the profit of the wool-grower is enhanced to the extent of the duty, and this alone, he says, equals about one-third the price of the wool of the former.

The tariff then raises the prices of the wool, according to the President, and this every wool-grower has found to be true. But Mr. MILLS thinks differently. In a speech delivered in February last at Providence, R. I., where it was doubtless thought the manufacturers desired cheaper wool, he said:

In 1860 they wanted more tariff, and they were successful in retaining it, and wool commenced going down. In 1867 was made the celebrated tariff which excluded all wool from the country except low carpet wool, and it has been going down lower and lower, and that is what the high tariff has done, making a lower price for wool.

If he is right, then explain to us what the President means when he says of this duty on wool:

And that it constitutes a tax which with relentless grasp is fastened upon the clothing of every man, woman, and child?

And that—

It is in order that the price of their wool may be increased?

Now, we are asked to compete on equal terms with the degraded labor of Australia and the Argentine Republic. In the latter we find 100,000,000 sheep, and herders are paid $3 per month, while in Oregon they receive from $20 to $40 per month. Is it any wonder that with the present tariff these people have entered our markets, increasing the imports from 1,715,699 pounds in 1882 to 14,038,030 pounds in 1887? Who is so blind as can not see that free trade in wool is the death-knell to American wool industries, and means the slaughter of our sheep and the consequent scarcity and increased price for mutton, the favorite meat of the poor man.

Under what system of economy or sound business method, laying aside all patriotic principles, do the President and the Ways and Means Committee justify their course in favoring free importation of foreign wools, which last year returned a duty of $6,000,000, and which yields to our own American producers of the North and West an annual income of $75,000,000, saying nothing of the $15,000,000 worth of mutton sheep sold in our markets? And yet, with all this, that these same "revenue reformers" should protect the sugar of the South, yielding only about $15,000,000 income, for the protection of which the American consumers are asked to pay an annual tax of $60,000,000, is a subject of grave reflection to all. Wool only imposed a "relentless grasp" of 12 cents on each inhabitant, while the duty on sugar "fastened" a tax of $1 on every man, woman, and child in the land. If all the wool tariff were removed, it would only reduce the surplus to the extent of $6,000,000! Is it for this so great a sacrifice must now be made?

WOOL-GROWERS' PROTEST.

Flock-masters everywhere ask for the retention of the present duty. They even desire a higher protection, and petition for a restoration of the duty of 1867. If a higher duty produced diminished prices is it reasonable to believe they would desire its enactment?

The Wool-Growers' Association, which assembled last fall at Washington, Pa., unanimously adopted the following:

Whereas there are those who are untiring in their efforts to destroy our industry by placing wool on the free-list in the tariff system of our country; and

Whereas, by false classification and fraud in our custom-houses, foreign wool is being admitted at but a nominal duty, thereby nullifying the protection now promised us on the face of the law; and

Whereas this threatening attitude of the free-trade element in legislation and the enormous importations now made in third-class wools, paying but from 2½ to 5 cents per pound duty on wool that should be imported as first class and second class, and requiring a duty of 10 and 12 cents, is the leading cause of the present depression and low price, and also the present admitted practice of importing scoured wool as unwashed at 10 cents per pound when it should pay 30.

At a meeting of Ohio wool-growers, held at Columbus last August, the committee reported—

That all are of opinion (wool growers and manufacturers) that the several interests are in great danger of serious injury from efforts to be made at the next session of Congress to pass unfriendly and disastrous laws in regard to their business.

When we view the astounding growth of the wool industry, the great per cent. of population employed in it, and the revenues it yields our own people, we are amazed to find intelligent persons seriously threatening to annihilate it. From 60,264,913 pounds in 1859 it increased to 302,000,000 pounds in 1885, while the imports of foreign wool increased from 26,282,935 pounds to 70,596,170 pounds. Has any member ever received any petitions from wool-growers asking that wool be made free? Have any petitions or resolutions from any other bodies come to us with this request? No more scathing rebuke was ever administered than that contained in the resolutions of the Wool-Growers' Association which assembled in this city in December, which are as follows:

The wool-dealers and wool-growers of the United States, representing a capital of over $500,000,000 and a constituency of a million wool-growers and wool-dealers, assembled in conference in the city of Washington this 7th day of December, 1887, having read the first annual message of the President to the Fiftieth Congress, declare that the sentiments of the message are a direct attack upon their industry, one of the most important of the country, and in positive violation of the national Democratic platform of 1884, as interpreted by the party leaders and accepted by the rank and file of the party; that the argument made by the President for the removal of our protection against foreign competition is the old one, repeatedly made by the enemies of our industrial progress, and effectively answered in nearly every school district of our land, and so thoroughly disproved by the logic of facts and the demonstrations of experience and history, as to need no answer from us. We acknowledge that our "small holdings," our scattered and unorganized condition, make us the easy prey of the free-trader, but we had a right to expect something different from the Chief Executive of the nation, at once the most happy, prosperous, and contented of any of the world, made so by a policy of protection and development which he now seeks to destroy. We had a right to expect our President would favor the wool-growers of the United States, and confess our deep disappointment that instead he favors the interests of our foreign competitors.

In 1883 a severe blow was struck at this great wealth by the reduction of the duty, and at once the flocks of the country began to decrease until at the commencement of this year they only amounted to 43,544,755 from 50,626,626 in 1884, a loss of nearly 6,000,000 sheep, or about $12,000,000.

OREGON INJURED.

This legislation will affect my own State seriously. The flocks of Oregon increased from 634,400 sheep in 1875 to 2,593,029 in 1887. The wool yield for last year is estimated at 14,000,000 pounds. It gave then to our people about $3,000,000, not counting the sales of mutton sheep. Millions of acres are utilized there in this industry which will prove unprofitable in any other. We are now the fourth State already as to number of sheep, hence it can be seen what we shall suffer under this "reform."

ENGLAND CONFESSES.

And yet with all this our nation is quietly but surely driving to the wall the wool industry in free-trade England. A little more protection and their works must at last fall before the all-conquering energy of the American. A most significant acknowledgment of this is from England's royal commission, which was appointed to "inquire into the depression of trade and industry in Great Britain." Hear what they say in their report as to their wool and woolen industry:

The seriously diminished value of our exports of woolens during the years 1880 to 1884 as compared with the years 1870 to 1874 must be accepted as a clear proof that foreign tariffs are the great cause at work to prevent the natural and healthy growth of this important industry in this country. How rapidly they must have been growing in France, Germany, and the United States, whilst comparatively languishing here, is strikingly shown in the tables on the preceding page. In the eight years from 1876 to 1884 France, Germany, and the United States increased their annual consumption of wool by 325,000,000 pounds, or, allowing for the estimated diminution of the home production of France and Germany, 295,000,000 pounds—that is, 45 per cent.—while ours increased by only 12,000,000 pounds, or 3¾ per cent. * * *

This is illustrated by the extraordinary fact that whilst the value of our exports of worsted and woolen manufactures in the five years from 1880 to 1884 exhibited, as compared with the five years from 1865 to 1869, a decrease of 43.1 per cent., the value of our imports, comparing with the same period, showed an increase of no less than 214.9 per cent.

This fact confirms the evidence given before us by witnesses connected with the various industries that in the case of countries like Germany, possessing in ample measure the population and other resources required for successful manufacturing enterprise, the adoption of a system of import duties on manufactures, and even on primary articles of food, has not disqualified them from successful and growing competition with us in the home and colonial as well as in the neutral markets.

OUR MARVELOUS PROGRESS.

This best of all admissions should satisfy any mind what is for the best interest of our country. Free-traders are the friends of Britain. They would destroy our barriers to save the "natural and healthy growth of this important industry" to England. Why will any American favor such suicidal policy? Are we not each decade making marvelous progress in this industry? Look at the figures: 1865, 155,000,000 pounds produced; 1875, 192,000,000 pounds; 1880, 240,000,000; in 1886, 285,000,000! Our manufactures of woolens are annually increasing, and each year becoming cheaper and cheaper to the consumer. Our importation of foreign woolen goods has relatively decreased, and hence the wail of the "royal commission." Between 1850 and 1860 imported woolens averaged $1.09 per capita; 1860 to 1870, 91 cents; 1870 to 1880, it fell to 86 cents. Our home-grown wool has increased per capita: 1850 to 1860, 2.3 pounds; 1860 to 1870, 4.2 pounds; 1870 to 1880, 5 pounds.

OUR WOOLEN FACTORIES.

And behold this magnificent monument to American skill, energy, and labor! Workmen, look at this:

Year.	Woolen establishments.	Capital.	Wool consumed.	Wages paid.	Employés.	Value of product.
1860	1,263	$30,922,654	83,608,468	$10,153,938	43,738	$65,596,364
1870	2,993	108,910,369	172,078,919	31,246,432	92,973	177,495,659
1880	2,689	159,091,899	240,000,000	47,389,087	161,557	267,252,913
1885*	..	..	.....	.....	.....	.....

*No census.

WE MANUFACTURE ALL OUR WOOL.

Are we ashamed of this grand record? Do we desire to transfer this wonderful element in our mighty progress to alien lands and alien hands? We consume all we produce. We have no export surplus for foreign markets. We manufacture all we produce, and in 1887 had an import demand for 114,000,000 pounds which found here a market from foreign shores, in addition to our own home production of 265,000,000 pounds, reduced by reason of great importations. When we add to the raw wool import the 133,899,788 pounds of imported wool in manufactured goods we have in round numbers 248,000,000 pounds of foreign wools imported here, and in view of the frauds in importations we can safely assume that to-day we manufacture and consume twice as much as we produce. And yet we are asked to abandon our home production and give the entire production up to foreigners! We already produce more wool than any other country on the globe, except one—Australasia. We have but this one yet to outstrip, and in the face of our marvelous advance thus far, who is to deny our ability to accomplish even this result?

SUGAR INDUSTRY.

This of all the protected industries of our nation has shown the least progress as the result of attempted stimulation. For the predominating sentiment of protectionists is to draw a line between those branches capable of developing a self-sustaining and independent growth and those not found so capable. We aim to foster and encourage the former, but where, after experience it is discovered that protection can be assured of no such results, the object is defeated, and the shield should be withdrawn. Protection is to be continued as to this but denied as to those great industries which have made astonishing advancement, and which take from rather than add to the cost on the necessaries of life.

To support and sustain this industry against foreign competition the people have paid each year of the last ten years an average of $45,000,000. And yet not to exceed one-twelfth of the sugar supply is produced here. Less, indeed, is now produced than in 1861'-62, and less the last year than that previous. In the mean while the foreign importations have increased. In 1880 they amounted to 1,869,173,808 pounds; in 1885 to 2,578,993,335, and the last year to 2,781,159,646 pounds. The duty collected in 1880 was $39,107,256; in 1885 it was $50,885,916, and last year it was $56,507,495. This article placed on the free-list, with alcohol used in the arts and for medicinal purposes, may not prove an injudicious reform. Every other protected industry has advanced and made marvelous progress. This has made none.

SUGAR A NECESSITY.

We are also reminded that this, of all articles, enters most closely into the necessaries of the American family. It is partaken in the tea and coffee and the humble meal of the poorest of the land. Formerly a luxury, it has become a necessity. We have admitted tea and coffee free; now let us advance one step more and admit their companion—sugar—free.

BEET SUGAR.

But I would still not suffer the American sugar-planter of the South to go to the wall, for one section of this Union is as dear to me as another. I should favor the system of a bounty, not only to the Southern planter of cane sugar, but to the Western planter of the sugar-beet. A new process has been discovered, and so perfect is the system of extraction of sugar from the beet that it is now found that 70,000 tons of beets will yield 10,000 tons of sugar.

In answer to questions submitted by me to Carl Spreckles during the sugar-trust investigation, that gentleman expressed the opinion that with proper encouragement we can in eight or ten years raise all the sugar that America would consume. California produced 600 tons in 1885 and 754 tons in 1886. A million tons could be produced in California and an equal quantity in Ohio and Oregon, and largely in Kansas. Many lands will yield $100 per acre in sugar-beets which now yield $10 in wheat, and will enrich, not impoverish the soil. Mr. Spreckles says:

You can raise enough sugar here to supply the world.

A BOUNTY ON SUGAR.

France and Germany offer bounties for beet-sugar production. In Germany the bounty system has quickened the beet-sugar industry and now it produces an excess over consumption and exports largely to other countries. The bounty is on the export raw, as well as refined beet sugars. The internal taxes received last year nearly equaled the bounty paid. Let us imitate these countries in their success, and infuse a new life among our farmers and thus stimulate them in the development of this new industry in our nation.

THE FARMERS WILL SUFFER.

Of all classes few will suffer like the American farmer. To-day there are about 9,000,000 people engaged in agriculture. As a class they outnumber all. They know that farming is profitable in proportion as consumers are greater than producers. Manufactures invite consumers. These build up the home market. Four million people in commerce and manufactures will consume, it is said, the surplus production of 6,000,000 farmers. This market is always sure, but a foreign market is often uncertain. We seek the nearest markets first. In every campaign it has been triumphantly charged that the Republican party, when in power, alone protected the manufacturer at the expense of the farmer. The facts, however, prove that this party has ever stood out as the consistent friend of the agricultural industries of the land. Nearly every production of the farm is now found upon the protected list, and I favor a higher protection so that American markets shall be more for American farmers.

The policy as well as the necessity for such legislation is at once apparent when we observe the immense importations of the foreign farmer, even with the payment of duty. This is for the three last months of 1886:

Imports.	Quantity.	Value.
Barley, with duty 10 cents ..... bushels...	6,621,793	$4,086,694
Corn, with duty 10 cents ..... do.....	15,096	7,650
Oats, with duty 10 cents ..... do.....	20,095	7,546
Wheat, with duty 20 cents ..... do.....	102,683	78,620
Butter, with duty 4 cents ..... pounds...	146,310	23,788
Cheese, with duty 4 cents ..... do.....	2,087,366	233,376
Beans and peas, with duty 10 cents ..... bushels...	256,888	254,952
Potatoes, with duty 15 cents ..... do.....	541,664	115,966

EXCLUSIVE CANADIAN FARM IMPORTS.

The cheaper farm labor of Canada is even now largely able to overcome our tariff duties, which the Canadians pay on many products and then compete with us. For instance, the following imports for 1880 and 1887 will show the quantity and also the increase:

Imports.	1887.		1880.	
Cattle ..... head...	59,653	$1,086,645	.....	.....
Horses ..... do...	25,525	3,430,594	.....	.....
Sheep ..... do...	450,175	1,215,437	.....	.....
Barley ..... bushels...	10,351,855	6,170,660	7,126,436	.....
Eggs ..... dozens...	13,682,914	1,930,844	7,662,068	.....
Hay ..... tons...	78,255	789,129	.....	.....
Potatoes ..... bushels...	1,228,406	339,163	660,656	.....
Wool ..... pounds...	1,610,123	357,142	.....	.....

In 1880 Canada sold into the United States nearly $14,000,000 in agricultural products, and in 1887 they had increased to $18,000,000. When the duty is removed let our farmers answer how much more these importations will cut the farmers' home market. Why should our nine million farmers suffer the cheap labor of Europe and Canada to enter this country with $2,500,000 worth of vegetables alone? Think of cabbages from Holland and potatoes from Scotland and Nova Scotia! Think of seventeen million dozens of eggs imported, and many come from Denmark, Norway, and Sweden into our markets! With all these articles on the free-list and no duty to pay, how formidable will be this competition to our farming interests.

But not content with this already formidable competition with our own farm products, it is proposed in the Mills bill to give the farmer a final blow. By reference to this measure we find on the free-list such products of the farm as flax, hemp, jute, beeswax, soap, vegetables, plums, prunes, currants, meats, game, poultry, milk, eggs, beans, peas, bulbs, feathers, grease, garden seeds, linseed, flaxseed, broom-corn, tallow. These are usually the products of the small farmer, as many a poor family is wholly maintained from the sale of their poultry, vegetables, and fruits. It may be asserted that these products have little competition from abroad and hence no harm can result from placing them on the free-list. Let us see. There were imported last year from foreign countries the following:

Articles.	Value.	Duty.
Eggs (now free)	$1,960,405.39	.....
Seeds	845,560.84	$172,437.63
Feathers for beds	204,961.55	.....
Fruits and nuts	15,088,073.82	210,098.64
Flax	1,908,845.00	154,508.63
Hemp, etc	9,971,276.00	1,778,831.39
Vegetables	2,276,204.47	547,509.99

With free trade for all these we can at once perceive how greatly these importations must increase.

Fruits, which our nation produces in such abundance, in such varieties, and of such incomparable quality are now protected by a tariff on the foreign import. They are to go on the free-list. Many vast orchards exist in this country and numerous canning and preserving establishments are located in every State of the Union and employ many thousands of people of all ages. Over $15,000,000 in fruits and nuts were imported last year from abroad, paying $4,210,098.64 as duties to share our rich market. But still the tariff was sufficient to stimulate our own fruit-growers, and this market developed an immense demand. Many poor families derive a livelihood in producing the smaller fruits, while millions of dollars are invested in more extensive dealings and properties.

My own State is about entering upon the fruit industry with renewed energy and hope. The Oregon apple is already world-renowned. Peach and prune orchards have been planted in all sections, the former chiefly in Southern Oregon, and already very remunerative returns have rewarded these energetic people for their toil and risk. No climate in the world is so well suited for this purpose, and the usual pests which annoy the fruit-growers of the East are comparatively unknown. The soil varies according to the location, but the fertile lowlands supply every requisite for the tree growth. The prune, of all the fruit varieties, seems to find in that climate the most congenial requisites and attains a perfection not surpassed in France or Germany. The American Horticultural Society says of the Oregon prune that it must be pronounced unqualifiedly the best that ever came to its notice. It will possibly not prove very glad tidings to these hopeful constituents of mine to learn that Americans are not wanted to produce fruits in this country.

Sir, my time will not permit me longer to dwell upon the various features of the measure before us. I can not bring my mind in aid of its approval. Those whom I have the honor to represent could justly assert that their best interests were sacrificed. Viewing it as a whole it is inequitable, partial, and sectional. It strikes at the farmers of the nation, taking from them many safeguards, and leaves them no compensating equivalent. It discriminates unjustly against the agriculturist of the North and West, while it continues protection to the planter of the South. It exposes and ruins the wool-grower, while it enriches what its friends have so incessantly termed the "robber manufacturer." It takes the means of livelihood from the wage-earner by encouraging British industries, while it strangely professes hope for the "poor man's blanket." While claiming high wages to the American laborer, it invites competition with the cheap labor of Europe. What it collects from the poor man's sugar it delivers to the rich importer.

The voices which plead to us through this measure are rather the entreaties of Birmingham and Leeds than of Chicago and Philadelphia. They should rather reach the people of the United States from the Parliament of England than through the American Congress. The principle is anti-Democratic and anti-Republican as well. Let us rather be admonished by the great statesman of our earlier decades as well as by the warning voices of the fathers of the Republic.

It was the immortal Washington who said:

> The safety and interest of the people require that they should promote such manufactures as tend to render them independent of others.

The clarion tongue of Henry Clay once uttered these words:

> The home market is first in order and paramount in importance.

The unyielding old patriot, Andrew Jackson, said:

> We should become a little more Americanized, and instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of Europe feed our own.

And it was our beloved Abraham Lincoln who said:

> I am in favor of the internal-improvement system and a high protective tariff.

No, sir, it is neither patriotic nor business like that our farms should be on one side of the ocean and our workshops on the other. It is not right that our raw material should be transported to Europe and then brought back again after leaving 90 per cent. to alien labor for manufacture. It is not right to say that any nation can be independent while it is a slave to a foreign market. It is not right that American industries, soon in their very zenith and splendor of perfection and growth, should now be destroyed by their own beneficiaries. Let us, sir, rather stand by that noble policy which has conferred on toiling man the highest wages on earth, which makes him comfortable and free, and decorates him with a dignity of citizenship with which the "golden fleece or Roman eagle" afford no parallel.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa, was recognized.

Mr. BYNUM. Will the gentleman from Iowa yield to me to make a suggestion? Only five minutes remain until the time for taking a recess. He has the floor and will retain it. Will he now yield to a motion that the committee rise?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I should prefer doing that, resuming the floor in the morning.

Mr. BYNUM. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9051) had come to no resolution thereon.

CLEMENT A. LOUNSBERRY.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill (H. R. 2524) for the relief of Clement A. Lounsberry.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clement A. Lounsberry, late postmaster at Bismarck, Dak., the sum of $1,214.51, that being the amount expended by said Lounsberry in the payment of clerks necessarily employed in said office from April 1, 1881, to June 30, 1882, and for rent, fuel, light, and other expenses from July 1, 1883, to the 30th day of September, 1885, and which amount was disallowed in the settlement of his accounts.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. What is the amount?

Mr. NELSON. A little over $1,200. The bill has been favorably reported.

Mr. BYNUM. Let the report be read.

The Clerk commenced to read the report (by Mr. SIMMONS).

Mr. NELSON (interrupting). I think I can make a brief explanation, which will take up less time than the reading of the report.

Mr. BYNUM. Very well; let the gentleman make an explanation.

Mr. NELSON. This claim is for clerk-hire paid out during what was called the boom period in Bismarck, Dak. The claimant was postmaster at Bismarck. A great amount of business was done during a short period, the boom period, and he was compelled to hire extra clerks. For what he paid out no compensation has ever been allowed him.

The bill has twice passed the Senate. It was favorably recommended by Mr. Frank Hatton, then Assistant Postmaster-General; and it has been favorably reported unanimously by the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SPRINGER. Does the gentleman mean the Committee on Claims of the last Congress?

Mr. NELSON. No, sir; I mean the Committee on Claims of this Congress. In the last Congress the bill came from the Senate too late to be considered at all.

Mr. BYNUM. The trouble about allowing this is that it is just such a claim as hundreds of others now arising on account of increased business.

Mr. NELSON. This was only a temporary matter.

Mr. SPRINGER. I suppose it is all right. I do not think the gentleman from Minnesota would ask anything that is not right.

Mr. BYNUM. I shall not oppose the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. NELSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid upon the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of 5.30 p. m. having arrived the House, pursuant to order, is in recess until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 8 o'clock p.m., and was called to order by Mr. MCMILLIN as Speaker *pro tempore*.

TARIFF.

Mr. MAISH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the tariff bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

[Mr. HOLMES withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. FELTON. Mr. Chairman, I shall not attempt to discuss this great economic question as a whole or as to the relative merits of the principle of protection versus free trade, it having been ably, and I may say exhaustively, discussed during the long period that has been consumed in its consideration, but will confine my remarks to one item of the free-list schedule in the bill now under consideration, which not only interests the people of the United States, but especially those of the State which I have the honor in part to represent.

Sir, I am opposed to the putting of quicksilver on the free-list, being of the opinion that such action will in nowise conduce to the benefit of the consumer or add to the nation's wealth, but, on the contrary, will enhance its value, cause the removal of the millions of dollars now annually received for this product from our coffers to those of other nations, and force those now engaged and employed in its production in this country to other avenues of industry, there to compete with those now engaged and laboring in them, as such action will effectually paralyze this home industry.

Mr. SPRINGER. May I ask the gentleman from California a question?

Mr. FELTON. Certainly.

Mr. SPRINGER. Do I understand the gentlemen to say that if the tariff is taken off quicksilver, as proposed in the pending bill, the quicksilver mines of California will be closed? Will it not pay to work them if the duty is removed?

Mr. FELTON. In my opinion that would be the effect. If the gentleman will kindly favor me with his attention, I think he will concur with me.

Mr. Chairman, it is necessary to a correct understanding of and conclusion on this subject that we review the history of the production of this metal and ascertain the facts in connection therewith as well as the present situation; it should be instructing, it may not be uninteresting.

The sources of the production of quicksilver in all the past and at the present time are practically but four—Spain, Austria, Italy, and California, in the United States.

The great Almaden mine in Spain was discovered over four hundred years before Christ, For twenty-two centuries it has been in course of development, always paying a profit, though its production previous to the fifteenth century was comparatively small (it being principally used for the making of vermillion), when in 1557 its amalgamating qualities with the precious metals was discovered, thus creating a large and increasing demand. It is the most perfect metallic deposit ever discovered of cinnabar, or perhaps of any other metal; consisting of three parallel veins or fissures, about 100 feet equidistant, penetrating the earth almost perpendicularly, they varying in no place over 10 degrees, growing richer and wider in metal each foot penetrated until a little over 1,000 feet is reached, where the bottom is richer than at any point above. There are immense reserves of ore in its lodes above the lower level, which are thought to contain sufficient metal to supply the world's demand for the next half century; for the last twelve years the average percentage of metal per ton of ore was 9 per cent.; for the last two years 10.50 per cent.; wonderful and fabulous as it may seem. Its product since 1850 is about equal to the entire production of the eighteenth century.

The Idria mine, in South Austria, was discovered at the close of the fifteenth century. Next to the Almaden this is the richest mine, the bottom of the lode showing no diminution either in the quantity or quality of its ores; for sixty-three years ending in 1880, its average yearly profits were $164,000. Its reserves of ore are estimated to contain 900,000 flasks of 76½ pounds.

It will be here noted that these two mines are respectively owned and controlled by the Spanish and Austrian Governments, and worked for their account; their policy always having been wise and conservative in producing only sufficient to supply the demand at good prices, having large reserves and invariably holding its surplus products for a good market.

Of the Italian mines I have been unable to obtain any reliable history or facts of its production other than that their yearly product amounts to a sum of between two and five thousand flasks, an amount too insignificant to affect the commercial value of the metal.

Cinnabar was discovered in California during this century, and its development commenced in 1850, cotemporary with that of the discovery and working of its gold mines, from which time it has steadily been prosecuted with varying results as to amount produced and profits realized. In 1850 the ruling price was $114.50 per flask of 76½ pounds, or $1.50 per pound; it now is $37 per flask, or 48.32 cents per pound; though great fluctuations in price have occurred during the thirty-seven years of its production in California (the highest figure reached being $118.55, the lowest $25.25), yet, notwithstanding these fluctuations, its price has in the main been steadily declining.

I have prepared a table which I desire to have printed with my remarks, showing the yearly production and prices from 1850 to 1888, or thirty-seven years, in California. A careful examination of the table will show that the prices during all that time have ruled in accordance with the California production; as the product increased, prices declined; as it decreased, prices increased; when the production for a term of years was uniform, the price practically remained so, taking into consideration the surplus stock and occasional unexpected demand. I therefore assert that the California production for thirty-seven years has controlled the price of the world, the conservative and wise policy of the Austrian and Spanish Governments being a material factor in the result.

Amount, production of quicksilver in California, and prices from 1849 *to* 1888.

Year.	Number of flasks.	Highest price.	Lowest price.
1850	7,723	$114.75	$84.15
1851	27,779	76.50	57.35
1852	20,000	61.20	55.45
1853	22,284	55.45	55.45
1854	30,004	55.45	55.45
1855	33,000	55.45	51.65
1856	30,000	51.65	51.65

Amount, production of quicksilver in California, etc.—Continued.

Year.	Number of flasks.	Highest price.	Lowest price.
1857	28,204	$53.55	$45.90
1858	31,000	49.75	45.90
1859	13,000	76.50	49.75
1860	10,000	57.35	49.75
1861	35,000	49.75	34.45
1862	42,000	38.25	34.45
1863	40,531	45.90	38.25
1864	47,189	45.90	45.90
1865	53,000	45.90	45.90
1866	46,550	57.35	45.90
1867	47,000	45.90	45.90
1868	47,728	45.90	45.90
1869	33,811	45.90	45.90
1870	30,077	68.85	45.90
1871	31,695	68.85	57.35
1872	31,621	66.95	65.00
1873	27,612	91.80	68.85
1874	27,796	118.55	91.80
1875	50,250	118.55	49.75
1876	75,074	53.55	34.45
1877	79,396	44.00	30.60
1878	63,889	35.95	29.85
1879	73,684	34.45	25.25
1880	59,926	34.45	27.55
1881	60,851	31.75	27.90
1882	52,732	29.10	27.35
1883	46,725	28.50	26.00
1884	31,913	35.00	26.00
1885	32,073	32.00	28.50
1886	29,981	39.00	32.00
1887	33,800	48.00	36.00
Total	1,485,170	118.55	25.25

In 1878 California had some thirty producing mines; in 1887 she has but ten. The decrease was largely owing to the decline of prices and the uniform low prices prevailing, at which they could not be profitably worked.

A comparison of the factors entering into the cost of mining in Spanish Almaden and the California Almaden will illustrate how unequal is the struggle in the production, namely:

"The whole of the underground working in the Spanish mine, after twenty-two centuries of working, can be comprised in a rectangular block 700 feet long, 350 feet broad, and 1,027 feet deep," having produced since 1850 to 1868, 1,239,776 flasks of metal. The exploration and ventilation is accomplished by three shafts. In 1883–'84 the total amount of material taken from the mine was:

	Tons.
From ore-chambers	17,557
From barren ground	1,900
Total	19,457
Ore raised	17,557
Ore worked	17,101
Worthless	456

Number of tons of ore reduced, 18,465.57, yielding 45,765 flasks, or 9.485 per cent.

The California Almaden workings extend over a very large area, "comprised in a rectangular block 5,000 feet long by 6,000 feet wide, and 2,300 feet deep." They do not cover all the area here indicated, being very irregularly distributed within it. The workings are accomplished through six shafts.

In 1885 the total amount of material extracted was:

	Tons.
From ore-chambers	78,452.86
From prospect and barren ground	56,095.70
Total	134,548.56
Ore raised	78,452.86
Ore worked	33,524.68
Worthless	44,928.18

Number of tons reduced, 39,534.65; yielding 21,400 flasks, or 2.07 per cent.

The wages paid at the Spanish Almaden mine, so far as I have been enabled to obtain them, though incomplete, are reliable:

Miners, ore-chambers contract, average per day	$0.81
Miners, barren-rock contract, average per day	.57
Masons in quarries, contract, average per day	1.03
Lumbermen (day pay)	.55
Furnacemen (day pay)	.40

These departments probably command the highest wages, and if the assumption be correct we may conclude the average wages to be from 50 cents to 60 cents per day. The cost of production in 1882–'83 being $7.10 per flask.

The amount of wages paid in the California Almaden mine for relative positions is:

	Per day.
Laborers in *labores*	$2.00
Miners on yardage contract	2.80
Laborers on surface	2.00

Firemen	1.75
Timbermen, including captain	3.20
Carpenters	3.04
Blasters	2.75
Surface mining	1.50

While the above table is incomplete, it will serve to illustrate the difference paid in wages, the lowest being $1.50 per day; and the statistics of this mine show that for the year 1885 the average wages paid, including all employés, was $2.43 per day, and the cost of producing quicksilver per flask $26.38, $19.28 in excess of the cost of production in the Spanish Almaden mine. This large advance of cost in the production is owing to the large amount of waste material necessary to excavate, the difference in the richness of the ores worked, and the higher prices paid for labor, the latter averaging four times greater than that paid by the Spanish mine.

And now, sir, in order to be fair in my statement to the House, in justice to the intelligence and skill of the mine managers and employés of this mine, it is incumbent on me to state that the statistics of the expenses of the working of the two mines develop the following facts: That in 1885 eight times the amount of material was extracted from the American mine that was taken from the Spanish mine in 1883, its production, however, averaging only 20 pounds of quicksilver per ton for that year, while the Spanish mine's production was 200 pounds per ton; that the average number of tons handled for each worker in the Spanish mine was only 6 23 tons, while at the American mine there was extracted over 63 tons per worker, or ten times the amount extracted in equal time; that the cost of production, as before stated, of the Spanish mine was $\frac{17}{100}$ of that of the American mine. It costs no more to extract and reduce rich ore than poor, and were the American ores equal in richness to the Spanish the production of the American mines would be ten times as great, and cost $2\frac{64}{100}$, equal to $2.64. Add for flasking $1, and we have $3.64 as the cost of production, as against $7.10 in the Spanish Almaden—a striking illustration of the benefits to be derived from an intelligent and well-paid labor, a labor only created or maintained by fair and commensurate wages, and only to be found in the United States.

Of California's production from 1850 to 1888, the New Almaden mine produced 873,259 flasks; estimated value, $35,321,350; from other sources, 611,911 flasks; estimated value, $24,751,799. Total value, $60,073,149, directly received from this home industry. But would we have its true value to the nation we must add its indirect value to the consumers, which should at the lowest be estimated at a sum equal to the amount directly received for the product, making a grand total of $120,146,298. Its use being a necessity, if not produced at home it must be purchased from foreign production, and consequently foreign producers receive in this instance such a figure as they choose to name; as, notwithstanding our production for 1887 was 33,000 flasks, our importation in January last was 36,041 flasks, and in March 13,844 flasks.

The United States is one of the largest of the few large consumers of this metal, if not the largest, owing to our great and increasing mining industries, which have no equal in extent or wealth, and consequently we are correspondingly interested in the price of the mineral consumed by them, amounting to millions of dollars annually. It may be said that upon its price will depend the continuance of many of the producing mines and the development of many others.

Now, sir, in view of the facts herein set forth, taking into consideration the position now occupied in this industry by the Spanish and Austrian Governments; the remarkable and unparalleled extent and richness of their mines, in which centuries of production has made no perceptible change or diminution in their ore bodies, with continuing and increasing percentages of value; their great reserves of explored ore; the large amount of surplus stock of metal (that of the Spanish mine being 64,000 flasks); the continuing and compact ore bodies rendering the exploration and extraction of its rock proportionately cheap; their present cheap labor and certainty of its continuance, and that, but for California's production, they would be practically the only owners and producers of this metal—in short, monopolizing its production and consequently its market price; that taking into consideration the facts connected with California's production, the poverty of its ores at the present time (their value being only from one-fifth to one-tenth the value of the Spanish ores); their want of concentration in continuous and compact ore bodies; the large area requiring exploration and development, thus causing additional cost for excavating and working of the ore; the handling of large quantities of refuse rock, occasioned by the diversity of the distribution of metal in the large areas of the lode; that American labor in this industry receives four times the amount paid to the foreign, for which reasons it costs about 3½ times more to produce it in America than in Europe—now add to the present cost of production, namely, $26.38 per flask, the amount of the present tariff, 10 cents per pound, or $7.65 per flask, and you have $34.03; take the present market price, $37, and you have a profit of $2.97 over cost and tariff.

Remove the present protective tariff of $7.65 per flask from the present market price and you have $29.35, at which the foreign importer could sell without losing his present profit, which is $22.25 per flask less freight and charges, and yet would only leave the home producer a margin of $2.97 per flask, an amount too insignificant to pay for wear and tear and the depreciation of plant, wholly ignoring interest on plant and capital invested.

No one could be induced to invest under this actual state of affairs; but those now engaged in it are forced to continue the struggle, hoping for favorable developments of ores in the future and an increased protection from the Government. But remove the present tariff and those left must suspend operations. As heretofore shown many of our mines have already been compelled to shut down at these and higher prices.

Now, sir, I submit to the very able chairman and the intelligent members of the Ways and Means Committee who now preside over the material interests and destinies of this nation, under this statement of facts, which are reliable, will they continue to keep this mineral on their free-list schedule, cause the consumer to pay at least twice the present price, and drive from this industry into others five thousand laborers earning unequaled wages? For this will be the inevitable result of such determination. Sir, in my opinion it would be wisdom to increase the tariff to 15 cents per pound, to insure the continuance of this industry to compete with a monopoly of nations in an article that has no equivalent; hence our consumers must have it at some price, or abandon enterprises requiring its use. Such a course would violate no principle of protection or free trade, as this industry is an exceptional one, subject to no principle rule or argument, except that of nature's first law, self-preservation.

Sir, could the committee visit the Spanish Almaden mine and behold the misery and often want of its laborers, observe their vices, and absolute ignorance, the accumulation of centuries of ill-paid labor and overpopulation, and then turn to the American Almaden mine, whose model village sits enthroned upon a mountain whose sides are dotted with plantations of the olive and the vine; gaze upon the spires of its churches, public schools, and libraries rising from among its vine-clad and flower-enframed cottages beneath the fraternal shades of its evergreen oaks; observe the manly bearing of its stalwart laborers, the intelligent countenances of its inhabitants beaming with smiles of content and happiness, all reflecting credit on its superior and humane management and intelligent laborers, a living monument of individual liberty and high priced labor, they would pause ere they made of this beautiful scene a deserted village of ruined homes.

Mr. THOMAS, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, from the report of the Secretary of the Treasury we learn that it will require $326,530,000 to meet the obligations of the Government during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1888, and ending June 30, 1889. The estimated income of the Government from sources other than taxation for the same period is $35,000,000. Taking this amount from the sum $326,530,000, estimated to meet the probable obligations of the Government, and there will remain $291,530,000 to be provided for either by a loan or taxation in some form. No party in this country proposes to borrow the money to meet the deficit. The only legitimate resource is a resort to taxation and this has already been provided for by law. The Secretary of the Treasury estimates that during the next fiscal year there will flow into the Treasury from—

Customs	$228,000,000
Internal-revenue sources	120,000,000
Making the sum	348,000,000

This would be $56,470,000 more than the estimated needs of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889. The Secretary of the Treasury in his last report also stated that the receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, were $371,403,277.66, that the expenditures for the same period were $315,835,428.12, which left a surplus of receipts over expenditures of $55,567,849.54. He also stated that the receipts for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, actual and estimated, are $383,000,000, and the expenditures for the same period $316,817,785.48, leaving a surplus of $66,182,214.52. From this it will appear that the aggregate surplus for the three years amounts to $178,219,270.80. This would be an average of $59,406,423 per year. In the reduction of the revenue Congress is limited to the result thus disclosed. We may and doubtless will differ in respect to the methods of reduction, but all will agree that the revenue the Government is now receiving should be reduced.

It is both unwise and unjust to the people to collect more revenue than is demanded to defray the proper purposes of the Government. All experience shows that an increasing and accruing surplus in a State or Federal Treasury invites a profligacy in the expenditure of money, and in the end brings in financial disaster and ruin. It seems therefore plain that there must be such a change in our tax laws as will bring about a reduction of the revenue to the basis of the probable annual expenditure of the Government. If the reduction of the surplus was the only result to be attained the problem could be solved without difficulty.

To cut off, indiscriminately, sufficient revenue would bring about the desired result. But the chief end to be attained is not the reduction of the revenue. The serious conflict of opinion, and the main point in the controversy, is the method by which that reduction is to be brought about. We are confronted with a multitude of probable results as soon

as we come to consider the question of reduction. We should be governed with great care in our movements, for the result of ill-advised and inconsiderate action would do more harm to the public interest than a great surplus in the Treasury.

This is the only nation in the world disturbed with a surplus revenue; other nations are worried in devising measures to enlarge their revenue; their statesmen become skilled in the methods invented for the imposition of more taxes, and the amount of their debts and taxes has increased with the years of their progress. Taking the decade from 1870 to 1880, taxation increased in Great Britain, France, Russia, Sweden and Norway, Germany, and all other governments, great and small, of Europe 28 per cent., England being the lowest at 20 per cent. and Germany highest at 57 per cent.

For more than a hundred years we have looked to Great Britain for examples of legislative wisdom, but in ascertaining ways and means for the reduction of the surplus revenue of this country we must examine our own case and treat it in the best light we can. We stand as a noted exception in this respect in the line of nations. Debts in other countries are increasing, while in this country the opposite condition exists. In 1866 our public debt was $2,678,123,103.87. On January 1, 1888, it was, less cash in the Treasury, $1,225,598,401.99, being a reduction of $1,452,527,701 in the short period of twenty-two years. The average increase of percentage of taxation in European countries from 1870 to 1880, as before stated, was 28 per cent. What was it in the United States for the same period? There was no increase, but, on the contrary, there was a decrease of 9.15 per cent.

Our national debt is fast disappearing; the rate of taxation is being diminished; the revenues are greatly in excess of our expenditures. Our financial condition is most satisfactory, exceptional when compared with that of the nations of the world. We have a large annual surplus, and the all important question before the country is what are we going to do with it?

How shall the reduction be brought about? Shall the proposed reduction be taken from internal revenue, or shall it be taken from customs revenues, or shall it be taken from both; and if the reduction is to be taken from both, then in what proportion from each? These are questions of great importance to the people of this country, and upon these questions the Republican and Democratic parties divide.

The revenues of the Government are derived from two sources, that is internal taxation and a tax on imports. From this it will be seen that we have a double system of taxation—the one direct, the other indirect. It has not been the settled policy of the Government to permanently maintain both systems. The founders of the Republic had a choice of the two methods, and they determined to raise the revenue which was necessary for the support of the Government by imposing a duty on imports from foreign countries. While that method has undergone modifications, it has never been wholly abandoned at any time, and I think I can safely say that it has been the approved method of raising revenue to provide for the ordinary expenses of the Government. While direct taxation has been resorted to upon two occasions before 1862, to meet great national emergencies, it has always been abandoned as soon as the necessity passed away.

In 1791 direct taxation was resorted to in order to replenish an empty Treasury of the new Government, and in 1813, in our second conflict with Great Britain, we again resorted to direct taxation to raise the necessary means to carry on that war. The act of 1791 was repealed nine years after its passage; and the act of 1813 was repealed in the year 1817, during the administration of President Monroe. From the organization of the present National Government, in 1789, to 1862, a period of seventy-three years, not more than $22,000,000 of all our revenues were derived from direct taxation.

In 1862, to meet the extraordinary demands of a great civil war, we again resorted to internal taxation, and we have continued that system to this time, and the result has been that we have a large surplus in the Treasury.

The Republican party believes that in imposing duties upon imports that these duties should be so levied as to give encouragement to American enterprise, the employment of American labor, and the investment of American capital; and that party insists that the duties on imports should be levied not with a view to raising "revenue only," but also with a view to encourage American industries and the employment and protection of American labor.

The Democratic party, under the lead of President Cleveland, denounce the system as "vicious and illogical," and assert it to be not only unwise but unconstitutional. It must be remembered that that party of late years has been the peculiar guardian of the Constitution. That party insists that duties on imports should be levied "for revenue only," in the language of their last national platform; that the end to be attained is revenue and the accidental protection is a mere incident. If we should follow the advice of the President and secure a reduction of the revenue in the manner he proposes—that is, by a revision of the tariff without touching our internal revenues—we would, in effect, be putting in operation the doctrines of free trade, and such a course would lead to the destruction of our protective system. Here, then, is a question of policy which we must settle before we undertake to consider the bill reported by the committee. We will approve or condemn the bill as we are in favor of the doctrine of protection or in favor of a doctrine which favors and encourages free trade.

As before stated, it has been the uniform policy of the Government under the Federal, Whig, and Democratic parties to rely solely upon revenues collected from duties on imports to meet the expenses of the Government, and when a resort to direct taxation was necessary it was abandoned as soon as the emergency had passed. The Republican party has been criticised in this debate for continuing the established policy of the Government in the reduction of the revenue; that is, first reducing the direct taxes before interfering with the tariff. Under this policy the Republican party in eleven years reduced taxation more than $362,000,000, while the Democratic party since 1866 has been in control of the House of Representatives for eleven years only reduced taxation a fraction over $6,000,000.

By putting tea and coffee on the free list and other modifications of the tariff we reduced taxation $78,000,000, and by removing internal taxes we reduced the revenue $284,000,000. These were war taxes which had been imposed to raise money to carry on the war; and if they had been retained the protective system must have been destroyed, because we were raising more money than we needed and had to make a reduction from the internal revenue or reduce the duties on imports. The Republican party will never consent to the substitution of direct taxation for that policy which yields revenue sufficient to carry on the Government and at the same time encourages American industries and protects American labor. In the reduction of $6,000,000 made by the Democrats while they had a majority in the House of Representatives they lost sight of the poor man's clothing and the necessaries of life, and relieved that portion of our people who were suffering under the load of taxed whisky, snuff, and tobacco.

When the first Congress under our national Constitution assembled we had an enormous debt, no credit, and no money in the Treasury. To provide sufficient money to meet the national obligations was the first duty. Under the new Government Congress had the power of taxation and the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations. How should this power be exercised? Should the duties be so imposed as to develop American industry, or should they be imposed to raise "revenue only?" They devised a plan not only for raising revenue, but they laid the foundation of that great American system which achieved our industrial independence and resulted in making this the richest and the most powerful Government in the world. To the act imposing duties was a preamble in this significant language:

> Whereas it is necessary for the support of Government, for the discharge of the debts of the United States, and for the encouragement and protection of manufacture that duties be laid on goods, wares, and merchandise imported: Therefore, etc.

From which it will be seen that the fathers of the Republic in the very beginning took the bold ground that duties were to be levied not only for revenue but to encourage and protect American industries. The Government, under the Articles of Confederation, was not able to protect our manufacturing interest or to advance our commerce. It was the commercial interest of the country as much as anything else which secured the adoption of the present Constitution. One of the leading statesmen of that period said that—

> To be independent for the comforts of life we must fabricate for ourselves. We must now place our manufactures by the side of the agriculturist. The grand inquiry now is, shall we make our own comforts or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to dependence upon that nation or to be clothed in skins and live like beasts in dens and caverns.

This is the language of Thomas Jefferson, the great apostle of Democracy. He enunciated an idea which has stood the test of time, and that is, "We must place our manufactures by the side of the agriculturist." He also said that—

> Experience has taught me that manufacturers are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort.

President Washington said to Congress in his annual message:

> Congress have repeatedly and not without success directed their attention to the encouragement of manufactories. The object is of too much consequence not to insure a continuance of their effort in every way which shall appear eligible.

The policy of protection has been confirmed by a hundred years of national experience and it has been approved by the foremost men and statesmen of this great country. From the 4th day of July, 1789, when the first tariff act was approved by President Washington, to this time, we have tried the system of a protective tariff and a tariff for revenue only. What has been the history of the country during that period as to prosperity? Did the country flourish more during the time a tariff "for revenue only" was in existence, or did we have the greatest amount of prosperity during the existence of a protective tariff?

An appeal to history will show that the eras of free trade or a revenue tariff have been times of depression and disaster, and that during the periods of protection this country has witnessed the greatest amount of prosperity. The British Government during our colonial history prevented the establishment of manufacturing industries in this country, and by an act of Parliament a manufacturing establishment was declared a public nuisance and abated in South Carolina, and this same State of South Carolina in 1833 tried to destroy the Union because the

Government had established a policy of protection. It was the policy of the British Government that we should not be permitted to establish manufactures in this country. We were to be confined to agriculture, and our markets for our products was to be in England. We must buy all manufactured articles in England. There must be no home market for our products. We were at the mercy of England. Then we had free trade, but upon such terms as England thought proper to concede to us. Do the people of this country wish to be placed in that condition again? Free trade will bring it about. The act of July 4, 1789, gave to this nation industrial independence and destroyed the dominating voice of British statesmen in the affairs of this country. In 1824 a measure was enacted which gave sufficient protection to guaranty capital and labor from foreign ruinous competition. The tariff before that date, while a great protection to home manufactures, was not deemed sufficient, and the result was that our manufacturing industries were of uncertain growth. The embargo of the war of 1812 stimulated the industries of the country, but as soon as peace was declared in 1814 a flood of foreign importations brought disaster to our manufactures.

England was determined not to lose her American market, and foreign goods were placed upon our market at a loss to the manufacturer in order to destroy our industries. Her statesmen declared that it was well worth while to incur loss upon the first exportation in order by the glut to stifle in the cradle these infant manufactures in the United States which the war had forced into existence contrary to the natural order of things. If the tariff is reduced to a revenue basis England will again attempt her old policy of exporting at a loss in order by the glut to stifle in the cradle our infant industries.

The tariff of 1824 and 1828 enthused new life into our industries, which had been languishing by reason of British competition, and the country witnessed a period of marvelous prosperity. A writer of that day said:

> So soon as the tariff of 1824 went into operation the whole aspect and course of affairs changed. Capital was invested, labor came into demand, wages advanced, mines were opened, furnaces built, mills started, shops multiplied, business revived in all its departments, revenue flowed copiously into the coffers of the Government; the debts created by two expensive wars were entirely paid off. Such a scene of general prosperity had never before been seen by our people.

Unfortunately for the country the compromise tariff of 1833 was passed, and this act provided for a gradual reduction of duties until they should reach an average of not to exceed 20 per cent. The effect of this change of policy was that our manufactures one after another went down under excessive foreign importations. To save itself capital invested in industrial enterprises was withdrawn. American labor stood idle. Then came the panic of 1837, which created more wide-spread desolation than any event of the kind in the history of the country. In 1840 the people of this country demanded a change, and in the election of General Harrison in that year by the Whigs a change was brought about. The tariff act of 1842 was passed, and the protection system again resorted to. The result was that in a short time our industries, which had been destroyed under the operation of the tariff of 1833, were revived, and instead of disaster we had wide-spread prosperity.

In 1844 the Democrats defeated Henry Clay by the cry of "Polk and Dallas and the tariff of 1842." At least that was the issue in Pennsylvania, and that State was carried for Polk on that issue, and he was elected. The result was the tariffs of 1846 and 1857, and men now living know the disastrous consequences which resulted to the country from the passage of these revenue-tariff acts. The Government, in times of profound peace, was forced to borrow money at ruinous discounts of from 12 to 30 per cent. as the Treasury was empty. This brings us to a new era of protection in the year 1861. In March, 1861, the Republican party assumed control of the affairs of the country, and then commenced the most important movements in the history of this nation. The party which then took control of the Government has demonstrated that it had the capacity and the courage to control a great country during the period of a great civil war.

A lack of either courage or capacity in the Republican party would have brought disaster and ruin upon the country. But that party did not fail, but took up its great work, the preservation of the Union, and it succeeded in its purpose as no other party in this country or any other country ever did. It required supreme courage and boundless wisdom in Congress and executive capacity of a high order to meet the startling and extraordinary circumstances which confronted the country at the time. We had no money and we were without credit. We had to have both, and both were essential to success. Credit had to be created and money had to be created, and both were created in such a volume that the continuing demands of one of the greatest wars that ever afflicted a nation did not exhaust them.

In taking upon itself the legislative, executive, and judicial powers of the Republic the Republican party clearly demonstrated that it possessed the essential qualities to govern the country in time of great peril, and no partisan criticism can deprive that party of the honor of carrying the country successfully through the great conflict. As before stated, in 1860 we had no credit at home and none abroad. How is it to-day? People seek our securities for investment, and they command a premium here and in Europe. We were then borrowing money to meet the ordinary expenses of the Government and paying an exorbitant rate of interest. We now authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to anticipate our obligations with money taken from an overflowing Treasury.

In 1860 our manufactured products amounted to less than $2,000,000,000 annually. Now they amount to about $7,000,000,000 annually. In 1860 this country was the third in rank of the manufacturing nations of the world. Now we are in the front rank. How about our farmers? If they could be present at the debate in this House they would conclude that they were the worst oppressed people in the world; that their farms were depreciating annually; that their annual harvest was of less value each year. We find that our farm values in 1860 were about $3,000,000,000. In 1880 they were more than $10,000,000,000, and producing an annual harvest value of more than $3,000,000,000.

England in 1860 boasted of a national wealth of $30,000,000,000. At that time our aggregate accumulations were only $16,000,000,000. But what have we done under these years of protection since 1860, under the most adverse circumstances of a great civil war? In 1880 we were the proud possessors of more than $60,000,000,000 of accumulated wealth. In 1860 England boasted of her great wealth and claimed that it was the result of her free-trade policy. How is it now? We have passed her in the great industrial race. She is now behind, with only $42,000,000,000 of accumulated wealth.

After saying this much it seems to me that it can be said that the protective system, after a century of national experience, has been confirmed as the true policy of this country, and a policy of taxation sanctioned by the fathers of the Republic and confirmed by experience ought not to be abandoned and destroyed.

The majority of the Committee on Ways and Means propose to assail and demolish our protective system. A reduction of $78,000,000 annually is proposed, what is, $24,000,000 from internal taxation and $54,000,000 from duties on imports.

It is proposed to transfer from the dutiable to the free list a large number of articles, such as wool, lumber, salt, flax, and other products of the factory and the farm, upon which $22,000,000 revenue was derived last year, and the balance of $32,000,000 is sought to be obtained by placing the duties at a lower rate. This reduction is upon the theory that if you lower the duty you will reduce the revenue. This is a false theory, for by lowering the duty the importations are increased and the revenue will not be diminished.

We are collecting annually $120,000,000 from internal taxation. It is proposed by the bill under consideration to take only $24,000,000 from that source. The President, in his message opposed the reduction of the internal-revenue taxes. It would seem that he is anxious to assail and impair our protective system. He was anxious to relieve the Treasury of its plethoric condition, but insisted that the result should be reached through the methods of free trade.

But what do the majority of the committee propose in their revision of the tariff? We find that the great wool-growing interest of the country is to be exposed to a ruinous foreign competition. Foreign competition will be the destruction of that great interest. Wool-growing is a matter of prime necessity to a civilized people. In this country that great interest is only in the infancy of its development. If the wool-growing interest is properly protected and encouraged we could produce the material for the clothing of all our people. The majority of the Committee on Ways and Means in their report on this bill advance the idea that free wool means cheap wool, and that cheap wool means cheaper clothing, and that the farmers will obtain cheaper woolen goods and they can afford to submit to the destruction of sheep husbandry.

It may be and no doubt will be true that wool would be cheaper while our foreign rivals are destroying this domestic industry. But when they have destroyed the industry and driven our flocks to the slaughter-pen and taken from our market an annual production of 300,000,000 pounds of domestic wool what will be our condition? Will we not be at the mercy of the foreign producer, manufacturers and consumers both alike? Will there be any restraint upon the cupidity of the man who furnishes foreign wool in our markets?

The farmers are not manufacturers. They produce raw material. In the true commercial sense everything grown by the farmer on his farm is raw material. I speak of the productions of the farmer in the commercial sense. We hear a great deal said about the oppression of the farmer by the existing tariff. What relief is proposed by the President or by the revenue bill under consideration to the farmer? His prejudice is appealed to. The President says that if the manufacturers get raw material free of duty they can stand a reduction of import duties, and still they would maintain their profits. From this it would seem that the President does not want to interfere with the profits of the manufacturers. His object is to reduce the revenue.

It is plain this can not be done without casting the burden on some other industry and injuring the persons engaged therein. Where does he place the burden? He places it on the producers of raw material. Every article produced on the farm is raw material. Labor represents a large percentage of the gross cost in raw material. The policy proposed by the President is hostile to agriculture and labor, for he pro-

poses to unload the burdens from the manufacturing industries and place them on the farmer and on the labor of the country. I do not think I am mistaken in respect of the doctrines promulgated by the President in his message; I do not mean to misconstrue the language used by him.

I think the President is an honest and conscientious man. I am glad that he has brought his party square up to the issue of a tariff for "revenue only." He has been aided in arriving at this conclusion no doubt by one of the most accurate and able writers in favor of free trade in this country. I mean Mr. Henry Watterson, of Kentucky, a thoroughly honest man, and dangerous because he is honest. In order that the farmer may purchase woolen goods at cheaper prices he must consent to a repeal of the duty on wool. This will preserve the profit to the manufacturer, and then he can reduce the price of the goods. Who is to pay the cost of this transaction? The farmer by selling his wool at a lower price pays the cost. The repeal of the duty on wool puts the farmers of this country in competition with the products of foreign countries, and the result is the depression in price and the suppression of that industry.

The production of wool under protection rose from 60,000,000 pounds in 1860 to 308,000,000 in 1884, the year after the change in duty. In 1886 it was 285,000,000 pounds, and according to the estimates of the Agricultural Bureau, 265,000,000 pounds in 1887. The reduction of the tariff duty (act of 1883) caused it to fall off 43,000,000 pounds. Importation of foreign wool has increased from 63,016,769 pounds in 1882 to 114,404,174 pounds in 1887. Here we find an increase of 50,387,405 pounds of imported wool. In 1860 the farmers of the United States owned 22,471,275 sheep. In 1870 this number had increased to 28,477,951. In 1880 the number was increased to 35,192,074.

By our last national census it is shown that our farmers produced in the year represented therein 1,754,861,535 bushels of corn, 459,479,505 bushels of wheat, 407,858,999 bushels of oats, 44,113,495 bushels of barley, 19,113,495 bushels of rye, 35,205,712 tons of hay, 11,817,327 bushels of buckwheat, 110,131,373 pounds of rice, 26,546,378 pounds of hops, 169,458,539 bushels of potatoes, and 5,737,257 bales of cotton. These are all raw material in the proper commercial sense, and labor constitutes the greater percentage of the cost of production. All of these articles can be produced in this country in quantities beyond the home demand. But still we imported them in 1887 to the extent of about $15,000,000. The reason for this importation is the fact that articles are not sufficiently protected against foreign producers. In 1887 we imported of other products of our farms (excluding sugar, molasses, and tobacco in the unmanufactured condition) over $50,000,000, making an aggregate of about $65,000,000.

The farmers in the Western States produce about 12,000,000 bushels of flax-seed. This result has been brought about by reason of the tariff duty on flax-seed. The farmers receive a fair price for the product by reason of protection against cheaply raised seed of foreign countries. A large number of oil-mills have been erected in proximity with the production of the raw material, and the result has been that the price of flax-seed oil, which ranged from about 80 cents to $1 per gallon before these mills were established, now ranges from about 36 cents to 55 cents per gallon. It was the duty on the seed which induced these results. If the duty placed on many articles manufactured in whole or in part from the flax fiber was increased, it would induce the establishment of plants for the manufacture of articles from flax fiber; but as it is the foreign manufacturers of such articles control the American market to a great extent.

The President in his message seems to believe that a duty imposed upon an imported article by the amount of the duty paid enhances the cost of such article to the consumer, and he says that it is a direct tax upon him to the amount of such duty, and he claims that by reducing the duty the article would be lessened to the purchaser to the extent of the duty paid, and he affirms that the duty imposed upon an article imported into this country not only raises the price of the foreign article, but advances at the same time in equal degree the price of the domestic product. In order that I may not do the President injustice I quote from his message as follows:

> But our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles. Many of these things, however, are raised or manufactured in our own country, and the duties now levied upon foreign goods and products are called protection to these home manufactures, because they render it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers to make these taxed articles and sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid customs duty. So it happens that while comparatively few use the imported articles, millions of our people, who never use and never saw any of the foreign products, purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles. Those who buy imports pay the duty charged thereon into the public Treasury, but the great majority of our citizens, who buy domestic articles of the same class, pay a sum at least approximately equal to this duty to the home manufacturer. This reference to the operation of our tariff laws is not made by way of instruction, but in order that we may be constantly reminded of the manner in which they impose a burden upon those who consume domestic products as well as those who consume imported articles, and thus create a tax upon all our people.

The chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means asserts the same theory, and in his speech on the bill under consideration he assumes that a duty is a tax paid by the consumer.

Let us look for a moment, as an illustration, at the steel-rail industry of the United States. In 1865 the first Bessemer steel rail was made in this country. There was a duty of 45 per cent. on the foreign product at that time. This continued until January 1, 1871, when the act of Congress which imposed a specific duty of $28 a ton went into effect. Steel rails in 1867 were selling in our market for $166 a ton in currency, or $138 in gold. The price had fallen to $106.75 in 1870 when the duty was imposed. Now, if the President is correct in his theory, the imposition of the duty of $28 per ton would have had the effect of advancing the price from $106.75 a ton to $134.75 a ton.

But what has been the result? In 1867 our steel-rail mills produced 2,277 tons. In 1887 they produced 2,101,904 tons. How about the price? A ton, in 1867, was sold in our market at $166; a ton, in March, 1888, sells for $31.50. What becomes of the President's theory that the duty enhances the cost of the article and becomes a tax to the consumer? But in this connection we must not lose sight of the fact that millions of capital have been invested in this industry by reason of the encouragement extended by the act of 1870, and that thousands of laborers have been employed in this great industry.

But to further illustrate the unsoundness of the President's theory we have only to refer to the manufacture of soda-ash in the United States. Before 1884 there was none manufactured in this country, and we imported every pound at a cost of about $48 per ton. We consume about 175,000 tons in the manufacture of glass and other products. A duty of $5 per ton was imposed. A company was organized and commenced manufacturing in January, 1884, with a capacity of 50,000 tons annually. Was the duty of $5 per ton added to the $48, thereby advancing the cost to $53 a ton? That is the President's theory. The $5 per ton was not added to the costs, but on the contrary the price fell in the American market in three years as low as $28 per ton, and thus the people paid annually $20 a ton on the entire consumption of 175,000 tons, or $3,500,000.

But why multiply instances? The instances are as numerous as our industries. Every product of a protected American industry has been cheapened by reason of protection. The price of a commodity does not depend upon the rate of duty, but upon a law universal in its application, and that is the great law of supply and demand. If the demand for an article is great and the supply is limited the price will be high, but if the demand is limited and the supply abundant the price will be low. While it may be true that the immediate effect of a tariff will be an increase in price, the ultimate effect will be the contrary. Alexander Hamilton, a man who impressed his ideas upon the age in which he lived, and the greatest intellect of his time, said a hundred years ago:

> But though it were true that the immediate and certain effect of a tariff was an increase of price, it is universally proved that the contrary is the ultimate effect with every successful manufacture. When a domestic manufacture has attained to perfection, and has engaged in the prosecution of it a competitive number of persons, it can be afforded and accordingly seldom or never fails to be sold cheaper, in process of time, than the foreign article for which it is a substitute. The internal competition which takes place soon does away with everything like monopoly and reduces the price of the article to the minimum of a reasonable profit on the capital employed. This accords with the reason of the thing and with experience.

It has been suggested that the protective system is crippling our commerce. In 1860 our exports were only $336,576,057, our imports $356,616,119, being balance of trade against us of $20,040,062. In 1880 our exports were $835,638,658, our imports $667,954,746, which leaves a balance in our favor of $167,683,912. In 1860 our total commerce was only $687,000,000, while in 1880 it reached the enormous sum of $1,500,000,000. From 1848 to 1860, during the low tariff, there was but one year in which the balance of trade was in our favor, and during these thirteen years the net balance against us was $396,216,161, and this sum was drawn out of the country in gold to pay for goods manufactured in foreign countries. In the last thirteen years there has been but one year in which the balance of trade was against us, while we have the immense sum of $1,612,659,755 in our favor, and this has been achieved under the operation of a "vicious tariff."

We have heard a great deal said in this debate about cheap clothing and cheap food for the poor man. No articles are of more universal use (and they are always placed in the list of necessaries) than sugar and molasses. They are found in the home of the poor man, and are consumed by all of the people. Why not place these articles on the free-list? The yearly collections from sugar and molasses are $58,000,000. The repeal of the duty would reduce the price to consumers to the extent of the revenue derived from it. The demand for consumption in this country so far exceeds the amount we produce that the element of competition between our producers and foreign producers is wholly excluded from the case.

When this is the case the amount of duty paid becomes a part of the costs, for the duty paid follows the article into the possession of the consumer. During the year 1886–'87 we imported 2,377,289,920 pounds of sugar and 36,477,626 gallons of molasses. The domestic production was of sugar, 299,533,920 pounds; of molasses, 21,508,732 gallons. From this it will be seen that the element of domestic production is quite insignificant. The effect of the protective policy is almost unappreciable in respect of the development of the home manufacturer.

We wish to reduce our annual collections from revenue about $60,000,000. It will be seen that we collect $58,000,000 per year from sugar and molasses. This vast sum of $58,000,000 is added to the cost of these articles to the consumers. This results from the fact that the domestic production falls so far below the demand for home consumption that competition disappears from the case.

The average lowest price for sugar for sixty-one years, running from 1825 to 1886, appears to have been 7½ cents per pound, and the average highest price for the same period was 10½ cents per pound. For the year 1886 the highest price was 5½ cents per pound and the lowest 4⅜ per pound. It seems from this to be true that, while the consumers of sugar have been paying the duty, the article has been lowered in price. This has been the result of the increased production and the changes in the general conditions of the industry. But the statement is true that the consumers of sugar in this country pay the duty levied on it because, as before stated, the home consumption is much greater than the domestic production. We could put an end to our financial troubles by wiping out the $58,000,000 of annual collections from sugar and molasses. A reduction of $60,000,000 is demanded. Take off the $58,000,000 would leave the insignificant sum of $2,000,000, which would not require a great effort to dispose of.

But I do not wish to destroy the sugar industry of this country. Let us provide for paying a reasonable bounty for the production of sugar in the United States by adopting the plan that has worked so well in European countries. The consumption of sugar in the United States in 1876 was 37.1 pounds for each person in our population. This rate had increased in 1885 to 51.4 pounds, and is still increasing. In 1864 we produced 56 per cent. of all the sugar consumed in the United States.

As disclosed by the statistics of 1884, in twenty years our production supplied only 9¾ per cent. of the total consumption. In 1872 the total production of sugar from the beet in Europe was 873,000 tons. In 1884 this was increased to 2,305,000 tons. A few years ago Germany did not produce sugar in quantity equal to the demand for home consumption. She now manufactures over 1,000,000 tons, and of this she exports 600,000 tons. This is the work of the bounty system. The agricultural industries of the European countries adopting this system have been greatly promoted.

But there is another way by which we can get rid of the surplus without injuring our two industrial conditions. For the last fiscal year there was collected from spirits the sum of $65,829,321.71; from fermented liquors, $21,922,187.49, making a total collection under the internal-revenue law of $87,751,509.20 on the several kinds of liquors and the traffic therein. The total revenue collected for the same period from customs duties, internal revenue, and from all other sources, was $371,403,277.66, from which it will appear that nearly one-fourth of our gross revenue was derived from the internal tax on intoxicating liquors.

Do those who manufacture and deal in intoxicating liquors object to this tax? They do not. They are in favor of the preservation of the tax. The removal of a tax is always hailed with joy and satisfaction. Why should the whisky interests be different from all others in this respect? Do they wish to fix permanently in our revenue system the business of making and selling intoxicating liquors? Shall we make it a necessary presence in our revenue system by giving to it the enduring support of law? One-fourth of the gross revenue of the Kingdom of Great Britain is derived from intoxicating liquors, and in that country it is regarded as a fixed and permanent part of their system of taxation. The habit of use in that country has grown and the volume of consumption increased. All other interests in the kingdom are opposed to any reduction of the taxes on intoxicating liquors.

This determination on the part of the Government of that country to continue that tax has brought about habits of wastefulness which have prevented the acquisition of homes and comforts by the people. I see it stated that intoxicating liquors cost our people $900,000,000 per year. Is this vast expenditure accompanied by any counteracting good? If it were possible any good could be said of it, a multitude of evils would be offset against it. It subordinates every other interest to the promotion of its own ends. It has no politics and it has no religion, except such as it can control to its own purpose. It does nothing to promote the happiness of the people and has nothing in common with any of those elements that are essential to their prosperity. It is the enemy of the best type of humanity. It insists on being let alone and never interferes in elections, and cares not as to political results if its interest is protected. But it is the active enemy of all persons and parties who propose to put restraints on its sale.

It unsettles the moral convictions of the persons engaged in the business, and the demoralization growing out of it often obstructs the administration of justice. In some localities it elects the judges and controls the courts. The whisky interest is a power in this Republic. It never looks to see what good is moving in the political field, but its malign purpose seems to be to see to its own interest alone. But I am asked, why take the tax off this business, which is so injurious to the best interest of the country? I will tell you why. I have learned that numbers will make any cause, however odious in the beginning, respectable. In 1860 Abraham Lincoln, a native son of Kentucky, and the greatest man produced in the tide of time, received 1,300 votes in that State for President. It was then odious to be a Republican in the State. In 1887 the Republicans cast 127,000 votes for Colonel Bradley, the gallant leader of the party.

It is now respectable to be a Republican anywhere in Kentucky. It is the same with any business. Let a large amount of money be invested in any business, that business will become respectable in the eyes of many well-meaning people. Was there ever a more odious system in this or any other country than African slavery? Yet the vast amount of money invested in that wicked institution not only made it respectable but was the cause of one of the most unjustifiable wars that ever afflicted a brave people. Look at the desolated homes in the country, the loss of half a million of men, a public debt of immense proportions—all incurred by reason of an institution in this country which was condemned by the civilized world.

Whisky can be produced at 15 to 20 cents per gallon. A large capital can not be invested in whisky at 15 to 20 cents per gallon. The Government puts on a tax of 90 cents per gallon—about six times the original cost. To pay this tax and take the whisky out of bond requires an immense capital. Now, the business becomes respectable by reason of the capital that must be raised to carry it on. The whisky can be bought at 15 to 20 cents per gallon, but the tax of 90 cents a gallon must be paid and the product put upon the market.

If the whisky tax is repealed the monopoly in the production would be destroyed. The whisky trust is the strongest political power in this country. The rich distillers of the States form the combination. It controls more men in political life than any other interest represented in State or Federal legislation. There is no organization in this country which can raise as large a fund for political use. It controls every liquor store and drinking saloon in the United States, and holds the solid vote of the drunkards and liquor-sellers, a million in number, under its control. They say, "In getting rid of the surplus don't you touch the whisky tax. You may tear down the tariff and destroy American industry if you want to. The tax of 90 cents on the gallon is necessary to our monopoly. If that is abolished our business will be ruined by unchecked competition which we can not control, either as to the quantity to be produced or the price at which it may be sold in the market. We now control the price and the quantity to be produced. The supreme power in this country—that is the United States Government—is our partner in the business. This partner puts our whisky in a warehouse, takes care of it, keeps a small army of men to shoot the poor devils in the mountains of Kentucky and other States who attempt to distill a few gallons, gives us three years to pay the tax till it commands a good price, and then if the market is depressed we are allowed to export our product to escape payment of the tax. Yes, the arrangement between us and the Government suits us as it is now arranged. If you want to be re-elected don't you disturb our partnership. Oh, yes, smash the tariff if you want to; destroy the industries of the country; turn thousands of laboring men out of employment; bring on a financial disaster such as has not been seen in this country since that fatal year, 1837, but don't touch our business." Many a man in this country will take off his hat and then and there swear fealty to the whisky ring. I appeal to the laboring men of this country (and those who know my early history know that I have cause to be their friend, for I have felt the stings of poverty) will you permit the shops and factories in which you now earn your wages to be closed by a reduction of the tariff, and suffer yourselves to be turned idle into the streets that the whisky ring may maintain its enormous monopoly?

Let us make a start towards the ultimate elimination of the liquor tax from our system of taxation. We must not permit the tax upon the manufacture and traffic in intoxicating liquors to become permanent in our system of revenues. We must take our revenue from sources that will promote our industries and maintain the wages of the people who work for a living. If there must be more protection in order to effect this result, then I say let it be extended. If we wish to promote the general welfare let us encourage right and desirable industries and scatter manufacturing plants all over the country and bring the producer and consumer in close proximity.

I know some of my friends will not agree with me in the ideas I here express. I appeal to them to read and carefully study what I have said and I think they will come to the conclusion that it would be a great mistake to intrench this worker of evil in the revenue system of our country so as to enable it to successfully retard and resist the active efforts of the Christian men and women for its ultimate extinction. I am not willing by my vote to give aid and assistance to the most malign foe of organized society. You may ask, what do you propose to do. I propose to remit to the States this whisky question, and if there is to be a revenue to be derived from it let it go to the people of the counties or States. I do not think prohibition is possible in the large cities.

Public sentiment is law. Where prohibition can be enforced let the people adopt it. Where it can not be enforced I would adopt high license. I take humanity as I find it and not as I want it, and I would legislate accordingly. I do not agree with the Prohibitionist, for I think they are trying to accomplish the impossible in this day and generation. Let us build churches and school-houses and educate the people and create a healthy public sentiment, and in that way we may be able to

control the appetites of men, as we certainly can not control their appetites by legislation. The Prohibitionist in 1884 did their cause great harm and lost the sympathy of thousands of temperance people when they deliberately organized their party with a view to defeat the greatest and the grandest man this country ever produced, the man who was the great leader of the only party which has ever done anything for the temperance cause in this country.

Before I close I wish to inquire, Why do we find this large surplus in the Treasury? Who is to blame? Have the President and those in authority under him done their duty? I find that an act was passed March 3, 1881, authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase United States bonds with the surplus in the Treasury. The second section of said act is as follows:

The Secretary of the Treasury may, at any time, apply the surplus money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, or so much thereof as he may consider proper, to the purchase or redemption of United States bonds: *Provided*, That the bonds so purchased or redeemed shall constitute no part of the sinking fund, but shall be canceled.

That act has stood upon the statute-books until now, and subsequent administrations without question redeemed and bought up $182,241,750 of the bonds of the United States.

The President's own Secretary of the Treasury under the same law has purchased not only the 4½ per cent. bonds due in 1891, but has also purchased the 4 percents due in 1907, paying for the former 108 cents on the dollar, and for the latter 127 cents on the dollar, and expending in the purchase of $18,088,000 of such bonds $21,665,500 of the surplus under this authority, which the President said in his message was "subject to the suspicion that it was intended as temporary and limited in its application."

The President refused to proceed under the act of March 3, 1881, because he said that it was "subject to suspicion." Has the law been repealed? Has any court decided against the law? Where does he get the power to set aside a law at will? Where does he get the authority to nullify an act of Congress? If the President had caused this law to be enforced from the time he went into office, March 4, 1885, would there be any large surplus in the Treasury at this time?

There is another question to be considered in this connection, and that is the granting of pensions to the soldiers of the late civil war. If the President had signed the bill passed by Congress upon this subject the surplus would have been greatly reduced in carrying out the provisions of that law. I hope to see that bill passed again. In paying the bondholder, which is all right, let us pay another debt with more merit in it—that is, the debt which we owe to the brave men who went to the front in time of great peril, and by their heroic efforts made it possible for this Government to pay the bondholder his money. I want to see the day when every honorably-discharged soldier of the late civil war who is now in need is granted a sufficient pension to provide for him and his family.

I shall vote for such a law, and also for a law giving to the widows of soldiers a pension. Pay the soldier, the widow, and the orphan what they are justly entitled to out of this vast surplus in the Treasury, and by so doing you will place upon the statute-books of the country an act which will teach the coming nations that this is the greatest, grandest, and the most just and liberal nation to its brave defenders that has ever existed in the tide of time.

[Mr. MAISH withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

[Mr. SPOONER withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

[Mr. ROMEIS withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. SAWYER. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to take any part in the discussion of the general principles of the tariff bill now under consideration. Gentlemen on both sides of the House, distinguished for their experience in public life and for their familiarity with all aspects of this question, have already spoken, and I do not profess to have either the ability or experience which would enable me to add anything to what has already been said.

My only excuse for saying anything is the fact that I have the honor to represent a district which has one of the largest salt industries in the United States, and I am led to believe that this industry will be seriously injured by the proposed legislation.

I desire to speak in behalf of these interests, and in so doing I shall not discuss the question as a party issue, because several gentlemen upon the other side of this House represent districts whose interests on this question are the same as those of the district I represent.

The three great salt interests in the United States, naming them in the order of their development, are the Onondaga reservation, in New York, the Michigan, and the Warsaw district, comprising portions of the counties of Wyoming, Livingston, and Genesee, New York.

The Onondaga reservation has been worked a little over ninety years. Its production has increased from 5,095 barrels in 1797 to 1,220,351 barrels in 1886, the largest yield being in the year 1882, when it was 1,810,775 barrels. The estimated product for the year 1887, as I learn from a speech made in the New York Legislature the present session, was 1,177,145 barrels. The production at this point for the past few years has been slowly diminishing. Salt at these works is made almost entirely by solar evaporation.

The development of the salt interest in Michigan practically began about the year 1860, since which time the production has rapidly increased, especially since 1869, when provision was made by law for its inspection.

Its production has increased from 4,000 barrels in 1860 to 3,667,257 barrels in 1886.

The production for the year 1886 was graded as follows:

	Barrels.
Fine salt	3,548,731
Packers'	22,221
Solar	31,177
Second quality	71,235
Common coarse	3,893

"Common coarse" simply means a salt of imperfect grain but standard purity, and making this a separate brand leaves "fine salt" more uniform and of a higher grade.

The yield in this district for the year 1887 was 4,200,000 barrels, as I understand.

In this district the salt is almost exclusively evaporated by artificial heat, the fuel being very largely the refuse of these lumber mills, slabs and saw-dust. Down to 1882 the two competing points in the manufacture of salt were the Onondaga reservation and the Michigan districts.

The Warsaw Salt Company, I believe the oldest company in the Warsaw district, sunk the first well in the spring of 1882, and began the manufacture of salt November 22, 1882. The production of salt in this district has increased from 120,000 barrels in 1883 to 1,213,212 barrels in 1886, and the yield for 1887 is estimated at 1,660,000 barrels. In this district there are now twenty different companies having in operation sixty-five wells, besides one company largely engaged in mining salt.

The capital invested by these companies in this industry in this one district is $3,000,000, and employment is furnished to over two thousand persons in the different processes of manufacture and the work connected therewith, besides the large additional numbers directly supported by their labor, making, at a low estimate, three thousand persons directly supported from this single industry in this one district. The development of this industry has greatly increased the growth and business of the country surrounding these salt establishments.

Salt in this district is evaporated by artificial heat, the fuel being principally coal and coal-dust.

For the finer grades after evaporation it is refined by kiln-drying, grinding, and sifting, and if from too much heat or any other cause the salt is off color, and not because of the impurity of the salt itself, it is sold for agricultural purposes.

As to the cost of fuel and labor in this district, one company during the months of December, January, and February last past made 165,033 bushels of salt, at a cost for fuel of $5,000.93, or a little over 3 cents per bushel or $1.25 per net ton; and during the same time the same company paid for labor the sum of $440.03, equal to 2.66 cents per bushel or $1.06 per net ton. So that the total cost of the manufacture of the salt during this period for fuel and labor was 5.26 cents per bushel or $2.29 per net ton.

If to this are added a reasonable interest on investment and a reasonable amount for depreciation of machinery and utensils, some idea may be formed of the cost of salt production.

The average price at which salt has been sold in this district has been 6 cents per bushel, or $2.25 per net ton, delivered on board the cars, packages not included.

In this district there is one company, the Retsoff Mining Company, that mines its salt, raising it through a shaft from a depth of about 1,000 feet. This salt is largely used in large lumps for salting cattle on the plains and elsewhere, or crushed into small pea-sized fragments for salting hides, manufacture of acids, and other purposes.

The entire salt product of the United States for the year 1886 was 7,707,081 barrels, being three-fourths of the entire consumption, of which 6,108,820 barrels were manufactured in Michigan and New York, and 1,598,261 barrels were produced in the other States and Territories, as follows:

	Barrels.
Ohio	400,000
West Virginia	250,000
Louisiana	229,091
California	214,285
Utah	164,285
Nevada	50,000
The other States and Territories	240,000

PRICE.

Previous to the development of the salt industry in Michigan the cost of salt along the Great Lakes was about $2.35 per barrel, or 47 cents per bushel. In 1868, after the Michigan works had been in operation about six years, the price had fallen to $1.80 per barrel. In 1883, when the Warsaw works had fairly begun operations, it had fallen to 81 cents per barrel. In 1886 it had fallen to 60 cents per barrel, and in 1887 it was freely offered at 55 cents per barrel.

The above prices mean salt delivered on board the cars at the works and include the barrel, and estimating them at 25 cents each, would leave cost of salt on board the cars at the works 30 cents per barrel, or 5 cents per bushel.

The coarser grades of salt used for agricultural purposes and for salt-

ing stock can be bought in the Warsaw district by the car-load, delivered on the cars, at prices varying from $1.75 to $2 per short ton, or about 4 cents per bushel.

Dairy or factory-filled salt brings at the works in Michigan and New York from $5 to $6 per short ton, in sacks holding about 200 pounds each, the sacks costing about 4 cents each; the cost of such salt being about 15 cents per bushel.

The margin of profits upon salt manufactured and sold in the Warsaw district for the past two years has been so small that no dividends have been made. The business has been conducted without profit, and in most instances at a loss, although this may be due in part to expensive improvements made to improve the quality of the salt made. Some of the companies have suspended.

A firm in the city of New York, largely engaged in the importation of salt and holding a monopoly in the celebrated Ashton salt, has sent to members of the House a circular for the purpose of increasing the sale of foreign salt at the expense of our own domestic manufacturers.

In it they say that the "cost of mining and crushing salt at Piffard," the Retsoff Mining Company, "is from 50 cents to $1 per ton."

I have the letter of an official of that company stating that this statement is untrue, but that the cost of mining this salt and putting it on the cars is fully $2 per ton.

The same firm says that this company are receiving very large profits upon their salt sold.

To show the contrary to be true I have a copy of returns made by this same firm upon a consignment of over 13 gross tons of salt shipped by this same company in April, 1887, which shows that the net receipt of this shipment, exclusive of commissions, was $8.70, being about 66 cents per ton of 2,240 pounds. Certainly this is a clear illustration of the correctness of their statement.

It is claimed that the quality of American salt is inferior to the best foreign salt.

Whatever truth there may have been in that statement in the past, it is certain that it is not true now.

The most noted producer of creamery butter is the Elgin Butter Company of Illinois, and they use American dairy salt exclusively.

Mr. W. H. Hintze, the president of that company, in a letter to the Genesee Salt Company of the Warsaw district, says:

> After making the most thorough tests we have substituted the Genesee salt for the Ashton heretofore used in all our creameries, and have used nearly two cars of it. We believe the salt to be fully equal to Ashton in purity and perfection of grain, and greatly superior to it in strength. The salt has a great sale. All our customers are using it, and their experiments fully confirm our own and give the Genesee a greater make-weight power than is possessed by any other salt.

At the meeting of the National Butter and Cheese Association held in Chicago in 1886 the majority of the prizes for butter and cheese were taken by users of American salt, and at a meeting of the same association held at Manchester, Iowa, in November, 1887, fifteen premiums were awarded on butter, of which thirteen were taken by butter salted with American salt.

The principal packing-houses in Cincinnati, St. Louis, and Kansas City rely almost exclusively on American salt. One salt company in my district during the six months ending December 31, 1887, shipped to the packers in one Western city over 2,000 tons of salt. Dr. Englehardt, formerly New York State chemist, states as the result of his analysis of Ashton salt, the best foreign salt, that he found pure salt 97.75 per cent., and on an analysis of three samples of different American salt the lowest per cent. of pure salt was 98.48 per cent.

Mr. Chairman, I have principally spoken of the salt industry as it exists in my own district. But taking into consideration the entire salt industries of the United States, from the best information I can gather, more than $10,000,000 capital is invested in this business and over seven thousand persons engaged in the several branches of its manufacture and more than nine thousand persons directly interested in and supported by its manufacture.

The statistics furnished by Dr. Switzler on this subject to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] and used by him in his speech on this subject were taken from the census of 1880, before this discovery of the large saline deposits in the Warsaw district, and do not include the increase of over 1,000,000 barrels in the Michigan district alone. They are therefore clearly and necessarily defective, as showing the present condition of this industry.

Foreign salt pays duty as follows: Imported in bags, sacks, barrels, orother packages 12 cents per 100 pounds, packages included; imported in bulk, 8 cents per 100 pounds.

The amount of salt imported in 1887, as appears by Dr. Switzler's report, and not including salt imported and used in curing fish, upon which the duty is remitted, is as follows: Imported in packages 327,379,530 pounds, valued at $999,504.78; duties paid $392,855.44; ad valorem rate of duty 39.30 per cent. Imported in bulk 355,012,544 pounds; value $356,442.18; duties $284,010.06; ad valorem rate of duty 79.68 per cent., making total amount imported 682,392,074 pounds, or 2,433,114 barrels; total value $1,355,946.96. Total amount of duty received was $676,865.50, and the average ad valorem rate of duty was 49.92 per cent.

From this official statement it appears how greatly mistaken the distinguished gentleman of Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] was when he stated in his speech made in this debate:

> Salt is also made free. The salt manufacturers of this country are protected by a duty on imported foreign salt equal to about 100 per cent. This has had the effect of building up a number or wealthy and powerful companies.
>
> Salt is a raw material in cheese-making, butter-making, and in meat-packing—three interests that exceed the salt-making interests tenfold—but our tariff policy forbids our dairymen and meat-packers from buying cheap imported salt, and compels them to buy from the protected home manufacturers in New York, Michigan, and Ohio, at a price which is nearly doubled by the tariff duty.

His statement that the tariff compels the purchase of salt from home manufacturers at a price nearly doubled by the tariff duty, or, in other words, salt could be bought at the rate of 3 cents per bushel were it not for the duty, is too absurd to need refutation in view of the facts above stated. Our strongest competition is with salt shipped from Liverpool, England.

Of the salt imported into this country for the year 1887 a little over 34 per cent. was imported from Liverpool. The importations of salt from this point, as stated in the circular, dated January 4, 1888, of Mr. Falk, one of the heaviest exporters of salt to this country, has been gradually lessening since 1880:

1880, tons of 2,240 pounds	261,687
1884, tons of 2,240 pounds	233,170
1887, tons of 2,240 pounds	169,136

From the same authority it appears that the price of salt at Liverpool, free on board ship, has been gradually falling.

Common salt:	
1874, per ton of 2,240 pounds	$4.00
1880, per ton of 2,240 pounds	2.25
1887, per ton of 2,240 pounds	1.87½
Fine salt, including packages:	
1874, per ton of 2,240 pounds	10.50
1880, per ton of 2,240 pounds	6.50
1887, per ton of 2,240 pounds	6.12½

FREIGHTS.

The same circular states that at that date, January 4, 1888—

Ocean freights have risen from 40 to 70 per cent. since autumn.

PRESENT FREIGHTS TO AMERICA.

	Per ton.
Southern ports	$1.25 to $1.75
Baltimore	1.00
Newport News	1.12½
Boston	1.00 to 1.25
New York	1.87½

From this it appears that the cost of Liverpool common salt delivered at the city of New York is as follows:

Delivered on board ship, per gross ton	$1.87½
Freight	1.87½
Total	3.75
Add duty	1.79
Total	5.54

So that with no duty the English exporter could as well afford to sell their salt in our markets at $3.75 per ton as they can now to sell at $5.54.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what is the cause of this constant decrease on the quantity and price of salt imported into this country?

Mr. Falk, in his circular above quoted, in speaking of the present English condition of the salt trade, says:

> The salt trade is at the most deadly crisis. Salt is being offered at 50 per cent. below cost. The external cause which mars the trade's progress is protection. To all nations we offer at fabulously low rates cheaper and better salt than any they can make.
>
> But governments, even those of civilized Europe, still force the interests of our small manufacturing class between us and their peoples. The great mass of consumers will doubtless correct this misgovernment at no remote date; and even now the President of the great Republic of the West has sounded the first note of freedom. President Cleveland has now suggested in very clear terms that all necessaries be freed from imposts.
>
> It is scarcely credible that his voice will not avail with the people and with Congress against the small clique of plutocrats which owns the United States salt works.

Now, what is the cause of the great decrease in the price of salt? Can it be owing to the great liberality of the foreign exporters of salt? Certainly not, for they complain of the fact that they are obliged to sell their salt at 50 per cent. below cost. Nothing but necessity forces them to this. But this decrease in amount imported and this great reduction of price is because of the discovery of the immense salt deposits in our own country, the energy and enterprise of our own people in the wonderful development of our salt industries, and the consequent increase of production and the competition necessarily arising therefrom, that there has been this gradual but rapid reduction in the price, so that now a bushel of salt at the works costs less than an equal bulk of sand, and during this time our own people engaged in this industry have been protected by a small tariff duty against foreign competition, and the consumers have been able to purchase the article at a constantly diminishing price.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER], in his speech discussing that question, says:

> I have said, sir, I would illustrate by one single article which the Committee on Ways and Means have ventured to put at last on the free-list. It is the article of salt, so essential, as I have said, in all the departments of industry, on

the farm and in the curing of everything. On that article you have permitted a tax to be levied from the time salt first became an object of taxation to secure a revenue. Now it bears a duty of 12 per cent. on salt imported in bags and packages, and 8 per cent. on salt bought in bulk, except that you took the precaution to exempt from taxation the fish-curer on the coast of New England, which is the home of the protective-tariff system. To him you give a rebate of duty on this great necessity which should have been as free as the air or the water.

Is not sugar an essential article in every man's family, be he rich or poor? and has the gentleman forgotten that the people of this country paid for the year 1887 as duties on this article alone over $56,500,000, and an average ad valorem rate of duty of over 82.04 per cent., and this for the protection of a class producing only about one eleventh part of the entire quantity consumed?

Has the gentleman forgotten that the people of this country last year paid as duties on rice—another essential article in every man's family—imported into this country over $970,000, at an average ad valorem rate of duty of 64.01 per cent., and this to protect a class producing a little over one-half the rice consumed; and if the gentleman believes, as do many on his side of the House, that the amount of duties paid is so much added to the cost of the article bought and paid for by the consumer, does he not believe that the people of this country for the past year paid for these two articles a price increased by over $57,000,000 for the benefit of the producers of these two articles?

His rather sneering allusions to the fish-curers of New England are hardly consistent with his willingness that the people of this country should pay to the producers in his own section of these two articles of sugar and rice, even under the proposed reduced rates, an amount exceeding fifty times the amount claimed to be paid in consequence of the tariff on salt.

The gentleman speaks of the duty on salt as being a tax upon salt paid by the consumer to the producer, and quoting another he says:

You do not dare to say you want it as a tribute. You will put it on a tariff act, but it will come to be seen that it is a tribute.

Is he willing that the producers of sugar and rice should demand that the consumers of these articles should pay to them a tribute of over $30,000,000 even under their proposed reduction of rates?

I do not object to protection to the producers of sugar and rice, on the contrary I favor it. I would encourage the development of these industries, for I believe that under a wise system of legislation we may produce in our country all the sugar and rice our people need for their own use.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND], in his speech, speaking of protecting labor, uses the following remarkable language:

The only way to protect labor in this country, or wage-workers, would be to reverse the system; that is to say, to let the cheap commodities that go into the consumption of life, manufactured by the pauper labor, so called, of other countries, come here and supply at cheap prices the laborer of this country. Thus laborers here would get the benefit of labor and capital abroad, and, on the other hand, to prohibit by law or by a tax all immigration or importation of any character of laborers from other countries to our shores to break down the labor market. This wage-workers in these protective industries are demanding at the hands of Congress in so far as to prohibit the importation of contract labor, but we know how easily this law may be evaded and secretly set at naught. Besides, immigration is free; people go and come as they choose, and this law is of no practical benefit.

These remarks are based upon the idea, which is undoubtedly correct, that foreign labor is cheaper than American labor, and also that "cheap commodities" should come in free of duty. Now, supposing that these "cheap commodities," sugar, salt, blankets, clothing, and "other cheap commodities that go into the consumption of life, manufactured by the pauper labor," should "come here free of duty and supply at cheap prices," in whole or in part, the markets of our own country, would it not seriously affect and reduce the wages of our own laborers engaged in the production of these cheap imported commodities?

Again, the gentleman would prevent by law or tax all immigration or importation of any character of laborers from other countries to our own shores for the reason that it would break down our own labor market.

Now, if it would be unwise, in order to protect our own laborers, to allow these foreign laborors to come here and pursue their particular avocations when the money they might spend for their own support would be spent among our own people, would it not be equally unwise to permit the productions of this foreign "pauper labor," so called, to be brought here free of duty and be sold in competition with the same class of articles produced here by our own laborers to their prejudice. I must confess that I am unable to understand why a manufacturer of salt in my own district should be prohibited from going into the salt district of England and there engaging by contract men working there at their low wages to come here and work at the same industry, and at the same time permit the salt manufactured by these same men at home to be brought here free of duty and sold, to the prejudice of our own manufacturers and laborers.

The gentleman from Kentucky, in speaking of the law passed in 1864, under the peculiar situation of the industries of our own country during the last years of the civil war, regulating the importation of foreign laborers by contract, says:

A Democratic House of Representatives repealed this entire act in 1885

But he forgot to say that the vote of a Republican Senate in favor of the repeal and the approval of a Republican President were just as essential factors in the repeal as the vote of a Democratic House of Representatives.

He also says, that—

A Democratic President approved an amendment to the act repealing it, which made the repealing act more effective,

but forgot to say that a Democratic President could not approve an act which had not been previously approved by a Republican Senate.

But now it appears that a Democratic President favors receiving into our own country, free of duty, articles produced by these "foreigners and aliens" whom he is unwilling should come here under contract to labor and spend their earnings, and at the same time permit the importation of articles made by the same class to come here in competition with the same articles produced by our own laborers.

If our own laborers should be protected against the importation of foreign contract laborers, which I concede, it seems to me equally clear that our own laborers should be protected against the importation, free of duty, of the products of the same laborers at home.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have clearly shown that the production of salt in our own country has so largely increased that we now produce three-fourths of all the salt now consumed in the United States. That the quality is now, in fact, and is rapidly becoming known to be, equal to the best imported salt of the same grade. That the price has now fallen so low that it is sold by the barrel, free on board the cars at the works, at the low price of 55 cents per barrel, barrel included. That the competition of our own manufacturers has been so great as to force the English exporters to put their salt, they themselves being the witnesses, upon the market at 50 per cent. below cost.

Besides, it is well known that the price of labor in foreign countries exporting salt is much less than that paid our own laborers in the same employment; that the cost of iron, steel, and copper used in the construction of the machinery and appliances used in the manufacture of salt is much cheaper in foreign countries than here; that coal is cheaper in England than it is here.

It is also well known that gentlemen largely interested in this industry have been here urging that the duty on salt be retained and protesting against its being placed upon the free-list, claiming that this would be ruinous to their industry. These are gentlemen of high personal character and of different political faith, and while they may be interested, it seems to me clear that their reasons are so conclusive that their views should be adopted and their wishes regarded.

And now, sir, in conclusion, I would appeal to this House in view of the facts established, not to sacrifice by its action one of the most promising of American industries.

But a very small part of the vast area of our country underlaid with saline deposit has as yet been developed. This area is so vast that it contains more square miles of territory than is contained in the whole of England, our most formidable competitor.

This industry in our country is yet in its infancy. The energy, industry, and skill of our people will, by the continued development of these vast deposits, reduce the price of salt to its lowest possible sum—a price so low as to render competition from abroad impossible; and while by wise legislation we seek to foster and encourage the production at home of sugar and rice, two of the necessaries of life among our common people, let us be careful not to cripple or destroy one of the most useful of all our industries by placing the same on the free-list.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, Article II of the Constitution of the United States, defining the powers and duties of the President, reads as follows:

SEC. 3. He shall from time to time give to the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

George Washington, the liberator of the country, when he became President adopted a plan of communicating to each session of Congress a message either oral or written, in which he treated of all the questions that were expected to be considered by Congress; that is, of all which he deemed important. This custom has been continued—all the Presidents of the United States have followed it—and at every recurring session of Congress each has laid before that body a paper in which the President has discussed every grave and important question affecting both the internal and external relations of the country. Every President, I said, Mr. Chairman, has done this until the convening of the Fiftieth Congress, on the first Monday in last December, then President Cleveland departed from the rule laid down by the Constitution, carried out by Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Jackson, and all the other distinguished men who have preceded him as the Chief Executive of this nation.

There are many subjects of grave importance that the Congress of the United States, now in session, should consider; questions of both foreign policy and internal rule, but the President of the United States did not seem to be aware of this fact. Grave complications were threatened with England and Canada because of the fishery question. Other questions of foreign policy in regard to the American continent, and the interference of European countries were also pending. The differences

between labor and capital, threatening the very foundation-stones of our Government, the attempts of monopolists to control many of the articles necessary to the life and health of the people. All these and many other subjects demanded the attention of the people; but they surely were not known to the President of the United States, because he has failed to do what the Constitution required of him—speak of them to Congress.

Instead of doing this he has transmitted a message upon but one subject, and I regret to say, Mr. Chairman, in sending that message the President of the United States has not confined himself to such a strict statement of the facts as would be expected from one holding his high position. President Cleveland has declared that the only business which he considers important for Congress is to retain the internal-revenue laws and reduce the tariff. The leaders of his party, acting upon his recommendation, have so organized this House that nothing else can be attended to. The Speaker appointed a Committee on Ways and Means, and a steering committee, to control the business, and these intend to force the adoption of the President's recommendations; that is, the retention of the internal-revenue tax and the reduction of the customs dues. Here is what the President says, which constrains me, as a representative of the people, to rise and enter my protest:

> Our scheme of taxation, by means of which this needless surplus is taken from the people and put into the public Treasury, consists of a tariff or duty levied upon importations from abroad and internal-revenue taxes levied upon the consumption of tobacco and spirituous and malt liquors. It must be conceded that none of the things subjected to internal-revenue taxation are, strictly speaking, necessaries. There appears to be no just complaint of this taxation by the consumers of these articles, and there seems to be nothing so well able to bear the burden without hardship to any portion of the people.
>
> But our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles. Many of these things, however, are raised or manufactured in our own country, and the duties now levied upon foreign goods and products are called protection to these home manufactures, because they render it possible for those of our people who are manufacturers to make these taxed articles and sell them for a price equal to that demanded for the imported goods that have paid customs duty. So it happens that while comparatively a few use the imported articles, millions of our people, who never use and never saw any of the foreign products, purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the same enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported article.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> The farmer and the agriculturist who manufacture nothing, but who pay the increased price which the tariff imposes upon every agricultural implement, upon all he wears, and upon all he uses and owns, except the increase of his flocks and herds and such things as his husbandry produces from the soil, is invited to aid in maintaining the present situation; and he is told that a high duty on imported wool is necessary for the benefit of those who have sheep to shear, in order that the price of their wool may be increased.

Mr. Chairman, it is not true that there is no demand for the repeal of the internal-revenue law; it is not true that customs duties raise the price of the articles on which they are levied; it is not true that the system of collecting revenue by levying customs duties and our present tariff laws are "the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation;" it is not true that the farmer suffers because of our tariff laws.

This system of collecting revenue was recommended by Washington in his first message, and the first law ever passed by the Congress of the United States was one which declared in the statute the necessity of protection for American manufactures. All the great fathers of the Republic favored a system which would build up our home manufactures.

Washington, in his first annual message, January 8, 1790, said:

> A free people ought not only to be armed but disciplined, to which end a uniform and well-digested plan is requisite; and their safety and interest require that they should promote such manufactories as tend to render them independent on others for essential, particularly military, supplies.

Jefferson, in his second annual message, December 15, 1802, says:

> To cultivate peace and maintain commerce and navigation in all their lawful enterprises, to foster our fisheries and nurseries of navigation, and for the nurture of man, and *protect the manufactures adapted to our circumstances.*

And in a letter to Benjamin Austin, of Boston, Mass., 1816, he uses these words:

> The general inquiry now is, shall we make our own comforts or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He therefore who is now against domestic manufactures must be for reducing us either to a dependence upon that nation or to be clothed in skins and live like beasts in dens and caves. I am proud to say I am not one of these. *Experience has taught me that manufactures are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort.*

Madison, in his special message, May 23, 1809, uses this language:

> The revision of our public commercial laws proper to adapt them to the arrangement which has taken place with Great Britain, will doubtless engage the early attention of Congress. It will be worthy at the same time of their just and provident care to make such further alterations in the laws as will more especially protect and foster the several branches of manufacture which have been recently instituted or extended by the laudable exertions of our citizens.

And in his first annual message, November 29, 1809, in speaking of the condition of the country, he says:

> In a cultivation of the materials, and the extention of the useful manufactures, more especially in the general application to household fabrics, we behold a rapid diminution of our dependence on foreign supplies.
>
> But there is no subject that can enter with greater force and merit into the deliberations of Congress than a consideration of the means to preserve and promote the manufactures which have sprung into existence and attained an unparalleled maturity throughout the United States during the period of the European wars. This source of national independence and wealth I anxiously recommend, therefore, to the prompt and constant guardianship of Congress.

Monroe was just as decided in his utterances. In his inaugural, March 5, 1817, he says:

> *Our manufactures will likewise require the systematic and fostering care of the Government.* Possessing, as we do, all the raw materials, the fruit of our own soil and industry, we ought not to depend in the degree we have done on supplies from other countries.
>
> Equally important is it to provide at home a market for our own materials, as by extending the competition it will enhance the price and protect the cultivator against the casualties incident to foreign markets.

And in his first annual message, December 2, 1817, he reiterates these views:

> Our manufactures will require the continued attention of Congress. The capital employed in them is considerable, and the knowledge required in the machinery and fabric of all the most useful manufactures is of great value. Their preservation, which depends on due encouragement, is connected with the high interests of the nation. Under this impression I recommend a review of the tariff for the purpose of affording such additional protection to those articles which we are prepared to manufacture, or which are more immediately connected with the defense and independence of the country.

J. Q. Adams says:

> As yet no symptoms of diminution are perceptible in the receipts of the Treasury. As yet little addition of cost has even been experienced upon the articles burdened with heavier duties by the last tariff. The domestic manufacturer supplies the same or a kindred article at a diminished price, and the consumer pays the same tribute to the labor of his own countryman which he must have otherwise paid to foreign industry and toil.

In the second annual message of Andrew Jackson, December 7, 1830, occur the following words:

> The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust those duties with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry is so completely identical with that power that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States have delegated their whole authority over imports to the General Government, without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to their inspection laws.

In fact, he had before this given quite plain expression to his views. In a letter to Col. Robert Patterson, of Philadelphia, dated May 17, 1823, in acknowledging the present of a hat for Mrs. Jackson, made of American materials by American hands, he says:

> Its workmanship, reflecting the highest credit upon the authors, will be regarded as an evidence of the perfection which our domestic manufactures may hereafter acquire if properly fostered and protected. *Upon the success of our manufactures, as the handmaid of agriculture and commerce, depends in a great* measure the independence of our own country, and I assure you that none can *feel more sensibly than I do the necessity of encouraging them.*

In a letter to Dr. L. H. Coleman, of my own State (North Carolina), August 26, 1824, he says:

> Heaven smiled upon us and gave us liberty and independence. The same Providence has blessed us with the means of national independence and national defense. If we omit or refuse to use the gifts which He has extended to us we deserve not the continuance of His blessings. He has filled our mountains and our plains with minerals, with lead, iron, and copper, and given us a climate and soil for the growing of hemp and wool. These being the great materials of our national defense, they ought to have extended to them adequate and fair protection, that our manufacturers and laborers may be placed in a fair competition with those of Europe, and that we may have within our country a supply of these leading and important articles so essential to war.
>
> *In short, sir, we have been too long subject to British merchants. It is time we should become a little Americanized, and instead of feeding the paupers and laborers of England feed our own, or else in a short time, by continuing our present policy, we shall be paupers ourselves.*

And yet President Cleveland and his party, professing to believe in the doctrines and follow in the footsteps of Andrew Jackson, want to turn us over again to the tender mercies of "British merchants."

The fact that John Quincy Adams stated in 1825 that the price of goods is not increased by the duty levied on the foreign article, a fact that is known to every man in the country who will take the trouble to read a price current of 1859 and one of this year, does not seem to have penetrated to the White House. The President asserts that the farmer pays more for what he buys because of the levying of customs duties, when in fact the farmer pays less for what he has to buy and receives more for what he has to sell.

Mr. Chairman, it is because I represent a district in this House which has been almost purely agricultural in the past, but which is now in part becoming a manufacturing district, that I am compelled to rise here and enter my protest against such doctrines as are contained in the message from which I have quoted and which it is proposed to put into practical operation by the bill under consideration. It is a fact that has been demonstrated so plainly that, he who runs may read, and even a fool can understand, that in those States where the vocations are diversified, where manufactories are erected, where artisans are employed with their skilled labor in producing from the raw materials that come from the field or farm, from woodland or from the mine, such goods as are required for the use of civilized man that there the price of farm lands is increased, not tenfold, nor one hundred fold, but several hundred fold over the price of the same but better lands where only agriculture exists. While the price of the land is thus improved its products are diversified and a ready sale found for them.

It may seem a strange assertion, Mr. Chairman, I have just made, that the products of the land are diversified by the introduction of manufacturing establishments, but it is nevertheless true. Unless home markets are established the farmer can only find sale for those articles which will bear transportation to a distant or foreign market, but if you have a place near at hand where everything can be sold that the soil can produce, he can raise all kinds of vegetables, fruits, milk, butter, eggs, and those smaller products of the farm that will not bear transportation, and I therefore say that the products of the farm are diversified by the introduction of manufacturing establishments.

That it is true what I assert as regards the value of land in manufacturing States, the following table is the best evidence:

Here are three Southern farming States in a group, and three Northern manufacturing States:

	Value of farming lands.
Farming States:	
North Carolina	$6.07
South Carolina	5.10
Georgia	4.30
Total	15.47
Average	5.15
Manufacturing States:	
New York	$44.41
New Jersey	65.16
Pennsylvania	49.30
Total	158.87
Average	52.95

Observe the difference. The farmers, land is worth more than ten times as much in the manufacturing States as it is in the agricultural States.

Wages paid for transient farm-labor per day two years ago was, in—

New York	$1.26
New Jersey	1.17
Total	2.43
Average	1.21
And in—	
North Carolina	.60
South Carolina	.60

Less than one-half as much.

In North and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Arkansas 77 per cent. of the people are engaged in agriculture. These six States possess the best climate, the finest land, and grow the most valuable products of the country. The farming lands have an average value of $5.18 per acre; the rugged lands of Pennsylvania, with only 21 per cent. of the population engaged in agriculture, are worth $49.30 per acre.

In thirteen counties of that State (Pennsylvania) are to be found the principal manufacturing establishments, and the farming land in these counties is worth $86.73, whilst in the remainder it is worth only $40.02. In Ohio the most of the manufacturing of iron is in twelve counties, and the land in these counties is worth $67.85, whilst in the remainder it is only worth $42.46.

But it is true not only of counties in the same States but of neighborhoods in the same counties, that the building of manufactories increases the prices of land near that factory, and gives to the farmers who own that land better prices, and a quicker market for all they produce. The district I have the honor to represent in this House contains eight counties, and I herewith present a table of these counties, showing the aggregate land, the average value of land per acre, the value of money invested in manufactories, the real and personal property, the population, and the wealth per capita.

Statistics of counties of the Fourth Congressional district, North Carolina.

Name of county.	Area in acres.	Aggregate land values.	Average value per acre.	Stock in incorporated companies.	Total value real and personal property.	Population.	Wealth per capita.
Alamance	220,203	$1,593,848	$7.23+	$304,542	$3,217,220	14,613	$219.47+
Chatham	487,470	2,084,924	4.27+	9,630	3,218,206	23,453	138.34+
Durham	154,524	937,811	6.07+	110,940	4,013,049	.....	.....
Franklin	271,333	1,598,773	5.89+	8,560	2,543,502	20,829	122.11+
Johnston	480,504	2,432,891	5.06+	14,090	3,978,684	23,461	169.12+
Nash	332,816	1,669,026	5.01+	825	2,629,925	17,731	148.25+
Orange	234,561	1,030,775	4.82+	30,098	1,995,057	23,698	84.18+
Wake	523,473	3,302,520	6.49+	1,119,963	10,609,189	47,930	121.34+

It will be seen by looking at this table that Alamance County, which has much the largest amount of money invested in manufactories, has $219 wealth for each person in the county, that its land has an average value of $7.23 per acre, whilst Chatham County, immediately adjoining Alamance, only has $138 per capita, and its land is only worth $4.27 per acre, and it has almost no manufactories. Durham County is a new county made from Orange and Wake. Numbers of manufactories have been established in this county, and though its lands are no better than those of the counties from which it was taken, they are worth $6.07 average per acre; that is, a few manufactories built in Durham County have increased the value of its lands in five years $1.80 per acre on the average.

Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen on the other side of the House, following the lead of President Cleveland, declare that they are in favor of the repeal of war taxes. So am I. And strange to say, I am willing to let the Democratic party declare what war taxes are. The only difficulty in agreeing to this proposition is to decide which is the Democratic party. Its convention, which met in 1884 at Chicago, composed of delegates from every district in the United States, from every State and from every Territory, declared that the internal-revenue taxes are "an odious war tax," and should be repealed. President Cleveland, whom this convention nominated and whom a chapter of accidents and a hook full of frauds placed in the Presidential chair, in his message to this Congress said that the internal-revenue taxes were the best taxes to retain, and that the system—the great system of protection to American industry—was an odious war tax.

Mr. Chairman, which is the original Jacobs? Is it that large body of men assembled at Chicago representing the Democrats of the country, or is it that large man seated at the other end of the avenue? Does he compose the Democratic party? Because if he does, I am not willing that the party shall determine what are war taxes and what are not; but if the representatives of the Democratic people assembled in their convention constituted the Democratic party, then I am willing that it should decide this question for me as to what war taxes are.

I assume, Mr. Chairman, that Mr. Cleveland is not the Democratic party. It is true beyond a question that he has the Democratic party by the throat and is compelling it to do what he pleases. I notice gentlemen on this floor who are Democrats and have been all their lives, who come here as the representatives of Democratic constituencies, that squirm and wriggle in the tight grasp of this political despot, but they can not escape; they bend to his will because he has possession of the flesh-pots, which have always been attractive since the days when Moses led the Israelites from the land of Egypt and out of the house of bondage. Holding the flesh-pots as he does, ladling out the pork, Mr. Cleveland is the Democratic party. The others rush to the feed-trough at his call and obey his commands. Taking him as the Democratic party, I will not permit that he select what are and what are not war taxes that should be removed.

Sir, since the foundation of this Government there has been one set of taxes recognized as a direct war tax. The Democratic party in its convention was right when it said the internal-revenue taxes are a war tax. I want that tax repealed. It has taken from the people $3,569,174,618. From my own State there has been taken $38,000,000 in the last twenty years. Poor, impoverished Carolina has been compelled to pay at the rate of 2 per cent. per annum on the valuation of its property. It has paid in twenty years nearly $40 for every living soul within its borders. It has paid a tax of $30 on every acre of land in the State planted in tobacco. It has paid over 4 per cent. of the value of all its farm products each year into the United States Treasury. The reconstructed States have paid into the Treasury of the United States in twenty years over $300,000,000 as internal-revenue taxes. The value of the farms in these States only equals the value of the farms in the single State of Ohio, and yet, poor as they were, these farms have been compelled to pay twice as much of internal-revenue taxes as the State of Ohio has paid.

I could load down the RECORD, Mr. Chairman, with tables to show the injustice of this tax upon the farmers of the country, but it is unnecessary; enough of that has been done. I only desire to say, sir, that, so far as my State is concerned, the demand for the repeal of the internal-revenue tax is universal. It comes from every one, of all politics, without regard to race, color, or previous condition of servitude. There is not a voter in the State of North Carolina that does not demand this repeal. There is not a man, be he Democrat or Republican, who dare advocate the retention of this tax before any audience in North Carolina; and this, Mr. Chairman, is the highest proof possible of the statement I heretofore made that President Cleveland has the Democratic party by the throat. He wants to retain the internal-revenue tax; North Carolina Democrats want it repealed; and yet these same North Carolina Democrats propose to advocate the renomination of President Cleveland, and when that is done they will throw up their hats and shout for him as though they wanted him elected.

Some of them will even go so far as to vote for him, but the number will be ridiculously small in comparison with the number of Democrats in the State, and those that do shout and vote for him will do it with a mental reservation. They will be in the condition of a Western man who made a bet that he could eat crow. When the dish was prepared he sat down to it and commenced his task. He swallowed a few mouthfuls, and said, "Yes, I kin eat crow, but I'm blamed if I hanker arter it."

My Democratic colleague from the Second district of the State admits this when he said here but a day ago—

It is well understood that the people of North Carolina, whom I have the honor in part to represent on this floor, are intensely opposed to the present internal-revenue system, and that their plan of revenue reduction is to begin with the repeal of that system.

My colleague correctly states the wishes of the people who sent him and me here to represent them in part. Knowing their desires, knowing their will, my colleague announces that he does not intend to respect their desires or obey the will of his constituents. He deliberately misrepresents the people of his State and section at the bidding of the Democratic dictator at the other end of the Avenue.

Mr. COWLES, another colleague, from the Eighth district, in his speech on Monday last, says:

Sir, we have too much revenue and too many systems of revenue. Strike down that which is effete and has been permitted to remain beyond the period of its allotted time, and give vital force and energy to that which since the organization of this Government has been established and maintained as the true source of Federal revenue.

The natural conclusion to be drawn from this declaration is that the speaker regards the repeal of the internal-revenue law as of paramount importance to the revision of the tariff.

The votes of my colleagues on the Mills bill will be watched with no little interest by the people of North Carolina.

I beg to quote from the proceedings of a Democratic convention held in Rockingham County, North Carolina, only a few days since. This is one of the strongest Democratic counties in the State. Among the resolutions adopted was the following:

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Democracy of Rockingham, in convention assembled, that our Representatives in Congress should vote for the immediate and unconditional repeal of the internal-revenue laws, and that if they find it impossible at this session to abolish the internal revenue and revise the tariff, we prefer the former should be done.

But to pass on to other subjects. I desire to say a few words upon the action of this Administration and of this House upon the subject of finances, and I shall confine myself to two propositions; that is, the contraction of the currency, and the payment of a premium on bonds. During the last campaign Democratic speakers and Democratic papers were proclaiming from the hill-tops that the Republican party had accumulated $400,000,000 in the Treasury and were holding it there to the great damage of the country. They said that when the Democrats came into power this money should be distributed among the people of the country; it should no longer be hoarded in the Treasury of the Untied States. Mr. Daniel Manning, who succeeded a Republican as Secretary of the Treasury, found in the Treasury $375,000,000. In the three years which the Administration has been in power the amount in the Treasury has nearly been doubled, and there is hoarded to-day nearly $700,000,000. This is the difference between Democratic pledges and Democratic performances.

Instead of reducing the surplus the Administration has nearly doubled it. It is true the Administration had an object in doing this; its object has been to be able to say that it was necessary to reduce taxation, and in that way attack the American system of protection for the benefit of its friends in foreign lands; and why not, when we find that Thomas F. Bayard, the Secretary of State; Charles S. Fairchild, the Secretary of the Treasury; and William W. Endicott, the Secretary of War, are all members of the Cobden Free Trade Club of London, and that, in unison with them, the Speaker of this House, elected by Democratic votes to preside over it (though he failed of being elected a member of the body) is also a member of this free-trade Cobden Club.

The free-traders, controlling the executive as well as the legislative departments, were determined to hold all the money possible in the Treasury, that they might have an excuse to declare it was necessary to reduce what they choose to call taxation—that is, the duties on imported goods. In March, 1881, when a Republican President was inaugurated and a Republican Secretary took charge of the Treasury Department, both this President and this Secretary, coming from the great Northwest, not being the tools of the Wall-street speculators, as is the condition now, it was evident that there would accumulate a great surplus in the Treasury and that the price of bonds would appreciate very rapidly. That Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Windom, immediately and without hesitation acted upon the law then and now on the statute-books—the law of 1869, which authorized him to refund the debt at a lower rate of interest. And he did refund the debt, reducing yearly interest several million dollars by so doing, and at the same time preventing a gorge of money in the Treasury.

Mr. Cleveland and his Secretaries lacked either the inclination or the capacity, perhaps both, to act as did President Garfield and Secretary Windom; the result has been the accumulation of money of which I have already spoken, and the appreciation of bonds until they now bear from 25 to 30 per cent. premium.

In the whole history of the world, from the earliest days of civilization down to the present time, no nation has ever paid a premium upon its own indebtedness. Every nation reserves the sovereign right to pay its debts when it pleases. The United States did this by special enactment in the acts of 1869 and 1870, when the bonds were refunded. But for the first time in the history of the world this Administration, failing and refusing to exercise the sovereignty which belongs to the nation, has been paying a premium upon the indebtedness of the Government.

In marked contrast with the actions of Secretary Fairchild is that of Mr. Goschen, the financial minister of Great Britain, called there the chancellor of the exchequer, but occupying a similar position in that government to what Mr. Fairchild does in this. Mr. Goschen found, when the present Parliament assembled, a surplus in the treasury of Great Britain. He found that money could be obtained at a lower rate of interest than what Great Britain was paying on its consols. Mr. Goschen at once notified the holders of all the three classes of English bonds that he intended to reduce the interest from 3 to 2½ per cent., and he allowed the holders of these 3 percents one quarter of 1 per cent. premium, provided they exchanged their bonds within a certain period of time; and they have accepted Mr. Goschen's proposition. The entire debt of Great Britain has been refunded at 2½ per cent., a premium of only a quarter of 1 per cent. being paid for all the exchange. Mr. Fairchild is paying 25 to 27 per cent. premium on bonds of the United States, when, besides the universal law which authorizes nations to cancel their indebtedness at any time, there is a specific contract made with the holders of the United States bonds that the debt may be canceled or refunded upon contingencies which have already arrived.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other subject in which the people of my State, the people of my section, and the people of this country are all interested. Intelligence is the foundation-stone upon which free governments must be rested or they are in the condition of that building that was erected upon the sands, which, when the floods came and the rains descended, was swept away. Any free government not founded upon intelligence will be swept away and destroyed. A table which I append to my remarks shows how many of the people of the country are incapable of reading and writing. It shows how many in each State are incapable. A bill has been introduced and passed in the Senate of the United States which provides, out of the abundance of money in the Treasury, aid for each State to educate its ignorant. This aid is continued over a period of nine years and amounts to $77,000,000. It is given to the States in proportion to the number in each State incapable of reading and writing. This bill has come to this body. It has been referred to a committee and there it lies sleeping a sleep as sound as that which comes to those who pass away from this existence into another.

The Committee on Education has charge of this bill. It is composed of Messrs. CANDLER of Georgia, MAHONEY of New York, CRAIN of Texas, CARUTH of Kentucky, BUCKALEW of Pennsylvania, LANE of Illinois, COBB of Alabama, PENINGTON of Delaware, Democrats; and O'DONNELL of Michigan, TAYLOR of Ohio, RUSSELL of Connecticut, BELDEN of New York, and WHITE of Indiana, Republicans. I want the people of this country to read these names. I want them to know that these Democrats are denying to the ignorant children of the country benefits of education. I want them to know that at the behest of Grover Cleveland JOHN GRIFFIN CARLISLE, the Speaker of this House, stocked a committee as dexterously as the most proficient gambler would a deck of cards to prevent the passage of a bill which would give the benefits of education to the ignorant. But, Mr. Chairman, that is in accord with Democratic ideas. It is the ignorant and vicious to whom they are indebted for power, and thus they properly encourage ignorance and viciousness.

The State of North Carolina, which I have the honor to represent in part, would receive of the money appropriated by this bill $5,749,121. Instead of the present average of fifty-four school days in the year we could more than double the term. Instead of sending only 148,000 children to school we could send all who are now growing up in ignorance.

Instead of the terrible reproach of having 464,000 of our people over ten years of age who can not write their names, and 368,000 who can not read their Bibles, all would be able to do so.

The district which honors me with a seat in this Congress has 40,968 voters, and I say it with profound regret and mortification that not one-half the children in that district have the privilege of attending school. We have done all we could. We are doing the best that is possible for us to do. It is not the will but the ability that is wanting, and the $791,766 that district would receive under this bill would provide the means of education for all of them.

Mr. Chairman, in the name of the poor ignorant children of the South I denounce the men who are strangling this bill as the enemies of the Republic; as the enemies of free government. I denounce the party which sends such men to legislate for the country as unfit to make laws.

On behalf of the thirty thousand children in my district who are growing up in ignorance for the want of school facilities, I demand the passage of this bill. I present a table showing the population in my district, schools, scholars who attend, children of school age who can not attend, and the amount of money that would be given to us by the passage of this measure, "the Blair bill:"

Counties.	Population.	No. of voters.	No. of schools.	No. of children attending school.	No. of children not attending school.	Amount of money under Blair bill.
Alamance	14,613	3,066	64	3,321	1,827	$59,621
Chatham	23,453	4,862	103	3,732	4,180	95,688
Durham	22,340	3,950	40	2,091	2,128	91,146
Franklin	20,829	4,259	44	1,991	4,818	84,983
Johnston	23,461	4,879	73	3,491	5,027	95,717
Nash	17,731	3,701	60	4,077	1,812	72,332
Orange	23,693	5,283	40	1,576	2,700	96,683
Wake	47,939	10,968	144	7,083	7,934	195,593
Total	194,064	40,968	568	27,362	30,426	791,766

NOTE.—Later returns may slightly change these figures, but they are substantially correct.

Mr. Chairman, the people of this country are not in sympathy with these Democratic policies. They do not believe in free trade. They do believe in protection, and the result is that in November, when the people speak, the free-trade party will once more be driven from power, as it ought to be.

Mr. Chairman, the Democratic party poses as the friend of the workingman. The author and the advocates of this bill declare it is in the interest of the workingman. They even hope to induce workingmen to believe them. With tears in their eyes and supplication in their voices they say to the laborers, "Behold your friends! Look at us; we love you as dearly as a wolf loves mutton." They throw their arms round the workingman and while holding him proceed to reduce him to pauperism by legislation which reduces his wages to the starvation rates paid in Europe.

But, Mr. Chairman, the workingmen of this country will not be deceived by these false pretenses. They are men of brains as well as muscle. They know that upon their intelligent labor rests the prosperity of the nation. They know that only through protection can they obtain wages which lead to independence and the means of education, which leads to intelligence.

Mr. Chairman, the great body of mechanics and workingmen in this country will never submit to the wholesale destruction of American industries, and have their wages reduced to a level with the pauper labor of Europe, and political parties will do well to be warned in time. The party that attempts it will, and deservedly so, be utterly crushed out of existence.

Preliminary computation of amounts to be received by the States and Territories, excluding the District of Columbia, of $77,000,000 *distributed on the basis of the number of persons who could not write in* 1880, *as per Senate bill* 194.

[Prepared by the Bureau of Education, January, 1885, at the request of Hon. H. W. BLAIR.]

States and Territories.	Total population, census of 1880.	Persons who could not write in 1880.	Quota of each State and Territory for the— Whole time.	First year.	Second year.	Third year.	Fourth year.	Fifth year.	Sixth year.	Seventh year.	Eighth year.
			Dollars.	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*
United States	50,155,783	6,214,180	77,000,000.00	7,000,000.00	10,000,000.00	15,000,000.00	13,000,000.00	11,000,000.00	9,000,000.00	7,000,000.00	5,000,000.00
Alabama	1,262,505	433,447	5,370,848.45	488,258.95	697,512.78	1,046,269.14	906,766.59	767,264.07	627,761.49	488,258.95	348,756.39
Arizona Territory	40,440	5,842	72,388.30	6,580.75	9,401.08	14,101.61	12,221.40	10,341.19	8,460.96	6,580.75	4,700.54
Arkansas	802,525	202,015	2,503,170.97	227,561.00	325,087.14	487,630.72	422,613.29	357,595.86	292,578.43	227,561.00	162,543.57
California	864,694	53,430	662,051.95	60,186.54	85,980.77	128,971.25	111,775.00	94,578.85	77,382.69	60,186.54	42,990.39
Colorado	194,327	10,474	129,783.50	11,798.50	16,855.00	25,282.48	21,911.45	18,540.50	15,169.49	11,798.50	8,427.50
Connecticut	622,700	28,424	352,202.22	32,018.38	45,740.55	68,610.83	59,462.72	50,314.61	41,166.49	32,018.38	22,870.28
Dakota Territory	135,177	4,821	59,737.09	5,430.64	7,758.06	11,637.09	10,085.48	8,533.87	6,982.25	5,430.64	3,879.03
Delaware	146,608	19,414	240,559.17	21,869.02	31,421.45	46,862.08	40,613.89	34,365.60	28,117.31	21,869.02	15,620.73
Florida	269,493	80,183	993,548.79	90,322.62	129,032.31	193,548.46	167,742.00	141,935.54	116,139.08	90,322.62	64,516.16
Georgia	1,542,180	520,416	6,448,482.66	586,225.70	837,465.28	1,256,197.92	1,088,704.87	921,211.81	753,718.75	586,225.70	418,732.64
Idaho Territory	32,610	1,778	22,031.23	2,002.84	2,861.20	4,292.24	3,719.64	3,147.32	2,575.44	2,002.84	1,430.60
Illinois	3,077,871	145,397	1,801,616.46	163,783.31	233,976.16	350,964.24	304,169.01	257,373.78	210,578.54	163,783.31	116,988.08
Indiana	1,978,301	110,761	1,372,441.26	124,767.39	178,239.12	267,358.68	231,710.86	196,063.04	160,415.21	124,767.39	89,119.56
Iowa	1,624,615	46,609	577,532.84	52,502.99	75,004.27	112,506.39	97,505.54	82,504.69	67,503.84	52,502.99	37,502.14
Kansas	996,096	39,476	489,147.72	44,467.97	63,525.68	95,288.51	82,583.38	69,878.25	57,173.10	44,467.97	31,762.84
Kentucky	1,648,690	348,392	4,316,930.63	392,448.24	560,640.34	840,960.42	728,832.36	616,704.38	504,576.30	392,448.24	280,320.16
Louisiana	939,946	318,380	3,945,051.48	358,641.04	512,344.35	768,516.52	666,047.66	563,578.79	461,109.91	358,641.04	256,172.17
Maine	648,936	22,170	274,708.81	24,973.53	35,676.47	53,514.79	46,379.41	39,244.12	32,108.82	24,973.53	17,838.24
Maryland	934,943	134,488	1,666,442.88	151,494.81	216,421.15	324,641.73	281,357.50	238,063.27	194,779.04	151,494.81	108,210.58
Massachusetts	1,783,085	92,980	1,152,116.61	104,737.87	149,625.54	214,438.31	184,513.20	164,588.09	134,662.98	104,737.87	74,812.77
Michigan	1,636,937	63,723	789,592.67	71,781.15	102,544.50	153,816.76	133,307.86	112,798.96	92,290.05	71,781.15	51,272.25
Minnesota	780,783	34,546	428,060.02	38,914.55	55,592.21	83,388.31	72,269.87	61,151.43	50,032.99	38,914.55	27,796.10
Mississippi	1,131,597	373,301	4,624,339.33	420,394.48	600,563.55	900,845.43	780,732.72	660,619.91	540,507.19	420,394.48	300,281.78
Missouri	2,168,380	208,754	2,586,674.03	235,152.18	335,931.65	503,897.50	436,711.19	369,524.86	302,338.54	235,152.18	167,965.85
Montana Territory	39,159	1,707	21,151.46	1,922.86	2,746.95	4,120.40	3,571.02	3,021.64	2,472.23	1,922.86	1,373.47
Nebraska	452,401	11,528	142,843.63	12,985.78	18,551.12	27,826.66	24,116.46	20,406.24	16,696.00	12,985.78	9,275.56
Nevada	62,266	4,069	50,419.04	4,583.55	6,547.93	9,821.88	8,512.30	7,202.72	5,893.13	4,583.55	3,273.96
New Hampshire	346,991	14,302	177,216.30	16,110.57	23,015.11	34,522.76	29,919.74	25,316.62	20,730.59	16,110.57	11,507.55
New Jersey	1,131,116	53,249	659,809.18	49,982.65	85,689.50	128,534.26	111,396.36	94,258.46	77,120.55	59,982.65	42,844.75
New Mexico	119,565	57,156	708,220.88	64,383.72	91,976.78	137,965.09	119,569.75	101,174.41	82,779.06	64,383.72	45,988.37
New York	5,082,871	219,600	2,721,666.98	247,369.73	353,385.32	530,077.98	459,400.92	388,723.86	318,046.79	247,369.73	176,692.66
North Carolina	1,399,750	463,975	5,749,121.37	522,647.41	746,639.14	1,119,958.70	970,630.88	821,303.06	671,975.23	522,647.41	373,319.57
Ohio	3,198,062	131,847	1,633,718.21	148,519.84	212,171.20	318,256.78	275,825.55	233,388.32	190,954.07	148,519.84	106,085.60
Oregon	174,768	7,423	91,978.52	8,361.68	11,945.26	17,917.89	15,528.84	13,139.79	10,750.73	8,361.68	5,972.63
Pennsylvania	4,282,891	228,014	2,825,324.98	256,847.72	366,925.32	550,387.98	477,005.92	403,617.86	330,232.78	256,847.72	183,462.66
Rhode Island	276,531	24,793	307,210.44	27,928.22	39,897.46	59,845.19	51,863.70	43,887.21	35,907.71	27,928.22	19,948.73
South Carolina	995,577	369,848	4,582,792.26	416,617.48	595,167.82	892,751.83	773,718.27	654,684.61	535,651.04	416,617.48	297,583.91
Tennessee	1,542,359	410,722	5,089,262.62	462,660.24	660,943.20	991,414.78	859,226.15	727,037.52	594,848.87	462,660.24	330,471.60
Texas	1,591,749	316,432	3,920,913.78	356,446.71	509,209.58	763,814.36	661,972.45	560,130.54	458,288.62	356,446.71	254,604.79
Utah Territory	143,963	8,826	109,363.10	9,942.10	14,202.00	21,304.50	18,463.90	15,623.30	12,782.70	9,942.10	7,101.50
Vermont	332,286	15,837	196,236.51	17,839.68	25,485.26	38,227.89	33,130.84	28,033.79	22,936.73	17,839.68	12,742.63
Virginia	1,512,565	430,352	5,332,498.25	484,772.57	692,532.24	1,038,798.35	900,291.91	761,785.47	623,279.01	484,772.57	346,266.12
Washington Ter	75,116	3,889	48,188.66	4,380.79	6,258.27	9,387.40	8,135.75	6,884.10	4,332.44	4,380.79	3,129.13
West Virginia	618,457	85,376	1,057,895.33	96,172.30	137,389.00	206,083.51	178,605.71	151,127.91	123,650.10	96,172.30	68,694.50
Wisconsin	1,315,497	55,558	688,420.03	62,583.64	89,405.20	134,107.64	116,226.61	98,345.58	80,464.67	62,583.64	44,702.60
Wyoming	20,789	556	6,889.40	626.31	894.73	1,132.08	1,143.14	984.20	805.25	626.31	447.36

Mr. LANE. Mr. Chairman, during the course of the debate on the pending bill my colleague from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] made the following statement in his speech:

If we place our great wool interest in competition with the cheap land and labor of Australasia and South America we shall destroy it, and then prices will increase and we shall be at the mercy of the foreign wool-grower.

As one of the Representatives from the great State of Illinois, I can not suffer this statement to go unchallenged. I deny the proposition, and aver that the history of the wool interest does not warrant the conclusion. I will read from the Chicago Tribune, a Republican paper published in Illinois, now supporting Gresham for President, an article reviewing this statement, and I think completely answering it:

Congressman CANNON, of the Danville district of this State made, if correctly reported, a singular argument in support of continued needlessly high tariff taxation. He is quoted as having declared that he would take $24,000,000 off the whisky and tobacco taxes, make sugar free, and pay a bounty of 2 cents a pound on the home product of sugar, thus doing away with eighty-six millions of the Treasury surplus, and making it impossible to reduce tariff taxation on clothing of the people and other like necessaries of life.

Is this the "reduction of the surplus" and the "correction of the inequalities of the tariff" promised by the Republican party in its platform of 1884? Mr. CANNON is also reported as opposing any reduction of the wool duties or of the enormous duties on woolen clothing, blankets, etc., declaring that "three-fourths of the wool consumed in the United States is produced here," and that to put wool on the free-list would destroy sheep-raising in the United States.

Mr. CANNON fails to take any account of the wool in the $50,000,000 worth of woolen goods imported annually—a singular omission. In fact, half the wool consumed in the United States must be imported, because the quantity and quality demanded can not be produced here, and therefore must be obtained from abroad in the form of wool or cloth, notwithstanding the high tariff tax. Why, then, tax sixty millions of consumers so heavily on articles they must have and can not obtain at home?

This paper says further:

Where can sheep husbandry be cheaper than in the Southwestern Territories, where grazing is free or land rent only nominal, no winter feeding required, and the labor employed that of cheap Mexican greasers and shepherd dogs? It is this competition which has virtually destroyed sheep husbandry for wool in twenty States east of the Missouri, including Mr. CANNON'S own State. There are not 50,000 sheep in all Mr. CANNON'S district, and they are raised only for mutton—the fleece will not pay half the cost of keeping. Granting all the bounty that is claimed, the farmers of Mr. CANNON'S district can not receive more than 50 cents a sheep or $25,000 per annum from the 43 per cent. wool bounties now imposed.

Free wool, however, would reduce the cost of clothing to the 175,000 people he represents an average of at the very least $3 each, a saving to the district of $525,000, or twenty-one times as much as Mr. CANNON'S few constituents who raise sheep can possibly gain by keeping up the present wool tax. Why, then, does Mr. CANNON favor retaining the wool tax so that his constituents may gain $25,000 when its repeal would save them twenty-one times that amount? Will he please explain? Why would he pay bounties to sugar-growers of Louisiana in preference to grain-growers or hog and cattle growers of Illinois? Don't Illinois farmers need better prices for their crops? Why would he readjust whisky and tobacco taxes in such a manner that whisky and tobacco middlemen will pocket every cent of the repealed tax? And so that there can be no reduction of the taxes on the kitchen, the taxes on the bed-chamber or sitting-room, the taxes on the wardrobe, and the taxes on the sick room, all of which are excessively high and still up to the war standard?

	Per cent.
House furnishing:	
Glassware	40.00
Furniture	35.00
Clothing:	
Women's dress goods, cheapest	67.80
Women's dress goods, dearest	59.06
Women's cloaks	67.74
Woolen cloth for men's wear, cheapest	89.94
Woolen cloth for men's wear, dearest	68.91
Ready-made clothing	54.18
Linen	35.10
Silk piece goods, etc.	50.00
Gloves	50.00
Hosiery, woolen	62.80
Hosiery, cotton	40.00
Hosiery, silk	50.00
Flannels	70.02
Corsets	36.00
Hats and caps, wool	54.01
Hats and caps, straw	30.00
Hats and caps, silk	50.00
Buttons	25.00
Food:	
Salt	49.82
Sugar	82.04
Molasses	28.05
Rice, cleaned	113.03
Fish	21.72
Lemons	16.50
Prunes	30.81
Raisins	35.40
Farm-work:	
Horses	20.00
Horseshoes	54.95
Chains	44.37
Glue	20.00
Garden seeds	20.00
Pocket-knives	50.00
Files, cheapest	50.85
Files, dearest	63.29
Hand-saws	40.00
Lead pipe	60.82
Cleanliness:	
Castile soap	20.00
Toilet soap	35.20
Physic:	
Castor-oil	194.77
Knowledge:	
Books	25.00
Writing-paper	25.00
Inks	30.00
Shelter:	
Umbrellas	40.71

Mr. CANNON in this speech clearly commits himself to cheaper whisky and high wool, which is in perfect harmony with his colleagues on the other side of this Chamber. I respectfully submit that these principles will not be entertained by the people of Illinois.

I am ready to concede that this is the issue tendered by the Republican party in the coming campaign; but there can be no question as to where the masses of the people will be found. They can not and will not accept cheap whisky in preference to free wool. The Republican party wants to reduce the internal-revenue tax. The Democratic party says that the taxes should be reduced on the necessaries of life.

What does the President say in his late message to this House?

He says in regard to the whisky and tobacco tax as follows:

It must be conceded that none of the things subjected to internal-revenue taxation are, strictly speaking, necessaries. There appears to be no just complaint of this taxation by the consumers of these articles, and there seems to be nothing so well able to bear the burden without hardship to any portion of the people.

The President here does not seem to agree with Mr. Blaine that tobacco is one of the necessaries of life; nor does he agree with the gentleman from Illinois that whisky should be made cheaper. Now, what does the President say in regard to wool? He says in his message:

The farmer and the agriculturist, who manufacture nothing, but who pay the increased price which the tariff imposes, upon every agricultural implement, upon all he wears and upon all he uses and owns, except the increase of his flocks and herds and such things as his husbandry produces from the soil, is invited to aid in maintaining the present situation; and he is told that a high duty on imported wool is necessary for the benefit of those who have sheep to shear, in order that the price of their wool may be increased.

They of course are not reminded that the farmer who has no sheep is by this scheme obliged, in his purchases of clothing and woolen goods, to pay a tribute to his fellow-farmer as well as to the manufacturer and merchant; nor is any mention made of the fact that the sheep-owners themselves and their households must wear clothing and use other articles manufactured from the wool they sell at tariff prices, and thus as consumers must return their share of this increased price to the tradesman.

I think it may be fairly assumed that a large proportion of the sheep owned by the farmers throughout the country are found in small flocks numbering from twenty-five to fifty. The duty on the grade of imported wool which these sheep yield is 10 cents each pound if of the value of 30 cents or less, and 12 cents if of the value of more than 30 cents. If the liberal estimate of 6 pounds be allowed for each fleece, the duty thereon would be 60 or 72 cents, and this may be taken as the utmost enhancement of its price to the farmer by reason of this duty.

Eighteen dollars would thus represent the increased price of the wool from twenty-five sheep and $36 that from the wool of fifty sheep; and at present values this addition would amount to about one-third of its price. If upon its sale the farmer receives this or a less tariff profit, the wool leaves his hands charged with precisely that sum, which in all its changes will adhere to it until it reaches the consumer. When manufactured into cloth and other goods and material for use, its cost is not only increased to the extent of the farmer's tariff profit, but a further sum has been added for the benefit of the manufacturer under the operation of other tariff laws. In the mean time the day arrives when the farmer finds it necessary to purchase woolen goods and material to clothe himself and family for the winter.

When he faces the tradesman for that purpose he discovers that he is obliged not only to return in the way of increased prices his tariff profit on the wool he sold, and which then perhaps lies before him in manufactured form, but that he must add a considerable sum thereto to meet a further increase in cost caused by a tariff duty on the manufacture. Thus in the end he is aroused to the fact that he has paid upon a moderate purchase, as a result of the tariff scheme, which, when he sold his wool, seemed so profitable, an increase in price more than sufficient to sweep away all the tariff profit he received upon the wool he produced and sold.

When the number of farmers engaged in wool-raising is compared with all the farmers in the country, and the small proportion they bear to our population is considered; when it is made apparent that, in the case of a large part of those who own sheep, the benefit of the present tariff on wool is illusory; and, above all, when it must be conceded that the increase of the cost of living, caused by such tariff, becomes a burden upon those with moderate means, and the poor, the employed and unemployed, the sick and the well, and the young and old, and that it constitutes a tax which, with relentless grasp, is fastened upon the clothing of every man, woman, and child in the land, reasons are suggested why the removal or reduction of this duty should be included in a revision of our tariff laws.

Can there be a doubt who is right, the President or the learned gentleman from the Fifteenth district of Illinois? The article quoted from the Tribune shows clearly that free wool would reduce the cost of clothing to the 175,000 people in his district by at least $3 each—a saving to his district of $525,000 per annum, or to the whole State of Illinois over $10,500,000 annually, assuming that each of the twenty districts in the State is as large as the Fifteenth district. Will the people be hoodwinked any longer? The facts are before them. He who runs may read.

Again, the same paper says:

The following table will show where in this country wool-growing is profitable and where the great ranchmen with the big flocks are located—the interests that are still to be heavily protected as they wage a destructive competition against wool-growing in the States east of the Missouri. The table is for 1886:

States.	Owners.	Average flock.	Increase in five years.
			Per cent.
Utah	2,001	282	8
Washington	1,067	428	18
Oregon	4,605	560	99
California	4,326	1,430	11
Idaho	128	1,455	60
Colorado	406	3,075	14
Montana	137	3,400	67
Nevada	97	4,000	68
New Mexico	814	5,450	13
Texas	8,390	9,480	118
Wyoming	44	13,600	35
Arizona	55	23,220	74

Why do Congressmen like Mr. CANNON, representing farmers who have been driven out of sheep husbandry for wool alone by the undercutting competition in the far West and Southwest, still insist on big bounties for the ranchmen who are destroying wool-growing in Illinois and other States? Why do they aim to reform the tariff only by reducing internal-revenue taxes on whisky and tobacco for the benefit of middlemen, or by taking off the sugar tax and replacing it with a direct bounty taken out of the people's pockets?

These are not the measures that will relieve Western farmers, especially reducing the whisky and tobacco taxes. If Mr. CANNON desires to learn what duties can be reduced with great advantage to his constituents, who only get half prices for their hard-earned crops, and where reform can be made effective, let him study the following table showing the high war rates still levied on articles of prime necessity:

Name of article.	Use.	Taxes on each $100 worth.
Lumber, pine or spruce, rough	House-building	$16.13
Nails	do	43.75
Lime	do	10.00
Cement	do	20.00
Clapboards, spruce	do	10.98
Shingles	do	16.80
Screws, largest size	do	26.17
Screws, smaller sizes	do	61.17
Linseed-oil	do	54.79
White lead	do	40.19

Name of article.	Use.	Taxes on each $100 worth.
Zinc	House-building	$35.34
Window-glass, smallest sizes	do	60.17
Window-glass, largest sizes	do	108.50
Wall-paper	House furnishing	25.00
Carpets, ingrain	do	45.79
Carpets, tapestry	do	61.13
Carpets, Brussels	do	59.03
Oil-cloth	do	40.00
Crockery	do	59.02
Hollow-ware, iron	do	45.36
Tinware	do	45.00

I suppose it will not be denied by any one that a duty on wool increases the price of that commodity. If, then, the present duty is taken off, the same logic will show that it will be cheaper; and, if cheaper, then the price of all woolen goods which the farmer and laborer of Illinois must buy will be cheaper. In our Northern climate wool is an indispensable article of daily consumption to protect our people from the cold winds of the prairies. It shelters them by day from the winter's blast, and covers them at night when the light of the fire is extinguished.

The life of the farmer and laborer of Illinois without the protection of woolen clothing would be insupportable, and it will be difficult for them to understand why any person interested in making laws in their interest should favor a law that would necessarily increase the price of their clothing, and especially so now as their wheat crops to a great extent have failed and the great majority of the Illinois farmers are largely indebted, and the proposition to reduce the price of whisky and tobacco would seem to me at this time to be a mockery of their misfortunes. No, Mr. Chairman, this is not what the people of Illinois want, and I know what I am speaking about; but it is the best time in the world to make the clothing of the people cheaper, and this can be done by taking the duty off wool.

I affirm that the most offensive result of the wool duty is to keep out such wools as we can not produce and which are absolutely necessary in the manufacture of woolen goods. Mr. George William Bond, of Boston, who contributed an article on the development of wool manufactures in the United States to the special wool report of the bureau of statistics, in answer to a question whether any wool is imported that can not be grown here, said:

"In reply I would say that there are none of the third-class wools that can be grown in this country to advantage. * * * It is more difficult to explain so as to be readily understood why we can not produce any particular grades of first-class wools. We may grow wool in some places equally fine and apparently as good in other respects as wools that are imported, but they may not have the same working qualities. * * *

"Such is the influence of climate and soil upon wool that no two places can grow wool exactly alike. * * * We raise, comparatively to the demand, a small portion of first-class combing and delaine wool, and very little, even of this, has the characteristics required to make the finest goods which fashion demands from France and England. Without the same wools that are used there these goods can not be made here."

In order to manufacture woolen goods for sale at low prices to home consumers as well as to ship abroad in competition with foreign manufacturers we must have cheap raw wool, and it is utterly impossible to grow what we need in this country. Instead of destroying the American prices of wool it is proposed to afford a home market for the home product, which is increased by the importation of foreign wool to mix with home-grown wool.

Free raw wool will be an advantage to the importer, the manufacturer, the consumer, and most of the growers, except a few who are perfectly willing to sell inferior wool at high prices and raise the cost of every blanket in the country. No duty upon any imported article is more indefensible and bears heavier than the tariff on wool, which taxes everybody to no lasting purpose.

Mr. Chairman, I will send to the Clerk's desk and have read an article of recent date from the Missouri Republican, which bears on this question:

THE ADVANTAGE OF FREE WOOL.

Fifteen years ago D. D. Wells, a Republican, and one of the best authorities in this country on the subject of tariff and taxation, boldly asserted that a high tariff on foreign wool, instead of being an advantage to the American wool-grower, is a positive disadvantage—first, because it deprived home manufacturers of foreign wools and prevented that mixture of different wools which has become an art in the manufacture; and second, because it discourages the home manufacturer of woolen goods, invites foreign goods, and thereby breaks down the home market for home wool.

The wool duty can be made high enough to make the manufacture of woolen goods nearly impossible in competition with foreign rivals who have the advantage on free wool—and when this point is reached the home demand for wool disappears.

A careful review of the domestic wool trade for a series of years, under different tariffs, by Mr. Rowland Hazard, a large woolen manufacturer of Rhode Island, goes far to confirm this opinion, and to indicate that the wool-growing interests would thrive as well, perhaps better, under a free-wool arrangement than under a high duty.

There was a high duty—50 to 60 per cent.—on wool from 1867 to 1872, inclusive; and yet the wool-clip of the country, instead of increasing under it, actually fell off from 177,000,000 pounds to 146,000,000 pounds. In 1872 the duty was reduced from 45 to 55 per cent., and the clip began to increase under the reduction, growing from 146,000,000 pounds in 1871 to 208,000,000 in 1877.

Immediately after the enactment of the high tariff of 1867, says Mr. Hazard, "the number of sheep in the great wool-growing States began to decline." The total number in the United States in 1867 was 39,385,000; in 1877 it was only 35,804,000, a falling off of 3,581,000.

In Ohio the number ran down from 7,159,000 in 1867 to 3,783,000 in 1878; in Michigan from 3,473,000 to 2,320,000; in Pennsylvania from 3,230,000 to 1,785,000; in New York from 5,117,000 to 1,732,000; in Indiana from 2,783,000 to 1,111,000; in Illinois from 2,446,000 to 1,026,000; in Iowa from 1,550,000 to 482,000—the decrease in these eight States being from 26,829,000 to 14,761,000, or nearly one-half.

It is true the number of sheep in the country is now increasing, and has been for several years past, but it is under the very wool duty which the Ohio sheep farmers complain of as too low. It is now 48,000,000.

Another curious fact shown by Mr. Hazard's tables is that the best average prices of wool were during the comparative free-trade era from 1857 to 1860, when they ranged from 49 to 59 cents a pound. So far from the high tariff of 1867 benefiting the wool-grower by enhancing the price of wool, it had the very opposite effect.

The price began to decline immediately, and did not recover until the "wool famine" in 1871–72.

Our wool clip at present is valued at $85,000,000, and it is not as much as we need by one-half. We require a large amount of woolen clothing, and if we do not make it ourselves we must import a portion of it from abroad.

But it makes no difference to the wool-grower whether the wool we import is in a raw state or in the form of manufactured goods; it competes with home-grown wool in the latter form just as much as in the other.

To secure a good home market for the wool-growers we must encourage the manufacture of woolen goods and the consumption of them at home, and this can be more effectually done by admitting wool free of duty than by placing on it a high duty that manufacturers are not able to pay and compete with foreign rivals.

Besides, the sixty-odd millions of consumers of woolen clothing have something to say in the matter; they demand cheaper woolen clothing, and the demand is certainly reasonable.

Mr. Chairman, the farmers of Illinois at least think the demand is reasonable, and the man who does not comply with the demand will be asked the reason why, which he will not be perhaps able to give.

But, Mr. Chairman, my colleague is not alone in his position on the wool question. The eloquent and gifted gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], the Republican member of the Ways and Means Committee, said in this debate:

The great wool-growing industry of the country, only in the infancy of its development [?], was to be exposed to a "ruinous" foreign competition which would surely prove its destruction. The majority tried to delude the people into the belief that free wool meant cheap clothing.

He admitted that wool would be cheaper while our foreign rivals were trying to destroy our industry, but when they had eliminated from our market the production of 300,000,000 pounds of domestic wool, we would find ourselves bound hand and foot at the mercy of the foreign producer. What restraint would there be then on his power or cupidity?

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will send to the Clerk's desk and have read what the Chicago Tribune says of this statement by Mr. BURROWS:

If Mr. BURROWS desires a "parallel" to this absurd and ridiculous argument he can find it in the tariff debates of 1857 preceding the adoption of the Republican act which placed nearly all kinds of wool on the free-list. A few benighted Congressmen predicted blue ruin, and "being bound hand and foot by foreigners," as glibly or as hoarsely as Mr. BURROWS does now, but the result was that during the four years following the free-listing of wool that product commanded the best maintained prices for any consecutive four years in the history of the country.

How does BURROWS get around that fact. A slight wool duty was imposed in 1861, a stronger one in 1862, and so on until the high protective duties of 1867 were reached. Under the latter wool has sagged down in price, and the number of sheep in the States between New York and Nebraska has decreased nearly one-half. Mr. BURROWS's own State of Michigan had in 1867, when the high wool duty was imposed, 4,028,767 sheep, while in 1880, after enjoying thirteen years of high protection, only 1,930,656 remained alive. How does Mr. BURROWS explain that?

Mr. BURROWS ought to know that the United States is the only civilized country that now thinks of levying an import tax on such a product as wool. No country produces all the varieties of wool needed for mixing in making fine woolen goods, and hence when the import is free woolen manufacturing has a great advantage, and the demand even for the home product is strengthened. The lack of wool duties has not "ruined" sheep husbandry in England, France or Germany, and did not in this country when, under virtual free trade in wool, prices were better than at present and better maintained through terms of years than they ever were under high protection.

If Mr. BURROWS desires another "parallel" to his ultra-protectionist harangue he can find it in the outeries of 1867, when the import duty was taken off raw cotton. During the war the cotton manufacturers of Europe found their supply of raw material from the United States cut off, and in order to keep their mills going extraordinary and quite successful efforts were made to stimulate cotton growing in India, and it was predicted that the competition so developed would overwhelm and ruin the planters of the United States if our ports were made free.

Nevertheless, cotton was put on the free-list in 1867 by a Republican Congress, and the results have been satisfactory to everybody concerned. Considerable cotton is imported, but it is of varieties not produced in the United States, and is needed for mixing purposes by our cotton factories—just as would be the case if wool were free.

Mr. BURROWS could find another "parallel" to his argument in the howling and bawling that took place in 1867, when it was proposed to put hides and skins on the free-list. The "ruin" of the cattle and calf crop was predicted and startling arrays of figures were paraded to show the irreparable injury that would be inflicted on the country.

Nevertheless hides were put on the free-list by the same Republican Congress that put raw cotton on the free-list, and the consequence was that boots and shoes were cheapened to the whole people, and leather manufacturers were enabled to build up a valuable foreign export trade, increase their product, and employ far more labor and at better wages, while no injury whatever was done to the cattle industry. The export of leather goods last year amounted to $10,436,138 and the year before nine millions.

But conceding for the sake of the argument BURROWS's false and foolish claim that the wool duty is added to the wool's price and benefits sheep-growers to that extent, why does he propose taxing his constituents four or five times as much in the extra cost of their woolen goods as they can possibly get from the wool duty even as he figures it?

BURROWS's claim that if the duty were removed sheep husbandry would cease in the United States, and after the sheep had all disappeared foreign wool-

growers would hold a monopoly and force up the price, is a piece of rot and more absurd than the other Congressional chestnuts which BURROWS has been airing in the recent debate. See how the record demolishes his false statements of "ruin." For many years preceding 1856 the duty on wool was 30 per cent. ad valorem. In 1857 the Republican House agreed to put all wool on the free-list except the costliest grades. The average price in Boston from 1847 to 1881 was thus quoted:

Year.	Duty.	Gold, per pound.
	Per cent.	*Cents.*
1847	30	40
1848	30	39
1850	30	45
1851	30	47
1852	30	45
1853	30	49
1854	30	49½
1855	30	46
1856	30	48
1857	Free	53
1858	Free	45
1859	Free	49
1860	Free	54
1861	5	44
1862	15	47
1863	15	52
1864	25 to 30	45
1865	25 to 30	46
1866	25 to 30	47
1867	50 to 60	46
1868	50 to 60	42
1869	50 to 60	48
1870	50 to 60	51
1871	50 to 60	58
1872	45 to 55	60
1873	45 to 55	50
1874	45 to 55	50
1875	45 to 55	52
1876	45 to 55	44
1877	45 to 55	47
1878	45 to 55	39
1879	45 to 55	37
1880	45 to 55	44
1881	45 to 55	43

Now compare the prices of wool under the 30 per cent. protection duties from 1847 to the time of placing wool on the free-list in 1857. Do they show that the loss of the duty "ruined" the price of wool, as Mr. BURROWS asserts? Nothing of the kind. On the contrary, the price increased, while the cost of clothing was reduced to the people.

When the progressingly heavy war duties began to be imposed in 1864, was the effect to add the duty to the price of wool? Not at all. Wool declined rather than advanced. In what a sorry plight do these facts from the record leave Mr. BURROWS!

Mr. Chairman, these two gentlemen speak the opinion of the Republican party in this House. Are they correct and will the people sustain them? I believe not. I believe when wool will be put on the free-list—and it will—the result will be a large increase in manufacturing, a large addition to the number of operatives employed, and a large increase to the farmer, and a reduction of more than 25 per cent. in the price to the people who have to purchase woolen clothing.

Mr. Chairman, the passage of the Mills bill by this Congress means cheaper clothing, cheaper houses, and cheaper food for the people. It means more prosperity to the farmer and laborer. It means the putting down of monopolies and trusts. It means the triumphant election of Grover Cleveland, this fall, as President of the United States. It means the perpetuation of Democratic supremacy, and the eternal principles of truth and justice. [Applause.]

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. SPRINGER having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. LYMAN reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue and had come to no resolution thereon.

On motion of Mr. MONTGOMERY (at 10 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 10011) to increase the pension of Elizabeth B. Smith—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARDY: A bill (H. R. 10012) for the relief of Mary Sterzel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN (by request): A bill (H. R. 10013) granting a pension to Hezekiah F. Kiester—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10014) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George W. More—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10015) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Justin I. Wisner—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. S. T. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 10016) granting a pension to Fidelia E. Mead—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HUNTER: A bill (H. R. 10017) granting a pension to Samuel Anderson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10018) granting a pension to John R. W. Rose—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10019) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Jacob Moog—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES O'NEILL: A bill (H. R. 10020) for the relief of James B. Roberts, alias James Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 10021) for the relief of Charles Spencer—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PHELPS: A bill (H. R. 10022) granting a pension to Ellen O'Malley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10023) to authorize the Cairo and Tennessee River Railroad Company to construct bridges across the Tennessee and Cumberland Rivers—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. WARNER: A bill (H. R. 10024) granting a pension to John Hobart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. R. WHITING: A bill (H. R. 10025) for the relief of James T. Teeple— the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITTHORNE: A bill (H. R. 10026) granting a pension to William N. Edny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also (H. R. 10027) granting a pension to John Schade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAREY: A bill (H. R. 10028) granting to the Wyoming Midland Railway Company the right of way through the Wind Rive, or Shoshone Indian reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10029) for the relief of Allard & Crozier—to the Commitee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. J. M. ALLEN: Petition of Knights of Labor of Corinth, Miss., to protect free labor from convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BACON (by request): Petition of George Winter and others, against the employment of convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BARRY: Petition of Mrs. Nancy R. Cavett, of Noxubee County, Mississippi, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BIGGS: Petition of Eliza G. Kennedy, heir of John H. Quisenberry, of Mercer County, California, for payment of war claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLOUNT: Petition of Jacob Gainey, administrator of Elizabeth Gainey, of Wilkinson County, Georgia, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BROWER: Petition of Basil H. Marcom, administrator of Thomas Marcom, of William A. Markham, and of John D. Horton, executor of John Horton, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BYNUM: Petition of Emmett Ltre and 250 others, citizens of Shelby County, Indiana, in favor of the erection of a soldiers' home at Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FELIX CAMPBELL: Petition of B. H. Cannon, secretary United Order of A. C. and J. Lodge, of Brooklyn, N. Y., to protect free labor from convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. CHEADLE: Petition of Col. N. A. Logan and 24 others, citizens of Michigantown, Clinton County, Ind., for the establishment of a soldiers' home in Indiana—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLEMENTS: Papers in the claim of N. P. Haiben, and of Benjamin Hamilton, of Whitfield County, Georgia—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. COGSWELL: Petition of merchants of Boston, Mass., against the passage of Senate bill, No. 977—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONGER: Petition of citizens of Adair County, Iowa, for the passage of the international copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of postal clerks on the Dubuque and Sioux City Railway, for the passage of the Cox bill for the readjustment of salaries of postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CRAIN: A bill authorizing the Brazos River and Channel and Dock Company to improve the mouth of the Brazos River, Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petition of Elizabeth Porter, widow of Elias Porter, of Russellville, Ky., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Petition of G. W. Feigan, Grand Army of the Republic department commander, for an appropriation of $200,000 for head-stones—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GAY: Petition of citizens of Jeanerette, La., in favor of House bill 8716 to protect free labor from convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HAUGEN (by request): Petition of citizens of Pepin County, Wisconsin, for a pension for George W. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. D. B. HENDERSON: Petition of E. J. Stonebraker and 33 others, citizens of Hampton, Iowa, in favor of House bill 8716—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. JACKSON: Petition of A. P. Lewis and 30 others, citizens of the Twenty-fourth district of Pennsylvania, against the reduction of the tariff on window-glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KERR: Petition of Iowa railway postal clerks, for the passage of the bill to readjust their salaries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LANDES: Petition of Henry C. Wilfong, late of Company K, Fifty-third Indiana Volunteers, for a pension, indorsed by M. W. Nanly and 100 others, citizens of Wayne County, Illinois—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LODGE: Petition of A. V. Fisher and 53 others, of Methuen; of Ira D. Rodgers and 28 others, of Lynn; of E. G. Knowles and 55 others, of Lowell; of D. L. Richards and 53 others, of North Dana; of C. E. Mann and 69 others, of Lexington; of M. A. Stone and 69 others, of Reading; and of H. M. Chadwick and 69 others, of Lawrence, Mass.; of Edward A. Talpey and 29 others, of Cape Neddick; and of Edwin Towne and 77 others, of Waterville, Me.; of J. M. Chaffee and 69 others, of Staffordsville, Conn.; and of C. W. Preston and 63 others, of Boston, Vt., in favor of bill introduced by Mr. LODGE for repeal of duties on sugar and molasses—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LYMAN: Petition of railway postal clerks of Iowa, in favor of the passage of the bill to readjust their salaries—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Knights of Labor of Council Bluffs, Iowa, to protect free labor from convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McADOO: Petition of Knights of Labor, and of the Pioneer Labor Association, of Jersey City, N. J., to protect free labor from convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. McCOMAS: Petition of Joseph C. Keller, of Frederick County, Maryland, for payment of his war claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of T. H. Conon, administrator of Alfred O. Conon, of Marshall County, Mississippi, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORROW: Memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., for the establishment of a national quarantine station at San Francisco—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, memorial of the same, for an immediate appropriation of $850,000 for a post-office site at San Francisco, Cal.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, memorial of the same, recommending an appropriation for the survey of public lands in California—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. NICHOLS: Petition of Local Assembly No. 3606, Knights of Labor, of Raleigh, N. C., to protect free labor from convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. PEEL: Memorial of Loyal Creek Indians—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition of Mrs. M. A. Bauman and Louisa Teufel, for reference of their claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICE: Resolutions of the Minnesota Academy of Medicine, urging that instruments, scientific apparatus, medical books and materials, etc., be placed on the free-list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RUSK: Petition of Local Assembly 1466, Knights of Labor, of Baltimore, Md., in favor of House bill No. 8716 to protect free labor from convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. SHIVELY: Petition of members of the Grand Army of the Republic, Women's Relief Corps, and Sons of Veterans, of Silver Lake, Ind., for the establishment of a soldiers' home in Indiana—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES STEWART: Petition of the Cotton Exchange of Houston, Tex., in relation to the sale of options on cotton and other products—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: Petition of John H. Harris, for payment of his war claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITTHORNE: Petition of Mary E. Walter, of Williamson County, Tennessee, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:.

By Mr. KELLEY: Of 111 citizens of Philadelphiae,

By Mr. O'DONNELL: Of G. V. Collins, of Charlott Mich.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. BINGHAM: Of members of the West Philadelphia Rifle and Gun Club, of Philadelphia, Pa.

By Mr. COLLINS: Of professors, teachers, and advanced students in the Museum of Comparative Zoology, of Harvard College.

By Mr. McCULLOGH: Of Edward Donohoe and others, citizens of Greensburgh, Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. GOFF: Of A. McCoy and others, of West Virginia.

By Mr. GROUT: Of W. S. Williams and 24 others, citizens of East Roxbury, Vt.

By Mr. PHELPS: Of citizens of New Jersey.

The following petition, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. McCULLOGH: Of John Chalfant and other ex-soldiers of Fayette and Washington Counties, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. PUGSLEY: Of 52 citizens of Fayette and Clinton Counties, Ohio.

By Mr. THOMAS WILSON: Of 121 citizens of Winona, Dodge, and Wabasha Counties, Minnesota.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *May* 18, 1888.

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

The House was called to order by Mr. McMILLIN, who stated that the Speaker was unavoidably absent, and directed the reading of the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 18, 1888.

I hereby designate Hon. BENTON McMILLIN to preside at the session of the House to-day.

JNO. G. CARLISLE, *Speaker.*

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK,
Clerk House of Representatives.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read in part.

On motion of Mr. McKINLEY, the reading of the remainder of the Journal was dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. HOOKER, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for ten days, on account of important business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

On motion of Mr. MILLS the reference of bills and communications upon the Speaker's table was postponed until to-morrow.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order, and I move that the morning hour for the call of committees for reports be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MILLS. I now ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to present from committees may send them to the Clerk's desk and have them duly referred.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

FILING OF REPORT.

The following report was filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

RELIEF OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. BROWER, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9956) for the relief of certain soldiers and sailors of the late war; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

TARIFF.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of bills raising revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, the highest duty of the statesman in this country, where we proceed upon the theory of the equality of man, is to assist as best he may in maintaining the equality of the nation's forces. It is for the reason that within the last few years, and following close upon the heels of a mighty martial struggle wherein the further perfection of our fundamental idea of government was the leading thought, we have drifted unwittingly, at least on the part of the masses, into a species of class legislation that is discriminating between the industries of men, thus nullifying the fruits of the victories we have gained in the direction of legally equalizing men, and subverting the underlying principles of our Government, that I have been an attentive and interested listener to the debate that has been in progress upon the measure pending before the House.

The discussion has already taken a wide range, and the inspiring feature of it is found in the fact that this discussion of tariff reform, so quietly begun, is destined to widen until it embraces the whole brood of tariffs of every description in this tariff-ridden country. And this debate is none the less important for the reason that it was inaugurated in the interest of relief from but one of the important tariffs of the long list of unjust tariffs that are inflicted upon the people of this country in the interest of special lines of business and industries. This discussion is not only serving a great purpose in exposing these various tariffs, levied in the interest of the few upon the many, in their proper character and nature, and showing them all akin, being of a common parentage, greed, and sustained by a common method, the elimination of the principle of competition from the commerce of the country; but it is important in this, that it is stripping the mask from the face of fraudulent pretense and placing individuals as well as parties before the people for what they are rather than for what they profess to be. Through this debate and the discussion that it will inevitably lead to throughout the country there will be thrown a flood of light where light has long been sorely needed; and in this light the people of this country will see the real issues in which they are interested and be the better enabled to draw a line between their friends and their foes without accepting blindly as conclusive the party label on the sleeve.

And in the light that must come from a discussion of this tariff question in all its varied forms party lines will be reformed and political organizations will come to stand for living, vital, modern questions as well as sacred memories, and the beginning of the end of the days of the politician who has exalted past party virtue for the sole purpose of obscuring the present vicious methods in vogue everywhere in the commerce of the country will have come.

The great battle between monopoly and competition has begun, and in my judgment will be waged until the people shall have gained well-defined victory with practical and enduring beneficial results over the commercial monsters that have been too largely dominating the country, dictating its officiary, and shaping its legislation.

Grave abuses exist everywhere in the name of commerce, and through these abuses colossal fortunes, aggregating an undue proportion of the nation's wealth, have been placed in the hands of a few individuals at the expense of the many.

And thus, in this Republic, founded on the principles of the equality of all men and industries before the law, we find that the grossest inequalities of the nation's forces have been built up through great commercial agencies exercising unrestrainedly in their right as their own private property the sovereign powers of the Government, which belong alone to the whole people.

This sovereign power of the people has been let to the banks to control the people's money, to the railroads to control the transportation of the people's commerce, to the telegraph to control the transmission and dissemination of the people's news, and to the jobbers and the manufacturers to control the prices of the people's food and clothing and the other necessities of life, until we find the Government an indorser without profit in all these gigantic agencies wielded by individual hands, directed by individual heads, in the sole interest of strictly private citizens.

This class of men, panoplied with the usurpation of this sovereign power, have so far abused their trust as to be wrongfully extorting from the body of the people and putting into their own private coffers more than a billion annually of the people's hard-earned money. This monstrous condition of affairs has borne its legitimate fruit, and we see springing up everywhere as the hateful progeny of this usurpation innumerable modern monsters, known as "trusts," all like their more respectable, and for that reason more dangerous, predecessors, sired by greed and damed by contrivance that eliminates from American commerce the vital principle of honest competition. And through the demoralization that has resulted from this course of commercial conduct we have reached a point where lead in the dice represents the genius of American enterprise and the Government of the United States is looked to as the common agent to place the dice or keep watchful ward over the agency that does. And all this in the sacred name of the development of the commerce and the industries of the country and to protect American labor. No business enterprise in this day of pools, tariffs, and trusts is regarded as worthy the attention of a really great business man that does not afford its proprietor some undue advantage over his competitors and his customers, enabling him to drive the former out of business and to compel the latter to deal with him on such terms as he shall dictate with no other limitation on his greed than his own sense of policy may suggest.

That this principle is as actively present under the practical operation of a tariff levied with a view to protection as it is under the operations of a pooling arrangement between railroad companies or trust combines, by which they forestall the market value of the articles and commodities in which they deal, is so self-evident that it needs no proof. In both instances the object is the extinction of competition, and the difference between the two is one of degree measured by the distance each halts short of reaching a point of absolute prohibition. That one relates to foreign and the other to domestic trade can make no sort of difference so far as the principle of discrimination is concerned. All concede that as to domestic affairs the principle is odious and not to be tolerated, but as to foreign affairs some contend that it is a blessing for which we should all be devoutly thankful. That there is a distinction between being extorted from by home-folk and those you know and by foreigners and mere strangers, I am willing to concede; but that there is such a distinction as to convert that which is crime in the former to benefaction in the latter I most emphatically deny, and I need only call up the farmer of the West, and especially those in the district which I have the honor to represent, who are paying the coupons of pool and protection agents, which are contrived on and clipped from every industry and calling they pursue, in order to furnish an unbroken line of testimony in support of the proposition I here affirm. A more fertile and Heaven-favored country God in His most generous mood never made than that which the farmers of the West occupy; and a more honest, intelligent, sober, economical, and industrious people can not be found among the civilized peoples of the earth than are to-day tilling the soil of this great fertile West.

But notwithstanding Heaven's favor and their own inherent virtue, the balance of trade is against that section of country, and the mortgages that plaster the homes of the people stand for the difference, and represent the price they pay through one protective contrivance and another, like the pool, for the development of every "home" industry save their own. They pay the extortionate rates of the railroad pool, the telegraph pool, the insurance pool, the coal pool, the coal-oil pool, the corn pool, the wheat pool, the lumber pool, the salt pool, the sugar pool, the manufacturers' pool, the jobbers' pool, and the various other pools of this pool-cursed country, and then, in consequence of the necessities created by this series of exhaustive processes, they are compelled to borrow their own money back from another class of pool agents at extortionate rates of interest. This is the same principle that our protection friends grow so fervidly eloquent about as it works in that portion of our country characterized by some Eastern friend, no doubt an ardent protectionist, as the "rowdy West."

Our farmers in the West are more and more coming to understand that the beauties of protection, as portrayed by its advocates, relate to the condition of those who are the beneficiaries of the system, and not to those who foot the bills. But do not understand from what I here say, as to the balance of trade being against the farmers of the West and as to mortgages that rest upon their homes to meet that balance, that the people of that section of the country are in a forlorn and hopeless condition. I mean nothing of the kind. The farmers of the West are a proud, and, considering their condition, a prosperous people, and with a fair fight a great future before them. But what I do mean to say is that there is unjust discrimination against them; that there are unjust and onerous limitations placed upon them and their industry, and that the contest that they are engaged in with the agents of the protective pools of the country, backed by the sovereign power of the Government, is an unequal contest. And it is for the reason that the discussion of that phase of protection involved in the pending measure will arrest the attention of the public and lead to the discussion of protection in general that I hail with unfeigned pleasure the present debate.

When the smoke of battle shall have lifted from the field and the people calmly and dispassionately consider the facts as they shall then appear, they will see that a pool is a pool; that a trust is a trust; that protection is protection, whether relating to foreign or domestic concerns, the leading, vital principle of the life of all of them being the extinction of the principle of competition. Protection without proper restraint means monopoly, and both mean death to the most vital and efficacious principle of American commerce—competition. Competition means fair play, monopoly means foul play; and it means foul play on the highest authority, for it surrounds men with conditions of temptation that subvert all honesty and lead us up to where we can appreciate as never before, perhaps, the full force and meaning of that portion of the Lord's Prayer which prescribes the absence of temptation as the condition on which man shall gain the kingdom of heaven. But as odious as the principle may be, its application may be at times, and doubtless is as necessary in the complex affairs of state as the deadly poisons are necessary in the practice of the life-saving science of medicine.

But happily for the country the time has come when the farmers of the great West have such time for thought and action with reference to their own affairs as to see to it that a line of policy is marked out that has a tendency to equalize the burdens and the benefits between the

different sections of the country and the industries peculiar to each. And speaking for myself as a citizen of one of the great commonwealths of the West, which I have the honor in part to represent, I will say that the West will meet this question in the broad-minded, generous spirit with which she has ever come to the discharge of all her duties to the Republic, but in so doing she will endeavor to disabuse the minds of our Eastern protection friends of the impression they seem to have gained, from the expressions of Western representatives with Eastern ideas, that we are such dull, obtuse, and easily deceived people as not to be able to tell a burden from a blessing, and that in acquiescing in the policy of a tariff for revenue with incidental protection we are doing it in obedience to duty, undeceived by the sophistries of the modern protectionist, who is ready to ascribe to his idol all the blessings that have come to man in this goodly-land. The matter of tax-paying is business and not pleasure, and no amount of sophistry can make it seem otherwise.

The Secretary of the Treasury estimates the needs of the Government for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1888, and ending June, 1889, at $326,530,000. He also estimates that there will come into the Treasury within that time from—

Customs duties	$228,000,000
Internal revenue	120,000,000
All other sources	35,000,000
Making a total of	383,000,000

being $56,470,000 in excess of the needs of the Government for the ensuing year.

All, or nearly all, agree that there should be such a recast of the revenue laws of the country as to leave that excess of $56,470,000 in the pockets of the men whose rightful property it is.

All, or nearly all, agree that the obligations of the Government, economically administered, are the just measure of taxation.

To meet these obligations is stern business, and no array of figures nor labyrinths of statistics can obscure the fact that the identical people who pay this great sum of $326,530,000 are the people who buy the articles on which this burden directly and indirectly rests. This much is clear, and the protectionist, feeling that the burden is on him to do so, in view of this mighty contribution to his business of $228,000,000 by the consumers of his goods, endeavors to show by one intellectual invention and another that each of these contributors to protection has had a benefit in the development of home industries and the increased wages of labor.

Concede this statement to be literally true, and it is the most nonsensical investment that a people ever made, of two hundred and twenty-eight millions of money. Look at a few figures and contemplate a few facts deducible therefrom, and you will reach the conclusion that as a mere investment the proprietors of this cash had better bought stock in the Standard Oil Trust or have started a new one on their own hook. According to the Tenth Census—

The whole population was	50,155,783
Total number engaged in manufactures and mining	3,837,112
Total	46,348,671

Here we have 46,348,671 people paying $186,522,065 of money to maintain an increase in the wages of 3,837,112, or at the rate of $48.61 + per head for every man, woman, and child thus employed, or $4.02 per head for the 46,348,671; or for the Congressional district which I have the honor to represent, the farmers would have paid the enormous sum of $683,400 for the development of industries they did not own and to increase the wages of people they did not employ. And on the estimates of this year by the Secretary of the Treasury the amount of import duties will reach $228,000,000, which will amount to $4.27 for every man, woman, and child in the United States, or $725,900 for my Congressional district. But we can not concede only momentarily for the sake of argument the claims of the protectionists. Our farmers know that as a common contribution to our country the development of industries in which they have no pecuniary interest is something to be proud of, but they know that glory as a diet is exceedingly thin, and that as raiment it is too diaphanic for the temperature in which they live to be of any value.

And, Mr. Chairman, as to the claim that protection increases the price of labor, I have something to say. In the first place I deny that we are indebted to the tariff in any degree for the difference in wages in this country and in Europe. And in the second place, conceding for argument's sake the point, I deny that the pending measure proposes any such reduction of duties on imports as to interfere in the slightest degree with the wages of those employed in this country in the production of dutiable articles, and on these points I desire to submit proof which, in my judgment, conclusively sustains them both. The higher wages paid labor in this country are due to several causes, and none of those the tariff, for while on that specious pretext the manufacturers have been protected to an extent that enabled them to execute their purpose, they have, in every instance, proved recreant to their professions of friendship to labor, and have taken the proceeds of the protective legislation, generously given them in the interest of their workmen, and coolly put it in their own pockets; and as the absence of evidence is sometimes as strong as affirmative proof, I point to the remarkable fact that the entire history of protective legislation, so far as my research goes, fails to disclose a single instance where the wages of the laborer in a given industry were increased by reason of the imposition of an import duty or the increase of a duty already imposed.

It is true that as to this question, as to most others, they present columns of figures showing that wages in this country are higher than in other countries, and then presumptuously claim the difference as a trophy of protection. And while there is no proof that the tariff has anything to do with the increase of wages, there are many circumstances, like the varying wages in adjacent cities with the same tariff conditions, that abundantly prove that the lion's share of the benefits (as is notably shown in the steel-works of Edgar Thomson) given the American manufacturer goes into the pockets of the rich proprietor. Among the leading and prime conditions which account for the greater wages American laborers receive over foreign laborers is in the superiority of American labor, and on that point I submit as high protective authority an extract from a letter by Hon. W. M. EVARTS, then Secretary of State and now a Republican United States Senator from New York, transmitting to Congress May 17, 1879, the consular reports on the state of labor in Europe. He says:

> The average American workman performs from one and one-half to twice as much work in a given time as the average European workman. This is so important a point in connection with our ability to compete with the cheap labor manufactures of Europe, and it seems at first thought so strange, that I will trouble you with somewhat lengthy quotations from the reports in support thereof. * * *
>
> For the first time our manufactures are now assuming international proportions. At a time of universal depression we have met those nations which held a monopoly of the world's markets, met them in their strongholds, etc. * * * Within the last fifteen years we have demonstrated our ability by the brilliant development of our own resources to exclude by honest competition foreign manufactures to a large extent from our shores.

But if this superiority of American labor over the pauper labor of Europe did not more than account for the difference in wages, still the American manufacturer would have no cause of complaint against the pending bill, as the per cent of duty imposed on every article is in every instance largely in excess of the per cent. which the labor represents in the article produced in this country.

Making protection to American labor the leading ground for asking laws protecting them from foreign competition with the cheap products of pauper labor, the American people have consented to take upon themselves the great burden of adding, as the law stands at present, 47 per cent. to the price of the whole range of dutiable articles, which, taking the estimated value of such articles at $2,500,000,000, and one-half the duty as added to the price, we have the enormous sum, in round numbers, of about $600,000,000 that the American laborer should receive. The following table of statistics, prepared by Mr. Seaton, Superintendent of the Tenth Census, and extended to show the present and proposed tariff rates by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN], demonstrates the fact that as to the articles named in the table labor receives only 16.9 per cent., while the per cent. of protection demanded for it by the manufacturer and generously accorded by the people amounts to 69 per cent.:

Table, compiled from the Tenth Census, showing value of various manufactured products, per cent. of labor cost, rate of duty existing and proposed.

Industries.	Value of product.	Labor.	Percentage of labor.	Present tariff.	Proposed rate.
				Per ct.	*Per ct.*
Carpets	$31,792,802	$6,835,218	21.5	47	30
Cotton goods	210,950,383	45,614,419	21.6	50	40
Bolts, nuts, etc	10,073,330	1,981,300	19.7	59	35
Nails and spikes	5,629,240	1,255,171	22.3	43	34
Iron pipe, wrought	13,202,162	1,788,258	13.5	70	35
Oil, castor	653,900	44,714	6.8	194	97
Oil, linseed	15,393,812	681,677	4.4	54	21
Screws	2,184,532	456,542	20.9	50	35
Wool hats	8,516,569	1,893,215	22.2	54	40
Woolen goods	160,606,721	25,830,392	16.1	70	40
Worsted goods	33,549,942	5,683,027	16.9	68	40

This exhibit discloses the fact that the manufacturers have not dealt in good faith with this question, and that they have cheated both the people and their employés, or, in other words, are guilty of obtaining money under false pretenses. On this estimate they have retained 52.1 per cent. of the amount granted them on account of labor, and the mild form of punishment they receive at the hands of the pending measure, which is characterized by the protectionist advocates as "an assault upon home industries," is a reduction of duties to such a point only as leaves them an average of 40.7 per cent., or 23.8 per cent. more than the average wages the manufacturers are now paying their employés. It would seem that on this showing the American manufacturer, tempering his greed with prudence, would be less presumptuous in his demands and less offensive and provocative in his treatment of his victims.

Here he stands as the exponent of a system that has filched from the people hundreds of millions annually on one false pretense and another,

not only not offering to make any restitution to the laboring men of these millions whose property it equitably and rightfully is, but is fighting with the desperation of a wild beast to prevent any modification of this great burden of extortion in the future. Protectionists might as well understand that this fight is on to a finish, and that there will be no rest in this country until this system of plundering the American people in the name of American labor shall be torn, root and branch, from our revenue policy and cast out forever. And certainly every laboring man in whose name this outrage is committed is interested in seeing this end accomplished, or at least in seeing that there is a division of the spoils in harmony with the conditions on which it is procured.

In truth, evidence multiplies on every hand that the manufacturer, the capitalist, and not the laborer, is the beneficiary of our protective system. Were it not so, Mr. Chairman, instead of bringing into this country in great numbers pauper laborers of Europe to take the place of American laborers, our protection friends would join in the movement to put a high protective duty on such labor importations and thus show themselves not only the friends of the laboring man but consistent protective tariff advocates.

And the laboring man is not such a fool as not to know that it is a much graver crime against him and his family to import pauper labor to drive him out of business or bring him down to starvation wages than it is to import merely the product of that pauper labor. Hundreds of thousands of dollars are spent by these protected industries in prepar, ing arguments bristling with statistics to show the blessings of taxing one class of people to sustain the business of another class of people, and great enterprise and ingenuity, without regard to expense, is exhibited in placing these arguments where they will do the most good.

They are made to appear as original matter in an editorial way, as the disinterested sentiments of the editor, and they are sent in season and out the year round into the homes of the farmers and others of their victims in order to hold them in a state of repose. But when the argument has ended there appears but one fact beyond the realm of doubt, and that is the fact that the consumers of dutiable articles in this country, whether they be foreign or domestic, pay in excess of what they would have to pay but for the tariff, the tariff duty whatever it may be, whether 47 per cent. as now, or more or less. In other words, if the tariff is at the rate of 47 per cent. of the value of dutiable goods the consumers pay an excess of 47 per cent. over and above what they would pay but for the tariff. The importer adds the tariff among other items to the cost of his goods, and then meets the price fixed by the American merchants on his goods, and thus the consumers in each instance pay the enhanced price, and if the amount required by consumers be three billions, one billion four hundred and ten million represents the price they have paid to aid home industries. Of course these figures may not be correct in every instance, but they are approximately so as a basis of calculation for all practical purposes in illustrating in greater or less degree the sum of the burden borne by the American people in the name of protection to American industries.

Vehement denial that the duty is added to the cost and specious arguments to show that dutiable articles are produced in this country as cheaply as abroad are all, no matter how plausible, tainted with fraud, doubt, and great uncertainty, in view of a few established facts about which there never has been any doubt. And the skeptic is altogether pardonable, for he sees the American manufacturer spending hundreds of thousands of dollars to keep the European manufacturer out of the American market, and he sees the European manufacturer so eager to get into this market that he is willing to pay about $225,000,000 per annum for the mere chance of having his products exposed in our markets. The American manufacturer is fleecing his victims at such a rate that the European manufacturer can afford to pay $225,000,000 per annum for a stand in our market-place. This is a condition and not a theory. And while there is but one single fact about which there is no controversy, and that the fact that the consumers of the classes of articles subject to duty pay the duty, all else as to offsets and the like being mere speculation on the part of the protectionist, the wiser and safer practice is to hold fast to the path marked out by the fathers of the Republican party before the various protected interests had assumed such vast proportions and had gained as undue and as dangerous a power over the minds of men as they have over the commerce and industries of the country.

The Republican party recognized this rule and applied it in legislation, and if their voice could be heard to-day a vast majority of the people (of Iowa at least) would declare in favor of a tariff for revenue, with incidental protection, in such sum as, added to the internal-revenue taxes paid in under existing laws, would meet the just obligations of the Government, honestly and economically administered. When I ask my neighbor to pay me $2 for an article, the product of my labor, that he can buy across the way for $1, there rests on me a decisive burden to explain to my neighbor how on business principles he can afford to do that thing, and the explanation will be largely in the nature of the venerable and often-told story in which a white man and an Indian and a turkey and a buzzard were the leading characters. Of the $228,000,000, the estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury of the receipts of the Government for the ensuing year from tariff duties, 100,000,000 at least will be paid by the farmers, estimating their numbers at the moderate sum of 44 per cent. of the population of the United States; and they will pay it because they have to pay it as good citizens, and not for the reason that they regard it a privilege and a blessing.

They know they must bear their just proportion of the tax, and that to pay it in this disguised way, when they have some voice in determining the amount of it, more or less, as they will to buy more or less of dutiable articles, is perhaps quite as satisfactory as to pay a fixed sum over the Treasurer's counter, as they do as to State and county taxes, and which if not paid exposes their property to distraint and sale. But the tax-payers of the Eighth Iowa district, which I have the honor to represent, in paying $725,900, their proportion of the $228,000,000, the estimate for the current year, will demand that there be such a reduction of the revenues as will bring this enormous burden to the smallest possible amount. And the people of Iowa are in such earnest mood on this and kindred subjects that no amount of sophistry as to benefits accruing from protection nor juggling as to the non-partisan character of the question will induce them to forego holding individuals personally responsible for their official action. A Representative will not this year be permitted to vote with the trusts and then plead in his defense that his action was not political action.

Nothing but large and well-trained majorities, held together by force of habit, from long association and prejudice, and other than by principle, will return an Iowa member this year who, on any pretext, does not vote for a reduction of the excessive taxation that, in connection with other drains from other protected industries, is draining Iowa annually of her substance and putting $100,000,000 per annum in the Treasury more than is needed to meet the obligations of the Government. From long suffering the people have been seeking light, and, in my judgment, the time has come when the cry of "free trade" and "British gold" will no longer divert the attention of the tax-payer from the hand that, during the diversion thus created, glides deftly into his breeches pocket.

The nation is at peace within its own borders and with the world. We have had now more than three years' Democratic administration, and there is no rent in the flag and no stoppage of Union soldiers' pensions or payment of the rebel debt. The time has come when the people can look after their own private interests, as contradistinguished from public affairs, without endangering the public weal. There is no longer any call to sacrifice personal for public interests. If the regulation of the tariff, the railroads, the telegraphs, the banks, and the trusts are not political and party questions, the people will make them party questions, and men who wish to remain in public life that do not seek to find some way of putting these institutions on an equality with the ignored farmers, who stand for one-half—and the better half—of the industry of this country, to the end that the hundreds of millions that the farmers are now paying in extortionate rates into custom-houses, railroad and telegraph offices, and banks, will be notified that their services are no longer wanted.

One of the most forceful schemes on the part of this combination of interests against the people has been the non-partisan dodge by which they (the pool agents) have maintained the equality of political forces by keeping one party as deep in the mire as the other in the mud, and the people left without any inducement to change their party relations. In my own State, where I am familiar with men and methods, the audacity of the corporation bosses, who associate themselves with the dominant party for the purpose of directing its course in the interest of monopolistic power, is largely born of the fact that a few leaders admitted to the councils of the minority share with them in their devotion to monopoly as well as in the spoils that follow such devotion.

TARIFF.

For the purpose of opening up the way for men who want the benefits of belonging to party, and also want the benefits that accrue from doing those things that are in violation of party promises and party tradition, an ingenious way has been opened up that is worthy of the inventive ingenuity of the pool agents of the day. The declaration has gone out that the tariff is not a political question, and that therefore no party sin can be committed in relation to it, let the action of the individual be what it may. That this will prove as weak as most of the other propositions the agents of monopoly seek to sustain their cause with will appear when it is stated that according to Worcester's dictionary politics is defined as "the science or the art of government, or the administration of national or public affairs; that part of ethics which consists in the knowledge or practice of conducting the various affairs of a State or nation." It strikes me that raising the revenues is a part of the various "affairs" involved in "conducting the affairs of the State or nation." If on the leading question in politics, committed to the leading committee of the House, and whose chairman is conceded to be the leader of the House, party lines can not be drawn, it is a strong point made in support of the common charge, now so frequently heard everywhere, that parties have outlived their usefulness and are only able to draw the lines on historical questions, always breaking on all questions affecting banks, railroads, telegraphs, trusts, and other Government-aided enterprises that are making private merchandise of the sovereign power of the people. The tariff question is a

political question, and the Republican party has so recognized it, and has a well-defined position with reference to it, notwithstanding the fact that some of its self-constituted leaders are trying to harness it up in the interest of monopoly. The party faith, as formulated in its platforms and through the utterances of party leaders, as well as the general line of legislation it has enacted since it came to power, bind the party to the policy of a tariff for revenue so adjusted as to encourage home industry. In view of the fact that the Constitution limits the tariff to the revenue needs of the Government, and the further consideration, of a practical nature in the working out of that policy under the constitutional limitation, that the annual receipts from tariff are now about $225,000,000, and that Senator SHERMAN, a protectionist, and probably, from his long experience in public affairs of a financial character, the highest authority in the land, said, in a speech delivered in 1869, that—

The wit of man could not possibly devise a tariff that would yield $140,000,000 in gold without amply protecting our domestic industry—

there does not seem to be any other tenable ground for the party to stand on. The whole history of the party as a party shows this. The Whig party was the original tariff party in this country, and Henry Clay was the oracle and idol of his party in general and on that question in a special sense. Henry Clay, advocating this position from the standpoint of a patriot and as to its effect upon the whole country, asked for a temporary protective tariff for our American industries during their infancy, which is the exact position of General James A. Garfield (the last President the Republican party elected), as he defined his position on this question as being in favor of such protection as would lead to free trade. When the Whig party went into bankruptcy the Republican party fell heir to the assets, and especially to its position on the tariff; and consequently President Garfield was voicing the organic law of his party on the tariff when he declared himself in favor of only such protection as would lead to free trade.

Chester A. Arthur, elected as Vice-President upon the ticket with Garfield, and whose admirable administration as Garfield's successor received the cordial indorsement of his party and made it possible for his party to prolong its power, declared in his last annual message in favor of—

such tariff reductions as may seem advisable when the result of recent revenue laws and commercial treaties shall have shown in what quarters those reductions may be most judiciously effected.

The "recent revenue laws" he there referred to as the result of the revision of 1883 were followed by increased, instead of reduced revenues, adding fresh force to his recommendation and proving the soundness of his political views. President Arthur's policy was the party policy, and that was, only such import duties as, taken in connection with the revenue from other existing sources, were needed to meet the obligations of the Government honestly administered.

The protection spoken of in the party platforms was the protection that came from a wise adjustment of the duties imposed.

President Arthur had three Secretaries of the Treasury—Charles J. Folger, of New York, an Eastern State; and General Gresham and Hugh McCulloch, of Indiana, a Western State—and all three were able and trusted leaders of the Republican party, and all three were outspoken for tariff reform.

Secretary Folger, in his report for 1883, recommended—

That the duties upon the articles used or consumed by those who are the least able to bear the burden of taxation should be reduced.

And Secretary McCulloch, in pointing out in his report the proper way in which to do this, said:

1. That the existing duties upon raw materials which are to be used in manufacture should be removed.
2. That the duties upon the articles used or consumed by those who are the least able to bear the burden of taxation should be reduced.

Again I desire to call attention to the fact, in order to emphasize it as it deserves in these days, when the launching of the mere epithet of "free-trader" is expected to successfully degrade the work of tariff reform, that President Arthur's administration was not only a Republican administration but one that won exceptional commendation from his party, that found warm and generous expression in the resolutions of every party State convention held that year. Mr. Arthur's administration was but executing Republican principles in compliance with the Republican platforms; and the Chicago Tribune, the leading Republican newspaper in the United States, when measured by its devotion to the masses as against special interests, puts the situation in a nutshell and voices the sentiments of its party in the West when it says:

Thus the last Republican administration anticipated by four years the recommendation just made to Congress by Mr. Cleveland and laid down the precise doctrine which, coming from a Democratic President, is now expected to excite the abhorrence of Republicans.

And passing from national to State affairs, I find that the record of the Republican party in Iowa is well defined as being for tariff with incidental protection; and in proof of this allegation I will submit the platform utterances of the party, as I have them at hand, until at an unfortunate moment monopolistic power largely dominated the State and, taking advantage of the great diversion from its machinations created by the agitation of the prohibitory question, stole into the party platform in 1883 a paragraph declaring against any tinkering with the tariff.

I have been a Republican from my youth up, following, in peace and war, the fortunes of my party banner without breach of discipline during all these years, save in two instances, the most notable one being when I gave my somewhat cordial support to the candidacy of an independent Republican. How many of my brethren on this side of the House can say as much? And, however much my action in these instances may be open to criticism by that class of Republicans who have just made their last return from their latest escapade into the Democratic party, it does not alter the record of the Republican party in my State nor my familiarity with it as a party to it. And I shall proceed to present it to the House.

In 1871 the Republican State convention declared—

That while we favor a just and reasonable degree of protection to all branches of American industry against foreign competition, we are unalterably opposed to any system of legislation which favors one section of the country or department of industrial enterprise at the expense of another, and therefore advocate such protection only as a fairly adjusted revenue tariff will afford.

In 1873—

That we demand a general revision of the present tariff laws that shall give us free salt, iron, lumber, cotton and woolen fabrics, and reduce the whole thing to a revenue basis only.

In 1875—

That we favor a tariff for revenue, so adjusted as to encourage home industry.

In 1877—

That we favor a wisely adjusted tariff for revenue.

In 1878—

That we favor a wisely adjusted tariff for revenue.

In 1879 the very same words occur in the eighth paragraph of the Republican platform. And as late as 1880 the then Republican governor of Iowa put a paragraph in his inaugural message speaking in hostile terms against the prohibitory duty of $28 on steel rails as being a grievous burden on the farmers, by making railroad building more expensive and transportation of their products higher, and asking the Legislature to memorialize Congress to reduce or abolish the duty.

But, Mr. Chairman, soon after this corporate power in Iowa politics became bold, and even insolent, and when it could not control conventions and put such planks in the platform as it desired, it went to the Legislature and accomplished what it had failed to accomplish with delegates at conventions fresh from the country. A great change, however, has taken place within the party within the last two years. The party, enraged by the shameful manner in which it had been misrepresented in a legislative way, arose in its might and displaced the recreant public servants in such decisive numbers that the last Legislature of that State, which has just adjourned, enacted several propositions into law that former Legislatures had refused to listen to. Corporate monopoly power has received hard blows in Iowa within the last two years.

Its executive and legislative departments have been retrieved by the people, and with vigilance on the part of the earnest men of the party more valuable ground will be gained. Pools, trusts, special rates, and other monopolistic contrivances for the prevention of competition and the distribution of favors among the friends of corporate control have been legislatively denounced. And as high protective-tariff interests have everywhere made common cause with the railroads, the telegraphs, and the trusts, and advanced from the old-time doctrine of tariff for revenue, with incidental protection, to protection for the sake of protection, no matter how much money was thereby being taken from the people and hoarded in the Treasury, so this class of tariff pretensions have met the fate of the company they kept and have in Iowa retired to the old ground; and I have not the least doubt but that the wise heads of the party will advise a retreat on this question to the point it occupied before being carried away by the pools and the trusts. And Iowa's representative Republicans have been more outspoken in official life than even their party through its platform.

In July, 1866, the revision of the tariff was before the Congress. Then, as now, the high-tariff men were telling the West they would receive benefits in this way, and that when Hon. John A. Kasson, one of the ablest and most popular men Iowa ever produced, and whom it kept continuously in office until within the last three years, when he voluntarily retired, told the House such propositions were "illogical" and "absurd." "What you call protection," he said, answering the New England sophistries, "amounts, therefore, simply to an equal robbery; taking from one home interest to pay to another." The bill under discussion then was very similar to existing law. Again, in the same speech, speaking of the then pending bill, Mr. Kasson said:

And now what does this bill do? It raises the tariff on lumber, which is so necessary to the Western prairie farmer; on nails, without which he can not drive his boards on his house or build his fence; and on salt, without which he can not preserve his beef and pork. There is hardly a thing we consume which this bill forgets to raise the duty upon. Every prominent necessity of life, food, fuel, shelter, and clothing, is embraced and made more expensive to the consumer throughout the country. Even on boys' pocket-knives the duty is increased about three times, 600 per cent., one member of the committee tells me; and yet it is said this is a tariff for mere protection.

James W. Grimes, Iowa's first Republican governor, her most gifted Senator during the war, and whose history is one of the brightest lega-

cies Iowa has inherited, from his place in the Senate on January 24, 1867, the question of the tariff being under consideration, spoke as follows:

Mr. GRIMES. Mr. President, the man who opposes the passage of this bill must expect to be slandered. The "protectionists," as they choose to call themselves, have already opened the vials of their indignant wrath upon the heads of those whose opposition they anticipated. Threats of utter political extinction are hurled against every man who, in the exercise of an independent judgment, is not prepared to impose upon his constituents the burdens which the various manufacturing combinations demand. That portion of the public press suborned to their interest is rife with charges that "the Capital is thronged with free-traders, and that British gold is operating to secure American legislation for British interests." Every man is condemned in advance who would inquire before he would vote.

We know what all this means, and so far as I have the ability, I am resolved that the people shall know what it means.

It means that two or three large manufacturing interests in the country, not satisfied with the enormous profits they have realized during the last six years, are determined at whatever hazard to put more money in their pockets; and to this end they have persuaded some and coerced other manufacturing interests to unite with them in a great combination demand for what they call protection to American labor, but what some others call robbery of the American laborer and agriculturist. * * * It is the fashion to denounce every man who does not favor a prohibitory tariff as a free-trader. The charge is made that free-trade agents are at work to influence Congress, and that our tables are incumbered with free-trade documents. Who has seen these free-trade agents? I have yet to see the first man who was in favor of free trade, nor have I seen any man who was opposed to a revenue tariff which would incidentally protect such branches of American industry as needed the fostering aid of the Government. It is on questions of detail that we differ. We disagree as to now much money shall be taken from the pocket of Peter to support and enrich his brother Paul.

Hon. W. B. ALLISON is an Iowa Republican who has served in Congress since 1864, and was for some years a member of the Ways and Means Committee in this House. He is so strong with his party today in that State that it is presenting him with great earnestness as the proper man to receive the indorsement of his party at large as its candidate for the Presidency. And Senator ALLISON'S strength in Iowa is due to the defense he has made of Iowa interests, and especially with reference to the tariff. On March 24, 1870, in this House, discussing the tariff bill then pending, Senator ALLISON said:

The agricultural interest, it will be seen, is much the largest interest in its aggregate product as well as in the number of persons employed. I believe no one will claim that this large interest is directly protected. It is true that under customs laws there is a small duty upon wheat, barley, oats, and other agricultural products, but it does not afford any protection to the great wheat and grain-producing regions of the country. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Wilson], in discussing this question yesterday stated that the cost of wheat in New England is about $1.70 per bushel, while in Illinois, Iowa, and Wisconsin the price is about 65 cents per bushel. The Canadian wheat is the only wheat that comes in competition with our own. Canada being nearer New England than the wheat-growing States more than makes up the duty in the reduced cost of transportation.

What is true of wheat is equally true of other grains. Therefore the farmer has practically no protection at all, and whatever benefit he derives is from what the home market furnishes for home products. Unfortunately for the farmer, the market price of wheat is fixed by the price which the surplus will bring abroad, or the price of wheat in London or Liverpool. At that market, where the surplus is sold, and which fixes the value of the whole crop, he comes in competition with the grain produced in the Crimea, in Hungary, and in the region of the Baltic, from fields cultivated by what is known, in comparison to our own, as pauper labor.

But I am told we must so legislate as to furnish a home market for all our agricultural products, and this can only be done by high tariff. Any one examining the subject will see that our agricultural products increase more rapidly than our population, so that if we do not export these products in their natural condition we must do so by converting them into manufactured articles, and export these articles. But this can not be done under a high tariff, for all nations will buy manufactured products where they are the cheapest, and the nation selling the cheapest will control the market. This rule excludes our highly-taxed manufactures made from highly-taxed materials from the markets of the world, although we have natural advantages possessed by no other nation.

To the above remarks by Senator ALLISON I invite the attention of the House and country to show the position of the party and the people of his State; and to my colleague from Iowa [Mr. HENDERSON], who seems to think the farmers of Iowa are sufficiently protected by the tariff on wheat, corn, and other farm products to equalize their benefits under the tariff with the manufacturers in whose special interest it was conceived and enacted, I kindly commend the views of his predecessor, who owes his political eminence to them, with the suggestion that he carefully revise his own sentiments in harmony therewith if he would realize the cherished hope of his friends to still further follow in the way opened up by his illustrious leader.

Thus, Mr. Chairman, it appears from an examination of the record that the weight of the evidence establishes the fact that the true position of the Republican is that of tariff for revenue with such adjustment as will afford incidental protection to our home industries. And this is undoubtedly the correct position.

As a Western man I have no sort of patience with that protection craze which has developed in this country in the form of trusts, having for their object the prevention of competition and fair play; and while the tariff isn ot responsible for all these trusts that are amassing large fortunes on unpaid stocks, the beneficiaries of our tariff laws have abused their trust to such an extent as to put the people who pay the bills on their guard. The history and growth of protection in this country prove this. In the first place, protection was only demanded for our "infant industries." Then, again, it was presented in the shape of a war necessity, to raise the extraordinary sums of money needed to defend the nation's life; and in this connection, in consideration of the heavy tax imposed upon manufactured articles under the internal-revenue system, the duties on imports were largely increased with the distinct pledge and understanding that when the internal-revenue taxes were removed the duties on imports levied to meet them should also be removed.

Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont, who reported the bill to increase the duties on imports, stated that the increase was necessary as an "equivalent" to the internal-revenue taxes imposed on manufactured articles. This was in the long session of 1864, and at the close of his speech he made this distinct pledge:

This is intended as a war measure, a temporary measure, and we must give it our support as such.

And again, as—

a war measure imposed by the necessities of the Government, the scarcity of laborers, and the enormous direct taxation.

From this history it appears that it was reserved for the later advocates of protection to put their claim on its own merit as a permanent system. The earlier advocates of protection and all those who spoke for it, up to the day when monopolistic power, through pools and trusts, began to feel that it owned the country, did not pretend that the manufacturers of this country needed legislative aid save in a temporary way, and the country, relying upon the good faith of the statements thus made, acceded to their demands. Protection has run nearly the whole gamut of subterfuges, pleading, among other things, its own infancy and its country's misfortunes as the different reasons why the people should give it aid, promising solemnly in each instance that when the reason for the tax had ceased the tax itself should cease. But the friends of this special interest are fertile in resources, and now, when infancy has passed, when the misfortunes of war are over and the taxes on manufactured products are removed and the people come to claim their own according to the bond, they are met with another subterfuge.

Recognizing a need of an apparent growth in grace, the alleged friends of protection are massing their forces on high moral grounds, and are now demanding that before the tax is removed from the poor man's necesssities the tax must be taken from whisky and tobacco, but more especially from whisky. This is the last resort, and I trust it is doomed to meet the ignominious defeat it deserves. But why on any pretext longer dally on this subject? What promise has been kept? What promise has been made by the advocates of these high duties that they have not violated? Not only so, but in many instances we find the beneficiaries of this aid combining to regulate and forestall the market value of their own products and cheat the country out of the benefits of the promised competition among themselves after the country generously conceded them the protection asked from foreign competition.

With this kind of record before the country, can protectionists complain if some people should suspect protection capable of making common cause with the monopolistic interest of the country, and that the miraculous conversions to their cause that they parade as the result of honest research and enlightened understanding, are simply the effects of a prudent and well-disposed extension of the metallic influences of a most lucrative system. If protection has not been recreant to an indulgent people, it has been peculiarly unfortunate in the record it has made, and can not blame the people, and especially the farmers of the West, whose interest in any view of the case are most remote and most doubtful, for wanting a showing of assets and a general accounting of stock.

For these reasons the people of the West turn instinctively to a modification of the tariff for a reduction of the revenues to a point commensurate with the needs of the Government.

The pending measure does not meet my views, as I am opposed to any reduction of internal taxes, and would prefer a greater reduction of duty on sugar if not indeed its entire removal. But modification being one of the demands of the hour, differences as to details must give way to compromise if anything is to be accomplished and the country assured that its Representatives are not again violating faith and reaching the same end by another road that it reached in the previous House. My objection to the bill is that it does not sufficiently reduce the tariff duties and reduces internal-revenue taxes too much.

But I can not have my way, and as the bill leaves the duty at a higher average per cent. than former tariffs enacted by the special champions of protection, and is higher than is needed to cover any difference there may be between the price of labor in this country and foreign countries, and conflicts to as limited an extent with any special interests in my State, and especially the district I have the honor to represent, as any that is ever likely to meet the approval of a majority of this House, I am prepared to support the measure with some few modifications. And it is impossible for me to see what reasonable excuse a Western Representative can frame for his defense in voting against the bill in all cases where it does not encroach upon some special interest in the district in which the member may chance to live.

OTHER TARIFFS TO MODIFY.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are other tariffs that need revising and reducing as well as the tariff on imports, and the leading one is the tariff the railways are imposing upon the domestic commerce of the country. And as these tariffs hunt in couples and constitute the component parts of a trap that catches the commerce of the country, foreign or domestic, whether it be going or coming, it is altogether pertinent to

this discussion to submit in this connection a few suggestions as to the imperfection of any tariff reform that does not radically reform the railway tariffs of the country. And this matter is of special interest to my section of the country, so far inland and from the leading markets, whether at home or abroad. Our farmers pay the extortionate rate of the railroad tariff going to market with their products, and they pay the manufacturer's tariff and the railroad tariff coming home with the necessaries of life.

Our railroad establishment is a great blessing, yet dominating as it has, and still does, all other interests in this country, building up this point and crushing that, enriching one man and impoverishing another, corrupting with its vicious methods the entire business of the country, extorting hundreds of millions from the people each year in excess of reasonable charges for the services rendered, and corrupting the various departments of government, State and national, until the entire country seems helpless in the railway barons' grasp, it would be better that this country had struggled on with its old-fashioned methods of transportation if these great evils can not be arrested and forever prohibited.

The railroad companies, like the manufacturers of the country, have abused the generosity of the people who contributed of subsidy, both public and private, a large proportion of the capital which built the roads. And when, after the roads are built, equipped, and in running order, the people look over the account and find that these roads, notwithstanding the generous gifts of individuals, towns, cities, counties, States, and the United States—these highways are charged up to the country for transportation purposes at about three times what they are worth, and when they suggest some plan of adjustment or management that will have a tendency to equalize the burdens between the companies and the people they are set down as an unreasoning, raw mob who are simply dissatisfied on account of the great distance they see between themselves and gentlemen who are able to be connected with the railway establishment of the country. And those who have been in authority have been so dead as to the trespasses and sins of this great establishment that but little progress has been made in the way of correcting the great abuses connected with it.

Built, as I have said, largely by public and private subsidy, this establishment is charged up to the country at an enormous cost, which, with the tremendous power it has in commanding the highways, makes the contest between it and other industries a most unequal one.

These various lines, according to Poor's Manual, had in operation in 1886 125,146 miles of road charged up to the country in capital stock, and debt at more than $8,000,000,000, with earnings to the amount of about $800,000,000, whilst for the year 1887, Mr. Poor says, at page 10 of his Manual for 1887, that—

> The earnings for 1887 are likely to equal $900,000,000, the increase to equal fully 10 per cent. over that of 1886.

And from the same authority we learn that the roads earned $305 per mile more in 1886 than they did in 1885, and he adds that—

> Hereafter it seems probable that the earnings of our railroads are to increase in ratio considerably greater than the amount of capital invested in them.

And for the benefit of those who are endeavoring to make the people think the interstate-commerce law of last year is a thing of virtue, I call attention to Mr. Poor's observation that—

> The general managers of our great lines feel themselves to be much more masters of the situation, as it were, than for some years past.

And this is perfectly natural, as I shall endeavor to show before I finish. This railroad establishment is the most costly one in existence on the earth, and unless put under stringent legal control will make itself such complete "masters" of the entire country that the people will practically be transferred from a republic to an amalgamated corporation. The entire obligations of this Government for the ensuing year are estimated at $326,000,000, and yet the railroads taxed the people of this country, according to Mr. Poor, for the year 1887, $900,000,000, or nearly three times as much as the United States charged the people to run the machinery and discharge the obligations of the Government.

These railroads have a funded debt that is as much a debt and charge on the people as the debt of the United States, and that debt is this year about the enormous sum of $4,000,000,000 or $1,300,000,000 larger than the debt of the United States at the close of the war, and on this debt the companies are making the people pay a greater interest than they are paying on the Government debt. And the whole stands for fraud and ought to be wiped out of existence. When a farmer puts a mortgage on his farm it goes on as an incumbrance, and he is hard pressed till it is removed; whereas a railroad company may be characterized as a creature organized for the express opportunity of going into debt, and the peculiarity is that the more the company becomes indebted the richer becomes its proprietor, for it has methods which enable it to fix its value at any arbitrary sum it pleases and levy contributions on the people of the surrounding country to make that valuation sound and reliable. Peter A. Dey, a railroad commissioner of Iowa, first chief engineer of the Union Pacific Railroad Company, and a thoroughly competent man in his profession, testified before the Pattison Pacific Railroad Commission last year that the Union Pacific road could be replaced, equipped, for $25,000 per mile, and I doubt not that the entire system in the United States could be replaced at that figure, or perhaps less, which would put their value at about $3,000,000,000.

If this be true these railroads are costing the country this year in excess of a reasonable charge for their services as common carriers about the sum of $600,000,000, which, in connection with the $550,000,000 it is estimated the people pay on account of tariff duties, is the snug sum of $1,150,000,000, which annual drain from the people accounts for the fabulous fortunes so suddenly made by the railroad and trust barons of the country. The prices of all property, save railroad and trust property, fluctuate and vary being affected by the surroundings; but the stocks and bonds of railroads, let the property cost what it may, been ever so extravagantly built, and when prices of labor and materials were high, let these all vary, and come and go in price as they may with good and hard times, railroad stocks and bonds, the alleged cost of the roads, stand as steady as the earth that is checkered with their mileage. The people saw this great wrong, and they asked that they have such legislation as would right it. They demanded that the pool by which the companies fixed arbitrarily the charges for transportation, thereby fixing arbitrarily the value of railroad property, be prohibited, and that the companies be denied the power of favoritism called special rates by which they have been able to transform old-fashioned bribery into a "common courtesy."

The people made demand that pools and special rates, the twin abominations by which the railroads have placed every other industry in this country at their feet, should be taken out of the hands of the companies as power too dangerous to trust in the hands of anybody. With competition restored, favoritism abolished, rates would seek their level like other property, and the equilibrium be restored. The companies saw the rage of the people; and, taking time by the forelock, they find themselves intrenched behind a commission, the dumping ground of legislative responsibility, and the result is that rates are increased, the roads are made to earn $305 per mile more than before the law was enacted, and in the language of Mr. Poor, an authority on that subject, "The managers of our great lines feel themselves to be much more masters of the situation, as it were, than for some years past." The "managers" feel that they have something that their friends can keep the country quiet with, until they see how the "experiment" works, and the companies know that by that time they will be the better enthroned and established through judicial and legal barricade in the possession of their ill-gotten gains and fictitious values.

These companies know that any public and governmental recognition they can have from their present standpoint of fraudulent stocks and bonds and values in general is in the direction of giving them character and stability. Hence they regard the interstate-commerce law, with a commission provided for that treats with them as an honorable establishment on an honest and sound basis, as a step in the direction of a general curative statute, and "they feel more like masters of the situation than they have for years." And when the first act of the commission was to suspend the law pending investigation, instead of after investigation, it looked as though the companies had made no mistake.

And when, on reading the first annual report of that august tribunal instituted to execute a law to prevent and break up certain practices on the part of the railroad companies of the country, we find that it simply offers an apology on behalf of the companies to show why they are not complying with the most important provisions of the law, the people of this country will be the more confirmed in the opinion that the railroad managers knew what they were doing, and that the people in asking for bread received a stone.

I have given this matter attention, and I do not believe there is substantial compliance with the law, or ever will be until the discretionary power exercised by the companies by virtue of the words "undue" and "unreasonable" and "like circumstance and condition" is taken root and branch out of their hands, their schedules of rates required to be posted where men can see them instead of filed away in drawers in the office of the Interstate Commerce Commission, where it takes three days to find them after you get to the office, and State courts given jurisdiction for the enforcement of rights under the law, instead of practically denying parties aggrieved a day in court by sending them to United States courts or the United States commission. And to show that in the matter of rates the companies are ignoring both the law and the commission and furnishing grounds for the next annual apology on the part of the commission, I submit the following extracts from schedules of rates in the office of the commission as they were prepared for me by Mr. C. C. McCain, the competent and courteous auditor of that body:

Rates from Chicago to New York.

Class.	All rail.	Via lake.	Class.	All rail.	Via lake.
1	$0.75	$0.60	4	$0.35	$0.30
2	.65	.52	5	.30	.25
3	.50	.40	6	.25	.20

Rates to Chicago from Kansas City and Council Bluffs.

Class.	Rate.	Class.	Rate.
1	$0.75	A	$0.30
2	.60	B	.25
3	.40	C	.20
4	.30	D	.17½
5	.25	E	.16

Rates to New York from Burlington, Dubuque, and Davenport.

Class.	Rate.	Class.	Rate.
1	$0.91½	4	$0.42½
2	.79½	5	.36½
3	.61	6	.30½

Rates from Denver to New York.

Class.	Rate.	Class.	Rate.
1	$2.20	A	$1.10
2	1.85	B	1.00
3	1.60	C	.85
4	1.30	D	.85
5	1.10	E	.75

Rates from Denver to Chicago.

Class.	Rate.	Class.	Rate.
1	$1.80	A	$0.90
2	1.46	B	.81
3	1.34	C	.70
4	1.12	D	.60
5	.90	E	.50

Rates from Dubuque, Davenport, and Burlington to Chicago.

Class.	Rate per 100 pounds.	Class.	Rate per 100 pounds.
1	$0.40	A	$0.14
2	.30	B	.12
3	.20	C	.11
4	.15	D	.09
5	.10	E	.08

Rates from Des Moines to Chicago.

Class.	Rate per 100 pounds.	Class.	Rate per 100 pounds.
1	$0.62	A	$0.24
2	.52	B	.22
3	.35	C	.17½
4	.25	D	.14½
5	.18	E	.12

Rates from Creston to Chicago.

Class.	Rate.	Class.	Rate.
1	$0.73	A	$0.28
2	.59	B	.25
3	.40	C	.20
4	.28	D	.17
5	.23	E	.14

Rates from Bedford to Chicago, and from Sidney to Chicago.

Class.	Rate.	Class.	Rate.
1	$0.75	A	$0.30
2	.60	B	.25
3	.40	C	.20
4	.30	D	.17½
5	.25	E	.16

Respectfully, yours,

C. C. McCAIN, *Auditor.*

These tables show that the rate from Council Bluffs and Kansas City, about 500 miles, is as great as the rate from Chicago to New York, about 1,000 miles; and that the rate from Bedford, Iowa, to Chicago is as great as the rate from Kansas City over the same line in the same direction to the same destination, though the distance from Kansas City to Chicago is about 150 miles greater than from Bedford. And the distance from Sidney, Iowa, to Chicago is 50 miles less than from Council Bluffs, and from Creston, Iowa, is 100 miles less, and yet the rate is substantially the same.

Mr. Chairman, the reduction of the railroad establishment in this country to an equality with other industries is the first business of the hour. As the system stands at present it commands everybody and everything by the tremendous power it exercises over the highways, that power being as recklessly and as wantonly exercised as it ever was by the gentlemanly highwaymen of the olden time. And as it stands at present the people are as helpless in the grasp of railroad managers, who are "masters of the situation" in fact, and have as little to say as to how the $900,000,000 is to be collected off them for transportation this year as he who at the muzzle of the highwayman's gun quietly gave up his purse. And those managers are not content with extorting from the people more than half a million money directly as common carriers, but they organize commercial companies along the line of their roads, and through the preference the managers of the roads can give those companies as special rates enable them to drive into bankruptcy and out of business all competition. The Standard Oil trust, that has absrobed hundreds of millions of the people's money, could not have been a thing possible but for the unlawful and vicious contracts it had with transportation lines.

And along the line of all these roads, and notably along the line of the Union Pacific Railway, commercial companies are organized whose owners control the transportation lines they are situated on, and through special rates granted them are enabled to bankrupt and drive out of business all competition, so that the people are left utterly helpless in the hands of the railroad managers not only as to the price of transportation but as to the price of all that is transported. Under these circumstances it is not at all strange that farm lands and farm products should be steadily declining all the time, and that railroad property, and the stocks of any trust with arrangements for special rates from a railway company, should be steadily appreciating in value and scarcely obtainable in the open markets. These great wrongs must be crushed out of existence. If the laws were as they should be in this country, and those laws were decently enforced, the proprietors of such conspiracies for forestalling the market value of products and to prevent the due course of trade and commerce would be convicted of felonies and sent to prison, where they would properly belong.

The great West is suffering more to-day from the abuse in railway tariffs than from the abuse in high impost duties. But she is suffering from both, and she joins hands cordially with the tariff reformers in the reduction of duties, and she asks them to join hands with her in her effort to reduce the charges of railroad transportation, which at the present time are at least 50 per cent. higher than honesty and good conscience demand.

The great West, the granary of the world, is charged so much for transportation that all her profits are absorbed in going to market, and the cheap products of the outside world come to her with high tariff duties and high freight rates added, so that between the upper and the nether mill-stones of tariff for revenue and tariff for railroads the great West is dispoiled of her substance, and seems to be left the common prey of the manufacturers and common carriers of the country.

This condition of things will not much longer be tolerated by a brave and self-respecting people. Unrest is manifest everywhere. Labor unions, farmers' alliances, and numerous other organizations are forming, and while there is more or less lack of harmony, light is breaking and the day is not far distant when all these men, with common cause and common interest, will unite to overthrow the commercial monsters that are coining their sweat. And when they do who can doubt the result? Then will come legislation for men as well as commerce. And this legislation will be for the men who in time of peace create the nation's wealth and in time of war defend it with their lives.

The great contest in this country that we are now entering upon is one for the equality of commercial and industrial establishments before the law, as men are equal before the law. The people are awakening to the fact that after having contended in this country for more than a hundred years, in war and in peace, for the equality of all men before the law they are in danger of losing the fruits of their costly triumphs through a species of class legislation in the interest of certain industries.

The people can not cope with these Government-aided interests, whose agents, procurers, slanderers, and bribe-distributers throng the halls of all legislation in this country; and when they come to understand that this is the source of the inequalities that exist and the prolific source of all the extortionate burdens they bear they will unite their straggling forces, and with the same invincible power with which they slew the monster of human slavery at the South they will slay this more modern monster that is seeking to enslave all men who eat their bread in the sweat of their face, and again place the Government in the hands of the whole people, where it rightfully belongs.

The following colloquy took place during the foregoing speech:

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Will my friend permit a question?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. My friend will observe that the protective

system regulates competition between our own country and other countries, to make it fair, just, and humane, while combines and trusts destroy all competition. That is the difference.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I think the gentleman will find his question answered fully and emphatically in the course of my remarks.

Mr. CHEADLE. Mr. Chairman, the presence of a large surplus in the national Treasury has inspired the gentlemen on the other side of the Chamber to deliberately attack the industrial system inaugurated by the Republican party in 1861; a system which has brought marvelous prosperity and industrial development to the whole country; a system which in twenty-two years time, since the close of the war, has brought into the Treasury enough money to defray the current expenses of Government, bring its depreciated paper money up to par with gold and silver, and enable the Government to refund the war debt at a much lower rate of interest, pay off seventeen hundred millions of dollars of the principal of the war debt, and collect into the Treasury the present surplus—a system that has attracted and now commands the admiration of the ablest political economists and wisest statesmen in the world.

A system that has produced such results must possess intrinsic merit, must be based upon wise, conservative, sound, economic principles, and before we, the representatives of the nation that has under its prospering provisions achieved so many industrial victories and such marvelous increase of wealth, consent to set it aside and make a change, it will be the part of wisdom to know that the new system, the one proposed for adoption, will be able to afford wiser safeguards to American industrial development.

PROTECTION THE CENTRAL IDEA.

The central idea of the present system is the levying of duties on importations from foreign governments in conformity to a rule that will, while it brings into the national Treasury the required sum of money necessary to meet the demands of the Government, so arrange the levy that American goods, wares, and merchandise shall be protected from free and unrestricted competition with those of foreign governments.

Mr. Chairman, this principle that has been tested for a period of twenty-seven years under the greatest possible variety of conditions; tested in time of war and in time of peace; tested with a depreciated paper currency and with a circulating medium redeemable in coin and equal to it in purchasing value; a principle that has proven by that fairest, safest, and best of all tests, experience, to be equal to any and all demands that can be made upon it, to be set aside, and for what reason? Because, notwithstanding it has accomplished all, yes, much more than its most sanguine advocates ever claimed it would, it has come to be considered by that modern Pericles of Democracy, President Cleveland, to be the "vicious, illogical, and iniquitous source of unnecessary taxation."

The wise men of ancient and modern times have laid down this axiom—that there is no rule of guidance in human affairs so safe, none that can be so implicitly relied upon, as that of experience. This fact must hold good for special reasons in the consideration of all industrial questions.

Happily for all who may wish to contrast conditions and results under different industrial policies in the history of our Government, the past "rises before us like a dream," and we can see and know what results have been produced under tariff laws enacted and enforced in the interest of protection, and the results when the tariff laws have been enacted and enforced with the sole purpose in view of raising revenue to defray the expense of Government.

The lines of light and darkness are not more distinctly drawn in nature than are those of prosperity and prostration of business under these different industrial systems. I shall not go into a statistical statement to prove the facts stated in support of my views, but will say, quoting from the history of the past, that every one, not one, or two, or three, but every period of industrial development from the organization of the Government in 1789, to this good hour, every one of them, and all of them, were preceded by the adoption of a tariff so adjusted and levied as to afford protection to American goods, wares, and merchandise from open and unrestricted competition with foreign importations. This is the history of the past, and I group these eras after the second war with England as follows, from 1825 to 1833, from 1842 to 1846, and from 1861 to 1888.

I do not stop here. I am willing to go further, to accept other burdens, and to assert, and challenge successful contradiction of the truth of the statement I now make, that every single period of industrial and business depression and every financial disaster, with one single exception, and that phenomenal and growing out of the war, was preceded by a change in the manner of levying duties, whereby the feature of protection to American goods, wares, and merchandise was stricken out and tariff duties were levied for the sole purpose of providing revenue for the support of the General Government. I group these periods of industrial and business depression and financial disaster as follows: From 1817 to 1825, from 1833 to 1841, and from 1847 to 1861. There they are, gentlemen, recorded and of history, and it is from a careful study of these facts that we must reach a conclusion in reference to our duty in considering the pending bill.

Henry Clay, a leader of industrial thought, left it as his deliberate judgment that the period of most sweeping and universal depression in all our commercial and industrial interests was from 1817 to 1825. By the terms of the treaty of Ghent, at the close of the war of 1812 between America and England, and at the request of the progenitors of the present Cobden Club, all the protective features of our tariff laws were removed, and duties were levied for the purpose of raising revenue only. Mr. Clay also declared that the eight years from 1825 to 1833 were the most prosperous in our history. What wand of progress touched our prostrate and perishing industries in 1825 and awakened them into not only a newness of life but to such marvelous development?

Mr. Chairman, I say to you, to the committee, and especially to my colleagues from the South, that if history and experience establish any one fact more clearly than any other, it is that it was the protective tariff of 1824, increased and amplified by the act of 1828. The people had been for eight years staggering under the revenue tariff of 1816; our industries were practically destroyed; labor was unemployed, except in agriculture, and want was an unbidden guest everywhere, when, in 1824, the protective features were restored to our tariff laws, and at once, and as if by magic, these industries awakened to a newness of life, and in less than eight years the whole current of events was changed. Labor was everywhere in demand at remunerative prices, and prosperity, such as our nation had not up to that time known, blessed all our people, blessed them through the diversification of labor industries and the consequent increased demand for labor. One would think that such an illustration would have caused the statesmen of that day to have permitted plenty to bless the land.

Mr. Chairman, history is ever repeating itself. The leaders of the section of the Union who are now demanding the repeal of the protective tariff of 1861 then demanded the repeal of the tariff of 1824 and 1828, and they succeeded, and the revenue tariff of 1832 was enacted and went into operation in 1833 and continued in force until 1842. Did it give the farmers, mechanics, and laborers relief? Did it bring prosperity to the country and plenty to the homes of those who toil? The history of that decade is one of widespread disaster. Loss to the capitalist. Loss to the business man. Loss to the farmers. Loss to the mechanic and artisan. The blight of industrial prostration rested like a cloud over all the country, until all the varied business and commercial interests were covered with it as the waters cover the deep. It is not strange that it was so.

Labor is king, the mightiest king that ever ruled the earth. Labor, when employed, is a powerful force, felt in every avenue of trade and business. Give labor employment at remunerative wages and nothing can impede the onward march of its progress. It lays its hands upon a wilderness, and it becomes a garden of roses and flowers. It wants the continent bound by bands of steel, and lo! a railroad reaches from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Every mile of these railroads opens up new industries, new markets, and thus the boundary of labor's possibilities widens on every hand. This is a law as inexorable as those of fate, and as true as Holy Writ; and yet, because it always has been and now is, an existing condition at variance with certain platitudes of theories considered by certain theorists to be true, they will not accept them, deny their existence, and though again and again demonstrated, persist in flying in the face of history and ofttimes repeated precedents, by insisting that if it be true that a revenue tariff did produce these results from 1833 to 1842, they could theoretically demonstrate the fact that a tariff for revenue only would not produce them from and after January, 1847, when the Walker tariff was to go into effect.

I pause long enough to remark that it did, however. Strange as it may appear to my colleagues, who clamor for a revenue tariff or a tariff for revenue only, it did work out the same identical results. In a time of profound peace, when the wants of the Government were merely nominal, and during a decade when there was taken from the mines of California and added to the circulating medium of the people the enormous sum of one thousand millions of gold, a sum sufficient in itself to awaken into life the energies of a continent; in a decade in which there were no epidemics, at a time when pestilence did not oppress, at a time when rain and sunshine brought forth abundant harvest to bless the farmer, what was our condition ten full years after the law of 1847 went into effect? Were our great labor industries busy? Was labor everywhere employed at fair wages? Did peace and prosperity bless our people? Were the receipts of the Government equal to or in excess of its current expenditures? Were the shelves of our merchants filled with the products of our looms and spindles? Did the Treasury report show a surplus? As an historical fact was the condition of the people and of the Treasury such that we can now point with pride to that period?

Mr. Chairman, this is a Democratic House that leans strongly towards free trade; a House whose Speaker is and has been since 1883 a member of the English free-trade Cobden Club; a Speaker who, in naming the Committee on Ways and Means, did not place on the majority a representative of any of these great labor industries from any one of the great manufacturing States of the Government, nor did he name the committee so that its control would be in the hands of men who have in the past and do now believe in the dignity of labor; but he did name the Committee on Ways and Means in such a way that the control of

the majority was left in the hands of men who have been and now are not only opposed to protection and in favor of free trade, but were so deeply impressed with the idea that capital should own its own labor, that they had the courage to risk life itself in an effort to create a confederacy the corner-stone of which should be human slavery.

While I am a Republican protectionist, therefore, Mr. Chairman, in order that my reply may be shorn of all personality, I shall call upon a prominent and honored Democratic official to bear testimony in my behalf, a name the mere mention of which must command the respect and confidence of my colleagues upon the other side of the Chamber. A man ripe in years and in experience; a man who from childhood to a ripe old age had studied all the phases of this industrial problem and brought to his aid in reaching his conclusions all the experience of the past industrial history of the Government, and his evidence is not merely a casual remark; it is his judgment upon existing facts known to him and carefully set forth in his first annual message to Congress, delivered December 8, 1857. My witness is none other than ex-President James Buchanan, who, in speaking of the conditions—not theories—then existing in all branches of our industrial and commercial circles, said:

> We have possessed all the elements of material wealth in rich abundance, and yet, notwithstanding all these advantages, our country, in its monetary interests, is at the present moment in a deplorable condition. In the midst of unsurpassed plenty in all the productions of agriculture and in all the elements of national wealth, we find our manufactures suspended, our public works retarded, our private enterprises of different kinds abandoned, and thousands of useful laborers thrown out of employment and reduced to want. The revenue of the Government, which is chiefly derived from duties on imports from abroad, has been greatly reduced. Under these circumstances a loan may be required before the close of your present session, but this, although deeply to be regretted, would prove to be only a slight misfortune when compared with the suffering and distress prevailing among the people.

Mr. Chairman, I appeal from the statement of President Cleveland, who says the present protective tariff is the "vicious, iniquitous, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation," and who makes an appeal for a revenue tariff, to the experienced statesman and learned Democratic President, James Buchanan, who, in his annual message to Congress in December, 1857, laid before Congress and the country the existing conditions, not theories, of the national Treasury, the business and industrial conditions existing at the end of an uninterrupted decade of the same tariff reform, ten years of the same tariff policy that President Cleveland and the gentlemen of the South now ask us to adopt.

I ask if in the light of this Democratic official evidence, if in the light of history and in the face of these ascertained and established facts, it will be wise for Congress, with an outstanding national war debt of $1,200,000,000 and unadjudicated debts running into the hundreds of millions, which must be paid within the next five years, to set aside an industrial policy which has been found to be equal to every emergency, in war and in peace; a policy which has quadrupled our wealth in twenty-eight years and enabled the people to pay the heavy tax burdens laid upon them and pay off seventeen hundred millions of the principal of the war debt; a policy that has built up an industrial system so diversified that it has been able to meet all the demands of our people in all their wants—I repeat, in the light of experience and history, can we afford to set aside the present policy and enter upon another and different one, one that has been often tried, and one that has just as often as it has been tried inevitably resulted in business depression, industrial paralysis, driven labor out of employment and into enforced idleness, depleted the national Treasury and left it in bankruptcy; and the national credit seriously impaired?

I take it, Mr. Chairman, that no one fact is more clearly established than this, that the inevitable result of every change in our tariff laws, from protection to a revenue tariff—or a tariff for revenue only—or in the case of every material reduction in the tariff that the trade balance has been largely increased against our Government.

The average rate of tariff in 1832 was 37.6 per cent. The same in 1833. In 1834 it was reduced to 18 per cent. The average trade balance against our Government during these three years was $11,156,618. Then the reduced tariff of 1833 went into full effect and the average for the next three years ran down to 18, 16, and 14.5 per cent., and the average annual trade balance increased to $30,939,540. The great financial revulsion of 1837 began in May of the latter year, and resulted in universal loss to every industry and business, while labor was everywhere in enforced idleness.

Take another financial revulsion, that of 1857. The average per cent. of the tariff for the years 1854, 1855, and 1856 was 22.7. During these years the average annual imports amounted to $267,764,352; the exports to $224,391,807, leaving a balance of trade against us of $43,372,545 a year. Then the average tariff levy was reduced to 15.6 per cent., with this marvelous result: in six months our imports ran up to $183,733,038; our exports decreased to the sum of $105,420,659, leaving a trade balance against us in half a year of $78,312,379, or a balance against us of more than $156,000,000 a year; and in less than six months after the reduction took place the great financial revulsion of 1857 began, a crisis that wrought havoc and widespread disaster all over the land.

What is a balance of trade against our Government? It is the difference between what we sell abroad and what we buy from abroad, and must be paid in gold or its equivalent, and yet notwithstanding the fact that the past history of our financial and business disasters shows conclusively the cause for each and all of them to be a radical change in our tariff laws, or a material reduction, yet we are gravely asked to-day to embark once more on the treacherous course, where we know that dangers and breakers will menace us on every hand. For one, Mr. Chairman, I shall enter my protest against such a suicidal policy, because experience, the best of all guides, tells me the result will be disastrous to the whole country, and more especially so to the labor and labor-industries. I think, Mr. Chairman, that it is our first, our highest, our imperative duty, to enact laws for the protection of the material interests of the people we represent. I do not believe that we can be justified, in the light of history and experience, in adopting a policy that has in every instance when it has been tested resulted in such dire results to the industrial and financial interests of the people.

PROTECTION DOES PROTECT LABOR.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard gentlemen upon the other side of the Chamber declare that protection does not protect the laborer here in America. I am not a theorist, and yet if the great industrial system of protection to American labor does not protect it I have wondered why it was that hundreds of thousands of men and women left their homes in Europe every year and emigrated to America to become citizens of the Republic and co-workers in its manifest destiny. Sir, do you believe that all these thousands come here to be made slaves? Would they flee from the oppressions of Europe to become still more oppressed here by an industrial system that is talked about, studied, and prayed for in every humble cottage in Sweden, Germany, Ireland, wherever there is a resolute heart that yearns for larger liberty, better wages, and a greater margin of profit from daily toil?

Mr. Chairman, protection does protect labor, and I am going, in a practical way, to demonstrate just how it does it in one or two lines of trade. First, I want to illustrate, by two actual purchases of clothing, one made in London, England, the other here in Washington City, and show just how the American tailor is protected in the question of wages paid him in comparison with the wages paid the tailor in London. I desire to state the amount paid in London for a suit of clothes and the amount paid for an overcoat; then the price paid the tailor in London for making the suit of clothes and the price paid him for making the overcoat. I desire then to shew the amount the dealer retained to pay for the material used, for cutting the garments, and profit on his business in London, and having done this to institute a comparison between them and the amounts paid and received here in Washington for the same purposes.

I may be permitted to remark, Mr. Chairman, that these facts and figures, obtained from actual purchases, not from any theorist, demonstrate conclusively the truth of the declaration I now make, that protection does protect the American laborer who is a tailor and works on woolen clothing. My townsman, Dr. J. M. C. Adams, of Frankfort, Ind., was in London, England, last fall, and while there had an overcoat and suit of clothes made to order. He paid the merchant tailor in our money $20 for the suit of clothes and $20 for the overcoat. He asked the gentleman what he had to pay his journeyman tailor for making the suit of clothes, and he was astonished, as I have no doubt you, Mr. Chairman, the committee, and the country will be when told that the tailor who made the suit of clothes was paid the magnificent sum of $3.50. Three dollars and fifty cents paid in the great city of London—home of the Cobden Club—for making a suit of heavy winter clothes!

Upon further inquiry he was informed that the journeyman tailor who made the overcoat was also paid the magnificent sum of $3 for making a heavy beaver cloth overcoat. Let us for the purpose of easy comparison and illustration take $1,000 worth of merchant tailoring in London and compare it with the same amount of work here in Washington. Let us see how much of the $1,000 is paid in London to the men who make the clothes, and how much is retained by the dealer to pay for material used, for cutting garments, and as profits on his business; and having done that then ascertain the same facts here in Washington City, and having done this institute a comparison between them.

COST OF LONDON CLOTHING:

25 suits of clothing at $20 each	$500.00
25 overcoats at $20 each	500.00
Total value of London clothing	1,000.00

MONEY PAID TAILORS TO MAKE LONDON CLOTHING.

Paid journeyman tailors for making 25 suits of clothes at $3.50 each	$87.50
Paid journeyman tailors for making 25 overcoats at $3 each	75.00
Total amount paid for making $1,000 worth of clothing in London	162.50

Deduct from the $1,000 the amount paid for making the clothing, $162.50, and we find that out of the sum the merchant tailor had left $837.50 to pay for material, cutting, and profits. Thus we find that out of $1,000 worth of clothing made the men who made the clothes received only $162.50; the merchant $837.50; or, put in another form, labor was paid 16.25 per cent. the dealer received 83.75 per cent. out of each dollar's worth of clothing sold. I bought a suit of clothes here in the city and an overcoat, and from my tailor I learned what he paid his jours for making the suit and for making the overcoat. I paid him for a spring

overcoat $28 and he paid his journeyman tailor $10 for making it. If it had been a heavy winter overcoat, like my townsman bought in London, then he would have paid his journeyman $12 for making it. I paid him for the suit of clothes $38 and he paid his journeyman tailors $16 for making the suit.

Let us take $1,000 worth of merchant tailoring here, or as nearly as we can, and ascertain what amount is paid for making the clothes and how much is retained by the merchant to pay for material used, for cutting the garments, and profit on the business.

COST OF WASHINGTON CLOTHING.

Sixteen overcoats at $28 each	$448
Fifteen suits of clothes at $38 each	570
Total value of Washington clothing	1,018

MONEY PAID WASHINGTON TAILORS.

Paid journeyman tailors for making sixteen overcoats at $10 each	$160
Paid journeyman tailors for making fifteen suits of clothes at $16 each	240
Total amount paid for making $1,018 worth Washington clothing	400

Deduct from the $1,018 worth of Washington merchant-tailor work the sum of $400 paid Washington jour tailors for making the clothing, and we find that the merchant has left to pay for material used in the clothes, for cutting them, and profit on his business, the sum of $618; while the merchant tailor in London has, out of the same amount, left him for the same purposes the larger sum of $837.50. Thus out of $1,018 worth of clothing made here in Washington, the tailors who make the clothes are paid the sum of $400, while the merchant receives $618; or, if you please, stated in another form, labor was paid 40 per cent.; the merchant received 60 per cent. out of each dollar's worth of clothing made and sold here in America, where, according to the arguments, declarations, and conclusions of the members of the South, labor is oppressed and impoverished by the "vicious, illogical, and iniquitous policy of protection."

These facts, which are true, facts obtained from actual sales and purchases, show that here in America the tailors who make the thousand dollars' worth of clothing receive $400 for their labor, while in London they receive only $162.50. Four hundred dollars paid to tailors here in protected America for making $1,000 worth of clothing *versus* $162.50 paid for making the same amount of clothing in free-trade London tells the story of how protection protects American tailors in more convincing language than any argument I can offer, or than any words I can possibly utter. Mr. Chairman, like an axiom in mathematics, it demonstrates itself.

I make two points on the facts I have given, and I challenge contradiction of either one of them. They cannot be successfully denied. They can not be disputed. They will stand as mile-stones to mark the progress we have made in industrial development. They tell how, under the wise, practical, and beneficent system of protection, we have so diversified labor industries that the price paid for labor here is two and one half times greater than the price paid for similar work in London, England.

First. I make the point that labor here in protected America is paid 40 per cent., while in London, England, labor is paid only 16¼ per cent. of the cost of clothing for making the clothes.

Second. I show that while the merchant tailor in London received 83¾ per cent. of the value of the clothing he made and sold, the same person here in protected America received only 60 per cent. for the material furnished, for cutting the goods, and profit on his business.

These figures and illustrations are conclusive, and prove that labor is equally as well protected under our system of taxation as the manufacturer. Does any man pretend to think or believe, that the protected American tailor who is paid $16 here in Washington City for making a suit of clothes can not buy more of the necessaries of life here, can not live better here, can not save more money here, is not better off here, than the English tailor in London is, or can ever hope to be, who is paid and receives only $3.50 for doing the same work in that great metropolis of free trade?

Sixteen dollars paid here in the capital of protected America for making a suit of clothes *versus* $3.50 paid in free-trade London! Gentlemen of the South, advocates of the proposed Mills bill, a measure which should be entitled "An act to paralyze American industries and pauperize American labor for the sole benefit of foreign manufacturers, and laborers, and American importers, whose only interest in America is the rent they pay," how do you like this photograph from real life? How can these facts, and figures, and conclusions be evaded? Will any advocate of the bill under consideration stand up here, in the presence of this committee and of the country, and even pretend to say that the tailor who made my overcoat here in Washington, and was paid $10 for the work, does not live on that sum infinitely better than the tailor in London ever can hope to live who was paid $3 for making an overcoat there?

Ten dollars for making an overcoat here in protected America *versus* $3 for making the same article in free-trade London carries with the statement its own conclusive answer to all the arguments that can be formulated against it, and shows in a way so plain and simple and conclusive that even a child can see and know and comprehend, and at the same time so convincing and irresistible that human sophistry can not impair the force of the truth in the declaration that protection does protect the wages of American laborers.

AMERICAN LABORERS HAVE A SHARE OF THE WEALTH WROUGHT BY THEIR HANDS.

My distinguished colleague, Mr. BYNUM, said the other day in his able tariff speech:

> The advocates of protection tell us that the country has grown rich under this system. True, it has grown rich, but where is the wealth? In the hands of the few, while poverty abides in the homes of the many. Why is it that the great masses of the people have no share in the wealth that has been wrought by their hands?

My reply to this statement is that the only true measure of prosperity is the balance the laborer has left after he has provided the necessaries of life for himself and those dependent upon him; and it is by a comparison of this balance under different conditions that we can arrive at an intelligent and correct conclusion of the queries, whether the money made is in the hands of the few, and whether labor has a share of the wealth it produces here in protected America. My colleague boasts that he represents thousands of intelligent wage-workers and manufacturers of fifty millions of annual products. I admit that fact, and then I challenge him to show a community where there are an equal number of wage-workers, a city whose manufacturers produce fifty millions a year, beyond the limits of the United States, anywhere on the face of the earth, where the wage-workers own as many homes and have as much money to their credit in the banks, the savings of their labor. I tell the gentleman and the committee no man can find such a place anywhere.

I do not stop here. There are in Europe 312,000,000 people, and in the industrial North not far from 40,000,000 of people, or one-eighth the number in Europe; and yet the laborers of the North, the men who, in the opinion of my distinguished colleague, are oppressed by protection, have to-day on deposit in their savings-banks a sum equal to the savings of the wagemen of the 312,000,000 people of Europe and in addition thereto a surplus of more than $200,000,000 to spare. Mr. Chairman, this sum, vast as it is, is not taken into consideration and does not represent a dollar's value in the millions of homes owned by the laborers of the busy industrial North. No other country on earth presents such a magnificent spectacle. No other policy than protection could enable the bread-winners in millions of instances to own their homes and in addition thereto have placed to their credit in their savings banks more than one thousand millions of dollars.

My distinguished colleague also said: "American labor to-day is carrying upon its back burdens which the labor of no other country could stand." And why, Mr. Chairman? Why can not the labor of any other country stand the burden of taxation? I will tell my colleague why. It is because they are not so well paid as American labor; not so well housed as American labor; not so well clothed as American labor; not so well fed as American labor; do not have so large a balance left after paying for the necessaries of life as American labor has; and that is why they can not bear such a burden. In the great industrial North the children of our wage-workers are sent to school from six to nine months in the year; and the nearer the schools are located to one of these manufacturing centers the longer the term of school and the higher the branches of scholarship taught. I ask my colleague and the committee to name the place on earth, outside the industrial North, where the children of laborers enjoy such benefits! I pause for a reply.

I will say to gentlemen from the South that one-half nearly of the tax burdens in that section are for school purposes, and I want to remark that these public schools are the idols of our hearts.

I have for fourteen years been giving employment to labor, and believe I am familiar with its wants and demands. I have yet to hear the first objection raised by any laborer against national tariff or State taxation.

I have often heard objections raised by them against the taxes levied by city councils, township trustees, and county commissioners, and the reason is plain—the tax burden that is heavy, the tax burden that is felt, is the direct one made by municipal, township, and county tax levies. The reason I have not heard objections to the State tax is because it is light, is not felt; and the reason why no objection is made to Government tariff taxation is because it is an indirect levy, one that is not felt by the people.

My distinguished colleague will find a complete answer to the financial condition of the wagemen of Indiana in the fact that at no other period in its history have so many homes been owned by wage-workers as now; and in the further fact that at no other time have they had so much money on deposit to their credit. The amount to their credit in the savings-banks of the State is $2,170,000, and I find by an inquiry in the district I have the honor to represent that about 40 per cent. of all the deposits in the national and private banks belongs to the wage-workers and farmers of the district. Take for illustration the First National Bank of Frankfort, Ind., just after the April payment of taxes, when deposits always run low. They have fifteen hundred depositors; of this number seven hundred are farmers and laborers. Out of a total deposit of $230,000, $85,000 belong to the laborers and farmers of Clinton County. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that an in-

quiry in the other districts of the State would show an equal per cent. of the deposits in their banks to be the property of the wagemen and farmers that I find in the Ninth district.

I desire to call the attention of my colleague to the material prosperity of Indiana to-day as contrasted with what it was when the present tariff law was adopted; to the financial standing of the State now compared to what it was then; to the wealth of our people now as compared with their wealth then; to the financial condition of our farmers now with what it was then. I ask him to compare the comforts and conveniences of our farmers now with what they were then, their surplus money, the value of their farms, the kind of homes they live in now, the stock, herds, roads, and other evidences of thrift to be found everywhere among Indiana farmers, and contrast them with the same conditions when we adopted the protective principle in levying tariff duties, and then I challenge him to say that the policy has not been of incalculable value to Indiana farmers, laborers, mechanics, and Indiana capital, whose wealth has been increased more than $300,000,000.

If I had time I would tell him of our dependence then upon other governments and States for all our manufactured goods, plain woolens alone excepted—not a railway-bar mill, bar-iron mill, nail-mill, plow-works, car-shop, glass-works in the State. Now Indiana has the largest wagon and carriage, plow, and plate-glass works in the country. We make railway bars of steel and ingots of steel, nails, bar-iron, railway-cars, the finest polished plate-glass, furniture, woolen goods, giving employment to scores of thousands of laborers at good wages. These consumers are brought to the doors of our farmers, who thus find a ready home market for all the products of garden, field, and farm, until Indiana has become a hive of busy industry whose people are rapidly increasing in wealth and all the accomplishments which follow in its train.

At New Albany is located the great polished plate-glass works of the late W. C. De Pauw, one of the four successful works in America. Mr. De Pauw informed me not long before his death that he lost half a million in establishing the works before a cent of profit was made up on his investment (the loss sustained by reason of the Ohio floods was not included in this amount). He also informed me that he had never made in any one year more than 5 per cent. upon the capital invested, and he told me then, as his son, N. T. De Pauw, writes me now, that they can not stand a reduction in the tariff; that if a reduction is made one of two things must occur, the works must close down or they will be forced to reduce wages. I give a table of wages paid to laborers in plate-glass works in America, England, France, Germany, and Belgium:

Statement showing the amount paid per month to workmen in plate-glass manufactories.

Department.	France, Germany, and Belgium.	England.	United States.
Casting department:			
Founders	$45.00	$50.60	$100.00
Skimmers and teamers	30.00	39.20	80.00
Casters	18.00	27.00	40.00
Kiln-firers	19.00	27.00	45.00
Producer-firers	22.00	28.00	50.00
Grinding department:			
No. 1 grade	27.00	33.80	75.00
No. 2 grade	20.00	29.20	65.00
No. 3 grade	16.00	23.60	50.00
Boys	4.00	5.10	25.00
Smoothing department:			
No. 1 grade	27.00	33.80	70.00
No. 2 grade	20.00	29.20	60.00
No. 3 grade	10.00	23.60	50.00
Boys	4.00	6.80	18.00
Polishing department:			
No. 1 grade	32.00	39.20	80.00
No. 2 grade	25.00	31.40	60.00
Boys	4.00	10.80	25.00
Cutting-room:			
Chief	26.00	39.20	100.00
Assistants	24.00	33.80	75.00
Blockers	14.00	23.60	32.00
Packers	13.00	27.00	50.00
Emery-washer	24.00	45.00	80.00
Crocus-burner	24.00	33.80	75.00
Laborers	11.00	19.60	30.00
Bricklayers	39.00	39.60	100.00
Carpenters	37.00	39.60	65.00

The foregoing table shows almost the same increase of wages paid American glass-workers that is paid American tailors.

I want to add one illustration. In 1873 I had to buy, as trustee for another, some plate-glass. At that time American plate-glass had not been successfully made, and we were at the mercy of foreign plate-glass makers. I then paid $260 for foreign-made glass that I can now buy for $110, this reduction in price having been brought about by the building up of the plate-glass industries in our country and the creation of competition between home and foreign manufacturers. I will not vote to break down and close up or vote to make necessary a reduction of wages to an American industry that has in fifteen years reduced the cost to the consumer more than one-half, an industry that gives employment directly to 6,000 American laborers at double the wages paid to foreign plate-glass makers. I would vote to build up more works and to increase wages, but I will never vote to reduce them. I desire to say further to the committee, Mr. Chairman, that, while American plate-glass makers have reduced the price to consumers more than one-half, in addition the national Treasury has been enriched in the sum of $17,257,481.18 receipts from duty on plate-glass.

I am persuaded that every consideration demands the protection of all such American manufactures. Time forbids any further argument in this line. I know that a comparsion of facts will show the same results in any one of our manufactures. Such has been the result in all cases where investigations have been made. To emphasize the condition, if possible, of wage-workers who are most directly affected by our protective system, I ask my colleague to go with me to Massachusetts, the cradle and home of protection, as it is of liberty, where American industries have been fostered for many years, and where can be found stalwart advocates of protection to American wage-men. With less population than Indiana, we find that 848,787 of her laborers and mechanics have on deposit to their credit in their savings-banks the enormous sum of $274,098,413. If he is not yet convinced that they who produce the wealth have a share of it, I will ask him to go with me to Connecticut, land of invention and workshops. With only half the population of Indiana, 256,097 of her wage-workers have on deposit in their savings-banks the great sum of $92,481,425. If all his doubts are not removed, I would request him to journey with me to New York, where more than 1,000,000 of her laborers—to be exact, where 1,208,072 wage-workers have placed to their credit in their savings-banks the marvelous sum of $457,050,250. I tell my colleague here in these savings-banks are the savings of a part of those who have under our protective system created the wealth of the North by honest labor well rewarded.

To enable these truths to become indelibly impressed upon the tablets of his memory, I invite him to examine the statistics of the nine great manufacturing States, Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Vermont, where 2,944,731 wage-workers have on deposit in their savings-banks $1,033,279,827, a sum almost equal to the national debt. What more evidence can be wanted? What more conclusive answer to the query of my colleague can be made? What clearer refutation of the charge that protection impoverishes labor is possible? I say to my colleague, Mr. BYNUM, my dear sir, you are mistaken in your query, "Why is it that the great mass of the people have no share in the wealth that has been wrought by their hands?" They do have. The great number of 2,944,731 of them, in nine States, have placed to their credit the enormous sum $1,033,279,827 of the wealth that was wrought by their hands, and these people are the wage-workers under the protective system your President has seen proper to style the "vicious, illogical, and iniquitous source of taxation;" and as I read the history of the past twenty-seven years of my country, note its mavelous growth in wealth, see how the cost to the consumer has been reduced one-half by reason of the competition fostered and built up under our wise industrial policy, whereby protection to American labor and American industries has been the central idea, and when I try to comprehend the quantity of the savings of those directly benefited in only nine States, over $1,000,000,000 earned—ay, earned and saved under that system of protection President Cleveland styles "vicious, illogical, iniquitous"—I am reminded of the expression of a Hoosier who, as he in his ignorance imagined, had been converted, and who, when called upon soon thereafter to pray in public, had the audacity to begin his prayer by exclaiming, "Oh, thou logical, rogical, diabolical God!"

I place the famous expression of President Cleveland, who in an official message to this House, in speaking of the protective features of our tariff laws, a system which has, as it has been clearly shown, in twenty-seven years quadrupled our wealth, made America the greatest manufacturing nation on earth, enabled our wage-workers to place on deposit out of their savings a sum $200,000,000 larger than all the combined savings of laborers in Europe; a system which has brought our national currency to par and made our national credit the best of any Government on earth; a system that has provided money to defray the current expenses of Government, and pay off seventeen hundred millions of the principal of the war debt; a system which has reduced the cost to consumers one-half, and enables American wagemen to be paid the highest wages on earth; a system that has done all these things and left a large surplus in the Treasury—I repeat, I place President Cleveland's famous expression in reference to this system, which he styles the "vicious, illogical, iniquitous source of unnecessary taxation," alongside the one where the tyro in religion prayed to God as the "logical, rogical, diabolical God," and I present them, Mr. Chairman, as companion pieces of ignorance of the plainest fundamental principles of the subjects under consideration when they were uttered.

DEMOCRACY OPPOSED TO PROTECTION.

My distinguished friend, Mr. MCCOMAS, of Maryland, in his speech of May 2, in speaking of the bill now pending, said:

Has any friend of this bill in this debate uttered one sentence in favor of the American tariff system, which discriminates in favor of the home producer and laborer?

He paused and yielded time for a reply, whereupon the eloquent member from Mississippi [Mr. HOOKER] replied. I quote from the RECORD of May 3:

Mr. HOOKER. No. There was no one, and you will not hear any Democrat utter one.

That statement will not be forgotten. I want to publicly thank the distinguished gentleman for that frank, clear, honest, and conclusive statement:

No. There was no one, and you will not hear any Democrat utter one.

It is refreshing after years of doubt to know from so high an authority that no Democrat here upon this floor will utter a word in favor of the American tariff system, which has wrought such marvelous development for American industries. I read the words, Mr. Chairman, and then I thought that the distinguished Democratic leader from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] and his colleagues were Democrats. Mr. RANDALL has been in Congress for a quarter of a century, has won honorable party leadership along the line of this industrial problem. I have yet to hear of his ever being accused of writing, speaking, working, or voting for any other than the Democratic party and all of its candidates, and I submit if twenty-five years of continuous public service for the Democratic party can be so easily and summarily dispensed with. I say to the gentlemen of the South that Mr. Cleveland owes his election to Mr. RANDALL'S influence in New York and New Jersey.

I am sure, Mr. Chairman, that the distinguished gentleman, Mr. HOOKER, voiced not only his own sentiments, but also those of his people when he uttered the words I have quoted. The people of his section, I regret to say, since 1832, when they became thoroughly imbued with the pernicious doctrines of the great leader in South Carolina, Mr. Calhoun, have not deemed it wise or proper to support legislation in Congress which would tend to establish an American system of industrial development, that would protect American interests and foster and build up American industries; and yet, Mr. Chairman, I have asked myself this question, What interests can possibly lie nearer the hearts of my distinguished friend, Mr. HOOKER, and those of his constituents, than the interests of the American people? We are all Americans—the people of Maine and those of Texas, the people of Mississippi and those of Indiana—and I must, as an American, feel a just pride in any policy which brings blessings and plenty to any section of my country.

I concede the fact that the leaders of the South since 1832 have fought the principle of protection and the American industrial policy; fought it persistently, bravely, openly; upon the forum, in this Hall, at the ballot-box, and upon hundreds of battle-fields. The great war of the rebellion was brought about for the sole purpose of creating a government whose fundamental principles should be human slavery and free trade. The constitution of the so-called Confederate States provided among other things that its congress should be clothed with the authority—

To lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises for revenue necessary to pay the debts, provide for the common defense, and carry on the government of the Confederate States; but no bounties shall be granted from the treasury; nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry; and all duties, imposts, and excises shall be uniform throughout the Confederate States.

That is free trade, pure and simple.

Before the war the institution of slavery, which existed only in the South, demanded as its companion-piece in their industrial system free trade. They were complements of each other, and I can readily see and understand why before the war and so long as the people of the South had slavery they should favor free trade and oppose the principle of protection, because the latter would be antagonistic to the institution of slavery. The war has changed all these conditions. A new era has dawned upon our country, the cause for sectionalism has been removed, and there is no longer any reason in theory or in fact, why the people of one section of the Union shall oppose a principle which the history of the past and our own experience teaches us has benefited all classes in every community where it has been adopted. I point my colleagues of the South to the cotton and iron manufacturies which, under the present protective system, have been established in Georgia, Tennessee, and Alabama, and ask them if their coming has not largely increased the value of real estate and benefited the farmers and laborers of that section.

I invite the gentlemen to go with me among the workmen in the industrial centers of the North, ascertain the number of the homes they own—millions of homes earned and paid for out of the savings of their daily toil. Let us examine their savings of money on deposit in the laborers' banks, the savings-banks of that section—in round numbers three millions of depositors, with more than a thousand millions of dollars to their credit. Let us visit their homes, their schools, their reading rooms, their societies, where we shall find many evidences of plenty, contentment, and even the luxuries of life; and then when we have done this I ask my colleagues of the South to contrast the condition of these wagemen, their homes, schools, savings, and general surroundings and intelligence, with those of the South, of England, or anywhere else on earth, and then they will see and know why the Republican party, representative of the great loyal, liberty-loving, and American-imbued North, accepted the wager of battle tendered them in 1861 and fought to a successful conclusion the war to preserve the nationality of the Union. The great loyal heart of the North believed that labor should be made a king, not a slave.

They believed that freedom was the birth-right and heritage of every American citizen; and that every citizen was entitled to the amplest protection in life, liberty, and business. So thoroughly imbued are the Republicans with this theory of equal rights and protection that I challenge my colleagues upon the other side of the Chamber to name one Republican voting precinct in any State from Maine to Oregon where there is not absolute protection of the sacred right of the ballot. There can not be found one Republican voting precinct anywhere where the humblest citizen, native or foreign born, black or white, who is a legal voter, can not go openly and freely as becomes a freeman, and vote for the men of his choice, have his vote counted as it was cast, and the result honestly announced. So deeply and thoroughly are Republicans imbued with this doctrine of protection for all in all their rights of citizenship that the man who would oppose it would be as one in fifty thousand.

The Republican masses and the great industrial North are in favor of equal rights and protection; protection of national unity; protection of the equality of citizenship whereby one vote in Indiana shall equal one vote from any other State in this House and in the councils of the nation; protection of American manufactures and laborers by a wisely devised protective-tariff system. "Ah, my dear sir," says one of my colleagues of the South, "Do you not know that your protective system is a giant robber?" My reply is, "My dear sir, I can not comprehend your meaning when you call protection a robber. I look into the national Treasury and see that it brings into it the money required by the wants of the Government? I talk with the men who have their money invested in American industries, and they tell me, 'We do not want a change.' I go among the great mass of the people—those who buy and consume the products of these protected industries—and they tell me, 'We now buy our articles at one-half the price we paid before we built up these industries and made them ourselves; we are not robbed at all.' I then seek an interview with the bread-winners, the men who toil; we talk over the whole situation and contrast conditions under different systems; some of them have fled from the oppressions of free trade and know from experience, the best of all teachers, the 'God's truth about the whole business.' They tell me, 'We own more homes, have more money saved, receive better wages, than any other bread-winners on earth. The system does not rob us, and we ask you to let well enough alone.' Upon inquiry I learn that our national wealth has increased 400 per cent. in twenty-eight years of this robbery, four of those years being a period of cruel, devastating war, and I wonder who has been robbed. Surely not America, nor her people, for they have grown rich beyond comparison with any other people on earth during the same time."

Mr. Chairman, protection is not robbery. It is a blessing both to the Government and the people. It has been a blessing to the United States of America since 1861, when the present policy went into operation. There comes to me, Mr. Chairman, a voice from out of the experience of the past which says to me that it is the highest duty of the legislator in this Government of the people to enact laws whereby the people shall be fully protected in all their rights; hence I am in favor of protecting the unity of the nation, protecting the purity and equality of the ballot, protecting the honor of my country, protecting American industries, and protecting American labor from being forced to accept the cheaper wages paid to free-trade European bread-winners.

DEMOCRACY AND MONOPOLY.

The distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], in speaking of tariff reform and Democracy, April 30, said "I want it to be of that kind that can point to Mount Vernon's shades and Monticello's heights and say that from the day of its birth it has been the mortal enemy of monopoly." And as I read I wondered, Mr. Chairman, if it could be possible that my eloquent colleague had forgotten the history of this generation. The head and heart and soul of Democracy have not been, nor are they now, the "mortal enemy of monopoly" from its birth. Upon the contrary, not content with advocating the claims of the giant monopoly of the century—human slavery—within the jurisdiction of the Government, they actually endeavored to withdraw from the Union and organize a confederacy, the chief corner-stone of which was to be the giant monopoly, human slavery. The Democratic party of to-day is the open ally, the avowed champion, the chief support of the greatest monopoly of this age, the whisky league, a monopoly that is not content with controlling the whisky business, but assumes to dictate political policies, control party management, and corrupt elections by bribing electors and election officers, and Old Sumptuary will once more be called into service at St. Louis in June to sound the key-note of the new alliance of 1888, entered into between the Democratic party and the Whisky League of America.

I desire to remind my distinguished friend of another fact which shows how the souls of Democratic leaders yearn for a chance to become the "mortal enemy of monopoly." I refer him and the committee to the metal schedule in the bill under consideration, and to the item of steel railway bars. Under existing laws the tariff is $17 a ton. It is proposed to reduce the tariff on railway bars to $11 a ton, a

reduction of $6 a ton, or a fraction over 35 per cent.; and for whose benefit? For the sole benefit of the railroad monopolists of America. I concede that the majority report tries to theorize and show that if the tariff is reduced the cost of building railroads will be cheapened, and then freights and fare will also be cheapened. I say, however, and I appeal to the history and experience of the past to prove the truth of the saying, that the rates of fare and freight are not in any way whatever affected by the tariff on railway bars, but are agreed upon and adjusted in advance, at least annually, by the great trunk lines, when they meet to make assignments of per cents. of traffic to competing lines. And yet so intense and burning is the desire of the Democratic party to become the "mortal enemy of monopoly" that it would reduce the tariff on railway bars $6 a ton, thereby seriously crippling the rail-mills of the country, with all the scores of millions of invested capital, and largely reduce the wages of all the thousands of workmen in these mills; and for whose benefit? For the sole benefit of the railway monopolists of America and the rail-makers of Europe; while by the provisions of the pending bill it is proposed to levy and collect $45,000,000 a year from sugar, a prime necessity of life.

Mr. Chairman, just imagine the force of the declaration of Democracy's "mortal hatred of monopoly" in the bill under consideration, wherein Democracy makes a reduction of 35 per cent. in favor of railway monopolists and only 20 per cent. on sugar, a prime necessity of life. The majority report of the bill under consideration places the total value of all manufactured products in America last year at $7,000,000,000. The amount of wages paid to American laborers to make these products was $1,400,000,000. The sum of money that would have been paid in Germany to labor to make the same products would have been $616,000,000, and in England English laborers would have been paid $784,000,000. The total amount of tariff collected last year was $217,286,893, therefore I say to the gentleman that the difference paid to the workmen here in America above the wages paid either in Germany or England is nearly equal to three times the total sum of tariff taxes levied and collected.

TABLE OF PRODUCTS, LABOR AND TARIFF.

Amount of manufactures	$7,000,000,000
Wages paid to make them in America	1,400,000,000
Wages paid to make them in Germany	616,000,000
Excess of wages paid in America	784,000,000
Wages paid to make them in America	1,400,000,000
Wages paid to make them in England	784,000,000
Excess of wages paid in America	616,000,000

Let us charge the whole tariff levy to labor and see how the balance will stand:

American pay-roll in excess of pay-roll in Germany	$784,000,000
Deduct total amount of tariff	217,286,893
Balance to credit of American wages	566,713,107
American pay-roll in excess of pay-roll in England	616,000,000
Deduct total tariff duties	217,286,893
Balance to credit of American wages	398,713,107

Mr. Chairman, I am astonished, that with full knowledge of the very great difference paid in wages here and in Europe, that gentlemen will seriously insist that the way to reduce the revenue of the Government is to reduce the rate of duty. If the Mills bill shall become a law without amendment I predict that, instead of reducing, it will double our revenues, close down the greater part of our manufacturing industries, and place our laborers in enforced idleness.

I call the attention of the committee to the history of increased imports in 1835 and in 1857, immediately after material changes in our tariff laws, and to the very large excess of wages paid in America above those paid in Germany and in England to manufacture the products of last year, as the reasons why this result will surely follow until the accumulated wealth of our wagemen, an amount over one thousand millions, shall become exhausted. There is only one practical way to reduce the revenues of the Government, and that is to increase the free-list and also increase the rate of duty levied upon importations, and thereby decrease the quantity of importations upon which duties are levied. The adoption of such a policy would surely reduce the revenues of the Government.

Mr. Chairman, there is another monopoly in existence in this country; a monopoly that is inimical to the peace, the prosperity, and the happiness of the people. This monopoly is an active, aggressive factor; it will not tolerate opposition, and is so constituted that its charter may become perpetual. It is insolent in its demands, imperial in its methods, un-American in its tendencies, and yet, strange as it may appear, Democracy is not the "mortal enemy" of this monopoly.

Democracy loves political power. The monopoly I refer to exercises autocratic political power in the name of the solid South. The Democratic party, through this monopoly—the solid South—arrogates to itself the right to count and claim all the votes of that section. It will not tolerate opposition to its purposes. It has demonstrated a new problem—that a unanimous vote can be greater than the vote cast.

Democracy may not be united upon other questions, but it is upon its monopoly of the right to receive votes in the South. I have heard it said, and believe the saying to be true, that if there is any one idol that is more precious than all others to Democracy, any one central idea around which the head and body, the heart and soul of Democracy love to rally, as its chosen leaders ponder over and fully contemplate the length and breadth, the height and depth of Democracy's "mortal hatred of monopoly," it is its darling pet—the solid South. The alliance between them is both offensive and defensive. How disconsolate indeed would modern Democracy be without its monopoly of the solid South. To contemplate Democracy without the solid South could only be equaled by an effort to contemplate the play of Rip Van Winkle with the character of Old Rip left out. When the days of this monopoly are ended, the mission of Democracy will be completed. Democracy can not exist without its monopoly of the solid South. They are one and inseparable, as much so, Mr. Chairman, as were the famous Siamese twins of that section.

A MATERIAL REDUCTION OF REVENUE MEANS OPPOSITION TO PENSIONS.

Mr. Chairman, I am not in favor of any material reduction of the revenues of the Government. No greater mistake could be made by Congress than to largely decrease the revenues at this time. The funded debt of the Government is over $1,200,000,000, two hundred millions and more of which fall due inside of five years. The current expenses of Government exceed three hundred millions a year. There is a great outstanding debt not yet adjudicated, which will run up into hundreds of millions of dollars, claims pending for half a century. Besides all these there are now pending in the Pension Department in this city one hundred thousand claims of Union soldiers and their loved ones; claims for pension which ought to be allowed; claims that are as legal, just, and binding as claims can be; claims that can not be allowed under existing laws, because of technical failure of proof. The Government owes these heroes a sacred debt, and it should by a general law enable these claims to be allowed. To meet all these solemn obligations will require sixty millions or more and thereafter largely increase the annual pension-list. We can not enact a law which will secure so large a measure of justice to the people as one which shall provide for these claimants. We should by a general law provide for every Union soldier who is now broken in health, and for all the widows and children of deceased Union soldiers.

The Government very wisely pensioned all the Mexican war veterans at the age of sixty-two. I say, sir, and with all due respect to those veteran heroes, that great and honorable as their services were, they become dwarfed into insignificance when compared with the services rendered the Government by the Union soldiers. The Union soldiers won the greatest victory of all the ages in behalf of humanity. They saved the United States to the arts of peace and industrial development. They preserved the unity of the nation and rescued our flag from destruction and made it the proud emblem of a government of the people, whose chief glory is that the people are equal before the law. The Union soldiers saved this temple of human hopes and of liberty protected by law to bless all the countless millions who shall occupy it.

Who can measure the obligation we owe these Union soldiers? They risked life for country and humanity. What more could they do? What better evidence of consecrated devotion could be presented? Having done so much for the Government, I now demand that in the hour of the nation's prosperity, when its Treasury groans beneath its weight of silver and gold, when all the current obligations are met and there still remains a surplus, that the Government these heroes saved shall properly care for all of them and their widows and children. Care for them as a Government of the people should care for its citizen soldiers who in the hour of its greatest peril risked life in its behalf.

Mr. Chairman, I can not speak for other members; I cannot know into what lines of thought and action duty may call them. I do know this, however, that, on behalf of the million surviving comrades of the Union Army, the men to whom we are indebted for all the blessings of constitutional liberty and a Government of the people, I shall oppose any and all material reductions of the revenues of the Government until all its solemn obligations to all these Union soldiers, for pay, bounty, and pensions, shall have been fully paid. I shall insist that the promises made these soldiers shall be sacredly kept by the Government; every promise to every soldier, and to his widow and his children. The surplus is theirs. It belongs of right to the men who saved not only the surplus, but the Government itself, from total destruction.

Again, Mr. Chairman, one of the results of the late war was the enfranchisement of the colored race—a race that had been held in legal bondage under the laws of the land. Other laws made the act of teaching them to read and think for themselves a crime punishable by fine and imprisonment. The law not only held them in slavery, it also kept them in ignorance. The war has changed their legal status; then they were slaves; now they are citizens, equal before the law with their more highly favored brothers of Saxon origin, and every consideration of national honor and safety demands that this race be educated and through it be made capable of exercising intelligently the rights and duties of citizenship, intelligence being one of the greatest safeguards of the state. The presence of slavery in the South made

ignorance the birthright and heritage of all the poor white people of that section, and to them education should be sent. I hold, Mr. Chairman—and it is the judgment of the people I have the honor to represent as well as my own—that, under these circumstances, the line of duty is very plain for the Government to pursue. The least it can do, the least it ought to do, is to take out of its overflowing Treasury not less than $12,000,000 a year, and expend it in organizing and aiding the public schools in the South. The Government made the slaves citizens; it should qualify them for citizenship and then let them alone to work out as a race their own destiny.

There is no justice in or need of the direct tax on cigar-dealers and druggists. These should be removed. This would decrease the revenue three millions. No man can justify the levying of a revenue tax on alcohol used in the arts. This tax should be removed. There are known safeguards which will prevent the alcohol used for that purpose from ever being used as a beverage. This would reduce the revenue not less than eight millions. More than 25 per cent. of the tariff revenue of 1887 was paid on sugar—a prime necessity; an article that enters into use in every home, whether it be the cottage of the laborer or the palace of the millionaire. It is not a protective tariff beyond the sum of six millions of dollars, because of the fact that we do not produce over one-tenth the sugar we consume. Of the vast sum of fifty-eight millions of duty derived from the tariff on sugar, it therefore follows that six millions operates as a protection to American sugar, and the enormous sum of fifty-two millions of the sugar tariff was a tariff for revenue, pure and simple, and that levied on a prime necessity of life.

The bill under consideration proposes to raise the great sum of forty-five millions a year of tariff revenue from sugar, a necessity in every American home, and I shall enter my protest against such a burden being laid on sugar. It is not a tariff levied with a view of protecting American sugar beyond the sum of $6,000,000, but will, if adopted, make sugar bear a direct revenue tariff of $39,000,000 a year. The Government can pay a direct bounty on every pound of sugar produced in America for a period of nine years, levy a tariff on imported sugar to pay the bounty to American sugar, and if under the stimulus of a direct bounty the amount produced shall increase from one-tenth to one-half the quantity our people consume, they will save in nine years time, by the adoption of the bounty system and the repeal of the present unjust and outrageous sugar tariff, the sum of at least $220,000,000. No man can be a consistent protectionist and advocate and favor the levying of a tariff on sugar, which will bring into the Treasury forty-five million a year—a sum of money which is and must be a revenue tariff pure and simple, and that too collected upon a necessity in every home.

USE THE SURPLUS TO RESTORE SILVER TO PAR.

When our fathers adopted the standard of values for our Government upon which should be based the financial transactions of Government and people, they said silver and gold shall be the standards, and they adopted a ratio between these precious metals. Their action was eminently wise, conservative, just. From the day, long centuries ago, when for thirty pieces of silver a burial place was purchased, to this hour, silver has changed less in intrinsic value than gold. The same fact holds good in the history of our own country. Certain holders of bonded securities have for years been actively engaged in an effort to have the leading governments of earth adopt a single-coin standard, and that to be gold. No friend of humanity, no friend of this Government of the people, can advocate that measure. No more pernicious legislation can be conceived than an act to reduce the standard of values one-half by demonetizing one of the two precious metals. Its effect would be to double the wealth of every creditor and double the debt of every debtor, thus creating an impassable barrier between poverty and wealth. America is a coin-producing country, large quantities of both silver and gold being produced each year; hence it follows that the Government should, by every known legal enactment, and by every recognized diplomatic policy known, exert its great influence in favor of keeping and maintaining both standards at par. At this time, and for a few years past, the bullion value of our silver dollar has been, and is, worth less in the money markets than the bullion value of gold. What have we done to restore the equilibrium of values? Nothing, absolutely nothing. What are we doing to-day? Nothing whatever.

We produce about fifty millions of silver a year. All our national debt and private debts are based on it as one of the two equal standards, and yet when there is a deliberate effort made to demonetize silver, and thus destroy its value as a standard of other values, with the national Treasury overflowing we sit idly by and do absolutely nothing to arrest the depreciation of silver. Under existing law the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to purchase and coin two millions of silver every month. If the Government would go upon the markets and purchase double that sum, buy four millions a month, in less than two years' time silver would be equal to its former value, and once more equal to gold. The Government has made $30,000,000 out of the coinage of silver, therefore the Government can well afford to make an investment in silver, the inevitable result of which will be to pull the whole mass of silver up to par with gold in all the nations of earth. The Government owes this effort to place the metals at par on the old ratio to the people and business interests, not only of our Government, but the world.

Mr. Chairman, it may be wise statesmanship to take 125 or 126 cents of the people's money and go upon the markets and buy with it 100 cents of the people's paper. I repeat, it may be wise, businesslike, and economic statesmanship to do that thing if it be, I am not able to see it in that light. I can not believe it is a wise policy to do that; yet the Secretary of the Treasury is doing that very thing. Recently, when the bill was under consideration to increase the circulation of national banks from 90 to 100 per cent. of the face value of the bonds deposited to secure the circulation, I was amused as I contemplated the anomaly of Congress trying by the enactment of one law to increase the value of the outstanding Government bonds, while by another bill then pending it proposed to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to go upon the market and buy the very same bonds out of the surplus in the people's Treasury. I would, if I could, authorize the Secretary to go upon the market and buy silver with the surplus. If bondholders in Europe and America continued their efforts to depreciate silver, I would let them know that Uncle Sam was the backer of silver to the amount that he had decided that the law which has been in existence for nearly a century, which said that 412½ grains of 900 fine silver, stamped with the sovereignty of the United States as being a dollar, was a dollar, and should be so received and accepted everywhere; and when this is done it will be because it is known that Uncle Sam's resources are beyond computation.

Doubting Thomases predicted in 1861 that the Union would be destroyed. Uncle Sam said it should not be. The Union exists, and is one and inseparable. Then these same people declared that the war debt could never, no, never be paid. Uncle Sam very quietly and yet firmly declared it shall be paid, every dollar of it, and I will show you how to enable the people to pay it and at the same time enrich themselves; and then he started up an American industrial system that has been and is the marvel of the ages, and, lo and behold, how rapidly that debt disappears. Every dollar that is due is paid, and a great surplus balance in the Treasury.

Whenever Uncle Sam shall lay his hand on the silver problem and say it shall be taken and accepted as an equal standard of values with gold, according to the law fixing the ratio adopted by our fathers, it will be so accepted, because the resources of Uncle Sam are illimitable. Silver is distinctively the people's money. Uncle Sam is the representative of the people's Government. He should utilize the surplus in his Treasury in buying silver and restoring it to par with gold. It is his coin. Silver should be Americanized fully and completely, like our industrial policy, and when this is done it will be at par. When we authorize the purchase of silver instead of bonds out of the surplus in the Treasury we shall confer a lasting blessing on this generation by a restoration of the equality of values, and by inaugurating an era of unprecedented prosperity in all the avenues of business, and thereby confer a blessing upon all the sons and daughters of toil.

Mr. PLUMB Mr. Chairman, the question before the committee, which has been so long and so ably discussed, is, under the present state of public affairs, a broad one. It reaches far beyond any paltry cent per cent. view of rates of duties to be demanded on this or that importation; it comprises within its ample outline the surplus in the Treasury, debt payment, internal-revenue taxation, a proper economic system for the country, and thus affects the prosperity and happiness of every citizen of the United States.

The settlement of this question involves the supremacy, if not the very existence, of the political parties of the day, and with them the different policies they propose to pursue in administering the affairs of the Government. It, moreover, goes to the very bottom of the social condition of the various sections of the Union, both as to what these conditions now are and what they are to be.

Taken with our system of money, with which it is intimately connected, it is by far the most important that in time of peace interests and affects the American people. In what I may say upon this occasion I do not propose to enter upon a discussion of the principal provisions of the Mills bill so called. Others who have addressed the House on both sides of this Chamber have given special attention to the details of this measure, and it has been shown that whatever is its purpose, it is an ill-advised and unsatisfactory bill, which if enacted into law, would deal a death-blow to our system of protection.

It is with such a view that I shall offer to the committee the ideas I entertain on this great question. In so doing I shall speak plainly, especially of such public men as are actors in the important events now transpiring, not for the purpose of traducing them personally, but in the exercise of the privilege of a member on this floor to criticise every public officer for his official acts.

I shall refer to the surplus in the Treasury and the course pursued by the President in relation to it, as well as his determined purpose to overthrow protection. I shall refer to the course of the Speaker of the House in the appointment of the Ways and Means Committee and of the fitness of that committee to discharge the duties thereof, and shall endeavor to show that ever since this Administration came into power a plan has existed which has at length ripened into a conspiracy to cause the Democratic party to entirely change front, both on the question of protection and of taxation by means of internal revenue.

SURPLUS.

When President Cleveland was inaugurated there were less than

$10,000,000 in the public Treasury applicable to the payment of the public debt, the administrations that preceded him having pursued faithfully the Republican policy of using the surplus to pay the debt and stop interest. But not so Mr. Cleveland; although there were subject to call enough 3 per cent. bonds to absorb the accumulations in the Treasury, some nine months were suffered to pass and nearly a hundred millions had accumulated before the Treasury began to call for these bonds.

The evils of such financial management were clearly understood by the President, for in his message he says:

> The public Treasury, which should only exist as a conduit conveying the people's tribute to its legitimate objects of expenditure, becomes a hoarding-place for money needlessly withdrawn from trade and the people's use, thus crippling our national energies, suspending our country's development, preventing investment in productive enterprise, threatening financial disturbance, and inviting schemes of public plunder.

And, what is more, this Administration came into power demanding that the surplus be used for paying the public debt; and yet this same Administration, guided by this same President, inaugurated a financial policy which violated not only every doctrine laid down in his message, but a prominent plank in the platform of his party, and he has continued to do so to this very hour.

Mr. Chairman, there is not now, nor has there been since December 1, 1873, any legal necessity for ceasing to pay off the public debt, and no Republican administration has faltered in the work of debt payment. The law as it stands in the statute-books, and as it stood before and since any of the 4½ and 4 per cent. bonds were issued, provides for the redemption and payment of the public debt whenever conditions exist such as have prevailed ever since this Administration came into power.

Sir, I deny emphatically that there is a dollar of surplus in the Treasury.

How is it possible to have a surplus when the Government debt exceeds one thousand millions of dollars, nearly all of which sum is represented by bonds that were issued under a statute which reserves to the Government the right to redeem them before maturity under certain prescribed conditions which now exist? Would any business man or banker dare to report a surplus in a statement of his private affairs under similar circumstances?

If General Andrew Jackson was now in the Presidential chair, does any one think he would be paying a premium to bondholders? No, sir; far from it. It is left to this Administration to put its hands into the Treasury and pay in premiums millions of dollars, when the law clearly points to a payment of the principal and interest of the debt with no premium added, and for one I can not resist the conclusion that had he been as true to the people in this matter as he has ever been to the hoarder of capital he would not have asked for Congressional sanction as a shield and excuse for not relieving the tax-payers of the country from the payment of premiums for the sole benefit of a small but powerful class of bondholders.

But, Mr. Chairman, this financial jugglery had another object, which was to obtain Congressional assent to the avowal made in his message that—

> In considering the question of purchasing bonds as a means of restoring to circulation the surplus money in the Treasury it should be borne in mind that premiums must of course be paid upon such purchases, and that a large part of these bonds could not be purchased at any price—

a proposition which contemplated that the bonds would become too dear to purchase, which would justify an attack on the principles of protection to American industries as the only means left for the reduction of the surplus.

It is pertinent to ask here, Mr. Chairman, why the House of Representatives, with a Democratic majority of 41 in the Forty-ninth Congress, did not pass a measure which would have effectually provided against the surplus then in the Treasury—the surplus complained of by the President, and for which the Speaker, on taking the chair, urged Congress for a speedy enactment of some substantial measure of relief. It was in the power of the Speaker to have constituted the Ways and Means Committee without changing the number of good and true Democrats on it, so that a measure would have been reported from it and passed the House which would have corrected the inequalities of the tariff and reduced taxation without attacking or endangering protection to labor, so essential to the prosperity of all our people

Mr. Chairman, it was the earnest desire of the constituents of a large majority of gentlemen then on this floor to have had this done, and but for the power exercised for its defeat by the Speaker, it would have been done then. Sir, the gentleman from Kentucky, who presides over our deliberations, receives and is entitled to the confidence and respect of this body, regardless of party, for the able and impartial manner in which he discharges his duty as a parliamentarian; but, sir, as impartial as he may be in deciding questions of order, it can not be denied that he and he alone is accountable for the existence of the surplus in the Treasury. Sir, if there be in the history of financial legislation a more flagrant exercise of political power than this, I know not where it is to be found. But, sir, this is not all. The committee appointed by the Speaker again and again refused to permit the majority of the House to vote upon such effective measures for disposing of the surplus as to them seemed best.

Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly plain that all that was thus done to retain the surplus in the Treasury was in pursuance of a well matured plan and for a well understood purpose, which was nothing less than to furnish an excuse for an attack upon protection—a plan which was as fully entertained by the President as by the Speaker. If any doubt exists as to this, the remarkable message of the President will at once dispel that doubt. On the question of the surplus he has spoken with all the solemnity of a state paper. He has deemed his dictum on this subject to be of so much importance as to justify himself in an absolute refusal to follow the direction given in the Constitution, as understood and followed by every one of his predecessors from Washington to Arthur. That instrument says:

> The President shall from time to time give the Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient.

This is his plain duty, "but whatsoever is more than this cometh of evil." The President has informed Congress as to the condition of the Treasury, and no one has a right to criticise the language employed for that purpose; but, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that when the Chief Magistrate goes further than to give information, and not only recommends for our consideration measures, but passes judgment in advance on the different methods by which the end desired may be reached, commending as he does one method of taxation and condemning another as vicious, both being constitutional, and each having been adopted by the Government ever since it had an existence, that high functionary betrays either a lack of regard for the requirements of the Constitution or an unwarranted desire to dictate to a co-ordinate branch of the Government what legislation it must adopt.

INTERNAL REVENUE.

I have already pointed to the President's stubborn refusal to dispose of the surplus and have not shown the subterfuges which have been resorted to in order not to do the very thing he was clothed with power to accomplish, and I next call attention to the new position he has taken on the subject of internal-revenue taxes, and which, at his instigation, the Democratic party is expected to take on that question.

The Democratic platform of 1884 declares that—

> From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the custom-houses have been the chief source of Federal revenue, and such they must continue to be. The internal revenue is a war tax. We denounce the Republican party for having failed to relieve the people of crushing war taxes.

Every one of the above declarations was Democratic gospel when Mr. Cleveland was nominated as the standard-bearer of the party, and to these propositions there was no dissent. It has been the boast of Democracy that its principles never change. They were time-honored and immutable; but alas! for these degenerate days, this cry can no longer suffice to give confidence and comfort to the hearts of the Bourbons. Their new President has for some reason made a new platform covering the issue I have quoted, and his chosen Secretary of the Treasury uses his influence to aid in foisting a new and different doctrine of finance on the party and on the country from that of 1884. The President insists that internal revenue shall remain as a part of our system of taxation, and the Secretary of the Treasury, after conceding that internal taxation is a war measure, says that it should not be done away with, but should be installed as a permanent part of our system.

Why this right about face, Mr. Chairman, and from whence comes the authority of a junto of Democratic leaders to commit the lesser lights of the party to such a new departure? Surely something occult must account for this radical change of front, and to bring this hidden something to light will be my endeavor.

Bear in mind, Mr. Chairman, the President well knew that no important changes in our protective system would be tolerated as long as surplus was employed in reducing the public debt, nor as long as the expressed sentiment of all parties in favor of dispensing with internal-revenue taxes known as war taxes remained unchanged. We have seen in what manner he has maneuvered with debt reduction and the surplus, and we now see with what deliberation he repudiates the Democratic platform in regard to the removal of the internal-revenue or war tax, both being necessary in order to have an excuse to attack protection. I know, Mr. Chairman, that the President has protested over and over again that such is not the object, but "he doth protest too much" with his words. Let the argument of his message speak on this point.

The President states that the sum of one hundred and thirteen millions will be on hand as a surplus in the Treasury on the 30th of June next, the close of the fiscal year, and this sum he claims measures the excess of taxation which he insists must be reduced by that amount; and he further declares against any reduction in internal revenue which now amounts to one hundred and twenty millions per annum. So when one figures out these propositions they find them to mean that one hundred and thirteen millions should be taken from revenues now collected annually from customs. These collections for the last fiscal year amounted to $217,000,000; now, if you follow the President's figures and reduce this sum by one hundred and thirteen millions, which

ought not, as he insists, to be levied, there would remain only one hundred and four millions to be collected annually as duties on imported goods, a reduction of nearly 50 per cent. on the present amount.

These estimates and these propositions are of the President's own making, and they show to what extent he proposes to reduce the tariff. I know, Mr. Chairman, that none of the President's supporters on this floor dare adopt his bold utterances on the amount of reduction to be insisted upon, for they well understand that it would be impolitic to do so now, but there the figures stand, and they show how thoroughly the President is committed to the destruction of protection, for who can not see that it would be impossible to reduce the tariff 50 per cent. without bringing absolute destruction upon every important manufacturing industry in the land.

So, instead of striking the full blow at once, as the proposals of the message clearly indicate, the Mills bill is brought forward; not as a full expression of the free-trade idea now, but as one more possible to adopt and just as sure to accomplish that destruction in the end.

Mr. Chairman, the *personnel* of the Ways and Means Committee of the present Congress shows unmistakably that the interests of the majority of the people was not considered in its formation. I have no wish or desire by thought or word to in the least disparage any of the gentlemen composing that committee. They are not to be blamed for accepting the high position assigned to them by the Speaker. They each and all of them have ability and attainments which entitle them to the respect of those who know them, but they are not in sympathy with the people of this country on the economic questions committed to their charge. This is not strange, as will appear when we consider their antecedents and surroundings.

The committee consists nominally of thirteen members, five of whom are Republicans and eight Democrats, but six of the latter come from States recently under the thraldom of slavery, namely, Texas, Arkansas, Kentucky, Georgia, and West Virginia—these States thus furnishing six-eighths of this important committee; and I say this advisedly, for while there are nominally five Republican members, the bill comes solely from the eight Democratic members, not one of the Republicans having been permitted to see the bill or even to know a single syllable it was to contain until it had been published to the country. Every Republican on that committee might as well have been at their homes as dancing attendance at the committee-room while this bill was being formulated. It is a delusion to think that there were thirteen members on that committee; there were but eight, the five appointed from manufacturing States and favoring protection were absolutely ignored; they were not permitted to participate in the work of the committee, and were not recognized as having any right to act or to have a voice in its deliberations; and of the eight practically constituting the committee, six, as I have shown, come from a particular section.

Mr. Chairman, look next at the antecedents of these six members. Examine their surroundings with a view to determine their fitness for a proper discharge of the duties imposed upon them. Look at the States from whence they come. Does Texas furnish any such practical knowledge of the various interests to be affected as justifies clothing one of her Representatives with such power as the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee possesses? When at home does he reside in a district having diversified industries? Before I close I will present some figures from official sources which will throw light upon this branch of the inquiry.

Next to Texas comes Tennessee, a State of such varied resources and conditions that in order to find materials adapted to the end in view the Speaker was obliged to select a district that furnished the required surroundings, and it was found not among the hills rich with minerals with which Providence has blest that growing commonwealth—not in the new Tennessee, but in the old, where manufactures have obtained no foothold, and where diversified industries have no existence.

Arkansas was the next State which the Speaker thought was entitled to a position of power over questions affecting the whole country. She has within her borders untold material resources. Her coal fields and her forests, her rich ores and her richer soil, adapted to the culture of wheat, cotton, and sugar, will, under an enlightenment of her people, which can not long be delayed, lead her forth and cause her to shine with all the vigor of a new life, a peer among the grand States of this Union. But as yet she sleepeth. On the rich bottom-lands of the Arkansas and White Rivers cotton is still raised with success, even in the slip-shod way peculiar to that region, but no diversity of production exists there. Here it was that a representative was found having the business experience of a cotton-planter, and he is the third on the committee we are analyzing. In all candor I submit that such experience does not and can not fit any one to act on the Ways and Means Committee for the advancement of the industrial interests of the entire country.

But let us go further in our work of analyzing this committee. Kentucky has the fourth place, a State which furnished to the councils of the nation the most gifted statesman the South has produced since the days of Thomas Jefferson, a man whose noblest instincts and early public efforts were in favor of the emancipation of the slave, and whose power in controlling national legislation and Southern sentiment was overthrown only because the interests of slavery demanded free-trade instead of the American system of protection, for which he labored. I mean Henry Clay. I know, alas, too well how that great man yielded his convictions that he might gain the Presidency, and how he failed in reaching the goal of his ambition; but, sir, had he been content to stand firmly by freedom and protection, what greatness and what glory would have been her's to-day?

Such a lead must have been followed by State after State, until the whole South by peaceful and proper means would have become free; preparation for freedom and citizenship would have been secured to the negro in a manner which to enforced abolition was impossible. We should have had no internecine war with its immense cost in blood and treasure; and being one in sentiment, one in purpose, what imagination can portray the greatness and grandeur the Union would have achieved when the first centennial of its existence was reached.

But, sir, it did not so occur; the doctrines of free trade based upon the heresy of slave-labor were too subtle to be withstood. Calhounism became the doctrine of the South and of Kentucky, and behold the result. Unsurpassed in the salubrity of her climate, the fertility of her soil, the beauty of her scenery, the richness of her hills in mineral wealth, abundantly supplied with natural waterways adapted to cheap transportation, yet, with all these advantages, that State has fallen back, back, until she is as far behind her younger and naturally no better sister States in material progress as is the accomplished member from the Lexington district behind what he would be if he were to-day advocating the doctrines of protection, so ably maintained by his predecessor, Henry Clay.

But, sir, I venture to suggest that the adhesion of that gentleman to the doctrines of Kentucky's idolized statesman would have unfitted him in the eye of the Speaker for a place on the Ways and Means Committee. If but one of his eloquent utterances had been for protection, the oligarchy whose mouthpiece and effective manager was chosen to name this committee would have rejected this worthy Kentucky member as totally unfit for the purposes of Democracy in 1888.

Then Georgia comes in for a position which gives her an opportunity to especially express her ideas on the economic legislation of this nation, and that State has a right to so express herself; but would it not have been eminently proper to vary somewhat the monotony which we have found to have governed the action of the Speaker thus far? And if Georgia must be represented, why not take one from that portion of the State in which her vast mineral wealth, long hidden, now begins to be brought to light by the new order which universal freedom has inaugurated therein? Why have recourse to that Congressional district where slave labor for so long a time has been used for the production of a single staple, and where diversified industry has never yet secured a foothold? I will endeavor to make the answer plain further on.

The sixth and last State out of which this committee has been formed is West Virginia, a State that in the near future will demonstrate the fact that raw material, labor, and capital will be as strongly united in interest as her citizens will be overwhelmingly in favor of protection, for even now a change of 75 votes in that Congressional district would have deprived the Speaker of an opportunity to venture quite so near the old Mason and Dixon line to find a Representative who would give his sanction to the Mills bill.

Mr. Chairman, geography is a good guide in many important investigations; a careful study of locality aids the Speaker of this House to know where he may look for those upon whose action he can depend for the execution of his purpose. Why, sir, it will not be claimed that the Democrats on this floor from the excluded States—States in which there exists a condition of things furnishing actual experimental knowledge of the effect of diversified industries on the prosperity of the people—are not the peers of their fellow Democrats on this committee.

But, sir, it seems that the qualifications required by the Speaker are not good standing in the party, not ability to legislate, not experience with the leading industries of the country, not a broad-minded purpose to have the interests of all sections fairly represented; not any of these; but his idea was this, and only this, to select a committee which, from its surroundings and antecedents, as well as from the well-known devotion of its members to the doctrines of free trade, could be trusted to frame a bill which under the pretense of standing by all productive industries would, if it became a law, deal a fatal blow to protection.

Run this list over once more and you will find that four of its members were elected as Democrats without any opposing Republican candidate, and why? Let the peculiar methods now in vogue in certain sections of this country for silencing political opposition answer. I am dealing, Mr. Chairman, with sectionalism not as its defender, but to expose the most glaring and indefensible sectionalism which the political history of this country affords. The impropriety of looking to the States named for a Ways and Means Committee is shown by the following facts, compiled from the Tenth Census reports, from which is seen the relation these States bear in the number of manufacturing establishments, capital employed, and the annual value of their products to similar industries in the country:

States.	Establishments.	Capital employed.	Number of hands.	Wages.	Product.
Texas	2,996	$9,245,561	12,159	$3,343,087	$20,719,928
Arkansas	1,202	2,953,130	4,550	925,358	6,756,150
Georgia	3,593	20,672,400	24,875	5,266,152	36,440,948
Tennessee	4,326	20,092,845	22,445	5,254,775	37,074,886
West Virginia	2,375	13,883,390	14,400	4,313,965	22,867,126
Kentucky	5,328	45,813,039	37,391	11,657,844	75,483,377
Totals	19,820	112,660,375	115,821	30,761,181	199,342,415

Now take six other States, but one of which has practically a representative on this committee, and see what place the census gives to them, as shown by corresponding data:

States.	Establishments.	Capital employed.	Number of hands.	Wages.	Product.
Illinois	14,549	$140,652,066	144,727	$57,429,085	$414,864,673
Massachusetts	14,352	303,806,185	352,255	128,313,362	631,135,284
New York	42,739	514,286,575	531,553	198,634,029	1,080,696,596
Ohio	20,699	168,939,614	183,608	62,103,800	348,298,390
Pennsylvania	31,232	474,510,993	387,072	134,055,904	744,878,445
Missouri	8,592	72,507,844	63,995	24,309,716	165,386,205
Totals	132,163	1,694,663,277	1,663,190	604,845,946	3,385,189,593

Why, Mr. Chairman, the six States selected by the Speaker have only about 19,000 establishments, while the unrepresented States have 132,000, in round numbers, and $112,000,000 of capital against $1,694,000,000, and the number of hands employed are only 115,000 against 1,663,000; wages paid $30,000,000 against more than $600,000,000. The entire product of the six States represented by the six sectional members of the committee is less than $200,000,000, and less than one-half of the same product in the State of Illinois alone. Why, Mr. Chairman, I know of a single rail mill in my own State the value of the output of which in the manufactured product for the past year amounted to $8,000,000, with a pay-roll for wages alone of nearly a quarter of a million of dollars; considerably more than that of the entire State of Arkansas. The ore used at that mill was shipped by vessel and by rail, the coke and coal consumed were mined and manufactured at a distance and transported, giving employment at the mill and at the mines and in transportation to more men than were employed in manufacturing in the entire State of Arkansas in 1880.

Mr. Chairman, I desire now to compare the two classes of States named in respect to their agricultural importance, and for that purpose I beg leave to present the following table compiled from the Tenth Census, which demonstrates that not only in manufactures, but in agriculture, the six manufacturing States I have named were entitled to a representation in the committee in the persons of some of the able Democratic Representatives from those States who are honored with seats on this floor:

States.	Number of farms.	States.	Number of farms.
Arkansas	94,443	Ohio	247,189
Georgia	138,626	Illinois	255,741
Kentucky	168,453	Pennsylvania	213,542
Tennessee	165,650	New York	241,058
West Virginia	62,674	Missouri	215,575
Texas	174,184	Massachusetts	38,406
Total	804,030	Total	1,211,514

Total cereal production.

States.	Per cent.	Bushels.
Arkansas	1.03	27,670,856
Georgia	1.19	32,031,312
Kentucky	3.34	89,953,432
Tennessee	2.78	75,037,844
West Virginia	0.76	20,409,044
Texas	1.36	36,625,011
Total		281,727,499
Illinois	16.48	444,622,350
Missouri	9.22	248,839,465
Ohio	7.00	188,933,077
Pennsylvania	3.96	106,840,422
New York	3.33	89,962,704
Massachusetts	10.00	2,819,484
Total		1,081,981,439

I repeat, sir, that none of these great manufacturing and agricultural States are represented on the Ways and Means Committee by a Democrat save Pennsylvania, and some Democrats will question whether the Keystone State is properly represented after all. To be sure, the distinguished gentleman whose name stands seventh and last on the Democratic side on the register of this committee [Mr. SCOTT] lives in one corner of that great Commonwealth, but this fact does not of itself show that he represents the avowed sentiments of the people of his own State on the question of protection. It must be conceded, however, that his impress has been made on the Mills bill, for he is one of the largest owners and operators in soft coal in the United States, and yet that wonderful document appears to leave the duty on soft coal unchanged.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the Democrats on this committee, with but two exceptions, were supporters of the lost cause; they were Confederates, and several of them officers in the rebel army. That army took the field for the purpose of establishing a government as different from our own in its primal doctrines and purposes as the Stars and Stripes differ from the Confederate flag. Their plan was to make human slavery the corner-stone of their political system, the central idea being that slavery furnishes the best and most desirable labor system possible. For a half century they had used their utmost endeavor to secure the adoption of that idea by this Government, and because a majority of the people clung to the Declaration of Independence and to the Constitution and would not accept the hideous doctrines of the slave power, they resorted to open rebellion. They adopted the principle that no branch of industry should be protected for the plain reason that their laborers being slaves would have no laborers to protect. Their constitution declared among other things:

SEC. 8. Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises for a revenue necessary to pay the debts, provide for the common defense, and carry on the government of the Confederate States; but no bounties shall be granted from the Treasury, nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry.

Such a constitutional provision as this demonstrates the sagacity and ability of the men who sought to erect a state on the idea that the workingmen should be the property of the owner of the soil and of the capitalist. It unquestionably meets the wants of such a government but it was rejected by the framers of our own Constitution as totally unsuited to "a government of, and for, and by the people."

Since then these members have taken an oath to support the Constitution of the United States. "They are here in the house of their fathers, and intend to stay." They acknowledge that in the war they were overborne and obliged to lay down their arms, but they do not confess that they were wrong; on the contrary, they still insist that they were right on principle, and they are now advocates of the same political ideas they then put forth on economic questions.

Mr. Chairman, such is the record, fairly stated, of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, and who by their unprecedented course towards the minority constituted themselves the entire committee; and in concluding what I have to say respecting it I submit that it would be unreasonable to expect from such a source a bill that ought to command the support of this House or the approval of the country.

THE STATUS OF THE FREEDMEN.

Mr. Chairman, the true inwardness and real purpose of those who are responsible for the present endeavor to break down protection can not be fully understood without considering the status of the negro, by whose muscle the labor of the South has been and in the main must be performed. True, he is no longer a chattel; he can not be put on the auction block as of old, but he is not regarded as a free man of right ought to be. His former owner finds by experience that the labor of the negro free is more valuable than was the labor of the negro slave, and for that, if for no other reason, there is no wish or purpose to re-enslave him; but it does not yet enter into the average Southern mind that the negro must become educated and must be protected in all of his civil rights; in short, a fellow-citizen equal with themselves, in order to enable the South to reach the material prosperity to which its natural resources entitle it.

Those who control the politics of the South do not as a whole desire that the colored man shall become educated, and they do not intend to permit him to enjoy or exercise the rights of a citizen, such as the amendments to the Constitution of the United States have vouchsafed to him. They do not think that it is proper to have the negro advance a single step beyond the condition of an unowned slave, and in that condition the people of the old planting States of the South still propose to have their laborers remain.

In those States where colored men are most numerous they are not heartily accorded their civil rights; they are tolerated rather in their quasi condition of freedmen for the cheap labor they furnish and for the political power their enumeration unjustly confers upon their old owners. I say unjustly, for by force and fraud the colored citizen is deprived of his vote, and yet that very citizenship goes to increase a representation which on this floor is employed to deprive the negro laborer and all other laborers of the protection to which they are entitled.

Mr. Chairman, one of the strongest reasons I have for standing by

the principle of protection to American labor is the belief that just in proportion as the wonderful resources of the South come to be developed under the new era now dawning upon her, will education take the place of illiteracy, the recognition of all the civil rights of the negro take the place of their denial, which to-day is unblushingly practiced in the old planting States. What the South most needs is the development of her material resources, and this can only be secured by diversified industries, by manufactures wherewith to employ labor.

The negro is the laborer of the South, and no man will ever take his place. He is there "in the house of his fathers" eight millions strong, and he is there to stay. He must be educated in order to become a profitable laborer and a good citizen. He must be elevated from the low condition compatible with the plantation drudge to that higher state in which his naturally bright mental qualities can be brought out by actual endeavor and thought-inspiring work. In this new field the negro will vindicate his claim to manhood, and will by his own advancement secure the admiration of his fellow-men, and when this is done he will be as secure in the enjoyment of his citizenship as any one anywhere. Free trade will never bring to the South that happy day, but with protection it can not be long delayed.

If you will insist that the public debt can not be paid except at a high premium, and therefore taxation should be reduced, let it be done by taking off the enormous tax on sugar, and by removing internal-revenue taxation, so that the principle of protection to our industries may be preserved, and for that end give to the sugar industry a bounty to encourage to the utmost its production on our own soil. No doubt the tariff needs revision to remove inequalities and to simplify collection laws. Let that be done, and done by the friends and not by the enemies of protection. But, Mr. Chairman, this is not the object of the bill before us nor of the party in power.

Sir, a fair adjustment is not the question before us. It is,

WHICH IS RIGHT, FREE TRADE OR PROTECTION?

They say free trade is right on principle, and they consent to violate that principle and adopt a wrong one far enough to collect the taxes required to defray the expenses of the Government economically administered.

It is difficult to find anywhere as much folly and political wickedness crowded into so few lines as this proposition contains. If absolute free trade between this country and foreign nations is right, why not adopt it and collect the taxes directly from the people, for whose benefit Government exists? Collect from property and accumulated wealth what it costs Government to protect them and from the individual what it costs to protect his life and liberty. That would be fair and honest; but to place all the burden of supporting the Government on those who consume manufactured goods and the necessaries of life and let accumulated wealth in the form of either property or money go free is rank injustice.

I am for protection for the sake of protection, and not for revenue. If there be no better reason for maintaining duties on foreign goods than that it furnishes the best mode for raising revenue, then I will be against it. That method of taxation can not be defended standing by itself; with no compensating facts to sustain its equity, it is totally indefensible. I know it is justified on the ground of the ease with which the tax is collected when the tax-payer is not aware of the exaction, but I submit that such an argument is unworthy of intelligent men.

I am for protection because it surrounds the laboring man with conditions which secure to him employment at a rate of wages which enables him to pay the taxes imposed on the articles he consumes and then have more left to sustain himself and his family than he could possibly have on the other plan. I am for protection because it is the only way in which we can develop our own resources as a nation, employ our own muscle, our own machinery, our own brains, and our own capital, and in which these forces can work together in the most successful manner to promote the advancement of our own country. I am for my own country, and for the people of my own country, against the world.

But you say we propose to dispense with foreign trade. We have never failed to have commercial intercourse with the nations of the earth, and we propose to enlarge that intercourse; but not by reducing wages, and in this we radically differ from the advocates of free trade. They would follow in the footsteps of monarchies and extend commerce by reducing the condition of the employé to the level of the laborers of the Old World. This we will never do.

And now comes President Cleveland and tells us—

> That the plain effect of our tariff laws is to raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties, and that millions of our people purchase and use things of the same kind made in this country, and pay therefor nearly or quite the enhanced price which the duty adds to the imported articles.

This is a grave charge that the President has put in his message, and inasmuch as the duties on foreign importations average over 40 per cent., if the charge is true an awful burthen of taxation is laid on consumers which ought at once to be removed. But is it true? Or is it only the President's theory unsustained by facts, as the conditions which confront us when examined will abundantly prove?

This theory has been so many times disproved and shown to be utterly groundless by exhibitions of the prices at which our manufactories produce the goods consumed by our people that to repeat them would be useless. But, inasmuch as the President makes a special effort to convince the farmer and agriculturist that he is imposed upon and fearfully injured by protection, I will be pardoned for a single attempt to nail the false theory he seems so anxious to have believed like base coin.

Farmers use cut nails. In the year 1887 we made in this country 6,908,870 kegs of these useful articles of 100 pounds to the keg. The gross price of iron nails on the 16th of April last at Pittsburgh was $1.90 per keg. The duty imposed by the existing tariff on cut nails is 1½ cents per pound. Now, if the President is correct, the people of the United States paid $8,646,087.50 more for nails alone than they could have purchased them for, but for the "vicious and illogical" tariff. And it follows also that the same nails could have been bought in New York from English or Belgian nail-makers at 65 cents per keg of 100 pounds.

Mr. Chairman, there is not a Democrat in my Congressional district that believes the President is right. He may think he is honest possibly, but he will tell you the Chief Executive of this great nation has got beyond his depth and is dealing in theories that he does not comprehend. The logic is all on his side, but where are the facts? There is something in this protection business that is hard for a theoretical free-trader to understand, something "that giveth and yet increaseth."

Mr. Chairman, when a mere lad I stood in front of a country store in Ohio and saw a six-horse team, such as Thomas Corwin so graphically described, come lumbering up the road with its broad-tired wheels and its wagon-bed with heavy bows covered with linen that was spun and woven by hand. It was laden with 5 tons of merchandise, not a box or bale or cask of which had changed its place in that wagon since it was loaded in Chestnut street, Philadelphia. How many weary weeks had been consumed in the journey over the Alleghanies I do not know, but I learned since then that freight paid by the pioneer merchant in Ohio on that load of goods was $6 per 100 pounds. About that time the State of Pennsylvania proceeded to build a canal to the West for the purpose of cheapening transportation and extending the commerce of her metropolis.

The farmers and teamsters of that State, many of them, were decidedly opposed to such a scheme. They were logicians like our President, and they demonstrated (to themselves) that when a canal-boat laden with 80 tons of freight could be hauled by a single mule, when it required sixteen six-horse teams to do the same work, the teamster's occupation would be gone, the farmers would no longer have a market for either horses or oats, and ruin was sure to come. But the canal was built and the farmer lived to see the prices of horses, oats, and farms doubled and quadrupled by the very condition from which he expected nothing but disaster. What was the matter with the Pennsylvania farmer? Mr. Chairman, it was simply this: He had never had an experience that caused him to look beyond the mere logic of the proposition to those forces and influences that were sure to come and contradict his theory, and that is what ails our President and all advocates of free trade.

But gentlemen on the other side tell us that protection does not protect the laborer. A few figures, taken from industries in my own immediate neighborhood, will show this statement to be as groundless as the one I have just discussed. I refer to coal mining, window-glass manufacturing, and bottle blowing, and give the following tables of prices paid in England, in Belgium, and in the United States. The prices paid are gathered from parties in whom I have the utmost confidence, and the figures they give are, as I personally know, exact.

COAL MINING.

Hon. Thomas Burt, M. P. for the Northumberland district in England, writing from Newcastle-upon-Tyne under date of April 23 last, gives a full account of the hours of labor and wages of the employés engaged in coal mining in that district, from which the following statement is made and the earnings of employés tabulated:

> The hours of adults in the coal mines of Northumberland vary from seven to ten, from the time they leave the surface till they return, or, to quote the words of the act, "from bank to bank." The coal-hewers—who are the great majority of the workmen—are employed about seven hours. The hewers' work is exceedingly hard, and any one who has done it or seen it done,

WILL THINK THE HOURS LONG ENOUGH.

> Deputies, stone-men, shifters, and laborers generally work eight hours a day. In some cases rolley-way men and others employed in the transit of coal work ten hours a day. This longer period, however, applies only to comparatively few underground workers. Banksmen, screeners, and other persons employed on or about the pit-head usually work ten hours, and in some few cases eleven hours per day.
>
> Having given the hours of labor, I proceed to state the rate of wages paid at the present time. Trappers, per day, 1s.; drivers, 1s. 2d.; putters are paid by the piece or score, and their average earnings are 2s. 9½d. per day. In the case of adults the following wages are paid: Coal-hewers average, 4s. 7d. per day; stone men, about 4s.; deputies, 4s. 3½d.; shifters, 3s. Officials are paid as follows: Overmen, £2; back-overmen, master shifters, and master wastemen, 22s. per week.

The earnings above stated, compared with wages paid for similar service in coal-mines of my district, are as follows:

Employés.		Northumberland.	Illinois.
Trappers	per day	$0.24	$0.75 to $0.90
Drivers	do	.28	1.25 to 2.25
Putters	do	.67	1.25 to 2.25
Coal-hewers (miners) while employed	do	1.10	*1.25
Stone-men	do	.96	2.00 to 2.25
Shifters	do	.72	1.50 to 2.25
Overmen	per month	40.00	1.60 to 1.50
Deputy overmen	do	31.50	65.00

*Year round.

Now, take the window-glass and glass-bottle industries, both of which have obtained a foothold in my own neighborhood, and compare the wages paid in the State of Illinois with the wages paid for same service performed in foreign countries:

Table of wages paid for making window-glass in Belgium and Illinois.

Employés.		Belgium.	Pittsburgh and the West.
Blowers	per month	*$75.00	$125.00 to $150.00
Gatherers	do	*25.00	70.00 to 90.00
Flatteners	do	*25.00	100.00 to 140.00
Assistant flatteners	do	*12.00	45.00
Cutters	do	25.00	90.00 to 130.00
Master shearers	do	30.00	90.00
Shearers	do	15.00	45.00
Pot-makers	do		90.00
Laborers	do		35.00 to 40.00

*About.

Some blowers will make much more than the amount stated, but that is exceptional.

The wages in Belgium are for much longer hours and a greater number of days per annum. The workmen in the United States have averaged only about thirty-two weeks per year since 1883.

Next comes bottle-making. In Belgium and England first-class bottle-blowers get from $1.60 to $1.75 per day, while the earnings of the same class of workmen in Illinois amount to from $5.50 to $6 per day. Laborers of various kinds around bottle-works in Belgium and England get from 40 to 50 cents per day, while the same laborers in Illinois ar paid from $1.75 to $2.50. These figures tell the story.

WHO ASKS FOR A CHANGE?

Mr. Chairman, who has petitioned Congress for the removal of duties on imported goods? Have mechanics or laboring men, manufacturers or operatives, mill-owners or workers in mills, mine-owners or miners, petitioned for a reduction of the tariff? How many agriculturists have asked for the passage of the Mills bill? There has been next to no demand for tariff reduction from the people of the United States. England and the Democratic party on this floor alone seem to be in a praying mood for the reduction of tariff rates. Has anybody save distillers asked that the internal-revenue tax on whisky should remain undisturbed? On the other hand, is it not true that two hundred thousand of as good and as earnest men and women as inhabit the several States have asked for the removal of that tax, knowing that it enables the producers of alcoholic drinks to wield their questionable business so as to make immense profits and at the same time create a political power which no other combine in the country can equal, not a jot or tittle of which is withheld from the Democratic party on election day in every town, city, or hamlet in this broad land?

Mr. Chairman, for one I am ready to repeal the internal-revenue tax on spirits, and in that way to reduce the surplus and break up the great whisky trust, for I think that rich and powerful combination, which now not only manufactures whisky, but builds its saloons and hires its bartenders in every place desirable for their nefarious business where the law permits, would fall to pieces in a single year after the repeal of the Government tax on whisky. I am not seeking for a way to promote the rum traffic; I am not anxious to lighten the burden of the rum-seller. In any municipality where public sentiment practically fails to prohibit the sale of intoxicants as a beverage, let the highest possible tax be levied on the retailer for the sole benefit of the tax-payer in those counties where the immense cost of the crime they cause to be committed has to be borne.

I pity the man who can look with indifference on that great destroyer of life, happiness, property, and good morals, dram drinking, which lays a heavy hand on the happiness and prosperity of the laboring men of this country. Of the nine hundred millions annually expended for drink it is safe to presume that one-half of it is taken from the pockets of laboring men, and for this vast contribution there comes no return but misery and crime. How many snug homes, filled with such comforts and delights as the human heart craves, would this worse than wasted sum bring to the family, making the light of hope and love to shine where now the thick darkness of despair so often casts its baneful shadow. Sir, show to me that by my voice or vote I can even restrain this great evil in a practical way, and that voice and vote will not be wanting.

Talk of trusts; there is the Cotton-seed oil trust, the Standard Oil trust, and transportation combines, not one of which has any relation to tariff protection, but greater and more powerful than any in this country is the whisky trust. It and the Democratic party are one in interest—they are united in life, and in death they will not be divided. The internal-revenue tax on whisky will not be disturbed by Democratic votes, for this tax is the umbilical cord that insures the existence of both. It signifies its wish that the tax on whisky shall remain undisturbed, and the ready response of the President is, your wishes shall be gratified whatever may be the effect on the manufacturing interests of the nation that need protecting; and the Speaker, more than ready to sustain such a policy, so frames the committee that whisky is safe.

NATURE OF THE CONFLICT.

Mr. Chairman, the political conflict in which we are now engaged is the addenda to the late conflict of arms, and it has not come an hour too soon. The issue is made so clear by the action of the President that the disguises of this bill are of but little account. Free Trade vs. Protection is the title of the cause now on trial before the American people, and upon which we as jurors will in a few days be compelled to vote. That such is its true character is understood both by the workingmen of America and the manufacturers of England. In proof of this I beg leave to insert here a copy of a preamble and resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of workingmen held at Cooper Union, New York, on the 8th instant, which reads as follows:

Whereas the so-called Mills tariff bill, now under discussion in the House of Representatives, by placing on the free-list many articles that come into competition with the products of American labor, and by sweeping reductions in the duties upon others, menaces the ruin of many of our industries, and would, if enacted into a law, entail great loss of employment and widespread suffering among working people; and

Whereas the workingmen of this country have been contemptuously denied a hearing by the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, which framed the bill; and

Whereas it is now apparent to every workingman that the prevailing agitation of the tariff question and the proposed reduction of duties are destroying confidence in business, reducing wages in some occupations and stopping altogether the wages in others:

Therefore, we, the workingmen of the city of New York, in mass meeting assembled, earnestly protesting against the passage of the Mills tariff bill and against any and all measures of a similar character which threaten the labor and industry of our country and propose to lower the American standard of wages, do hereby declare and proclaim the following resolutions:

Resolved, That we demand, of the Representatives in Congress from this city that they not only vote against this most recent attack on the prosperity of American labor, but that they use their utmost endeavors to secure its defeat.

Resolved, That we protest against a bill which puts raw material on the free-list when that so-called raw material is the product of American labor.

Resolved, That we protest against a bill which would break down the barrier which defends American labor from competition with the pauper labor of Europe and Asia, and aims to reduce our families to the foreign level of cheapness and poverty.

Resolved, That we demand that the internal-revenue war taxes be repealed, and that protection to American labor be maintained and made more effective.

Resolved, That we call upon our fellow-workingmen in all parts of the land to rise up and denounce the Mills tariff bill as a menace to our welfare and to our rights as citizens, which threatens to deprive us of the opportunities of education afforded by the American system of high wages, and we denounce as a fraud the free-trade argument that the cost of living in this country is increased in proportion to the rates of duty on imports, except as we choose and are able to live better here than our unfortunate rivals in foreign countries.

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be sent to the President and to every member of Congress.

And should any doubt exist in any mind as to how the manufacturers of England regard this movement, it would be dispelled by the following, from the London Saturday Review, which is only one out of twenty English editorials on the subject which are of similar import. It says that the message deals with a question which is as interesting to Englishmen as Americans, and it adds:

President Cleveland has devoted himself entirely to the tariff. It is impossible to recast this without touching directly the pockets of every citizen of the United States and indirectly influencing the commercial interests of the world. The President and the Democratic leaders have finally decided that they have nothing to gain by keeping measure any longer with the protectionists. They have, from whatever motive, resolved to adopt the free-trade policy. Nothing can be more explicit than the President's language. "The simple and plain duty which we owe the people is to reduce taxation to the necessary expenses of an economical operation of the Government, and to restore to the business of the country the money which we hold in the Treasury." In America this means free trade.

Mr. Chairman, whatever may be the decision of Congress on this question, it will be reviewed by the court of last resort in this country, the citizen, whose scepter of power is a free ballot, and to that grandest tribunal on earth this case must be submitted; and for one I can not doubt as to what the verdict will be. The good sense of the American people has never been appealed to in vain; their instinctive tendency is to right action, and whenever occasion calls for their serious thought an expression of their judgment has thus far proven to be indeed the voice of God. Mr. Chairman, in dignity and independence there is no sovereign on earth who can compare with the intelligent, independent, and fearless citizen of the United States who does not hold an office and who aspires to none. Such a one is without a peer, except it be his fellow-citizen in like condition. To such the destiny of the Republic is committed, and the first century of matchless progress through which they have conducted it justifies the faith that centuries to come will add to its glory and renown.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, the President in his recent message apprised Congress that the proceeds of surplus taxation in the Treasury by June 30, the end of the current fiscal year, may be expected to reach the sum of $140,000,000, including prior accumulations, or, more closely stated, the sum of one hundred and thirteen millions, apart from prior accumulations, over and above all authorized expenses, including the sinking fund for the current fiscal year. In reference to this condition, he proceeds:

Our scheme of taxation, by means of which this needless surplus is taken from the people and put into the public Treasury, consists of a tariff or duty levied upon importations from abroad, and internal-revenue taxes levied upon the consumption of tobacco and spirituous and malt liquors. It must be conceded that none of the things subjected to internal-revenue taxation are, strictly speaking, necessaries. There appears to be no just complaint of this taxation by the consumers of these articles, and there seems to be nothing so well able to bear the burden without hardship to any portion of the people.

But our present tariff laws, the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation, ought to be at once revised and amended. These laws, as their primary and plain effect, raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by precisely the sum paid for such duties. Thus the amount of the duty measures the tax paid by those who purchase for use these imported articles.

From this utterance I understand the President to be averse to any reduction in internal taxation, as that mode of taxation affords, as he says, "no just complaint," and that "nothing is so well able to bear the burdens without hardship to any portion of the people." He further says our tariff laws are "the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation," and "ought to be at once revised and amended," and with intent "to enforce an earnest recommendation that the surplus revenues of the Government be prevented by the reduction of our customs duties," he urged upon Congress "immediate consideration" of these matters to the exclusion of all others.

These are distinct declarations and not susceptible of doubtful construction. In substance it is asserted that the reductions necessary should be made through the means of additions to the free-list and lower rates of duty on importations.

In the presence of such language, emanating from the Executive, authorized by direction of the Constitution to communicate and—

from time to time give to Congress information of the state of the Union, and recommend to their consideration such measures as he shall judge necessary and expedient—

it is the imperative requirement of the representatives of the people of the United States to give fair, intelligent, and prompt attention to the suggestions made. I have done so, and as a remedy for the evils pictured, I introduced and had referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, on March 12 last, a bill—

to reduce and equalize duties on imports, to reduce internal-revenue taxes, and for other purposes.

An examination of the provisions of the bill mentioned shows the remedies I would apply are at variance with those recommended by the President. He seeks to prevent the continuance of surplus revenue by a resort to changes in our customs duties only. The remedy I propose is through a repeal of internal-revenue taxes as well as by a full revision of the tariff, as promised to the people by the Democratic convention which assembled in Chicago in 1884.

The reductions provided for in the bill alluded to would aggregate on internal taxation about $70,000,000. It repeals the entire internal tax on tobacco and fruit brandies; it repeals the license tax on wholesale and retail dealers, leaving these for such control by State authority as the respective States may see fit; it makes all alcohol used in the arts and manufactures free, and reduces the tax on whisky to 50 cents per gallon.

These taxes have always been the last to be levied and the first to be repealed when no longer needed. It was the boast of Jefferson that he had given the death-blow to the excise tax, "that most vexatious of all taxes," at the commencement of his administration; and among other things for which he received the thanks of the Legislature of his native State on his retirement from office was for "internal taxes abolished."

The first tax also to be repealed after the war of 1812 was the excise tax, which was recommended by Madison, and was the first law enacted under the administration of Monroe.

The Democratic convention of 1884 declared that "the system of direct taxation known as the internal revenue is a 'war tax,'" and this declaration, taken in connection with other declarations in the platform which I will quote further on, clearly establishes the fact that the opinion of the convention was that the internal-revenue "war" taxes should first go, and should all go whenever a sufficient sum was realized from custom-house taxes to meet the expenses of the Government, economically administered. We are practically in such condition now, and a true response to these instructions warrants the repeal of the internal laws to the extent the bill proposes.

I favor now, as I have always done, a total repeal of the internal-revenue taxation. [Applause.] In the bill which I introduced I proposed to sweep all these taxes off the statute-book except 50 cents on whisky, and I would transfer the collection of that tax to the customs officials, if upon examination and reflection it was found to be practicable.

Some of the reasons which induced me to form this judgment and now to adhere to this course I can not better state than by a repetition of some of my former expressions in this connection:

With Albert Gallatin I have regarded the excise or internal-revenue taxes as offensive to the genius of our people, and tolerated by the framers of the Constitution only as a measure of necessity in the emergency of war, and that just so soon as the occasion for them had passed away they should cease to exist. He and Thomas Jefferson, as the very first act of Jefferson's administration, secured a repeal of internal taxes and relieved the people from their inequality, inquisitorial annoyances, and hordes of officials clothed with dangerous powers. Only in these latter days have I heard men calmly claim these war taxes are still necessary—a generation after the war which gave rise to them had closed. And it is a very suggestive and suspicious feature of the affair that those upon whom the tax is laid clamor loudly against its being taken off, regarding it no doubt as a protection against competition to the large monopolies.

To substantiate the ground taken by me in that letter, I will refer to two authorities. I will read first from Blackstone's Commentaries (book 1, pages 317, 318) to show excise is a war tax:

But at the same time the rigor and arbitrary proceedings of excise laws seem hardly compatible with the temper of a free nation. For the frauds that might be committed in this branch of the revenue, unless a strict watch is kept, make it necessary, wherever it is established, to give the officers the power of entering and searching the houses of such as deal in excisable commodities at any hour of the day, and, in many cases, of the night likewise. And the proceedings in cases of transgression are summary and sudden.

* * * * * * *

However, its "original establishment was in 1643, and its progress was gradual both sides protesting it should continue no longer than to the end of the war, and then be utterly abolished. * * * But from its first origin to the present time its very name has been odious to the people of England." It has been kept up, however, to supply the enormous sums necessary to carry on the continental wars of Europe.

So believed Jefferson; and let us next see what he did. I read from Schouler's History of the United States, volume 2, page 21:

In economy and retrenchment the President had already made a beginning by reducing the diplomatic establishment and consolidating some revenue offices subject to executive control. The movement now contemplated was to abolish that whole system of internal taxation, which he had heartily detested as tyrannous, burdensome, and liable to abuse of patronage; which had always been unpopular in the Middle and Southern country, and which cost more than the first three years' net produce to put down resistance to its collection. But excise receipts had risen gradually to the neighborhood of $1,000,000, and many feared that the Treasury would suffer if this resource was suddenly cut off. Jefferson had, however, gone over the ground carefully with Secretary Gallatin; against the present yield of the internal taxes they set off what the Government might safely economize elsewhere.

Customs duties alone would, as they correctly surmised, supply a revenue sufficient to support the Federal establishment, and, besides paying interest on the public debt, extinguish its principal, should peace continue, in fifteen or eighteen years. Federalists were incredulous, and those with friends in place tried to induce a repeal, only partial at most, but the ax was laid to the root, and with the downfall of this system went about half the offices at the disposal of the Administration.

In addition I then said and now repeat that if this internal-revenue system were abolished to-day we would have no surplus revenue to scare us, while the administration of public affairs would be rendered purer and better.

On the tariff the bill embraces a revision of the entire system on principles believed to be in harmony with the last authoritative declaration of the Democratic party, from which I quote, as follows:

From the foundation of this Government taxes collected at the custom-house have been the chief source of the Federal revenue. Such they must continue to be.

* * * * * * *

All taxation should be limited to the requirements of economical government. The necessary reduction in taxation can and must be effected without depriving American labor of the ability to compete successfully with foreign labor and without imposing lower rates of duty than will be ample to cover any increased cost of production which may exist in consequence of the higher rate of wages existing in this country.

This declaration of principles clearly recognizes the fact that a difference exists in the cost of the production of commodities in this and other countries in consequence of the higher rate of wages existing in this country, and declares for duties ample to cover this difference.

This is the cardinal principle that must govern in any intelligent revision of our tariff. Our industrial system differs from that of any other country in the important fact that labor in this country receives a much larger share of what is annually produced than in any other. It is believed to be demonstrable that this advantage to labor can be maintained only by giving to our industries protection equal to the difference. Whether this difference be expressed by wages or by what wages will command for wage-earners, does not matter in the final analysis. The question is, what proportion of the annual products of labor and capital combinded does labor receive, and how much larger is that proportion in our system than in any other? It may not be possible to state exactly this difference, but statistics are abundant enough to prove that the difference is largely in favor of American labor. No one will deny that an industrial system under which annual products are most widely distributed and in which labor receives as its share a larger proportion is the better system.

As the name of Edward Atkinson has been referred to in this debate, publishing his opinion which was given a long while ago, let us see how he speaks of recent events in his late article on "Low prices, high wages, small profits; what makes them?" He says that—

Since the end of the civil war, in 1865, and yet more since the so-called panic of 1873, there has been greater progress in common welfare among the people of this country than ever before. It has been the period in which there has been the greatest application of science and invention to the production and distri-

bution of food that ever occurred in any single generation in the history of this or any other country; and food is the prime necessity of material life. * * * The cost of the material for food, of materials for clothing, boots, and shoes, and of fuel, probably represents about 70 per cent. of the cost of living on the part of well-to-do mechanics, railway employés, or of other persons in analogous occupations who may be considered in the average position of working people. All these elements of life have declined very greatly in their prices in the period under consideration. * * * Some one has wisely and wittily said that "It does not much matter what happens to the millionaire; how is it with the million?"

If it shall appear that out of this great reduction in prices the millions have gained higher wages; that hundreds of thousands of families have gained better homes and greater comfort in life; while those who have suffered temporary loss have been only the rich who have been incapable of adjusting themselves to the new conditions, or the unskilled poor who have been unable to grasp the greater opportunities for welfare which invention has offered them, then may we not come to the conclusion that diminished profits and low prices are merely the complement of higher wages and lower cost, and are therefore most certain indications of general progress from poverty to welfare, yet still leaving the problem open, how to help the unskilled poor?

This would seem to settle the question as to whether we should adhere to the beneficent policy pursued of encouraging and protecting our own home manufactures by the protection which necessarily results from any proper adjustment of duties in any tariff bill for the purpose of raising revenue to carry on the Government economically administered. It demonstrates unmistakably the truth of what those who agree with me have contended would be the result. To increase wages products must be increased, for in the end wages are but the laborers' share of products. While a dollar may buy more in another country than here, a day's labor, which is the crucial test, will exchange for more of the necessaries and comforts of life here than anywhere else. [Applause.]

Under free trade this advantage which accrues to labor would disappear. It is impossible that it should be otherwise; for if a tariff does not in itself give higher wages to labor, it does preserve from destructive competition a system in which labor can and does receive as its reward better wages or a larger share of the fruits of its own toil than in any other system. No two industrial systems side by side, with labor in one receiving double the wages of labor in the other, could long exist under free trade between them. Too much stress can not be laid upon such facts as these, because on them hinges the necessity of protecting American industries, in order to preserve the advantages to labor that have arisen under them; and who would wish to see that system overthrown and reconstructed on the basis of other countries, with labor kept at the level of a bare existence, and with no hope of ever bettering that condition?

Before proceeding to explain the principles and provisions of the bill which I introduced, as it affects the tariff, I will stop to refer to a few of the fundamental propositions which have been persistently maintained throughout this debate, and which appear to exercise a controlling influence over the opinions of so many.

First. That duties are always added to the price which the consumer must pay.

On articles not produced in this country this is doubtlessly true, as a general rule, and measurably true also on articles in part produced in this country but not sufficient to supply the entire demand. But on all those commodities produced in sufficient abundance to supply, or measurably supply the home market, different principles control. In that case competition, where it is free to operate, determines the prices of the various products and the foreign producer comes to this as a market where prices are fixed, and the duties are what he pays for the privilege of entering our market. [Applause.]

Another erroneous proposition is that duties on articles produced in this country are a tax or bounty which the consumer pays to the manufacturer, by means of which the manufacturer derives larger profits than prevail in other industries.

If this were true it is not easy to see what justification could be offered for the committee bill any more than for the present tariff laws. But that this, as a general rule, is erroneous becomes apparent enough on a closer examination of the laws of trade which prevail under all systems.

That there is a tendency in every industrial system to an equalization of profits on capital and wages of labor is an admitted principle of political economy. Adam Smith long ago laid down the proposition that larger profits in one industry than in others could not long prevail in the same country. Other economists state the same principle. Suppose that, with our industries constituted as they are, we formed a world by ourselves, would it be claimed that one class, as consumers, paid a perpetual tax to another class, as producers? Would not rather the economic law just stated prevail? Such would be the condition, too, under a tariff entirely prohibitory. The same law, too, operates under a tariff that covers the difference in the cost of production between this and other countries.

Of course the tendency to an equalization of profits on capital and wages of labor never reaches a dead-level, because of the varying conditions and influences under which production and consumption go on.

From these principles it follows that all who participate in an industrial system are partakers of its benefits, whether they are employed in one industry or another—not the manufacturer alone, but the laborer; in short, all who produce and exchange products are alike benefited under this system, and that is the system we seek to continue by a proper adjustment of tariff duties. Only those who have fixed incomes or are in office for life with fixed salaries, would be benefited by the overthrow of this system and the establishment of free trade. But this is the last class that has a right to complain.

Still another assumption is that any class of producers—for instance, the agricultural class or the wage-earners—could continue indefinitely to sell their products, or their services, in our present higher market, and at the same time buy the products or the services of others in cheaper markets. That this is not possible becomes clear enough on the most casual examination. If the farmer ceases to buy the products of the manufacturers, he will certainly cease to sell to them, and must sell his products in the market where he buys what he consumes himself. Suppose last year we had manufactured a thousand millions' worth less than we did and had gone abroad for these products, expecting to pay for them with agricultural products; could a thousand millions more of agricultural products have been sold abroad at the price such products brought here? We sold all the wheat and corn and meat products that Europe would take at the prices that prevailed. Who can tell at what prices Europe would have taken even five hundred millions or one hundred millions more of our agricultural products than she did take? The mere statement of the proposition is enough to disclose the error on which it is founded, and shows the importance of uniting manufactures with agriculture, or, as Jefferson states it, put the manufacturer by the side of the farmer. In fact, both must, in our country, depend almost exclusively on our home market. It is folly, if not a crime, to attempt a change in these respects. It would bring ruin and bankruptcy without the possibility of having such a result accomplished. The greater the diversity of industries in any country, the greater the wealth-producing power of the people, and the more there is for labor and capital to divide, and the more independent that country becomes. [Applause.]

I now come to the principles on which the bill I have introduced is framed.

The bill embraces a full revision of the tariff.

It carries to the free-list many articles which enter into consumption as raw material, or otherwise, and in the production of which there is no injurious competition between this and other countries.

In fixing the tariff rates the aim has been to adjust the duties as nearly as possible to cover the difference in the cost of production in this and other countries, arising from the different conditions I have stated. This rule has been extended to all the industries embraced in our system where climatic or other causes do not put us at a disadvantage in carrying on production.

In working out the details of the bill under these principles it has been my purpose to lower the duties wherever possible and reduce the revenues.

But here we come upon principles that require careful attention. Between the extremes of free trade on the one hand and a prohibitory tariff on the other there are three principles, one or the other of which must governs in levying a tariff. First, revenue only, or an even rate of duty on all imports, just high enough to yield the revenue needed to support the Government.

Second, maximum revenue; that is, a tariff that will yield the largest possible revenue.

Third, a tariff to cover the difference in cost of production in this and other countries.

The points important to consider in connection with these principles is, that the line of "revenue only" falls below either of the others, and that the line of maximum revenue (which is the largest product resulting from multiplying the rate of duty on any article by the quantity imported) is always and necessarily below the line of difference in the cost of production. Consequently, to lower the rate of duty, until the line of maximum revenue is passed, must result in an increase of revenues and not a decrease. To reduce the rate from the line of maximum revenue down, will result, of course, in reduced revenues. On the other hand, to raise the rate until the line of maximum revenue is reached, is to increase the revenues; but from the line of maximum revenue up, an increase in the rate of duty necessarily results in reduced revenues. To ignore these principles is to act blindly, and any computations calculated to show the results of changes in the tariff that do not take these facts into account are utterly worthless.

An all-important consideration in connection with these principles, as will be seen from a close inspection, is that, in order materially to reduce revenues by reducing the rate of duties on competing industries, it is necessary to go below the maximum revenue line, that is, below the line of fair or even competition, and give the advantage to foreign manufacturers.

It is for this reason, it is believed, that the committee bill in very many cases, and especially where ad valorem duties are substituted for existing specific rates, will result in an increase rather than a decrease of the revenues.

To determine just where the line of difference in cost falls is, of course, in many instances, difficult; but it may be safely assumed, and has been adopted as a governing rule in preparing the bill I have introduced, that when the importations in any line of commodities is

large and increasing from year to year (and no good reason appears why the things can not be as well produced here), that the duties are below the cost line, and that the advantage is with the foreign producer. If production in the same line is diminished, or suspended altogether, in this country, it becomes proof positive that the advantage is too great to be overcome without a readjustment of duties.

Where importations are light or not increasing, it may consistently be assumed that the duties are quite high enough and in many cases may be safely reduced; and in case the industries are of such a nature as to permit trusts or combinations of any kind to raise prices above the level of prices or profits in other industries, then it becomes important that the cost line should be closely adhered to.

It is less important, of course, to apply this rule rigidly where prices are regulated through free competition. In such cases, under the economic principles I have stated, the tendency is always to a general level in profits, wages, and prices in all industries.

And before leaving this point I wish to state distinctly that if in any case it can be made to appear that the measure I have proposed gives more protection than is needed to cover the difference in the cost of production, I am ready to lower it; on the contrary, if in any instance the rate of duty is too low to cover this difference, I am ready to help raise it; and on this principle in the bill, I have offered the duty on a few articles has been increased, as I shall later on explain.

Again, if it is made to appear that the present duties, or the rates proposed in my bill in any way are made use of, or can be, to foster monopolies, I stand ready to apply the remedy. Monopolies may and do exist, with or without the tariff. Certainly the greatest monopolies and trusts in this country now—the Standard Oil trust, the whisky trust, the cottonseed-oil trust, and others I might name, have no connection with our tariff laws. I have never advocated a tariff for the purpose of supporting monopolies, but for the protection of labor, and I am for the protection of labor, not at one stage merely, but at all stages in the production of any commodity. I am for the protection and maintenance of an industrial system that allows to labor better reward than any other. I believe such a system to be the outgrowth of our better form of government and our higher civilization, and that its overthrow will endanger the very existence of our institutions. [Applause.]

ADMINISTRATIVE FEATURES OF THE BILL, SPECIFIC DUTIES.

The late Secretary Manning signalized his administration of the Treasury Department by a more complete and thorough inquiry into the administration of the customs service than had ever been attempted by his predecessors. His annual reports for the years 1886 and 1887 on the collection of duties, his report on the revision of the tariff in February, 1886, and his various special communications to the Committees on Finance and Ways and Means of Congress, are monuments of his marvelous, effective, and conscientious labors in this regard. In all these he urged a thorough and complete revision of the tariff and the elimination of its many ambiguities, which had led to endless disputes and litigation and consequent hardships to importers and losses to all interests concerned. He urgently and repeatedly dwelt upon the necessity for the substitution of specific for ad valorem duties wherever practicable, not only in the interest of good administration, but as a guard against fraud and to protect the honest trader.

In these views respecting specific duties he was supported by the almost unanimous opinions of the leading importing merchants as well as the principal manufacturers of the country, whose testimony on the subject he transmitted to Congress with his report on the revision of the tariff.

The customs officers, charged with the immediate work of appraising imports and collecting duties, also gave emphatic and convincing testimony to the importance of the adoption of the system of specific instead of ad valorem rates.

The present Secretary of the Treasury, in an able letter to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, dated June 14, 1886, presented unanswerable arguments in favor of the application of specific duties in place of high ad valorem rates, particularly as to silks, laces, embroideries, and leather gloves.

In submitting schedules covering these articles and recommending their adoption by Congress, he said:

> Should the recommendations herein made be adopted, it is confidently believed that the greater part of the contentions constantly prevailing at the port of New York with respect to appraisements will disappear, importations by regular merchants throughout the country become general, and the full duties provided by the laws be secured at a diminished cost of collection.

In his last annual report to Congress he also used the following language:

> Whatever the rates of customs taxation may be the laws for collection of the same should be made as efficient as possible. In this the bona fide importer who wishes to gain only the legitimate profits of his business, the home manufacturer, and laborer are equally interested. They all have a right to demand that the laws be so administered as to give them every possible protection in their business. The high ad valorem tariff of the last quarter of a century has been the fruitful cause of devices to gain improper advantage at the custom-house. It is, therefore, desirable that in revising and reducing rates of duty they should be made specific instead of ad valorem so far as the nature of the merchandise will permit. Theoretically considered ad valorem are preferable to specific duties, but in practice, under such rates as we have had and must continue to have for years to come, the former are the too easy source of deception and inequality at the custom-house. Congress has it in its power to change, from time to time, as may be advisable, specific rates so as to meet any permanent changes in values.

In matters relating purely to the administration of the laws I esteem it to be the duty of Congress to consider carefully and to act upon the advice of the executive officers, who know the facts and are charged with the responsibility of the administration of the law, and in the preparation of the bill presented by me I have conformed to this view; and as a part of the work of revision of the tariff the aim has been to remove the incongruities and inequalities with which it abounds and which have been so fruitful of lawsuits and losses to the revenue and merchants, and which have been obstacles in the way of honest and orderly administration.

ADJUSTMENT OF RATES.

In adjusting the rates under the various schedules information has been sought and obtained, so far as practicable, from those having knowledge of the industries affected, and these interests have been duly considered in arranging the details of the bill.

It is estimated that the customs revenue will be reduced by this bill something over $20,000,000 per annum. These reductions are distributed throughout the various schedules, reductions being larger in some than in others.

Of all the industries in this country those deriving least direct benefit from tariff laws are the products of agriculture, and no material reduction in rates on these products has been deemed advisable. One important change proposed in one of the schedules is that imposing a specific rate of duty on animals. This, it is believed, will prove a better measure of protection to our stock-raisers and wool-growers. There has been much complaint among wool-growers over the depression in the domestic wool market since the enactment of the tariff in 1883. This depression, it is believed, is in large measure due to evasions of duty by the importation of wool tops and waste—which the bill corrects—and the discrimination in our present tariff between worsted and woolen cloths, which has well nigh driven worsted manufactures from this country. The Secretary of the Treasury, in his last annual report, refers to this interest in these words:

> A conspicuous example of the inequalities of the tariff is found in the discrimination in the rates of duty imposed on woolen and worsted cloths.

And adds:

> There is much reason to believe that the manufacture of worsted cloths must soon cease in this country unless the tariff law in this regard is amended.

Careful attention has been given in the bill to this subject, with a view to remedy the evils complained of and to restore this important industry to the United States.

The time allotted to me in this discussion will not permit detailed reference to the different schedules. This must be left to other occasions, but certain provisions in the metal schedule having been sharply assailed, I feel compelled to occupy a little time in the consideration of a few items.

THE METAL SCHEDULE.

In the metal schedule the reductions in rates apply to a majority of the articles therein enumerated, and include iron and steel rails, bar-iron, plate-iron, iron and steel fish-plates, nails and tacks, iron and steel beams, girders, and other structural iron, railway wheels, iron and steel ingots for making wheels and tires, sheet-iron, hoop-iron, anchors, tubes, axles, chains, screws, needles, horseshoes, mechanics' tools, castings, hollow-ware, copper, lead, and various other manufactures of metal. A comparison of the two bills will show that the reduction of duties extends to many more articles in this schedule than does the committee's bill. Certain articles in this schedule, namely, bronze-powder, taggers' iron, tin and terne plates, cotton-ties, iron and steel wire rods and ingots, billets, slabs, and blooms, are dutiable under the present tariff at such low rates, or at ad valorem rates which are so easily and largely evaded, that their home production is either wholly prevented or seriously restricted, so that the greater part of the revenue derived from this schedule comes from the large and constantly increasing importation of these articles.

TIN-PLATE.

Particular objection has been made to the increased rate of duty provided for in the bill introduced by me above the existing law on tin-plate. The present rate is 1 cent per pound, the proposed rate 2.10 cents per pound. This increase is necessary to secure the production of tin-plate in the United States.

At present tin-plate making is practically unknown in this country, though we are as well fitted to make it as England and Wales, from which countries most of our tin-plate come. The United States is the largest consumer of tin-plate in the world. We take nearly two-thirds of the production of Great Britain. Within six years we have paid British manufacturers over $100,000,000 for tin-plate, besides paying freight. This is too much money to send out of the country for an article which we are capable of producing at home.

The value at the port of export of the tin-plate imported during the year ending June 30, 1887, was $16,883,813. As near as I can learn, the total wages paid the British laborers in the production of the tin-plate imported into the United States last year were about $9,000,000. My wish is that such amount be expended in our own country, and

that it go to our own wage-earners. The rate fixed would induce such extended manufacture, that in my judgment, by reason of competition and the law of demand and supply, the price would not be higher after twelve months than we are now paying for the same article, and would put the manufacture of tin-plate where, by proper inspection laws, it could be kept free from poisonous adulterations when manufactured for canning purposes. At the same time it would create such a demand for labor as to give employment to every idle iron and steel worker in the country, and thus enable labor to maintain a standard of wages that would secure to the workingman reasonable remuneration and a respectable livelihood. It would also give additional employment to labor in the production of coal, iron ore, coke, limestone, and other materials. There were imported into the United States about 255,000 gross tons of tin-plate in 1887, which represent 870,000 tons of iron ore, 300,000 tons of limestone, 1,800,000 tons of coal and coke, 360,000 tons of pig-iron, 5,000,000 pounds of lead, 25,000,000 pounds of tin, 12,000,000 pounds of tallow and palin oil, 35,000,000 pounds of sulphuric acid, 12,000,000 feet of lumber, and, in addition, fire-brick, clay, oil, and other lubricants, hemp, etc.

It would require sixty-eight large works of five trains of rolls each, involving an outlay of $30,000,000 capital, and employment to about 24,000 workmen, who would earn at least $12,000,000 in wages. All this would be accomplished, I believe, without the least injury, within one year to any consumer of tin-plate in the United States.

COTTON-TIES.

Cotton-ties are used chiefly for baling cotton, rags—waste, and similar articles. They are made of hoop-iron. The hoops are usually 1 inch wide by No. 18 wire gauge thick, are cut to lengths of 11 feet each, punched, have a buckle riveted or attached to them, are varnished or painted, and put into bundles of 50 pounds each.

The present rate on cotton-ties is one of the most marked inconsistencies of the tariff, as they bear a less rate of duty than the article out of which they are made.

It is plain that these cotton-ties should not only bear no less a duty than is levied on hoop-iron, of which they are made, but it is fair that they should pay an additional duty, equal to the additional labor cost. They do not now bear the hoop-iron duty, and yet it is proposed in the bill before the House to place cotton-ties on the free-list. In the act of 1883 the duty was put at 35 per cent. ad valorem, which, on the invoice price, is equal to a duty of four-tenths of a cent a pound, while No. 18 hoop-iron, 1 inch wide, bears a duty of 1.2 cents per pound. It is thus seen that cotton-ties pay, under the existing law, but one-third the duty on the articles from which they are made. This is a positive discrimination against the home manufacturer in favor of the foreign producer and shipper, and the foreigner to-day controls the market in this country. In 1887 the average invoice value per pound of cotton-ties imported was 1⅔ cents. The average invoice value of hoop-iron not thinner than No. 20, imported, was 2½ cents per pound. In other words, the cotton-ties made out of 1 and No. 18 hoop were invoiced at about one-half the invoice price of the hoop-iron out of which they were made. The invoices on cotton-ties are undervaluations, of course, and the injury done to the American manufacturers is greatly aggravated by the application of an ad valorem duty, a system which gives most protection where least is needed and the least protection where most is needed. In a word, permits the foreign manufacturer and the American importer to fix the rates of duty on imports, and not those who administer our tariff laws.

The placing of cotton-ties on the free-list prevents any hope of their production in the United States, for the rate of wages for rolling and heating a ton of cotton-ties in England is $2.31; in Pittsburgh, $4.10, nearly double, and so on all through. The cotton-growers of the cotton belt do not suffer in any way as regards the price of cotton-ties. They sell their entire bales, including bagging and iron, at cotton rates, and no tare is charged in this country and the charge abroad is borne by the shipper. There is no reason or equity in the proposition to place this article on the free-list.

WIRE RODS, ETC.

The clause in the present tariff as to wire rods reads as follows:

Iron or steel rivet, screw, nail, and fence, wire rods, round, in coils and loops, not lighter than No. 5 wire gauge, valued at 3½ cents or less per pound, six-tenths of 1 cent per pound. Iron or steel, flat, with longitudinal ribs, for the manufacture of fencing, six-tenths of a cent per pound.

In the bill which I introduced limitation to sizes smaller than No. 5 is abandoned, and the rate is based on value.

The present rates of duty are six-tenths of a cent per pound on sizes not smaller than No. 5 wire gauge, and 45 per cent. ad valorem (according to the rulings of the New York custom-house) on smaller sizes. I propose to make it 1 cent per pound.

This rate will not, it is believed, on a fair valuation, exceed 45 per cent., if it reaches that. Relative to the duties at present collected on these articles, a statement from the Treasury Department says:

Steel wire rods lighter than No. 5 wire gauge, not being specially provided for, fall under the provision "for all forms or kinds of steel not specially enumerated," at 45 per cent. ad valorem, while both iron and steel wire rods above No. 5 wire gauge are provided for at six-tenths of a cent per pound, or $13.44 per ton. Enormous quantities of the article lighter than No. 5 have been imported at values which, at 45 per cent., have yielded a duty of only the equivalent of $11 per ton. Thus a lower rate of duty is apparently collected upon the finer and more costly than upon the coarser and cheaper article.

The statistics show that the importations of iron and steel wire rods not lighter than No. 5 wire gauge were invoiced at an average value in 1886 of about 1¾ cents per pound, while steel wire rods lighter than No. 5 wire gauge were invoiced at an average value of only 1.1 cents per pound. This would seem to indicate that the latter was undervalued, since (being finer) they are supposed to be worth more than the article invoiced at 1¾ cents.

It is impossible for our manufacturers to make wire rods under the present tariff. Taking into account the price and the duty on pig-iron, and the cost of the various processes necessary to convert it into wire rods, including loss of material, the rate I propose is less than the average rates imposed on heavy bar-iron under the present tariff, and is the same as is proposed by the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means on ordinary bar-iron of coarser size. It should be borne in mind that wire rods do not go directly into consumption by the people in that form, but are mainly used by the manufacturers of wire. There is no bill before Congress which proposes any reduction of rates of duty on barbed, galvanized, and other wire used for fencing. These rates have practically kept such foreign wire out of our market, and while they remain unchanged there can be no appreciable increase in the price to the farmer of his wire for fencing, notwithstanding an increase in the duty on wire rods.

During the year 1887 there was imported into the United States 334,698,837 pounds of these rods, of which 247,730,164 pounds were steel, lighter than No. 5 wire gauge, paying duty at 45 per cent. ad valorem, equal to $10.80 per ton, which is less than the duty proposed by the bill of the committee on heavy railway bars, and is only $4.80 per ton more than the same bill proposes on pig-iron. Even my colleague from the Erie district, with his disposition to figure down the cost of manufacturing metals in this country, would hardly pretend that this margin is sufficient to cover the difference between labor in this country and abroad in the manufacture of this article.

The rate proposed in my bill is not more than sufficient to cover the cost, and its adoption will give work to home laborers, prevent the large and increasing importations, and result in large reduction of revenue.

STEEL INGOTS, BLOOMS, AND SLABS.

In the bill which I introduced a change is made from ad valorem duties, as authorized by existing law, to specific rates. The reason for this is "to guard against undervaluations which are shown to have been extensively practiced, particularly in blooms and slabs, which have been invoiced below 1 cent per pound. These undervaluations have been sources of just complaint by reputable merchants and domestic producers."

That the present rates are too low is evident from the enormous increase in importations since the act of 1883 went into effect. What that increase has been will be seen from the following table:

Table showing the importation of various grades of steel, 1884–1887.

Articles.	1884.	1886.	1887.
Bars, billets, etc., valued at 4 cents a pound or less	28,639,833	95,537,022	323,180,959
Ingots: cogged ingots, blooms, and slabs, valued at 4 cents a pound or less	11,548,375	38,752,868	279,819,950

In the ordinary course of business there has been no such increase in the demand in this country for steel in this form as to justify any such increase in importation as above. It has come because the advantage on account of this low rate of duties has given the foreigner the possession of the American market.

The average entered value of this merchandise in 1887 was only $17.75 per ton, which, at 45 per cent. ad valorem, is less than $8 per ton, or only about $1.28 more than the duty now imposed on pig-iron, and only $2 per ton more than is proposed by the bill of the committee.

I apprehend, sir, no gentleman on this floor will contend that this is not an inequality which should be corrected. It is manifest that a necessity exists for a revision and change in the rates on these several articles, and the rates suggested have been made with reference to the cost of production, and are in harmony with the rates on iron ore and pig-iron, and are no more than necessary to compensate for the difference between the cost of labor and other legitimate costs of manufacture in this country and abroad. The adoption of these rates would largely prevent the enormous flood of importations, give the work to our mills and laborers, and cause a large reduction of revenue.

DECREASE OF REVENUE.

The statement has been recklessly made on this floor within a few days that the changes proposed in my bill in the metal schedule would cause an increase in duties of about $9,000,000. This statement was directed presumably to the particular articles to which I have just made extended reference. I have shown that these changes would largely decrease rather than increase the revenue from these articles. I now emphatically assert that the changes proposed throughout the metal schedule would cause a reduction in revenue of over $6,000,000. This result is arrived at by fair and logical estimates, an[illegible]

not by that wonderful method of computation by which my colleague [Mr. SCOTT] sought to demonstrate the other day that a duty of $5.50 per ton would be a sufficient protection on steel rails made from pig-iron paying a duty of $6.72 per ton.

COST OF STEEL RAILS.

Respecting the cost of steel rails at the works of Carnegie Brothers, which my colleague has presented, I will give some figures which have been furnished to me, and which I believe to substantially correct, although I have not had time to test the same. At any rate, they will serve to show the worthlessness of estimates made up from imperfect knowledge of industrial processes and which take into account only the cost of the last stages of production.

Pig metal required for a ton of rails, 2,610 pounds, costing		$19.83
Spiegeleisen and manganese		3.24
Cost of labor in the mill		4.80
Cost of ingot-molds, fire-brick, fire-clay, coke, oil, maintenance, etc		3.20
Making total cost of ton of rails		31.07
From this deduct 285 pounds steel scrap	$2.18	
Deduct also 10 per cent. from wages of 1888	.48	
		2.66
Leaving as the actual cost		28.41

including those sold as second class. This does not include interest on or profits on capital.

All rails are sold on five years' guaranty, to be replaced, if found defective, at the expense of the manufacturers.

Respecting structural iron, I insert a letter from Belgian makers offering beams, girders, and structural iron for bridges, etc., promising a "nice profit" to all who secure orders. I consider that this circular letter is a complete answer as to the insufficiency of the rate fixed in the committee's bill.

LA PROVIDENCE ROLLING-MILLS.

[General agent for United States of America and Dominion of Canada, Andris-Jochams, Charleroi, Belgium.]

CAARLEROI (BELGIUM), 1887.

DEAR SIR: We beg to solicit your orders in iron beams and channels, which we can offer you at:

(Price quoted on application under rate of any competition.)

New York, Boston, Philadelphia duty paid. (Baltimore, New Orleans, or San Francisco.)

We make currently all sections of beams and channels usually required in America, and also up to 20 inches beams sections.

Prompt delivery is guarantied from eight days to a fortnight after receipt of order, f. o. b. Antwerp.

Contracts are executed f. o. b. Antwerp, or c. i. f., duty paid, free on cars into the largest cities of United States of America.

All the irons are guarantied to weigh within a few pounds of the weights that your architects require.

Tensile strength and quality guarantied as good as the best American products.

Private cable-code sent on application, made in such a way as to enable you to stipulate orders in a few words.

We undertake to execute complete iron building, and any architectural work according to drawings; also bridge work.

Awaiting the favor of your order, which shall have our best attention,

We are, dear sirs, yours, obediently,

ANDRIS-JOCHAMS.

CHARLEROI, *le 14th March*, 1888.

DEAR SIRS: I beg you to take notice that we have appointed ——— ——— as our sole and general agents in United States of America for the sale of our architectural iron, as per circular inclosed, and you will oblige us in addressing your demands to them in future.

With the prospect of a reduction in duties on architectural iron and steel in your country, we will be soon ready to offer you such advantages in prices and quality that you will find a nice profit in importing from us.

Messrs. Weir, Smith & Rogers intend to keep a large stock of our products always in hand, so that to be able to make at all times immediate deliveries.

We remain, dear sirs, with much respect, your obedient servants,

ANDRIS-JOCHAMS.

THE COMMITTEE BILL.

Having thus indicated my views of the principles which should govern tariff legislation, I now come to examine briefly the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. It should be borne in mind that a number of the gentlemen composing the majority of the committee have served upon the committee in previous Congresses, have participated in the discussion and preparation of tariff measures, and have had special opportunity for becoming familiar with the facts and information presented to Congress by the Secretary of the Treasury with regard to the ambiguities and inequalities of the existing tariff, the innumerable protests, appeals, and suits which have grown out of the faulty construction of its schedules and free-list, and the need of their thorough overhauling and revision, if for no other purpose than to cure the defects and remedy the evils in their construction. They should have been familiar, moreover, with the repeated recommendations for the adoption of specific duties made by the Secretary of the Treasury, as being necessary for the collection of the customs revenue with regularity, uniformity, and certainty.

Notwithstanding these facts, we have before us the bill of the committee, which is not in any proper sense a revision of the tariff, but consists of amendments constituting, I might say, a patch-work upon the existing law, perpetuating and multiplying its numerous infirmities of phraseology; its ambiguities and inequalities, which have perplexed and vexed the executive officers in its administration, have been the subject of volumes of Treasury decisions year by year, and have embroiled the Government and merchants in untold litigation, making it necessary to create new courts for the special trial of custom cases, which are increasing in number month by month and involve unknown millions of demands upon the Government—a constant menace to the Treasury.

Not only have the committee ignored the recommendations of Secretaries Manning and Fairchild and of the customs officers at the various ports for the adoption of specific duties, but have actually, in a large number of cases, substituted ad valorem rates for existing specific duties, thus showing preference for a system which has been abandoned by all the civilized commercial nations on the globe, and which has been fitly characterized as a system under "which thieves prosper and honest traders are driven out of business."

A declared purpose of this bill is to secure "free raw materials, to stimulate manufactures." In execution of this idea the bill places on the free-list a large number of articles which are really articles of manufacture, such as salt, sawed and dressed lumber, laths and shingles, hackled and dressed flax, burlaps, machinery, terne or galvanized plates, glue, glycerine, soap, certain proprietary articles, extracts of hemlock, oils of various kinds, including hemp-seed and rape-seed, olive and fish oils, refined sulphur, various coal-tar preparations, earth paints, distilled oils, alkalies, and various other chemical compounds; various manufactured mineral substances, prepared china clay, quicksilver, bricks of all kinds except fire-brick, prepared meats, lime, plaster of Paris ground and calcined, various prepared drugs and chemicals, and many other articles of like character.

These constitute the products of large and useful industries throughout the United States, in which many millions of capital are invested and employing many thousands of working people.

At the same time the bill leaves or puts upon the dutiable lists such articles as lead ore, iron ore, zinc ores, nickel ore, and coal, which might be called raw materials, if that term can be properly applied to anything involving the expenditure of labor in its production. Further than this, the bill not only makes so-called "raw materials" free, such, for example, as flax, jute, hemp, hemp-seed and rape-seed, crude borax, opium, and hair of animals, but places on the free-list the manufactured products of these materials, namely, burlaps (for bagging, etc.), hemp-seed and rape-seed oil, boracic acid, codein and other salts and compounds of opium, and curled hair for mattresses, etc. [Applause.]

Thus the manufacture of such articles is made impossible in this country, except by reducing American labor to a worse condition than that of labor in Europe. It goes even farther, and places or leaves dutiable certain so-called raw materials, as, for example, iron ore, lead, coal, paper, paints, caustic soda and other alkalies, and sulphate of ammonia, while placing on the free-list articles made from these materials, such as hoop-iron and cotton-ties, iron or steel sheets or plates or taggers iron coated with tin or lead, known as tin-plates, terne-plates, and taggers tin, sulphate of iron or copperas, machinery, books and pamphlets, paintings, soap, and alum. In other words, the bill leaves or makes dutiable the raw material and puts on the free-list the article manufactured from it, thus not only placing an insurmountable barrier in the way of making such articles here, but actually protecting the foreign manufacturer and laborer against our own, and imposing for their benefit a burden upon the consumer in this country. [Applause.]

Again, the bill places lower rates on some manufactured articles than on the materials used in making them, as for instance: Manufactures of paper, 15 per cent.; and the paper to produce it at 25 per cent.

The paint known as orange mineral, 1½ cents per pound; white lead, from which it is made, 2 cents per pound.

Type metal, 15 per cent.; pig-lead, from which it is made, 1¼ cents per pound, equal to 44 per cent.

Axminster and all other carpets 30 per cent.; yarns used in their manufacture, 40 per cent.

It leaves an internal-revenue tax of more than 300 per cent. on alcohol used in the arts, amounting, according to a fair estimate, to as much as the entire amount of duty collected on raw wool, which alcohol enters as a material in a vast number of important and needful articles, which the committee have either made free or have so reduced the rates thereon that the duty would be less than the tax on the alcohol consumed in their manufacture.

In some cases the difference between the duty imposed by the bill on the so-called raw materials and the articles made from them is so small as to destroy these industries, except upon the condition of leveling the wages of home labor to that of Europe.

For example, the difference between the duty proposed on pig-lead and that proposed on litharge and red lead, which are made from pig-lead, is only one-fourth of a cent per pound.

The difference between the duty on pig iron and that on steel blooms is only $2 per ton; between steel blooms and steel rails but $3 per ton; and between blooms and wire-rods less than $3 per ton, coupled with the free admission of hoop-iron, cotton-ties, and sheet-iron in the form of galvanized and coated plates.

It is plain that such legislation would leave the ore in the mines, the pig-lead at the smelting works, the pig-iron to rust at the furnaces, while foreigners would supply our markets with these manufactured products.

In a large number of articles throughout the schedules, not already named, the reductions proposed by the bill are so large that the effect must be to destroy or restrict home production and increase enormously foreign importations, thus largely increasing customs revenue instead of reducing it, as claimed by the advocates of this bill. I mention particularly the following: Earthen and china ware, common window and plate glass and glass bottles, leaf-tobacco, manufactures of cotton, manufactures of flax, hemp, jute, and other fibers, carpets, fancy-goods, brushes, leather gloves, manufactures of India rubber, clay pipes, and other pipes.

It is claimed by the committee that the bill will reduce the customs revenue about $54,000,000. On the contrary, I assert that it is fair to estimate that its effect would be to largely increase the revenue instead of reducing it; while the amount of material wealth it would destroy is incalculable.

Those supporting the bill hold themselves out as the champions of the farmer, while they take from him the protection duties on his wool, hemp, flax, flax-seed, meats, milk, fruits, vegetables, and seeds. And what do they give him in return?

They profess to give the manufacturer better rates than they now have. If this be so, how is the farmer to be benefited, or where does he get his compensation for the loss of his protective duties?

Much has been said about removing taxes upon "necessaries" and imposing them upon "luxuries." What does this bill propose to do in that direction?

It gives free olive-oil to the epicure, and taxes castor-oil 97 per cent.; it gives free tin-plate to the Standard Oil Company and to the great meat-canning monopolies, and imposes a duty of 100 per cent. on rice; it gives the sugar trust free bone-black, and proposes prohibitory duties on grocery grades of sugar; it gives free licorice to the tobacco manufacturer, while retaining prohibitive duties on manufactured tobacco; it imposes a duty of 40 per cent. on the "poor man's blanket," and only 30 per cent. on the Axminster carpet of the rich. It admits free of duty the fine animals imported by the gentlemen of the turf, and makes free the paintings and statuary of the railway millionaire and coal baron. [Great applause.]

I forbear further criticism of this singular measure, for enough has been said to show that my objections to it are not only to the rates imposed on many articles, but to the theory generally on which it has been constructed.

I yield to no man on this side of the House in my desire for continued Democratic control in the administration of the Federal Government. I do not believe the adoption of the committee's bill will make such result certain. I can not be coerced into any particular action upon economic questions by the direction of party caucus. The period of the political caucus has departed, never to return, and yet we should confer and have unity, if it is possible. In these matters I speak only for myself. My convictions on the tariff are strong, and founded, as I think, upon principle, and upon information and intelligent comprehension of the subject. When any one here enters upon the task of invoking caucus power or other modes of coercion, I can only say to him, if he acts with good purpose, that it will prove a fruitless undertaking; or if with ill motive, then I assign him to all the natural contempt which such self-constituted superciliousness deserves. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, the question of affording protection to American industries is not a new one. It was the question uppermost in the colonies when our Government was founded. It contributed, perhaps, more than any other consideration to the adoption of the Constitution by the States. It has continued a question in every Congress from that day to this, and it will not die with this Congress nor this generation. It will continue as long as industries exist and our Government requires revenue. But I speak, I believe, with the sanction of the very highest authority when I say that for the first forty years of the existence of our Government there was no question as to the right of Congress to protect and encourage American manufactures by the exercise of the taxing power, or, in the language of Madison, "encouraging by duties * * * the manufactures and products of the country." That this was the policy, too, of every administration, and particularly of every Democratic administration, from Jefferson to Van Buren, is among the incontrovertible facts of our history. Jefferson favored such a policy. In his letter to Colonel Humphreys, January 20, 1809, he says:

> My idea is that we should encourage home manufactures to the extent of our own consumption of everything of which we raise the raw material.

And again, in his letter to Mr. Leiper, January 21, of the same year, he says:

> I have lately inculcated the encouragement of manufactures to the extent of our consumption, at least.

Again, in his letter to Governor Jay, he says:

> An equilibrium of agriculture, manufactures, and commerce is certainly become essential to our independence. Manufactures sufficient for our own consumption, of what we raise the raw materials, and no more; commerce sufficient to carry the surplus produce of agriculture, beyond our own consumption, to a market for exchanging for articles we can not raise, and no more. These are the true limits of manufactures and commerce. To go beyond them is to increase our dependence on foreign nations and our liability to war.

Other quotations might be made to show the interest of the founder of the Democracy in American manufactures and his concurrence in the prevalent opinion that it was legitimately within the powers granted to Congress by the Constitution to so levy duties as to protect and encourage home industries. But as to the constitutional powers of Congress over this subject, none will dispute the high authority of Madison, who, above all others, as said Webster, was most competent to judge of the intentions of the makers of that instrument; but I wish to say for myself, before reading what I am about to present as coming from this authority, that I have never found it necessary or proper, for the justification of my own course, to claim more than such protection as incidentally might come from properly adjusted duties on imports. But that the doctrine that duties might under the Constitution be imposed as a means of regulating trade, passed unquestioned by the framers of the Constitution, who afterwards participated in the legislation of Congress on this subject, will hardly be disputed. But on this point hear what Madison himself says. In his letter to Mr. Cabell as late as 1828, he enters into an elaborate discussion of this question from which I extract the following:

> It is a simple question, under the Constitution of the United States, whether "the power to regulate trade with foreign nations," as a distinct and substantive item in the enumerated powers, embraces the object of encouraging by duties restriction nd prohibition, the manufactures and products of the country.

And then he goes on:

> If Congress have not the power, it is annihilated for the nation; a policy without example in any other nation and not within the reason of the solitary one in our own.

And further on in the same letter:

> If revenue be the sole object of a legitimate impost and the encouragement of domestic articles be not within the power of regulating trade, it would follow that no monopolizing or unequal regulations with foreign nations could be counteracted; that neither staple articles of subsistence nor the essential implements for the public safety could, under any circumstances, be insured or fostered at home by regulations of commerce, the usual and most convenient mode of providing for both.

And in his closing argument he adds these convincing conclusions:

> That the encouragement of manufactures was an object of the power to regulate trade is proved by the use made of the power for that object in the first session of the first Congress under the Constitution, when among the members present were so many who had been members of the Federal convention which framed the Constitution, and of the State convention which ratified it, each of these classes consisting also of members who had opposed and who had espoused the Constitution in its actual form. It does not appear from the printed proceedings of Congress on that occasion that the power was denied by any of them. And it may be remarked that members from Virginia in particular, as well of the Anti-Federal as the Federal party, the names then distinguishing those who had opposed and those who had approved the Constitution, did not hesitate to propose duties and to suggest even prohibitions in favor of several articles of her production. By one a duty was proposed on mineral coal, in favor of the Virginia coal-pits; by another, a duty on hemp was proposed, to encourage the growth of that article; and by a third, a prohibition even of foreign beef was suggested, as a measure of sound policy.
>
> A further evidence in support of the constitutional power to protect and foster manufactures by regulations of trade—an evidence that ought of itself to settle the question—is the uniform and practical sanction given to the power by the General Government for nearly forty years, with a concurrence or acquiescence of every State government, throughout the same period, and, it may be added, through all the vicissitudes of party which marked the period. No novel construction, however ingeniously devised or however respectable and patriotic its patrons, can withstand the weight of such authorities or the unbroken current of so prolonged and universal a practice.
>
> * * * And may it not be fairly left to the unbiased judgment of all men of experience and of intelligence to decide which is most to be relied on for a sound and safe test of the meaning of the Constitution, a uniform interpretation by all the successive authorities under it, commencing with its birth, and continued for a long period through the varied state of political contests, or the opinion of every new legislature, heated as it may be by the strife of parties, or warped, as often happens, by the eager pursuit of some favorite object, or carried away, possibly, by the powerful eloquence or captivating address of a few popular statesmen, themselves perhaps influenced by the same misleading causes? If the latter test is to prevail, every new legislative opinion might make a new constitution as the foot of every new chancellor would make a new standard of measure.

Monroe continuously, in all his messages, recommended protection and encouragement of American industries; and in his special message of May 4, 1822, he said:

> Duties and imposts have always been light, not greater perhaps than would have been imposed for the encouragement of our manufactures had there been no occasion for the revenue arising from them; and taxes and excises have never been laid except in cases of necessity, and repealed as soon as the necessity ceased.

I call the attention of gentlemen, Democrats of the later school, to this language:

> Duties * * * not greater perhaps than would have been imposed for the encouragement of our manufactures, had there been no occasion for the revenue arising from them.

In his second annual message Jackson presents in clear language views in conformity with those who preceded him:

> Among the numerous causes of congratulation the condition of our import revenue deserves special mention, inasmuch as it promises the means of extinguishing the public debt sooner than was anticipated and furnishes a strong illustration of the practical effects of the present tariff upon our commercial interests.
>
> The object of the tariff is objected to by some as unconstitutional; and it is considered by almost all as defective in many of its parts.
>
> The power to impose duties on imports originally belonged to the several States. The right to adjust those duties with a view to the encouragement of domestic branches of industry is so completely incidental to that power that it is difficult to suppose the existence of the one without the other. The States

have delegated their whole authority over imports to the General Government without limitation or restriction, saving the very inconsiderable reservation relating to their inspection laws. This authority having thus entirely passed from the States, the right to exercise it for the purpose of protection does not exist in them, and consequently if it be not possessed by the General Government it must be extinct. Our political system would thus present the anomaly of a people stripped of the right to foster their own industry and to counteract the most selfish and destructive policy which might be adopted by foreign nations. This surely can not be the case. This indispensable power thus surrendered by the States must be within the scope of the authority on the subject expressly delegated to Congress.

And he adds:

In this conclusion, I am confirmed as well by the opinions of Presidents Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, who have each repeatedly recommended the exercise of this right under the Constitution, as by the uniform practice of Congress, the continued acquiescence of the States, and the general understanding of the people.

I quote also on this point one who, though not a Democrat, on constitutional questions may be always listened to—Webster. While this question was before the country in 1844, he said:

I consider it as capable of mathematical demonstration as any proposition in Euclid, that the power of discriminating in custom-house duties for the protection of American labor and industry was understood, not by some but by all, by high and low everywhere, as included in the regulation of trade.

I am aware that about this period another doctrine and another set of ideas, under the leadership of Mr. Calhoun, more in consonance with the institution of slavery which then existed, began to take root in the South, and later to exert its unhealthful influence on the policy of the Government. I do not propose, however, here to traverse the history of this contest and the conflict between the industrial institutions of the two sections of the country, or the results of that conflict. But the new doctrine did not change the opinion of Jackson, nor swerve him from his settled purpose. For thirty years the contest between these two ideas went on. The tariffs of 1842 and 1846 marked the supremacy for the time being of the different views. And I stop here to note that the Democrats from Pennsylvania in the Senate and House of Representatives all voted, I believe, for the tariff of 1842, and all against the tariff of 1846, except Mr. Wilmot.

What would have been the destiny of our Republic had these ideas, with the condition of things of which they were the outgrowth, prevailed I leave to other imaginations. Happily, as I believe, for the whole country, the ideas and the doctrines of those who founded our Government and organized our institutions prevailed instead. Under these ideas our industrial system was founded with the establishment of the Constitution of 1789. The first Congress, in the first act imposing duties, declared that they were laid, among other purposes, "for the encouragement of manufactures." Here was the beginning of that system which has had such a marvelous growth and under which the accumulation of wealth has exceeded in a hundred years that of any other nation on the earth. It is that system I would perpetuate. If Jackson could say he was confirmed in the opinions I have quoted from him, by the opinions of Jefferson, Madison, and Monroe, how much more am I confirmed in my opinions by his great authority added to that of the founders and builders of the Democratic party?

I warn the party that it is not safe to abandon principles so fundamental to our institutions and so necessary to the maintenance of our industrial system, principles which attest the wisdom of those who established them by the fruits they have born, the full fruition of which, however, can only be realized in the extension of diversified industries to all parts of the country, not in the North and East alone, but in the South and West as well.

A new era of industrial enterprise has already dawned upon the South. No section of the country possesses greater natural advantages than the South, with her genial climate, her limitless raw materials, her mines of coal and iron, with abundant labor ready to develop them. Considering what has been there achieved in a single decade, what may not a century bring forth for her under a system calculated to favor the highest industrial development? When I read the history of my country and consider the past and present, and reflect on what is before us, I can not believe that the ideas that went down in the convulsions of 1861 will ever again dominate the destinies of this Republic. [Prolonged applause.]

When the chairman announced that Mr. RANDALL's hour had expired,

Mr. BIGGS said: I ask that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be permitted to go on.

Mr. MILLS. I must object. [Cries of "Oh, no!" and "Withdraw the objection."] I can not consent to throw back toward the close of the day gentlemen who are yet to speak. The gentleman from Pennsylvania was to speak at 10 o'clock.

A MEMBER on the Republican side (to Mr. MILLS). We gave Mr. COX two hours yesterday. Why did you not object then?

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the zeal of you gentlemen of the Republican party; but it was not a proper thing to do. This time has been divided.

Mr. RANDALL. I yielded the hour which I was to have from 10 to 11 to-day.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I believe I am to be recognized next after the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I yield him fifteen minutes of my time. [Applause.]

Mr. RANDALL. I did not hear the statement of the gentleman from Ohio.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has yielded the gentleman from Pennsylvania fifteen minutes of his time.

Mr. RANDALL. I appreciate the gentleman's kindness.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I understand that the gentleman from Ohio has yielded a portion of his time to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. He has.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I think it proper, Mr. Chairman, with the consent of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Ohio, to make a statement which I think I can afford to make—— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. COX. I think it is only decorous and kind that the time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania should be extended. [Applause, mingled with cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I believe it due to all of us that I should say—and I think I can afford to say it, as I have asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] to withdraw his objection—that the facts in regard to the occupation of the time to-day were these: It was understood that the gentleman from Ohio and myself were to have so much of the beginning of this day as might be needed; it was the understanding in the Committee on Ways and Means on both sides that the gentleman from Ohio was to commence at 11 o'clock and to speak so long as he might desire to speak; that I was to answer him and should have my time extended.

That was the distinct agreement between the gentleman from Ohio and myself, not personally, but as members of the committee selected by our respective sides to close the debate, with the exception of the remarks which may be made to-morrow by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] and my colleague [Mr. CARLISLE], the honored Speaker of the House. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] approached me the other day, stating that he was sick and would not be able to speak until to-day, and he asked me to consent that to-day the House should meet at 10 o'clock, and that he should speak from 10 till 11. I said that was a matter as to which I could not answer except with the concurrence of the gentleman from Ohio. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Ohio, and myself had a friendly colloquy which ended in an agreement made by us, subject, of course, to the ratification of the House, that to-day the House should meet at 10 o'clock; that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should occupy the hour from 10 to 11; and that then the agreement which had been made by the Committee on Ways and Means as to the occupation of time by the gentleman from Ohio and myself should be carried out.

Mr. RANDALL. That is——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. One moment. Subsequently the gentleman from Ohio requested that the House should meet at 10 o'clock on the intervening days, Wednesday and Thursday, to which gentlemen of the Committee on Ways and Means on both sides agreed, and at their request I made the proposition to the House, and in pursuance of that arrangement we have been meeting at 10 o'clock. The understanding was that the gentleman from Pennsylvania should commence at 10 o'clock to-day and continue until 11; that the remainder of the day should be divided as I have indicated. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, however, gave up the time from 10 until 11 this morning at the request of certain persons, and I have no doubt properly——

Mr. RANDALL. A gentleman got the floor last evening. I was here at 10 o'clock to-day ready to take the floor.

A MEMBER. The arrangement made last night was in open House.

Mr. MILLS. They had no right to make that arrangement.

Mr. RANDALL. I should have been through with my remarks by this time if I had been allowed to proceed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. When I came here this morning I was informed of that change in the programme, with which I had nothing to do, but to which I immediately gave cordial assent, feeling that whatever was agreeable to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Ohio, and the House, would be entirely agreeable to me. But when I informed the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee——

Many MEMBERS. Let us have the regular order.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa (to Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky). Have you any proposition to make?

Mr. RANDALL. If I had been allowed to go on I should have concluded by this time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. My reason for making this explanation is this——

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I think this is the regular order. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has yielded for a moment.

Mr. RANDALL. Oh, no.

Mr. MILLIKEN. He has no time to yield.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The proposition I desire to make——

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Let us hear the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The proposition I desire to make——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend until order is restored.

Mr. PAYSON (after a pause). Mr. Chairman, what is the regular order?

Mr. KELLEY. To hear a proposition which is about to be made.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is general debate on this bill.

Mr. PAYSON. Who has the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor, having had fifteen minutes yielded to him by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky to make a proposition whereby I shall not encroach upon the kindness of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The proposition I was going to make was in order to relieve the gentleman from Ohio, because when he gives the fifteen minutes he proposes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and objection is made that he shall consume more than an hour in the discussion of this question, it will of necessity place him and the House in a most uncomfortable attitude when he takes the floor in his own right. My proposition is that the gentleman from Ohio, who has yielded his time, take it back, and that the gentleman from Pennsylvania shall have such time as he may desire to conclude his remarks, it being understood that the time so occupied shall come equally out of the time allotted to the gentleman from Ohio and my own time when I shall follow him. [Cries of "That's right!" and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDALL resumed and concluded his remarks as above.

Mr. MCKINLEY was recognized.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Before the gentleman from Ohio proceeds I desire to ask unanimous consent that he, as well as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], who follows him, may be permitted to occupy unlimited time in the discussion—the same courtesy which has been extended to other gentlemen on the committee.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, our country is in an anomalous situation. There is nothing resembling it anywhere else in the world. While we are seeking to find objects to relieve from taxation, in order that we may relieve an overflowing Treasury, other nations are engaged in exploring the field of human production to find new objects of taxation to supply their insufficient revenues. In considering the situation that thus confronts us, and the bill that is presented here as intended to relieve it, it is well that we should understand at the beginning the things upon which all are agreed.

They are, first, that we are collecting more money than is required for the current needs of the Government; and second, that the excess, whatever it may be, beyond the wants of the Government should be left with the people. Our contention, therefore, is upon the manner of the reduction and not upon the reduction itself; not that no reduction shall or ought to be made, but how and upon what principle can it best be accomplished. We agree, further, that the tax upon tobacco shall be removed and thus leave with the people $30,000,000 which they annually pay upon this domestic product. Were we men of business, governed by the principles which guide practical men of affairs, this burden would have been and could have been removed any time within the past two years, and if removed two years ago no surplus would now vex the Administration or alarm the business of the country. In passing, it is suitable that I should say that within the period named no hinderance from this side of the House would have been interposed to the abolition of this tax.

It is also suitable that I should say, for the sake of the truth of history, that gentlemen on this side and gentlemen on the other side of the House repeatedly made efforts during the last Congress to secure recognition for the purpose of offering a bill to abolish this tax, which request was refused by the presiding officer of the House, and refused, too, Mr. Chairman, when every intelligent representative on this floor knew that if an opportunity was given to vote upon a bill for the abolition of that tax it would have received not simply a majority, but the vote of fully two-thirds of the House. I repeat that if that had been done, if the House as then organized had given to the representatives of the people an opportunity to vote upon a simple proposition to reduce taxation, no immediate surplus would be now in the Treasury to interrupt and disturb the business of the country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But this tax was not abolished, and if done now still leaves about forty millions of revenue collected in excess of the public necessity. How can this amount be remitted with the least disturbance to the business and employments of the people?

This, Mr. Chairman, is the real, the practical question. At this point parties and individuals differ, and herein the two lines of political thought which have prevailed from the formation of the Government are clearly manifested, and present for consideration and the ultimate judgment of the people the division between the Republican and Democratic parties upon a purely economic question. I can not forbear, in this connection, to congratulate the country that upon this question our fellow-citizens of all sections and all nationalities, without regard to past party affiliations, unbiased by prejudice, and uninfluenced by passion, can divide. Here is presented an issue which leaves the past behind and looks only to the present and the future, an issue without a tinge or touch of sectionalism, which awakens none of the bitter memories of former discord or divisions, which appeals neither to race nor geographical lines, which knows no North, or South, or East, or West, but brings all within its sweep and contemplation, each dividing upon what each may honestly regard for the best interests and highest welfare of all; an issue which we can consider and discuss calmly and deliberately, having only in view the future of the individual citizen and the highest and best destiny of the Republic. In this spirit I welcome the issue so sharply, and I may say boldly, made by the President in his annual message and now further made by the bill under debate, and approach its consideration with the single purpose to reach if possible a conclusion which shall bring to the country and the whole country, with whose interests we are temporarily intrusted, the widest benefits and the most lasting good. [Applause.]

It will be freely confessed by our political opponents that this bill is but the beginning of a tariff policy marked out by the President, and is a partial response only to his message, to be followed up with additional legislation until our system of taxation shall be brought back to the ancient landmarks of the Democratic party, to a purely revenue basis; that is, that the tariff or duty put upon foreign importations shall hereafter look to revenue and revenue only, and discard all other considerations.

WHAT IS REVENUE TARIFF?

This brings us face to face, therefore, with the two opposing systems, that of a revenue as distinguished from a protective tariff, and upon their respective merits they must stand or fall. Now, what are they? First, what is a revenue tariff? Upon what principle does it rest? It is a tariff or tax placed upon such articles of foreign production imported here as will produce the largest revenue with the smallest tax; or, as Robert J. Walker, late Secretary of the Treasury and author of the tariff of 1846, from whom the advocates of the measure draw their inspiration, put it:

> The only true maxim is that which experience demonstrates will bring in each case the largest revenue at the lowest rate of duty, and that no duty be imposed upon any article above the lowest rate which will yield the largest amount of revenue. The revenue (said Mr. Walker), from ad valorem duties last year (1845) exceeded that realized from specific duties, although the average of the ad valorem duties was only 23.57 per cent. and the average of the specific duties 41.30 per cent., presenting another strong proof that the lower duties increase the revenue.

To secure larger revenue from lower duties necessitates largely increased importations, and if these compete with domestic products the latter must be diminished or find other and distant and I may say impossible markets or get out of the way altogether. A genuine revenue tariff imposes no tax upon foreign importations the like of which are produced at home, or, if produced at home, in quantities not capable of supplying the home consumption, in which case it may be truthfully aid the tax is added to the foreign cost and is paid by the consumer.

A revenue tariff seeks out those articles which domestic production can not supply, or only inadequately supply, and which the wants of our people demand, and imposes the duty upon them, and permits as far as possible the competing foreign product to be imported free of duty. This principle is made conspicuous in the bill under consideration; for example, wool, a competing foreign product, which our own flock-masters can fully supply for domestic wants, is put upon the free-list, while sugar, with a home product of only one-eleventh of the home consumption, is left dutiable.

Any tax levied upon a foreign product which is a necessity to our people, and which we can not fully supply, will produce revenue in amount only measured by our necessities and ability to buy. In a word, foreign productions not competing with home productions are the proper subjects for taxation under a revenue tariff, and in case these do not furnish the requisite revenue a low duty is put upon the foreign product competing with the domestic one—low enough to encourage and stimulate importations, and low enough to break down eventually domestic competition. For example, the duty proposed under this bill upon cotton bagging will extinguish the industry here, and under its provisions we would import all of that product from Calcutta and Dundee. A large revenue would come from this source, because the foreign would take the place of the domestic production. This duty is a revenue one, and gives no protection whatever to the home producer. If it did it would not be a revenue tariff. As the Cobden school of political science puts it, "The moment it is made clear that a tax is a benefit to home producers then the free-trade dogma condemns it. The test is simple and easy of application. Free-trade or a revenue tariff does not allow any import duties being imposed on such articles as are likewise produced at home." Or if produced at home a revenue tariff would soon destroy their production.

WHAT IS A PROTECTIVE TARIFF?

What is a protective tariff? It is a tariff upon foreign imports so adjusted as to secure the necessary revenue, and judiciously imposed upon those foreign products the like of which are produced at home or the like of which we are capable of producing at home. [Applause.] It imposes the duty upon the competing foreign product; it makes it bear the burden or duty, and, as far as possible, luxuries only excepted, permits the non-competing foreign product to come in free of duty. Articles of common use, comfort, and necessity which we can not produce here it sends to the people untaxed and free from custom-house exactions. [Applause.] Tea, coffee, spices, and drugs are such articles, and under our system are upon the free-list. It says to our foreign competitor, if you want to bring your merchandise here, your farm products here, your coal and iron ore, your wool, your salt, your pottery, your glass, your cottons and woolens, and sell alongside of our producers in our markets, we will make your product bear a duty; in effect, pay for the privilege of doing it. [Applause on the Republican side.] Our kind of a tariff makes the competing foreign article carry the burden, draw the load, supply the revenue; and in performing this essential office it encourages at the same time our own industries and protects our own people in their chosen employments. [Applause.] That is the mission and purpose of a protective tariff. That is what we mean to maintain, and any measure which will destroy it we shall firmly resist, and if beaten on this floor we will appeal from your decision to the people, before whom parties and policies must at last be tried. [Applause.] We have free trade among ourselves throughout thirty-eight States and the Territories and among sixty millions of people. Absolute freedom of exchange within our own borders and among our own citizens is the law of the Republic. Reasonable taxation and restraint upon those without is the dictate of enlightened patriotism and the doctrine of the Republican party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Free trade in the United States is founded upon a community of equalities and reciprocities. It is like the unrestrained freedom and reciprocal relations and obligations of a family. Here we are one country, one language, one allegiance, one standard of citizenship, one flag, one Constitution, one nation, one destiny. It is otherwise with foreign nations, each a separate organism, a distinct and independent political society organized for its own, to protect its own, and work out its own destiny. We deny to those foreign nations free trade with us upon equal terms with our own producers. [Applause.] The foreign producer has no right or claim to equality with our own. He is not amenable to our laws. There are resting upon him none of the obligations of citizenship. He pays no taxes. He performs no civil duties; is subject to no demands for military service. He is exempt from State, county, and municipal obligations. He contributes nothing to the support, the progress, and glory of the nation. Why should he enjoy unrestrained equal privileges and profits in our markets with our producers, our labor, and our tax-payers? Let the gentleman who follows me answer. [Applause.] We put a burden upon his productions, we discriminate against his merchandise, because he is alien to us and our interests, and we do it to protect our own, defend our own, preserve our own, who are always with us in adversity and prosperity, in sympathy and purpose, and, if necessary, in sacrifice. [Applause.] That is the principle which governs us. I submit it is a patriotic and righteous one. In our own country, each citizen competing with the other in free and unresentful rivalry, while with the rest of the world all are united and together in resisting outside competition as we would foreign interference.

Free foreign trade admits the foreigner to equal privileges with our own citizens. It invites the product of foreign cheap labor to this market in competition with the domestic product, representing higher and better paid labor. It results in giving our money, our manufactures, and our markets to other nations, to the injury of our labor, our tradespeople, and our farmers. Protection keeps money, markets, and manufactures at home for the benefit of our own people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It is scarcely worth while to more than state the proposition that taxation upon a foreign competing product is more easily paid and less burdensome than taxation upon the non-competing product. In the latter it is always added to the foreign cost, and therefore paid by the consumer, while in the former, where the duty is upon the competing product, it is largely paid in the form of diminished profits to the foreign producer. [Applause.] It would be burdensome beyond endurance to collect our taxes from the products, professions, and labor of our own people.

THE BILL WILL NOT REDUCE THE REVENUE.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is a bill ostensibly to reduce the revenue. It will not do it. Take from this bill its internal-revenue features, its reduction of twenty-four and a half million dollars from tobacco and from special licenses to dealers in spirits and tobacco, eliminate these from the bill and you will not secure a dollar of reduction to the Treasury under its operation. Your $27,000,000 of proposed reduction by the free-list will be more than offset by the increased revenues which shall come from your lower duties; and I venture the prediction here to-day that if this bill should become a law, at the end of the fiscal year 1889 the dutiable list under it will carry more money into the Treasury than is carried into the Treasury under the present law, because with every reduction of duties upon foreign imports you stimulate and increase foreign importations; and to the extent that you increase foreign importations, to that extent you increase the revenue.

THE INCONSISTENCIES OF THE BILL.

There is another singular thing in connection with this bill, and I have nowhere seen attention called to it. Now I do not intend to examine the bill item by item. The minority of the Committee on Ways and Means (whose views, on behalf of my political associates I presented) went sufficiently over the bill in detail. But there are a few striking things in the bill which the country ought to understand. No one would have supposed from hearing this discussion but that the bill reduced duties all along the line. You never would have suspected, had you listened to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS], or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], or the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM], or other gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee, that this bill increased duties, would you? How many men on the other side of the House know what is in this bill to-day? I would like to poll them. [Laughter].

Now, here is a single item, steel billets. The present duty on steel billets is 45 per cent. ad valorem. In this bill it is increased to $11 per ton, which is equivalent to 68.33 per cent.—an advance of 45 per cent. Do you know what is made out of these steel billets? Wire fencing, which incloses the great fields of the West; and the raw material is increased 45 per cent. by this bill; and if the principle of the gentlemen who advocate the bill be true, that the duty is added to the cost, every pound of wire fencing that goes to the West will be increased from one-quarter to one-half a cent a pound; all this under a Democratic bill. What else is made out of steel billets? Nails, which everybody uses, which enter into the every-day uses of the people. The duty upon nails is reduced 25 per cent., and the raw material is increased 45 per cent. [Laughter.] As a friend near me suggests, when one end goes up the other goes down; and the latter, I trust, will be the fate of this bill. [Laughter.]

Why, sir, the duty on wire fencing is only 45 per cent. ad valorem; yet the billet from which wire fencing is made must pay in this bill 63 per cent. Here [illustrating] is a piece of wire rod drawn from these steel billets, and which finally goes into fencing. That is dutiable at 45 per cent. under this bill; and the steel from which it is made is dutiable at 63 per cent. What do you think of "raw material for manufactures? [Laughter.] No account is here taken of the labor required to draw the rods.

But, Mr. Chairman, that is not all which is remarkable about this bill, this great bill which is based upon principle, it is said, which the President stands behind and beneath, and which he insists shall be passed, whether or no, in this House, and for the passage of which he is dispensing official favors; for, as the Post, of this city, says, "there is an Allentown for every SOWDEN." [Laughter and applause.]

What else? Here, for example, are cotton-ties; which present another queer freak in this bill. Everybody knows what cotton-ties are; they are hoop-iron cut into lengths just large enough to go round a bale of cotton. Now, if the Southern cotton-planter wants some of this hoop-iron with which to bale his cotton, he goes to the custom-house at New York or Charleston and cuts off all he wants; and he does not have to pay a cent of duty; but if the farmer-constituent of my friend who sits before me [Mr. NELSON], or your farmer-constituent, want some hoop-iron of precisely the same width and thickness, and goes to the custom-house to get it, the Government makes it pay one cent and a half of duty upon every pound he takes, while it lets the cotton-planter take his for nothing. If the Western farmer wants it for his bucket or his barrel or to go on his wagon-bed, or if the washerwoman wants it for her washtub, every one of these must pay a cent and a half a pound, under the philosophy of the gentlemen who framed this bill, while the cotton-planter gets his absolutely free of duty.

Gentlemen, is that fair? I appeal to Southern men who sit before me; I appeal to Northern Democrats who sit around me; is that fair upon any principle of justice or fair play? Talk about sectionalism! You raise the question in your bill; you make a sectional issue which I deeply regret, and I am sure you must upon serious reflection.

There are some other features in this bill which are a little singular. The proposed duty on white lead is 2 cents a pound, while orange mineral, which is made from white lead, is reduced to one cent and a half a pound. [Laughter.] That is another case of high duty upon raw material and low duty upon the finished product.

Why, what in the world, Mr. Chairman, has this bill done for the people anyhow? What has it done for the farmer? It has taken the duty practically off of everything he grows; I will not stop to give the items. It makes free practically every product of the farm, the forest, and mine.

It takes the duty off of wool. What does it give the grower in return? Does it give him anything free? Everything he buys is dutiable. The coat he wears, the hat that covers his head, his shoes, his stockings, his sugar, his rice, everything bears a duty and substantially everything he raises put on the free-list.

The duty on wool must go. What has this Democratic party given the agriculturists in return for this slaughter of their interests? I

have looked this bill up and down, and I will tell you what they have done for the farmer. They have given him free sheep-dip. [Laughter and applause.] Sheep-dip is made free and the duty is released. My distinguished friend from Virginia [Mr. LEE], who honors me with his presence here, knows what this article is. It is a preparation which is used on sheep. It is made up largely of the stems of tobacco. It has got a little sulphur in it, I believe; it has got a little lime in it. They put that on the free-list, and that is all they do for the farmer. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. What good is that to the farmer after they have destroyed his flocks?

Mr. MCKINLEY. None. They leave the shears he clips his wool with at 45 per cent. ad valorem. They make his wool free and make the farmer pay 45 per cent. for the shears with which he clips his wool. [Laughter.]

But that is not all. The bell, the sheep bell—if my friend from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] is here, if that golden-shod shepherd from Worcester is here [laughter and applause], he will understand. It is the bell that is put around the neck of the sheep to admonish the shepherd of the whereabouts of the wandering flock under his charge. I am told the gentleman has got on the outside. I learn now he is here in his seat; I am glad to see him. He knows what I am talking about. [Laughter.]

They have left them dutiable at 45 per cent. ad valorem. Why, the sheep even will be ashamed of you, gentlemen. [Laughter.]

Tin plates are made free. What are tin plates made of? Ninety-seven and a half per cent. are sheet-iron or sheet-steel: 2½ per cent. tin. Tin plates are made free. Sheet-iron, sheet-steel are dutiable at 2 cents a pound. Now, I shall not tax you further with the details of the bill. I might spend hours in pointing out like inconsistencies. I will leave their further discussion for the five-minute debate. I only give these samples so that my honorable and learned friend from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] who replies to me, shall take them up and explain the principle on which these rates are fixed and these duties levied.

Mr. Chairman, there is another thing which I wish to call attention to in connection with this bill, and that is the internal-revenue part of it. It seems to have escaped attention. Now, so far as the abolition of the tax on tobacco is concerned we are all in accord; but this new feature of the bill provides for the repeal of the law which authorizes the destruction of illicit stills when found in unlawful use. Under the present law if you find a man engaged in unlawful distilling, not having paid the tax or secured the license, the officer is authorized to go and destroy the whole outfit. This bill repeals that section of the law and provides that the still shall neither be mutilated nor destroyed, but preserved presumably for future violations of the law. [Laughter and applause.]

And in this bill further provision is made that in case a man is arrested for illicit distilling, the judge is charged especially with the duty of looking well to his comfort and to his well-being while he is in the custody of the officials of the law. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

That provision does not apply to any other class of criminals under any of our statutes; but if a man is engaged in violating the revenue laws he must be tenderly looked after by the judge, who is directed to see that he is in every way made comfortable while serving out his sentence in prison. [Renewed laughter on the Republican side.]

THE VICIOUS AD VALOREM SYSTEM INTRODUCED IN BILL.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is one leading feature of this bill, which is not by any means the most objectionable feature, but which, if it stood alone, ought to defeat this entire measure; and that is the introduction of the ad valorem system of assessment to take the place of the specific system now generally in force. You all know the difference between the ad valorem system and the specific mode of levying duties. One is based upon value, the other upon quantity. One is based upon the foreign value, difficult of ascertainments, resting in the judgment of experts, all the time offering a bribe to undervaluation; the other rests upon quantity, fixed and well known the world over, always determinable and always uniform. The one is assessed by the yard-stick, the ton, and the pound-weight of commerce, and the other is assessed by the foreign value, fixed by the foreign importer or his agent in New York or elsewhere; fixed by the producer, fixed by anybody at any price to escape the payment of full duties. Why, the valuation under the ad valorem system is not even uniform throughout the United States.

My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], who listens to me now, knows that the valuations fixed upon imported goods at the port of Boston are often different from the valuations fixed on the same class of goods, costing the same, arriving in New York, Philadelphia, San Francisco, or Charleston.

So we do not have and can not have a uniform value, for the value is subject always to the cupidity or dishonesty of the foreign importer or producer. It is a system, sir, that has been condemned by all the leading nations of the world. There is not a leading nation that adheres to any considerable extent to the ad valorem rates of duty upon articles imported into its borders; and England has abandoned all ad valorem duties except one, for the very reason that there can be no honest administration of the revenue laws so long as the value is fixed thousands of miles away from the point of production and impossible of verification at home. Henry Clay said fifty years ago:

Let me fix the value of the foreign merchandise, and I do not care what your duty is.

Mr. Secretary Manning, in his very able report made to the last Congress, has gone over the entire question, and he publishes in a volume the opinions of the experts of the Treasury, the collectors, the naval officers, the special agents of the Department, all of them declaring that there is nothing left for the American Government to do but to abolish the ad valorem system and adopt the specific in the interest of the honest collection of the revenue and for the safety and security of reputable merchants. And the Secretary himself says in language too strong and plain to be misunderstood that it is the duty of Congress to abandon the ad valorem and establish specific duties.

I give below these opinions.

Naval officer Burt, of New York, says:

I have long been convinced that a change from ad valorem to specific rates would not only be a benefit to the revenues, but would go far to relieve their administration from the friction and inevitable injustice that have made it in a measure odious. I might give here a *résumé* of my reasons for this opinion, as frequently expressed officially hitherto, but I presume the Department is fully apprised of all the arguments adduced on either side. I will therefore simply say that the ad valorem system is theoretically the perfect system, and that this has engaged its support by those who have only had opportunity to view it as an abstract proposition. This prejudice in its favor must surely give way before the overwhelming evidences that in practice, particularly with high rates, it breeds injustice, contention, and commercial obstructions that are almost intolerable.

James D. Power, a special agent of the Treasury, in a report to the same Secretary, says:

Ad valorem rates of duty afford temptations and opportunities for fraud which can not be guarded against, even by the most rigid rules and vigilant watchfulness. The assessment of values under this system is based upon expert knowledge of values, the most uncertain and arbitrary method that could be devised. Under the ad valorem system fraud has prospered and demoralized the importing trade, which has passed from the hands of American citizens into the control of men who have taken advantage of our high import duties to enrich themselves at the expense of the revenue and the ruined trade of American wholesale firms. Fraud of this nature is difficult to detect and more difficult still to establish. In the absence of documentary proof it resolves itself into a mere difference of opinion between experts; and the owner of the suspected goods can at all times procure experts who will maintain the correctness of his invoice prices, or he may select an easier and more convincing and efficacious line of defense by procuring affidavits from his buyer or partner abroad to the effect that the invoice cost was the actual price paid for the goods

Messrs. L. G. Martin and A. K. Tingle, special agents, make the following statement to the Secretary:

There can be no doubt that a change from ad valorem to specific rates would help to diminish the tendency to corrupt action and loss to the revenue by the incompetency or indifference of appraisers. The application of specific rates to all textile fabrics would undoubtedly be a work of great difficulty, particularly as to woolen goods, but it is believed that a schedule can be prepared by the skilled officers in the appraiser's department, with the aid of manufacturers and merchants, which would be satisfactory to all interested, except those who are profiting by the present system of undervaluation.

The late Secretary Manning sums up the objections to ad valorem rates, and I beg to quote his language. He exposes the vice of the system which this bill seeks to engraft upon our legislation:

Whatever successful contrivances are in operation to-day to evade the revenue by false invoices, or by undervaluations, or by any other means, under an ad valorem system, will not cease even if the ad valorem rates shall have been largely reduced. They are incontestably, they are even notoriously inherent in that system.

One advantage, and perhaps the chief advantage of a specific over an ad valorem system is in the fact that, under the former, duties are levied by a positive test, which can be applied by our officers while the merchandise is in possession of the Government, and according to a standard which is altogether national and domestic. That would be partially true of an ad valorem system levied upon "home value;" but there are constitutional impediments in the way of such a system which appear to be insuperable. But under an ad valorem system, the facts to which the ad valorem rate is to be applied must be gathered in places many thousand miles away, and under circumstances most unfavorable to the administration of justice. One hears it often said that if our ad valorem rates did not exceed 25 or 30 per cent. undervaluation and temptation to undervaluation would disappear; but the records of this Department for the years 1817, 1840, and 1857 do not uphold that conclusion.

This one feature of the bill ought to be enough to insure its defeat, and if the party associates of the late Secretary had given heed to his sound utterances this vicious mode of assessment would have no place in the bill. Instead of simplifying the collection of the revenues as the title of the bill declares, it will increase the difficulties now experienced, encourage fraudulent invoices, promote undervaluation, impair the revenue, and do incalculable injury to honest importers and merchants.

THE GENERAL EFFECT OF PROTECTION.

I now come to consider the general effect of the protective system upon our people and their employments. There is no conflict of interests and should be none between the several classes of producers and the consumers in the United States. Their interests are one, interrelated and interdependent. That which benefits one benefits all; one man's work has relation with every other man's work in the same community; each is an essential part of the grand result to be attained, and that statesmanship which would seek to array the one against the other for any purpose is narrow, unworthy, and unpatriotic. The President's message is unhappily in that direction. The discussion had on

this floor has taken that turn. Both have been calculated to create antagonisms where none existed.

The farmer, the manufacturer, the laborer, the tradesman, and the producer and the consumer all have a common interest in the maintenance of a protective tariff. All are alike and equally favored by the system which you seek to overthrow. It is a national system, broad and universal in its application; if otherwise it should be abandoned. It can not be invoked for one section or one interest to the exclusion of others. It must be general in its application within the contemplation of the principle upon which the system is founded. We have been living under it for twenty-seven continuous years, and it can be asserted with confidence that no country in the world has achieved such industrial advancement, and such marvelous progress in arts, science, and civilization as ours. Tested by its results, it has surpassed all other revenue systems.

From 1789 to 1888, a period of ninety-nine years, there have been forty-seven years when a Democratic revenue-tariff policy has prevailed, and fifty-two years under the protective policy, and it is a noteworthy fact that the most progressive and prosperous periods of our history in every department of human effort and material development were during the fifty-two years when the protective party was in control and protective tariffs were maintained; and the most disastrous years—years of want and wretchedness, ruin and retrogression, eventuating in insufficient revenues and shattered credits, individual and national—were during the free-trade or revenue-tariff eras of our history. No man living who passed through any of the latter periods but would dread their return, and would flee from them as he would escape from fire and pestilence; and I believe the party which promotes their return will merit and receive popular condemnation. What is the trouble with our present condition? No country can point to greater prosperity or more enduring evidences of substantial progress among all the people. Too much money is being collected, it is said. We say stop it; not by indiscriminate and vicious legislation, but by simple business methods. Do it on simple, practical lines and we will help you. Buy up the bonds, objectionable as it may be, and pay the nation's debts, if you can not reduce taxation. You could have done this long ago. Nobody is chargeable for the failure and delay but your own Administration.

Who is objecting to our protective system? From what quarter does the complaint come? Not from the enterprising American citizen; not from the manufacturer; not from the laborer, whose wages it improves; not from the consumer, for he is fully satisfied, because under it he buys a cheaper and a better product than he did under the other system; not from the farmer, for he finds among the employés of the protected industries his best and most reliable customers; not from the merchant or the tradesman, for every hive of industry increases the number of his customers and enlarges the volume of his trade. Few, indeed, have been the petitions presented to this House asking for any reduction of duties upon imports. None, that I have seen or heard of, and I have watched with the deepest interest the number and character of these petitions that I might gather from them the drift of public sentiment—I say I have seen none asking for the passage of this bill, or for any such departure from the fiscal policy of the Government so long recognized and followed, while against this legislation there has been no limit to petitions, memorials, prayers, and protests, from producer and consumer alike.

NO PUBLIC DEMAND FOR SUCH A MEASURE.

This measure is not called for by the people; it is not an American measure it is inspired by importers and foreign producers, most of them aliens, who want to diminish our trade and increase their own; who want to decrease our prosperity and augment theirs, and who have no interest in this country except what they can make out of it. To this is added the influence of the professors in some of our institutions of learning, who teach the science contained in books and not that of practical business. I would rather have my political economy founded upon the every-day experience of the puddler or the potter than the learning of the professor, the farmer and factory hand than the college faculty. Then there is another class who want protective tariffs overthrown. They are the men of independent wealth, with settled and steady incomes, who want everything cheap but currency; the value of everything clipped but coin—cheap labor but dear money. These are the elements which are arrayed against us.

Men whose capital is invested in productive enterprises, who take the risks of business, men who expend their capital and energy in the development of our resources, they are in favor of the maintenance of the protective system. The farmer, the rice-grower, the miner, the vast army of wage-earners from one end of the country to the other, the chief producers of wealth, men whose capital is their brain and muscle, who aspire to better their condition and elevate themselves and their fellows; the young man whose future is yet before him, and which he must carve out with his hand and head, who is without the aid of fortune or of a long ancestral line, these are our steadfast allies in this great contest for the preservation of the American system. Experience and results in our own country are our best adoisers, and they vindicate beyond the possibility of dispute the worth and wisdom of the system.

What country can show such a trade as ours, such commerce, such immense transportation lines, such a volume of exchanges, and such marvelous production from the raw material to the finished product. Its balance-sheet is without a parallel in the world's history—richest in agriculture, greatest in its domestic trade and traffic, and leading in manufactures any nation in Europe. Why abandon a policy which can point to such achievements and whose trophies are to be seen on every hand? The internal commerce of the United States is greater than the entire foreign commerce of Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Holland, Belgium, and Austria-Hungary. Why, a single railroad system in this country (that of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company) carries more tonnage and traffic in a single year than all the merchant ships of Great Britain. The whole of Europe has not built as many miles of railroad as this country has during some recent years, and in 1880 the whole known world did not lay as many miles of track as were laid across this country. Great Britain's foreign commerce equals about one-sixth of our domestic commerce. Can we do better under any other fiscal policy? We say not. Wise statesmanship commands us, therefore, to let well enough alone.

Sir Edward Sullivan, in a recent article in the London Post, makes these suggestive comparisons, which I beg every gentleman to hear:

Under free trade the masses must get poorer, because they get less employment. A well-known statistical work gives a comparison of the material progress of France under protection and England under free trade. If there is any truth in figures it ought to startle us from our free-trade dream.

The comparison is based on the returns of legacy duty:

In 1826 England was 10*s.* a head richer than France.
In 1850 England was 19*s.* a head richer than France.
In 1877 England was 5*s.* a head poorer than France.

France has 57 per cent. of her land under tillage, and it is increasing every year.

The United Kingdom has 30 per cent. of land under tillage, and it is diminishing every year, but the population of England increases much more rapidly than the population of France.

The commerce of England has increased 21 per cent. in ten years.
The commerce of France has increased 39 per cent. in ten years.
The commerce of the United States has increased 68 per cent. in ten years.
The commerce of the world has increased 26 per cent. in ten years.
So much for the blasting effect of free trade.

In Germany, so long ago as the 14th of May, 1882, Bismarck, in a speech before the German Reichstag, paid to the Republican tariff high eulogy. He said:

The success of the United States in material development is the most illustrious of modern time. The American nation has not only successfully borne and suppressed the most gigantic and expensive war of all history, but immediately afterward disbanded its Army, found employment for all its soldiers and marines, paid off most of its debt, given labor and homes to all the unemployed of Europe as fast as they could arrive within its territory, and still by a system of taxation so indirect as not to be perceived, much less felt. Because it is my deliberate judgment that the prosperity of America is mainly due to its system of protective laws, I urge that Germany has now reached that point where it is necessary to imitate the tariff system of the United States.

You may try protection by any test you will. You may try it not only by the condition of the individual citizen and his happiness and prosperity and the aggregate prosperity of the nation, but try it by the progress which has been made in invention and scientific development; try it by any standard you may raise, the protective system shows by its results that it surpasses any other. You can match it with no other.

Go to the Patent Office and examine the evidences furnished from that great register of the products of American genius. Take the States which have stood by the protective system, which have believed in it, which have been built up under it, and contrast them with the States whose Representatives have stood in unyielding opposition to the system on this floor. See what result you get. Take Connecticut, a little State, but a manufacturing one. In the year 1887 there were 788 patents granted to the inhabitants of that State, 1 for every 790 of its inhabitants, while for Arkansas the number of patents granted was 65, 1 for every 12,346. Take Massachusetts: In 1887 there were 1,875 patents granted to the people of that State, 1 to every 950 of her population, while to Kentucky there were 245 patents granted, or 1 to every 6,729 of her population. Take Illinois: 1,595 patents were granted to her people, 1 to every 1,929 of her population, while for Georgia there were 130, or 1 in every 11,862 of her population. Here is the list:

[From the Commissioner's report, 1887.]

States.	Patents.	One to every inhabitant.
Connecticut	788	790
Arkansas	65	12,346
Massachusetts	1,875	950
Illinois	1,595	1,929
Kentucky	245	6,729
Georgia	130	11,862
New Jersey	988	1,144
Louisiana	112	8,392
New York	4,047	1,255
Mississippi	45	25,146
Ohio	1,477	2,165
North Carolina	66	21,208
Pennsylvania	2,109	2,030
South Carolina	52	19,145
Rhode Island	224	1,234
Tennessee	121	12,746
Vermont	112	2,905
Virginia	132	11,458
California	565	1,712
Texas	265	6,006

These figures need no comment; they point their own moral; they enforce their own lesson. They demonstrate better than any argument that I can make that invention and progress and the general diffusion of knowledge follow manufacturing and industrial enterprises. [Applause.]

A HOME MARKET.

Why, Mr. Chairman, the establishment of a furnace or factory or mill in any neighborhood has the effect at once to enhance the value of all property and all values for miles surrounding it. They produce increased activity. The farmer has a better and a nearer market for his products. The merchant, the butcher, the grocer, have an increased trade. The carpenter is in greater demand; he is called upon to build more houses. Every branch of trade, every avenue of labor, will feel almost immediately the energizing influence of a new industry. The truck farm is in demand; the perishable products, the fruits, the vegetables, which in many cases will not bear exportation and which a foreign market is too distant to be available, find a constant and ready demand at good paying prices.

What the agriculturist of this country wants more than anything else, after he has gathered his crop, are consumers, consumers at home, men who do not produce what they eat, who must purchase all they consume; men who are engaged in manufacturing, in mining, in cotton-spinning, in the potteries, and in the thousands of productive industries which command all their time and energy, and whose employments do not admit of their producing their own food.

The American agriculturist further wants these consumers near and convenient to his field of supply. Cheap as inland transportation is, every mile saved is money made. Every manufacturing establishment in the United States, wherever situated, is of priceless value to the farmers of the country. The six manufacturing States of New England aptly illustrate the great value of a home market to the Western farmer. These States have reached the highest perfection in skill and manufactures. They do not raise from their own soil, with the exceptions of hay and potatoes, but a small fraction of what their inhabitants require and consume; they could not from their own fields and granaries feed the population which they had in 1830, much less their present population. The most intense revenue-reformer, the most unenlightened Democrat, will have to confess that New England is indebted in large part for her splendid development to the protective system. Now, has her prosperity and progress been secured at the sacrifice of other interests and other sections? I answer no, but has brought, as I believe I shall be able to show, a positive blessing to all of our 60,000,000 of people.

In 1880 the population of these six States was over 4,000,000. The food products required by their people, the very necessities of their daily life in a large measure, came from other States and remote sections of the Union. They raised in 1880 but one-quarter of 1 per cent. of the total wheat production of the United States. They raised in the same year but one-half of 1 per cent. of the total crop of Indian corn, 2½ per cent. of the oats, 12 per cent. of the hay, and 13 per cent. of the potatoes which were produced in the United States. What did they consume? What did they buy of the Western farmer? Fifty millions of dollars' worth of meat were consumed by their industrial people in a single year. The extent of their needs is strikingly shown by the fact (obtained from the accounts of Commissioner Fink, that during the year 1884 "the trunk lines" brought into New England no less than 470,000 tons of flour and 950,000 tons of grain. At 200 pounds to the barrel of flour, this is an importation of 4,700,000 barrels, or one and one-fifth, nearly, for each inhabitant. During the same year there were exported from Boston and Portland, the only points in New England from which breadstuffs are sent abroad, 2,100,000 barrels of flour, leaving for consumption within these States 2,600,000 barrels. These figures take no account of the large trade by water from New York. I am informed that a large part of the flour consumed in Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Southern Massachusetts is received in this way, but no reliable statistics are available. It is reasonable, however, to suppose, and this comes to me from what I deem good authority, that the amount thus received and consumed offsets a large portion of the foreign exports to which I have referred.

Of the grain received during the same year rather less than 400,000 tons were exported, leaving for New England consumption 550,000 tons, for all of which these States were the customers of the West in addition to the amount grown upon their own soil. In addition to this, New England consumed, in 1886–'87 in her factories nearly one-fourth of the entire cotton crop of the country. More than this, she used in her woolen mills in 1880 fully one-half of the entire wool clip of the United States, and during the year 1886 she consumed more than one-sixth of the entire anthracite-coal production of the country and 5½ per cent. of the bituminous-coal production, and every pound of both came from the Middle and Southern States.

Is not New England (I appeal to the gentlemen of the other side, I appeal to the farmers of the country) worth preserving? Is not the industrial system which makes such a community of consumers for agricultural products possible worth maintaining? Does not she furnish you a market worth fostering? Does not she give you a trade and an exchange of products worth your while to guard with the most considerate care? And does not her condition indicate the wisdom of the policy we advocate? Is not her market better for you than a foreign one? Is not New England a better customer for you, more reliable, more easily reached, more stable, than Old England? [Applause on the Republican side.] Is not Boston a better consumer for the people of the United States than London, New York than Liverpool, Pittsburgh than Manchester, Cincinnati than Birmingham? [Applause on the Republican side.]

New England buys of you for all her wants; Old England takes not a pound or a bushel from you except what she must have and can not get elsewhere.

Now, let us contrast this home market of New England with the foreign market of Old England. In 1880 New England consumed 540,000,000 pounds of cotton, at 11.61 a pound, which in value then amounted to $62,695,000, 20 per cent. greater than the per capita value of all our domestic exports to the United Kingdom, and this was only New England's contribution to the Southern producers of cotton. She sends at least $70,000,000 to the West and Northwest for her food supplies. She sends to the wool-growers of the Middle, Western, and Pacific States $40,000,000 annually for their fleeces. I repeat, is not this market worth preserving, ay, cherishing, and does it not make us long to have New England thrift, New England enterprise, and New England politics more generally distributed throughout all sections of the country? [Applause on the Republican side.]

You can destroy this valuable home market by such legislation is as proposed in this bill; you can diminish this demand for food, for cotton, for wool, for flax, and hemp produced in other sections of the country by following the delusive theories of our friends on the other side of the House; you can diminish the capacity of the operatives to buy of you by diminishing their wages; you can drive them from the cotton and woolen factories to the farms; they will then drift to the West and Northwest, not to engage in manufacture, but in a great measure to become tillers of the soil, and instead of being as they are now, and as they will be under a proper tariff system, your consumers, they become your competitors. They go from the ranks of consumers to the ranks of producers; diminish the consumers and increase the producers. The foreign market for agricultural products is one of the delusions of free trade. If it ever had any real substance as against a good home market that has long since disappeared.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee says to the Western farmer, "Let New England go. Pass her by and go to Old England." Well, that is about as practical as the Democratic party ordinarily is. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. DUNN, a prominent member of this House and chairman of one of its leading committees, and I remember to have heard him say what I now read from the RECORD:

> The wheat producer of the Northwest is standing face to face with the wheat producer of India. A few years ago India shipped 40,000 bushels of wheat. Last year (1885) she put into the market 40,000,000 bushels. Can you protect the Northwest farmer against that labor? India can put wheat down in the markets of consumption in Europe cheaper than we can transport it from the fields of production to the markets of consumption; that is to say, India can produce and market her wheat in Europe for what it costs the farmer of the Northwest to transport his to the market of consumption, without allowing him for the cost of production. In other words, the transportation of wheat costs the American farmer as much as both transportation and production cost the India farmer.

In the face of a statement like this, from such high Democratic authority, how, I ask, is the wheat of the American farmer to reach the European market with any profit to our producers? And yet it is to this kind of competition the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee invites the American farmer. Do the farmers want such a market with such a competition? What their answer will be no man can doubt. They reject with indignation and scorn the chairman's moriation. [Applause.] The home market is the best, besides being the safest. It has got the most money to spend, and spends the most. It consumes the most; it is therefore the most profitable.

The masses of our people live better than any people in the world. Great Britain only buys our food products when she has not enough of her own and can reach no other supply. This market, therefore, is fitful and fluctuating, and can not be relied upon as we can rely upon our own consumers. The foreign market under a revenue tariff for agricultural products has not been encouraging in our own experience in the past. It promises less under such a system in the future.

INCREASED IMPORTATIONS THE PURPOSE OF THE BILL.

The chairman of the committee in opening this debate boldly announced that we must increase foreign importations to secure national prosperity. How much does the gentleman and the party with which he is associated desire to increase importations? Are they not large enough already? Are they not now crowding our producers and diminishing their annual productions? Are they not already making labor restless, filling it with apprehension and uncertainty as to the future? Is this country to be the dumping ground of foreigh products? During the last fiscal year over $233,000,000 in value of foreign merchandise was imported into the United States free of duty, and over $450,000,000 additional was imported which paid a duty. Is this not enough? Do the iron and steel workers want further importations in their line, representing cheap labor, to compete with the product of their labor? Over $50,000,000 in value of iron and steel manufactures was imported last year, every dollar of which repre-

sented foreign capital and foreign labor, which might well have been produced at home. Every ton could have been made here, and American hands were waiting to make it.

How much labor do you suppose was represented by the $50,000,000 worth of iron and steel that came into this country last year? It would have taken 1,740 puddlers and helpers, working every day for 300 days in the year, to have produced the scrap-iron that came from Europe last year. It would have taken 2,500 men 300 days to have produced the bar and structural iron, and steel billets, and slabs, and ingots which were imported into the United States last year. It would have taken 300 men 300 days, besides those engaged in preparing the raw material, to have produced the plates and sheets, the corrugated iron, and the steel in various forms imported last year. It would have taken 3,700 men 300 days to have made the wire rods and the nails and the screws and wire in various shapes which were imported into the United States last year. It would have taken 800 men 300 days to have made the washers, and the bolts, and the fish-plates, and railway-plates, the steel tire, hinge-iron, and tubes of steel which were imported into this country last year. It would have taken 500 men 300 days to have made the iron and steel rails which were brought into the United States from abroad last year. It would have taken 24,000 men to manufacture the tin-plate imported last year. Summing up these figures 33,540 men, working for 300 days, would have been required to produce the $50,000,000 worth of iron and steel which we imported last year. Do you want that volume increased? Ten million sixty-two thousand is the aggregate number of days' work that were taken from American workingmen, every day's work of which they could have performed, and were waiting ready to perform. [Applause.] Including all branches of labor required to manufacture the fifty millions of imported iron and steel and the manufacture thereof, taking into account the labor employed in the mining, transportation, and manipulation of the raw materials, and it would employ nearly, if not quite, one hundred thousand men.

I do not know what you think about it; but I would not permit a single ton of steel to come into the United States if our own labor could make it. [Applause.] Let American labor, as far as practicable, manufacture American products. [Applause.] And if you do not like it, you know what you can do. [Laughter.] This Government is made for Americans, native-born and naturalized; and every pound, every bushel, every ton, every yard of foreign product that comes into this country to compete with ours deprives American labor of what justly belongs to it.

Do the farmers want increased importations of agricultural products? Of barley alone there were $6,152,000 of value imported last year, and of vegetables a value of $2,276,000. The total imports of the products of agriculture for the year 1887 free and dutiable were in value $197,308,240. Of this sum $46,678,443 was admitted free of duty and the remainder paid a duty. Do the agriculturists want the duties all removed and their products driven from this market. Seven million three hundred thousand dollars' worth of foreign glass came into this country last year. Do the glass-blowers want this volume increased? Five million five hundred and forty-five thousand dollars' worth of pottery of foreign make entered our market last year. Do the potters want this vast sum augmented? Will the wool-growers who were compelled to compete with $16,000,000 worth of foreign wool last year relish the prospect of having their product further displaced next year; and the labor engaged in woolen manufactories in this country, are they anxious that the $44,000,000 worth of woolen goods imported in 1887 in competition with the products of their labor shall be multiplied in 1889? All these importations will be greatly increased if this bill shall become a law. Every invoice of foreign goods which comes here the like of which we can make crowds out just so much American labor. Is there to be no limit to this foreign invasion?

I answer, only to the extent that our people shall make importations impossible by reducing the cost of the home product. This will be the only restraint upon foreign merchandise glutting this market to the displacement of our own. If our present labor conditions are maintained—and this bill gets upon our statute-book—there will be no barrier in the way of a perfect inundation of foreign goods in the United States. It should not be forgotten that low duties or no duties substitute foreign imports for home-made and home-grown products, and to the extent of such substitution take work and wages from American labor. The effect of this bill, and there can be no other, is to increase importations, displace our own products by foreign ones, diminish the output of our factories and mills, curtail the demand for labor, and reduce the wages of those who may be able to get work. This result is as clear and manifest to me as the simplest mathematical problem, and we have only to look at the wage scale of competing nations to know what our labor will come to with free trade or its equivalent. We can not compete with foreign nations without the restraint of a tariff unless we have equal conditions and equal labor cost. To do this we must introduce European conditions and European methods in the United States, and that is what this bill and all similar legislation mean.

"The trammels of trade must be removed" is the language employed by the friends of this bill. How and in what way? First, by removing the duty from raw materials used in manufacture, which of necessity will be at the expense and loss of those engaged in preparing them. But to a tariff reformer that is of little account. This trammel must go, to enable the domestic manufacturer to compete with the foreign manufacturer at home and abroad. After this, and next in order, the trammel of high wages must be removed. This is the most important and essential of all. This is the chief obstruction. Free raw material will not equalize the condition of manufacturers at home with those abroad. Cheap labor, underpaid labor, underfed labor will be the next demand of the advocates of this bill. Some of them have been frank enough to avow it already. This is the inexorable logic of the situation. If we are to control the whole of our own market and send our manufactures across the sea, it can be accomplished in one way only, by reducing the cost of the home product to the same or below the cost of the foreign product. To do this every intelligent man knows involves an enormous reduction of the wages of American workingmen. To this a revenue tariff comes at last and from which there is no escape and against it every true American interest cries out in an emphatic and earnest protest.

I propose a wiser and more patriotic solution of the difficulties of our financial situation. If we will buy more American goods and less foreign, we will reduce the income of the Government and leave and increase the surplus among the people. If we will buy more American merchandise and less of foreign make, manufactures at home will run the year round and labor will be suitably rewarded and steadily employed. If we had some of that lofty patriotism evinced by the fathers, if we were more American in feeling, sentiment, and purpose, there would be fewer advocates of this bill.

AMERICAN WAGES AGAINST EUROPEAN WAGES.

There has been much effort made in this debate to show that, after all, American workingmen get no better pay than the workingmen of other countries. Let us consider this branch of the discussion for a little while, for if it be true that labor here is no better rewarded than elsewhere, then the strength of protection is much weakened. I beg to cite, against the unsupported statements of the gentlemen who have already spoken upon the other side, the testimony of American workingmen whose opportunity for information from experience in both countries, and otherwise, makes their evidence incontrovertible. From the statements made March 10, 1886, before the Committee on Ways and Means, I read. Some of this testimony is two years old, but the only reason it is so is because laboring men were not permitted to testify this year. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Roger Evans, workingman, speaking upon this subject, said:

Of course you must not gauge the American workingman by the amount of coarse bread and meat which will be necessary for him to subsist upon. It can not be. The American workingman must have other things than those. He must be fed and clothed and be able to maintain his family as becomes the dignity of an American citizen.

Another, Mr. Philip Hagan, spoke as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I was born under a free-trade government, and I believe that that free-trade government deprived me of an education. The reason of that was that I had to go to work when I was eight years of age; and I remember also my little brother going to work under that free-trade government when he was eight years of age. I remember well when there was a family of nine of us (including my father and mother), and when my wages for working in a mill were 10 cents per day. That was under a free-trade government. Subsequently I went up higher there to 5 shillings a day, or $1.25. That was about the limit I could reach—six and sixpence a day—and having to pay 60 cents out of that to my helper.

Many members of this committee know all this just as well as I am stating it, and I am not going to detain you any longer; but I will state that as soon as my limited knowledge informed me that labor was protected in the United States I came here. I declared my intentions and I became a citizen of the United States. And now I have a family, and now I make regularly 14 shillings a day. The produce on which I lived in England came mostly from the United States, and certainly I ought to get it as cheap here as in England. I worked for 5 shillings a day in England, and I get 14 shillings a day here. Consequently I am able to send my children to school, and they are getting an education, which their father did not get under a free-trade government. I want to see these children raised up and educated as citizens.

[Applause.]

Mr. Thomas Williams said:

As American citizens we can not be compelled to subsist upon what the working people of England, France, or other European countries subsist upon. The people of this country have made it just what it is, and in a very great measure the workingmen have made it what it is. Some of us have come across the Atlantic, leaving the land of our birth, and have come here with the expectations that we were going to better our condition. We have bettered it in a great measure. We will get along if you will let us alone. The manufacturers and ourselves will fight our own battles.

Mr. Thomas P. Jones said:

I came to this country to better my condition, and I am happy to say that I have bettered my condition. I have made more wages than I ever made in the old country.

It has been shown here to-day, and, as I think, very clearly, that this tinkering with the tariff is not for the best interests of the country; is not for the best interests of the wealth-producers, of the men who built up this country. Then, gentlemen, I take it that it is your duty to throw this bill to the dogs. I certainly do not stand to dictate to you altogether in this matter, but I will assure you this far: that there is a school of education among the working people in this country, and that if this tinkering of the tariff is allowed to proceed; if you will, in spite of our remonstrances, go on destroying our interests and shutting up the industries of the country, our working people will be ere long sufficiently educated to step forth and say, "Gentlemen, thus far shall you go, and no farther." We will elect men and send them here to legislate for our interests if you will not do so. We have the power, gentlemen, and you know it.

Laborers in this country were never so cemented as they are to-day. One of

the principal things which has helped us to that is this very bill which the honorable chairman has brought before this committee. Where I live, in Chicago, you would be surprised to see the feeling that exists among the working classes. And why? Because some of the people there worked in this country in free-trade times. I have a brother-in-law who, in free-trade times, traveled to his work 6 miles in the morning, getting there at sun-up, worked all day, and walked home at sundown, and all for a paltry 50 cents a day. I also have worked for 50 cents a day, but not in this country, thank God. I have worked for 25 cents a day, but I do not want to have to do it again. I have seen in the city of Glasgow, in Scotland, men working for 12 cents a day and a bowl of soup. That does not become an American citizen. We can not have such a state of affairs here, and we will not have it.

I have a letter from Mr. William Barbour, of the Barbour Flax Spinning Company, of Paterson, N. J., under date of 31st of March, in which occurs the following:

DEAR SIR: As a stockholder and director of Barbour Flax-Spinning Company, of Paterson, N. J., I wish to make a statement to you regarding the flax-thread industry, and to call your attention to the effect which the proposed Mills bill would have upon it.

* * * * * * *

While I am an American born, and the industry I represent in Paterson, N. J., is thoroughly American, I am also a large stockholder in a flax-spinning company in Ireland; and that you may judge of the relative wages paid in the two countries, I would state that the pay-rolls of the two mills, as recently compared, differed only about $500, the number of hands in the Irish mill being 2,900 against 1,400 in the New Jersey mill.

* * * * * * *

Yours, truly,

WM. BARBOUR.

Hon. W. MCKINLEY, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

That is, 1,400 American laborers are paid the exact sum which 2,900 laborers are paid for the same labor in Ireland, and yet gentlemen would have us believe there is no difference in favor of the American workingman. [Applause.]

The Singer Sewing-Machine Company maintains a factory in Glasgow, Scotland, as well as its works in New Jersey. It employs one-third more hands in its Scotch establishment, yet the pay-roll there is only half that of its American works, the actual figures being $18,000 and $35,000.

Mr. HERBERT. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HERBERT. Can the gentleman tell me the price a sewing-woman in Scotland pays for a sewing-machine and the price a sewing-woman in New Jersey pays for the same kind of a sewing-machine?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Yes, sir; I am told the prices are about the same except a sewing-machine in Scotland costs more than a sewing-machine in America. [Laughter and applause.]

John H. Ross, superintendent Boston Thread and Twine Company, under date of April 23, 1888, says:

We are paying three times the average wages paid for similar labor throughout Europe.

Here is a letter under date of April 26, 1888, from the representatives of at least a half million workingmen of the United States:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April* 26, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Having seen by the papers that Mr. MILLS and others, in their speeches in the House of Representatives upon the tariff bill, have asserted the wages paid to labor were no higher in the United States than in Europe, we, the undersigned, desire to state, through you, to the members of Congress that such statements are misleading and false. Wages are higher in this country than in any other in the world. Notwithstanding the fact that the statements have been made by members on the floor of the House of Representatives that the tariff only benefits the manufacturer, and that they receive all the advantages from the protection given by the Government, we know that we receive our share of the benefits of protection on the industries we represent.

We therefore emphatically protest against any reduction of the duties that will bring us on a level with the low price paid for labor in Europe. We insist upon the maintenance of a strong protective tariff, in order to maintain an American standard of wages for American workingmen.

Respectfully yours,

WILLIAM WEIHE, *President of Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers.*
WM. MARTIN, *Secretary of Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers.*
JOHN CONKLING, *Master Workman National Assembly Iron and Steel Workers' Knights of Labor.*
JOHN COFFEY, *Master Workman Glass Blowers' Assembly* 149.
LOUIS ARRINGTON, *Master Workman Glass Blowers' Assembly* 143.
JAMES CAMPBELL, *President of Local Assembly* 300, *Knights of Labor, Window Glass Workers of America.*
WM. J. SMITH, *President American Flint Glass Workers' Union.*
WM. J. DILLON, *Secretary.*

Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY,
Washington, D. C.

This bill proposes to equalize American production with European production by bringing down American wages to the level of European wages, and, Mr. Chairman, I give you notice here to-day that you can not do it. [Applause.]

AGRICULTURAL WAGES.

Now as to farm wages here as contrasted with other countries. I have a letter from Mr. Dodge, the Statistician of the Agricultural Department:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF STATISTICS,
Washington, D. C., March 29, 1888.

The wages of white labor in agriculture in this country is about $24 per month.

In England, the average wages paid for agricultural labor, according to J. S. Jeans, in the Royal Agricultural Society's Journal, was about $12.65 per month. It has been reduced since 1880.

In the Argentine Republic the common farm hands get $10 to $12 per month.

In India agricultural wages are about $20 to $25 per year.

Wages here in the wool-growing industry are two or three times as much as in competing countries.

Consul Warner, at Cologne, in his official report of May 21, 1886, to the State Department, gives a statement of the increase of exports from Germany to the United States, also the wages paid. The laborer, whether he works in iron or steel works, factories, stone-quarries, or railroads, earns as a rule from 47 to 70 cents per day, and for skilled labor he may get from 80 to 92 cents per day. Women, when employed, earn from 24 to 30 cents per day. Boys under sixteen receive 19 to 24 cents a day, and an extra strong boy may earn 30 cents. Working hours are from 6 to 6 in summer, and 7 to 7 in winter, with one hour for dinner.

The consul-general at Vienna, in speaking of the Austrian laborer, says a home of his own, though ever so modest, is beyond his reach.

Consul Tanner, at Chemnitz, Saxony, says:

The customary wages to hired servants on a farm are $57.19 per year, with board and lodging, for men, and $28.50 for females. Field hands are paid at the rate of 5½ cents per hour. Women receive 2½ cents per hour.

Speaking of their food, he says:

Sugar or sirup are never allowed, and but very little milk. Tea is never used. For dinner they have meat and vegetables three times a week, and always on Sundays.

This effectually disposes of the claim that wages in England and other countries are as high as here.

WAGES IN THE SOUTH AND PROTECTION TO RICE.

The wage question in the South is interesting, and I have seen it no better stated, and the reason for maintaining protection nowhere more strongly presented than in the report made this year on the American rice industry, prepared by the Rice Association and addressed to the association of Savannah. I read:

During this period [from 1840 to 1860] the duty on foreign rice was 20 per cent. ad valorem. In all the rice-producing divisions of the country slave labor was then employed, and no foreign rice was imported.

It will be noted that slave labor operates as a positive prohibition to foreign imports. It takes the place of a protective tariff, and presents to labor a choice between the one and the other.

Cheap labor can successfully compete with cheap labor on equal terms and with equal chance of profits in the markets of the world without the aid of legislative protection, and what I have read shows the character of labor best adapted to free trade. This report says the conditions surrounding the American producer have entirely changed. Let me read:

Since the emancipation of the slaves the cost of agricultural labor in the South has been greatly increased. In the rice districts of the Carolinas and Georgia field labor ranges from 40 to 60 cents, and the best expert (not mechanical) labor to $1 per diem.

So that no time since 1865 could rice have been cultivated as a staple product without the protection afforded by import duties upon foreign grain.

Now, with what labor does the Southern rice-grower compete? I will read from this report a quotation from the report of the United States minister at Pekin:

Coming now to the field-hand whom the farmer hires, we arrive at the substratum of labor. The average wages of an able-bodied young man is $12 per annum, food, straw, shoes, and free shaving. Deducting $4 for his clothing, he saves $8 annually—or may do so.

Ten years' saving will enable him to buy one-third of an acre of land (value per acre, $150) and necessary implements by which he can attain by his own labor a subsistence. * * * In ten years he can become possessor of two-thirds of an acre.

The report goes on further:

In Japan, the field-hands receive their food and lodging with wages from $8.60 to $12.96 per annum. The wages of females are about $6 per annum.

In British India the per diem is 6 cents for males and 1½ cents for females.

In Kurnel the highest permanent wages are 50 cents per month.

In Borat men employed by the year get from 80 to 100 pounds of grain per month, and from 44½ cents to $1.98 per annum.

In Bombay and Madras laborers are paid from 6 to 12 cents per diem.

Hence the wages paid at the South in the rice-fields are many fold greater than those paid to laborers in the rice-fields of Asia. Two-thirds of the cost of production is disbursed in wages in the former.

The report then concludes:

The contrast in this element of cost should render unnecessary any further comment than that without the intervention of the existing import tax on Asiatic rice competition would seem impossible.

This argument I commend for its force and fairness, and it makes out a strong case for the rice-grower, who in my judgment deserves protection and which we cheerfully accord; but the same argument applies with equal force to domestic wool, flax, and hemp, and other products of agriculture and manufacture. They are all within the same principle; all of them cultivated and produced with wage-labor greatly in excess of that paid abroad. Yet these American products are to be severely crippled, if not wholly destroyed.

This statement of the rice-growers is a most striking demonstration of the wisdom and necessity of protection. It shows what is true in the North is true in the South. The chief and controlling question is one of labor, and so long as the labor cost here in any department of employment exceeds the labor cost in Europe so long we must have a protective tariff which shall compensate for this difference. And whether the labor is in the rice-fields of Georgia and of the Carolinas, or in the wheat-fields of the Northwest, in the factories of New England, the mines of Maryland and Virginia, or the furnaces of Pennsylvania, Ohio, and New Jersey, it must be protected against the less rewarded labor

whose products come in competition with theirs. Either this tariff must be maintained to maintain the difference of wages or one of two things must inevitably occur: we must abandon production in many of the most valuable fields of industry here or our labor must come down to the standard of the competing labor; and we may discuss our theories until the frosts of December and we can not alter the fact.

This is the issue and it can not be evaded.

LABOR NOT ASKING FOR IT—CHEAP CLOTHING.

It is a fact worthy to call to the attention of the House that a labor organization representing a million working men, with its representatives in this city whose sole duty is to look after the interests of labor, have given no sign of approval of this bill. Not a petition has come through this source asking for its passage, or anything like it. Whatever utterance has been made has been in opposition and protest. Every member on this floor has observed the activity of this committee of Knights of Labor in regard to legislation affecting the interests of labor, but in all their vast constituency, found in every State of the Union, found in the fields, in the factories, workshops, and mines, no word or sign but of disapproval and condemnation has come.

The expectations of cheaper clothes is not sufficient to justify the action of the majority. This is too narrow for a national issue. Nobody, so far as I have learned, has expressed dissatisfaction with the present price of clothing. It is a political objection; it is a party slogan. Certainly nobody is unhappy over the cost of clothing except those who are amply able to pay even a higher price than is now exacted. And besides, if this bill should pass, and the effect would be (as it inevitably must be) to destroy our domestic manufacturies, the era of low prices would vanish, and the foreign manufacturer would compel the American consumer to pay higher prices than he has been accustomed to pay under "the robber tariff," so called.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a district comprising some 200,000 people, a large majority of the voters in the district being workingmen. I have represented them for a good many years, and I have never had a complaint from one of them, that their clothes were too high. Have you? [Applause on the Republican side.] Has any gentleman on this floor met with such complaint in his district?

Mr. MORSE. They did not buy them of me.

Mr. McKINLEY. No! Let us see; if they had bought of the gentleman from Massachusetts it would have made no difference, and there could have been no complaint. Let us examine the matter.

[Mr. McKINLEY here produced a bundle containing a suit of clothes, which he opened and displayed amidst great laughter and applause.]

Come now, will the gentleman from Massachusetts know his own goods? [Renewed laughter.] We recall, Mr. Chairman, that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means talked about the laboring man who worked for ten days at a dollar a day, and then went with his ten dollars wages to buy a suit of clothes. It is the old story. It is found in the works of Adam Smith. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I have heard it in this House for ten years past. It has served many a free-trader. It is the old story, I repeat, of the man who gets a dollar a day for his wages, and having worked for the ten days goes to buy his suit of clothes. He believes he can buy it for just $10; but "the robber manufacturers" have been to Congress, and have got 100 per cent. put upon the goods in the shape of a tariff, and the suit of clothes he finds can not be bought for $10, but he is asked $20 for it, and so he has got to go back to ten days more of sweat; ten days more of toil; ten days more of wear and tear of muscle and brain to earn the $10 to purchase the suit of clothes. Then the chairman gravely asks is not ten days entirely annihilated?

Now, a gentleman who read that speech or heard it was so touched by the pathetic story that he looked into it and sent me a suit of clothes identical with that described by the gentleman from Texas, and he sends me also the bill for it, and here is the entire suit, "robber tariffs and taxes and all" have been added, and the retail cost is what? Just $10. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] So the poor fellow does not have to go back to work ten days more to get that suit of clothes. He takes the suit with him and pays for it just $10. [Applause.]

But in order that there might be no mistake about it, knowing the honor and honesty of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MORSE], he went to his store and bought the suit. [Laughter and cheers on the Republican side.] I hold in my hand the bill.

Mr. STRUBLE. Read it.

Mr. McKINLEY (reading):

BOSTON, *May* 4, 1888.

J. D. Williams, bought of LEOPOLD MORSE & Co.; men's youth's, and boys' clothing; 131 to 137 Washington street, corner of Brattle—

I believe it is.

Mr. MORSE. Yes, Brattle.

Mr. McKINLEY (reading):

To one suit of woolen clothes, $10. Paid.

[Renewed laughter and applause.]

And now, Mr. Chairman, I never knew of a gentleman engaged in this business who sold his clothes without a profit. [Laughter.] And there is the same $10 suit described by the gentleman from Texas that can be bought in the city of Boston, can be bought in Philadelphia, in New York, in Chicago, in Pittsburgh, anywhere throughout the country at $10 retail the whole suit, coat, pants, and vest, and 40 per cent. less than it could have been bought in 1860 under your low tariff and low wages of that period. [Great applause.] It is a pity to destroy the sad picture of the gentleman from Texas which was to be used in the campaign, but the truth must be told. But do you know that if it was not for protection you would pay a great deal more for these clothes? I do not intend to go into that branch of the question, but I want to give one brief illustration of how the absence of American competition immediately sends up the foreign prices, and it is an illustration that every man will remember. My friend from Missouri [Mr. CLARDY], who sits in front of me, will remember it. The Missouri Glass Company was organized several years ago for the manufacture of coarse fluted glass and cathedral glass. Last November the factory was destroyed by fire. Cathedral glass was their specialty. Within ten days from the time that splendid property was reduced to ashes the foreign price of cathedral glass advanced 28 per cent. to the American consumer. [Applause on the Republican side.] Showing that whether you destroy the American production by free trade or by fire it is the same thing; the price goes up to the American consumer, and all you can do is to pay the the price the foreigner chooses to ask. [Renewed applause.]

THE POOR MAN'S BLANKETS.

Now, the gentleman had a lot of blankets here the other day. The very climax of the gentleman's speech was reached when he came to a description of the American blankets, and the enormous burdens that the tariff laid upon the poor man's bed and covering. Why, you would have supposed that he was enunciating the national issue for 1888, and I think really that is about all they have left now that civil-service reform is gone. [Laughter.]

Now what is the fact? He told you that for one pair of 5-pound blankets, which he exhibited, the price was $2.51, the labor cost 35 cents, the tariff $1.90, and the difference between the labor and the duty $1.55. Then the gentleman from Texas turned to this House and to his admiring associates and listening audience and said: "Why does not the manufacturer give the laborer that $1.55, the difference between the labor cost and the duty?" which inquiry was followed by deafening applause.

Did he not leave the impression upon the mind of everyone that the manufacturer got the duty? He asked why did he not give it to the laborer? and turning he said: "Of course he would not do that; he put it into his pocket." I will tell you the reason, or at least a sufficient reason why the manufacturer did not give it to the laborer. It was because he did not get it himself.

I do not know where the gentleman got his figures, but I have a careful statement from one of the leading blanket manufacturers of this country, and I intend to give the facts fully.

Blankets are numbered according to grade and according to weight. There are several grades of five-pound blankets numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5. A No. 1 five-pound blanket made in the city of Philadelphia sells for $1.72. The labor represented in the blanket is 87½ cents; the duty is $1.02. Of a scarlet blanket, five pounds, the price is $2.27; the labor is 87½ cents; the duty is $3.17. Of the white all-wool Falls of Schuylkill blanket the price is $3.62; the labor $1.05; the duty $2.60. Of the Gold-Medal blanket the price is $4.53; the labor $1.05; the duty $3.50.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the duty was added to the cost, what would the American manufacturers get for these blankets? They should get for the first blanket $2.74. How much do they get? They get only $1.72. They should get for the second blanket, duty added, $3.77. How much do they get? They get $2.27. They should get for the third $5.12. How much do they get? They get $3.17. They should get, duty added, for the fourth class $6.22. How much do they get? They get $4.35. They should get, duty added, for the highest grade, $8.03. How much do they get? They get $4.65.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what did these same blankets cost in 1860 under a revenue tariff, under the free-trade domination of this country by the Democratic party? What did we pay for the same blankets that year as contrasted with what we pay now? The blanket that sells to-day for $1.02 sold in 1860 for $2. The blanket that sells now for $1.45 sold in 1860 for $2.50. The blanket that sells now for $1.31 sold in 1860 for $2.25. The blanket that sells now for $1.90 sold in 1860 for $3.50. The blanket that sells now for $2.58 sold for $3.75 in 1860. The blanket that sells now for $4.35 sold for $7.50 in 1860. The blanket that sells for $5.85 now sold for $10 in 1860. The blanket that sells now for $6.80 sold for $13 in 1860.

PRICES OF 1860 AND 1888 COMPARED.

Now let us see how the wages are, for that is an essential element in this question. In 1860 a spinner got $6 a week in this same establishment, and I am speaking from the books of the manufacturer. It is no idle and hearsay, second-hand statement that I am making, nor does it come from any foreign source, nor is it based on any information from abroad. It is taken from the actual books of a manufacturer of blankets in Philadelphia, who has been manufacturing for a great many years. A spinner got for a week's work in 1860, $6. What does he get now? Fifteen dollars. Six dollars a week in 1860, and $15 a week in 1888! A piecer boy got $1.15 a week in 1860, and he gets $3.50

now. A weaver got $1 in 1860, and $10 in 1888. A finisher, unskilled, got $4.15 in 1860, and he gets $9 in 1888. A skilled finisher got $6 in 1860, and $16 in 1888. A dye-house hand, unskilled, got $4.25 in 1860, and he gets $9 in 1888. A common laborer $1 in 1860, and gets $7.50 in 1888. A skilled laborer got $4.50 in 1860, and he gets $9 in 1888. An engineer got $6.50 in 1860, and he gets $16 in 1888.

The weekly earnings of the spinner in 1860 could buy three pairs of cheap blankets for one week's work. The spinner under American protection in 1888, for the price of one week's work can buy fifteen pairs of blankets. Talk about productive capacity! Think about buying capacity! The spinner buys his blankets for one-half what they cost him in 1860; and he gets two and a half times as much for his labor in 1888 as he got in 1860. Do you wonder these men do not like your bill? [Applause.] Do you wonder these men condemn the action of the committee for not listening to their protests? Why, you are preparing here to-day—and that is the purpose and effect of this bill—you are preparing here to reduce the scale of American wages. But I am not through with the blanket issue. You may think that what I have already given is sufficiently exhaustive, but I have an actual transaction here that I know will be of interest to the members of this House, and, therefore, at the expense of wearying your patience, I am going to ask your attention to it. [Cries of "Go on!"]

THE UNITED STATES BUYING FOREIGN BLANKETS.

On the 25th of March, 1887, the United States Government advertised for bids for the purchase of blankets for the use of the medical department of the Army. This was in 1887, under the present Administration. There were foreign bids and there were American bids. Now, if the President is right in saying that the duty is added to the cost, then the foreign cost, duty added, ought to be just equal to the American price. Now, what are the facts of this transaction? As I have said, there was a foreign bid, and there was an American bid. The foreign bid was for a four-pound blanket for medical purposes, to be furnished for $2.25\frac{7}{10}$. For the same four-pound blanket for the same purposes, the American bid was $2.56, there being a difference of $30\frac{3}{10}$ cents. Who, who do you suppose got the contract? There was a foreign bid, and an American bid, and the difference between the bids was 30 cents on each blanket. Now tell me which manufacturer, the American or English got the contract? Is there anybody here who would not have given it to the American, there being a difference of only 30 cents between the bids?

Is there any gentleman on this floor who would send abroad to get a pair of blankets merely to save 30 cents on them, thus taking away from the American manufacturer and the American farmer and the American laborer that much business? However that may be, that contract did go abroad. English labor, with foreign wool, made those 2,000 blankets for the use of our army. American labor was boycotted and they came in without paying any duty. The Government took advantage of a law that stands on the statute-book and admitted them free of duty. There being so little revenue in the Treasury, it was necessary, of course, to save every penny, so they took advantage of that law which permits the United States to bring in goods free of duty.

Now let us look at the figures. The duty on blankets of that quality is 18 cents a pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem. Eighteen cents a pound upon 2,000 blankets, 4 pounds each, is $1,440; 35 per cent. ad valorem is $1,576.40, making a total duty upon those 2,000 blankets, which were bought from a foreign blanket maker, of $3,016.40. The cost of those blankets, free of duty, amounts to $4,504; with the duty added the total would be $7,520.40.

Now, if the President is right and if the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means is right in saying that this duty is added to the price to the American consumer, then $7,520.40 is exactly what the American price would be.

Now, then, gentlemen, what was the American price? The American price was $5,120. That is, it was $2,400 less than the foreign cost, duty added. Without any duty, the difference between the cost of the American and the cost of the foreign blankets, the whole 2,000, was about $600. Now you see the American manufacturer does not get the duty, and that, I submit, is a sufficient reason why he does not give it to his workmen. I am very sorry, Mr. Chairman, that the President of the United States did not know of this transaction, which had occurred under his own administration, so that he might have avoided making the blunder which he made in his message when he said that the duty was added to the cost. And I do not know what those around me may think about it, but I am very sorry that our Government went abroad and bought those blankets just to save 30 cents apiece on them. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Chairman, I wish that this Government of ours, which is supported by its own people, and not by foreigners, would patronize its own people. I think that is an example of patriotism which should be set by those charged with public administration. I wish the men who pay the taxes to support this Government, to pay the President's salary and other expenses of the Government, would be patronized when the Government has anything to buy, don't you? And are you not a little ashamed of this transaction, all of you? I do not know whether the like was ever done under any former administration or not; but it never ought to be done, except in time of war or great public necessity, by any future administration of any party. [Applause on the Republican side.]

ALL EUROPE INTERESTED IN THE PASSAGE OF THIS BILL.

All Europe is watching the progress of this bill. Its immediate promoters are not following it with keener vigilance and more absorbing interest than their foreign sympathizers. All trades, all manufacturers across the Atlantic, are watching it with the deepest concern and anticipating the rich harvest which awaits them when our gates shall be opened, our industrial defenses torn down, and free and unrestrained access to our splendid markets afforded for the products of their cheap labor.

I have in my hand the Pottery Gazette, published in London, under date of January 2, 1888, from which I read:

Earthenware is reported to be reduced to 33 per cent. This will help the trade, but we trust the men and masters here will not be too sanguine as to results and upset the trade.

Their information upon the earthenware schedule is quite accurate; they had it in advance of the minority members of the committee, and while thoroughly pleased the editor of the Gazette feels constrained to advise the men and masters not to be too sanguine as to results and thereby upset the trade and defeat the bill. He advises them not to rejoice too soon; the news is almost too good to be true, and too much ecstacy on their part might prejudice it before the American House. Why should they rejoice when our tariff goes down? Our workingmen and employers have no such feeling. They dread it; they oppose it; they know what it means to them. They know that it will benefit the foreign rival and bring distress to them.

The reduction of duties upon earthenware will help Staffordshire, England, and their people know it well, while it will hurt American potters and the labor they employ.

Again I read:

Our American friends are expected over shortly—

They are detained here during the pendency of this bill—

when we shall hear what the effect is to be of the promised alteration in their tariff. The protected manufacturers in the States are already making efforts to stop the reduced imports, but it will be useless.

With what confidence they speak! They mistake the temper of our people. They are staking too much upon the fulfillment of Democratic pledges.

This long nursed and favored class must give way a little to the consumer, whose long suffering has at length come to the front.

The generous sympathy which the English manufacturer has for the American consumer is touching indeed.

The consumers are as ten to one of the United States inhabitants, and the protection to the pottery and glass manufacturer of the commoner description represents the cost of labor many times over.

This reads like the speech of the gentleman from Texas. It sounds so like the Democratic speeches of the last two weeks that we might well conclude that the gentlemen of the majority on this floor were representing an English and not an American constituency.

Again I read:

Is this fair to the housekeeper? Is it right? Nay, is it just?

This sympathy would have been more highly appreciated by the American consumer had it been extended at a time when the Staffordshire potteries controlled the American market, before we had become successful competitors, and when they were charging us 100 per cent. more for the coarse tableware that went into the houses of the masses than we now have to pay, resulting from the competition created by our own potteries. The hope of foreign producers is in the Democratic party.

Foreign producers are already preparing for the new order of things. They are already establishing agencies in the United States, preparing to invade and occupy this market.

I have among my notes a letter from Andris Jochams, of Charleroi, Belgium, proprietors of the La Providence Rolling Mills, which gives unmistakable evidence of preparation for the passage of this bill.

Let me read the letter:

CHARLEROI, *le 14th March*, 1888.

DEAR SIRS: I beg to take notice that we have appointed Messrs. Weir, Smith & Rogers as our sole and general agents in the United States of America for the sale of our architectural iron, as per circular inclosed, and you will oblige us in addressing your demands to them in future.

With the prospect of a reduction in duties on architectural iron and steel in your country we will be soon ready to offer you such advantages in prices and quality that you will find a nice profit in importing from us.

We remain, dear sirs, with much respect, your obedient servant.

ANDRIS JOCHAMS.

Messrs. WEIR, SMITH & ROGERS, 41 Broadway, New York.

The American public, it will be observed, is assured that "with the prospect of reduction of duties on architectural iron and steel in your country we will be soon ready to offer you such advantages in prices and quality that you will find a nice profit in importing from us." Reduced duties are to increase their profit which, for the time, at least, is to be divided so as to give to the American importer a "nice profit."

TRUSTS.

There has been much discussion about trades and combinations in the course of this debate—trusts to control prices, diminish produc-

tion, extinguish competition—and these are made a fruitful theme for vicious assaults upon the tariff. This is the only new feature that has been developed in the tariff discussion, and therefore deserves passing attention. I have no sympathy with combinations organized for this or any other purpose, to control the supply and thereby control prices. I regard all such as against public policy and opposed to fair and legitimate trade. They are, however, in no wise related to the tariff, and the tariff is in no way responsible for them.

There is nothing in the tariff laws to promote or even suggest them. They are of foreign origin—they originated in free-trade countries. They can and do exist among producers and factors not in any way affected by the tariff. They are of recent date in the United States. The most widely known trusts of the country are not engaged in what are termed "protected industries." The oil trust and the whisky trust, which are so commanding and powerful, which make prices and alter them, control supply and production, these surely can not be charged to a protective tariff, for nothing which they make or merchandise is subject to protective tariffs. The most oppressive trusts—oppressive to the American consumer—are those which deal in foreign goods, and all of which will be promoted and strengthened by the passage of this bill.

There is a trust or combination made up of all the plate-glass manufacturers of Europe. I have here a circular which is dated London, 25th of April, 1887, and which reads:

DEAR SIR: We beg to inform you that the Associated Plate-Glass Manufacturers have revised their prices for plate-glass of all descriptions, and that, withdrawing all previous quotations, we inclose you herewith our tariff of prices, the discount from which will be 30 per cent., with the exception of glazing glass used for silvering purposes, the discount from which will be 25 per cent.

We are, dear sir, yours, respectfully,

LONDON AND MANCHESTER PLATE-GLASS MANUFACTURING COMPANY (LIMITED.)
UNION PLATE-GLASS COMPANY (LIMITED.)
PILKINGTON BROTHERS.

A de GRAND BY, AGENCE GÉNÉRALE DES-GLACERIES, *Belges.*

This trust is still in force. Here is a foreign combination to control the price of plate-glass, and the gentlemen on the other side are engaged in making the monopoly more complete and controlling by reducing the import duties now paid on their product and by relieving them of a burden they now have to bear, and thus enabling them to break down American competition, which alone has reduced the price of plate-glass, and now prevents the most extortionate exactions for the foreign product upon American consumers.

Here, again, is an importers' trust in the same line of goods. I read from the New York Herald of February 28 an account of the investigation by the New York Legislature:

THE GLASS TRUST.

Mr. James H. Heroy, an importer of plate and French glass, was next called to tell what he knew about the glass trust. He is a spry old gentleman who has been in the business for fifty years. Colonel Bliss asked the witness to identify a circular. It is a very peculiar circular, and will open the eyes of the public, if not the eyes of the committee. It is as follows:

"HENRY C. MARRINNER,
"*Plate and sheet-glass importer, No. 126 South Fifth avenue:*

"We beg leave to quote you 70, 10, and 5 per cent. discount from the price-list, January 20, 1887, for French window-glass. In case you wish to make any large purchases we can make you extra discounts as follows: If you receive from us or any members of our association in New York (which includes all the regular importers), either all from one house or part from each of the houses, one hundred boxes in one calendar month, you are entitled to an extra discount of 5 per cent.; or if the deliveries to you in any one calendar month from any or all of these houses should amount to $1,000, then you will be entitled to an extra discount of 10 per cent. This is done, as you will see, to give large purchasers the advantage over small buyers, which they have been long entitled to, but which could not be given to them until we made our present organization to regulate prices.

"This arrangement of rebates takes effect from February 1.

"We can also make deductions from the new price-list of January 5, 1888, for colored, enameled, ground, and cathedral glass, extra discounts, as follows:

"For orders of twenty cases or 2,000 feet or more at one time, 10 per cent. discount.

"For import orders of 7,500 feet or more of cathedral and one hundred cases or more colored, enameled, and ground glass we will make special prices, according to the conditions of the order.

"Yours, very truly,

"HEROY & MARRINNER."

NOTHING DONE IN A HURRY.

There was no doubt about the intention of that trust. Mr Heroy said "it was simply" to make prices below which they would not sell their goods. At the last meeting he attended he thought it was the desire of the combination to reduce prices, and added, "We have not yet decided what to do in the case of a man who undersells us. We do not decide these things in a hurry. As a result of the combination prices have advanced. I can't tell exactly the amount of the business done. It is largely exaggerated, but including all branches, it is about $20,000,000."

I have also in my possession a copy of the trust contract. Not content with making this combination among themselves, they sought in every way possible to induce our American producers of plate-glass to join them and assist in fleecing the American public.

There is a foreign trust on china and earthen ware. I have the evidence here in the London Pottery Gazette of March 10, 1888, from which I read:

If any manufacturers are not true to the rules of the new association the bond they will have signed will enable their fellow-manufacturers to sell them up "rump and stump." Nothing but the state of dire necessity into which the trade has fallen would tempt men to put their hands to such a bond. The scheme has just been successful with the china manufacturers. They have just obtained a second advance.

If the keen buyers who always want to beggar the trade and reduce prices say to a manufacturer who will not sell at lower than the fixed rate, "Well, if I am forced to pay the association price I will not buy from you," such manufacturer can reply, "All right; if you buy from another, and I have to stand for orders, I shall get my pull out of your business, for our rules will not let me suffer through refusing to reduce at your request." So you see one manufacturer can not be played off against the others.

There is a foreign tin trust and a foreign iron trust to control prices and deprive the public of the advantages of legitimate competition. All these are to be benefited by this bill. Its author should change its title so as to make it read, "An act to promote foreign trusts and combines and break down American competition." We should set our faces against all these unnatural associations. We should crush out those at home, and do nothing to encourage those abroad who organize to prey upon the American market. We can control the former, but the latter, while robbing our own citizens, are beyond our control and out of our jurisdiction.

PROTECTION SENTIMENT EXTENDING.

Mr. Chairman, while the Democratic majority, aided by the active force of the Administration, is seeking to break pown the protective system, under which we have realized such unexampled prosperity, what do we witness elsewhere and in other countri ? Within the last six months there was held a great meeting in England, representing thirty thousand workingmen. The meeting was called to consider the depressed condition of labor, and to demand such a change of the fiscal legislation as would abandon free trade in the United Kingdom and adopt a protective tariff. They resolved—

First. That this meeting is strongly of opinion that the time has come when all classes interested in the nation's prosperity should unite in demanding a revision of its fiscal system.

Second. That this meeting records its opinion that all articles imported from abroad should bear a fair share of taxation with the same articles produced at home.

These resolutions, with a suitable memorial, were presented to the British Parliament. In the same month the Chamber of Commerce of Lincolnshire, England, adopted the following resolutions:

That this meeting is of opinion that the fearful depression both of trade and agriculture are intimately connected with, and both are caused by, foreign competition, resulting in low prices, which are affecting all the industries of this country; that false free trade is a failure obtained at the expense of the native producer. This meeting, therefore, begs to urge of their representatives in Parliament and the Government the necessity of speedily taking measures to prevent the ruin impending over trade, and especially over the land of this country and all concerned in it, either as owners, cultivators, or tradesmen, and that a reconsideration should at once take place of our present fiscal arrangement.

The working people of England find that competition with countries employing cheaper labor too oppressive to bear longer, and are demanding in the interest of themselves and families to be saved from the further degradation it will entail. It is not American competition they dread; it is the competition of France, Germany, and Belgium—countries whose labor is even more poorly paid than the labor of England. They have come to appreciate at last that nothing but tariffs which are defensive in their character will save them from utter ruin and destitution. We will be in precisely the same situation if this bill shall become a law. Our competition is with all the world, for no labor is so well paid as ours, and being the highest paid labor invites the sharpest competition from the lowest. We will have no objection to free trade when all the competing nations shall bring the level of their labor up to ours; when they shall accept our standard; when they shall regard the toiler as a man and not a slave; but we will never consent while we have votes and the power to prevent the dragging down of our labor to that of the European standard. [Applause.] Let them elevate theirs; let them bring theirs up to our level, and we will then have no contention about revenue or protective tariffs. We will meet them in open field, in home and neutral markets, upon equal footing, and the fittest will survive. [Applause.] This is no time to seriously think of changing our policy. The best sentiment, the practical judgment of mankind, is turning to it. Sir Charles Tupper said a year ago in the Canadian House of Commons:

No person who has carefully watched the progress of public events and public opinion can fail to know that a very great and marked change has taken place in all countries, I may say, in relation to this question (protection). * * * In England, where it was a heresy to intimate anything of that kind a few years ago, even at the period to which I am referring, a great and marked change in public opinion has taken place. Professor Sidgewick, a learned Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and professor of moral philosophy in that great university, and the gentleman who read at the meeting of the British Association in 1886 a paper on political economy, has published a work in which opinions that would have been denounced as utterly fallacious and heretical at that time have been boldly propounded as the soundest and truest principles of political economy. * * * Statesmen of the first rank, men occupying high and commanding positions in public affairs in England, have unhesitatingly committed themselves to the strongest opinion in favor of fair protection to British industry.

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES.

Why, even Canada, a dependency of free-trade England, is too wise to favor the false doctrines of her mother, and has rejected her teachings, and to-day is prosperous under a protective system, which she in the main borrowed from us. I wish every citizen might read the budget speech of the minister of finance in Canada, and contrast it with

that of my honored but misguided friend from Texas. On the 12th of May, 1887, in the Commons, Sir Charles Tupper, in speaking of a previous period in the history of Canada under free trade, said:

When the languishing industries of Canada embarrassed the finance minister of that day, when instead of large surplus large deficits succeeded year after year, the opposition urged upon that honorable gentleman that he should endeavor to give increased protection to the industries of Canada, which would prevent them from thus languishing and being destroyed. We were not successful—I will not say in leading the honorable gentleman himself to the conclusion that that would be a sound policy, for I have some reason to believe that he had many a misgiving on that question—but at all events we were not able to change the policy of the gentleman who then ruled the destinies of Canada. As is well known, that became the great issue at the subsequent general election of 1878, and the Conservative party being returned to power, pledged to promote and foster the industries of Canada as far as they were able, brought down a policy through the hands of my honored predecessor, Sir Leonard Tilley, * * * and I have no hesitation in saying that the success of that policy thus propounded and matured from time to time has been such as to command the support and confidence of a large portion of the people of this country down to the present day.

Under this system he proceeds to show that Canada has enjoyed a prosperity the like of which she never enjoyed before, and then, instead of recommending a reduction of duties, proposes the increase of duties upon certain foreign merchandise, to the end that Canadian industries may be fostered thereby.

Here is what the gentleman from Texas, our premier, says. Mark the contrast:

Now, sir, what has been the result of this policy [of protection]? Enormous taxation upon the necessaries of life has been a constant drain upon the people; taxation, not only to support the expenditures of the Government, but taxation so contrived as to fill the pockets of a privileged class and take from the people five dollars for private purposes for every dollar that it carries to the public Treasury. * * * This is one of the vicious results, etc. * * * What use have our manufacturers for the tariff at all? Why are they constantly beseeching Congress not to ruin them by reducing war rates? * * * It is a policy that is at war with the institutions of this country—the concentration of the wealth of the country in the hands of a few.

My friend has not read with profit or purpose the history of his country. Wedded to the economic teachings of Calhoun and Walker, he has not observed their contradiction and refutation in the matchless progress of his country. He still lives in the past. The condition of his own State, her boundless resources, appeal to him, but her voice, if heard, is not heeded. He seeks to throw across her pathway and the pathway of the Republic the tattered dogmas of a half century ago and stop the wheels of progress, interrupt our advancing civilization, and stifle the just aspirations of the people. The country is in no frame of mind for such retrogression; against it every instinct of humanity revolts, every noble sentiment protests.

If the people of the country want free trade or a strictly revenue tariff it is their privilege to have it. The majority voice should be controlling, but it must be after a full, fair, and candid expression. I do not believe that a majority in this House were instructed by their constituents to vote for this bill or any other committed to the doctrine of free trade. If the issue had been so understood many of the gentlemen who are promoting this legislation would not be here. I do not believe the country understood in 1886 that if the Democratic party carried a majority in the House it would do what is now being proposed. How many Representatives on that side of the House would have been left at home upon a platform favoring free wool and substantially free agricultural products? More by far than your majority.

LET THE PEOPLE VOTE ON THE ISSUE BETWEEN A REVENUE TARIFF AND A PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

The opportunity of the people of this country is next November. If they want free trade they can so vote, but they must have it after full discussion. The majority now on the floor of this House were not instructed by the elections in 1886 to vote for this bill; there was no such issue. Wherever we sought to make it the issue it was obscured or denied by Democratic protectionists in the North. Nobody knows that better than the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the friend of labor. [Laughter.]

The House of Representative, I say, was not elected upon that issue. I challenge your party, under the instructions given you by the people two years ago, to force this measure through the House.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman allow me——

Mr. MCKINLEY. Certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. I voted for the consideration of the Morrison bill; and my people sent me back here by double my previous majority.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I am aware of that; I had not intended to allude to the gentleman at all. A man who has under his control thirty or forty thousand miles of railroad; a man who has coal mines all over creation; a man who has great plantations down here in Virginia, must be a very weak candidate, indeed, if he can not come to Congress in an off year on almost any issue. [Laughter.]

Mr. SCOTT. I have been a Democrat all my life; and in a Presidential year I was elected to this House in a district which gave Mr. Blaine 6,000 majority, and gave me 900. [Applause.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I am very glad if the gentleman made the issue on free trade; but if he did, he is the only man in the North who did so. And when he was elected in 1884, he had not voted for the Morrison bill; had you [addressing Mr. SCOTT]?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Did you vote for the Morrison bill before 1884?

Mr. SCOTT. I voted for the Morrison bill before my people elected me for my second term.

Mr. MCKINLEY. But you had not done so before being elected the first time.

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir.

Mr. MCKINLEY. You were boasting of the immense majority you had in 1884, when Mr. Blaine was a candidate.

Mr. SCOTT. No. The gentleman from Ohio said that I was elected in an "off year." I replied that I had been a Democrat all my life, and that in a Presidential campaign, when Mr. Blaine carried my district by 6,000 majority, I was elected by a majority of 900; and at the next election, after I had voted for the Morrison bill, I carried the district by double the majority that I had received before. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. What I cannot understand is this: If the gentleman's district believes in free-trade and is against protection, how did it happen to give 6,000 majority for Mr. Blaine? [Applause.]

Go back to the people and ask to be returned on this bill and the President's message; do not dodge or equivocate, but stand up to the issue squarely, make your platform in Connecticut the same as in the Carolinas, in New York and New Jersey, the same as Mississippi and Georgia; and then if your majority is returned you will be commissioned to adopt this bill or something like unto it, abandoning the American for the British policy. [Applause.] The details at this time can be of little moment. This bill points to the overthrow of the protective system; that is its tendency and mission.

It is the system which is on trial; not one item or one schedule of the tariff, but the principle upon which the whole rests. Nothing which that side of the House can do or will do touching the tariff can be other than hurtful. If it corrected a single abuse or inequality or incongruity it will be at the expense and sacrifice of many great interests. It is destruction, not correction you are after. When your bill levels at all it levels down. When it equalizes articles belonging to the same group and family, representing the same raw material and the same amount of labor, its equality is with the lowest. It does not help that which bears the lowest duty, but destroys that which bears the highest. It injures the whole that it may put the whole upon the same footing. It gives no consideration or protection to a single home industry or American product, except probably cotton and rice. It puts no languishing American industry on its feet; it sets in motion no idle spindles; it starts no new fires; it creates no increased demand for labor; if an industry is down it keeps it there, its very breath is paralyzation, it injures what it touches and touches that it may injure. [Great applause.]

If the tariff needs revision—and in some particulars revision would improve it—it must be done by its friends and in full recognition of the principle of protection. It must be done by a party with courage enough to raise duties if needed and reduce them if unnecessarily, and with wisdom enough to foresee and provide against redundant revenue, and in correcting inequalities prudent enough to inflict no injury upon any, but bring good to all. That is the correction of inequalities to which the Republican party pledged itself in its national platform of 1884, and for the fulfillment of which it has not since then had a majority in the House to enforce. If it had it would have long ago been done. It will do it when it is again in control. Not correction which destroys, but which makes simple, harmonious, and equitable all of the provisions of the tariff.

It is fortunate that our Government is founded upon the consent of the governed, that every citizen has a voice in making and unmaking the House of Representatives every two years, and even if he is deprived in the interim of a hearing there is one day when he can speak and vote and make his influence felt [applause]; for I tell you, Mr. Chairman, if the workmen were without the ballot we would have free trade within twelve months, and their protests and ours would be as idle as the wind which none of us heed. Fortunately for them they have a vote, and if they fail to use it for their homes, and their firesides, and their families they will show much less manhood, independence, intelligence, and righteous resentment than I am sure they possess. It was the ballot in the hands of labor to be used next November which kept coal and iron ore from being placed on the free-list in this bill, and unless the majority is reversed in this body and the Fifty-first Congress placed under Republican control these products, with others of equal importance, will be stricken from the dutiable and placed upon the free-list. This is only the initial step. The chairman of the committee has so declared. Listen to his words found in his opening speech:

We should lay taxes to obtain revenue, but not restrict importations. * * * We should place every material of manufacture on the free-list. * * *

This is the proclamation made by the premier of this body; this is in direct line with the President's message; this is the plan, the policy, and the purpose of the Democratic party. The elections once safely over, the party now in control again invested with power, and the work will go on to the end. The Democratic patriots and protectionists must get out of the way. Even Democrats who believe that protection is "a local issue," and as such worth maintaining, must not further in-

terrupt the procession. You saw an exhibition of the spirit this morning [laughter], when the generous courtesy of my friend from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] saved his party from a most unfortunate embarrassment. The hope of the country, Mr. Chairman, is in the ballot. The future, and, as I conceive, the welfare and progress of the Republic, the future condition of the wage-earners depends upon the issue to be settled in November. American citizens who love their country must be on guard on that day of supreme concern; it is their day, their one great opportunity. Parties must be subordinated to the great interests of the masses. No party necessity is great enough to force its adherents against its country's best interests. I care not what in the future may be the party name which stands for this system, which stands for the people, I will follow its flag under whatever designation or leadership, because it is my country's flag and represents its greatness and its glory.

Now, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I conclude and thank you for your kind attention and for the generous indulgence of the House. [Long and continued applause, and cries of "Vote!"]

I desire to print in the RECORD a letter received from the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers:

[National Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers of the United States, general office, Nos. 512 and 514 Smithfield street.]

PITTSBURGH, PA., *May* 14, 1888.

DEAR SIR: We respectfully ask you to submit to the Fiftieth Congress the following statement of the importations of iron and steel for the year ending June 30, 1887, and its relation to labor. The quantities imported are of various grades, and the calculations made are for the number of men that could have been employed in and about our rolling mills had that amount of iron and steel been manufactured in the United States:

The items have been taken from the Report of Commerce and Navigation for 1887. It has been estimated as near as could be done to give a fair average of the number of men in each item that it would require directly at the furnaces and trains of rolls to make the amount of iron and steel as enumerated in the following clauses:

First. The amount of scrap imported was 261,268 tons. If this amount had not been brought over, and had been made out of pig-iron into muck bar in our mills it would have given employment to about seventeen hundred and forty puddlers and helpers, each day of three hundred days in a year. It would also have given employment to many others at the muck rolls rolling it into bars before it could be used at the finishing trains and worked into finished product ready for the market. The number of men herein specified does not include the miners of ore and coal or those employed at blast furnaces, foundries, machine shops, etc., which are necessary in order to make this material.

Second. Bar and structural iron and steel, also billets, slabs, blooms, and ingots imported during the year amounted to about 275,000 tons. This would have given employment to at least 1,000 men per day in and about steel mills in getting it in shape for the different departments that make it ready for the market, or into a merchantable article. Again, it would require and give employment to fifteen hundred men working in the iron mills in which the iron and steel is reworked and made into a finished article. This is in addition to the one thousand already mentioned.

Third. The importation of cotton-ties, hoops, bands, and scolls of iron and steel was in the neighborhood of 19,800 tons. This amount would have given employment to two hundred and fifty men per day, at three hundred days per year.

The cotton-ties especially have given cause to considerable trouble among the men employed in mills making a specialty of cotton ties. Because of the ad valorem rate of 35 per cent. we have almost every year to contend with a reduction in the price per ton of the imported article that caused prices to be established here from which the American manufacturer and workingman suffered alike. The Mills bill provides that cotton-ties be placed on the free-list. We positively object, as such action will deprive our workmen of the opportunity of making the limited amount of cotton-ties they now make, and in addition, it will very materially injure our hoop-iron trade. When cotton-ties were admitted under a specific duty, the unit of value was a fraction over 2 cents per pound. Since the introduction of the ad valorem rate, the unit of value has declined every year, until now it is 1.2 cents per pound.

Fourth. Plates, sheets, and corrugated iron and steel was imported in various forms amounting to about 23,300 tons. That amount would have given work to three hundred men each day of three hundred days in the year, and, as already stated, to many others in preparing the material from which sheets and plates are manufactured. Sheet steel, we understand, has been imported during the past year at 45 per cent. ad valorem. We claim that this is a gross injustice on our steel workers, as the duty on sheet steel should be no less than that on sheet iron of the same sizes. We claim that ad valorem rates should be eliminated from the lists of imports, as it admits of undervaluations and fraud. You need no further proof of this than the fact that 30 gauge sheet iron is admitted at a lower rate than the heavier gauges, yet the cost of production of the former exceeds that of the latter.

Fifth. Wire rods, nails, screws, and wire in various shapes was imported to the amount of about 150,000 tons. This amount would have given employment to at least thirty-seven hundred men per year.

Sixth. Nuts, washers, bolts, and railway fish-plates, or splice-bars, steel tire for railway purposes, including hinge iron and tubes of steel, were imported to the amount of about 50,000 tons, to manufacture which eight hundred men would have been employed three hundred days in a year, had such been manufactured in this country instead of abroad.

The number of men that could have been steadily employed here in making the above amount of products a livelihood for themselves and their families can be readily estimated. Therefore, should the Mills bill pass, which provides for a still further reduction of duties on iron and steel, it would certainly augment the importation of such manufactured articles, and would therefore cause more idleness and suffering among the working classes, who have already been affected since the measure was introduced in the present session of Congress.

There was also imported over 49,500 tons of iron and steel rails. The Mills bill proposes to take off the present duty $6 per ton, thereby leaving the duty only $11 per ton. Taking into consideration the amount that was imported, such a reduction as proposed by the bill would have a tendency to still further increase importations, and would be the cause of throwing hundreds of more men into idleness that are merely getting a living now in the mills manufacturing rails.

The 49,500 tons would have given at least five hundred men employment for the entire year in addition to those producing the material to make the same into rails.

In the foregoing statement we have dealt with none in a numerical sense, except those directly employed in and about rolling mills and steel works. We have not included the millions who are benefited by the product of our labor, not the least of whom is the farmer. Our hard-earned earnings ramify through them all—the grocer, butcher, baker, broker, lawyer, insurance agent, real estate agent, banker, merchant, in fact every kind of business derives a benefit from the brawn and muscle of the physical laborer—and any reduction therefrom means a corresponding reduction all around.

Again, we desire to call your attention to the manufacture of tinned plates.

The Mills bill places tin-plates on the free-list. Whatever professions of friendship and partiality to American labor the majority of the Ways and Means Committee may have made, this act of theirs in placing tin-plates on the free-list clearly indicates their real intentions of ultimate free-trade. It is an act solely and absolutely in the interest of British capital and labor, securing to them a monopoly of tin-plate manufacture needed to supply the needs and wants of the American people. It is an act that implies the inability of American labor to produce tin-plates, or that it is better to employ British labor at low wages to supply us with tin plates, rather than permit the same to be done by home labor at reasonable wages.

It is unnecessary that we should enter here into the history of the tin-plate question in this country. Suffice it to say that although strenuous ttempts were made between 1872 and 1878 to establish tin-plate manufacture in this country, all failed for lack of proper encouragement by the Government. A protective tariff was never enforced for the purpose of promoting tin-plate manufacture here.

British manufacturers, though possessing a monopoly of tin-plate manufacture since 1720, never supplied cheap tin-plates to this country until attempts to manufacture tin-plates were made here. In 1875 we had four tin-plate works in operation in this country. Prices of British tin-plates were very high up to that date. Quoting from the Iron Age, we find the prices to have been, in 1875, for ordinary coke grades, $12 per box, and for charcoal grades $14.75 per box. A box contained 112 sheets of 14 by 20, and weighed about 112 pounds. It was the high prices that had existed up to this time that tempted American capital to undertake tin-plate manufacturing. The duty at that time was 15 per cent. ad valorem. In 1875 the duty was made specific, 1.1 cents per pound; but it was only a low revenue duty, equal to about 15 per cent. ad valorem. The British manufacturers finding that the attempts to manufacture tin-plates in this country were successful rapidly reduced prices, and by the aid of cheap labor and a low tariff in 1878 completely throttled the young American industry. Since this little episode took place we have had an era of low prices and an extremely poor quality of tin-plates.

As workingmen we reason that if British manufacturers were enabled to throttle this young industry by the aid of a low revenue tariff, that the same results would follow in bars, sheets, structural, and all other forms of iron and steel manufacture, had we not a protective duty.

The low revenue tariff on tin-plates, which also includes terne plates, have furthermore been very injurious to our sheet-iron and steel industry. For several years the imported tin and terne plates have been steadily displacing home productions of sheets of the finer grades, particularly galvanized and leaded sheets in several directions. In the roofing business the quantity of home-produced sheet-iron has fallen off within the last six years nearly one-half. If these results have followed from a low tariff, what may we expect to follow in the wake of free tin-plates? It is reasonable to presume nothing less than the complete annihilation of the sheet-iron and steel business in all the finer grades.

The arguments used by a majority of the Ways and Means Committee in favor of free tin-plates seem to us very illogical and impracticable. They make but one point, to wit: Cheaper cans to promote the export trade in canned goods. This is ridiculous, as the law now provides a drawback of 90 per cent off of the duty to the exporter. The remaining 10 per cent. affects the price of a dozen 3-pound cans of salmon about 1 cent. Just imagine an item of 1 cent per dozen cans of salmon giving the exporter such an advantage in the foreign market as would effectually overcome all competition.

The majority report does not show that free tin plates would be any advantage to the home consumer of canned goods. Nor can canners expect any advantage, as the tax is not paid by them, but by the consumer of canned goods. For this reason we fail to comprehend why canners are agitating lower duties on tin plates or free tin plates.

Importers and such large users of tin plates as the Standard Oil Company are naturally in favor of free tin-plates. There are quite a number of importers who are interested as owners of the tin-plate works—Henry, Nash & Co., Bond & Parsons, Sims & Coventry, Taylor Brothers, Phelps, Dodge & Co., and others. We readily admit that to these free tin-plates would be quite an advantage.

British manufacturers would also expect to realize some benefit from the free tin-plates. For over eight years they have been constantly complaining of the low price of tin-plates in the United States. It must be observed that the agitation for a protective tariff and home production of tin-plates has had its moral effect, in a large measure at least, of keeping down the price of the article in our markets. Let free trade in tin-plates be established, and the agitation in favor of protection and home production ceases. It is but natural to suppose that British manufacturers, finding themselves absolutely masters of the situation, will so materially advance prices to a point at least satisfactory to themselves.

It is therefore evident to our minds that the real beneficiaries of free tin-plates would be the foreign producers of the article, foreign merchants, and importers.

To the American workingman and chief consumer no material benefit whatever would accrue. On the other hand as wage-earners our workingmen would be greatly injured. In the name of the iron and steel workers, we therefore protest against the action of the majority of the Ways and Means Committee in placing tin-plates on the free-list, or against any reduction in the present duty.

We go further, and earnestly petition Congress to seriously meditate as to the advisability of placing a protective duty on tin-plates, a duty commensurate with the higher labor cost in this country; thus securing employment to American labor, in the production of tin-plates, at wages in harmony with those now existing in our iron and steel manufactories.

For the purpose of fully demonstrating this matter we submit herewith a cost sheet, showing comparative cost of production of tin-plates in this country and Great Britain. We have taken great care in preparing this cost sheet, and as it is a new feature in the presentation of this subject we hope you will give it careful study and consideration.

The effect of placing a protective duty on tin-plate will not have the effect, as some people argue, of raising the price in proportion to the increase in duty. The increase in price will be really immaterial. It should be observed that under our present system of having all our tin plates manufactured abroad, that a large expense is incurred between manufacturer and consumer. This, with home production, would be absorbed in higher wages to labor.

The value at the port of export of the tin-plates imported during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, was $16,883,813. The average price of tin-plates for last year, paid by the American consumers, not including the Standard Oil Company, and a few other large corporations, was about 5.2 cents per pound. Our total importation last year would thus indicate a value of nearly $30,000,000.

The cost of production of the tin-plates, according to the cost sheet we submit, would be $15,877,623, in Great Britain, and in this country $28,267,982. This indicates that with home production the price to the consumer would be advanced but very little over present rates.

The advantages to the home market, however, would be immense. The total

wages paid to British labor in the manufacture of tin-plates imported last year was about $8,991,468. American wages for same amount of work would be $23,352,875.

This increase in employment furnished to labor would more than remove the glut in the labor market. It would create such a demand for labor as to give employment to every idle iron and steel worker in the country.

It would also stimulate labor in the production of coal, iron, ore, coke, limestone, and other materials. The 254,751 gross tons of tin-plates represent 870,000 tons of iron ore, 300,000 tons of limestone, 1,800,000 tons of coal and coke, 300,000 tons of pig-iron, 5,000,000 pounds of lead, 25,000,000 pounds of tin, 12,000,000 pounds of tallow or palm-oil, 35,000,000 pounds of sulphuric acid, 11,000,000 feet of lumber, fire-brick, clay, oils and lubricants, hemp, etc.

It would require sixty-eight large works of five trains of rolls each, involving an outlay of over $30,000,000 capital, and giving employment to about 24,000 workmen in the rolling-mills alone, who would earn at least $12,000,000 per annum.

Comparative cost of the manufacture of black plate of ordinary quality in iron or steel at a Welsh tin-plate works, and the like at an American works, at wage rates paid in each country.

[In Great Britain there are 94 works, with a capacity of 376 mills, or 4 mills to each works. English works make 30 boxes per day, Welsh works 35 and 40 boxes. Weekly average per mill, 11 turns, 400 boxes. Total for 4 mills, 1,600 boxes per week, or 80,000 boxes in a year, 17 boxes to the ton.]

	English rates.	American rates.	English earnings.	American earnings.	Cost per box in England.	Cost per box in United States.
BLACK PLATE DEPARTMENT.			*Per day.*	*Per day.*		
Steel or iron bar, per ton	$24.60	$38.00			$1.44 7/10	$2.23½
Roller,* per box	.06½	.23	$2.27	$8.65	.06½	.23
Catcher, per box	.02½		.87		.02½	
Doubler, per box	.05½	.11	1.92	3.85	.05½	.11
Furnaceman, per box	.05	.10	1.75	3.50	.05	.10
Opener, per box	.01½	.05	.52	1.75	.01½	.05
Shearer and assistants,† per box	.02 3/10	.11	6.44	30.80	.02 3/10	.11
Annealers,† per box	.03 3/10	.12	10.13	32.00	.03 3/10	.12
Pickling, patent process in England	.03 3/10	.17			.03 3/10	.17
Cold rolling room:						
Oreman			‡7.20	‡25.00		
Boys rolling			.40	1.25		
Catching			.28	1.10		
Greasing			.20	.75		
Attending			.28	1.10		
On contract work 10s. ($2.40) per 100 boxes in England	.02 3/10	.09			.02 3/10	.09
One man weighing black plate			1.00	2.00	.00 7/10	.00 7/10
Doublers, bundlers, 32 cents per 100 boxes						
Finishers, 40 cents per 100 boxes	.00 7/10	.02			.00 7/10	.02
Two men assorting in annealing room	.00 5/10	.01½	.80	2.00	.00 5/10	.01½
Foreman and roll-turner			‡14.40	‡25.00	.00 5/10	.01 5/10
Mason (bricklayer)			1.44	3.00		
Blacksmith			1.32	2.75		
Helper			.72	1.50	.01 5/10	.02 5/10
Millwright for repairs			1.44	3.00	.00 5/10	.01 5/10
Watchman			.72	1.25		
Two engineers, each			1.20	2.50		
Two helpers, each			.84	1.75		
One man wheeling shearings			.80	1.60	.02 3/10	.05½
Sunday repairs, castings, bricks, clay, etc					.02	.04
Sulphuric acid, c £5, or hydro-chloric, c £3 per ton, 1c H, 8 H					.08	.18
Coal for boilers, annealing and mill, 30 tons per day					.13½	.13½
Annealing pots and stands					.01½	.02
Total					2.19½	3.74½
Credit shearings, 20 pounds per box					.10	.18
Net cost per box of black plate					2.09½	3.56½
TINNING DEPARTMENT.						
Tinman, 35 boxes per day, per box	.06	.12	2.10	4.20	.06	.12
Washman, 35 boxes per day, per box	.06	.12	2.10	4.20	.06	.12
Grease-boy, 35 boxes per day, per box	.02	.04	.70	1.40	.02	.04
Branning, $1.44 per 100 boxes						
Dusting, $1.08 per 100 boxes	.02¼	.05			.02¼	.05
One man wheeling plates and lighting fires			.80	1.25	.00 7/10	.00½
Assorters:						
First hand			1.40	2.80		
Two second hands			1.32	2.65	.01 5/10	.02 5/10
Reckoning			.40	.80	.00 5/10	.00 5/10
Boxing and branding boxes, $1.33 per 100 boxes			1.90	2.80	.01 5/10	.02 5/10
Foreman of tin house			‡14.40	‡25.00	10	.01 5/10
Bricklayer for repairing pots			1.44	3.00		
Smith and machinist			1.32	2.75		
Helper			.72	1.50	.01 5/10	.02 5/10
Storekeeper			.80	1.60		
Laborer attending to fire			.80	1.25		
Boy driving small engine			.32	.65	.00 7/10	.01 5/10
Lumber, boxes for packing plates					.08	.08
Stoves, nails, hemp, skins, brushes, etc					.04	.04
Welsh flux, acid process					.04	
Palm-oil flux, 1½ pound						.10½
Coal for melting pots					.00½	.00½
Block tin on Welsh plates, 2¾ pounds					.55	
Block tin on American plates, 3½ pounds						.70
Bran for cleaning plates					.00½	.01
Castings for repairs of tinning pots					.00½	.01
Lamp oil for lighting					.00 5/10	.00 5/10
Tinning royalty on patent rolls						.12

General charges.	Wales.	United States.				
Banker's commission	$2,500	$5,000				
Rents, taxes, etc	1,500	1,500				
Manager's salary	1,500	3,000				
Bookkeepers	750	1,500				
Pay and yield clerk	500	1 000				
General clerk	400	800				
	7,150	12,800			.08 3/10	.16
Total					3.13½	5.25
Credit copperns and tin-scruff					.08	.12
Net cost of 1 box I C plates, 14 by 20					3.05½	5.13

* The "roller" pays the "catcher" in the United States. † Paid for product of four mills in both countries. ‡ Per week.

We could elaborate on this subject still more, but we feel that we are encroaching upon your valuable time. What is herein given we can substantiate. Our people are no theorists in their line. They are men who by dint of hard physical labor (labor that has made it possible to encircle this country with a complete network of iron and steel), energy, experience, suffering, and hardships have become thoroughly practical. Our condition as workingmen is such that requires legislation—for our betterment, not for our detriment, which the passage of the Mills bill will make possible. Some will argue that our employers will reduce our wages anyway, even though the tariff remains as it is. We ask you to leave that to us, and we will endeavor to take care of ourselves. As is customary in all branches of business, even among lawyers, we have our little family quarrels, but we dislike outsiders to interfere in the settlement thereof.

We mean no disrespect to any one when we say that we look upon this yearly agitation of the tariff as a menace to our business, though, perhaps, unintended.

As an organization we have strenuously and persistently opposed any concerted political action. We never have and do not now owe allegiance to any political party. We know neither Republicans, Democrats, Greenbackers, Prohibitionists, Union Labor, or any other known political party in the United States. In the opening ceremony in our lodge meetings we forbid "the introduction of any subject of a political nature." We simply quote this to show that we have never dabbled in politics as an organization.

We have never contributed $1 or 1 cent toward electing or defeating any party or any man, and we ask Congress not to force us into that position by passing a bill that will undoubtedly jeopardize our wages. While every member in our organization is free to and does exercise his political preference, we are protectionists and have unanimously declared ourselves such as an organization at almost every recurring annual convention.

All parties directly or indirectly interested in or against protection were refused hearings before the Ways and Means Committee, and we have no method of reaching the ears of the members of Congress only in this way. We therefore submit this statement through you, and ask for it a respectful hearing to the end that we may be allowed through the medium of protection against foreign competition to maintain decent living wages.

Accompanying this, please find a copy of our "scale of prices" for reference in case of dispute.

Yours respectfully, and on behalf of the iron and steel workers,

WILLIAM WEIHE,
President.
WILLIAM MARTIN,
Secretary.

Hon. WILLIAM MCKINLEY, Jr.,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, when Congress assembled last December there had been purchased all of the bonds which were necessary to complete the required sum for the sinking fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888. There had accumulated in the Treasury a surplus of about $55,000,000, and the daily sum collected by taxation was about $1,000,000, so that it was estimated that the surplus remaining unexpended on July 1, 1888, would be not less than $150,000,000. The Forty-eighth and the Forty-ninth Congresses had refused to consider any act reducing taxation; and the Secretary of the Treasury was not willing, under the act of March 3, 1881, to purchase bonds not required for the sinking fund.

When the Committee on Ways and Means was announced, on January the 5th, it necessarily had to confront this condition of affairs and attempt to frame a bill which would so reduce the revenues of the Government as to bring its legitimate expenses and its revenues close together; and this, too, in such a way as to reduce the burden of taxation upon the people. It recognized that the revenues could be reduced by raising the duties to a prohibitory standard—but this only increased the burdens of taxation.

The repeal of the entire internal-revenue law would also reduce the revenue to a point where there might be an annual deficit of $20,000,000; but this deficit could not work harm for the present, as the surplus remaining on June 30, 1888, would be sufficient to comply with the requirements of the sinking fund until 1891, when the four-and-a-halfs fall due. But no large section of the American people really favored a plan which removed taxation from spirits, beer, and tobacco, and left the necessaries of life burdened; nor was the committee willing, in the assorting of taxes and in the attempt to give substantial relief from the present unnecessary taxation, to adopt a plan which did not light a single furnace, cause a single wheel to revolve, give to labor a single day's wage, remove from commercial activity any burden, nor from the manufacturer any annoyance. This plan simply took from the public Treasury that amount of taxes which were voluntarily paid in a mode which distributed those taxes equally, impartially, and not by burdens upon the necessities of life.

Rejecting, therefore, the proposition to increase the duties for the purpose of reducing the revenues of the Government and increasing the revenues of the manufacturers, and the proposition to repeal the internal-revenue system, the committee attempted to frame a bill which would reduce the revenues by a safe amount, and would relieve, as far as a moderate bill could do, the evils of the present unequal system; reform the inequalities of the present tariff, and promote American industry by giving to American labor the hope of a permanent, stable, and profitable market. It recognized that a system which had been in existence for over a quarter of a century could not be hastily nor recklessly overturned. It desired to harm no industry. It constantly leant in favor of the established rates of duty, and in case of doubt proposed a rate which it believed to be entirely safe.

No one can appreciate more than we that the bill reported by us does not answer all the conditions of to-day; that many duties are left at a rate entirely too high; that the relief which ought to be given has not been granted to the extent which the condition of the country and of labor required; but I venture to affirm that under all the circumstances which surrounded us—trying to perform an onerous public duty with an eye single to the public good—we have reported a bill which every fair-minded man in America may accept as wise, moderate, and proper legislation. And upon this statement, for one, I am willing to go to the country and to submit to its judgment. [Applause on the Democratic side].

And here it may not be improper to notice the personal criticism on this committee by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS].

With a wit which was equaled by the courtesy and much greater than the desire for accuracy exhibited, the gentleman from Michigan insinuated, what he would not be reckless enough to directly assert, that not only was the bill reported not prepared by the Committee on Ways and Means which reported it, but that,

When pressed upon this point, there was no member of the majority so lost to all sense of personal pride as to admit the parentage.

And this statement is introduced with the assertion of the gentleman that—

It would be no violation of the secrets of the committee-room to state that.

I trust that it is within the most rigorous bounds of parliamentary language to say that this is absolutely without foundation; in its length, breadth, height, depth, and thickness it is a creation of the gentleman's fancy, except that he violated no secrets of the committee-room in making the statement; what he violated I leave to him to determine. [Applause and laughter].

At no meeting in that committee-room or elsewhere, at no time or place, in no manner whatever has the majority of that committee ever given any one any pretence to say that it denied its responsibility for this bill, or that any one but the members of that majority was in any degree whatever responsible for it.

Of course any bill not in whole or in part prepared by the gentleman from Michigan would fail to meet his approbation, for it is the pleasing belief of gentlemen of his opinion that they alone are competent to prepare tariff bills; and if it were possible for Job to return and ask that olden question which puzzled the depth and the sea, "Where shall wisdom be found, and where is the place of understanding?" the modest gentleman from Michigan, either alone or in company with some of his colleagues, would feel constrained by the irresistible sense of duty and of fitness to rise and with downcast eye but firm demeanor and hand resting on his manly breast answer, "here!" [Great laughter and applause on the Democratic side].

There need be no denial on the part of the minority of the committee of complicity in the preparation of any bill reducing the amount of bonus paid by the tax-payer and consumer to the favored beneficiaries of class legislation. It goes without the saying that they are guiltless of such offense. And it is true that in the preparation of this bill we did not hope to meet their wishes, receive their approbation, or find their support of the provisions agreed on by us. We disagree *in toto cælo*. We believe that taxation is a sovereign power to be used only to the extent of public necessity and for governmental purposes; they believe it ought to be used for private interests and the promotion of private gain.

With us the burden of proof is on him who seeks to insert rates of duties in a tax bill to demonstrate that the revenue is necessary and that the tax is a proper one; they believe that the burden is on the tax-payer to demonstrate that no private profit will be lost by removing a public tax. With such opposite views it is the merest folly to suppose that it were possible for that committee to agree upon a tax bill.

But it is proper that this House and the country should know, what I doubt not is known, that this bill was the result of great labor, of an earnest desire to reach a fair and conservative compromise measure; and that every item of it underwent the scrutiny of every member of the majority of the committee. As a whole it is a compromise of independent and earnest opinions of earnest men bent on practical legislation. [Applause].

It does not pretend to change a system, to set aside the present system and substitute in lieu of it another and different system. It leaves the average rates of duty higher than they were under the Morrill tariff, and it is a protective-tariff bill. The committee did not believe that it was its duty to do more than to propose a moderate reduction of taxation by increasing the free-list, reducing certain rates, and removing as far as practicable unnecessary restrictions, and to make an effort to render the administration of the law more efficient to the protection of honest importers and the detection and prevention of fraud.

Whatever views any one may hold as to the proper theory on which a tariff bill ought to be framed, those views are not violated by this bill. We do not pretend that it is a scientific measure. The present law is very highly protective—in some instances prohibitory. He who believes that protection ought to be the main object and revenue only incidental may find it to his interest to accept so moderate an offer as is now made; he who thinks that in raising the revenues such incidental protection ought to be given as is practicable will find in the provisions of this proposition, when he examines them carefully, that his support of this measure would be consistent with his opinions. While men of my views, content with trying to accomplish what is practicable and patiently watching the fair experiment of reducing taxation and increasing the free-list by putting thereon raw material, ac-

cept the practical and give our support. It is a bill framed to meet the present condition, not to fit any particular theory.

The bill reported affects the schedules under which there were importations during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, to the value of $258,208,157.11, on which were collected $139,852,632.62 of duties, and it is estimated that the aggregate reduction of duties caused by the changes proposed in this bill will amount to $53,720,447.22. This estimate is, of course, conjectural. The reduction of rates sometimes produces increased importations, and in certain articles affected by the proposed changes this may occur. So, too, increase of population brings increase of consumption, and larger importations are needed to supply this increased demand. On the contrary, it is believed that this bill will enable the home manufacturer of woolen and other textile fabrics to so equally compete with his foreign competitor as to supply the home market with much of what is now supplied by importation, and that this will continue until the foreign goods of certain characters will be entirely driven from the American market.

We have no doubt that with the superior skill, intelligence, and machinery under the control of our manufacturers, that all that is necessary to secure for them the home market is that they shall be put on equal terms with the foreign competitor. We have kept steadily in view the fundamental principle of all true national growth—that there is no hostility between the man who produces the material out of which the fabrics must be made, the labor by which the change from raw material to finished product is accomplished, the manufacturer under whose supervision and by means of whose capital this change is made, and the consumer for whose benefit and at whose cost all this is done. Inextricably intermingled, there are no classes under a proper and natural system of development.

The changes proposed by this bill are designed to give to the farmer by whom all provisions are raised a market for his breadstuffs and for raw materials, which is only profitable when he has a prosperous manufacturer for a purchaser; to the laborer, the hope of a constant market; and to the manufacturer, freedom from unnecessary burdens. We have, therefore, put upon the free-list, as far as we felt it was just, the materials necessary for the manufacturer. We have reduced the rates, wherever we have touched them, to a point that gives to the home consumer the hope of fair competition whenever a demand may be made by an internal trust to advance the prices beyond a fair consideration for the article to be sold, and yet we have left the rates so that the protection afforded is greater than any necessity, and makes all competition of foreign manufactures upon terms of great advantage to the American manufacturer. We do not believe there is a single instance in the bill where the duty left upon an article is not more than the difference between the cost of production in America and the cost of production abroad, plus the freight. When the bill is examined in detail, I think this will be found to be true, and I remit the discussion of the details of the bill until it be taken up, item by item, under the five-minute rule.

But I will illustrate that this is accurate by a mere reference to the cotton schedule:

The last authoritative compilation and analysis concerning the cotton manufacturing interest of the United States was prepared by Mr. Edward Atkinson, an eminent practical expert, as the agent of the Tenth Census.

In the census year the cotton-mills of the United States consumed 1,570,344 bales of cotton, which cost $55.39 a bale, and sold the product at the rate of $122.32 per bale, the aggregate cost of the cotton being $86,925,725, and of other material $15,260,622, and the aggregate proceeds of the product were $192,090,110.

The mills paid $42,040,510 for the services of operatives and all other employés. The cost of labor was 21.28 per cent. of the value of the product, and 41.13 per cent. of the value of the cotton and all other raw material consumed.

The cost of the raw material of all kinds and wages was $144,246,857, and the product was sold for $192,090,110, leaving a credit balance of $52,156,747, which seems to include, though not so stated, the cost of insurance, interest, and selling, as those items are not charged in the account balance-sheet.

The cost of labor was 21.28 per cent.; the proposed duty is from 35 to 40 per cent., being from 175 to almost 200 per cent. on the labor. But, in addition to this enormous advantage, the English manufacturer has to pay freight on the cotton exported from America, which is about 12 per cent. on the material, and freight on his finished product, which is 12 per cent. on the fabric, and it is fair to estimate this double freight at 18 per cent. To this must be added the double marine insurance and the additional cost of the increased handlings necessary, and to this the increased productivity of the American laborer.

The rates proposed and the changes recommended ought to meet the approval of the gentlemen from Massachusetts, for they are even higher than those advocated by Henry Wilson and approved by Charles Sumner in 1857 (Globe, Thirty-fourth Congress, third session, volume 35, page 343), and of the gentlemen from Ohio, for they are far above what Senator SHERMAN declared in 1867 (Globe, volume 63, part 3, appendix, page 71, second session of Thirty-ninth Congress) was sufficient. Let me submit to the distinguished Representative from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] what his no less distinguished Senator then said—

We must now protect American manufacturers, not merely against foreign competition, but also against the effect of our own laws. This is really all the protection they now need.

* * * If you reduce their products to a specie basis, and put them on the same footing they were on before the war, the present rates of duty would be too high. It would not be necessary for scarce any branch of industry to be protected to the extent of your present tariff law.

They do not ask protection against the pauper labor of Europe, but they ask protection against the violation of your own laws. These are our paper currency and our internal taxation.

You have repealed every burden imposed on the manufacturer under the internal taxation except as to alcohol, and we are on a specie basis; and yet you asseverate, with a display of intense passion, that a bill proposing changes so much more moderate is, in its conception British, in its design unpatriotic, and in its effects fatal. Gentlemen, how do you expect the country to believe that you are sincere when they contrast your utterances with those of the statesmen who were your leaders?

It was determined, in response to what seemed to be the sentiment of a large part of the country, to propose the repeal of taxes on manufactured tobacco. For practical statesmanship is the art of wise compromise, and in a free country the desire and judgment of a large portion of the people whom we represent must be accepted as a sufficient reason for legislation.

In the twenty-five years in which the internal-revenue system has been in force certain statutes have been found to admit of an administration which is oppressive and irritating. The committee have thought it wise to repeal so much of these statutes as were not necessary to the proper administration of the system and the collection of the revenue under it. We propose the repeal of special retail licenses, the revenues from which we do not need, which licenses we do not believe to be necessary to the administration of the law and the collection of the remaining revenues, and which are a continual source of oppression and irritation, as is shown by the fact that more than 50 per cent. of all the prosecutions in the Federal courts are for the alleged violation of those provisions of the statute which are proposed to be repealed.

It is also proposed to give to the Secretary of the Treasury the discretion to make an experiment as to whether the revenues upon distilled spirits may be collected in a simpler and less expensive manner than under the present statute—as to whether the army of office-holders required by the present system can not be either greatly curtailed or wholly discharged. It is not made mandatory upon him, because the committee was not willing to force the Executive to try this experiment, but they did desire not only that he should have the opportunity so to do but that he should take advantage thereof. The present system is largely based upon the hypothesis that every one who manufactures spirits, beer, or tobacco is dishonest, and is to be watched as if he were intent upon defrauding the Government. It is believed that a system ought to be, and can be devised based upon precisely the opposite hypothesis, and this law permits the Secretary to make an experiment with the smaller distilleries if he chooses so to do.

There were reasons which made the committee examine with the utmost care whether it is practicable to exempt fruit brandies and alcohol used in the arts from taxation without destroying the legitimate distillation of taxed spirits; and no provision could be framed which seemed satisfactory—no provision that practically exempted these spirits on the one hand and yet was at all just to those who obeyed the law as to other spirits, or secured the collection of the revenue on the spirits taxed. Our belief was that to exempt fruit brandies and alcohol used in the arts was indirectly and hypocritically, but effectually, to destroy the internal-revenue system; and if this is to be done we preferred to do it or have it done openly, and thus fix the responsibility for it upon those who accomplished it. Those who vote to exempt alcohol thus used will do so with the knowledge that it is a vote to destroy the tax on distilled spirits.

The aggregate amount of reduction is estimated to be $78,176,054.22, taken in nearly the proportion of 2 to 1 from tariff taxation and internal-revenue taxation.

This reduction, of course, does not affect the surplus now in the Treasury. As to that the policy which the committee has desired to be pursued, and which under the bill reported by it and amended in the Senate, and under the resolution passed by this House on the 16th of April, has been inaugurated by the Secretary of the Treasury since this discussion began, is that the payment of the public debt with the surplus which has accumulated, and which will continue to accumulate, ought to be the settled policy of the Government. And as to the future the reduction of taxation by the removal of burdens through a revision of the tariff is the policy through which alone the Democratic party can hope to retain the confidence of the country.

The bill is before Congress; the responsibility of its preparation was upon us; the responsibility of legislation is upon you. No sneers as to its authors; no charges, however offensive or discourteous, as to the manner of its preparation; no abuse of those who were concerned in its preparation can remove from you the responsibility of action nor change the issue made by the bill itself. The surplus continues to grow; the evil effects of it are daily exhibited; schemes without number to squander the public money, to distribute it among the States, to cultivate a habit in the American people of looking to Washington as a great alms-giver can be defeated only by your action as to this bill. And it is no answer to say that it was prepared in secrecy, that its authors are incompetent, that there was impropriety in the mode of its consideration. Neither your own consciences nor the country will acquit you if you shirk the responsibility and evade the issue under such excuse. Nor will it be accepted as any answer that there was any provision of any sort in the

Confederate constitution, or that the gentlemen engaged in the preparation of this bill were on one side or the other side during that great strife, or that certain States have lagged behind in the progress of national growth. It might as well be understood that what we do and say here is done and said in view of the American people, who are in dead earnest concerning this matter.

It has been reported that in some savage tribes, out of the bones of the dead, implements of various sorts were made; but in this debate it has occurred to gentlemen so eminent as to be distinguished representatives of the people to deliberately dig up the bones of the heroes of the great war and out of them make dice, and loaded dice at that, to play in this game of politics. In such a game, even with such dice, the gentleman using them may rest assured that they will lose. The American people are in no humor either to witness or approve such proceedings.

The venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania may also be assured that no criticism he may permit himself to make upon Kentucky will be held to be any answer to the bill under consideration, or any excuse for refusal to give relief to the people, overburdened by excessive taxation and looking to this Congress for some wise legislation. Kentucky can bear with serenity both the commendation and the condemnation of that venerable gentleman, and I beg him to remember that no matter what he may feel called upon to say, he will again be welcome to our hospitality, which will be as generously afforded to him as it has heretofore been; for in his old age we will not remember, if he comes among us, that garrulity which has led him to say things the utterance of which can only harm him and which Kentucky can both forgive and forget.

If the tariff be such a stimulus, if under its operation only prosperity and progress are possible, then the question that he asks—why Kentucky is a laggard—is indeed a mysterious and unanswerable conundrum. If it be equal and just in its operation it becomes a still more mysterious problem, but if it be a carefully-devised system by which those sections which happened to be older and more developed and with larger accumulated capital obtained all the advantages under it, and made all other sections tributary to their gain and profit, then the question, if the implication contained in it were true, is of easy answer. You have obtained by the operation of an unjust law the surplus money which our fields and our mines and our labor have produced. Forced to purchase from you at prices which were wholly beyond the value of the articles purchased, debarred from the markets where we could buy the cheapest, and compelled to sell much of our product in the markets where we had to sell the cheapest, we have been laborers for your benefit; and it is scarcely becoming for you to ask of us why we have not prospered, when your cities have been partly built on our labor and your charities come from exactions laid upon our shoulders.

But while it is true that, relatively, these manufacturing States have grown unequally wealthy, I am confident that they are not as wealthy as they would have been if Carolina and Georgia had not voted for protection in 1816, or Webster had won in the great battle of 1824. The aggregate wealth would have been so much more that their just share thereof would be more than their unjust share under the protection system. It has been a giant moving upwards, but burdened and manacled. The flight has been that of the eagle, but an eagle weighted and trammeled. We took the wrong road in 1824, and surrendered the easy mastery of the world and the unrivaled supremacy of the seas.

It is not, however, true in the sense in which the gentleman asks it, that Kentucky has been laggard. Under the apportionment in 1870 she obtained one additional Representative on this floor, and again, under the apportionment of 1880, she obtained another. From 1870 to 1880, Kentucky increased in population nearly 24 per cent.; Pennsylvania nearly 22 per cent., and New England a little over 15 per cent., so that in spite of unequal laws her growth has been steady, homogeneous, and prosperous, without jealousy of any sister State, and with kindly regard for all sections.

It is true that we have not imported contract labor from Hungary to mine our coal at a price so small that the duty upon it will pay much more than the cost of the mining, and thereby driven the native population from their homes. It is true that we have not used the laws of the land to induce foreigners to settle among us under such contracts as to force the native laborer to work at starvation prices and thereby give to gentlemen in Kentucky the means to found great libraries, or even write valuable books showing the exploits of that "triumphant democracy" through whose delusions such accumulations became possible.

For the convenience of her citizens Kentucky has divided her territory into numerous counties, and the revenue paid by the citizens of some of these counties do not equal the expenditures needed to be disbursed within those counties, and such counties are called "pauper counties," being, however, not a term of reproach nor of poverty. But I felt a pang of pain when the venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania, in his blind attack upon Kentucky, spoke of these "pauper" counties, not on my own account, but for my friends, my Republican colleagues from Kentucky [Messrs. THOMAS, HUNTER, and FINLEY], each of whom lives in one of these "pauper" counties, and in these "pauper" counties resides the Republican strength of Kentucky.

Mr. THOMAS, of Kentucky. Will the gentleman permit me to ask, do not the gentlemen from the First, Second, and Tenth districts represent pauper counties? And are not all of these gentlemen Democrats?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The gentleman refers to Mr. LAFFOON, Mr. TAULBEE, and Mr. STONE. I am glad of it, when it puts my friend in such excellent company.

When that speech is read by the citizens of those counties, who have held in affectionate remembrance the name of my venerable friend, they will think, if they do not say, "*Et tu, Brute*," and I fear that they will not remember that the last word is in Latin and is a word of two syllables. [Applause.]

The venerable gentleman permits himself to say:

> In the midst of almost unparalleled wealth and general physical advantages the mass of her people are steeped in poverty and illiteracy, and are strangers not only to the comforts of humble life but to the commonest and most absolute daily necessaries of Northern laborers. In 1880 the number of her people above ten years of age who were reported by the census as unable to read and write were more than one-half of her total population. The number was 606,578, while her total population, which of course included those under ten years of age, numbered 1,163,498.

The venerable gentleman, after the speech of my colleague, Governor MCCREARY, corrected the figures, but did not retract the charges founded upon them; statements far more inaccurate than were the figures; a description so grotesque and exaggerated as to excite only pity for him who could deliberately write and deliberately utter it. It is a fair specimen of the accuracy and fairness of one of the fairest defenders of the present system, and of the temper, animus, and taste of the leader of the Republican House. It harms not the State of whom it is recklessly said.

I hope my Republican colleagues from Kentucky will circulate this speech of their leader over their districts which the gentleman attempts to describe; for he expressly declares of that portion of Kentucky in which I reside, and in which Democratic majorities are given:

> Central Kentucky, * * * I may say, is the seat of a more refined and cultivated pastoral community than I have ever been introduced to elsewhere, unless it was in the southern counties of England.

I know not whether the anonymous writers of the extracts read by the gentleman are Kentuckians; if they be, "It is a nasty bird that fouls its own nest."

Mr. Chairman, I venture to submit that in this Congress Kentucky needs no defense; that it is not immodest in her people to hope that her sons in either branch have not been unworthy of her, a fact to which I trust my venerable friend will hereafter feel more like testifying.

But I will not be tempted further; in passing I express the confident belief that the day has gone by when either the passions of the war, denunciations of the whisky ring, abuse of the South, identification of revenue reformers with the Confederate army, or any other of the skillful arts which those interested in the maintenance of this system have heretofore so successfully used, can prevent some action which will be the beginning of a system which is based on the great principle that all tariff legislation should be for the public good and not for private interest.

But I venture to affirm that the gallant Federal soldier who, urged only by a sense of duty, in time of great peril risked his life in retrieving the disaster impending at Shiloh, will hardly be satisfied, when he asks for cheaper clothing and cheaper lumber, to be told that he had fought at Shiloh to settle the question that the Eastern manufacturer had the right to compel the Western consumer to pay such duties as his greed demanded, and that any effort to cheapen the necessities of life by removing therefrom the present exactions would be held to be recognition of the Confederate constitution and the wisdom of that secession. The day has passed when under the old flag, and in the name of loyalty, the sweat of the farmer and the laborer, coined into hard money, can be taken without consideration under the pretense of tariff protection to American labor.

And as I listened to the venerable leader of the House and other eloquent colleagues denouncing the "whisky ring," and pleading in the name of morality for free whisky, and to other gentlemen declaiming with assumed ferocity of manner and exaggeration of rhetorical passion about the late war, the Confederate constitution, and the rebels, I could scarcely repress the hope that the enemies of tariff reform would accept these gentlemen as their leaders, and make up the issue to be tried by the people as they desired. On the one side the payment of the public debt, the reduction of tariff taxation by removing burdens from the necessities of life, and a peaceful rivalry among all sections in building up the future of a united country; on the other side, the squandering of the public money, free whisky, taxed necessities of life to benefit a favored few at the expense of the many, the protection of trusts, and sectional hate.

Representatives of the Republican party, did these gentlemen express your real sentiments? Was the applause with which you greeted their utterances sincere? So be it. We accept the issue, and appeal first to this House to decide, and then to the grand assize of the sovereign people, whose servants we are.

In the year from July 1, 1886, to June 30, 1887, our importations were in value $683,418,981, of which $233,093,639 were free of duty and $450,325,322 dutiable, and the total duty paid was $214,222,310.

Of the importations of last year, $245,587,016, under the classifica-

tion adopted by the late distinguished Secretary, Mr. McCulloch, were articles in a crude condition which enter into various processes of domestic industry, and articles wholly or partially manufactured for use as materials in manufactures and mechanic arts. The aggregate duty on this sum was $39,961,346. Of this sum $19,567,903 was paid as duty on "articles in a crude condition which enter into the various processes of domestic industry," and $20,393,493 duty on "articles wholly or partially manufactured for use as materials in the manufactures and mechanic arts." This aggregate sum of $39,961,396 is not only the protection paid on his material by the American manufacturer for the benefit of the foreign manufacturer in all the markets of the world, but it is much more. It is that much addition to the cost of production upon which he must make his annual profit.

It is that much added to the burden of the consumer, together with all the embarrassments, annoyances, and expenses arising out of a system which in its administration as well as in its rates opens the door to great frauds as against the honest purchaser and importer, and causes trouble to those who are compelled to use these imported materials. This sum is 10 per cent. profit on $400,000,000, 5 per cent. profit on $800,000,000 of manufactures. But if it be true that the computation of its real burden is the proportion that it bears to the profit of the manufacturer and not to the cost of production of the product, this prevents the production of far more than $800,000,000 worth of manufactures. In many of the mills of New England a profit of one-third of one cent on a yard is an ample return upon the capital invested and employed.

This necessary material which we have to import and upon which this burden of forty millions is imposed is in its added cost rendered too expensive to be used in the production of manufactures where the margin of profit is very small. When to the imported material, estimated last year at $245,587,016, is added the cost of the material, labor, and skill necessary to produce the finished fabric, and to that the necessary cost of handling, transportation, and delivery until the product is actually in the hands of the consumer, the aggregate sum forms a much larger proportion of the seven thousand millions which is estimated to be the annual product of our manufactories than has been ordinarily understood. If it was the last feather that broke the camel's back, the removal of only a very slight part of the precedent load would have enabled that caravan to carry in safety what had been committed to its charge. Every practical man knows that it is not always the largeness of the sum which prevents bankruptcy or which enables him to manufacture in successful competition with his rivals. The mere difference in location, the mere cost of a single as compared with a double handling, the slight advantage in freights, may produce success to one and disaster to another when in all other things as between them there seemed to be equality.

To remove this burden would therefore give a relief far greater than may be calculated by estimating it in relation to the cost of production. It would give new stimulus to many manufactures now languishing—would give profit to many which are now run at a loss, and it would be that small but absolutely necessary sum which marks the difference between profit and loss in the attempt of our manufacturers to compete with the foreign manufacturers in the markets of the world. We talk of subsidies to ships for the purpose of reviving our foreign trade. We spend many millions of dollars a year upon our rivers and harbors for our internal trade so that they may, as far as possible, aid us in our contest for foreign trade. Here is, in its highest sense, a real subsidy that ought to be given to commerce.

To release this forty millions to the producers of America is to enable them to enter on more nearly equal terms with their foreign competitors in all the markets of the world; and as in these latter times it has been discovered that it is the small profit on the large production, and not the large profit on the small production which brings wealth, the larger the output of our factories the cheaper is the cost per unit of production, and the lower therefore the price of the necessities of life to the ultimate consumer.

So, too, this is a direct gift to him who produces in America the materials necessary for our manufactures. The only possible profitable market for him who produces the material upon which more labor and greater skill must be expended to make it useful, is to the manufacturer who is prosperous. It is therefore absolutely necessary that the farmer, who produces such material as comes from the field and stock—the miner and the forest-owner—that we shall adopt such a policy as will give a constant, stable, and profitable market for the material which he must sell in its incomplete state, so that he will be able to buy and pay for the finished product after it has passed through the hands of the manufacturer.

The 265,000,000 pounds of wool raised in America can be turned profitably into the necessaries of life which the wool-raiser must purchase only when he has a wool manufacturer who is prosperous and can therefore afford to purchase his material at a fair price. He who from the bowels of the earth digs ore, or mines coal, or from the mountain side or Southern swamp cuts the timber to which the centuries have given life and vigor, must have, if he can make his labor support those who are dependent upon him, some person who can take these incomplete materials and by added labor and higher skill fit them for the uses to which they were designed, and thereby pay to him a fair price upon which he may always rely, and furnish to him a stable market upon which he may always make his calculations.

The greatest of all products, which in this country must have its daily sale—and that for cash—is labor. Whoever else may retain his goods or wares in barns, or granaries, or warehouses, he who has naught but labor must sell it, and that for cash, so that the daily bread which depends upon the daily wage can be given to those whom God has put upon him to support. Competition can alone furnish a profitable market for labor—that profitable competition which gives life to trade; not that ruinous competition which the stimulus of a forced and unnatural system produces; but the natural competition which grows out of the development of a country and the necessity for a daily supply of its daily wants. This wage-worker demands that we shall frame such a system, if it be within our power to do so, as will furnish twelve months' labor for twelve months' pay. As it is now, whatever other advantage may be claimed for the present system, no fair man will deny that in all the great "protected" industries there can be but seven months of labor, or at least seven months' pay for twelve months' labor, for in seven months when these factories run at their capacity they turn out twelve months' supply for the market they have, so that they give to their operatives the option of seven months' labor, at fair prices for that labor, to secure twelve months' living, or let them work the whole twelve months, but only at such rates as would in the aggregate amount to seven months' pay.

A protective tariff does not, and in the nature of the case can not, fix the wages of labor. Labor, like all commodities, will, under the operation of the law of supply and demand, command its worth in the market where it is for sale; and all that legislation can possibly accomplish is to interfere with the natural operation of this law, and so far as it does this only harm can ensue.

Canada, the United States, and Mexico have protective tariffs, but the price of labor is not uniform in any section of the continent; it differs in every Province of Canada, in almost every State of the United States, and of Mexico.

If there is demand for labor equal to or greater than the supply, then labor is profitably paid; and if combinations of capital to force labor to sell itself at prices fixed by the combination can not be successfully formed, then labor will be free to make its own bargains. But if the market be so restricted that the supply of labor exceeds the demand, or if capital is enabled to combine to prevent competition, then labor must be sold at the price fixed by the employer.

Now, our present system does both—it restricts the market to be supplied by our labor, and it enables the manufacturers to fix the price they will pay to labor. Whenever the duty is high enough to prevent foreign competition, then the operative making and the consumer purchasing those "protected" fabrics are in the power of the manufacturer. No organization of labor, no Knights of Labor, can break such shackles; the "strikes" give only assistance to the "trust," who own the market. The only relief is in Congress by the reduction of duty to the competitive point. We are in morals the partner of every combination rendered possible by the tariff. Who ever desires to dissolve this partnership will support this bill; and *per contra*, those who wish the "trusts" to continue will oppose any amendment or revision of the present law which could endanger their perpetuation. It is a contest between the revenue reform and the tariff trust party.

It is estimated that there are twenty millions of our citizens engaged in gainful operations. Of these it is a large estimate to say that fifteen hundred thousand can possibly be affected by the reduction of tariff duties; the most careful computation is that 7 per cent. may be thus effected. When you exclude all professional men, who, in one form or another, work for their livelihood; all agricultural laborers; all men who do work which must be done at the place where it is required—which is, by very large odds, the greatest part of other labor required in America than agricultural labor, such as house-building, repairing of all sorts, clothes-making, and the daily labor necessary in every community for its daily wants, which can only be done by persons resident in the community and being part of that community—and the operatives in those industries which are not protected or which do not need protection, the number remaining is not equal, in my judgment, to the number required to produce the exports which we now sell abroad.

If a proper estimate be made of the number of men whose labor is required to produce the cotton, wheat, breadstuffs, and manufactured goods which we export, I have no doubt that it would equal the labor employed in the production of the merchandise claiming protection. I do not know whether any one has attempted to make this calculation. If it be true, as I believe it is, then any system which renders unprofitable this labor can not be defended upon the ground that it renders profitable the labor employed in our protected industries, unless the proportion between them is so great that the country can afford to do without these exports or to export them at a disadvantage. But it is indubitably true that these exports are necessary to our prosperity and credit. We could not stand the drain of gold which would be necessary if our exports were seriously diminished. We hold our position

amid the nations of the world now because—I will not say solely, but mainly—of these exports, which furnish to them the food and clothing required by them.

The relief, therefore, of the manufacturer from the payment of this $40,000,000 a year is so much really given to the production of the crude material in America and to the laborer who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow, for it must be remembered that all of this material is absolutely necessary for the successful manufacture of the crude material produced in America. Without it many of our factories would have to be still, and much of the material for which our farmer and mine-owner receive fair prices would become comparatively valueless. From climatic and other reasons there are materials which we absolutely need, but which we can not raise, materials which we must have, and which America either does not produce or produces at such cost as to render the fabric into which it has to be put too expensive for common use. These large importations as a rule—to which, of course, there are some exceptions—add not only to the prosperity of the manufacturer, but are necessary to furnish a market for the product of the material man, and to furnish labor for the wage-earner.

The bill now reported is incomplete in that it does not remove all these burdens. The whole extent to which it does relieve by putting upon the free-list the articles which are on the dutiable list is $22,000,000. It does, however, reduce the burdens as to the other seventeen millions so far as the committee felt that it could do so at present; for some of these articles which are imported and are put under the classification I have indicated come in competition with articles manufactured in America. And the committee has left duties, in some cases altered, and in some unaltered, as in its best judgment the interests of each individual case required, giving the doubt always to the industry which claimed that it could not survive unless duty was left.

The principal items put upon the free-list have been wool and tinned plate, and the real issue between us and our opponents can not be better illustrated than by the different propositions concerning duty on tinned plate. Not one pound of this is made in America; not one pound of it can be used except in helping some other industry; it enters into many of the most important of our native industries. Our fruits, our fish, our vegetables, our meats, our milk, are canned in these tinned plates; it enters into the domestic economy of every housewife. There is hardly any material of which the distribution is so wide and the use so various, and the burden imposed by the tax levied on it so heavy. It will relieve in more ways and to a larger extent more of the minor industries of the country than almost any repeal of tax upon our whole schedule. Its repeal does not injure a single human being; it affects no interest injuriously. No manufacturer has accepted the offer of the Government, indirectly made by putting a duty on tinned plate, to erect a factory where it is made. Its repeal will cause at once great increase in the industries in which it is used. To make tinned plate free and cheapen sugar will at once give to every farmer who has milk now to waste a market in our large cities for condensed milk. Every owner of an orchard where any sort of fruit now goes to rot because its transportation is impossible will find a market for his product. On the other hand, our opponents offer to make the duty on this article absolutely prohibitory. It is an article which must be used, without which we can not get along. To make the duty 2.1 cents per pound necessarily requires either that it shall be imported at this increased cost, which will be some seven millions a year of added burden to the users of it, or that an inferior article at a much higher price shall be temporarily used by being purchased from the American manufacturer, and into his pocket will go not only the duty which is now paid, which is $5,706,433.89, but as much more, being the difference between the present duty, 1 cent, and the proposed duty, 2.1 cents, minus just the margin necessary to undersell the foreign manufacturer and prevent its importation.

So that our opponents, under pretense of reducing the revenue, deliberately propose to take from the American consumer of this necessary article a sum not smaller than $11,000,000, and pay this as a bonus to American manufacturers who already have a protection so large as to be able to make an association which does not hesitate to enter into the politics of the country and send its agents into Congressional districts to aid in the defeat of the Representatives of the people who stand in the way of their personal aggrandizement. On the one hand we propose to promote American industry in all its departments by putting this five million and odd dollars now paid into the Treasury of the United States as an additional sum that may be paid by those who turn tinned plate from its imported condition into the various forms in which it can be used in America to those who, in one way or another, furnish the material which is to be canned, or the labor used in these various industries. On the other hand, our opponents propose to pay as a bonus $11,000,000 taken from American tax-payers without consideration or compensation under the pretense of aiding American labor. It is not strange that with the hope of accomplishing such a result, associations can be organized, funds for corrupt election purposes raised, and lobbies paid to influence Congress.

As another illustration of this difference, I may give the different propositions concerning the duty on wool and woolen goods. In the report of the majority is a table showing the relation of the proposed duties under this bill to those proposed by the meeting held in this city last January of the so-called "Wool Growers' Association," and the "Woolen Manufacturers' Association," at which it was agreed that the schedule set out in that table should be submitted to Congress, and if possible, adopted by this Congress as a proper schedule of taxation upon the woolen goods which the American people must use.

To that meeting the tax-payers and the consumers were not invited. Their presence would have been held to have been an impertinence; and from the standard of the gentlemen participating in that meeting this would have been just. They knew that the present tariff law had been, in the main, the result of the dictation of just such meetings held in this and other cities during the last twenty-seven years. The tariff legislation had been practically in the nature of private and special legislation for the purpose of giving to those who succeeded in having "hearings" before the committee that rate of duty which their greed—not their necessities—required. They had grown habituated to the custom of dictating legislation, and the very force of habit, if nothing else, would have prevented them from inviting so inconsequential guests as the tax-payers and the consumers. Some one at that meeting boasted that the Wool-Growers' Association carried a million of voters in its pocket. Such votes as that gentleman could carry in his pocket might find entire comfort in the space which would be allotted to him, in company with a million others, in such pocket.

Their ideal of a Ways and Means Committee was one composed of gentlemen who represented such associations, which belief seems to be shared by Representatives on this floor, whose indignation at the spectacle of a committee framed to represent the tax-payers and the consumers struggles with the proprieties of life to find utterance. Yet the same fierce charge was made in the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses.

This Kentucky Speaker seems to be possessed with the absurd idea that the people who pay taxes and purchase goods, who raise wheat and cotton, who live on farms and till the soil, really ought to have some voice in legislation concerning the weight of the burden of taxation which they are to bear, and some representation on the committee whose duty it is to report bills for raising revenue. The idea may be absurd, but, gentlemen, it is growing in popularity, and we are ready to join issue with you in your clamorous plea that the tariff must not be revised except by the friends of the industries protected by it, and to assert that it must be revised by the representatives of all the people who are taxed by it.

I do not hesitate to declare that the schedule agreed upon at that meeting is simply iniquitous. It will be borne in mind that we raise in America about 265,000,000 pounds of wool; that it requires more than 600,000,000 pounds for the uses to which wool is put in our country under our climate. By reason of climatic influences, over which Congress has no control, the hair necessary to be used in certain manufactures can be grown only outside of our territory; and also certain wools not produced in America are absolutely needed to be mixed with our wools to produce the fabrics required. Therefore to utilize the 265,000,000 pounds of American wool and to produce the amount of woolen goods absolutely necessary, there must be imported, either in its raw state or in its manufactured state, over 300,000,000 pounds of wool.

The wage cost of producing woolen goods is estimated to be about $17.70 per $100 worth. This is ample protection for the difference between the cost of labor in America and abroad upon any theory whatever, because it gives to the manufacturer the entire cost of the labor he uses. But every pound of wool imported in a manufactured state is so much labor taken from our wage-earners. Every yard of imported cloth represents labor done abroad and the subtraction of that much labor that could by possibility be done here. So that any system which results in the introduction of finished product rather than of crude material is a direct blow at the labor of this country. But this is not the only injury done to labor by this system. The laborers must wear the clothes made out of the wool; our climate necessitates it. The duty on the material increases the cost of his clothing, so that he is by the same act deprived of labor and also compelled to pay an increased cost for his clothing. In addition, as the duty on the raw material is inflexible and must be paid by the manufacturer, whenever there is a depression in prices the only place where the manufacturer can make diminished expenditure is by decreasing the wages of his laborers, so that this laborer who has been deprived in large part of what is his legitimate work and has had added to his expenses the increased cost of his living, becomes now also the victim of the periodic depressions caused by this tax.

The farmer obtains no better advantage under this tax than the laborer. Except in a very few instances, the husbandry of sheep is a subsidiary interest to the farmer's business. Our opponents talk of the "million of flock-masters," as if "the flocks" these "masters" own were their principal capital. They talk also, in adding up the startling sums of money invested in this business, of the value of the farms on which these flocks are kept. There never was a more transparent piece of humbuggery. There are less than fifty millions of sheep in America. Making due allowance for the large flocks in the Territories and some of the Western and Southwestern States, and the large

flocks owned by a few Eastern flock-masters, the average flock of the ordinary "flock-master" can not be greater than twenty to twenty-five sheep, whose cost is almost nothing, for they are the scavengers of the farm. And as mutton, they would pay for the slight expense to which their owners are put in taking care of and breeding them.

I have no doubt that I speak the experience of the great majority of farmers when I aver that a small flock of sheep is of itself an advantage to a farm, and that for the amount invested, the profit on a small flock of sheep is the very largest return of the farmer's operations. The vast majority of those who own sheep do not raise enough wool to clothe their families. The difference between the cost of their clothing by virtue of our tariff, and what it would be if wool were free, would in the great majority of cases cover more than the entire value of their clip—certainly more than any possible difference between the value of wools as "protected" if all our adversaries claim for protection were true, and the price of wool as free; so that the wool-raiser is more interested in the revision of the tariff and the reduction of the duties upon woolen goods upon the basis of free wool than he is in the perpetuation of the present tax. But as there are only a million of flock-masters, the fifty-five million of people scattered all through America who are not pecuniarily interested in the ownership of these flocks are compelled to pay an increased cost for all the woolen goods which they are obliged to use.

But the duty on wool has, by the experience of the last twenty-seven years, been demonstrated not to be of advantage to the wool-grower, because it has not given to him a constant, profitable, and permanent market. Of all the manufacturers we have had in America the woolen manufacturer has had apparently the largest protection and the hardest struggle for existence. He has had to produce his goods at so large a cost of production that he has been constantly on the verge of being unable to dispose of these goods at a price which rendered their manufacture remunerative. He has had to compete with foreign manufacturers who had an absolutely untaxed material, in the use of which, by the very necessity of the case, selection of different sorts of wool was necessary.

No duty could be made so high as to pay the American farmer for raising the sheep whose wools are necessary to be mixed with our wools, and no law could relieve the manufacturer from the necessity of using those wools. It has been a hopeless fight against the elements. Some men have made large fortunes under it by making the cheaper fabrics which, under the prohibitory operation of specific duties, has given to them the absolute control of the American market, which cheaper fabrics are made, not out of wool, but out of wool and adulterants in all proportions from one-tenth wool up, as the conscience or the greed of the manufacturer dictated.

Now, after these twenty years of experience, this meeting held in Washington deliberately undertook to force upon the American people a schedule which increases the almost intolerable burdens now put upon woolen goods, in utter disregard to the claims of justice or the laws of supply and demand. The committee propose duties which are too high, duties which are unnecessary to give to the woolen manufacturer the control of the American market, and these duties range from 30 to 50 per cent.

We have placed these duties thus, because we felt it was to the interest of every section of the country that the woolen industry should be prosperous; that the wool-grower should have a prosperous purchaser of his wool; and the woolen wage-worker finds steady employment in factories running at full time the whole year. And we have placed the duties high enough, in our judgment, to absolutely secure this in spite of any undervaluation or fraud that dishonest importers may be guilty of. And yet our opponents propose to put on these same goods duties running from 69 to 134 per cent. We have arranged the schedule so that the cheaper article may be imported, if it be necessary so to do to prevent any combination or trust, and so as to give to the purchaser thereof an opportunity to buy goods made out of wool instead of so-called woolen goods made out of wool and adulterants. They have devised a scheme by which all the cheaper goods are absolutely prohibited from importation. The finest goods which the rich need have had placed upon them the lowest duties, while the goods which the humble, and even the prosperous who are not wealthy, must use, must be purchased from the American manufacturer. If the American people could be induced to take this table and thoroughly understand the present schedule, the schedule proposed by the committee, and the schedule proposed by the meeting held in January, I believe it would end the controversy between us.

The clamor against free wool which has frightened some is absolutely without justification. The proportion that the wool interest bears to the agricultural interests of America is so small, and the difference—even if all that our opponents say could be true—between its value now and its value under free wool is so inappreciable when compared to the aggregate of the vast wealth of America, and of all the investments which the farmer holds, that the clamor for its protection demonstrates what skillful organization, backed with the aggressiveness of private gain, and urged with conscienceless audacity can do. If this bill goes into operation, one of its beneficent results and not the least will be the emancipation of American politics from the domination of the so-called wool-growers and the freedom of the representatives of the people from the control of those who profess to speak in the name of the million of flock-masters.

The mortgages on the farms and city property of the West represent only a small part of the aggregate price the farmer has paid under a system he has been induced to support by the bribe of taxed wool.

No one, in the true sense of the word, owns the soil he tills, unless the profits of his toil belong to him; otherwise he is merely a tenant, no matter under what name he may work. Under our system the farmer is forced to see his profits, willy-nilly, go to those by whom and for whose benefit this tariff was enacted. By a law which no Congress can control the price of the surplus of any merchandise fixes the price of the entire supply. The price of wheat, cotton, and of other crops and produce, of which we export a surplus, is fixed under free trade at Liverpool. The profits of this produce are more than swallowed up by the cost of what has to be purchased, which is fixed at home under this tariff; so that the farmer's profit has annually gone under the operation of this tariff to those for whom in reality he has been toiling. If it were the profit only it might be endurable, but it has been far more than the profit. The enormous debt owed by the West and South to the East represents two distinct sums—investments out of which the debtor hopes for profitable return and the deficit between the income and the expenditures of the debtors. What this latter amount is it may be impossible to accurately estimate, but in the aggregate it is very large, and is due to the operation of our class legislation.

And as the causes which created the first deficit still exist, and in addition thereto must the annual interest be met, this deficit must continue to increase until disaster occur or those causes be removed. That which produced the necessity for borrowing even when agricultural products were high, will increase this burden of debt, and the depression of our agricultural interests will continue. Our country is so new and rich and there are so many sources of wealth that the slowly accumulating debt is carried without such bending under the load as to make the debtors cry out. But the private debt of the farmers of America is very large, and must of necessity increase unless relief comes by enabling them to sell their products where they can sell at the highest and buy their supplies where they can purchase at the lowest price.

Can he not afford to try the experiment and see if it be not possible to have a financial system which will enable him to keep his own surplus?

The failure of legislative attempts to make employments permanent is signally illustrated in the flax and hemp industry of America. Flax and hemp and the grasses out of which fabrics can be made can be grown in every part of America. The seed of the flax and hemp is valuable for oil, of which great quantities are needed. Since 1842 the duties on both flax and hemp have been more than sufficient to make the production thereof profitable if there were no other causes at work. The duty on hemp was originally imposed in 1789 for the benefit of Georgia, in which State not a pound, practically speaking, has been raised for many years. Under natural causes wholly independent of the tariff the production of hemp increased in America until it reached 79,000 tons.

The peculiar form of labor in Missouri and Kentucky, with the fertility of their soil, rendered it so profitable to raise hemp that they gradually drove from the market all other American hemp. While the tariff still remained the production of hemp in America decreased until it fell below 5,000 tons, while the products made out of hemp and kindred fibers enormously increased. During the last few years, with the duty at precisely the same amount, the farm value of hemp has fluctuated from over $10 a cwt. to less than $4 a cwt., and the amount of its production has varied from less than 5,000 to probably as much as 10,000 tons. The duty did not raise the price to $10 a cwt.; it did not lower the price to less than $4 a cwt.

Substantially, this has been the history of flax as well as hemp, until to-day the flax grown in America is grown for the seed, and no attempt made to use the fiber. In the mean time substitutes have been found for all the coarser products made from flax and hemp. Our cotton has been covered by bagging made from jute butts; standing cordage has been made from wire. As wheat and cotton had to compete in the Liverpool market with wheat and cotton raised in India, the cost of their production had to be reduced to the lowest possible sum; and so inventive genius has been at work to cheapen the expense of these necessary articles. In the process of these inventions the wheat is harvested with reapers which tie the bundles with twine. Over 33,000 tons of this twine was used in America last year out of, in the main, imported crude material. The use of the finished fabrics made from flax has continued in America even though, for climatic reasons, most of it must be made abroad. Now, during all these years, in the vain attempt to "protect" the flax industry, large taxes have been imposed on the raw material and on the manufactured product. It has been a hopeless contest, except in one aspect. Those who were interested in keeping up this system and who were making from it large sums of money could easily afford to pay to Kentucky nominally $25 a ton on from 5,000 to 10,000 tons of hemp to silence her protest against the continuance of taxation which required her to pay not only this bribe, which she appeared to receive, but in addition thereto enormous sums.

It was a bargain that the gentleman from Pennsylvania can well afford to plead with the Kentucky people to keep up, that they should apparently receive from $150,000 to $300,000 a year nominal protection for their hemp, which sum they actually paid themselves, and in addition thereto paid to others very much larger sums, while his constituents and those interested with them really obtained through the operation of this system those profits which built up their cities and States. And the references made on this floor by him and other gentlemen to Kentucky and the whisky trust are simply to weaken the influence of the Representatives from Kentucky, who will no longer consent to be parties to any such "combine." Last year nearly 160,000 tons of these fibers were imported, upon which was a tax of $1,930,340, and on the products manufactured therefrom an additional tax of $7,567,641.72.

I submit to the good people of that State that it is my duty to accept the proposition contained in the bill reported, by which the nominal protection to hemp, amounting to perhaps $200,000, is surrendered, and the American people relieved thereby from a tax of $4,766,846.88; that it would be utterly unbecoming in me to ask the American Congress to pay to the people residing in the blue-grass section of Kentucky less than a quarter of a million of dollars if thereby they had to tax themselves this $4,766,846.88. This is the debit and credit side of this much of this bill, but the result thereof is of far more importance really than the amount of taxation removed by this bill.

I trust that the passage of this bill will break up the "trust" made by the Binder Twine Association, by which the price on binding-twine is kept at several cents per pound more than a fair profit thereon.

Wheat and cotton are relieved of a burden which was constantly growing. All articles which have to be put in bags, all furniture which has to be wrapped in burlap, and the numerous other products into which these materials are woven, will be so much cheapened by this bill and the cost of their manufacture diminished that all the goods which can be made out of them in our climate ought to be made in America, and the the result of that will be that the uses to which American flax and American hemp can be put will increase the demand for such products. It will be no longer in the power of combinations and trusts to control prices, and the producer of the raw material in America will find that he will have a free market and a fair demand for his crop.

There can be no better demonstration of the wisdom of permitting raw material to be imported free of duty than the experiment tried with raw silk and raw hides. To-day our silk industry is in a most prosperous condition, gradually but surely driving foreign silk from our market, and it will, I confidently predict, successfully compete in other markets with such silks as our climate will permit to be made in this country. It is still more strikingly illustrated in all those industries which are based upon raw hides. The producer of the raw material in America has not been injured; but, on the contrary, benefited by the permission given to our manufacturers to import the material needed by them free of duty, and our tanners, glove-makers, manufacturers of all kinds of leather and of boots and shoes have continued to prosper.

The importation of hides has greatly increased, and the prosperity of those who use them has proportionately increased. There is no reason to doubt that precisely the same result would follow the permission to obtain wool on the same terms that raw silk and raw hides are obtained. The indirect influence has been equally as marked. Our only trade with certain countries grows out of our purchase of raw hides and coffee. Remove the barriers and this trade will widen until we will control the entire trade of those countries whose principal products are raw material, which we can turn into the finished product which they must have.

The questions which necessarily arise out of the discussion occasioned by the introduction of the bill reported by the Committee on Ways and Means have been inherited from our fathers and will be of equal interest to our sons. The very existence of government necessitates the sovereign power of taxation. It is impossible to conceive of a government, in any true sense of that term; of society organized into any form in which it is capable of protecting life, liberty, and property, without the power of requiring the payment of the sums needed for the daily administration of its affairs.

It is the sovereign power, for by it the Government assumes the right and exercises the power to take from the citizen such part of his earnings as is necessary for its support, prior to permitting him to use them for the support of those dependent upon his labor. By means of it, it substracts from the support of the families of its citizens its own expenditures. It ought therefore to absolutely need the money before it resorts to this power, and the limitation upon its exactions should be its necessities. And in a free government where there are, in the eyes of the law, no classes; where every one is the equal of every other one under our institutions and in the protection afforded by the law, not only ought the taxation to be strictly limited by the necessities of the Government, but it ought to be impartially and equally collected from the citizenry. As far as it is possible to accomplish this end, every man should be required, as every man ought to be willing, to pay his fair proportion of the expenses of the Government which has been formed for the purpose of his protection, to which he owes his allegiance, and by means of which he is secured in the enjoyment of the property that he has earned or inherited; and he ought not to be required to pay any more than that fair share.

We therefore, in the very nature of our institutions, find these two fundamental principles; the amount of taxation is to be limited by the necessities of the Government; the distribution of the burdens is to be impartial and equal. When I say the necessities of the Government I mean that the objects for which taxation is levied must be governmental and public purposes; that it is a fraud, under the guise of providing for public expenditures, to lay taxes for private objects. It may be difficult to draw the line of division between public and governmental purposes and private purposes, precisely as it is difficult to draw the exact line which the twilight obscures between day and night. But he who professes to have any doubt about the existence of this line of demarkation is as absolutely foolish or false as he who would deny that there is a broad and visible distinction between the light of noonday and the darkness of midnight.

So, too, it may be quite impossible to so lay and collect the taxes as that the exact proportion that in absolute justice should be assessed against each individual citizen can be ascertained, but it is not difficult to frame the law with the desire and to draw its provisions with the honest purpose to secure that approximate equality which is possible.

Therefore, in the very nature of our Government, the power of the United States to levy and collect taxes is limited by the necessities of the Government economically administered, and its power to apportion those taxes is limited to an impartial distribution among the citizens of the United States. Any system of taxation which violates these two principles is necessarily vicious. But even in a broader view it is vicious under any form of government. The very foundation of all social order is both private and public honesty. Under no form of government nor under any possible pretense can the mere power by which one man's money is given to another man, without his consent and without compensation, be justified. Whenever by operation of law the money earned by one man can be taken by another without just compensation, then the power by which it is done, no matter under what pretense it is exercised, is in the ultimate analysis immoral, and the result is legalized robbery. No argument can change this essential truth; no possible appeal to the growth of the country, to the accumulation of wealth, to the apparent prosperity of the years in which such a system may have been in vogue can justify such a system.

I know that the old and divine test that "by their fruits ye may know them" has been applied by those who profess to be great thinkers as demonstration of the virtue of systems which have in them some inherent vice; so, too, coincidence and proximity are taken for cause and effect—the *post hoc* for the *propter hoc;* and we are in the midst of argumentation of precisely the same sort to-day about the fiscal system of the past twenty-seven years. In my boyhood and early manhood I heard this argument applied when it seemed to be unanswerable. Through negro slavery, it was claimed, a great and fertile country had been redeemed from the forest, had been cultivated to the highest degree of fertility; noble cities had been built; magnificent rivers covered with a profitable commerce; a civilization as delightful as it was splendid had within the memory of living men been developed under a sky of surpassing beauty amid a people adorned with every noble characteristic; and at the beginning of the year 1860 the prosperous, rich, and powerful Southern States, with a future of illimitable hope and glory—the demonstraton that African slavery was indeed a beneficent and fruitful institution—seemed by this rule to set the matter beyond dispute. But who now, recalling those sad years of war, and sadder years of reconstruction, and the difficulties which now encompass our people as they are trying to solve the problem of the duplex races, would attempt by that rule to prove the proposition which our fathers so firmly believed?

It has been recognized by the world that the union of church and state has not by the same rule been demonstrated to be most wise. Its advocates point to the gradual illumination of the world, as it emerged from the Dark Ages, led by the church, whose bishops were soldiers and whose soldiers were priests, as the result of that union which gave to the church the power of the sword, and made the sword instinct with the spirit of the church, so that by the power of heroic might the nations were conquered, and by the sweet influence of priestly care they were converted. Yet who in America, recalling all the other facts connected with this long union of church and state, the scaffold and the fagot, the dungeon and the rack, would dare to advocate that we should return to the day when the ruler of the people knelt before the head of the church, and when the decrees of councils contemptuously set aside the enactments of parliaments. The free churches of America, the free churches everywhere, have found that the only true servitude is to God, the only lasting power from God; that, ruling by love through the faith which makes men free, they are indeed powerful. The lesson can not be too often taught, that a vicious principle is in the very nature of the case obliged to work in the end disaster. Whatever may be the appearance during the time when this principle is at work, of prosperity or power, or growth, or wealth, is either only appearance, or it is in spite of and not because of the principle. [Applause.]

No system of taxation could be so oppressive and so vicious as to

have prevented the development and growth of the United States. A country like ours—in its resources so abundant, in its soil so fertile, in its minerals so exhaustless, in its water-power so powerful, lying midway between the two oceans, so as to face Europe on the one shore and the Orient on the other; inhabited by a people the very most enterprising, energetic, and aggressive that the world has ever seen; possessing in the highest degree the faculty of order and the capacity to build States—could not but prosper in spite of any system of taxation which the wit of man perverted to the aggrandizement of personal ends might devise.

When the mere erection of a cabin and the building of a fence and the plowing of the surface of the virgin soil change the value of land from a dollar and a quarter an acre to ten and fifteen dollars an acre; when the deficit of breadstuffs, which would have brought the world to the verge of starvation, could be supplied only by the surplus which these virgin farms, with scarcely any culture joyously rendered; when the clothing which the world needed had in large part to be weaved from the cotton which grew hoar on these fields; when the immigrants from narrow and tax-ridden homes abroad found new and ample homes and constant and profitable labor in these new and outstretching prairies, there was no possibility that any system of taxation could be so oppressive and mischievous as to prevent the marvelous growth and development of such a country. It could only retard that growth and create conditions which would bring unhappiness and distress. It could not prevent the accumulation of wealth; it could only distribute it unequally and oppressively. It could not make the country weak; it could only make the citizens divisible into unequal classes. It could do great harm, but it could not produce destruction.

All the good which these various and fruitful causes have produced has been claimed by the advocates of this system as the necessary and natural result of it. By it God gave to the sun the heat which produced the harvests; through its occult influences the rivers ran downward to the sea; by the resistless might of its silent energies the crops grew and were harvested, and the new homes of the West built, and the railroads laid down. Without it nothing can be accomplished. Its advocates, however, do not ascribe to it the evils which have grown up during the years of its domination. All prosperity comes from it. All adversity comes from other sources.

I am not one of those who in my zeal for revenue reform undertake to prove that the country has not grown richer during this past quarter of a century. Nor am I one of those who ascribe to the protective tariff all those troublesome problems which press upon us for solution. We have daily increased in wealth. There have been sufficient causes for this increase. We have had and now have evils which need remedy. There are other causes than the protective tariff which have helped to produce these evils. We deceive ourselves and we weaken our cause when we are not frank and just about these matters. But there are evils which a protective tariff either produces or, uniting with other causes, aids in producing.

Thirty years ago the American flag was seen in every port. In our bottoms outgoing cargoes paid freight to our ship-owners and incoming cargoes added to the profits of the trip. Our insurance companies during those years obtained the premiums on those cargoes. Our warehousemen received the commissions for their storage. Our merchants made the profits on the exchange of these goods. We sold in the foreign markets in which we were able to buy. We sold at a reasonable profit, we bought at a fair price. The material which we obtained in exchange for our manufactured product we turned into new product, and our laborers obtained the profit of the wages thereby occasioned. And so, year by year, as this commerce grew our wealth accumulated.

All this has been changed; partly it has been caused by the substitution of the iron vessel for the wooden vessel; but largely caused by a system of taxation which rendered it impossible for an American to carry on trade with a foreigner. You can not sell to advantage where you can not buy at a profit. While barter in the old mode, where one man traded his grain for another man's cloth, has apparently passed away, all the commerce of the world is equally barter now as it was then. No man can buy unless some man will buy from him that which he has to sell. No man can sell unless he can buy from the person to whom he sells, directly or indirectly. Besides that, there is a profit which is enormous from the mere handling, if I may so express it, of trade. As civilization increases, in the mere bringing to the consumer that which the producer has made and returning to the purchaser that which the consumer has paid there is a large profit. He who transports these goods, he who insures them, he who guaranties the credit involved in the transaction, he who manages the business of the exchange, becomes as necessary as the weaver or the manufacturer, and must have his share of the cost of production and profit of the transaction.

The little country of Holland has never raised enough in any one year to preserve it from starvation during that year. It has never manufactured enough cloth to prevent its people from great suffering. Rescued from the sea by dykes, it has seized from the sea its enormous accumulation by the mere profit of the exchange of commodities between the producer and the consumer. With the possible exception of two States of the American Union, and a tribe or two of American Indians, the people of Holland per capita are the wealthiest in the world—literally the accumulations given by the ocean to the people who have gathered the profits from exchanging the commodities of the world.

We ought to own the ocean; with our mineral resources and our forests and our extraordinarily long seacoast, with our interior lakes and our mighty rivers, we ought to have been the ship-building, ship-owning, and ship-carrying nation of the world. Into our hands ought the commerce of the world to have naturally drifted; into our coffers ought to have been gathered the profits of these exchanges. It was ours thirty-five years ago; not all of it, but more than 70 per cent. of it, and the great bulk of it ours potentially. We have lost it. We own no ships except those that are in the coastwise trade, with such exceptions that they scarcely need to be spoken of. Our own exports are transported in foreign bottoms under foreign flags, and all the profits of their carrying in every way, and of the returning cargo of imports for which they are sold, go to foreigners. Millions upon millions which ought to have belonged to us have been literally given by us, thrown into the laps of foreigners by our own action.

In 1855, of the tonnage of our foreign trade 71.95 was American; in 1887, 14.80 per cent. was ours; an aggreg ate decrease of 57.15—the average annual decrease from 1855 to 1866 and from 1866 being about 1½ per cent.

The annual freight paid on our foreign trade to foreigners has been variously estimated from $140,000,000 to $200,000,000. This enormous annual tax, now paid to foreigners, ought to have been ours; and the aggregate sum which we have thrown away in our selfish folly since 1855 is much larger than our public debt.

The advocates of the present tariff system vehemently deny that this gradual and fatal decay has been caused by it. They can not deny that as a remedy this policy has been wholly inefficacious. Since 1866 this decay has gone on under the protective system. We can hope for no relief from it.

The unrestrained power in Congress to enact navigation laws was the result of a "bargain" of the New England States with some of the Southern States by which an equivalent therefor, the continuance of the African slave trade for twenty years, was guarantied (Hildreth's United States, volume 3, page 520), and the navigation laws under which we have lost the carrying trade of our own foreign commerce were conceived in that spirit and enacted in pursuance of that bargain.

The basal thought on which rest legislation creating slavery, prohibitory tariffs, and compulsory navigation regulations, is precisely the same; the power of society organized into government to take from one man that which is his and bestow it by operation of law upon another. Slavery took all of a man's labor, returning only a livelihood measured by the humanity and will of the master. High tariff filches so much of his labor as is necessary to pay the difference caused by the tariff in cost of necessary articles. Compulsory navigation laws force him to purchase, not where he chooses, but where he must. All restrict liberty of action and of selection by legislation, and restrain freedom of choice for the private benefit of others. This thought is at war with the development of man and the progress of civilization, and all legislation based on it must fail.

The substitution of steam for wind as the motive power, and of iron for wood as the material, at once made our navigation laws "antiquated," and to preserve our superiority on the seas we ought to have so amended our laws as to permit American ship-building to be done on equal terms with foreign ship-building, and to permit our citizens to purchase wherever they could buy on the best terms. As sea-freightage is fixed by the laws of free trade—for the oceans scorn our tariff laws and despise our navigation regulations—our obstinate adherence to the selfish policy which controlled our legislation could have no other result. We doomed our ship-owners to a ruinous competition with foreign ship-owners by our navigation laws; and to make the fight absolutely hopeless we prohibited them from receiving returning cargoes by our tariff laws.

We have lost not only what I have just pointed out, but in addition to that, we have actually lost that trade which ought to be ours, even if it were carried on for us by foreigners. Not even can the foreigners, who get all the profit of what commerce we have, keep the American commerce from dwindling year by year. American goods can not be sold anywhere in the world, except as to certain articles of which I will hereafter speak, because America will not allow the purchaser of those goods to sell to American consumers that which that purchaser raises, nor will it allow its own citizens to purchase from those consumers that for which and for which alone they could be induced to buy from us.

An American manufacturer is not able to compete in South America with English manufacturers, because when he offers his goods to that consumer in South America the consumer has nothing with which he can pay—leaving out hides and coffee—that the American can afford to purchase to bring into the country; for the first act that the American Government does to this American citizen who tries to extend American commerce is, without judge or jury, to mulct him in a fine of an average of $46 for every $100 of goods which he has had the criminality to attempt to purchase to bring into America, to have worked up by American laborers in American factories, for the purpose of selling at a profit to go into the pockets of American citizens.

This is not a fancy sketch or flower of rhetoric. We have Canada on the north of us, Mexico, Central America, and South America on the south of us; China, Japan, and "The Isles of the Sea" opposite to us on the west, and their trade ought to be with us—by divine

right it is ours. The millions which a fair profit thereon gives to other nations could belong to us. These golden currents which would beautify and fructify our fair land have been turned from our shores by the miserable short-sightedness of those whose greed has weakened their vision and whose selfishness has obscured their judgment.

The climate and other influences which, under Divine Providence, determine what shall be the natural products of a country force us to buy certain material which we need, and which we can not raise. To the extent of that necessity, and to it alone, seek we any commercial relations with the world anywhere. We must have certain articles. At great loss and burden, with enormous duties, we purchase those articles and pay for them so far as possible with our manufactures. To this extent and this extent alone have we trade relations with the world, except so far as our cotton, our breadstuffs, and our provisions are concerned. There the reverse is true—the nations must have these products—they would not buy them from us if they could obtain them anywhere else in the world. Our surplus wheat supplies the deficit of the world's harvest. Our cotton supplies the clothing of the world, and if it were not a necessity we could sell neither wheat nor cotton, so that all the trade we have with the world is compulsory.

But for the blessings of an abundant Providence we would have isolated ourselves from all mankind. If we could have raised all we wanted, and if the world could have raised without us all it wanted, we would have succeeded in erecting barriers more impassable than the fabled Chinese wall. Wherever there has been a possibility to estrange a nation from us, so far as commercial relations were involved, we have succeeded in doing it. It is the only civilized country in the world whose policy has been sedulously to make money by eating each other up—whose highest political economy has been that a people can grow fat upon each other; that by taxation wealth can be accumulated; that the more the Government takes from its citizens the richer the citizens are by the subtraction. And of course such a system must necessarily produce evil symptoms; not at once, and not disastrously in the time at which it has been at work, because other causes have operated and other forces have been at work to minimize the evils of this system.

The necessity for our breadstuffs, our provisions, and our cotton has made a trade out of which we have gotten great profit in many ways and have preserved commercial relations from which great good has resulted. On the other hand, the absolute free trade which under the most beneficent provision of the American Constitution has been made obligatory within the territory of the United States, has given to this great country and to its many millions of people a trade and commerce the blessings of which can not be estimated. The really marvelous growth of the country, so far as any financial system has effected it, has been the result of this magnificent experiment of absolute internal free trade, which has given day by day a daily lie to all the theories upon which our foreign system has been advocated. While it has been claimed that Boston can not succeed with her wealth and enterprise and capital against Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, she has succeeded against the pauper African labor of the South; and Chicago, which could not by any possibility have succeeded as the rival of Toronto, has been able to grow into a magnificent city of a million people in rivalry to New York.

When the boundary of the American territory was the eastern bank of the Mississippi River, all our good people had to be protected against the pauper labor that roamed at large in the uncivilized territory west of the river. But as soon as Thomas Jefferson acquired the territory of Louisiana it was found that free trade was a blessing to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, but that it was disastrous for it to go one step further so that the pauper labor of the Mexicans living beyond that boundary could compete with the American laborer; but when the war of 1847 carried our boundary to the Pacific Ocean and gave us the magnificent territory of Texas, it was found that free trade from ocean to ocean and from lake to gulf made every section prosper. And when in the certain progress of American development Canada becomes one with us, absolute free trade between us will again vindicate itself, as it has between the States.

In levying taxes they ought to be so levied until we may be ready for direct taxation, as, first, to be just, as nearly as this can be accomplished; and second, if it were possible, to be imposed upon and payable out of the surplus of the country, and not out of the amount necessary for the support thereof; and third, to be voluntary, so that the tax-payer, who is also citizen, should not be in a constant state of irritation towards the Government to which he owes allegiance and of which he is in part sovereign.

The system we have violates all of these principles. The very essence of protection is that one man shall pay under the pretense of revenue to his government a bonus to another man; that the purchaser shall be compelled to purchase from an American manufacturer at a price higher than he would be able to obtain the articles for if he were absolutely free to buy wherever he chose; that he should therefore pay for that article two distinct sums of money—one, its fair value to him; the other, the added price which by operation of law he is compelled to pay to the manufacturer, and for which he directly gets nothing. Whatever excuse may be given for this, however it may be claimed that the country is indirectly benefited thereby, and that the purchaser of these protected goods contributes in this way as really to the public prosperity as if he paid these sums into the public Treasury; the fact remains that in all these industries in which protection is of any advantage one citizen receives by operation of law the earnings of another citizen for which he gives nothing.

I say advisedly, where protection is of any advantage, for there are duties imposed under our present system which are absolutely of no advantage to any human being, neither to the manufacturer, the purchaser, nor the consumers. There are others about which we may dispute as to whether they are of advantage or not. There are others which were purely shams put into the statute for the purpose of deception. The duty on wheat and cotton, whose price is fixed in Liverpool under free trade, is purely a sham; it does not in any way affect the price of either of these articles. The duty on certain cotton fabrics, of which we export large quantities to the East, has ceased to be of any advantage either to the Government, which derives no revenues thereby, or to the manufacturer, who finds that he can make and sell them at prices which successfully compete in foreign markets with foreign manufacturers. And in some cases where the duty is just so much added to the price of the article changes wholly beyond the power of American legislation alter this condition. The duty on copper did not bring to the American Treasury scarcely a cent; it simply put into the pocket of the owners of our copper mines the whole duty imposed, and was a burden, to the precise extent of the duty, upon all American manufacturers of copper and copper wares, and was added, together with the interest and profits thereon, to the cost of such articles as American purchasers had to buy in which copper was a component material. Enormous profits therefore went into the pocket of the copper-mine owners. Some of these profits have been beneficently spent by those to whom by the operation of this iniquitous law these large sums were paid. Charities which bear the name of these copper-mine owners were in reality paid in small sums by all the American citizens scattered over every section of the country who are compelled to use copper in the various forms in which it enters into domestic use. And the foreign manufacturers of copper obtained from the American mines their crude article at the same price that the American manufacturer did, minus the duty, and to that extent had the advantage of their American competitors.

But as the production of copper in the world was not equal to its use, a foreign syndicate has been formed which has purchased the entire output of the known copper mines for a period said to be three years in the future, and has by this means put up the price of copper all over the world nearer to the level of its former price to the American user thereof. So that at present, while the copper-mine owner obtains his profit from the foreign syndicate, and the American consumer of copper is not benefited by this syndicate, the American manufacturer is put more nearly upon a level with his foreign competitor.

The duty upon steel rails has been largely a bonus. It is fair to say that steel rails can be profitably made in America for $26 a ton. They have been able by the operation of our tariff, giving $17 a ton protection, to do what it may be impolite, but perhaps not inaccurate, to call levy tribute on the railroad builders of from one thousand to twelve hundred dollars a mile for the 13,000 miles of railroad that were constructed in America in the year 1887. So that the profit over and above a fair living profit on their produce for that year, created altogether by law, could not have been less than $13,000,000.

The Pittsburgh Post in an editorial of May 1, speaking of the late labor difficulties at the Braddock Works, says:

> The cost of labor in the production of a ton of steel rails is estimated not to exceed $5 a ton. It is probably less than $4.

At other places the labor cost of a ton of steel rails varies from $3.85 (at Bethlehem, Pa.) to $7.57. So with the proposed duty of $11 per ton the entire wage is paid and a possible bonus of from $3.43 to $7.15 given to the manufacturer.

It is, however, fictitious to assert that this sum, enormous as it is, was paid out of the pockets of those who builded the railroads; it was raised mainly, if not altogether, by the sale of railroad bonds, the coupons upon which are part of the fixed charges which the railroad companies must earn or go into bankruptcy. This annual interest must be raised by the reduction of the wages of those employed by those companies, or by the increase of freight charged on what they transport. It is no doubt partly done by both. When the railroads pool this interest is raised by increased freight. When the railroads fall out and fierce competition ensues, it is raised by reduction of wages; so that in the end these enormous yearly bonuses paid to the steel-rail makers are burdens upon labor; they are paid by the reduced wages of the railroad employés, and the reduced cost that the farmer and producer must receive for his wares by means of the increased cost of transportation thereupon. Every bushel of Western wheat, every pound of Southern cotton, every barrel of pork transported over these roads, their price also fixed in the Liverpool market, must pay its share of this enormous sum mulct from honest labor by a provision of the tariff law passed in the name of American labor at the dictation of the most powerful organization in America.

I select these instances to illustrate that the present system violates intentionally the first principle I have laid down, that all taxation should be impartial, and also that it violates intentionally the second

principle, that this taxation should, as far as possible, be paid from the surplus of the nation instead of from its daily livelihood. As it is now all the direct and indirect sums which must be paid because of the present tariff law are to be first subtracted from the aggregate income of the American nation, and are that much taken from this income before any of it can be used for the support of the American people. It is estimated that on the basis of the labor of 1880 the income of the American people was ten thousand millions of dollars. Before this can be distributed among the partners in this enormous corporation that we call the United States of America these sums must be subtracted, and as the sum is to be distributed among sixty millions of people, the amount subtracted, while in itself it may seem not to be very large in proportion to the enormous aggregate, is large in proportion to the amount received by each laborer in the country. The amount he pays must be measured not by the entire amount of this income, but by the sum which he is to receive therefrom.

A system of taxation which, if it could be devised, would give to each person in America a fair and comfortable living, and impose the burdens of the Government upon the surplus, which, being produced by the united labor of everybody, ought to bear, if it could be done, the expenses necessary to the protection of everybody, would be a wise and beneficent system. Under it there might be less rapid accumulations of great fortunes, but there could be no distress. It would fall so equally that no single person under its operation would be distressed. Now, the operation of the present law during the last twenty-five years has been precisely in the opposite direction, as is demonstrated by the accumulation of the almost fabulous fortunes which we have seen grow up under our eyes during those years.

Unequal distribution of the wondrous wealth which has been produced by American toil and accumulated by American economy has given to certain individuals fortunes greater than the world has ever seen under any other sky or any other system. The law of primogeniture, operating through the centuries, together with the vast growth of wealth in Great Britain, has not been able to give to any human being such a fortune as the protective tariff of America has enabled a few gentlemen to secure within a score of years. Colossal fortunes, made as if in a day, bear testimony to the viciousness of a system which enables so few men to absorb the surplus accumulations of a nation, and that, too, without adding anything to the growth of the country or to its happiness. It has laid the foundation of caste in creating classes and distinctions between the classes created by it.

Inevitably unjust legislation, giving unearned privileges to classes as classes, must produce class combinations and organizations to maintain the legislation once obtained; and this with equal certainty begets hostile combinations, and the result is the formation of caste, which simply means the permanent defeat of the weaker classes. I am not censuring those who have been the beneficiaries of this system, nor am I uniting in the clamor, which sometimes savors of demagogy, against them personally. I am simply pointing out the outward symptom which demonstrates that there must be an inward disease. I am simply asserting that the possibility of such a result must be caused by the viciousness of this financial system which for twenty-seven years has existed in America.

Generically the same causes produce strikes, riots for bread, labor organizations, and the other manifestations of resistance to oppressive class distinctions in Europe and America. It is the operation of unequal laws creating class benefits. In whatever form this oppressive distinction appears there will also be found resistance to it. As man moves forward in the upward path to a civilization imbued with the controlling spirit of the truth that all men are born free and equal, the depth of his original degradation and the weight of the yoke he wore measure the nature and extent of the revolt. In France the horrors of the revolution measured the long years of oppressive crimes of which that revolution was the retribution. In England the parliamentary struggles mark the point from which those people began the march to equality. If we will persist in class legislation we must submit to accept its necessary concomitant, discontent, exhibited first in protest by murmurings, then in resistance only by organizations, and then by whatever force the circumstances produce. We have as our hope of safety the ballot-box, by which peaceful revolution may prevent forceful revolt. But if enormous capital, through organized effort, can control the ballot-box and return its servants to Congress, discontent, founded on justice, will find a remedy. Free trade in England can not prevent, it will hasten, the ultimate abolition of the law of primogeniture, the disestablishment of an established church, the exclusive ownership of the soil, and of a hereditary legislative chamber. Protective tariffs and monopolistic legislation can not introduce into America permanent and hereditary class distinctions. He is a shallow thinker who does not know that man is essentially the same everywhere, and that his ultimate goal is a civilization based on equality.

And also our system enforces the collection of the taxes so as to give the tax-payer no option as to its payment. He does not pay to the tax-gatherer, as in the States where direct taxation is enforced. Nor does he pay voluntarily in the same sense as a man does who purchases a luxury, knowing that its ncreased price is caused by a revenue duty imposed thereon, but he is compelled to pay by the increased cost levied upon the necessities of life. Even if a hundred and twelve per cent. duty be levied upon his blanket, the blizzards which sweep over Kansas require a Kansas father to pay this involuntary tax with a demand more compulsory than the pistol of the highwayman with "Stand and deliver." He who has to build a house for his family on the homestead which he has acquired for nothing from the Government is compelled by a law, which knows no exception, to pay this involuntary tax upon every pane of glass which he puts into the window to let the sunshine in and keep the rain out; upon every foot of lumber and every nail which, together, make his home—not one dollar of which, as a rule, goes to his Government, nor lessens the burdens of his State taxes, but goes to citizens entitled under the law to no greater consideration and no higher favor than he.

It is undoubtedly true that under the operation of the stimulus of high protective duties, competition takes place. Men with small capital, unfamiliar with the particular industries thus protected, rush into them, factories are erected at large expense, and frequently on credit, at improper places, because the calculation on paper of the cost of the production and of the possible price under the protective duty, leaves an apparent profit so large as to overcome the great expense of interest, unfortunate selection of locality, and unfamiliarity with the business. Temporarily this competition produces decrease of the price asked of the consumer, and causes an overproduction of the article. Then comes, inevitably, disaster. The weak go to the wall. Bankruptcy diminishes the number of manufacturers, clamor is made for increased protection for the purpose of paying higher wages, while the wage of the laborer is necessarily diminished.

Then comes combination. The strong who have survived the storm of disaster see that they can take advantage of these duties much more profitably by a union among themselves, and fleecing their customers, rather than fighting each other, and trusts, pools, and organizations are formed by means of which prices are advanced and production diminished. I do not mean to say that a tariff either necessarily produces trusts or that it alone produces them. These organizations can be formed whenever combination of producers can prevent competition, but these trusts can be destroyed whenever they are formed under the operation of protective duties by lowering the duty so as to afford opportunity for foreign competition, whereby the consumer of the necessary article may have a chance to purchase it from some one else than the trust. I need not illustrate this by an attempt to go over the category of trusts, like the sugar trust, the linseed-oil trust, the borax trust, and the various other combinations which are the legitimate outgrowth of the system which Congress is asked to perpetuate, and which has the power by the irresponsible action of those interested in the product of these various articles to levy taxation upon the American people to the extent that our duty enables them to keep out the foreign manufacture.

The bill reported by the committee does not render certain the destruction of these combinations, but as to some of them it renders their exactions tolerable, and as to others we believe it will result in their dissolution. We urge that in the present condition of our financial affairs the country can well afford to make this experiment and say whether it is possible for Congress to prevent the exactions of these organizations. Those interested in these trusts, made possible by the present tariff, and which the proposed bill will dissolve, or will reduce their present exactions to more reasonable profits, naturally denounce those who prepared this measure, and use the gains gotten from the law to preserve unchanged the law. And those Representatives who represent these organizations may be expected to resist the passage of this bill desperately. I hold in my hand The Manufacturer, the official organ of the Manufacturers' Club of Philadelphia, in which is published a memorial, and the opening sentence of the editorial thereon is:

> The club as a body of business men spoke in no unmeaning phrases at its last meeting. For the guidance of those who represent it in Congress, it put in the form of a memorial its sentiments concerning the reduction of revenue, etc.

Who represents "it" in Congress? "It" knows, I do not. But who ever represents the "Its," who have combined to enact this burdensome tariff and to defeat any amendments thereto which will give relief from the enormous exactions imposed by it and by means of it, will be found compacted against any tariff legislation which renders possible the dissolution of the "trusts." Fortunately no laws, however prohibitory, and no trusts, however greedy, can prevent the progress of invention and the achievements of skill, by which the cost of production is always being diminished. Our opponents point to the diminished cost of all articles during the period of the present tariff, and claim that it is because of the tariff.

The facts are as they state; the cause is not. There is not one product named by them, which is not to-day cheaper in England than in America. If the tariff thus operated, its present friends would soon become its bitterest foes. They do not fight so desperately for the continuance of laws whose operation is to destroy their profits. But no law can prevent that development which increases the efficiency of human labor as it increases in skill and multiplies many fold its power

of production, nor can any nation so isolate itself as to be beyond the influence of this universal spirit of improvement. This at last is our safety.

Therefore skilled labor never needs protection. The more unskilled the labor is the less is it in demand and the lower its productive power and the higher its relative cost. So in times of depression the labor to which least money is paid is the first discharged, because the highest priced labor is the cheapest labor, producing more results in proportion to wage and therefore costing less to employer. The leader of the bar needs no tariff to protect him from the shyster, the great doctor does not fear the competition of the quack, nor does the respectable mechanic feel alarm at the competition of the pauper journeyman.

So it is certain, in spite of doctored figures, manipulated to conceal and mislead, that in America the labor receiving the highest wage produces for its employer the largest return, and is therefore the cheapest, and that as a rule the wage-cost of the fabrics in America is less than anywhere in the world. Free American labor from the trammels of our present tariff and it will conquer the world of trade. [Applause.] But even with prohibitory tariffs and numerous trusts the cost of production will continue to decrease and thereby cause some decrease in the cost to the consumer; but not in proper proportion, for under such a system the bulk of the sum thus saved in production will swell the profits of the manufacturer.

The question has been often asked by our opponents, why do immigrants come to America if labor is paid so nearly as much abroad as here. Our first answer is that the questioner always confounds the daily wage received by the wage-earner with the cost of his labor to his employer. The daily wage may be much greater than is paid elsewhere and yet the relative cost be, and probably necessarily is, less; for labor cost is to be measured by volume and value of production to him who pays; by amount of money and the purchasing power of that money to him who receives. But, secondly, in the meaning of the questioner, the assumed fact is not true. The "operatives" do not migrate to America; those who are in Great Britain and Europe, the wage-earners in those industries which are "protected" here, do not come to us. Mr. Powers, one of the brightest of the "press gang," to whom we owe so much, has done good service in an article exhibiting the occupations of our immigration, from which I have gathered this:

In the ten years from 1877 to 1886 there arrived in this country 4,255,295 immigrants, of whom somewhat more than one-half were women and children; of the remaining 2,120,582 there were only 35,581, or less than 2 per cent. operatives in the textiles, metals, and other protected industries, excluding miners, of whom there were 38,570, being less than 2 per cent. These were, as a rule, those with whom life had not gone well at home, and were of numbers just sufficient to be used either as a menace or a substitute to striking operatives. In the unprotected industries we received 2,046,431, of whom 1,523,707 were house servants, tillers of the soil, and common day laborers. These are attracted evidently by other causes than our tariff laws.

But, thirdly, the advantages offered by the new continent and our free institutions tempt men of all climes to cast their lot in with us. The tax-gatherer, the recruiting sergeant drafting into armies where 2,200,000 men are under rigorous discipline, and the hopeless contest against class distinctions drive thousands to our shores. Let us keep them and our own children happy by low taxes, no standing armies, and absolute equality of chances in the struggle of life.

Several times since this debate commenced the true argument against this bill, the only really effective appeal, has been uttered; it may be condensed into "United we stand, divided we fall." It is the argument of combination, of threat. Each "protected" syndicate says to all others in this greatest of all American "trusts," the "tariff combine," "We must stand together, four-squared like infantry in battle resisting a charge, for revision anywhere is defeat everywhere." So the sole duty any one will give up is that on sugar, because they believe the surrender of the sugar duty will take from the Treasury so many millions of dollars that thereby all the other duties may be saved. The promise to give bounties is as purely illusory as were the offers made on the Mount of Temptation. The present tariff is the result of combination; it is to be maintained by combination. The interests which secured its passage are to retain its benefits; the means received by it, so far as necessary, are to be used to perpetuate it. Yes, gentlemen, we recognize the force of this argument.

The removal of the duty on sugar will give no relief to the manufacturers of New England; it will not aid in the restoration of our lost commerce, remove the necessity for the use of Pinkerton's detectives to put down those strikes which have been lately discovered to be the evidences of contented labor and the demonstration of wise and happy industrial progress; secure a profitable market for Western wheat or Southern cotton; furnish competition to keep trusts within bounds; nor end—believe, good gentlemen, who defend this prohibitory tariff and class legislation—the agitation of which you complain. Free tobacco and free sugar will not bring submission to your exactions. Let us understand each other. We want a fair, conservative, moderate measure; we extend to you a compromise and offer a fair experiment. You may reject it, but you can not evade the issue. He who rejects compromises may live to regret it.

The present law can not remain as it is; its inequalities are too numerous and too unjust, its temptations to fraud too great, its burdens too onerous; revision is needed, and that, too, by every section of the country. The arrogance displayed on this floor by certain Representatives does not reflect the anxiety felt by many of their constituents. In New England and Pennsylvania, as in Minnesota and Michigan, are heard the murmurings of discontent. There is no section whose interests demand the passage of this bill more than New England. And to-day I appeal from such of her Representatives here as stand in the way of progress to her people at home to take hold of this matter. It was against her protest that the protective tariff was enacted—perhaps the most splendid protest against it was by her Webster. Her true interest is the reconquest of the seas. Her hope of regaining leadership in the Republic is to put herself in the van of this movement for free commerce and unshackled industrial activity. It doth not become her to oppose where men fight for ampler freedom.

The boast has been made on this floor that the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means in the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses—that gallant and pure gentleman, brave of heart, clean of life, loyal to friend, frank to foe, with a conscience void of offense and a love for truth that nothing could daunt—has been stricken down because he opposed this "combine." Greatly as I deplore his defeat and as much as I miss his presence, it may be that his defeat, compassed as it was, will be of greater benefit than his presence. His very absence arrests the attention of the Republic, and all the people ask, "Are such elections necessary to the maintenance of this system?" Gentlemen protectionists, I warn you that the vacant seat of Morrison cries louder than the virtues of Duncan "against the deep damnation of his taking off." [Great applause on the Democratic side].

The effort in this debate by grave Representatives to demonstrate that taxation on foreign commodities is paid by the producers and not by the consumers; that prices are lowered by increasing the cost of production, and that taxation gives added wealth to the fruits of labor puts to shame the rhetorical and pious demonstration of Rev. Jasper, of Richmond, Va., that "the sun do rise and set," for not even before Galileo did any one ever believe thus, nor has it as much excuse as had the riots against the introduction of machinery which Miss Martineau so graphically describes.

One of the greatest of modern scientists has very recently said:

> No fact in political economy is more clear than that taxation on foreign commodities must ultimately be paid by the consumers, not by the producers. All taxation is a deduction from the fruits of labor and from the fertility of the soil of the country imposing it. No political economist has ever been able to show how prices to consumers can be lowered by increasing the cost of production.

This thinker and scientist had not the pleasure and advantage we have enjoyed of hearing this debate, for nothing can be more certain than our friends on the other side are political economists with whom "wisdom shall die," and that they have proven to their own entire satisfaction that those who believe what this thinker announces are miserably shallow and altogether wicked.

These agile and fertile debaters have as little regard for the facts of history as they have for the truths of political economy. To them the established fact that the era from 1850 to 1860 was one of wondrous prosperity and growth, and that 1860 was peculiarly and singularly a prosperous year, does not prevent them from solemnly declaring that under the Walker tariff the country nearly went to the damnition bowwows and was in 1860 on the very verge of bankruptcy. And no one has put this with greater power than did General Garfield in his speech of March, 1878.

The two countries which in the last quarter of a century have increased with the most marvelous growth have been our own and Australia. Different financial systems have dominated these two new and prosperous countries. One common cause for their prosperity attracts attention; that is, new land to be had almost for the asking. This is the prime cause of the past and present growth of both of these lands—not the only cause; for these countries are dominated by an English-speaking race, and on their fertile soil flourish free institutions. The continued prosperity of each is assured. Loving my own country more than all others in the world, I desire her to adopt a system that will enable her to outstrip this lusty young rival of the Pacific seas. It is within our power.

Seventy per cent. of the cotton which England turns into finished product and sells all over the habitable globe grows upon American soil. She comes to our markets, buys our raw material, transports it in her vessels to her docks, manufactures it with her laborers in her factories, transports it in her vessels to every port, transmutes it by barter under the laws of supply and demand into other articles; makes a profit on the purchase, on the freightage, on the manufacturing, and then on the articles for which she sells it. Her annual increase of receipts over the price that she pays us for our cotton is not less than $125,000,000. In twenty years her apparently overcrowded population has increased over six millions. The wages of her laborers have steadily increased. The number of her paupers and convicts has proportionately decreased. With equal strides have her political privileges been widened to larger classes of her citizens.

Now, this profit from the manufacture of this cotton should be ours. Our citizens ought to take this raw material raised in our fields, turn

it into the finished product in factories owned by American capital, where American operatives receive the wage that would be a just proportion of the profit of this labor. Our ships ought to transport the outgoing and the incoming cargoes; our insurance companies receive the premiums; our commission merchants the commissions; our bankers the exchange. A system which prevents this is a system to be set aside. A system which gives hope of this is a system to be fairly tried. And as with cotton, so with wool, and all the material which by the ingenuity of man can be used for the comfort of man in his advanced civilization. Such a country as ours with such a system has a future which no imagination is able to accurately picture. If one standing on the banks of the Mississippi River eighty-five years ago, when Thomas Jefferson acquired that great western territory for America and free institutions, could have foreseen what has occurred during these years, not longer than the lifetime of some venerable citizens who linger yet among us, and had given utterance to the heavenly vision which passed before his eyes, he would have been held to be a mere dreamer.

If one, standing here in this Hall to-day and looking into the future, could be able to see what the years would bring us under a system where the untrammeled activities of a free Christian people find fruition, under a climate so salubrious and with a soil so fertile, all burdens to progress thrown aside, all the passions of the past removed, and every one engaged in a generous and unselfish rivalry to make for and out of the opportunities to which he is called all that is possible, no hand could paint and no orator picture what would be the result.

Then we, the children of exiles and emigrants, could welcome our kinsmen of all lands to cast their lot with us, for willing hands would find waiting work to yield a livelihood. The silence of rivers now broken only by the occasional boat would be turned into the sweet hum of profitable commerce. The secret lodges of anxious and discontented operatives would become the open assemblies of happy and contented families from whose hearth-stone the shadow of want had given place to the mild radiance of permanent comfort. The husbandman, no longer sowing in tears, would yet reap in joy—that joy which springs from content, and is founded in the certainty of an assured market at remunerative prices.

The legislation of the country, having for its object the public good and freed from the domination of private greed, would successfully grapple with the problems which progress will present, and a free people be represented by free representatives neither owned, seduced, nor terrified by organized interests.

Slowly will this future come. We have had our backs to it; to-day let us turn our faces to its rising sun. If we can do no more, we can lift our eyes toward this east of new hopes and resolve that from this hour our steps shall be in that direction. [Loud and long-continued applause.]

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the tariff bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment House bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 108) for the relief of John C. Weaver;

A bill (H. R. 639) to authorize Commander John W. Philip, United States Navy, to accept a silver pitcher from the Government of the United States of Colombia;

A bill (H. R. 2068) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain citizens of Chicago, employés of the custom-house, for extra-time service;

A bill (H. R. 4908) for the relief of the heirs of A. Gates Lee and heirs of B. P. Lee, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 4909) for the relief of the estate of C. M. Briggs, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 5683) to authorize the commissioners of the District of Columbia to complete a contract for the sale of certain real estate of Job Barnard;

A bill (H. R. 8006) to amend section 5388 of the Revised Statutes of the United States in relation to timber depredations.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, the bill (H. R. 5445) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, requested a conference with the House on said bills and amendments, and had appointed conferees on the part of the Senate, as indicated:

A bill (H. R. 4920) for the protection of the officials of the United States in the Indian Territory. Conferees: Mr. DAWES, Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, and Mr. STOCKBRIDGE; and

A bill (H. R. 8394) to authorize United States marshals to arrest offenders and fugitives from justice in Indian Territory. Conferees: Mr. DAWES, Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, and Mr. STOCKBRIDGE.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a resolution, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, for printing the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations (Miscellaneous Document No. 109, first session Fiftieth Congress) relating to the fisheries treaty, in connection with a message of the President of the United States on the same subject, the proposed treaty with Great Britain, etc.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Joint resolution (S. R. 59) authorizing Brig. Gen. Absalom Baird, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor;

A bill (S. 66) giving a military record to Thomas Miller;

A bill (S. 128) for the relief of the inmates of the United States Naval Home;

A bill (S. 204) for the relief of the heirs of Maurice Grivot;

A bill (S. 304) to correct the military record of John Hinsmann, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Cavalry;

A bill (S. 326) for the relief of Clement A. Lounsberry;

A bill (S. 577) for the relief of the American Grocer Association of the city of New York;

A bill (S. 586) for the relief of Asher W. Foster;

A bill (S. 587) for the relief of Christian Fredericksen;

A bill (S. 686) for the relief of B. F. Rockefellow;

A bill (S. 773) for the relief of James E. Walter;

A bill (S. 1031) for the payment of Sewell Coulson and Porter, Harrison & Fishback for legal services;

A bill (S. 1092) for the relief of certain property in the District of Columbia;

A bill (S. 1503) for the relief of Mrs. S. B. Duvall, widow of the late Rev. W. P. Duvall, deceased;

A bill (S. 1612) to provide for the closing of parts of two alleys in square 132, in the city of Washington, D. C., and for the relief of Charles Early and Corbin Warwick;

A bill (S. 1864) to provide for the erection of a public building at San Diego, Cal.;

A bill (S. 2199) authorizing the Little Rock and Alexandria Railway Company to maintain and construct a bridge across Bayou D'Arbonne, in Louisiana;

A bill (S. 2213) for the relief of John McBean, of Umatilla County, Oregon;

A bill (S. 2316) restoring the right of pre-emption to Jesse A. Corn;

A bill (S. 2461) appropriating $150,000 for quarters and barracks at the branches of the National Military Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers;

A bill (S. 2517) for the establishment of a light-ship at Bush's Bluff Shoal, Elizabeth River, Virginia;

A bill (S. 2427) to establish a public park, to be called and known as the Royal Arch Park;

A bill (S. 2551) to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia, so as to make Inauguration Day a holiday within said District; and

A bill (S. 2602) concerning the militia of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House now take a recess until 8 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House took a recess until 8 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House (at 8 o'clock p. m.) was called to order by Mr. MCMILLIN, who directed the reading of the order providing for the Friday evening sessions.

The Clerk read the order.

JOHN RUTLEDGE.

Mr. DIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2651) to remove the political disabilities of John Rutledge, of South Carolina, and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That John Rutledge, of the State of South Carolina, be, and he is hereby, relieved of all political disabilities imposed upon him by the third section of the fourteenth article of the amendments to the Constitution of the United States.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, was passed, two-thirds voting in favor thereof.

HETTY K. PAINTER.

Mr. MORRILL. I desire to call the attention of the House to the bill (H. R. 3839) granting a pension to Mrs. Hetty K. Painter, and to make this statement. This bill passed the House and went to the Senate, and was there amended. It came back to the House, was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and by them reported to the House with the recommendation that the amendments of the Senate

be non-concurred in. I desire to move now that the amendments be non-concurred in, and that the request for a conference be granted.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will appoint the conference committee hereafter.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole under the special order which has been read.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, Mr. DOCKERY in the chair.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. I ask unanimous consent that the Calendar of private bills be taken up, and that we commence where we left off on last Friday evening; each case to be called in its order on the Calendar, and when called unless responded to it be informally passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

Mr. RYAN. Before that is done may I ask where we left off; on what page of the Calendar?

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk at the desk is unable to state where the call was suspended at the last meeting. The RECORD, the Chair supposes, will show it.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. LONG. I object to that.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. Then I demand the regular order.

Mr. FORD. I ask unanimous consent that the regular order may be observed with this exception, that if no member present calls for the consideration of a bill when it is reached on the Calendar it be informally passed over, retaining its place.

Mr. TAULBEE. I am in favor of that, but would like to offer this suggestion as an amendment to it. I think it would meet the objection of the gentleman upon the other side if the call began where it rested last Friday evening, but with the understanding that we first take up for consideration such bills as were then passed over at the request of the members present.

Mr. LONG. I have no objection to that.

Mr. TAULBEE. We will save the calling of their bills in their order on the Calendar and thus save time, as my request will obviate the necessity of going over the whole list.

Mr. CHEADLE. I can state where we left off on last Friday evening. On page 63 of the Calendar, at bill No. 4504.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan as modified?

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first bill on the Calendar.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 48, House bill 5961, to increase the pension now paid to Mrs. D. P. Woodbury.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I do not understand that there was any objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan, but only to the modification of the gentleman from Kentucky.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Ohio to object.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. As I understood the Chair to put the request of the gentleman from Michigan as modified, I objected. I have no objection to the original request.

Mr. FORD. Then I renew that request.

Mr. RYAN. There is no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection that order will be pursued. There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

LIZZIE WRIGHT OWEN.

The first business on the Calendar called up by Mr. HERMANN was the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Lizzie Wright Owen, only surviving daughter of George Wright, late a brigadier-general of United States Volunteers, and pay her a pension at the rate of $50 per month.

Mr. HERMANN. As the report is somewhat lengthy perhaps gentlemen may not object to my making a brief statement of what it embodies.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let us have the report. This is a peculiar case and we ought to have it read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the report (by Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio), as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen, having considered the same, report it back with the recommendation that it do pass, and in support of this action adopt and make part hereof the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, which is as follows:

"[Senate Report No. 177, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

"The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen, have examined the same, and report:

"This bill passed the Senate in the last Congress, and your committee report it back again, recommending its passage, and submit their former report:

"'The claimant is the daughter of George Wright, late a brigadier-general of the United States volunteers. We append hereto the record of his distinguished military service furnished by the War Department, and a notice of his services and death which appeared at the time; also a copy of her petition, which states the grounds of her present claim, and other documents in support thereof.

"'She is now poor, and her physician in this city presents a statement of her present condition, that she is suffering with attacks of disease, increasing in severity, which will soon entirely disable her.

"'It will be observed that the extraordinary services and misfortunes detailed in this case prevent its forming a precedent to any extent for other applications, and to refuse this application would, in the opinion of your committee, be an exhibition of ingratitude unworthy the Republic.

"'We recommend the passage of the bill.'"

Mr. HERMANN. The remainder of the report consists only of the petition and some communications bearing upon the subject.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let the report be read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the remainder of the report.

Mr. GLASS. That seems to be a very long report, and I think this bill ought to go over to a full House. I shall object to its consideration to-night.

Mr. HERMANN. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee if he will indulge me for a moment? I am sure no gentleman will deliberately object to a measure of this character when acquainted with the circumstances. I desire to make this statement, and if the gentleman from Kentucky, Governor McCREARY, was present, he would corroborate largely what I desire now to say briefly. Unfortunately, however, he is not here, though he was present at the last time, expecting this case to be considered then.

This is the daughter of Maj. Gen. George Wright, who went down in a shipwreck on the coast of Oregon some twenty years ago on the ill-fated Brother Jonathan. This woman's mother was with him at the time. He was traveling to Portland, Oregon, with a number of soldiers, and in a great storm which overtook the ship she went down and all were lost. Her brother, Colonel Wright, was massacred in the Modoc massacre at the time he was gallantly leading his command into the conflict, about the same time that General Canby was killed. Under those circumstances she lost her brother, who had given her valuable support subsequently to the death of her father.

Her husband, who had rendered gallant service in the war, received wounds which ended his life. She is now without father, mother, brother, or husband, except one brother, who has been recently appointed to a position in the Supreme Court under this Administration, who, I understand, is now contributing to her support. Of the three persons who were her supporters I may say all of them gave their lives in the service of the country.

This woman is to-day penniless, up to a recent period working with her own hands for a livelihood. Never has this Government suffered to the extent of a single cent in the matter of a pension in any one of those cases, neither for the general who went down, nor the brother who died for his country in the Modoc difficulty, nor for her husband. So you will see this is certainly a meritorious case, and it is a case of very peculiar hardship. It is a case, it seems to me, in which the Government could very well afford to extend its gratuity under these peculiar circumstances. Being an exceptional case, I ask that this House shall do as it has done in so many other cases not possessing nearly the merit this case possesses. I hope the House will agree to grant the relief requested. The bill has passed the Senate unanimously, and it comes before the House with a unanimous report from the House Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. FORD. Does the gentleman say that this bill has passed the Senate?

Mr. HERMANN. It has.

Mr. MACDONALD. What other similar case has the House passed?

Mr. HERMANN. The House has passed a number of cases of much less merit. The House granted pensions to widows whose husbands were possibly of greater distinction, but in this case the widow did not receive a pension.

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the gentleman mention any such case?

Mr. HERMANN. You may take the case of the widow of General Ricketts or the widow of General Logan, and others.

A MEMBER. Those cases are quite different.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Why could this lady not be pensioned on account of her husband?

Mr. HERMANN. Her husband died after the war, when not in the service.

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not rise to oppose this bill, but for the purpose of calling the attention of the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the fact that they have reported to the House a bill granting a pension to the invalid daughter of General Hackleman. In my experience in connection with the late war there has been no case of so high merit as that. I understand that the Committee on Invalid Pensions has reported a bill to pension the daughter at $18 a month; not a widow, but a daughter, as in this case.

I wish to say if this bill passes that I will ask the Committee on Invalid Pensions to put Mrs. Hackleman's pension on the same footing.

Mr. McMILLIN. If this bill is to pass at all, why not put the pension on the footing of a widow's pension? There is no ground on earth on which you can justify giving the daughter of a deceased soldier, who is not entitled to a pension at all under the law, $50 a month,

while you give the widow of a man whose head was shot off in battle only $12 a month.

Mr. HERMANN. This lady is not only the daughter of a soldier, but she is the widow of a soldier.

Mr. McMILLIN. Why, then, can she not get a pension under the general law?

Mr. HERMANN. For the reason that her husband died after the war, when not in the service.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then she is not entitled to a pension under the general law; but you propose to give her more than you give to four women whose husbands were actually killed in battle.

Mr. HERMANN. I submit to the gentleman from Tennessee that the circumstances which surround this case are entirely exceptional.

Mr. McMILLIN. There are no more harrowing circumstances, of course, than those surrounding a woman who has to look at a dead husband. But the tendency of this kind of legislation is to build up classes and to grant larger pensions to widows on account of the former official standing of their husbands, ignoring the fact that all American citizens before the law are, or should be, on an equal footing.

Mr. HERMANN. Has the gentleman taken the same position with regard to other cases?

Mr. McMILLIN. I have, exactly. I have uniformly voted against granting these exorbitant pensions to one class while we give a mere pittance to others.

Mr. HERMANN. Does the gentleman think it is right and just that this House should make a discrimination in favor of those who possibly may have more influential friends or whose husbands may have borne more distinguished titles than others?

Mr. McMILLIN. No, sir; but you are going upon the idea that this woman has got fifty-dollar influence.

Mr. HERMANN. I do not claim it on that ground at all.

Mr. McMILLIN. I inferred that you did from the way you spoke.

Mr. HERMANN. Not at all, sir.

Mr. McMILLIN. I have tried in my action here to do equal justice to all, and I state now most candidly that my acumen is not sufficient to enable me to see that because a woman is the daughter or the widow of a deceased general she has any greater claim upon this Government than the daughter or the widow of a poor fellow who did not have any rank in the war, and who went out to fight not for the glory but for his country. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, since I observe that there is such opposition to this bill in its present form, as I do not wish to delay pension legislation here this evening, I will make a proposition which I believe will meet with the cordial indorsement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN]. I will accept an amendment making this pension $30 instead of $50. That was suggested in this House some two or three weeks ago, but I declined then to accept the compromise, preferring to submit the case to the House upon its merits. Under the present circumstances, however, I will accept it.

Mr. McMILLIN. Why not put this woman on the same footing as we put the daughter of a man who was killed in battle? She is not entitled to any pension at all under the law. What is given is given as a gratuity. I am not objecting to that, because I propose always to resolve my doubts in favor of those who appear to have claims on the Government. I had not intended to open my mouth at all upon this subject, but I desire to say now, as a citizen of the United States and a representative of its people, that in my judgment we will legislate most wisely and most equitably when we make our laws uniform, and when we leave every American citizen to believe that he or she has the same right before the law as every other one has. I do not believe in building up classes in this country founded upon the standing or rank which individuals may have obtained. There is no higher standing in this country than American citizenship, and we have all got that. [Applause in the galleries.]

Mr. LYMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the galleries be cleared.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. DOCKERY). If the applause is repeated the Chair will direct that the galleries be cleared.

Mr. MORRILL. I simply desire to say in behalf of the Committee on Invalid Pensions that I have no recollection of this bill having ever passed that committee. I do not want to be understood as saying that it did not pass, because I may not have been present when it was considered, but if I had been present I should have opposed it bitterly.

The principle adopted by the Committee on Invalid Pensions has been to allow pensions to invalid children who have passed the age of sixteen. Where a child is imbecile or crippled and helpless, we have gone to the extent of granting pensions to children over sixteen, but only in such cases. In the case of General Hackleman, who was killed in battle, we allowed her a pension of $18. We fixed upon that amount because she was a helpless invalid unable to take care of herself. We have established that rate in such cases—that is, in all of them that we have allowed, but we have only allowed pensions to children over sixteen years where they were invalids or helpless and compelled to depend upon charity for support. As I understand this case, the claimant is not an invalid, but is capable of taking care of herself.

Mr. HERMANN. She is an invalid.

Mr. MORRILL. I understood the gentleman to say she earned her living with her own hands. I move to amend this bill by striking out $50 and inserting $18.

Mr. McMILLIN. I suggest that the pension be fixed at the rate provided by law for a widow.

Mr. MORRILL. In the cases of imbecile children——

Mr. McMILLIN. But this is not such a case.

Mr. MORRILL. In those cases we have fixed the rate at $18 a month.

Mr. McMILLIN. I am in favor of granting pensions wherever they are deserved, but we do not popularize the system of pensions, nor do we satisfy the pensioners themselves when we place one class upon the rolls at a rate twice or three times as high as another class equally meritorious.

Now, I suggest to the gentleman from Oregon that he can get along easily with this bill by agreeing to make the pension the same that is allowed to other widows, and, as I have said, even that is beyond the law, because this is not a soldier's widow. She went from under her father's protection and married another man who did not lose his life in the service.

Mr. HERMANN. He lost his life from disabilities incurred in the service.

Mr. McMILLIN. Then the case comes under the general law, and if so, why does not she get her pension through the Pension Office?

Mr. HERMANN. Simply because she is unable to prove certain facts that the office requires proof of.

Mr. McMILLIN. Oh, yes. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] by striking out "$18" and inserting "$12."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN].

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, before the vote is taken I desire to say a word in vindication of myself. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] has suggested that he has no knowledge of this bill having passed the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. MORRILL. I said I was not present at the time.

Mr. HERMANN. Well, the gentleman who reported the bill from that committee is present this evening.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] was present.

Mr. HERMANN. But, Mr. Chairman, rather than delay other pension legislation this evening, I will accept the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL]. I know, of course, that I have the power under the rules to delay all legislation until this measure can be properly considered with a full quorum of the House present, but I have too much patriotism, and, if it comes to that, too much humanity, to desire that other cases should be deferred by keeping this case standing in the way, and for that reason I will agree to accept the amendment making the pension $18, if that is the best proposition that gentlemen will permit to go through this evening.

I think the gentleman from Tennessee should be willing to consent to a pension of at least $18 or $20.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think this pension ought to be on the same footing as that of other widows.

Mr. SPOONER. If she is the widow of a captain the regular pension would be $20.

Mr. McMILLIN. But she is not the widow of a captain.

Mr. SPOONER. I understand she is.

Mr. McMILLIN. My understanding was different.

Mr. HERMANN. Her father was a general; her brother, a colonel; and her husband, as I understand, a captain. I will agree to $20 as a compromise.

Mr. McMILLIN. I thought the gentleman had accepted $18.

Mr. HERMANN. Very well; I will accept $18 rather than have further delay.

Mr. CHEADLE. I wish to say that we ought in these matters to follow the law. One-half an hour of the valuable time of the House this evening has been occupied in the consideration of a case that is to be rated outside of the ratings of the law. No greater truth was ever uttered than that uttered by the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] when he said that there is no higher title on this earth than that of American citizenship.

Mr. HERMANN. We all know that.

Mr. CHEADLE. And what is the pride of American citizenship if it be not that we are equal under the law? I shall object to the consideration of every one of these special bills unless there is a constitutional quorum present. I want to say to my Republican colleagues that the great central idea around which our party has rallied since its organization has been the equality of citizenship under the law. I have letters by the score from men of the rank and file of the Army, who have thanked me for the words I have said here in speaking for the equality of citizenship under the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state the position of the question. This bill proposes to grant a pension of $50. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] has moved to amend by striking out "50" and inserting "18;" and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] has moved to amend the amendment by striking out "18"

and inserting "12." The first question is on the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. MCMILLIN'S amendment to the amendment was not agreed to.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. MORRILL, to strike out "50" and insert "18," it was agreed to.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I move to further amend by striking out the words "only surviving daughter of George Wright, late brigadier-general of United States volunteers," and inserting "widow of —— Owen, a soldier in the late war." I do not know what her husband's full name was; but my object is to put this pension upon the ground on which it ought to be granted. The fact that this woman is the daughter or granddaughter of somebody who was a general ought to be no foundation for a pension. I voted against pensioning the granddaughter of Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of Independence.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. MCMILLIN, it was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JOHANNA LOEWINGER.

The next business on the Calendar was the bill (S. 739) granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I call for the consideration of this bill. I am going to call for the consideration of every bill as it is reached on the Calendar.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Johanna Loewinger, widow of Charles Loewinger, deceased, late of Company E, Twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio), which was read in part, the further reading being dispensed with on motion of Mr. GUENTHER, is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 739) granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger, having considered the same, report it back with the recommendation that it do pass, and in support of this action adopt and make part hereof the report of the Committee on Pensions of the Senate, which is as follows:

"[Senate Report No. 205, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

"Charles Loewinger, the husband of the widow now claiming a pension, enlisted June 13, 1861, in Company E, Twenty-eighth Ohio Volunteers. Discharged for disability May 18, 1862. Application for a pension filed January 27, 1865, for chronic diarrhea and ulceration of the bowels. He died July 17, 1876. His widow filed her application to be put upon the pension-roll March 31, 1880; claim rejected July 25, 1885.

"The medical reviewer rejects the claim of the widow on the ground 'that the soldier committed suicide, as shown by the verdict of the coroner's jury, and his death in this manner is not considered the result of chronic diarrhea, nor chargeable in any way to his military service.' If the above finding is sustained by the evidence filed with the widow's application there could be no question that her claim had been properly rejected. On a careful analyses of the testimony the committee can not agree with the finding of the Pension Office, and is satisfied that the evidence clearly supports the opposite conclusion.

"The verdict of the coroner's jury finds: 'The deceased came to his death from suicide by cutting his throat with a razor, caused by long-continued illness.'

"This verdict is supported as to the cause of his suicide by an overwhelming amount of testimony.

"The 'certificate of disability for discharge' finds him 'incapable of performing the duties of a soldier, because of chronic ulceration of the mucous membrane of the colon, resulting from an attack of camp fever contracted while on Big Sewell Mountain, in October, 1861, marked by excessive exhaustive diarrhea, occasional hemorrhage of the bowels, and such reduction of strength that he is utterly unfit for service.'

"The evidence of a number of physicians, as well as his neighbors, embracing the period from the date of his discharge to the hour of his death, conclusively proves that his disease, for which he was discharged from the service, continued, without intermission, during that whole period, and that he suffered excessive pain and was totally unfit to perform any labor, and that during the latter years of his life he was confined to his house, and most of the time to his bed; that his condition preyed upon his mind, and at times it was seriously affected.

"Dr. G. C. Werner, who attended him during the last years of his illness and at the time of his death, testified that—

"'The soldier became affected with melancholy and became very debilitated several months before he committed suicide; that affiant never had any doubt but that the chronic diarrhea, from which he was continuously suffering, was the immediate cause of his melancholy; that death was not caused by cutting his throat, as affiant sewed up the wound and there were no arteries severed, and that, in affiant's opinion, he could not have lived more than a few days longer, as he was then in a dying condition from chronic diarrhea.'"

"This statement is supported by the affidavits of Neland Frentz, Dr. F. L. Emmert, Annie N. Rohrer, Mary Byer, Frank Geiler, Carl Keneher, and Carl Lirche.

"The medical reviewer, July 14, 1885, upon these facts, in referring the cause to the chief of the medical division, said: 'As the case now stands we must, in my opinion, accept death as due to diarrhea, and not to the wound in the throat.'

"This conclusion, which the committee think is fully sustained by the testimony, was reached after the medical reviewer had commented upon the case, May 6, 1885, and the medical referee himself had called for further testimony June 12, 1885.

"It is clear from the evidence that the pensioner was the victim of painful, exhausting, and debilitating disease; that no cause other than this disease is pretended to have existed which could have affected the mind of the husband of the petitioner and caused him to take his life. And it is fair to conclude that at the time he made the attempt on his life his mind, by reason of the disease contracted in the service, was seriously affected. And the evidence of the physician that he did not die from the injury inflicted, but as the result of his debilitated condition resulting from that disease, seems to your committee conclusive of the case.

"The conclusion of the committee in this case is fully sustained by the decisions and rulings of the Pension Bureau, found in the 'Digest of Pension Laws and Decisions,' pages 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 279.

"Your committee would report the bill favorably, after amending the title so as to read: 'A bill granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger;' and by striking out, in line 6, the word 'Johnanna' and inserting in lieu thereof the word 'Johanna.'"

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

BERRY DAY.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 737) granting a pension to Berry Day.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Berry Day, father of A. L. Day, deceased, late of Company I, Fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill S. 737, having considered the same, report it back and recommend its passage, and in support of this action adopt and make part hereof the report of Senate Committee on Pensions, which is as follows:

[Senate Report No. 140, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

This claim was rejected by the Bureau of Pensions March 4, 1886, upon the ground that the claimant was not dependent upon the soldier for support at the date of his death.

The claimant is now eighty-one years of age. His only son, A. L. Day, of Company I, Fifth Ohio Infantry Valunteers, was killed at the battle of Cedar Mountain, in August, 1862. His mother died in 1847.

At the time of the soldier's death the father owned a house worth about $2,000, which was under a mortgage of $1,000. He had also about $500 in personal property, and this was all of his estate. S. W. Reud and John W. Fisher depose that the son worked for his father up to near the time of his enlistment, and, as deponents understood, contributed his wages to aid his father. The claimant's business (trading in horses) was a constant loss to him until 1858, when he disposed of the last vestige of his property, and has ever since been supported by the labor of his second wife and by the Odd Fellows.

Mrs. Kate Fisher, sister of the deceased, deposes that this soldier sent her money nearly every pay-day to aid their father in supporting the family, amounting to some $25 or $30, and that he sent to his father much larger sums.

The report of the board of examining surgeons, dated October 15, 1882, states that the claimant is incapable of supporting himself, and that the disability is senility.

The passage of this bill is recommended.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ELIZA DOUGLASS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 339) granting a pension to Eliza Douglass.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the penson-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eliza Douglass, dependent mother of James Douglass, late of Company H, Fifth Regiment Colored Troops.

The report (by Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 339) granting a pension to Eliza Douglass, having considered the same, report it back and recommend its passage, and in support of this action adopt and make part hereof the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, which is as follows:

"[Senate Report No. 49, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

"This is a claim for a pension by Eliza Douglass, as the dependent mother of James Douglass, a private in Company H, Fifth Regiment of Colored Troops.

"The proof in this case seems to be sufficient to show that the soldier, James Douglass, who enlisted on the 15th of June, 1863, and was discharged September 20, 1865, contracted the disease of which he subsequently died, April 15, 1870, whilst in the service of the United States and in the line of duty.

"The facts which would ordinarily justify the granting of a pension to the mother of a deceased soldier appear to be sufficiently established by the evidence. The only question presented by the record adverse to the claimant, Eliza Douglass, as the dependent mother of James Douglass, is the fact that the proof is conclusive that at the time of the death of the said James Douglass he left a widow, who some time subsequent to his death married.

"Section 4707 of the Revised Statutes of the United States provides—

"'If any person embraced within the provisions of sections 4692 and 4693 has died since the 4th day of March, 1861, or shall hereafter die by reason of any wound, injury, casualty, or disease which under the conditions and limitations of such sections would have entitled him to an invalid pension, and has not left or shall not leave a widow or legitimate child, but has left or shall leave other relative or relatives who were dependent upon him for support in whole or in part at the date of his death, such relative or relatives shall be entitled in the following order of precedence to receive the same pension as such person would have been entitled to had he been totally disabled, to commence at the death of such person.'

"This section clearly contemplates that the right of a dependent relative to a pension shall accrue only in those cases in which the soldier dying has not left a 'widow' or 'legitimate child.'

"Section 4708 of the Revised Statutes of the United States provides—

"'The remarriage of any widow, dependent mother, or dependent sister entitled to pension shall not bar her right to such pension to the date of her remarriage.' * * *

"'But on the remarriage of any widow, dependent mother, or dependent sister having a pension, such pension shall cease.'

"The committee know of no provision of law which authorizes the substitution of a dependent mother to the rights which the law gives to the widow of a deceased soldier in case said widow should marry after the death of her husband, section 4708 not applying to such a case.

"This view was taken by the Pension Bureau in the above claim, and the right of the claimant to a pension denied on this construction of the law. Under these circumstances the action of the Commissioner of Pensions in rejecting the claim was correct under the law as it exists.

"But the committee in this case feel compelled to report the above bill favorably under the circumstances disclosed by this record, and recommend that the bill be passed."

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Chairman, last Friday I was present, as I have been almost every pension night, and the rule has been for the Calendar to be gone through with and to consider bills which are not objected to. Under that rule gentlemen have passed four or five bills which they have had an interest in in behalf of soldiers' widows in the State from which they come. I have introduced bills now upon the Calendar which were in the interest of soldiers of the State of New Jersey. It was understood last Friday that to-night bills were to be taken up beginning where we left off on last Friday. I do not see any possible way of reaching bills in the interest of New Jersey unless we clear the Calendar as we go along. If we had gone on in that way we would have gotten through the Calendar by this time, and could have commenced again at the beginning, but as we have gone on I do not see any chance to reach the bills in which I am interested. Now, I would rather go on and consider the bills as they come up on the Calendar and dispose of them. But if the committee will agree to take up the Calendar where we left off on last Friday, so that we may consider such cases as are called up, then I am willing to withdraw all further objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the pending bill.

There was no objection, and the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

C. R. THOMAS.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S 335) granting a pension to C. R. Thomas.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be passed over.

MARY E. JOHNSON.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 337) granting a pension to Mary E. Johnson.

Mr. FINLEY. I would like to say to the gentleman from New Jersey that if he undertakes to call up bills in every case when they are reached, without the request of the gentlemen who are interested, it may be that they would not regard it as courteous on his part.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be passed over.

MANON VANGORDEN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 330) granting a pension to Manon Vangorden.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be passed over.

JOHN GERMAN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3504) for the relief of John German.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be passed over.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

Bills of the following titles were passed over, no member asking for their consideration:

A bill (H. R. 5752) for the relief of Julia Triggs;

A bill (H. R. 5751) for the relief of Margaret M. Hatch; and

A bill (S. 1638) granting a pension to William Richardson.

JOHN TAYLOR.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 2656) to increase the pension of John Taylor.

Mr. CHEADLE. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to increase the pension of John Taylor, late of Battery M, Third New York Light Artillery, from $12 to $16 per month, on account of gunshot wound of the head and its results.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2656) to increase the pension of John Taylor, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

A similar bill was before the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the Forty-ninth Congress, and their report thereon is as follows:

"The applicant for pension is now receiving a pension of $12 a month by an act of Congress approved May 4, 1882.

"On the 5th day of November, 1884, he applied to the Department for an increase on account of disabilities incurred while in the service, and was rejected by the Department upon the certificate of the examining board, made November 4, 1885, which is as follows:

"'Ball entered 2 inches below and behind the right angle of the mouth, injuring the inferior maxilla and passing through the structure of the lower portion of the mouth, coming out an inch above and to the left of the pomum Adami; cicatrices are depressed and adherent; there is considerable alilia, probably owing to the injury of the nerves of the tongue; there is no external evidence of injury to the left shoulder, but there is apparent slight loss of sensation of face and of left shoulder.

"'Examining Surgeon S. A. Lumly certifies to gunshot wound fracturing inferior maxillary right jaw; ball entering lower border of the inferior maxillary, passing inwards and emerging from left jaw below inferior maxillary, removing several molars and causing partial paralysis of vocal organs and impairing speech; considerable pain in cold weather; atrophied condition of left jaw; facial neuralgia; health impaired; degrees of disability permanent.'

"Examining Surgeon George Kellog and others certify substantially as last above, and add that articulation is much impaired; that claimant at times is unable to speak; has difficulty in mastication. Claimant says his articulation was perfect before he was wounded; has loss of power in left arm and hand; circulation slightly impaired, probably due to injury to filaments of cavical flexus.

"The claimant claims an increase of disability on account of the injuries received while in the service.

"He has personally appeared before the committee, and it is evident that he is incapable of using his left arm so that he may earn his livelihood by manual labor; that he is also afflicted with a painful and embarrassing stammering of his speech, arising from the gunshot wound above referred to.

"From the evidence presented, and his personal appearance and examination by the committee, the committee are of the opinion that claimant is entitled to a further rating than he already has, namely, $16 per month, and that the bill be amended by striking out the words 'twenty-four,' in lines 7 and 8, and inserting instead thereof the word 'sixteen.'"

The bill then under consideration passed both Houses of Congress, but was vetoed by the President on the ground that the increase allowed under the act approved May 4, 1882, "when applied for at the Pension Bureau in 1885, was denied, on the ground that the rate he was receiving was commensurate with the degree of his disability, a board of surgeons having reported that he was receiving a liberal rating."

Your committee concede that the disability is liberally rated on the basis provided by law, *i. e.*, ability to perform manual labor, and that is as far as the Pension Bureau is permitted under the terms of the law to go. But this case is of a different character. It is not as much claimant's inability to perform manual labor which induces him to come to Congress for relief as his inability to procure employment by reason of the very serious impairment of his speech. Impairment of speech and deafness alike, while not an interference in the performance of manual labor, subject the unfortunate individual to much embarrassment in obtaining employment, and Congress already has taken the necessary steps to grant relief to those who are totally deaf.

Recognizing the merit of the bill under consideration, your committee report favorably on the same, and ask that it do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

W. A. LEMASTER.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 647) for the relief of W. A. Lemaster; which was passed over, no member asking for its consideration.

HANNAH H. LATHAM.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3506) for the relief of Hannah H. Latham; which was passed over, no member asking for its consideration.

B. S. VAN BUREN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 3568) for the relief of B. S. Van Buren.

Mr. TAULBEE. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the limitations of the pension laws, the name of Barent S. Van Buren, late a musician in the Fourth Regiment of Illinois Cavalry Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. LANE) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3568) for the relief of B. S. Van Buren, submit the following report:

The case of Barent S. Van Buren, formerly a musician of the Fourth Illinois Cavalry Volunteers (claim for invalid pension No. 389982), was rejected by the Pension Office September 17, 1885, on the ground that the evidence on file in the case did not show that tumors of breast and thigh originated in the service and the line of duty.

The history of this case is as follows: Soldier, who was the son of Judge E. Van Buren, of Chicago, was a musician and joined the regiment composed of the Fourth Illinois Cavalry Volunteers in October, 1861; was discharged with the other members of the band at Cairo in the spring of 1862. The testimony on file in this case in the Pension Office goes to show that soldier contracted tumors of chest, abdomen, and thigh, on the march from Fort Henry to Fort Donelson, Tennessee, in February, 1862. The weather was wet and cold, and the constant riding day and night, and the constant exposure, brought on sickness, which resulted in said tumors, which were hard and soft alternately and at times suppurated; always tender and troublesome.

These tumors existed at the date of discharge in April, 1862, and Dr. Joseph W. Freer, who treated him immediately after arriving home after discharge for these tumors, is dead, and soldier has been unable to furnish the testimony of a commissioned officer of the regiment as to the incurrence of his disability in the service, owing to the fact that the members of the band were not with the regiment when traversing the country from Fort Henry to Fort Donelson, Tennessee.

He has furnished the testimony of the different members of the band who were with him at the time, and to whom he showed his tumors at Randolph Forges in February, 1862, after the ride across the country.

The testimony shows that he was a strong, healthy man when he enlisted, by parties who knew him. This is shown by several witnesses, and that he was afflicted as above set forth on his return from the Army. It is certain from the testimony on file that this man was sound and well when he enlisted, and it is equally certain that he was discharged because of his sickness which he contracted after his enlistment. It seems that by an equitable construction this claimant contracted this disability while in the service and in line of duty.

Therefore the committee recommend that this bill do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

Bills of the following titles were passed over, no members asking for their consideration:

A bill (H. R. 8291) granting a pension to Julia Welch;

A bill (H. R. 5123) to increase the pension of Charles Ritchey;

A bill (H. R. 4182) granting a pension to Elizabeth Jones;

A bill (H. R. 3509) granting a pension to Harriet I. Peabody; and

A bill (H. R. 7932) granting a pension to Mary Calvert Truxtun.

MRS. F. SELINA BUCHANAN.

The next business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 1985) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. F. Selina Buchanan.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask for the consideration of that bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. F. Selina Buchanan, widow of the late McKean Buchanan, of the United States Navy, and pay her a pension of $50 per month, in lieu of the amount she is now receiving.

The report (by Mr. BLISS) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred Senate bill 1985, adopt the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, and recommend the passage of the bill.

"The petitioner, Mrs. F. Selina Buchanan, is the widow of the late McKean Buchanan, who, at the time of his death, March 18, 1871, was pay director in the United States Navy, with the rank of commodore (the highest attainable by officers of his grade), assimilated to that of brigadier-general in the Army.

"Pay Director Buchanan entered the Navy in 1826, and participated in two wars. By act of Congress of December 21, 1861, limiting the term of active service to forty-five years of service, or to sixty-two years of age, he was retired from service, he having been born in 1798. Although by this law permitted to withdraw from active duty, he remained at his post on board the frigate Congress until she was sunk in Hampton Roads, March 9, 1862. During the engagement with the Merrimac on the date named he commanded the berth-deck division and performed gallant service until the sinking of the ship.

"Being at that time sixty-four years of age, the shock to his system was such that his health was seriously undermined, and his death was the result.

"By the act of March 3, 1871, revising the various naval grades, Paymaster Buchanan was raised to the grade of pay director (then newly created) with the rank of commodore, but his death occurred two weeks later, on March 18, 1871, before the issuance of his commission.

"In view of the foregoing facts, of the decedent's long and valuable services, of the widow's advanced age, she being over eighty-three years old, and in view of the further fact that there are now, or were not long since, on the pension-rolls the widows of ten admirals, four commodores, and a number of other officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, receiving $50 per month, your committee recommend that the prayer of the petitioner be granted, and they submit herewith a bill increasing her pension from $30 to $50."

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the bill will be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. CHEADLE. I object.

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no desire to discuss the general propositions contained in this bill. It is so thoroughly in keeping with every bill reported from the Committee of the Whole, having passed the Senate and been reported from the House committee, that I can not understand the gentleman's objection. But I desire to be consistent with the record that the House has made on every bill submitted embodying this proposition, and as the gentleman, I am sure, desires to be consistent in his opposition to the principle involved, I am perfectly willing to entertain any suggestion coming from the committee with reference to the bill, in order that it may not delay proceedings with respect to other bills following it on the Calendar and yet at the same time give to the bill consideration of the same character that other bills have always received.

Mr. MORRILL. I move to amend the bill by striking out "fifty" and inserting "thirty-five."

Mr. BINGHAM. I shall not object to letting the bill go to the House on such an amendment as that. I only want the House to pass upon the question.

Mr. CHEADLE. I object to $35 as well as fifty.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman offer an amendment?

Mr. CHEADLE. No, sir. I am not in charge of the bill. I will state to my colleague on the committee that a number of similar cases have been set down for the 28th of the month, directly after the reading of the Journal, and I am perfectly willing that this bill shall take the same course.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman submit any motion?

Mr. CHEADLE. I move to amend by inserting $30 per month.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is what she now gets. I am willing, if it be the judgment of the committee to fix $35 as the rate, to let the House pass upon the question involved, as it has done in similar cases.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania permit a suggestion.

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. FORD. Why not allow it to take the same course as the other bills set for consideration in the House on the 28th of May?

Mr. BINGHAM. I have no objection to that, as I have said. Does the gentleman mean at $35?

Mr. FORD. No; just as it stands.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. TAULBEE. Let the recommendation of the committee be that the bill go over to the 28th day of May with the previous question ordered, but with the right of amendment, and with fifteen minutes' debate on each side.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am perfectly willing for that.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, that order will be made.

Mr. MORRILL. If that agreement is entered into I will withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of objection this bill will be reported to the House with the understanding that a vote is to be taken on it in the House on the 28th day of May, following the bills which have been similarly reported for consideration on that day, with fifteen minutes' debate on each side and the previous question being considered as ordered, with the right, however, to offer amendments.

There was no objection.

ANDREW FRANKLIN, ALIAS M'KEE.

The next bill on the Calendar, the consideration of which was asked by Mr. RYAN, was the bill (S. 626) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Franklin, alias McKee.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Andrew Franklin, alias McKee, and pay him a pension at the rate of $30 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving under an act of Congress approved February 28, 1885.

The report (by Mr. BLISS) was read, as follows:

They recommend the favorable consideration thereof, and adopt the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, as follows:

"The claimant was a soldier in the Mexican war, and is now about ninety-five years of age. By special act, approved February 28, 1885, he was granted a pension at $8 per month. He now asks for an increase of the same to $30 per month. The testimony which was produced before the committee at the time the bill granting him a pension was pending shows that the claimant saw hard service in the war with Mexico and was wounded in action.

"On account of the great age, the infirmities, and the total dependence of the claimant, the committee are of opinion that the increase should be allowed. They therefore recommend the passage of the bill."

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MOSES L. CHASE.

The next business on the Calendar, the consideration of which was asked by Mr. GROUT, was the bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Moses L. Chase.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be hereby directed to put upon the pension-roll, subject to the limitations and restrictions of the pension laws, the name of Moses L. Chase, a private in Company M, First Vermont Cavalry.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Moses L. Chase, having considered the same, report as follows:

The claimant was a private in Company M, First Vermont Cavalry, being enrolled August 27, 1864, for three years. The records show that soldier participated in several battles. It is also shown that he had hospital service at Chappel Point, Md., for intermittent fever; at the Armory Square Hospital, Washington, D. C., for chronic diarrhea, and at the Baxter Hospital, Burlington, Vt., and the Sloan Hospital, Montpelier, Vt., for the latter disease. His treatment at Montpelier, Vt., was in June, 1865, shortly after which he was mustered out.

Soldier made application for pension, alleging chronic diarrhea, and also kidney disease, resulting from being thrown from a horse at Harper's Ferry, W. Va., by which his back was severely injured.

There is medical evidence on file showing that soldier is now incurably sick with kidney and bladder disease, the board of examining surgeons of Newport, Vt., giving this opinion, and there is also both medical and lay evidence showing that when he came home from the army he was very feeble with chronic diarrhea and kidney disease.

The case was submitted for special examination to Homer Riggs, and after a very thorough inquiry the examiner made a favorable report, closing as follows:

"The evidence of Samuel F. Stearns, who is considered one of the most reliable men in his town, shows beyond a reasonable doubt that the soldier was thrown from a horse and hurt, and was taken up by his comrades unconscious. From the evidence before me, I am of the opinion that the claim is meritorious."

Notwithstanding this favorable finding, the claim was rejected, and as your committee are fully persuaded that the claim is a thoroughly just one, and that a hardship has been done the soldier by its rejection in the Pension Office, report it back favorably and recommend its passage, with an amendment substituting the word "place" for the word "put" in the third line.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

LAURA L. WALLEN.

Mr. McKINNEY. I inadvertently allowed the bill just preceding this on the Calendar to be passed over. I now ask that it be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5593) granting an increase of pension to Laura L. Wallen.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension to Laura L. Wallen, widow of Henry D. Wallen, late colonel of the Second Infantry, United States Army, to the sum of $50 per month.

Mr. McKINNEY. I do not desire to consider this bill now; but I ask that it go over to the 28th of May, under the same conditions precisely as those bills preceding it.

Mr. CARUTH. I do not object to the request of the gentleman; but how are we to dispose of the number of bills which are fixed for that day?

Mr. RYAN. If not disposed of on that day they will go over to another day.

Mr. CARUTH. I have a bill set for consideration on that day which I do not want interfered with.

Mr. McKINNEY. This will not interfere with it or any previous bills.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Let us have the report read.

The report (by Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut) was read, as follows:

That Laura L. Wallen is the widow of Henry D. Wallen, who at the time of his death, December, 1887, was colonel of Second Infantry. The records of the War Department show that Colonel Wallen was appointed in 1836 and served in the Mexican war, and in each grade of promotion upon the frontier, until his death, which was from disease contracted upon the frontier of Arizona. The most notable service of Colonel Wallen's life, in obedience to orders most distasteful to an officer anxious for military distinction and rank, was performed during the late war.

His knowledge of the Indian tribes and his great tact and judgment in dealing with them pointed to him as a man suited to the arduous and delicate task of dealing with the warlike tribes of Apaches and Navajoes on the frontier of New Mexico. Though averse to this service in the condition of the country, as his letters to the War Department, to President Lincoln, and to the Military Committee of the Senate show, he complied with the orders of the Secretary of War with such zeal and energy that though commanding but three companies of his regiment, composed of fresh volunteers, he kept the frontier, that for a century had been exposed to the violence of savage tribes, in a condition of peace that it had rarely known.

About 9,000 Indians were brought into a reservation, disarmed, and induced to labor, land was reclaimed by irrigation, crops planted and harvested in peace, while all the energies of the Government were engaged in the prodigious work of war. The value of this frontier service can scarcely be overrated; but for the discretion and executive ability of Colonel Wallen the whole frontier of New Mexico would have blazed with the fires of savage warfare, and the Government embarrassed at a time when it had no forces to spare.

This continuous service in a hot and unhealthful region broke down Colonel Wallen's health, and after years of suffering he died, leaving a widow, advanced in years, and an invalid daughter dependent upon a pension of $30 per month.

In view of Colonel Wallen's services, and the present condition of his widow, the committee recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I would like to ask the gentleman from New Hampshire on what ground it is asked that an increase shall be given in this case beyond that given in other cases of a similar character?

Mr. MCKINNEY. Because of the services given to his country, and because the widow to-day is entirely dependent upon her pension. We have many precedents for this kind of increase.

Mr. MORRILL. I wish the gentleman would name some of them, because I am not familiar with any.

Mr. MCKINNEY. I think there are quite a number, if the gentleman will look.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I ask the gentleman from Kansas if that is the course of his committee?

Mr. MORRILL. The Committee on Invalid Pensions never recommended such a case. Indeed, in the case of Colonel Hendricks, who was killed in battle, the committee reported adversely on a similar application.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio. This case comes from the Committee on Pensions?

Mr. MORRILL. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCKINNEY. I do not object to the bill going over to the 28th of May, under the same order as has been adopted with regard to other bills. The House can then discuss the bill, and can pass it or kill it, as it pleases.

Mr. DOCKERY. Let it go over with the right to offer amendments.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I do not object to the bill going over with the right to be voted on in the House. But I do object seriously to the practice of selecting out some cases of this class to the exclusion of others.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri). Is there objection to the proposition that the bill shall go over to be considered in the House under the conditions which have been stated?

There was no objection, and the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation stated.

EVELINE M. ALEXANDER.

The next bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. SAWYER) was the bill (H. R. 4578) granting a pension to Eveline M. Alexander, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Alexander.

Mr. SAWYER. This is a bill where a widow is now receiving a pension of $30. The bill recommends a pension of $50 per month. Her husband was wounded while serving in the Army with the rank of brigadier-general. I ask that this bill take the same course as others and be considered in the House on the 28th of May under the same order, with the right to offer amendments.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Let the bill and report be read.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands, the gentleman who calls up this bill does not desire to have the bill now considered.

Mr. SAWYER. I ask to have it considered merely to the extent of its being ordered to take the same course as the others.

Mr. MCMILLIN. If that action is to be taken, the bill and the report should be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Eveline M. Alexander, and rate her pension at $50 per month, which shall be in lieu of the pension she now receives.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4578) granting a pension to Eveline M. Alexander, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Alexander, submit the following report:

It appears from the report of the Adjutant-General, on file in the Pension Office, that General Alexander entered the regular Army of the United States July 26, 1861, as second lieutenant, and remained until May 4, 1887, when he died, holding the rank of lieutenant-colonel. He served as adjutant-general of the Third Army Corps of Army of the Potomac, and of the Seventeenth Corps of the Department of the Tennessee. Served as chief of staff to General Stoneman, commanding Department of the Tennessee, and also inspector-general in 1865. Subsequently served with his regiment and in other capacities in Arkansas, New Mexico, Arizona, Colorado, Texas, and Montana. That in 1865 he was retired from active service in consequence of disabilities incurred in the line of duty as an officer of the Army.

It appears that in 1865 he commanded the Second Brigade, Fourth Division Cavalry Corps, Military Division of the Mississippi.

Mrs. Alexander is now receiving a pension of $30 per month as the widow of a lieutenant-colonel.

The evidence shows that she is a lady, in ordinary circumstances, with a young son, about twelve years of age, and at that age when the expenses of education are rapidly increasing.

The letter from General Wilson, one of the most distinguished cavalry officers of the Army, addressed to one of the committee, is annexed hereto and made a part of this report.

The committee believe that this lady, the widow of so distinguished an officer, who bravely commanded a brigade while in active service, who was in fact a brevet brigadier-general, there being no vacancy in the full rank, is under the circumstances fairly entitled to the relief this bill seeks to give, and therefore recommend that the bill pass.

WASHINGTON, *March 14, 1888.*

SIR: I beg to call your attention to the claim of Eveline M. Alexander, wife of the late General Andrew S. Alexander, for an increase of pension.

It was my good fortune to know General Alexander during the rebellion—appointed into the Army from Missouri, and by conspicuous merit rose to the command of a brigade of cavalry in the corps which I had the honor of organizing and commanding. Prior to that he was a lieutenant-colonel and assistant adjutant-general of the Seventeenth Army Corps, on the staff of his brother-in-law, Maj. Gen. Frank Blair.

After serving with me as chief of staff through the Nashville campaign, during which he rendered most valuable service, I secured for him the rank of brevet brigadier-general (it being understood that he could not be appointed to the full rank because there were no vacancies in that grade), and assigned him to the command of a brigade of cavalry in Upton's (Fourth) division, which command he held during the final campaign through Alabama and Georgia, with which the war was ended. He greatly distinguished himself in the battles at Montevallo, Ebenezer Church, the assault and capture of Selma, the passage of the Alabama, the assault and capture of Columbus, Ga., and finally in the operations which resulted in the capture of Jefferson Davis.

In all these battles and operations he was conspicuous for the energy, courage, activity, and ability with which he commanded and led his brigade. He was constantly under my observation, and I most cheerfully bear witness to his high qualities and character, as well as to the untiring industry and persistency with which he performed every duty.

I was personally a witness to an incident which I do not doubt was proximately the cause of his death. During the passage of the Alabama by the corps on a ponton bridge, built for the occasion, Alexander, with a small boat and crew, was trying to protect the bridge from the drift-wood with which the river was filled by the rapidly rising flood. An enormous tree caught his frail craft between it and the bridge, overturned the craft, threw the general into the water, and as he arose to the surface and seized the bow one of the pontons caught and crowded him almost to death.

"He was rescued with great difficulty; two of his ribs were broken, his back was severely injured, and his lungs badly bruised. Twenty-two years afterwards, while suffering from disease directly the result of his long and faithful services, he died from the bursting of an abcess on his lungs, which I doubt not had its origin from the injury just described. He was at the time in the line of his duty as a brigadier-general, and it was not his fault that he did not hold the full rank. He was regularly assigned to command before that date as a brevet brigadier-general, and for all purposes of the military service and for the law he was just as much a brigadier-general as a dozen appointments to that grade could have made him. He commanded and was obeyed as such, he was injured as such, and now that he is dead, leaving his wife and young son dependent upon the justice and liberality of his country, I submit that they should receive a pension according to his services and command as a brigadier-general and not according to the lineal rank he had when he died.

"I am well acquainted with Mrs. Alexander and her father's family, one of the most distinguished in New York, and am sure she has no support and no means of educating her young son except what she derives from the small pension now allowed her and from the meager saving from her husband's army pay, which he invested several years before he became disabled.

"She needs, and ought to have, the largest pension ever paid under such circumstances, and no one who will take time to read the little volume I prepared and which his wife published, giving an account of his life and services, can doubt the justice of this conclusion.

"He was a brave, virtuous, heroic soldier, and of the highest character in all the relations of life, and as the actual commission of brigadier-general of volunteers could have imposed no additional service, danger, or command upon him. I trust his widow's petition may be promptly granted. He who gives quickly, gives twice. In this case I hope there will be no delay.

"If deemed necessary, I will cheerfully make affidavit to the truth of the foregoing statement.

Perhaps I should add that General Alexander was also the brother-in-law of Major General Upton, of New York, and that young Upton Alexander is now the sole representative of those two most gallant and patriotic soldiers and is dependent upon this increased pension for the education a boy of such lineage should receive.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

JAMES H. WILSON,
Late Maj. Gen. Vol., Comdg. Cav. Corps M. D. M., and Brevet Maj. Gen., U. S. A.

HON. JOHN G. SAWYER,
House of Representatives.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion that the bill be reported to the House with the recommendation that it shall go over for consideration in the House on the 28th of May, with the previous question ordered, fifteen minutes of debate on each side, and the right to offer amendments. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

HARLOW B. HYDE.

The next business on the Private Calendar, called up for consideration by Mr. SAWYER, was the bill (S. 1477) granting a pension to Harlow B. Hyde.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Harlow B. Hyde, dependent father of George B. Hyde, late a private in Company C, Second Wisconsin Infantry.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1477) granting a pension to Harlow B. Hyde, submit the following report:

The committee, from an examination of the very full statement of the facts as contained in the report of the Senate committee on this bill, hereto attached and made a part hereof, find that this is a meritorious claim, and therefore they recommend that the bill do pass.

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Harlow B. Hyde, have examined the same, and report:

Harlow B. Hyde is the father of George B. Hyde, late private in Company C, Second Wisconsin Infantry. From the record testimony it is shown that the soldier was enrolled on the 22d day of April, 1861; that he was wounded in action August 28, 1862; that he received his wound at the battle of Gainesville, and that he died from its effects on the 10th of September, 1862. The father claims that he was dependent upon his said son at the time of his enlistment, and on the 17th of April, 1883, he filed an application for a pension. The claim was rejected October 7, 1885, on the ground that the claimant's physical condition was not satisfactorily shown, neither his property or income at that date; that the contributions from his son are shown by the testimony of the family, which consisted of himself—the mother having died before the war—and a daughter nineteen years of age.

Apart from his immediate household he had a married son, aged twenty-nine, three unmarried sons, two of whom were in the Army. Another objection to the allowance of his claim consisted in his having a home, which he sold for $1,000, from the proceeds of which $150 had to go for debts. It is also held that the evidence does not show that his physical infirmities prevented his earning a living. He appealed from the decision of the Commissioner, but the Secretary of the Interior sustained the rejection.

The committee are of the opinion that there is ample proof, independent of that contributed by claimant's family, to show that he was dependent upon his son for support, and it consists in the fact that the son lived with his father before and at the time of his enlistment; that he labored for his father's maintenance, and in the well-established fact that the father was unable to labor for his own support.

Dr. L. F. Benedick, Winooski, Vt., testifies as follows:

"Has attended claimant for the last fourteen years (prior to July 3, 1883, covering a period from 1869) for rheumatism. Is unable to give dates, as his pecuniary circumstances forbade the idea of much pay. When able to pay he did so at the time of service. Also had a right inguinal hernia. Since 1869 has been quite infirm. That his age is now seventy-nine. Know him to be truthful, honest, and industrious, when able to work, and too proud to ask the Government for a pension if he did not believe it to be his legal and moral right."

The surgeon's certificate of examination, made at Burlington, Vt., describes his condition as follows:

"We find an elastic soft tumor in right groin. It protrudes from external abdominal ring; is size of butternut, or about 1½ inches in diameter. It is an oblique inguinal hernia. He has moderately varicose veins of right leg. The facts of duration of above condition are not within our personal knowledge, but in our best judgment these conditions were present for several years previous to late war. We also believe that in consequence of such disabilities he was unfitted for manual labor."

Then follows the rating, which is total.

The report, which is official, shows that in the best judgment of the examiners the conditions they describe existed prior to the war. Assuming that they are correct—and their statement is corroborated by that of Dr. Benedick—the claimant was a dependent father when his son enlisted. He was dependent before, since, and is now. The son contributed to his support up to the time of his death, for he had no income from any other source, and the only property he had he sold for $1,000, upon which there was a mortgage of $300.

At the time of his son's enlistment he was fifty-eight years old, was afflicted with inguinal hernia and other disabilities—was disqualified for manual labor. He was dependent, and upon whom if not upon his son, who lived with him and was his sole support? He is now eighty-four years of age, and the pension to which he is plainly entitled, in the opinion of the committee, has been too long withheld.

The accompanying bill is reported for his relief with a recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

GEORGE W. PEAVEY.

Mr. CLARK. I ask consideration of the bill (S. 1478) granting a pension to George W. Peavy, just preceding the one last considered.

There was no objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George W. Peavey, late first lieutenant Fifty-seventh United States Colored Volunteer Infantry.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let the report be read.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1478) granting a pension to George W. Peavey, have examined the same, and report:

The report of the Senate Committee on Pensions on this case, hereto attached and made a part hereof, contains a full statement in detail of the facts in this case. Your committee are led to believe that it is a meritorious case, and would therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of George W. Peavey, have examined the same, and report:

This case is fully explained in the report of the committee made at the last session of Congress, which is as follows:

"The petitioner made application to the Pension Office on April 12, 1884, and his application was rejected; and he now appeals to Congress for the aid to which he thinks he is entitled, and which it is evident he needs. His term of service embraces the time from July, 1861, to October, 1866. He enlisted as a private in Company B, First New York Cavalry, and was discharged June 13, 1865, that he might be promoted to a lieutenancy. At the time of his promotion the colonel of his regiment says:

"'He has served in my regiment nearly four years. He is a meritorious soldier, and I think well worthy of promotion. He is efficient, intelligent, and of good repute.'

"James A. Hudson, an attorney of New York City, says he was an enlisted man in the same regiment with the petitioner; that he knew him during all the time of their service, and has known him ever since; that he has been in the habit of seeing him every week and oftener. In his affidavit he refers to his knowledge of his severe complaining some time after 1870, and of his continued suffering from that time to the present. The petitioner produces the testimony of his attending physicians to show that his disability is great, and that it severely affects his back and one leg.

"The Pension Office rejection is on the ground that he has had no pensionable disability since the date of filing his claim, April 12, 1884. If he had a pensionable disability prior to filing his claim, and contracted it in the service, he would have a claim to a pension during the prevalence of such disability.

"The Adjutant-General's report shows that during the last year of his service he was four times reported sick, and twice on special duty. He believes and claims that his helplessness was caused by sleeping over the steam-pipes on a transportation boat. The record gives no account of the nature of his sickness while in the Army. It never does, and he is unable to procure official testimony as to his condition prior to discharge. He hoped to subsist without a pension, but he became almost helplessly disabled, lost his property, and was compelled to appeal to the Government for what he deemed to be due him. He is now seventy years old.

"His case seems to have merit, but he has had no attorney, and it is not well prepared. In the opinion of the committee, though the evidence is not such as is required by the Pension Office, his illness is due to his service. It is the experience of any careful observer that but very few of those who served in the late war have escaped disabling diseases. This man served about five continuous years. He was very faithful and of good repute. In any case he will not require the aid he asks very long, and it is better to give it to him upon the shadow of a doubt that he has not technically made out a case than to commit the injustice of withholding it if it is his due.

"Your committee report a bill for his relief with a recommendation that it do pass."

It appears from the record reports that this soldier enlisted July 12, 1861, and was discharged October 23, 1865. It is also proven from this source that during the five years of his service he is always reported "present for duty," or "present, sick." James A. Hudson, whose testimony is in part quoted in the previous report, says that he knew him while serving with him in 1861, 1862, 1863, and 1864, and after an interval of two or three years their intimacy was renewed.

"Through all of these years I have known that he claimed and believed that the injuries from which he suffered were received while in the Army and in the line of duty."

The Pension Office called for testimony as to his treatment in hospital during his service. His answer was that he was not treated in hospital at any time, but in his own quarters, being an officer. Then the regimental surgeon's statement was required, which he declares emphatically that he procured and forwarded to the Pension Office. No notice was taken of this, and he says that his repeated requests to be informed as to whether the affidavit of his surgeon has been received or not have not been noticed.

It is true, as stated in the previous report, that his case has not been properly completed. He had no attorney, and depended upon his friends and his own efforts to procure proper testimony. To the committee it is evident that he was sound when he entered the service. It is beyond question that he was accepted as such. His service during the years was uninterrupted and without a cloud. His reputation is vouched for by some of the best citizens of New York. Without an exception he is rated as a temperate, honest, reputable man. He gives as a reason for delaying his application that so long as he was able to support himself he would not become a pensioner; but a change came. The little property which he and his wife had saved is gone; his health entirely failed; age is coming on, and dependence stares him in the face. It may be added, as shown by statements of his neighbors and friends, that he is utterly dependent, and is now supported by those who respect and pity him.

The Commissioner of Pensions states that his claim was rejected "on the ground that there has been no pensionable disability since the filing of his claim." This rejection is based upon the reports of the medical examiners before whom he was ordered.

Physicians who have examined him differ very materially from the doctors appointed by the Government. Dr. Holbrook, of New York, says:

"Mr. Peavey has been carefully examined by me, and I find him suffering from chronic bronchitis and partial paralysis of nerves controlling bladder and sexual organs. As near as I can trace the origin of his troubles, they had their first cause in exposure as a soldier in the war. While thoroughly opposed to granting pensions on slight pretext and without searching investigation, I am strongly inclined to believe Mr. Peavey is entitled to one. At any rate, he is entitled to a most thorough and impartial hearing."

Dr. Thomas W. Ogden, of New York, certifies, "from a sense of duty," as follows:

"I have had an intimate personal acquaintance with Mr. Peavey for a number of years and know him to be an unusually worthy and honest man. I have not the least hesitancy in stating that he has an entirely just claim against the Government, payment of which has doubtless been withheld from the fact that his case has not been properly investigated. I have examined Mr. Peavey's memorial, herewith exhibited, and can vouch for the truthfulness of all statements made concerning his impaired health and pecuniary embarrassment, and it is my candid belief that these conditions are the direct result of the exposure to which he was subjected during the five years of his service as a soldier in the Union Army.

"I know Mr. Peavey's claim to be based upon facts which make the Government his debtor, and hence I earnestly commend him and his case to the confidence and sympathy of all who have the power to aid him in securing recompense for the disabilities entailed through the hard service he rendered the nation at a time when, had he devoted his time and energies to making money, he could, without risk of life or exposure inimical to health, have placed himself in independent circumstances."

The committee are of the opinion that the prayer of the petitioner should be granted, and report the accompanying bill for his relief.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. TAULBEE. I ask unanimous consent to take up and consider the bill (S. 2356) which is found on page 82 of the Calendar.

Mr. CHEADLE. I call for the regular order.

Mr. DOCKERY resumed the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next bill.

MARY GAMMELL.

The next bill on the Private Calendar, called up for consideration

by Mr. SAWYER, was the bill (S. 1298) granting a pension to Mary Gammell.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Gammell, widow of Andrew Gammell, late private in Company C, Thirty-fourth Massachusetts Infantry.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1298) granting a pension to Mary Gammell, submit the following report:

The full and convincing facts in this case, as appears in the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions, hereto attached and made a part hereof, convince the committee that this is a just case, and they therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

[Senate Report No. 13, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Mary Gammell, widow of Andrew Gammell, have examined the same, and report:

Andrew Gammell, the late husband of the petitioner, was a private in Company C, Thirty-fourth Massachusetts Regiment. From the report made by the Adjutant-General to the Commissioner of Pensions, it appears that he was wounded on the 15th of May, 1864, and sent to the hospital at Frederick, Md. This wound is thus described by an examining surgeon:

"A ball passed in near the spine on a level with left shoulder; passed deep under muscles of neck out in front."

For this disability the soldier was pensioned September 2, 1869, from January 21, 1866, at $4 per month. During the subsequent years he applied for increase, and was rejected. He died at Holden, Mass., December 10, 1882, and on the 25th of January, 1886, his widow applied for pension, which was rejected on the ground that the evidence did not connect the death with the wound.

From the affidavit of Dr. I. O. West, of Princeton, Mass., filed with the soldier's application for invalid pension, it is shown that—

"He has suffered a good deal from pain, soreness, and lameness of left shoulder, extending up the neck to a tumor, which was developed immediately after a gunshot wound received during the late civil war. He had a great deal of severe pain in his left side, and on one or two occasions I have treated him for inflammation of lung and pleura of left side."

The affiant says he is disqualified for labor to any extent, and that his disability is the result of his wound. This testimony was given August 13, 1869.

Dr. James G. Shannon, a resident of Rutland, Mass., and late hospital steward, United States Army, testifies in support of the widow's claim as follows:

"That the late Andrew Gammell came under my care in January, 1879, and he continued under my care the greater part of the time until his death, December 10, 1882. He died of consumption, and I always believed that the gunshot wound in the lower part of the neck was the primary cause. During my acquaintance with him he was never able to support his family."

In a subsequent affidavit the same witness says:

"He died of consumption, caused, I believe, by a bullet wound near the apex of, I think, the left lung. A large tumor had formed at that point and extended up the neck."

Dr. Joseph S. Ames, of Holden, Mass., testifies that the disease of which he died was induced by the bullet wound received while in the service. In a subsequent affidavit the same affiant says:

"I have for a long term of years been well acquainted with the late Andrew Gammell, and have at different times prescribed for him; that his death, occurring on the 10th day of December, 1882, was caused by consumption, and that the primary cause of his disease was a gunshot wound in the neck. Of this opinion I am well satisfied."

M. V. B. Jefferson, a resident of Worcester, testifies that—

"He knew Andrew Gammell long before the war; that Gammell worked for him on his farm before he enlisted, and he never knew but what he was a strong and healthy man. After he came home from the war he lived in my house and worked for me until he died, when he was able to work, but there was a good deal of the time when he was not able to do anything. He had a large bunch on the back of his neck, where he was shot, and a bad cough a long time before he died. I think the wound was the cause of his death. He was sick a long time before he died, and he used to complain of the back of his head and neck, and had a good deal of trouble with his lungs about breathing, especially if he had a cold."

The examining surgeon, before whom the soldier was ordered during the pendency of his application for invalid pension, says in his report—

"The disability is permanent. I find a ball hit opposite the seventh cervical vertebra, passed deep under the muscles of the neck, out at the left side of the same, leaving that shoulder and arm weak, lame, and painful."

The board of surgeons at Worcester, who examined the soldier on his application for increase, say in their report:

"A ball passed in near the spine on a level with left shoulder; passed deep under muscles of neck out in front."

The testimony from all sources is positive as to the nature, extent, and severity of the wound. It is shown that his disability was nearly total, and yet he was allowed the meager pension of $4 a month.

All the evidence filed with the widow's application positively and unequivocally connects the death with the wound, nor is there any evidence to the contrary. The examining surgeons say "they find a large tumor above the wound, but having no connection with it." It is not pretended that there was any fatal tendency in the existence of the tumor. It is assumed and proved by physicians of the highest respectability that the soldier died from the effects of the wound, which resulted in pulmonary disease, and this conclusion is perfectly consistent with the facts.

"The ball passed in near the spine and on a level with the left shoulder—passed deep. He died of consumption caused by a bullet wound near the apex of the left lung. He had a cough a long time before he died."

Notwithstanding the positive and consistent evidence of all the affiants, based upon professional knowledge and continuous intimacy with the sick man, and without any proof to the contrary, the conclusion of the medical referee is, "Death resulted from consumption, not gunshot wound."

This assumption is so brief and unsatisfactory that the committee are at a loss to understand why the case is thus disposed of in the face of so much undisputed and positive testimony. If it is intended as a merely technical way of disposing of it, because the doctors affirm that he died of consumption, it is at least apparent that this is not a liberal or even a just decision. The bullet penetrated to near the apex of the left lung; inflammation ensued; there was a gradual decline, waste, and decay—a diminution of the vital powers whose functions had been impaired by the bullet, which penetrated deep, passing in near the spine, on a level with the left shoulder, near the apex of the left lung. There is not a doubt in the mind of the committee that this man died from the wound received in the service.

The accompanying bill for the relief of his widow is reported herewith, with a recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ADVERSE REPORT.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to call the attention of the committee to the position of the bill (S. 811) for the relief of Lydia D. Haltz, which passed the committee and the House at last Friday evening's session by mistake, the bill having been reported adversely by the Committee on Invalid Pensions. Having ascertained this fact, the present occupant of the chair stated it in the House on Saturday, and the action of the House on Friday evening was reconsidered. Now, if there be no objection, this Senate bill No. 811, having been reported adversely, will be reported to the House with the recommendation that it be indefinitely postponed.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

COLUMBUS BOSTEDER.

The next bill on the Private Calendar, called up for consideration by Mr. RYAN, was the bill (H. R. 432) granting a pension to Columbus Bosteder.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-rolls, subject to the limitations of the pension laws, the name of Columbus Bosteder, late a private in Company B, First Regiment of Missouri Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 432) granting a pension to Columbus Bosteder, submit the following report:

In March, 1876, claimant filed an application for pension, alleging that "while engaged in building breastworks at Atlanta, Ga., he strained his back, and suffers from same, which also resulted in varicocele." This application was rejected on the ground of no record and inability to furnish satisfactory evidence.

Claimant enlisted in Russell's regiment of Missouri Engineers, and served from October 31, 1861, until July 22, 1865. The regimental hospital records are not on file at the War Department. The company books show that he was absent, sick, at Nashville hospital February, 1864.

Dr. William A. Neal, the assistant surgeon of the regiment, states that he was well acquainted with the claimant, and that at the time of his enlistment he was in good health and particularly free from varicocele and lameness of the back; that while the claimant was in line of duty on or about October 15, 1864, at Atlanta, Ga., while engaged in lifting sand-bags for the fortifications (according to the claimant's and his comrades' statements, who saw him at work, to the affiant), the claimant contracted a varicocele and strain of the back; that he, as the assistant surgeon, saw the claimant shortly after the injury and treated him for varicocele and strain; that about the 20th of November, 1864, on the march, near Hillsborough, Ga., the claimant reported to him for difficulty in marching, from lameness in back and varicocele, and was by him admitted to ambulance; that the claimant also came to him in Washington, D. C., in June, 1865, in regard to his lameness, when affiant again examined him, finding lameness and varicocele still existing. This was shortly before his discharge.

Capt. Thomas W. Bailey, of his company, testifies to incurrence of the disability from personal knowledge.

Dr. Seth Byram testifies to treatment after discharge, and that claimant could not do half a day's work.

Dr. Ralph B. Crawford testifies to treatment in 1870, and subsequent; says he found claimant suffering from varicocele, hydrocele, and spinal weakness, causing great debility.

Enoch Hunter, a neighbor, testifies to an acquaintance from 1870, and says claimant was suffering from a rupture that prevented his performing manual labor.

The examining surgeon at Ponca, Nebr., says, July 18, 1883:

"I find that left testicle is enlarged to about 3 inches in length and nearly 2 inches in width; is very painful on pressure. * * * Can not walk much on account of the dragging pain suffered."

The medical boards, at two subsequent examinations, describe the disability fully and recommend a three-fourths rating. The claimant in his affidavit, and also in his examination before the special examiner, states that he did not notice any swelling until 1869, though there was a constant soreness and pain in the affected parts. Great stress has been laid upon this statement in the Pension Office, and the presumption was raised that the disability might have been subsequently incurred. On the other hand, it is clearly shown by witnesses, who are reputed worthy of credit, that a disability was incurred at the time, place, and in the manner claimed; that he was treated for same shortly after and twice subsequently in the service; that he is now permanently disabled, and has been for nearly twenty years.

To grant him the benefits of this bill seems to your committee but tardy justice, and they therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

CORDELIA R. JONES.

The next business on the private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. SPOONER) was the bill (S. 1300) granting a pension to Cordelia R. Jones.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Cordelia R. Jones, widow of Theodore Jones, a private in Company G, Twenty-eighth Illinois Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1300) granting a pension to Cordelia R. Jones, submit the following report:

The report of the Committee on Pensions of the Senate is a full statement of the case, and is adopted by your committee with a recommendation that the bill pass.

[Senate Report No. 20, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Cordelia R. Jones, praying for a pension, have examined the same, and report:

The claimant's husband, Theodore Jones, enlisted as a private in Company G, Twenty-eighth Illinois Volunteers, March 8, 1865, and was discharged March 8, 1866, by reason of the expiration of the term of his enlistment.

The claim is that he contracted a catarrhal disease in Camp Butler in March, 1865, and died of the effects March 29, 1876. He has no hospital record. Oliver P. Cromwell, first sergeant of his company, deposes that Jones was sick in Camp Butler with a severe cold and complained of his head hurting him from then until Cromwell left the company, about August 1, 1865.

Cromwell was called on by the Department for further information, and made the same statement, adding that Jones went to the doctor quite often.

B. F. Kerrick corroborates the above, adding that Jones was frequently exempt from guard duty on account of disability, and was more or less afflicted during his whole term of service. Called on for information under his own hand, Kerrick informed the Department, August 16, 1886, that Jones contracted catarrh in Camp Butler between the 8th and 31st of March, 1865, by exposure to cold in open barracks, which settled in his head, gathered and broke, and would appear again after taking a slight cold. Was favored by captain by exemption from guard duty. Was affected by his ailment after his return home, and whenever deponent met him afterwards, would say he was all well except the catarrh in the head. He was no shirk, but was a good soldier.

Adam R. Mulholland corroborates this testimony.

Dr. A. T. Tustison deposes, February 16, 1884, that he first knew Jones in August, 1868, and first treated him in December, 1868; again in March, 1869, and thence up to the time of his death, for nasal catarrh. Treated him during his last sickness. Direct cause of death was congestion of the lungs. Jones was disabled by the disease more or less during the time deponent knew him. Called on by the Department for a more circumstantial history, Dr. Tustison writes that it is a recognized fact that in the majority of catarrhal diseases of long standing the lungs become diseased out of sympathy, especially if there be any tubercular or scrofulous taint, which was the case in the Jones family.

Jones had an irritable cough, which gradually grew upon him the last four or five years of his life. In a subsequent affidavit, April 5, 1887, Dr. Tustison testifies that Jones had a chronic catarrh of the head and throat and an irritable cough, which grew upon him.

It appears satisfactorily that claimant can not ascertain the address or whereabouts of either of the surgeons of the regiment, or any of the officers of the company; that the family physician, Dr. Cutler, who treated him after his discharge, is dead, and that deponent Tustison was the second physician who treated him.

This claim was rejected March 26, 1887, in accordance with the opinion of the medical referee "showing that the fatal disease can not be accepted as a result of nasal catarrh." Claimant appealed, but the rejection was affirmed by the Secretary, on the ground that the issue is a "pathological question, which, having been determined adversely by the medical referee, the Department is constrained to adopt the same conclusion."

After a careful consideration of the evidence in this case, your committee are of the opinion that, notwithstanding the technical objections of the Department, the widow of this soldier is entitled to a pension on account of the death of her husband.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was not agreed to.

SAMUEL E. WYMAN.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar, called up for consideration (by Mr. SPOONER) was the bill (H. R. 2478) for the relief of Samuel E. Wyman.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of Samuel E. Wyman, late of Company G, Fifth Regiment Massachusetts Infantry Volunteers, on the pension-roll, subject to the conditions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. FRENCH) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2478) for the relief of Samuel E. Wyman, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Samuel E. Wyman served in Company G, Fifth Massachusetts Volunteers, from September 10, 1852, to July 2, 1863, when discharged. He again enlisted in the same command July 14, 1864, and served until November 16, 1864, the expiration of his term of service. He applied for pension November 8, 1879, on account of rheumatism, contracted about December, 1862, at New Berne, N. C.

The claim has been rejected upon the ground that there is no record of the alleged disability or evidence of treatment therefor in the service or prior to 1867. This action was had after special examination. The report of the special examiner covers 269 pages, and for the purposes of this report it is deemed sufficient to embody only the summing up of the case by the special examiner, which is as follows:

"The general feeling is that claimant is an honest man, and that he would not ask for a pension unless he believed himself honestly entitled thereto. I am told that he was rather seclusive in the service and not as sociable as a good many others. He is proud, and on account of his deformed condition stays at home and does not show himself as much as he might. It is therefore not at all singular that so many of his comrades have forgotten about him since the war.

"Twenty-four comrades testify that they do not recollect of claimant being lame, or of his complaining about rheumatism or any other disability in the service. Seven comrades testify that they do remember of his being lame and off duty and complaining of rheumatism. I believe the case must be settled by the positive evidence (referring to the several depositions) from comrades, and in depositions (twenty-four in number) as to condition since discharge, and from all the facts in the case I believe the claim to be meritorious."

Medical examination shows back is bent forward so that he looks like a man with a large lump on his back, and the spine is not flexible; right ankle and left knee enlarged and inflamed; is pale and delicate, and has rheumatic iritis of both eyes. Is bent over to such a degree that the abdomen and thorax come so near to each other that the ear of the surgeon can not be placed over the heart. Heart's sounds rapid, feeble, and muffled; slight murmur with second sound. Disability total second grade.

Your committee have carefully examined the evidence in the case, and can not but concur in the opinion of the special examiner, who made such a thorough investigation of the case, that the claim is meritorious, and therefore report favorably on the accompanying bill and ask that it do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

THOMAS M'GUIRE.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar called up (by Mr. LONG) was the bill (H. R. 7829) granting a pension to Thomas McGuire.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Thomas McGuire, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. FRENCH) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7829) granting a pension to Thomas McGuire, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Thomas McGuire enlisted in Company I, Ninth Massachusetts Volunteers, August 2, 1862, and was discharged June 21, 1864. He alleges that by reason of exposure during the campaign in the Wilderness he contracted disease of left leg, resulting in varicose veins and partial paralysis. The claim has been rejected by the Pension Bureau because there is no record of the alleged disability, and the evidence, including that obtained by special examination, is not deemed sufficient to connect it with the service.

A careful perusal of the testimony establishes beyond a doubt that claimant was healthy and sound at enlistment; that, as a matter of fact, after the crossing of the Rapidan he became lame from some cause; that his lameness increased, and although able to resume his old occupation (that of puddler's helper) after discharge, was soon compelled to seek lighter labor. Probably within a year after discharge he was treated for this leg trouble for a period of five months at the Massachusetts General Hospital, while the postmaster at Weymouth, Mass., testifies that shortly after his return from service, the exact time not now remembered, soldier did receive town aid because of this disability, affiant then being one of the overseers of the town.

The absence of record evidence, as well as of the testimony of commissioned officers and surgeon, would seem to be satisfactorily accounted for by the fact that the disability was contracted but a short time before the muster-out of the command, and had not at that time become so serious in character as to be easily remembered after a lapse of more than twenty years.

The claimant, as well as all the principal witnesses in the case, are shown by the special examiner to be credible, and, while there is not that mass of evidence in the case usually found in pension claims, your committee are convinced of its sufficiency as to origin in the service.

The disability has continued, and is described by the examining surgeons as partial paralysis and varicose ulcers of left leg. Claimant has not been able to do any work since 1886. He is without resources, and now aided by the town in which he lives.

Believing the claim meritorious, your committee report favorably on the accompanying bill and ask that it do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MRS. ADELINE COUZINS.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to take up Senate bill 2356 in order that it may go over until May 28, to be considered with other bills set for consideration on that day. It is a bill granting a pension of $50 a month to Mrs. Adeline Couzins, and I ask that it go over until May 28, subject to the same conditions as the other bills of like character that are then to come up for consideration.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Let the bill be read.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I do not ask that the bill be considered now. I do not wish to delay the business of the evening. I merely ask that the bill go over until the 28th.

Several MEMBERS. Let it be read.

The bill was read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. O'NEILL] asks unanimous consent that this bill go over until the 28th instant, subject to the conditions agreed upon as to several other bills of like character which are to be considered on that day. Is there objection?

Mr. CHEADLE. Let us have the report read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman understands that the bill is not called up for consideration now.

Mr. CHEADLE. Yes; but I call for the reading of the report.

Mr. MACDONALD. I call for the regular order.

Mr. CHEADLE. I will withdraw the call for the reading of the report provided it is printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. O'NEILL] with that understanding.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I do not understand the effect of the proposition, Mr. Chairman. Is the previous question to be ordered on the bill? I object to that.

Mr. MACDONALD. I call for the regular order. I object to any more time being taken up in this way.

Mr. CANNON. I think the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. O'NEILL] can state in three minutes what the report contains.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I am confident that the gentleman will not object. It is a case——

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. For the present objection is made, Mr. Chairman. I do not understand the effect of the proposition.

MARY A. WEST.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. GALLINGER) was the bill (H. R. 7815) granting a pension to Mary A. West.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary A. West, widow of Edward West, late corporal of Company E, First Regiment Heavy Artillery New Hampshire Volunteers, pension claim numbered 321,490.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7815) granting a pension to Mary A. West, having considered the same, report as follows:

Edward West was a corporal in Company E, First Regiment New Hamp-

shire Heavy Artillery, and was pensioned for varicose veins. This disability increased in severity until the soldier became greatly broken in health, the blood being impoverished and the brain suffering as a consequence. Finally he died from an embolism (blood clot) at the base of the brain. Claimant applied for pension, as widow of soldier, but it was rejected on the ground that it was not absolutely certain that death resulted from the disease for which soldier was pensioned.

Laying aside all technicalities, there seems to be no good reason for the rejection of this claim. Soldier was attended at different times during the last years of his life by four reputable physicians, and they severally testify that death was the result of the disease contracted in the Army.

Dr. N. W. Bean, of Chichester, N. H., says:

"It is my opinion, from my knowledge of the case derived from attendance on soldier, that the obstruction to the circulation, caused by the varicosed condition of the leg, was the inciting cause of all the symptoms attending his death."

Dr. B. S. Warren, of Concord, N. H., a medical examiner for the Government during the war, testifies as follows:

"I believe that the disease of the brain was caused by minute embolia, derived from disintegrated clots formed in the dilated sacs of the varicose veins of the lower limbs."

Dr. N. T. Clark, of Loudon, N. H., and Dr. James C. How, of Haverhill, Mass., both testify unqualifiedly to the same facts, the latter physician saying:

"I frequently saw him. He was suffering from large varicose veins of the right leg, with enfeebled action of the heart and dyspeptic trouble. I have no doubt that the disease from which soldier died was caused by and was to be expected from the condition of the veins."

This case was approved for admission, but, as above stated, was rejected by the medical reviewer on the ground that it had not been medically established. Inasmuch as four reputable physicians, who attended the soldier and knew all about his condition, swear positively that he did die from disease contracted in the Army, and for which he was pensioned, your committee regard the claim as one of exceptional merit, and therefore recommend its passage with an amendment striking out all after the word "volunteers," in the eighth line.

The amendment recommended by the committee was adopted.

There being no objection, the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

EDNA M. HILDRETH.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar called up (by Mr. GROUT) was the bill (H. R. 4103) granting a pension to Edna M. Hildreth.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby directed to put on the pension-roll, at the rate of $25 per month, the name of Edna M. Hildreth, of Jay, Vt., the helpless invalid daughter of William H. Hildreth, who was a member of Company D of the Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteers, and who died from wounds received in battle.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) was read, as follows:

Claimant is the helpless invalid daughter of William H. Hildreth, late a private in Company D, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteers, who was severely wounded at the battle of Fredericksburgh, and died in Harewood Hospital, in the city of Washington. There is abundant evidence before the committee, medical and otherwise, to show that claimant is utterly unable, in consequence of an incurable disease, which has afflicted her all through life, to do anything for her own support, and that she has no relatives who are able to care for her.

For many years she has been supported by a step-father, but what little property he had was recently destroyed by fire, and now this daughter of a soldier who gave his life for his country must either receive aid from the Government or become a pauper, to be supported at public expense. This case is directly in the line of numerous precedents, several of which have been passed at the present session of Congress, the rate of pension being placed at $18 per month.

Your committee recommend that the bill be amended by substituting the word "eighteen" for the word "twenty-five," in the fourth line, and also by striking out all after the word "Hildreth," in the sixth line, and inserting the words "a private in Company D, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteers," and with these amendments recommend its passage.

The amendment reported by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MRS. ADELINE COUZINS.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the gentlemen who objected to the order requested by me with reference to Senate bill No. 2356, to provide a pension to Mrs. Adeline Couzins, have consented to withdraw the objection. I renew the request for unanimous consent that this bill go over with the others of the same class until May 28, the previous question being considered as ordered, but the bill to be open to amendment at that time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I will state that upon the explanation made to me by the gentleman from Missouri I withdraw my objection.

Mr. BYNUM. The only question is whether, if the previous question be ordered, there will be any right to offer amendments when the bill comes up.

The CHAIRMAN. That right will exist, if it be now reserved.

Mr. BYNUM. If that can be done, I have no objection to the previous question being ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, this bill will go over till May 28 with the understanding that the previous question is ordered, but that the bill shall be open to amendment. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

ABIAL S. CHAMBERLAIN.

The next business on the Private Calendar called up (by Mr. LONG) was the bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Abial S. Chamberlain.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions of the pension laws, the name of Abial S. Chamberlain, late Company K, First Massachusetts Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. FRENCH) was read, as follows:

Chamberlain was mustered as captain of Company K, First Massachusetts Volunteers, May 24, 1861; promoted to lieutenant-colonel and transferred to the Third Regiment North Carolina Colored Volunteers November 10, 1863. He was mustered out of service June 16, 1865. On June 25, 1862, in battle at Fair Oaks, he was severely wounded in mouth and jaw, for which he is now in receipt of a pension at the rate of $20 per month. He filed an application for increase on account of paralysis resulting from the wound, which application has been denied by the Pension Office, the medical referee holding that the paralysis is not chargeable to the wound.

The certificate of the surgeon, who examined the pensioner at his home on September 29, 1887, he being unable to leave his room, is as follows:

"I find a scar on the right side of lower lip, extending to jaw, also on the end of tongue. The scar on lip about an inch long, not adherent. Another cicatrix about an inch below the angle of lower jaw, which is adherent to the bone, with an indentation in bone about one-quarter inch in depth and one-half inch in width, not tender to pressure. His walk is feeble and staggering. His intellect is dull, appears bewildered when questioned. The power of motion of left arm and leg is greatly impaired, so as to require help in dressing. He has only partial control of his bladder; his urine runs away, keeping his clothing wet. I think the paralysis is due to cerebral lesion, caused probably by injury of branches of the trifacial nerve, lying in the track of the ball. He is, in my opinion, entitled to total rating for the disability caused by wound of mouth and jaw, and for that caused from resulting paralysis first grade, requiring aid of another person."

Dr. A. Elliot, late assistant surgeon One hundred and fourth United States Colored Troops, under date of February 28, 1888, testifies that claimant is unable to be about his room only as he is assisted. He requires the assistance of some one all the time, he not even being able to attend the calls of nature without being assisted.

Claimant's hearing and eye-sight are likewise impaired by the wound.

The effect of a wound upon the nervous system is at times extraordinary in character, as is well illustrated in cases of lockjaw, following often upon the slightest injury. In this case there is a serious wound, which, in the opinion of the examining surgeon, acting under the special instruction of the Pension Bureau, after a thorough examination of the case, affected the branches of the trifacial nerve. If this is true, and your committee have no reason to doubt the correctness of the surgeon's opinion, the connection of the paralysis with the wound seems to be established. At any rate no other cause for this deplorable condition appears in the case.

Therefore, believing that some relief should be granted this great sufferer, your committee return the accompanying bill, with the recommendation that it do pass, amended, however, by inserting therein, after the word "Volunteers," in last line, the following words: "And pay him a pension at the rate of $45 per month, in lieu of the pension now received by him."

The amendment reported by the committee was read, as follows:

And pay him a pension at the rate of $45 per month in lieu of the pension now received by him.

Mr. CHEADLE. I move to amend the amendment by striking out "$45" and inserting "$72." This report shows that the applicant is totally disabled; and the rate under the law for a pensioner totally disabled is $72 per month. It appears from the report that the applicant's wife has been obliged to attend him continuously for the last six months. If in any case ever presented the applicant was entitled to $72 under the law, this is such a case. I trust the amendment will be adopted without division.

Mr. MORRILL. The law allows only $50 in a case of this kind, where the pensioner requires the constant assistance of another person.

Mr. CHEADLE. Then make it $50.

Mr. McMILLIN. I wish to inquire whether the facts which would entitle this applicant under the practice of the Pension Office to a pension of $50 a month are made to appear in the report?

Mr. MORRILL. The Pension Office rejected this claim on the ground that the paralysis was not proved to have been the result of the wound. If that fact had been established to the satisfaction of the office $50 a month would have been allowed. In such cases the rule of the committee has been to fix the rate just below $50—at $45, as in this case.

Mr. CHEADLE. If there is any objection to my amendment, I withdraw it.

The amendment reported by the committee was agreed to.

Mr. LONG. I move to amend the title and body of the bill by correcting the name, which should be "Abial G. Chamberlain," instead of "Abial S. Chamberlain."

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LONG] will be agreed to.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

The bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I move that the committee now rise.

Mr. SAWYER. Before that is done, I hope the gentleman from Michigan will allow the next bill on the Calendar to be considered. It is one introduced by myself, and I expect to be absent for the next two weeks.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I have no objection. I withdraw my motion for the present.

NETTIE ELLICOTT.

The next business on the Calendar called up (by Mr. SAWYER) was the bill (H. R. 8798) granting a pension to Nettie Ellicott.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension-roll of the United States, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Nettie Ellicott, widow of George E. Ellicott, late a private in the Seventeenth New York Independent Battery.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The beneficiary named in this bill is the widow of George G. Ellicott, who was mustered in the United States service. August 26, 1862, as a private in the Seventeenth New York Independent Battery, and was discharged June 12, 1865. The soldier died May 17, 1884, leaving surviving him the beneficiary, his widow. The solder at the time of his death was receiving a pension for chronic diarrhea, the

rate being increased from July, 1881. He had been drawing a pension for this disability from June, 1865. The good character of the soldier fully appears.

The physicians who attended the soldier during his last sickness state in their affidavit that he died from chronic diarrhea and erysipelas. The widow applied for a pension, and the same was rejected on the ground that the erysipelas was not a result of chronic diarrhea and not otherwise traced to the service.

There was no dispute that chronic diarrhea continued down to soldier's death, and pension paid to that time. The evidence as to cause of soldier's death, aside from the evidence of the widow and non-professional witnesses, consists of the report of examining surgeons, the opinion of the examining officer in the Pension Office, and the affidavits of Drs. Munson, Warren, and Chamberlain, physicians living near the soldier, and who knew him and treated him the last years of his life. The personal character and professional standing of these gentlemen is fully indorsed.

The certificate of the surgeon general shows that the soldier was treated in hospital in 1864 and 1865, while in service, for this disease, and the evidence shows the soldier was sick with the same disease at time of his discharge. The reports of the examining surgeons, made in 1878 and 1881, show the continuance and existence of this disease at those periods, and the evidence on file shows that the disease continued down to the time of his death.

Dr. Chamberlain states in his affidavit that he treated the soldier "in the month of November, 1881, for a severe attack of chronic diarrhea, which continued for a week or ten days. The diarrhea was of a very bad, chronic form, and much pus and blood passed with the feces. There prevailed a low general tone and lack of vitality evidenced by palor, flabbiness, lassitude, and general debility.

"I afterwards saw him in each year to his death, observed his condition, and talked with him frequently. I saw his growing weakness and debility, and the advancing effects of his said diarrhea until he finally died in the spring of 1884. From my personal knowledge of his case, I have no doubt that the chronic diarrhea was the primary and leading cause of his death, as it was my opinion when treating him, as above stated, that he could not long survive the said chronic diarrhea."

Dr. Munson states in his affidavit:

"I attended said Ellicott from the 6th day of May, 1884, until the 16th day of May, 1884. That said Ellicott was suffering from chronic diarrhea and erysipelas, the latter developing a phlegmonous character as it proceeded, the former accompanying it through all its stages. That in my opinion said diarrhea was an aggravation of a chronic diarrhea which had existed since said Ellicott left the Army, and that said diarrhea both predisposed him to the erysipelas from which he suffered, and was the prominent factor in the case which precluded a favorable issue."

Dr. Warren, in his affidavit, states:

"On or about the 15th day of May, 1884, I was called in consultation with Dr. Edward Munson to see said Ellicott. I found him suffering from phlegmonous erysipelas of the face and head, which I was informed by the attending physician had commenced as an ordinary form of erysipelas about one week previous. The following symptoms had obtained when I saw him: Pulse 130, temperature 104; low muttering delirium; face swollen and edematous; fetid; skin of face, forehead, and ears puffy, dark, and almost purple, extending to neck, where a natural color prevailed.

"I found in the history of the case that he was a pensioner from chronic diarrhea, and that the diarrhea which prevailed at that time and during his sickness was, in our opinion, an aggravation of his chronic disease. It was consequently my opinion that the low condition of his system, which predisposed him to the erysipelas and prevented him from successfully passing through the attack, was due to and directly consequent upon this same chronic diarrhea."

The same physician, in a subsequent affidavit, says, upon reconsidering his affidavit:

"I wish it to be understood that the primary and active cause of the said soldier's death was chronic diarrhea, which had so vitiated his system and reduced his general vitality as to render him liable to complication of diseases, or the supervening of secondary causes, such as erysipelas or ulcerations in various parts of the body, which might hasten, and in this case undoubtedly did, the final fatal result.

"I should say that the erysipelas which supervened upon the chronic diarrhea in this case was only an incidental contributing cause of death, whereas the chronic diarrhea was the original and primary cause of the sickness and death of the said soldier."

The medical examiners in the Pension Office had the affidavits presented to them, and while the committee would not desire to criticise in the least their action, they feel that the clearly stated opinions of these physicians of high standing in their profession, who personally knew the soldier, examined his case, and saw his condition, and who had better opportunity of forming a correct conclusion, are entitled to acceptance, and they therefore recommend that this bill to place the name of this widow, who is shown to be a worthy and poor woman, upon the pension-roll, do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker *pro tempore* having resumed the chair, Mr. DOCKERY reported that the Committee of the Whole House, having had under consideration the Private Calendar, had directed him to report sundry bills with various recommendations.

BILLS PASSED.

House bills of the following titles, reported without amendments, were severally ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, they were accordingly read the third time, and passed, namely:

A bill (H. R. 2656) to increase the pension of John Taylor;
A bill (H. R. 3568) for the relief of B. S. Van Buren;
A bill (H. R. 432) granting a pension to Columbus Bosteder;
A bill (H. R. 2478) for the relief of Samuel E. Wyman;
A bill (H. R. 7829) granting a pension to Thomas McGuire; and
A bill (H. R. 8798) granting a pension to Nettie Ellicott.

Amendments reported to House bills of the following titles were severally agreed to, and the bills as amended were ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, they were accordingly read the third time, and passed, namely:

A bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Moses L. Chase;
A bill (H. R. 7815) granting a pension to Mary A. West;
A bill (H. R. 4103) granting a pension to Edna M. Hildreth; and
A bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Abial G. Chamberlain.

Senate bills of the following titles, reported without amendment, were severally ordered to a third reading, and they were accordingly read the third time, and passed, namely:

A bill (S. 739) granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger;
A bill (S. 737) granting a pension to Berry Day;
A bill (S. 339) granting a pension to Eliza Douglass;
A bill (S. 626) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Franklin, alias McKee;
A bill (S. 1477) granting a pension to Harlow B. Hyde;
A bill (S. 1478) granting a pension to George W. Peavey;
A bill (S. 1298) granting a pension to Mary Gammell; and
A bill (S. 1300) granting a pension to Cordelia R. Jones.

The amendment reported to the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

BILL INDEFINITELY POSTPONED.

The bill (S. 811) granting a pension to Lydia D. Holtz was indefinitely postponed in accordance with the recommendation of the Committee of the Whole.

BILLS UNDISPOSED OF.

Bills of the following titles, in accordance with the recommendation of the committee, were postponed to May 28, the previous question ordered thereon, and thirty minutes allowed for debate:

A bill (S. 1985) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. F. Selina Buchanan;

A bill (H. R. 5993) granting an increase of pension to Laura L. Waller;

A bill (H. R. 4578) granting a pension to Eveline M. Alexander, widow of Bvt. Brig. Gen. Andrew J. Alexander; and

A bill (S. 2356) to provide a pension for Mrs. Adeline Couzins.

Mr. MORRILL moved to reconsider the votes just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MARY ANN LANG.

On motion of Mr. CHIPMAN, the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7907) granting a pension to Mary Ann Lang.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of Mary Ann Lang, widow of Peter Lang, late private Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteers, on the pension-roll, at the rate prescribed by existing provisions of law.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7907) granting a pension to Mary Ann Lang, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Mary Ann Lang is the widow of Peter Lang, who enlisted in Company K, Sixteenth Regiment Michigan Volunteers, December 21, 1863, and was mustered out July 8, 1865. He died February 21, 1881, of dropsy. At the battle of Mechanicsville, Va., June 1, 1864, he received a wound of nose, on account of which he was a pensioner at time of his death. A week previous to his death he applied for increase of pension on account of rheumatism, but this application was not filed until February 26, 1881.

The widow's claim has been rejected, and the rejection affirmed by the Secretary of the Interior, on the ground that the soldier's death (cause, dropsy) was, in the opinion of the medical referee, due to the excessive use of alcoholic liquors. This decision appears to have been based upon the report of a special examiner. It appears therefrom that soldier, at time of his death and for some years prior thereto, kept a beer saloon in the city of Detroit; but it is not shown, excepting by the testimony of one person, that in the pursuit of this business he drank to excess or that he ever was under the influence of liquor, while on the other hand it is clearly shown that he used beer moderately and at his place of business only.

This witness is one Dr. Hoyt, who attended the soldier at different times probably after 1873, and who treated him in his last illness. He testifies that he first treated soldier for rheumatism affecting arms and legs severely, which, as he then understood, was of long standing. This rheumatism kept up, and he had attacks lasting four or five weeks up to about a year and a half before he died. Then he had a liver trouble, which was of a cirrhosis character, that resulted in dropsy, which caused his death. Thinks there was also heart trouble, but does not think that there was any disease of kidneys. Affiant was unable to connect the rheumatism with the liver trouble and could not give any other reason for it except his (soldier's) long use of beer and liquor.

Dr. Julius Richter testifies to an acquaintance with the soldier since 1867, and that he treated him from that time until 1871 for chronic rheumatism. Again treated him at intervals from 1873 to death. There was no enlargement of the liver, but there was atrophy of the heart. Some three years before death dropsy appeared. Was in attendance upon the soldier three or four hours before his death. Does not believe that soldier's daily drinking had any connection with his fatal disease.

A number of comrades testify, and their testimony is uncontroverted, that soldier did contract rheumatism and suffered therefrom at the time he was wounded, as before stated. Neighbors testify that when home on furlough, after the receipt of the wound, he used liniments for rheumatism of legs. At date of final discharge he is again shown to have suffered from the same disease, and its continuance thereafter is clearly established.

There was no *post-mortem* examination. The soldier's occupation would seem to have so prejudiced the claim of the widow that no effort whatever was made by the Pension Office to examine the comrades and others who have testified in the case.

It is a well-established medical fact that rheumatism of long duration will produce disease of heart, and that dropsy is a common sequel of the latter disease.

That soldier did contract rheumatism in the service, and that he was a constant sufferer therefrom ever after, is shown beyond a doubt. It is likewise shown that his heart became seriously affected therefrom. Why should the widow now be deprived of a pension because one physician attributes dropsy to the use of beer, when another, who was more intimately acquainted with the soldier and his habits, connects the same with the rheumatism of service?

In the opinion of your committee the widow should have the benefit of the doubt, and therefore report favorably on the accompanying bill, and ask that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

EMILY M'CLURE.

On motion of Mr. BAKER, of New York, the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8884) granting a pension to Emily McClure.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Emily McClure, mother of Thomas J. McClure, late first lieutenant, Company L, Seventh Regiment New York Artillery, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8884) granting a pension to Emily McClure, have had the same under consideration and beg leave to submit the following report:

The beneficiary named in the bill is the mother of Thomas J. McClure, who was killed in the battle of Cold Harbor, June 3, 1864, while serving as first lieutenant of Company L, Seventh Regiment New York Artillery. He left surviving him a widow, but no minor child, who was pensioned and died after remarriage.

Prior to his enlistment as well as during his service the soldier contributed to the support of his widowed mother, who was not, and is not now, possessed of any property affording her an income, but has since the death of her husband in 1857 been dependent upon her own labor and the contributions of others. Of these facts there is ample evidence before the committee. She is now seventy-one years of age and unable longer to gain a subsistence through her own efforts.

The fact that the soldier left surviving him a widow deprives the mother of a pension under the general pension law. But Congress having in many instances granted relief to the poor and aged parents of deceased soldiers who are not otherwise provided for, your committee are of opinion that the relief asked for in this case should likewise be granted, and therefore report favorably on the accompanying bill and ask that it do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of 10.30 having arrived, the House, pursuant to order, stands adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

PRIVATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills and joint resolutions of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. DUNHAM: A bill (H. R. 10030) for the relief of Dearborn Foundry Company, of Chicago, Ill.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HEARD: A bill (H. R. 10031) for the relief of Joseph L. Walls—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUNTER: A bill (H. R. 10032) granting a pension to Milton Wallen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10033) granting a pension to Charlotte Taylor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAGAN: A bill (H. R. 10034) in relation to the claim of William H. H. Brooks against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY: A bill (H. R. 10035) for the relief of J. M. Blacklock—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. D. STEWART: A bill (H. R. 10036) for the relief of Reddick Aycock—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. E. J. TURNER: A bill (H. R. 10037) granting a pension to Aaron Shurtleff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADE: A bill (H. R. 10038) for the relief of Joseph C. Black—to the Committe on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10039) for the relief of George W. Claypool, administrator of Reuben Claypool—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10040) for the relief of A. D. Powers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWER: Petition of Robert D. Sears, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARUTH: Petition of citizens of Louisville, Ky., in favor of the bill to prevent convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Mrs. Susan C. Ashcroft for relief—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of the Grand Army of the Republic of Vermont, in favor of an appropriation for headstones for departed comrades—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of General Daniel Butterfield, for the restoration of Fort Putnam as provided for by House bill No. 9210—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JACKSON: Petition of the employés of the Pioneer Flax Mills, of New Brighton, Pa., against the reduction of duties on goods manufactured from flax and hemp—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEE (by request): Petition of John J. Trice, of Anna L. Boxley, widow of Joseph C. Boxley, and of Mattie D. Trice, heir of Silas Boxley, of Louisa County, Virginia, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. REED: Petition of Excelsior Assembly, No. 325, Knights of Labor, against convict labor—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. RICE: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., for an appropriation for certain improvements at Fort Snelling, Minn.—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: Petition of Johanna Merckle, of East Feliciana Parish, Louisiana, and of Alphonse H. Amand, of Point Coupee Parish, Louisiana, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. D. STEWART: Petition of C. M. Meriwether and others, heirs of David Meriwether, of Jasper County, and of J. B. Ozburn, heir of John M. Ozburn, of Clayton County, and of Reddick Aycock, of Georgia, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of J. S. Stalcup and others, regarding convict-made goods—to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of heirs of Sarah Hayes, of Davidson County, Tennessee, for reference of their claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WISE: Petition of E. W. Gates, executor of Hiram W. Tyler, of Henrico County, Virginia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. BUNNELL: Of druggists and physicians of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. CANDLER: Of citizens of Georgia.

By Mr. HARMER: Of citizens of Pennsylvania.

The following pétition for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, was received and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. MACDONALD: Of citizens of Beaver Falls, Minn.

The following petition for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by means of certain import duties, was received and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. C. A. RUSSELL: Of citizens of Plymouth, Conn.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. JEHU BAKER: Of 135 citizens of Washington and St. Clair Counties, Illinois.

By Mr. McKENNA: Of 76 citizens of Alameda County, California.

By Mr. TRACEY (by request): Of 75 citizens of Albany, N. Y.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *May* 19, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McMILLIN. I ask unanimous consent that bills on the Speaker's table be permitted to remain there until next Monday's session.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 484) for the relief of Thomas C. Dickey;

A bill (H. R. 1640) changing the name of the port of Lamberton, in the district of Burlington, New Jersey, to the port of Trenton, in said district;

A bill (H. R. 2365) for the relief of William P. Thorne;

A bill (H. R. 6887) for the relief of Henry Brock; and

A bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government and the Bureau of Agriculture and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the Centennial Exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, from July 4 to October 27, 1888.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. McMILLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with the morning hour for the call of committees for reports.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLIN. I now ask unanimous consent that members having reports to make from committees may be permitted to hand them in at the Clerk's desk.

There was no objection.

FILING OF REPORTS.

The following reports were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

EXTENSION OF JURISDICTION OF CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT COURTS.

Mr. ADAMS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back the bill (H. R. 1208) extending the criminal jurisdiction of the circuit and district courts to the Great Lakes and their connecting waters; which was laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, reported a bill (H. R. 10041) extending the criminal jurisdiction of the circuit and district courts to the Great Lakes and their connecting waters; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ARNO VOSS.

Mr. LAWLER, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 2076) for the relief of Arno Voss; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SARAH FRIEDMAN.

Mr. LAWLER also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 8786) for the relief of Sarah Friedman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES H. JUDKINS AND WILLIAM T. JUDKINS.

Mr. LAWLER also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table:

A bill (H. R. 2018) for the relief of the estate of James H. Judkins; and

A bill (H. R. 2019) for the relief of the estate of William T. Judkins.

He also, from the same committee, reported a bill (H. R. 10042) for the relief of the estates of James H. Judkins and William T. Judkins; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CLAUDE H. MASTIN.

Mr. LAWLER also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (S. 437) for the relief of Claude H. Mastin, surviving partner of Le Vert & Mastin, of Mobile, Ala.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

Several messages, in writing, were received from the President of the United States, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

The message further announced the approval of bills of the following titles:

An act (H. R. 3727) for the relief of William P. Gorsuch;

An act (H. R. 518) for the relief of T. J. Edwards, administrator of David Edwards, deceased;

An act (H. R. 3180) granting a pension to John H. Sayers;

An act (H. R. 5195) granting a pension to David W. Seely;

An act (H. R. 5311) granting a pension to Alonzo H. Gregory;

An act (H. R. 7882) granting a pension to John Kinney;

An act (H. R. 3554) granting a pension to Catharine Black;

An act (H. R. 3735) granting a pension to Eliza Shreeve;

An act (H. R. 4845) granting a pension to Wilhelmina Kuhlmann;

An act (H. R. 8211) granting a pension to Lafayette Lakin;

An act (H. R. 404) for the relief of Mary McGrath;

An act (H. R. 2071) for the relief of Martha Gray;

An act (H. R. 6576) for the relief of James M. McKeehan;

An act (H. R. 6971) to pension Peter Clark, jr.;

An act (H. R. 4519) to grant a pension to William J. Miller;

An act (H. R. 3158) increasing the pension of Howard S. Abbott;

An act (H. R. 6379) to increase the pension of David M. Rennoe;

An act (H. R. 3844) granting an increase of pension to Wilson C. Moles;

An act (H. R. 5249) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Smith;

An act (H. R. 130) granting a pension to John E. Smith;

An act (H. R. 138) granting a pension to Joseph Perry;

An act (H. R. 428) granting a pension to William B. Johnson;

An act (H. R. 431) granting a pension to Hannah Varquison;

An act (H. R. 680) granting a pension to Henry H. Stutsman;

An act (H. R. 4104) granting a pension to Mahala Dexter;

An act (H. R. 4491) granting a pension to Rosanna Robey;

An act (H. R. 4579) granting a pension to Mary G. Crocker;

An act (H. R. 5237) granting a pension to Norah S. Cramer;

An act (H. R. 5847) granting a pension to Elizabeth Twigg;

An act (H. R. 5966) granting a pension to Mrs. Lepha A. Osborn;

An act (H. R. 6582) granting a pension to Elizabeth Ward;

An act (H. R. 7094) granting a pension to Nancy Van Dyne;

An act (H. R. 7181) granting a pension to Aletta V. Quick; and

An act (H. R. 8185) granting a pension to David L. Partlow.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. McMILLIN. I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of bills raising revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation, and to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

Mr. BAKER, of Illinois, rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that it was understood on both sides of the House that this day should be given to the honorable gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] and the honorable gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARLISLE]. It was further understood, however, that the gentleman from Maine was not to begin until half past 11 o'clock to-day. In the mean time the Chair will recognize, by request, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BAKER], but will be obliged to limit the recognition to the time specified—that is, until half past 11.

Mr. CANNON. The House can extend the time.

Mr. BAKER, of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday, happening for the moment to be out of the Hall, words were spoken by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] reflecting upon my honor, reflecting upon the honor of my constituents, and as taken down by the Official Reporters I ask the Clerk to read them in the hearing of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

On this floor it has been thrown up to us that the gentleman under whom I served in the last Congress had been defeated. That man, clean in life and brave of heart, frank to his foe and loyal to his friends, with a great, boundless love of truth that nothing could impair—they taunt us that his seat is vacant, and that William R. Morrison is the victim of the "combine;" but, gentlemen, much as I miss him—for I have passed the time of life when men ordinarily form new attachments—yet his vacant seat is more clamorous with true eloquence than his presence would be. I tell you, gentlemen protectionists, the virtues of Duncan never cried as loud against the "deep damnation of his taking off," as the vacant seat of Morrison. And the American people are asking whence comes the funds that have debauched the ballot-box and defeated the election of a representative of the people.

Mr. BAKER, of Illinois. Here, sir, is a direct and outrageous attack upon my honor and upon the honor of the district I represent on this floor. In my own name and in the name of the entire Eighteenth Congressional district of Illinois, which he has dared to defame, I hurl the words back to the gentleman from Kentucky and denounce the imputation they convey as grossly untrue. [Applause on the Republican side.] I hurl the words back into the face and teeth of the gentleman from Kentucky with absolute and unmitigated defiance. [Applause.] To use an expressive, though perhaps not very elegant figure of speech, no gentleman from Kentucky shall swing his black-snake whip over my shoulders or the shoulders of my constituents with impunity. He will at least incur the risk of having it wrenched from his hand, and of feeling, mayhap, the butt end of it. [Laughter.]

If there be distinction in the adjective Kentuckian, then I, too, am a Kentuckian. I first saw the light of day hard by the shades of Ashland, the home of that immortal Kentuckian, Henry Clay [applause]—unswerving as Abdiel in his great-hearted patriotism, grand in all his proportions, eloquent as mortal man ever was in pleading the mighty cause of his country, and his whole country, and whose old-time seat of peerless honor and glory in this Hall is now, alas, worse than empty, occupied, as that seat now is, by a gentleman whose speeches are garlands of flowers without leaves or fruit, totally unsuited to affairs, and well adapted to a lady's boudoir, but for their habitual touches of domineering arrogance. [Great applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

That great old-time seat I say is worse than empty—occupied as it is by a gentleman who hisses through his teeth his ill-informed derision of the grand ideas of the grand old statesman whom he succeeds. [Applause.] The colossal shade of that great man hovers over the entire Republic, from ocean to ocean. It walks the Northland and the Southland, and will be a living inspiration in that mighty contest, that impending groundswell which will lift President Cleveland from the White House, and very possibly lift the gentleman of Kentucky from the seat of Henry Clay. [Great applause.]

Be Mowbray's sins so heavy in his bosom,
That they may break his foaming courser's back,
And throw the rider headlong in the lists,
A caitiff recreant.

The words of the gentleman from Kentucky challenge a comparison between his district and mine. The Congressional Directory shows that 30,339 votes were cast for Congressman in my district, whilst in his but 4,791 votes were cast, about one-eighth of the voting popula-

tion, as I am told, and all voting on one side, whatever the reason of that curious arrangement may have been. [Laughter.] The gentleman from Kentucky represents less than one-sixth of the votes cast that I represent—a feature of minor representation which is spread wide and far through many States affiliating with the gentleman politically. It will be seen that the gentleman from Kentucky does not occupy ground that makes it prudent for him to indulge in reckless and damnatory statements affecting the honor of an election in another State of which he actually knows nothing—even if the law of fair and manly dealing were not sufficient to duly restrain him in such case. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Kentucky is as unfortunate in his historical relation to his own great father as is the seat he occupies to its former grand occupant, Henry Clay. Robert J. Breckinridge is a name that belongs to the whole Republic. He was great as a thinker, great as a scholar, great as a writer, great as an orator, and transcendently great as a patriot—a patriot whose intellect, whose heart, whose soul embraced the entire country, instead of a fragment of it. [Applause.] It is narrated of him that, meeting a young man who was about to join the Confederate army in the war for secession and disruption of the Union, he remarked to the youth as follows, using a strong metaphorical expression to convey the intensity of his patriotic feeling:

I understand you are going to join the rebel army. Your father brought you to me in his arms, a struggling infant, and asked that I might baptize and dedicate you to the service of Almighty God; but had I known at that hour that you would have ever betrayed your country and joined the ranks of those who were attempting to destroy it, I could have found it in my heart to have strangled you at the baptismal font.

[Laughter and applause.]

There was a Kentuckian who *was* a Kentuckian [great applause], and good for something else besides—good for the whole country, with all its mighty interests of civilization and humanity. [Applause.]

The bottom truth about the election in the Eighteenth district of Illinois is that that district was released from the entanglements of one of the most wretched sloughs of political debauchery that could be found anywhere in the United States.

As an illustration of this as bearing upon one important part of the election I will ask the Clerk to read, with clear voice and due accent [laughter and applause], the following purely spontaneous testimonial brought to me by a committee consisting of two Democrats and one Republican shortly after the election.

The Clerk read as follows:

ROOMS OF THE CITIZENS' LEAGUE,
East St. Louis, Ill., November, 1886.

To Hon. JEHU BAKER.

At a meeting of the Citizens' League of the city of East St. Louis, Ill., held this date, the following preamble and resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Whereas for several years our city has been misgoverned, its affairs conducted regardless of the people's interests and will, its public funds stolen and squandered, and its people oppressed and terrorized by men elevated to office through chicanery, fraud, and crime; and

Whereas this pernicious and frightful state of affairs was produced and continued by the most shameless frauds perpetrated on the ballot-boxes, whereby tramps, repeaters, and other illegal voters were voted at each election in large numbers, our honest voters intimidated, bulldozed, and assaulted at the polls while attempting to exercise the sacred privilege and right of the franchise; and further, the honest ballots cast were tampered with and changed, or the ballot-boxes stuffed by dishonest election judges and clerks; and

Whereas this atrocious condition of affairs had attained such a firm hold here, the perpetrators thereof being intrenched in office and power, and sustained by our municipal authorities and enforced by our police power, assisted by the evil elements of other sections, that our people had begun to well-nigh despair of ever being able to remove the galling and damnable yoke; and

Whereas every legitimate interest in our city was suffering, real estate depreciating, industrial enterprises fearful of remaining here, merchandising unstable, rents decreasing and uncertain, and business generally flagging and waning and the lives of our people in constant jeopardy; and

Whereas, Hon. JEHU BAKER, by his noble and patriotic espousal of the cause of our down trodden and terrorized people, and his able, vigorous, and unrelenting—which proved a destructive one—onslaught upon the outrageous and atrocious ballot-box frauds which prevailed at elections here and rendered the name of East St. Louis a synonym of shame and disgrace, awakened the slumbering powers of our people and encouraged them to make an exhibition of their vigor and majesty as American freemen; and

Whereas such an exhibition of a pure ballot and an honest count was made by our people at the election here, held on November 2, 1886, at which both triumphantly prevailed, and the cohorts of fraud, dishonest elections, and crime were routed and scattered, and the new election or registration law was adopted by a vote of nearly three to one; and

Whereas the adoption of said new election law insures the dethronement of all the evils aforementioned and the disenthrallment of our people from the rule of fraud, violence, and crime, and the future rule of the people, and good government of our municipality; and

Whereas Hon. JEHU BAKER very materially and patriotically contributed to this great and beneficent achievement: Therefore be it

Resolved, By the Citizens' League of East St. Louis, composed of people who have the welfare and true interests of East St. Louis at heart, and irrespective of race, politics, or creed, that the most hearty thanks are due and cordially extended to Hon. JEHU BAKER, as we know the same are as generously felt by every good citizen of our municipality, for the manly, patriotic, Christian and most invaluable services rendered our whole people in their successful battle for the regeneration and redemption of East St. Louis.

Resolved, That these resolutions be spread upon the record of this league and a copy of the same be conveyed to Mr. BAKER by a committee appointed for that purpose and the same be published if not objectionable to Mr. BAKER.

THE CITIZENS' LEAGUE OF EAST ST. LOUIS.
D. C. MARSH, *Acting President*.
H. C. JACKIESCH, *Secretary*.

Mr. BAKER, of Illinois. That, sir, was a purely unpartisan testimonial, perfectly spontaneous, and it was a surprise to me when I received it, being waited upon as I said by a committee composed of two Democrats and one Republican, and representing citizens of East St. Louis, irrespective of race, politics, or creed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Sir, I say truth when I say the change wrought in the city of East St. Louis was similar—only on a much smaller scale—to that which was wrought in the great city of New York when Tweed and his methods were torn up by the roots.

That, sir, was truly honest work, as in my heart of hearts I know it was honest work. Defamation took wing, wretched falsehoods were manufactured and circulated widespread over the United States—shameless falsehoods. I will glance at two of them, giving some idea of the alleged frauds by which my predecessor was defeated. In one case the scene was located at Mount Carmel, in Illinois, far outside of my district [laughter and applause on the Republican side], charging that there were fraudulent tickets, and that voters were purchased at so much a head. Who, outside of Illinois, would know that Mount Carmel was not in my predecessor's Congressional district? Another case. A gentleman performed the ordinary act of drawing out of a bank at Alton $199.50, and the agents or commissioners of two of the Chicago papers spread all over the land the infamous falsehood that the amount was $25,000, and based the report upon a gross perversion of a statement of an honorable Democrat, who, when his attention was drawn to the matter, stated the amount at about $200, and added:

The Democrats of Alton were not purchased and are not purchasable; and our losses in this city ought not to be attributed to the unlawful use of money.

And yet these falsehoods, these atrocious falsehoods, these damnable falsehoods, these corrupting and debasing falsehoods, have continued to float in the putrid air of the lowest stratum of partisan malignity; and the gentleman from Kentucky in effect becomes their sponsor and purveyor, and upon their rotten foundation formulates in this Hall an imputation against the honor of the good people I represent—of all parties. The lightning of Heaven should consume me, God should take my name from out the Book of Life, if I did not rise up in self-contained indignation (for my language is parliamentary, at all events) to repel and crush the imputation! [Applause.]

I proceed, however, to a closer approach to the gentleman from Kentucky. He impugns the integrity of my election. He impugns the character of my constituents, those masses of honest farmers, workingmen, and business men who bore me to this place upon their honest shields as the result of as fair a political victory as ever took place within the limits of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I, whose election is impugned by a solitary voice here, that of the gentleman from Kentucky, and not by a memorial signed by thousands of Kentucky voters [laughter], instantly throw down the gauntlet with ringing defiance at his feet and tell him the imputation is grossly and scandalously false, and challenge—ay, challenge is the word—an investigation. [Great applause on the Republican side.]

Thrice is he arm'd, that hath his quarrel just.

[Applause.]

Lay on, Macduff;
And damn'd be him that first cries, *Hold, enough!*

[Great and continued applause.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman—— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order being called for, the first thing is to have order in the Hall. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I had supposed, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. BUCHANAN. I call for the regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I judge the gentleman from Maine will be willing to give me five or six minutes, which will come out of the time of the Speaker.

Mr. BAKER, of Illinois. By all means let that be done.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. It is quite significant that the quotation which I made was concerning the act of Macbeth, and the gentleman from Illinois closed his defense by identifying himself with Macbeth in his quotation, "Lay on, Macduff!" etc. It may be a fair and just identification that the gentleman has unconsciously made with that imaginary historical character. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.] I am not surprised at the temper of the venerable gentleman from Illinois, against whom I said nothing. I made no charge on him. He was the mere usufruct of what others did. He got the benefit of what other persons did.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What did they do?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. And I have no doubt from what I have heard of him that he was in the main innocent of what was done; that in the innocency of his simple modesty he thought that the election was due to his merit; that it was his commanding intellect and great popularity that accounted for the defeat of Mr. Morrison. I am sorry that the facts should dispel that pleasing conceit of the ven-

erable gentleman from Illinois. [Cries of "Oh!" "Oh!" from the Republican side.]

I desire to have read by the Clerk, as the foundation of whatever was in the few brief remarks that I made, the letter which I send to the desk, and then I will ask him to follow that with the other letter which I also send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE AMERICAN TINNED PLATE ASSOCIATION,
Room 49, Lewis Block, Pittsburgh, Pa., October 8, 1886.

DEAR SIR: I spent a few days last week at East St. Louis and Belleville, looking into the chances of defeating W. R. Morrison and electing JEHU BAKER for Congress. I was very much encouraged in believing that this can be done. A large number of workmen at the above places who supported Morrison two years ago are now working hard for Mr. BAKER. Morrison is a free-trader, and has been the acknowledged leader of the free-traders for over three years, and as such can not be esteemed as a friend of labor. BAKER defeated him several years ago, and I believe can do so again, as he is a straightforward, honest man, a protectionist, and, though not a rich man, yet one of a large heart and splendid character. His record, also, is irreproachable.

Your name has been given me as a good, reliable man, and one especially fitted to do work among the coal miners in the interest of Mr. BAKER. They tell me that the miners are a large and very influential part of the voters of your Congressional district, hence we need to put in some good work among them. I am informed that Mr. Morrison is popular among the miners, and, if so, then the greater the necessity of work among them. It needs no argument to show that Mr. Morrison is not, at heart, the workingman's friend. It was only last winter that he informed our committee of workingmen at Washington, who were there to plead against his infamous bill to increase the free-list and reduce the tariff, that they must expect wages to continually come to the level of the wages paid in foreign countries. His whole course in Congress has been one of opposition to labor. Miners, no more than iron-workers and glass-workers and other workmen, can not afford to support such a man, as his principles are all wrong. Now, friend Williams, I would be glad to have you go among the miners of the district and help us elect Mr. BAKER. As I am only a workingman, an honorary member of the Amalgamated Association, and an active member of the Knights of Labor, I have not but little funds at my command. I can, however, manage to pay you reasonable compensation for lost time and your expenses. There will be a committee of workmen there in a few days from this section. I will be there myself in about ten days from now. Please let me know at once if you can accept my proposition, and if you do I will forward you a small amount of money to start you out. Hold me responsible for everything in this letter.

Hoping to have a favorable reply, I remain, truly and fraternally, yours,

JOHN JARRETT,
Ex-President Amalgamated Association.

P. S.—Judging from your name, I would think you to be a Welshman or of Welsh extraction. I am of the same nationality, and possibly you are either a Republican or a Greenbacker or a prohibitionist in politics. As such you will find BAKER a good man to support. I do not suppose the Greenbackers have a candidate in the field.

J. J.

By the way, if you know a good man who can assist us in that line, say at Collinsville, you can engage him to assist you on same terms as yourself. I will supply you with the needed funds, all of which will be provided for by our Workingmen's Tariff Club. Answer at once, please.

JARRETT.

Mr. THOMAS WILLIAMS,
Caseyville, Ills.

[In the reading of the above communication some passages were greeted with loud applause from the Republican side of the House and other passages with loud applause from the Democratic side of the House.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I thank you, gentlemen of the other side, for applauding what Mr. Jarrett did. It was what I charged upon you yesterday. I am glad you plead guilty. Will the Clerk now read the other communication?

The Clerk read as follows:

[William J. Lewis, president, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Alfred Marshall, treasurer, Philadelphia, Pa.; John Jarrett, secretary, Pittsburgh, Pa. Executive committee: W. J. Lewis, L. Bacon Foss, Alfred Marshall, W. C. Cronemeyer, B. F. Jones, E. P. Williams, Charles Gilpin, Henry Whiteley, John Jarrett.]

THE AMERICAN TINNED PLATE ASSOCIATION,
Room 49, Lewis Block, Pittsburgh, Pa., October 19, 1886.

DEAR SIR AND BROTHER: Your favor is just received. I am exceedingly pleased to hear from you, and especially to hear that you are right on this matter. I will be at Belleville on Friday, and would like to meet you there. As I know that it is and has been pretty hard on the miners, I will defray your expenses to Belleville on that day if you come. I desire to have a special talk with you over matters. Also bring a good German representative with you. Hold me responsible for any expenses you may incur. Till then, good-bye.

Yours, truly and fraternally,

JOHN JARRETT.

THOMAS R. WILLIAMS, *Caseyville, Ill.*

[The reading of the above was also interrupted by applause, occasionally from the Republican and occasionally from the Democratic side of the House].

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Now I ask the Clerk to read this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time yielded by the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. REED. It seems as if the gentleman were taking up more than the five minutes. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. If the gentleman from Maine desires to take the floor away from me I will yield it.

Mr. REED. I see you are going to have read a newspaper extract.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not understand whether the gentleman from Maine objected to the gentleman from Kentucky proceeding.

Mr. BAKER, of Illinois. I hope the gentleman from Kentucky will be allowed to go on.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman from Maine to yield five minutes of his time?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

The Clerk read the following extract from the Commercial Gazette of Pittsburgh, Pa.:

[Commercial Gazette (Pittsburgh, Pa.), November 4, 1886.]

JOHN JARRETT—HIS REMARKS ON HIS FIGHT AGAINST MORRISON—HE CRITICISES PITTSBURGH MANUFACTURERS AND THE LABOR LEADERS BECAUSE OF NEGLIGENCE—NO HELP FROM THIS CITY TO FIGHT FREE TRADE.

Mr. John Jarrett, who has been conducting a tariff campaign against Morrison and the other free-traders of the West, returned home yesterday and was seen at his residence on Bedford avenue by a Commercial Gazette representative. He said:

"I have just come home from St. Louis. I was campaigning in Congressman Morrison's district, the Eighteenth of Illinois. You know that he was defeated, but I do not claim that it was I who accomplished his defeat. I did all that was possible, but I do not take all the credit to myself."

"Did you go of your own volition?"

"No, sir."

"Then why did you go?" was the next query.

"I went because I was sent," was Mr. Jarrett's reply.

"And who sent you?"

WHO BACKED HIM.

"I went as the representative of the American Tin-Plate Association, to talk to the workingmen of Illinois."

[The reading of the extract was followed by applause from the Democratic side.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I will not take up the time of the gentleman from Maine to have read, but will put in the RECORD another interview with Mr. Jarrett, of November 10, and a letter from Mr. Powell, which shows he received from Pittsburgh $1,550, which was used in that election. The papers referred to are as follows:

[Penny Press, November 10, 1886, Pittsburgh, Pa.]

WHAT IT COST TO KILL MORRISON—JARRETT'S EXPENSES IN THE CAMPAIGN AGAINST THE FREE-TRADER.

"The expenses of my campaign against free-trade Morrison amount to just $747.42," said John Jarrett this morning. "I made three trips to his district, and during the last of the fight had thirteen men in the field. I paid for their time, and also their traveling and hotel expenses. This is all the money that was used."

GENERAL POWELL OUT OF HUMOR—HE DOES NOT SEEM TO BE HAPPY AND SERENE.

BELLEVILLE, *November 12, 1886.*

DEAR SIR: In your issues of the 10th and 11th instant you have said much more than the facts will warrant, and much more than you or any of your friends can prove when called upon to testify, as you may be, about the means and methods and persons employed in the recent campaign. Had you been as intelligently observant and discerning as were many of your friends of the same political faith in this district, you would not now be so stupidly blind as to the real causes that led to the overwhelming defeat of Mr. Morrison, for I assume that you are not ignorant of the fact that very many Democrats voted with the Republicans for Mr. BAKER, not because they were paid for their votes, but for good and substantial reasons justifying their actions in judgments.

In reference to the undersigned's connection with the recent campaign, he is pleased to say, for the enlightenment of yourself and others who have drawn so heavily upon your vivid imagination as to the amount of money employed to secure the defeat of Mr. Morrison, that his services were of a voluntary character, extending in the main to the Congressional feature of the campaign, because of its national importance, as I believe; and I am impressed with the idea that I have an equal right with you in the enjoyment of my opinions and to work for the cause I espouse. Hence, Mr. BAKER having been selected as the Republican standard-bearer and the champion of protection to American industries and American labor, the only issue in the campaign, I felt it my duty to aid in every honest and honorable effort necessary to secure his election. In pursuance of this purpose, whilst in Pittsburgh in October on other business connected with our works, I made an effort to obtain assistance for meeting the ordinary expenses of the campaign from a few of my friends, which I found hard work, because they, like yourself, regarded the defeat of W. R. Morrison next to an impossibility, because, like yourself, they were ignorant of the actual condition of things in our district.

Hence, I secured all told in and outside of the district the enormous sum of $1,550, an amount that you admit inadequate to cover the legitimate expenses of a Congressional campaign, when considered that there are five counties in this district to divide that amount between. I have no personal knowledge of any other moneys having been brought into this district by any one else, except a sum not exceeding $700 paid Mr. Jarrett and others for actual work, expenses, and time engaged in canvassing in the district for some weeks previous to the election, which Mr. Jarrett and his friends had a right to do without asking your consent. Now, sir, I want to inform you and your disappointed friends that I did not go to Philadelphia nor Chicago. Nor do I believe that you can find a single instance in the entire district where one dollar was spent for beer or votes to secure Mr. BAKER's election by Mr. Jarrett or any one else working in the interest of Mr. BAKER. I know that the entire amounts specified were used strictly in providing for the payment of legitimate expenses, such as you recognize and have enumerated.

Mr. BAKER's canvass was an able and honorable one, rising above the unjustifiable personal abusive methods adopted by his opponents up into the earnest and able discussion of questions of vital importance to every man, woman, and child in our district, made chiefly by himself squarely upon the question of protection to American industries and necessarily American labor, your opinion to the contrary notwithstanding. Mr. Jarrett's visit to the district, to my knowledge, was at the instance of and under control of the workingmen, Democrats and Republicans in the district, independent of the action of iron barons of Pennsylvania and the district or county committees. I repeat that the facts warrant the conclusions that the defeat of Mr. Morrison was effected by and through the able and honorable canvass made by Mr. BAKER, aided by the disaffection in the Democratic party. The prevention of the usual fraudulent voting in East St. Louis by the honest Democrats there, the intelligent and earnest work of Mr. Jarrett, the thoroughly organized efforts secured throughout the district, all combining, influenced the verdict of the voters in the district in favor of Hon. JEHU BAKER.

Yours, in the true interests of American industries, American labor, agriculture, and good, old-fashioned American butter,

W. H. POWELL.

W. J. UNDERWOOD,
Editor News-Democrat.

The foregoing characteristic letter, with its admixtures of weak sarcasm and baronic threats, is published as General Powell's contribution to current political literature in this Congressional district. It neither vindicates him nor his champion nor does it disprove the fact that an attempt was made by Republican managers to defeat Colonel Morrison by corrupt means contributed through outside influence.

As far as the News Democrat is concerned, it knew nothing of the part taken by General Powell in the contest until after the election; and during the campaign we do not remember that he was censured or criticised in any respect for his friendship to Mr. Baker. We knew that he was a partisan in the faith of his party and expected him to use all honorable means to elect his man. After the election, however, in an unguarded moment of jubilation, he could not suppress himself and let the cat out of the bag by saying that he had asked for "assistance" in the East in the interest of his party. This admission, added to the fact of Jarrett's presence in the district and the exposure of his (Jarrett's) methods, was a link in the chain of the damaging evidence that really settled the case.

General Powell says he only received $1,550 "to cover the legitimate expenses of a Congressional campaign." This is the first time we ever heard of the managers of a political party going abroad for money for that purpose. It was certainly an extraordinary precedent, and is well calculated to leave the impression that people abroad desired Colonel Morrison's defeat more than the people at home. As far as we know, the legitimate expenses of local elections are always provided for at home. It is to be presumed that the candidates of the Republican party were assessed by its leaders and managers, as was the custom, and if they did not contribute to their own election it is not probable that people abroad would feel interest enough therein to help them out.

In his letter General P. says that he has "no personal knowledge of any other moneys having been brought into the district by any one else, except a sum not exceeding $700 paid Mr. Jarrett and others for actual work, expenses, and time, etc." It does not follow that because he did not know of "other moneys" that there were none. It is pretty well established that Jarrett obtained money at Alton through one of the banks there, and as he made more than one trip from Pittsburgh, he could have carried on his person several thousand dollars without the knowledge of General Powell.

The truth about the matter is, General Powell's letter establishes, in our opinion, two important facts that sustain the prevailing theories of Colonel Morrison's defeat. Foreign assistance was secured to accomplish the result, and now that this fact is known Republican leaders are worried and out of humor about the matter. Public indignation has reached a degree that causes them alarm, and their energies are taxed to the utmost capacity to divert attention to other than the theories. There may have been other causes tending in a small degree to diminish Colonel Morrison's vote, but these causes were not potential in his defeat.

General Powell further says that to his knowledge Jarrett's presence in the district was "at the instance of and under the control of the workingmen, Democrats and Republicans, in the district." He may be better posted in this respect than we are, but we imagine the number of workingmen engaged in the business was limited to a very small circle—say about a half-dozen who were conspicuous with Jarrett in his manipulation, and who were on his list of friends; and even these workingmen are of the sort that would like to be iron barons—something of the order of the constituents of the now famous Workingmen's Tariff Club, of Pittsburgh.

Therefore it is demonstrated by these statements that there were two different agents who raised money in Pennsylvania, carried it to Mr. Morrison's district, and used it to defeat him. How much more money there was, and how many more agents there were, no one of course knows.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BAKER] either knew of this money raised outside of the district by the agents of the American Tin-Plate Association and other Pennsylvania manufacturers to be used to elect a Representative in the State of Illinois, or he did not. If he knew it, then of course he can not be offended at that fact being known to the American people. If he did not know it, he can not be offended at me for bringing it to his attention to-day. All I said was that that was a mode of debauching the ballot-box that ought to be condemned. To send money raised in another State, and agents from an association which is now seeking to have the duty on tin-plate raised 110 per cent., which duty Mr. Morrison would have voted against, and which duty, it is presumable, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BAKER] would vote for—I said that was not the way to elect representatives of the people. No personal slight to me, no offensive reference to me by the venerable gentleman from Illinois, can obscure that issue before the American people. He and I sink into insignificance in contrast to that issue as to whether the associations and trusts built up by the tariff can send into other States to defeat representatives of the people who will not vote what they desire and elect men who will vote what they demand.

One more reference, sir, and I conclude. The venerable gentleman compliments my father. He does not know, no one into whose family the plowshare of that terrific civil war did not run and divide it can understand, the awful dilemma of a loving son with the irresistible dictates of his conscience on the one side and the unspeakable veneration and love for a father on the other. My father was a Kentuckian who never gave utterance to the miserable and cruel twaddle that the gentleman from Illinois puts into his mouth about throttling that child. He was a manly and generous man who would have looked upon that as both cruel and silly.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois. I heard him say a great deal worse than that myself in Lexington, Ky., if the gentleman will pardon me.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. And I say to the venerable gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BAKER] that I forgive him for hiding behind the grave of a dead father to wound a living son. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BAKER, of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, one word. The Kentucky mountain has labored and brought forth a ridiculously small mouse. [Jeers on the Democratic side.] In the letters which he has had read I detect nothing that is of any importance, and as to his statement of the contents of the letter of General Powell, the gentleman is inaccurate. Having seen that letter I am prepared to say that there is not one thing in it against which an impeachmeant can be brought, not one thing, and, as far as I can see, there is not a thing in either of the letters read from Mr. Jarrett which contravenes the election laws of the State of Illinois, and the gentleman from Kentucky, while looking after the purity of the ballot-box, might better be exercised in regard to that considerable region of our country where it is generally understood that immense masses of American votes are suppressed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the families of the members who can not find places in the galleries, and who are now in the corridors of the House, be admitted to the floor. It is a privilege which has often been granted before.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I shall not object provided gentlemen will observe the rules and refrain from smoking while the ladies are here. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Several members objected.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I purpose to discuss to-day some of the general principles which, in my opinion, underlie the two modes of national action which are confessedly in dispute in Congress and in the country. I shall treat the bill before us as in their hearts the leaders on the other side treat it, as a step only in a particular direction. The whole course of the debate has gone that way, and it is a just and proper way.

How important the propositions at issue are the intense interest already excited by the pending measures on two continents bears the strongest witness that can be borne by men. Those who, living on this side of the ocean, grow and make articles which are necessary for the comfort and happiness of the people of the United States are on one side of the question, while the foreign manufacturers, foreign political economists, and foreign statesmen are all on the other.

This, however, should not prejudice the question. If it be true that by having their goods manufactured abroad the people of the United States as a whole would become richer and more prosperous, would have their houses better furnished, their tables spread with finer linen, and covered with more healthful food; if their bodies would be protected by warmer woolens from the cold of Maine and by finer clothing from the burning sun of Texas; if they would on the whole, and from generation to generation, enjoy more of the comforts and luxuries of life, and would themselves be more intelligent, more independent, and better fitted to be the citizens of a Republic already great and destined to be mighty beyond all former dreams of empire, then by all means let us sink national prejudice, burst the barriers of provincial narrowness, and with one accord adopt not merely the present bill, but such legislation as will surely treble the spindles of Europe and destroy our own—such measures as will put out our furnaces and illumine those beyond the sea.

Let us vote for such laws as will make our mines mere holes in the ground, and stand aside to behold the glory alike of free raw materials and cheap goods purchased in the cheapest markets. Let the tall chimneys no longer disfigure our beautiful skies, and the rushing streams flow to the sea unvexed by mill-wheels, their murmurs undisturbed by the clash of the shuttles and the click of the looms.

If of every two dollars in our pockets, the one alone is sufficient, if spent in England, to give us all we have now, and we are sure of still having in our pockets the same two dollars which we now have, surely the problem is too easy for dispute, too simple for discussion. We have only to pass a bill which gives free course to what the free-trade professors, with glib secularization of the Deity, call the international law of the Almighty; and if the learned economists on the other side are true to their logic, and do not palter with both their language and their convictions, they can propose no other course.

Napoleon was right when he said that Europe must be Cossack or republican; Lincoln was right when he said the United States must be either free or slave. The house divided against itself has to unite or fall. The revenue reform argument is either a false pretense or covers the whole ground. Protection is either in its essence a benefit or a curse. You can not dilute a curse and make it a blessing. Ratsbane and water are no more food than ratsbane pure. [Laughter.] Incidental protection is a sham. Tariff for revenue only goes down before the same arguments which are used against protection.

If protection be a tax for manufacturers' benefit then it is the same tax if it be the result of even a revenue tariff. Incidental protection is of all the most inexcusable. It is an accident which ought to be avoided like a railway disaster. If when you take one dollar from the citizen for the Treasury and four for the manufacturer, is it any the less robbery that you call it a revenue tariff?

If you gentlemen on the other side believe what you say, you ought to be as furious against the rapine and plunder of the Mills bill as you profess to be against those of the present law.

The President is the leader of the Democracy. He is also the dispenser of patronage, and as he is rapidly shaking the dust of civil-service reform off his feet [laughter], he is assuming control over

his party. One paragraph in his message covers the whole ground of protection and free trade, and points out the plain duty of the Democracy.

There is but one free trade, and the President is its prophet. Whoever falls in battle in the service of this new Allah and its prophet for him shall open the shining gates of the heaven of foreign missions and Federal offices. [Laughter.] Therefore, with confidence I quote to the true believers the inspired wisdom of the message. It is an old quotation much wondered at. The mere wisdom of this world has refuted it many times and oft. But it is of the essence of the doctrines which oppose protection. It is the warp and woof of the whole discussion, which must be my excuse for again inflicting it on a weary world. "These laws," he says, and he is speaking of tariff laws—"These laws raise the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty by *precisely* the sum paid for such duties." "Precisely" is the word he uses, and it is a word of tremendous significance. But the corollary which he draws from the whole sentence is of still more tremendous significance. If the consumer pays "precisely" the duty in excess of the price of the imported article, then the President is also right when he says that on all domestic protected articles the consumer pays "nearly or quite the same enhanced price." That is the whole counsel of the Lord on the subject. Whether the protection be incidental or accidental, the result of war tariff or peace tariff, the consumer not only pays the duty on imported articles to the Government, but also on all domestic productions its equivalent to the greedy manufacturer.

At last, then, we have a mathematical basis on which to calculate the damage inflicted on this country by the system established by the men who framed the Constitution. By tariff taxes, whether great or small, whereby manufactures are encouraged, every dollar raised by the Government takes out of the pockets of the people other dollars and puts them into the pockets of capitalists. All these dollars are not merely changed from the pockets of the poor to the pockets of the rich—their value is lost to the nation; for by just so much has the nation's labor been unprofitably expended and wasted.

Since, then, we pay to protected industries the equivalent of the duty which is imposed on imported articles, we have only to calculate the amount of this payment thus lost to the country to find just what we have been doing and just where we are. Our manufactured products in 1880 were $5,370,000,000. If you add less than one-third for increase you will have for the year 1887 the figures given by the report of the Committee on Ways and Means, $7,000,000,000. If you take only one-half of this sum as being under protection, and calculate the duty, you will find that the sum uselessly paid is more than one thousand millions of dollars.

Since 1880 more than six thousand six hundred millions of dollars have been wrested from the people, and six thousand six hundred millions would have bought every acre of farming land in the United States at the outbreak of the war. If you carry back the baleful calculation to the day when we Republicans took charge of the country, you will find, if the President be right, that we have thrown away the whole value of the land we lived in, and instead of turning over to civil-service reform a country worth $44,000,000,000, we turned over a rack-rented farm mortgaged far beyond its value.

There are other remarkable figures to be deduced from that paragraph in the message; figures which must light up the pathway of Democratic duty with the electric light of conscience. [Laughter.] In 1887 forty millions of woolen goods were imported, paying twenty-seven millions of duties, 40 per cent. on cost and duties. This went to the Government. Three hundred and fifty-six millions of domestic woolen manufactures were bought that same year by the impoverished American people. Under the radiant light of the message it will be seen that one hundred and forty-two millions of that money went into the gaping pockets of manufacturers and were lost forever to the down-trodden people. [Laughter and applause.]

We imported thirty-one millions' worth of silks; we manufactured forty-six millions, of which sixteen and one-half millions lined the purses of the plunderers. The same story can be told of every protected industry, until the total of more than one thousand millions of the people's money rolls into the pockets of these licensed robbers of the poor. If this message from our ruler be true, every factory is the abode of a robber baron, more fell and sure than ever swooped down a European hill-side to harry a cavalcade of honest merchants.

In every mine mouth lurks a more dreadful giant than ever before smelled the blood of an Englishman. [Renewed laughter.] But what do the friends of virtue propose to do with these wicked people? Sweep them out of existence with the strong hand of justice? Does the gentleman from Texas intend to lasso these creatures and tangle them in the folds of his lariat? Does the gentleman from Arkansas mean that from their dead bodies the handle of his bowie-knife shall protrude? Ah, no! they are still to live and still to flourish. They will have only the delightful punishment of being turned over to the melting eloquence, the soothing rhetoric of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] while he explains his theory of fair plunder, of honest and decent robbery, with no restrictions save such as will be satisfactory to those good manufacturers who have been admitted to private interviews by the back-stairs. [Laughter and applause.]

The castles of these marauders are still to smoke upon the hill-tops, and the tall chimneys are still to break the sky-line of this unhappy country. They are to be allowed to rob within 7 per cent. of what they rob now, and as compensation they are to be let loose upon the markets of the world, where, according to the learned chairman, they are to reap larger wealth and pile up statelier millions. Do you think that the calculations I have made are but ridiculous imaginings of a scoffer; are but toying with the deep seriousness of the Presidential mind? Nay, not so. The belief that what I have figured out is absolute truth pervades the Democratic mind from one extremity to the other; from the very head to the very tail. [Renewed laughter and applause.]

The Hon. John Randolph Tucker, then a member from Virginia, as delightful in private life as he was able in the service of his country, in the year of our Lord 1882, in a speech delivered May 5, on the twenty-fifth page of the same, made the annual sum thus plundered from the people eight hundred millions for the year 1880. That speech was the most frank and honest grappling with the question I have seen, except perhaps the speech of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HEMPHILL]. In the same year, on the 20th day of April, in a speech delivered that day, on page 6 thereof, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, the member from Illinois, proclaimed the astounding fact that during the last nineteen years these ungodly manufacturers had swindled the people out of $15,000,000,000. Let me be exact, for the calculation is specific and precise. The exact sum was $15,063,754,645. [Laughter.] I do not need to cite the learned occupant of the chair [Mr. SPRINGER] or the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX], or even that individual who from the Speaker's bench in the gallery overlooked the opening of the debate on the bill which it is insinuated he did not frame. He made it a thousand millions a year six years ago.

Great heavens! These amazing plunderers had in their pockets fifteen thousand millions in 1882; have had eight hundred millions a year since—in all, nineteen thousand eight hundred millions, or three thousand millions more than this whole country is listed for taxation, and the Mills bill, the representative of the concentrated and concatenated wisdom of the Democracy proposes to give them more. [Applause and laughter.] Gentlemen of the other side, heroes of the new crusade for revenue reform and civil-service reform, if you believe what you say, is it not ample time that this tribute cease? What excuse have you for continuing it?

If the President be right, and you don't dare to doubt him, an annual tribute is paid protected manufacturers out of the pockets of the people more impoverishing than ever was exacted by an Oriental despot. In the face of your plain duty to free the people from this iron yoke you stand higgling about the amount of the tribute. Instead of $47 for every hundred you purpose to give $40 of the people's money and throw into the trade the markets of the world!

If it be a tribute, be bold and sweep it away. Why do you hesitate? Is it because you dare not be caught lowering the wages of the laboring men who have votes? Have the courage of your leaders' convictions—for has not the gentleman from Texas, godfather of this bill, who has promised to bring it up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, loudly proclaimed to the open day that tariffs have nothing to do with wages? Is it out of mercy to the capitalist that you falter? [Laughter.]

Do you say there is capital invested under our laws, and we must keep faith with those who have invested it? Whether faith should be kept with such vampires is for you to say. But surely no better faith need be kept than to pay back every cent they have invested. If the President be right, if John Randolph Tucker be right, if the honorable and gallant member be right; if J. S. Moore, who fixes the tribute in 1882 at one thousand millions, more than any of us, be right—if they all be right, then every year more than one thousand millions come out of the people for these men.

What is their whole stock in trade? What is the tale of every dollar they have as capital invested? If you take one-half the industries as protected, and we have made our other calculations on that basis, the whole capital is only one billion eight hundred and sixty million dollars. Now we have shown, according to our chief ruler, that the plunder of these manufacturers is $1,000,000,000. Therefore, in one year and four-fifths of a year, every dollar of that capital could be repaid, provided they kept their mill wheels unturned, and the people of the United States, protected against protection, could be as free and as happy as if the ægis of the Confederate constitution, article 1, section 8, were spread all over the land. [Jeers on the Democratic side.]

Why do men with such beliefs so plain, and so distinct, hesitate to do their duty? It is because every wind that blows, every sight that strikes their eyes, every sound that resounds in their ears, shows the folly of their theories, the absurdity of their logic. What use is it to tell the people of this empire that they have been robbed and plundered one thousand millions of dollars every year, during the very time when over 3,500 miles of distance cities have been springing up like magic, richer in a decade than the old world cities have grown in centuries, when 120,000 miles of railroad have been built, which compress the broad expanse of a continent into a week of time. When the commerce of its inland lakes has grown to rival the commerce between the two worlds; when from every land under the sun the emigrants have been flocking to its happy shores, drawn

there by the peace and prosperity which shine on all its borders and sweep from circumference to center. There are no eyes so dull that can not see the ever-rising glories of this Republic except those which are bandaged by the prejudices of long ago. [Applause on Republican side.]

Thus far I have employed a familiar method of argumentation which is called in Latin *reductio ad absurdum*, or, in plain English, confronting the principles a man lays down with the facts of the universe and showing him the dreadful absurdity of which he has been guilty. [Laughter.] The principles are the President's, the facts are from his own familiar friends. Which do you believe? The two sentences of the message which I have quoted are the essence of free trade. Whoever believes them has but one honest course to pursue. He must demand direct taxation. There is no escape from it. [Applause.]

Now let us turn to the other side. The system we believe in is called protection, and is founded upon the doctrine that a great nation like ours, having all varieties of climate and soil, will be richer, more independent, and more thrifty, and that its people will be better fitted to enjoy the comforts and luxuries of peace, and better situated to endure the calamities of war, if its own people supply its own wants.

I do not purpose to defend protection. Its vast growth within the last quarter of a century defends it better even than eloquent orations. It was born with the Republic. It is the faith and practice of every civilized nation under the sun save one. It has survived the assaults of all the professors of the "dismal science" called political economy. It has stood up against all the half knowledge of learned men who never had sense enough to transmute their learning into wisdom. [Great applause.]

On the face of the earth to-day there are but two sets of people who believe in free trade, whether pure and simple or disguised as revenue reform, and those two are the masked majority of the Committee on Ways and Means and their followers and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with Ireland suppressed.

Russia, the granary of Europe, has abandoned free trade, with the striking result that whereas, in 1876, before the duties were raised, she bought eight million hundred-weight of British metals and paid therefor thirty million of dollars (eight for thirty), she got the same quantity in 1884 and paid only seventeen million for it (eight for seventeen). Three dollars and seventy-five cents per hundred-weight before tariff, and $2.12½ after. Austria, Germany, Italy, Mexico, and the Dominion of Canada, that child of Britain herself, have all joined the army of protection. It is the instinct of humanity against the assumptions of the book men. It is the wisdom of the race against the wisdom of the few.

Perhaps the best argument I can make for protection is to state what it is and the principles on which it is founded.

Man derives his greatest power from his association with other men, his union with his fellows. Whoever considers the human being as a creature alone, by himself, isolated and separated, and tries to comprehend mankind by mathematically adding these atoms together, has utterly failed to comprehend the human race and its tremendous mission.

Sixty millions even of such creatures without association are only so many beasts that perish. But sixty millions of men welded together by national brotherhood, each supporting, sustaining, and buttressing the other, are the sure conquerors of all those mighty powers of nature which alone constitute the wealth of this world. [Applause.] The great blunder of the Herr professor of political economy is that he treats human beings as if every man were so many foot-pounds, such and such a fraction of a horse-power. All the soul of man he leaves out.

Think for a moment of the foundation principles involved in this question, which I now ask, Where does wealth come from? It comes from the power of man to let loose and yet guide those elemental forces the energy of which is infinite. It comes from the power of man to force the earth to give her increase, to hold in the bellying sail the passing breeze, to harness the tumbling waterfall, to dam up the great rivers, to put bits in the teeth of the lightning. Foot-pounds and fractions of a horse-power will never do this. It takes brains and the union of foot-pounds and fractions of a horse-power working harmoniously together.

To grasp the full powers of nature, to reap the richest wealth of the world, we must utilize the full power of man, not merely muscles and brains, but those intangible qualities which we call energy, vigor, ambition, confidence, and courage. Have you never remarked the wonderful difference between a sleepy country village, lying lazily alongside an unused waterfall, where more than half the energy of the people was lost for lack of the kind of work they wanted to do; where, whenever three men met together in the road, the rest looked out of the windows, idly wondering what the riot was about [laughter], and that same village after the banks were lined with workshops and the air was noisy with the whirr of the spindles, and every man was so eager to work that there never seemed hours enough in the day to tear from the powers of nature their imprisoned richness?

If you have, you have also seen the contrast between men left to themselves, so many foot-pounds and fractions of a horse-power, and men incited by hope, spurred on by ambition, and lighted on their way by the confidence of success. [Applause.]

For a nation to get out of itself or out of the earth all the wealth there is in both, it is not necessary for the nation to buy cheap or sell dear. That concerns individuals alone. What concerns the nation is how to utilize all the work there is in men, both of muscle and brain, of body and of soul, in the great enterprise of setting in motion the ever-gratuitous forces of nature.

How shall you get out of the people of a nation their full powers. Right here is precisely the dividing line. The let-alone school say leave individual man to his own devices. The protectionist school say let us stimulate combined and aggregated man to united endeavor. What made men work before governments? Was it an intellectual belief that work was good for the muscles? Not the least in the world. It was hunger and desire. Hunger has ceased to play the greater part, but desire will never pass away.

In the ever-growing desire of mankind for new worlds of comfort and luxury to conquer is the blazing promise of the unhasting, unresting march of civilization. In that column of march the whole nation must be ranged. Association is the instinct of humanity which grows with its growth. First the family, then the tribe, and then the nation. The race will come by and by. Faithfulness to each in their order is the true route to the next.

Here in the United States are 60,000,000 people with all the varied characters their numbers indicate. Some have faculties fit for farming, some for the management of machinery, some for invention. The problem before you is what system will get from all these creatures, so different from each other, the maximum of work and wealth and wisdom. [Applause.]

I have already said that the great incentive, the motive power of man, is desire. That is the magnet which draws him, but, like all other magnets, it must be put near the armature. The quenching of desire must not cost too much. The pathway to its accomplishment must not be too rugged. If you say to him who loves invention and hates farming, your path and your desire lies through the cultivation of the fields, he will say this thing costs too much. If you say to the man who loves the fields, your way must be through the workshop, you bar his progress.

There is only one way to get the best work out of men, and that is to give each the work he can do best. You can only accomplish this by diversifying industry. To diversify industry completely in a country such as ours, there is but one way given under Heaven among men. To enable the American people themselves to supply all their wants, you must give and assure to the American people the American markets. What does this phrase mean in practical life? It means that we, the nation, say to capital, "Embark yourself in the manufacture of such and such articles, and you shall have a market to the extent of the wants of the American people."

Capital then says to labor, "Go with me into this new field, all of you who like this work best, and we will share the results." Then begins a new industry. Multiply this by hundreds and you have a community where every man honestly minded will get what on the whole suits him best, and the nation will get the greatest amount of work from the greatest number.

To this system, so far sketched, no human being can find reasonable objections. But it is averred that there are some drawbacks. It is alleged that the people who are in the older industries—those which establish themselves without law—have to pay higher prices for the articles so manufactured, and that the employment in new industries is all at their expense. This does not in the least touch upon the utilization of human energy and natural energy which would otherwise run to waste. It does not touch upon the question of the divine right of those who are adapted to the older industries to reap alone the riches of the earth.

So seemingly unjust has this last appeared in one instance, that of the land-owner, that a prominent free-trader, Mr. Henry George, who will vote next election for revenue reform, has proposed to take away from land more or less of its value to the owner. That I do not agree to. I make no reclamations on that account.

I meet the question squarely and asseverate that protection does not raise prices. The opposite statement and the argument which backs it up I purpose to state fairly, for we now come to the famous revenue-reform dilemma. You tell us, they say, that protection is for the purpose of enhancing prices to enable high wages to be paid, and yet you say that protection lowers prices. This is flat contradiction. So it is as you state it. But your statement, like all revenue-reform statements, flourishes only by assumption.

In order to make yourself clear, you have utterly omitted the element of time. You assume that we say that both our statements of higher prices for higher wages and lower prices for consumers are for the same instant of time. Not so. When you begin there are higher prices for higher wages, but when you establish your manufactories, at once the universal law of competition begins to work. The manufactories abroad, urged upon by the lower prices which the tariff forces them to offer in order to compete with us, cause every element of economy in manufacture to be set in motion. Every intellect is put to work to devise new machinery which will produce at lower cost, to seek out new methods of utilizing waste, to consolidation of effort to lessen general expenses, and the thousand and one devices every year invented to get more work out of the powers of nature.

At home the same causes are at work, and with redoubled energy, because on account of higher wages there are greater inducements

to substitute labor-saving devices for costly labor. And this colossal struggle between two great empires of industry, the foreign and the domestic, results everywhere in the cheapness of commodities, in which progress of cheapness the world has marched on in one unbroken undeviating line, until to-day the citizens of the United States, the sovereigns of to-day, as we call them in moments of patriotic exaltation, the poorest citizens have for the commonest necessities of life the luxuries of the sovereigns of old days. [Applause on the Republican side.]

That lower prices will come at once, we have never said. That they will come and grow lower and lower so that in the series of years which make up a man's life all he needs will cost him less than under revenue reform we asseverate and maintain, and all history is behind our asseverations.

But would not all this take place under free trade; would not English manufactures, supplying all the world, have grown thus cheaper by themselves? Let me answer this question by two others. Do you believe in the lowering of prices by competition? Of course you do. Do you believe that the great production of $7,000,000,000 of manufactures have not entered into competition with those of England? You know that they have been the great power which has forced English prices down.

Do you want an example of to-day? In 1883 the importers were eager to prevent the increase of the tariff on pottery. I know it, because a gentleman was here earnestly urging me not to consent to the increase. Only three years afterwards he acknowledged to me that the foreign manufacturers were obliged, in the face of the great increase of product, both in quantity and quality, to cut their prices so as to pay even more than the tariff tax. Perhaps some revenue reformer may ask me, on the strength of this example, how our raising tariff helped manufacturers here if the foreign manufacturer lowered his prices.

I am glad to answer that question, for it answers many others. Before the raise we were on pottery fighting foreigners gorged with profits and flushed with the spoils of our markets. To-day we are fighting them on even terms, or would have been, but for the package clause. Their profits would be going into our treasury, not into their pockets, and between them and us would still be going on that equal contest for cheaper and cheaper manufactures which, without lowering wages, is giving us every day lower prices and an ever-widening manufacture.

Perhaps some gentleman will say to me that this is all a dream; that the very fact of a barrier raised by our tariff prevents competition. Every manufacturer knows better. England must work or starve. She has piled up her capital, and if she can not get large profits she will take small. Let me not confine myself to theory. Let me once more recall that tremendous fact about Russia. In 1876, three years before her tariff, she bought 8,000,000 hundred-weights of British metals at $30,000,000, 8 for 30. In 1883, four years after the tariff, she bought the same amount, 8,000,000 hundred-weights for $17,000,000, 8 for 17, $3.75 per hundred-weight before, $2.12½ after. Was that the effect of the Russian tariff alone? Not so. It was the effect of tariffs the world over.

Let me show the same fundamental fact on a larger scale. I have here the report of the royal commission to inquire into the causes of the depression of British trade. There is much matter of excellent admission throughout that work, but one paragraph will serve my present purpose. It is on the page numbered xii, where you will find that the exports in 1883 were £240,000,000, but that the value of those same exports at the prices of ten years before were £349,000,000.

The difference is £109,000,000—$545,000,000. If you want it in percentage, you will find that you must add more than 45 per cent. to the price of 1883 to get the richly profitable prices of 1873. To what does the world owe this gain of $545,000,000 in a single year? Who was the fruitful mother of all this gain?

She whom in your short-sighted wisdom you have always called barren, tariff taxes [applause]; and facing your most opprobrious phrase, the one you roll most lovingly under your tongue, I dare to asseverate that if the whole world will repeal its tariff taxes England will reap in the next ten years not only ten times these five hundred and forty-five millions, but a thousand millions more every year. Tariff taxes! How men like to fool themselves with phrases! Because the taxing power is used not only for revenue but as the barrier, and taxes are odious, therefore the barrier must be odious also. How can taxes produce? This is only mere word-trifling. Can you keep cattle out of the cornfield by sticking wood into the ground? Yes, if you make a fence.

Do you mean to tell me, said the wise bumpkin to the engineer on the banks of the Merrimac—do you mean to tell me that you can make that stream useful by putting rocks into it? Yes, said the engineer, as he proceeded to build his dam and set in motion the water-wheels of mighty Lowell.

I have said that the professor of political economy treats man as a soulless aggregation of foot-pounds. Let me give you a striking example of this humanizing science.

Speaking of shorter hours of labor the British commission report, from which I have quoted, says, page XXI, paragraph 82, speaking of shorter hours of labor:

It must be for the country and the workman himself to decide whether the advantages of shorter hours compensate for the increased cost of production or diminished output. We believe that they do, and on social as well as on economical grounds we should regret to see any curtailment of the leisure and freedom which the workman now enjoys. No advantage which could be expected to accrue to the commerce of the country would, in our opinion, compensate for such a change.

On the commission was Bonamy Price, the only recognized professor on it, and here is his sole contribution to this volume:

I beg to express my dissent from paragraph 82. It contains a specified repudiation of the great doctrine of free trade. [Great is Diana of the Ephesians.] Shorter hours of labor do not and can not compensate to a nation for increased cost of production or diminished output. They tax the community with dearer goods in order to confer special advantages on the working man. They protect him, and that is a direct repudiation of free trade. The country is sentenced to dearer and fewer goods.

BONAMY PRICE.

He is right, the dear professor, though rather crisp and brutal. Shorter hours and higher wages are "direct repudiations of free trade." [Laughter and applause.]

Let me now treat you to an argument for protection in America out of Bastiat. Fredrick Bastiat, of France, was the brightest free-trader that ever charged down the lines. No man can refuse the tribute of admiration to the wonderful play of that subtle intellect. He has furnished the other side most of its brains and all its dialectics.

Yet while he is arguing free trade for France, I think he has proved protection for America. Talking to Frenchmen, he says: "I say, and I think so very sincerely, that if two countries find themselves placed in unequal conditions of production, *it is that one which is the least favored of nature which has the most to gain by liberty of exchanges.*"

He proves his case this way. Labor is the sole cost. All the rest is the gratuity of nature. Whatever labor produces in one land more than the same labor in another land is difference of gratuity only. It is the measure of relative richness of the two countries. If one man should discover rich soil he would alone reap the gratuity. If ten thousand men discover it the principle of competition comes in and the gratuity goes to consumers. If one farm could double its fertility, the owner would be richer. If all the farms doubled their fertility, the whole gratuity would go over to the consumers. Let me illustrate that by something which Bastiat never knew, for he died forty years ago.

If one railroad alone in this country had had steel rails, all the benefit of that would have gone to the company. But when all the companies had them, and thereby could do their work cheaper and so save vast amounts of money, some railroad presidents looked for big dividends. What happened? Why each one said I can get a little more business if I do it cheaper, and get the same results. Then they began to compete, and the final result now is that that magnificent gift of nature, through Sir Henry Bessemer, the difference between the strong, long-lived steel rail, and the weak, short-lived iron rail, has, every dollar of it, gone to the people, making cheap transportation instead of big dividends. [Applause.]

Let my poor scared friend who covers his head with the bed-clothes at night lest he should be devoured by monopolies take courage. The Great Maker of this universe knows how to get His gifts distributed to His children. Since, then, the gratuitous part must be distributed, it follows, as Bastiat claims, that exchange is the barter of values, and value being reduced by competition to represent work, exchange is the barter of equal works, and, therefore, in free trade the richest country gives the most; in fact, it levels itself down and levels the other countries up.

Now, which is the richest, Europe or America? We are all agreed on that. We say America because our eyes behold it. You say so because your eyes behold it, and you see one thousand millions wasted besides. What do you mean to do? I will tell you what we mean to do. We mean to keep this wealth here. We mean to do it even if we build a "Chinese" wall of tariff taxes around this country. [Applause.]

Let me give this great truth of Bastiat's another application. Nature produces all. That is the origin of the much-abused phrase, "The farmer pays all." Whenever the farmer goes beyond his farm for the gratification of his desires, Bastiat, the free-trader, shows that he must then share his riches. Now whom shall he share it with, the mechanic at home or the mechanic abroad; his fellow-citizen or an alien? Which is for his interest?

Let me put it in other phrase. Which is it better for a farmer to do, send his surplus wheat a thousand miles to the sea-coast, three thousand miles across the water, pay the freight, sell it to the mechanic who gets less wages, or sell it right here at home to the mechanic who gets more wages? The answer seems obvious.

The minor arguments for free trade are exceedingly simple. Reasoning in a circle always is. There is nothing so compact as begging the question. Truth is difficult. "Easy as lying," is a proverb. Says a learned professor, "If under your tariff I can buy for a bushel of wheat in Liverpool the same articles for which I pay in New York a bushel and a peck, will anybody tell me I don't lose a peck of wheat, and lose it by your tariff?" Looks so, doesn't it? [Laughter.]

But there are two assumptions you perceive on examination; first, that under free trade American wheat will be as high at Liverpool and British wares as low. In other words the learned professor assumes that two bushels of wheat bidding for one set of wares will get them at the same price as when two sets of wares are bidding for

one bushel of wheat. Verily this seemeth to be the very thing we are discussing. This was the very point the learned professor started out to prove. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Frank Hurd, the melodious child of free trade, is now traversing this country founding a great oration on the same convincing argument. If a laborer with two dollars in his pocket won in a day in protectionist America can buy in Liverpool for one dollar what he wants, and you make him pay two dollars to the Rhode Island manufacturers don't you cheat him every day out of half his day? Dear, departed friend, first great martyr in this great cause, why not put it the other way? If a poor laboring man in free trade America without a cent in his pocket, and perhaps no pocket in his trousers, should find out that things cost the same in Rhode Island and Liverpool, would the happiness he would undoubtedly feel be anything more than an intellectual delight? [Laughter and applause.]

There are only two fallacies in this foundation stone of the new Jerusalem. The little one is that what costs one dollar in Liverpool will cost two in Rhode Island. This is rhetoric. Let us pass the rhetoric. The big one is that the laborer will get his two dollars under free trade, and goods at Liverpool will be as cheap. This is assumption. I not only point out that all this is assertion and not proof, but I think I can prove the contrary.

You asseverate that if part of the people now there left manufactures and went on the land and produced more wheat we could supply ourselves thereby with the manufactures we failed to make and have a profit, because on our fertile lands we can make wheat cheaper than hardware. Perfectly true, if prices would obligingly keep the same.

What makes wheat so cheap to-day? So many unexpected thousand bushels from India. Would not the same number of extra bushels in America have done the same? Would not so many extra bushels from America added to so many extra bushels from India drive it down at more than double the per cent.? British prices are low because the outside world manufacturing for itself won't buy, and these prices have been forced down, say the board to investigate, etc., 57 per cent. from 1873 to 1885. More wheat from America would lower prices of wheat just as more manufactures under tariff have lowered prices of goods. What a jolly rise those same prices would have if we supplied our lost manufactures by import. [Applause.]

The great folly of this most taking free-trade argument is the reasoning from the individual to the nation. If you should suspend the tariff laws for a single man he could, beyond a doubt, buy in Liverpool for a bushel of wheat what in New York costs a bushel and a peck. But would it not be the same if the laws were suspended as to all? By no manner of means. "Why not," says the free-trader; "is not the nation made up of individuals?" Certainly; but compared with one individual the universe is practically unlimited. He can move round and disturb nothing. Sixty millions of him make a big disturbance when they move.

Let me give you an illustration from Wall street. I suppose that when a distinguished man, an ex-minister to England, which is the least of his distinctions, a man whose perceptions are of such delicacy that the present President reminds him of Abraham Lincoln, of blessed memory, has without reproach compared protection to three-card monte, I may refer to Wall street without censure. [Laughter and applause on Republican side.]

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] who, by the wisdom of the Speaker, so well represents the wishes of his State on the Committee on Ways and Means was once an honored director in the Lake Shore and is now an honored director in the Canadian Pacific. Suppose he were to say to one of his friends—to me, for instance, for I like to dream of such a good thing—you have a hundred shares of Lake Shore. They pay 4 per cent. and sell at 92. Canadian Pacific's sell at 59 and pay 3 per cent. Canadian Pacific is a better road. Interstate-commerce bill favors it and the President is friendly. [Laughter.]

Sell your 100 Lake Shore and buy 156 Canadian. You will get $468 instead of $400 for income and lots of nice chances. I could do that as per programme. My sale of 100 Lake Shore would not depress that stock. My purchase would not raise the Pacific. But suppose 5,000 men tried the same transfer—nay, 500—what would be the result? Canadian Pacific would go up like a rocket and Lake Shore down like a stick, and there would be 500 badly disappointed men, and the more of them there were the more disappointed they would be. If ever the Democratic party, under the lead of the learned professor, on the ground that one man can save a peck of wheat by trading with Liverpool instead of New York, puts this whole nation at the mercy of Liverpool, we shall be a lucky people if we get back the basket.

People say that these tariff discussions are dull and tiresome, but there are always delightful things in them. I don't know when I have bathed my weary soul in such a reverie of bliss as I did while the chairman, by the aid of Edward Atkinson, and the great doctrine of labor-cost, was explaining that the high wages of our work people were not an obstacle, but the very reason itself why the whole circumambient atmosphere should be flooded with the pauper sunshine of Europe. [Laughter.]

The more you pay the workman the less the "labor-cost." The more you give your shoemaker the less the shoes cost. The former, he explained, is the cause of the latter. Less "labor-cost" is produced by higher wages. The higher the wages the lower the labor-cost. No limitation, of course, was set to so divine a principle. The only limit to lowness of "labor-cost" is our generosity to the laboring man. Give infinite dollars to the laboring man and things will cost nothing. [Laughter.] Surely no frantic orator on labor day, the session before election, ever offered to the horny-handed sons of toil such a sweet boon as the great doctrine of "labor-cost."

But softly, my friends. This is not the millenium. It is not the Heavenly Jerusalem newly descended. It is only the old Jerusalem of the Jews, sacred but ancient. It is the old, old fact that the smarter the workman the better the pay, and the manufacturer makes more out of him besides. It is not an absolute fact. It is a relative one. It only means that a better workman in the same country can get better pay than a poor one, and is worth it and a percentage over. It is a valuable fact, but it is an old one, and if Mr. Atkinson, reputed an able man, ever gave such an extension to that idea as his pupil has he must be one of those men who discover a full-fledged planet with moons whenever an asteroid comes within his field of vision.

But the pleasure given by the great doctrine of "labor-cost" is soon lost in the admiration at the cool courage of what follows. Stimulated by the theory of "labor-cost," the chairman ordered an investigation into the oldest manufactories in New England. What was the result? Why, constantly increasing wages and constantly decreasing cost; the two very things his side has sneered at since tariff debates were invented, higher wages for the worker and lower prices for the consumer.

What industries did he select? Cotton sheetings and cotton prints; cotton goods, the very articles, and perhaps the only articles which have had continuous, unbroken, effective protection since 1824. He selects industries which, under all tariffs, have had sixty-four years of solid protection, shows by them higher wages for labor and lower prices for consumers, then boldly wraps the flag of labor-cost about him and proclaims to a wondering world that tariff has nothing to do with wages. I wonder what Edward Atkinson thought of his new disciple at that moment.

Oh, no; tariffs have nothing to do with wrges. It is coal and steam and machinery. But what set up the machinery? What caused the cotton factory to be built? Why, the tariff. So, then, the tariff built the mill, set up the machinery, the machinery increased the wages, but the tariff did not. Is not that very much like saying your father was your progenitor, but your grandfather wasn't. [Laughter.] How could you improve machinery you didn't have? How could you increase the efficiency of machinery that didn't exist?

Perhaps now would be a good time to introduce the Chairman's yard of cassimere. I hate to invite this respectable audience into even this small Sahara of figures; but really there are oases in it. In the original it is one line and a half, specimen of a whole column. Here it is:

"One yard of cassimere, weighing 16 ounces, costs 138 cents; the labor-cost is 29 cents; the tariff is 80 cents." Borrowing from the rest of the column he means, as you will see if you read it, "You pretend, you manufacturers, that you want a tariff for the laborer; and here you are, 29 cents to the laborer, and 80 cents tariff; 51 cents into your infamous pockets."

This is certainly bad. I do not remember ever seeing such a startling exposure of cold-blooded villainy. Why, a robber baron of the middle ages, dead and buried five hundred years ago, with nothing left of him but his coffin, would rise at such a charge and hurl back as indignant contempt as if he had been a Kentucky member charged with refusing hearings on midnight revenue reform. But let us repress our feelings. May be that this news is like the news we used to get from Texas during the war, "Important if true." And it is not true. A yard of cassimere selling at 138 cents, weighing 16 ounces, and paying 80 cents tariff is an impossibility. Just permit me to prove it.

First you take off 27 cents discount for selling. This includes all other incidentals. That leaves 111 cents. Take off 80 cents, the alleged tariff. That leaves 31 cents. That is cost. You see I am liberal. No extras there. Now, if 31 cents is the cost and the goods are invoiced honestly—you see, I am again liberal—what is the duty? It will be largest under the woolen schedule. Therefore we will take that. It can only be 35 cents a pound and 35 per cent. ad valorem. The 35 cents is compensatory for the wool duty paid by the manufacturer. The 35 cents is 35 cents. Add 35 per cent. of 31 cents—10.85 cents—and you have 45.85 cents, which must be your tariff. But 45.85 cents added to 31 cents cost and 27 cents for selling gives only 103.85 cents instead of 138 cents, which shows that the sum doesn't prove.

Now listen to what the rate must be: 138 cents is the agreed price; 27 cents off for selling leaves 111. Now, the fixed specific tariff on a pound of cassimere is 35 cents. Take that out and there remains 76 cents for cost and ad valorem duty at 35 per cent. In other words, 76 cents is 135 per cent. of the cost. Therefore the cost is 56.29 cents, and the ad valorem tariff is 19.71, which, added to the 35 cents specific

is 54.71 cents. Adding them all together you have 138 cents. This proves. Now let us see what ratio this bears to the rest of the calculation of the learned chairman. Eighty cents tariff, taking out 29 for labor, gave the heartless manufacturer 51 cents; 54.71 cents will only leave him 25.71.

Can he get away with that? How lucky he would be if he could. Out of that he has got to pay just 35 cents to the woolman, tariff on his wool. In fact, the 35 cents a pound in the tariff is put there for that very purpose. So, according to the chairman's theory, this poor robber baron has got to put his hands into his own pockets and pay 9.29 cents of his own money besides what he gets from tariff. Really any intelligent robber baron would go back to the middle ages, where he certainly had no such luck. [Laughter and applause.]

Of course these figures are of no real earthly value except to prove the absurdity of a line and a half specimen of the chairman's speech. He started out grandly. Go to, he said, I will pay this man's labor and show he pockets 51 cents a yard besides; all out of the tariff. The chairman does not realize that 51 cents a yard profit on cassimere is a colossal preposterousness. He does not have even a suspicion of it.

Between the two kinds of free-trade orators the manufacturers have a poor chance. One of them, like the chairman, proves the inordinate profit of 51 cents a yard, and shouts loudly against the infinite extortion and the piled up wealth. The other, like the member from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL], who seems to have a valuable assortment of unknown facts, proclaims the wide-spread bankruptcy of woolen manufacturers and then wants to know, in an equally loud tone of voice, how we defend such a beggarly business as this. When one insinuates 51 cents profit for every yard and the other testifies to bankruptcy we have between them a millionaire insolvent and a beggar rolling in wealth. [Laughter.]

When the chairman asserts more than 60 per cent. profit on woolens and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. RUSSELL] declares that no nation but ours taxes imported wool, while the last publication of the State Department shows at least sixteen, one hardly knows which to admire most, the stupendous imagination of the gentleman from Texas or the rigorous accuracy of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

After all, this exaggerated idea of the profits of manufacturers is at the bottom of the chairman's feelings. Whenever I walk through the streets of that Democratic importing city of New York and look at the brownstone fronts my gorge always rises. I can never understand why the virtue which I know is on the sidewalk is not thus rewarded. I do not feel kindly to the people inside. But when I feel that way I know what the feeling is. It is good, honest, high-minded envy. When some other gentlemen have the same feeling they think it's political economy! [Great laughter.]

Why have I spent so much time on this wretched little yard of cassimere? Simply because it is a sample of a whole column which has been put forward here as the finest result of the free-trade intellect; and there are eighteen more just such palterings with common sense.

Before I leave cassimere let me add one word. One of the chiefest arguments on the stump of the free trader is that our tariff taxes are on the necessities of life. Why shouldn't they be, if protection makes cheaper? The chairman has already shown how cheap cotton is. Let Matthew Arnold tell about woolens. Here I have him in the Nineteenth Century, April, 1888.

> On the other hand, for that immense class of people, the great bulk of the community, * * * things in America are favorable. * * * Society is organized for their benefit. * * * Luxuries are, as I have said, very dear, above all European luxuries, but the working-man's clothing is nearly as cheap as in England, and plain food is, on the whole, cheaper. Even luxuries of a certain kind are within the laboring man's easy reach.

I have thus gone over, well or ill, the real arguments on the other side, all that are really worth touching, but there is in all these rhetorical battles much artillery firing which comes from unshotted guns. They make as much noise as real artillery. They obscure the heavens also with much smoke, and they seem to the careless to contribute to the dead and wounded. Some of these I must ask you to examine, for it is really worth while to see what a part smoke and noise play in this world.

"Monopoly," said Horace Greeley, a doctor of laws, and once a candidate of the Democratic party for the Presidency, "monopoly is, perhaps, the most perverted and misapplied word in our much-abused mother tongue." How very tame this language is. I suppose that during the ten years last past I have listened in this Hall to more idiotic raving, more pestiferous rant on that subject than on all the others put together. And yet I do not regret it. What a beautiful sight it is to see the revenue-reform orator go into action against monopoly. Nelson, as he stood blazing with decorations on the decks of the Victory on the fatal day of Trafalgar; Napoleon at Friedland, as the Guard went cheering and charging by; Thomas Sayers as he stripped for the championship of England when Heenan had crossed the lifting waters; the eagle soaring to his eyrie; the royal man-eating Bengal tiger in his native jungle; nay, the very bull himself, the strong bull of Bashan, as he uplifts his bellow over the rocky deserts of Palestine, are all but pale reminders of one of these majestic creatures. [Laughter.] And yet, outside the Patent Office there are no monopolies in this country, and there never can be. Ah, but what is that I see on the far horizon's edge, with tongue of lambent flame and eye of forked fire, serpent-headed and griffin-clawed? Surely it must be the great new chimera "Trust." Quick, cries every masked member of the Ways and Means. Quick, let us lower the tariff. Let us call in the British. Let them save our devastated homes. Courage, dear brethren. Be not too much disturbed. The Lord will reign even if the board of mayor and aldermen should adjourn.

Call in the British! When the day comes that this Republic can not save itself from a dozen of its own citizens without aid from over the sea, I hope to be buried a thousand leagues under some respectable and permanent mountain range. What unreasonable talk this is. A dozen men fix the prices for sixty million freemen! They can never do it. There is no power on earth that can raise the price of any necessity of life above a just price and keep it there. More than that, if the price is raised and maintained even for a short while, it means ruin for the combination and still lower prices for consumers. That is one of the laws of God working for His children. Compared with one of your laws of Congress, it is a Leviathan to a clam.

Doubtless there are evils in this world to be corrected by law. But let us go at it with sense. The kindly bear who flung a paving stone to drive away a fly which disturbed his sleeping friend killed the man and did not hurt the fly.

But if the revenue-reform orator on the monopoly is terrible, like an army with banners, there is a theme on which he can take up the notes of the dying swan. How we do love to hear him on the impoverished farmer. Then he is not sublime, but he is pathetically great. I heard him first ten years ago. To me, innocent, untraveled, it seemed as if the Western farmer was the most woe-begone, down-trodden, luckless, unsuccessful, dispirited devil on the face of the earth. The Eastern vampire had mortgaged his farm and thrown down his fences, and scattered his substance wantonly to the winds.

In the fullness of time I traveled West myself. You may well imagine my astonishment, who had never seen 10 acres together in corn, to behold fields of that great staple stretching way out to the horizon's edge, to see tracts of land which seemed to have no boundaries but the visible sky; land so rich that if we had an acre of it in Maine we would have sold it by the bushel [laughter], while on every side were the great brick houses, such as only the squire lived in in our villages. After some days of this I became sulky. I said, gentlemen, of course we have robbed you; your Congressmen would not lie about trifles like that. But what disgusts me is that we did not do it more thoroughly. The gleaning looks bigger than the harvest. These crumbs are finer than the food we put on our tables. Then they confided to me that the Western Congressmen were great orators and did this for practice. [Laughter.] Since then I have not been so much moved by it.

Here is another unshotted gun called "the markets of the world." The markets of the world! How broad and cool these words are. They stretch from the frozen regions of the northern pole across the blazing tropics to the ice-bound shores of the Antarctic continent. All this we can have if we will but give up the little handsbreadth called the United States of America. What are these markets of the world?

To hear these rhetoricians declaim, you would imagine the markets of the world a vast vacuum, waiting till now for American goods to break through, rush in, and fill the yearning void. Will your goods go to Austria, to Italy, Germany, Russia, or France? Around all these benighted countries are the "Chinese" walls of tariff taxes. Britain herself is protected by vast capital, accumulated through ages, the spoils of her own and other lands, by a trade system as powerful as it is relentless. All these nations will contest with you the other countries which they already overflow.

Does your mouth water over the prospect? What market do you give up for all this? Where is the best market in the world? Where the people have the most money to spend. Where have the people the most money to spend? Right here in the United States of America after twenty-seven years of protectionist rule. And you are asked to give up such a market for the markets of the world! Why the history of such a transaction was told twenty-four hundred years ago. It is a classic. You will find it in the works of Æsop, the fabulist.

Once there was a dog. He was a nice little dog. Nothing the matter with him except a few foolish free-trade ideas in his head. He was trotting along happy as the day, for he had in his mouth a nice shoulder of succulent mutton. By and by he came to a stream bridged by a plank. He trotted along, and, looking over the side of the plank, he saw the markets of the world [great laughter and applause] and dived for them. A minute after he was crawling up the bank the wettest, the sickest [great laughter], the nastiest, the most muttonless dog that ever swam ashore!

We have now spent twenty days on the discussion of the Mills bill. Have you noticed what has been the most utterly insignificant thing in the discussion? The most utterly insignificant thing in the discussion has been the Mills bill. How do you account for it? I will tell you. If the principles you have enunciated are true, it is an unworthy compromise with Satan. If the principles we have

stated are true, it is an unworthy ambuscade, and you know it. You mean this merely for one step. You mean to cut deeper next time. You mean the destruction of the system which now exists.

The whole case can be put succinctly in a few words. If the principles you announce are true, you must have direct taxation. If the dollar you pay the custom-house on the import is followed by a dollar to the manufacturer for every like quantity of domestic goods, which your tariff accidentally encourages, then that manufacture is a misfortune. It takes dollars out of the farmer or lawyer without return. It is no reply, under this Government, to say that the indirect collection of two dollars, one-half of which is lost to the people, is easier because the poor fools don't know it.

That is the old quotation made from Colbert by the gentleman from West Virginia. Surely in this country you do not avow that you are trying to get "the maximum of feathers out of the goose for the minimum of squalling." You don't mean to take feathers out of the American goose and deny him the poor privilege of noise. No, if our proud bird ought to surrender feathers he is plucky enough to surrender like an eagle, and if it is a tax alone he has a right to see just what feathers go.

The forefathers of these Democrats saw this, and, like the honest men they were, clamored for direct taxation. They were right. Why do not you act like them? Why not be bold? Why do you hesitate? It is because twenty-seven years of knowledge divide you from them. In your heart of hearts you suspect your own logic and you dare not. You may well hesitate. Whoever takes down the map of 1860 and the map of 1888 will look upon the most wondrous growth that ever the sun shone on in all its myriad courses around the earth. It is a marvelous spectacle. It is not alone the great cities, born like exhalations, which flash prosperity over the great lakes, over the broad plains, over the mighty fields rich with verdure or teeming with uncounted harvest. It is not alone the piled-up billions under which the great national debt caused by the greatest war expenditure the world ever saw has melted like an iceberg under a tropic sun. It is not alone the rejuvenated South turning its face to its great future. Nay, it is not even all of these combined. It is the fact found by the most cultured Englishman of our day that all this wealth and prosperity has been so shaped that it seeks the comfort—not of the rich, not of the lounging owner of fixed income, not of the pampered minion of governmental power, but of the plain people whom Abraham Lincoln loved, and who are of right the chief glory of this Republic. [Prolonged applause.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky (when Mr. REED'S hour was about to expire) said: Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him just a moment? His hour is within a minute of expiring, and I ask unanimous consent that his time and that of my colleague [Mr. CARLISLE], who is to follow him, be extended without limit.

There being no objection, the extension requested was granted.

Mr. REED resumed and concluded his remarks.

Mr. CARLISLE (the Speaker). Mr. Chairman, I am very much obliged to the committee for its courtesy in granting me an unlimited extension of time, but I shall endeavor to confine my remarks within the usual limits, even if compelled to omit some matters which it had been my purpose to discuss.

I shall not attempt to follow the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] in all the arguments he has made, or in all the illustrations he has submitted to the committee; for, in fact, I was unable to hear a large part of what the gentleman said.

The gentleman started out with the proposition that the supporters of the pending bill are either inconsistent or insincere, or perhaps both; because, he says, if protection is wrong, a tariff for revenue is also wrong; that there is no difference in principle between them, the difference being only in degree.

Therefore the gentleman's argument is that the supporters of this bill should advocate absolute free trade. I might retort upon the gentleman by saying that if the doctrine of protection is correct, then that doctrine should be carried by its friends to its logical and legitimate results—absolute prohibition of foreign imports. But the gentleman from Maine has made this unnecessary, because he has announced that such is his purpose, and the purpose of his political associates, if necessary, and that they will preserve in this country all of its own trade and wealth, even if compelled to erect a Chinese wall around it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Sir, China preserved all the trade and wealth of her own people within her own limits for thousands of years, but I do not think that the advocates of diversified industries or the friends of labor can find much to encourage them in the social and industrial condition of that country to-day. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.] There the doctrine of protection, pure and simple, was carried to its logical results, and it produced its inevitable effects. With the oldest civilization in the world, with every variety of soil and climate and natural resources, with a frugal and industrious people, with a literature abounding in philosophical and speculative thought, the useful arts and manufactures are still in their infancy, and labor is still the abject slave of capital. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

No, sir; we do not want another China here, nor do we want or expect absolute free trade. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.] We all recognize the fact, which I suppose even the gentleman from Maine will concede, that the Government must have a revenue for its support, and that this revenue must be raised by taxation in some form or other. I presume the gentleman from Maine will also concede that all taxation is an evil which it would be well to avoid, if possible, but that, as it cannot be avoided entirely, we are simply reduced to a choice between that system which would confine the trade of our own people, in a large measure at least, to our own limits without increasing the revenues of the Government and the more liberal system which will make trade and commerce as free as possible consistently with the raising of sufficient revenue for the support of the Government. [Applause on the Democratic side.] If our manufacturing or mining industries, or any other industries in the country, receive a benefit by the imposition of duties upon imported goods under this system, they are entitled to it and they are welcome to it. [Renewed applause.] It is impossible to impose taxes under any system that can be devised without hurting somebody or helping somebody; and for my part—and I think this is the sentiment of my political associates on this floor—I would rather help them than hurt them. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.]

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maine, in all his long discourse, lasting nearly two hours, made no reference whatever to the actual situation which now confronts us—a situation which makes it the imperative duty of the Representatives of the people to reduce the revenues before this Congress shall adjourn. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It appears from the last official statement that there was in the Treasury at the close of the last month, including subsidiary and minor coins, the sum of $136,143,357.95 over and above all the current liabilities of the Government. This was $56,676,662.65 more than the surplus on hand on the 1st day of December, 1887, and shows that there has been since that date an average monthly increase of $11,335,332.15. The surplus accumulation each month under the existing system of taxation is more than the total cost of the Government during the first two years of Washington's administration, while the aggregate sum is considerably in excess of the whole expenditure of the Government during the first eighteen years of its existence under the Constitution, including civil and miscellaneous expenses, war, navy, Indians, pensions, and interest on the public debt.

Every dollar of this enormous sum has been taken by law from the productive industries and commercial pursuits of the people at a time when it was sorely needed for the successful prosecution of their business, and under circumstances which afford no excuse whatever for the exaction. [Applause on Democratic side.] There is not a monarchical government in the world, however absolute its form or however arbitrary its power, that would dare to extort such a tribute from its subjects in excess of the proper requirements of the public service [renewed applause]; and the question which Congress is now compelled to determine is whether such a policy can be longer continued here in this country, where the people are supposed to govern in their own right and in their own interest.

During the progress of this debate more than one gentleman on the other side has referred to the enormous surplus now in the Treasury as a matter of but little consequence; and in fact there are some who appear to regard it as a blessing, rather than a misfortune, that we should have more than $130,000,000 of the people's money withdrawn from the channels of trade and securely locked up in the vaults of the Government. Sir, I can imagine no financial condition more dangerous to the integrity of legislation and the prosperity of the country than that which results from the existence of a large surplus in the public Treasury. Even if it were possible for such a surplus as we now have to accumulate without the imposition of any tax or burden upon the people, it would still be, in my opinion, a very great misfortune, because the inevitable effect would be to encourage useless and extravagant appropriations in violation of those principles of public economy which are absolutely essential for the preservation of a popular government with constitutional limitations upon its powers. [Applause.]

If there be any serious danger now threatening our institutions, it is the growing disposition among those who represent particular classes and special interests to disregard the checks and break down the barriers of the Constitution in a promiscuous scramble for a division of the public treasure. Fortunately there is in no part of the country any feeling of opposition to the proper exercise of public authority, either State or Federal. On the contrary, the prevailing tendency is toward the enlargement and extension of governmental power by construction, especially in matters involving the appropriation and expenditure of money.

When the Government has collected, or is collecting, more money than it needs the people, realizing the injustice of a policy which unnecessarily deprives them of a part of their earnings, are almost sure to demand its return in some form or other. If the Government may rightfully exercise the power of taxation for other than public purposes, it is difficult to convince those who pay the money that it can

not also rightfully exercise the power of appropriation for other than public purposes. It is safe to say, therefore, that so long as this policy shall be continued, not only will largesses and bounties for the promotion of purely private interests be demanded, but new fields for the exercise of legislative power and new objects for the appropriation of the public money will be discovered.

But it is said that we still have outstanding a large public debt, and that no great injury can result to the country if the present rates of taxation shall be continued and the surplus revenue used in the purchase of bonds. I agree, Mr. Chairman, that so long as we have a surplus its application to the extinguishment of the public debt is the very best use that can be made of it. [Applause.] But I totally dissent from the proposition that it would be wise or just to raise a surplus revenue by taxation merely for the purpose of purchasing at a premium the unmatured bonds of the Government, except so far as may be necessary to meet the requirements of the sinking-fund law; and I am not satisfied that it would not be good policy, if the revenue could be properly reduced, to suspend the operation of that law, in whole or in part, for a reasonable time. It is not possible to defend, and it would be ruinous to perpetuate, a fiscal policy which compels the people to pay to the public creditors twenty-five cents on the dollar more than the obligations of the Government call for; and yet that is just what we are doing and just what we must continue to do unless the revenue is reduced by the passage of this or some other bill.

On the 17th day of last month the Secretary of the Treasury, in pursuance of authority conferred upon him by the law of March, 1881, as interpreted by the two Houses of Congress, issued a circular inviting proposals for the sale of bonds to the Government. The first purchase was made under this invitation on the 18th day of April, and between that date and the close of business yesterday, a period of one month, he has purchased on account of the Government 4 per cent. bonds to the amount of $13,456,500, upon which interest had accrued at the date of the purchase to the amount of $53,172.07. For these bonds he was compelled to pay the sum of $17,046,136.06, which was $3,536,464 more than the principal and accrued interest, or a premium of 26⅓ per cent. During the same time and under the same authority he purchased 4½ per cent. bonds to the amount of $12,404,450, upon which interest had accrued to the amount of $108,086.55. For these bonds he paid the sum of $13.379,188.37, which was $866,652.37 in excess of the principal and interest. The premium paid upon this class of bonds was nearly 7 per cent.

This is the situation into which the Government has been forced by the failure of Congress in past years to make provision for a reduction of taxation. Millions of dollars which ought to have remained in the hands of the people who earned the money by their labor and by their skill in the prosecution of business have been taken away from them by law to be paid out to the bondholders in excess of their legal demands against the Government. [Applause.] And, sir, if the present Congress shall adjourn without applying a remedy, this unjust process must go on for an indefinite length of time. In the presence of such a situation we can not afford to quarrel about trivial details. A reduction of the revenue—not by increasing taxation, as some propose, but by diminishing taxation in such manner as will afford the largest measure of relief to the people and their industries—should be the great and controlling object to which everything else should be subordinated. [Applause.] I do not mean that every interest, however small and insignificant, should not be carefully considered in a friendly spirit, but I do mean that the general interests of the many should not be subordinated to the special interests of the few. [Applause.]

Although the question now presented is purely a practical one, it necessarily involves, to some extent, a discussion of the conflicting theories of taxation which have divided the people of this country ever since the organization of the Government. There is a fundamental and irreconcilable difference of opinion between those who believe that the power of taxation should be used for public purposes only, and that the burdens of taxation should be equally distributed among all the people according to their ability to bear them, and those who believe that it is the right and duty of the Government to promote certain private enterprises and increase the profits of those engaged in them by the imposition of higher rates than are necessary to raise revenue for the proper administration of public affairs; and so long as this difference exists, or at least so long as the policy of the Government is not permanently settled and acquiesced in, these conflicting opinions will continue to embarrass the representatives of the people in their efforts either to increase or reduce taxation.

While no man in public life would venture to advocate excessive taxation merely for the purpose of raising excessive revenue, many will advocate it, or at least excuse it, when the rates are so adjusted or the objects of taxation are so selected as to secure advantages, or supposed advantages, to some parts of the country or to some classes of industries over other parts and other classes; and this, Mr. Chairman, is the sole cause of the difficulties we are now encountering in our efforts to relieve the people and reduce the surplus. It is the sole cause of the unfortunate delay that has already occurred in the revision of our revenue laws, and if the pending bill shall be defeated and disaster in any form shall come upon the country by reason of overtaxation and an accumulation of money in the Treasury, this unjust feature in our present system will be responsible for it. [Applause.]

Whenever an attempt is made to emancipate labor from the servitude which an unequal system of taxation imposes upon it, whenever it is proposed to secure as far as possible to each individual citizen the full fruits of his own earnings, subject only to the actual necessities of the Government, and whenever a measure is presented for the removal of unnecessary restrictions from domestic industries and international commerce, so as to permit freer production and freer exchanges, the alarm is sounded and all the cohorts of monopoly are assembled to hear their heralds proclaim the immediate and irretrievable ruin of the country. [Applause.]

We have been told over and over again during this debate that the passage of the pending bill will destroy many valuable industries now flourishing in various parts of the country; that it will deprive thousands of laborers of employment and greatly reduce the wages of those who continue to work; and the gentleman from Maine, who has just spoken, has substantially repeated the gloomy predictions to which the House has listened so often during the last three weeks. Sir, if I believed that the passage of this measure would injure a single honest industry, or reduce the wages of those who are employed in it, I would, notwithstanding the great emergency which now confronts us, hesitate long before giving it my support. [Applause on the Democratic side.] But in my opinion the reductions now proposed on dutiable imports, and the proposed additions to the free-list will be beneficial to the manufacturers themselves as well as to their laborers and the consumers of their products. As the Representatives from New England on the other side of the House appear to be especially alarmed concerning the injurious effects of this bill upon the great manufacturing industries in their part of the country, it may not be inappropriate to call their attention to a few historical facts connected with our tariff legislation in the past and the effects of low rates of duty upon the prosperity of their people. The highest rate of duty imposed by the tariff act of 1846 upon any class of woolen goods, cotton fabrics, manufactures of leather and of hardware, was 30 per cent. ad valorem, and upon most kinds of cotton goods it was only 25 per cent. These were the industries in which New England was most largely engaged, and her Representatives here, except those from the State of Maine, who were divided upon the question, protested against the passage of that act, as they now protest against the passage of the pending bill, upon the ground that it would paralyze and ruin these great interests. The Representatives from Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, and Vermont voted unanimously against the bill, with the exception of Mr. Collamer, of Vermont, who did not vote at all. But it passed nevertheless, and became a law; and now, Mr. Chairman, let us see what its effect was upon the most important industries of these great manufacturing States, and what the subsequent action of their Representatives was after an experience of eleven years under these moderate rates of duty.

We have no authentic statistics showing the progress made by manufacturing industries between 1846 and 1857 as a separate and distinct period of time, but it may be fairly assumed that the full force and effect of the new rates of duty were realized at least as early as the census year 1849, and we have the census returns of 1850 and 1860, the latter based upon the productions of the year 1859, to which I beg leave to invite the attention of gentlemen from New England and other gentlemen who believe that low tariffs destroy manufactures and pauperize labor. During the period mentioned the value of all our woolen manufactures increased more than 42 per cent.; the number of hands employed increased 18½ per cent., but the total amount of wages paid increased nearly 37 per cent. [applause], showing that the percentage of increase in the amount of wages paid was twice as great as the percentage of increase in the number of hands employed. [Applause.] Taking all the New England States together the increase in the value of the product in this industry was 62 per cent. The increase in Massachusetts was 54 per cent.; in Rhode Island, 176 per cent.; in Vermont, 61½ per cent., and in Maine, 83½ per cent. In the manufacture of hosiery the progress during the ten years under consideration was almost marvelous. In the Eastern States the increase in the value of the product was 481 per cent. It was 523 per cent. in Connecticut, 377 per cent. in New Hampshire, and 373 per cent. in Massachusetts.

What was the effect upon the manufacture of cotton fabrics in New England and in the whole country? Why, sir, the value of the production in the United States increased 77 per cent., the number of hands employed increased 28½ per cent., and the total amount of wages paid increased 39 per cent. [Applause.] In New England the increase in the value of the product was over 81 per cent., in the number of hands employed 28 per cent., and in the amount of wages paid 36 per cent. Massachusetts increased her product 77 per cent., New Hampshire 55 per cent., Rhode Island over 87 per cent., Connecticut 116 per cent., Maine 137 per cent., and Vermont 27½ per cent.

In the six New England States the increase in the value of the product in the manufacture of boots and shoes was 83 per cent.; in Massachusetts the increase was 92 per cent., in Connecticut 10 per cent., in Maine 99 per cent., and in Rhode Island 337 per cent. The production in New England alone in 1860 was greater than the aggregate produc-

tion of all the States of the Union in 1850. In the manufacture of hard ware New England increased the value of her product 100 per cent., and in this industry also her product in 1860 was greater than the product of all the States in 1850.

Instead of paralyzing the industries and pauperizing labor in New England, or any other part of the country for that matter, the tariff act of 1846 infused new life and vigor into our languishing manufactures and secured more constant employment and higher wages to our laboring people; and the consequence was that even the strong prejudices of New England were removed by actual experience, and in 1857 every Representative from that part of the country who voted at all voted for a bill making an almost uniform reduction of 20 per cent. from the rates imposed by the act of 1846 and placing many additional articles upon the free-list.

Here is the vote upon the tariff act of 1857, as it first passed the House, a Republican House over which Nathaniel P. Banks, of Massachusetts, presided as Speaker. Five of the six Representatives from Maine voted for it, and the other one, who was absent when the vote was taken, had made a speech in favor of its passage. Nine of the ten Representatives from Massachusetts voted in the affirmative, and the other was in the chair and did not vote. Every Representative from New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, and Rhode Island was present and voted for the bill, and among them appears the name of the venerable and distinguished Senator who still serves his State at the other end of the Capitol, Hon. JUSTIN S. MORRILL.

The bill to which I have referred was sent to the Senate, where it was amended by making a very slight increase in the reduction of certain articles, and, finally, upon agreeing to the conference, eighteen Representatives from New England voted in the affirmative and nine in the negative. Two-thirds of the men chosen by the people of New England to represent their interests in Congress declared by this vote that a further reduction would be beneficial to their industries, and thus the tariff act of 1857, which we have so often heard denounced on the other side of the House, became the law of the land by the votes of Republican and New England Representatives.

These Representatives of the greatest manufacturing section of the country had seen their industries grow and prosper as they had never grown and prospered before; they had seen capital realizing adequate returns upon its investment; they had seen the number of laborers employed constantly increasing and the rates of wages continually rising, and they had seen at the same time the agricultural and commercial interests of the people in all parts of the country flourishing to an extent which the wildest enthusiast had scarcely dreamed of before. All these things they had seen, Mr. Chairman; but there are other things with which we have grown perfectly familiar in these times of high-tariff and class legislation which they did not see. They did not see great monopolies and trusts created to limit the supply and control the price of the necessaries of life. [Great applause.] They did not see enormous fortunes accumulated in a few years by corporations and individuals engaged in favored industries, while the great mass of the people were struggling hard to live comfortably and pay their taxes; nor did they see at any time during that period, as we have seen, thousands of honest laborers parading the streets of our cities clamoring for work, or assembling around our mines and factories with hired police to watch them. [Applause.]

This was the experience of the Representatives from the New England States during the eleven years from 1846 to 1857, under a low tariff; and is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman, that they came here and by a unanimous vote a still further reduction in the interest of the manufacturers demanded? [Applause.] And if this bill shall pass and become a law, I predict that within less than eleven years from this time the gentlemen who now represent New England on this floor and oppose this bill will be here voting for a further reduction, or the people will send somebody here who will so vote. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, if time would permit I would like to submit some of the opinions delivered by the leading representatives of our manufacturing interests during the debate upon the tariff act of 1857, and even at the risk of dwelling too long upon this subject I will venture to read a few short extracts from the speech of Henry Wilson, of Massachusetts, afterwards Vice-President of the United States, a gentleman who perhaps understood as thoroughly as any one the real condition and necessities of his constituents. Among other things he said:

> The manufacturers, Mr. Chairman, make no war upon the wool-growers. They assume that the reduction of the duty on wool, or repeal of the duty altogether, will infuse vigor into that drooping interest, stimulate home production, and diminish the importation of foreign woolen manufactures, and afford a steady and increasing demand for American wool. They believe this policy will be more beneficial to the wool-growers, to the agricultural interests, than the present policy. The manufacturers of woolen fabrics, many of them men of large experience and extensive knowledge, entertain these views, and they are sustained in these opinions by the experience of the great manufacturing nations of the Old World.
>
> Since the reductions of duties on raw materials in England, since wool was admitted free, her woolen manufactures have so increased, so prospered, that the production of native wool has increased more than 100 per cent. The experience of England, France, and Belgium demonstrates the wisdom of that policy which makes the raw material duty free. Let us profit by their example.

When this speech was delivered wool had been admitted free of duty in England for a period of less than thirteen years, and yet the testimony of this distinguished New England Senator was that it had already doubled the product of native wool in that country. In the same speech he said further:

> If our manufactures are to increase, to keep pace with the population and the growing wants of our people; if we are to have the control of the markets of our own country; if we are to meet with and compete with the manufacturers of England and other nations of western Europe in the markets of the world, we must have our raw materials admitted duty free or at a mere nominal rate.
>
> * * * * * * *
>
> We of New England believe that wool, especially the cheap wools, manila, hemp, flax, raw silk, lead, tin, brass, hides, linseed, and many other articles used in our manufactories can be admitted duty free, or for a mere nominal duty, without injuring to any extent any considerable interest of the country.

Further on he said:

> In closing, Mr. Chairman, the remarks I have felt it my duty to submit to the Senate and the country, that the Commonwealth I represent on this floor—I say in part, for my colleague, Mr. Sumner, after an enforced absence of more than nine months, is here to-night to give his vote if he can raise his voice for the interest of his State—has a deep interest in the modification of the tariff of 1846 by this Congress. Her merchants, manufacturers, mechanics, and business men in all departments of a varied industry want action now before the Thirty-fourth Congress passes away.
>
> They are for the reduction of the revenue to the actual wants of an economical administration of the Government; for the depletion of the Treasury, now full with millions of hoarded gold; for a free-list embracing articles of prime necessity we do not produce; for mere nominal duties on articles which make up a large portion of our domestic industry, and for such an adjustment of the duties on the productions of other nations that come in direct competition with the product of American capital, labor, and skill as shall impose the least burdens on that capital, labor, and skill.

In the same debate Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont, said:

> On Sheffield hardware, such as cutlery, edged tools, files, and saws, some protection is needed a little longer, but for this 20 per cent. is ample, and upon all other kinds 10 per cent., I feel quite sure, is fully sufficient.

The present duty on cutlery is 50 per cent., just two and a half times the amount which Mr. MORRILL said was fully sufficient more than thirty-one years ago. On files the duty now runs from 52 to 65 per cent., an average of three times the rate specified by Mr. MORRILL; and on hardware it is now three times what he thought was necessary.

Mr. Chairman, it is customary in all our debates on the tariff for gentlemen on the other side to depict in the darkest colors the condition of the country during the financial depression of 1857. That depression, from which the country recovered in a few months, was an insignificant incident in our history in comparison with the great industrial, commercial, and financial storm which began here in 1873 and devastated the country for five years [applause], closing mills and factories, extinguishing the fires in our furnaces, ruining banking and mercantile houses, and throwing hundreds of thousands of laboring people out of employment. Under a low tariff our industries soon revived and the country started again, like an awakened giant, on its march to wealth and power [applause], but under a high tariff it struggled on for five weary years, and, for the first time in its history, was brought face to face with those difficult and dangerous social problems which still confront us, and which it will require all the wisdom and patriotism of her ablest and best citizens to solve.

It has been repeatedly charged here and elsewhere that the credit of the Government was so reduced by the act of 1857 that it was compelled to sell its bonds at a discount of 12 per cent. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], speaking of the effects of the acts of 1846 and 1857, said:

> But this brief period of prosperity was quickly followed by the revenue tariff of 1846 and 1847, which brought to the country another era of industrial depression, culminating in the bankruptcy of 1857, the disastrous consequences of which are still within the memory of living men. Universal bankruptcy confronted the people, and the Government, with an empty Treasury, was forced in a time of peace to borrow money at a discount of from 12 to 30 per cent.

I hold in my hand a volume issued from the Treasury Department in 1881, while Mr. Windom was Secretary, giving the history of all the loans negotiated by the Government from the time of its organization to the date of the publication; and this account, taken from the official records, shows that from the time of the passage of the tariff act of 1846 down to the last ten days of Mr. Buchanan's administration, when civil war was imminent, not a bond or Treasury note or Government obligation in any form was sold at less than par, while many of them having but a short time to run and bearing but 5 per cent. interest were sold at a very considerable premium in gold. [Applause.] After the passage of the Morrill tariff bill, in March, 1861, and after the Democratic administration had gone out and a Republican administration had come in, twenty-year bonds, bearing 6 per cent. interest, were sold at 15 per cent. discount. [Applause.] But does the gentleman think it would be fair to charge this to the high tariff of 1861? Does the gentleman think that it would be fair for me to say that these bonds were sold at a discount because the rates of duty on imported goods had been increased by the act of March 2, 1861? Sir, I would be ashamed of myself if I should make such a charge. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The truth is that the credit of the Government was always good until the breaking out of the civil war, or at least until it became evident that there was to be a great civil commotion in this country. But, Mr. Chairman, I have already devoted too much time to this part of the subject. My only excuse for it is that there has been so much misunderstanding or misrepresentation concerning the history of what the

gentlemen on the other side call the "free-trade" period that it seemed necessary to make some allusion to it.

Mr. Chairman, during the last fiscal year the average rate of duty upon dutiable imports was about $48 upon each $100 worth of goods, and the revenue collected from that source was more than $212,000,000. During the same time the Government collected about $119,000,000 under the internal-revenue laws, nearly all of which came from the taxes on distilled spirits, fermented liquors, and manufactured tobacco. In the fiscal year 1866, which was the first entire fiscal year after the close of the war, the receipts from internal-revenue taxes amounted to nearly $311,000,000, while the receipts from customs, or tariff taxes, amounted to $179,000,000, and the rate upon dutiable goods was $40.19 upon each $100 worth.

This brief statement shows that while the receipts from customs have largely increased, the receipts under the internal-revenue laws have been greatly diminished, and that the taxes imposed by those laws are now collected from a few articles of luxury, or of taste, the use of which could be almost, if not entirely, dispensed with without injury to the people. There are many who believe, in view of the large reductions heretofore made in the internal-revenue taxes, and in view of the fact that they are not now imposed upon articles of necessity, that the whole reduction now so much needed and so urgently demanded by the country should be accomplished by the revision of the tariff laws; but the framers of the pending bill, recognizing and respecting the differences of opinion which exist upon this question, have proposed to deal with both systems of taxation. They propose to make a reduction of $78,000,000 based upon the receipts of the fiscal year 1887. About $54,000,000 of this is proposed to be taken from the tariff taxes and about $24,000,000 from the internal-revenue receipts by the repeal of the tax on tobacco and the abolition of certain special taxes upon dealers and others.

So far the opposition to the bill has been directed mainly against that part of it which proposes to repeal or reduce the tax upon certain classes of imported goods; and gentlemen, speaking for the interests which have long ago been relieved of all the burdens imposed upon their industries, earnestly protest that the consumers of their products shall have no relief, or at least that they shall not have the full measure of relief contemplated by this bill. In 1866 there was collected from the incomes of those having net annual receipts exceeding $600 the sum of $72,982,159, and from manufacturers and their products, excluding distilled spirits, fermented liquors, and tobacco, the sum of $127,230,609. Every vestige of this enormous burden upon our manufacturing industries has been removed, and properly removed, but the high rates of duty imposed on imported goods, to compensate for this domestic taxation, have not been removed. It was a very great mistake, to say the least, that they were not both removed at the same time, for after having afforded relief to one side it seems almost impossible to secure relief for the other. There never was a time while these heavy internal taxes remained upon their products that the manufacturers would not have been glad to surrender a large part of the tariff duties in order to secure a removal of the charges upon their industries. In 1867 Mr. SHERMAN, of Ohio, who was doubtless familiar with the views of those engaged in manufacturing industries, said in a speech in the Senate:

> Every law imposing a duty on imported goods is necessarily a restraint on trade. It imposes a burden upon the purchase and sale of imported goods and tends to prevent their importation. The expression "a free-trade tariff" involves an absurdity.

Again he says:

> Every duty on imported merchandise gives to the domestic manufacturer an advantage equal to the duty.

[Applause.]

How will gentlemen reconcile this statement with the contention on that side that the consumer does not pay the increased price?

> Every duty on imported merchandise gives to the domestic manufacturer an advantage equal to the duty, and to that extent every tariff is a protective tariff.

[Applause.]

Again he said on the particular point I am discussing:

> If you converse with intelligent men engaged in the business of manufacturing they will tell you that they are willing to compete with England, France, Germany, and all the countries of Europe at the old rates of duty. If you reduce their products to a specie basis, and put them upon the same footing they were on before the war, the present rates of duty would be too high. It would not be necessary for scarce any branch of industry to be protected to the extent of your present tariff law. They do not ask protection against the pauper labor of Europe, but they ask protection against the creation of your own laws.

[Applause.]

He referred to the internal-revenue laws and the paper currency. All the internal-revenue laws of which the manufacturers then complained have been long since abolished. The business of the country is now, and has been for many years, conducted upon a specie basis, and I submit, Mr. Chairman, that the great body of consumers in this country, the men and women who toil in the unprotected industries, have a right now to demand that their claims for relief shall be considered in any measure that may be passed for the reduction of the revenue. [Applause.]

In a speech delivered in the Senate in 1872 upon this same general subject, Mr. SHERMAN repeated substantially the same views, but I will not detain the committee by reading it.

A MEMBER. I would like to hear it.

Mr. CARLISLE. It is good reading.

A MEMBER. It will help him at Chicago.

Mr. CARLISLE. If he will stand by the doctrines and policy he announced then it ought to help him to secure the Republican nomination at Chicago. He said, in a speech delivered on the 15th of March, 1872:

> It must be remembered that the present duties, taken together, are far in excess of what they were before the war, and that they have been three times largely increased since the passage of the Morrill tariff act of 1861.
>
> The result of such duties is to secure to mechanical industries higher wages than can be earned in other kindred employments. Such excessive protection not only ceases to diversify production, but forces labor into protected employments. If the present rates of duty were high enough during and since the war, when home industry was burdened with heavy internal taxes—with stamp duties, income taxes, and high rates on raw materials—then surely they are now too high when all these taxes are removed. * * * I have listened with patience, day by day, to the statements of gentlemen who are interested in our domestic productions. I am a firm believer in the general idea of protecting their industries, but I assure them, as I assure their representatives here, that if the present high rates of duty, unexampled in our country, and higher by nearly 50 per cent. than they were in 1861, are maintained on metallic and textile fabrics after we have repealed the very internal taxes which gave rise to them, and after we have substantially given them their raw materials free of duties, we shall have a feeling of dissatisfaction among other interests in the country that will overthrow the whole system, and do greater harm than can possibly be done by a moderate reduction of the present rates of duty. And I am quite sure that intelligent men engaged in the production of various forms of textile and metallic fabrics feel as I do, that it is wiser and better to do what is just and right, to make a reduction on their products, at least to the extent of the reduction in this bill on their raw materials, rather than to invite a controversy in which I believe they will be in the wrong.

[Applause.]

And he also said this, to which I desire to call the particular attention of my friends on the other side of the House, those who disagree with me upon the principles which ought to govern taxation in this country:

> The public mind is not yet prepared to apply the key to a genuine revenue reform. A few years of further experience will convince the whole body of our people that a system of national taxes, which rests the whole burden of taxation on consumption, and not one cent on property or income, is intrinsically unjust. While the expenses of the National Government are largely caused by the protection of property, it is but right to require property to contribute to their payment. It will not do to say that each person consumes in proportion to his means. This is not true. Every one must see that the consumption of the rich does not bear the same relation to the consumption of the poor as the income of the one does to the wages of the other. As wealth accumulates this injustice in the fundamental basis of our system will be felt and forced upon the attention of Congress.

[Great applause.]

I do not know any place where this principle has been more clearly stated than it is here stated by the Senator from Ohio. But I must pass on to other matters.

It seems that our friends on the other side have at last concluded that there ought to be a reduction of the revenue, and many gentlemen who have spoken in opposition to the pending bill have foreshadowed their policy. Its main feature, in fact about its only feature as regards the tariff, is the total repeal of the duty on sugar and the payment of a bounty to the producers of that article; not to the laborer who tills the soil and converts the cane juice into sugar, but to the capitalist who owns the plantation and the refinery. After all their professions of love for the laboring man, after all their arguments to show that labor receives the benefit of the tariff, after all their harrowing descriptions of the deplorable condition to which our laboring classes would be reduced if the tariff were removed, when they come to put their propositions in the form of practical legislation the mask falls off and the natural features of the system are exposed.

But, sir, let us see what would be the effect of the repeal of the duty on sugar—the effect upon the revenue and upon the people who are compelled to pay taxes in some form for the support of the Government.

The latest reports I have at hand showing the total amount of sugar produced in this country and the total amount consumed are for the year 1886, and they show that the domestic production was 302,754,486 pounds, while the total consumption was 3,111,640,000 pounds. It thus appears that considerably less than one-tenth of the domestic consumption is produced at home, and that the remainder is imported and pays duty at the custom-house. The duty collected during the last fiscal year was $57,000,000. Now, assuming that the whole amount of the duty is added to the price of the domestic article, it is clear that whenever $1 is taken out of the pocket of the consumer on account of this increased price more than $10 are paid into the public Treasury for the support of the Government and the discharge of its obligations.

The repeal of this duty, therefore, while it would undoubtedly reduce the revenue, would afford very little relief to the people in comparison with the relief that would be afforded by the repeal of duties upon many other articles in common use. For instance, the duty collected last year upon woolen goods, cotton goods, and iron and steel was $62,000,000; but this was a very small proportion of the burden actually imposed upon the consumers of these articles. According to the last

report of the American Iron and Steel Association, which has just been issued, there were produced in this country during the year 1887, 2,354,130 gross tons of Bessemer-steel rails. The duty upon this article is $17 per ton. Applying the same rule to this article which I have applied to sugar, and which gentlemen on the other side also apply to sugar, that is, that the whole amount of the duty is added to the price of the domestic product, it is easy to see that the increased cost of steel rails alone to the people of this country in 1887 was over $40,000,000, although the Government received only about $1,000,000 revenue from this source.

The proposition to pay a bounty of 2 cents per pound out of the Treasury to the sugar-grower is a confession of all that has been charged against the present system of tariff taxation. It is a confession that the tariff tax is a bounty to the manufacturers or other producers of the domestic article of the same character as the imported article, and it is a confession that the amount of the duty on the foreign product is added to the price of the domestic one; for if these charges be not true there is no semblance of justice or propriety in the proposition to pay a bounty of 2 cents per pound as a compensation for the repeal of the duty.

Sir, I am just as much opposed to the raising of a fund by taxation for the purpose of paying a bounty to the sugar-growers of Louisiana as I would be if it were to be paid to the cotton-growers of Georgia or the wheat-growers of Minnesota. It is a vicious and demoralizing policy, and can never become permanent in this country. If gentlemen desire to extend relief to the producers of sugar, and at the same time help all the other people of the country, let them propose to reduce or repeal the taxes upon the iron and steel implements used in the cultivation of the soil; upon the machinery employed in the preparation of their crops for the market; upon the materials used in the construction of their buildings, and upon the clothing which they and their families and laborers are compelled to wear. This would be a general and not a partial measure of relief, and would be creditable to a great political party which seeks to govern the whole country. The people who are interested in the production of sugar can neither be bribed nor deceived by the offer of a bounty, for they know that their fellow-citizens engaged in other pursuits will not consent to be taxed for any great length of time for any such purpose.

Mr. Chairman, it has been stubbornly contended all through this debate that high rates of duty upon imported goods are beneficial to the great body of consumers, because such duties, instead of increasing the price of the domestic articles of the same kind, actually reduce the prices. If this be true, all the other arguments in support of the existing system are not only superfluous, but manifestly unsound. The proposition that a high tariff enables the producer to pay higher wages for his labor, and the proposition that it also reduces the prices of the articles he has to sell, which are the products of that labor, are utterly inconsistent with each other, and no ingenuity of the casuist can possibly reconcile them. [Great applause.] Labor is paid out of its own product, and unless that product can be sold for a price which will enable the employer to realize a reasonable profit and pay the established rates of wages, the business must cease or the rates of wages must be reduced. When the price of the finished product is reduced by reason of the increased efficiency of labor, or by reason of the reduced cost of the raw material, the employer may continue to pay the same or even a higher rate of wages and still make his usual profits. But the tariff neither increases the efficiency of labor nor reduces the cost of the raw material.

I do not deny that prices have greatly fallen during the last fifty years, not only in this country, but all over the civilized world—in free-trade countries as well as in protectionist countries. Nor do I deny that during the same time the general tendency has been towards an increase in the rates of wages; and this is true also of all civilized countries, free-trade and protection alike. It is not possible for me now to enumerate, much less discuss, all the causes that have contributed to these results. One of the most efficient causes, in fact the most efficient cause, is the combination of skilled labor with machinery in the production of commodities. The introduction and use of improved machinery has wrought a complete revolution in nearly all our manufacturing industries, and in many cases has enabled one man to do the work which it required one hundred men to do before. Here is a statement furnished by the United States Commissioner of Labor to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, showing the value of the product of a week's labor in spinning cotton yarn by hand and the value of the product of a week's labor combined with machinery in the same industry. In 1813, one man working sixty hours by hand could turn out 3 pounds of cotton yarn, worth $2.25, or 75 cents per pound; now the same man, if he were living, could turn out in sixty hours with the use of machinery 3,000 pounds of cotton yarn of the same character, worth $450 [applause], or 15 cents per pound. The cotton-spinner now receives as wages for his week's work more than three times as much as the total value of the product of a week's work, including the value of the material, in 1813; and yet labor is far cheaper to the employer now than it was then. Although the employer now receives only one-fifth as much per pound for his cotton yarn as he did in 1813 he realizes from the sale of the products of a week's labor just two hundred times as much as he did then.

I have also a statement prepared by the same official, showing the relative production and value of product of a weaver using hand and power machinery, from which it appears that a weaver by hand turned out in seventy-two hours in 1813 45 yards of cotton goods (shirtings), worth $17.91, while a weaver now, using machinery, turns out in sixty hours 1,440 yards, worth $108. Substantially the same exhibit could be made in regard to a very large number of our manufacturing industries.

Is it strange, Mr. Chairman, in view of these facts, that the prices of manufactured goods have fallen or that the wages of the laborers who produce them have risen? Is it not, on the contrary, remarkable that there has not been a greater fall in prices and a greater increase in wages? Undoubtedly there would have been a greater reduction in prices and a greater increase in wages if there had been a wider market for the products and a lower cost for the material.

The tremendous productive forces at work all over the world in these modern times, and the small cost of manual labor in comparison with the value of the products of these combined forces, can not be realized from any general statement upon the subject. In order to form some idea of the magnitude of these natural and mechanical forces, and the efficiency of manual labor and skill when connected with them, let us look at the situation in six of our own manufacturing industries. In the manufacture of cotton goods, woolen goods, iron, and steel, sawed lumber, paper, and in our flouring and grist mills, there were employed, according to the latest statistics, 517,299 persons, not all men, but many of them women and children. This labor was supplemented by steam and water power equal to 2,496,299 horse-power. This is equal to the power of 14,977,794 men; and thus we find that a little over 517,000 persons of all ages and sexes are performing, in connection with steam and water power, the work of 15,495,093 adult and healthy men.

The railroad, the steam-vessel, the telegraph, the improved facilities for the conduct of financial transactions, and many other conveniences introduced into our modern systems of production and distribution and exchange have all contributed their share towards the reduction of prices, and it would be interesting to inquire what their influence has been, but I cannot pursue this particular subject further without occupying too much time.

Gentlemen are in the habit of referring to the great decline in the price of steel rails in this country as conclusive evidence of the fact that the tariff reduces the cost of manufactured products to the consumer. Why, sir, they could not, in my opinion, have selected a more unfortunate illustration. In the first place, the price of steel rails has fallen all over the world and especially in England, where they are and always have been admitted free of duty. The price there is now and has at all times been very much lower than here. In the second place the price was falling rapidly both here and in England before the imposition of the duty of $28 per ton by act of Congress in 1870. During the five years next preceding the imposition of that duty the price in England had fallen steadily, year by year, and had declined from $85.65 per ton to $50.37 per ton; and in the United States the same process had been going on, and the price had fallen from $148.50 per ton in gold in 1864, to $91.17 in 1870. Then the increased duty was imposed and what was the result? The price immediately began to rise, both here and in England, so that in 1873 the average price in England was $80.05 per ton and the average price here was $103.91 per ton in gold. Then came, in the fall of that year, the great industrial and financial depression which arrested the growth and development of the country, suspended the construction of works of internal improvement, paralyzed our industries, and brought down the prices of nearly everything that the people produced. Steel rails, of course, like all other manufactured products, felt the influence of this depression, and the price declined and has never since been as high as it was before.

But, Mr. Chairman, we are told that a tariff is beneficial to the farmer because, first, it protects him against competition from the agricultural products of other countries, and, secondly, because by diversifying our industries and increasing the number of person engaged in other than agricultural pursuits, it furnishes him with a profitable home market for his products. It can not be necessary for me to make an argument to show that no rate of duty, however high, upon articles which the farmer is compelled to send abroad and sell at foreign prices, can possibly benefit him here at home or elsewhere. This has been so often shown, and is so thoroughly understood by the farmers themselves, that it would be a waste of time to dwell upon the subject.

It is barely possible that at particular points along or near our Canadian border there are times when the small duty on barley, potatoes, hay, and a few other articles prevents competition from the other side of the line, but if the gentleman from Maine is correct in his contention that the tariff does not increase the price of the domestic product, of course this is of no advantage whatever to the American farmer. In fact, according to the gentleman's argument, if the tariff has any effect at all upon the interest of the farmer in the cases I have mentioned, it reduces the prices of his product, and is therefore an injury to him.

But I do not agree with the gentleman, and I concede that the producer of these articles at the places indicated may occasionally receive higher prices for them than he would receive if there were no duty; but while they receive this occasional benefit—which is a very slight one even when they enjoy it—they are all the time and under all circumstances subject to the burdens imposed by high rates of duty upon articles which they do not produce but are compelled to buy and use. When the advantages are set off against the disadvantages, the benefits against the burdens, the balance will be very largely on the wrong side. [Applause.]

Of course our home market has been constantly improving, and under any system of taxation will continue to improve to a greater or less extent with the increase of population and wealth, the extension of the use of machinery, which reduces the cost of production, and the multiplication of facilities for communication and transportation, which reduces the cost of distribution. But how long, Mr. Chairman, are our farmers to be compelled to pay tribute to other industries and wait for the creation of a home market that will take all their own products at fair prices? Among our greatest agricultural products are wheat and cotton. They constitute the main reliance of millions of our people for a profitable use of their lands, and many hundred millions of dollars are invested in the soil and buildings and machinery devoted to their production. Taking the average crop of wheat in this country for several years past, and assuming that there shall be no increase whatever in production, and that the domestic consumption per capita shall remain just at what it now is, there would still be no sufficient home market for this great agricultural staple until our population had reached nearly one hundred million.

The official statistics of the domestic production, exportation, and home consumption of raw cotton show that it would require three times as much machinery and three times as many operatives as we now have to convert this material into commercial fabrics here at home; in other words, we are now compelled to export two-thirds of our product to be manufactured in foreign countries, while one-third only is manufactured at home by all the machinery and labor now employed. In 1880 there were $219,505,000 invested in cotton manufactures, and there were employed in that industry 172,554 hands. To work up our present production of raw cotton would require an investment in this manufacture of $660,000,000 and the employment of 517,662 hands. If we have been more than one hundred years, part of the time under very high tariffs, in so developing our cotton manufactures as to enable them to take one-third of our product at European prices, how many more centuries will be required to enable them to consume the whole product at prices fixed by competition here at home? [Great applause.] When gentlemen have solved this problem to the satisfaction of the American cotton-grower, he may be able to listen with patience to the arguments by which they attempt to convince him of the immense advantages of a home market that will never exist. What is to be done with these great agricultural products, and with many others which are now exported, while the farmers are waiting for the home market which the advocates of restrictive legislation have been promising them for so many years? Are the farmers and planters of the North and South to abandon their wheat and cotton lands or cultivate crops not suited to their soil or climate while gentlemen are making experiments to ascertain whether or not a home market may not be created by legislation? No, sir. No matter what gentlemen may predict or what they may promise, these great industries must go on, and the American farmer must sell his products in any market he can reach and at any price he can get. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], while appearing to admit that the prices of our exportable agricultural products are fixed in the foreign markets in which they are sold, endeavors to avoid the force of the admission by contending that the prices in the foreign market are regulated by the amount of production here. Now, Mr. Chairman, undoubtedly the amount of production here has some influence upon the prices abroad, but the controlling elements are the world's supply and the world's demands. Our farmers do not compete among themselves alone in the provision markets of Europe. Our wheat-growers, for instance, compete with the wheat-growers of England, France, Germany, Russia, Hungary, India, and all the other grain-growers of Europe and Asia, and their product meets in the open and free markets of the world the products of the poorest-paid labor on the face of the earth.

The lately emancipated serfs of Russia, the oppressed peasantry of Hungary, the ryot of India, who lives on millet and rice, wears no garment except a coarse cotton shirt, and sleeps on the floor of a bamboo hut, all pour the products of their labor into the free markets of Europe to be sold in competition with the grain from our Western States and Territories. Sir, our agricultural constituents are not ignorant of the true situation. They know very well that as to all the articles which we are capable of exporting and are actually exporting—and this includes all the principal productions of their industry—the foreign market is just as valuable to them as the home market, for the obvious reason that the prices are fixed abroad, and they receive here only what they could receive there, after deducting the cost of transportation. [Applause.]

What the American farmer most needs is a home market in which he can purchase his supplies as cheaply as his competitors purchase theirs [applause]; and if he can not secure this, then he simply asks the poor privilege of making his purchase where he is compelled to make his sales, and to be permitted to bring his goods home without being compelled to pay unreasonable taxes and fines by his Government for carrying on a harmless and legitimate business. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, we want not only the home market, but all the markets of the world for the varied products of this great country. [Applause.] We want to send our agricultural products, our cotton, and our breadstuffs, and our provisions to the naked and hungry manufacturing peoples of Europe, and our manufactured products to the agricultural peoples of South America, Mexico, and Asia. We can do this when we determine to trade with other people upon fair terms, but we can not do it so long as we protect England and other manufacturing countries in the great markets of the world upon the pretense of protecting ourselves in our own. Let us diminish the cost of production in our agricultural and manufacturing industries, not by diminishing the wages of labor, but by reducing taxation upon the necessaries of life and upon the materials which constitute the basis of our finished products, and by removing, as far as we can, the restrictions which embarrass our people in their efforts to exchange the fruits of their own toil which they do not need for the commodities of other countries which they do need. [Great applause, loud and prolonged.]

Relative production, value of product, and earnings of a spinner using hand and power machinery.

Industry.	Year.	Description of unit.	Product of one spinner per week.		Earnings of one spinner per week.		Hours of labor per week.
			Amount.	Value.	Highest.	Lowest.	
			Pounds.				
Cotton yarn	1813	No. 10	3	$2.25			60
Do	1880	No. 10	3,060	450.00	$9.30	$7.20	60

Relative production, value of product, and earnings of a weaver using hand and power machinery.

Industry.	Year.	Description of unit.	Production of one weaver per week.		Earnings of one weaver per week.		Hours of labor per week.
			Amount.	Value.	Highest.	Lowest.	
			Yards.				
Cotton goods (shirting).	1813	No. 17½ (yarn)	45	$17.91			72
Do	1880	No. 17½ (yarn)	1,440	108.00	$8.00	$4.00	60

Number of establishments, number of employés, steam and water power reduced to horse-power.

Industry.	Number of establishments.	Number of employés.	Supplemented by steam and water power equal to horse-power below.	Reckoning six men to a horse-power, equal to men below.	Actual employés and horse-power reduced to employés.
Cotton goods	956	135,519	275,504	1,653,024	1,788,543
Flouring and grist mills	24,258	58,448	771,201	4,627,206	4,685,654
Iron and steel	781	77,555	397,247	2,383,482	2,461,037
Lumber, sawed	25,680	149,997	821,928	4,931,568	5,081,565
Paper	692	17,910	123,912	743,472	761,382
Woolen goods	1,984	77,870	106,507	639,042	716,912
Total	54,351	517,299	2,496,296	14,977,794	15,495,093

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union having had under consideration the tariff bill had come to no resolution thereon. And then, on motion of Mr. MILLS (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. C. L. ANDERSON (by request): Petition of James Smithart, administrator of Calvin Johnson, of Scott County, Mississippi, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BLAND: Petition of Simeon Traw, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CUTCHEON: Petition of Thomas Lazelle, of Big Rapids, Mich., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Six petitions of settlers upon the Maxwell land grant, in New Mexico, praying for relief—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LAGAN: Petition of Edward Lacroix, of Louisiana, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers in the claim of Edward Lacroix—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: Resolutions of the Minnesota Academy of Medicine, for abolition of the tariff on certain articles—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of John A. Myers Post, No. 60, Grand Army of the Republic, of Minnesota, in favor of the Burrows service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. J. O'NEILL: Petition of the St. Louis Circuit of Turners, against the passage of any law to restrict or impede immigration—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PATTON: Petition of Sullivan Grange No. 84, of Sullivan County, Pennsylvania, in favor of pure food—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PEEL: Petition of Mary Phillips, of Madison County, Arkansas, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICE: Resolutions of the John A. Myers Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Jackson, Minn., indorsing the service-pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of Ellen Young, of heir of E. R. Bond, of J. T. Bell, and of Rebecca Wright, of Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WEST: Petition of citizens of the Twentieth district of New York, for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. YOST: Petition of citizens of Jefferson County, Montana, for legislation to preserve mineral rights in Montana to citizens of the United States—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The following petitions in favor of House bill 8716, for the better protection of free labor from convict labor, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Labor:

By Mr. C. H. ALLEN: Of the Knights of Labor of Lawrence, Mass.

By Mr. BOUND: Of the Knights of Labor of Paxton, Dauphin County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. BOWEN: Of the Knights of Labor of Wabash, Giles County, and of Wytheville, Wythe County, Virginia.

By Mr. W. C. P. BRECKINRIDGE: Of Knights of Labor of Lexington, Fayette County, Kentucky.

By Mr. C. E. BROWN: Of Knights of Labor of Cincinnati, Ohio.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Of Knights of Labor of Trenton, Macon County, New Jersey.

By Mr. LAGAN: Of Local Assembly No. 6106, Knights of Labor, of New Orleans, La.

By Mr. CARUTH: Of Local Assembly 1777, Knights of Labor, of Louisville, Ky.

By Mr. COMPTON: Of Knights of Labor of Baltimore, Md.

By Mr. DUNN: Of Local Assembly No. 8469, Knights of Labor, of Alvis, Ark.

By Mr. FORD: Of Coopers' Assembly, No. 7435, Knights of Labor, of Grand Rapids, Mich.

By Mr. KEAN: Petition of Knights of Labor of New Brunswick, Middlesex County, New Jersey.

By Mr. LAGAN: Of Local Assembly No. 6106, Knights of Labor, of New Orleans, La.

By Mr. LEHLBACH: Of Knights of Labor of Orange and of Newark, N. J.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY: Of Knights of Labor of Elizabethtown, Ky.

By Mr. CHARLES O'NEILL: Of Knights of Labor of Philadelphia, and of the Pennsylvania Prison Society.

By Mr. PATTON: Of 259 members of Faith Assembly of Philipsburgh, of workmen of Clearfield, and of 37 workmen of Mountdale, Pa.

By Mr. RYAN: Of Knights of Labor of Clements and of Toronto, Kans.

By Mr. SCULL: Of Knights of Labor of South Fork, Cambria County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: Of Knights of Labor No. 10243, of Paducah, Ky.

By Mr. TRACEY: Of Knights of Labor, No. 6322, of Albany, of No. 5358, of Cohoes, and of Amulet Association of Jack Spinners of Cohoes, N. Y.

By Mr. WEST: Of Knights of Labor of Mechanicsville, Saratoga County, New York.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. DINGLEY: Of Charles L. Abbott and others, of Upton, Me.

By Mr. SEYMOUR: Of John F. Roberts and others, of Central Mine, Mich.

By Mr. TRACEY: Of citizens of Albany, N. Y.

By Mr. WEST: Of 12 citizens, and of 15 citizens of the Twentieth district of New York.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. CUTCHEON: Of citizens of Le Roy, and of Oceana County, Michigan.

By Mr. HARVEY: Of Isaiah Dennis and 115 others, of Salem, and of C. Gardner and 20 others, of Huron, Ind.

The following petition, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. WEST: Of citizens of the Twentieth district of New York.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. CROUSE: Of 171 citizens of Cuyahoga County, Ohio.

By Mr. FULLER: Of 97 citizens of Delaware and Clayton Counties, Iowa.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *May* 21, 1888.

Prayer by Rev. GEORGE M. STONE, D. D., of Hartford, Conn.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting certain information in partial response to a resolution of March 28, 1888, calling for information as to what suits to vacate land patents issued by the United States have been commenced by the direction of the Department of Justice and are now pending in the courts, and the present status of the same, etc.; which was read.

Mr. STEWART. I move that the communication be printed and lie on the table. It does not contain all the information which I desired. I have submitted another resolution on the same subject, which is pending. I will look the communication over. Perhaps it will require a more pointed resolution to get at the real information. After the communication is printed I shall ask the Senate to take action on the subject.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter and the accompanying papers will lie on the table and be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented the petition of John Pope Hodnett, of the District of Columbia, and petitions of other citizens of the District of Columbia, praying for the passage of the bill (S. 2794) to pay John Pope Hodnett for services rendered as counsel to the Government in the investigation into affairs of the District of Columbia, acting as such counsel by order of a re solution of the House of Representatives; also for acting as counsel for the workingmen of the District of Columbia for fifteen years last past; which were referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PADDOCK. I present the petition of his excellency, John M. Thayer, the governor of Nebraska, praying for a survey of the headwaters of the Platte River, with a view to constructing storage reservoirs to increase and preserve the water supply for irrigation and other uses in Colorado and Nebraska. There has been much complaint of the withdrawal of the entire water supply of the Platte for irrigation purposes in Colorado during the summer, when the water is very low, leaving none even for the use of stock at the cattle ranches below in Nebraska. It is believed that an abundant supply can be secured throughout the season for all purposes throughout that entire region of country by the storage-reservoir system. Governor Thayer has before called attention to the necessity of action in respect to this matter. Some days ago I presented resolutions on this general subject, which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and as the subject is before the Committee on Appropriations, I move that this petition be also referred to that committee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PADDOCK presented a petition of the Omaha (Nebr.) Board of Trade, praying for the passage of House bill No. 8184, for the extension of the time of payment of the debt of the Union Pacific Railway; which was referred to the Select Committee on the President's message transmitting the report of the Pacific Railway Commission.

He also presented a petition of ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Nebraska, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Montana, praying for legislation to preserve the mineral lands of Montana for citizens of the United States, and to prevent the Northern Pacific Railroad Company from acquiring any lands to which it is not clearly entitled under its grant; which was referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

Mr. CAMERON presented a petition of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the abolition of the tax on tobacco; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented two petitions of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the repeal of that portion of the internal-revenue law which classes druggists as liquor dealers, and for the reduction of the tax on spirits; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Shamokin, Pa., praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of T. V. Powderly, General Master Workman, Knights of Labor, and 262 other citizens of Scranton, Pa., praying for the better legal protection for womanhood and girlhood, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANDERSON presented the petition of W. A. Chapman, M. D., and 72 other male citizens of Hastings, Nebr., praying for better legal protection for womanhood and girlhood, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Grand Army of the Republic, of the Territory of Utah, praying that an appropriation be made for headstones for graves of comrades; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Dawson County, Nebraska, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Omaha (Nebr.) Board of Trade, praying for the passage of the Outhwaite bill for the extension of the time of payment by the Union Pacific Railway Company of its bonded indebtedness to the Government; which was referred to the Select Committee on the President's message transmitting the report of the Pacific Railway Commission.

Mr. BLAIR presented a petition of 175 citizens of Genesee and Moscow, in the Territory of Idaho, and the petition of J. M. Howe, mayor of Lewiston, Territory of Idaho, and 13 other male citizens of that Territory, praying for better legal protection for womanhood and girlhood, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. COKE presented a petition of citizens of Burnett County, Texas, praying that provision be made for the payment of Indian depredation claims; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Fayette County, Texas, praying that, in view of the recent disclosures of gross violations of the interstate-commerce law by railway companies, effective measures be adopted to prevent existing evils or the continuance thereof; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. WALTHALL presented the petition of Hon. W. F. Love and 21 other State senators of Mississippi, praying for better legal protection for womanhood and girlhood, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. VEST presented the petition of A. H. Cashion and other citizens of Perry County, Missouri, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VEST. I present a petition of the tobacco manufacturers of the city of St. Louis, the largest manufacturers in the West, expressing their views in regard to the tax on tobacco. It is brief, and I ask that it be read.

The petition was read, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

To the honorable Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

We, the undersigned, tobacco manufacturers of St. Louis, Mo., respectfully represent that the internal-revenue tax on tobacco is paid, ultimately, by the consumers of tobacco, and that, so far as we can learn, no request for the removal of the tax has ever come from them. On the other hand, the growers of leaf-tobacco complain of the restrictions that are now placed upon the sale of their product; and, with the impression that these restrictions can not be removed except by the total abolition of the tax, they naturally ask that the whole tax be abolished.

That these objections to the present internal-revenue law may be met we respectfully ask that all licenses and restrictions now placed upon the sale of leaf-tobacco be removed, and that the tax on manufactured tobacco be fixed at 2 cents per pound, and the present system of packing and stamping be retained.

This, in our judgment, will give the desired relief to the growers and dealers of tobacco, largely reduce the revenues of the Government, and save the manufacturers and their employés from the loss that a sudden and entire abolition of the tax and the package system would entail.

The present revenue law, which has been in force since 1865, requires manufacturers of tobacco to put up and label their product in packages of a prescribed size. All the methods for manufacturing and packing tobacco have long been and are still adjusted to meet the requirements of this law. Larger factory buildings and additional machinery have been constructed, and a greatly increased force of men and women employed. Should the entire tax, with the system that belongs to it, be abolished, these large factory buildings and the expensive machinery would be partly abandoned and a large number of employés thrown out of work.

We are advised that the bill now before the House of Representatives, known as the Mills tariff bill, provides for the total abolition of the tax on manufactured tobacco, and also provides that a rebate be paid to manufacturers and dealers for stock on hand at the date when the bill becomes a law, but makes no appropriation for the payment of this rebate.

While earnestly urging a reduction of the tax on tobacco to 2 cents per pound, with a rebate covering amount of reduction to be paid to manufacturers and dealers, as provided in the Mills bill, we no less urgently request that an appropriation clause to meet the payments of the rebate be made part of any bill or bills that may embrace a reduction or abolition of the tax on manufactured tobacco.

Very respectfully

LIGGETT & MYERS TOBACCO COMPANY.
CATLIN TOBACCO COMPANY.
DRUMMOND TOBACCO COMPANY.
HY. McCABE.
WEISERT BROTHERS.
HILLS & FRITZ.
CHRISTIAN PEPER.
JAS. G. BUTLER & CO.

ST. LOUIS, MO., *May* 16, 1888.

Mr. SHERMAN presented the petition of Mrs. L. P. Bancroft and 60 other women of Granville, Ohio, praying for better legal protection for womanhood and girlhood, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. QUAY presented the petition of Leonard H. Eaton and 10 other citizens of Allegheny, Pa., and the petition of R. A. Stewart and 20 other citizens of Mercer, Pa., praying for better legal protection for womanhood and girlhood, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, presented the petition of Mrs. Laura J. Ives, of Mount Pleasant, Iowa, praying for the passage of an act granting to her a pension, and petitions making the same prayer from—

John W. Palm, treasurer of Henry County, Iowa, and 24 others, ex-officers of that county and of the city of Mount Pleasant, Iowa;

Rev. Thomas E. Corkhill and 19 other leading citizens of Mount Pleasant, Iowa; and

Hon. T. A. Bereman, of Mount Pleasant, Iowa.

The petitions were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, presented the petition of John Morrison and 28 other surviving soldiers of the Union Army, residents of Mahaska, Wapello, and Keokuk Counties, Iowa, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HISCOCK presented a petition signed by numerous citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., praying for the passage of Senate bill 283, for the better protection of the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of the John W. Cochrane Post, No. 164, Grand Army of the Republic, of Buffalo, Department of Minnesota, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Duluth, Minn., remonstrating against the passage of the Senate bill proposing to take from the Army engineers the supervision of public works; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. COCKRELL presented a petition of ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Perry County, Missouri, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BROWN. I present a petition of a number of highly respectable physicians and druggists of Senoia, Ga., praying for the repeal of that portion of the internal-revenue laws which classes druggists as liquor dealers, and also that part which imposes a tax on alcohol used in the arts and in medicine. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER presented the petition of J. D. Hale, who served as a scout during the war of the rebellion, praying that he be allowed a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. RANSOM presented the petition of John W. Wilborn and 14 other citizens of Randolph County, North Carolina, praying for better legal protection for womanhood and girlhood, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. DOLPH presented a petition of 28 citizens of Independence, Polk County, Oregon, praying for better legal protection for womanhood and girlhood, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GEORGE presented a petition of M. L. Henry and 65 other

members of the Legislature of Mississippi, praying for better legal protection for womanhood and girlhood, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR. I present the petition of Joseph M. Day and others, members of volunteer regiments who served during the late rebellion, praying for an amendment of the pension laws so that applications for pension shall be granted if the applicant shall show his enlistment, his honorable discharge, and that he incurred the disability claimed to exist in the line of his duty, or that if the cause existed prior to his enlistment such cause was so aggravated in the line of his duty as to result in permanent disability. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2674) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Nebraska City, Nebr., and for other purposes, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2816) to authorize the construction of a bridge for railway purposes across the Mississippi River, between the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota, to be located north of and in the vicinity of Alma, Wis., reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2911) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at or near Guntersville, Ala., and for other purposes, reported it with amendments.

Mr. MORGAN, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2845) granting to the corporate authorities of the city of Tuskaloosa, in the State of Alabama, all the right, title, and interest of the United States to fractional sections 22 and 15, lying south of the Warrior River, in township 21 and range 10 west, reported it with amendments.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2875) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of certain settlers on public lands, and to provide for the repayment of certain fees, purchase-money, and commissions paid on void entries of public lands," approved June 16, 1880, reported it with amendments.

Mr. TELLER, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2922) setting apart a tract of land to be used as a cemetery by the Alvarado Cemetery Association, of Georgetown, Colo., reported it with an amendment.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the petition of D. D. Dana, formerly provost-marshal of the Third Brigade, Twenty-second Army Corps, praying pay for services performed in the capture of the assassins of President Lincoln, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the committee were discharged from the further consideration of the petition.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the petition of the governor and Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Utah, praying for a grant to that Territory of 10 acres of the Fort Douglas military reservation on which to erect suitable buildings for an orphans' home, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the committee were discharged from the further consideration of the petition.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom were referred a petition and a resolution of the representatives of the Grand Army of the Republic for Wisconsin, praying for an appropriation of $200,000 to furnish a number of headstones for marking the last resting-places of deceased soldiers, for which requisitions have been made under acts of Congress, to report it back. There seems to be no legislation needed upon this subject, and it is a matter for the Committee on Appropriations. I ask that the Committee on Military Affairs be discharged from the consideration of the petition and resolution, and that they be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the resolution of the military board of the National Guard of Nebraska, in favor of an appropriation of $1,000,000 for the militia of the States, submitted a report thereon, accompanied by a bill (S. 2973) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 1661 of the Revised Statutes, making an annual appropriation to provide arms and equipments for the militia;" which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am instructed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 84) to authorize the Commissioner of the General Land Office to have certain maps printed, to report it adversely, a bill having been passed at this session having the same object in view.

The adverse report was agreed to; and the join tresolution was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. HAMPTON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 627) for the relief of Thomas H. Gehagan, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agree to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1480) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to apply the unexpended balance of the appropriation made by the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the amounts due to citizens of the United States for supplies furnished to the Sioux or Dakota Indians of Minnesota subsequent to June 1, 1861, and prior to the massacre of August, 1862, and providing for the payment thereof," approved March 3, 1885, now remaining in the Treasury, to the payment of interest on the sums found due by said Secretary under said act, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 82) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry S. French, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

WILLIAM BITTINGER.

Mr. CAMERON. On the 14th of February last the Committee on Pensions, through the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS], reported adversely on the bill (S. 125) granting an increase of pension to William Bittinger, and it was indefinitely postponed. I have a letter from the claimant, in which he states that the report was based on an erroneous supposition. I therefore move that the vote by which the bill was postponed indefinitely be reconsidered, and that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions, with the letter from the claimant, which I herewith present.

The motion was agreed to.

SMITHSONIAN BUILDING.

Mr. MORRILL. I am directed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to report a bill to provide for making the west end of the Smithsonian Institution fire-proof, and for other purposes.

The bill (S. 2972) to provide for making the west end of the Smithsonian building fire-proof, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title.

Mr. MORRILL. I am also directed by the committee to ask for immediate consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. I do not desire to object, but I have been away for some days; and I wish to make a motion, and I am obliged to ask the information of the Chair as to whether I can do it. I want to move to reconsider the vote on the resolution which I offered some time ago to reconsider the fisheries treaty in open session. I hear that it has been passed upon since. I have been absent, in attendance upon a political convention.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The pending matter is the request of the Senator from Vermont for the present consideration of the bill reported by him. Does the Senator from Virginia object to its present consideration?

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. I ask the Senator from Vermont if he will withdraw his request until I can get information from the Chair as to whether the three legislative days have expired within which to enter a motion to reconsider. I only want to have the motion entered.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will have the Journal examined and inform the Senator later.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. When the Journal is examined, if it is found to be within the time, I shall ask leave to enter a motion to reconsider. I do not want to debate it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will notify the Senator from Virginia after the examination of the Journal. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed now to the consideration of the bill reported by him, the title of which will be again stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2972) to provide for making the west end of the Smithsonian building fire-proof, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill having been just reported, the request requires unanimous consent. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to appropriate $17,500 for the purpose of making the roof of the Gothic chapel at the west end of the Smithsonian building fire-proof, and for other purposes, under the direction of the Regents of the Smithsonian Institution.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FISH AND FISHERIES REPORT.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am directed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred a House concurrent resolution for the correction of an error made in the issuing of a document, known as "Fish and Fisheries," to report it favorably, and I ask for its present consideration. I desire to say on behalf of the committee that while it favors the adoption of a resolution designed to reach the mistake which has been made in the House folding-room, it feels like entering its protest against the concurrent resolution in the form in which it is drawn. It is exceedingly argumentative, and in language constructed very badly; but still the committee report it favorably, and ask for its present consideration.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be read for information.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *April* 27, 1888.

Whereas it appears by the report made to the House of Representatives from the Committee on Printing, February 16, 1888, that there are in the hands of the Public Printer 507 sets of the document known as Fish and Fisheries, held by him for sale; and

Whereas it also appears by said report that in prorating these books about the 1st of February, 1886, a mistake was made by prorating 6,000 copies instead of 5,000 copies, the actual number printed for the House. This mistake credited each member with 3 more sets of this book than they were entitled to receive, making the folding-room about 1,000 sets short of the number credited. As the mistake was not discovered for nearly eighteen months after, and very many members had in the mean time drawn the number thus placed to their credit, it was too late to fully correct the error. After it was discovered, however, 3 sets were deducted from the accounts of members who had that number still remaining to their credit, and where only 1 or 2 sets were to the credit of members the account was canceled. On account of this error there are 437 sets of this book still to the credit of members and ex-members which can not be furnished until some provision is made to supply the folding-room with that quantity of them:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That the Public Printer be directed to withhold from sale and turn over to the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives 437 copies of the document known as "Fish and Fisheries," the same to be used in making good to the respective members of Congress entitled thereto under the joint resolution passed July 21, 1882, the deficiency occurring to them by reason of the mistake made in the prorating and distribution of such documents under said resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SHERMAN. That was no doubt an inadvertence. I think the Senate had better agree to accomplish the object sought for by the other House, but to put the resolution in the usual form. In its present form it embodies the report as well as the resolution. An amendment could be made striking that out.

Mr. MANDERSON. It embodies the whole argument for the conclusion that is reached, but it comes to us as a concurrent resolution adopted by the House of Representatives, concerning a matter that is entirely their own. Therefore, although feeling that it was quite objectionable in its form, we felt like taking it as we had received it.

Mr. HAWLEY. I think I shall withdraw my assent as a member of the Committee on Printing to the report. The resolution is ungrammatical, badly drawn, verbose, and I was about to say ridiculous. All that is necessary would be three lines, to change the account kept in the folding-room of such a document. I ask that the resolution may be recommitted.

Mr. MANDERSON. Let it go on the Calendar.

Mr. HAWLEY. Very well; let it stay on the Calendar.

Mr. MANDERSON. I suggest that the resolution be placed on the Calendar, and we can look at it again and put it in proper form.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 2974) for the relief of Thomas Holmes; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2975) for the relief of William Barrymore; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2976) for the relief of Patrick L. Dunn; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2977) granting a pension to Henrietta Brown; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAMPTON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 2978) for the purchase of a portrait of Maj. Gen. Ward B. Burnett, etc.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, introduced a bill (S. 2979) granting a pension to Mrs. Laura J. Ives; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2980) to amend section 707 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2981) granting a pension to Walter N. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLAIR introduced a bill (S. 2982) granting a pension to Ellen M. Thornton; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2983) to secure to the people the enjoyment of the first day of the week as a day of rest, and to promote its observance as a day of religious worship; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BLAIR. I wish to say in regard to this bill that, as the Senate has observed, many thousands of petitions of citizens of the United States have been presented during this and the former Congress for the better observance of the Sabbath day. The petitions were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, which gave the representatives of the petitioners a hearing. They were requested to formulate a bill embodying their ideas, but have failed to do so, and at their request I have endeavored to draw one which I think will facilitate their purposes. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 2984) granting a pension to Olive I. Workman and Philena E. Hershman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COKE introduced a bill (S. 2985) for the erection of a public building at Brownsville, Tex.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 2986) to incorporate the American Historical Association; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 2987) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of George S. Ackerson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HALE introduced a bill (S. 2988) for the relief of Andrew R. G. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO BILL.

Mr. HALE, Mr. HAWLEY, and Mr. PLATT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

ENLISTMENT OF MARRIED MEN.

Mr. HOAR submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs be directed to consider and report whether some amendment to the laws ought not to be made prohibiting the enlistment in the Army of the United States in time of peace of men with wives or families dependent on them for support without notice to or consent of their wives.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I desire to observe, in sending the resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs, that I suppose it is within the experience of every Senator that our existing law and practice relating to Army enlistments operate with the most extreme cruelty upon many worthy and deserving families. The head of a family, on whom they are entirely dependent for support, in a fit of gloom, or of intoxication, when so far recovered as to have the power to make a legal contract, ties himself up in the service of the Government for the period of enlistment—for five years. The sufferer is not the man chiefly, but the innocent and dependent wife or child or aged parent who is dependent.

The laws of nearly all our States put it out of the power of the husband to convey the homestead or to convey the entire interest in other real estate without the consent of the wife. It puts it out of the power of the wife to make a like conveyance without the consent of the husband. The enlistment law in the United States Army operates as a man-trap, by which what is more important than the homestead or other real estate, the actual earning capacity of the head of the family, is removed from the household for a long space of time.

Whether my honorable friend at the head of the Committee on Military Affairs, who is one of the most humane men I know of anywhere, can devise some change in the practice which will at least put it in the power of the Secretary of War and make it his duty in fit and proper cases, where enlistment has taken place without the consent or knowledge of the wife, to discharge the soldier, I do not know; but it seems to me that it would be better to increase the pay of the soldiers of the rank and file in our own Army by 50 per cent. rather than to have the existing cruel arrangement continue without some mitigation of its severity.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LAND-PATENT SUITS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further concurrent or other resolutions, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a former day, submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], relative to suits authorized by the Department of Justice to vacate certain land patents issued by the United States. What disposition does the Senator from Nevada desire to have made of the resolution?

Mr. STEWART. The resolution may lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will lie on the table for the present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 422) granting a pension to Columbus Bosteder;
A bill (H. R. 2478) for the relief of Samuel E. Wyman;
A bill (H. R. 2524) for the relief of Clement A. Lounsberry;
A bill (H. R. 2656) to increase the pension of John Taylor;
A bill (H. R. 3568) for the relief of B. S. Van Buren;
A bill (H. R. 4103) granting a pension to Edna M. Hildreth;
A bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Moses L. Chase;
A bill (H. R. 7815) granting a pension to Mary A. West;
A bill (H. R. 7829) granting a pension to Thomas McGuire;
A bill (H. R. 7907) granting a pension to Mary Ann Lang;
A bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Abial G. Chamberlain;
A bill (H. R. 8798) granting a pension to Nettie Ellicott; and
A bill (H. R. 8884) granting a pension to Emily McClure.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 339) granting a pension to Eliza Douglass;

A bill (S. 626) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Franklin, alias McKee;

A bill (S. 737) granting a pension to Berry Day;

A bill (S. 739) granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger;

A bill (S. 1298) granting a pension to Mary Gammell;

A bill (S. 1300) granting a pension to Cordelia R. Jones;

A bill (S. 1477) granting a pension to Harlow B. Hyde;

A bill (S. 1478) granting a pension to George W. Peavey; and

A bill (S. 2651) to remove the political disabilities of John Rutledge, of South Carolina.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen with amendments; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (H. R. 484) for the relief of Thomas C. Dickey;

A bill (H. R. 1275) for the erection of a public building at Columbus, Ga., and appropriating money therefor;

A bill (H. R. 1640) changing the name of the port of Lamberton, in the district of Burlington, New Jersey, to the port of Trenton, in said district;

A bill (H. R. 2365) for the relief of William P. Thorne;

A bill (H. R. 6887) for the relief of Henry Brock; and

A bill (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government and the Bureau of Agriculture and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the Centennial Exposition of the Ohio Valley and Central States, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, from July 4 to October 27, 1888.

CONSIDERATION OF THE FISHERIES TREATY.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* In response to the suggestion made by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. RIDDLEBERGER] the Chair states that an examination of the Journal discloses the fact that the resolution to which he called the attention of the Chair was acted upon adversely on Monday last. More than two legislative days having intervened, a motion to reconsider can not be received.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. I ask the Chair——

Mr. HAWLEY. I am inclined to think that is a matter of executive session. If so, it is not in order now.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. I ask the Chair to hear me one minute.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The Senator from Virginia will proceed.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. The RECORD shows that a report was made on the resolution by the Senator from New York [Mr. EVARTS] adversely, and on May 14 it was considered and rejected. It is the second time that the resolution was reported in my absence; the second time it was taken up and considered in my absence. I find that there is a rule which justifies me in asking unanimous consent to have the vote reconsidered.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator does not wish to take it up now?

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. No, sir; I do not want to take it up now. Rule XIII provides that—

> When a question has been decided by the Senate any Senator voting with the prevailing side may, on the same day or on either of the next two days of actual session thereafter, move a reconsideration; and if the Senate shall refuse to reconsider or, upon reconsideration, shall affirm its first decision, no further motion to reconsider shall be in order unless by unanimous consent.

I think that, having offered the resolution some time ago, it having been reported here twice and acted upon each time in my absence, each time when I was paired on the vote itself, so far as the treaty was concerned, I may ask the Senate to give unanimous consent that I may have entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was rejected. I think it is nothing more than right that the Senate should allow that motion to be entered. I shall not ask the Senate to hear any debate on this subject to-day; I shall not ask it to consider the question of the fisheries; but the Senators themselves, I think, owe it each to the others, as they have expressed themselves around this Hall, to allow me at some time to have this matter considered when I am in the Senate Chamber.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to enter a motion to reconsider, and then whatever disposition the Senate shall make of that motion will be conclusive to me. I would prefer that the motion should lie on the table, so that I can call it up hereafter.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent to enter a motion to reconsider the action of the Senate on the resolution to which he has referred. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the motion to reconsider is entered.

Mr. HOAR. I should like, with the leave of the Senate, to observe that the taking up of the resolution at the time it was done was by the express and urgent personal request of the Senator from Virginia. It was his desire that it should be taken up before certain other matters should be reached.

JAMES L. HENDERSON.

Mr. SHERMAN. Is it in order now to proceed to a case on the Calendar?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The Chair thinks that under the unanimous consent entered last week, if there be no further morning business the Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to pass a particular bill, which is one of three that I should like to have go together. It is a bill about a public building in Ohio.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* In the execution of the order of the Senate, the Chair announces the close of morning business and the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII, which is to be resumed at Order of Business 1082, the title of which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. Order of Business 1082, a bill (H. R. 314) authorizing the Secretary of War to place the name of James L. Henderson on the roll of Company B, Sixteenth Kentucky Volunteers.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent——

Mr. SHERMAN. I withdraw the request. I will not interfere with the Calendar. Let it go on. At some later hour of the day perhaps I may ask the Senate to indulge me.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 314) authorizing the Secretary of War to place the name of James L. Henderson on the roll of Company B, Sixteenth Kentucky Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS G. CORBIN.

Mr. CAMERON. I ask that the Senate consider Order of Business 420, which was on the Calendar and passed over during my absence several days ago. It is Senate bill 1232.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The bill having been passed over on a former day without prejudice, retaining its place on the Calendar, the Senator from Pennsylvania asks that it be now considered. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1232) for the relief of Thomas G. Corbin. It provides that Thomas G. Corbin, now a captain on the retired-list of the Navy, shall be considered as having remained upon the active-list of the Navy next after J. W. A. Nicholson, and as having passed through the various grades through which he would have passed had he so remained on the active-list and been promoted according to seniority and retired as a rear-admiral upon reaching the age of sixty-two years; and that in computing the benefits which he shall thereby receive he shall be considered as having been upon leave or waiting-orders until the date when he would have been so retired.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let the report in that case be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The report will be read.

Mr. CAMERON. I will state that the bill has already passed the Senate twice and passed the other House once, but failed to become a law because of the want of action by both Houses at the same session.

Mr. COCKRELL. What is the effect of the bill? Is it to give back pay for fifteen or twenty years?

Mr. CAMERON. It gives him just what he is entitled to.

Mr. COCKRELL. If he is entitled to it, he can go in the Court of Claims and secure his rights.

Mr. CAMERON. No, he can not.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then he is not entitled to what is claimed.

Mr. CAMERON. Yes, he is, as you will see by the report.

The Secretary read the report submitted by Mr. CAMERON February 23, 1888, as follows:

> The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill for the relief of Thomas G. Corbin, beg leave to submit the following report:
>
> This bill has several times been before the Naval Committee of the Senate, and each time has received a favorable recommendation.
>
> This committee now report the bill back to the Senate with a recommendation that it do pass, for the reasons set forth in the following report, made in the last Congress, which is hereby adopted and made a part of this report:
>
> [Senate Report No. 719, Forty-ninth Congress, first session.]
>
> The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1262) for the relief of Thomas G. Corbin, have duly considered the same, and beg leave to submit the following report:
>
> Three favorable reports have been made by this committee and three by the House Committee on Naval Affairs in the Forty-sixth, Forty-seventh, and Forty-eighth Congresses, respectively, on bills for the restoration of Capt. Thomas G. Corbin, United States Navy, to the position in the Navy of which he was deprived by retirement in consequence of the action of a board of promotion. One of these bills passed the Senate in the Forty-eighth Congress, but was not reached in the House.
>
> The committee append and adopt the statements and conclusions of the report made to the Senate in the last Congress, and in further support thereof have added a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, found in House Report No. 701, Forty-seventh Congress, first session.
>
> Since this matter was first brought to the attention of Congress Captain Corbin has reached the age (sixty-two years) prescribed for retirement by section 1444, Revised Statutes. The bill now reported does not, therefore, contemplate his restoration to the active-list of the Navy, but leaves him on the retired-list, only changing his rank and pay to that which he would have attained if he had not, as the committee believe, been unjustly deprived of his promotion.
>
> [Senate Report No. 178, Forty-eighth Congress, first session.]
>
> The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 427) for the

relief of Thomas G. Corbin, have fully considered the same, and beg leave to submit the following report:

The facts in this case are well stated and fully set forth in the following report made by the Committee on Naval Affairs of this body in the Forty-seventh Congress:

"The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 14) for the relief of Thomas G. Corbin, have duly considered the same, and beg leave to submit the following report:

"The bill proposes to authorize the President of the United States to restore Thomas G. Corbin, now a captain on the retired-list of the Navy, to the active-list, to take rank next after Commodore J. W. A. Nicholson, with restitution, from December 12, 1873, of the difference of pay between that of a commodore on the active-list on waiting-orders pay and that of a captain retired on half-pay.

"The act of April 21, 1864, 'to amend an act entitled "An act to establish and equalize the grade of line officers of the United States Navy," approved July 16, 1862,' provides:

"'That no line officer of the Navy upon the active-list below the grade of commodore, nor any other naval officer, shall be promoted to a higher grade until his mental, moral, and professional fitness to perform all his duties at sea shall be established to the satisfaction of a board of examining officers to be appointed by the President of the United States. And such board shall have power to take testimony, the witnesses, when present, to be sworn by the president of the board, and to examine all matter on the files and records of the Department in relation to any officer whose case shall be considered by them.

"'SEC. 2. *And be it further enacted*, That such examining board shall consist of not less than three officers senior in rank to the officer to be examined.

"'SEC. 3. *And be it further enacted*, That any officer, to be acted upon by said board, shall have the right to be present, if he desires it; and his statement of his case on oath, and the testimony of witnesses, and his examination, shall be recorded. And any matter on the files and records of the Department touching each case as may, in the opinion of the board, be necessary to assist them in making up their opinion, shall, together with the whole record and finding, be presented to the President for his approval or disapproval of the finding. And no officer shall be rejected until after such public examination of himself and the records of the Department in his case, unless he fails to appear before said board after having been duly notified.'

"The whole case narrows down to a simple interpretation of the true intent and meaning of the sections just quoted.

"Your committee have carefully examined Captain Corbin's history while in the naval service, and find that his record is unexceptionable and without blemish. He was appointed acting midshipman in 1838, and passed through all the intermediate grades of the service, having acquitted himself in a most meritorious and gallant manner throughout the entire war, and in July, 1866, was promoted to the rank of captain.

"On the 21st day of May, 1873, Captain Corbin was ordered to report in Washington to Rear-Admiral Rodgers for examination preliminary to promotion. In obedience thereto he appeared before the examining board, and was referred to the medical board for physical examination. This board examined and recommended him as physically qualified for promotion. He was then informed by the examining board that he would be required to submit to an oral examination to test his proficiency in the knowledge of his profession. He refused to submit to this oral examination on the ground that it was entirely beyond the purview of the act of April 21, 1864, and declined to appear before the board. Captain Corbin was thereupon discharged from further attendance before the board, who submitted a report to the Secretary of the Navy, refusing to recommend him for promotion. The Secretary then offered him an opportunity to reconsider his determination not to appear before the examining board, of which privilege he again declined to avail himself. The papers in the case were then, by request of Captain Corbin, placed before the President, who sustained the action of the Department. Captain Corbin still declining to appear before the board for the purpose of an oral examination, on January 5, 1874, he was, by order of the Secretary of the Navy, placed upon the retired-list. This is the sum and substance of the whole case.

"Your committee, after maturely examining the act of April 21, 1864, are of the opinion that it leaves it optional with the officer to be present or absent during the examination. The act simply intended the ascertainment of an officer's fitness, mentally, morally, and professionally, by examination of witnesses and records. The framers of the act could not have meant to subject an officer like Captain Corbin, who had served his country faithfully and gallantly for thirty-five years, to the humility of an oral examination before he could receive that promotion which he so eminently deserved. Such an examination of young midshipmen about entering the Navy, or of clerks about entering one of the Government Departments might be proper enough, but to require a person of the age and service of Captain Corbin to submit to such a thing would be unfair and unjust in every respect.

"The following letter, from Hon. G. V. Fox, formerly Assistant Secretary of the Navy (who shaped and administered the act of April 21, 1864), to Senator EDMUNDS, explains the intent of this law:

'WASHINGTON, D. C., *February* 17, 1881.

'DEAR SIR: I inclose Senate report No. 743, and House report No. 116, Forty-sixth Congress, third session, in reference to the case of Capt. T. G. Corbin, United States Navy. I am able to write to you with confidence that the conclusions of these two committees as to the true meaning of section 3 of the act of April 21, 1864, agree with the intent of the Navy Department, which shaped and administered this law.

'The act of July 16, 1862, neither required nor permitted the presence of any officer whose case was pending. This was made a subject of complaint by those who suffered from the action of the board; but it was more specious than valid, because the true measure of merit entitling an officer of the senior grades to promotion is not an oral examination, but the record of his whole career on the files of the Navy Department as established by himself. The inefficient clamored to be present because before a board, where there was no public prosecutor, they hoped to exert a personal and sympathetic influence. They reasoned well, and the authors of section 3, act of April 21, 1864, offset it by requiring that those who chose to be present should be "examined," and the board were also required to use "any matter on the files and records of the Departments touching each case."

'This is the briefest explanation I can give you of the two acts referred to, and the reasons for putting in the option of being present. This legislation was for the purpose of raising the spirit of the Navy by removing from the active-list the drunkards and imbeciles. It had no reference to and was not intended to act upon officers whose record was blameless.

'I am, respectfully, your obedient servant,

'G. V. FOX.

'Hon. GEORGE F. EDMUNDS,
'*United States Senate, Washington, D. C.*'

"Under section 4 of act of July 16, 1862, no interrogation of officers upon professional subjects was ever made, because their professional reputation was satisfactorily established by the records of the Department and testimony of witnesses. A similar interpretation of section 3 of the act of 1864 was doubtless intended, otherwise that act would never have given the candidate for promotion the option of appearing or not appearing before the examining board. It requires his presence before the board of naval surgeons to ascertain his physical fitness, but it leaves his mental, moral, and professional qualifications to be ascertained from the files of the Department and the testimony of his brother officers. The evidence from that source is very complimentary to Captain Corbin, and can be referred to, if desired, in the papers accompanying the bill. Rear-Admiral C. H. Davis, Commodore C. R. P. Rodgers, and Capt. D. M. Fairfax, United States Navy, in answer to interrogations propounded by the Navy Department relative to Captain Corbin, state that his reputation is the very best and that his habits are excellent; and they all pronounce him as well qualified in every respect for promotion. Commodore Rodgers says in his statement that 'he,' referring to Captain Corbin, 'is one of the ablest officers in the Navy,' and, in answer to the question, 'Would you, as commander of a squadron, have sufficient confidence in Captain Corbin to send him on an important separate service in command of a vessel of war?' says, 'I would. I should esteem myself happy in having such an officer to send on any service.'

"Commodore Rodgers was also asked this question: 'Do you or not consider Captain Corbin to be mentally, morally, and professionally a fit officer to perform all his duties at sea in a higher grade?' And his answer was: 'I do so consider him eminently qualified.'

"It was the duty of the examining board to summon reliable witnesses to testify as to whether, in their opinion, based on actual knowledge of and contact with Captain Corbin, he was mentally, morally, and professionally qualified to fill a higher rank than the one he held. It was also its duty to call upon the Department for all the papers connected with his naval career, to examine them carefully, to see whether he has ever been charged with conduct unbecoming an officer, or whether he has ever been guilty of intemperance, and when it had done that its power ended; it could go no further, and it was its duty to either recommend or not recommend him for promotion, as the evidence might justify, and any examination beyond this was a usurpation of power totally unwarranted by law. That Captain Corbin was a brave, honest, intelligent, and reputable naval officer there is no doubt; neither is there a doubt but that he was unjustly dealt with in being placed upon the retired list without cause.

"Being satisfied as to his entire fitness for promotion, your committee report the bill back to the Senate without amendment and recommend its passage."

'NAVY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, January* 17, 1882.

"SIR: The bill for the relief of Captain Corbin, which has been referred to me for my opinion, has received at my hands due consideration.

"I do not deem it necessary to decide whether Captain Corbin was right or wrong in declining to submit to the oral examination tendered him by the board of officers on the 21st of May, 1873. He believed that he was not compelled by law to submit to that examination. In that opinion he was sincere. The opinion was sustained by that of Hon. G. V. Fox, formerly Assistant Secretary of the Navy, who shaped and administered the law with reference to examinations for promotion. The report of Senator CAMERON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, on the 12th of January, 1881, conforms to the view taken by Captain Corbin and concurred in by Hon. Mr. Fox.

"A different view of the law was held by the examining board before which Captain Corbin was summoned. The Secretary of the Navy at the time approved the action of the board and the President adopted the opinion of the Secretary. In this conflict of judgment I repeat that I do not deem it necessary at this date to decide whether or not the course adopted by Captain Corbin was legally correct. The case is one where an officer, conspicuous for his faithful performance of duty during many years, and for his gallant conduct on all occasions, and his firm adherence to the cause of the Union under circumstances of unusual trial, appeals to his country to be relieved from a position which he honestly believes correct, and in which belief he was sustained by distinguished authority. In view of all these considerations, and of the further fact that the restoration asked by Captain Corbin must necessarily terminate in about six months from this date by reason of his reaching the age for retirement, I think the prayer of his petition should be favorably considered, and the bill for his relief should be promptly passed by Congress.

"I have the honor to be, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"WILLIAM H. HUNT,
"*Secretary of the Navy.*

"Hon. J. H. KETCHAM,
"*House of Representatives.*"

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS J. TAYLOR.

The bill (H. R. 2161) for the relief of Thomas J. Taylor was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides for the payment to Thomas J. Taylor of $861 as compensation for services rendered by him as a scout during the late war of the rebellion, the services having been rendered under written instructions of the commanders of the Federal Army commanding the Department of the Tennessee.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABIAL G. CHAMBERLAIN.

Mr. HOAR. Is the Senate now going on with the Calendar?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Yes; under Rule VIII.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent that the Chair shall now lay before the Senate and the Senate take up for consideration a pension bill just received from the other House, a bill granting a pension to Abial G. Chamberlain. If the bill is read for information, and the certificates which I hold in my hand showing that the case is one of extreme urgency, there will be no difficulty in the way.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Abial G. Chamberlain was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions of the pension laws, the name of Abial G. Chamberlain, late Company K, First Massachusetts Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $45 per month in lieu of the pension now received by him.

Mr. HOAR. Let the Secretary now read the letter from the wife, and a certificate of the physician, with the report of the House Committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The papers will be read if there be no objection.

The Secretary read as follows:

BLACKWOOD PLACE, BROCKTON, MASS., *May* 16, 1888.

HONORED SIR: Please add this paper of Doctor Paine's to those on file in relation to my husband's pension. I declare to you, and to all the world, that my husband, Col. A. G. Chamberlain, late captain First Massachusetts Volunteers, is wholly incapacitated from even feeding himself. He has lost his mind, and his mouth is stiff from paralysis caused from the effects of the wound in mouth. I fear lockjaw; he is paralyzed almost wholly. I have to lift him whenever he is moved in bed; he can not turn himself even.

Please send his pension, or see that it is sent. It is one of the clearest cases on record of total disability. If you can not prove it send some one to see the dying man, and please send relief before too late.

Yours, in trouble,

MRS. E. R. B. CHAMBERLAIN.

GOV. J. D. LONG.

Please read this, and act, for the love of Christ, for an officer's wife of the late war.

BROCKTON, MASS., *May* 16, 1888.

This is to certify that I have examined Abial G. Chamberlain (late captain Second Massachusetts Volunteers) this date.

I find him confined to his bed, very much emaciated, the left leg being flexed on thigh and very rigid, being nearly impossible to straighten it; the left arm being somewhat the same. He still has involuntary condition of bowels and bladder. He requires an attendant all of the time, he being helpless. I further say I have no interest in the case.

A. ELLIOT PAINE, M. D.

The report submitted by Mr. FRENCH, in the House of Representatives, March 27, 1888, was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Abial G. Chamberlain, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Chamberlain was mustered as captain of Company K, First Massachusetts Volunteers, May 24, 1861; promoted to lieutenant-colonel and transferred to the Third Regiment, North Carolina Colored Volunteers, November 10, 1863. He was mustered out of service June 16, 1865. On June 25, 1862, in battle at Fair Oaks, he was severely wounded in mouth and jaw, for which he is now in receipt of a pension at the rate of $20 per month. He filed an application for increase on account of paralysis resulting from the wound, which application has been denied by the Pension Office, the medical referee holding that the paralysis is not chargeable to the wound.

The certificate of the surgeon who examined the pensioner at his home on September 29, 1887, he being unable to leave his room, is as follows:

"I find a scar on the right side of lower lip, extending to jaw, also on the end of tongue. The scar on lip about an inch long, not adherent. Another cicatrix about an inch below the angle of lower jaw, which is adherent to the bone, with an indentation in bone about one-quarter inch in depth and one-half inch in width, not tender to pressure. His walk is feeble and staggering. His intellect is dull; appears bewildered when questioned. The power of motion of left arm and leg is greatly impaired, so as to require help in dressing. He has only partial control of his bladder; his urine runs away, keeping his clothing wet. I think the paralysis is due to cerebral lesion, caused probably by injury of branches of the trifacial nerve, lying in the track of the ball. He is, in my opinion, entitled to total rating for the disability caused by wound of mouth and jaw, and for that caused from resulting paralysis first grade, requiring aid of another person."

Dr. A. Elliott, late assistant surgeon One hundred and fourth United States Colored Troops, under date of February 28, 1888, testifies that claimant is unable to be about his room only as he is assisted. He requires the assistance of some one all the time, he not even being able to attend the calls of nature without being assisted.

Claimant's hearing and eye-sight are likewise impaired by the wound.

The effect of a wound upon the nervous system is at times extraordinary in character, as is well illustrated in cases of lockjaw, following often upon the slightest injury. In this case there is a serious wound, which, in the opinion of the examining surgeon, acting under the special instruction of the Pension Bureau, after a thorough examination of the case, affected the branches of the trifacial nerve. If this is true, and your committee have no reason to doubt the correctness of the surgeon's opinion, the connection of the paralysis with the wound seems to be established. At any rate no other cause for this deplorable condition appears in the case.

Therefore, believing that some relief should be granted this great sufferer, your committee return the accompanying bill, with the recommendation that it do pass, amended, however, by inserting therein, after the word "Volunteers," in last line, the following words: "And pay him a pension at the rate of $45 per month, in lieu of the pension now received by him."

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills, received from the House of Representatives, were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 432) granting a pension to Columbus Bosteder;
A bill (H. R. 2478) for the relief of Samuel E. Wyman;
A bill (H. R. 2656) to increase the pension of John Taylor;
A bill (H. R. 3568) for the relief of B. S. Van Buren;
A bill (H. R. 4103) granting a pension to Edna M. Hildreth;
A bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Moses L. Chase;
A bill (H. R. 7815) granting a pension to Mary A. West;
A bill (H. R. 7829) granting a pension to Thomas McGuire;
A bill (H. R. 7907) granting a pension to Mary Ann Lang;
A bill (H. R. 8798) granting a pension to Nettie Ellicott; and
A bill (H. R. 8884) granting a pension to Emily McClure.

The bill (H. R. 2524) for the relief of Clement A. Lounsberry was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

PORT OF SAULT STE. MARIE, MICHIGAN.

The bill (S. 2318) to constitute Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., a port of delivery with privileges of inland transportation in bond was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments beginning in line 3, to strike out the words "that Sault Ste. Marie, in the State of Michigan, be, and is hereby, constituted a port of delivery, and;" in line 9, after the words "extended to," to strike out "said port" and insert "the port of Sault Ste. Marie, in the State of Michigan;" so as to read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the privileges of immediate transportation of dutiable merchandise conferred by the act approved June 10, 1880, entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," be, and the same are hereby, extended to the port of Sault Ste. Marie, in the State of Michigan.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend to the port of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., the privileges of inland transportation in bond."

PORT OF DELIVERY AT GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

The bill (H. R. 1540) to establish a port of delivery at Grand Rapids, Mich., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GENERAL W. E. WOODRUFF.

The bill (H. R. 335) granting a pension to General W. E. Woodruff was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes, in recognition of meritorious service, to place the name of General W. E. Woodruff, of Kentucky, on the pension-roll at the rate of $50 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROADS TO PRESIDIO RESERVATION, SAN FRANCISCO.

The bill (H. R. 6098) authorizing the construction and repair of the roads from the entrance to the reservation of the presidio at San Francisco, Cal., to the national cemetery on the same, and the fencing and protection of the said reservation and the cemetery thereon, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHIEF CLERK OF DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

The bill (S. 2702) to amend so much of section 351 of the Revised Statutes as fixes the salary of the chief clerk of the Department of Justice was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to fix the salary of the chief clerk of the Department of Justice at $2,500 a year.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WATER-RESERVE LANDS IN WISCONSIN.

The bill (S. 1880) declaring that certain water-reserve lands in the State of Wisconsin are and have been subject to the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act granting to railroads the right of way through the public lands of the United States," approved March 3, 1875, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, to add to the bill the following additional proviso:

Provided further, That the railroad companies availing themselves of this act shall, before entering upon construction, in addition to filing the maps now required by law to be filed, also file maps of definite location of their proposed lines of railroad, and until the approval of said maps by the Secretary of War no construction shall be undertaken; and no location shall be permitted which takes for right of way or stations lands needed for the use of the present reservoir system, or any proposed or probable extension of the same, or which will obstruct or increase the cost of the present or prospective reservoir system; nor shall any railroad company be permitted to take material for construction from any of said reservoir lands outside the right of way granted herein.

Mr. PLUMB. I move to amend the amendment by inserting, after the word "railroad," in line 32, the words:

Over said water-reserve lands, in the office of the Secretary of War.

That is necessary in order to make it appear certain that the maps are to be filed in that office, and not in the office of the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB. In lines 33 and 34 I move to strike out the words "no construction shall be undertaken," and insert "the right to occupy said lands shall not vest in such company;" so as to read:

Also file maps of definite location of their proposed lines of railroad over said water-reserve lands in the office of the Secretary of War, and until the approval of said maps by the Secretary of War the right to occupy said lands shall not vest in such company.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB. In line 36, after the word "system," I move to insert:

Or in the construction of dams and other works.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB. I now move to strike out, in line 29, after the word "shall," the words "before entering upon construction," that point having been covered by the amendments I have already offered.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. PLATT. I wish the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands would state for the information of the Senate just what this bill proposes to accomplish.

Mr. PLUMB. Some years ago Congress provided for the reservation of considerable tracts of land in the State of Wisconsin, at the headwaters of the Mississippi River, for the purpose of erecting reservoirs whereby the excess of water which fell at certain seasons might be retained until it was necessary to be used for the purpose of feeding the channel of the Mississippi River. These lands were by that act put under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of War. It has been held that by reason of such reservation these lands were not subject to what is called the railroad right-of-way act passed in 1875, which gave to all railroads the right of way across the public domain for a certain width, together with a certain right to select depot grounds at stated intervals. This bill simply puts these lands under the operation of the general law, with a provision that no occupation shall interfere with their use for reservoir purposes, and that the occupation shall not extend, as it does under the general law, to the extent of allowing timber and stone to be taken from adjacent lands. It limits the railroad company to the right of way, but it is all the time under the control of the Secretary of War, and all the time under the provision that this shall not in any wise interfere with the use of the lands for reservoir purposes.

I would state that the bill has the concurrence of the Secretary of War, having been submitted to him.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS FOR POST-OFFICE PURPOSES.

The bill (S. 2762) to provide for the erection of public buildings for post-offices in towns and cities where the post-office receipts for three years preceding have exceeded $3,000 annually was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not desire to object to the consideration of this bill under the five-minute rule, but simply to call the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the fact that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] has been called away from the Chamber by a domestic affliction in the family of his colleague, and I know that he feels great interest in this bill. I suggest whether it would not be advisable to let it go over without prejudice, retaining its place until he returns to the Chamber.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Wisconsin and myself prepared this bill, and he would have reported the bill but for the fact that he was unavoidably called away from the city at the time I made the report. I made it at his request. If the Senator from Nebraska thinks he desires to be here, I shall not press it now, but I understand that he approves fully of the bill. I am very anxious to have the bill considered. It is a very important one, and I just want to state to the Senate in general terms in regard to this bill that it is unanimously reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. It was very carefully prepared, and is intended, I may state generally, to do away with the practice of securing large appropriations for buildings in certain towns and cities of the Union and adopting in lieu of that system a general one for the construction of post-office buildings in all towns and cities of a certain size. It is intended to do away with the great objection suggested by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] and by other Senators, that under the present system certain towns receive enormous appropriations whilst others are entirely neglected. In other words, it is intended to adopt a general equitable system which gives no preference to any locality or to any section of the country, but provides post-office buildings, and also where it is practicable to provide accommodations for the other Departments of the Government.

The architectural structure of these buildings is to be adopted by the Post-Office Department, and where accommodations are sought to be provided for the other Departments they are to be consulted. This is a very important measure. It was recommended by the late Postmaster-General in his last report, and the present Postmaster-General is very much in favor of it.

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not desire to be understood as objecting to the consideration of the bill; I am heartily in favor of it, and I think its general scope is certainly to be desired, and if the Senator from Missouri and my colleague [Mr. PADDOCK], who I know has given very much thought to this subject-matter and has had prepared legislation upon it, think the bill had better progress in the absence of the Senator from Wisconsin, I certainly have no objection.

Mr. VEST. I will make this additional statement for the information of the Senate: I notice that the House of Representatives has under consideration, it having been reported from their Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds there, a bill very much like the present bill, differing in detail, but with the same general object. I have not the slightest doubt that, if action is taken by the Senate, the result will be a committee of conference. I mention that fact because if that be so, it is not so absolutely necessary that the Senator from Wisconsin should be present. I know he sympathizes with me entirely in regard to this bill. He and I did the larger portion of the work in preparing it.

Mr. GRAY. Has the Senator made an estimate of the amount of money required to carry the bill into effect?

Mr. VEST. That matter has been considered fully. It always happens that in this matter of estimates as to everything *in future*, there is a very great difference in calculations. It is supposed by the Postmaster-General that it will take an appropriation of $5,000,000. I will say that the bill in the House provides for $2,000,000, and the bill introduced by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK] I think made an appropriation of $20,000,000, and another bill $10,000,000.

Mr. PADDOCK. The Senator is mistaken in that. My original bill provided for $10,000,000. Then an amendment which I proposed later was for a much less sum.

Mr. VEST. I stand corrected; it was $10,000,000. We considered that matter. It is impossible to say what will be the actual expense. The present bill fixes it at $10,000,000. I think that is the amount.

Mr. GRAY. I should like to ask another question while the Senator from Missouri has the floor, and that is whether the passage of this bill will have any tendency to diminish the special legislation by Congress at every session appropriating for public buildings at particular places?

Mr. VEST. That is the specific object of the bill. Under the present system, as every Senator knows, bills are passed for cities of 12,000 or 15,000 inhabitants where there is simply a necessity for a post-office alone, where there is no internal-revenue department, where there are no United States courts held, where there is nothing but the necessity for a post-office, and these bills come to us with appropriations of one hundred, and one hundred and fifty, and two hundred thousand dollars.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH] asks me in regard to the rental of post-offices. We have a report showing the rentals in different localities. I can not undertake to say what the aggregate amount is, but the report of the Postmaster-General shows specifically what is paid in the different towns of the United States. I have not the slightest question that the rent now paid would be more than the interest on the amount appropriated in this bill, but of course I can not speak accurately.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. President, early in the session I presented a bill on this subject, which went to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and that bill, I think, contains provisions omitted in this reported bill which ought to be in whatever bill passes on this subject. The bill as reported does not contain some of the essential provisions of that bill and omits others that I should be glad to have incorporated in it.

After the bill was reported by the committee I submitted an amendment in the nature of a substitute to cover several of these changes. As a matter of convenience, I put it in the form of a substitute and had it referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and I think that amendment of mine was referred by the chairman of the committee to the Supervising Architect of the Treasury, and by him, I understand, some of the suggestions which I had made before to the committee and which were embraced in my amendment were indorsed by that officer, and a letter was written by him to the chairman of the committee recommending changes in the bill as reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to make it correspond in certain respects with the ideas set forth in the amendment which I presented and which, as I have said, was referred to the Supervising Architect.

In my view one of the chief objections to the bill in its present form is that it provides for setting up in the Post-Office Department another supervising architect's office. If it is necessary in the case of any class of buildings to do that in the Post-Office Department, it may be equally necessary for that class of buildings which would come under the Department of Justice, court-house buildings, that there should be a supervising architect's office in that Department, and so on all the way through the Executive Departments as to the particular Government buildings to be constructed for their use.

I am assured by the Supervising Architect of the Treasury that he can take charge of the entire subject, that he can provide for the additional labor necessary to be done under the requirements of this proposed act without any material additional force. There need be no increase of expense to the Government on this account, and he could combine the whole system of supervising the architectural designs and structure of all public buildings under one office. Besides, it must be remembered that under my amendment the Secretary of the Treasury, the Postmaster-General, and the Secretary of the Interior are required to approve the design, plan, estimates, and cost within the maximum limit.

Mr. STEWART. I inquire of the Senator if he has an amendment to that effect?

Mr. PADDOCK. I have an amendment which was introduced by me some days ago and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, which I propose to offer at the proper time, including that feature to which I have called attention, and in some other respects.

Mr. SPOONER. I desire to suggest to the Senator from Nebraska, in reply to his argument, that if we create an architect's office in the

Post-Office Department to supervise post-office buildings it does not follow that we must have an architect in the Department of Justice to supervise the construction of court-houses. The court-houses are comparatively very few as compared with the post-offices.

Mr. PADDOCK. That is true, but under this proposed system every time a new building is to be erected there must be a new bureau of design in substantial duplication of that now existing and another and different responsibility of superintending, thus multiplying cost and dividing responsibilities all the way through. I think all this work should be confined under one head, under one responsibility, and be provided for by one appropriation.

My notion about this is that ultimately the subject of architectural designing and construction of public buildings, together with other kindred works, should be concentrated in one bureau or department of public works. I think it would be to the interest of the Government that all such duties should for the present be left as they are until the duties accumulate from time to time and the office now in charge of this subject shall grow into an independent bureau or department to take charge of public works generally.

Another serious objection to the bill as reported by the committee is that the limitation of the cost of a public building, which is stated at $25,000, is fixed arbitrarily. I think that is a mistake. The limitation to be put upon the cost of a building in every town of the population and importance of those which have made application heretofore, and for which appropriations have been made by special acts, could not, under the maximum rule fixed by the committee, have secured such a building as their necessities required, and all towns of the class that have been provided for by special acts, which have no buildings now, could not, if this rule of the committee should be adopted, be provided for hereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). The Senator's time has expired.

Mr. PADDOCK. I should like to go on.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, the Senator from Nebraska will proceed. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. PADDOCK. The trouble is that in trying to escape special legislation and special appropriations for buildings in larger towns we do not avoid it; the necessity will still be upon us just as it is now if the bill passes with the maximum limit proposed by the committee. All that class of towns with the buildings heretofore provided for by special acts can not possibly be provided for under this act with the maximum limitation it contains. Twenty-five thousand dollars will be wholly inadequate for the construction of a building such as may be required for the business of a town of from 15,000 to 30,000 people, and towns having 50,000 to 100,000 would be left out altogether. I propose an amendment such as I have indicated, which limits the maximum of cost to the aggregate amount of receipts of the post-office for which the building is to be provided for three years preceding the order for the construction of the building, which gives a flexible limitation as to the maximum amount of cost; and if in qualification of this limitation you put it under the control of the Secretary of the Treasury and the Postmaster-General and the Secretary of the Interior to reduce the limit, if it shall be deemed best to do so in any particular case, it will make it certain that the maximum cost of any building would be wisely and impartially determined. I think this would be a much wiser limitation than the amount fixed in the bill as a maximum. Certainly $25,000 will not provide a building large enough and commodious enough for a town having 15,000, 20,000, or 30,000 people, and would be entirely out of the question for all towns larger than these.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri has spoken once, and can only proceed by unanimous consent. [No "objection."]

Mr. CALL. I have considered this subject, and it is an important one, as to the propriety of having architects in the different Departments of the Government to determine with the approval of the different heads of Departments on the buildings to be furnished and the conveniences to be provided for the respective Departments of the Government, or whether all should be under one supervising architect. In order that we may consider this subject carefully, I prefer that the bill should go over, because I know it will give rise to discussion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida object to the further consideration of the bill?

Mr. CALL. Not yet.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to have the attention of the Senate.

Mr. PADDOCK. I should like to have the unanimous consent of the Senate to present the amendment to which I have referred, if the bill goes over, in order that it may be printed with the bill in the RECORD for consideration.

Mr. STEWART. I move that the bill be referred back to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with the understanding that it shall be framed so that the work shall be done under the Supervising Architect of the Treasury.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has recognized the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST].

Mr. VEST. I believe I have the floor, but I may be mistaken.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator will allow me to say a word further?

Mr. VEST. Very well.

Mr. STEWART. I wish to say in regard to the present Supervising Architect that I think he is an exceedingly efficient man, who will be able to organize and dispose of this work more rapidly than any other officer. Under these circumstances I would not create a new office, because certainly the work will be done more expeditiously under him than under a new officer. He has shown a great deal of capacity in bringing up the work rapidly. I had a conversation with him recently and he said he could attend to the whole business very quickly.

Mr. VEST. I wish to make a single observation. My experience here has been such that I do not think I have ever found a single officer of the Government who was ever willing to give up one particle of his jurisdiction. I have never seen one yet that was willing to give up any of the functions of his Department or bureau or office, and the present occupant of the position of Supervising Architect is no exception to the rule. I say that without intending to say anything derogatory to him, because he is a very good officer as far as I know.

However, in putting this provision in the bill it was designed that the post-office buildings should be under the control of an architect in the Post-Office Department, and it was thought that the Post-Office Department could best judge of the buildings they should have for their work; and the same reason would apply to all the different Departments.

The Supervising Architect of the Treasury, it is said, wants to control the whole matter. He does more work than any other officer of the Government that I know of already. He ought to have a salary of $10,000 a year in order to obtain the best talent and recompense him properly. The Supervising Architect of the Treasury will have control of the buildings under this bill, but not exclusively. The architect of the Post-Office Department will be practically his assistant, and the Supervising Architect of the Treasury will have control of the buildings.

In regard to the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK], I wish to say that there is hardly a town in this country where a handsome and commodious building can not be put up for $25,000. There is nothing in which more extravagance and reckless expenditure has been made than in regard to public buildings. I say that from an experience of ten years on the committee having charge of that subject. Twenty-five thousand dollars in the hands of a competent architect will construct a building that will answer for all purposes, that will not only be useful, but beautiful; but it seems that the minute we come to a construction by the Government of the United States all the rules of business are thrown aside, and $100,000 or $150,000 or $200,000 is the least that any one thinks ought to be called for.

The truth may as well be told at once. The Congress of the United States must stop putting up public buildings as a local electioneering instrumentality. Until we adopt the rules that govern men in the prosecution of their own business, the public have a just right to complain of us as to the manner in which we provide for lavish and extravagant expenditures for public buildings.

I hope, sir, that the bill will not go over. There is on the Calendar no more important question. If the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK] want to kill the bill, they can do so now. It is no great question what particular architect shall have charge. What I want is to start this reform.

Mr. PADDOCK. The Senator will allow me a word?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. PADDOCK. I certainly indorse the desire to consider the bill now. I have not suggested that I want it to go over.

Mr. VEST. I want to get this bill up and to understand whether we are to go on with the log-rolling system, session after session, or whether we are to adopt a system to transact this matter as one of business. No man who has been ten years in the Senate can look back at that which has been done in this regard with any feelings of satisfaction.

Mr. STEWART. I concur with most of what the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] has said. I think this is in the main a good bill and should be passed. My only objection is that it will create another office and multiply the expense of doing business which ought to have one head. If the Supervising Architect of the Treasury has not enough force, add to it; but the work will be done more cheaply and efficiently by having it all in one office. That is my objection, and I hope the Senator from Nebraska will introduce his amendment now, and let the bill pass as amended.

Mr. PADDOCK. I send the amendment to the desk as a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has not been read through. The reading was interrupted. After the reading is concluded amendments will be in order. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair will lay before the Senate the unfinished business, being the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor.

Mr. HARRIS. That is to be set aside by unanimous agreement.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill relative to post-office buildings will be continued as in Committee of the Whole.

The reading of the bill (S. 2762) was resumed and concluded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK] offers an amendment, which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and in lieu thereof to insert——

Mr. STEWART. I hope the Senator from Nebraska will withhold his amendment to allow the original bill to be dissected and amended first.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska withdraw his amendment?

Mr. PADDOCK. The change in the mind of the Senator from Nevada is not the only one I desire. There are several changes which I would like to have made, and therefore I offer my amendment now as a substitute for the bill.

Mr. STEWART. I thought we might first propose to strike out the provision for a new architect, and let the bill be perfected before we vote on a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Nebraska will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be prepared by the Supervising Architect of the Treasury a design, plans, working drawings, and specifications for post-office buildings, which, before being adopted, shall be approved by the Postmaster-General, Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Interior, which design and plans shall be so devised as to provide for the construction of buildings of such dimensions as may be required for the transaction of the business of Presidential post-offices, and said design and plans shall be so made that additions to their capacity may be constructed from time to time without injury to the harmony of the design or usefulness of the building, and such design and plans shall be as nearly uniform as practicable, both as to exterior appearance and internal arrangement, and all such buildings shall be fire-proof and provided with a suitable fire-proof vault.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall from time to time cause to be constructed buildings, in accordance with said general design and plans hereinbefore mentioned, for the accommodation of all post-offices the annual gross receipts of which for three years preceding shall have exceeded the sum of $3,000: *Provided*, That the cost to the United States of any such building shall not exceed the aggregate amount of such gross receipts for such period of three years, and that said cost and the material to be used in the construction of such building shall be determined by the Postmaster-General, Secretary of the Treasury, and Secretary of the Interior, subject to the approval of the President. All contracts for the construction of such buildings, and for materials, fixtures, or apparatus to be used therein, shall be let to the lowest and best bidder, after such advertisements for proposals as the Postmaster-General shall direct, one of which advertisements shall be printed in a newspaper published at the place where such building is intended to be constructed, if any such there be, and if there be none at such place, in some newspaper published nearest thereto.

SEC. 3. That no contract for the construction of any such building shall be made until there shall have been conveyed to the United States, with perfect title, approved by the Attorney-General, a suitable site for such building, of such size as shall afford a clear space of not less than 50 feet in extent on each side of and beyond the limits of such proposed building, and, in addition, so much as in any particular case the Secretary of the Treasury shall deem requisite, nor shall any such contract be made until jurisdiction over such site shall have been ceded to the United States by the State within which the same is situated. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to accept any such site by donation or grant thereof, and contributions to the purchase of such ground or in aid of the construction of the building to be erected: *Provided*, That the Postmaster-General is also authorized, when in his judgment it shall be necessary, to purchase a suitable site for any such building, at a price not exceeding $5,000, or, where the same can not be otherwise procured, to acquire title by condemnation, in the name of the United States, under the laws of the State within which such site may be situated.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury shall annually report to Congress a statement of all post-office buildings constructed under the provisions of this act, together with all contracts therefor or relating thereto, and a particular statement of the cost of each during the preceding fiscal year, and also of all contracts for buildings which may be unfinished; and he shall also at the same time report to Congress a list of the buildings, with the estimated cost thereof, to be erected under the provisions of this act during the next ensuing year.

SEC. 5. That whenever, in the opinion of the Postmaster-General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of the Interior, it shall be necessary or expedient to provide, at any place where a building is to be erected under the provisions of this act, for the accommodation of Government officials other than those connected with the Post-Office Department, the said building shall be designed and erected with a view to furnishing such accommodation.

SEC. 6. That there is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to carry out the provisions of this act the sum of $3,000,000, to be drawn from the Treasury and expended during the fiscal year 1889, and the accounts therefor to be audited in the same manner as other expenditures for the postal service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK].

Mr. SPOONER. I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Nebraska will not be adopted. I was chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds which considered this subject, and, together with the Senator from Missouri, gave it laborious attention, and we prepared the bill, after a careful study of the subject, in this form, which we thought would guard thoroughly the interests of the Government. I think the inspiration of the main amendment proposed to the bill comes from the Supervising Architect, and is based upon a natural reluctance to see the authority to be exercised under it vested in any other officer; but the bill does not relieve altogether the Supervising Architect of the Treasury from responsibility in connection with the erection of public buildings under this bill.

Mr. PADDOCK. When the Senator says the inspiration incorporated in my amendment comes from the Supervising Architect of the Treasury he is mistaken.

Mr. SPOONER. Then I will change it and say that it meets the hearty approval of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury. The Supervising Architect of the Treasury, a gentleman whom I do not happen to know personally, is so crowded by the business of his office to-day that it is simply impossible for him to discharge in all respects the functions of that office as they should be discharged. I do not say this to reflect on this officer in the slightest sense, for I think him capable and faithful.

All public-building bills—and I should like the attention of the Senate to this—which have been referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds we have referred immediately to the Supervising Architect of the Treasury with a request that he advise the committee as to the public necessity for the erection of the proposed buildings, and also of his estimate of the probable cost. I believe I am within bounds when I say that in four cases out of six we have received a reply from the Supervising Architect simply communicating to the Senate a letter from the postmaster or some local officer, advising the Supervising Architect of the necessities of the Government in that particular locality, not giving us, however, his judgment of the public necessity and not giving the committee his estimate as to cost.

I do not find any fault with the Architect for this, and do not make the statement to reflect in any wise upon him, for I believe it is impossible, as that department is organized and with the work which it has in hand, for him to respond more intelligently than he does to the demands of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds in both Houses for necessary information on the subject. And if in addition to all that, being overwhelmed almost to-day with work, we charge him with the responsibility of supervising the construction of all the post-offices to be constructed under this bill, if the bill shall become a law, it would be, it seems to me, impossible for him to meet the demand of public duty under the circumstances.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to inquire of the Senator from Wisconsin if there will be any difficulty in organizing all the forces wanted for public buildings under one head. If you multiply the offices and have different people doing the same thing, is there not confusion and additional expense? One person having the whole subject in charge could overlook the entire field under him. Why not organize the bureau by adding more force?

Mr. SPOONER. After the enactment of this bill as a law, if it be enacted, the Supervising Architect of the Treasury will have every function left to him which he exercises to-day. It will be his duty to supervise the erection of every public building provided for by Congress by special act, and this very bill does not leave him without a voice as to the post-office buildings to be erected under it. The bill provides that the plans shall be adopted with the assistance of the Supervising Architect. In a sense this Post-Office Department architect is to be subordinate to the Supervising Architect of the Treasury.

It was thought by the committee that as these buildings were to be simply post-office buildings, not buildings pertaining to the class in which court-houses and custom-houses are included, the Post-Office Department would better understand than the Supervising Architect of the Treasury just what the needs of the Department were in each locality. They are not uniform; they may require one construction and plan in one locality and a different construction and plan in another, varying with the needs of the Department. It therefore seemed to us on every ground that it would be better to leave the plans, the arrangements, and the construction of these buildings, limited in their use to post-office purposes, to an architect of the Post-Office Department who would be there in the Department and constantly under the eye of the Postmaster-General and his subordinates.

The other principal amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska relates to the limit of cost. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds thought that $25,000 would erect in almost any community a building adequate for the wants of the Government as a post-office, and enable us in that way to stop the yearly rents which the Government is obliged to pay. That may not in the end be found sufficient. I think it will, however, be adequate in most localities, and this legislation is in a sense experimental. If we find that the limit is too low, Congress can hereafter change it; but vesting in a Department officer or in a board the power to erect generally public buildings of this class throughout the country, we thought it better to put an absolute and fixed limit upon the amount of expenditure.

Mr. REAGAN. Allow me to ask a question.

Mr. SPOONER. Certainly.

Mr. REAGAN. It has been contended heretofore that in certain places there ought to be provided a local post-office costing $10,000, or at most $12,000, to supply the average extent of the construction needed for all the offices now of the third class. But this bill goes beyond that, does it not?

Mr. SPOONER. I have no doubt myself that $25,000, properly expended, if the work is done as it ought to be done in the construction of such buildings, will erect a sufficiently handsome structure in almost any locality, and one adapted entirely to meet the wants of the Government. Of course it will not build a structure with much adornment, and we do not wish to provide for the expenditure on a large scale of the public money in that way. I think both amendments proposed by the Senator from Nebraska would not improve, if adopted, the bill.

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator from Wisconsin permit me to have a quotation read on this subject?

Mr. SPOONER. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. VEST. I send to the desk to be read what is marked in the last report of the Post-Office Department.

The Chief Clerk read from page 18 of the annual report of the Postmaster-General for the year ending June 30, 1887, as follows:

Of the whole number of offices chargeable to the Government 86 were, on the 31st of October last, in Government buildings, the heating and lighting of which the Secretary of the Treasury provides for out of the general appropriation for the expenses of the public buildings; 303 were under lease for different terms at a gross annual rental of $285,729.50; besides 50 stations at the rental of $62,621; and to the remainder, money allowances for rent, incurred and to be paid by the postmaster, to the amount in gross for the year of $32,643, have been ordered. Appended hereto is a tabular exhibit, prepared by the law clerk, of the post-office leases in force at the end of the fiscal year; and also an amendatory exhibit showing all the changes up to the 1st day of October. On that day the annual rate of cost for the rentable offices and stations stood at $501,331.50, of which $440,993.50 was for rent, and $60,338 for heating and lighting, not included in rentals; besides 31 offices recently elevated to the second class, the cost of provision for which had not been definitely adjusted.

Should the plan discussed for the reclassification of post-offices meet approval (or should third-class offices of the grade of $1,400 salary and upwards be included in the list of renting), it would add 1,072 offices to the charge of the Department, making altogether 1,589 as they are at present graded; a number to increase gradually from year to year if peace and prosperity continue with us. There are now 104 Government buildings containing post-offices, and the Supervising Architect of the Treasury advises me that 44 Government buildings, which will furnish post-office quarters, are in process of erection, and that special appropriations have been made for 32 more whose construction is not yet begun. Of the 104 in present use, 3, all in the State of Maine, are fourth-class offices; 2, 1 in Maine and 1 in Massachusetts, are of the lowest of the third class, and 1 holds the Georgetown office, now a station of the Washington post-office. This leaves 98, of which 86 are in the first and second classes, and 12 in the third, out of the number of 1,589 proposed for renting, already so provided for, besides 76 which soon will be also in buildings owned by the Government. The number remaining for further provision, on the plan suggested, will therefore be 1,415.

The average rental of the 303 offices now leased is $943; and of the remainder provided by allowances, $604.41; and of the total of both sorts, as now provided for, $857.74; and doubtless suitable premises can be secured for the additional ones proposed, because of their small requirements and location in small places, at an average annual rental not exceeding $400 each, or a total additional cost of $445,800 per year for rent. Add for heating and lighting the estimated sum of $50,000, and the annual charge for quarters for post-offices will become approximately $1,000,000, and increase from year to year at the rate of 3 to 5 per cent.

Mr. SPOONER. There is one proposition involved in the amendment as to which I have some doubt. I have none as to the two features to which I have referred. I believe the bill itself is better than the proposed amendment in those respects.

It will be observed by the Senate that we provide that the buildings to be erected under this bill shall be fairly distributed among the several States and Territories. There is also a provision in the bill, and it is in the bill recommended by the Post-Office Department, that the Postmaster-General may accept a site by donations of ground from different localities, and contributions to the purchase of such ground, or aid in the construction of the building to be constructed. Then it provides that in selecting the locality for the construction of the buildings under the provisions hereof preference shall be given to localities which provide free of expense to the United States ground for sites satisfactory to the Postmaster-General.

I do not, I confess, quite like the proposition that the United States shall be to any extent a beggar of the different localities in which post-office buildings or sites are needed, and I am not certain that it is right or seemly that the distribution of these buildings should be affected by the amount of money given by the different localities to aid in construction, or to aid in the purchase of sites; and, so far as I am concerned, as one member of the committee, I should not object to striking out the language in the bill which regulates the distribution of the buildings according to the contributions made.

Mr. TELLER. Is that in the amendment?

Mr. SPOONER. In the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska. I shall vote for that portion of his amendment.

Mr. PADDOCK. My judgment of that is that it gives preference to the stronger towns which may be located in the East against the weaker towns in the West and South. That is one of my chief objections to the committee plan. I have left that out in the substitute.

Mr. PLUMB. Will the Chair state the question again?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, in the chair). The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK] as a substitute for the bill.

Mr. PLUMB. I did not know it was a substitute. I wish to say in regard to the remark just made by the Senator from Wisconsin relative to that part of section 4 which relates to the donation of sites, that I think it is exceedingly offensive to put the Government in the attitude of begging from the different localities a site for its own purposes, and especially to give preference to localities so offering sites, thereby interfering with an equal distribution by sections.

One reason why I am in favor of the bill is that it puts the Government out of the begging business. As the thing stands now, the Government forces itself in the matter of rent on different localities, and the Department is engaged, I think, unnecessarily and unwisely and invidiously in playing off one part of a town against other parts, whereby the Government is getting rent in the large towns for either nothing or a mere nominal rent.

The people of the United States to-day support the Post-Office Department; they pay good prices to the railroad companies for carrying the mails; they pay the prices determined by fair competition for carrying the mails on what is called the star-route service; they pay for paper, for twine, for stamps, for bags; they pay good prices to the persons who render service to the Department, and there is no reason in the world why the Government after paying for all these items that relate to the postal service should go to the various towns and say, "We want to build a post-office here and we want it located in such a way as to promote the speculation on one side of the town or the other side of the town, or business on one side of the town or on the other, if you will only give us a building free." The Government ought to get out of that class of business.

Of course, if a site is offered at the proper place and there is no other controlling consideration, there would be no impropriety in the Government taking it; but the provision embodied in this bill is to urge localities to secure the early erection of a building and its location in such a way as to permit private speculation. That, in my judgment, is against public policy.

I hope the Senator from Missouri, whatever he may think about other amendments, will at least consent that all that portion relating to that subject shall be stricken out. I would strike out that portion of the paragraph commencing with the words "the Postmaster-General," in line 12 of section 4, and concluding with the same words, in line 18.

Mr. VEST. Let me make this suggestion, that this portion of the paragraph, from line 11, be stricken out:

The Postmaster-General is authorized to accept any such site by donation or grant thereof, and contributions to the purchase of such ground or in aid of the construction of the building to be erected.

Then strike out, in line 14, the word "and," and all down to "Postmaster-General," in line 16, so as to do away with that provision.

Mr. PLUMB. That would be right enough in itself, if it did not hold out a means whereby one locality would get a public building to the exclusion of another.

Mr. VEST. Does the Senator seek to deny to any locality the right of donating a site to the Government if it sees proper to do so?

Mr. PLUMB. Not at all.

Mr. VEST. Then, why not adopt what I suggest?

Mr. PLUMB. But the Postmaster-General can do that anyhow?

Mr. VEST. I doubt it.

Mr. PLUMB. The head of the Treasury Department accepts donations all the time for public buildings under the present system.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair did not understand whether the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] submitted an amendment.

Mr. VEST. I submitted no amendment.

Mr. PLUMB. If it is in order to submit an amendment——

Mr. PADDOCK. Is it in order?

Mr. REAGAN. It is in order to perfect the original bill before voting on the substitute.

Mr. PLUMB. Then I move to strike out of the bill, in section 4, beginning with the words "The Postmaster-General," in line 11, down to and including the same words in line 18.

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator from Kansas will permit me a moment, I desire to suggest to him that it might be well to leave in the authority to the Postmaster-General to accept a donation.

Mr. TELLER. No. He has that authority now.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not know about that.

Mr. REAGAN. If an amendment to that amendment is in order, I should like to submit an amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is in order.

Mr. REAGAN. Then I move to strike out all after the word "situated," in line 11 of section 4, down to the words "Postmaster-General," in line 18.

Mr. PLUMB. That is my amendment.

Mr. REAGAN. I thought the Senator's amendment commenced at a different place.

Mr. PLUMB. No, at the same place.

Mr. REAGAN. If that is the Senator's motion, I have no motion to make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Kansas will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 4, line 11, after the word "situated," it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the word "*Provided*," in line 18, as follows:

The Postmaster-General is authorized to accept any such site by donation or grant thereof, and contributions to the purchase of such ground or in aid of the construction of the building to be erected; and in selecting the locality for the construction of buildings under the provisions hereof, preference shall be given to localities which provide, free of expense to the United States, ground for site satisfactory to the Posmaster-General: *Provided*.

Mr. PADDOCK. Is that amendment in order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is.

Mr. PADDOCK. That amendment, I think, is proposed to the original bill and not to my amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The pending amendment is an amendment to the text of the bill, and, of course, an amendment to the amendment would be in order.

Mr. PADDOCK. If the Senator from Kansas will look at the substitute amendment he will see that his amendment, as he has stated it, is an amendment to the bill and not to my amendment.

Mr. PLUMB. It is an amendment to the original bill. I understand the ruling of the Chair to be that it is in order first to perfect the bill before voting on the substitute.

Mr. PADDOCK. Yes; undoubtedly that is true, and the Senator is correct.

Mr. TELLER. As it has been suggested that it is necessary to keep in the words, "The Postmaster-General is authorized to accept any such site by donation or grant thereof," for fear that he should not have that right, I will simply say that that right has been exercised by the executive department of the Government for many years. If there was any question about it, of course he could buy the land at a nominal sum. So it is not necessary to keep that provision in the bill. If it remains, it does seem to be an invitation or a sort of call on the people of a locality to make a present of land to the Government of the United States. It seems to me the whole of it ought to go out.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the objection to that part of the bill which provides for donations of land or money for the construction of post-office buildings is, in my judgment, well founded. The Government requires a building in a city at a certain place such as suits the convenience of the public business; that should be the sole consideration which should control the selection of a site. That being determined, the Government should pay for it its reasonable market value. Certainly if any one wishes to give that to the Postmaster-General without any reservation, he would have the authority to accept it at a reasonable price, which means the market value, or doubtless entirely; but to say in this bill that his judgment should be affected, or to leave an implication for the location of a building somewhere else than the public convenience requires is certainly an error, and it invites any amount of corruption, any amount of double dealing. It is an invitation to people to secure the location of buildings, as has been suggested by other Senators, not at such place as the public convenience of the people may demand, but at such place as the private interests of the donors may suggest, and it is an implied authority to the Postmaster-General, or the officer charged with this duty, to make this selection under the influence of this motive.

For that reason, I think the suggestion to strike out is well founded, and that the provision should be stricken from the bill. It gives no additional authority, but invites an exercise of authority under improper motives and for improper objects.

Mr. VEST. I am not so clear, as a lawyer, about the proposition which has been suggested here as to the general authority existing in any head of a Department to receive a deed from any person who wishes to donate property; but to settle this controversy, if there is any idea that this would lead to any corrupt bargaining for sites, so far as I am concerned (and the Senator from Wisconsin, who is really the sponsor of the bill, I understand agrees to it), let all that part of the section be stricken out, as suggested by the Senator from Kansas, including the word "provided," in line 18, and that would end the discussion as to that point. Then it would be necessary, in line 19, in order to correct the verbiage of the bill, to strike out the word "also," in the clause, "That the Postmaster-General is also authorized." I hope that amendment will be satisfactory to my friend from Florida.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 4, line 11, after the word "situated," it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the word "*Provided*," in line 18, in the following words:

> The Postmaster-General is authorized to accept any such site by donation or grant thereof, and contributions to the purchase of such ground or in aid of the construction of the building to be erected; and in selecting the locality for the construction of buildings under the provisions hereof preference shall be given to localities which provide, free of expense to the United States, ground for site satisfactory to the Postmaster-General: *Provided*,

And in line 19, to strike out the word "also" before "authorized;" so that the section when amended would read:

> That no contract for the construction of any such building shall be made until there shall have been conveyed to the United States, with perfect title, approved by the Attorney-General, a suitable site for such building, of such size as shall afford a clear space of not less than 50 feet in extent on each side of and beyond the limits of such proposed building, and, in addition, so much as in any particular case the Postmaster-General shall deem requisite, nor shall any such contract be made until jurisdiction over such site shall have been ceded to the United States by the State within which the same is situated. That the Postmaster-General is authorized, when in his judgment it shall be necessary, to purchase a suitable site for any such building, at a price not exceeding $5,000, or, where the same can not be otherwise procured, to acquire title by condemnation, in the name of the United States, under the laws of the State within which such site may be situated.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the proposed amendment?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I should like to inquire whether that provision has been retained in the bill which requires such a building to be 50 feet from other buildings. If so, I think the limitation of $5,000 to buy a site would not be adequate. It will be perhaps desirable to locate many of these buildings right in the business part of towns where there are already business houses or other buildings erected, and $5,000, if it is to be 50 feet from side to side, would not buy the site in any thriving town in this country. I do not know whether the provision requiring the building to have a space of not less than 50 feet from other buildings has been stricken out or not. I have not been here all day.

Mr. VEST. That has not been stricken out.

Mr. SAULSBURY. Then I am sure the sum of $5,000 in any thriving town in this country will not be sufficient to buy a suitable location in the central part of the town where the business interests of the town are. In almost any town not much short of $10,000 will be necessary if a site is to be selected in the business part of the town. There ought to be some change in that respect.

Mr. VEST. I have not the slightest objection to striking out in line 5 of section 4 the limitation as to 50 feet. I had doubts about it when the bill was constructed, but we came to the conclusion that in almost any town in which the gross receipts of the post-office had not exceeded $3,000 a year for three years, $5,000, even with the limitation of 50 feet, would buy a very good site. I know that is the case in the West, but as to what would be the cost upon the Eastern seaboard I am not so well informed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Missouri propose an amendment?

Mr. VEST. I have no objection to the amendment as proposed by the Senator from Delaware, if he wants to strike out the limitation.

Mr. HALE. May I ask the Senator from Missouri a question?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. Is the $5,000 to be paid for a site to be additional to the $25,000 limited as the cost of the building?

Mr. VEST. Certainly; the provision is a specific one as to the ground to be purchased, and then the building is not to exceed in cost $25,000.

Mr. HALE. Now, one further question. What did the examination of the committee upon this subject lead it to believe would be about the size of a town where the gross receipts would amount to $3,000?

Mr. VEST. Let the Senator refer to the response of the Postmaster-General to the following resolution of the Senate:

> That the Postmaster-General be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, a list of Presidential post-offices in the United States and in the Territories whose annual receipts for the three last preceding years have exceeded $3,000 per annum; and also a statement of the amount of rent paid by the Government for the accommodation of each such post-office.

It is Executive Document No. 155.

Mr. HALE. Does that cover the point suggested by my question as to the size of a town where the gross receipts would be $3,000? What I am trying to get at is the likelihood of the value of property in a place of a given number of inhabitants.

Mr. VEST. It would be simply impossible, without taking the census and the list of buildings in Executive Document No. 155, and going through and comparing them, to answer that question, as the Senator very well knows that the post-office business is not at all in proportion to the size of a town.

Mr. HALE. I know it is not.

Mr. VEST. There are small towns with a population of 3,000 or 4,000 in which the post-office business exceeds that in towns of 10,000 and 12,000, and for very obvious reasons. All I can answer is that here is a list of the Presidential post-offices in the United States where the gross receipts for three years preceding amount to $3,000.

Mr. HALE. I should take it that it would embrace towns ranging from 5,000 to 8,000 and 10,000 people. Of course it varies with locations and situations, and with peculiar incidental circumstances, but I should think that generally some kind of a rule could be drawn. In some cases a town with 5,000 inhabitants will not have reached $3,000 of gross receipts.

Mr. VEST. That is true.

Mr. HALE. In some cases it would require a town of 7,000 or 8,000 inhabitants to reach gross receipts to the amount of $3,000, and I did not know but that there was some average.

Mr. VEST. I do not think any rule could be established, from the nature of the case.

Mr. REAGAN. When the Senator from Maine asked about the cost of such a building I was about to say that the estimate of the Postmaster-General as to the probable cost, as to what would be sufficient for post-offices at third-class offices, is from $10,000 to $12,000, and for other offices not to exceed $20,000. That is the estimate he states in his report.

Mr. PADDOCK. I rose to make a suggestion to the Senator from Maine, that I thought he would discover, if he made an examination, that towns where the gross receipts are $3,000 would have an average population of 4,000 to 4,500, probably not to exceed in any case where a town is well established 4,500.

Mr. HALE. That is rather less than what I supposed. It is more of an answer to my question than I succeeded in getting before.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] propose any amendment?

Mr. SAULSBURY. In section 4, line 5, in the clause which requires he clear space to be "not less than 50 feet in extent on each side of

and beyond the limits of such proposed building," I move to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty." There is no necessity to have a space of 50 feet.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment of the Senator from Delaware will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 5 of section 4, before the word "feet," strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to read:

Of such size as shall afford a clear space of not less than 30 feet in extent on each side of and beyond the limits of such proposed building.

Mr. SAULSBURY. At the suggestion of friends, I will move to strike out without inserting anything, but leave it to the discretion of the Postmaster-General, who is to approve the plan.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Will the Senator from Delaware indicate the words he proposes to strike out?

Mr. SAULSBURY. In lines 5, 6, and 7, strike out the words "of not less than 50 feet in extent on each side of and beyond the limits of such proposed building."

Mr. SPOONER. If the Senator from Delaware will permit a suggestion, I suggest that he modify his amendment so that it shall insert the word "sufficient" before the word "clear" and strike out the words "of not less than 50 feet in extent." It would then read:

A suitable site for such building, of such size as shall afford a sufficient clear space on each side.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I am willing to accept that suggestion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment will be read at the desk.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 5, before the word "clear," insert the word "sufficient," and in the same line, after the word "space," strike out the words "of not less than 50 feet in extent;" so as to read:

A suitable site for such building, of such size as shall afford a sufficient clear space on each side of and beyond the limits of such proposed building.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the proposed amendment?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I suggest to the Senator from Delaware that that amendment would not meet the case. It provides that there shall be a clear space included in the site, so that if a building shall be located on the street the space afforded by the street is excluded from that which the terms of the bill would require for the erection of the building; whereas, on the other hand, if it were provided that it shall afford a clear space, including streets and alleys, of a certain amount it would meet the case, it seems to me.

Take most of the Western towns; they are laid out in blocks, and the blocks are subdivided into quarters. The usual dimension of the quarter-blocks is 132 feet by 132 feet, but those quarter blocks are bounded on two sides by alleys and on two sides by streets. If the proposition contained in the bill without amendment should be retained, a building put in the center of one of those 132-feet-square blocks would not comply with the requirements of the bill.

I think if the amendment of the Senater from Delaware should be adopted, still the one I suggest, to insert after the word "space," in line 5, "including streets and alleys," should be properly made.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I have no objection to that amendment. My only object was not to have the size of the site so large that it could not be bought for the money specified in the bill. I am satisfied that in almost any thriving town $5,000 can not buy a suitable site for the location of a post-office if the site is to have the dimensions specified in the bill. I know that a few years ago there was a small post-office built in my town, and the engineer went down and selected a site on which there was a frame dwelling-house. He paid $8,000 for the site, the owner moving everything off. I know that in certain towns in my State, and I suppose it is so in all States, if a site is selected in the business part of the town it will require $10,000 to procure a site such as is provided for in the bill. My only object is to secure a proper site for the building.

Mr. VEST. I suggest to the Senator from Delaware, in order to meet his statement of the case, that in line 5, after the word "as," the words "shall afford a clear space of not less than 50 feet in extent on each side of and beyond the limits of such proposed building, and, in addition, so much as in any particular case," be stricken out, and then the section as amended would read, that there shall be purchased "a suitable site for such building, of such size as the Postmaster-General shall deem requisite." That puts no limitation upon the discretionary power of the Postmaster-General.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I am willing to leave that in the discretion of the Postmaster-General.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Delaware proposes to modify his amendment. The amendment will be stated as modified.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 5, after the word "as," it is proposed to strike out the words:

Shall afford a clear space of not less than 50 feet in extent on each side of and beyond the limits of such proposed building, and, in addition, so much as in any particular case:

So as to read:

A suitable site for such building, of such size as the Postmaster-General shall deem requisite; nor shall any such contract be made until jurisdiction over such site shall have been ceded to the United States by the State within which the same is situated.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 15th instant approved and signed the act (S. 2267) for the relief of the Omaha tribe of Indians in Nebraska, to extend time of payment to purchasers of land of said Indians, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the President had on the 16th instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 2605) relating to the anchorage of vessels in the port of New York;

An act (S. 333) granting a pension to Reuben Brownmiller;

An act (S. 334) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Allgower; and

An act (S. 734) granting a pension to guardian of Enos J. Searles, of Clermont County, Ohio.

The message further announced that the President had on the 17th instant approved and signed the act (S. 1204) to provide for holding the circuit and district courts of the United States at Martinsburgh, in the district of West Virginia.

KANSAS RAILROAD GRANTS.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent to make a report from the Committee on Printing at this time, on a matter which seems to require some haste.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be received, if there be no objection.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am directed by the Committee on Printing to report back the letter of the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting certain information relative to railroad land grants to the State of Kansas, and to suggest to the Senate that it be not printed. It seems to be a matter that is entirely local and of no general interest.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nebraska, from the Committee on Printing, reports back a letter of the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to a resolution of January 17, 1888, information relative to railroad land grants to the State of Kansas, with the recommendation that it be not printed.

Mr. PLUMB. That report is desired for evidence in a suit now pending in the United States circuit court for the district of Kansas. I move that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to transmit the same to the United States district attorney for the district of Kansas for use in that suit, to be returned to the Secretary at such time and under such direction as he may give.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. EDMUNDS. On which question are we voting?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. On the motion of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB].

Mr. EDMUNDS. What is the nature of these papers, Mr. President?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. This is a letter from the Secretary of the Interior in response to a Senate resolution of January 17, 1888, transmitting information relative to railroad land grants to the State o Kansas.

Mr. REAGAN. Is it not somewhat remarkable that the Senate should collect evidence for suits in the courts? I do not think that I have ever known of such a thing before.

Mr. PLUMB. I had a letter some time since from the district attorney for Kansas asking me for this report, and I had a letter also from the counsel associated with him in the cause. It is a suit begun by the Attorney-General of the United States for the purpose of setting aside the conveyance of certain land made to a railroad company, and joined with the United States district attorney the counsel who represent particularly the settlers on those lands have been desirous for months of getting this information. Whether they want it because they have not been able to get it from the General Land Office or otherwise I do not know; but it is certainly proper they should have it; and while I would not say that the resolution was offered for the purpose of obtaining it, because I had no such purpose, although the resolution was prepared by gentlemen who are interested in the proceedings, at the same time it is useful for this purpose, and I do not know of any other purpose that it is useful for.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I think it is absolutely unprecedented for the Senate to allow to go out of its possession, except in charge of some of its officers, for purposes of justice, any original paper that may be on its files. Therefore on principle I should be opposed to agreeing to such a motion as the Senator from Kansas suggests. Then I will add to him (which will occur to him in a moment when I suggest it) that this letter or report of the Secretary of the Interior is not certified in the way that the laws of the United States require information from the Departments to be certified, and being sent there it would not be received in evidence for a single moment; that is, it would not be open to discussion. The Attorney-General or a private citizen, because the law provides for that, can get a certified copy of these papers from the Department of the Interior on application, when they would be admissible in a court of justice, if they were otherwise admissible in respect of the subject they applied to. I hope the Senator will withdraw the motion.

Mr. PLUMB. I withdraw the motion for the present.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is withdrawn. The Committee on Printing will be discharged from the further consideration of the matter, and the accompanying papers will lie on the table.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Yes, or be placed on file, whatever is the proper course.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8394) to authorize United States marshals to arrest offenders and fugitives from justice in Indian Territory.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 325) granting to the Billings, Clark's Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company the right of way through the Crow Indian reservation.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2017) to incorporate the Rock Creek Railroad Company of the District of Columbia, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. HEARD, Mr. COMPTON, and Mr. ROWELL managers at the conference on its part.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6899) to incorporate the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the bill and amendments, and had appointed Mr. HEMPHILL, Mr. LEE, and Mr. BREWER managers at the conference on its part.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4920) for the protection of the officials of the United States in the Indian Territory, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the bill and the amendments, and had appointed Mr. ROGERS, Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina, and Mr. FULLER managers at the conference on its part.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5445) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, asked for a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. FORAN, Mr. GAY, and Mr. LONG managers at the conference on its part.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7052) relating to postal crimes and amendatory of the statutes therein mentioned, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the bill and amendment, and had appointed Mr. DOCKERY, Mr. ERMENTROUT, and Mr. PETERS managers at the conference on its part.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. FRYE. I ask leave, out of order, to report back the river and harbor bill with certain amendments, and I ask that it may be printed and recommitted to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine, from the Committee on Commerce, reports back with amendments the bill (H. R. 9859) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes. The Senator from Maine asks that the bill may be printed and recommitted. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 22, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *May* 21, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of Saturday's proceedings was read and approved.

VETO MESSAGE—THEODORA M. PIATT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, on motion of Mr. SPRINGER, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 2282, entitled "An act to pension Mrs. Theodora M. Piatt."

The deceased husband of the beneficiary named in this bill served faithfully and well in the volunteer service, and after his discharge as major entered the regular Army and was on the retired-list at the time of his death, which occurred on the 17th day of April, 1885. At that time he seems to have been engaged in the practice of the law at Covington, Ky.

He does not appear to have contracted any distinct and definite disability in his army service, though his health and strength were doubtless somewhat impaired by hardship and exposure.

It is conceded that he committed suicide by shooting himself with a pistol.

A coroner's inquest was held and the following verdict was returned:

"Benjamin M. Piatt came to his death from a pistol bullet through the brain, fired from a pistol in his own hand, with suicidal intent, while laboring under a fit of temporary insanity, caused by morbid sensitiveness of wasted opportunities, and constantly brooding over imaginary troubles and financial difficulties."

It is said in support of his widow's claim for pension that being lame, as a result, in part at least, of his military service, he, by reason of such lameness, fell from a staircase a few months before his death, the injury from which affected his mind, causing insanity, which in its turn resulted in his suicide.

Much interest is manifested in this case, based upon former friendship and intimacy with the deceased and kind feeling and sympathy for his widow. I should be glad to respond to these sentiments to the extent of approving this bill, but it is one of the misfortunes of public life and official responsibility that a sense of duty frequently stands between a conception of right and a sympathetic inclination.

The verdict returned upon the coroner's inquest, founded upon a friendly examination of all the facts surrounding the melancholy death of this soldier, made at the time of death and in the midst of his neighbors and friends, both by what it contains and by what is omitted, together with the other facts developed, lead me to the conclusion that if a pension is granted in this case no soldier's widow's application based upon suicide can be consistently rejected.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 18, 1888.

VETO MESSAGE—NANCY F. JENNINGS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. SPRINGER, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 5545, entitled "An act granting a pension to Nancy F. Jennings."

William Jennings, the husband of the beneficiary named in this bill, enlisted in October, 1861, and was discharged June 24, 1862, upon a surgeon's certificate of disability, the cause of disability being therein stated as "hemorrhoids."

He never applied for a pension, and died in 1877 of apoplexy.

In the report of the committee which reported this bill the allegation is made that the deceased came home from the army with chronic diarrhea and suffered from the same to the date of his death.

The widow filed a claim for pension in 1878, which was rejected on the ground that the fatal disease, apoplexy, was not due to military service nor the result of either of the complaints mentioned.

If we are to adhere to the rule that in order to entitle the widow of a soldier to a pension the death of her husband must be in some way related to his military service, there can be no doubt that, upon its merits, this case was properly disposed of by the Pension Bureau.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 18, 1888.

During the reading of the foregoing,

Mr. MORRILL said: Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as these several messages were laid before the House on Saturday, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with, and that they be appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. ADAMS. I think it would be entirely proper to have them read by their titles, at least.

Mr. NELSON. I object to dispensing with the reading.

The SPEAKER. Objection being made, the Clerk will proceed with the reading.

VETO MESSAGE—SALLY A. RANDALL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. SPRINGER, referred to the Committee on Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 88, entitled "An act granting a pension to Sally A. Randall."

Antipas Taber enlisted in the war of 1812, and was discharged in the year 1814. There is no claim made that he received any injury in the Army or that his death, which happened long after his discharge, was in the slightest degree related to his military service. It does not appear that he ever made any application for a pension or was ever upon the pension-rolls. He died at Trinidad, in the Island of Cuba, April 11, 1831, leaving as his widow the beneficiary mentioned in this bill. About twenty-two years after his death, and in February, 1853, she married Albert Randall, and twenty years thereafter, in October, 1873, Randall died, leaving her again a widow.

It is alleged in the report of the committee in the House to which this bill was referred that Mrs. Randall is a worthy woman, seventy-five years of age, in needy circumstances, with health much impaired, and that the petition for her relief was signed by prominent citizens of Norwich, Conn., where she now resides.

All this certainly commends her case to the kindness and benevolence of the citizens mentioned, and the State of Connecticut ought not to allow her to be in needy circumstances.

It seems to me, however, that it would establish a bad precedent to provide for her from the Federal Treasury. From the statement of her present age, she must have been born during the time of her first husband's enlistment. She knew nothing of his military service except as the same may have been detailed to her. Her first widowhood had no connection with any incident or condition of health traceable to such service; and her second husband, with whom she lived for twenty years, never entered the military service of the Government.

I do not see how the relief proposed can be granted in this case without an unjustifiable departure from the rules under which applications for pension should be determined.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 19, 1888.

VETO MESSAGE—WILLIAM H. HESTER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. MATSON, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 8164, entitled "An act granting a pension to William H. Hester."

It is claimed that the beneficiary named in this bill was injured by sand blowing in his eyes during a sand-storm while in the service in the year 1869, resulting in nearly if not quite total blindness.

It is conceded in the report of the committee to which this bill was referred

in the House, that the claim for pension made by this man to the Pension Bureau was largely supported by perjury and forgery; but the criminality of these methods is made to rest upon three rogues and scoundrels who undertook to obtain a pension for the soldier; and it is stated by the committee as their opinion that the claimant himself was innocent of any complicity in the crimes committed and attempted.

I have quite a full report of the papers filed and proceedings taken in relation to the claim presented to the Pension Bureau, and I am sorry that I can not agree with the committee of the House as to the merits of the application now made, or the good faith and honesty of the beneficiary named in the bill herewith returned.

Among the facts presented I shall refer to but one or two touching the conduct of the claimant himself.

Upon his examination, under oath, by a special examiner, he stated that he was brought to Washington to further his claim by a man named Miller, one of the rascally attorneys spoken of in the committee's report; that Miller was to pay his expenses while in Washington, and was to receive one-third of the money paid upon the claim.

This is not the conduct of a man claiming in good faith a pension from the Government.

He further stated under oath that his eyes became affected about January 15, 1869, by reason of a sand-storm; that the sand blew into them and cut them all to pieces; that he was thereafter hardly able to see or get around and wait on himself, and that Edward N. Baldwin took care of him in his tent.

This Mr. Baldwin was found by the special examiner, and testified that he knew the claimant and served in same regiment and bunked with him; that he never knew of the sand-storm spoken of by Hester; that he never knew that he had sore eyes in the service; that he (Baldwin) did not take care of him when he was suffering with sore eyes, and that he never knew of Hester being sick but once, and that was when he had eaten too much. He was shown an affidavit purporting to be made by him, and declared the entire thing to be false and a forgery.

I believe this claim for pension to be a fraud from beginning to end, and the effrontery with which it has been pushed shows the necessity of a careful examination of these cases.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 19, 1888.

VETO MESSAGE—ROYAL J. HIAR.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. MATSON, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 879, entitled "An act granting a pension to Royal J. Hiar."

The beneficiary named in this bill enlisted November 11, 1861, in the First Regiment of Michigan Engineers and Mechanics. He is reported as absent without proper authority from May 24, 1862, to January 15, 1863, when he was discharged by reason of varicose veins of the left leg and thigh, claimed to have existed before enlistment.

He filed a claim for pension August 30, 1876, alleging disease of the right side and hip, due to typhoid pneumonia, contracted while repairing a hospital tent in March, 1862.

There is no record of this disease; the proof he furnishes of the same is extremely slight, though he was furnished ample opportunity; the disability of which he complains has no natural relation to the sickness he claims to have had during his service, but is quite a natural result of "an injury while logging," to which some of the witnesses examined in a special examination of the case attribute it.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 19, 1888.

VETO MESSAGE—CYRENIUS G. STRYKER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. MATSON, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 5234, entitled "An act granting a pension to Cyrenius G. Stryker."

The beneficiary named in this bill enlisted for nine months, in September, 1862, and was discharged June 27, 1863.

His enlistment was in Company A, Thirtieth New Jersey Regiment. The bill proposes to pension him as "a private in Company A, Thirtieth New York Volunteers."

He alleges that he was pushed or fell from the platform of a car in which he was transported to Washington after enlistment, and injured his spine. On the claim which he presented to the Pension Bureau in June, 1879, repeated medical examinations failed to reveal any disability from the cause alleged, and after a special examination his claim was rejected, because, with the assistance of such special examination, the claimant did not prove the origin of alleged injury in service and the line of duty, or a pensionable degree of disability therefrom since discharge.

The evidence now offered in support of this claim appears to have reference to a time long anterior to its rejection by the Pension Bureau in 1886, and does not impeach the finding of the bureau that at the latter date there existed no pensionable disability.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 19, 1888.

VETO MESSAGE—ELLEN SHEA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. MATSON, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 3579, entitled "An act granting a pension to Ellen Shea."

This beneficiary is an old lady and a widow. Her son, Michael Shea, enlisted in January, 1862. The records show that he was sick on one or two occasions during his service; he is also reported as a deserter and absent without leave and in arrest and confinement fully as often as he was sick. He was discharged January 20, 1865.

No application for a pension has been made on his behalf. The mother filed a claim for pension in July, 1884, alleging that her son contracted a fever in the service which resulted in insanity, which was the cause of his death on the 10th day of March, 1884.

He was killed by a snow-slide in the State of Colorado. The only hint that his death was in any way connected with the service is the suggestion that not having the proper use of his mind he wandered away and was killed.

His mother now lives in Chicago, and I suppose lived there at the time of her son's death. There is very little evidence offered of any unsoundness of mind, and his death occurring at Woodstock, Colo., it is hardly to be supposed that he wandered that far. And as tending to show that unsoundness of mind had nothing to do with his death it may be mentioned that an attorney having the mother's application for pension in charge withdrew from the case in October, 1884, for the reason that having made inquiries at the place where the soldier was killed he found that his death was caused by a snow-slide, and that he was informed that a number of other persons lost their lives at the same time.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 19, 1888.

VETO MESSAGE—SARAH E. M'CALEB.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. PLUMB, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 6609, entitled "An act for the relief of Sarah E. McCaleb."

The husband of the beneficiary named in this bill was wounded in the head at the battle of Fort Donelson on the 15th day of February, 1862. He served thereafter and was promoted, and was discharged June 30, 1865.

He died by suicide in 1878.

He never applied for a pension.

The suggestion is made that the wound in his head predisposed him to mental unsoundness, but it does not appear to be claimed that he was insane.

I can not believe that his suicide had any connection with his army service.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 19, 1888.

VETO MESSAGE—FARNAREN BALL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, on motion of Mr. MATSON, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 4590, entitled "An act granting a pension to Farnaren Ball."

In the report of the committee to which this bill was referred, the name of this beneficiary is given as "Farnasen Ball," and in a report from the Pension Bureau it is insisted that the correct name is "Tamezen Ball."

Her son, Augustus F. Coldecott, was pensioned for disease of the lungs up to the time of his death, which occurred June 2, 1872.

The cause of his death was an overdose of laudanum, and whether it was taken by mistake or design is uncertain.

The mother is not entirely destitute, deriving an income, though small, from the interest upon a mortgage given to her upon a sale of some real estate.

The proofs with which I have been furnished failed to satisfy me that the Government should grant a pension on account of death produced by a self-administered narcotic in the circumstances which surrounded this case.

As a general proposition I see nothing unjust or unfair in holding that if a pensioner is sick and through ignorance or design takes laudanum without the direction or regulation of a physician the Government should not be held responsible for the consequences.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 19, 1888.

VETO MESSAGE—IMPROVEMENT CASTLE ISLAND, BOSTON HARBOR.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, as follows:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval a joint resolution which originated in the House of Representatives "authorizing the use and improvement of Castle Island, in Boston Harbor."

This island is separated from the mainland of the city of Boston by a channel over one-half mile wide. Fort Independence is located on the island, and it is regarded by our military authorities as quite important to the defense of the city.

The proposition contained in the joint resolution is to permit the city of Boston, through its park commissioners, to improve and beautify this island in connection with a public park to be laid out in the city, with the intention of joining the mainland and the island by the construction of a viaduct or causeway across the water now separating the same.

It is quite plain that the occupancy of this island as a place of pleasure and recreation as contemplated under this resolution would be entirely inconsistent with military or defensive uses. I do not regard the control reserved in the resolution to the Secretary of War over such excavations, fillings, and structures upon the island as may be proposed as of much importance. When a park is established there the island is no longer a defense in time of need.

This scheme, or one of the same character, was broached more than four years ago, and met the disapproval of the Secretary of War and the Engineer Department.

I am now advised by the Secretary of War, the Chief of Engineers, and the Lieutenant-General of the Army, in quite positive terms, that the resolution under consideration should not, for reasons fully stated by them, become operative.

I deem the opinions of these officers abundant justification for my disapproval of the resolution without further statement of objections.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 18, 1888.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not advised as to what committee reported this joint resolution.

Mr. COX. It comes from the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the message, with the accompanying joint resolution, will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ARRESTS IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 8394) to authorize the United States marshals to arrest offenders and fugitives

from justice in the Indian Territory, with amendments by the Senate, and a request by the Senate for a committee of conference.

Mr. ROGERS. This is a House bill which passed the House without any sort of opposition. One or two verbal amendments have been put on it by the Senate. They do not change the bill in the slightest degree, except to make it a little more specific. I ask that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, after the word "process," in line 3, insert "connected with any criminal proceeding."

Page 1, line 6, insert after "execute" the word "like."

The amendments of the Senate were concurred in.

PROTECTION OF OFFICIALS IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 4920) for the protection of the officials of the United States in the Indian Territory, with amendments by the Senate, and a request by the Senate for a committee of conference.

Mr. ROGERS. This is a House bill with Senate amendments. The Senate requests a conference. I ask that the House non-concur in the amendments of the Senate and agree to the conferenee.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILLS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 5445) making an appropriation for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

The amendments of the Senate were read, as follows:

On page 1, lines 7 and 8, strike out "$79,000,000" and insert "$80,473,000."

On page 1, strike out all after "further," in line 11, down to and including "husband," in line 12, and insert "that all pensions which have been or may hereafter be granted under the general laws regulating pensions to widows in consequence of death occurring from a cause which originated in the service since the 4th day of March, 1861, shall commence from the date of the death of the husband."

On page 2, line 19, strike out "fifteen" and insert "eighteen."

On page 2, line 21, after "Treasury," insert "where practicable."

On page 2, line 24, strike out all after "respectively" to the end of the bill.

Mr. FORAN. I ask unanimous consent that the House non-concur in the Senate amendments, and ask for a committee of conference.

The motion was agreed to, and a conference was requested with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and Mr. FORAN, Mr. GAY, and Mr. LONG were appointed as conferees on the part of the House.

BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER OF THE NORTH.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 2528) authorizing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Red River of the North by the North Dakota and Pacific Railroad Company, with amendments by the Senate; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 3290) to amend section 685 of the Revised Statutes, relating to the District of Columbia, with amendments by the Senate; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

NICHOLAS LEUSCHEN AND OTHERS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 4601) to amend the naval record of Nicholas Leuschen, Peter Leuschen, and Loth Possum, with amendments by the Senate; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

POSTAL CRIMES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 7052) relating to postal crimes and amendatory of the statutes therein mentioned, with amendments by the Senate.

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask unanimous consent to non-concur in the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

Mr. McMILLIN. What is the object of the bill?

Mr. DOCKERY. The object is to punish the crime of forgery by clerks, and other postal crimes.

Mr. NELSON. I call for the reading of the amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, at end of line 21, insert: "And all matter otherwise mailable by law upon the envelope or outside cover or wrapper of which, or postal-card upon which, indecent, lewd, lascivious, obscene, libelous, scurrilous, or threatening delineations, epithets, terms, or language, or reflecting injuriously upon the character or conduct of another, may be written or printed are hereby declared to be non-mailable matter and shall not be conveyed in the mails or delivered from any post-office, nor delivered by any letter-carrier. And any person who shall knowingly deposit or cause to be deposited for mailing or delivery anything declared by this section to be non-mailable matter, and any person who shall knowingly take the same or cause the same to be taken from the mails for the purpose of circulating or disposing of, or of aiding in the circulation or disposition of the same, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall for each and every offense be fined not less than $100 nor more than $5,000, or imprisoned at hard labor not less than one year nor more than ten years, or both, at the discretion of the court.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] asks that the amendments of the Senate be non-concurred in and that the House agree to the request for a conference.

Mr. ADAMS. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection being made the bill, with the Senate amendments, is referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Subsequently Mr. ADAMS withdrew his objection, the Senate amendments were non-concurred in, and the request of the Senate for a conference agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce during the day the conferees on the part of the House.

JOHN POWERS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 6800) for the relief of John Powers, with amendments by the Senate; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WILLIAM CLIFT.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a bill (S. 90) for the relief of William Clift.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I will state in regard to that bill that one for the same purpose passed the House in the Forty-ninth Congress, and a bill has been reported by the Committee on War Claims of this Congress for the same amount. I therefore ask for the unanimous consideration of the Senate bill.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. NEAL], that the bill be now considered?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Let the report be read.

The SPEAKER. There is no report. This is a Senate bill.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Then let the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. NEAL] make a statement.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, as I have already said——

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, I think we had better wait and consider the bill in its regular order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] objects.

J. HENRY RIVES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a bill (S. 517) for the relief of J. Henry Rives.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have that bill reported at length.

The bill was read, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House Senate bills of the following titles; which were severally referred as indicated:

A bill (S. 566) making an appropriation for a final survey and estimates for the commencement of the construction of a boat-railway around the obstructions to navigation at The Dalles and Celilo Falls in the Columbia River—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

The bill (S. 661) for the relief of Charles Murphy—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 961) for the presentation of badges to the officers and men of the Greely relief expedition—to the Committee on the Library.

The bill (S. 975) for the relief of H. A. Myers—to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (S. 1171) for the relief of the legal representatives of George McDougall, deceased—to the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill (S. 1177) for the erection of a public building at Fortress Monroe—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 1242) for the relief of the legal representatives of Maj. William Kendall—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 1323) to authorize the President to confer brevet rank on officers of the United States Army for gallant services in Indian campaigns—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 1554) to increase the appropriation for the erection of a public building at Sacramento, Cal.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 1599) correcting the military record of Lieut. James O'Rourke—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 1525) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880—to the Committee on Commerce.

SCHOOL AND UNIVERSITY LANDS, WYOMING.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a bill (S. 1782) to authorize the leasing of the school and university lands in the Territory of Wyoming, and for other purposes.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think that bill ought to go to the Committee on Public Lands.

Mr. NELSON. I would like to have the bill reported in full, Mr. Speaker.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House Senate bills of the following titles; which were read a first and second time, and referred as indicated:

The bill (S. 1871) to perfect the military record of Warren C. Alden—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 1882) to authorize the construction of a railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa—to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 1883) to authorize the construction of a railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Muscatine, Iowa—to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 1903) granting the right of way through the Fort Riley military reservation, Kansas, to the Chicago, Kansas and Western Railway Company—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 1969) granting right of way to the Junction City and Fort Riley Street Railway Company into and upon the Fort Riley military reservation in the State of Kansas, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 2030) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at Forest City, Dak., by the Forest City and Watertown Railway Company—to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 2116) to provide aid to State homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 2377) providing for the issue gratuitously of certain meteorological instruments to voluntary observers at present recognized in the Signal Service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 2393) to fix the compensation of inspectors of hulls and boilers in certain districts of the United States—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department.

The bill (S. 2410) for the relief of L. A. Davis—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 2411) for the relief of C. A. Williams and others—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 2446) granting an increase of pension in certain cases therein mentioned—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2519) to make enlisted men of the Signal Corps responsible for public property—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Joint resolution (S. R. 59) authorizing Brig. Gen. Absalom Baird, United States Army, to accept from the President of the French Republic a diploma conferring the decoration of Commander of the National Order of the Legion of Honor—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 66) giving a military record to Thomas Miller—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 128) for the relief of the inmates of the United States Naval Home—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (S. 204) for the relief of the heirs of Maurice Grivot—to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (S. 304) to correct the military record of John Hinsmann, late of Company G, Eleventh Regiment Kentucky Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 326) for the relief of Clement A. Lounsberry—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 577) for the relief of the American Grocer Association of the city of New York—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 586) for the relief of Asher W. Foster—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 587) for the relief of Christian Fredericksen—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 686) for the relief of B. F. Rockefellow—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 773) for the relief of James E. Walter—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 1031) for the payment of Sewell Coulson and Porter, Harrison & Fishback for legal services—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 1092) for the relief of certain property in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (S. 1503) for the relief of Mrs. S. B. Duvall, widow of the late Rev. W. P. Duvall, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 1612) to provide for the closing of parts of two alleys in square 132, in the city of Washington, D. C., and for the relief of Charles Early and Corbin Warwick—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (S. 1864) to provide for the erection of a public building at San Diego, Cal.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 2199) authorizing the Little Rock and Alexandria Railway Company to maintain and construct a bridge across Bayou D'Arbonne, in Louisiana—to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 2213) for the relief of John McBean, of Umatilla County, Oregon—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 2316) restoring the right of pre-emption to Jesse A. Corn—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The bill (S. 2461) appropriating $150,000 for quarters and barracks at the branches of the National Military Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers—to the Committee on Appropriations.

The bill (S. 2517) for the establishment of a light-ship at Bush's Bluff Shoal, Elizabeth River, Virginia—to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 2427) to establish a public park, to be called and known as the Royal Arch Park—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The bill (S. 2551) to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia, so as to make Inauguration Day a holiday within said District—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The bill (S. 2602) concerning the militia of the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

QUARANTINE STATIONS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting correspondence relative to Senate bill No. 2493, for the establishment of quarantine stations on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

OVERLOADING OF VESSELS ON GREAT LAKES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the House, reports by the Supervising Inspector of Steam Vessels upon the overloading of vessels on the Great Lakes; which was referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, and ordered to be printed.

PIERRE ZERIA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of the Navy concerning an appropriation for compensation to Pierre Zeria for injuries received while employed on the United States steamer Quinnebaug at Villa Franca; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

NICHOLAS BIGLEY VS. UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact in the case of Nicholas Bigley *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

REPORT ON FISHERIES TREATY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a concurrent resolution of the Senate providing for the printing of 5,000 copies of Miscellaneous Document No. 109, first session Fiftieth Congress, in relation to the fisheries treaties; which was referred to the Committee on Printing.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of the Navy for an appropriation, to be immediately available, for repair of sea-wall at the Naval Hospital, Norfolk, Va., was referred erroneously to the Committee on Appropriations. That committee will be discharged, and the communication will be referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CUTCHEON, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. BROWER, for one week from Monday, May 21.

To Mr. BRUMM, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. ROMEIS, until further notice, on account of sickness.

To Mr. ROCKWELL, for two weeks, on account of a death in his family.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEES APPOINTED.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of conference committees as follows, namely:

On the bill (H. R. 3839) granting a pension to Mrs. Hetty K. Painter: Messrs. CHIPMAN, FRENCH, and MORRILL;

On the bill (H. R. 4920) for the protection of officials of the United States in the Indian Territory: Messrs. ROGERS, HENDERSON of North Carolina, and FULLER;

On the bill (H. R. 2017) to incorporate the Rock Creek Railroad Company of the District of Columbia: Messrs HEARD, COMPTON, and ROWELL; and

On the bill (H. R. 6899) to incorporate the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia: Messrs HEMPHILL, LEE, and BREWER.

ALASKA SEAL-FUR FISHERIES.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the resolution I send to the desk, and that the same be put upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read, subject to objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries be authorized and directed to fully and thoroughly investigate the fur-seal fisheries of Alaska, and all contracts or leases made by the Government with any persons or companies for the taking of fur-seals or other fur-bearing animals in Alaska; the character, duration, and conditions of such contracts or leases, and whether and to what extent the same have been enforced and complied with or violated; the receipts therefrom and the expenses incurred by the Government on account of any such contracts or leases; and to fully investigate and report upon the nature and extent of the rights and interests of the United States in the fur-

seal and other fisheries in the Bering Sea, in Alaska; whether and to what extent the same have been violated, and by whom; and what, if any, legislation is necessary for the better protection and preservation of the same; that said committee be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House, send for persons and papers, and administer oaths, employ a messenger if found necessary, and that all expenses of such investigation shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House.

Mr. DUNN. The committee recommend an amendment by inserting, after the words "Merchant Marine and Fisheries," the words "or a subcommittee thereof."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. BLOUNT. I think we had better go on with the regular order of business.

Mr. DUNN. This is a unanimous report from the committee.

Mr. DINGLEY. I hope the gentleman from Georgia will not object.

Mr. BLOUNT. I was in hopes the House would go on with appropriation bills to-day.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Georgia object?

Mr. DUNN. This will take but a moment.

Mr. BLOUNT. If it leads to no debate I shall not interpose an objection.

Mr. DUNN. There will be no debate.

Mr. Speaker, there are several verbal amendments in the body of the resolution as reported by the committee and read by the Clerk which I ask to be adopted, as well as the amendment I have just suggested providing for the subcommittee.

The amendments were adopted.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the resolution whether there is any limit to the expenditure it provides. I was not able to hear distinctly the reading of the resolution.

Mr. FELTON. There is no limit.

Mr. DUNN. There is not, and in view of the fact that the investigation proposed by the resolution will take place here, it is not probable that there will be any considerable expenditure.

Mr. BUCHANAN. But how many witnesses will traveling expenses from Alaska have to be provided for?

Mr. DUNN. It is impossible to tell the gentleman how many witnesses there will be, or where they will come from. I can not give him any information on that point.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think there ought to be some limit.

Mr. RANDALL. Does this provide for stenographers?

Mr. DUNN. No, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. It proposes to use the stenographers appointed for committees?

Mr. DUNN. Yes, sir.

The resolution as amended was adopted.

Mr. DUNN moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BUSINESS OF COMMITTEE ON LABOR.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to submit a resolution recommended by the Committee on Rules.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That to-morrow, Tuesday, May 22, immediately after the reading of the Journal, be, and the same is hereby, set apart for the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on Labor, in such order as said committee may indicate.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. MILLS moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

CORRECTION.

Mr. DALZELL rose.

Mr. BLOUNT. I call for the regular order.

Mr. DALZELL. I rise to a question of privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DALZELL. I desire to call the attention of the House to certain errors in the RECORD of last Thursday morning. On Wednesday of last week I made some observations with respect to a certain essay read by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] on the previous Friday, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania undertook to reply. During the course of that reply a colloquy ensued between the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM], and myself.

Mr. BLAND. I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLAND. I can not hear a word the gentleman from Pennsylvania says.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has endeavored to secure order. Gentlemen will take their seats and stop conversation.

Mr. DALZELL. I repeat that during the discussion a colloquy took place, in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM], and myself took part. I find on an examination of the proceedings as reported in the RECORD of Thursday morning, that the report of the transaction has been very materially altered, in two ways. It is altered first by the suppression of that which actually took place in the House, and it is altered in the second place by the insertion in the RECORD of what did not take place in the House. These omissions and these insertions are both, in my judgment, material to the discussion. They both relate to a subject-matter in which not only the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], but the other gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM], and myself are interested.

Now, while I concede in the fullest and most generous way the right of any member to revise his remarks, I suggest that the rules of the House and the rules of common fairness and common sense do not carry that liberty to revise remarks so as to include those in which other parties than the reviser are interested, and that the gentleman from Pennsylvania had no right to so alter this colloquy as to place my colleague [Mr. BRUMM] or myself in an attitude which we did not occupy, and to place himself in an attitude which he did not occupy in the debate of the previous day. I found, upon an examination at the office of the Public Printer, that the record sent to the gentleman from Pennsylvania of the day's transactions had not been returned with the exception of one or two pages, but something prepared by the gentleman himself had been substituted in lieu thereof. I therefore applied to the Official Reporter for a transcript of his stenographic notes, and received from him yesterday this letter:

HOUSE, *May* 19, 1888.

DEAR SIR: I inclose copy you requested, giving exact report of Mr. SCOTT's remarks.

Very truly,

J. J. McELHONE,
Chief Corps Official Reporters.

Hon. JOHN DALZELL, *Arlington, City.*

I shall send to the Clerk's desk and have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks what Mr. McElhone, the Chief Reporter, characterizes as an "exact report of Mr. SCOTT's remarks."

That exact report, as it ought to have appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Thursday last, is as follows:

Mr. SCOTT. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the personal attack upon myself by the gentleman—I will call him so, although I may be mistaken in that.

A MEMBER. I guess not.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not know, sir, if he is speaking in the interest of the American people and his direct constituency, or whether he is here as an attorney in the interest of certain interests in this country. I will leave him, sir, to decide that question for himself. But I will tell the gentleman one thing, that if he will go to Scott Haven, which he refers to, he will find two thousand men who triweekly receive their cash at a dollar a day more than the gentleman's friends pay or the Carnegie Steel Works pay. [Applause.]

I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as he is a constitutional lawyer and I am not, whether he has ever heard of the case of the Thomson estate?

Mr. DALZELL. Against whom?

Mr. SCOTT. It is his case, and I will just briefly refer to it. Why did not the gentleman stand up in his seat, and while he was defending the Edgar Thomson Steel Works, why did he not refer to the Pennsylvania Steel-Works and the Johnstown Steel-Works?

But I am stating here facts brought up in a court of justice, and I will very briefly say what this case shows in the way of the profits by protection to home industries, and I hope the gentleman will give me his attention.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh! I know all about that case.

Mr. SCOTT. I paid very close attention to what the gentleman said.

Mr. DALZELL. I am giving you attention.

Mr. SCOTT. I will ask the Clerk simply to read what I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

"At the auditing of the account of the trustees of the estate of Edgar Thomson, the decedent, the following facts appeared:

"The testator at his death owned one thousand shares of stock of the Pennsylvania Steel Company. This company being in need of funds, the stock at the time having been somewhat depressed, sold to the Pennsylvania Railway Company six thousand shares, and used the proceeds to improve its plant and carry on a larger business, which proved very remunerative, and in December, 1881, the directors of the Pennsylvania Steel Company authorized their president to repurchase of the Pennsylvania Railroad Company five thousand shares at $265 a share; which was accordingly done and duly paid for. At the purchase it was stipulated that the Pennsylvania Steel Company should immediately offer to its shareholders to take their pro rata proportion of these five thousand shares at par, and that the Pennsylvania Railroad Company should also take and pay for the shares which might be allotted to it on the remaining one thousand shares which had not been resold to the Pennsylvania Steel Company.

"On the same day a communication marked 'confidential' was sent to each stockholder of the Pennsylvania Steel Company, citing the facts and offering to apportion these shares pro rata and at par among the stockholders of the company. The rate for fractional shares was fixed at $200 a share. At the time of this purchase the undivided profits of the Pennsylvania Steel Company amounted to $3,286,423.51. The net cost to the company of the purchase was $825,000, leaving a surplus of profits which amounted to $2,461,423.51."

Mr. SCOTT. That is enough. Now, sir, I did not refer to but one steel industry in my State, and I offer that quotation in evidence in this House to show what one other company had. With a capital stock of $2,000,000, a surplus of $3,600,000, and that accumulated when the iron industries of the country were depressed. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania get up here and say that he believes Carnegie & Co., in forcing their men by Pinkerton's detectives to go back at 10 per cent. less than the wages paid, can be justified? Does he justify it?

Mr. DALZELL. Do you want me to answer the question?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, I want you to answer it.

Mr. DALZELL. There are two answers. The first is, that you are trying to divert this House from the subject that I discussed, and which I would like you to meet. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, answer the question. Do not try to evade it.

Mr. DALZELL. And this is the second, that the statement that the Edgar Thomson people compelled their employés to go back by detectives is untrue in fact.

Mr. SCOTT. I did not state that, but I stated that they covered their works with Pinkerton detectives and then hired foreign labor to come there and drive their men out. And you are standing here to-day professing to represent an

enlightened constituency, and yet advocate the man who would be guilty of such an act as that. [Renewed applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. DALZELL rose.

Mr. SCOTT. No; just let me proceed now.

Mr. DALZELL. But do you not want me to answer your question?

Mr. SCOTT. I say to the gentleman that he has mistaken his calling.

Mr. DALZELL. That may be; but do you not want me to reply?

Mr. SCOTT. I do; but I have but five minutes left. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Then you ought not to ask any questions.

Mr. BRUMM. We will give an extension of your time.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Will the statesman from Erie allow a question right at this point?

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir; you are a general interrupter, and I will not yield to your questions. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I admire the patriotism of the gentleman from Pennsylvania in the interest of those he represents. But I would like to know how many days' labor he ever furnished to the wage-worker of this country. I would like to know when the week came around how many men have ever been on his pay-rolls.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, I am not a millionaire, and do not pretend to be. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, you are not. You have had the opportunity of being a millionaire, but you have not had the brains to get there. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, no, I had not the opportunity.

Mr. SCOTT. It is just such gentlemen as the member from Pennsylvania whom the Constitution and the laws of this country are intended to protect and whom we are all endeavoring to protect to enable all, whatever their abilities may be, to get an honest living.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, I can take care of myself.

Mr. SCOTT. Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has not denied, or at least he has not submitted any figures or facts denying the statement I made that $4.09 was the total amount that labor received in the production of a ton of steel rails.

Mr. DALZELL. Why, certainly.

Mr. SCOTT. I can prove right here that what you say is not true.

Mr. DALZELL. Now will the statesman from Erie allow me just a minute?

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir. Here is a contract under seal, as awarded by the board of arbitration of the Knights of Labor between the Edgar Thomson Steel Works and their employés, specifying the name of every employé, number of men employed, the work they were to do, and the percentage each man was to get. I will further state to the gentleman that if the gentleman will get up on this floor and offer a resolution appointing a select committee to go to the Edgar Thomson Steel Works and ascertain from them what they pay for their labor or what it costs to produce a ton of steel rails, I will open every book I have, every balance-sheet I have. I will take them up to Scott Haven and compare the wage-workers of Scott Haven with those of the industries which the gentleman here is pleading for, and I will abide by the report of that committee, and a majority of it may be gentlemen on the other side if they are only honest and square men.

Mr. BRUMM. Will the gentleman include also his anthracite miners?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, the anthracite miners, too.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that a question so important as this to the whole country could have been discussed on this floor without personal attacks upon any gentleman. I made no personal charges against the proprietors of the Edgar Thomson Steel-Works. I merely stated facts in connection with that industry, and I merely stated what the senior member of that firm had admitted to me in the Committee on Ways and Means, that he had drawn this amount of money which I stated he had drawn, and I made certain illustrations in connection with it. But it appeared to have stuck in the heart of the gentleman who has just preceded me, and in answer to my arguments, and in answer to my facts he comes here and makes a personal attack upon me. I can say to him, sir, that I mind it no more than I would the barking of a dog in the street. [Applause on the Democratic side and derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

I will stand upon my record at home and with my people. And if I have ever been the oppressor of labor, if I have ever ejected a man from his home, if I have ever endeavored in my life, although I have been, I may say, a large employer of labor, to put one laborer in the place of another, or to force one man in the place of another; if I have employed a detective—not a Pinkerton detective, merely, but any other kind of a detective—to come and protect my property or to protect it against the men that are working for me, or have worked for me, I, sir, will resign my seat and leave this Hall the day it is proved.

Mr. BRUMM. Does the gentleman not contribute to pay the coal and iron police?

Mr. SCOTT. I never so contributed. I know you made that statement on this floor.

Mr. BRUMM. And I will prove it.

Mr. SCOTT. I will make you prove it. I am going to bring you before the bar of the House and make you prove that charge.

Mr. BRUMM. All right; I will be there.

Mr. SCOTT. It is as false as hell itself, and the gentleman when he made the charge ought to have known what he was doing.

Now, I have nothing more to say. I have been identified with the laborers of this country all my life; I have worked and toiled with them; and when I start out to rob anybody or to get anybody's money it will not be the money of the wage-worker of this country. [Applause.]

I desire now to call the attention of the House to one or two features in which the RECORD does not furnish a true statement of the transactions of Wednesday, in so far as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] and myself were interested. Upon page 4501 of the RECORD I find the following:

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, yesterday evening I received a letter by special messenger from the member from Pennsylvania who has just taken his seat, as follows:

"HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *Washington, May* 15, 1888.

"DEAR SIR: Some time during the session to-morrow, probably in the afternoon, I propose to make some observations with respect to your speech of Friday last. I think you will probably be interested, and hope you may be present.

"Yours, truly,

"JOHN DALZELL.

"Hon. W. L. SCOTT."

A letter so courteous, Mr. Chairman, could not but receive that consideration to which it seemed to be entitled. I have therefore, sir, remained here all day waiting until the member from Pennsylvania might have an opportunity to explain to this House and the country wherein, as has been whispered about, I was mistaken in the facts presented in my speech of Friday last. Sir, I expected the gentleman, as the special representative of the trust interests of this country, to come here prepared at least to say something in rebuttal of the facts I have presented. With those interests, representing $20,000,000, at his back to supply him with the data necessary to refute my statements, with five days to prepare a carefully written speech which he has just delivered, with time unlimited in which to deliver it, I have waited here until this late hour expecting to hear the statements I have made controverted, or at least denied. But, sir, the gentleman from Pennsylvania confines himself to the subject only in a criticism of my historical allusions and ridiculing my illustration of the Braddock farmer. There he stops and devotes the remainder of his speech to a personal vilification of myself.

Mr. Speaker, not one word nor one syllable of this was spoken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in this House on Wednesday, and the RECORD, so far as that is concerned, incorrectly undertakes to record the transactions of Wednesday. Now, Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman actually did say I propose to read:

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the personal attack upon myself of the gentleman—I will call him so, although I may be mistaken in that——

A MEMBER. I guess not.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not know, sir, whether he is speaking in the interest of the American people and his direct constituency, or whether he is here as an attorney in the interest of certain interests in this country. I will leave him, sir, to decide that question for himself.

But I will tell the gentleman one thing: that if he will go to Scott Haven, which he refers to, he will find two thousand men who tri-weekly receive their cash at a dollar a day more than the gentleman's friends pay or the Carnegie Steel Works pay. [Applause.]

I desire to call the attention of the House now to the material differences between these two records of what took place on Wednesday last. The printed RECORD omits the assertion upon the part of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] that he pays his men at Scott Haven in cash and tri-weekly, and I am unwilling that the gentleman's assertion made in this House and to the country upon that subject shall not stand as made by him. In the actual transaction as it occurred on this floor, it will be observed that the gentleman from Pennsylvania hesitated, even in the heat of debate, to impute to me a position and character upon this floor different from that which I am presumed to occupy. What he said was this:

I do not know, sir, whether he is speaking in the interest of the American people and his direct constituency, or whether he is here as an attorney in the interest of certain interests in this country. I will leave him, sir, to decide that question for himself.

Let me repeat that in the heat of debate the gentleman shrank from assigning to me a position and character different from what I am presumed to occupy in this House, but in the deliberation of his closet he made himself say:

I expected the gentleman, as the special representative of the trust interests of this country, to come here prepared, etc.

Now, sir, I make simply one comment upon that. It is not creditable to the gentleman that he assumed in the heat of debate a more manly position than he did when he undertook to sit down in his room and make for the country an imaginary record of what took place in the House on that day, and the charge that he makes—if he makes it as a charge—is untrue, as I believe I need hardly say in this House.

With respect to the minor errors which are the result of this process of cutting and filling and suppressing and creating, I pass them over. They will be apparent to members of the House upon reading the RECORD. I want simply to call the attention of the House to one or two other matters that seem to me to be material in view of the attitude assumed by the gentleman [Mr. SCOTT] in his speech on Friday. During the course of the colloquy Mr. BRUMM asked: "Does the gentleman not contribute to pay the coal and iron police?" The answer of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] was:

I never so contributed. I know you made that statement on this floor.

Mr. BRUMM. I will prove it.

Mr. SCOTT. I will make you prove it. I am going to bring you before the bar of this House and make you prove that charge.

In the RECORD, as contributed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT], the colloquy reads this way:

Mr. BRUMM. Does the gentleman not contribute to pay the coal and iron police?

Mr. SCOTT. I never so contributed. I know you made a statement on this floor that I had employed Pinkerton detectives, which is false, "etc."

Now, the House will observe and the country will observe that on this floor on Wednesday last the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] denied point-blank that he ever contributed to the payment of coal and iron police, and said that the statement made on the floor of the House by my colleague, Mr. BRUMM, that he had so contributed, was false; but the record as the gentleman returns it to the Public Printer suppresses that denial and puts it in this way:

I know you made a statement on this floor that I had employed Pinkerton detectives, which is false.

I simply call the attention of the House and the country to this point now, so that the gentleman's statement made on Wednesday last may perhaps at some future time be put to the test of proof.

One other correction only and I have done. According to the record as furnished by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] he said this:

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's argument in regard to my employing a $10,000 cook has the same foundation for truth that some of his other statements have, and if such were the fact, sir, I could only compare the wages paid my cook with the wages paid by his clients at the Edgar Thomson Steel Works. As to the salaries paid my secretaries, or at least those who assist me in my business, if he refers to the men in my employ, I can tell him that there are a good many of them who get more than $5,000 a year.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] never uttered any such words in this House, nor anything like them. What he did say is this: "It is as false as hell itself, and the gentleman when he made the charge ought to have known what he was doing."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have nothing more to say than to repeat what I said at the outset, that while I concede the right of every member of this House to revise his remarks, I deny his right to put that into the RECORD which did not occur or to take that out which did occur, when the omissions and the interjections affect the interests and rights of another member, without the consent of that member.

Mr. SCOTT. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to inquire whether the remarks just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the matters he has had read will go into the RECORD of to-day?

The SPEAKER. They will.

Mr. SCOTT. Then I have very little to say on this subject. I wish simply to refer to one fact. One of the strong points made by the gentleman in regard to my statement of fact was in connection with his colleague [Mr. BRUMM]. During my absence from the House of Representatives the member from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM] made the charge——

Mr. DALZELL. I suggest to the gentleman that Mr. BRUMM is now absent.

Mr. SCOTT. I can not help it.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. He ought to be here.

Mr. SCOTT. I was not here when Mr. BRUMM made this charge against me.

Mr. REED. The question before the House at present, I understand, is in regard to changing the RECORD. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] now rises to a question of personal privilege in the absence of Mr. BRUMM.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to do so.

Mr. REED. He can not do it as a reply to the matter which has been raised by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL].

Mr. HATCH. The gentleman from Pennsylvania who has just taken his seat [Mr. DALZELL] all through his statement brought the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM] into this colloquy.

Mr. REED. Solely with reference to changing the RECORD.

Mr. HATCH. He quoted the language of Mr. BRUMM and the language of Mr. SCOTT in reply.

Mr. REED. All right.

Mr. HATCH. This is only a specimen of the subterfuges that gentlemen on that side get up.

Mr. DALZELL. I have no objection at all to the gentleman from Pennsylvania going on.

Mr. SCOTT. Have I the floor?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the floor.

Mr. SCOTT. I ask to have read as a part of my remarks a part of the proceedings of this House as taken down at the time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BRUMM. Is it not true that the very men who employed the Pinkerton men in all those coal strikes are free-traders, headed by Mr. SCOTT, of this House; Mr. Corbin, of New York, and Mr. Cox, of Pennsylvania—all free-traders?

Mr. MCMILLIN. Does the gentleman charge that Mr. SCOTT has done so? Do you [Mr. BRUMM] assume to say that he has?

Mr. BRUMM. I assume to say that he has, and am responsible for it, and am ready to show it.

Mr. MCMILLIN. He says it is not true.

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Corbin and Mr. Cox, are leaders of Democratic free trade.

Mr. SCOTT. Now, Mr. Speaker, that was the utterance of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM] during my absence from the House, but the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the next morning did not show one word of what has just been read. But, sir, the gentleman from Pennsylvania who uttered that took occasion to see that it was sent out in the public press of this country, charging me with engaging Pinkerton's detectives and being in alliance with Mr. Corbin and other gentlemen from Pennsylvania whom I have never seen and do not know. And the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] now gets up in defense of the charges he makes against me and tries to show that I have been misrepresenting Mr. BRUMM as to the charge he made against me. At the time that he fell from the Pinkerton police he dropped into the local police. I send to the desk and ask to have read a telegram received by me from the superintendent of the mines in Mr. BRUMM's district. This telegram is sent in reply to an inquiry of mine, "Have you ever employed a Pinkerton detective?"

The Clerk read as follows:

SHAMOKIN, PA., *May* 10, 1888.

W. L. SCOTT, *Washington:*

No, sir, never had any occasion to employ detectives.

HOLDEN CHESTER.

Mr. SCOTT. Now, sir, that is all I have to say in regard to this question. If the gentleman [Mr. DALZELL] is satisfied with what he stated, and is willing for this whole thing to go before the country in the condition in which he has put it, it is perfectly agreeable to me; and I will not detain the House by discussing it further.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Who is Holden Chester, who signs that telegram?

Mr. SCOTT. He is my superintendent at the mines in Mr. BRUMM's district.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, with respect to the merits of this matter, if the gentleman is now introducing that subject into the House, I will say that I do not intend to be precluded from the discussion of that question by making no reply at this time. I simply refrain for the reason that the remarks of the gentleman just made seem to apply to my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. BRUMM], who is able, as I conceive, to take care of himself.

Upon the other question, the question involved in that telegram sent up, as to the employment of detectives and all that sort of thing, I have on my table evidence sufficient, if read, to occupy the attention of the House all day; but I abstain.

A MEMBER. What does that evidence go to show?

Mr. DALZELL. It goes to show the attitude of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] with respect to the question of evictions at his works, with respect to the question of "pluck-me" stores, with respect to the question of employment of detectives, with respect to the question of paying as good wages as anybody else. I say with regard to all these questions, if the House had time to go into them on the merits, as I think it has not now, I have evidence on my table sufficient to occupy the attention of the House all day against the statements made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I refrain from offering it now simply because I take it that the statements just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SCOTT] have relation to my colleague [Mr. BRUMM], and not to anything that I have said. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. KERR. I wish simply to say as a matter of privilege that the day before yesterday Mr. BRUMM asked me to have him excused on account of important business; and for that reason he is now absent.

VISITORS TO WEST POINT MILITARY ACADEMY.

Mr. STEELE. Having been appointed one of the Board of Visitors to the Military Academy at West Point I ask to be excused on account of important business.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is excused, and during the day the Chair will make an appointment to fill the vacancy.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS.

The SPEAKER. This being Monday, the first business in order is the call of States and Territories for the introduction and reference of bills and resolutions.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask by unanimous consent to dispense with the call of States and Territories for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and that members having bills and joint resolutions and memorials to present can do so by handing them in at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. HATCH. We will get the House into confusion as to the reference of bills and joint resolutions, and I therefore object.

Mr. BLOUNT. It has been done heretofore.

Mr. HATCH. I think never has it been done.

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes; it has been done, and done within a month.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

PUBLIC BUILDING, BOULDER, COLO.

Mr. SYMES introduced a bill (H. R. 10048) for the erection of a public building at Boulder, Colo.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

RICE LAND, HUTCHINSON'S ISLAND, SAVANNAH RIVER.

Mr. NORWOOD (by Mr. TURNER, of Georgia,) introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 171) providing for the survey of the rice land on Hutchinson's Island, in the Savannah River; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

FREE-LIST.

Mr. SPRINGER introduced a bill (H. R. 10049) to provide for placing on the free-list articles of merchandise the production of which may be controlled by trusts or combinations; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

WATER-METERS IN HOTELS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. ROWELL introduced a bill (H. R. 10050) to amend section 216 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with reference to the District of Columbia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

LOCATION OF STEAM RAILROADS AND DEPOTS.

Mr. ROWELL (by request) also introduced a bill (H. R. 10051) to provide for a commission to determine the location of steam railroads and depots in the District of Columbia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

REUNION SIOUX CITY, IOWA.

Mr. STRUBLE introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 172) authorizing the Secretary of War to furnish tents to the Northwest Soldiers' Association of Iowa for use at a reunion to be held at Sioux City, Iowa, from

October 2 to 6, 1888, inclusive; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, CLINTON, IOWA.

Mr. HAYES (by Mr. WEAVER) introduced a bill (H. R. 10052) for the erection of a public building at Clinton, Iowa; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

MAY 30 A HOLIDAY.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa, introduced a bill (H. R. 10053) making May 30 a holiday in the District of Columbia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

FOUNTAIN, ETC., FRANKFORT, KY.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, introduced a bill (H. R. 10054) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to accept fountain and lamp from the city of Frankfort, Ky.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

CUSTOMS AND INTERNAL-REVENUE LAWS.

Mr. MILLIKEN (by request) introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 173) relative to the act of March 3, 1883; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

DECEASED PENSIONERS.

Mr. BURNETT introduced a bill (H. R. 10055) to provide for the widows and children of deceased pensioners; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

FORT SEWALL, MASS.

Mr. COGSWELL introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 174) authorizing the use and improvement of Fort Sewall, at Marblehead, Mass.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

IMPORTATION OF CONVICTS, ETC.

Mr. LODGE presented the following resolution of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD:

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, *in the year* 1888.

Resolution relative to the immigration and importation into the United States of convicts, lunatics, idiots, and other persons liable to become a public charge.

Whereas his excellency the governor, in a message to the senate and house of representatives, for good and sufficient reasons has requested that Congress be memorialized for a modification of existing laws which will more effectually prevent the immigration and importation into the United States of convicts, lunatics, idiots, and other persons liable to become a public charge:

Resolved, That the accompanying memorial, addressed to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled, be signed by the president of the senate and speaker of the house of representatives, and that the secretary of the commonwealth is hereby instructed to transmit copies to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress, to the Senators and Members of Congress from this Commonwealth, and to the governors of the several States of the Republic.

IN SENATE, *April* 20, 1888.

Adopted. Sent down for concurrence.

E. HERBERT CLAPP, *Clerk.*

IN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *April* 26, 1888.

Adopted in concurrence.

EDWARD A. MCLAUGHLIN, *Clerk.*

Memorial.

To the Honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

The senate and house of representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, in general court assembled, present this memorial:

The act of Congress, regulating immigration, passed 1882 and amended 1884, forbids the landing of convicts, lunatics, idiots or any other person liable to become a public charge, and provides for the return of all convicts arriving at any port of the United States, except those convicted of political offenses, to the countries from which they came.

From testimony submitted to a committee of this Legislature it is evident that, notwithstanding these enactments, convicts are released from penal institutions in Great Britain and Germany before the expiration of their terms of sentence, upon the condition of their accepting a passage ticket to this country or to Canada; that persons who have received relief from public charity, or who are likely to ask for such relief, are also sent to this country; that a few, through the vigilance of the immigration officers, are detected and returned; but that by falsehood, subterfuge, assistance of interested parties, and by being in possession of prepaid tickets to some interior town or city, large numbers succeed in evading the law, especially when the immigrant is accompanied by a relative or volunteer friend who has once been in the United States, and who is ready to vouch for the good character and the ability of the immigrant to earn a livelihood.

It is plain that any examination, conducted with the utmost vigilance on the part of the immigration officer, of one thousand or more passengers at the gangway of a steam-ship, at the best, can only be superficial, and that convicts, who by their vocation of crime have habituated themselves to evade the law and deceive detectives, in many instances are able to effect a landing.

It is an indisputable and well established fact that convicts are not only released from prison, but that they are transported to this country either at the expense of foreign governments or by associations acting in concert with the officials, who, in disregard of international comity, violate the laws of the United States, thus imposing their burdens upon the people of this country—a procedure which should awaken the just indignation of every American citizen, and which calls for remedial legislation.

The reports of the public institutions of this Commonwealth show a marked disproportion between the native and foreign born inmates—the foreign born receiving public charity being 60 per cent., a very large proportion of whom have arrived in this country at a comparatively recent date. In other States, especially those that have received large accessions from Great Britain, the increase of foreign born in the charitable institutions is equally disproportionate to the native born.

In one of the reputable literary reviews for the month of March, 1888, it is stated that nearly every pauper from Great Britain was assisted to this country either by governmental aid or by so-called philanthropic associations.

The transportation of the improvident and thriftless classes to other countries is openly advocated as a measure of philanthropy in an article published in a reputable literary review in London, January, 1888:

"There is no wider field of work for the philanthropist than this: let each benevolent person take up one thriftless family as a special charge, and assist emigration. Care must be taken to provide a friend on the other side, for the thriftless do not lose their thriftlessness on the voyage, and a good start in the new home is invaluable."

In 1882, and again in 1883, by acts of Parliament, $1,000,000 was appropriated to assist emigration from Great Britain; coincident with that legislation, and with assistance by philanthropic effort in that country, is a marked increase in the disproportion between those of native and foreign birth in the prisons, almshouses, and asylums for the insane throughout the United States.

Of paupers in the almshouses of the United States in 1880, there was 1 in 981 of the native-born inhabitants to 1 in 291 of the foreign-born. Of the criminals in prisons and workhouses, there was 1 in 938 of the native-born inhabitants of the country to 1 in 518 of foreign birth. Of the inmates of insane asylums there was 1 in 662 of the native-born population to 1 in 254 of the foreign-born.

From an examination of the reports of the public institutions in several of the States, the evidence seems to be conclusive that the disproportion between the native and foreign born inmates of those institutions is much greater than that reported by the census of 1880.

To the end, therefore, that the people of this Republic may be protected from the evils and burdens resulting from the importation of convicts, paupers, idiots, insane, and the thriftless of other countries, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, with this memorial, asks for such amendment of existing laws as shall effectually exclude these classes of immigrants.

HALSEY J. BOARDMAN,
President of the Senate.

CHAS. J. NOYES,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SECRETARY'S DEPARTMENT, *Boston, May* 3, 1888.

A true copy. Attest:

HENRY B. PEIRCE,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

BUSINESS OF COMMERCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. CLARDY submitted a resolution setting apart three days for the consideration of measures reported by the Committee on Commerce; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

PENSION FOR PARTIAL LOSS OF SIGHT, ETC.

Mr. NUTTING introduced a bill (H. R. 10056) to fix the rates of pension for partial loss of sight of one eye, the sight of the other eye being lost before entering into service; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and ordered to be printed.

VENEZUELA STEAM TRANSPORTATION COMPANY.

Mr. WHITE, of New York, introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 175) for the relief of the Venezuela Steam Transportation Company; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

OATHS OF NOTARIES PUBLIC.

Mr. WHITE, of New York, also introduced a bill (H. R. 10057) to amend section 2805 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, so as to allow oaths to be administered by notaries public; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

OGDEN LAND COMPANY.

Mr. LAIDLAW introduced a bill (H. R. 10058) to provide for the extinguishment of the claim of the Ogden Land Company to the Allegheny and Cattaraugus Indian reservation in the State of New York, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNOR'S ISLAND.

Mr. COX introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 176) granting permission to the park commissioners of New York City to improve and beautify Governor's Island in connection with a public park, to be laid out on said island and on land adjoining and connecting therewith; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REGULATION OF PLUMBING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEMPHILL introduced a bill (H. R. 10059) to authorize plumbing regulations in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

TAX SALES, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEMPHILL introduced a bill (H. R. 10060) prescribing the times for sales and for notice of sales of property in the District of Columbia for overdue taxes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

PAY ENROLLED MILITIA, MEMPHIS, TENN.

Mr. PHELAN introduced a bill (H. R. 10061) granting pay to the enrolled militia of the District of Memphis, Tenn.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Militia, and ordered to be printed.

PARIS, CHOCTAW AND LITTLE ROCK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CULBERSON introduced a bill (H. R. 10062) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct and operate a railway, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER, TEXAS.

Mr. CULBERSON also introduced a bill (H. R. 10063) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct a bridge across the Red River at or near Hook's Ferry, Red River County, Texas; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

COURT OF CLAIMS.

Mr. CULBERSON (by request) also introduced a bill (H. R. 10064) to reorganize the Court of Claims, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, MARTINSVILLE, VA.

Mr. JOHN R. BROWN, of Virginia, introduced a bill (H. R. 10065) for the erection of a public building for the use of the internal-revenue and post-office at Martinsville, Va.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The regular call being now completed, the Chair will recognize gentlemen who were not in their seats when their States were called.

ARREARAGES OF PENSIONS, ETC.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana, submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Rules:

Whereas the Committee on Invalid Pensions of this House has reported House bill 9961 by Report No. 2120, entitled "A bill relating to the arrears of pensions," with the recommendation that it do pass; and

Whereas said committee in said report estimate that said bill, if passed, will cause the expenditure of $250,000,000; and

Whereas all political parties profess to be in favor of granting to the Union soldiers of 1861 to 1865 liberal pensions for services rendered: and

Whereas on the 9th day of January House bill No. 3345, granting a pension to all such soldiers, was referred to said committee; and

Whereas it is important that said several propositions should be disposed of before any bill is passed materially reducing the revenues of the country: Therefore,

Be it resolved, That the Committee on Invalid Pensions be discharged from the further consideration of said House bill No. 3345, and that said bill and said bill No. 9961, reported by said committee, be made a special order for Friday, the 25th day of May, and that the consideration thereof shall continue from day to day until they are disposed of.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that resolution be put upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not entertain that request pending this call.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana. Not by unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not. The Chair is simply continuing the call of States and Territories for bills and resolutions for reference under the rules of the House.

MANAGER OF SOLDIERS' HOME.

Mr. DALZELL submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs:

Whereas the time of General James S. Negley is about to expire as a manager of the Soldiers' Home and a vacancy will be created in said board requiring a new appointment to be made: Now

Resolved, That the said General James S. Negley shall be selected for appointment as a member of said board and shall serve as his own successor thereon for the time as fixed by law.

COMPENSATION OF FOURTH-CLASS POSTMASTERS.

Mr. MONTGOMERY introduced a bill (H. R. 10066) to increase the compensation of fourth-class postmasters; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BELMONT. I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills.

Mr. BLOUNT. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York what general appropriation bill he proposes to call up?

Mr. BELMONT. My purpose is to reach the first bill on the Calendar in Committee of the Whole; that is to say, the bill making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the Government.

Mr. HATCH. I am instructed by the Committee on Agriculture to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. There is a motion now pending. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BELMONT] has moved that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to consider general appropriation bills. While that is pending the Chair can not entertain another motion.

Mr. HATCH. I desire to ask a parliamentary question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HATCH. If the House should vote down the motion of the gentleman from New York, then is not the regular order the call of committees to suspend the rules?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state the situation exactly. On the last Monday for motions to suspend the rules, the first of the month, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] was recognized, and moved to suspend the rules and pass a bill which was read. A second being demanded and a vote taken, no quorum appeared, and the House thereupon adjourned. If the House shall now disagree to the motion of the gentlemen from New York [Mr. BELMONT], the first question will be on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], and after that is disposed of committees will be called for motions to suspend the rules.

Mr. HATCH. I desire to state that the Committee on Agriculture is the first on call.

Mr. RANDALL. If debate is in order I want to answer that.

Mr. BELMONT. I should like to answer it too.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BELMONT].

The question being put, there were—ayes 80, noes 77.

Mr. HATCH. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, 61 members voting therefor.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 90, nays 155, not voting 79; as follows:

YEAS—90.

Adams,	Crisp,	Kean,	Perry,
Allen, Miss.	Dargan,	Kelley,	Post,
Bacon,	Davidson, Fla.	Kilgore,	Randall,
Belmont,	Dibble,	Laidlaw,	Rayner,
Bland,	Dingley,	Landes,	Reed,
Blount,	Dougherty,	Lawler,	Rice,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Dunn,	Lind,	Richardson,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Elliott,	Lodge,	Rogers,
Browne, Ind.	Ermentrout,	Long,	Rowell,
Buckalew,	Farquhar,	Macdonald,	Russell, Mass.
Burrows,	Fisher,	Mansur,	Seney,
Butterworth,	Foran,	Mason,	Sowden,
Bynum,	Forney,	McAdoo,	Spooner,
Candler,	French,	McCullogh,	Tarsney,
Cannon,	Grimes,	McKinney,	Tillman,
Caruth,	Hemphill,	McMillin,	Tracey,
Chipman,	Herbert,	Moffitt,	Turner, Ga.
Clements,	Hiestand,	Montgomery,	Walker,
Cobb,	Hitt,	Neal,	White, Ind.
Collins,	Hogg,	Nelson,	Wilson, Minn.
Cothran,	Holman,	Oates,	Wilson, W. Va.
Cowles,	Hovey,	O'Neall, Ind.	
Crain,	Hudd,	Owen,	

NAYS—155.

Abbott,	Dockery,	Lanham,	Sawyer,
Allen, Mich.	Enloe,	Latham,	Sayers,
Anderson, Iowa	Felton,	Lehlbach,	Scull,
Anderson, Miss.	Finley,	Lyman,	Shaw,
Anderson, Ill.	Fuller,	Mahoney,	Sherman,
Anderson, Kans.	Funston,	Maish,	Shively,
Atkinson,	Gallinger,	Martin,	Simmons,
Baker, N. Y.	Gear,	Matson,	Smith,
Baker, Ill.	Gest,	McClammy,	Snyder,
Bankhead,	Glass,	McCormick,	Springer,
Barnes,	Goff,	McCreary,	Stewart, Tex.
Barry,	Grout,	McKenna,	Stewart, Ga.
Bayne,	Guenther,	McKinley,	Stockdale,
Biggs,	Hare,	McRae,	Stone, Ky.
Bingham,	Harmer,	Milliken,	Stone, Mo.
Boothman,	Hatch,	Moore,	Struble,
Bound,	Haugen,	Morgan,	Taylor, E. B., Ohio
Boutelle,	Hayden,	Morrill,	Taylor, J. D., Ohio
Bowden,	Heard,	Morrow,	Thomas, Ky.
Bowen,	Henderson, Iowa	Newton,	Thompson, Cal.
Brewer,	Henderson, N. C.	Nutting,	Townshend,
Browne, T. H. B., Va.	Henderson, Ill.	O'Donnell,	Turner, Kans.
Brown, J. R., Va.	Hermann,	O'Ferrall,	Vance,
Buchanan,	Hires,	O'Neill, Pa.	Vandever,
Bunnell,	Holmes,	Osborne,	Warner,
Burnett,	Hopkins, Ill.	Outhwaite,	Washington,
Campbell, F., N. Y.	Hopkins, N. Y.	Parker,	Weaver,
Carlton,	Houk,	Patton,	Weber,
Cheadle,	Howard,	Payson,	West,
Clark,	Hunter,	Peel,	White, N. Y.
Cogswell,	Hutton,	Penington,	Whiting, Mich.
Conger,	Johnston, Ind.	Peters,	Whitthorne,
Cox,	Johnston, N. C.	Phelan,	Wickham,
Crouse,	Kennedy,	Phelps,	Wilber,
Culberson,	Kerr,	Plumb,	Wilkinson,
Cutcheon,	Ketcham,	Pugsley,	Wise,
Dalzell,	Laffoon,	Robertson,	Yoder,
Darlington,	La Follette,	Rowland,	Yost.
Davidson, Ala.	Lane,	Ryan,	

NOT VOTING—79.

Allen, Mass.	Davenport,	Jones,	Scott,
Arnold,	Davis,	Lagan,	Seymour,
Belden,	De Lano,	Laird,	Spinola,
Blanchard,	Dorsey,	Lee,	Stahlnecker,
Bliss,	Dunham,	Lynch,	Steele,
Brower,	Fitch,	Maffett,	Stephenson,
Brown, Ohio	Flood,	McComas,	Stewart, Vt.
Brumm,	Ford,	McShane,	Symes,
Bryce,	Gaines,	Merriman,	Taulbee,
Burnes,	Gay,	Mills,	Thomas, Ill.
Butler,	Gibson,	Morse,	Thomas, Wis.
Campbell, Ohio	Glover,	Nichols,	Thompson, Ohio
Campbell, T. J., N. Y.	Granger,	Norwood,	Wade,
Caswell,	Greenman,	O'Neill, Mo.	Wheeler,
Catchings,	Grosvenor,	Perkins,	Whiting, Mass.
Clardy,	Hall,	Pidcock,	Wilkins,
Cockran,	Hayes,	Rockwell,	Williams,
Compton,	Hooker,	Romeis,	Woodburn,
Cooper,	Hopkins, Va.	Russell, Conn.	Yardley.
Cummings,	Jackson,	Rusk,	

So the motion was not agreed to.

Mr. WADE. I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the Hall, and did he fail to hear his name when it was called?

Mr. WADE. I was not.

The SPEAKER. Then the gentleman does not come within the rule.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the names.

There was no objection.

The following pairs were announced until further notice:

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. WHITING, of Massachusetts.

Mr. GRANGER with Mr. ROCKWELL.

Mr. GLOVER with Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin.

Mr. BURNES with Mr. BROWER.

Mr. NORWOOD with Mr. COOPER.

Mr. JONES with Mr. STEPHENSON.

Mr. HOOKER with Mr. DUNHAM.

Mr. CUMMINGS with Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut.

Mr. GREENMAN with Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois.

Mr. WHITE, of New York, with Mr. COCKRAN.

For this day:

Mr. STAHLNECKER with Mr. STEWART, of Vermont.

Mr. WHEELER with Mr. ROMEIS.

Mr. LEE with Mr. BRUMM.

Mr. BRYCE with Mr. DE LANO.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, with Mr. ALLEN, of Massachusetts.

Mr. COMPTON with Mr. MCCOMAS.

Mr. MCSHANE with Mr. YARDLEY.

Mr. RUSK with Mr. BOWDEN.

The result of the vote was then announced as above stated.

Mr. HATCH. I call for the regular order.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE APPOINTED.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 7052) relating to postal crimes and amendatory of statutes therein mentioned, Mr. DOCKERY, Mr. ERMENTROUT, and Mr. PETERS.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH CROW INDIAN RESERVATION.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the pending motion to suspend the rules, made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], coming over from last suspension day.

Mr. NELSON. I desire to make an objection to the consideration of that bill, and, if the Chair will allow me, I will briefly state the ground of my objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. NELSON. The bill involved in this motion, Mr. Speaker, is a bill reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, and is on the Calendar. On last suspension day, being the first Monday in this month, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], who is not a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs, moved to bring that bill up for consideration under a suspension of the rules. Now, Mr. Speaker, under the rules of the House the first Monday of every month is given to motions to suspend the rules brought up by individual members recognized by the Speaker, and the third Monday of the month is given to propositions brought up on the motions of committees or some member of the committee.

This is the day designated by the rules for bills to be brought forward by members of committees, and my contention is that this being a bill brought up not on behalf of any member of the committee or on behalf of the committee, but by an individual member, and belonging, as I contend, to individual suspension day, it is not the pending proposition to-day, but will be the pending proposition on the first Monday of next month, namely, the next individual suspension day. To hold the contrary to that would violate the spirit and tenor of the rules. Certain days are set apart under the rules for certain kinds of business to be brought up by members. Under our rules we have the first Monday of the month assigned for individual suspensions, and I suggest that a matter like this bill, coming properly under that class, can only be considered in order when the next day for that class of business, namely, the next individual suspension day, arrives. In other words, my contention is briefly this: That this proposition, brought up as it was on last individual suspension day, ought to go over until next individual suspension day, and ought not to be taken up to-day.

The SPEAKER. The Chair had occasion to examine and decide this question in the Forty-eighth Congress. The rule provides that it shall be in order on the first Monday and the third Monday in each month to move to suspend the rules, preference being given—that is the language of the rule—to individuals on the first Monday and to committees on the third Monday. Another rule, and the universal practice of the House, is that business unfinished at the time of an adjournment is resumed when that class of business next comes up for consideration. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], although not a member of the Committee on Indian Affairs, had a right under the rules and practice of the House to select any bill he chose, and move, as an individual member, to suspend the rules and pass it. He made that motion with reference to this bill, and when the House adjourned that business was pending. The House this morning resumes the consideration of that class of business to which the gentleman's motion belongs, to wit, suspensions of the rules, and it can make no difference whether the motion is made by an individual or by the authority of the committee. It is the class of business which regulates the matter, and that, as the Chair has just said, is suspensions of the rules, and there can not be two motions to suspend the rules pending at the same time; the one pending must be disposed of before another one can be entertained by the Chair. The Chair therefore thinks the point of order is not well taken, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. TOOLE] appointed to act as tellers will please resume their places.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, if I have been correctly informed, I understand the gentleman from Montana [Mr. TOOLE] is willing to withdraw his demand for a second——

Mr. TOOLE. I am willing to consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. If there be no further objection a second will be considered as ordered. Under the rules of the House thirty minutes are allowed for debate, fifteen minutes in support of the motion and fifteen minutes in opposition to it. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] to control the time in support of the motion, and the gentleman from Montana [Mr. TOOLE] to control the time in opposition to it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, it has always been the policy of Congress with reference to the construction of railroads over the public domain to be not only liberal, but positive in its action against monopoly, and so general has been this legislation that the act of March 3, 1875, grants to any company desiring to build a railroad a right of way through the public domain. That is the general policy of Congress in its legislative action upon this subject; but when it comes to the reservation of the Indian it has been the rule that special acts shall be passed by Congress, in order that its watchful care should surround the Indians in their needs and in their rights.

Built upon that, sir, has been the rule followed, I think, with rarely if ever an exception, that when the Indians in their rights are protected, when their consent has been given to the construction of a road through their reservation, Congress has invariably, following its general policy of the development of the public domain, granted and conceded the right of way. It is under this record of legislation, it is under this record of general policy, that this bill asks the right of way for 40 miles through the Crow reservation for the construction of a railroad running in its length of 120 miles through the Territories of Wyoming and Montana.

This bill follows in every part the well-defined laws of protection to the Indians as well as the exaction of obligation and fidelity on the part of those to whom the right of way will be given for the construction of the road within the recognized reasonable limit of two years. This bill follows the old bills always passed in such cases by this House. It makes it the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to fix the amount of the compensation to be paid the Indians for such right of way and material. It leaves it with the President of the United States in his discretion to require the consent of the Indians to said right of way, "which shall be obtained by said railway company in such manner as he may prescribe before any right under this act shall accrue to said company."

It goes further and declares—

That said company shall not assign or transfer or mortgage this right of way for any purpose whatever until said road shall be completed.

It is further provided—

That no part of said line shall touch any portion of the Yellowstone National Park.

In other words, this bill follows in the line of all the legislation that Congress has enacted in the past; in no particular does it make any departure from the well-recognized policy of Congress in reference to grants or the right of way through Indian reservations.

A bill similar to this was passed by the Senate in the Forty-ninth Congress, was favorably reported by the House committee, and went upon the Calendar. The present measure has been passed at this Congress by the Senate, has been favorably reported by the House committee, and is now upon the Calendar. The House bill being identical with the Senate bill, the latter has been substituted for consideration at this time.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Has there not been a minority report in this House against this bill?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will state the fact about that matter with great pleasure; it comes in as a part of my intended discussion of the proposition.

In the last Congress this bill having been passed by the Senate came to the House on the 15th day of February, and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PEEL], chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, asked unanimous consent to take it up and pass it as it came from the Senate upon the ground that a similar bill reported favorably by the House committee was on the Calendar. Mr. Wakefield, then a member from Minnesota, objected. The bill that now comes up under suspen-

sion of the rules has received a favorable report from the House committee; but a minority consisting of three members, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS], and the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr McSHANE] take exception to the passage of the bill. They base their position upon two declarations: First, that as the Rocky Fork and Cooke City Railroad bill which was passed by Congress March 3, 1887, just before the closing of the last Congress, gave to that company the right to construct a railroad, this bill would infringe the charter right given to that road. The requirement that the road be completed within two years is, as the minority contend, an implied guaranty that if this condition should be complied with Congress will not authorize a competing line. I merely wish to say that this clause requiring the road to be completed in two years is simply the qualification which ordinarily accompanies bills of this character. Congress on its part made no stipulation that in the future the right of way for the construction of a railroad through the Crow reservation should not be given to any other corporation.

But to show how unjust this position of the minority of the committee is with reference to the Billings, Clark's Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company, permit me to give briefly the history of these two roads. The present bill is antagonized on two grounds only—first, that this measure is an injustice to the road already chartered; and second, that it is intended simply for speculative purposes. To those two points I wish, in the few minutes I have, to direct attention.

The Billings, Clark's Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company was incorporated under the laws of the Territories of Wyoming and Montana February 20, 1886; Rocky Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company incorporated December 30, 1886.

Billings, Clark's Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company's maps filed October 22, 1886. Approved by Department of the Interior December 15, 1886. Rocky Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company's maps filed April 12, 1887. Approved by Department of the Interior October 16, 1887.

Billings, Clark's Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company's surveys completed October 22, 1886. Rocky Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company's line located April 12, 1887. (Organized December 30, 1886.)

Billings, Clark's Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company's bill introduced in Senate June 30, 1886; Passed February 11, 1887. Rocky Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company's bill introduced in Senate January 10, 1887; Passed February 24, 1887.

Billings, Clark's Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company's bill, reported favorably from House committee with amendments, January 14, 1887; Rocky Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company's bill, reported from House committee February 10, 1887; Rocky Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company's Senate bill, passed House, under suspension of the rules, March 3, 1887.

In Senate December 12, 1887. (S. 325.) Read twice and referred to Committee on Indian Affairs. In Senate February 9, 1888. Reported without amendment In Senate April 4, 1888. Passed Senate with amendment, "that no part of said line shall touch any portion of the National Park."

In House of Representatives April 5, 1888. (S. 325.) Referred to Committee on Indian Affairs. In House of Representatives April 13, 1888. Reported favorably and committed to Committee of the Whole House.

Every precedent act of incorporation under Territorial law, the filing of maps with the Interior Department and approval of same, completion of surveys, introduction of bill in Senate and passage of the same, favorable report from House committee and standing upon the Calendar antedate the Rocky Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company from one month to ten months.

Certainly that would not seem like a speculative operation to sell out to a road that was never thought of or conceived until months after the Billings, Clark's Fork and Cooke City Railroad had complied with all Territorial and United States statute requirements.

And the only reason the bill now under consideration was not passed in the last Congress was that one member, Mr. Wakefield, of Minnesota, had the power under the rules, by his objection, to prevent it. So much for the simple history of the two roads.

Now, as to the charge that this bill is gotten up for speculative purposes. It is stated in the minority report that—

> There being no possible use for two roads, the granting by Congress of an opposition and parallel right of way would work a great injustice to parties who have made investments in the Rocky Fork Company, and is liable to defeat the construction of any road.

I have read you the provision of the bill declaring that this company shall not assign or transfer or mortgage this right of way for any purpose whatever until the road shall be completed, that is, the entire road. What is the wording with reference to this short line, the Rocky Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company, that is to-day antagonizing this long line? I read from the act itself:

> That said company shall not assign or transfer or mortgage this right of way for any purpose whatever until said road shall be completed—

Completed to what extent? Completed its entire length? No.

> Completed through that part of said reservation through which it shall be constructed.

If there is any speculation on the part of either road in reference to this matter I leave it to the intelligence of this House to decide where the speculation is. In the case of the Rocky Fork and Cooke City road it is provided that the right of way shall not be assigned, transferred, or mortgaged until the road shall be built through the Crow reservation, a distance of 40 miles, while under this bill it is provided that the right of way shall not be assigned, transferred, or mortgaged for any purpose whatever "until said road shall be completed," covering specifically the entire length of the road, 120 miles.

Mr. FELTON. I wish to inquire of the gentleman whether the going through the reservation is not all that Congress and the people it represents have anything to do with.

Mr. BINGHAM. Most assuredly.

Mr. FELTON. That is what I thought.

Mr. BINGHAM. I concede that; but my purpose is to show that the two Territories have given their consent and that this proposition is presented in perfect good faith on the part of this road. I am antagonizing the position taken by the three gentlemen who have signed the minority report and who state that the purpose of this measure is speculative, the object being to sell out the right of way.

Mr. FELTON. I only wanted the fact to appear.

Mr. BINGHAM. I reserve the residue of my time.

Mr. PEEL. How much time has the gentleman left?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. CRISP in the chair). The gentleman has five minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. TOOLE. I will yield for three minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, as one of the members of the Committee on Indian Affairs, I concur in the minority report, and I wish to say briefly that, in the judgment of three of the members of that committee who are opposed to the bill, it should not be passed by this House. Personally, I know nothing of this corporation, nor do I know anything of the incorporators of the other company. As has been suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], the Forty-ninth Congress passed a bill giving to a company the right to build across the Crow Creek reservation in Montana Territory. They did not succeed in getting their plats filed for some time as that mountainous region is a very cold country. Yet, subsequently to the filing of their plats, they have built 40 miles across that reservation, and expended something like $300,000 or more as an evidence of their good faith and as an evidence of their purpose to build the road according to the act of Congress.

Now, it is believed that this bill ought not to pass because it will embarrass that company in its efforts to complete the road under the act of Congress. They say it is universally admitted there is no business for two companies, that two railroads should not be constructed and operated in that sparsely-settled country. Hence, they say that this road, under the pending bill, was asking for a charter which would put them in a position to speculate and speculate only. Now, whether that is true or not, I do not pretend to say. As I said awhile ago, personally I do not know anything of either company, but it must be admitted by every man who gives thoughtful consideration to the subject, that there is no business there for two railroads. And the Territory of Montana says through its Delegate upon this floor that there is no business for two roads, and this company ought not to be given the privilege, which would have the effect only of paralyzing and frustrating the undertaking we authorized by the act of last Congress, and which is now in process of completion. We have, too, the protest of the Indians themselves against allowing another railroad across their reservation. The Indians say they do not want two railroads crossing their reservation.

Whoever is familiar with the topography of that country knows if the railroad contemplated by this bill is constructed, it must necessarily follow the same cañon the present company proposes to follow.

Mr. PAYSON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PERKINS. I have only three minutes.

Mr. PAYSON. I assume the gentleman desires to be accurate. Does he not know these two roads run parallel for only 10 miles from the Yellowstone, and that then they diverge between the Big Horn range of the Snow Mountains, and that the coal fields sought to be reached by his company lie on the west side of this range, and the coal fields sought to be reached by the company named in this bill are on the east side of that range, which range is about 8 miles across and practically impassable?

Mr. PERKINS. No; I do not understand that to be the fact. I understand the opposite is true.

Mr. PAYSON. These two lines of road run parallel for not more than 10 miles, and there is no foundation in fact for any other statement than that.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. After leaving the reservation it does follow the same line for 100 miles and more. There is no other place for the road than that.

Mr. TOOLE. I yield now for two minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I regret to be in an attitude of op-

posing any bill, and especially one under the circumstances, as I know gentlemen will raise the cry of "Monopoly" against me. I know it is an argument which is very plausible, that if it is good to have one road it is good to have more than one.

Now, I wish to tell the facts in reference to this matter. If gentlemen will look upon this map they will see that here is the reservation running down to this dotted line. All of these two railroads south of that is outside of the reservation.

In the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress this railroad got a bill passed by which they were to go through the corner of the Yellowstone reservation. The bill was called up by my friend from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON].

Mr. PAYSON. Will the gentleman allow me to say——

Mr. NELSON. My time is so short that I can not yield.

Mr. PAYSON. The gentleman is mistaken; there is not a shadow of fact for the statement he is making.

Mr. NELSON. That company afterwards changed its plan and had the bill changed to give it this line.

Now, last year two bills were pending before Congress granting the right of way; one of the roads starting from a point on this map which I hold in my hand and following the dotted line shown here, known as the Rocky Fork road, and the other as the Billings road. Last year Congress passed the bill granting to the Rocky Fork Railroad Company the right to build up through these cañons to a certain coal deposit, but in the bill which passed then the road was required to be completed within two years, or in the event of a failure a forfeiture of its rights would follow. They had, to begin with, great difficulty in securing the right of way from the Indians themselves and in filing the necessary papers; and only last October the papers were approved and accepted by the Interior Department and the company was enabled to get to work. They did go to work, and built it, or rather they graded and constructed about 40 miles of the road.

They have expended in building that portion of the road, for bridges, embankments, etc., and in opening the coal-mines, upwards of half a million of dollars. You know that in that country winter comes quite early, and by the 1st of December, or rather by the middle of December, I believe, they were compelled to suspend operations, and there has not been an opportunity to do any work in the way of construction until now. They now say if the Government grants another right of way, practically parallel with their line, not only in the same direction but following to some extent the same cañons and valleys, you clip their wings and prevent them from completing the work, and the large sums of money which they have invested must be lost to them.

Now, while I am in favor of roads through the public domain, yet it is a fact that but one road is required there through that valley; and if you give another company the right of way, a conflict will be created, and one or the other will be driven to the wall; and this Congress will be instrumental, not intentionally of course, but will be instrumental in enabling one set of speculators in Wall street to take hold and choke off the men who projected the building of this line and who put their money into it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the bill under consideration is unobjectionable so far as its form is concerned. It is such a bill as was reported by the House committee in the last Congress, and such a one as met my approval at that time, and which, so far as its form is concerned, meets my approval now. At the last session of Congress I informed the friends of the bill that I did favor its passage, and early in the present session advised them that I would do whatever I could to promote its consideration. I did this upon the general principle that as a representative of the Territory of Montana I was in favor of granting rights of way to any and all railroad companies who desired to build roads in that Territory. They are the great factors in the development and settlement of the country, and unless there is some valid reason for opposing their construction, I would naturally be inclined to aid all such enterprises. I am constrained, however, to oppose the present consideration of this bill, and for reasons which, in my opinion, are satisfactory.

The simple facts are these: In March, 1887, Congress passed a bill granting the right of way over the Crow Indian reservation to the Rocky Fork and Cooke City Railway Company, under which the railroad company was to build and construct its road within two years from the date of the passage of that bill. It also provided for the definite location of the route and for obtaining the consent of the Indians. The company went to work diligently, definitely fixed the location of its line and procured the consent of the Indians, paid the compensation agreed upon, and graded, tied, and bridged 46 miles of its road. Having done this much, that company found it necessary to go to the markets of the East and negotiate its bonds to secure funds to insure the completion of the road. They have been acting in good faith and using every effort possible to complete the road according to the provisions of the bill. My information is that the passage of the present bill would materially embarrass and hinder the Rocky Fork and Cooke City road in negotiating their bonds, and would be likely to stifle the entire enterprise, the result of which would be that, instead of having two roads over the proposed line, the people of Montana would be the loser and neither road would be built.

This information is furnished me by gentlemen who are interested in the prosperity of the Territory, whose means of information are adequate, whose judgments are considered reliable, and whose characters are above reproach. It seems to me to be a plain business proposition. If the Rocky Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company with 46 miles of its line bridged, tied, and graded are unable to go into the market and negotiate their bonds in order to secure the completion of the line, it seems to me that little could be expected of the Billings and Cooke City road, for whom a right of way is now asked, who have not done one dollar's worth of work, and whose line is a parallel line to undeveloped coal fields.

Mr. PAYSON. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. TOOLE. I have but a moment or two myself.

Mr. PAYSON. I merely wish to ask what the gentleman means by saying that this company has some 45 miles of its road built. Does not the gentleman know that there has not been a pound of iron laid on that line?

Mr. TOOLE. I said that distance had been graded, tied, and bridged.

Mr. PAYSON. I understood the gentleman to say it had been built.

Mr. TOOLE. No, sir; I shall make no misrepresentations to this House upon this proposition, for there is no one who is interested in the building of a railroad over the proposed line more than the people whom I represent. And in reply to the suggestion from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON] that this is not a parallel line, I desire to inform him that it must be so considered in its strictest sense, because there is but one objective point of two roads, and both roads run through the Indian reservation, and having no point from which to draw its traffic except at the termini.

It must necessarily be considered a parallel line. The truth is, that the lines run alongside of each other for a distance of 11 miles, and at no point are they farther apart than 8 or 10 miles. It is therefore a matter of no consequence what the distance is between them, inasmuch as the only points from which they can draw their business are the termini, and in this connection permit me to say that the suggestion made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] concerning the general law granting rights of way through public domain is not an analogous case, as will be apparent to every one.

There is but one desideratum with the people of the Territory of Montana in connection with this matter. They desire at least one road constructed to what is known as the Red Lodge coal-fields, and an extension of that line to the Cooke City mines. In its construction is involved the question of fuel supply to a large extent in that Territory, and, we hope, transportation to an important mineral section. This is the result desired by the people of Montana, and it matters little to them whether that is attained by the construction of one or the other of these roads. But confronted as I am with the facts which I have detailed to the House, it seems to me that there is but one thing to be done in justice to the people of the Territory, whose interests are greater than that of either of these companies, and that is to aid that road which is most likely to be built.

As before suggested, the Rocky Fork and Cooke City road has graded, bridged, and tied 46 miles of its line. By reason of the proposed parallel line, the Rocky Fork and Cooke City road has been prevented from negotiating their bonds, for every man of business knows that the granting of the right of way to a rival road would necessarily produce that effect. I am told that the people asking the right of way under the provisions of this bill claim that they have the money ready to build this competing line, and are only waiting to secure the right of way. So far as my observation and experience go, I do not think that railroads are built that way, and that it will eventually turn out, if this road is built, that the people representing it will, like the Rocky Fork and Cooke City people, build it by sale of its bonds.

I do not hesitate, from all the information in my possession, to give it as my deliberate opinion that if this right of way is granted at this time it simply stifles the old enterprise, and neither one of these roads will be built, or but one at least will be built. I am not opposed to the passage of this bill. The question now presented is whether the House will suspend the rules and pass the bill. What I desire in the premises is that the House will refuse to suspend the rules at this time and that the consideration of the bill may be delayed for at least thirty days, during which time I believe that the railroad company now constructing its road will be able to secure the necessary funds to complete it and that the Territory will be in the enjoyment of at least one of these roads. I want to give them an opportunity to secure the fruits of their labors. There are gentlemen connected with that enterprise who are constituents of mine, who have invested in it their fortunes, the accumulation of years of toil in that mountain country. They have invested their money, and I think it only fair that they should have a reasonable opportunity to reap the rewards of their labors so long as it does not conflict with the material interests of the Territory. As I have said before, I think they will be able to do this within thirty days, and when that time arrives I promise the friends of this bill that they shall have my hearty and cordial support to secure its consideration and passage.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Will the gentleman support this bill after thirty days have elapsed?

Mr. TOOLE. I have said to the friends of the bill that after thirty days I would aid its passage upon the floor of the House, and I consider it is asking but little under the circumstances that the consideration of this bill shall be postponed for that time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is the gentleman of the opinion that if one road is not built the other will be?

Mr. TOOLE. I have said that if this right of way was granted before the road under construction was completed, that I very much feared that neither of the roads would be built, and I very much desire that both shall be.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Is there any necessity for two roads there?

Mr. TOOLE. I would dislike very much to make the admission that there is not, because that section of country has inexhaustible mineral resources, and no one can approximate the amount of transportation which it would furnish within a year or two.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Is there a necessity for it?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Is there a business necessity for two roads? There does not seem to be an immediate commercial necessity for the construction of two roads.

Mr. GOFF. Is this company chartered under the laws of Montana?

Mr. TOOLE. It is.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Under the general incorporation law?

Mr. TOOLE. Yes, sir. There is nothing in the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] that there are any equities in favor of the Billings and Cooke City road which are not possessed by the road under construction. They have proceeded in good faith from the time of the passage of the act granting their right of way; they have left nothing undone that it was possible for them to do, and they have done it as diligently as could be done under the circumstances, and while I am in favor of all possible competition by the construction of as many railroads as individuals or companies are willing to build, I believe that it would be an exhibition of punic faith which Congress ought not to tolerate, to give a right of way to this company at this time without giving it a fair opportunity within a reasonable time to secure the completion of its road and save the projectors of the enterprise what they have invested in it.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to ask a question for information. I understand the gentleman from Montana to say that both these companies have been chartered by the Territorial Legislature.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TOOLE. They have been incorporated under the general laws of the Territory. I trust the consideration of this bill will be postponed, that the rules will not be suspended in order to pass it to-day. Have I any time remaining?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. CRISP). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas, the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. PEEL. It is not a pleasant duty for the Committee on Indian Affairs to antagonize the wishes of the gentleman from Montana. After the bill had been discussed for hours and hours by the attorneys for these corporations I was in favor of a postponement, that the men who had undertaken the construction of the road might have an opportunity to negotiate the bonds. But three solid months have passed and they have not yet negotiated the bonds. And the question is, can the Committee on Indian Affairs or can this House afford to postpone this bill in the interest of another private corporation?

The fact is, this company was incorporated, had their surveys made, and they were filed with the Secretary of the Interior and were approved. Both bills came before the Committee on Indian Affairs in the last Congress. They were reported favorably, and by accident one got through and the other did not.

Now, it is but fair, it is a matter of common justice and right between man and man, between individuals, and between the people interested in those companies, that there should be right of way granted for both those roads. The Territory chartered them both, and the people there ought to know.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. The Delegate ought to know, too.

Mr. PEEL. And the Delegate from Wyoming, where this road goes and terminates, supports this bill. I hope this House will not put itself on record as refusing a right of way through the Indian country for a railroad.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Did not the President veto one bill because we gave too many rights of way?

Mr. PEEL. No, sir; he never had this bill before him.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Not this, but another bill.

Mr. PEEL. I do not yield. I have no interest whatever in this matter, but I am not willing to see a monopoly granted to a private corporation to the exclusion of another, especially when this company was incorporated and started and had mapped out its route and filed the map with the Secretary of the Interior and had it approved before the other one commenced at all.

Mr. BLOUNT. I understand the gentleman to say that bills were reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs in the last Congress granting the right of way to both these roads.

Mr. PEEL. Certainly.

Mr. BLOUNT. And there was no contest about it then, I understand.

Mr. PEEL. None whatever in the last Congress. There was a unanimous report on both bills. The opposition in our committee-room now has come solely from this other railroad. There is no opposing interest on the part of the Government, or of anybody else, except this other railroad company and its friends.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. PEEL. No, sir. Don't bother me, if you please.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. You allowed the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] to ask you a question. I don't want to bother you.

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Speaker, if we suspend the passage of this bill for two or three weeks to enable this company to negotiate their bonds, the matter will be hanging over us then just the same as it is now. Let us dispose of it now, extend this right of way, and give the people the benefit of the competing lines. For my part, I wish that every railroad in this country was compelled to compete with another.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] to suspend the rules and pass this bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker *pro tempore* declared that, in the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds had voted in favor of the motion.

Mr. TOOLE. I call for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 112, noes 40.

So (further count not being called for, and two-thirds having voted in favor of the motion) the rules were suspended, and the bill was passed.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Agriculture to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill which I send to the Clerk's desk, being a bill (H. R. 8191) to enlarge the powers and duties of the Department of Agriculture, and to create an Executive Department to be known as the Department of Agriculture.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill to enlarge the powers and duties of the Department of Agriculture and to create an Executive Department to be known as the Department of Agriculture.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Department of Agriculture established at the seat of Government of the United States shall be an Executive Department, to be known as the Department of Agriculture, under the supervision and control of a Secretary of Agriculture, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate; and section 158 of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended to include such Department, and the provisions of Title IV of the Revised Statutes, including all amendments thereto, are hereby made applicable to said Department.

SEC. 2. That there shall be in said Department an Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall perform such duties as may be required by law or prescribed by the secretary.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall hereafter receive the same salary as is paid to the Secretary of each of the Executive Departments, and the salary of the First Assistant Secretary of Agriculture shall be the same as that now paid to the Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

SEC. 4. That all laws and parts of laws relating to the Department of Agriculture now in existence, as far as the same are applicable and not in conflict with this act, and only so far, are continued in full force and effect.

SEC. 5. That the Weather Service of the United States Signal Service Bureau is hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture, to take effect July 1, 1888, and shall consist of one chief and such subordinate officers and employés as may be necessary to efficiently manage said bureau. Until otherwise provided by law, the present organization of the subordinate force of said bureau, including the second lieutenants now in service, shall continue as at present: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as altering or affecting in any way the present status in the Army of the commissioned officers of the Signal Corps. The chief of said bureau shall receive an annual compensation of $4,500, and be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That the Chief Signal Officer of the Army, in addition to his strictly military duties, may be assigned to the charge of the Weather Bureau until a chief shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate; and the compensation now paid to the employés and enlisted men of said service shall continue as now; and the moneys appropriated for said service and hereafter appropriated shall be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture.

The Secretary of War is authorized and directed, within thirty days after the passage of this act, to appoint a board of three Army officers, of which the Chief Signal Officer shall be a member. The duty of said board shall be to make an inventory of all property now in the control and possession of the Signal Service Bureau, and shall separate and turn over to the Department of Agriculture such portions of the property as the said board may determine to be suitable for the work of the Signal Service Weather Bureau. The remainder of the property shall remain in the control of the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is a second demanded? If not, the question will be upon the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH].

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this bill has been so often discussed in this House and has passed the House by such large majorities, I ask unanimous consent that members who desire to do so may print remarks upon the bill in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH]?

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the gentleman if he will not consent to take a vote upon an amendment striking out the fifth section. That section transfers to this new department the Weather Bureau——

Mr. HATCH. I have sent the bill to the Clerk's desk under the in-

structions of my committee, and I say to the gentleman that I have no authority from that committee to change it in any respect.

Mr. HERBERT. Will you not allow a vote on that?

Mr. HATCH. I can not. The bill is presented just as it passed the House and the Senate.

Mr. HERBERT. Then I demand a second.

Mr. HATCH. Then I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HATCH. Now, Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that gentlemen desiring to do so may have leave to print remarks in the RECORD on this bill.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] to control the time in support of the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT] to control the time in opposition to it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, I will reserve my time and let the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT] say what he has to say in opposition to it.

Mr. HERBERT. I asked the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] whether he would consent to a separate vote on a motion to amend the bill by striking out the fifth section. That section of the bill provides for the transfer of the Weather Bureau to this new department, and contemplates a reorganization of the bureau as it at present exists. That bureau is, in my opinion, one of the most efficient in the service of the Government. Its present chief is the only head of a bureau that I know of anywhere under this Government who has of his own motion reduced by a very large percentage—probably 20 per cent.—the expenses of his bureau without in the least impairing its efficiency. I agree with the authors of this bill that the Weather Bureau is chiefly important to the farmers, and it is the farmers of this country who chiefly pay the taxes and who are mostly interested in having an efficient and economical administration of the bureau. Since General Greely has been put at the head of it he has reduced by $100,000 the annual expenses of the bureau, and it is more efficient now than it was when General Hazen administered it.

General Greely has also made recommendations which as he claims will further reduce the expenses of the bureau by about $112,000. Now, what is the reason for dispensing with the present organization of the bureau? Why abolish the present officers who have grown up in the service and who know more about it than anybody can know who has not their experience? I think General Greely has been in this service—I am certain that others of the officers have been there—from fifteen to twenty years.

This bill contemplates the dismissing of these experienced officers and appointing new ones, civilians. It is true there is a provision that the Chief Signal Officer of the Army, General Greely, in addition to his strictly military duties, may be assigned to the charge of the bureau, but how long? Only till a chief shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. That is to say, if any gentleman will read this important bill which the committee seeks to drive through this House with only fifteen minutes' debate on either side, he will discover that the purpose is to dismiss General Greely and these other officers, and form a new organization which is to be composed entirely of civilians, and, so far as we can see, men of no experience. There are no men in this country, as I understand, who have sufficient character and experience to be placed at the head of that bureau except these Army officers. And why is it that this bill seeks to strike down that bureau? Mr. Speaker, I reserve the residue of my time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman has ten minutes remaining.

Mr. HERBERT. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT].

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, if I could see any benefit to result to the farmers of the country from this bill I would give it my cordial support. I have been unable to see in the legislation of Congress anything which can specifically promote agriculture. Legislation has aided various other branches of industry, but as I observe the condition of things in this country I can not see anything we can do here toward advancing the interests of agriculture except by economy in legislation and economy in administration, to be followed by a reduction of taxation.

What is proposed in this bill for the purpose of advancing agriculture? You have to-day the Agricultural Bureau in existence, with all its functions; and what are you proposing now? Simply to create some new offices. You propose to make the head of that Department a Cabinet officer, with increased salary; and you propose to create an assistant who is to receive a liberal salary. Beyond this, except transferring to the Agricultural Department the Signal Service—a service which, so far as I know, is well conducted to-day—there is nothing in this bill. I can not see anything in it for the purpose of promoting agriculture; and I will not, because of the designation of the measure, because it purports in mere words to be in the interest of agriculture, give a stone to the agricultural interest when bread would be much more acceptable.

I have voted time and again against this proposition because I could not see in the bills hitherto offered anything calculated to advance the interest of agriculture in this country, but simply propositions to create a Cabinet officer, with additional bureaus and clerks. In the present bill not a single additional duty except the one I have named is given to the officer at the head of the Agricultural Department. I do not hear any complaint of any lack of capacity in the narrow circle of work which has been hitherto assigned to this branch of the public service. I have heard no suggestions of additional work presenting anything helpful to agriculture.

In some of the former bills providing for creating a Department of Agriculture, "labor" has been associated with agriculture. In this way it has been proposed to take away duties from other Departments of the Government and add them to this department, in order that this great Cabinet officer, not being sufficiently occupied with matters of agriculture, might have something more to do. This is all that I have been able to discover, and for one, representing as I do an agricultural constituency, I will not support by my voice or vote a measure which means nothing except increase of offices, increase of salaries, increase of expenditures, and *pro tanto* an obstruction to the reduction of taxation.

Mr. HERBERT. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES].

Mr. OATES. Mr. Speaker, I desire to say only a word in opposition to this measure. Outside of the question of the constitutional power and right of Congress to pass this bill, which I deny, I can not see in it a solitary feature which is calculated in any degree to benefit the farming interest of the country. That great interest is not to be benefited by the paternal care of this Government. What those engaged in that industry desire from the General Government, and what is most beneficial to them, is that they be let alone, that the Government lay its hands upon them as lightly as possible, imposing only such burdens in the way of taxation as are absolutely necessary, and allowing the farmers to work out their own destiny in their own way. Let Congress legislate, as it may rightfully do, to give to farm products the best market facilities, and do not tax the farmer to death to foster other industries, and they are content. They do not come here as some of your skilled labor organizations, and seek the largesses and paternal care of the Federal Government, and I trust they never will.

The creation of a Cabinet officer at the head of a great Department with numerous clerks will not increase the agricultural productiveness of the country to the extent of a single hill of beans; it will merely create additional offices for politicians to fill, and that is not in the interest of agriculture. It is said that this bill will dignify farming as a business. It will do nothing of the kind. The business of farming is already the most dignified, honorable, and independent of any in this boasted land of freedom. A Cabinet officer of agriculture in imitation of the monarchical governments of Europe is another step in the direction of centralization. It involves a multiplication of offices and consequently of expenditures, which the politicians, place-hunters, and men who work in the shade will seek and obtain, but a single farmer will never reach the humblest of them. They will be left to follow the plow as at present and pay a small increase of taxes to meet the increased expenditure which this will impose.

Mr. HERBERT. I presume the advocates of this bill have a right to conclude the debate; but I would like to hear from the other side in response to the objections I have made to the bill. I think it is only fair that I should know something of the answer of the other side before I occupy the four minutes left to me.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman reserve the remainder of his time?

Mr. HERBERT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Speaker, it is not my purpose to occupy the time of the House in discussing this bill. It has been so often discussed here, and the speeches of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] and the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OATES] have been so often answered by the overwhelming vote of this House, and by every farmers' organization in Alabama and Georgia, as well as every other State in the Union, that it is absolutely unnecessary to pay any further attention to those objections?

Mr. OATES. The first "answer" cited by the gentleman is not a very important one.

Mr. HATCH. Certainly the farmers of this country, when their organizations meet in county, district, or State assemblies, and in national conventions, ought to know as well what they want and require as do the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. OATES. Will the gentleman allow me to put a question?

Mr. HATCH. With pleasure.

Mr. OATES. If the organizations to which the gentleman refers know exactly what Congress ought to do, do not the Grand Army organizations know what Congress ought to do, and do not the associations of manufacturers know what Congress ought to do?

Mr. HATCH. Well, sir, the farmers of this country, throughout the length and breadth of the land, are above any other organization on earth. They are not an incorporated body, and they are less organized

than any other class of people; and they are more imposed upon than any other class.

Mr. OATES. I agree to the latter proposition.

Mr. HATCH. They have been knocking at the doors of Congress for ten long years, asking the passage of a bill of this character; and nothing in the world except the high respect which the constituents of the gentleman from Georgia and the gentleman from Alabama have for them upon other questions——

Mr. OATES. Allow me to interrupt the gentleman.

Mr. HATCH. Let me get through with my sentence. The gentleman stops me right in the middle of a question. I know both gentlemen are popular at home, but the farmers in Georgia and Alabama are not as much interested as those in the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. OATES. During my service as a member upon this floor I wish to say that I have not received a single petition from Alabama in favor of this proposition.

Mr. HATCH. It was because they knew you were against the bill, and they therefore sent them to the Commissioner of Agriculture instead of to the gentleman from Alabama. [Laughter and applause.]

I wish to call attention to the fact that the fourth section of this bill was drawn, as I am informed, under the direction and with the approval of General Greely himself. It was authorized by the Senate committee, passed the Senate, and came over in the last Congress attached to this bill. It does not legislate General Greely out of office; not a bit of it. It is simply hypercriticism of the bill and of that section of the bill. It transfers to the Department of Agriculture one of the most important bureaus of the Government, that of the Weather Reports. It will make it more efficient than before. I have already said more than I intended. I will yield now to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. McCLAMMY].

Mr. STEELE. Let me inquire of the gentleman from Missouri, if you transfer by this bill the Weather Bureau to the Agricultural Department then what do you leave of the Signal Service to General Greely?

Mr. HATCH. I have yielded the floor to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. McCLAMMY. Mr. Speaker, the bill now pending before the House ought to commend itself to every member by reason of the vast interests with which it deals, and of its purpose to elevate and dignify the great and basic pursuit of American citizens. It ought to commend itself to them regardless of political proclivities and affiliations. It dragoons into its service no partisan follower. It appeals for support to no sectional issue, fixes no parallel beyond which it may not enter, because the subject with which it deals is as broad as the American continent and as absorbing as the institutions of our great Republic. There is no other interest so vast or so vital as the interest of agriculture.

There is no other pursuit whose followers are so numerous, or whose wealth in the aggregate is so great and so permanent as they are in agriculture, none upon which we are so dependent in peace and in war. We have, sir, a Department of State whose able head watches with the jealousy of lofty patriotism and eternal vigilance the international rights of our free and prosperous country. That Department is rightly dignified by giving to its chief a Cabinet position. We have a Secretary of War whose stainless sword enforces through the patriotic courage of our citizen soldierly the commands of the civil law, to which it is forever subordinate and tributary.

Our great postal routes, with their bewildering and mazy ramifications, have at their head a genius and spirit of order whose voice is potential in the councils of the Cabinet. We have a Secretary of the Navy who deserves not only the high and commanding influence of his proud position, but also the pæans of national praise for his heroic efforts to make our Navy what our Navy was when our country's colors were nailed to the top-mast and floated triumphant and glorious amid the thousand fleets that sought its destruction. In that Cabinet is a Secretary of the Treasury worthy of his place and the exalted regard of his countrymen. He has diverted for a time into the natural and lawful channels of trade and industry those pactolian streams that have hitherto been lost in the great dead sea of a bursting treasury, whose fulness is waste and whose wealth is but ruin.

We have in the Cabinet a Secretary of the Interior, who seeks to refine and civilize the savage tribes upon our distant border, to watch over that extensive domain reclaimed by his illustrious predecessor from the soulless corporations, who, despite the Jeffersonian spirit of our age and institutions, would despoil the teeming millions of the coming century of happy homes beneath the ægis of American liberty. All of these great interests are elevated into potential influences in the formation of a governmental policy. And yet, sir, the interest of agriculture is greater than all, and inferior to all in the place accorded it. The countless millions of our own population are fed and clothed by the American farmer. The grain waving in golden beauty upon the great plains of the West, the cotton drifting like summer snow upon the fields of the South, freight the fleets of nations and loose their sails, thread continents with tracks of steel, fill the earth with the roar of trains, and heap for trade and commerce and useful art those stores that make a nation great. It is the brawn and muscle of labor that is felling our forests, building our cities, developing our mines, and accomplishing in a thousand varied ways the marvelous destiny of freedom's great empire.

Traffic is regulated by agricultural reports. Capital, with its vast and fatally increasing power, waits in thralldom upon advices from the harvest. The resistless spirit of American energy grapples with hooks of steel to the great commercial centers the most distant sections, upon which Ceres pours her favors and bids everything keep pace with her measureless advance. The movement of crops is watched to-day with an interest like that which centered upon the movement of armies when our country trembled in the throes of mighty revolution. Where, sir, are the sinews of our strength, if they are not found in our great diversified agricultural products? What victorious hosts ever waved as joyous banners as those that float above the tasseled maize from the snows of Maine to the spicy groves of California? What spirit of beauty hovers above Southern fields when fleecy bolls uncover to crown their king!

What a marvelous power, that has defied for a quarter of a century grievous political wrong more destructive than pestilence and more cruel than war! What a marvelous people, that have borne without revolt an utter abandonment of their interest by legislative bodies and a merciless war by monopolies upon their great pursuit! Of what crime have they been convicted, that they are thus punished? What greater conservators of social laws have you than they? What people more distinguished for patriotic love of liberty than those who, reared amid pastoral scenes, cling to the home of their birth, its customs and its laws, with more than a Switzer's love for the heights and lakes of his own dear Switzerland? What other people in your midst can you so rely upon in peace or in war? Who filled the great armies in that immortal struggle of the blue and gray and baptized American valor anew in an ever-widening and brightening fame?

Sir, there are sylvan retreats all over this land, sequestered nooks rich in idyllic charm, sacred forevermore to warrior spirits who left these quiet scenes at their country's call to return no more, unknown and yet immortal. In obedience to that pure and holy patriotism their survivors without regard to geographic division have waited for a recognition of their great claim, not alone upon capital that has sought and justified every pretext for their robbery and spoliation, not alone upon trusts and combines more hurtful than floods and frosts, but upon the American Congress they have waited in the vain hope that their numbers, their wealth, their intelligence, and, more than all, their devotion and importance would secure for them remedial legislation.

While they have waited they have witnessed many novel occurrences. They have seen a contraction in the volume of currency so great as to beggar their industry; manufacturers arrayed against them; common carriers pooling their freights to their manifest injury; Standard Oil Companies waxing mighty upon their wretchedness; gamblers in futures gloating upon their ruin; everywhere hostile organizations; everywhere lurking assassins; yea, even the very arches of her temple have rung to the footfalls of treason when agricultural statistics were fabricated in the interest of monopoly. But despite these hostile surroundings, despite the miserable pittance realized for their products by reason of the accursed policy of contraction, despite storm and flood and drought, they annually add three billions of wealth to the American people. They annually feed and clothe our vast population. They annually export to other countries such a vast surplus of food and raw material that the tax, even, upon the importations paid for by these agricultural products is sufficient to pay for the vast expenses of government, and under existing laws to fill the Treasury with dead and useless capital. They light the fires in every forge; turn the countless wheels of every industrial enterprise; gird continents with glittering threads of steel and hurrying steeds of fire; whiten the seas with the sails of commerce; pour upon all lands and all peoples and every human pursuit the fatness which their toil has wrought from the earth.

They are starving of a money famine while the Treasury vaults are bursting with tons of idle gold. Crippled, they limp upon the earth while lordly manufactures and pious combines mount with eagle's wings to the empyrean realms of boundless wealth and power. Each passing year beholds new favorites of the salvation trusts dubbed Sir Knight and Millionaire by Prince Aladdin's sword, and millions of these patient toilers amerced anew to support the royal favorites.

But light is breaking upon their long night. They, too, are combining for their protection—this great host, who have in their keeping every political possibility of this Government, are organizing; the accursed policy of contraction in the volume of the currency can not always fetter them; the cry of overproduction can no longer deceive them; an inferior place in the Government can no longer satisfy them. They ask a place upon the advisory board of the Government; to be consulted in every measure pertaining to the general welfare, because their pursuit is the basis upon which the general welfare rests. Who shall oppose them in their righteous demand?

Who shall stay them when they summon their clans? Can you fetter the ocean? Can you arrest the avalanche? Can you deny justice to millions of your long-suffering and confiding countrymen? Shall the policy of building up one pursuit at the expense of another be eternally continued? Or shall our policy be like the sun in his benefi-

cent journey, as he lights the summit and valley to favor honest toil and industry everywhere, until the cry of classism shall cease from the land, until self-reliance and sturdy independence shall regain their power, and the American people with deserved trust in their rulers and representatives shall satisfy the world that this great country, under the guidance of God and the ægis of liberty, belongs neither to millionaire or anarchist, but to the people and the whole people, who are accomplishing with brain and brawn and great forbearance the marvelous destiny of freedom's great empire.

Mr. HATCH. I now yield for one minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the passage of this bill, in the first place, because the farmers in my State want it; and in the second place, because it is right. We have around the council board of the nation gathered the Secretary of War, representing a few thousand men in epaulettes or carrying muskets. We have the Secretary of the Navy, representing a few vessels floating and some others to float, and some which will not float. [Laughter.] We have the chief of the postal system of the country, and so I might go on and say we have a number of men gathered there around the council board of the nation representing various interests, giving the President advice and helping in the direction of public affairs, but the most important interest of all in the United States, the agricultural interest, has no one there as its special representative, and it is about time that it had. [Applause.] I am in favor of the passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HATCH. I yield now for three minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CARLTON].

Mr. CARLTON. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry so short a time has been allotted me to speak on so important a subject, yet I am glad to know that my first appearance on the floor of this House is in behalf of the great interest of agriculture. [Applause.]

That it becomes necessary in this case, after the debate we have had for the past few weeks, to speak in support and defense of this important and foundation interest of the whole country is to me a matter of profound surprise.

My distinguished and esteemed colleague [Mr. BLOUNT], who has just preceded me, will pardon me for saying that I am almost equally surprised that he should find it consistent with his views to oppose this measure, living as he does in an agricultural district, knowing full well the necessity of improved, progressive, and better sustained agriculture in our land, and being himself a farmer. [Laughter and applause.]

During the course of the tariff debate which has been had in this House for weeks past no interest in America (and properly so, too) has received greater consideration or been watched with more zealous care than agriculture. Especially has this been true of gentlemen, who here, represent the great agricultural sections of the Union.

The line of their arguments, and, to my mind, the force and justice of their position has been that in considering, readjusting, and reforming our economic system this industrial interest of the country should receive equal and just rights, with other interests, as well as fostering care at the hands of our Government.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, why should not this interest receive, at all times, the highest consideration at the hands of the Government? Why should it not receive the most constant and watchful care and consideration at the hands of Congress? It is, at least, 73 per cent. of the whole industrial interest of the country. It is, beyond doubt, the basis, the solid foundation of that growing commercial and industrial interest which is fast becoming the pride of America. What would be the fate of our manufacturing, commercial, and other varied industries if it was not for American agriculture? If this interest be not sustained, where with all shall they subsist and be maintained?

But, Mr. Speaker, they tell us that this measure contemplates the creation of new and superfluous offices; that it will only enlarge the salaries to be paid out of the Treasury. I do not so regard this bill. It only seeks to enlarge, to make more important and valuable to the agricultural interest of the whole country, the existing Agricultural Department; to dignify and elevate this Department alongside with other Departments of the Government, and where, certainly, it has a right to be. But admit, for the sake of the argument, that it would create new offices and require something more of salaries in order to maintain and make more useful and efficient this all-important Department. Is this an argument against it if it is right, just, and necessary for the promotion and improvement of this great foundation interest?

The overflowing surplus in the Treasury of $150,000,000, which is far beyond all needs of the Government, is now very properly a matter of our greatest legislative concern. In our efforts to reduce this unprecedented plethora of our Treasury, and perchance to provide against its further increase, is it right or just, I would ask, to deny to the agricultural interest of the country its fair, equitable, and much needed benefits of government; and that, too, when the hard-worked and poorly-paid farmers of the land, constituting as they do so large a percentage of our population, have contributed so largely towards filling to redundancy the coffers of "the best government the world ever saw?"

Mr. Speaker, disclaiming all that might appear as invidious comparison, I would most respectfully submit, is not agriculture quite as important and necessary to the support and maintenance of the country and its varied interests as is our postal system? The one might be said to be, in a large degree, a convenience and a comfort, perchance a luxury, to the people; the other, an absolute and primary necessity. While upholding our Agricultural Department, and anxious as I am for its enlarged usefulness and efficiency, yet it must be said that the pretended governmental support and maintenance given to agriculture in this country to day amounts to nothing more than a farce.

While I commend in the highest terms the industry, the zeal, the efficiency, and the exceeding great courtesy of the honorable Commissioner of Agriculture, yet this Department, with its meagre appropriation given it by Congress, restricting thereby its powers of usefulness, when, if enlarged, it might be made a blessing and a benefit to the whole people engaged in agricultural pursuits, and consequently to the whole country, has so far proven but an annoyance to Congressmen, requiring of them much of mere clerical duty to their constituents, oftentimes to the interference with more important duties, with comparatively, but little benefit to the latter, and positively none to the great system of agriculture throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, Napoleon Bonaparte, in all of his greatness, in all of the splendor of his military genius, was never so great as when, after his mighty military campaigns, he rose to that magnificent position of statesmanship wherein he laid down the civil code for the restoration and the resuscitation, the growth and prosperity of France. He said:

First. Agriculture, the soul, the first basis of the empire. Second. Industry, the comfort and happiness of the population. Third. Trade, the superabundance, the proper application of the surplus of agriculture and industry.

Then, emulating so great a statesman, let us to-day be wise unto the interests of our whole country; let us be just and fair to the largest and most important interest which should command our legislative care; let this bill pass, even at the risk of creating a few more offices and a few more salaries, to be paid out of a Treasury overflowing with its $150,000,000 surplus. [Applause.]

Mr. HERBERT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] one minute.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] has taken occasion to voice the sentiment of agriculture all over this country, Georgia, Alabama, and Louisiana. I claim, sir, to know as much about and to be as loyal to the interests of my constituents as any gentleman on this floor, especially if he lives in Missouri. The fact that he happens to be at the head of the Committee on Agriculture gives him no right to superiority of opinion in this House on that question.

I do not know why my constituents have seen fit to keep me here. It does not become me to inquire; but I do know that when my judgment leads me to believe a measure is right or wrong, I have self-respect enough to vote my convictions no matter what clamor may be excited here by appealing to the record of the House in the past, and its hurried legislation. I shall vote against this measure because it has nothing in the world in it except salaries; and I have a constituency intelligent enough, when I shall lay my reasons before them, to appreciate and respect them.

Mr. HATCH. How much time is remaining in opposition?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. One minute and a half.

Mr. HERBERT. I had four minutes, I understood the Chair to say, and yielded one to the gentleman from Georgia.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair did not understand that the gentleman had put any limitation upon the time yielded to the gentleman from Georgia, but will of course accept his statement. The gentleman from Alabama has three minutes remaining.

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Speaker, any gentleman who will take pains to read the fifth section of this bill will, I think, be driven to the conclusion that it contemplates not only the creation of a new bureau, but the displacement of the officers who are now conducting the weather service. I have not time to show this fully in three minutes, but the bill provides first for a chief, second for his salary, and, finally, there is a proviso to the effect that the Chief Signal Officer of the Army, General Greely, "in addition to his strictly military duties," may be assigned to the Weather Bureau "until a chief shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate." That provision, taken in connection with what precedes, can only be fairly construed to mean that the present Chief of the Signal Service is only to be allowed temporarily to remain in charge of that office in addition to his duties as a military officer, and that then another and a different officer is to be appointed.

So much for that. My objection on that point is that the bill does contemplate the destruction of the present bureau and the creation of another more expensive and less efficient, because conducted by officers who have not had the experience.

Mr. STEELE. It does not destroy it, but there will be two departments.

Mr. HERBERT. I regret I have not the time to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. STEELE. It transfers the Weather Bureau and leaves the Signal Bureau.

Mr. HERBERT. Yes, that is what it does; and now in reply to what has been said by the chairman of the committee I have but a word. I am sure he is mistaken in supposing General Greely wrote this section; I am sure he would not favor the transfer, and have reason for what I am saying. Now, sir, the gentleman from North Carolina said he favored this bill because it dignified agriculture. Is that the ground upon which gentlemen, representatives of the people, propose to pass this bill? Does agriculture need to be dignified? Can the farmer of this country be dignified by anything this Congress can do? As a representative of the farmers I scout the idea. Agriculture is already not only the most ancient but the most independent and most honorable of all professions, and far above the efforts of Congress or any other body of living men to dignify by legislation.

The farmers need no such decoration. They stand upon their own merits. What they do need is substantial legislation. I have voted to the Bureau of Agriculture always the most liberal appropriations for seeds, for publications, for experimental stations; for everything that I believe will benefit them I stand here ready to vote. I know this bill will pass this House, but I, by my action now, am simply predicting that it will not benefit the farmer to turn his bureau from a business department, which it now is, into a political machine; it will not help him any to put at the head of it a politician who, if the protectionists ever again get possession of the Government, will use this department we are creating for the dissemination of protection sentiments, for the scattering of protection documents, to reconcile the people to onerous and oppressive taxation. What I would do for the farmer is to relieve him now from the burdens that are weighing him down to the earth; not multiply offices and pile up taxes on him, but go honestly to work to pass the Mills bill and stay here all the summer, if necessary, to do it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in the short time allotted me I can say but little on this most important subject.

The bill under consideration deals with the agricultural interests of the country and seeks to give them recognition at the hands of the Government.

Agriculture forms the basis of American prosperity and independence; with its prosperity comes thrift and happiness; with its failure all other industries languish.

The farming class comprise more than one-half of all the people engaged in productive industries; in most of the States they constitute more than one-half the voters and pay more than one-half of the taxes levied for governmental purposes. They control nearly five million farms and cultivate about 300,000,000 acres of land. Their farm products, on the farm, are worth $4,000,000,000. Farming in this country has increased 300 per cent. in a generation, and the skill of our people displayed in the construction of farming implements and machinery is not surpassed in the world. Why, then, should not our farmers have a voice in the administration of the Government, and why should not the present Department of Agriculture be elevated to a dignity commensurate with its great importance to the nation?

Agriculture is the oldest occupation of man, and through all past ages has been most honorable. It is the foundation of our earliest civilization, and its development denotes human progress with as much certainty as the sun's light increases the growth of vegetation. To me it is a matter of wonder that the country has legislated so much about all other great interests and so little about agriculture. If manufacturing, mining, railroading and navigation, commerce, labor, and trade are proper subjects of legislation, why not agriculture?

The Government now has under its control and in operation an Agricultural Department, and for the means furnished and appliances at its command it no doubt does all it can; it has and is now accomplishing substantial benefits. But if this bill should become a law the chief of this department will become a Cabinet officer. This will give the cause of agriculture a voice in the affairs of government and no doubt will stimulate those who are engaged in tilling the soil to higher aims, and much good will be accomplished.

The bill also transfers to this department the "Weather Bureau," which is now controlled by the War Department. This, it seems to me, is most proper. What could be more beneficial than for those engaged in agriculture to possess a thorough knowledge of the weather. Rainfall, heat, cold, storm, and sunshine are potential influences that affect the farmers of the country more than those engaged in any other pursuit or calling. And since the Government has undertaken to furnish information touching these matters, it appears most reasonable that the Weather Bureau should be under the control of the Agricultural Department.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does not create a new department of government, but only seeks to elevate, enlarge, and make more efficient a department already organized. Will not the passage of this bill commend itself to the farmers as an evidence that the Government holds their industry in high esteem, and that as far as the Constitution and laws will allow will extend its fostering care to it as readily as to any other industry?

Mr. Speaker, as a justification for our conduct in favoring this bill, and as a part, I trust, of interesting history, I beg to call the attention of the House to the conduct of other governments with reference to the subject of agriculture and kindred industries.

Mr. Speaker, the establishment of an agricultural department the chief officer of which ranks with the heads of the other departments of government in the countries of Europe is a regulation of long standing. France, Austria, Prussia, Italy, and Russia each has a department of government denominated "the ministry of agriculture and commerce." This department of government takes jurisdiction in most of these countries of the subjects of agriculture, animal industry, forestry, draining, food supplies, external and internal commerce, manufacturing, labor, mineralogy, and geology. They procure and furnish for the people of their respective countries most valuable information, such as depth of rainfall, heat, and the testing of the growth of vegetation, as well as making experiments with the most improved implements of husbandry. They procure statistics of the number of acres of land in cultivation, and the number of laborers engaged in various industrial pursuits, together with the sanitary condition of the country, and the effect of labor upon the health of those engaged in manufacturing and other pursuits.

The sums of money which those countries of Europe annually spend in the cause of agriculture is an evidence of the importance which they attach to agriculture and kindred industries.

France expends about	$8,000,000
Austria expends about	4,000,000
Russia expends about	14,000,000
Prussia expends about	3,000,000
Italy expends about	3,000,000

Shall this country, with a territory of almost boundless acres, with a climate and soil greatly surpassing that of Europe, fail to appreciate its superior advantages by not making it the greatest agricultural country on the globe? Who can deny but that in the near future the rainfall and melting snows of vast mountain ranges will be gathered into reservoirs, and by processes of irrigation cause millions of acres of land in this country now uncultivated to yield a rich harvest capable of sustaining a dense population?

If fully developed how vast are our resources. The State of California contains more acreage of arable land than Great Britain and Ireland. Texas is larger than the great Republic of France with Switzerland and Servia included. Our cotton fields include more acres than Sweden, Denmark, Holland, and Belgium.

The imperial domain of Russia has less land in cultivation than the United States.

America produces about one-half of the cotton raised upon the globe for commercial purposes. About two-thirds of the corn of which we have any census record is grown in the United States.

Our tobacco crop equals that grown in all other countries. In view of the adaptation of this country to agricultural pursuits, and in view of the fact that the happiness and prosperity of the people depends so largely upon this industry, is it not the part of statesmanship that Congress, by appropriate legislation, recognize its importance and contribute all within its power towards its advancement?

Having been raised upon a farm and inured to the duties of farm life, without affectation I can say that farmers have the warmest sympathy of my heart, and if I could say one word or do one act which would lighten their burdens or make plenty and contentment dwell within their homes it would be the proudest aim of my life.

When I remember that the Southland, from the Potomac to the Rio Grande, has for these twenty-four years struggled to rebuild homes made desolate by the red hand of war, and at this hour farm mortgages cover what were once happy homes, I would be less than a man and devoid of a proper sense of humanity did I not feel deeply for the farmers of the South; and while some question both the propriety and the constitutionality of this bill, and while it is not the province of the Government to engage in farming or in any private enterprise for the benefit of an individual or combination of individuals, yet, under the Constitution, the Government has the right to promote the general welfare of the United States, and without entering into any discussion of the constitutionality of this measure I will give the farmers the benefit of the doubt and vote for it. Trusting that the wisdom of those placed in charge of this Department will devise such methods as will infuse new life into this great industry, may not the adoption of this measure be the means of establishing the farming interests of this country upon a basis which shall not only command the admiration of all, but make it a lasting blessing to humanity?

Some seem to fear that the passage of this bill will require a greater expenditure of money. Let it be so. We spend money for most everything else, and this measure furnishes a worthy object.

Speaking for myself, I am in favor of making an appropriation large enough to make the Agricultural Department efficient.

Who can tell but that this Department, when fully equipped, can procure in this and other countries information on agriculture, animal industry, forestry, and kindred subjects which will enable our people to enhance the quality and quantity of their products, as well as cheapen labor by improved methods and machinery? May not this Department procure new and improved varieties of plants and seeds, which will enable us to diversify our crops? May it not make test of

the adaptation of soil and climate to the growth of vegetation? When we consider what has been done, who can tell what is yet in store for us?

Mr. HATCH. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. I am delighted to see so many gentlemen with their sleeves rolled up, ready to do a hard day's work for the farmer. The trouble with the farmer, from his standpoint, I fancy, is that he has had his affairs too long in the hands of gentlemen who imagined they were better able to attend to his business than he was himself. I realize, speaking for the section I represent, that it has an extraordinary interest in the fact that seven millions of people who attempt to make a living and get happiness out of the ground are unrepresented in the center of political power in this country; and that, in defiance of the fact that from the man who shoes your horse to the carpenter who builds your house, from the carpenter who builds your house to the doctor who cures your ailments and to the preacher who tries to save your soul, the proposition holds true that you deliver over the tools of life into the hands of the men who know best how to use them.

It is a notorious fact that until the passage of the Hatch bill agriculture as a great productive interest has never been represented directly in the councils of the country; has never had a half million dollars bestowed upon it. It is the industry from which flows the daily life of the nation, and yet anybody who cares to be conversant with the facts knows that it has been treated very differently in this country from what is the case in Russia, Italy, Sweden, France, Germany, and Austria, whose governments pour out millions for the benefit of agriculture and have this department of industry represented in their cabinets.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr HATCH. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LAIRD] has said much better than I can what was in my mind. But I want to say in answer to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT] that the State and National Governments have organized bureaus at great expense for the purpose of giving commercial men, if not speculators, in advance, accounts of the prospects of the differents kinds of crops, in order that they may speculate therein to a greater or less extent. Now, if the Government does that for the men who are buying and selling, much more ought it to give the farmer, by every possible means, the information it can get as to the probable state of the weather. Thousands of dollars can be profitably spent in this direction, so that the farmers of this country may know in advance, as far as possible, just what to anticipate. And this service should be under the control of that Department which by this bill we hope to create—a Department with a Cabinet minister at its head whose time and talents shall be devoted to those interests that feed and clothe every human being.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HATCH. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RYAN].

Mr. RYAN. I am heartily in favor of this measure precisely as it is reported. I have no time to discuss the merits of this bill. I am in favor of the creation of the department, because I think the greatest industry of this country should be more closely allied with the Federal Administration. All the interests of agriculture could then be more thoroughly represented in executive council, and information in regard to them could be more fully and intelligently presented to the Congress of the United States by the President in his annual message.

As regards the Weather Bureau, which is one of the most important adjuncts of agriculture that we have, it should be under the Agricultural Department, as the bill provides, whether the Department remains a bureau or becomes an executive department of the Government. The Signal Service proper ought not to be connected with the Weather Bureau, but should be left to the Army of the United States, of which it is a necessary part, as this bill contemplates.

Once you create an executive Department of Agriculture, its chief becomes a member of the Cabinet. This brings this great national industry directly under the charge and responsibility of the President. The very importance and magnitude of such a trust must necessarily make the Chief Magistrate solicitous regarding all the interests and conditions of agriculture. These considerations and interests must almost weekly become the subjects of Cabinet consideration and discussion. Whatever injustice this supreme industry may suffer from iniquitous combinations, from transportation extortions, from oppressive legislation, or from any other cause, must inevitably become the subject at once of Executive and Cabinet solicitude, of thorough and anxious consideration by the head of the nation, whose duty it will be to lay before Congress from time to time all the facts, with such suggestions and recommendations as in his wisdom he may deem important. This will bring Congress face to face with the whole subject and impose directly upon it the responsibility of just action. This bill ought to pass without a dissenting vote.

Mr. HATCH. I demand the yeas and nays on my motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 236, nays 13, not voting 75; as follows:

YEAS—236.

Abbott,	Dunn,	Laidlaw,	Richardson,
Adams,	Elliott,	Laird,	Robertson,
Allen, Mich.	Enloe,	Landes,	Rowland,
Allen, Miss.	Ermentrout,	Lane,	Russell, Conn.
Anderson, Iowa	Farquhar,	Lanham,	Russell, Mass.
Anderson, Miss.	Felton,	Lawler,	Ryan,
Anderson, Ill.	Finley,	Lehlbach,	Sawyer,
Anderson, Kans.	Fisher,	Lind,	Sayers,
Arnold,	Flood,	Lodge,	Scull,
Baker, N. Y.	Foran,	Long,	Seney,
Baker, Ill.	Ford,	Lyman,	Seymour,
Bankhead,	Forney,	Lynch,	Shaw,
Barnes,	French,	Macdonald,	Sherman,
Barry,	Fuller,	Mahoney,	Shively,
Bayne,	Funston,	Maish,	Simmons,
Biggs,	Gallinger,	Mansur,	Smith,
Bingham,	Gay,	Martin,	Snyder,
Bland,	Gear,	Mason,	Spooner,
Boothman,	Geist,	Matson,	Springer,
Bound,	Glass,	McComas,	Stahlnecker,
Boutelle,	Goff,	McCormick,	Steele,
Bowen,	Grimes,	McCreary,	Stewart, Tex.
Brewer,	Grout,	McCullogh,	Stewart, Ga.
Browne, T. H. B., Va.	Guenther,	McKenna,	Stockdale,
Browne, Ind.	Hare,	McKinley,	Stone, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Harmer,	McMillin,	Stone, Mo.
Brown, J. R., Va.	Hatch,	McRae,	Struble,
Buchanan,	Haugen,	Moffitt,	Symes,
Bunnell,	Hayden,	Montgomery,	Tarsney,
Burnett,	Heard,	Moore,	Taylor, E. B., Ohio
Burrows,	Hemphill,	Morgan,	Taylor, J. D., Ohio
Butterworth,	Henderson, Iowa	Morrill,	Thomas, Ky.
Bynum,	Henderson, N. C.	Morrow,	Thompson, Cal.
Campbell, F., N. Y.	Henderson, Ill.	Neal,	Tracey,
Campbell, T. J., N. Y.	Hermann,	Newton,	Townshend,
Cannon,	Hiestand,	Nutting,	Turner, Kans.
Carlton,	Hires,	O'Donnell,	Vance,
Caruth,	Hitt,	O'Ferrall,	Vandever,
Catchings,	Hogg,	O'Neall, Ind.	Wade,
Cheadle,	Holman,	O'Neill, Pa.	Walker,
Chipman,	Holmes,	O'Neill, Mo.	Warner,
Clardy,	Hopkins, Ill.	Osborne,	Washington,
Clark,	Hopkins, N. Y.	Outhwaite,	Weaver,
Clements,	Houk,	Owen,	Weber,
Cobb,	Hovey,	Parker,	West,
Cogswell,	Howard,	Patton,	White, Ind.
Conger,	Hudd,	Payson,	White, N. Y.
Cothran,	Hunter,	Peel,	Whiting, Mich.
Crisp,	Hutton,	Penington,	Whitthorne,
Crouse,	Jackson,	Perkins,	Wickham,
Culberson,	Johnston, Ind.	Perry,	Wilber,
Dalzell,	Johnston, N. C.	Peters,	Wilkins,
Darlington,	Kean,	Phelps,	Wilkinson,
Davidson, Ala.	Kennedy,	Pidcock,	Williams,
Davidson, Fla.	Kerr,	Post,	Wilson, Minn.
Dibble,	Ketcham,	Pugsley,	Wilson, W. Va.
Dingley,	Kilgore,	Randall,	Wise,
Dockery,	Laffoon,	Reed,	Yoder,
Dorsey,	La Follette,	Rice,	Yost.

NAYS—13.

Blount,	Cummings,	Morse,	Turner, Ga.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Dargan,	Oates,	
Breckinridge, Ky.	Hall,	Rogers,	
Buckalew,	Herbert,	Tillman,	

NOT VOTING—75.

Allen, Mass.	Cooper,	Hopkins, Va.	Rayner,
Atkinson,	Cowles,	Jones,	Rockwell,
Bacon,	Cox,	Kelley,	Romeis,
Belden,	Crain,	Lagan,	Rowell,
Belmont,	Cutcheon,	Latham,	Rusk,
Blanchard,	Davenport,	Lee,	Scott,
Bliss,	Davis,	Maffett,	Sowden,
Bowden,	De Lano,	McAdoo,	Spinola,
Brower,	Dougherty,	McClammy,	Stephenson,
Brumm,	Dunham,	McKinney,	Stewart, Vt.
Bryce,	Fitch,	McShane,	Taulbee,
Burnes,	Gaines,	Merriman,	Thomas, Ill.
Butler,	Gibson,	Milliken,	Thomas, Wis.
Campbell, Ohio	Glover,	Mills,	Thompson, Ohio
Candler,	Granger,	Nelson,	Wheeler,
Caswell,	Greenman,	Nichols,	Whiting, Mass.
Cockran,	Grosvenor,	Norwood,	Woodburn,
Collins,	Hayes,	Phelan,	Yardley.
Compton,	Hooker,	Plumb,	

So the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HATCH, by unanimous consent, the reading of the names of members voting was dispensed with.

Mr. STAHLNECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am informed that I am paired with the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. STEWART] on all political questions, but, considering this not to be a political question, and believing that the gentleman from Vermont, if present, would vote as I do, I desire to have my vote recorded in the affirmative.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. COWLES with Mr. FITCH, for the remainder of the day.

Mr. CRAIN with Mr. CUTCHEON.

Mr. COMPTON with Mr. KELLEY.

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BELMONT. Mr. Speaker, I now renew the motion which I made earlier in the day, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills. I trust that gentlemen will see the wisdom of this course. The com-

mittee which I represent has a bill which might be called up and passed under a suspension of the rules, but we waive that course for the present, and under the instruction of the committee I make the motion that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment it is too late to enter into the consideration of an appropriation bill, and therefore I think we had better proceed with the regular order.

Mr. RANDALL. Not at all.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from New York——

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, in view of some things which have been said here, I hope I may be allowed to say that there are four or five other appropriation bills in the Committee of the Whole, and that we are getting pretty near to the end of the fiscal year.

Mr. BELMONT. Mr. Speaker, let me add that we can finish the bill this evening.

The motion of Mr. BELMONT was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. TOWNSHEND in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of general appropriation bills. The Clerk will report the title of the first bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6833) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year 1889.

Mr. BELMONT. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has found it necessary under the rules to report a bill which contains no change of existing law. We have been in receipt of many communications from consuls and diplomatic officers, as well as from the Department of State, which, under other circumstances, would have required us to recommend some important changes for the benefit of the service; but we are confronted with a rule which binds us to such an extent that the House now has before it a bill which is practically a re-enactment of last year's appropriation bill. The House is of course familiar with the rule, but for the benefit of others interested, who are not, I will ask to incorporate it. It is as follows:

Rule XXI, paragraph 3:

"No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order in any amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto."

Under this rule it only remains for me to ask to have the Clerk perform the clerical duty of reading through the bill in the ordinary way. I know that there is no member of the committee who desires to speak upon it. I have only to say that proposed important changes in the consular service have been considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and are embodied in another bill which we shall ask the House to consider on some future occasion.

Not only is the present bill exactly in accordance with last year's bill, but the amounts appropriated in it are the same, with the exception of a decrease of $16,077.44, provided last year for the Venezuela and Haytian Commissions, which are not now needed. There are a few verbal changes necessary, which I shall ask the Committee of the Whole to make as we proceed with the consideration of the bill. I now move that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BELMONT. I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, that the bill be read by sections under the five-minute rule.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Foreign Affairs considered this bill very carefully; and I had the honor to be a member of the subcommittee which had it especially under consideration. It is true, as stated by the chairman of the committee [Mr. BELMONT], that the bill, with the amendments which he intends to offer, will be in exact accordance with the bill passed by the House at the last session. We endeavored in committee to make this bill conform in every respect to the present law and to the bill passed at the last session. I make this statement with the view of facilitating and hastening the passage of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the general debate will be dispensed with, and the Clerk will proceed to read the bill by paragraphs for amendment, under the five-minute rule.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONTINGENT EXPENSES FOREIGN MISSIONS.

For the purpose of enabling the President to provide, at the public expense, all such stationery, blanks, record and other books, seals, presses, flags, and signs as he shall think necessary for the several legations in the transaction of their business, and also for rent, postage, telegrams, furniture, messenger service, clerk-hire, compensation of cavasses, guards, dragomans, and porters, including compensation of interpreter, guards, and Arabic clerk at the consulate at Tangier, and the compensation of dispatch agents at London, New York, and San Francisco, and for traveling and miscellaneous expenses of legations, and for printing in the Department of State, $105,000.

Mr. BELMONT. I move to amend by inserting after the word "dragomans," in line 92, the word "janitors."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To enable the President to meet unforeseen emergencies arising in the diplomatic and consular service, and to extend the commercial and other interests of the United States, to be expended pursuant to the requirements of section 291 of the Revised Statutes, $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. DINGLEY. In order to put a question to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BELMONT] I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire whether there is any appropriation in this bill for the expenses of the Fishery Commission.

Mr. BELMONT. There is no specific appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is this appropriation for the secret-service fund one which will be available for that purpose?

Mr. BELMONT. It might be so considered, but there is nothing in the bill which would carry that intention. The money is to be expended in accordance with section 291 of the Revised Statutes, a provision with which the gentleman from Maine is no doubt familiar. This can hardly be said to be a secret-service fund; it is simply a fund placed at the disposal of the Department of State in the same manner as we have done hitherto. But I am not able to say that it is for the purpose of paying salaries or any portion of the expenses of the commission referred to.

Mr. DINGLEY. I do not observe in this bill any specific appropriation for the payment of the gentlemen who represented the United States upon the Fishery Commission. I observe that in the British Parliament a specific appropriation for the payment of the British commissioners was made with great *éclat*. I had supposed that provision for the payment of our commissioners might be included in this appropriation. I understand from the chairman of the committee that, though there is no specific provision, such compensation may be drawn from the fund here provided.

Mr. BELMONT. That may be possible, but it may be inferred that the gentlemen who served as commissioners were not so zealous about the question of salary as they were in their desire to be of service to the country.

Mr. DINGLEY. I had supposed the committee might make specific provision for the payment of these commissioners.

Mr. BELMONT. No such specific provision was made.

Mr. DINGLEY. But you think these expenses might be paid from this appropriation?

Mr. BELMONT. I think it possible, but I have no information on the subject.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is all I wish to say. I simply desired to get information. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For defraying the expenses of transporting the remains of ministers and consuls of the United States who may have died, or may die, abroad, while in the discharge of their official duties, to their former homes in this country, and for the ordinary and necessary expenses of such interment, $10,000.

Mr. BELMONT. In accordance with the desire of the accounting officers of the Treasury, I move to amend, by striking out, in line 145, the words "and consuls," and inserting the words "diplomatic officers, consuls, and consular clerks;" so as to read, "ministers, diplomatic officers, consuls, and consular clerks."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Great Britain and British dominions:

Consuls at Amherstburg (Canada), Antigua (West Indies), Auckland (New Zealand), Barbadoes, Bermuda, Bristol, Brockville (Canada), Cape Town, Ceylon (India), Charlottetown (Prince Edward Island), Clifton (Canada), Fort Erie (Canada), Goderich (Canada), Gibraltar, Guelph (Canada), Kingston (Canada), Leicester, London (Canada), Malta, Newcastle-on-Tyne, Quebec, Picton (Canada), Port Hope (Canada), Port Sarnia (Canada), Port Stanley (Falkland Islands), Prescott (Canada), Southampton, Saint Helena, Saint John's (Canada), Saint Stephen (Canada), Stanbridge (Canada), Stratford (Canada), Three Rivers (Canada), Windsor (Canada), and Winnipeg (Manitoba).

Mr. BELMONT. I move to amend by striking out, in line 303, the word "Leicester," which has been left in by inadvertence. Leicester is now a consular agency, paid by fees. In the bill as originally drafted it was proposed to make it a salaried consulate, but as this would be a change of existing law, it is stricken out.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BELMONT. In order to correct a similar inadvertence, I move to amend by striking out, in lines 307 and 308, the words "Stanbridge (Canada)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Barmen, Belfast, Dundee, Halifax, Leith, and Matamoras, at $640 each, $4,480.

Mr. BELMONT. I move to amend by striking out "and" after "Leith" and inserting after the word "Matamoras" the words "and Victoria." There is already a clerk provided for at Victoria, and this omission has happened merely through inadvertence.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask unanimous consent to return to line 28 on page 2 for the purpose of making an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HOLMAN. Let us first hear what it is.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is an amendment which will not involve any expenditure at all. I desire to strike out, in line 28, the words "min-

isters resident," and insert the words "envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary." This change will cost nothing at all, but will have the effect of giving to our ministers resident an increased dignity and rank. Every gentleman who has been abroad knows that in all foreign countries our representatives suffer by reason of the inferior rank which their country gives them. As the governments to which these ministers resident are accredited send ministers plenipotentiary to our Government it will cost nothing to give our representatives similar rank; and I see no reason why it should not be done. I therefore desire to move an amendment (which will involve no increase of expense whatever), striking out the words "ministers resident" and inserting the words "envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary." I make this proposition with the consent of the chairman of the committee and of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HITT], a member of the committee.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope my friend from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] will not insist on this amendment. It is simply laying a foundation for increased salaries.

Mr. SPRINGER. Not at all. I assure my friend it has nothing at all to do with salaries.

Mr. HOLMAN. It must have an effect in that direction.

Mr. SPRINGER. Oh, no.

Mr. RANDALL. The mere change of title will not do these officers any good.

Mr. SPRINGER. There is where my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] does not understand diplomatic affairs. I refer him for information on this subject to the distinguished gentleman who at this moment sits behind him, Mr. Curtin, recently a Representative in this House, and who, having been at one time a foreign minister, could, if now permitted to speak on this floor, tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] that it makes a great deal of difference whether our minister to a foreign country is accredited as a minister resident or as an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary.

Mr. RANDALL. My sympathies run in the direction of the consuls rather than in favor of the diplomatic representatives.

Mr. SPRINGER. My sympathies run in favor of both classes of officers. There is where I have the advantage over my friend. I think it important that we should be represented in foreign countries by ministers of equal rank with the representatives which they send here. I have received information from one of our ministers resident abroad to the effect that it frequently happens when our minister appears at court to transact public business he has to wait in the ante-room until the minister of Nicaragua, for instance, has had a hearing.

Mr. RANDALL. There appears to be no real necessity for this change.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX].

Mr. HOLMAN. I call for the regular order.

Mr. RANDALL. I believe the amendment is not before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not if objection is made.

Mr. SPRINGER. I hope there will be no objection to hearing my friend from New York [Mr. COX].

Mr. RANDALL and Mr. HOLMAN. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of objection, the gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. COX. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] is on the right track, but he does not go far enough. He should also strike out from this bill the high-sounding sesquipedalian words "envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary," and insert the simple and constitutional word "embassador." He would thus succeed in crystallizing a capital idea.

The embassadors of the great powers of Europe are the diplomatic representatives who always have precedence in all audiences for business or ceremony. Even if we call our "ministers resident" "envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary" they will, under the old and senseless rule of international practice, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] well suggests, made by the Holy Alliance after the fall of Napoleon, be nevertheless constrained always to defer to and wait for the embassadors. I have been asked unexpectedly to speak to this matter.

I can speak from not a little experience. Our minister to Turkey until within a few years was a minister resident only. He had to take rank after envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary. He had to wait in the ante-room not only until the embassadors but the envoys were received. No matter how urgent his business, he had to await the etiquette which left him out in the cold.

This mode of proceeding and preference was peculiarly irksome and humiliating to my predecessor, General Wallace, and to his predecessors. Afterwards, during the term of his service—General Wallace, who was when appointed only "minister resident" to Turkey—Congress struck out minister resident for the Sublime Porte and put in envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary. This was some advancement. It was quite a comfort and a relief, but still there remained the precedence of the embassadors, and the envoy had still to defer to the embassadors.

When, as envoy, etc., I went to the Porte to call on the foreign minister it was always on a Monday. That day was set apart for the diplomatic calls for business. Being only an envoy, and although my name was registered ahead of the embassadors, I was compelled to wait as soon as one of these highly-favored diplomats appeared, until Austria, England, France, Russia, Germany, Persia, and Italy, whose diplomats at Constantinople are called embassadors, went first and foremost. There was no chance for America until the monarchies were regarded. The minister of poor little Persia—a mere dependency or khanate of the White Bear of the North—took precedence of our country of sixty millions of people. Why? Because the Persian minister, like those of the great powers, was called "embassador!"

Mr. Chairman, this inconvenience and degradation should be remedied. How? As it is a mere matter of verbiage and form, what matter is it what we call our diplomatic functionary? The simplest title is the best and most republican in form and fact. That title is embassador. It is named in our Constitution. It means a minister of the highest rank. What do we care as a nation about "rank." Rank is but the stamp, not the man or the officer, or functionary. Are we not entitled to the same rank as every other power? Is it wise, since we want to advance our interests in the East and elsewhere, to adopt the less pretentious name when another name will obtain for us greater advantages? It is the same at the other courts of Europe. When the accredited ministers are named embassadors, the chambers of courtesy and power fly open to this "open sesame." They thereby obtain the entré before mere envoys, or ministers resident, or chargé d'affaires, and more than an entré—a greater consideration and emphasis.

Mr. PETERS. Can we not coin a word to put us ahead?

Mr. COX. The word embassador has the charm, at least for the Orient, for it comes from an Oriental word which means "powerful," as Bassa, or Bashaw.

The reason why the United States has never created an embassador, except, perhaps, for special embassies, is this: By the treaty of the Holy Alliance, in the conspiracy against democratic republicanism, they agreed among themselves that no popular government should ever be recognized at their imperial courts and foreign offices if they came by and through an embassador. An embassador—oh, he represented a sovereign. He was vicariously in the place of one annointed of the Lord. He was specially dedicated to monarchy and absolutism. Republics should uncover their heads and stand outside with their chargés, ministers resident, and envoys, however extraordinary, until the Lord's annointed passed through the swelling scene.

Since the French Republic has been established its Government still continues to call its minister an embassador. If France can disregard the exclusive prescripts of the Holy Alliance why not the United States of America?

I do not know how this debate arose or whether any motion to amend is pending. I wish I had known that the matter was to be considered. I would have made a motion—and it would carry, too, if in order—to make all of our diplomats embassadors.

If we are to have our ministers respected, and in order to give them their proper status and dignity corresponding with our country's position among the powers of the earth, we ought to strike out the words envoy extraordinary, etc., and insert embassador. If the great powers do not like it let them do their worst. It is not such a great loss to be unrepresented abroad as we may surmise. Then our ministers abroad representing our growing interests, if we must have them, will have precedence of the little powers, which generally have ministers of a lower grade, and be the equals of those who are of a higher rank without representing grander nations.

Why, sir, the representative of Servia, Roumania, Greece, Sweden, Belgium, or Holland, or of any of these smaller nations, can at any time, by calling their diplomats "embassador," do as little Persia did at the Porte—step in, although arriving late, ahead of our envoy "extra-ordinary." Why should we, because a Republic, be bound to make our salaam before Russia, Germany, or England, by the ridiculous rules of the Holy Alliance, to which we never consented and as to which we were never consulted. Although when minister to Turkey I used to be on time and in advance of others, I was compelled to wait and to wait in an ante-room of the Porte, the pleasure of these excellencies of the monarchies and empires, with the thermometer going up beyond the nineties, from 12 o'clock to sunset. [Laughter.] Then sometimes, without having accomplished my work, I was compelled to leave. I used to wait patiently, because I had important duties with the foreign minister. I always gave way to those of similar or less rank, when they had urgent business, if they happened in after my "registry." The "embassadors," however, did not always return the courtesy.

When the embassadors arrived they wrote down their names on the list, and the waters of the pool were at once stirred for them, and they stepped in ahead of the representatives of the United States. There was not a little disgust along with humiliation at seeing a little power like modern Persia—a petty colony on the borders of Armenia, India, and Russia, a travesty on ancient Persia and government generally—take precedence of my own native land, even though so poorly represented as by myself. To speak confidentially, I believe it was one

of the reasons why I yearned for home and for my old place here, to enjoy the equal and genial society of this elegant assembly of gentlemen. [Laughter and applause.]

I wish all this ceremonial nonsense could be changed—for my successor and for our other envoys extraordinary. I think that our Secretary of State would favor the change if it were properly presented to him in a republican and a business point of view by one who has suffered, like Minister Phelps.

I have only spoken for Turkey. The humiliation is worse at the court of St. James. Our ministers feel the indignity, if they do not express their indignation.

Any embassador could care better for the fifteen millions of property of our country invested in the Turkish dominions if our interests were in charge of an embassador. Our missionaries and colleges and teachers, printing houses, etc., scattered all over that empire from Bagdad to Stamboul, from Albania and Macedonia to the Adriatic and the Danube, would have more protection afforded them under the superior offices of an embassador than of a mere envoy, however extraordinary, or a minister, however plenipotential!

Our interests in that country are spreading. Our sentiments are permeating that empire. They are doing practical good. They have republicanized Bulgaria and are leavening East Roumelia. They are by force of education and example creating American institutions. Our preachers and teachers are often in great distress when persecution and oppression fall on them, whether from the jealousy of the Greek Christians or the Armenian bigots. Their schools are closed, from envy and distrust of their growth and utility, by the clamors of other religionists, who are not Mohammedans either. Our colporteurs of tracts in many tongues are often suppressed and their property seized in spite of "capitulations" and treaties, and especially when they are remote from the capital and central power. Our missionaries and teachers, of both sexes, have been robbed and outraged by tramps and brigands, and with little hope of relief or reclamation. And here, sir, is just exactly where the rank and services of an embassador, or rather those of an envoy with a big affix, enable our representative to meet more speedily and effectually the minister of foreign affairs for the purpose of a prompt rectification of the abuses incident to these Oriental countries.

Now, sir, I did not expect at this time to talk on this subject; and I would not have spoken but for the call of gentlemen who seemed to be so interested in the matter.

Mr. DINGLEY. Before the gentleman from New York takes his seat I would like to ask him a question for information.

Mr. COX. Certainly, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. If the change proposed by the gentleman, which of course would be a change of law, giving the name of "embassador" in these countries, or "minister plenipotentiary," should be adopted, would it not carry with it certainly, by way of emolument, an increase of compensation?

Mr. COX. That is the argument that has hitherto been made against the suggested change. It was made by my friend from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN]. It is not well grounded. It could be guarded against by proper provision from the committee.

But let me say to my honorable friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] that when we raised the rank of the minister at Turkey from "minister resident" to "envoy," etc., it did not by force of existing law, raise the salary of that officer. We may fix the salary in this and similar bills of appropriation. The mere change of the title or rank of the diplomatist does not of necessity work a change or increase of compensation. Such change depends altogether upon the action of Congress, and not by a mere change of the rank or title. This is as I understand it.

Mr. DINGLEY. But is there any minister plenipotentiary who receives now less than ten, twelve, or seventeen thousand dollars a year? while the ministers resident receive but $7,500, I believe.

Mr. COX. Let me say——

Mr. DINGLEY. And, therefore, it would seem that officers having the same rank should receive the same compensation.

Mr. COX. That does not and should not follow. We do not pay for rank, but for service. I would not advocate the raising of the salary simply because we saw proper to change or raise the rank. The salary should be regulated by the utility of the minister at the place assigned, by the business of his office, instead of by the rank which he holds. At some of the countries of South America and at the courts of Asia, as Japan and China, we have enormous business relations. They grow out of our commerce. The compensation of such ministers should be fixed upon a different basis from that granted to our ministers, even if of the same rank, at Holland, Greece, Denmark, Portugal, or other small countries where we have no possible complications, and very few interests; or such interests as our consuls might attend to in the absence of a minister. The salary should be correspondingly low in such cases. It should be raised according to the interests involved and the duties to be done.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, and in order to make my ideas more perspicuous, may I be allowed to draw upon a description of my own experience, recorded in a volume called "The Diversions of a Diplomat?" It is not without reluctance that I quote from my own humble writings, but the unexpected interest excited by this chance discussion, and the call upon me for some statement, give me the courage to print here what may be read with more interest than these desultory remarks. Besides, since this bill goes to the Senate without the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] as to raising the ministers resident to envoys, and without the amendment I suggested of raising envoys to ambassadors, or raising all our diplomats to embassadors, I crave the liberty to insert some paragraphs from my volume, pertinent to this debate, as more expressive of my observation and experience:

It is not a very great diversion; nevertheless, when one becomes reminiscent it becomes amusing to recognize that so much depends, in Europe and elsewhere, upon the name, the title, the decoration or the rank of people who come and go, both as officers, diplomats, and otherwise. Let me give an illustration.

For many years the office of minister to Turkey from the United States was simply that of minister resident. That made him third in the list of diplomatic personages at the various courts; the first being an embassador, the second being an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, the third being minister resident, and the fourth being chargé d'affaires. When General Wallace began his services in Turkey in 1881 he was simply a minister resident. Perhaps it irked the author of "Ben Hur" greatly to know that while he could soar, as few men of genius can, into the hierarchy of literature, and dwell among the princes of earth, or revel in the Valhalla with the great ones of the Elder Day, while in gorgeous and glowing imagery he could depict Oriental scenes with rarest skill, learning, and dramatic power; still, as minister, he had to wait, upon every official occasion, and in all the various phases of Oriental etiquette, while some envoy from a little state, or some swell of an embassador from an effete dynasty, took precedence of the representative of many millions of progressive and free people. I will not say that he ever complained of this inversion of official and personal dignity, although when I was in Constantinople in 1881, he did use some democratic-republican forms of speech which I thought proper and pertinent. To these I have added some of my own vehemence since, growing out of my own experience. I happened to be one of the legislators who helped to raise General Wallace's rank from minister resident to that of envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary. It was done to add one step to his rank; but it was not enough, as the sequel will show.

Now, one would suppose that a man who is entitled to such magnificent and unabridged-dictionary titles as envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary ought to take precedence of certain representatives at the court of the Sultan who were representing inferior states.

I had occasion to feel this one sultry afternoon in the month of August, 1886. Along with the dragoman, Mr. Gargiulo, I call on the minister of foreign affairs, Said Pasha, at the Porte. It is on Monday, when all the various diplomats are received. We are accustomed to record our names on our *entrée* to the reception-room. My arrival is timely; my name is first on the list as an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary.

It is 2 o'clock in the afternoon and the thermometer is 90°. I mop the perspiration from my brow, and am about to be ushered into the presence of the foreign minister, when lo! Monsieur Nellidoff, the Russian embassador, appears all aglow with heat and all agrowl like the bear of the north. By virtue of his being an embassador he makes his courtesy, takes precedence, and goes in. Then comes a minister resident from Greece. I have precedence of him, of course, as being an envoy, but as he has some distance to go this afternoon up the Bosphorus, I politely yield my place to him. Thus passes away about an hour, the thermometer trembling at 91° and the perspiration running in canals from my corrugated brow. I am about to congratulate myself that my time has come, when a polite and facile gentleman, the French minister, Count de Montholon, a connection of La Fayette, with partialities toward our country and representing a republic, appears. He is registered, he passes in, and the envoy from America, a republic which antedates his, still remains outside. The thermometer is still rising somewhere among the nineties. The four thousand pores to the square inch on the cuticle of the envoy pour forth their beaded drops. The count, who is very polite when he arrives, remarks: "I am quite in a hurry, excellence! You will be detained but a few moments."

He stays about an hour. As I have to go to the Island of Prinkipo this afternoon, and am rather loath to test the sultriness which sometimes brings storms over the old Propontis, I become quite uneasy and begin to perspire freely at 92°, and to go over in my mind the advantage of being an embassador, when Herr Radowitz, the German embassador, with his pleasant smile and shining spectacles, peeps in, after making his registry and the courtesies, and "Sorry to take precedence of the American minister," he enters in. The thermometer begins to rage fiercely at 93°, and the perspiration is as fluent as the Bosporus. I knew that he would not stay long. The representative of "The Honest Broker," as Germany has been called, soon dispatches his business, to my great relief. Five o'clock is shown upon the clock, with the thermometer still rising and the sweat still falling, when—but I can not swear—when lo! the deaf-mute, who still hovers around Oriental courts and Portes, appears.

He makes his signs and gives his orders as an "unspeakable Turk" in his ineffable way, smiling over the prospect of my now being reached in order, and over the backsheech at the end of my long experience with the thermometer and the embassadors, when lo! the embassador from Persia is announced! Meshallah! He takes precedence, of course. Is he not known as His Excellency Marshal Mirza Mohsin Khan? C-A-N is the way to spell it, with capital letters; for he goes in. He is accompanied by his cousin, who is also quite a dignitary of the legation; and without saying "by your leave," or looking at the list, the thermometer, or the clock, or making apology or inquiry as to my forbearance, they, too, have entered into the penetralia! The thermometer by this time is near bursting. As he passes in he remarks, coolly: "I will be only five minutes, Excellence!" I know the Marshal Mirza Mohsin Khan well. He is a good Mahometan, and he has many relations with the Porte which do not belong to the outside world. I anticipate his long conversation with the minister.

After waiting until about 6 o'clock, the shades of evening begin to fall, and the thermometer with them. I gaze into the big black eyes of the dragoman, give one sigh for my far-off country, cast one long look out of the window over the old Saraglio Point, think over its sanguinary scenes, and, while wiping my anxious brow, I indicate to that patient interpreter that if the embassador of a little, miserable, half-fed dependency of Russia, known as the Khanate of Persia, may take precedence of an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary, representing a nation of sixty million of independent freemen, I wanted to go home. I went. I made a solemn resolution that if I ever entered the American Congress again, I would move to strike out the grand six-footed words to which our minister is accredited to the Porte, and insert the simple word "Embassador." It is the magical word to the jewels and gold of Oriental diplomacy.

But can a republic have an embassador? That is the momentous question. It was settled by the Holy Alliance and some other powers confederating that only monarchial governments could have embassadors. Republics were then forbidden to have other than ministers or envoys. This is a solemn treaty among

the powers, but at that meeting we were not present and not consulted; and then, too, France was a monarchy. She is now a republic. She holds on to the embassador with all its advantages. Why should not we have the same? If titles have any value, let us use the best in the lexicon.

There is room for reform in the diplomatic service. In fact it might be abolished altogether where the telegraph can play its part for special embassies and emergent occasions. What a solemn farce it is after all, for an American minister to pretend to any style or rank, when he can not do as other ministers, conclude any treaty or anything so as to bind any one. The making and confirming of conventions by our Constitution depends on the Executive or his Secretary of State, and then absolutely upon the Senate. The minister is powerless for good except in a few remote countries like China, Japan, and Turkey, and in certain cases like the very ones I was waiting to conclude when the other powers step before me into the agitated pool at the Porte. What I mean is this: That for over ten years two treaties accomplished by this country with Turkey have been suspended at the Porte. They had been made by Mr. Minister Boker, signed and already confirmed by the Senate.

Our country was anxious for them. They were in accord with the American doctrines of expatriation and naturalization. They were a triumph of the right of locomotion and the liberalities of our time. By the special iradé of the Sultan, and after great trouble, vexation, patience, and delay, the ex-minister, who writes this chapter, succeeded in securing, by the Sultan's favorable interposition, the acquiescence of the Porte with these treaties. It was supposed to be a finality. Have they been consummated now by our Chief Executive or his Secretary of State? No; and inasmuch as they illustrate a line of honorable progress in diplomacy, secured by a subordinate and remote official, they are now regarded, since their acceptance by Turkey, as of little or no moment! We prize little that which we obtain, after it is obtained, or which others have secured, even though secured under specific instructions. Of this hereafter, and in another forum than the republic of letters.

If this be the end of such labors under such favorable circumstances, better make an end of all such fruitless and salaried diplomatic intercourse!

Mr. BELMONT. While the House is engaged in this discussion I think it proper to say that the Committee on Foreign Affairs has carefully considered the proposition to increase the rank of our minister in London to that of embassador, under a resolution introduced by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON]. It did not appear to the committee, if I may be allowed to speak for them, that it was wise to make any change in London alone, for reasons which might apply with equal force to other diplomatic posts. Whatever arguments may be presented in favor of raising the rank of our missions and the creation of American embassies, there is another phase of the question, and one usually but little thought of, that is, the receiving of foreign embassadors in this country. If we send embassadors abroad we must prepare to receive embassadors here.

If such a course were pursued it would entirely change the character of the diplomatic representation in Washington. Under the rules established by the Congress of Vienna, in 1813, completed at Aix-la-Chapelle, in 1818, and formally assented to by the United States, four grades of diplomatic representation were established: First, embassadors; second, envoys; third, ministers resident, and fourth, chargés d'affaires. If I understand rightly the proposition of my colleague from New York [Mr. COX], he would make all our ministers abroad embassadors. This would require, under the rules of international etiquette, that every country which now has representation in the Diplomatic Corps in Washington should send to the United States a minister of the same rank as the United States accredited. Consequently only embassadors would be sent to Washington. I need hardly say this would be almost absurd.

Embassadors in the earlier days of diplomacy were understood to represent the person of the sovereign, and were received with a certain amount of ceremonial honors. This has been changed in part. Embassadors, no longer even in theory, are supposed to deal directly with the sovereign. They, as well as ministers of lower rank, now transact their business through the foreign offices. Still, there are some ceremonial observances connected with the rank which are yet maintained, and which would be a source of considerable embarrassment here in Washington if the plan outlined by my colleague were carried into effect.

It would be a more dignified and proper course, in my opinion, for the United States, if it is considered well to do anything at all in reference to the matter, of which I have some doubt, to propose that there should be a modification of the rules established by the Congress of Vienna, so as to simplify and reduce the number of diplomatic grades, thus establishing an actual instead of a theoretical equality between sovereign States.

The proposition advanced by many publicists is that there should be but two grades, one corresponding to the minister plenipotentiary or minister resident, all to be designated by the same title, which would convey with it the idea which my friend from New York [Mr. COX] has presented to the House, that is to say, an embassadorial representative; and the other to be simply charges d'affaires. A resolution might be passed, asking that initial steps be taken with other nations for a revision of the rules. But it must be important for Congress to consider the fact that if we send embassadors we must be prepared to receive them here in Washington, and, as I have said, it would make a great change in the present diplomatic corps.

Mr. COX. Let me ask my friend this question. If the treaty of Vienna, he calls it—I think it was Paris——

Mr. BELMONT. No, it was the Congress of Vienna that established the rules, which were completed at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1818.

Mr. COX. Very well; if that treaty limited embassadors only to monarchical governments, why is it, and that is the next question, since France has become a republic, that they still keep up the embassadorial rank there? They have made no change since they became a republic. Why should we not do the same thing?

Mr. BELMONT. I will repeat that writers on international law are pointing out the fact that the distinction between embassadors and envoys extraordinary is growing less and less from day to day; and it is for that reason it is proposed in some quarters to have a revision of the rules.

It is quite true the distinction is obsolete. Originally, as I have said, embassadors were assumed to represent the person of the sovereign. That, of course, is no longer the case, as my friend from New York has stated. France, a republic, sends an embassador to Switzerland, another republic.

If we want to take a step that is progressive, we might very properly call upon the Executive to inaugurate some conference on the subject. But so long as the rules of Vienna exist this distinction between embassador and envoy will be continued, and in some cases to our detriment. I have known, however, cases where an American minister refused to submit to any such discrimination in the transaction of his business with the foreign office. For instance, Mr. Bancroft, in Berlin, when he called on the minister of foreign affairs, being obliged to wait because of the arrival of the British embassador, returned to his residence and made it known to the foreign office that he would not transact the business of the United States unless he was received as other ministers; and the rule in that case was changed.

A similar change of rule was brought about in like manner in Holland. In Russia the foreign office has for some time observed the plan of receiving ministers in their order of arrival, irrespective of their rank.

I only mention these cases in order to show that there is reason to believe that a revision of these rules might be brought about, and that this course would be much preferable for the United States.

Mr. RANDALL. I think the Constitution of the United States permits the President to appoint embassadors if he sees fit.

Mr. BELMONT. Yes, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. And it is then for Congress to appropriate the money. But to change the title is, in my judgment, the first step towards an increase of pay.

Mr. COX. That was not the result when we raised ministers resident to envoys extraordinary.

Mr. RANDALL. It either means increased pay or it is a mere tinsel title of which the American citizen stands in no need.

Mr. COX. It means something else than a mere title. It means the transaction of business; when you have to wait for a dozen people not half so important as you are.

Mr. RANDALL. The dignity of a representative of the American Government commands respect at all these places, and I have near me at this moment a gentleman [ex-Governor Curtin, of Pennsylvania] who corroborates that statement.

Mr. COX. That depends on one thing. The result of sticking to the old etiquette is that no man with a different title can get ahead of embassadors.

Mr. RANDALL. I would either go ahead or go away and let them send for me.

Mr. COX. In that case I would abolish the whole system.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] opposing this reform, I withdraw my amendment. The responsibility for its failure will rest upon those gentlemen.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question pending.

Mr. BELMONT. I move that the bill be laid aside to be reported to the House with the amendments.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. COX. I would like to have the privilege of printing a little statement on this matter in a better shape, that the Senate may take notice of it.

Mr. RANDALL. I hope the gentleman will give it better shape. [Laughter.]

There was no objection to the request of Mr. COX.

DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next general appropriation bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8989) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1880, and for other purposes.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I deem it wholly unnecessary to take the time of the committee in general debate upon this bill. I simply state that it carries about $226,000 more than the bill of last year. This is mostly owing to the increase of school buildings and to increased appropriations for the improvement and repair of streets.

I do not wish to take the time for any further explanation of the bill, but will be glad to explain its provisions as we go on. Therefore I ask, if no member of the committee desires to speak, that we consider general debate as closed.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed to read the bill by paragraphs for amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Seventeenth street from Q to R street, $155,748.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out all after the word "street," in line 7, and all of line 8, and insert after line 7, "Corcoran street from Fifteenth to Sixteenth street, $160,924."

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Should not that be from Fifteenth to Seventeenth street? It should be, according to my memorandum.

Mr. McCOMAS. Yes, that is correct. That covers the whole gap.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I move to amend the amendment of my colleague [Mr. CLEMENTS] so as to make it read "from Fifteenth to Seventeenth street."

Mr. CLEMENTS. Then you must change the amount.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I think the amount does not require to be changed.

Mr. McCOMAS. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS] will find that the House will assent to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Georgia accept the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

D street southeast (north side), from Pennsylvania avenue to Eighth street; South Carolina avenue southeast, from Seventh street to Pennsylvania avenue;

Seventh street southeast, from D street to South Carolina avenue; $27,784.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting on page 10, at the end of line 25, "$22,500;" and on page 11, by striking out from lines 1 to 5 inclusive.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

To grade and pave Chapin street from Fourteenth street extended to Wayland Seminary, $2,500;

To pave Stoughton street, $2,500.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, when the committee prepared the bill we had no estimate as to what the cost of paving Stoughton street would be, but we examined the street and determined to put $2,500 into the bill for that purpose. Subsequently an examination was made by one of the District officers, and it was found that it would require $7,000 to put Stoughton street in proper condition. In this connection I desire to have read a letter which I have received from Professor King, of the Wayland Seminary, which is situated at the head of Stoughton street.

The letter was read, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April* 11, 1888.

Hon. D. B. HENDERSON:

I wish to put in a plea to have an appropriation made to so improve Chapin street, Meridian Hill, that it can be used during all seasons of the year to bring supplies to our seminary. During the winter months it is impossible for our supplies to come to us through the deep mud that abounds in this street.

The institution holds property valued at about $100,000; this amount has been contributed by the benevolent of the land.

Congress has never helped us by an appropriation.

The school educates the poorest class among our citizens. We send colored teachers and colored preachers wherever their people are found.

This year we have had one hundred and sixty students.

The benevolent from all parts of the country sustain the work.

Is it a wonder that we desire to see Chapin street, at the head of which street our institution stands, well graded and paved?

The friends who have aided the school complain bitterly of the mud through which they must find us during the winter.

Very truly, yours,

G. M. P. KING.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, in lines 11 and 12, page 13, by striking out $2,500 and inserting $7,000. This matter has not been before the committee, and I am offering this amendment on my own responsibility, upon information which has come to me since the bill was made up. This little block which is to be improved extends from Fourteenth street to the top of the hill, where this seminary stands. The citizens have improved about half the block at their own expense, and they have it in good condition. The $2 500 in the bill will not do the work, and it seems to me that if we are going into it at all it should be done properly, and that we should appropriate enough to do the work thoroughly to the top of the hill, which is what we had in contemplation.

Seven thousand dollars will do the work. I will say for the information of my colleague [Mr. CLEMENTS] that the District government sent the officer who has charge of making these improvements to examine this street and make an estimate, and the amount he fixed was $7,000.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I was just going to ask my colleague how he arrived at the probable cost of this work. It is true that this street was put into the bill without an estimate, but it was assumed that this amount of $2,500 would be sufficient, and I should like to know how my friend got the official information upon which he offers his amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Professor King and the petitioners on that street went to the District government and they sent the officer who makes the estimates—I have forgotten his name at this moment, but I think it was Captain Griffin—to make an estimate. I have his statement among my papers, but I can not lay my hand upon it at this instant. I have here a letter from one of the parties, stating that this officer did make the estimate, and later I can produce the officer's own estimate fixing the amount at $7,000.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to add to my amendment, on the suggestion of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN], after the word "dollars," the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I see that the appropriation in the bill for this street is $2,500.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Yes, sir; and this amendment is to increase this amount from $2,500 to $7,000.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that the last amendment of the gentleman from Iowa, adding the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary," will amount to anything, and his amendment substituting $7,000 for $2,500, when the committee, including the gentleman himself, estimated that $2,500 would be sufficient, seems to me to be unwise under the circumstances. Comparing this with other work, this seems to be a very great increase upon the amount estimated. I think we are going rather in the dark in making this appropriation, and that we had better stand by the amount in the bill.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. My colleague on the committee [Mr. CLEMENTS] will allow me to call his attention to the fact that when we made up these appropriations we inserted this sum of $2,500 without any information as to the amount which would actually be required to do the work. He also knows that the work, as it is to be done on steep, rising ground, must be expensive. It was understood that these amounts were subject to change by amendments which might subsequently be offered. The estimate on which my amendment is based was made by an engineer upon careful examination.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am aware that when the amount was inserted in the bill we had not full knowledge as to the character of the work; but $7,000 is so large an increase upon $2,500 that I hardly think we have gone so far out of the way. I do not feel well enough satisfied in that respect to assent to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I think my colleague will concede that if we had had before us, when making up the bill, the estimate of $7,000 for this work, we would have agreed to it.

Mr. CLEMENTS. No doubt we would have given whatever the report of the proper District official showed to be necessary.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. The amount named in my amendment is absolutely required.

The amendment of Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa, was agreed to; there being—ayes 50, noes 27.

The Clerk read as follows:

To pave Stoughton street, $2,500.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. For the purpose of properly paving Stoughton street I believe an appropriation of $5,500 is required; but, although $2,500 is not sufficient, I will not press an amendment upon the House, as the reasons for an increase in this case are not so urgent as in that just now under consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC SCHOOLS.

For salaries of superintendents, teachers, and janitors, secretary of the board, and clerks, including additional teachers, rents, repairs, fuel, furniture, books, stationery, new school buildings, furniture for new school buildings, and other necessary items, $842,195, namely:

For officers: For superintendent first six divisions, at $2,700; superintendent seventh and eighth divisions, at $2,250; one clerk to superintendent of first six divisions and secretary to board of trustees, $1,200; one clerk to superintendent of seventh and eighth divisions, $900; messenger to superintendent first six divisions, $300; messenger to superintendent seventh and eighth divisions, $300; in all, $7,450.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I move to strike out, in line 16, "$2,700," and insert "3,000;" so it will read:

For superintendent first six divisions, at $3,000.

I simply desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that——

Mr. HOLMAN. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I make the point of order against the gentleman's amendment that the law has already fixed this salary.

The CHAIRMAN. If the law has fixed this salary the Chair will hold the point of order to be good.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. If there is any law fixing the salary I should like to see it produced.

Mr. CLEMENTS. This is the salary of this office year after year provided for in the various appropriation bills, and in that way it has been a fixed salary.

Mr. HOLMAN. I suggest that even if there were no law fixing the salary—and I presume there is—if there were no other law but the law of the appropriation bill, the appropriation bill is the law for the current year and is the law now, and an amendment to increase the salary is a change of existing law, and therefore not in order. I think it has been so ruled uniformly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that unless there is a law produced fixing the salary of this officer the point of order is not good. An appropriation contained in an appropriation bill of a certain amount as salary is not, in the judgment of the Chair, such a law as

will prevent the offering of an amendment of this character, and unless the gentleman can point out to the Chair a statute fixing this as the salary of this officer the Chair will be compelled to overrule the point of order.

Mr. HOLMAN. This is general legislation on an appropriation bill. It increases the appropriation. It is not merely an act of legislation on an appropriation bill, but it is a new law fixing $3,000 as the salary for this office for the next fiscal year. I do not think there is any precedent except one, which I never regarded as entitled to be referred to as a precedent, where it is held that if there is no law fixing a salary it may be increased without limit. The suggestion is against the whole rule of the House. In that event any law fixing a salary will allow of an increase of it without limit. It will allow such increase to be made every succeeding year.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. The gentleman has said nothing so far which in my opinion shakes the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless some statute is cited fixing this as the salary of this office the Chair must overrule the point of order. The mere fact that this has been provided as the salary for this office in an appropriation bill from year to year does not render the amendment obnoxious to the rule to which reference has been made.

Mr. HOLMAN. Such a ruling throws open this bill entirely.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless the word "hereafter" is employed, thereby fixing this as the salary not only for this year but for the future, making it a portion of the permanent law, it is not such a law as comes within the rule prohibiting amendment. In other words, the statute has not been cited where this salary is made a part of the permanent law. It is simply a provision in the appropriation bill appropriating that much for this salary from year to year.

Mr. SPRINGER. I agree with the Chair in its decision. It is only the existing law for the year for which the appropriation is made. The test of whether there is a law fixing a salary is this: In case no appropriation was made could the party go on and discharge the duties of the office, or would the failure to make the appropriation legislate him out of office?

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the rule will be read; that is, the third clause of Rule XXI.

The language there in that rule requires that appropriations shall be made in conformity to law. There has therefore to be a law before we can make any appropriation at all. The only reason this appropriation is reported here is because it is in conformity with law. It is the only round upon which it stands.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. There is a law for this office, but there is no law fixing the salary of the office. That is left to be fixed by Congress.

Mr. HOLMAN. That can be said of almost every office, the salaries of which are fixed by Congress from time to time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

By paragraph 3 of Rule XXI of the House of Representatives it is provided: "3. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill or be in order in any amendment thereto for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto."

Mr. HOLMAN. Nobody pretends to say under the circumstances this does not change existing law; that it is not in conformity with the law. The present law has fixed it at $2,700, and it is inserted in this bill in conformity with that law, otherwise it would not be here at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that if the appropriation is not made for the salary of this officer until the end of the fiscal year the office would be necessarily discontinued, and as has been intimated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] this officer, if he continued to perform the duties, would have no recourse upon the Government for the salary in the absence of any law providing for the payment.

It is the judgment of the Chair, therefore, that no law being presented which fixes the salary at the present limit, the amendment is in order, and the Chair so holds.

Mr. CLEMENTS. One word before the vote is taken. The estimates that were sent to the committee embraced propositions to increase a great many salaries; in fact, salaries all along the line of the District of Columbia officials and their employés. Amongst others an increase was asked for the superintendent of police, which salary is now fixed at $2,600, a very responsible office, quite as much so as the superintendent of the public schools; indeed, more so, in my judgment. There are two superintendents of public schools, one, for whom this amendment is offered, receiving $2,700 and the other $2,250. There is no greater reason for an increase of this salary than can be assigned for the increase of many others.

Mr. ROGERS. What did I understand the gentleman to say it was now, and for what office?

Mr. CLEMENTS. Twenty-seven hundred dollars for the superintendent of public schools.

Gentlemen say that this is inadequate as compared with other salaries, but we might draw the comparison on the other line by stating that there are in some of the States governors who do not receive so much.

Mr. HOLMAN. The surveyors of the public lands only receive $2,700.

Mr. BLOUNT. Let me ask my colleague if there is not good reason for an increase of all these salaries according to the statements of the incumbents?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I have not heard of any where the incumbents can not assign good reasons for an increase. I do not mean to criticise in any way the superintendent of public schools. He is an excellent and capable educator, and suitable in all respects for the place; but he is receiving, as I think, an adequate salary, and hence we object to the amendment.

Mr. HERBERT. How long has he been receiving this salary?

Mr. CLEMENTS. He has not been here very long, I believe.

Mr. HERBERT. How long has the salary been attached to the office?

Mr. CLEMENTS. For a great many years, ten or twelve at least. It was the salary when he accepted the position.

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Chairman, this is a proposition, as I understand it, to increase a salary that has been fixed by the appropriations for a number of years.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes; $2,700 is the salary that was fixed.

Mr. HERBERT. How far back; ten years?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I should say for ten years anyhow.

Mr. HERBERT. And during all these ten years the prices of everything have been falling greatly, until now we have reached a level of prices which has not existed here certainly since 1860. Most of the things we now live upon are cheaper than they ever were, and there is no sort of doubt that $2,700 now will purchase more of the necessaries of life than $3,500 would have done ten years ago.

Now, what is the reason assigned by the gentleman from Illinois why a salary that has been sufficient for the past ten years is not now sufficient? I think the House is entitled to know something about it.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I shall be very happy to give the gentleman the information.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment?

The gentleman from Georgia wants to move that the committee now rise so as to secure an extension of the time this evening.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I will yield.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I wish to ask that the committee rise so that we may have an extension of the time to complete this bill this afternoon. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. CRISP having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. TOWNSHEND reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments.

Mr. TOWNSHEND further reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the District of Columbia appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I ask unanimous consent that the order fixing the hour for adjournment at 5 o'clock be vacated for this day only.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

CONSULAR AND DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit to the House the report of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the consular and diplomatic bill.

The first question is on agreeing to the amendments reported from the committee, unless a separate vote on some amendment be demanded.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BELMONT moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. TOWNSHEND in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the bill H. R. 8989.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT] said he would like to know some of the reasons that have actuated me in making this motion to increase the salary of this super-

intendent from $2,700 to $3,000 per annum. I shall be happy to give him some of those reasons.

In the first place, I contend that the superintendent of public schools in this city has not been adequately paid for the amount of learning and ability required for the discharge of the duties of an office of that kind. My second answer is that the school system of the District of Columbia has grown immeasurably during the last ten years, and during that time, too, the salaries of teachers have been increased throughout the country; and $3,000 for a position of this kind is a very moderate salary indeed.

I do not know whether the gentleman is aware of it or not, but it is the fact that more than five thousand scholars have been added to the schools here in the city of Washington within the last year and a half. The development has been wonderful. The like is not shown in any school system of any other city in the country, as I understand. If the gentleman from Alabama has watched the system he will find it is one of the most perfect and grandest school systems that can be found anywhere in the country. If I am credibly informed, this gentleman has something like thirty-five thousand scholars under his charge, and he has from four hundred and twenty to four hundred and thirty teachers immediately under his supervision. Where there is such a large interest as that it seems to me that $3,000 is a very moderate salary indeed.

The gentleman who has charge of the bill spoke about the superintendent of the colored schools receiving only $2,200. I contend, as a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, that to raise the salary of this superintendent to $3,000 will not compensate him for the discharge of his duties upon the same scale that the colored superintendent is being compensated for his duties. I say that, because he has charge of nearly three schools to one that the colored superintendent has charge of. In addition to all the white schools in the city of Washington and the District of Columbia, this superintendent has charge of all the colored schools in the District outside of the city.

If there is any class of persons in the world who ought to be properly paid for their services, they are the teachers of the young. If there is any man in the country who is doing a mighty good to the rising generation in this District, it is the gentleman who has charge of the schools, whose salary I propose to raise by this amendment. Think of it for a moment! Thirty-five thousand children daily attending in these different schools. Think of the wonderful influence a man occupying this position must have over these children.

I say this is a matter in which every one of us is interested. I have three children attending the public schools here, and I have had occasion, as every thoughtful parent has, to visit them, and I record with pleasure the fact that no better school system is to be found in America than the school system we have here to-day.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WEAVER. I assure the gentleman from Illinois that I have no doubt the superintendent is an efficient officer; but this is a bad time and the wrong time to be raising salaries. It is true it is but a mere pittance to add $300 to his salary; but his salary now is $2,700, and I call the gentleman to witness that that is really a better salary than he or any other member of Congress is drawing, taking everything into consideration, as he has no campaign expenses, lives at home, and has had for a number of years the same salary, which has now double the purchasing power that it had ten years ago. Let us relieve the tax-payer before we begin to raise salaries.

Mr. CHEADLE. I move to strike out the last word, and yield my time to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I do not agree with the gentleman from Iowa, that this superintendent is receiving a salary as great as that of a Congressman.

Mr. WEAVER. Taking everything into consideration he does.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I think not. He lives here all along, and his expenses are as great as those of a Congressman; and every one knows that it takes a Congressman's salary to support him here.

Beyond that I say his responsibilities are ten times as great as the responsibilities of a single Congressman. They can not be measured. They not only reach the present, but his influence will be felt a generation from now on those children who are attending the public schools; and this little addition I ask is but a poor pittance, and it seems to me it comes with a bad grace for any man, when we consider the character of the schools here, to raise any objection to this proposition.

Mr. HERBERT. The gentleman says he thinks it comes with very bad grace from any member on this floor receiving a salary of $5,000 a year to be caviling at the attempt to increase the salary of this official from $2,700 to $3,000. For myself, I represent here a part of the State of Alabama, which State has about fourteen hundred thousand inhabitants, yet neither the attorney-general, the treasurer, the auditor, the circuit judges, the chancellor, nor any executive officer of that State, nor the superintendent of education for that population of nearly a million and a half of people receives as much salary as $3,000, or as $2,700. I venture to say, also, that in the gentleman's own State of Illinois there are many officers who are much more important than this official who do not receive as much salary. I will ask the gentleman how much does the circuit judge receive in his State?

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. In the city of Chicago he receives $7,000; in the country $3,500.

Mr. HERBERT. Well, sir, in half the States of this Union the circuit judges do not receive so much. In one-third of the States of this Union the governors do not receive so much salary. In one-third of the States of this Union no public officer receives as much salary as $2,700 per annum, and it seems to me, as remarked by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] who has just taken his seat, that the time has come when we ought to do something for the tax-payers instead of all the time raising the salaries of the office-holders.

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois, and it was rejected—ayes 49, noes 52.

The Clerk read as follows:

For teachers: For teachers, not to exceed six hundred and ninety-three in number, including teachers of manual-training schools, to be employed at a rate of compensation not to exceed the rate provided by the present schedule of salaries, and at an average salary not to exceed $670, $464,310; and no increase in salaries paid to teachers in grades now receiving $900 or more and no increase in the number of teachers in any of such grades shall be made, and the minimum compensation shall not be less than at the rate of $300 per annum, and the names of and actual compensation paid to each teacher under this provision shall be reported to Congress at its next session by the commissioners: *Provided*, That in assigning salaries to teachers no discrimination shall be made between male and female teachers employed in the same grade of school or performing a like class of duties.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Page 17, line 9, after the word "more," insert "except in cases of promotion to fill vacancies occurring before or after the passage of this act, and except in salaries to principals of normal schools."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the police court: For one judge, $3,000; one clerk, $2,000; one deputy clerk, $1,000; two bailiffs, at $3 per day each; one messenger, $900; one doorkeeper, $540; contingent expenses, including compensation of a justice of the peace acting as judge of the police court during the absence of said judge, not exceeding $300; books, stationery, fuel, ice, gas, witness-fees, and other necessary items, $2,500; for judicial expenses, $2,500; in all, $14,318.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend on page 25, line 6, by inserting after the word "dollars" the words "United States marshal's office, $1,400;" and by striking out in line 12 the words "fourteen thousand three" and inserting "fifteen thousand seven."

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the relief of the poor, $15,000.

For the support and maintenance of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum, $15,000.

For the Women's Christian Association, $3,000.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend on page 30, line 3, by striking out "three" and inserting "four;" so as to make the appropriation for the Women's Christian Association $4,000.

I understand, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment will only make the appropriation what it has been in previous years, $4,000. The committee have reduced it from four thousand to three thousand, and my amendment would simply restore it to the former sum. I think if the committee were familiar with all the facts they would not have proposed the reduction, and upon that point I beg leave to say that I think that perhaps the ladies in charge of the institution did not give the committee as full information in regard to their work as they ought to have done.

The association own the building. It has been furnished by the Government heretofore, and it is in a condition to accommodate a larger number than the association will be able to feed with this appropriation of $3,000. I am told that they accommodate there a class of indigent, infirm, and disabled women that can not be received at other institutions in the city except for limited periods. The ladies who have charge of this institution are undoubtedly spending their time and effort as a matter of pure charity, as a labor of love, without remuneration or reward; and they claim that the reduction of this appropriation from $4,000 to $3,000 will very seriously embarrass them, that in fact it must limit the number of women that they will be able to feed, while they say at the same time that the number of applicants now is greater than it was when the appropriation was $4,000. I have been hoping that the committee would accept this amendment and restore the appropriation to what it was before. I will say to the committee that I am not personally very familiar with this work, but my attention was called to it at a time when the ladies in charge of it were unable to obtain an audience before the committee.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a few words in reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. This bill is the most liberal one in favor of charities and institutions of that kind that has ever passed this House, so far as I know. In several cases it increases the appropriations of last year for institutions of this sort, and new ones are added to the list. It is true that this institution has been cut down from $4,000 to $3,000 in the present bill.

The principal reason that influenced the committee in that action was the fact that last year, as shown by the report of the commissioners, this institution received by the appropriation from the Government $4,000, and from other sources $3,978.62, making a total of

$7,978.62, while the total expenses of the institution for the last fiscal year was $5,980.80, leaving a balance on hand on June 30, 1887, of $1,997.82. I do not claim that that is on hand now, but it was on hand at the end of the last fiscal year, and the amount spent by the institution last year was less than $6,000. Now, we appropriate $3,000 in this bill, and if that is doubled by outside contributions it will make the $6,000, and we see no reason why the amount in the bill should be increased.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. It is true that last year, and I think for some years back, $4,000 was the amount appropriated for the Women's Christian Association. When we were making up this bill in the subcommittee the managers of this institution did not appear before us, and inasmuch as no estimates were sent to us in regard to charities, we were somewhat in the dark. Information came to us from other quarters that the Women's Christian Association were not doing all that they should do under their articles of incorporation, and the further information came to us that no one could get in there unless indorsed by some of the churches. We felt that if this charity was sustained by the General Government no church should have exclusive control as to those who should enter it, and we thought—to use a homely phrase—that we would wake them up a little by cutting them down a thousand dollars until we could find out about the matter. We did find out—at least I did; for the ladies in charge of this work came up here in a body and I was just fool enough to state frankly what had operated upon my mind, whereupon I got a flood of light upon the subject which I had not bargained for [laughter], and became thoroughly satisfied that we had done gross injustice to the ladies and the institution.

They denied *in toto* that there was any such limitation as we had heard, and maintained that the charity which Christ advocated is recognized in this institution, no matter from what source the needy ones may come. I advised them to see my worthy colleague on the subcommittee, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS], and they made every effort to do so, but were unable to see him at that time. I do not know whether they have yet seen him or not.

For my part, I will now cheerfully add my vote in favor of this amendment. I believe we wronged this institution in cutting the appropriation down $1,000 below what has heretofore been given. But if the facts were as we had been informed I should be in favor of cutting down even a little further, because if we are to pay out the money of the Government for charity I want the charity to include every deserving applicant contemplated by the object of the institution appropriated for. The officers of this institution assure us that they are acting in conformity with this rule. Therefore I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The amendment was agreed to, there being—ayes 36, noes 17.

The Clerk read as follows:

For interest on water-stock bonds, $26,250.
For sinking fund on water-stock bonds, $18,360.

Mr. CLEMENTS. By instruction of the committee, I move to strike out the paragraphs just read and insert in lieu thereof—

For interest and sinking fund on water-stock bonds, $44,610.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That the Treasurer of the United States is hereby directed and authorized to apply such portion as may be deemed expedient of any surplus which may remain at the close of the fiscal year 1888, and of each fiscal year thereafter, of the general revenues of the District of Columbia in excess of one-half of those appropriations payable equally out of the revenues of the District and the United States, to the payment of the balance yet remaining unpaid of the debt of the District of Columbia created by the act approved July 15, 1882, entitled, "An act to increase the water supply of the city of Washington, and for other purposes." *Provided*, That the amount of said surplus shall first be reported to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Treasurer of the United States by the First Comptroller of the Treasury when called upon to do so.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, the section just read is admitted to be subject to a point of order, and for the purpose of presenting some questions in connection with it I desire to interpose a formal objection. Perhaps the committee has been wise in putting this section in the bill and asking us to pass it by unanimous consent; but surely it is not wise to pass so important a provision without any explanation whatever. I will state very briefly why I make this formal objection, which perhaps I shall not insist upon.

Every one who has been in Washington for the last few years knows how rapidly the city has been growing, both in population and in the assessed value of its property. I have lived for thirty years in a city of which the same remark is true; and I know how hard it is for a legislative body, either a city council or a Congress, to appreciate the rapidity with which the needs of a growing city increase. It seems that there is here a surplus revenue, due to the rapid growth of the city and the rapid rise in the assessed valuation of property. This surplus, as appears by a statement near the bottom of page 2 of the report accompanying this bill, is already about $400,000. The committees say that, owing to this increase of surplus revenue, some disposition must be made of it; and on this point they submit three questions for the House to answer. If I had not interposed this formal objection, the effect would have been that, passing this bill in the manner in which we usually pass it, paying very little attention to its provisions, leaving them almost always to the hands of the committee, a permanant provision of law would have been adopted which might, perhaps, embarrass the growth of the city. I do not say positively it would do so; for I do not profess intimate knowledge of the affairs of the District. But on page 3 of the report, in view of the surplus revenue which is accruing, the committee state, if I may use the phrase, three alternatives, one of which must be adopted: First, that the tax-payers ought to pay something more than the 50 per cent. proportion of the expenses of the District; second, that the excess of revenue should be applied to the extinguishment of the funded debt; or, third, that the surplus should be applied to the liquidation of the debt owing to the General Government by the District for the increase of the water supply.

Now, every one must see that there is a fourth alternative, so to speak, Congress might appropriate more money. If the city is growing very rapidly and its demands are correspondingly increasing, if it needs to have more money appropriated for it, then Congress must appropriate more, or else the tax-payers must pay more than the 50 per cent. proportion. That is the question we start with. The committee say that "this bill is believed to be amply liberal in its provisions, and sufficient in the aggregate for a wise and provident administration of the government of the District." I observe that they say also, in the first part of the report, that the estimates upon which this bill was framed aggregated $4,998,755, which is a great deal more than is appropriated in this bill.

Now, I would like to ask the committee whether the tax-payers of the District, either directly or indirectly, have been consulted as to whether they would not rather pay something more of the 50 per cent. of the expenses of the District in order that the streets may be more rapidly improved? Every one knows that we, sitting here in this Chamber, can not appreciate the growth of this city.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RANDALL took the floor and yielded his time to Mr. ADAMS.

Mr. ADAMS. I think the impression is prevalent that street improvements do not go on here as fast as they ought to; and every one who has given a moment's reflection to the matter must become convinced of the fact that, growing as rapidly as this city does, if more money were expended, and expended in the right way, the actual value of the assessable property would be vastly increased, and the appropriations which are taken from the Treasury of the United States might be largely diminished, and after a few years in all probability be altogether suspended. As the assessable value of the property of the city increases and as the city grows more money will necessarily be derived from taxation, and I ask if it is not good policy instead of hampering this growth to do what may be done in a proper way to advance it?

Have these matters, I ask, been considered by the committee? Are not the tax-payers of the District willing on their part to increase their proportion of appropriations over and above the 50 per cent. now paid rather than not have these street improvements go on? For my part, I, as a Congressman, would be glad to appropriate more money to match the additional money which would come in in the shape of revenue by the growth of the city and the enhancement of its values; and on the ground, as I stated a few moments ago, that as these values increase and additional money flows into the treasury of the District from its available sources of revenue, that we may be enabled after awhile to stop the expenditure of money from the public Treasury. That I would be willing to do as a Congressman. Now, suppose I was a tax-payer here and the owner of real estate, which I am not, I would rather pay more than the 50 per cent. than see the city outgrowing the appropriations made from year to year.

As I said, I live in a city where we have suffered for years because people have not been able to appreciate the growth of the city and to make the expenditures on such a scale as to conform to that growth and aid it.

I have spoken on this subject, Mr. Chairman, professing no familiarity whatever with the question, but upon the ground that the committee, in my judgment, ought to give us a little light upon it, and particularly as to whether the District would not prefer to increase its percentage, fixed by the act of 1863, to a larger amount than that specified, so that these improvements could be carried on more expeditiously.

I would rather have that done, if I was a tax-payer here, than to have the growth of the city crippled and hampered by inadequate appropriations.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman from Illinois should remember that the Government of the United States is largely in advance on this subject already by the appropriation of money for the extension of the water-works, and it is hardly possible to devise a better mode of returning that money to the United States than in the manner here spoken of. We should fall into the same difficulty exactly if we were enforced to be extravagant here and hoped to realize increased revenue by the collection of taxes.

I can not imagine a better way than that which we have devised here of getting this money into the Treasury of the United States from the District than to appropriate that surplus in excess of the requirements of the District. By so doing we return to the United States that

which it has so liberally and largely advanced in this connection; and it will relieve not only the tax-payers but the Government itself from paying this amount.

Mr. ADAMS. I will admit all of that. That is an economic way of disposing of the matter unquestionably, and is a very satisfactory way, unless, of course, a more economical plan can be devised. The question is, what is the difference between the $4,998,000 the estimate calls for and the amount you actually do appropriate?

Mr. RANDALL. This bill is not only liberal but generous towards the District. The Government of the United States agreed by law to pay 50 per cent. of these expenses on a false basis, which includes not only the public buildings but the streets and reservations of the city.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. RANDALL. I have not entirely concluded, but will listen to any suggestion the gentleman desires to make with pleasure.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I was going to say that I hoped the gentleman from Illinois would not insist upon the objection he has made, in order that we might be allowed to finish the bill this evening. If he will notice the language of this section 3, it only provides that the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to apply such portion as he may deem expedient of this surplus fund. It does not obligate him to dispose of the whole of it in that manner. Now, of course there will be no surplus if Congress appropriates this sum. It depends upon the appropriations made as to whether there is anything to apply. If this bill passes we have about $483,000 of surplus.

The gentleman from Illinois says there was an estimate made for a much larger sum than that recommended.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes; four millions nine hundred thousand.

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is true; but I will state to the gentleman that to have complied with those estimates would have required new law all along the line, or a waiving of the rule against a change of the law. That would apply to the increase of the police force, to the superintendent of public schools, to the superintendent of police. All along it would have required a change of law, which we are not authorized to make, to comply with the estimates to which the gentleman alludes.

Now, this bill recommends $107,000 more for streets than was appropriated last year. Still this surplus is left over and above all; and next year there will be a reassessment, which occurs every three years, and experience of the past shows that the assessed value of the property has increased always under those valuations. This surplus will be greatly increased hereafter; and we will not only have to dispose of what is now on hand, but provide in all probability for disposing of further accumulations.

As regards the liberality with which the District has been treated, it must be remembered that not only does Congress make appropriations for streets, but it makes appropriations for other public purposes. The Freedman's Hospital and others are provided for in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. RANDALL. And that comes wholly out of the United States Treasury.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Yes; no part of that comes from the District. Then the public parks, etc., are provided for from the United States Treasury.

Mr. SPINOLA. Will the gentleman be kind enough to state the rate of taxation in the District of Columbia?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The rate is $1.50 per hundred dollars in the city and $1 outside of the city.

Mr. SPINOLA. One-half of which is paid by the property and the other by the Government?

Mr. CLEMENTS. That is what is paid by the property, and then we appropriate for the purpose of the District, the United States Treasury paying one-half the appropriation.

Mr. RANDALL. For every dollar the rate-payers give the Government gives another.

Mr. SPINOLA. It is the cheapest governed city that I know of.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Allow me to state one other fact. It must be remembered that this District and the Government of the United States together are now paying interest on the bonded debt of $20,000,000, nearly all of which was incurred in the cutting down, grading, and improving of the streets.

Now we have advanced the whole expense of the new improvement for bringing water into the city. That has been advanced by the Federal Government; and we simply provide that any surplus for which Congress does not appropriate an equal amount shall go to that purpose instead of remaining idle in the Treasury.

Mr. ADAMS. That is all right of itself, provided it does not take the place of another change which the people of the District might prefer, by which the citizens should pay not merely one-half, but, say, two-thirds of the expenses of the District. If I were a tax-payer I would rather have it that way, and have the whole applied to the improvements that are needed, instead of having an accumulating surplus.

Mr. McCOMAS. If the gentleman were a tax-payer he would find the great majority of the citizens did not want to pay more than half the expenses.

As regards the objection of the gentleman from Illinois I think two statements will remove his difficulty. This is not a removal of any limitation on the appropriation. I think we have been fairly liberal toward the citizens of the District in the bill before the committee. It is $111,000 in excess of the act for the current year.

Mr. RANDALL. Two hundred and twenty-two thousand dollars.

Mr. McCOMAS. The net amount is what I have stated. It is $152,000 less a decrease of $41,000, which makes a sum of $111,000.

There was a surplus in the Treasury in the year 1885 to the credit of the District of $30,380. In 1886 the surplus was $184,000; and in 1887 the surplus was $294,000. For the current year it will exceed $300,000. The total, therefore, at the end of last year, after deducting certain charges, was $381,000 of surplus. At the end of next year it will be nearly three-quarters of a million, if no unforeseen expenditure occurs. If the Senate should conclude to give all or near all the estimates of expenditure in this bill, there would still be a surplus to be appropriated out of District funds; and where could it be better appropriated than to the payment for the water-works now being executed at a cost of several million dollars, and for which the District has had an appropriation made in the deficiency appropriation bill, so that the current revenue may be applied to the current expenditure of this year?

The objection my friend from Illinois foresees as to the policy of this District if there should be a large and rapidly accumulating surplus does not arise on this bill. The committee guard against it by making this provision as to the surplus on hand until further arrangements can be made.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I will take the floor and will yield the gentleman my time if in the first place he will answer me a question. If in any locality in or about this city it is absolutely necessary that streets should be opened and improved, should that work be left undone if there be money in the Treasury to do it? Should it not be appropriated wherever it is necessary to have immediate improvements?

My friend is aware there are localities where men have been waiting for years to build, men who have been paying taxes for forty years, and yet have not a road by which they can get to their property; the commissioners being willing to do it for them and asking for the necessary appropriations. My own impression is that an appropriation to enable them to make those improvements should be made. I agree there has been no bill ever presented to this House which has been prepared with more scrupulous care. I have no doubt the commissioners are willing to meet the wants of the public and to do it economically. And I feel some arrangement should be made by which men who have property they want to get to might secure the opening of the street.

Mr. McCOMAS. In answer to the question of my colleague on the committee, I will say the present bill has an increase to the extent of $108,000 for the improvement of the streets over the appropriation for the current year.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I am aware of that.

Mr. McCOMAS. There is also a largely increased amount of appropriation for current repairs. The provision of this bill does not prevent my colleague or anybody from putting on the appropriation bill the expenditure of every dollar of this surplus. It only provides that when Congress shall not appropriate, the appropriation shall not lie idle, but shall be applied toward paying the water bond debt.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I understand that; but where the necessity for improving streets is urgent a larger appropriation might properly be made, and the commissioners of the District have pointed out localities where improvements might be made. My friend knows we have visited localities of this city where in winter the mud was so deep that coal and other necessaries could not be delivered to the families, and almost within the shadow of this Capitol. I suggest, therefore, to my friend from Illinois that the surplus is needed to make improvements in various localities.

Mr. McCOMAS. There can not properly be a surplus while the District has twenty millions of debt.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, is there any proposition pending on which we can vote? Let us dispose of this matter by a vote.

Mr. ADAMS. It is not a proposition on which the committee has to vote. I simply urged an objection which I now withdraw.

Mr. McCOMAS. I desire to have a correction made on line 23, by striking out the period after "same," in the last line of that page, and inserting a semicolon.

The CHAIRMAN. In the absence of objection, that correction will be made.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. CRISP having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. TOWNSHEND reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8989), had directed him to report back the same with sundry amendments.

The amendments were agreed to; and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CLEMENTS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill

was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. McCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed without amendments House bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 314) authorizing the Secretary of War to place the name of James L. Henderson on the roll of Company B, Sixteenth Kentucky Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 335) granting a pension to General W. E. Woodruff;

A bill (H. R. 1540) to establish a port of delivery at Grand Rapids, Mich.;

A bill (H. R. 2161) for the relief of Thomas J. Taylor;

A bill (H. R. 6098) authorizing the construction and repair of the roads from the entrance to the reservation of the Presidio, at San Francisco, Cal., to the national cemetery on the same, and the fencing and protection of the said reservation and cemetery thereon; and

A bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Abial G. Chamberlain.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 1232) for the relief of Thomas G. Corbin;

A bill (S. 1880) declaring that certain water-reserve lands in the State of Wisconsin are and have been subject to the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act granting to railroads the right of way through the public lands of the United States," approved March 3, 1875;

A bill (S. 1948) to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River, on the lands of Mrs. M. A. Bower, in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark.

A bill (S. 2318) to extend to the port of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., the privileges of inland transportation in bond;

A bill (S. 2702) to amend so much of section 351 of the Revised Statutes as fixes the salary of the chief clerk of the Department of Justice; and

A bill (S. 2972) to provide for making the west end of the Smithsonian building fire-proof, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to introduce the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk, and to put it upon its passage. It is simply a resolution providing for the consideration of business from certain committees, without interfering materially with the regular course of the proceedings of the House.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the House will on Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, Saturday, and Monday, May 22, 23, 24, 26, and 28, take a recess at 5 o'clock p. m. until 8 o'clock p. m., and that the evening sessions shall be devoted exclusively to bills and measures reported by the following committees, in the order to be designated by such committees, namely:

Tuesday evening, to bills and measures reported from the Committee on Commerce;

Wednesday evening, to bills and measures reported from the Committee on Pacific Railroads;

Thursday evening, to bills and measures reported from the Committee on Territories;

Saturday evening, to bills reported from the Committee on the Public Lands; and

Monday evening, to bills and measures reported from the Committee on Military Affairs. And that if, at the adjournment of the House on either of the evenings indicated any bill called up and partially considered should remain undisposed of, such bill shall be considered in the House on the succeeding legislative day, immediately after the reading of the Journal, and, after one hour's debate thereon (except on Thursday, when three hours' debate shall be allowed), to be equally divided between those in favor of and those opposed to the bill, the House shall proceed to vote upon all pending amendments and on the final passage of the bill without any intervening motion or business.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. HERBERT. Is this a report from the Committee on Rules?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. It is not, but I do not think they will object to it.

Mr. MACDONALD. This is too important a matter to be passed upon now.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection is made.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Then let it be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. MACDONALD. I think it should be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WEAVER. It is understood by the House generally that the Committee on Rules are unanimous in approving it.

Mr. MACDONALD. I don't care about that. I want to have it acted upon by the committee.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Minnesota object to the introduction of the resolution for reference to the committee?

Mr. MACDONALD. No, sir.

The resolution was referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BURROWS. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Before putting the motion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] the Chair will lay before the House a report from the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 4908) for the relief of A. Gates Lee, surviving partner of A. G. and B. P. Lee;

A bill (H. R. 2068) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain citizens of Chicago, employés of the custom-house, for extra time services;

A bill (H. R. 8006) to amend section 5388 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to timber depredations;

A bill (H. R. 5683) to authorize the commissioners of the District of Columbia to complete a contract for the sale of certain real estate to Job Barnard;

A bill (H. R. 639) to authorize Commander John W. Philip, United States Navy, to accept a silver pitcher from the Government of the United States of Colombia;

A bill (H. R. 108) for the relief of John C. Weaver; and

A bill (H. R. 4909) for the relief of the estate of C. M. Briggs, deceased.

The motion of Mr. BURROWS was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 6 o'clock p. m.) adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 10043) for the relief of Simeon Traw—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FORD: A bill (H. R. 10044) granting a pension to Perry Dunton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOFF: A bill (H. R. 10045) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Matthews, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LODGE: A bill (H. R. 10046) for the relief of Albert M. Burnham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULL: A bill (H. R. 10047) to increase the pension of James Snyder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAMS: A bill (H. R. 10067) for the relief of Lieut. F. S. Bassett of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. ANDERSON, of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 10068) granting a pension to Lieut. Starkey R. Powell—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BLISS: A bill (H. R. 10069) for the relief of Capt. Theodore F. Kane, United States Navy—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. C. R. BRECKINRIDGE: A bill (H. R. 10070) for the relief of Mrs. D. J. Wells—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. C. E. BROWN: A bill (H. R. 10071) for the relief of William Muirhead—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (by request): A bill (H. R. 10072) to promote the progress of life-saving and time-saving improvements, etc.—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CONGER: A bill (H. R. 10073) granting a pension to P. F. Jonte—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10074) correcting the military record of John Nichols—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10075) granting a pension to John Skinner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CULBERSON: A bill (H. R. 10076) for the relief of J. N. Womack—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FUNSTON: A bill (H. R. 10077) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Runkle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUENTHER: A bill (H. R. 10078) for the relief of Mathew O. Regan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERMANN: A bill (H. R. 10079) for the relief of Mary A. White—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. S. T. HOPKINS: A bill (H. R. 10080) establishing a post-route extending from the mail station or post-office, Eureka, Sullivan County, New York, to the mail station known as Sundown, Ulster County, New York—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. LYMAN: A bill (H. R. 10081) for the relief of Caroline Craig—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 10082) to amend an act entitled "An act for the relief of the widow and orphan children of Col. William R. McKee"—to the Committee on Private Land Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10083) for the relief of the heirs of Joel A. Stokes—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10084) for the relief of John McDaniel—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NUTTING: A bill (H. R. 10085) for the relief of George W. Briggs from the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PLUMB: A bill (H. R. 10086) granting a pension to Christopher J. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SAWYER: A bill (H. R. 10087) granting a pension to Allen C. Feathers.

By Mr. M. A. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 10088) granting right of way to the Arizona Improvement Company, etc.—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SYMES: A bill (H. R. 10089) granting a pension to Daniel M. Snider—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. T. L. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 10090) granting a pension to Christian Kembeck—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. R. WHITING: A bill (H. R. 10091) for the relief of Mary White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10092) granting arrears of pension to the widow of James Gain—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOST: A bill (H. R. 10093) for the relief of the heirs of E. O. Watkins—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 10094) for the relief of William Bixby alias Charles Ashley—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS WILSON: A bill (H. R. 10095) to correct the record as to the discharge of George D. Wilder—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HEMPHILL (by request): A bill (H. R. 10096) for the relief of Thomas J. Parker—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TURNER, of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 10097) for the relief of Hall & Gregory—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Change in the reference of a bill improperly referred was made in the following case, namely:

A bill (H. R. 4575) granting a pension to Michael Hargain, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the Select Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMS: Memorial of Lieut. F. S. Bassett, of the Navy, to accompany House bill for his relief—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. G. A. ANDERSON: Petition of citizens of Scott County, Illinois, asking that a pension be granted Lieut. S. R. Powell, of the Black Hawk war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BAYNE: Petition of James L. Graham and 11 others, citizens of the Twenty-eighth district of Pennsylvania, for better legal protection of women and girls—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLISS: Petition of Richard Mays, of Brooklyn, N. Y., for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BOUND: Petition of members of the bar of Northumberland County, Pennsylvania, asking that said county be detached from the western and be attached to the eastern district of Pennsylvania—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. C. R. BRECKINRIDGE: Petition of D. J. Wells, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BREWER: Petition of Augustus Holden and 13 others, citizens of Greene County, Michigan, relating to postage on bulbs, seeds, etc.—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. C. E. BROWN: Petition of S. A. H. McKim, executor of James Gill, for relief—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, memorial of W. H. Harrison, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Petition of William Farr Goodwin, of Stelton, N. J., for extension of certain patents—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BUTTERWORTH (by request): Petition of David Miller, of A. W. Hicks, and of Wolff & Brown, for payment of their war claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of John B. Wolff, for payment of Indian depredation claims—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

Also, petition of Thomas H. Kelly, administrator of John. H Piatt, for payment of his claim—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARDY: Petition of citizens of St. Louis, Mo., for a reduction of the duties on rice—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLLINS: Petition of 1,193 citizens of Massachusetts, in favor of a postal telegraph—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. DORSEY: Petition of citizens of Montana, for cancellation of grant of mineral lands to the Northern Pacific Railway Company—to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.

By Mr. DUBOIS: Petition of C. B. Reynolds and others, male citizens of Lewiston, Idaho, for better legal protection of women and girls—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FLOOD: Petition of William Bixby, alias Charles Ashley, for removal of the charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORD: Petition of Charles Scott, president of Hope College, and 20 others, male citizens of Holland, Mich., for better legal protection to women and girls—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FORNEY: Petition of the Creek Nation, for reimbursement of certain moneys accruing under the treaty of 1886—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of 14 postal-clerks, of Iowa, in favor of bill to readjust salaries of railway postal-clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GEAR: Petition of Beklin Winyers and others, asking that rice be put on the tariff list at half a cent per pound—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GROUT: Memorial of E. W. Leggett, for removal of duty on glue—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KEAN: Petition of citizens of Monmouth County, New Jersey, protesting against any reduction of duties on agricultural products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAISH: Petition of Ida F. Bossler, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIKEN: Petition of Otis Gray, for removal of charge of desertion from the United States naval service—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NUTTING (by request): Petition of George W. Briggs, for removal of charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES O'NEILL: Petition of Edward McBride, for removal of charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PERKINS: Petition of O. N. P. Sheffer, of Neodesha, Kans., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. PERRY: Petition of Mary E. Hilton Partridge, heir of Thomas Hilton, and of W. S. Brown, heir of James Brown, of Richland County, South Carolina, for reference of their claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of the bar of Finney County, Kansas, for the erection of a public building at Garden City, Kans.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. RAYNER: Petition of C. Morton Stewart & Co. and other business men of Baltimore, Md., relative to fixing a time when any change in the tariff on sugar, if any be made, shall go into effect—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of numerous citizens of Little Rock, Ark., relating to certain amendments of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SENEY: Petition of Charles Foster and 28 others, citizens of Fostoria; of George V. Hull and 91 others, citizens of Finlay; of James Michard and 31 others, citizens, and of John Hichelet and 64 others, citizens of Ohio, against reduction of the duty on window-glass—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of the Empire Woolen Company; J. C. Bailey and 255 others, citizens of Clayville; of Hathaway & Reynolds and others, citizens of Augusta; of Lewis R. Stelle and others, citizens of Paris, and of S. E. Barton and 85 others, citizens of Trenton, N. Y., in favor of protecting American products—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STOCKDALE: Petition of William Smith of Amite County, Mississippi, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SYMES: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Denver, Colo., in favor of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. TILLMAN (by request): Petition of Riley R. Dowling and others, heirs of William M. Dowling, for reference of their claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of J. M. M. Johnson, and of widow of John W. Utley, of Davidson County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. B. WHITE: Petition of soldiers of George Humphrey Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Fort Wayne, and of Grand Army of the Republic post at Waterloo, Ind., for the establishment of a soldiers' home at Indianapolis, Ind.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILBER: Petition for the passage of House bill 8072, for the relief of railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WISE: Petition of the Virginia fruit and vegetable packers for the abolition of the duty on tin-plate—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The following petitions in favor of House bill 9716, for the better protection of free labor from convict labor, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Labor:

By Mr. ARNOLD: Of Knights of Labor of River Point, R. I.

By Mr. BAYNE: Of Knights of Labor of Dravosburgh, Pa.

By Mr. BOUND: Of Knights of Labor of Sunbury, Pa.

By Mr. C. R. BRECKINRIDGE: Of Knights of Labor of Beebe, Ark.

By Mr. BRYCE: Of Knights of Labor of New York City.

By Mr. BUCKALEW: Of Knights of Labor of Centralia, Columbia County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. BURNETT: Of Local Assembly 9250, Knights of Labor, of Hudson, Mass.

By Mr. BUTTERWORTH: Of Local Assembly 6596, and of Local Assembly No. 1781, Knights of Labor, of Cincinnati, Ohio.

By Mr. BYNUM: Of Knights of Labor of Indianapolis, Ind.

By Mr. T. J. CAMPBELL: Of Local Assembly 1971, Knights of Labor, of New York City.

By Mr. COBB: Of Knights of Labor of Strasburgh, Ala.

By Mr. COCKRAN: Of Knights of Labor of New York City.

By Mr. COGSWELL: Of Knights of Labor of Haverhill, and of Ballard Vale, Essex County, Massachusetts.

By Mr. COX: Of Knights of Labor of Newark, N. Y.

By Mr. CUMMINGS: Of citizens of Mount Vernon, N. Y.

By Mr. DINGLEY: of Local Assembly No. 4930, Knights of Labor, of Sabattas, Me.

By Mr. DORSEY: Of Local Assembly No. 3790, Knights of Labor, of Grand Island, Nebr.

By Mr. DUNN: Of Local Assembly No. 817, Knights of Labor, of Newport, Ark.

By Mr. ERMENTROUT: Of Knights of Labor Assembly No. 6287, of Reading, Pa.

By Mr. FITCH: Of Knights of Labor of New York City.

By Mr. GREENMAN: Of Knights of Labor of Troy, Rensselaer County, New York.

By Mr. HARMER: Of Knights of Labor of Philadelphia, Pa.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Of Local Assembly No. 5620, Knights of Labor, of East Cambridge, Mass.

By Mr. HIESTAND: Of Cigar-Makers' Assembly No. 1104, Knights of Labor, of Lancaster, Pa.

Also, of Local Assembly No. 9649, Knights of Labor, of Lancaster, Pa.

By Mr. A. J. HOPKINS: Of Knights of Labor of Aurora, Ill.

Also, of citizens of Batavia, Ill.

By Mr. S. T. HOPKINS: Of Knights of Labor of Athens, Greene County, and of East Kingston, Ulster County, New York.

By Mr. KETCHAM: Of Knights of Labor of Ponghkeepsie, N. Y.

By Mr. LAIDLAW: Of Knights of Labor of Richburgh, Allegany County, New York.

By Mr. LODGE: Of Knights of Labor of Wakefield, Mass.

By Mr. McADOO: Of members of labor organizations of Jersey City, N. J.

By Mr. McCORMICK: Of Knights of Labor of Sawyer City, of Williamsport, of Durham, and of Forest House, Pa.

By Mr. McCREARY: Of Knights of Labor of Altamont, Laurel County, and of citizens of Laurel County, Kentucky.

By Mr. McRAE: Of Knights of Labor of Chidesta, Ark.

By Mr. MOFFITT: Of Knights of Labor of Ticonderoga, and of Mineville, Essex County, New York.

By Mr. NEAL: Of Knights of Labor of Sale Creek, Tenn.

By Mr. NORWOOD: Of workmen and of Knights of Labor of Savannah, Ga.

By Mr. NUTTING: Of citizens of Clyde, N. Y., and of Knights of Labor of Auburn, N. Y.

By Mr. O'FERRALL: Of Knights of Labor of Harrisonburgh, Va.

By Mr. CHARLES O'NEILL: Of Knights of Labor, No. 6285, of Philadelphia, Pa.

By Mr. PERRY: Of Knights of Labor of Wilkinsville, Union County, South Carolina.

By Mr. PETERS: Of Knights of Labor of Kinsley, Kans.

Also, of Knights of Labor of Portland, Sumner County, and of La Crosse, Rush County, Kansas.

By Mr. RANDALL: Of Local Assemblies No. 3534, No. 3048, and other Knights of Labor, of Philadelphia.

By Mr. C. A. RUSSELL: Of Central Labor Union of Norwich, Conn.

By Mr. SIMMONS: Of Knights of Labor of Garysburgh, N. C.

By Mr. SNYDER: Of Knights of Labor of Cedar Grove, and of St. Albans, W. Va.

By Mr. SPINOLA: Of Onward Labor Club, No. 1, of New York City.

Also, of Local Assembly No. 5698, Knights of Labor, of New York City.

By Mr. STONE, of Missouri: Of Knights of Labor of Oronogo, and of Alba, Mo.

By Mr. STRUBLE: Of Knights of Labor of Sanborn, Iowa.

By Mr. SYMES: Of Knights of Labor of Silver Plume, Clear Creek County, Colorado.

By Mr. E. J. TURNER: Of Knights of Labor of Mankato, Kans.

By Mr. WEBER: Of Knights of Labor, No. 10821, of Lockport, N. Y.

By Mr. S. V. WHITE: Of the File Makers' Union of Brooklyn, N. Y.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. LIND: Of Dr. R. D. Barber, of Worthington, Minn.

By Mr. PERKINS: Of Dr. William A. McCulley and others, of Independence, and of J. K. Tulloss, of Selan, Kans.

By Mr. J. D. STEWART: Of citizens of Georgia.

By Mr. H. G. TURNER: Of W. S. Wood & Co. and others, of Camilla, Ga.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. BUTTERWORTH: Of John P. Murphy and others, of Ohio.

By Mr. CAREY: Of citizens of Laramie City, Wyo.

By Mr. PARKER: Of citizens of New York.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. BUNNELL: Of Grange No. 174, Patrons of Husbandry, of Big Pond, Bradford County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. S. T. HOPKINS: Of 140 farmers of Schaghticoke, N. Y.

By Mr. LAIDLAW: Of Joseph W. Smith and others, of Alfred, Allegany County, N. Y.

By Mr. NUTTING: Of W. D. Stephens and 25 others, of the Twenty-seventh district of New York.

By Mr. PARKER: Of citizens of Chippewa Bay and of De Kalb Junction, N. Y.

By Mr. SENEY: Of J. W. Butler and 360 others, citizens of Hancock County, and of J. B. Gormley and 40 others, citizens of Crawford County, Ohio.

By Mr. SYMES: Of citizens of Evergreen, Colo.

By Mr. J. B. WHITE: Of farmers of Allen County and of Noble County, Indiana.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. BLISS: Of citizens of Brooklyn, N. Y.

By Mr. CLARDY: Of Frank Stieber and 60 others, citizens of Perry County, Missouri.

By Mr. DORSEY: Of ex-soldiers of Ewing, and of Dawson County, Nebraska.

By Mr. GROUT: Of members of Barry Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of South Wheelock, Vt.

By Mr. WILBER: Of the Grand Army of the Republic, of Oneonta, N. Y.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. DORSEY: Of 229 citizens of Madison and Dodge Counties, Nebraska.

By Mr. GREENMAN: Of 161 citizens of Washington County, New York.

By Mr. NUTTING: Of 54 citizens of Cayuga County, New York.

By Mr. SHIVELY (by request): Of 78 citizens of Marshall County, Indiana.

By Mr. J. B. WHITE: Of 88 citizens of Noble and La Grange Counties, Indiana.

By Mr. J. R. WHITING: Of 188 citizens of Huron and Macomb Counties, Michigan.

The following petition for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Of citizens of Edisto Island, South Carolina.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *May* 22, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

Mr. HOAR. The Journal as read by the Secretary states that a resolution which I offered yesterday was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The resolution was adopted. It was a resolution instructing the Committee on Military Affairs to consider a certain subject, and it was adopted. I move to amend the Journal.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Journal entry will be read. However, before the Journal entry is read by the Secretary, the Chair would call the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts to his own statement on page 4684 of the RECORD, the first paragraph of which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK read as follows:

Mr. HOAR submitted the following resolution; which was read:

"*Resolved*, That the Committee on Military Affairs be directed to consider and report whether some amendment to the laws ought not to be made prohibiting the enlistment in the Army of the United States in time of peace of men with wives or families dependent on them for support without notice to or consent of their wives."

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I desire to observe, in sending the resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs—

Mr. HOAR. I observed that, but I did not intend by that phrase to imply that the resolution was to be referred to the committee to be considered, but I intended that it should be acted upon. As an easier way to get out of it, I will ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs be reconsidered, and that the resolution be adopted.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the vote of the Senate referring the resolution to the Committee on Military Affairs will be reconsidered, and the resolution will be agreed to. It is so ordered, if there be no objection.

If there be no motion to amend or correct the Journal, it will stand approved as read.

L. J. WORDEN—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 1054, entitled "An act for the relief of L. J. Worden."

This bill directs the Postmaster-General to allow to L. J. Worden, recently the postmaster at Lawrence, Kans., the sum of $625, paid out by him as such postmaster for clerk-hire during the period from July 1, 1882, to June 30, 1883.

The allowances to these officers for clerk-hire and other like expenses are fixed in each case by the Post-Office Department, and are paid out of an appropriation made in gross to cover them all. The excess of receipts for box-rents and commissions, over and above the salary of the postmaster, is adopted by law as the maximum amount of such allowances in each case; and within that limit the amount appropriated is apportioned by the Post-Office Department to the different offices according to their needs.

The allowances to the Lawrence post-office for the year ending June 30, 1883, were $3,100. This was fully its proportion of the appropriation made by Congress for that year, and as much as was in most cases given to other offices of the same grade. In September, 1882, during the first quarter of the year in question, the postmaster made application for an increase of his allowances, which was declined; and a similar application in December of the same year was also declined. The reason given for non-compliance with this request in both cases was a lack of funds. It is the rule to make only such allowances in any year as can be paid from the appropriation made for that period.

No further application for increase of allowances was made by Mr. Worden until March, 1884, when the same was increased $500 for the year, to date from the 1st day of January preceding.

It was found at that time, after a full and fair investigation by the Department, which had in hand abundant funds for an increase of these allowances, that notwithstanding the increase of business at this post-office, $500 added to the allowances for the year from July 1, 1882, to June 30, 1883, was sufficient. And yet more than twice that sum is added by the bill under consideration to the allowances for the year last named.

Forty-four postmasters have submitted vouchers, amounting to nearly $9,000, for clerk-hire during that year, in excess of allowances; but they were all rejected, and I understand have not been insisted upon.

I assume that the Post-Office Department in 1884 dealt justly and fairly by the postmaster at Lawrence, and upon this theory, if he should be reimbursed any expenditure for a previous year, the demand he now makes is excessive.

But the cases should be exceedingly rare in which postmasters are awarded any more than the allowances made by the Department officers. They have the very best means of ascertaining the amount necessary to meet the demands of the service in any particular case; and it certainly may be assumed that they desire to properly accommodate the public in the matter of postal facilities. When the appropriation is sufficient, the decision of the Department should be final; and when the money in hand does not admit of adequate allowances, postmasters should only be reimbursed money voluntarily expended by them when recommended by the Postmaster-General.

Any other course leads to the expenditure of money by postmasters for work which they should do themselves, and to the employment of clerks which are unnecessary. The least encouragement that they may be repaid such expenditure by a special appropriation would dangerously tend to the substitution of their judgment for that of the Department, and to the relaxation of wholesome discipline.

I think when the application of Mr. Worden for an increase in his allowances was twice declined for any cause during the year covering his present demand, that if he made personal expenditures for clerk-hire, and especially if he did so without the encouragement of the Department, they were made at his own risk. It appears, too, that the amount of his claim is larger than can be justified in any event.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 18, 1888.

The time allowed the Executive by the Constitution for the examination of bills presented to him by Congress for his action expired in the case of the bill herewith returned on Saturday, May 19. The Senate adjourned or took a recess on Thursday afternoon, May 17, until to-day (the 21st of May).

On the day of said recess or adjournment the above message, disapproving said bill and accompanying its return to the Senate, where it originated, was drawn, and on May 18 was engrossed and signed. On Saturday, the 19th of May, the Senate not being in session, the message and the bill were tendered to the Secretary of the Senate, who declined to receive them, and thereupon they were on the same day tendered to the President of the Senate, who also declined to receive the same, both of these officials claiming that the return of said bill and the delivery of said message could only properly be made to the Senate when in actual session.

They are therefore transmitted as soon as the Senate reconvenes after its recess, with this explanation.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

Mr. HOAR. The communication of the President of the United States, which has just been read, raises a very important constitutional question, far beyond anything involved in the merits of the bill itself. I think it proper that the Senate should give its careful consideration to the matter, and I move that the message be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the bill and the accompanying message be referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to.

LIZZIE WRIGHT OWEN.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen; which were in line 3, after the name "Owen," to strike out "only surviving daughter of George Wright, late a brigadier-general of United States Volunteers," and insert "widow of —— Owen, late an officer of the Army of the United States;" and in line 6, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "eighteen;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Lizzie Wright Owen, widow of —— Owen, late an officer of the Army of the United States, and pay her a pension at the rate of $18 per month.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask that the amendment as to the rate be disagreed to, and that a committee of conference be appointed thereon. I did not understand the other matter.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire moves that the Senate disagree to the amendments made by the House of Representatives, and ask for a conference on the bill and amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. BLAIR, Mr. DOLPH, and Mr. FAULKNER were appointed.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives non-concurring in the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5445) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, and asking for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. ALLISON, Mr. DAWES, and Mr. GORMAN were appointed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. DOLPH presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Portland, Oregon, praying that a large appropriation be made for the support of the revenue marine; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Portland, Oregon, praying that river and harbor improvements be continued in charge of the Army engineers; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. STANFORD presented a petition of the faculty of the University of California, located at Berkeley, Cal., praying for the passage of the international copyright law; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the city officials of San Francisco, Cal., praying for the establishment of a quarantine station at that place; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of packing companies and canners of California, praying for the removal of the duty on tin-plate; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Southern California, officially signed, representing 1,378 members, praying for the repeal of the internal-revenue tax on all alcoholic liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of 30 citizens of San Francisco, Cal., a petition of 71 citizens of the Sixth Congressional district of California, and a petition of 120 citizens of the First, Sixth, and Seventh Congressional districts of California, praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia; which were referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. VOORHEES presented petitions of members of the Grand Army of the Republic, the Women's Relief Corps, and of the Sons of Veterans and citizens of Richmond, Wayne County, Indiana; of Alexandria, Madison County, Indiana, and of Jonesborough, Grant County, Indiana, praying for the passage of House bill 8391, providing for the establishment of a branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and Sailors at Marion, in Grant County, Indiana; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Mount Olive Post, No. 428, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, praying for the establishment in the State of Indiana of a branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and Sailors, to be located at Indianapolis; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented the petition of H. Van Voorst and 27 other honorably discharged soldiers of the late war, members of Hall Tippecanoe Post, No. 51, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Indiana, at Monticello, Ind., praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of William E. Walters and 60 other citizens and soldiers of Brown County, Indiana, praying for the repeal of the arrears-of-pension limitation; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition adopted at a meeting of the ex-Union soldiers of Cass County, Indiana, held at Logansport April 26, 1888,

praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill, the repeal of the limitation on pension arrears, that the widows of all soldiers shall receive $12 per month from the date of death, and for the passage of the 40 per cent. bill introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. HOVEY; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. TELLER. I present a petition of citizens of Montana Territory, praying for legislation to preserve to citizens of the United States mineral lands along the Northern Pacific Railway, and to prevent the Northern Pacific Railway Company from acquiring lands to which it is not entitled by its grant.

I desire to say that it seems to me it is impossible that there should be any legislation needed or required on this subject. It is entirely within the province of the Department charged with the execution of the law under this grant to protect the people in all the rights that they have.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON presented a petition of 28 ex-Union soldiers, citizens of Dexter, Iowa, praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of James Parker, of Davis City, Decatur County, Iowa, praying to be allowed a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of postal clerks of Iowa, praying for a readjustment of their pay; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Paul, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made to provide for improvements at Fort Snelling, Minn.; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FARWELL presented a petition of citizens of Marion, Ill., and a petition of citizens of Peoria, Ill., praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. EVARTS presented a petition of the Northrup Glove Manufacturing Company and 13 other firms doing business in the State of New York, praying that the import duty on glue be maintained as it now is; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Arch. M. Campbell, M. D., and 31 other citizens of Mount Vernon, Westchester County, New York, praying for better legal protection for womanhood and girlhood, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2823) to authorize the building of a railroad bridge at Fort Smith, Ark., reported it with amendments.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2825) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin T. Baker, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HAWLEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2515) to provide pneumatic gun-carriages for the War Department, reported it with an amendment.

WILLIAM H. FREAR.

Mr. SHERMAN. I report from the Committee on Foreign Relations a letter of the Secretary of State, transmitting certain papers relating to the claim of William H. Frear, and ask that it be printed under the resolution which I send to the desk, for which I ask present consideration.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the letter of the Secretary of State of May 16, 1888, transmitting certain papers respecting the claim of William H. Frear against France, be printed as a supplement to Senate Executive Document No. 148 of the present session.

HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON POST-OFFICES AND POST-ROADS.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, to whom was referred the following resolution, reported it without amendment, and it was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads is hereby authorized to employ a stenographer to report proceedings before said committee regarding House bill No. 4910.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 2989) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William P. Gregg; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2990) granting a pension to Eliza Settle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL introduced a bill (S. 2991) granting a pension to Augustus Pyle; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. COCKRELL. In connection with the bill I present two petitions praying for the passage of a special act granting Augustus Pyle a pension, also the military record of Mr. Pyle from the War Department, and his military record from the adjutant-general of the State of Missouri, together with the affidavit of Mr. Pyle, and sundry other affidavits showing his condition and his right to a pension. I move their reference with the bill to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. DAWES introduced a bill (S. 2992) to accept and ratify the agreement submitted by the Shoshones, Bannocks, and Sheepeaters of the Fort Hall and Lemhi reservations in Idaho, May 14, 1880, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. FRYE introduced a bill (S. 2993) granting a pension to Margaret A. Hillard; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 2994) for the relief of William A. Hunter; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 2995) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Stewart; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PAYNE introduced a bill (S. 2996) for the relief of John H. Merrill; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HAWLEY introduced a bill (S. 2997) for the relief of Samuel B. Horne; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 2998) for the relief of Lieut. Col. Charles G. Sawtelle, deputy quartermaster-general United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SABIN introduced a bill (S. 2999) granting to the Duluth and Winnipeg Railway Company the right of way through the Fond du Lac Indian reservation, in the State of Minnesota; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 3000) granting a pension to Sarah Sheldon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3001) granting a pension to J. Niebels; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FARWELL introduced a bill (S. 3002) to correct the retired-list relating to Lieut. F. S. Bassett, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BLAIR (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3003) to provide for the use of the business envelope, "Crossman and Brown quality," for the Federal Departments and United States Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3004) to prevent any person or persons in the cities of Washington and Georgetown from making books and pools on the result of trotting or running races or boat races and contests of any kind in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. BLAIR. This is similar to the bill which was recently passed, but which applied only to the cities of Washington and Georgetown. A mother came to me desiring that a bill be passed covering the District, saying that boys in the District found their way outside of these cities. I move that the bill be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN introduced a bill (S. 3005) for the relief of the estates of James H. Judkins and William T. Judkins; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PUGH introduced a bill (S. 3006) to amend the law relating to the execution of wills in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT TO POST-OFFICE BUILDING BILL.

Mr. PADDOCK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2762) to provide for the erection of public buildings for post-offices in towns and cities where the post-office receipts for three years preceding have exceeded $3,000 annually; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 8191) to enlarge the powers and duties of the Department of Agriculture, and to create an Executive Department to be known as the Department of Agriculture; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had

signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (H. R. 108) for the relief of John C. Weaver;

A bill (H. R. 639) to authorize Commander John W. Philip, United States Navy, to accept a silver pitcher from the Government of the United States of Colombia;

A bill (H. R. 2068) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain citizens of Chicago, employés of the custom-house, for extra-time services;

A bill (H. R. 4908) for the relief of A. Gates Lee, surviving partner of A. G. and B. P. Lee;

A bill (H. R. 4909) for the relief of the estate of C. M. Briggs, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 5683) to authorize the commissioners of the District of Columbia to complete a contract for the sale of certain real estate to Job Barnard; and

A bill (H. R. 8006) to amend section 5388 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to timber depredations.

PAPERS WITHDRAWN AND REFERRED.

On motion of Mr. HALE, it was

Ordered, That the papers in the case of Andrew R. G. Smith be withdrawn from the files of the Senate and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SANTA MONICA BREAKWATER.

Mr. FRYE submitted the following resolution; which was considered, by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, directed to inform the Senate of the probable cost of a breakwater at or about a depth of 9 fathoms, in the bay of Santa Monica, California, such breakwater to be of such length and in such location as to secure safe anchorage at all points within a space of not less than 1 mile in width; also to inform the Senate what proportion of said cost may be judiciously expended within the coming fiscal year.

MINNIE A. BAILEY.

Mr. PLATT. On the 24th of April, when I was not in the Senate, the Committee on Pensions reported adversely upon the bill (S. 2344) granting a pension to Minnie A. Bailey. I think that the report was made under a misapprehension, and I ask unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill was indefinitely postponed be reconsidered, and that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Connecticut asks unanimous consent that the vote by which the bill (S. 2344) granting a pension to Minnie A. Bailey was indefinitely postponed be reconsidered, and that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 8191) to enlarge the powers and duties of the Department of Agriculture, and to create an Executive Department to be known as the Department of Agriculture, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PUBLIC BUILDING IN ZANESVILLE.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 351) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Zanesville, Ohio.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 4, after the word "purchase," to insert "acquire by condemnation;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to purchase, acquire by condemnation, or otherwise provide a suitable site, and cause to be erected thereon, at the city of Zanesville, in the State of Ohio, a substantial and commodious public building, with fire-proof vaults, for the use and accommodation of the post-office, internal-revenue office, pension office, and for other Government uses.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 13, before the word "thousand," to strike out "150" and insert "75;" and in line 18, before the word "thousand," to strike out "150" and insert "75;" so as to read:

The site, and the building thereon, when completed according to plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall not exceed the cost of $75,000; and the site purchased shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of at least 50 feet, including streets and alleys; and for the purposes herein mentioned the sum of $75,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH LAC DE FLAMBEAU RESERVATION.

Mr. SPOONER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2901) granting to the Milwaukee, Lake Shore and Western Railway Company the right of way through the Lac de Flambeau Indian reservation, in the State of Wisconsin.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 2, line 14, after the word "paid," to insert:

And the consent of the Indians on said reservation thereto shall have been first obtained in a manner satisfactory to the President of the United States.

Mr. DAWES. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the word "thereto," after "reservation," in line 15.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. After the word "reservation," in line 15, I move to insert "as to the amount of said compensation."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Indian Affairs was to add to section 2 the following proviso:

Provided, That said railroad shall be located, constructed, and operated with due regard to the rights of the Indians and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, line 3, before the word "years," to strike out "five" and insert "three;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That the rights herein granted shall be forfeited by said company unless the road is constructed through said reservation within three years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add as a new section:

SEC. 4. That Congress may at any time amend, add to, alter, or repeal this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. In section 1, line 8, after the word "State," I move to insert:

The said Indians having consented by treaty to a reservation by the United States of the power to grant rights of way through said reservation.

So as to read:

That there is hereby granted to the Milwaukee, Lake Shore and Western Railway Company, a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Wisconsin, and its assigns, the right of way for the extension of its railroad through the Lac de Flambeau Indian reservation in said State, the said Indians having consented by treaty to a reservation by the United States of the power to grant rights of way through said reservation.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. In section 2, at the end of line 16, after the amendment already agreed to, I move to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That if said Indians shall refuse to accept a sum which, in the judgment of the President, is a just compensation for said right of way, the said compensation shall then be ascertained in such manner as the President shall direct, having due regard to the rights of the Indians, in which event the said company shall have the right to take and occupy said right of way by paying the compensation so ascertained in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior shall direct.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. In section 2, line 19, after the word "*Provided*," I move to insert the word "*further*."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT BAR HARBOR, ME.

Mr. FARWELL. I move to take up Senate bill 2615, Order of Business 938.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator yield to me for the passage of a bill that will take no time?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I appeal to the Senator to yield to me for the passage of a bill which has been a good deal delayed and is a local matter.

Mr. FARWELL. This is the Baltimore and Potomac bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Illinois is entitled to the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. FARWELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HALE. I move to take up for passage Order of Business 1273, being House bill 4467.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4467) for the erection of a public building at Bar Harbor, in Maine.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REVOLUTIONARY BATTLE-FIELD OF BENNINGTON.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1304, Senate bill 2920, reported from the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FARWELL. How much time will it take?

Mr. EDMUNDS. About a minute and a half.

Mr. FARWELL. I yield.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Vermont.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2920) relative to the Revolutionary battle-field of Bennington. It provides for the payment to the governor of the State of Vermont of $22,000, to be by him transferred to the Bennington Battle Monument Association, to be expended by them in the erection of a suitable iron stairway, for the removal of buildings, and grading and improving the grounds surrounding the monument erected to commemorate the Revolutionary battle of Bennington.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE AT NEBRASKA CITY.

Mr. FARWELL. I now move to take up Order of Business 938, being the bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. PADDOCK. I appeal to the Senator from Illinois. I wish to call up a bridge bill.

Mr. FARWELL. If it will not take longer than two minutes, I will yield.

Mr. PADDOCK. It will not, I think.

Mr. FARWELL. I yield.

Mr. PADDOCK. It is Order of Business 1369, Senate bill 2674. I move to take it up.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 2674) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Nebraska City, Nebr., and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill has not yet come in from the Printer.

Mr. PADDOCK. I have it here. I send it to the desk.

The bill was read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. When this bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce it was with amendments which have not been incorporated in the bill which has just been read, the bill with the amendments not having been received from the Printer.

Mr. PADDOCK. I inquire of the Senator who reported the bill if there are amendments to the bill?

Mr. VEST. The bill was reported with amendments.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. They do not appear in the printed copy that has just been read.

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course I know nothing about the bill after I reported it. That is a clerical matter.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Then the paper which has been read is not the true present file of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It was stated when the bill was called up for consideration that the printed bill with the amendments of the committee had not yet come in. The original bill has been read.

Mr. CAMERON. I move that the bill be postponed.

Mr. PADDOCK. I will simply suggest that the bill be laid aside until the printed copy comes in.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be laid aside.

BALTIMORE AND POTOMAC RAILROAD.

Mr. FARWELL. I renew my motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Illinois moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. VEST. Unless I am very greatly at fault in my memory, my impression is that that bill by a general understanding was to go over until to-day a week. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], whom I see in his seat now, made that request of the Senate, and I understood it to be agreed to. The Senator from Vermont is in no condition physically to discuss the bill to-day, and I suppose he is under the same impression that I am. I hope its consideration will not be pressed under the circumstances.

Mr. CAMERON. The following proceeding took place on the 11th of May:

Mr. FARWELL. I desire to call up for consideration at this time Order of Business 938, being the bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAULKNER. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] asked me to state that he received this morning a telegram from Senator MORRILL, of Vermont, asking him to see the Senator and request him to postpone calling up this bill until next week, when he will be here. He wants to be present when it is considered. That was stated to me this morning by the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. FARWELL. I do not feel like yielding at this time. This bill has been on the Calendar for six weeks, and the feature which the Senator from Vermont objects to is the bridge across Sixth street. This bill does not disturb anything north of Maryland avenue.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The merits of the bill are not subject to discussion while a motion to take up is under consideration.

Mr. FARWELL. I do not feel like yielding to the request. I insist on my motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. HOAR. I do not think the Senator from Illinois could have heard the request made by the Senator from West Virginia. The Senator from Vermont is absent from the city and is ill. He asks to have the bill postponed until next week, when he will be here.

That is, this week—

Mr. FARWELL. Very well; if that is the desire I will defer calling up the bill until Monday.

That "Monday" was yesterday. There was no understanding whatever that this should be put off until next Tuesday.

Mr. MORRILL. This matter was under consideration a week ago to-day.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair is compelled to state that, under the rules, before 2 o'clock a motion to proceed to the consideration of any bill on the Calendar must be decided without debate.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague have leave to make a statement.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. I do not understand the Chair. If there is anything that involves the Baltimore and Potomac line, I may have an objection to offer. I could not hear anything because there was talk behind me here. I have no objection to any Senator making a statement, but I do want to know what motion is to be put.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the Senator from Virginia that the question is upon the motion of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL] to proceed to the consideration of the bill. The Chair holds that it must be decided without debate, except by unanimous consent, which has been given to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] to proceed.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. President, a week ago yesterday I was present when the Senator from Illinois called this bill up again, and it will be seen from my statement that I expected it to be postponed to a week from to-day. I said in reply to a question of the Senator from Illinois:

I hope the Senator from Illinois will not insist on that motion. This is a minor question as compared with the one presented by the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER], and just made a special order for a week from Tuesday next.

Then at the close of what I said I remarked:

I do not feel well enough to do it to-day, but I hope to be prepared to do it a week from Tuesday, or I will make no further opposition.

This was considered, and the motion to take up the bill was finally withdrawn by the Senator from Illinois without making any objection to my proposition. Now, it does seem to me that a decision of this kind so arrived at has never been changed by the Senate. It was the clear understanding, I think, on the part of the Senate, all except perhaps the Senator from Illinois, that it was to go over until a week from the following Tuesday. Now, Mr. President, I have taken some pains to prepare some facts on this question. I do not often intrude myself unless I think I have some contribution to make to the subject; and in relation to this matter I have accumulated a great many facts that I think it is important for the Senate to know, and if this question is postponed it will not prevent the Senator from Illinois from having his bill considered, as it is embodied in a substitute proposed for the bill reported from the committee.

If the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company can get an opportunity to go into any square where it chooses, or any street it pleases, we may bid farewell to any further legislation so far as any relief is concerned from the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad. It is all the legislation we are likely to have.

I hope that the clear understanding as presented by the RECORD of the 15th instant will not be violated by taking up this subject this morning when I have no documents here prepared to exhibit to the Senate to show my side of the question.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the Senator from Virginia proceeding? The Chair hears none.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. I only desire to state that I should like to have the consideration of this subject postponed until some time next week. I have a constituent interest to represent in this matter, and I have also some interest to represent throughout the entire South.

Mr. FARWELL. I think the Senator from Virginia mistakes the character of the bill now called up.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. No, sir; I am for your bill. My friend from Vermont wants to offer an amendment, and I am afraid of that amendment. I think the subject had better go over until next week. The opposition to your bill will agree to its going over.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask the consent of the Senate ["Go on!"] to authorize me at least to appeal to the Senator from Illinois, and I do so from the standpoint of a member of the committee in the main in sympathy with his views and his policy on this question? If the bill reported by the Senator from West Virginia shall be first acted upon, and if the policy provided by that bill shall be agreed to by the Senate, then the passage of the bill of the Senator from Illinois follows as a necessary incident, as it seems to me, and he will have no trouble in passing the bill. But to press it now involves not only the question

provided for in his bill, but necessarily and incidentally all the questions provided for in the other bill when the other will not be considered for a week from this time.

But wholly independent of these considerations, in the face of the appeal of the Senator from Vermont, I am sure I would not insist upon the consideration of any bill when any Senator would make such a statement as has been made by the Senator from Vermont. It is due to that Senator that he have the time and opportunity to reflect the views that he wishes to reflect, and to give the Senate the information that he proposes to give in respect to the questions involved both in his bill and in the bill reported by the Senator from West Virginia. I therefore appeal to the Senator from Illinois to withdraw his motion and let his bill remain on the Calendar until a week from to-day.

Mr. FARWELL. Mr. President, I ask consent to make a statement.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the Senator from Illinois will proceed.

Mr. FARWELL. This bill was reported on the 6th of April. I have been endeavoring to get it before the Senate at various periods from that day to this.

The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company have had a bill prepared to enable them to come into the city and have their station opposite the Baltimore and Potomac station. That bill the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] has had made a special order for next Tuesday. The bill of the Senator from Vermont involves exactly what is provided for in that bill with the addition of removing the Baltimore and Potomac station something over half a mile farther south. That is a question which, as I understand, will be discussed by those Senators.

The little bill which I have had the honor of asking for the consideration of on different occasions provides for no such question. I will state again that it only provides that the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company may obtain lands south of the present tracks, south or Virginia and Maryland avenues, so as to enable them to take the tracks off the streets and enable them to get to a block of land near the Long Bridge on this side of the river. The question of bringing in the Baltimore and Ohio and the question of removing the Baltimore and Potomac station to another point are not involved in this bill.

This is simply a question of permitting the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire ground to extend their tracks to a square near the Long Bridge. I do not think I have been unaffable, so to speak, in this matter at all. I do not think there has been any understanding which I have violated. The question in this bill has been well known. Every railroad that has been built into a city has had strips of land for its business and has had permission to purchase more; that is all the bill provides for. I ask that it be considered.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, is debate in order?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. By unanimous consent only. Is there objection to the Senator from Connecticut proceeding? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am a little surprised by the remarks of the Senator from Illinois. It is true that the pending bill refers only to taking possession of certain lots of land and squares below the present station; but if I am correctly informed by a petition presented in behalf of the Citizens' Representative Committee of One Hundred, of Washington, it does not designate in advance what lands or streets are to be acquired, and it is without limit of time when such railroad company may exercise the rights accorded by the bill. But I was not born yesterday, and I think most of the Senators are older than that. It is perfectly apparent, from the remarks made by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], and from the remarks interjected by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON], that it is all part of one question. Nobody supposes, if the Baltimore and Potomac Company are at liberty to go and take possession by condemnation of unlimited quantities of land just below for the establishment of permanent buildings, it will be worth while then to discuss the great question as to whether the Baltimore and Potomac Company shall ever remain a tenant without the payment of a cent of this magnificent Mall. If this bill be passed, then there is no use of resisting the Baltimore and Ohio bill. If the Baltimore and Ohio bill is passed there is no use in resisting this. This will settle that question, and that Baltimore and Ohio bill will settle this, that the two great railroads are to have their two great stations and sidetracks and shops, for aught I know, without limit, covering that magnificent piece of public ground. It is all one question.

Why not make it on next Tuesday all one discussion? I beg the Senator from Illinois not to attempt to push through this little bit of a bill to fortify the Baltimore and Potomac in the present possession of the Mall by itself.

Mr. FARWELL. I do not think it does. I wish to say right here, in answer to the Senator from Connecticut, who says that the Baltimore and Potomac has paid nothing, that it pays $7,500 a year for the ground taken; and in taxes last year in all $16,000.

Mr. HAWLEY. I was not aware of the rent. I am glad to be corrected.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Illinois yield? The Senator from Illinois has the floor.

Mr. FARWELL. I yield.

Mr. SPOONER. I do not ask the Senator to yield; I ask unanimous consent to proceed. With some amendments, I am in favor of the bill to which the Senator from Illinois refers, but I am utterly opposed to its present consideration, and that without any regard to its merits or to its effect, if it should be enacted, upon the other propositions to which the Senator from Connecticut has alluded.

A week ago yesterday the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], standing here in his place, stated that he desired to be heard against this bill, that he could not be ready to debate it until a week from to-day, and that if he were not ready at that time he should forbear further opposition to the bill. I know that he understood, and I am free to say that I understood it as he did, that by general consent under the circumstances the consideration of this bill was to be postponed until next Tuesday.

If that be a misunderstanding on the part of the Senator from Vermont, which I think it is not, I hope the day has not come and will not soon come when this Senate, distinguished for courtesy among its members, will force upon consideration a bill where a Senator opposed to it, acting in perfect good faith, is able to say he has been misled or was misunderstood as to the day on which it was to be considered and is not now prepared to debate it.

There is no tremendous haste about this matter. This Congress is not to end in a week, and I fancy the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company can transact without any extraordinary difficulty, having very complete possession of many streets and of some of the public grounds of this city, the business of a public carrier until next Tuesday. It seems to me not a debatable proposition in the attitude of this measure to-day that it should be postponed until next Tuesday.

Mr. DAWES. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the Senator from Massachusetts proceeding? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DAWES. I simply wish to make an inquiry. I have not been able to hear all this discussion, and I should like to inquire of the Senator from Illinois if there is any particular reason why the bill should be brought up to-day rather than a week from to-day. It may have been stated, but I have not heard it. If the Senator will indulge me by restating, if he has stated it already, any particular reason why it should be discussed to-day rather than a week from to-day, I shall be obliged to him.

Mr. CAMERON. Will the Senator permit me? Perhaps I can give him a reason. There are now pending in the courts of this District sixty suits against the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company for obstructing the streets by freight cars along the line of the road. These suits are being brought daily. They are a great annoyance and a great expense. If this bill passes the railroad company can remove their storage from the streets and put it on the property they have already purchased or will purchase in the future.

Mr. DAWES. What will transpire as to these suits between to-day and a week from to-day?

Mr. CAMERON. There will be no more such suits brought if they take the cars off the streets.

Mr. DAWES. I do not see that that changes the condition of things. So far as the Senator from Pennsylvania knows, it will be precisely the same a week off as it is to-day. Perhaps the Senator from Illinois can answer.

Mr. CAMERON. What are you trying to get at? [Laughter.]

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Senators must address the Chair.

Mr. DAWES. I am trying to get at the bottom of this attempt to ride over all the usages and customs of the Senate, and I thought that perhaps there might be some paramount reason that could be stated why for the first time in my experience, as in that of the Senator from Wisconsin, all these usages are to be overridden. The Senator from Illinois who has charge of the bill of course knows why it is that he is trying to have it done to-day rather than a week from to-day.

Mr. FARWELL. If the question of removing stations was involved, or if the bringing in of the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad was involved, I should have no objection to the postponement; but there seems to be an opposition to this bill to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad to buy certain property. I can not understand why it is opposed.

Mr. DAWES. I was prompted a little to this inquiry, I will say to the Senator in all frankness, by my memory. I remember a time when they could not wait an hour for the consideration of a measure somewhat kindred to this in the past, a measure which went into immediate effect and which I think the common judgment of everybody except those who have profited by it has regretted ever since. If there is, however, such a paramount reason that the Senator will state, I shall be governed by it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, and appeal to my friend from Illinois to agree to it, that this bill be postponed until Tuesday next and made a special order for that time, so that it will come up every day if it is not reached that day.

Mr. FARWELL. Prior to the other order?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I have no objection to that—prior to the other order.

Mr. FARWELL. I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Vermont asks unanimous consent that the bill moved by the Senator from Illinois may be postponed until Tuesday next and made a special order for 2 o'clock on that day, taking precedence of all other and prior orders.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Standing at the head of the special orders for that day.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRIS. I do not want to object and shall not object to any arrangement that may meet the approbation of the Senate; but it does seem to me so obviously proper that the other bill should be considered before this one——

Mr. EDMUNDS. I withdraw my request.

Mr. HARRIS. No; I am not going to object. I am hoping that the Senator from Illinois will not insist upon giving his bill priority to the other bill.

Mr. FARWELL. I desire a vote on this first. The other may be discussed; I do not care about that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Illinois to proceed to the consideration of this bill, the application of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] for unanimous consent being withdrawn.

The motion was not agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The first order of business will be stated.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator permit me?

Mr. EDMUNDS. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

WITHDRAWAL OF A BILL.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the bill (S. 483) for the relief of E. R. Shipley. A general law has been passed and approved on the 9th of May, 1888, entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act authorizing the Postmaster-General to adjust certain claims of postmasters for losses by burglary, fire, or other unavoidable casualty,' approved March 17, 1882." This bill is now pending before the Committee on Claims, and the law to which I have referred provides for its adjustment. Therefore I desire to withdraw it so that it will not be pending any longer.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims may be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 483) for the relief of E. R. Shipley, and that it be indefinitely postponed. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and that order will be made.

BILLS RECONSIDERED.

Mr. SABIN. Senate bill 1480 was reported adversely by the Committee on Indian Affairs and indefinitely postponed. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was indefinitely postponed, and that it be placed on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The title of the bill will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1480) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to apply the unexpended balance of the appropriation made by the act entitled "An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to ascertain the amounts due to citizens of the United States for supplies furnished to the Sioux or Dakota Indians of Minnesota subsequent to June 1, 1861, and prior to the massacre of August, 1862, and providing for the payment thereof," approved March 3, 1885, now remaining in the Treasury, to the payment of interest on the sums found due by said Secretary under said act.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Minnesota asks that the order of indefinite postponement be rescinded, and that the bill be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. SABIN. I also make the same request in relation to the bill (S. 1576) for the relief of the heirs of Joseph Anderson.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The order of indefinite postponement will be vacated and the bill placed on the Calendar if there be no objection.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After twenty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 6833) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year 1889; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 8394) to authorize United States marshals to arrest offenders and fugitives from justice in Indian Territory; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

On motion of Mr. BECK, the bill (H. R. 6833) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year 1889 was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

Mr. BLAIR. I call for the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANDERSON in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor.

Mr. STEWART. I desire to call up Senate joint resolution No. 80 for the purpose of making some remarks upon it.

Mr. BLAIR. I feel obliged to insist on the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Hampshire yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BLAIR. This bill has been in position some little time, and I desire to have it disposed of. I hope the Senator from Nevada will not ask to have it put aside for the purpose he suggests. I ask that the unfinished business be proceeded with.

Mr. STEWART. I desired to call up the joint resolution for the purpose of submitting some remarks thereon. Do I understand the Senator from New Hampshire to object?

Mr. BLAIR. I am not aware of any notice which the Senator has given of his desire to speak to-day. The labor bill will take but a short time. I have been at great inconvenience watching for an opportunity to dispose of it, and I hope the Senator will not ask to have it laid aside. It will not take a great while to dispose of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. I manifested my desire to make a few remarks in the morning hour, but there was not an opportunity on account of the consideration of other bills.

Mr. BLAIR. I think that I should submit to more inconvenience than the Senator if I assent to displacing the regular order. It can take but a short time to dispose of it, and I hope it may be proceeded with.

Mr. REAGAN. Is the bill to establish a department of labor up now?

Mr. BLAIR. It is the regular order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Nevada withdraws his request for unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the resolution which he has indicated?

Mr. REAGAN. I shall ask for the regular order.

Mr. STEWART. I withdraw my request, but give notice that to-morrow, after the routine morning business, I shall ask unanimous consent to call up the joint resolution (S. R. 80) proposing an amendment to subdivisions 2 and 3 of section 7 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States for the purpose of making some remarks thereon.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor.

Mr. REAGAN. Mr. President, we have been met at the threshold of the discussion of the merits of the bill before us, for the establishment of a department of labor, by the statement that it passed the House of Representatives by a unanimous vote, and that it has the unanimous indorsement of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. I think it right to state plainly at the outset that when a question about labor or agriculture or pensions comes before this Congress something more than the unanimous reports of committees and something more than the unanimous vote of either or both Houses of Congress is necessary to satisfy the demands of reason and of justice.

If the fathers and founders of the Republic could have been called back to life and could have witnessed much that has been said in the discussions in Congress on these questions for the last few years, they could hardly have failed to blush for shame on account of the degeneracy and want of manhood of their descendants in dealing with these questions.

There are two standpoints from which the "bill to establish a department of labor" and the amendments to it may be discussed.

First, from the standpoint of those who seek to secure the popular vote by misleading the laboring class.

Second, from the standpoint of patriotism, which seeks to protect the laboring classes against injustice because right and duty require this much.

The bills and amendments offered are apt to foreshadow the character of the discussion which is to follow.

The bill reported from the Committee on Education and Labor, now under consideration, "to establish a department of labor" needs but to be briefly analyzed to enable us to determine whether the purpose of it is to secure popular favor or to really benefit the laboring classes. To obtain a correct view of its real import we should inquire what object should be attained by the passage of such a law and how far that object is accomplished by existing laws.

The law of June 27, 1884, provides for the establishment of a bureau of labor in the Department of the Interior, to be under the charge

of a commissioner of labor to be appointed by the President, to hold office for four years, and to receive a salary of $3,000 a year. He is required by this law to "collect information upon the subject of labor, and the earnings of laboring men and women, and the means of promoting their material, social, intellectual, and moral prosperity," and he is required to make an annual report of the information so collected and collated to the Secretary of the Interior, with such recommendations as he may deem calculated to promote the general efficiency of the bureau.

The powers here conferred are ample. They are all that could be desired or conferred to that end.

The bill reported by the committee provides for the establishment of a "department of labor," instead of a "Bureau of Labor," to be under the charge of a commissioner of labor, to be appointed by the President, to hold his office four years, and to receive a salary of $5,000 a year. This bill provides that he—

> Shall acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful information on subjects connected with labor, in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word, and especially upon its relation to capital, the hours of labor, the earnings of laboring men and women, and the means of promoting their material, social, intellectual, and moral prosperity.

The law of June 27, 1884, to which I have referred, and the bill reported by the committee have the same object in view, confer the same powers to carry that object into effect, and are of equal value to the laboring classes. Why, then, the proposed change? And what do the laboring people gain by the change? They get a law calling this "bureau" a "department;" paying an additional $2,000 a year to the officer who is to be at its head. And Hon. Carroll D. Wright, the present Commissioner of Labor, informs us in his official letter to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, which has been read to the Senate, that the cost of this bureau under the present law is $108,000 per annum; and that its cost under the committee's bill would be $152,760, thus increasing the cost of this service to the extent of $44,760 a year for the same results.

I submit that this is too high a price to pay for a mere name, which secures no additional benefit to the class of persons it is assumed will be benefited by it. And if it is meant by this bill to make the laboring people believe that by it they get a Cabinet officer to represent their interests, it is to that extent a fraud on them, as the head of the "department of labor," as provided for in this bill, would not be a member of the President's Cabinet. He would only be the head of a sort of outside bureau.

The seventh section of the committee's bill gives some special directions about obtaining information as to the cost, etc., of dutiable articles, the profits of manufacturers, the cost of living, the effect of the tariff, the effect of the currency on agriculture, and mortgage indebtedness on farms, and the effect which trusts have had on limiting production and keeping up prices. This could be done under the authority of existing law. But if additional legislative direction is deemed necessary it could with as much convenience and propriety be given by an amendment to the present law as by the bill proposed by the committee, and this large increase of expense be saved. And if additional clerical force should be required for the purpose of carrying out additional legislative instructions, that could be provided for without going through the pretense of establishing a "department" which is no department in the sense of its head being a Cabinet officer.

I must regard this bill as a mere tub thrown to the labor whale, on the assumption that the laboring people have not information enough to understand that the mere change of the name of this bureau of information is not an answer to their demand for legislation which will protect them against the power and influence of employers and corporations and secure to them the full fruits of their labor.

Are the laborers, the wealth-producing classes of this country, to be treated as mere children? Are their cries for relief to be hushed by a bauble like the bill under consideration, which accomplishes nothing but a change of some of the machinery for collecting information?

Do Senators understand that the laboring people of this country have made any demand for the passage of such a law as this as answering the real complaints which they make? I must confess I have no such information. They have real grounds of complaint, and they have on many occasions and in many ways made those grounds of complaint known to the public. But I have never heard that they demanded a mere change of the machinery for collecting information about labor as being sufficient to satisfy their complaints.

Their complaint is that this Government has been run for a good many years past in the interest of railroad and banking and seal-fishery and other corporations; in the interest of bondholders and large capitalists; in the interest of extravagantly-protected manufacturers, for whose benefit they are taxed more than $47 on every hundred dollars' worth of taxed merchandise they buy; in the interest of a large retired-list of officers who draw high salaries and render no service. In short, that the Government has been run in the interest of specially favored classes ever since the Republican party got control of it, to the injury and oppression of those engaged in agriculture, in the mechanical arts, in labor, and in professional vocations, such as law, medicine, teaching, etc.

If Senators will call for specifications, the oppressed will point them to the years of unjust and unreasonable exactions and discriminations imposed on them by the railroad, telegraph, and express companies; to the unnecessary and prodigal squandering of more than a hundred million acres of the public land which ought to have been reserved for the use of actual settlers; to the tens of millions of money, principal and interest, unnecessarily taken from the people and given to the railroad corporations.

They will point also to the fact that during and directly after the war between the States the Government was under the necessity of putting a very large amount of legal-tender notes in circulation; that these notes, while they were a legal tender in payment of public and private indebtedness, became, as a result of causes beyond the control of the Government, and without the fault of any one, greatly depreciated; that in order to increase the value of these notes and bring them nearer to par the Government adopted the policy of reducing the volume of them by funding them into interest-bearing bonds, when to carry out this policy it had to allow speculators to purchase the bonds with this depreciated paper at par, although that paper was greatly below par, it being a part of the time not worth 50 cents in gold on the dollar; that these bonds were redeemable in lawful money, which, at that time, was gold and silver coin and legal-tender notes.

Up to this point in these matters the Government was doing the best that the circumstances enabled it to do, and no fault is imputed to its management. They will remind you that specie payment had been suspended, and so remained until the fall of 1878; that on the 1st of July, 1869, the public debt amounted to $2,588,452,213.94; that the State, municipal, corporate, and private indebtedness of the country was very great; that in this condition of things a Republican Congress passed and a Republican President approved the act of March 18, 1869, entitled "An act to strengthen the public credit," in which it was declared that—

> The faith of the United States is pledged to the payment in coin, or its equivalent, of all the obligations of the United States not bearing interest, known as United States notes, and of all the interest-bearing obligations of the United States, except in cases where the law authorizing the issue of any such obligations has expressly provided that the same may be paid in lawful money or other currency than gold and silver.

On the 1st of January, 1869, the amount of legal-tender notes in circulation was $355,892,975, which large sum was thus impaired in use and value.

The effect of this law was to take from the Government the right to pay its bonded indebtedness in the same kind of notes for which it sold them, though these notes had appreciated considerably in value, and to make the Government bonds payable in coin alone when specie payment was suspended, and when there was very little silver and gold in the country, to reduce the kinds and value of money out of which they might be redeemed, to greatly increase the value of the bonds and the difficulty of paying them, and to as greatly reduce, relatively, the value of the property and labor of the country out of which they were to be paid. This was an act passed in the interest of the money power, a violation of the faith of the Government to the people, which greatly increased their burdens and for which there could be no justification.

They will point to the fact that in 1873 the Republican Congress suspended the coinage of silver dollars of 412½ grains and provided that they should no longer be a legal tender for any sum above $5, and thus reduced the volume of metal money out of which the Government bonds might have been paid about one-half, again greatly increasing the value of the bonds, and by reducing the kinds and amount of money available for their payment they again greatly reduced, relatively, the value of the property and labor out of which these bonds had to be paid; and by this reduction of the volume of the currency they put it out of the power of the people to pay their private debts and their taxes. And for several years following this financial suicide in the interest of the moneyed classes bankruptcies were a most frequent occurrence, and vast amounts of land and other property were sold under the hammer for taxes. A pall spread over the country which would probably have produced a revolution in any other country than ours.

And a Republican Congress, as if not yet satisfied that it had shown sufficient contempt for the rights and interests of the people, and sufficient subserviency to the money and corporate classes, in 1875 provided for the redemption and cancellation of the $400,000,000 of outstanding legal-tender notes by the "act to provide for the resumption of specie payments," and to substitute for this circulating money the interest-bearing bonds of the Government, imposing this further burden on the tax-payers for the benefit of money-holders, bond-buyers, and bankers. And its third section repealed the laws which limited the aggregate amount of the circulating notes of the national banks to $354,000,000, and provided that banks might be organized and issue their notes without limit. They thus provided for retiring nearly $400,000,000 of legal-tender notes and converting them into an interest-bearing debt, in order to open the way for the banks to issue their notes and secure the profits on the use of this large sum of money.

Farmers, mechanics, laborers, and professional men of all sorts (for these are all laborers) might make further answer that there now lies in the Treasury of the United States $100,000,000 in gold which it is

pretended is held for the redemption and cancellation of the outstanding legal-tender notes. This large sum of gold is withdrawn from the channels of commerce and from the use of the people for the benefit of the money classes and to the injury of the business of the country, in violation of the act of Congress of May 31, 1878, which provides—

That from and after the passage of this act it shall not be lawful for the Secretary of the Treasury, or other officer under him, to cancel or retire any more of the United States legal-tender notes. And when any of said notes may be redeemed or received into the Treasury under any law from any source whatever and shall belong to the United States, they shall not be retired, canceled, or destroyed, but they shall be reissued and paid out again and kept in circulation.

This act, the passage of which was secured mainly by Democratic influence and by Democratic votes, has been disregarded by the Treasury officials from the time of its passage. Congress by that act meant that these legal-tender notes were not thereafter to be regarded as a debt to be paid off at the earliest time practicable and to be converted into an interest-bearing debt to still further emburden the tax-payers of the country for the benefit of bankers and bondholders, but it did mean that they should constitute a part of the currency of the country to aid in its commerce and business and to reward the labor of the people. That large sum of gold lies there now idle and utterly useless, while the people of the rural parts of the country, indeed of all parts of the country away from the great centers of trade, are cramped in their business, distressed, and in need of a larger amount of circulating money.

Besides this, they might point to the accumulation of nearly $100,000,000 of surplus revenue accumulating in the Treasury annually, under a cruelly unjust system of taxation, withdrawn from the channels of trade, or squandered in corrupt and corrupting legislation; and to the fact that over $130,000,000 in addition to the $100,000,000 of gold just mentioned now lies idle in the Treasury.

And all the laboring and producing men and women of the country might point also to the following facts: that under a high protective tariff they are paying a tax of about $47 on every hundred dollars' worth of merchandise they buy of the classes which pay revenue to the Government; that the total value of imported merchandise for the year ended June 30, 1887, was $692,319,768; that the value of the taxed imports for the same year was $450,325,322; that the duty collected on the same was $212,032,224, being a little more than 47 per cent.; that the census of the United States of 1880 shows that the people of the United States manufactured that year articles of the value of about $5,500,000,000.

Let us assume that $4,000,000,000 worth of these manufactures were of the classes of taxed imports; and let us assume further that, when we tax the foreign product 47 per cent., the domestic manufacturers may add 47 per cent. to the selling price of his like product, and still undersell the foreign product by the cost of transportation to this country, and of handling, commissions, etc. At these rates, while the Government would receive its $212,032,424 from the tax on $450,325,322 worth of imports, the home manufacturers would be enabled to collect from the people $1,880,000,000 of tribute, year by year, from the American farmers, mechanics, laborers, professional people, merchants, and others; a sum equal to $500,000,000 more than the present public debt of the United States, not one dollar of which would go into the public Treasury to aid in the support of the Government and the payment of the public debt. All would be the tribute levied on American industry for the private benefit and enrichment of the millionaire manufacturers and the corporations of which they are members. But we should reduce this sum by the amount which would necessarily have to be paid them under a reasonable revenue tariff—say an average duty of 25 per cent; and we would still save to the people, after allowing a deduction of $1,000,000,000 transferred to the manufacturers under an average duty of 25 per cent., $880,000,000 a year.

Do you wonder, under existing circumstances, that granges, alliances, and labor organizations have come into organized existence, and that they are demanding the repeal of class legislation and special privileges? Do you wonder at their insisting that in their place we shall have just legislation protecting all citizens alike? Had we not better listen to their appeal now, and do justice voluntarily, than to go on in this career of wrong-doing until a condition of affairs shall be produced from which every good citizen may shrink with horror?

The people engaged in the various industrial pursuits in this country might also with propriety point to the fact that the class and monopoly interests of this country combine to secure and to prevent the repeal of legislation for their benefit. If we attempt to secure legislation to prevent extortionate charges and unjust discriminations by the railroad, the telegraph, and express companies, the friends of the national banks and of tariff protection will come to their relief. Whenever the national banks call for more legislation, or attempt, as they did in 1878, to defeat legislation for the good of the people, the protectionists, the railroad, telegraph, and express companies join hands with them in carrying out their purposes.

Thus we find the class interests of the country and the corporations banded together to promote their own schemes of aggrandizement and wealth, at the expense and to the great injury of the industrial and laboring classes. And when we attempt to reduce the burdens of excessive taxation on imports, the Representatives of the railroads and banks join the protectionists to resist such reduction.

Do Senators think that changing the name of a bureau of information is a sufficient remedy for all this, and that such an act will satisfy the just demands of the people?

The time was in the past history of this country when the public policy was formulated, the laws enacted, and the Executive Departments administered by Democrats.

Then the country was blessed with equal laws and just and honest administration. Then there was no class legislation. Then there were no grinding monopolies. Then there were no lawless trusts to limit production as a means of raising prices on the great staples of the country. Then there were no millionaires. Then every citizen was protected alike, and each interest was left to take care of itself, without special Government aid. Then there was no complaint of class, partial, and unjust legislation. The Government had the confidence and respect of the people. Then every citizen felt a patriotic pride in every portion of the country and in every legitimate interest in it. Then the laws were enacted and the Government administered in the interest of the whole people. Then we had no grange organization. Then we had no farmers' alliances. Then we had no Knights of Labor, no labor organizations, no strikes, no labor riots and destruction of property by men maddened by oppressions and wrongs.

Now, special and privileged classes, monopolies, and trusts struggle for the control of the Government as an instrument to aid them in monopolizing the wealth of the country and in impoverishing and degrading the great mass of the people. Money, selfishness, greed has taken the place of patriotism to a large extent, and as the saddest mark of the decadence of our patriotism, the consequence of the citizen is more frequently determined by the amount of his wealth than by his learning, his talents, or his virtues.

No one can more than myself deplore all this class legislation and all these class organizations. No one but an enemy of the Republic and of popular liberty can desire the continuance of either. I shall labor as faithfully as I can to abolish all class legislation, and I shall do what I can to discourage all class organizations for political purposes.

The Democracy as a party—I do not mean all its members, but the great body of the party—has steadily and on all occasions opposed all class legislation and monopolies. And after the Democrats got the control of the House of Representatives in 1875–'76, and ever since, they have been doing all they could to secure the repeal of such class legislation. In 1878 they, by the aid of some Republicans, secured the repeal of the law for the redemption and cancellation of the legal-tender notes, and preserved to the people about $346,000,000 of those notes as a part of the currency of the country. During the same year, by the like aid, they secured the passage of a law which provided for the coinage of not less than $2,000,000, nor more than $4,000,000 of silver a month. These two acts, due to Democratic policy, restored confidence in business, enabled the Government to resume specie payments, and were the largest factors in securing a return of prosperity after years of bankruptcy and ruin, brought about by the Republican policy of running the Government in the interest of corporations and monopolies.

And under Democratic policy, since the inauguration of President Cleveland, on the 4th of March, 1885, by acts of Congress and by the action of the Secretary of the Interior, 72,591,384 acres of land have been restored to the public domain, which had been claimed by railroad companies, individual entries canceled for fraud, private claims rejected, etc., an amount of land equal in area to the States of Connecticut, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware, and more than one-half of the State of Maryland; and measures are in progress which will probably restore 22,808,927 acres more to the public domain, an amount nearly equal to the area of the State of Indiana. This is a gratifying illustration of the vigilance with which the Democracy guards the public domain for the benefit of actual settlers. And it shows that fraudulent appropriations of the public lands are not tolerated by a Democratic administration.

And during the administration of Mr. Cleveland the civil service has been improved, the expenditures of the Executive Departments reduced, and public confidence in the administration of the Executive Departments restored; and the President has given the country a clean, honest administration.

Congressional abuses and maladministration by the Executive Departments of the Government had become very common and notorious in past years, and the fact that the Democratic party has not yet had control of both branches of Congress and the Executive Departments at any time since the period of the complete ascendency of the Republican party, so as to be able to fully correct the abuses complained of, has caused many people to distrust the fidelity of the Democratic as well as the Republican party to their interest. To this cause is to be attributed the formation of many new political parties during the last ten or fifteen years.

The real significance of the formation of these new parties is that they are so many protests of parts of the American people against the past corrupt legislation of Congress and the maladministration of the Exec-

utive Departments, and because these people failed to understand the relative positions of the Republican and Democratic parties on these questions. If they had understood that the Democratic party—I do not mean every member of it, but the great body of that party—had opposed, as they did, all the vicious and oppressive legislation I have described, and that from the time it got the control of the House of Representatives in 1875-'76 up to this time it has secured the legislation and executive reforms which I have mentioned, and has done all it could, not having in its control all the machinery of Government, to secure other needed reforms in the interest of the people, I do not think these new political parties would have been organized; but I do believe much the greater portion of those who organized them, if they had rightly understood these facts, would have united with the Democracy, and would before this time have aided to put the Democratic party in control of both branches of Congress and of the Executive Departments, and would thus have assisted in securing a Government in the interest of the people, instead of one for the benefit of corporations, monopolies, trusts, protected manufacturers, bankers, and bondholders, and in restoring the Government and people to the condition of equality and contentment which existed for many decades of Democratic rule previous to the late war.

If those forming these new political parties and acting with them now sincerely desire relief and good government, I can not doubt that their true policy would be to disband them and unite with the Democratic party to secure the overthrow of the Republican party, which is responsible for the evils complained of. If they desire the defeat of the Democratic party, by division of its forces, and the re-establishment of the Republican party in power, one of the ways to accomplish that end is to draw as many voters as they can away from that party by the formation of new political parties.

I feel that the line of argument I have been presenting is necessary to a full understanding of the subject before us, and to a proper consideration of the bill and amendments.

In order to determine what is our duty to do in reference to this bill and amendments, we must consider what is needed and what is expected of us.

The agricultural interests of the country have been demanding for years that that great interest should be under the care and supervision of a Cabinet officer and an intellect of the first order.

Mr. GEORGE. Will the Senator allow me to state that several days ago the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the Senate reported a similar bill, which is now on the Calendar awaiting the action of the Senate?

Mr. REAGAN. I was not aware of that.

I will observe here that this morning a bill has been announced to the Senate as having passed the other House for the organization of an executive department of agriculture with a Cabinet officer at its head.

The commercial interests of the country have for several years been making a similar demand in behalf of our immense internal and foreign commerce.

And now there comes before us a bill to organize a department of labor; and no doubt if the laboring people are demanding a department of labor, about which I have no information beyond what is implied from the appearance of such a bill, they too will expect to have a member of the President's Cabinet to supervise and protect their great interests.

Will Congress create an executive department for each of these important interests? If not, will it create such a department for any one of them; and if so, which of them, and shall the others be left unprovided for in this respect?

I do not believe the country is prepared for the creation of three new executive departments, nor do I believe it would sanction the creation of such a department exclusively for the labor interests of the country, great as they are; but I do believe the best interests of the country would be subserved by the creation of one new executive department, under whose control and direction all of these great interests and others should be placed.

And to this end I have, in the absence of my friend the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KENNA], offered a bill prepared by him two or three years back, as a substitute for the bill reported by the committee. The object of this substitute is to secure the establishment of "a department of industries," in which there shall be a division of agriculture, to be superintended by a commissioner of agriculture to be appointed by the President, and to receive a salary of $5,000 a year. The powers conferred and the duties devolved on the proposed division of agriculture will be best understood by my reading the third section of the bill.

Section three is as follows:

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of collecting and disseminating all important and useful information concerning agriculture, and also concerning such scientific matters and industrial pursuits as relate to the interests of agriculture, the secretary of industries shall organize the following bureaus in the division of agriculture, namely:

First. The bureau of agricultural products, which shall include divisions of botany, entomology, and chemistry; and the chief of which bureau, who shall be a practical agriculturist, shall investigate the modes of farming in the several States and Territories, and shall report such practical information as shall tend to increase the profits of the farmer respecting the various methods; the crops most profitable in the several sections; the preferable varieties of seeds, vines, plants, and fruits; fertilizers; implements; buildings; and similar matters.

Second. The Bureau of Animal Industry, to be in charge of a competent veterinary surgeon, who shall investigate and report upon the number, value, and condition of the domestic animals of the United States; their protection, growth, and use; the causes, prevention, or cure of contagious, communicable, or other diseases; and the kinds, mees, or breeds best adapted to the several sections for profitable raising.

Third. The bureau of lands, the chief of which shall investigate and report upon the resources or capabilities of the public or other lands for farming, stock-raising, timber, manufacturing, mining, or other industrial uses. And all powers and duties vested in the commission now known as the Geological Survey, together with all clerks, employés, and agents, and all instruments, records, books, papers, and so forth, are hereby transferred to the department of industries. And the secretary of industries shall institute such investigations and collect and report such information, facts, and statistics relative to the mines and mining of the United States, and facilities for their ventilation and general operation as may be deemed of value and importance.

Section 4 of this substitute provides for the transfer of the Bureau of Statistics from the Treasury Department to the proposed department of industries. And it somewhat enlarges the duties of that bureau. It is as follows:

SEC. 4. That, in addition to the duties imposed by chapter 10, Title VII of the Revised Statutes, the secretary of industries shall cause to be collected and report the agricultural statistics of the United States; and, in addition, all important information or statistics relating to industrial education and agricultural colleges; to markets and prices; to modes and cost of transporting agricultural products and live-stock to their final market; to the demand, supply, and prices in foreign markets; to the location, number, and products of manufacturing establishments of whatever sort, their sources of raw material, methods, markets, cost of transportation, and prices; to such commercial or other conditions as may affect the market value of farm products or the interests of the industrial classes of the United States. And the secretary is hereby authorized to establish such divisions in this bureau, and to make such monthly or other reports as he shall deem most effective for the prompt dissemination of such reliable information respecting crops and domestic and foreign markets as will be of service to the farmers, miners, mechanics, laborers, or other industrialists of the United States.

For a full understanding of this section chapter 10 of Title VII of the Revised Statutes should be read.

The fifth section of this substitute provides for the transfer of the Bureau of Labor from the Department of the Interior to the proposed department of industries. The duties of this bureau are prescribed by the "act to establish a bureau of labor," of June 27, 1884 (Laws, volume 23, page 60), with some enlargement of the force of the office and of its duties as prescribed by the act of Congress of July 31, 1886 (Laws, volume 24, page 202), making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ended June 30, 1887, and as prescribed by the act of March 3, 1887 (Laws, volume 24, page 625), making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the year ending June 30, 1888.

If it is thought necessary to confer additional powers on this bureau, that can be done by amending the substitute bill if adopted. The sixth section of the substitute which I offer provides for the establishment of a division of commerce in the department of industries, to be under the superintendence of a commissioner of commerce, to be appointed by the President, who is to receive a salary of $5,000 a year. That section is as follows:

SEC. 6. That there shall be in the department of industries a division of commerce, and to superintend said division a commissioner of commerce, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a salary of $5,000 per annum.

Sections 7 and 8 of the substitute provide for the transfer of a number of the bureaus now in the Treasury Department to the proposed department of industries, and are as follows:

SEC. 7. That all divisions and subdivisions, bureaus or parts thereof, heretofore attaching to the Treasury Department by virtue of the provisions of chapter 10 of Title VII of the Revised Statutes, relating to the Bureau of Statistics, which shall hereafter be known as the bureau of external commerce; Title XLVIII, relating to commerce and navigation; Title XLIX, relating to the regulation of vessels in foreign commerce; Title L, relating to the regulation of vessels in domestic commerce; Title LII, relating to the regulation of steam-vessels; Title LVI, relating to the Coast Survey; Title LV, relating to lights and buoys; sections 4801, 4802, 4803, 4804, 4805, and 4806, of chapter 1, Title LIX, relating to hospital relief for seamen; and chapter 265 of the acts of the Forty-fifth Congress, second session, relating to the Life-Saving Service, or by virtue of any law amendatory of said several provisions or regulations in pursuance thereof, shall, from and after the passage of this act, be parts of the division of commerce in the department of industries; and the secretary of industries shall establish in said division of commerce a bureau of internal commerce, to be organized and governed as other bureaus in said division.

Section 8 provides—

That all duties involving upon the Secretary of the Treasury by virtue of the several provisions mentioned in the preceding section shall, from and after the passage of this act, be performed by the secretary of industries. The authority conferred and the duties imposed by said several provisions upon the Register of the Treasury shall, from and after the passage of this act, be exercised and discharged by the commissioner of commerce. All bonds authorized by any of the provisions aforesaid to be made payable to the Register of the Treasury shall, from and after the passage of this act, be made payable to the commissioner of commerce.

Then the ninth section of the bill provides—

That section 158, Title IV, of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the words: "Eighth. The department of industries."

Which is to make the eighth Cabinet officer.

All who are at all familiar with the business of the Treasury Department will recognize the fact that those duties which appertain exclusively to the finances of the country are sufficient to give full em-

ployment to any person who may fill the office of Secretary, however great his abilities; and that the transfer of the bureaus named in section 7 to the department of industries would be a necessary relief to him, while it would give the interests which come under the control of those bureaus a chance for the advantage of the supervision of an officer of first-class ability and a member of the Cabinet of the President. As it is now, any one who will consult the Secretary of the Treasury will find that it is physically impossible for him to give personal attention to any great extent to the business of these bureaus; and that the duties pertaining to them have to be left largely to the discretion of the chiefs of these several bureaus.

The ninth section of this substitute provides that the secretary of industries shall be a Cabinet officer.

This substitute would marshal together in one department the great industrial interests of the country, would place them under the supervision of a member of the President's Cabinet, and would secure to these industries and to the public all the advantages which can at present reasonably be desired, and would at the same time reduce considerably the onerous duties now imposed on the Secretary of the Treasury and on the Secretary of the Interior.

It would give to the agriculture, the labor, and the commerce of the country some real advantages they do not now possess; and it would tend to prevent the further annual appeals of those seeking popularity at the expense of principle, for the support of others whose highest idea of statesmanship is the supposed promotion of class interests at the expense of others. I propose this substitute not because I am opposed to so much of the purpose of the committee's bill as looks to the promotion of the welfare of the laboring classes of people, but because by the adoption of this substitute, while preserving all the interests of labor, we will promote the welfare of all the productive occupations of the country and satisfy the reasonable demand of those engaged in agriculture and commerce, as well as really benefit labor. Whatever the legislation of Congress can properly do to secure profit and honor to honest toil shall have my cordial support. But when labor asks for bread I will not consent to give it a stone like the bill before us.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask for a vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands the Senator from Texas to propose an amendment.

Mr. REAGAN. I move to strike out all after the enacting clause of the bill and to insert what I send to the desk, and if that shall be adopted I shall afterwards ask to change the title of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That there shall be at the seat of Government an executive department to be known as the department of industries, and a secretary of industries, who shall be the head thereof.

SEC. 2. That there shall be in the department of industries a division of agriculture, and to superintend said division a commissioner of agriculture, who shall be a practical agriculturist, and who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and who shall be entitled to receive a salary of $5,000 per annum.

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of collecting and disseminating all important and useful information concerning agriculture, and also concerning such scientific matters and industrial pursuits as relate to the interests of agriculture, the secretary of industries shall organize the following bureaus in the division of agriculture, namely:

First. The bureau of agricultural products, which shall include divisions of botany, entomology, and chemistry, and the chief of which bureau, who shall be a practical agriculturist, shall investigate the modes of farming in the several States and Territories, and shall report such practical information as shall tend to increase the profits of the farmer respecting the various methods; the crops most profitable in the several sections; the preferable varieties of seeds, vines, plants, and fruits; fertilizers; implements; buildings; and similar matters.

Second. The Bureau of Animal Industry, to be in charge of a competent veterinary surgeon, who shall investigate and report upon the number, value, and condition of the domestic animals of the United States; their protection, growth, and use; the causes, prevention, or cure of contagious, communicable, or other diseases; and the kinds, races, or breeds best adapted to the several sections for profitable raising.

Third. The bureau of lands, the chief of which shall investigate and report upon the resources or capabilities of the public or other lands for farming, stock-raising, timber, manufacturing, mining, or other industrial uses. And all powers and duties vested in the commission now known as the Geological Survey, together with all clerks, employés, and agents, and all instruments, records, books, papers, etc., are hereby transferred to the department of industries. And the secretary of industries shall institute such investigations and collect and report such information, facts, and statistics relative to the mines and mining of the United States, and facilities for their ventilation and general operation, as may be deemed of value and importance.

SEC. 4. That in addition to the duties imposed by chapter 10, Title VII, of the Revised Statutes, the secretary of industries shall cause to be collected and report the agricultural statistics of the United States; and, in addition, all important information or statistics relating to industrial education and agricultural colleges; to markets and prices; to modes and cost of transporting agricultural products and live-stock to their final market; to the demand, supply, and prices in foreign markets; to the location, number, and products of manufacturing establishments of whatever sort, their sources of raw material, methods, markets, cost of transportation, and prices; to such commercial or other conditions as may affect the market value of farm products or the interests of the industrial classes of the United States. And the secretary is hereby authorized to establish such divisions in this bureau, and to make such monthly or other reports as he shall deem most effective for the prompt dissemination of such reliable information respecting crops and domestic and foreign markets, as will be of service to the farmers, miners, mechanics, laborers, or other industrialists of the United States.

SEC. 5. That there shall be in the department of industries a division of labor, which shall be under the superintendence of the Commissioner of Labor; and the Bureau of Labor, as provided for in chapter 127 of the acts of the Forty-eighth Congress, with its officers and duties, shall be transferred from the Department of the Interior to the department of industries.

SEC. 6. That there shall be in the department of industries a division of commerce, and to superintend said division a commissioner of commerce, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, and shall receive a salary of $5,000 per annum.

SEC. 7. That all divisions and subdivisions, bureaus or parts thereof, heretofore attaching to the Treasury Department by virtue of the provisions of chapter 10, of Title VII, of the Revised Statutes, relating to the Bureau of Statistics, which shall hereafter be known as the bureau of external commerce; Title XLVIII, relating to commerce and navigation; Title XLIX, relating to the regulation of vessels in foreign commerce; Title L, relating to the regulation of vessels in domestic commerce; Title LII, relating to the regulation of steam-vessels; Title LVI, relating to the Coast Survey; Title LV, relating to lights and buoys; sections 4801, 4802, 4803, 4804, 4805, and 4806, of chapter 1, Title LIX, relating to hospital relief for seamen; and chapter 265 of the acts of the Forty-fifth Congress, second session, relating to the Life-Saving Service, or by virtue of any law amendatory of said several provisions, or regulations in pursuance thereof, shall, from and after the passage of this act, be parts of the division of commerce in the Department of industries; and the secretary of industries shall establish in said division of commerce a bureau of internal commerce, to be organized and governed as other bureaus in said division.

SEC. 8. That all duties devolving upon the Secretary of the Treasury by virtue of the several provisions mentioned in the preceding section shall, from and after the passage of this act, be performed by the secretary of industries. The authority conferred and the duties imposed by said several provisions upon the Register of the Treasury shall, from and after the passage of this act, be exercised and discharged by the commissioner of commerce. All bonds authorized by any of the provisions aforesaid to be made payable to the Register of the Treasury shall, from and after the passage of this act, be made payable to the commissioner of commerce.

SEC. 9. That section 158, Title IV, of the Revised Statutes is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the words: "Eighth. The department of industries."

SEC. 10. That this act shall not be construed to interfere with the present organization of the various Departments, divisions, subdivisions, and bureaus embraced herein, except with reference to the transfer thereof to the department of industries, subject to the general provisions of law relating to regulations in the various Departments of the Government and appointments to office therein.

SEC. 11. That all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN].

Mr. BLAIR. I merely wish to say that this is a substitute for the bill, very much larger in its scope than the bill, and I hope it will not be adopted.

Mr. REAGAN. I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask that the amendment be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be again read.

Mr. BLAIR. The amendment is very long. It has just been read. It is an amendment proposing to establish a department of industry, including agriculture, labor, commerce, and all that.

Mr. MANDERSON. A substitute for the present bill?

Mr. BLAIR. It is moved as a substitute for the present bill.

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not care about the reading of it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The roll-call will proceed.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. COLQUITT (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. CHACE].

Mr. PADDOCK (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS].

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Maryland [Mr. WILSON]. I do not know how he would vote if present, and therefore I withhold my vote.

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. SPOONER. The absence of my colleague [Mr. SAWYER] from the Chamber is caused by the death of his wife, and will continue perhaps for a week or ten days. During his absence he is paired with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. BERRY. I am paired with the Senator from Colorado [Mr. BOWEN].

Mr. BROWN. I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. VEST. Has the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] voted?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. He has not responded to his name.

Mr. VEST (after having voted in the affirmative). I withdraw my vote. I am paired with the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MANDERSON (after having voted in the affirmative). When I voted I did not notice the absence from the Chamber of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN], and therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. BATE. My colleague [Mr. HARRIS] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 27; as follows:

YEAS—9.

Bate,	Daniel,	Hampton,	Pugh,
Beck,	Gray,	Morgan,	Reagan.
Coke,			

NAYS—27.

Aldrich,	Farwell,	Jones of Arkansas,	Sherman,
Blair,	Faulkner,	Mitchell,	Spooner,
Chandler,	Frye,	Palmer,	Stockbridge,
Cullom,	George,	Pasco,	Teller,
Dawes,	Hale,	Payne,	Turpie,
Edmunds,	Hiscock,	Platt,	Walthall.
Evarts,	Hoar,	Quay,	

ABSENT—40.

Allison,	Cockrell,	Ingalls,	Sabin,
Berry,	Colquitt,	Jones of Nevada,	Saulsbury,
Blackburn,	Davis,	Kenna,	Sawyer,
Blodgett,	Dolph,	McPherson,	Stanford,
Bowen,	Eustis,	Manderson,	Stewart,
Brown,	Gibson,	Morrill,	Vance,
Butler,	Gorman,	Paddock,	Vest,
Call,	Harris,	Plumb,	Voorhees,
Cameron,	Hawley,	Ransom,	Wilson of Iowa,
Chace,	Hearst,	Riddleberger,	Wilson of Md.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. No quorum having voted, the Secretary will call the roll of the Senate.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. REAGAN. As the sense of the Senate is manifestly opposed to the amendment, I do not think it worth while to have further delay, and I withdraw it.

Mr. EDMUNDS. We have no quorum.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Nothing can be done until the presence of a quorum is ascertained.

The roll-call was continued, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich,	Colquitt,	Hawley,	Platt,
Allison,	Cullom,	Hiscock,	Pugh,
Bate,	Dawes,	Hoar,	Quay,
Beck,	Edmunds,	Ingalls,	Reagan,
Berry,	Evarts,	Jones of Arkansas,	Saulsbury,
Blackburn,	Farwell,	Manderson,	Sherman,
Blair,	Faulkner,	Mitchell,	Spooner,
Blodgett,	Frye,	Morgan,	Teller,
Brown,	George,	Paddock,	Turpie,
Chandler,	Gray,	Palmer,	Vest,
Cockrell,	Hale,	Pasco,	Walthall,
Coke,	Hampton,	Payne,	Wilson of Iowa.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Forty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum being present, the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] asks unanimous consent, the yeas and nays having been ordered, to withdraw his amendment. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. EDMUNDS. On page 4 of the bill, section 7, line 15, I move to strike out the word "tariff" and insert "customs laws." There is no such word as "tariff" known to our legislation.

Mr. BLAIR. Unless that is a vital thing to do I hope the Senator will not press the amendment. It will cause a sending back of the bill to the other House, and I think the meaning of the bill is quite apparent without making the change. I hope the Senator will not insist on the amendment.

Mr. EDMUNDS. There is no such thing known in the laws of the United States as a tariff, but I would say to my friend from New Hampshire as a mere question of taste, this being a House bill, if there were no other amendment needed I would not insist on this; but if my friend looks down two or three or four or five lines beyond, he will find that the question of trusts as it is there is rather—I will not say industriously and purposely—put in a way which narrows the inquiry into the combinations of capital, business, and labor, etc., so as to make it entirely one-sided and ineffectual. If the bill is to go so as to really mean something—and I hope it is intended to mean something—it must be amended; otherwise this commission or department of labor or industry, or whatever it is called, will find itself limited in its jurisdiction in a way that will not enable it to get at the truth. So I propose to amend the bill, when we get down to the next part of it, so as to cover all combinations of capital, of business operations, and of labor, so as to give this department the power to make a complete investigation of the whole subject. The word "trusts," I should have said, is so used in the bill as to be a device to leave everybody out who does not go under the name of a trust.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS], in section 7, line 15, to strike out "tariff" and insert "customs laws."

Mr. BLAIR. I make no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Now I move to amend, in line 19 of the same section, after the word "trusts" where it first occurs, by inserting the words:

Or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated from the desk.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 19 of section 7, after the first word "trusts," it is proposed to insert the words:

Or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor.

So as to read:

And what articles are now controlled by trusts, or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor, and what effect, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I now move to amend by adding, after the word "trusts" where it occurs the second time, in line 19, the words:

Or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor.

So as to read:

And what effect said trusts or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor have had on limiting production and keeping up prices.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the amendment will be agreed to.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. I object to it. I do not want to offer any factious opposition; but I put in a caveat against a paragraph in the law using the words "business operations." I do mean to say that this is beyond what I expected to come from the State of Vermont.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will put the question on the amendment of the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move, in line 18, of the same section, to strike out the word "now," so as to give this commissioner the power to make an inquiry that is not limited to what has taken place before the passage of this law, but is a general power so long as the law stands.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated from the desk.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 18 of section 7, before the word "controlled," it is proposed to strike out "now;" so as to read:

And what articles are controlled by trusts or other combinations, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move, in line 19, with the same purpose, to strike out the word "had" after the word "have."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 19 of section 7, after the word "have," it is proposed to strike out the word "had;" so as to read:

And what effect said trusts or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor have on limiting production and keeping up prices.

Mr. HOAR. I think the amendment of the Senator from Vermont being made, there should be stricken out of the nineteenth line the words "limiting" and "keeping up," so that the report of the commissioner shall be as to the general effect on prices and on production, whether limiting or increasing. In a case where the commissioner finds that what is known by rather a cant name as an improper and selfish combination intended to secure an artificial and injurious effect, a monopolizing effect, has succeeded in its object, it would be well enough to imply that the effect would be to raise prices; but when you extend it to all combinations of capital, a great many of which are harmless, it would seem hardly fair that if the investigation shows that such an arrangement, as for example, a joint stock company, does result in reducing prices that he should not be at liberty to make the fact known. We want the fact whatever it is. So I move to strike out, in line 19 of section 7, the word "limiting," and the words "keeping up" in line 20; so as to make the language:

And what effects said trusts or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor have on production and prices.

Mr. EDMUNDS. The suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts is entirely correct, and I agree with it in every respect; and if he had not made the suggestion I should have moved next to strike out the words "limiting production and keeping up," and insert "in respect of."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The first question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Vermont, which has just been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Now I move, with the consent of my friend from Massachusetts and on his suggestion, to strike out the words beginning in line 19, "limiting production and keeping up," and insert "on production and;" so as to read:

And what effect said trusts or other combinations of capital, business operations, or labor have on production and prices.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment just moved by the Senator from Vermont.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TURPIE. I offer the following amendment to the pending bill as a new section:

SEC. —. It shall be the duty of the commissioner annually to compile from the best and most authentic sources and to prepare and publish a book, to be called the "Register of Labor," to be of the size of the Army and Navy Register combined, to contain the names and address, selected and alphabetically arranged with reference to occupation, of persons of known excellence in the vicinity in any line of skilled labor or mechanism, the names to be taken in proportion to population from the different States and Territories and District of the Union, said register to contain only the names of persons actually engaged in the manual work of their respective callings. The list to be carefully revised each year; no name to be dropped from the register as long as the person is known to be engaged as above provided; loss in the list by death or other causes to be replaced by other names taken from the same locality. The number of said books published for the use of Congress to be twice the number authorized to be published of the Army and Navy Register in any year. The expenses of said publication to be ascertained and certified by the commissioner, and paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. President, in relation to the amendment I have offered I desire to submit a few observations. I should like to know of what great practical use is it that there is given the information, which is being published year after year at the public expense and furnished to the members of the National Legislature and to others, that Andrew Jackson Jones, or Robinson is second lieutenant in the Army or assistant surgeon in the Navy? Nevertheless there is a certain demand for this kind of information. In the first place, those engaged in the Army and Navy use these books, and then there are others who use them for the purpose of forming a general acquaintance with naval or army

affairs, and there are others who have relatives or friends in the service who use the book occasionally for the purpose of learning their whereabouts; and once in a while they are consulted and perhaps even read by the general reader. I think this demand for the Army and Navy Register is entirely normal and natural. It is certainly not excited by any artifice of puffing or of advertisement.

Mr. HOAR. I wish the Senator from Indiana, before he proceeds, would allow his amendment to be read from the Secretary's desk. I was not able to catch it from his reading.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be read, if there be no objection.

The Secretary read the amendment.

Mr. TURPIE. I was remarking that the demand for the Register of the Army and Navy was perfectly natural; at least it is not excited by any artifice of puffing or literary advertisement. In the numerous book notices and articles of literary criticism I have seen no line of praise or censure concerning the Army or Navy Register. Its perusal is confined, nevertheless, to a limited circle of readers.

I am not objecting to that class of books as at present ordered and allowed by law; but the claim, however, is that the publication authorized by this amendment would be of a much more practical character and would insure the attention of a much more numerous class of readers. As for instance, in regard to skilled laborers, persons who have a desire to keep up an acquaintance with them, the persons who have friends and relatives engaged in the same, and the general reader who may take or have some concern in the useful arts—all these would make a very much larger number of readers or of those who might have occasion to use by way of reference such books than can possibly be found for the Register of the Army or Navy.

The Army and Navy Registers do not contain the names of all those engaged in the military and naval service of the United States. They contain only a very small minority of the persons so engaged; only those thought to be worthy of such notice and recognition. In the same way the register of labor would not contain the names of all the persons who are engaged even in skilled labor, even in works of mechanism, but it would be a representation of that element, as the Army and Navy Registers are of the military and naval elements in the country.

The register of labor would be a public representation of all those who are so engaged, of the numberless legions and divisions of labor, in the presence of whose mighty achievements the proudest exploits of the sword pale their ineffectual fires. It would be a representation of that vast constituency composing the republic of the arts, a commonwealth whose boundaries transcend the limits of race, of language, of nationality, which girds the whole world of civilization in its kindly grasp. It is on account of such a representation, especially in a Government like ours, really democratic in its origin, republican in its teachings and traditions, that even what little may be done by the aggrandizement of this great element will be to ourselves as legislators becoming, to the persons so noticed grateful, to the whole mass of the people advantageous, profitable.

Such a list would enable a person wishing himself to engage or to employ others in mechanism, in skilled work in the structure of any kind of edifice, aqueduct, bridge, or artificial way, in the use or preparation of any material or machinery, to consult it first hand with those experienced in and acquainted with such work, as with their daily cares and toil. It would not be an advertisement of a magnificent incorporated association; it would not be a census containing the names of all those engaged in any particular industry; it would not be a directory containing the names of all those engaged in handicrafts in a particular locality; but it would be a list of notables, a list of actual workers near the sources of thought and of action that keep the frame and form of society in motion from day to day.

I know a certain artificer in wood, a poor, plain man, a carver working from day to day, a carver rich in device, of most shrewd and excellent fancy. I know him only by accident. He is totally unknown outside of the establishment in which he is employed, hardly known in the street in which he lives. The name of such a man should find its place on this record, with profit thereby to himself and others.

I do not speak now of the artist, nor of the discoverer, nor of the inventor. I speak of the workman who excels in well-known methods. Centuries ago we might go and see the artisan at work in his own shop. The most renowned smiths in silver, in gold, in iron, the most celebrated weaver or spinner in the textiles, in wool, in linen; we might notice them handling their material, see the eyes with which they watched, and the deft fingers with which they touched this material growing into forms of beauty before us. We can do so now no longer. Such a man now is hidden away in the recesses of a factory of some vast corporation. Of course he is highly prized by those who employ him, and he may be known to a very few intimate personal acquaintances and associates, but his excellence as an artisan, the fact that he excels as a worker, his name, fame, and identity are utterly lost and destroyed in that of the establishment in which he labors.

It is to bring out such a man individually and to rescue the man himself from this obscurity and give him some little prominence that this register will be useful. Perhaps the name of such a man on this register would do him no particular honor, but the publication of such names might be beneficial, and no better motive could move a legislative body. We have ourselves put in such a category as Senators or Members of the House of Representatives in the Congressional Directory, and is there not as much reason why publicity should be given in the one case as in the other?

It may be answered that if a person either wished to engage himself or to employ others in some skilled work of mechanism he might go to a friend who had some similar work or acquaintance with such a class, or if he had no near neighbors he might write to a city or a town where there were such and get the information. He might write to the postmaster of the town. Very truly, he might; and allow me to say that a person in this humor, whether the man of whom I speak or the gentlemen around him to whom I alluded, writing to learn about a second lieutenant in the Fifth Regiment of the Regular Cavalry, if there be such a regiment, might write to the Secretary of War to learn whether such a person was in the service, and if so what his rank was and what his present locality.

Would that be assigned by any one here as a reason for doing away with the Army or the Navy Register? What, I should like to inquire, would be the fate of any one who should propose, not to prohibit, but even here seriously to diminish the number of those valuable books now published by Congress? There would be an instant remonstrance from the commander-in-chief down to the lowest subaltern in the rank and file.

I do not object, as I said before, to those books already authorized, nor to the expenditure occasioned by them. but I do insist that the publications named in this amendment would be quite as worthy of the public expenditure as those now made.

It is true mistakes might occur in this register as in other registers, but allow me to say that the whole registry list would be submitted to the criticism of a thousand eyes, and that the real workers, the mass of workmen in this country, are chivalrous in their nature, willing to do homage to truth, hating above everything sham and imposition, and it would not be long before the register would become known as the select list, as the correct category of workers and laborers worthy of their fame and of their high position.

Only the first publication of it would be very laborious or expensive. Revisions afterwards would not be so, and mistakes in it could be corrected without the delay or the expense of a court of inquiry or a court-martial.

I think such a register would be of very valuable assistance to the proposed business of this new department in the performance of their functions. We must have information in order to have intelligent legislation, and this list of names would place the department itself in communication with a large number of persons nearly and personally interested in the success of their work, and it would also afford a field and scope for correspondence between these workers themselves, both of which ends and purposes are certainly worthy of the consideration of the National Legislature.

I favor the passage of this bill, and I trust that the amendment or some similar provision to the one now offered will prevail.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE].

Mr. EDMUNDS. There is a good deal that is valuable in the amendment of the Senator from Indiana; but I think as it stands it is inadequate to the purpose he has in view; for instance, in respect of publication. It leaves an unlimited capacity on the part of the Commissioner of Labor to publish a million copies, if he wishes to do so. I do not think that the arrangement of the list of persons named therein is such as to define the extent to which it may go, etc.

I should hope that the amendment might be printed and the bill go over until to-morrow, so that we may be able to see precisely what it is and make such suggestions of improvement as might be thought wise at that time. I therefore suggest to the Senator in charge of the bill to let it go over.

Mr. BLAIR. I suppose that this is a facetious amendment, and I have not the slightest idea that the Senator from Indiana was indulging in making anything but a very sharp specimen of ridicule of the Army and Navy Register. If he is in earnest, that is another question; but if the Senator from Indiana is in earnest, or if the Senator from Vermont is in earnest in undertaking to perfect it, I do not see how it is possible to make out a register of the laborers of the country when the choice of names will be affected by any tribunal whose decision would be likely to be satisfactory or whose decision would be in any way made more satisfactory by the subsequent formal revision to which the Senator alludes.

Such a measure as this, if it were to be adopted, I think ought to make its appearance here in the form of a separate bill, and it would require much consideration to put it in such a form as to be satisfactory to anybody. If properly limited and the selections made by competent tribunals, I can conceive that such a register would be of great value, and that to be upon its pages might be an immortal honor.

I do not object, I should not think of objecting, to any development of the idea, provided that development be made adequately, with suf-

ficient consideration, but I hope the Senator from Indiana will not insist upon its being made a part of this bill, which is simply designed to facilitate the operations of the existing bureau somewhat, which finds itself considerably fettered by its present limitations, requiring some addition to its working force and greater convenience and freedom in the movement or action of its internal machinery.

If the Senator from Indiana is in earnest and desires to press the amendment as an amendment to this bill, that is another thing; but as a friend of the measure and in the hope that we may get some legislation, I should be very glad if the bill might not be embarrassed with additional amendments. The verbal changes which have been made on the suggestions of the Senators from Vermont and Massachusetts will of course compel the bill to be returned to the other House, which I regret, because I do not consider those changes of much importance any way; but at the same time, being merely verbal amendments, I think they would be agreed to by the other House without much ceremony and would not require debate. But I think an amendment like the one suggested by the Senator from Indiana would be likely to lead to debate and it might lead to the defeat of the bill *in toto*, as the session is approaching its close, or if not its close, it is of course becoming full of other important measures awaiting and demanding consideration. Does the Senator from Indiana desire to insist upon this as an amendment to the pending bill?

Mr. TURPIE. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana offered the amendment. He desires to insist upon it in no other way.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Indiana.

The amendment was rejected.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BLAIR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments and ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. BLAIR, Mr. WILSON of Iowa, and Mr. GEORGE were appointed.

POTEAU RIVER BRIDGE, IN ARKANSAS.

On motion of Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, it was

Resolved, That the House of Representatives be requested to return to the Senate Senate bill 1948, to provide for the building of a bridge across the Poteau River, in the Indian Territory.

CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that to-morrow the Calendar be proceeded with under the rule we have been acting upon for the last few days, subject to executive business or privileged business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent that to-morrow, at the close of the routine morning business, the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII be resumed. Is there objection?

Mr. HARRIS. And continued during the day.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. And continued during the day.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Subject to executive matters.

Mr. SHERMAN. Subject to a motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business, as in other cases.

Mr. HARRIS. Subject to all the provisions of Rule VIII.

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (H. R. 314) authorizing the Secretary of War to place the name of James L. Henderson on the roll of Company B, Sixteenth Kentucky Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 335) granting a pension to General W. E. Woodruff;

A bill (H. R. 1540) to establish a port of delivery at Grand Rapids, Mich.;

A bill (H. R. 2161) for the relief of Thomas J. Taylor;

A bill (H. R. 6098) authorizing the construction and repair of the roads from the entrance to the reservation of the Presidio at San Francisco, Cal., to the national cemetery on the same, and the fencing and protection of the said reservation and the cemetery thereon; and

A bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Abial G. Chamberlain.

BRIDGE AT NEBRASKA CITY.

Mr. PADDOCK. The Senate this morning took up the bill (S. 2674) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Nebraska City, Nebr., and for other purposes, and proceeded to its consideration. The bill was read at length and was laid aside temporarily because the printed amendments proposed by the Committee on Commerce were not in the possession of the Senate. They are now in the hands of the clerks, and I should be glad if those amendments could be considered and the bill disposed of.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendments of the Committee on Commerce will be stated in their order.

The first amendment of the Committee on Commerce was, in section 2, line 17, after the word "*Provided*," to strike out:

That if the said bridge shall be made with unbroken and continuous spans, it shall have three or more channel spans, and shall not be of less elevation in any case than 50 feet above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, to the bottom chord of the bridge, nor shall the spans of said bridge be less than 300 feet in length, and the piers of said bridge shall be parallel with the current of said river, and the main span shall be over the main channel of the said river and not less than 300 feet in length: *And provided also*, That if any bridge built under this act shall be constructed as a drawbridge, the same shall be constructed as a pivot drawbridge, with a draw over the main channel of the river at an accessible and navigable point, and with spans not less than 160 feet in length in the clear on each side of the central or pivot pier of the draw, and the next adjoining span or spans to the draw shall not be less than 300 feet, and the head-room under such span shall not be less than 10 feet above high-water mark: *And provided also*, That said draw shall be opened promptly upon reasonable signal for the passing of boats.

And to insert in lieu thereof:

That the said bridge shall be built as a high bridge with unbroken and continuous spans, having at least one channel-span of not less than 400 feet clear channel-way, all other spans over the water way to have a clear channel-way of not less than 300 feet, and all spans shall have a clear head-room of not less than 50 feet above high-water mark, and the piers of said bridge shall be parallel with the current of said river and the bridge itself at right angles thereto, and no riprapping or other protection for imperfect foundations which will lessen the required water way shall be permitted.

Mr. PADDOCK. I desire simply to state that this amendment is made on the recommendation of the Chief of Engineers, who objected to a low bridge. In the face of that objection I see no propriety in undertaking to have his recommendation set aside. Therefore I assent to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, line 17, after the word "in," to strike out "which" and insert "whose jurisdiction;" so as to read:

And in case of any litigation arising from any obstruction or alleged obstruction to the free navigation of said river caused or alleged to be caused by said bridge, the case may be brought in the circuit court of the United States for the State of Nebraska or the State of Iowa in whose jurisdiction any portion of said obstruction or bridge may be located.

Mr. FRYE. These are committee amendments?

Mr. PADDOCK. They are.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert, after section 5, a new section, as follows:

SEC. 6. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date thereof.

Mr. PADDOCK. In line 3, after the word "within," I move to strike out "one year" and insert "two years;" and in the same line, before the word "years," to strike out "three" and insert "four;" so as to read:

Commenced within two years and completed within four years.

This amendment I move with the assent of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move to amend section 6—the "6" being stricken out, so that it is "7" as it now stands—by striking out all after the word "act," in line 2. The present statement of that section is that "Congress shall have power at any time to alter, amend, or repeal this act, so as to prevent or remove all material and substantial obstructions," etc. I wish to leave it as we do in all these acts, an absolute power in Congress to control the whole matter.

Mr. PADDOCK. That is perfectly satisfactory.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The part proposed to be stricken out will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section [6] 7, line 2, after the word "act," it is proposed to strike out the words:

So as to prevent or remove all material and substantial obstructions to the navigation of said river by the construction of said bridge and its necessary works; and the expense of altering said bridge or removing such obstructions shall be at the expense of the owners of or persons controlling said bridge.

So that when amended the section will read:

That Congress shall have power at any time to alter, amend, or repeal this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I now move to amend by inserting at the end of section 3 part of the words that were stricken out on my motion just now, so that if the act is not entirely repealed and the change is necessary it will be at the expense of the company. I move, therefore, to add, as a new paragraph, at the end of section 3 as it stands in the bill, these words:

And the expense of altering said bridge or removing any obstructions to navigation in respect thereof shall be paid by the owners of or persons controlling said bridge.

That is to be a separate paragraph at the end of the section, as a part of it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH YANKTON RESERVATION.

Mr. TELLER. I ask the Senate to take up Senate bill 2315. It will create no discussion.

By unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2315) granting the right of way to the Yankton and Missouri Valley Railway Company through the Yankton Indian reservation, in Dakota.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 2, after the word "reservation," in line 20, to insert the words:

Or, in case they shall have ceased to occupy the same, to the United States: *And provided further*, That before any such lands shall be taken for the purposes aforesaid the consent of the Indians thereto shall be obtained in a manner satisfactory to the President of the United States.

So as to make the proviso read:

Provided further, That no part of the lands herein authorized to be taken shall be leased or sold by the company, its successors, or assigns, and they shall not be used except in such manner and for such purposes only as shall be necessary for the construction and convenient operation of said railroad, telegraph, and telephone lines; and when any portion thereof shall cease to be so used such portion shall revert to the Indians of said reservation, or, in case they shall have ceased to occupy the same, to the United States: *And provided further*, That before any such lands shall be taken for the purposes aforesaid the consent of the Indians thereto shall be obtained in a manner satisfactory to the President of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, after the word "railway," in line 6, to strike out the following words:

In case of failure to make amicable settlement with any occupant, such compensation shall be determined, "according to the laws of said Territory providing for determining the damage when property is taken for railroad purposes," by the appraisement of three disinterested referees, to be appointed, one (who shall act as chairman) by the President, one by the chiefs of the said Indians, and one by said railroad company, who, before entering upon the duties of their appointment, shall take and subscribe, before a judge or clerk of a court of record in said Territory or United States commissioner, an oath that they will faithfully and impartially discharge the duties of their appointment, which oath, duly certified, shall be returned with their award to and filed with the Secretary of the Interior within sixty days from the completion thereof; and a majority of said referees shall be competent to act in case of the absence of a member, after due notice. And upon the failure of either party to make such appointment within thirty days after the appointment made by the President, the vacancy shall be filled by the judge of the second judicial district of said Territory, upon the application of the other party. The chairman of said board shall appoint the time and place for all hearings, at some place in or convenient to said reservation. Each of said referees shall receive for his services the sum of $4 per day for each day they are engaged in the trial of any case submitted to them under this act, with mileage at 5 cents per mile. Witnesses shall receive the usual fees allowed by the laws of said Territory. Costs, including compensation of the referees, shall be made a part of the award, and be paid by such railroad company. In case the referees can not agree, then any two of them are authorized to make the award. Either party being dissatisfied with the finding of the referees shall have the right, within ninety days after the making of the award and notice of the same, to appeal by original petition to the district court held at Yankton, Dak., which court shall have jurisdiction to hear and determine the subject-matter of said petition according to the laws of said Territory provided for determining the damage when property is taken for railroad purposes. If upon the hearing of said appeal the judgment of the court shall be for a larger sum than the award of the referees, the costs of said appeal shall be adjudged against the railroad company. If the judgment of the court shall be for the same sum as the award of the referees, then the costs shall be adjudged against the appellant. If the judgment of the court shall be for a smaller sum than the award of the referees, then the costs shall be against the party claiming damages. When proceedings have been commenced in court the railway company shall pay double the amount of the award into court to abide the judgment thereof, and then have the right to enter upon the property sought to be condemned and proceed with the construction of the railroad.

And insert in lieu thereof:

The amount of such compensation to be ascertained and determined in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may direct, and to be subject to his final approval.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 6, in the following words:

SEC. 6. That said company shall cause maps showing the route of its located line through said reservation to be filed in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, and also to be filed in the office of the agent of said Indians; and after the filing of said maps no claim for a subsequent settlement and improvement upon the right of way shown by said maps shall be valid as against said company: *Provided*, That when a map showing any portion of said railway company's located line is filed as herein provided for, said company shall commence grading said located line within twelve months thereafter, or such location shall be void; and said location shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior before construction of the same shall be begun.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 6. That said company shall cause maps showing the route of its located line through and station grounds upon said Indian reservation to be filed in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, and that said location shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior before any grading or construction on any section or part of said located line shall be begun: *Provided*, That said railway shall be located, constructed, and operated with a due regard for the rights of the Indians, and under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior shall prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 8, line 3, after the word "forfeited," to strike out the words "that said railroad company" and insert:

As to that portion not built; and that said railway company shall fence and keep fenced all such portions of its road as may run through any improved lands of the Indians, and also.

So as to read:

SEC. 8. That said railway shall be built through said reservation within four years after the passage of this act, or the rights herein granted shall be forfeited as to that portion not built; and that said railway company shall fence and keep fenced all such portions of its road as may run through any improved lands of the Indians, and also shall construct and maintain continually all road and highway crossings and necessary bridges over said railway wherever said roads and highways do now or may hereafter cross said railway's right of way, or may be by the proper authorities laid out across the same.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add as a new section the following:

SEC. 12. That said railway company shall execute a bond to the United States, to be filed with and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, in the penal sum of $10,000, for the use and benefit of the Indians of said reservation, conditioned for the due payment of any and all damages which may accrue by reason of the killing or maiming of any Indian belonging to said reservation, or of their livestock, in the construction or operation of said railway, or by reason of fires originating thereby; the damages in all cases, in the event of failure by the railway company to effect an amicable settlement with the parties in interest, to be recovered in any court of the Territory of Dakota having jurisdiction of the amount claimed, upon suit or action instituted by the proper United States attorney in the name of the United States: *Provided*, That all moneys so recovered by the United States attorney under the provisions of this section shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States, to be placed to the credit of the particular Indian or Indians entitled to the same, and to be paid to him or them, or otherwise expended for his or their benefit, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. I move an amendment. In section 5, I move to strike out all after the word "graded," in line 8, down to and including the word "provision," in line 23, as follows:

Provided, That if the said Indians, through the United States Indian agent in charge of said Indians on said reservation shall, within four months after the filing of maps of definite location as set forth in section 6 of this act, dissent from the allowances provided for in this section, and shall certify the same to the Secretary of the Interior, then all compensation to be paid under the provisions of this act shall be determined as provided in section 3 for the determination of the compensation to be paid to the individual occupant of lands, with the right of appeal to the courts upon the same terms, conditions, and requirements as therein provided: *Provided further*, That the amount awarded or adjudged to be paid by said railway company shall be in lieu of the compensation that said Indians would be entitled to receive under the foregoing provision.

There is an error. The committee have provided a different method for determining damages, and this should be stricken out.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT PATERSON, N. J.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I move to take up for consideration Senate bill 1978, Order of Business 1177.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 1978) for the erection of a public building in Paterson, N. J., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 4, after the word "purchase," to insert "or acquire by condemnation proceedings or otherwise;" and in line 12, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty-five;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase, or acquire by condemnation proceedings or otherwise, a site for, and cause to be erected thereon, a suitable building, with fire-proof vaults therein, for the accommodation of the post-office and other Government offices, at the city of Paterson, N. J. The plans, specifications, and full estimates for said building shall be previously made and approved according to law, and shall not exceed for the site and building complete the sum of $125,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert as a new section:

SEC. 2. That the sum of $125,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be used and expended for the purpose provided in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT PEORIA, ILL.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to call up Senate bill 2546, Calendar number, 1272.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2546) to appropriate $12,000 for the completion of the public building at Peoria, Ill., and increasing the limit of the cost of said building.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TENNESSEE RIVER BRIDGE AT KNOXVILLE.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1352, being House bill 7783.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7783) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Knoxville, Tenn.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 2, line 17, before the word "constructed," to insert the word "so;" so as to read:

That the said bridge shall be so constructed, either by draw, span, or otherwise, that a free and unobstructed passage-way may be secured to all water-craft navigating said river at the point aforesaid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, line 5, after the words "required by," to strike out "Congress" and insert "Secretary of War;" in line 6, after the word "act," to insert "or its entire removal;" so as to read:

That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act, so as to prevent or remove all material and substantial obstruction to the navigation of said river by the construction of the said bridge, is hereby expressly reserved; and any alterations or changes that may be required by Secretary of War in the bridge constructed under this act, or its entire removal, shall be made by the corporation owning or controlling the same, at its own expense.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, line 8, after the word "expense," to insert:

And if any litigation shall arise in regard to said bridge, the same may be had in the circuit court of the United States within whose territorial jurisdiction any part of said bridge is located.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, and ask for a conference with the House of Representatives upon the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. VEST, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. KENNA were appointed.

KENTUCKY RIVER BRIDGES.

Mr. BECK. I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2481, Order of Business 1270.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2481) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Louisville, Cincinnati and Virginia Railway Company.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 16, after the word "passengers," at the end of section 1, to add:

And all tolls charged for the passing of vehicles, animals, and foot-passengers over said bridge shall be subject to modification and approval of the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add to section 3:

All changes required by the Secretary of War in the structure of said bridge, or its entire removal after the same is constructed, shall be at the expense of the company owning or controlling said bridge; and in event of any litigation in reference to said bridge, or any part thereof, the same shall be had in the circuit court of the United States within whose jurisdiction said bridge or any part thereof may be located.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 5. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge or bridges herein authorized be not commenced within two years and completed within five years from the date thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALARIES OF DISTRICT JUDGES.

Mr. HOAR. I move to proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1166, being the bill (S. 407) fixing the salaries of the several judges of the United States district courts at $5,000 per annum, and for other purposes.

Mr. COKE. I hope that bill will not be taken up now. There are gentlemen on this side who desire to say something in opposition to it, and I am one of the number.

Mr. HOAR. If I may have unanimous consent of the Senate, I wish to say that I notified the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. GEORGE] of my desire to call up the bill at this time, but stated that if they wished to debate the bill, as I did not propose to press its consideration at so late an hour in the day, I should desist from the request.

I will then take this opportunity simply to give notice that at the earliest time after to-morrow, after the close of the morning business, when it is in order to make such a motion, I shall move to proceed to the consideration of this bill. I therefore now withdraw the motion.

Mr. COKE. I am entirely willing that the bill should come up at any time when there is opportunity to debate and consider it.

CONSTRUCTION OF CUTTER THOMAS CORWIN.

Mr. DOLPH. I move to take up for present consideration Order of Business 403, being Senate bill 54.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 54) for the relief of R. G. Combs and others.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to R. G. Combs, ship-carpenter, of Portland, Oregon, the sum of $93; to A. Thompson, ship-carpenter, of Portland, Oregon, the sum of $134.37; to William I. Henry, of same place, the sum of $127; to Thomas Homes, of same place, ship-carpenter, the sum of $84.75; to Rhys Gwynn, of same place, night-watchman, the sum of $127.50; to R. H. Holmes, of same place, ship-carpenter, the sum of $93; to Thomas Bulger, of same place, ship-carpenter, the sum of $117.50; to Edward Magee, of same place, ship-carpenter, the sum of $106.75; to Edward Cashen, the sum of $77.50; to John Smith, of same place, ship-carpenter, the sum of $158; to Ezra Brentnall, ship-carpenter, of same place, the sum of $60; to Ola Hansen, ship-carpenter, of same place, the sum of $31.50; to Reuben Crawford, ship-carpenter, of same place, the sum of $45; to John Thomas, ship-carpenter, of same place, the sum of $48.50; to B. A. Rickdol, ship-carpenter, of same place, the sum of $137.50; to Goldsmith & Loewenberg, of same place, hardware merchants, the sum of $889.17, for materials furnished; to Hodge, Snell & Co., of same place, druggists, etc., the sum of $132.62, for paints and oils; to Northup & Thompson, of same place, hardware merchants, the sum of $281, for iron, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated; the several sums set opposite each of the foregoing names being the value of labor and materials furnished in the building of the United States revenue-cutter called Thomas Corwin, built at Albina, Oregon, during the years 1875 and 1876, and for which labor and materials no sum whatever has ever been paid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

S. H. PEARCE.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I ask the Senate to take up Calendar No. 1361, Senate bill 2883.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2883) for the relief of S. H. Pearce. It provides for the payment of $80 to S. H. Pearce, of Columbia County, Arkansas, for excess of purchase-money paid by him for certain lands in that county.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF DENTAL SCIENCE.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1311, Senate bill 2941.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2941) to incorporate the National Academy of Dental Science.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I think this bill should be amended, and I therefore move to amend in line 8 of section 3, after the word "purpose," by inserting the words:

Upon estimates therefor communicated to Congress by the head of the Department for which said examinations, experiments, and reports have been made.

I think if we are to pass this bill, some officer of the Government should be responsible for the debts for which it initiates appropriations to provide for expenses under it.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the bill go over.

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] will not object. The bill has been carefully prepared by eminent men who desire to have an association in the District of Columbia. There can be no possible objection to it, and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] has offered an amendment entirely acceptable to me, changing the phraseology. It is a mere bill incorporating a national academy so that there can be no possibility of any implied obligation on the part of the United States.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Florida what is the meaning of the provision that the Academy of Dental Science shall charge nothing for any service rendered to the Government of the United States?

Mr. CALL. That is a literal copy of the law in regard to the National Academy of Sciences.

Mr. HOAR. Does it mean that they shall cut the eye-teeth of my honorable friend from Iowa gratis? [Laughter.]

Mr. CALL. I do not hear the Senator.

Mr. HOAR. Does it mean that they shall cut the eye-teeth of my honorable friend from Iowa gratis?

Mr. CALL. I do not know that it does, unless Congress shall appropriate money specifically for that object. But there is no objection if any Senator desires to amend that phraseology. It is now the law in regard to the National Academy of Sciences. These gentlemen have for

years been desirous of forming an incorporation, a private association in the District of Columbia, to which they could gather such resources as they may have for the promotion of this most valuable art of dentistry, in which very great improvements have been made of late years. I have no kind of interest except to promote their wish in the matter, and any amendment that may be suggested will be agreeable to me.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 3, line 8, after the word "purpose" and before the semicolon, it is proposed to insert:

Upon estimates therefor communicated to Congress by the head of the Department for which such examinations, experiments, and reports may be made.

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. President, I can hardly suppose that the national association of dentists have approved the precise form of this bill. It seems to me to be drawn without care. I can not imagine that a national association of dentists, which may be very useful to them in their profession, can possibly be called upon to give advice to this Government in any matter concerning teeth.

The trouble with the bill is that while it attempted to charter properly enough a national association—all well enough if Congress goes into that business generally—an association of scientific gentlemen that went to the statute-book and copied literally, I judge, the act establishing the National Academy of Sciences, which does have occasion on many most important questions to render opinions to the Government. I have had occasion to notice that when the reports have been printed from year to year.

I will mention just two of the reports of the National Academy of Sciences for example. There was a question as to whether we could in any way render alcohol used in the arts distinguishable from other alcohol, as by methylating it, and that question, which is a very interesting matter as one of taxation, as one can see in a moment, was submitted to the National Academy of Sciences, and a very valuable report made. Another question was concerning the proper relations of the scientific bureaus or departments of the Government, such as the Naval Observatory and the Coast Survey to the National Government. That was committed to the National Academy of Sciences, and it made a very valuable report. These are only two among the dozen or three or four dozen of such matters upon which that academy has been of use. But that is an institution covering the broad field of science in general, and of the highest science.

Now, however honorable and useful this association of dentists may be, I do not think it necessary in order to give them the conveniences of a national incorporation to copy the other, for I can not imagine the Secretary of the Treasury asking them any question about the filling of teeth, or any other Department of the Government consulting them.

I think the bill ought to have been drafted in such form simply as to give them a convenient charter of incorporation, that they may hold their annual meetings, and if necessary hold real estate enough for a headquarters building, if they choose to do it, etc. The simplest form of incorporation would have answered the purpose.

Mr. CALL. I have no objection, if the Senator from Connecticut wishes to strike out that section of the bill, to its being done.

In reference, however, to the suggestions he makes that the Government can in no proper sense stand in any relation to the practical use of the knowledge and the practice of dentistry, I do not see that he makes his point good. It occurs to me that it may be of very great importance to the Government to know the best methods of dental treatment in reference to its soldiers. I apprehend, if the distinguished Senator had been suffering very much with the defects which this art remedies when he was performing his magnificent military service, he would have found himself disabled, and it might have been very well for the Government to have had the instrumentalities and a knowledge of the best instrumentalities which might have contributed to his relief, as to that of all the other soldiers in the Army and the men in the Navy.

The practical use which these gentlemen suggest this might be to the Government is, I think, quite apparent; and that they are very much concerned so long as they have an army and a navy, and men in them, as to the bodily health of the soldier and his proper relief from ailments of every description.

Be that as it may, there have been great improvements made in this art, improvements which perhaps have contributed as much in this generation and this age to the advancement of mankind and the extension of life and its comfort as in any other. These gentlemen, with an honest desire to promote the interests of this particular and valuable science, sent me this bill, having copied it from the law incorporating the National Academy of Sciences, and they asked me to present it word for word as it is, being the result of their own thought and their own preparation. Without any other interest than an honest wish to aid the advancement of science and knowledge and everything that may promote the interests of mankind, I presented it to the consideration of the Senate, and I have asked for its passage simply to afford them the nucleus of a respectable organization to which they might gather around and contribute their thoughts and their discoveries.

Mr. HAWLEY. I move to strike out the third section of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Connecticut moves to strike out the last section of the bill.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest to the Senator to leave the first three lines in, which simply provide for an annual meeting, which is in all incorporation bills.

Mr. HAWLEY. I have no objection. I move to strike out the rest.

Mr. ALLISON. Strike out all after the word "designated," in the third line.

Mr. HOAR. Let the first two lines and a half be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chief Clerk will read as indicated.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That the National Academy of Dental Science shall hold an annual meeting at such place in the United States as may be designated.

Mr. HAWLEY. I move to strike out all after the word "designated."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chief Clerk will read the part proposed to be stricken out.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the word "designated," in line 3 of section 3, it is proposed to strike out:

And the academy shall, whenever called upon by any Department of the Government, investigate, examine, experiment, and report upon any subject of dental science, the actual expenses of such investigations, examinations, experiments, and reports to be paid only from appropriations which may be made for the purpose; but the academy shall receive no compensation for any services rendered to the Government of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ALLISON. In section 2, line 8, I move to strike out the words "and report the same to Congress."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] is understood as withdrawn.

Mr. ALLISON. That is out now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is in.

Mr. ALLISON. The language was stricken out.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. No action was taken upon the proposed amendment of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] which is now withdrawn.

Mr. ALLISON. In line 8 of section 2, I move to strike out the words "and report the same to Congress."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MORGAN RAWLS.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 92) for the relief of Morgan Rawls.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay Morgan Rawls, of Georgia, $800 for a dwelling-house taken from the village of Guyton, Ga., in the latter part of the year 1865, by order of the United States officer in command at Savannah, Ga., through mistake for a Confederate building.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT WINONA, MINN.

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2475) to increase the appropriation for the erection of a public building at Winona, Minn.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which proposes to increase the amount heretofore fixed as the limit of cost for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building for the accommodation of the United States courts, post-office, and internal revenue and other Government offices at the city of Winona, Minn., to $150,000.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GOVERNMENT BUILDING AT ATLANTA, GA.

Mr. COLQUITT. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7938) to enlarge, improve, and make repairs upon the United States court-house and post-office building in Atlanta, Ga., and to appropriate money therefor.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LANDS IN TUSCALOOSA, ALA.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2845) granting to the corporate authorities of the city of Tuscaloosa, in the State of Alabama, all the right, title, and interest of the United States to fractional sections 22 and 15, lying south of the Warrior River, in township 21 and range 10 west.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 5, before the word "Warrior," to insert the word "Black;" so as to read:

That all of the interest or claim of the United States in and to fractional sections 22 and 15, lying south of the Black Warrior River, in township 21 of range 10 west, in the State of Alabama, be, and the same is hereby, relinquished to and vested in the city of Tuscaloosa for the following purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 10, before the words "river margin," to insert "localities known as the;" and in line 12, after the word "absolutely," to strike out the word "forever;" so as to read:

First. The part and parts of said fractional sections constituting the localities known as the "river margin," the "streets of said city," the "pond," and the "common," shall vest in said city absolutely.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 15, after the word "thereof," to insert "who are owners in good faith;" so as to read:

Second. The residue of said fractional sections shall be vested in the said city in trust, for the use of each of the occupants of the lots, or parts of lots thereof, who are owners in good faith, according to the title which is now vested in each; the intent of this act being not to give any right to said occupants except what arises from the relinquishment of the right or claim of the United States thereto.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

A bill granting to the corporate authorities of the city of Tuscaloosa, in the State of Alabama, all the right, title, and interest of the United States to fractional sections 22 and 15, lying south of the Black Warrior River, in township 21, and range 10 west.

MILITIA EQUIPMENT.

Mr. MANDERSON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2973) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 1661 of the Revised Statutes, making an annual appropriation to provide arms and equipments for the militia."

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to amend section 1 of an act of February 12, 1887, entitled "An act to amend section 1661 of the Revised Statutes, making an annual appropriation to provide arms and equipments for the militia;" so as to read as follows:

That the sum of $600,000 is hereby annually appropriated, to be paid out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purpose of providing arms, ordnance stores, quartermaster's stores, and camp equipage for issue to the militia.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if the language in the law that was passed only a year or two ago which provided that $400,000 should be expended for certain particular items has been changed by this bill?

Mr. MANDERSON. I think not. It is the form of the present law with the exception of the change of the amount. I understand that the bill is in accord with the view of the committee, and that was simply that the amount should be raised from $400,000 to $600,000.

Mr. COCKRELL. I know that was the view of a majority of the committee. I am opposed to the amount fixed by the bill. I only wish to state that I am opposed to the increase proposed.

Mr. MANDERSON. That is the only change made in the present law.

Mr. COCKRELL. It increases the amount from $400,000 to $600,000. Only about two years ago we increased it from $200,000 to $400,000.

Mr. MANDERSON. But the Senator will remember that at that time the very evident desire of the Senate upon a vote taken on that question was to change the amount to the sum fixed in this bill—$600,000.

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand that perfectly well; but I think $400,000 is enough. However, I simply desire to place upon record the statement that I am opposed to the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN GALLAGHER.

Mr. PASCO. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2690) granting a pension to John Gallagher.

Mr. COCKRELL. There is a large number of pension bills on the Calendar, and it is now past 5 o'clock.

Mr. PASCO. I appeal to the Senator from Missouri to let this bill go through.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read at length, if there be no objection.

By unanimous consent, the bill (S. 2690) granting a pension to John Gallagher was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Pensions reported an amendment in line 9, after the word "date," to strike out "when he first made application therefor to the Bureau of Pensions," and insert "of the passage of this act;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Gallagher, who was a private in Company I, Second Regiment United States Dragoons in the Seminole Indian war of 1856, and that he be allowed a pension from the date of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT PETERSBURGH, VA.

Mr. DANIEL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2278) for the improvement and enlargement of the public building at Petersburgh, Va.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, in line 3, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $30,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the enlargement and improvement of the public building at Petersburgh, Va.; such improvement and enlargement of the said building to be made upon plans and specifications approved by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT VICKSBURG, MISS.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 786) to provide a building for the use of the United States courts, post-office, custom-house, and internal-revenue office at Vicksburg, Miss.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, in line 27, after the word "purchased," to insert "or acquired by condemnation proceedings;" so as to read:

That the site so purchased or acquired by condemnation proceedings shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of not less than 40 feet, including streets and alleys.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GOVERNMENT OFFICES AT COUNCIL BLUFFS, IOWA.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 1394) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase additional ground for the accommodation of Government offices in Council Bluffs, Iowa.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REPORT ON THE MISSISSIPPI AND ITS TRIBUTARIES.

Mr. COCKRELL. There being no quorum of the Senate now present——

Mr. MANDERSON. Will the Senator permit me to introduce a resolution for reference to a committee?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be received, if there be no objection.

Mr. MANDERSON submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved, That there be printed in pamphlet form for use of the Senate 3,000 copies of the report on the Mississippi and its tributaries, being Part V of the internal-commerce report for 1887, of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 23, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATION.

Executive nomination received by the Senate May 22, 1888.

SOLICITOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE.

Thomas J. Smith, of New Hampshire, to be solicitor of internal revenue, *vice* Charles Chesley, resigned.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *May* 22, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yester day was read and approved

LIGHT-HOUSE, ETC., AT GOOSE ROCK, MAINE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Light-House Board of an appropriation for the erection of a light-house, fog-signal, and day beacon at Goose Rock, Fox Island Thoroughfare, Maine; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PAY OF UNITED STATES DISTRICT ATTORNEY, NEW MEXICO.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Attorney-General for an appropriation to pay the United States district attorney for the district of New Mexico for the professional services performed for certain Indians at the request of the Attorney-General; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SAW-MILL, NORFOLK NAVY-YARD.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of the Navy of an appropriation for the erection of a saw-mill at the Norfolk navy-yard, Virginia; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following Senate bills; which were severally referred as indicated below:

The bill (S. 1880) declaring that certain water reserve lands in the State of Wisconsin are, and have been, subject to the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act granting to railroads the right of way through the public lands of the United States," approved March 3, 1875—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The bill (S. 1232) for the relief of Thomas J. Corbin—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (S. 2318) to extend to the port of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., the privileges of inland transportation in bond—to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 2702) to amend so much of section 361 of the Revised Statutes as fixes the salary of the chief clerk of the Department of Justice—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice.

The bill (S. 2972) to provide for making the west end of the Smithsonian building fire-proof, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SEYMOUR, from May 23 until June 1, on account of important business.

To Mr. BYNUM, for the remainder of the week.

To Mr. COTHRAN, for the remainder of the week, on account of important business.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of demanding the regular order, but I have no objection to leave being granted for members to file reports with the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that members having reports to submit may be permitted to file them with the Clerk for reference to the appropriate Calendars. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

GEORGE W. PITNER.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 490) granting a pension to George W. Pitner; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. CATHARINE PETERSON.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 3913) granting a pension to Mrs. Catharine Peterson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. CATHARINE REED.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7717) granting a pension to Mrs. Catharine Reed; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN H. CLAUS.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8150) for the relief of John H. Claus; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

THERESA HERBST.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8078) granting a pension to Theresa Herbst, widow of John Herbst, late private Company G, One hundred and fortieth Regiment of New York Volunteers; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELIZABETH DETTIS.

Mr. SAWYER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2575) granting a pension to Elizabeth Dettis; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ROZALIA JUNK.

Mr. SAWYER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2310) granting a pension to Rozalia Junk; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

FRANK PASCHKER.

Mr. SAWYER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2263) granting a pension to Frank Paschker; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RICHARD HUDSON.

Mr. SAWYER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2576) granting a pension to Richard Hudson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM KNIGHT, JACOB PARROTT, AND JOHN WHOLLAM.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 341) granting pensions to William Knight, Jacob Parrott, and John Whollam; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM CLIFT.

Mr. LAWLER, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (S. 90) for the relief of William Clift; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PATRICK C. M'QUEENY.

Mr. LAWLER also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9949) for the relief of Patrick C. McQueeny; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RICHARD H. PARHAM.

Mr. CROUSE, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back the bill (H. R. 825) for the relief of Richard H. Parham, administrator of George Gorman, deceased; which was laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, reported a bill (H. R. 10098) for the relief of Richard H. Parham, administrator of George Gorman and Robert S. McDonald; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GEORGE TURNER.

Mr. CROUSE also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4089) for the relief of George Turner, which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARGARET DOYLE.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9233) to pay Margaret Doyle, administratrix of James Doyle, for certain captured cotton; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ALMERON J. PATCHIN.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 8912) granting an increase of pension to Almeron J. Patchin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. MAGGIE A. WEED.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2579) granting a pension to Mrs. Maggie A. Weed, formerly Miss Maggie A. Egan; which was referred

to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES E. KABLER.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2616) granting a pension to James E. Kabler; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES M'LAUGHLIN.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1609) for the relief of James McLaughlin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

W. A. HICKS.

Mr. MORRILL also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1742) granting a pension to W. A. Hicks; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

EMILY J. STANNARD.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 9543) increasing the pension of Emily J. Stannard; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SARAH E. PALMER.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9678) granting a pension to Sarah E. Palmer; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SUSAN EDSON.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 915) granting a pension to Susan Edson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HANNAH BABB HUTCHINS.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (S. 1540) granting a pension to Hannah Babb Hutchins; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. WARD B. BURNETT.

Mr. STRUBLE, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 681) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. General Ward B. Burnett; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JESSE DICKEY.

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9682) increasing the pension of Jesse Dickey; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SALE OF LANDS, MONTANA TERRITORY.

Mr. McSHANE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7777) to provide for the sale of lands patented to certain members of the Flathead band of Indians in Montana Territory, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, FORT WORTH, TEX.

Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1974) for the erection of a public building at Fort Worth, Tex.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ANN ATKINSON.

Mr. BANKHEAD also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1844) granting an increase of pension to Ann Atkinson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MYRON TEACHARET.

Mr. YODER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 9894) granting a pension to Myron Teacharet; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GEORGE E. WELLS.

Mr. YODER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 965) granting a pension to George E. Wells; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. FLORA C. ANDREWS.

Mr. YODER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8771) to place the name of Mrs. Flora C. Andrews on the pension-roll; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SUSANNA WEIL.

Mr. YODER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2735) granting a pension to Susanna Weil; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARIA BEISER.

Mr. YODER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4591) granting a pension to Maria Beiser; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ANNA KRUMPHOLZ.

Mr. YODER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2737) granting a pension to Anna Krumpholz; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

FLORIDA KENNERLY.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5142) for the relief of Florida Kennerly; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES T. PEALE.

Mr. CAREY, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7873) to place James T. Peale on the retired-list of the United States Army; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, SACRAMENTO, CAL.

Mr. NEWTON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back with amendments the bill (S. 1554) to increase the appropriation for the erection of the public building at Sacramento, Cal.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JULIA E. AMBROSE.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7508) granting a pension to Julia E. Ambrose; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MELCHISEDEC ROBINSON.

Mr. PENINGTON, from the Committee on War Claims, reported a bill (H. R. 10099) for the relief of Melchisedec Robinson; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

FIRST BAPTIST CHURCH, COATESVILLE, GA.

Mr. PENINGTON also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5471) for the relief of the First Baptist Church of Coatesville, Ga.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NEW DIVISION IN SOUTHERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT OF GEORGIA.

Mr. STEWART, of Georgia, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7347) to create a new division in the southern judicial district of Georgia; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. CATHARINE SINNOTT.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5490) granting a pension to Mrs. Catharine Sinnott; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LUCY A. NOEL.

Mr. SPOONER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 9340) granting a pension to Mrs. Lucy A. Noel; which was referred to the Committee of the

Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. EMMA DILL.

Mr. SPOONER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2638) granting a pension to Mrs. Emma Dill; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 4467) for the erection of a public building at Bar Harbor, in Maine.

The message also announced that the Senate insisted on its amendments disagreed to by the House to the bill (H. R. 5445) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, agreed to the conference asked by the House, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. ALLISON, Mr. DAWES, and Mr. GORMAN.

The message also announced that the Senate disagreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen; asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed as conferees on the part of the Senate Mr. BLAIR, Mr. DOLPH, and Mr. FAULKNER.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 351) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Zanesville, Ohio;

A bill (S. 2901) granting to the Milwaukee, Lake Shore and Western Railway Company the right of way through the Lac de Flambeau Indian reservation, in the State of Wisconsin; and

A bill (S. 2920) relative to the Revolutionary battle-field of Bennington.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled the bill (H. R. 8394) to authorize United States marshals to arrest offenders and fugitives from justice in Indian Territory; when the Speaker *pro tempore* signed the same.

RELIEF OF SUFFERERS BY THE MISSISSIPPI OVERFLOW.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Illinois. I ask unanimous consent to introduce a joint resolution making an appropriation to relieve the sufferers by the overflow of the Mississippi River.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, this resolution will be read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Has the Committee on Appropriations jurisdiction of this subject?

The SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House, there seems to be no committee which has jurisdiction over such a subject.

Mr. MCMILLIN. How does this bill come up?

The SPEAKER. It is simply sent to the desk for reference.

Mr. MCMILLIN. It certainly does not belong to the Committ e on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. To what committee does the gentleman suggest that it be referred?

Mr. MCMILLIN. The Committee on Claims may have jurisdiction——

The SPEAKER. It certainly is not a claim.

Mr. MCMILLIN. The trouble is, I do not like this kind of legislation at all; and if I had understood the proposition I would have been inclined to object to its introduction.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman make any motion in regard to the reference of the resolution? The Chair will state that the Committee on Appropriations under the rules would have no jurisdiction over this matter, and could only acquire jurisdiction by a reference from the House, just as any other committee of the House might do. This is not a claim; it is merely a proposition to donate out of the public Treasury a certain amount of money.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Let us hear the resolution read.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. On account of the time which this matter threatens to consume, I must object to the introduction of the resolution.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask unanimous consent that the pension appropriation bill, with amendments of the Senate, be printed for the use of the House.

There being no objection, the order for printing was made.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. This day has been set apart for the consideration of business reported from the Committee on Labor, in such order as may be indicated by the committee. The Chair recognizes the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. O'NEILL].

SALE OF CONVICT-MADE GOODS, ETC.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I call up for present consideration House bill No. 8716.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8716) to protect free labor and the industries in which it is employed from the injurious effects of convict labor by confining the sale of the goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured by convict labor to the State in which they are produced.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as this is the day designated by the House for the consideration of reports from the Committee on Labor, and as we have four bills to be considered, I desire that the debate on this bill be limited to a reasonable time. I am not aware what gentleman desires to take charge of the time on the opposite side, but I would like to have some agreement on this subject.

Mr. ROGERS. I desire to be heard briefly in opposition to the bill.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Well, I ask that debate on the bill be limited to an hour and a half, and that the time be divided equally between the two sides.

Mr. ROWELL. I think this is too important and dangerous a bill to be debated under a limitation of that kind.

Mr. BLAND. The bill involves questions of State and Federal relations, and if passed would necessitate a meeting of the Legislature of my State in order to adopt measures in reference to our penitentiary system. In view of the importance of the bill I think no limit ought to be placed on the debate.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. If, instead of placing a limit on the debate, the House will unanimously agree to extend the time for the consideration of our bills until they are disposed of, I am perfectly willing that the debate on this bill be extended until we can hear the abstract views of every constitutional thinker on this floor.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman propose to permit amendments to this bill?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. In deference to requests made by the prison contractors and prison wardens, who are here in large numbers and who desire simply an extension of the time when the bill shall take effect, I am willing to have an amendment accepted fixing a reasonable time in that respect. That is the only request for amendment which we have heard.

Mr. CANNON. Without reference to the prison contractors, but in the interest of labor, I have a very important amendment which I desire to offer; and I will indicate it. As we are going into this business, I do not want convict labor abroad to have its products shipped in here——

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. We have a bill on that subject, reported from our committee, which will be called up; it is the very next bill.

Mr. CANNON. I am afraid it may not be reached.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. It will be reached if the members are disposed to let us have a vote upon it.

Mr. CANNON. Well, it can be done by way of amendment.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Why not put it on as an amendment to this bill?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I want to say that in fixing the time, as suggested by the gentleman from Missouri, this is not an abstract constitutional question by any means in the world. It is a grave and serious matter, and deserves to be seriously considered—as to the power of the House to pass such a bill. And, second, there is a question as to the wisdom of the measure, even if it be constitutional. So in fixing the time these questions should be taken into consideration.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this bill is not in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, but is in the House and subject, of course, to the demand for the previous question at any time the gentleman from Missouri chooses to take the floor for that purpose.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I only made the suggestions in order that in fixing the time it might be somewhat commensurate with the importance of the subject.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I want to state to the House that there are four bills to be called up by the Committee on Labor.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. What are the others?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. The one now before the House is the first; the second is to prohibit the importation into this country of the product of convict labor abroad; the third to prohibit enlisted men from coming in competition with civilians; and the fourth is the bill to provide for the payment to the employés of the Government for the overtime due them by the non-enforcement, or rather a violation, of the eight-hour law.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. That I believe is the unfinished business.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Now, recognizing the importance of the question I have in charge as chairman of the Committee on Labor, I desire to present to the House the importance of limiting the discussion on these bills so as to get them considered and acted upon without unnecessary delay; and I appeal to the House to give us the time necessary. I ask, therefore, unanimous consent that at 5 o'clock to-day, if the business of this committee is not then completed, a recess be taken until half past 7 for the further consideration of bills reported from that committee.

Mr. BLOUNT. To be in session how long in the evening?
Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Until we get through.
Mr. BLOUNT. That might be all night.
Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Very well; let us fix a limit to it.
Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Say until 11 o'clock.
Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Very well; the session to extend not later than 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the proposition of the gentleman to the House. It is that at 5 o'clock the House shall take a recess until 7.30 this evening, the evening session to be devoted to the consideration of bills reported from the Committee on Labor, and the session not to extend later than 11 o'clock. Is there objection?

Mr. ROGERS rose.

Mr. BURROWS. I think the gentleman from Missouri had better fix the time at not later than half past 10, as is the case on the pension nights.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Very well; I will say half past 10.

Mr. ROGERS. I think all this legislation is too important to be disposed of in an empty House, and I object.

Mr. COX. Oh, there will be a full House.

Mr. ROGERS. Such has not been the experience in the past.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I hope the House will recognize that there is no desire on my part to prevent a full and thorough discussion of this question. It is a new proposition, and it is perfectly natural that the attention of the members of the House has not been directed to it, and regard it with some little apprehension. And if an effort is made after a reasonable time for discussion to reach a vote on this bill, I shall appeal to the friends of labor legislation in this House to stand by us and to reach the bills and dispose of them. I am trying to discharge my duty, but am willing to make any concessions in order to have a proper time for the consideration of these important measures.

I ask now unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to two hours. I make that motion.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I think that the first thing in order would be the reading of the bill and the report.

The SPEAKER. That, of course, would be the first thing in order, but the Chair understood the gentleman from Missouri to reach some agreement as to the length of debate.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not care, myself, to interpose any sort of obstructive tactics to the proper consideration of this measure. I am perfectly willing that it should be considered, but believe that the debate ought to run briefly, and as it is in the power of the gentleman from Missouri at any time to close the debate, provided the House sees proper to do so, he can of course exercise his discretion in that direction.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Let me ask if there is any objection to limiting the debate to the time that I have suggested? You know the rule in regard to our speeches and how the time is usually distributed.

Mr. ROGERS. I have no intention or desire to occupy an hour or a half hour. Perhaps I shall not occupy a quarter of an hour; but I desire to express my views touching the constitutionality of this legislation, and I am in perfect candor when I say I regard it as a very grave and important precedent if we undertake to pass such a bill. I do not think such a measure, so widespread in its importance, touching the very organization of the Government itself, ought to be disposed of under the whip and spur. I repeat to the gentleman in all candor that I have no sort of obstructive tactics to offer. I am going to discuss it briefly and upon authority, and then let the House vote upon it.

Mr. BLAND. I have some amendments to offer, and it certainly involves a great question, upon which I would like fifteen or twenty minutes myself.

It cannot be expected, when a bill is brought in relating to a great public question, affecting the rights of the States, that it can be carried through in so short a time. If the chairman of the committee has other bills that he deems of importance and which are not objectionable, let him call them up. This is a bill which affects every State in the Union and especially the State which I have the honor in part to represent.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I think there will be no controversy between my colleague from Missouri and myself. We understand the interests of that State so far as this question is concerned. I understand the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] demands the reading of the bill and the report.

The SPEAKER. The reading of the report is in the nature of debate and can only be called for in the time of the gentleman who has the floor. The reading of the bill is necessary, unless dispensed with.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask unanimous consent that the report be read.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I do not object to that.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection the report will be read. The Clerk will now read the bill and report.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I ask also that the views of the minority be read.

The SPEAKER. In the absence of objection, the views of the minority will also be read.

BRIDGES IN NORTH CAROLINA.

Mr. CRISP. I rise to present the report of a committee of conference.

The Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 245) authorizing the construction of bridges across the Cape Fear River, Black River, and Northeast River, in the State of North Carolina, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 63 of said amendment, strike out the word "thereof" and insert the words "of the approval of this act;" and the House agree to the same.

CHARLES F. CRISP,
A. R. ANDERSON,
JAMES PHELAN,
Managers on the part of the House.
M. W. RANSOM,
G. G. VEST,
PHILETUS SAWYER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement by the managers on the part of the House was read, as follows:

The conferees on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate bill No. 245, submit the following in explanation of the report thereon:

The Senate recedes from its disagreement to the House amendment, and agrees to the same with a verbal correction.

CHARLES F. CRISP,
A. R. ANDERSON,
JAMES PHELAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report of the committee of conference was agreed to.

Mr. CRISP moved to reconsider the vote by which the report was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

CONVICT LABOR.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will now read the bill called up for consideration by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 8716) to protect free labor and the industries in which it is employed from the injurious effects of convict labor by confining the sale of the goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured by convict labor to the State in which they are produced.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That every person who knowingly transports, or causes to be delivered for transportation, from the State or Territory in which they are in whole or in part manufactured, any goods, wares, or merchandise, in whole or in part manufactured by convict labor in any penitentiary, prison, reformatory, or other establishment in which convict labor is employed, to or into any other State or Territory, or into the District of Columbia, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not less than $100 nor more than $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court, and such goods, wares, or merchandise shall be forfeited to the United States.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the several United States district attorneys to prosecute all violations of this act by any person making the complaint under oath, and the same shall be heard before any district or circuit court of the United States or Territorial court holden within the district in which the violation of this act has been committed.

SEC. 3. That this act shall take effect at the expiration of sixty days from and after its passage.

The report (by Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Labor, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 8716) to protect free labor and the industries in which it is employed from the injurious effects of convict labor by confining the sale of the goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured by convict labor to the State in which they are produced, beg leave to submit the following report:

A large number of persons, citizens of the United States, engaged in certain productive industries injuriously affected, as they claim, by the present systems of employment of convict labor prevailing in many of the States, appeared before your committee, including the accredited representatives of the labor organizations of the United States, on behalf of the bill. Statements were made, documents produced, and arguments submitted by them. They were permitted to be heard by counsel in respect to the constitutional questions involved.

Petitions, numerously signed by leading manufacturers of the country, have been presented to Congress and referred to your committee. They pray, among other things, for the passage of the bill under consideration, and assign reasons therefor. The following is a copy of these petitions:

"*To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States in Congress assembled:*

"Your petitioners most respectfully represent that they are citizens of the United States, engaged in industrial pursuits; that the prevailing system of employment of convict labor in the prisons of the several States operates unjustly and injuriously upon your petitioners and other citizens engaged in like productive industries, by imposing upon them an unjust, unequal, and ruinous competition in the markets of the country with the products of such convict labor; and that they believe no adequate relief can be afforded unless through the intervention of your honorable bodies in their behalf.

"They likewise most respectfully represent that practical experience teaches that such system fails either to reform the convict or to deter the evilly-disposed from the commission of crime; that it tends to degrade free labor, to harm honest workmen, to ruin long-established industries, and to impoverish the deserving citizen without profiting the State.

"Your petitioners submit that it is manifestly unfair and unjust that the State should enter upon an unequal and injurious competition with honest citizens, or unnecessarily employ its prisoners at such labor as lessens the wages and subverts the industrial interests of those engaged in productive occupations. That many of the most influential of the States have officially declared that the evils resulting from the present systems of employment of convict labor are serious and widely distributed and conceded that no general system of regulation or cure can be established by State legislation; and that national legislation and

mediation are required to afford adequate relief; and that Congress can alone confine trade within State lines and harmonize conflicting State interests. Your petitioners beg leave to add that this is one of those exigencies of general concern that the framers of the Constitution undoubtedly had in view when they so wisely conferred upon Congress the power 'to regulate commerce among the several States, establish justice, and promote the general welfare.'

"Your petitioners do not believe that the State should support its convicts in idleness, but that their reformation should be the paramount aim of prison discipline, and all mere economic considerations be subordinated thereto; that the State should stimulate them to acquire habits of industry by paying to them at their discharge a reasonable proportion of their earnings, and by teaching them complete trades and not parts of trades, as under present systems; that the number of hours of labor should be lessened and the number of hours devoted to moral instruction increased.

"Your petitioners believe that if the following system of employment of convict labor were generally adopted, the evils of which they complain would be substantially removed, without loss to the State, and with benefit to the convict, to wit, the public-account system alone used; prisoners confined to hand trades or to unskilled labor; the number of industries enlarged, including as few domestic industries as possible; the number of prisoners lessened by establishing reformatories in which shall be confined such as have been convicted of a first offense, not punishable with death, or for life; all public institutions supplied by prison-made goods, and all prison-made goods duly marked as such before offered for sale.

"Nevertheless, until such a uniform system has been established by the several States employing their convicts in skilled labor, your petitioners earnestly insist 'that the interests of honest labor engaged in productive industries imperatively demand the intervention of your honorable bodies in their behalf, and pray that an act be passed prohibiting, under adequate penalties, the sale or offering for sale of any goods, wares, or merchandise, the product in whole or in part of convict labor, outside of the State in which they are manufactured.

"Finally, they pray your honorable bodies to take such action, the premises considered, as may be fitting to secure the joint action of all the States employing their convicts in skilled labor, to the end that such a generni and harmonious system, consistent with the rights of the national and State governments, respectively, may be established, as will protect free labor engaged in productive industries; tend so far as practicable to the reformation of the convict, and 'promote the general welfare.'"

Public meetings have been held in various portions of the country since the introduction of the bill, and resolutions highly commendatory of its purposes passed.

Your committee present, as valuable and instructive, the following extract from the learned and exhaustive report made by the Commissioner of Labor in obedience to the joint resolution of Congress approved August 2, 1886:

"ANNUAL PRODUCTION OF CONVICT-MADE GOODS.

"The State producing the largest amount of convict-made goods is New York, the value there being $6,236,320.98. The next State in rank is Illinois, producing $3,284,267.50 worth of convict-made goods. Indiana comes next with a product of the value of $1,570,901.37, while Ohio stands next in line with a product of the value of $1,368,122.51; then Missouri, $1,342,020.07; then Pennsylvania, $1,317,265.85. Kansas ranks next, with a product worth $1,270,575.77. Tennessee comes after Kansas, with only $1,142,009; then Michigan, $1,087,735.62, and, last of the States producing over a million dollars' worth, New Jersey, $1,019,608.32. Each of the other States and Territories drop below the million-dollar point, Dakota coming at the bottom of the list with a product of $11,577.36." (Page 291.)

It appears from the report of the Commissioner of Labor (pages 300 to 303, both inclusive) that convict labor causes reductions, especially in the great manufacturing States, both in the wages of free labor and in the quantity of goods sold produced by free labor.

The State undoubtedly has many advantages over the citizen when it employs its convicts in the productive industries, whether under the contract or public-account system. It pays no taxes; its machinery and the power to propel it, its business capital, and buildings are supplied at the expense of the whole people. Under the public-account system the courts supply the labor; under the contract system it is sold by the State at substantially a nominal price. Whether it be the warden, ambitious of making profits for the State, or the mercenary contractor, desirous of making the largest possible gains for himself, the temptation is irresistible to drive out of the market all competing industries. The method is simple; goods are offered at less price than honest labor can produce them.

Take, for example, iron goods, stoves, and hollow-ware. Convict labor produces annually of these $2,413,222.60. The contractor pays for his labor in the great States of Illinois, Indiana, Maryland, New York, and Ohio, and in Oregon, on an average, per hour 5.7 cents; while the private producer must pay 26 cents per hour. The result of this disastrous competition is inevitable ruin to the law-abiding citizen; both manufacturer and skilled workman are involved in the same fate—the one left without custom, the other without employment.

Other industries are in like manner injuriously affected, such as boots and shoes, carriages and wagons, furniture, harness and saddlery, marble (dressed) and monuments, coopering, etc. In fact, the mischief seems to involve the citizens of all the great manufacturing States.

In the judgment of your committee the most deplorable of the evils resulting from the present systems of employment of convict labor is its tendency to injure and degrade free labor employed in competing trades. The learned professions are useful, but skilled labor is indispensable to the comfort, yea, the very existence of civilized society. It is the duty of the Government to encourage its youth to acquire trades and to protect them in their use when acquired. The wise Hebrews say "he that brings not up his son to some trade makes him a thief." Our own countryman, Franklin, taught that "he that hath a trade hath an estate for life." The great Solon caused a law to be passed relieving the son from the duty of supporting his father when decrepid with age, if the father had failed to teach his son a trade in his youth.

If the State become a manufacturing corporation its convicts must be taught trades; when released they must find employment, if at all, by the side of the honest workman, and necessarily to the disadvantage of the latter.

If the industry in which the skilled laborer has been employed is destroyed by the unequal competition with convict labor, then both the honest workman and the released convict are without employment. The latter may find employment by the commission of new crimes and a return to his comfortable prison home; the former, in his age, finds his "estate for life" taken from him, and himself left without the means of supporting a family equally helpless.

INABILITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL STATES TO RELIEVE FROM THE DISASTROUS EFFECTS OF CONVICT LABOR.

The following among other States have given expression to their views upon this subject:

MASSACHUSETTS.

The bureau of statistics and labor of Massachusetts, under the authority of a resolution of the Legislature of that State, reported among other things as follows, on convict labor:

"No specific legislation by this State can cure, or change even, this condition of things. The question has too many ramifications to be handled by State legislation. These and kindred questions in the body politic demand national investigation; and this country suffers in this as in other matters from its attempts to harmonize the many conflicting elements resulting from our separate State sovereignties."

NEW JERSEY.

The commission appointed by Governor McClellan by the authority of a resolution adopted by the Legislature of New Jersey in 1878 made many valuable suggestions, among others the following:

"No State, by itself, can protect its industries against convict or other competition. Trade, commerce, and manufactures ignore State lines entirely; and if convicts were employed in manufacturing an article of general use in one State only, the goods thus produced, if better or cheaper than those made by free labor, would very soon find their way to all the other States and compete with their labor in that branch of industry.

"Any distribution of prison labor among the various industries of the country, to be equal, just, and efficient, must be made by the joint action of all the States."

NEW YORK.

In April, 1879, Louis D. Pilsbury, superintendent of State prisons (New York), made a report relative to convict labor, with the following results:

"The only practicable way I know of preventing the so-called 'encroachments of convict labor' is to prohibit its employment. This would accomplish the desired result, but, in my opinion, would furnish little relief to 'honest labor' in the absence of concurrent legislation of like character by other States. Prohibitory legislation by New York alone would result in driving contractors to other States, whence the product of their convict labor could be brought as directly into competition with the labor of this State as if manufactured within our own boundaries."

WISCONSIN.

In the second biennial report of the bureau of labor and industrial statistics of Wisconsin, submitted by the commissioner, Frank A. Flower, in September, 1886, there is found the following suggestions:

"I believe that the present system of contract convict labor is doomed in the Northern States, yet we can not and should not abolish it until we have provided something to take its place. That now is the great problem. Nor can we temporize with it; for criminals we shall have with us forever.

"From a commercial standpoint we have not thirty-eight States—only one State. My own opinion is, therefore, that to abolish prison contracts in Wisconsin while they remain in force in other States will help our manufacturers very little. Our Legislature can not shut out the prison thrashing-machines of Minnesota, the cheap prison wagons of Texas, nor the prison hardware of New York. If Congress can say that no prison product, contract or otherwise, shall be sold outside of the State in which it is made, the whole matter will soon be adjusted. Otherwise I think that the several States should, by commissioners appointed for that purpose, meet and agree upon a plan of action that shall be as nearly uniform as possible as to the time of abandoning contracts at least."

At a meeting held in Chicago, Ill., August 26, 1886, to consider the convict-labor question, the following, among other resolutions, was passed:

"That the executive committee be instructed to inquire into the constitutionality of a law, to be passed by the Congress of the United States, prohibiting the sale of goods, the product of convict labor, outside of the State in which manufactured, and no constitutional objections being found, that they be instructed to obtain the passage of such a law by Congress."

The following States were represented at this meeting: Colorado, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nevada, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Texas, Wisconsin.

EVILS RESULTING FROM CONVICT LABOR, AS SHOWN BY STATE REPORTS.

Your committee present the following report of a special committee appointed by a resolution of the house of representatives of the State of Ohio, in 1877, to investigate and report upon "the effect of contract convict labor upon the manufacturing interest of the State."

Ohio.—After taking the testimony of many witnesses, and duly considering the questions submitted to it, the committee arrived at the following conclusions:

"The contract system interferes in an undue manner with the honest industry of the State. It has been the cause of crippling the business of many of our manufacturers; it has been the cause of driving many of them out of business; it has been the cause of a large percentage of the reductions which have taken place in the wages of our mechanics; it has been the cause of pauperizing a large portion of our laborers and increasing crime in a corresponding degree; it has been no benefit to the State; as a reformatory agency it has been a complete, total, and miserable failure; it has hardened more criminals than any other cause; it has made total wrecks, morally, of thousands and thousands who would have been reclaimed from the paths of vice and crime under a proper system of prison management, but who now have resigned their fate to a life of hopeless degradation; it has not a single commendable feature; its tendency is pernicious in the extreme.

"In short, it is an insurmountable barrier in the way of the reformation of the unfortunates who are compelled to live and labor under its evil influences; it enables a class of men to get rich out of the crimes committed by others; it leaves upon the fair escutcheon of the State a relic of the very worst form of human slavery; it is the bone of ceaseless contention between the State and its mechanical and industrial interests; it is abhorred by all and respected by none except those, perhaps, who make profit and gain out of it. It should be tolerated no longer, but abolished at once."

California.—Commenting upon the unjust competition with the free labor of the State, resulting from the employment of convict labor in productive industries, the bureau of labor of California, in its first biennial report (1884), says:

"Rather than such unjust competition should be practiced, or that the State should be made the instrument of an injurious opposition to manufacturers and free men engaged in similar businesses on the outside, or that a system should be carried on under State control tending to loss of employment or reduction of wages, the convicts should serve their terms in idleness."

We can not admit that great evils, destructive in their effects and widespread, can exist in defiance of the National Congress, created by the whole people to establish justice and promote the general welfare. The safety and usefulness of the State, the prosperity and happiness of the people, depend upon the just observance of the cardinal political truth expressed in the familiar maxim, "So use your own as not to injure your neighbor;" it applies with equal force to the State and to the citizen.

Your committee believe that free labor engaged in various important productive industries suffers great and serious injury from the unequal and unjust competition to which it is subjected by the prevailing systems of employment of convict labor by many of the States; that individual State legislation is incompetent to furnish adequate relief; that the necessary power is alone vested in Congress; that this power should be exercised to the end that capital invested, business good-will long established, experience and skill acquired by years of industry may be protected, and honest labor engaged in the productive industries involved may not be left without employment.

THE DUTY OF CONGRESS.

Although we are profoundly impressed with the conviction that the autonomy of the State should be preserved so far as possible under our dual form of gov-

ernment, yet nevertheless we feel it to be the duty of the National Legislature to exert to the fullest extent those constitutional powers conferred by the wisdom of the fathers, when they are invoked, as in the present case, by citizens exercising the sacred right of petition, and who furnish convincing proofs that their individual rights are assailed and their property threatened with destruction.

PURPOSE AND SCOPE OF THE BILL.

It is not the purpose of the promoters of the bill to encroach upon the right of any State to employ its convicts in any manner that to it may seem best, nor even to seek to correct the evils resulting from such employment, so far as the State's own citizens are concerned, but to prevent such evils from extending to and involving the citizens of other States.

Yet we do not believe that it was the intent of the framers of the Federal Constitution, nor of the States ratifying it, that any of the States should become great manufacturing corporations, gigantic trusts, so to speak, carrying on productive industries to the destruction of the business of its citizens.

It will be observed that the House at the present session has declared that the National Government shall not give either countenance or aid to convict labor by prohibiting its employment on public buildings and the purchase of convict-made goods for the use of any of the Departments of the General Government. The pending bill is in the same judicious line of legislation.

The right of Congress to prohibit the introduction of foreigners and aliens, under contract or agreement to perform labor, into the United States has not been questioned.

Congress has not hesitated to protect domestic industries, and free labor employed therein, by levying heavy customs duties upon the products of the cheap labor of Europe when imported into this country—a feature of the tariff that commends itself to all.

Congress disregarded State lines when it passed the act prohibiting the transportation of live-stock affected with any contagious disease from one State to another.

Congress wisely arrested the immigration of Chinese by passing restriction acts, because the interests of free labor suffered injuriously therefrom.

Congress protected the farming interests by taxing oleomargarine and its congeners, and subjecting its production and sale to the burdens of the internal-revenue system.

Federal laws vigorously expel foreign paupers and convicts from the Federal Union.

The act to regulate commerce, approved February 4, 1887, regulates the charges of interstate common carriers, creates misdemeanors, imposes fines, establishes a commission, and clothes it with semi-judicial powers, speeds causes in the ordinary civil courts, and in numerous other ways displays the measureless powers, express and implied, of the National Legislature.

These several acts derive their validity, as does the bill under consideration, from those clauses in the Constitution, together with the necessary and proper implications therefrom, that confer the power and impose the duty upon Congress to regulate commerce, foreign and interstate, establish justice, and promote the general welfare.

The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly decided that this power to regulate commerce is exclusively vested in Congress, and that no residuum, however small, resides in the States since the adoption of the Federal Constitution; that the grant of the whole to the General Government is incompatible with a grant to the States of a part; that the supremacy of the laws of Congress, in cases of collision with State laws, is secured in the article which declares that the laws of Congress, passed in pursuance of the powers granted, shall be the supreme law.

It has been judicially declared likewise that the police power of a State and the foreign commercial power of Congress must stand together. It follows from this that the State may prohibit the sale of articles injurious to the welfare of its citizens within its territorial limits, and with stronger reason that Congress may prohibit the introduction of such articles within the State.

It only remains, therefore, on this part of the subject to inquire what is commerce as the term is used in the Constitution. The Supreme Court thus defines it:

"Commerce among the States, as defined by this court, is trade, traffic intercourse, and dealing in articles of commerce between States by its citizens or others, and carried on in more than one State."

The Supreme Court has likewise held, in giving judicial construction to so much of the clause in the Constitution as confers power upon Congress to regulate commerce with the Indian tribes, that—

"Congress, under this constitutional power, may not only prohibit the unlicensed introduction and sale of spirituous liquors in the Indian country, but extend such prohibition to territory in proximity to that occupied by the Indians."

The exclusive and measureless extent of the power of the National Government to control interstate commerce was clearly and sharply defined in a case reaching the Supreme Court by a writ of error to the supreme court of Pennsylvania.

In that case it was held that—

"The statute of a State imposing a tax upon freight taken up within the State and carried out of it, or taken up without the State and brought within it is repugnant to that provision of the Constitution which ordains Congress shall have power to regulate commerce among the several States."

Finally, your committee base the authority of Congress to pass this bill not only upon the right in the National Legislature to regulate commerce between the States, to establish justice, to promote the general welfare, as expressly conferred in the Constitution, but in that fundamental principle upon which all legitimate sovereignty rests, that the welfare of the people is the supreme law.

The petitioners have brought to the notice of Congress the existence of a great evil—widespread, ever-increasing—an evil beyond the control of State legislation; and it is inconceivable that, under these circumstances, Congress is without power to protect American labor and domestic industries; that it is not possible that this is the only wrong without a remedy.

Your committee report the bill to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

The views of the minority (presented by Mr. PLUMB) were read, as follows:

The undersigned, a member of the Committee on Labor, finding himself unable to agree with the majority of said committee in recommending the passage of the bill (H. R. 8716) entitled "A bill to protect free labor and the industries in which it is employed from the injurious effects of convict labor by confining the goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured by convict labor to the State in which they are produced," begs leave to submit the following minority report:

The undersigned yields in no respect to the majority of said committee in an earnest desire to secure for free labor all the protection and benefits that can be secured for it by legislation or other proper methods; but ill-advised legislation can only prejudice the interests that it seeks to promote.

In a matter so important the committee should have made full and impartial investigation, instead of basing its action, as it seems to have done, upon "petitions, numerously signed by leading manufacturers of the country," many of whom buy of the importers' agents and sell in this country the product of the labor of jails and convict prisons of England.

Such investigation does not appear to have been made. The committee has not availed itself of the opinions and experience of many eminent and disinterested authorities in this country who have for years made a careful study of the relations existing between convict labor and free labor, and who have, for several months past, been engaged in perfecting a system for so adjusting the industries carried on in the prisons of the country that they may offer the least possible competition with free labor, and who will present to the National Prison Association, at its meeting in Boston on the 15th of July next, the result of their labors in the shape of measures to secure uniform legislation in the several States upon this subject.

In considering the proposed bill the question may first properly be asked, Has Congress the power, under the Constitution, to pass such a bill?

It seems a palpable violation of the Constitution. Bearing in mind the familiar principle that the Constitution of the United States is a grant of certain enumerated powers, and that Congress can only exercise such powers as are actually granted by this instrument, we may search in vain for any authority to enact such a law. The power "to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States" can not be invoked as a warrant for exercising the power here assumed.

This power to regulate commerce "was vested in Congress in order to secure equality and freedom in commercial intercourse against discriminating State legislation" (see 19 Wallace, 584-590). The reverse of this is the avowed object of this bill. It assumes to prohibit, under penalties and forfeitures, the transportation from one State to another of certain articles of merchandise, not for the purpose of regulating commerce, but "to protect free labor and the industries in which it is employed." It institutes an unwarranted, if not odious, discrimination; it prohibits the transportation of goods, wares, or merchandise, however intrinsically useful, simply because they have been manufactured by the State itself, or under State laws and State regulations. A grosser invasion of State authority and State rights can not be conceived. It is a direct attack upon State laws and State institutions. Suppose, in ante bellum times, Congress had prohibited the transportation of cotton and sugar from one State to another because produced by slave labor, what would have been said as to the constitutionality of such an act of Congress?

Again, it is said to be a familiar principle of law that the power to regulate does not imply the power to prohibit; but this bill assumes to absolutely prohibit the transportation from one State to another of a specified class of merchandise. The power to prohibit the transportation of a class of merchandise involves the power to prohibit the transportation of all merchandise, and are gentlemen prepared to say that Congress possesses the power to erect such a Chinese wall as this between the States of this Union?

The majority of the committee embodies in its report a copy of the petition addressed to Congress by certain "leading manufacturers of the country" and assumes as true a statement therein made, to wit:

"That the prevailing system of employment of convict labor in the prisons of the several States operates unjustly and injuriously upon your petitioners and other citizens engaged in like productive industries, by imposing upon them an unjust, unequal, and ruinous competition in the markets of the country with the products of such convict labor."

A statement involving interests so wide-spread and of such public importance should be more concise and definite in its description of the "prevailing system of employment of convict labor" that it opposes, and certainly more specific as to the nature and extent of the competition complained of, especially since reliable data, bearing directly upon the subject, are within easy reach.

That statistics do not justify the complaint of the "leading manufacturers" is found in the concise but comprehensive report for 1886 of the Commissioner of Labor, Carroll D. Wright, who, after tabulating (on page 95) the classes of industries on which convicts are employed, arrives at the definite conclusion (see page 371) that—

"The product of the prisons is but fifty-four one-hundredths of 1 per cent. of the total mechanical product of the country. The whole prison population of those institutions in which productive labor is carried on is but one in a thousand of the population of the country, and those engaged in convict productive labor but one in three hundred of those engaged in free mechanical labor."

In connection with the above statement it may be asserted without fear of successful contradiction, that the unskilled and unwilling convict laborer accomplishes, on the average, not to exceed one-half as much per day as the free laborer in corresponding industries. As to comparative systems of labor under which convicts are employed, the report of the bureau of labor of the State of Missouri embodies a report on the subject, which, coming as it does from a committee composed mainly of gentlemen connected or in sympathy with labor organizations, is entitled to the utmost consideration.

The committee, after thorough investigation of the subject, concludes, as to the different systems of labor upon which convicts are employed, as follows (see page 174 of said report):

"While the committee are convinced that the contract system, taking it all in all, is the best for the State and for all classes of people, so far as financial results are concerned, it is thought best to limit the number of convicts engaged in one line of manufacturing."

It is no purpose of the minority to discuss the various systems of labor, nor is such discussion strictly pertinent to the questions under consideration, but the opinion above quoted is brought forward to indicate the wide and perplexing range of public interests involved, and as a protest against hasty and unwise legislation on so important a subject.

Prison labor is purely a local question, and must vary in its methods with location and climate. It may be furthermore regarded as a police regulation, over which individual States must have sole jurisdiction.

The proposed bill provides that it shall take effect at the expiration of sixty days from and after its passage. Is this not a most remarkable, unreasonable, and unjust proceeding, destroying, as it will if it shall become a law, the business and property of a large number of citizens who, under the provisions of the laws of the different States and under their protection, are engaged in manufacturing, and have contracts reaching many months ahead for the sale of their products, to whom the faith of the States is pledged for the labor necessary for the completion of said contracts? Will it be seriously contended by any member of this House that such sudden and unwarrantable abrogation of said contracts is within the power of Congress or in accordance with the sense of justice which should control its legislation?

As bearing upon the subject-matter of this report, reference to the report of the minister of justice of the Dominion of Canada for 1887 seems pertinent. After alluding to the congress of the National Prison Association, held at Atlanta, Ga., in November, 1886, it states:

"It was also established that convict labor of a remunerative character, employed in the production of articles which must have a market, is an absolute necessity for the maintenance of discipline, and is beneficial to society at large."

Further on in said report the minister, referring to a protest that had been entered against the introduction of mat-making into a Canadian prison, uses language which is applicable to our own country when he says:

"In this connection the competition is with the exporters in England, who supply Canada with the great bulk of the commodity used here, the product of prison looms and the outcome of prison labor."

A well-known writer on penal matters says:

"The increase of crime in the United States in proportion to the population is

a demonstration of the failure of existing methods of dealing with it, and must arrest the attention of thoughtful and honest men."

At the close of the year 1886 the prison population of the United States was classified as follows:

Engaged in productive labor	45,277
Engaged in prison duties	15,100
Idle and sick	3,972
Total	64,349

The cost of maintenance was close upon 50 cents per convict per diem, or a total of $11,743,692.50 per annum. To maintain this army in the idleness which the proposed legislation would enforce would, besides its inhumanity, add such a burden to those already borne by the tax-payers of the country that a mere reference to the proposition should cause it to be dismissed as unworthy of the age.

The committee, in its conclusions and deductions, quotes largely, and with deserved approval, from the report of the Commissioner of Labor, yet it has strangely overlooked his strong and emphatic statement that—

"Convict labor is of no great account compared with the presence of crime itself, and to avoid the presence of crime its commission must be prevented."

Again, he says:

"The diversity of interests, the diversity of industries as well, interstate commerce, and freedom of trade all demand that no legislation should be had which would in any way interfere with traffic between the States. The suggestion is the result of the earnest endeavor of men to find a solution to the supposed difficulties surrounding convict labor, such difficulties being so many and running in so many directions that various solutions, more or less sound, come to the surface."

The question involves not only systems of labor, but moral and social interests, as well as considerations of a more efficient and statesman-like treatment of the whole subject of crime than has yet prevailed. It is recognized by our most thoughtful and earnest men who study this subject that in any plan for the punishment or repression of crime the element of steady, wisely directed, productive labor must bear a prominent part. Our civilization demands the recognition of the criminal as a man whose natural rights may not be invaded or disregarded by the State, and for whose reformation and rehabilitation patient and persistent effort should be made. Thorough and scientific classification of criminals, setting apart the incorrigible at hard labor requiring little skill, putting the young and first offenders where they shall be taught useful trades and where they shall also be prepared by educational and moral training for returning to society better than when they left it—all these methods are of the greatest importance to the people. In all of them industry must be recognized as not only "the law of competence," but the basis of all genuine reformation. Therefore enforced idleness becomes inhuman, tends to check the repression of crime, and is in the highest degree detrimental to the State.

It seems to the undersigned that such enforced idleness must inevitably be the result in all the prisons of the country of the enactment of the proposed bill, with all its penalties and forfeitures, into a law. While this might bring temporary advantage to the "leading manufacturers of the country," it is not believed that it would result in any substantial benefit to the toiling thousands whose names are invoked to secure its passage. It would throw the industries affected into chaos and involve the people in millions of dollars of expense without securing to the country any equivalent in the way of benefits.

For the foregoing reasons and others of equal force that are not herein enumerated, the undersigned is constrained to differ from the majority of the committee and recommend that the bill do not pass.

RALPH PLUMB.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this measure reported from the Committee on Labor originated from a visit to this city of manufacturers from New York, Brooklyn, Jersey City, Philadelphia, and other places, who came before our committee to picture to us the ruin, the absolute ruin, that stared them in the face from this character of competition. One industry after another was attacked by this convict-labor system, and in every case that industry was compelled to reduce their prices below even the cost of manufacture or be driven from the market. Industries long established, industries employing thousands of men, found themselves face to face with this state of affairs. Business men who in their interest only recognized that they should have to compete with competitors honorably engaged in like pursuits and the competition from other countries found at home an insidious enemy.

Labor-saving machinery and the subdivision of work into many branches enabled prison contractors to so utilize the labor of convicts that within a very few months they could make of them skilled workmen at specialties in the various industries. Business men employing honest labor, who were paying their workmen $2 and $2.50 a day, found themselves face to face with competitors whose price for labor was 5 cents per hour, or 40 cents per day; they found themselves in many cases face to face with gigantic enterprises, the entire plant being furnished by the State. Immense manufacturing establishments built up out of the taxes of the people, the buildings, machinery, and incidental expenses borne by the people, the contractor in many cases only required to hire the labor, who were placed under his control, like slaves compelled to work, and punished for negligence, spoilt work, and failure to perform an allotted task.

The manufacturers came to us claiming that it could not be just or right that their property should be destroyed through such unfair competition as this; that under our system of laws a man's property should not be taken from him by any such process; that the convicts whose crimes had sent them into penal servitude should not be farmed out; that their labor should not be used, or was not intended to be used for the purpose of wrecking industries and destroying the labor of this country; besides destroying the trades of honest workmen, the encouragement of which has been the pride of every civilized country; the incentive to learn trades taken away by practically degrading the cause of labor through the continual graduation of the felons of the land from the penitentiary to the workshop.

The legislative committee of the labor organizations of this country, which comprise over half a million of organized workmen, appeared before our committee on behalf of the organizations of labor unions of this country to ask of us the passage of this bill. They said that there is no other question before the American people which so nearly and dearly concerned the welfare of every workingman as this. Your tariff question, which for a month has occupied the attention of this House, sinks into insignificance when you realize that you have a cancer at home eating at the heart of every trade in this country.

It is that condition of affairs that you have to meet. Trade after trade falls under the blighting influence of this competition. It extends from State to State. Last year over one-half of the hollow-ware of the United States was produced in prisons and placed upon the market at 30 per cent. less than manufacturers employing honest labor could produce it. Your wagon industry, your harness and saddlery work, carpets, mattings, coopering, chains, and marble work are attacked.

In every branch of industry where by the use of machinery, where by the utilization of convict labor these men can compete, they are engaged in the business, and I have been advised to-day that it has been even proposed to establish a printing establishment in one of the prisons of New York, against which the Typographical Union are now raising their powerful protest. There are but two sources of opposition to this bill. The workingmen of this country ask for it. The honest manufacturers of this country ask for it.

The opponents of the bill comprise only two classes, for one of whom I have the most unbounded respect. I mean gentlemen who seriously question the constitutionality of a measure of this kind, men whose sympathies lead in the direction of aiding labor, but who conservatively fear that this is a step a little in advance of the line. The only other class that have been heard from in opposition to this bill are the prison contractors and the wardens of your penitentiaries, and I need hardly tell any man whose mind is disturbed in regard to the legal aspects of this question that they whose interests are so vitally affected and who certainly have taken counsel believe this bill to be constitutional, or you would not find the city to-day full of these same contractors and prison wardens, and others acting with them, who believe that this bill if passed will stand the test of law, and hence are doing their utmost to defeat it. They certainly fear that the bill is constitutional. The powers conferred upon Congress to regulate commerce and to provide for the general welfare are broad enough when supported by the evidence of a great evil and demanded by the business interests of our country, and by the honest workingmen of our country, and will justify the passage of this bill; they have no doubt but that it will become a law.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. There is no remonstrance against the bill from any other quarter, I believe?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. No, sir; there is no remonstrance against this bill except from that element. I am not referring now to the legal gentlemen who question the constitutionality of it, but when you leave them out you will find that the only other opposition to the bill comes from those who have sympathy for these prison interests—not an unfair sympathy, but the natural sympathy which men feel for their friends and for the enterprises in which they are engaged.

I have told gentlemen representing those interests that I am perfectly willing to accept a reasonable amendment, extending the time for the bill to become operative. One of these prison contractors had the manhood to come to me and admit that it was a dishonorable business; that the use of the labor of thieves to destroy the honest labor of this country was not a legitimate business, but he said: "Give us a little time to get out of it." The question to-day is whether or not this House will pass this bill in response to the demands of the workingmen of this country and in response to the demands of the honest manufacturing interests of this country, and permit the legal questions involved to be determined by the Supreme Court of the United States.

If you refuse to pass this bill you deprive the workingmen and the honest manufacturers of their remedy; you deprive them of an opportunity of arriving at a result upon this question; you refuse them any opportunity for relief. On the other hand, if the bill becomes a law the present contractors and others interested with them have their remedy in an appeal to the courts. You do not deprive them of any right by passing the bill; you simply respect and respond to the will of the people, and place the seal of condemnation on this infamous work. Where in the history of legislation has there been such a demand for any legislation as there has been for this? Introduced hardly two months ago, reported from the Committee on Labor with but one dissenting vote, already over one hundred and fifty members of this House have filed petitions, petition upon petition coming from every section of this country, demanding the passage of the bill.

Mr. GEAR. How many have been filed against it?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. None that I am aware of.

Mr. GEAR. I beg your pardon. I think there are some.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. How many?

Mr. GEAR. I do not know.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I say that over one hundred and fifty members have filed petitions in favor of it.

Mr. GEAR. I do not dispute that at all.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I have received resolutions adopted by a mass meeting of the people of Philadelphia, by mass meetings of the people of New York, of St. Louis, and of other cities. I have here at my desk also the petitions of over 10,000 workmen; also the resolutions of the joint executive board of a body composed of 5,000 workingmen in Scranton, and of 2,000 workingmen in one organization in New York, which I have not yet filed. The petitions already filed comprise, or represent, in my judgment, from 150,000 to 200,000 workingmen, and would, I believe, exceed double that number but for the late date when the petitions were circulated. I have in my possession a mass of evidence of the blighting effects of this villainous competition which I do not deem it necessary to read, as the House concedes the injury done. In regard to the legal question involved, I have freely covered that question in the report which has been made to-day and forms part of the record.

I am confident that each proposition of law presented in the report of the majority of the committee is fully supported by the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States.

In giving judicial construction to the clause of the Constitution conferring the power to regulate commerce among the States the Supreme Court said, the learned John Marshall, Chief-Justice, delivering the opinion:

It is the power to regulate, that is, to prescribe the rule by which commerce is to be governed. This power, like all others vested in Congress, is complete in itself, may be exercised to the utmost extent, and acknowledges no limitations other than are prescribed in the Constitution. (Gibbons vs. Ogden, 9 Wheaton, 1).

Justice Story employed the following language in his dissenting opinion in The City of New York *vs.* Miln (11 Peters, 102):

The power given to Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the States has been deemed exclusive from the nature and objects of the power and the necessary implication growing out of its exercise. Full power to regulate a particular subject implies the whole power and leaves no residuum, and a grant of the whole to one is incompatible with a grant to another of a part.

Chief-Justice Taney, in the celebrated license cases (5 Howard, 504), enunciates the same doctrine:

Congress, under its general power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, may prescribe what articles of merchandise shall be admitted and what excluded, and may therefore admit or not, as it shall seem best, the importation of ardent spirits. And inasmuch as the laws of Congress authorize their importation, no State has a right to prohibit their introduction. The supremacy of the laws of Congress in cases of collision with State laws is secured in the article which declares that the laws of Congress passed in pursuance of the powers granted shall be supreme law.

If we substitute "among the States" for the words "with foreign nations," both sets of words being found in the same clause, the principles of this decision would be perfectly applicable to the questions now under discussion.

That this power of Congress, absolute and exclusive in its nature, is not, in the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States, controlled by State lines is evident from the following decisions under that part of the same clause of the Constitution relating to commerce with the Indian tribes.

In United States against Holliday (3 Wallace, 407) it was held that—

The circuit courts of the United States have jurisdiction of the selling of ardent spirits to an Indian under the act of February 12, 1862.

By that act Congress made it penal to sell spirituous liquors to an Indian under the charge of an Indian agent, although it was sold outside of any Indian reservation and within the limits of a State. The act is constitutional under the power to regulate commerce with the Indian tribes.

And in United States *vs.* Forty-three gallons of whisky, etc. (93 United States, 188), it was likewise held that—

Congress, under its constitutional power to regulate commerce with the Indian tribes, may not only prohibit the unlicensed introduction and sale of spirituous liquors in the Indian country, but extend such prohibition to territory in proximity to that occupied by the Indians.

The power of the State over its internal commerce and the supreme control of the United States over interstate commerce are clearly defined by the Supreme Court of the United States in State freight-tax case (15 Wallace, 232). In that case, reaching the United States Supreme Court on writ of error to the supreme court of Pennsylvania, it was held that—

The statute of a State imposing a tax upon freight taken up within the State and carried out of it, or taken up without a State and brought within it, is repugnant to that provision of the Constitution which ordains Congress shall have power to regulate commerce among the several States.

In fact, the whole line of decisions pronounced by the Supreme Court, from Gibbons against Ogden, February term, 1824, to Bowman against the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad Company, decided at the present term, are thoroughly consistent, and authorize us to declare the law to be that the power to regulate commerce among the several States is wholly vested in the Federal Congress; that no fraction of this power, however small, remains in any State; and that in the exercise of this power Congress is not restricted by State lines. And upon being advised that a mischief exists injuriously affecting any considerable number of citizens, it is not only the privilege but the duty of Congress to intervene and correct the mischief by appropriate legislation.

In the report from the committee the members will find that every feature of this question has been carefully considered in the hope that every reasonable objection would be met and speedy action had upon the bill.

In the name of honesty to the enterprising manufacturers of our country, in the name of justice to the honest labor of this country, I appeal to every friend of labor to stand by this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. WARNER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether he can tell us how many convicts there are in the penitentiaries of the different States.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I presume there are several hundred thousand.

Mr. GEAR. Fifty-eight thousand.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. About sixty-five thousand in the penitentiaries; but in the reformatories and the other institutions to which prisoners are sent there are a great many more; I do not know the exact number, but it comprises several hundred thousand.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. Speaker, this bill, I have no doubt, has been honestly brought forward in the interest of labor. As a measure in that direction, and so far as it is possible in this way to conserve the interests of labor, the bill is entitled to my hearty support. I yield to no man on this floor or elsewhere in heartfelt devotion to the interests of the laboring men of the United States, and anything which can be done in their behalf will find in me a most earnest coadjutor.

But, sir, I consider this bill as a very extraordinary measure. What does it propose? It proposes to punish as criminals those who transport particular articles of merchandise from one State of this Union to another. Not those who make the goods, but those who transport the goods which are manufactured in a certain way, are to be made criminals and to be subjected to fine and imprisonment. It strikes me that this is a very extraordinary proposition, and nothing short of the most extraordinary circumstances would justify the passage of the bill as it now stands.

What are the circumstances? It has been stated very eloquently by the chairman of the committee [Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri] that labor comes here and asks to be protected. Sir, it is not merely labor that comes here, permit me to say, but it is the manufacturer who comes here; and if the manufacturer had not come in advance with this measure there would never have been a petition sent to this House on the subject. It is, then, a question with reference to the manufacturers. I have not the same degree of interest in the manufacturer that I have in the laborer; and I undertake to say that there is not an honest laborer in this broad land who would not be willing that the right thing should be done in order to give proper consideration to those who are to be affected by the passage of this bill.

What does the bill propose? It proposes to interdict absolutely from passage across a State line every article manufactured in whole or in part by any convict or any person confined in any of the reformatories of the land. We have reform schools in which boys and girls are employed, and we have prisons, the occupants of which are engaged in useful occupations; and under the operation of this bill anything which these persons may make becomes tainted, and on that account can not pass a State line. Sir, this bill proposes not only to correct the evil complained of in reference to labor, but it asks that Congress, by national legislation, shall step in and do that which is required to be done by the States and by those intrusted with the care of convicts, in order to properly conduct the prison reformatories of the whole country.

I had supposed, Mr. Chairman, that this duty belonged to the various States. I had supposed that these institutions were under the control of officers who had been selected on account of their ability, their humanity, their disposition to contrive means by which the great object of imprisonment, the reformation of the prisoner, could be secured. If we lived in the dark ages, if we had no consideration for men who have committed crime, but at once cast them outside of the pale of humanity upon conviction of any offense, this bill would be an appropriate measure. But, sir, we live in no such age. We live in an age when "A man's a man for a' that;" and though he may have been overtaken in the commission of a crime, still, whether inside or outside the walls of a penitentiary, he has a claim upon us which, as friends of humanity, we recognize, and it is our duty in every possible way to promote his welfare.

Now, it is the testimony of all who have had charge of prisons that in no way can we discharge our duty to the unfortunate prisoner unless we occupy him in productive industry. It will not do to put him upon the treadmill or to shut him up in solitary confinement; he must be occupied, he must have work, and that work must be productive—work which employs the mind and the hand, and makes him conscious that he is doing something, and that he is engaged in honest labor, and thus far discharging his obligation to the State.

The work of reforming prisoners has engaged the attention of many of the ablest men in the country for many years, and in conjunction with the States in which they operate, and acting in harmony with the great idea which has properly taken possession of the public mind, namely, that everything possible should be done in order to protect productive labor, these men have been contriving methods by which the labor of convicts should be so utilized as in the least possible degree to affect the price of labor outside. This sentiment has prevailed to such an extent in several of the States of the Union that they have

taken steps to get rid of contract labor. The States in which such action has been adopted are Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Ohio, and Illinois. The latter State, which I have in part the honor to represent, has by constitutional amendment provided that as soon as the present contracts have terminated there shall be no more contract labor in our penitentiaries. And it is well known that it is the object, and the sincere object, of those who have prison reform in their charge to so manage that in these various States the kind of convict employment even on State account shall be that which shall least affect labor outside of their respective prisons.

Now, sir, I submit that it is not proper for the Congress of the United States to undertake the work of prison reform. The language of this report goes on to state that the course pursued has been a failure in regard to prison reform. Has it come to this? Is it proper work for us to do to enter these States and their prisons, and decide here by law what shall and what shall not be done in reference to prison management.

I shall be very much surprised, Mr. Speaker, if a vote of this House shall determine such to be the legitimate work of this body. But a word more in reference to that feature of the question which refers to interfering with commerce between the States.

I have looked upon our great galaxy of States with supreme delight, recognizing the fact that there was nothing in the shape of an interdiction upon the States possible that could hamper or prevent in any manner the freest interchange between the States and the Territories of the nation. I had supposed that that was one of the chief glories of our system, that while we had the right to bar out other governments of the world and to interdict trade from distant nations, except on such conditions as we saw proper to prescribe, and had thus placed restrictions upon the commerce of the outside world; yet amongst the States themselves there was the freest trade, and as far as I know no law has ever undertaken where the article traded in is unobjectionable to interfere with the perfect freedom of exchanges between the States of this Union. I believe, sir, this is the first time since the formation of this Government that such a thing has been attempted, and it must be justified upon strong grounds of necessity before the Congress of the United States can enter upon such a course.

The effect of this proposition will be the contamination of the articles produced by the labor of all of these convicts. The girl who is employed in the reformatory for the time being for any light offense, in doing what is suited to woman's capacity, in kitting goods or such work, will so contaminate the work that she does that it may not be sold outside of the State where it is produced. It has got to be sold inside of the State where the reformatory is. So also with the boy; he can not be employed to make articles to ship to outside territory; they must all be sold inside of the State. The effect would be that the competition would come as certainly on outside labor as it would if transported to any other market, and, besides this, State regulations with reference to it would necessarily be changed, and that labor so essential in all of its necessary conditions, recognized now as so necessary that it is even being introduced into the common schools and acknowledged by all to be indispensable in promoting prison reform itself, must be abandoned and the work must be suspended.

I might enlarge upon these objections to the bill. I might offer other reasons which occur to me, but I am aware that other members desire to speak, and in conclusion will say that I am unwilling to give my sanction and consent by any vote of mine to the passage of such a bill, as much as I desire to benefit the laboring man. I can not get my own consent to step upon such dangerous ground and at the same time interfere with work which will better promote the efficiency of prison discipline and prison reform than any legislation we can adopt.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Before the gentleman sits down let me ask him a question. You represent in your district the Joliet penitentiary?

Mr. PLUMB. It is in my district.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Yes, sir; so I understand. Now the bill which recently passed the House to prohibit the purchase or use of the products of convict labor for the use of any department of the Government or on public buildings—I believe you advised me that you had a letter from the warden of the penitentiary in opposition to that.

Mr. PLUMB. What of it?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. You were opposed to that?

Mr. PLUMB. I did not oppose that bill by my vote.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. But you gave me the impression that you were opposed to it.

Mr. PLUMB. I did not oppose it by my vote.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Your penitentiary has done more harm to the trades of this country than any other in it.

Mr. PLUMB. I now yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS].

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Arkansas is recognized for fifteen minutes.

Mr. PLUMB. Before that I send to the desk and ask to have read an amendment which I shall offer at the proper time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 3 by adding:

"Except as to goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured under existing contracts that have been made by any State for the employment of its convict labor; and in such cases this act shall take effect immediately upon the expiration of such contract."

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. That is read for information I suppose?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Amendments are now in order and may be considered. But the gentleman from Illinois has an hour in which to debate the bill and pending amendments to it, but may yield any portion to other gentlemen, at which time the gentleman from Missouri may occupy the remainder of his hour, during which time it will be in order for him to demand a vote upon any amendment under the previous question.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. Has the time been limited? I was not aware of any limitation.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It has not been. No limit has been placed upon the debate. The gentleman from Illinois has the floor and is entitled to one hour.

Mr. HOUK. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. At what time are amendments in order?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. At any time when the gentleman gets the floor. The gentleman from Illinois now has the floor, and yields a portion of his time to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HOUK. That will not cut off amendments hereafter?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. This bill is not in Committee of the Whole; it is in the House, and it is in order of course to move the previous question at any time, which would cut off all amendments.

[Mr. ROGERS withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, during the remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] I asked him to yield to me a moment, but he declined to do so; and I am now compelled to call his attention to the fact that he erred in stating that the clause of the Constitution now under consideration was in issue before the Supreme Court in the case which he cited from 15 Peters. I have here a statement of the decision in the case of Groves and others *vs.* Slaughter, 15 Peters, 449, which shows that the Supreme Court of the United States in that case held merely that the prohibition in the constitution of the State of Mississippi adopted October 26, 1832, against the introduction of slaves into that State as merchandise or for sale after the 1st day of May, 1833, was inoperative without appropriate legislation by the Legislature of that State to give effect to the constitutional prohibition, there being no penalties or restrictions in the constitution for the due and effectual operation of the prohibition.

The case reached the Supreme Court of the United States on writ of error from the circuit court of the United States for the eastern district of Louisiana. Suits had been brought upon two promissory notes given in part payment for the price of certain slaves purchased from Robert Slaughter, which slaves were introduced into the State of Mississippi after the 1st day of May, 1833. The authority to "prevent slaves from being brought into the State of Mississippi as merchandise" was secured to that State in the first constitution of Mississippi, approved by Congress and the President of the United States December 10, 1817. The sole question presented to the court was whether the failure of the Legislature of Mississippi to pass laws to carry into effect the constitutional prohibition rendered the latter inoperative. All the rest of the opinions of the justices of the Supreme Court were mere reasoning—*obiter dictum*, as the gentleman from Maryland has suggested—which was not binding and did not become the law of the land. The decision had no binding authority beyond or outside of the simple question already stated.

It is to be noticed that the decision was by a part of the justices only. Judge Catron did not sit; Justice Barbour had died; Justice McKinley dissented from the opinion as delivered by Justice Thompson, as did also Justice Story. Judge Thompson, not Judge McLean, delivered the opinion of the court from which the gentleman from Arkansas has quoted. Judge McLean simply gave a separate opinion, including the voluntary statement which has been cited and which had nothing on earth do with the case.

It is also to be remembered that the decision was rendered at a time when slavery was potential and its existence dependent upon such a construction of the Federal Constitution; otherwise a Northern or free State could have excluded the cotton, rice, and sugar of the slave States.

Finally, the questions involved in this bill prohibiting a State from flooding a neighboring State with the products of the labor of her convicts belong rather to the courts than the legislature; and Congress by reason of the constitutional question is not relieved from placing the seal of condemnation upon this mischief, so widespread as to affect the general welfare within the meaning of the Constitution.

Mr. RAYNER. What is the paper from which the gentleman has been reading?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. A part of it is the decision of the court; the remainder is my own views.

Mr. RAYNER. Which were your views?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. The latter part—the best part. [Laughter.

Mr. HERMANN. I desire the attention of the gentleman from Missouri for a moment. I understand this is a bill introduced in the interest of labor, a bill intended to operate against cheap labor and in the direction of higher wages. Here I am with him for I am a friend of labor. Now, we have a law in force, which operates especially upon the Pacific coast, particularly in the State of California, for the exclusion of cheap Chinese labor, the Chinese having become an important (yet a most unwelcome and ruinous) element in our population. They have encroached upon the field of white labor of American citizens and every department feels the degradation inflicted upon our own people, and the sources of employment which should be theirs. These Chinese have already boot and shoe factories and cigar manufactories, and their products are shipped into other States. I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Missouri whether he claims that we have not also the authority under the principle of this bill to enact legislation to restrict the transportation of the products of that class of labor from the boundaries of California into other States.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. If it is convict labor that will be the effect of the bill, as it certainly ought to be.

Mr. HERMANN. Then I ask the gentleman upon what authority he would draw a distinction between that species of cheap labor called "convict labor" and that other class of cheap labor called Chinese labor.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Under what provision of the Constitution do we exclude the Chinese from California? Was it under the "general-welfare" clause?

Mr. HERMANN. I submit that the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Well, I have come close enough to it. [Laughter.] The same principle is involved of protecting American honest labor, and it was that sentiment which prompted the anti-Chinese legislation.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is true, as asserted by the gentleman from Missouri, that I was in error in referring to the opinion of the Supreme Court, in 15 Peters, as having been delivered by Mr. Justice McLean. It was, as the gentleman states, delivered by Judge Thompson. But in those days it was customary for all the judges to file opinions; and I read from the opinion of Justice McLean, supposing at the time that he was the judge who delivered the opinion of the court. The dissenting opinions, as my friend has stated, were delivered by Justices McKinley and Story; the remainder of the court concurred in the opinion.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Am I not also right in holding that the question here involved had nothing to do with the case which was before the court?

Mr. ROGERS. I do not think so.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. That question was in regard to the authority under the State constitution to introduce slaves into Mississippi.

Mr. ROGERS. I think that the question which was discussed in the language I cited was legitimately discussed by the court.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER].

Mr. RAYNER. When I examined this law this morning I had some serious doubts of its constitutionality, but after hearing the learned argument of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] I have no doubt whatever upon the point, but believe it to be entirely constitutional [laughter], and I say that in no spirit of disrespect for the learned argument, but simply because of the fact that the decisions quoted by the gentleman to show the unconstitutionality of the law, so far from doing that, indicate quite the contrary, that we have the constitutional power to pass it.

Now let me say that the opinion of Justice McLean was a running opinion; and while I say it with the greatest respect to one of the judges presiding over that court, his opinions are not so guarded and are not accorded the same share of attention and weight which it would seem they should be entitled to. In the present instance, as I said during the course of the gentleman's argument, it was a mere *obiter dictum;* it had nothing to do with the point at issue in the case to be decided. It was a sentiment expressed by the judge in rendering an opinion upon the facts there involved. He is the only one of the judges of the Supreme Court that I know of, and there is no decision of the Supreme Court except this that I know of, that draws any distinction whatever between the interdiction of foreign commerce and the regulation or embargo upon interstate commerce. That is the point, in my opinion, that tests and decides the question as to the constitutionality of the measure now before us.

The same clause of the Constitution that gives Congress the right to regulate commerce between the States also gives to Congress the right to regulate commerce with foreign nations. Justice McLean holds that there is a distinction between the right of Congress to regulate commerce with foreign nations and the right to regulate commerce between the States. With the utmost deference and respect to the learned judge, I say it was only an *obiter dictum;* that there is no such distinction, and that there is no authority and no decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which says that there is. I repeat, precisely the same clause which gives Congress the right to regulate commerce between the States gives it the right to regulate commerce with foreign nations; and the same construction that applies to a law regulating commerce between the States must apply, and with equal force, to every regulation touching commerce with foreign nations. What, then, is the fact? Why, Mr. Chairman, there is not a month that Congress is in session, or has been within the last few years, that it has not passed laws regulating commerce with foreign nations to the extent of total prohibition.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RAYNER. Yes, sir; if I can get a minute or two longer.

Mr. BLAND. Does the gentleman believe that Congress has the power to prevent the importation of tobacco, cigars, whisky or beers, or the products of any one State into another?

Mr. RAYNER. I will come to that in a minute.

Mr. BLAND. Because we had better have all of these questions understood before we undertake to pass such a bill.

Mr. RAYNER. Now, what has Congress done? It passed a law, and I wish I had it here. I have made inquiry among the Judiciary Committee, but they can not refer me to the date; but Congress passed a law, as gentlemen will remember, prohibiting the importation of foreign contract labor.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. That was passed in the Forty-eighth Congress, and was amended in the Forty-ninth.

Mr. RAYNER. Yes, sir, and the Supreme Court of the United States passed upon the validity of that law. They held that the law prohibiting the importation of foreign contract labor is a valid, constitutional exercise on the part of Congress of the power invested in it to regulate commerce with foreign nations. Now if we can tacitly prevent the importation of foreign labor, and if Justice McLean in an *obiter dictum* in which he is clearly wrong, draws a distinction between the right to regulate commerce with foreign nations and the right to regulate commerce between the States, a difference that does not exist, why, then, have not we the same right to do it between the States as we have between foreign nations, and wherein does the distinction lie?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I would ask general consent that the gentleman be allowed to finish his statement.

Mr. RAYNER. I should like to have about ten minutes.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the gentleman proceeding for ten minutes not to be charged to the time of either side in the debate?

Mr. FARQUHAR. Let me ask a question for information: whether the debate not having been limited it is necessary to make any such request as to an extension of time?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Missouri took the floor and occupied a portion of his hour, and yielded the floor, reserving the remainder of his time. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PLUMB] was then recognized and occupied a short time and yielded fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS]. After that time had been consumed, a slight extension was allowed by the same gentleman; after which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. O'NEILL] yielded five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland of his time, and now desires unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maryland may occupy ten or fifteen minutes longer, not to be charged to his time or to the time of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. OATES. Has any limit been fixed?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. None.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Does that contemplate that only two hours are to be allowed?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. No; after the two hours have been occupied the Chair will recognize any other gentleman, unless the previous question shall have been demanded and ordered.

The Chair hears no objection to yielding fifteen minutes further to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. RAYNER. There is another question that Congress has passed upon over and over again here, to prevent the transportation from State to State of cattle affected by contagious diseases.

A MEMBER. But that is a police regulation.

Mr. RAYNER. The courts have passed upon the constitutionality of such a law, and it is not a police regulation. Congress has no right to pass police regulations affecting the States, and there is no power that gives Congress any such rights. Police powers belong to the States themselves; and yet in the passage of this act to which I have referred it was understood to be a distinct right of Congress under the power to regulate commerce between the States. This act prohibited the sending of diseased cattle or infected cattle from one State to another, and was enacted by Congress on the ground of its constitutional right to regulate commerce between the States.

Mr. MCADOO. Besides that, the act required the sanction of the executives of the States.

Mr. RAYNER. Undoubtedly; the right to regulate commerce between the States carries with it the right to prohibit it. I do not think Congress has any right to pass a law that will operate on the State of Massachusetts or the State of New York to the detriment of other States in the Union; but I do think Congress has a right to pass a law which will operate on all the States.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. RAYNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Then, if I understand your argument, if Congress has a right to pass a law saying that the transportation of diseased cattle between the States may be inhibited, therefore Congress has the power and right to say no cattle shall be transported from one State to another.

Mr. RAYNER. No, sir; I do not say that.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Then your argument does not go so far as it would seem to go.

Mr. RAYNER. I will say to the gentleman from Minnesota that this is a diseased product made by different States. It is not a legitimate commerce. It is not within the lines of legitimate commerce. When Congress passes a law preventing the products of prison labor from competing with the products of labor of other States it is passing a law in the interest of commerce and for the benefit of the States against which that production operates.

I do not hold for a moment that Congress has the right to pass an act to prevent a State shipping its rice, its sugar, or its cotton crops to another State or to lay an embargo or to pass a non-intercourse act between the States. But this is another question, and you have to examine it in another light. This is a proposition to enable the legitimate commerce of every State to compete with the legitimate commerce of other States and to prevent the illegitimate commerce of other States, which in effect is not true commerce at all, because it is not produced by the citizens of the State, from coming into unlawful and illegitimate competition with the actual legitimate commerce of the various States.

Mr. CRAIN. Will the gentleman permit me a question?

Mr. RAYNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. CRAIN. You say the right to regulate commerce carries with it the right to prohibit.

Mr. RAYNER. To some extent.

Mr. CRAIN. Do you not know that a good deal of the sugar of this country is manufactured by convict labor?

Mr. RAYNER. What has that to do with it? We are discussing a constitutional question now—whether under the law to regulate commerce between the States Congress has not the right to prevent the transmission of convict-made goods from one State to another.

Mr. WARNER. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. RAYNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WARNER. If it be true that a part of our sugar is manufactured by convict labor, should not that be subject to the same regulation as a pair of boots manufactured by convict labor? Why should there be any distinction?

Mr. RAYNER. The different quality of the products does not affect the constitutionality of the law, whether it relates to sugar, to shoes, to whisky, or anything else.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. RAYNER. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Does the gentleman call this a diseased product because it is the product of convict labor?

Mr. RAYNER. The word diseased was used in connection with another act of Congress. I say this is not a prohibition of the legitimate commerce of a State. There is a broad line of distinction and demarkation between Congress passing a law to prohibit, for instance, the State of Maryland from sending any of its products into another State, and a law prohibiting all the States from sending a particular kind and quality of goods made by prison labor into any of the States. The distinction is easily discernible.

Mr. MILLIKEN. What I wanted to ask the gentleman was if he thought this was a product that should be prohibited, or against which the honest laborer of the country should be protected because it is the product of convict labor. If he says that is so, I agree with him. And then I want to ask him whether the same rule should not apply to the products of the pauper labor of the Old World that are brought here in competition with the products of our labor.

Mr. RAYNER. Undoubtedly; I am in favor of restricting what the gentleman calls foreign pauper labor, but we will not go into the policy of this just now. Let me give you two decisions, and I will then close this argument. See what the court says.

Mr. CRAIN. What has been suggested by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN] is just what the report says:

> Congress has not hesitated to protect domestic industries and free labor employed therein, by levying heavy customs duties upon the products of the cheap labor of Europe when imported into this country—a feature of the tariff that commends itself to all.

Mr. PAYSON. From what document is the gentleman from Texas reading?

Mr. CRAIN. From the report of a Democratic committee.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I reported that, and I think it is the sentiment of this country.

Mr. RAYNER. Let us see what the Supreme Court say in the last case.

Here is the case that is quoted by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] to sustain his view as to the unconstitutionality of this law. I have not heard a word that he has quoted from any court or any judge which shows that a law of this kind would be unconstitutional except the *obiter dictum* of Justice McLean in this case, and that was not in reference to a point in the case, and he afterwards modified his opinion. Here is what the court says:

> So far as these regulations made by Congress extend, they certainly are indications of its intention that the transportation of commodities between the States shall be free, except where it is positively restricted by Congress itself or by the States in particular cases by express permission of Congress.

You do not want anything plainer than that, and it is decisive of the whole question. That is the decision of the Supreme Court, and it cites the cases upon which the opinion is based.

The States have no right to do it except in the exercise of their police power, and in the last case that was quoted the same language was used. In these Indian cases here is the very point involved. My friend from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] did not read the whole of these cases. Of course he intended to do so, but he read only portions of them, and what he did read were the *obiter dicta* of the judges, and when you come to examine the cases you find that they decide exactly the opposite and hold that a law analogous to this is constitutional. It was also contended that the intercourse act was not a regulation of commerce within the meaning of the Constitution; but the court held otherwise, and said:

> It relates to the buying and selling and exchange of commodities, which is the essence of all commerce, and it regulates the intercourse between the citizens of the United States and those tribes, which is another branch of commerce, and a very important one, and this power is in no wise affected by the magnitude of the traffic or the extent of the intercourse.

That was a total interdiction of the selling of liquor to the Indians.

Now, if Congress had the right to prohibit the Indians of the State of Michigan, in which State there was not even an Indian reservation at the time, from buying liquor—if it had that power under the clause of the Constitution which gives it the right to regulate commerce, why has not Congress the power to prohibit the citizens of all the States equally from buying a product made by convict labor?

Mr. CRAIN. That was under an Indian treaty.

Mr. RAYNER. Congress has never passed a regulation except under the commerce clause.

Mr. CRAIN. Had not we a treaty with the Indians?

Mr. RAYNER. There could not be any treaty with the Indians except under the Constitution. The Constitution of the United States is an instrument of enumerated powers, and every law of Congress must be traceable to some provision of the Constitution. All your laws in relation to the Indian tribes, all your treaties with the Indian tribes, all your laws in relation to the importation of foreign contract labor, all your laws in reference to the exclusion of the Chinese, your oleomargarine law which you passed in the last Congress, your law prohibiting the transmission of infectious cattle from one State to another—all your laws must be traced and brought home to some particular provision of the Constitution, and the provision that these laws have been brought home to is the provision giving Congress power to regulate commerce between the States.

Mr. CRAIN. Not at all.

Mr. PAYSON. The oleomargarine law was a revenue bill.

A MEMBER. Yes; it got in under the false pretense of laying a tax.

Mr. RAYNER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON] is correct. I remember it now. The Supreme Court placed the oleomargarine decision upon that ground, but upon what ground has it placed the right to pass laws prohibiting the importation of foreign contract labor?

Mr. CRAIN. And the Chinese.

Mr. RAYNER. There is nothing about the Chinese in the Constitution.

Mr. CRAIN. Is there not? Let me read section 9, Article I:

> The migration or importation of such persons as any of the States now existing shall think proper to admit, shall not be prohibited by the Congress prior to the year 1808, but a tax or duty may be imposed on such importation, not exceeding $10 for each person.

That, of course, was intended to apply to slaves brought into this country, but not exclusively; the clause in the Constitution which gives power to regulate commerce is held to apply to steam-ships, although they were not in existence at the time the Constitution was framed.

Mr. RAYNER. Well, I say that when Congress passed the law to prohibit the importation of foreign labor under contract, it did it under its power to regulate commerce. The Supreme Court of the United States within the last ten or fifteen years have modified a good many of their strict constructions of the Constitution. In the case of Pensacola against the Telegraph Company and the case of Texas against the Telegraph Company, the Supreme Court held that a telegraphic message was a subject-matter of commerce; that under the right to regulate commerce between the States Congress could pass a law in relation to telegraph messages, and that the transmission of such messages was a subject of interstate commerce. On this question there have been many changes.

In conclusion, let me say that while I will not contend in the presence of either lawyer or layman that under the power to regulate commerce between the States Congress has the right to pass a non-intercourse or embargo act prohibiting a State from transmitting any of its products to another State, we have the right in order to encourage and promote the legitimate commerce of a State to pass such a law

operating only upon a particular product, that product being goods made by prison labor and coming directly in conflict with the legitimate commerce of citizens of the States.

Mr. CRAIN. Would not that confine them to the "home market?"

Mr. RAYNER. I am not so much in favor of the "home market" as the gentleman is.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. SPRINGER). The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PLUMB] is now entitled to the floor for fifteen minutes.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I do not wish to take the floor by permission of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PLUMB], but in my own right.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair can only recognize the gentleman from Illinois to conclude his hour, unless the gentleman from Missouri desires to conclude now the hour upon which he has entered.

Mr. PAYSON. Has not my colleague [Mr. PLUMB] the right to reserve his time?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Strictly speaking no member has the right to reserve any time. The rules regulating debate require that any gentleman entering upon an hour must at that time occupy that hour or resign the floor. But there has grown up a practice permitting gentlemen, after speaking a portion of their time, to reserve the remainder of their hour. If objection had been made in this case the Chair would have sustained the objection. These gentlemen having been permitted to reserve their time without objection, the Chair holds that they may now occupy the residue of their time. If neither of these gentlemen desires to speak, the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH].

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. The gentleman from Ohio had better speak now in the time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PLUMB].

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I understand the gentleman from Illinois yielded simply to accept the proposition made by the Chair that the gentleman from Ohio be recognized in his own right.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. The gentleman from Ohio can not be recognized if I am entitled to the floor.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I do not desire to take the time of either the gentleman from Missouri or the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. If the gentleman from Missouri should now resume the floor, and at the conclusion of his remarks demand the previous question, would not that demand, if sustained by the House, cut out the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I think it would.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It would, unless the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PLUMB] should claim the time which he reserved and to which he is entitled.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I am willing that the gentleman from Illinois give his remaining time to the gentleman from Ohio, and that then I occupy the remainder of my time.

Mr. ADAMS. There are several gentlemen who desire to speak against this bill, and they must occupy more than fifteen minutes, or they need not speak at all. It is not necessary to move the previous question at the end of two hours' debate. If the gentleman from Missouri attempts to do it he may succeed; but it will be unfair, and I think unwise.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Our committee has other business that it must look after.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I think I state the sentiment of the House when I say that I believe the House is ready to vote on this bill now, and pass it. At the same time I do not wish to take away from any gentleman the privilege of speaking on the question. I do submit, however, in all fairness, that there ought to be a reasonable limit fixed to the debate, in order that we may reach a vote promptly.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. The gentleman from Missouri says he believes the House is ready to vote. I suggest to him that two learned constitutional lawyers of the House have discussed this question, one claiming that the bill is unconstitutional and the other that it is not. Under these circumstances how are laymen going to vote?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. That very position of affairs should satisfy every member that only the Supreme Court of the United States can finally determine that constitutional question. I want to reach a vote as soon as possible. We have other bills to take up. I am willing that debate be closed in an hour from this time, giving as much time as possible to those gentlemen who have indicated a desire to speak—the gentleman from Illinois, the gentleman from Ohio, and the gentleman from Missouri. It is now ten minutes after 2 o'clock. Would gentlemen be willing to agree that the debate upon the bill and amendments close at half past 3 o'clock?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. So far as I am personally concerned, I would.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. If that can be assented to, I am willing, at the risk of offending some of my friends, to give gentlemen opposed to the bill most of the time. I give notice that at half past 3 o'clock I will call for the previous question on the bill and amendments; and I am willing to give most of the intervening time to gentlemen who oppose the bill.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Before that motion is put I think it but fair to the members that we should understand how this time is to be disposed of, so that the opponents of the bill may know what time is to be allotted to them in the discussion.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that this arrangement can only be made by consent of the House.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I am willing to give one hour to the opposition of the one hour and twenty minutes allowed for debate, if that will suit gentlemen.

Mr. PLUMB. That will be entirely satisfactory to me.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will submit the question to the House.

Is there objection to limiting the debate to one hour and twenty minutes?

Mr. HOUK. Does that cut off amendments?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It will not cut off amendments unless the previous question is ordered, but it will cut off all debate upon amendments.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not think we ought to be limited arbitrarily in that way. This matter had better be fully considered. Gentlemen who are opposed to this bill will probably want more time than that.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Is it not fair to give them an hour of the hour and twenty minutes allowed for debate?

Mr. BLOUNT. From your standpoint ten minutes would no doubt be enough time to occupy in the debate.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I am not disposed to say anything that is ungracious, facetious, unkind, or unfriendly because I want to reach a vote upon this bill. I have indicated my willingness to give all the time that could reasonably have been asked commensurate with the importance of other matters which we want to bring before the House. All of my efforts have failed up to this time. I intend, therefore, at the expiration of the hour, to move the previous question upon the bill and amendments. There is no other alternative.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman propose to allow amendments?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Amendments can be offered, and we will vote upon them.

Mr. CANNON. Very well; I have an amendment to offer.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Now, after stating my intention, I am perfectly willing that the gentleman from Illinois may take the remainder of his time and yield it to the gentleman from Ohio, or anybody else he sees fit.

Mr. BLAND. But other gentlemen desire to discuss this question; I want some time myself.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I will take the fifteen minutes allotted and preface what I shall say by merely stating that it is not the first time in the name of labor in this House that the rights of labor have been outraged. This is a most startling proposition.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman from Ohio allow me to send to the desk an amendment?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. If it does not come out of my time.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I only want to send it to the desk and have it considered as pending. It need not be read.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from Ohio allow me also to have an amendment read and have it pending? It does not come out of the time allowed for debate, I understand.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I will wait until these several amendments are handed in before proceeding with what I had intended to say.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that though these amendments may now be offered and considered as pending, it is impossible to determine whether they are offered in the order in which they will be voted upon. There may be amendments to amendments, and the Chair will be compelled to first entertain amendments in their proper parliamentary order as applicable to the subject-matter of the bill.

Mr. RYAN. It is understood that no amendments are excluded, and that being so, may they not as well be offered now?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has suggested that they may be sent up and be considered as pending.

Mr. CANNON. If the understanding is that the amendments may be offered hereafter, I have no desire to have this read now, but will withhold it for the present.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It will be withdrawn, then, for the present.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Mr. Speaker, fifteen minutes every gentleman upon this floor must recognize as being much too short a time in which to discuss the details of such a bill as this, much less the constitutional aspect of the measure that is here presented.

First, who are interested in this measure? The laborers of this country. And who are they? All who with brain or hands contribute to the well-being of the community of which they form a part. There are those who would establish classes in this country. I deny the right of any man on this floor or elsewhere or any set of men to separate the boys of my hearthstone into classes according to the occupation of each or the field of employment to which they may severally be called. Show me the man here not properly in the ranks of labor with hand or brain or both, and I will show you a man who is not fit to be here. There seems to be an impression, Mr. Speaker, that but a very small portion of my countrymen belong to the ranks of labor, and that there are but few whose rights are to be considered in connection with this measure.

The line is to be drawn, it would seem, between those who are employed in one avocation and the citizen employed in another; as if there can in this country be any proper difference in the rights and duties which citizenship secures and imposes between the carpenter and the farmer, the machinist and the lawyer. The good of all is best secured by laboring to promote the good of each. And we all must realize that fact.

Is there any gentleman here willing to concede for a moment that there is a desire nearer his heart than the promotion of the general good of all of our people wherever and however they may be employed? Is there a Representative upon this floor who can get his own consent to legislate with reference to the few regardless of the interest of the many?

We speak of disturbing men in the ranks of labor! A pebble dropped into the ocean disturbs every atom of water in that ocean, and so an injury inflicted upon any one in the ranks of labor affects every portion of the social system, from the highest to the lowest, from the circumference to the center, so intimately connected and interlaced are all our interests.

Sir, the man who intimates that any one on this floor is not devoted to what he believes to be the best interests of labor is either a knave or an unabridged ass. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, by these observations I mean to assert that we are all equally interested in a right disposition of this measure; because, to repeat myself, the well-being of the humblest man in the Republic has to do with the well-being of the mightiest. In other words, as society is constituted in this country, that which unjustly injures a member of society is in a measure detrimental to the whole community of which that member forms a part. So the highest interest of this House is to promote the well-being of all.

Now what does this bill look to? It provides—

That every person who knowingly transports, or causes to be delivered for transportation, from the State or Territory in which they are in whole or in part manufactured, any goods, wares, or merchandise, in whole or in part manufactured by convict labor in any penitentiary, prison, reformatory, or other establishment in which convict labor is employed, to or into any other State or Territory, or into the District of Columbia, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine not less than $100 nor more than $5,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding one year, or by both such fine and imprisonment, at the discretion of the court, and such goods, wares, or merchandise shall be forfeited to the United States.

In the State of Ohio, to illustrate the peculiarity of the operation of this measure, if it should become a law, and to show the crudity of the bill, I call attention to the fact that we have a parole system by which men under sentence of imprisonment who conduct themselves well are permitted to go outside and engage in some useful occupation, still being prisoners and, within the sense of the law, within the prison bounds. These men come clearly within the letter and spirit of this law. If such a prisoner constructs a rake, a hoe, or an ax, or puts a handle into a hatchet, and I take it into another State, I am liable to fine and imprisonment; or if I use a plow he has made to cultivate a row of corn running into an adjacent State there would be the same result. I would be liable to fine and imprisonment.

But it is said, "What we desire to do is to protect the interests of labor." Let us look into the merits of this proposition. I assert that the main backers of this bill are not the laboring men of my country. This is the first time I have known monopolies on the one side to join hands with labor on the other in order to elevate the criminals of my country and make them gentlemen of elegant leisure. Will any man pretend to say that five hundred criminals in prison would produce more than if they were engaged in useful occupations outside of the prison walls? Is their contribution to the great ocean of supply while they are criminals greater than it would be if they were employed outside of the prison walls?

Gentlemen, you desire we should have honest, industrious citizens in order that each one may contribute to support not only himself but those who are dependent upon him. Now I ask in all seriousness is it possible that as workmen these untrained and unskilled criminals can yield more to the source of supply inside than if honestly employed outside of prison walls? The exact truth is the other way.

Is it right or even tolerable, and does the interest of labor require that the wretch who enters my house, with murder in his heart, with dagger in his hand, prepared to commit murder if need be in his endeavor to rob me of my property, when arrested, convicted, and sent to State prison, should be kept there as a gentleman of leisure, while I, having suffered the loss of my property, am to toil on, not only to make good my loss, but to support that robber in idleness? Yet that is just what, in the last analysis, you propose in this bill.

This is said to be in the interest of labor. Yet what will be the effect of it? The widow whose husband has been killed by a burglar, if he escapes the gallows, has to toil not only for her own support, but that she may support in comfortable idleness that criminal whose hands are still wet with the blood of her husband. You seem to be concerned about the criminals of my country. I feel a little anxious about the honest men who bear the burden of supporting them.

Is it possible that, under the Constitution, if one of these men in prison or on the reform farm manufactures a hoe or an ax, of which I become the possessor, that I can be prohibited from taking it into a neighboring State? I insist the constitutional power does not exist to prohibit me from doing so. If so, Congress may also prohibit me from going into that State. The farmers of this country can not be benefited by the passage of this bill. The laborers of this country can not be benefited by its passage. Two classes alone are interested in it; those who desire a monopoly as against the world in some productive effort; the others are the criminals themselves.

I do not deny that my honored friend from Missouri means well by this bill; but I deny that any proper interest of my country can be subserved by its passage.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. What class of labor were you trying to protect when you made your tariff speech the other day?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I was trying, within the limits of the Constitution, to protect the labor of my country against the influence of underpaid laborers abroad. I was not attempting to tax our people to support paupers on the other side, and I also oppose taxing honest labor to support criminals in idleness on this side.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Which do you want to remain idle; the honest workman, with his wife and children, or your felon?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. You would tax the honest workman and his wife to support the felon in idleness. Your trouble in this instance, as in all your fulminations here, is that you assume the facts; assume facts which do not exist.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I assume only what I know. I demand——

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. One moment. You have not cited a particle of evidence that any industry has been stricken down. The proposition is flatly absurd. On the contrary, there is not a well-ordered establishment in this country that can not more than compete with prison labor, which is unskilled and untrained.

Mr. BRUMM. You are entirely mistaken in making that statement, friend BUTTERWORTH.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I may be. But beyond that, and if it were not true, I regard it as something very desirable that these men should contribute to the common stock by honest labor at least a portion of that of which they have robbed the community.

Mr. BRUMM. But does not my friend know that the greatest punishment that could be inflicted upon those convicts would be not to permit them to work?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I know that the greatest punishment we could inflict upon honest men is to tax them to support in idleness criminals who have robbed them. I know that. I can not understand how it is that these criminals are found to be so especially dangerous when they get together and work, although if they were industrious citizens working outside and adding double the amount to the general supply, they would not be regarded as dangerous.

Mr. BRUMM. It is not the criminals that are dangerous; it is the speculators in prison labor that are dangerous, and that threw these goods upon the market at prices below what they can be produced for by honest labor. It is the tariff question over again, only that in the one case the protection is against the pauper labor of Europe, and in the other it is against the criminal labor of our own country.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. The difference is this: We take our criminals guilty of violating the law and put them in prison and require them to work, as they would have to do if they were honest men, and the product of their labor is sold in the market exactly as it would be if they were honest men working outside. It is complained that these men drive hard bargains. From the complaints that are made one would suppose that there was no limit to the contributions of these convicts to the labor market. How many of them are there that contribute? I read from Mr. Carroll D. Wright, a good authority, who says that the product of the prisons is fifty-four one hundredths of 1 per cent. of the labor products of this country! Now, who was interested in saying as to that fifty-four one hundredths of 1 per cent. of our labor product that it is ruinous to the workingmen of this country? How many are injured by it? Those who pay the taxes receive the benefit of the reduction, if there is any reduction whatever, but that is not likely, because the men bidding in this business pay the last cent they are able to. If I should introduce a machine into Massachusetts which would make forty pairs of shoes where only one pair is made now, you might as well contend that the product of that machine should be kept within the borders of Massachusetts and not allowed to go outside, because otherwise some people would be thrown into idleness. Mr. Speaker, I will permit no one to go before me in utter and thorough devotion to the interests of the producers of this country, whoever and wherever they may be.

I recollect a committee being sent to me at my home to say that they would be compelled to oppose me because I was not friendly to the interests of the people in my district. I said to them, "Gentlemen, who told you? Did some stranger living a thousand miles from here convince you that he was more friendly than I to the best interests of the hearthstones that I represent?" "Well," they said, "we got a pamphlet making that charge because you did not vote as you were directed to do on a certain question." I said, "I owe the control of my vote to a higher power than some gentleman who sits in the gallery or moves about the corridors of the Capitol to command and threaten me-

bers who fail to trample under foot their own judgment and vote as directed. I stand here recognizing my obligation to my God, my country, and my constituency, to do the best for my people that I can, acting up to my highest convictions of right and duty. My boys play upon the same greensward with the sons of my constituents. Our interests are identical." What I desire, Mr. Speaker, is to keep wide open to them all the doors of opportunity; but I serve no honest interest of theirs by voting for this bill as presented. There is a way that seemeth good to a man, but the end thereof is death. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] may have his time extended not to exceed twenty-five minutes.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I again renew the request I made awhile ago for unanimous consent to have a vote taken upon this bill one hour from now, and if that is done I am willing to give forty minutes of the hour to the opponents of the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair can entertain but one request for unanimous consent at a time.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I shall be obliged to object unless that is done.

Mr. BRUMM. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object unless time is given to answer the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH]. I can not permit the statements made by gentlemen who do not understand the bill or its effect to go into the RECORD without being answered.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I wish to take the same position, Mr. Chairman. I can not allow an argument of the character of that made by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] to stand on this record uncontradicted.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. That is all right.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. How much time does the gentleman from Ohio desire?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. That depends upon the time at the disposal of the House. I can close in ten minutes if necessary.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve my thirty-five minutes, and let the gentleman take the floor and divide his hour up among the opponents of the bill.

Mr. ROGERS. I withdraw my request for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Arkansas withdraws his request, and if there be no objection the Chair will now recognize the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] in his own right.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Will my friend from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH], now that he has an hour under his control, allow me a word?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. My friend says he can not understand why the criminals, by the products which they make after they are incarcerated, should come in competition with the labor of the country more than they did when they were producing before their incarceration.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. They were not producing before their incarceration; they were ravaging upon the world when they ought to have been producing.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. That is just what I wanted to call attention to. Do you mean to say that when these criminals are outside the penitentiary, robbing and cutting throats, they are in competition with the honest laboring men of the country——

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Oh, no.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. And there is no difference between their being occupied in that way and their being engaged in the manufacture of products in the making of which they work at one-fourth or one-fifth the rate of wages paid to the ordinary laboring man.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I have too much respect for my friend's ability to suppose he thinks I take any such position.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. That is what I understood the gentleman to hold; and it was my respect for him that induced me to put this question and have the matter explained before he proceeds.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I asked, is the product of their labor inside the penitentiary a more dangerous competitor than if they were engaged in industrial pursuits outside?

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. That "if" amounts to nothing, because they are not so engaged before they are prisoners.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. But your mission in life as a good citizen is to induce them to enter the ranks of industry.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa, rose.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Wait a moment; I will answer you. The very object of this bill is to reform these criminals and make them, when they are liberated, contribute all they can as honest citizens to the wealth of the community.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. My higher mission is to take care of honest men and not sacrifice them for the scoundrels whom, according to our laws, under certain conditions, we even put out of existence.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I have no doubt that that is my friend's object; but, instead of reaching it he is traveling in exactly the reverse direction. The object of government is to protect and defend its citizens, to open for them the highway to industrial employments, that they may produce as much as possible for themselves and supply the markets of the world. These men have not been in the habit of making such contributions. Now that they are suffering the penalty of crime they do compensate somewhat to the honest men who pay the taxes by contributing their labor as producers, whereas they have been ravagers.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Allow me once more; I will not interrupt again.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. No, I can not.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. You have an hour.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. But you would take all the time away from other gentlemen.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. Very well; go on.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I have already answered the gentleman's proposition. In other words, in order to relieve his constituents in Iowa, he insists that they shall all be taxed to support in idleness the criminals confined there.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. The widow of a murdered man contributes her proportion of the expense of hanging the murderer; and you can not help it under our system of laws.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I insist that these unkempt scoundrels shall pay their way under as happy influences as can be thrown around them, so that when they are set free they shall enter the walks of life as producers, and not as land pirates.

This bill does not aim at contract labor. So far as that is concerned I am willing to vote to limit the system of contract labor in the States so as to prevent any unjust or unwise competition, but I am not willing that my constituents who labor shall be taxed in order to keep criminals in idleness.

The attempt has been made to utilize the labor of these convicts in the stone-quarries; but the workmen there say, "No; it interferes with us." When the effort is made to employ them in farm labor no objection is made, because men seem not to care for the interest of the farmer. They can pay taxes and toil, and men who engage in crime be supported by them. When they are employed in shoemaking, similar complaint is made. Now, how will you employ these convicts? To say that half of their product within the four walls of a prison is more dangerous than double the amount they would produce as honest men outside is a strange course of reasoning. And yet to that absurdity the reasoning we hear would lead.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Has not the gentleman from Ohio just as much respect for the workingman at his bench as for the professional man?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Would you educate these convicts so as to make lawyers or doctors of them, that they might for a compensation of 40 cents a day furnish legal opinions or medical advice? [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. If in that way they can be usefully employed and pay the expenses of their support, I should be perfectly willing that they should study law, or even become divines.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Oh, no; not divines.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I would be willing to risk my chance against them in any professional pursuit; if there are those who fear to do so, I pity them. I am willing they should even be sent to Congress, if there are constituencies of such a character as to require their services. I would not abridge the right of these convicts to be better men, and, above all, I would not abridge their right to become useful to the States whose laws they have broken and whose rights of property they have invaded.

It is said by this system the State comes into competition with private individuals. It does not do anything of the kind beyond this: by it men who are unwilling to work are made to go to work, whether willing or not. It says to them plainly, "You scoundrels, go to work and pay your way, and if at the same time you can be taught to do some work by which you can earn your living when you get out all the better."

Now, so far as the contract system tends to injure the manufacturing industries of any State, or the men employed in them, I am willing, for one, to eliminate everything that may have such a tendency.

Only one word more, Mr. Speaker, and I am done. It is said you ought not to ship the product of these men into other States, because it comes into competition with their manufactures. Strange, indeed, the production of this fraction of 1 per cent. by men who are compelled for once to earn their living is going to destroy the manufactures of any other State. Is not that altogether too limited an idea of what constitutes competition?

That those who keep up their penitentiaries, prisons, and reform-schools should be compelled to keep the inmates of those institutions in idleness, and all in the interest of a few manufactures in other States, it seems to me to be absurd. Of course what we desire is to secure the highest good to the greatest number. We are not legislating for any class, not for a few manufacturers to the injury of the rest of the community, but for the whole community; trying to do what will best

subserve the good of all who will be reached by legislation, and who should share alike in blessings and burdens.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how much time have I left?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman has used seven minutes of the hour.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. But I have a whole hour. I have then fifty-three minutes in all remaining.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Certainly.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Then I will yield to my friend from Minnesota [Mr. WILSON] seven minutes of that time.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to make a speech on this subject; but as I am opposed to the passage of this bill, I desire to state the reasons why I oppose it. I recognize the justice of the position taken by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH], who has just taken his seat.

If criminals transgress our laws and are incarcerated therefor, to say that we shall tax industrious, law-abiding people to keep them in idleness seems to me to be an absurdity. On the contrary, I would put them to hard labor, so as to make them feel that the way of the transgressor is hard; and in part, at least, to make up the expense to which they have put the State.

But this bill touches other than criminals. Here are boys, not felons, and yet who are so wild that it is necessary to send them to reformatories. Are we to keep them year after year without learning a trade or some useful employment? To do so would be to fit them to become criminals rather than good citizens. They can not learn any trade or employment without producing something. Shall we destroy the product of their labor or sell it? These are the questions which confront us. Are we to keep them in idleness or not? If we keep them in idleness we do not correct their wildness or viciousness, but again turn them out upon the community worse rather than better. If we compel them to work we must either sell or destroy the product.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Certainly.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does this bill prevent employment by the State of the State convicts?

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I will answer that by saying if it is right to make and sell their products in the State it is not wrong to sell them beyond the State; sometimes they can not be sold in the State.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman answer me a question?

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I would if I had time gladly yield to the gentleman from New Jersey, but I have only seven minutes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I thought you had more time.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. No, sir; I have only seven minutes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a constitutional question. There is but one gentleman on this floor who has pretended this is constitutional, or who has made any argument in that direction—the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], for whose opinions I have the greatest respect. He says it is constitutional. Why? I asked him whether Congress could prevent the transportation of our wheat from the State of Minnesota to the city of New York? If we can not do that, can we do this?

He answered that we could not do that, but we can do this, because this is a diseased product. Look at it. The State has the right to make it, as shown by the gentleman from Ohio. Indeed, it is the duty of the State to make it, as we have shown. The property so produced is in every sense the lawful product and property of the State as much as any other property. No distinction can be made. When pressed on this point I understood him to say that Congress may forbid its transportation or sale because it is not produced by citizens. In the State of Minnesota nearly half of our population are not citizens of the United States. They have come to our State and declared their intention to become citizens. But can it be said that we could legally forbid the transportation of their property and thus practically confiscate it? To that extent the logic goes or else it is a fallacy. Though I have had but a few minutes to examine this, I feel sure it is unconstitutional. Mr. Speaker, we are confronted by a question which touches our manhood. Shall we at the suggestion of men who have not fully considered the effect of this law do that which our judgment disapproves of; or shall we follow the dictates of our conscience and judgment? I doubt whether there are five lawyers—or more than one lawyer—in this House who will say that this law would be constitutional.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. You are mistaken.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. They say send it to the Supreme Court of the United States. I have sworn that I would not vote for a law which I believe to be unconstitutional; and I owe something to my manhood.

Mr. KERR. Has it not been said in argument that the Government has the right to exclude articles coming from abroad?

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. One gentleman perhaps made the argument that we have the right to exclude articles the product of pauper labor of Europe which might enter into competition with the products of our better paid labor.

I do not, Mr. Speaker, oppose this bill because I am in favor of bringing the products of convict labor into competition with the products of our workshops. This clearly is not the way to remedy any evil of that kind. The passage of this law could not benefit any one.

Mr. KERR. Did not the gentleman assume the power existed to exclude foreign products.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I will yield now for fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this bill on more grounds than the one that it is unconstitutional. I believe we have no constitutional power to pass the bill. If we do pass it, I believe it will be an obstacle to the adoption of such a system of prison labor as the working people of this country are clamoring for. I am opposed to it because it will involve a direct injury to my own State, and for the additional reason that it will inflict a very serious injury on the laboring men in my district and in the district of my colleague who stands before me.

I wish to give an illustration in view of the argument of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. RAYNER], that this is not to be considered as legitimate commerce between the States. He had in mind contract labor. I had in mind not only that, but labor performed on State account, such as is now performed in the southern penitentiary of my own State and in the penitentiary of the State of California. In the southern penitentiary of Illinois the contract system has been abandoned. We have adopted a constitutional amendment by which that system will come to an end throughout Illinois in a year or two. In the northern penitentiary some contracts are now outstanding, but they will all be terminated in a year or two. In the southern penitentiary that system has been abandoned altogether.

They are trying an experiment to find how convicts can be employed without coming into competition with the free labor of Illinois. At the present time convicts are engaged in the manufacture of brick. Now, let me suppose a case. Suppose throughout the river counties in the State of Arkansas brick can not be profitably made; I do not know whether that is the fact or not, but I merely take it as an illustration. Suppose by an agreement between the State of Arkansas and the State of Illinois these brick made on State account directly by the State of Illinois shall be transported along the river and accepted by the State of Arkansas; suppose that system is adopted without injury to the laboring men of those two States. Now, is it possible under the provision of the Constitution, which provides Congress may regulate commerce between the States, Congress can prohibit the transportation from the State of Illinois to the State of Arkansas of the goods directly made under the authority of the State of Illinois and accepted by the authority of the State of Arkansas?

I say that in view of the somewhat extraordinary argument of the gentleman from Maryland, that this sort of commerce can not be considered as commerce at all.

But let me give another illustration. The State of California has also abandoned the contract system, and it has by experiment found a sort of industry in which the convicts of the State can be employed without coming in competition with the free labor of the State. They are employed in the manufacture of jute bags for the use of the farmers of that State.

When I heard of that it occurred to me that these bags, made under the direct authority of the laws of California, might be acceptable and useful to the people of Oregon, and that it might be that in the State of Oregon there would be no manufacture of jute bags and there might be no competition with their free labor caused by the importation of the bags into that State. If that were the fact, can it be that the United States, by the constitutional provision to which we have been referred here, prohibit the transportation from California to Oregon of goods made by the State of California, the manufacture of which is acceptable to the laboring men of that State, and also to the labor organizations of the State of Oregon? And when I came here this morning I went to Mr. MORROW, of California, and found out how it was. I asked the question, whether it was true that the statement as there made was correct. It happened singularly enough that he had just received a letter from the governor of the State, which I ask to have read from the Clerk's desk in this connection.

The Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Sacramento, May 3, 1888.

DEAR SIR: I am informed that the House Committee on Labor intend to report favorably on bill 8716, introduced by O'NEILL, of Missouri, providing for the restriction of goods made in whole or in part by convict labor, to the State in which they are produced. I understand also that it makes it a crime to transport or offer them for transportation to any other State or Territory. We are much interested here in the manufacture of jute bags, and so successfully is the work being prosecuted that ere long we will be in a position to supply the farmers in Oregon and Nevada as well as other neighborhoods with that commodity.

It does not compete with white labor in the slightest, and hence it would work a great hardship on our interest here should the provisions of the bill be applied to California. Will you please give this your attention, and should the measure become a law, see if it would not be possible to exempt California from the force of its exactions? We are just now succeeding in putting our prison

upon such a basis, so far as work is concerned, as to make them self-sustaining, without coming in competition with white labor, at the same time relieving white labor, as far as possible, from the burden of taxation in the support of convicts.

Yours truly,

R. W. WATERMAN, *Governor.*

Hon. W. W. MORROW, *Washington, D. C.*

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I have been reminded by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. STEWART] that a large quantity of the Georgia prison-made brick is sold in Florida; and I rather suspect there is not a large manufacturing industry of brick in Florida, owing to the nature of the soil. I think, therefore, that the transportation from State to State in this respect benefits the laborers of Georgia and Florida alike.

There is still a further illustration to which I may call the attention of the House—to a large manufacture of saddle-trees, the largest in the world, which is carried on in the Missouri penitentiary. I understand that not more than 5 per cent. of these are sold within the State, while a very large percentage of them are sent into Mexico. This bill would prevent or prohibit the exportation of these goods to any foreign country from the State of Missouri, for of course they can not transport the saddle-trees from Missouri to Mexico without transporting them through or into another State, if I understand anything about geography. And I can not believe that the manufacture and transportation through another State of such products can injure the laboring men of Missouri, and if it has any bad effect upon the laboring men of the Republic of Mexico we may trust, I presume, to our Committee on Foreign Affairs to investigate the matter and produce some bill which will affect satisfactorily the rights of all concerned.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ADAMS. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. You spoke of the people of Oregon having these jute bags from California.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, only by way of illustration. I know nothing of it personally.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. That being the case, does that not interfere with the free labor employed in this branch of manufacturing?

Mr. ADAMS. Undoubtedly it comes in competition.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. That is the entire question.

Mr. PLUMB. But the bags that go to California come from abroad, and are manufactured in foreign prisons largely.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. Not all of them. They are manufactured East to a considerable extent.

Mr. ADAMS. I was assuming that there were large manufactories of jute bags in the Western States, or in the Eastern States, to supply Oregon; but the fact is that a large number, I am told, are brought in from foreign countries.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I can tell the gentleman that they are made in large quantities in my own district.

Mr. ADAMS. I have supposed, Mr. Speaker, the case of two States making a mutual agreement in regard to the transportation from one State to another and to the benefit to the laboring men of those two States. So we may suppose that at some time in the future experiments that are being made in many of the States of the Union in reference to some new system to be adopted will result in a system so general that probably all the States will be equally benefited and the laboring men benefited equally by transportation from the place of manufacture to some distant point in some other country or some distant State where competition will be less severe.

This bill will prohibit that. That is why I say I am opposed to it. Not only because I do not believe we have the right to pass it, but because I believe it raises an obstacle in the way of the adoption of some new system towards which enlightened minds in all the States and in all countries are looking, and trying by theory and experiment alike to reach. And, Mr. Speaker, I am confirmed in this impression by the very memorial sent to me in favor of the passage of this bill, and which I shall as in duty bound place in the petition-box for proper reference. I only use it now to illustrate my remarks. I thoroughly agree with some of the premises contained in this printed memorial, which has been circulated I suppose all over the country. But in that connection I desire to quote:

> Your petitioners do not believe that the States should support its convicts in idleness, but that their reformation should be the paramount aim of prison discipline, and all mere economic considerations be subordinated thereto; that the States should stimulate them to acquire habits of industry by paying to them at their discharge a reasonable proportion of their earnings, and by teaching them complete trades and not parts of trades, as under the present system.

The State can not pay them a portion of their earnings if they make none. Remember that this bill does not cover contract labor alone. It covers goods in whole or in part made by convicts; and if, as these memorialists allege, the convicts in our penitentiaries should be permitted to receive part of their earnings, it implies that there should be some system by which productive industrial labor should be used in the production of wealth, and I do not see how this radical bill will lead to the adoption of that system.

The boards of prison commissioners in Massachusetts, New York, and in my own State of Illinois have been studying this question, and the result will be that sometime in the future a better system will be adopted and the passage of this bill will be, I think, a serious obstacle to its adoption.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I yield three minutes more of my time to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ADAMS. I can not, in three minutes, speak of various other points to which I might have adverted. I simply desire to state how this will affect my own State and my own district. I have received a letter, and perhaps other Illinois Congressmen have, from the penitentiary Commissioners of Illinois, at Joliet, stating that if this bill should pass there is not an appropriation sufficient to support those convicts for two months, and that it would be necessary for the governor to call a special meeting of the Legislature. Gentlemen will consider that the bill applies not only to work under existing contracts which I have said would expire within a year or two, but it will also apply to work on State account at the penitentiary in Southern Illinois. I have not time to read that part of the bill.

Mr. HAUGEN. But there is an amendment providing that this shall not apply——

Mr. ADAMS. I am aware that there is an amendment providing that this shall not take effect until the expiration of the existing contracts. I say this bill covers something besides contract labor. It applies to the State labor, and until the Legislature of the State of Illinois shall have had an opportunity of adopting some new system, I do not desire this bill to pass at all.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in five minutes' time I can only say that it is believed generally by my constituency, and I may say in my State, and I so believe myself, that there has been, and are now, abuses in the employment of convict labor. Up to a short time ago in my State the labor was leased or let by contract, and worked by contractors; and as my colleague has said, that is still true as to one of the penitentiaries in my State.

My State did adopt a constitutional amendment prohibiting the leasing or letting of convict labor by contract, and that is now in force except as to a contract soon to expire. I understand that in some other States the same thing has been done; possibly in New York and Massachusetts. The people believed, and I apprehend the fact is so, that where this labor has been leased it has been at a low rate or at a less rate than production could be had by labor outside the prison and in the usual walks of life, and that has begotten what to my mind is a very just and proper complaint by people who come in competition with it. As I said before, the people of my State believed the system was unjust and adopted the amendment I have referred to.

Now, I think it would be better for my State and other States situated as Illinois is to take care of the convict labor in the respective States and market the product of such labor in the respective States, and that my State shall not be subject to the competition of the product of contract convict labor from other States.

Now it is alleged that this bill is not constitutional. I am not absolutely clear that it is. I am inclined to believe we have the right to legislate. I propose to resolve the doubt in favor of the bill, because we have courts that can construe it and determine whether it is constitutional or not. I think it would be well that the bill should be amended. I wish it could have been discussed and matured, and, without reflecting upon anybody, I wish it had been better prepared. For instance, my colleague [Mr. ADAMS] makes a suggestion as to an amendment which is clearly called for. I apprehend that under the terms of this bill you could not ship these goods from one State through another State to a foreign nation. I think an amendment should be made in line 9, and I will offer it, adding after the word "Columbia" the words "for sale in such State, Territory, or District."

One other thing, Mr. Speaker. I am not willing that this bill should be passed unless with it, on this bill, going along with it and in it, we place a provision which will prohibit the importation of foreign goods that are manufactured in whole or in part by convict labor, because it is a notorious fact that such goods come in by wholesale. I think it would be a poor remedy indeed to enact this legislation without that additional provision, and I shall offer such an amendment. There are other amendments that I have no doubt ought to be made.

I say again, I regret that this bill is to be passed through at railroad speed. I am inclined to think that wise statesmanship would dictate that we should even now provide the necessary time for the full consideration of the bill more carefully; that we should think about it and discuss it and mature it and get it into shape to correct the evil which I believe to exist, and at the same time to stand the scrutiny of the court. For that reason, sir, if the gentleman insists upon demanding the previous question, I shall vote against ordering the previous question unless it can be properly amended, and then I will co-operate, on some other day to be fixed, to the best of my ability with the majority of the members of the House in further consideration of the bill.

I think that is the sensible thing to do. I say again, I favor legislation on this line; but I think we ought to take a little more time to mature the bill and not rush it through here at railroad speed, and then in six months or a year, or two years perhaps, have it declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court, and all this owing to our want of vigilance in properly preparing and maturing the bill.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield eight minutes to my colleague [Mr. OUTHWAITE].

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Speaker, I shall not discuss at all the question of the constitutionality of this bill. I will say, however, that I am firmly convinced in my own mind that it is not constitutional, and therefore I shall be compelled to vote against it. I am not willing that it shall go to the courts to be submitted to them to determine whether it is constitutional or not when I have such profound convictions against its constitutionality. By the time the court could pass upon the constitutional question the evils which I see in the bill would have come to pass, and therefore I prefer that instead of this bill being submitted in some instances to courts which will immediately decide it to be unconstitutional and in other instances to courts which will decide it to be constitutional, thus establishing different systems in different parts of this country—instead of that I prefer now to say by my vote that there shall not be any such result. In addition to the unconstitutionality of the bill the evils that I see in it come from the Congress of the United States interfering in this manner with the domestic affairs of the States.

The States are all busily engaged in trying to solve this difficult problem of how to deal with the labor of their convicts without interfering too much with the labor of citizens outside. Gentlemen have talked a good deal this afternoon about "dishonest" labor as contrasted with honest labor. I wish to remind those gentlemen of the fact that a large percentage of the prisoners in our State prisons are honest men. They got into prison not by reason of dishonesty, but through violations of other provisions of law, by reason of assaults committed in the heat of passion, or by other crimes of a character that do not carry with them any of the peculiar disgrace of dishonesty. In my own State we have been, and still are, laboring with this problem. The State Legislature has adopted several plans, and we have at this time a plan in operation which appears to be working well. We carry out one of the suggestions of this petition; that is to say, we provide that those who labor and who behave themselves generally shall receive certain rewards. When they leave the prison they receive a part of the compensation which they have earned, but in addition to that we have, moving about through the State, working in the workshops in different places, about 700 convicts who are out on parole, out so long as they behave themselves, out so long as they labor, out so long as they conduct themselves like good citizens. Now, this bill would strike at this labor in the factories and workshops where these men are engaged, and it might possibly make such a condition of things that the establishments which now employ them would not feel at liberty to do so any longer because their labor is "convict labor."

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. The bill only applies to convict labor employed in any penitentiary, prison, reformatory, or other establishment in which convict labor is employed.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. "Or other establishment in which convict labor is employed."

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Yes; but if they are out on ticket of leave they are not subject to that provision.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. They are; or at least the bill is open to that construction. Now, Mr. Speaker, without undertaking to state the amount of capital invested in this way—because some who seek such legislation as this do not regard the rights of men who have thus invested their capital—I will state that in Columbus, Ohio, there are a million of dollars invested in plants of this nature, by the State and by individuals. All this would have to be changed. The Legislature would have to be called together to make provision on this subject, or the prison remain in a chaotic state for months.

The industries that are carried on within the walls afford employment for quite as large a number of citizens outside. The material which is necessary—the wood and the iron—must be produced and brought to be used inside; all affording employment to those citizens who produce and transport. The hand implements of agriculture are sent out of the State chiefly, but do not come in competition with any manufacturer or laborer anywhere within a range of 50 miles of the prison. Portions of the hardware, of which a great quantity suitable for saddlery is made therein, are sold in Ohio, and used by the makers of saddlery. Its making in the prison does not interfere with any labor within the same range; but under this bill as it now stands any harness in which any such hardware is used can not be taken or transported out of the State without subjecting the person who does so to a criminal prosecution. This would subject the business of the manufacturer of such saddlery to such interference as might deprive many honest citizens of employment.

Mr. Speaker, there are certain amendments to this bill which might make it less hurtful in its immediate effects. I shall assist every effort to perfect the bill, but with my present view of its unconstitutionality I must withhold my vote for its passage unless it is made much better than it now is.

I wish to call attention to this report, which embraces some rather peculiar features. In one portion of the report is stated:

Your petitioners do not believe that the State should support its convicts in idleness, but that their reformation should be the paramount aim of prison discipline and all mere economic considerations be subordinated thereto; that the State should stimulate them to acquire habits of industry by paying to them at their discharge a reasonable proportion of their earnings.

That is what is done in my State.

And by teaching them complete trades—

With the view, as I understand, of bringing these convicts out to compete with honest labor. On another page of the report we have this language:

If the State become a manufacturing corporation, its convicts must be taught trades.

Here the objection is made that the manufacturing interest in the prisons must necessarily teach the convicts trades.

When released they must find employment, if at all, by the side of the honest workman, and necessarily to the disadvantage of the latter.

If we reform a man, make a good citizen of him, train him to be a laborer, does that result in any disadvantage to the rest of his fellowmen? This bill, in one view, proposes to strike down the system of making convicts labor at all.

If the industry in which the skilled laborer has been employed is destroyed by the unequal competition with convict labor, then both the honest workman and the released convict are without employment.

That is very true—it is a truism, but will some one show me an instance in which this has happened?

Something has been said about the number of petitions of workingmen in favor of the passage of this bill. I hold in my hand the only petition of that kind which I have received from my district. There is situated there a city of 90,000 inhabitants, embracing at least 16,000 laborers, underneath the shadow of the walls of a prison; but this long petition is signed by only sixteen persons. There are thousands in that district interested in the cause of labor, and if there had been any general desire that this bill should be passed, so as to put an end to the competition of these convict-made articles, the workingmen there would have manifested their interest in some more emphatic way than by this meagerly signed petition.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I yield a few moments to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE, of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply in sympathy with the objects of this bill. I would by every constitutional means protect American free labor from competition with foreign pauper and domestic convict labor.

But my convictions are so clear that this bill contravenes the provisions of the Constitution of the United States and exceeds the limits of our legislative powers that, as much as I deprecate the continuous competition of convict labor, I can not vote for a bill which I believe to be void.

Prisons for the confinement of criminals are a necessity. The State which properly punishes its criminals can properly employ them at labor, and the product of that labor is property of equal dignity and consideration under the Constitution with any other product of man's labor.

If Congress, under its authority to regulate commerce between the States, can prevent all commerce between the States in the product of prison labor, it can prevent all commerce in the product of our farm labor or that of our paid operators in factories.

If the proposition were before us to prevent absolutely the shipment of wheat from one State to another, or of cotton goods from one State to another, I believe we would all agree that we did not have such power of prohibition under the power of regulation of commerce. But if we can prohibit goods manufactured by one establishment from transshipment we can in like manner prohibit goods from all establishments.

I believe that adequate relief can be had through the action of the States, whose Legislatures have undoubted right to direct that their own convict labor should not be permitted to compete with American labor. But if the States fail to protect American workmen, I am confident that it is beyond the power of Congress under its right to regulate commerce to prevent all commerce. So much for the milder provisions of the bill.

But what is to be said of the provisions of forfeiture, which are always obnoxious to the spirit of our laws? What is the United States to do with such property when it is forfeited? Will they sell it in competition with American labor? If they do will the Government give a disinfected title to it, so that a purchaser could ship it home, or is it liable to be reseized and reconfiscated and resold? I believe the bill unconstitutional because it prevents commerce instead of regulating it, and because it takes lawful property from its owner without due process of law.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT].

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I presume that almost every gentleman in this House experiences the embarrassment resulting from the circumstances under which we are brought to a consideration of this proposition. From the character of the measure which was pending when the previous time of the Committee on Labor expired we were led to expect that we should be brought to-day to a different question. Scarcely any of us—perhaps none outside of the Committee on Labor—had expected that this measure would come up for consideration.

In urging the bill upon the House gentlemen have been enthused by the fact that there are petitions here from labor organizations; but in spite of all their zeal it appears that in all this great country only 156,000 people have been induced to sign those petitions. More than that,

such petitions are discredited by the knowledge we all have as to the methods by which petitions of this character are gotten up.

This movement is further discredited by the fact that the petition, which makes up the great body of the report of the majority, seems to have been gotten up by a lot of manufacturers. It is by such pressure as this that the effort is made to hurry us forward into legislation upon a bill involving questions of the greatest interest—constitutional questions, for instance, affecting the power of the Federal Government under its authority to regulate commerce between the States; the question of the right of Congress to go into the several States and destroy the systems which, under the police powers of those States, have been adopted for the suppression of crime. With such questions as these presented we are asked to take up and, without consultation with the States, pass a measure of this kind.

Not only are these constitutional questions suddenly thrown upon us, but under the direction of the Committee on Labor they are brought into this House to be discussed under allowances of five and ten minutes' time. In this way we are expected to reach a conclusion on grave questions. So far as I am concerned—and I presume such is the experience of every gentleman who has taken the floor—the very suggestion of the character of the questions to be discussed is a negative upon any attempt to discuss them at this time. No gentleman can undertake to discuss propositions of this kind under such limitations; and there is practically an absolute preclusion of debate upon them so far as any satisfactory determination is concerned.

In my own State (which is an illustration of others) there is vice and crime which we have seen fit by law to regulate and punish. In this society has a deep interest. The thief, the burglar, the murderer, all manner of criminals are to be found there as in every community, no matter how high the grade of civilization may be. Like other States, we have been struggling with the question how to prevent crime; how to punish criminals; how they should be occupied while undergoing imprisonment; whether they should be worked inside the walls of a prison, or in the mines, on the farms, or on the public high-ways. And the final conclusion has not been reached until this hour, and it seems, sir, to citizens of my own State that it is not proper, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] has said, that this class of enemies of society, who have forfeited all rights to liberty, to property, all claims to respect, should be excluded from labor, should be charged upon the toil of honest, industrious people. It is abhorrent to the sense of the people of my own State. So I take it it is abhorrent to the people of other States.

What does this bill propose?

In this report gentlemen undertake to discuss the present convict systems and what should be done in reference to them. They are not content with that exercise of police power always regarded as within the province of the States. They undertake to discuss and to report legislation which has for its object the control of the States in that direction.

What does the bill propose? It proposes to protect free labor and the industries in which it is employed from the unjust competition of goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured in any State by convict labor.

It is contended if these convicts required to labor produce wealth in the States, which may be sold there in the limits of the State, or, indeed, outside of the limits of the State, it will result in depreciating the value of the products produced by free labor by being brought into competition with them. Now, if it is asked how we are to do this under the power of Congress to regulate commerce between the States, I wish to say that the power to regulate the commerce between the States, as our fathers understood it and as we understand it, was not intended to destroy the exchange of products, but, on the contrary, was intended to take away from the several States the power which they had claimed of preventing such interchange of commodities between themselves and confer upon Congress the power of regulating the commerce between the States and preserving free exchanges between them.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I will now yield to my friend from Kentucky [Mr. STONE].

[Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I am satisfied that the House not only regards this bill as raising a constitutional question, but a most important one, and that the bill, if constitutional, needs to be perfected to accomplish the good sought without carrying with it the evils which now infect it, and which need to be removed. I want to illustrate the practical operation of the bill as presented to show the necessity for amendment. Suppose, for instance, a man living on the line between two States has a wagon, a single part of which was manufactured, we will say, in Ohio. By the provisions of this bill he could not drive it across the line to go to his neighbor's mill without being guilty of a crime and becoming liable to imprisonment. I am more than willing to give the bill such time for consideration as its importance entitles it to, but it ought to be perfected, freed of its crudities, and improved so as to do away with the evils now embodied in it, while preserving all the good which it is hoped will result from its adoption. I trust, therefore, the gentleman from Missouri will agree to allow this bill to be recommitted, or else to fix some day certain for its further consideration, and then take up the other bills the committee have in charge and proceed with their consideration. That will give members time to examine this measure.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Will you permit me a moment?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. This is the only day under the rules of the House for the consideration of labor bills.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. True, but the House in its wisdom, no doubt, will see fit to give such time as may be necessary to the honorable gentleman to enable the bill to be perfected; and I think it would be good policy on his part to allow that.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I do not think that we would be able to get a day.

Mr. REED. But if the House should vote to postpone its consideration to a day certain that would give it a preference, would it not?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. If the House will now agree that this bill shall be taken up within a few days, I shall not object.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. My suggestion is that its further consideration be postponed to a day certain.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. But I have no guaranty that we can then get it up.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. So far as I am concerned, and other opponents of the bill, for whom I think I may speak, there will be no obstacle thrown in the way at that time.

Mr. REED. You have a guaranty of the strength of the bill, and also a guaranty of the gentleman from Ohio, who is opposed to the bill, and it gives you as great strength as you can have now, certainly.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. We have given to the enemies—not the enemies, I will not say that, but those opposed to the bill—two hours of solid debate, and there have been but twenty minutes occupied in favor of it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. There has been a lengthy debate allowed.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. And after you gentlemen have made every objection you can urge you now want to postpone its consideration just at the time its advocates are about to give you some good solid reasons why it should pass.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. You are taking my time. My friends on the right and on the left express their appreciation of a great constitutional measure when a bill which changes the entire system in every State in the Union is allowed two hours' consideration. Do gentlemen consider two hours as sufficient to consider and perfect a bill which reaches every part of the Union and is intended to change the management of all penal institutions in every one of the States, beyond the fact that the constitutionality of the measure is more than doubtful?

Mr. REED. But the point that the gentleman from Missouri makes is that you have occupied two hours in opposition, and now you want to postpone the consideration before hearing what is to be said in favor of it. That seems to be a fair objection.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I do not object to the gentleman occupying such time as he may consider necessary. I only suggest the propriety of continuing the consideration to such time as will enable us to understand thoroughly the merits of the various suggestions presented, thereby perfecting the bill, if such a thing is possible, and eliminating from it the objectionable and evidently bad features, some of which have been pointed out.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr O'NEILL, of Missouri. Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield to me a moment to offer an amendment?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I have but thirty-five minutes, and will yield five minutes of that time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. OATES. Before the gentleman proceeds I wish to ask in regard to the time when a vote is to be taken on this bill. I would like some indication as to what course the gentleman is going to pursue.

I do not think myself that sufficient time has been given to the discussion of the bill. I would like the gentleman to agree that after taking his time now he will permit the bill to be postponed to a definite time.

Mr. BRUMM. I suggest to the gentleman from Missouri that perhaps he had better agree to that.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. If we can have an opportunity to consider it at a fixed time I have no objection.

Mr. BLAND. I have been trying all day to be heard. I represent a State which is very much interested in this question, and I want at least fifteen minutes myself.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I will ask unanimous consent that this bill be made the special order for this day week immediately after the reading of the Journal. If that can be done and the House will give us that day, I will cheerfully consent that it may go over.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa. I hope that will be done, and that the vote shall be taken at an hour to be now fixed.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. After the reading of the Journal on that day that the bill shall be taken up for consideration.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Is that fair? I hope there will be no objection to that.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will submit the request of the gentleman to the House. Is there objection to assigning next Tuesday for the consideration of this bill?

Mr. WASHINGTON. I object.

Mr. COMPTON. I make the motion that this bill be postponed until the time suggested. I do not understand that it requires unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. But the gentleman from Missouri is entitled to the floor for debate, and the motion could not be entertained while he occupies the floor.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Then I will modify my request, as I understand the gentlemen expect to consider the tariff bill on that day, and fix next Saturday for the consideration of this bill.

Mr. COMPTON. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. Does that require unanimous consent?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It does.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Not a motion.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. But the gentleman from Missouri is entitled to the floor for debate, and is holding the floor for that purpose. He asks that the bill may be postponed until next Saturday. That request requires unanimous consent. It can not now be made a special order to the exclusion of all other business, except by unanimous consent. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman to postpone the bill, and make its consideration a special order on Saturday next, immediately after the reading of the Journal?

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I do not object to the postponement of the consideration of this bill to a time certain; but I object to its being assigned for Saturday, because that day may be assigned for the consideration of an appropriation bill.

Mr. RAYNER. I object to the request in regard to the postponement.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I have made every effort to concede to those who are opposed to this bill everything they have asked. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the Committee had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 314) authorizing the Secretary of War to place the name of James L. Henderson on the roll of Company B, Sixteenth Kentucky Volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 335) granting a pension to General W. E. Woodruff;

A bill (H. R. 1540) to establish a port of delivery at Grand Rapids, Mich.;

A bill (H. R. 2161) for the relief of Thomas I. Taylor;

A bill (H. R. 6098) authorizing the construction and repair of the roads from the entrance to the reservation of the Presidio at San Francisco, Cal., to the national cemetery on the same, and the fencing and protection of the said reservation and the cemetery thereon; and

A bill (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Abial G. Chamberlain.

CONVICT CONTRACT LABOR.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, objections of a double character have been made to this bill. One is that it is going to consign all the convicts of this country to a life of idleness, and the other that it is unconstitutional.

Now, as I understand this movement, and we have had it in our State for some years, the object is not in the least to consign convicts to idleness or to prevent their learning a trade, but simply to do away with the system of leasing them out in masses under contract at prices for their labor which defy competition. They often are leased out by the State in a single body in some single trade.

Last year in Massachusetts we adopted a law which covered these points. It forbade, in the first place, contract labor by convicts. It provided that the warden should have the power to say what trades they should learn, and it provided further that he should sell the product of their labor in open market at current wholesale prices.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. This bill does not touch that question at all.

Mr. LODGE. I have but five minutes and the gentleman has had his hour. All I understand by this bill is that it is to protect those States which have adopted this system against the contract system of convict-made goods in other States. We are told that this is an infringement of the rights of States. Now, no one questions that it is the right of a State to settle its own prison system; but a State which chooses to try this new system and prevent the leasing of convicts has its system nullified by other States. The whole drift of constitutional decision and of constitutional law, as this House is well aware, has been to curtail the rights of States.

It has been held in decisions cited here to-day that it is constitutional to prevent States from interfering with interstate commerce. The State which I represent, and there are other States in the same position, come here and say, "As we can not protect ourselves, we ask the Congress of the United States to protect us in our right to arrange our prison system to suit ourselves. We have set aside the system of contract convict labor, and do not want to be made a dumping-ground for the convict-made goods of other States. We do not quarrel with anybody else's system; they are welcome to have any system they like; it is a matter for each State to settle for itself; but we object to having the convict-made goods of other States sold within our borders; we want to maintain our present system in a way to suit ourselves."

The gentleman from Ohio said it would have no effect on labor. Now, let me give a single illustration. In the State of Pennsylvania they make cocoa matting in the State prison. That matting, required to have a convict brand in Pennsylvania, goes out of the State without a convict mark. It has severely crippled the manufacture of such matting in my own State. I have also documents in my desk showing that it has almost annihilated the manufacture in the city of Brooklyn, N. Y. In a small industry this convict competition is well-nigh ruinous, and in a large industry it lowers prices and reduces wages.

I say a bill of this sort is right in principle. I do not say it does not need amendment, for I think it does in one or two points; but a measure of this kind, in justice to the States which are trying to get rid of contract convict labor, and which are seeking rightly and properly to get it out of competition with free labor, ought to be enacted.

Moreover, I think these labor questions are of very great gravity. I know in my own State and in other States the laboring men feel interested in this question; and when they come before Congress with a reasonable request, such as this is, and ask us to aid them by a change of the law so that contract convict labor shall be taken out of the market, I think their request deserves consideration. There has been a good deal said here about petitions and demands for this legislation. I have had but a single letter upon the subject, and I can only say for myself that I advocate this measure because I believe it to be right in principle and for the best interests of the people and the country, and for no other reason or motive.

There are many things falsely asked for in the honest and honorable name of labor, which are neither honest nor honorable nor proper. But I believe that a full and fair consideration of labor questions and a granting of reasonable requests on the part of labor is the greatest security for good government, for general well being, for property, and for every right that we prize most. The strength of the Republic, as it seems to me, rests upon our workingmen and women having good wages. Domestic competition is severe enough and lowers them far enough. Foreign competition which it is proposed by free trade to let in is worse. But I think it is worst of all for us to stand still and allow States with their great power and unlimited resources to come into the market and sell convict labor at such a price that all competition with it on the part of free and honest labor is hopeless. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH].

Mr. CARUTH. Mr. Speaker, great minds differ upon great questions, and we have seen here to-day that great lawyers differ upon the questions whether the proposed bill is constitutional or not. And, sir, as these great lawyers do differ upon this question, the only way that the doubt can be solved is by sending the matter to the courts of the land and leaving them to decide whether or not this is a constitutional measure. We have just concluded a debate which is to be memorable in the history of this country, and we upon this side of the House and the gentlemen upon the other side were all agreed upon one proposition, namely, that at the basis of this whole discussion lay the interests of the laboring people and the workingmen of the United States.

It was merely a matter of speculation as to what the effect of the reduction of the tariff would be upon the laboring interests of the country, we contending that it would have no effect, and gentlemen upon the other side contending that it would lower wages. That discussion, I say, was speculative, but here is something real and tangible. I do not believe, sir, in that kind of missionary work which makes waistcoats for the natives of the Fiji Islands, while it lets our own people at our own doors go naked. Now, there is embodied in the report on this bill the statement, and it is true, that this convict labor is coming into competition with the honest labor of this country; that labor which is hired at 45 and 50 cents a day is brought into competition with labor which represents the comforts and the necessities of not only the workingman himself, but also of his wife and children who are dependent upon him for support. The labor of that honest laboring man is brought into competition with labor which represents merely the food and the meager clothing of the individual convict. I desire to have embodied in my remarks a letter which I have received from a prominent manufacturer in my city in relation to this bill.

I have filed, through the petition-box of this House, the request of the workingmen in my city that this bill be enacted into law. If this convict labor is to come into competition with honest labor then I say it is our duty to protect the honest labor of the country from unfair competition. Let us leave the question of whether or not this bill be constitutional to be solved by the courts while we do the best we can

to protect our people from this sort of labor. Reference has been made to the State of Pennsylvania, and we have been told that every dollar's worth of goods manufactured in her prisons are stamped "prison-made." But Pennsylvania in this respect is very selfish, because, while she allows none of the goods manufactured by convict labor to be sold to her own citizens without being duly marked, she does allow those goods to be shipped to markets outside the State, and they are brought into competition with the honest labor of other parts of the country. And that, Mr. Speaker, is the great State which has for its motto "Virtue, liberty, and independence." [Laughter.]

The letter to which I have referred is as follows:

LOUISVILLE, KY., *March* 30, 1888.

MY DEAR SIR: I understand there is a bill now pending in your House, No. 8716, introduced by Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, having reference to the protection of free labor and honest industry as against convict labor. We have suffered so prodigiously from the operation of this convict system that I dare to call your attention to this subject, and to urge your interest and co-operation in the passage of the bill, which I have just read. It will be unnecessary for me to say to you that the convict labor at Jeffersonville is now turning out enormous amounts of stove hollow-ware with labor which costs them 45 cents per day, while we are striving to compete with them by making the same goods with labor costing from two to three dollars per day. It is an unequal contest, and occurs to me as a great moral and commercial wrong. The time of these convicts should not be consumed in making wares in competition with the honest artisans of our country. It works an oppression upon the hard-laboring man, as well as upon the manufacturer. I feel that this legislation is so eminently needed and proper that I only need to call your attention to the matter. You have always been ready and prompt in your efforts to protect both questions to which I have alluded. May I not hope you will take hold of this question with your usual vigor and ability and assist in placing it among the laws of the land? I feel by so doing you will have performed a great public service.

With much respect and expressions of sincerest friendship, I am,

Yours, very truly,

J. L. SMYSER.

Hon. A. G. CABUTH,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BOUND].

Mr. BOUND. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to make any remarks in regard to this bill until I heard its general object and purpose assailed upon this floor, and statements made that this question did not affect the rights of labor. Sir, I look upon this bill in all that it contemplates as directly tending to protect honest labor in its endeavors to gain an honest living. There are nearly $72,000,000 worth of convict-labor goods put annually upon the markets of this country. There are engaged, directly or indirectly, in the manufacture of those goods from 240,000 to 300,000 convicts. Now, gentlemen need not tell me and need not argue that the throwing out of $72,000,000 worth of convict goods upon the markets of this country will not affect the rights and interests of labor and of laboring men. With a million of workingmen to-day standing idle in the labor market, waiting for employment, men who have wives and children depending upon them for support, you need not argue to me that this is not a question directly affecting those people.

Mr. Speaker, the institutions where goods of this kind are manufactured are supported by the taxes of the people. The very men who are brought into direct competition with this kind of labor are the men who pay the great bulk of the taxes. You rob the laboring men of their money to keep up these institutions. You keep these convicts, you feed them and clothe them, you furnish them shelter, you furnish them with shops in which to work, you furnish them with the very best machinery that can be purchased in the markets of the world, and then you turn around and say that with all these appliances and with some 240,000 to 300,000 convicts thus employed, their labor does not come into competition with the honest labor of the country! Sir, I deny the proposition. You not only do that, but, after imposing taxes upon the laboring men to support these convicts, you place the products of this convict labor in the hands of agents who are paid 10 per cent. to sell them at any price they can get, and they do sell those goods without regard to the effect upon the labor or upon the markets of the country, and pocket their percentage, because that is all they have at stake.

Look at our own Commonwealth. As has been already intimated, we have there in the penitentiaries convicts employed in the manufacture of cocoa-matting to such an extent that this industry, so far as honest labor is concerned, has been absolutely destroyed. In the State of New York another set of convicts are employed in the manufacture of hollow ware, and to such an extent has this manufacture been carried that all individual enterprise in that direction is absolutely crushed out. Do you tell me that these things do not affect the men who were recently employed at remunerative wages in these branches of industry? All the garniture of your cooking-stoves and ranges is now made in the penitentiaries, and those who are engaged in the stove business are now compelled to buy the products of this dishonest labor. It is a shame and disgrace that a great Commonwealth of our country should go into partnership with convicts in the manufacture of products to undersell the products of honest labor. It is a disgrace that the State of Pennsylvania should thus employ her convicts. And whilst she has on her statute-books a law preventing goods thus disgracefully produced from being sold in Pennsylvania, unless clearly marked "convict-made," yet those goods, without that mark, which the State herself places upon them, may be sold across her borders in New York, New Jersey, and elsewhere. Still gentlemen stand here to maintain that there is no power under the Constitution by which we may protect the honest laboring men against the competition of goods thus dishonored and disgraced.

Whatever doubt there may be in regard to the constitutional question involved in the passage of this bill, we are perfectly willing to allow the courts of the country to pass upon that question and say whether the bill is constitutional or not. So far as I am concerned I will resolve the constitutional doubt in favor of honest labor and against convict labor. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. There are several gentlemen who desire to speak, but I am advised that the sooner we reach a vote on this bill the better. I therefore hope that gentlemen who wished to speak will pardon me for now calling the previous question. I will simply give notice that I understand an amendment will be offered extending the time at which the bill will take effect.

Mr. BLAND. I hope my colleague is not going to cut me off from the right to be heard.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. It is now 4 o'clock, and the gentleman must pardon me.

Mr. BLAND. I understood that my colleague was to yield me ten minutes. I do not understand why I should be cut off.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. It is now 4 o'clock, and we have but one hour remaining; it will take all that time to vote on the bill and amendments. [Cries of "Vote! Vote!"]

Mr. BRUMM. There are other gentlemen who want to speak, but they waive their right to do so.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I move the previous question upon the bill and amendments.

In moving the previous question, which is necessary if we expect to reach a vote to-day, as within a short time the House must adjourn under the rule providing for adjournment at 5 p. m., I regret that I am compelled to cut off the following gentlemen to whom I had promised time, as they desired to speak in favor of the bill, namely: Messrs. SHIVELY of Indiana, BUCKALEW of Pennsylvania, WHITE of Indiana, ANDERSON of Kansas, YOST of Virginia, FARQUHAR of New York, and MILLIKEN of Maine.

Mr. RYAN and others sought the floor to offer amendments.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Amendments are not in order pending the motion for the previous question. One amendment was submitted by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PLUMB], another by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and another by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. No other amendments can be considered by the Chair as pending if the previous question should now be ordered.

Mr. RYAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. O'NEILL] stated that amendments should not be excluded, but that there would be no discussion upon them. I think that was the understanding of the House.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That proposition was made when the gentleman from Missouri was asking unanimous consent for a limitation of time; but as that request was objected to, both propositions fell together.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I am perfectly willing to permit the offering of any amendments which are presented in good faith for the purpose of perfecting the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, gentlemen will now be permitted to send their amendments to the Clerk's desk, to be read in their order as sent up.

There was no objection.

Mr. RYAN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "transportation," in line 4 of section 1, insert "for commercial purposes."

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I have no objection to the amendment. If permitted, I will accept it.

The question was taken on Mr. RYAN's amendment, and it was agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I move the following amendment to come in at the end of the first section.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That the provisions of this section shall only apply in cases where the goods, wares, and merchandise, mentioned in said section, are the product of convict labor performed at wages lower than the same class of labor could have been procured outside of prisons and from free laborers.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The amendment seems to be rejected.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 30, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLAND. I move the following amendment to come at the end of the bill.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. There is no objection to taking a vote on that amendment now.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the Chair will entertain the amendment for a vote at this time.

Mr. ROGERS. There is so much confusion in the House we can not hear a word of what is going on.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If gentlemen will only be patient they

will all have an opportunity to offer their amendments. It will also facilitate the business of the House to have gentlemen exercise a little patience.

Mr. BLAND. I ask for the reading of my amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to the third section of the bill the following:

"*Provided*, This act shall not take effect or be in force for one year after its passage."

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Shall not take effect until one year after its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Probably this amendment would come at the end of the bill, but if there be unanimous consent it can be considered at this time and voted on.

Mr. BLOUNT. I object to any business out of order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection being made, the amendment will come up to be voted on at the proper time.

Mr. WARNER. If my colleague's be considered and voted on now it may render unnecessary several amendments which otherwise will be submitted to the preceding sections of the bill.

Mr. BLAND. I thought there was consent given to consider my amendment at this time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. No, it was objected to by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT].

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I think it ought to be considered now and disposed of.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It has been objected to.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move the following amendment to the first section of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add at the end of section 1 the following:

"And no product or commodity produced by convict labor outside of the United States shall be imported or brought within the United States, and any person or corporation who shall bring or import into the United States, or cause the same to be done, any such product or commodity shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be fined in a sum not less than double the amount of the value of such product or commodity; and any common carrier who shall import or bring into the United States any such product or commodity shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be fined upon conviction thereof in a sum not exceeding five times the value of such product or commodity."

Mr. BLOUNT. I rise to a question of order on that amendment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLOUNT. It is not germane to the pending bill.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I will say that the committee has reported a separate bill on that subject, which is now pending before this House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment is in order. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. CANNON. I desire to offer a substitute for the amendment.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That is in order, and the gentleman will send it up.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does the Chair decide the pending amendment is in order?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks it is.

Mr. CANNON. I ask that my substitute be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The importation of all goods, wares, or merchandise from any foreign country into the United States which in whole or in part were manufactured or produced by convict labor is hereby prohibited. And it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Treasury to prescribe rules and regulations for the enforcement of this provision and to enforce the same. Every person who knowingly violates this provision shall be deemed guilty of misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be subject to the penalties and punishment provided in this act.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Let us have a vote. That seems to be all right.

Mr. BLOUNT. I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLOUNT. I make the point of order that the amendment affects the revenue, and must under our rules have its first consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The point of order made on the first amendment was that it was not germane to the pending bill. That point of order the Chair overruled. This point of order, however, is a very different one. The point is made that it affects the revenue and prohibits the importation from foreign countries, and thereby reduces the revenue, because if the law remained as it now is these goods would pay duties to the Government.

Mr. DINGLEY. Let me suggest to the Chair that this question was decided by the Speaker of the House when the retaliation bill was up, and the same point of order was made, that the bill affected the revenue. The Speaker decided on that occasion that it did not come within the meaning of the rule as a revenue bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair does not think the ruling in that case applies to the present one at all. Whatever goods come in from foreign countries at the present time, whether manufactured in prison or out of it, are subject to the rates of duty prescribed in the tariff law. If this bill be enacted into law it will prohibit those goods coming in and paying the duty upon them. It therefore affects the revenue, and must have its first consideration in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON. I wish to make a parliamentary suggestion. The amendment for which that is a proposed substitute also affects the revenue, and the gentleman having made the point of order upon it, which was overruled, and it being before the House for consideration, it is also before the House for amendment; and I apprehend anything that tends to perfect it would necessarily be in order.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not understand that the amendment is here for consideration. The matter has not been taken up for discussion, has not been debated at all. I raised one question of order on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama, and it is not too late even now, I insist, to raise the other question of order to which that amendment is undoubtedly susceptible. Ordinarily it has been the practice when an amendment was offered and debated that then it was too late; but I do not understand that it has been debated at all, or that there has been any effort to submit it for debate or a vote of the House.

Mr. BRUMM. But an amendment to the amendment was offered, which was equivalent to debate.

Mr. BLOUNT. I desire to raise the same question on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I insist that the gentleman is too late to raise that now.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Has not the Chair ruled upon the question of order?

Mr. BLOUNT. I have just raised it.

Mr. CANNON. But the point was overruled, and an amendment has been offered.

Mr. BLOUNT. I raised a new point of order, and there has been no intervening business since the first was made.

Mr. BANKHEAD. There was a ruling made by the Chair, and another amendment offered.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I understand the point of order is made that this ought to be first considered in Committee of the Whole. As I heard the remarks of gentlemen around me, they seem to think that bills affecting revenue must be first considered in a Committee of the Whole. I take it if this must be so considered, that it comes under clause 3 of Rule XXIII, and I respectfully ask the attention of the Chair to that clause. It seems to me it does not provide that this amendment must be first considered in Committee of the Whole. The rule declaring what propositions shall go to the Committee on Ways and Means is in the words:

Affecting the revenue.

But in declaring what propositions shall be submitted first to the Committee of the Whole, the language is entirely different and is embodied in clause 3 of Rule XXIII, which I ask the Chair to read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair was just reading the clause to which the gentleman refers. The Chair is of opinion that while this proposition might indirectly affect the revenues, and if that point of order had been made at the proper time on this proposition the Chair would perhaps have ruled differently, but having been admitted for consideration in the House, the Chair thinks that any amendment which is analogous to it is in order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is a copy of the Canada law.

Mr. LONG. I propose to amend the substitute by adding after the word "importation" the words:

For commercial purposes.

Making it read:

Importation for commercial purposes.

The amendment to the substitute was agreed to.

The question being taken on the substitute as amended, it was adopted.

The section as amended by the substitute was adopted.

Mr. HOUK. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of section 1 add:

"And the words 'goods, wares, and merchandise' are intended and shall be construed to include coal, iron ore, all kinds of marble products, lumber in all its forms, and all other articles of commerce produced, wrought, cut, or mined by convict labor."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB. I now ask the adoption of the amendment I sent to the desk a short time ago.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend section 3 by adding the following words:

"Except as to goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured under existing contracts that have been made by any State for the employment of its convict labor, and in such cases this act shall take effect immediately upon the expiration of such contract."

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 102, noes 68.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLAND. I move to amend section 3, in the second line, by striking out the words "sixty days" and inserting "one year."

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I move to amend the amendment by making it two years.

The amendment to the amendment was adopted, there being on a division—ayes 91, noes 71.

The amendment as amended was agreed to, there being on a division—ayes 148, noes 21.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I move the previous question upon the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. DUNN. I desire to make a motion now to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That is not in order at this time.

Mr. DUNN. I ask, then, to be recognized at the proper time for that purpose.

Mr. GEAR. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GEAR. It is this, whether the gentleman from Missouri can move the previous question after he has given consent and it has been agreed by the House that amendments should be offered to the bill. As long as any amendment is pending I do not think he can move the previous question.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Missouri is entitled to the floor and has moved the previous question. The motion is in order.

Mr CLARDY. I want to make a proposition which I think my colleague [Mr. O'NEILL] will agree to, and to which nobody will object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Debate is not in order.

Mr. CLARDY. I want to state an amendment which I desire to have made in the amendment already adopted of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUK] prohibiting the importation of iron ore. I want to insert "lead ores."

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I have no objection to that.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARDY] asks unanimous consent to submit an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee already adopted so as to include lead ores.

There was no objection, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Now I demand a vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on ordering the previous question on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The question being taken; there were—ayes 110, noes 67.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, and Mr. BLOUNT addressed the Chair.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I move the previous question on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. I call for the yeas and nays on the motion for the previous question.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I move the previous question on the passage of the bill, and upon that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That motion is not now in order. The previous question has just been ordered on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Speaker, I have demanded the yeas and nays on the question of ordering the previous question.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. That demand is made too late.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Did the gentleman from Georgia demand the yeas and nays in time?

Mr. BLOUNT. I did; at the first possible moment.

Mr. HOUK. The demand is made too late. The vote had been announced and the result received by the House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Did the gentleman from Georgia at the time demand the yeas and nays on the motion for the previous question?

Mr. BLOUNT. I did so instantly.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Then the gentleman was in time.

Mr. HOUK. The gentleman may have designed to do it, but he did not until the Chair had announced the result.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman from Tennessee did not hear me, but other gentlemen did.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair observed the gentleman from Georgia seeking recognition. The Chair did not recognize him at the moment, as the gentleman from Missouri was requesting recognition and the Chair recognized that gentleman. The gentleman from Georgia now states that he demanded the yeas and nays on the motion for the previous question.

The question being put, the yeas and nays were ordered, 70 members voting therefor.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I wish to ask the Chair if upon the vote being taken in favor of the engrossment of the bill it does not come up as unfinished business to-morrow?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is now on ordering the previous question on the engrossment and third reading of the bill, and upon that question the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Does not the previous question carry the bill over as unfinished business?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If this roll-call should result in the previous question being ordered, would not the bill come up as unfinished business in the morning?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Speaker, who will occupy the chair at that time, will decide as to that when the occasion arises.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am obliged to the Chair for the information he has communicated to me.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If the present occupant were the Speaker, he might decide such a question at once; but as it would devolve on the Speaker to decide the point if it should arise to-morrow, the present occupant will not usurp his prerogative.

Mr. WARNER. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WARNER. Under the rules of the House have we not to adjourn at 5 o'clock?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That is true.

Mr. WARNER. As it is evident we can not get a vote on this proposition before 5 o'clock, I ask, in the interest of the laboring men, that by unanimous consent the time be extended to 6 o'clock, that we may finish this bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. I object.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I move that the House take a recess until to-morrow at 10 o'clock.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That motion is not in order.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Why not?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. By a previous order of the House this day's session must close at 5 o'clock, and it is not in order to move a recess at this moment, the yeas and nays having been ordered on a pending proposition.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. And it is not in order to move a recess?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is not when the yeas and nays have been ordered on a pending question.

Mr. WARNER. I did not hear objection made to my proposition.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair did. The question is, Shall the previous question be now ordered on the engrossment and third reading of the bill?

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I desire the motion for a recess shall be considered pending when this is decided.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 44, not voting 95; as follows:

YEAS—185.

Allen, Mich.	Dingley,	Lind,	Russell, Conn.
Anderson, Iowa	Dockery,	Lodge,	Rusk,
Anderson, Ill.	Dorsey,	Long,	Ryan,
Anderson, Kans.	Enloe,	Lyman,	Sawyer,
Arnold,	Farquhar,	Lynch,	Scull,
Atkinson,	Fitch,	Mahoney,	Seney,
Bacon,	Flood,	Mansur,	Seymour,
Baker, N. Y.	Ford,	Mason,	Shaw,
Baker, Ill.	Forney,	Matson,	Shively,
Baukhead,	French,	McAdoo,	Simmons,
Belden,	Fuller,	McClammy,	Smith,
Bingham,	Funston,	McComas,	Snyder,
Bland,	Gear,	McCormick,	Spinola,
Boothman,	Gest,	McCreary,	Spooner,
Bound,	Goff,	McCullogh,	Springer,
Boutelle,	Grout,	McKenna,	Stahlnecker,
Brewer,	Guenther,	McKinley,	Steele,
Browne, T. H. B., Va.	Hall,	McKinney,	Stewart, Tex.
Browne, Ind.	Harmer,	McRae,	Stone, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Hatch,	McShane,	Stone, Mo.
Brumm,	Haugen,	Milliken,	Struble,
Bryce,	Hayes,	Moffitt,	Symes,
Buchanan,	Heard,	Montgomery,	Tarsney,
Bunnell,	Henderson, Iowa	Morrill,	Taulbee,
Burrows,	Henderson, N. C.	Neal,	Thomas, Ky.
Campbell, F., N. Y.	Henderson, Ill.	Nutting,	Thompson, Ohio
Campbell, T. J., N. Y.	Hermann,	O'Donnell,	Tracey,
Cannon,	Hires,	O'Ferrall,	Townshend,
Caruth,	Hogg,	O'Neill, Pa.	Vance,
Cheadle,	Holman,	O'Neill, Mo.	Vandever,
Chipman,	Holmes,	Osborne,	Wade,
Clardy,	Hopkins, Ill.	Owen,	Walker,
Clark,	Houk,	Patton,	Warner,
Clements,	Hovey,	Payson.	Washington,
Cobb,	Hunter,	Penington,	Weaver,
Cogswell,	Jackson,	Perkins,	Weber,
Collins,	Johnston, Ind.	Peters,	White, Ind.
Compton,	Johnston, N. C.	Phelan,	Whiting, Mich.
Conger,	Kennedy,	Phelps,	Wickham,
Cox,	Kerr,	Pidcock,	Wilkinson,
Crouse,	La Follette,	Post,	Williams,
Cummings,	Laidlaw,	Pugsley,	Wilson, W. Va.
Dalzell,	Landes,	Randall,	Wise,
Darlington,	Lane,	Rayner,	Yost.
Davenport,	Lawler,	Reed,	
Davidson, Ala.	Lee,	Rowell,	
Davis,	Lehlbach,	Rowland,	

NAYS—44.

Abbott,	Crain,	Hutton,	Rice,
Adams,	Crisp,	Kilgore,	Robertson,
Allen, Miss.	Culberson,	Lanham,	Rogers,
Anderson, Miss.	Dargan,	Latham,	Sayers,
Barry,	Elliott,	Morgan,	Stewart, Ga.
Blount,	Finley,	Newton,	Stockdale,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Glass,	O'Neall, Ind.	Til man,
Burnett,	Grimes,	Outhwaite,	Turner, Kans.
Butterworth,	Hare,	Parker,	Turner, Ga.
Carlton,	Hiestand,	Peel,	West,
Catchings,	Howard,	Perry,	Whitthorne.

NOT VOTING—95.

Allen, Mass.	Davidson, Fla.	Hopkins, N. Y.	Richardson,
Barnes,	De Lano,	Hudd,	Rockwell,
Bayne,	Dibble,	Jones,	Romeis,
Belmont,	Dougherty,	Kean,	Russell, Mass.
Biggs,	Dunham,	Kelley,	Scott,
Blanchard,	Dunn,	Ketcham,	Sherman,
Bliss,	Ermentrout,	Laffoon,	Sowden,
Bowden,	Felton,	Logan,	Stephenson,
Bowen,	Fisher,	Laird,	Stewart, Vt.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Foran,	Macdonald,	Taylor, E. B., Ohio
Brower,	Gaines,	Maffett,	Taylor, J. D., Ohio
Brown, J. R., Va.	Gallinger,	Maish,	Thomas, Ill.
Buckalew,	Gay,	Martin,	Thomas, Wis.
Burnes,	Gibson,	McMillin,	Thompson, Cal.
Butler,	Glover,	Merriman,	Wheeler,
Bynum,	Granger,	Mills,	White, N. Y.
Campbell, Ohio	Greenman,	Moore,	Whiting, Mass.
Candler,	Grosvenor,	Morrow,	Wilber,
Caswell,	Hayden,	Morse,	Wilkins,
Cockran,	Hemphill,	Nelson,	Wilson, Minn.
Cooper,	Herbert,	Nichols,	Woodburn,
Cothran,	Hitt,	Norwood,	Yardley,
Cowles,	Hooker,	Oates,	Yoder.
Cutcheon,	Hopkins, Va.	Plumb,	

Mr. OWEN. Mr. Speaker, I am paired with my colleague, Mr. BYNUM; but as I understand that he also is in favor of this bill, I have voted "ay."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Speaker, if I were not paired I should vote "ay."

On motion of Mr. BUTTERWORTH, the reading of names of members voting was dispensed with.

The following named members were announced as paired until further notice:

Mr. BIGGS with Mr. STEWART, of Vermont.
Mr. SOWDEN with Mr. YARDLEY.
Mr. BYNUM with Mr. OWEN.
Mr. HOOKER with Mr. CUTCHEON.
Mr. SCOTT with Mr. WHITING, of Massachusetts.
Mr. BURNES with Mr. BREWER.
Mr. GRANGER with Mr. ROCKWELL.
Mr. GLOVER with Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin.
Mr. NORWOOD with Mr. COOPER.
Mr. JONES with Mr. STEPHENSON.
Mr. GREENMAN with Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois.
Mr. WHITE, of New York, with Mr. COCKRAN.

The following were announced as paired for this day:

Mr. WILKINS with Mr. BOWDEN.
Mr. BLISS with Mr. DE LANO.
Mr. MOORE with Mr. ROMEIS.
Mr. MERRIMAN with Mr. SHERMAN.
Mr. DAVIDSON, of Florida, with Mr. KETCHAM.
Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, with Mr. KELLEY.
Mr. LAFFOON with Mr. MORROW.
Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts, with Mr. HAYDEN.
Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, with Mr. ALLEN, of Massachusetts.
Mr. WHEELER with Mr. BAYNE.
Mr. DUNN with Mr. DUNHAM.
Mr. HERBERT with Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR.

The following-named members were announced as paired on this bill:

Mr. RICHARDSON with Mr. GALLINGER.
Mr. BARNES with Mr. THOMPSON, of California.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota, with Mr. FORAN, Mr. FORAN being in favor of the bill and Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota, against it.

Mr. OATES with Mr. RAYNER. Mr. RAYNER, if present, would vote for the bill and Mr. OATES against it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. On this question the yeas are 185 and the nays are 44. The ayes have it, the previous question upon the engrossment and third reading of the bill. And by a previous order the House now stands adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. CHIPMAN: A bill (H. R. 10100) for the relief of Charles F. Campbell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEEL: A bill (H. R. 10101) to grant pension to Reuben E. Noel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PUGSLEY: A bill (H. R. 10102) to remove the charge of desertion from Wellington Doddridge—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 10103) granting a pension to William Fairbanks—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER: A bill (H. R. 10104) granting a pension to Jane W. Laidley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE, of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10105) for the relief of Martha J. Hale, widow of John Hale—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 10106) to place the name of Matilda Spangler on the pension-roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YOST: A bill (H. R. 10107) for the relief of Margaret J. Stephens—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE: A bill (H. R. 10108) to reimburse the Upper Potomac Steam-boat Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 10109) granting a pension to Mrs. Anna Leach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHELPS: A bill (H. R. 10110) authorizing the purchase of the original telegraphic instrument—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. FITCH: A bill (H. R. 10111) for the relief of Henry Sibo—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. T. H. B. BROWNE: Petition of the Military Board of Virginia, urging the passage of the bill for increase of annual appropriation for militia purposes in the States to $1,000,000—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COMPTON (by request): Petition of Henry Kropp, jr., for relief—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. FITCH: Petition of Charles Moehring, for pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GEAR: Petition of Wilkins Warwick, of Lewis, Cass County, Iowa, for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. GOFF: Petition of Rev. J. C. B. Stivers and 22 others, male citizens of the First district of West Virginia, for better legal protection of women and girls—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GROUT: Testimony in support of House bill granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Holmes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH: Petition of citizens of Putnam County, Missouri, that the benefits of the homestead laws be extended to soldiers of the late war—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HERMANN: Resolution of Board of Trade of Portland, Oregon, favoring the appropriation for the expenses of the revenue marine—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, resolution of Board of Trade of Portland, Oregon, in favor of Nicaragua Canal Company—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LODGE: Memorial of General Assembly of Massachusetts, relating to the immigration of convicts, lunatics, etc.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. PEEL: Petition of J. S. Dobkins, administrator of Hugh Dobkins, of Benton County, Arkansas, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PETERS: Resolution of Grand Army of the Republic, No. 449, Woodsdale, Kans., favoring general pension legislation—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULL: Paper to accompany House bill 10047—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of James Snyder, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPINOLA: Petition of John F. Hagan, for relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. A. C. THOMPSON: Petition of Collin W. Wickline, for relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WEST: Petition of residents of the Twentieth district, New York, for the more effectual protection of agriculture—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. W. L. WILSON: Petition of Joseph L. Roberts, of John Chamberlain, of Philip R. Moler, of J. Baker Kearfott, administrator of William M. Lemers, and of Francis A. Whittington, of Jefferson County, West Virginia, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Mrs. Olive Padgett, for relief—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The following petitions in favor of House bill 9716, for the better protection of free labor from convict labor, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Labor:

By Mr. ADAMS: Of Knights of Labor of Chicago, Ill.

By Mr. A. R. ANDERSON: Of Knights of Labor of New Market, Taylor County, Iowa.

By Mr. ATKINSON: Of Knights of Labor, Assembly 10268, of Waynesborough, Pa.

By Mr. BACON: Of J. B. Hands and others, citizens of New York.

By Mr. BOUND: Of Knights of Labor of Williamstown, Pa.

By Mr. C. E. BROWN: Of Knights of Labor of Cincinnati, Ohio.

By Mr. BRUMM: Of Knights of Labor of Silver Creek, Pa.

By Mr. T. J. CAMPBELL: Of Knights of Labor of New York City.

By Mr. DUNN: Of Local Assembly No. 1978, Knights of Labor, of Forest City, Ark.

By Mr. FARQUHAR: Of Knights of Labor of Lancaster and of Buffalo, N. Y.

By Mr. FORAN: Of Knights of Labor No. 8530, and of 500 citizens of Cleveland, Ohio.

By Mr. HARMER: Of citizens of Philadelphia, Pa.

By Mr. McSHANE: Of Knights of Labor of Omaha, Nebr.

By Mr. MOFFITT: Of Knights of Labor of Ticonderoga and of Mineville, N. Y.
By Mr. OSBORNE: Of Knights of Labor of Philadelphia, Pa.
By Mr. PHELPS: Of Knights of Labor Assembly No. 6469, of Paterson, Passaic County, New Jersey.
Also, of Knights of Labor of Paterson, N. J.
By Mr. PIDCOCK: Of Knights of Labor Assembly No. 4993, Washington, Warren County, New Jersey.
By Mr. RICE: Of Local Assembly No. 4031, Knights of Labor, of St. Paul, Minn.
By Mr. SPINOLA: Of Bricklayers' International Union of New York City.
By Mr. WICKHAM: Of Knights of Labor of Ashland County, Ohio.
By Mr. WILLIAMS: Of citizens of Piqua, Ohio.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:
By Mr. FORAN: Of citizens of Cleveland, Ohio.
By Mr. JACKSON: Of Hon. Daniel Agnew, and 44 others, citizens of Beaver, Pa.

The following petition for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, was received and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:
By Mr. SAWYER: Of 20 citizens of Perry, N. Y.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:
By Mr. E. P. ALLEN: Of O. E. Pratt and 31 others, ex-soldiers; of Joseph Bushway and 18 others, ex-soldiers, of Washington County, and of John W. Wise and others, ex-soldiers, of Ypsilanti, Mich.
By Mr. DORSEY: Of ex-soldiers and sailors of Dawson County, Nebraska.
By Mr. McCOMAS: Petition of Maj. O. A. Homer and 40 others.

The following petitions praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:
By Mr. GROUT: Of 160 citizens of Washington and Windham Counties, Vermont.
By Mr. McCOMAS: Of 143 citizens of Frederick County, Maryland.
By Mr. VOORHEES: Of 149 citizens of Walla Walla and other counties of Washington Territory.

The following petition for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:
By Mr. McCOMAS: Of 50 citizens of Selbysport, Md.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *May* 23, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. REAGAN presented the petition of G. W. Hidham, special delegate of the Creek Nation of Indians, praying for the reimbursement of that nation for certain moneys accruing under the third article of the treaty of 1866; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BERRY presented the petition of the Dudley E. Jones Company (D. E. Jones, president) and 190 other citizens of Pulaski County, Arkansas, praying for certain amendments of the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FAULKNER presented the petition of J. C. B. Stivers and 27 other male citizens of New Cumberland, W. Va., praying for the better legal protection of womanhood and girlhood, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McPHERSON. I present the petition of Rose Taylor, praying to be allowed a pension as mother of Daniel B. Taylor, late first lieutenant United States Army; the petition of Matilda Gillespie, praying to be allowed a pension as guardian of the minor children of John Burchill, late a private in Thirteenth and First New Jersey Volunteers, and the petition of Alfred E. Gathercole, of Paterson, N. J., praying to be allowed a pension. I move the reference of the petitions to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McPHERSON. I present the petition of John Fitzpatrick, late a private in Company B, Sixteenth New York Volunteers, praying favorable action on Senate bill 2037, to remove the charge of desertion from his military record, which is now pending in the Military Committee. I move the reference of the petition to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL presented a petition of residents and citizens of Lynn County, Oregon, praying that a pension be granted to William Meyer, late a private in Company L, First Regiment United States Cavalry, and formerly a private in Company B, Forty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteers; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Dayton, Oregon, praying that some provision be made by Congress for the payment of Indian depredation claims allowed by the Department of the Interior; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Sheridan, Yamhill County, Oregon, praying for the passage of Senate bill 283, for the better protection of the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Portland, Oregon, praying for the passage of the bill providing increased support for the revenue-marine service; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. HISCOCK presented the petition of John Pope Hodnett, in support of his claim for pay for legal services rendered the workingmen of the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also presented the petition of Matilda Joslyn Gage, of New York, praying for the removal of her political disabilities, and that she be declared invested with full power to exercise her right of self government at the ballot-box; which was referred to the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage.

Mr. CHANDLER presented the petition of Charles Gallagher, of New York City, praying for the reference of his claims against the Government for supplies furnished during the war to the Court of Claims; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CALL presented the petition of J. L. Walsingham and numerous other fourth-class postmasters in the State of Florida, praying that additional compensation may be allowed fourth-class postmasters; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. SPOONER presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., remonstrating against the adoption of a proposed amendment to the interstate-commerce act requiring the payment of customs duties on all merchandise upon its re-entrance into the United States after having passed out of this country into Canada; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PALMER presented the petition of John F. Robert and 9 other citizens of Central Mine, Mich., praying for the better protection of the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. EVARTS presented the petition of George Lane, of New York City, praying to be allowed $2,750 bounty for his military services in the United States Army; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of citizens of Crawford County, Pennsylvania, praying for certain amendments of the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DOLPH, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 474) for the relief of General G. Cluseret, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4691) for the relief of John P. Hageman, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7255) for the relief of A. B. Tyan, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, submitted a report to accompany the bill (S. 2447) regulating the practice in certain cases in the Post-Office Department, heretofore reported by him from that committee.

Mr. HOAR, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1896) for the relief of Mrs. Eliza A. Cutler Jones, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs; which was agreed to.

Mr. CAMERON, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2925) in relation to cadets at the Naval Academy, reported it with amendments.

Mr. PAYNE. I am directed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to whom was referred the bill (S. 631) for the relief of Edwin De Leon, to report it adversely. At the request of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] I ask that the bill be placed on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report of the committee.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 878) for the relief of John D. Maxted and Robert J. B. Newcombe, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2658) to validate acknowledgments taken before United States commissioners appointed by the circuit courts of the United States or by the supreme court of the District of Columbia, of

deeds recorded in the District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. FAULKNER. I am also instructed by the Committee on the District of Columbia to report a number of amendments to the bill (S. 2919) to define the routes of steam railroads in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes. I ask that the bill be reprinted as proposed to be amended by the committee, so that when it comes up for action next Tuesday the Senate will understand more intelligently the amendments made.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill previously reported, with the proposed amendments of the committee, will be printed, if there be no objection.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1582) for the relief of Lucien Goyaux, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 610) directing the Secretary of the Treasury to examine and settle the accounts of certain States and the city of Baltimore, growing out of moneys expended by said States and the city of Baltimore for military purposes during the war of 1812, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SPOONER submitted the following report:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2974) to pay John Pope Hodnett for services rendered as counsel to the Government in the investigation into affairs of the District of Columbia, acting as such counsel by order of a resolution of the House of Representatives; also for acting as counsel for the workingmen of the District of Columbia for fifteen years last past, have carefully considered the same, and, in accordance with the resolution of the Senate of February 7, 1884, report as follows:

That they have referred the same to the Court of Claims under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to afford assistance and relief to Congress and the Executive Departments in the investigation of claims and demands against the Government," approved March 3, 1883.

Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 262) to increase the efficiency of the medical corps of the Navy, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DAWES, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2929) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct and operate a railway, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. McPHERSON introduced a bill (S. 3007) for the relief of D. W. Ogden; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 3008) for the relief of James P. Chase; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3009) for the relief of James P. Chase; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 3010) for the relief of Charles Gallagher, and to refer his claims to the Court of Claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3011) to provide for the issue of the commission of Philip C. Johnson as a rear-admiral in the United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MITCHELL introduced a bill (S. 3012) to amend the military record of M. J. Gilstrap, of Junction City, Oregon; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3013) granting a pension to William Meyer; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FARWELL introduced a bill (S. 3014) granting a pension to Joseph Zerbach; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 3015) for the relief of C. M. Shaffer; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 3016) for the relief of Sarah R. Fisher; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 3017) for the relief of Daniel Donovan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. McPHERSON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 85) providing for medals to the officers and enlisted men of the three months' service in 1861; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. PALMER and Mr. PASCO submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FARWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2919) to define the routes of steam railroads in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. DAWES submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2807) to grant to the Puyallup Valley Railway Company a right of way through the Puyallup Indian reservation in Washington Territory; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2345) authorizing the construction of bridges across the Cape Fear River, Black River, and the Northeast River, in the State of North Carolina.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 1747) to authorize the sale of a tract of land in the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth, in the State of Kansas; and

A bill (S. 2901) granting to the Milwaukee, Lake Shore and Western Railway Company the right of way through the Lac de Flambeau Indian reservation, in the State of Wisconsin.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Harrison Swango; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After fifty minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

PAY INSPECTOR LUTHER G. BILLINGS.

Mr. CAMERON. I ask that Senate bill 1781, Order of Business 485, be taken from the Calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The title of the bill will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1781) to authorize the President of the United States to place upon the retired-list of the Navy Pay Inspector Luther G. Billings.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be taken from the Calendar and recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs, if there be no objection.

FUNERAL OF MRS. SAWYER.

Mr. SPOONER. Mr. President, it is known to Senators that death has crossed the threshold of my colleague's home, and has stricken down at his side the companion of his long life-journey. Many Senators on both sides of the Chamber have indicated to me a desire to testify their respect for my colleague and their sympathy for him in his sorrow by attending the obsequies of Mrs. Sawyer, which are to occur at 2 o'clock. To enable such to do so, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, May 24, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *May* 23, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

LIGHT-HOUSE, POINT ARGUILLO, CALIFORNIA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Light-House Board of appropriations for a light-house and fog-signal at Point Arguillo, California; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

STATUE OF LIBERTY, BEDLOE'S ISLAND, NEW YORK.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Light-House Board for building the pedestal and approaches to the statue of Liberty on Bedloe's Island, New York; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

LIGHT-HOUSE, PATOS ISLAND, WASHINGTON TERRITORY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Light-House Board for the erection of a light-house and fog-signal at Patos Island, Washington Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

LIGHT-HOUSE, POINT BUCHON, CALIFORNIA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Light-

House Board of appropriation for a light-house and fog-signal at Point Buchon, California; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

LIGHT-HOUSE, ETC., AT STEWART ISLAND, WASHINGTON TERRITORY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Light-House Board of an appropriation for a light-house and fog-signal at Stewart Island, Washington Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

LIZZIE WRIGHT OWEN.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Lizzie Wright Owen.

The SPEAKER. The Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to this bill, and the question is whether the House will insist upon its amendments and agree to a conference.

Mr. McMILLIN. I ask that that bill lie on the Speaker's table until the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MATSON], the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, can be present.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

PUBLIC BUILDING, ZANESVILLE, OHIO.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 351) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Zanesville, Ohio; which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

MILWAUKEE, LAKE SHORE AND WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 2901) granting to the Milwaukee, Lake Shore and Western Railway Company the right of way through the Lac de Flambeau Indian reservation, in the State of Wisconsin; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. HUDD. Mr. Speaker, this bill is substantially the same as a House bill which has been reported unanimously from the Committee on Indian Affairs, granting right of way through an Indian reservation. I therefore ask unanimous consent that this Senate bill be now taken up and put on its passage.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Reserving the right to object, I wish to inquire whether this bill has been reported by any committee of the House?

Mr. HUDD. Substantially the same bill has been reported by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the House.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was read a first and second time, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUDD moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, House bill No. 9958, relating to the same subject as the bill just passed, will be laid on the table.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

REVOLUTIONARY BATTLE-FIELD OF BENNINGTON.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 2920) relative to the Revolutionary battle-field of Bennington; which was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on the Library.

LIGHT-HOUSE, ETC., AT GOOSE ROCK, MAINE.

The SPEAKER. Yesterday morning a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Light-House Board of an appropriation for the erection of a light-house, fog-signal, and day beacon at Goose Rock, Fox Island Thoroughfare, Maine, was laid before the House and referred to the Committee on Commerce. Upon examination of the communication the Chair thinks it should have been referred to the Committee on Appropriations; and if there be no objection that reference will be made.

There was no objection, and the communication was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

HARRISON SWANGO.

Mr. TAULBEE. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Harrison Swango, and that it be now put on its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Harrison Swango, of Wolfe County, Kentucky, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,655, in full for horses and mules taken from him and converted to the use of Government by the United States Army during the late civil war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the report will be read.

The report of the Committee on War Claims (by Mr. STONE, of Kentucky) was read, as follows:

Your committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Harrison Swango, having carefully examined the claim in the office of the Quartermaster-General, United States Army, Nos. 1701, 1703, 2287, 2291, together with the proof filed with the committee, submit the following report:

Harrison Swango, a farmer residing in Wolfe County, Kentucky, during the late war, filed in the office of the Quartermaster-General, United States Army, a claim based on four counts, amounting in the aggregate to the sum of $2,315, for property and stores hereinafter enumerated, and which he claims were taken from him by the United States troops during the late civil war for the actual and necessary use of the Army, and that all of said property and stores were so used.

His claim was rejected on the 27th day of February, 1880, on the ground that the Quartermaster-General was unable to certify that he was convinced of the loyalty of claimant.

His claim was proven by the following witnesses in due form of law, namely, Harrison Swango, W. L. Kash, J. C. Swango, and W. F. Little as to claim for—

6 tons of hay, at $10 per ton	$60
100 bushels of corn, at 75 cents per bushel	75
20 cords of dry wood, at $1.50 per cord	30
Total	165

which was taken and used by a regiment of Federal soldiers, in charge of Colonel Craner, on or about December 31, 1862, while *en route* to Prestonburgh, Ky.

Also by claimant and Sarah Ellen Kash and Mariah McLain as to one horse, valued at $125, taken by Capt. Harrison Cockrell while in charge of his company, and was necessary for and used by him in the service of the United States.

Also by the claimant and G. B. Swango and J. C. Swango as to claim for—

18 mules, valued at $85 per head	$1,530
1 horse valued at	125
Total	1,655

These items are each proven to have been taken by and used in the service of the United States Army; the last-named items, 18 mules and 1 horse, were taken by Col. John Dils while in charge of a portion of his regiment on a raid.

Also, by Sarah Ellen Kash, Darius Brooks, and claimant, as to claim for 200 bushels of corn, valued at 75 cents per bushel, $150, taken and used by Federal soldiers on or about April 1, 1864, by a Michigan regiment commanded by one Colonel Brown.

All of the above-named witnesses appear to be credible and of good character for truth and veracity.

On the question of claimant's loyalty, seven witnesses testify to the effect that they resided in the same neighborhood during the late war from and including the year 1861 to and including the year 1866, and that his loyalty was never questioned to their knowledge. Said witnesses were all loyal to the United States Government during the late war.

Hon. George M. Adams, while a member of the Forty-third Congress, certifies that he knew claimant well, and never heard his loyalty to the United States Government questioned.

W. P. TAULBEE, a member of the Fifty-first Congress, says:

"I have known claimant, Harrison Swango, well, from before the late civil war to the present; he was reputed to be loyal to the United States Government throughout the war. I know all the witnesses who testify in his claims embraced in bill H. R. No. 4044, in Forty-ninth Congress. Each of said witnesses is of good character for truth."

The record nowhere bears any intimation of disloyalty on the part of claimant, save in a letter of one J. G. Trumbull, agent of the Quartermaster's Department, who states that the claimant was reputed in his neighborhood as being disloyal during the late war.

Your committee, in view of the foregoing statement of facts, report back the bill, and recommend its passage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have not observed in that report any evidence from the quartermaster or any of the Federal officers that this property was taken.

Mr. TAULBEE. An examination of the report will show that the evidence in support of this claim was taken from the records of the Quartermaster-General's Office. The claim is based entirely on that evidence, except a statement of one of my predecessors in this House and of myself upon the question of the claimant's loyalty.

Mr. BURROWS. Does the gentleman know the witnesses who have testified in this case?

Mr. TAULBEE. Every one of them; and they are all entitled to full credit; they are neighbors of mine.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What price has been allowed for the mules which are to be paid for?

Mr. TAULBEE. About $80 a head.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I believe that is lower than the average price.

Mr. BURROWS. I would like to know whether the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. TAULBEE] is personally acquainted with the witness who testifies as to the disloyalty of the claimant.

Mr. TAULBEE. No witness testified as to that.

Mr. BURROWS. I thought there was a letter to that effect.

Mr. TAULBEE. The letter on which the claim was rejected was written by J. G. Trumbull, an agent of the Quartermaster's Department, who stated that the claimant was reputed in his neighborhood to have been disloyal; but the loyalty of the claimant is proved by a number of witnesses.

Mr. BURROWS. The gentleman from Kentucky does not personally know the man who wrote that letter?

Mr. TAULBEE. No, sir; I do not. He was an agent of the Quartermaster-General's Department who was sent to investigate the claim.

Mr. HUNTER. Was there any evidence showing disloyalty on the part of the claimant?

Mr. TAULBEE. Not a bit.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to call attention to the fact that the claims for the adjustment of which provision was made by the act of July 4, 1864, known as "the 4th of July law," amounted to something over $60,000,000. Those claims have now been almost entirely adjusted and acted on, or disposed of by Congress. This bill and a few others which have preceded it propose to open up in particular cases the action of the tribunal which was authorized under "the 4th of July law" to adjust those claims.

I understand that this claim was rejected at the Department, and rejected, perhaps, on the ground of want of proof of loyalty. The committee, however, believe that the claimant was loyal and is entitled to be paid. I wish to suggest that at an early moment the question must arise whether these cases should be taken up one after another and acted on in this special way as a matter of favoritism or whether all these claims as a class shall undergo revision. I think the passage of particular claims through Congress in this way is the worst kind of special legislation; and while I shall not object to the consideration of this bill, I must insist that the practice which has sprung up in the last two Congresses of opening up these cases ought to be discontinued. If, as a general thing, these claims have not been adjusted on a proper basis, although the parties have had their day in court, the whole subject should be opened up and some system of review adopted.

Mr. BLOUNT. I would like to know if the gentleman from Indiana objects to the consideration at this time.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am consenting that it shall come before the House for a vote.

The SPEAKER. Without objection the bill will be considered as engrossed and read the third time; and the question recurs on its passage.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask a vote on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and it was decided in the affirmative.

So the bill was passed.

Mr. TAULBEE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MILITARY RESERVATION, FORT LEAVENWORTH.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1747) to authorize the sale of a tract of land in the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth, in the State of Kansas, and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Leavenworth City and Fort Leavenworth Water Company, of Leavenworth, Kans., a body corporate organized and existing under the laws of the State of Kansas, shall have the right to purchase from the United States that parcel and tract of land in the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth, State of Kansas, bounded and described as follows: Beginning at a point on the north line of Metropolitan avenue in the extension of the west line of the land owned by the Leavenworth Coal Company; thence north in the extension of said west line 500 feet; thence east parallel to the north line of Metropolitan avenue 820 feet, more or less, to railroad right of way; thence on the west line of said right of way 503 feet, more or less, to the north line of Metropolitan avenue; thence west on the north line of Metropolitan avenue 850 feet, more or less, to the place of beginning; containing 9¼ acres, more or less, reserving to the United States or assigns the coal or royalty for coal underlying the same.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to appoint a commission of three competent Army officers, which shall, without unnecessary delay, examine and report the value of the tract of land hereinbefore described, and report to the Secretary of War. On receipt of such report the Secretary of War shall forward a certified copy thereof to each the Secretary of the Interior and the Leavenworth City and Fort Leavenworth Water Company: *Provided*, That the report of the board of Army officers on the subject of the value of the land in question shall not be operative until the same is approved by the Secretary of War.

SEC. 3. That whenever the Leavenworth City and Fort Leavenworth Water Company aforesaid, being thus notified of the valuation of the said lands, shall pay to the Secretary of War, in lawful money, the amount of said appraisal, and shall notify the Secretary of the Interior of such payment, it shall be the duty of the Secretary of the Interior to cause to be issued to the Leavenworth City and Fort Leavenworth Water Company a patent to the said lands, and on such deposit being made and notice to the Secretary of the Interior being given the said company may enter upon, possess, use, and occupy the said lands.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, was passed.

Mr. MORRILL moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLOUNT. I now demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move to dispense with the call of committees for reports, and also ask unanimous consent that members having reports to make from committees may be permitted to file them with the Clerk.

The motion to dispense with the morning hour was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, the request of the gentleman from Georgia, that members having reports from committees may file them with the Clerk, will be considered as agreed to.

There was no objection.

FILING OF REPORTS, BILLS, ETC.

The following bill was introduced and reports were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

DULUTH AND WINNIPEG RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. NELSON, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 10112) granting to the Duluth and Winnipeg Railway Company the right of way through the Fond du Lac Indian reservation, in the State of Minnesota; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

ARREARS OF PENSIONS.

On motion of Mr. MATSON, by unanimous consent, the Private Calendar was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9961) relating to arrears of pensions; and the same was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

MRS. JEANNIE STONE.

Mr. FRENCH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably an amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 401) granting a pension to Mrs. Jeannie Stone; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH PUYALLUP INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. SHIVELY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 9781) to grant right of way to the Puyallup Valley Railway Company through the Puyallup Indian reservation, in Washington Territory, and for other purposes; which was laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, reported, as a substitute for the bill H. R. 9781, a bill (H. R. 10113) granting the right of way through the Puyallup Indian reservation to the Puyallup Valley Railway Company, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM CRUDGENTON.

Mr. BLISS, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 1168) for the relief of William Crudgenton; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ISHMAEL JONES.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 849) granting a pension to Ishmael Jones; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM N. STEPHENS.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5132) for the relief of William N. Stephens; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NATHAN COOK.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9228) for the relief of Nathan Cook; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GRISWOLD ROGERS.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8934) granting a pension to Griswold Rogers; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

J. W. PORTER.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4792) to pension J. W. Porter; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELIZA A. WOODS.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8885) granting a pension to Eliza A. Woods; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY NEWTON.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9227) for the relief of Mary Newton; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

THOMAS SHACKELFORD.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 9719) for the relief of Thomas Shackelford; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARGARET Z. AUSTIN.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9400) granting a pension to Margaret Z. Austin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY L. CLEVELAND.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9877) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Cleveland; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. ANN ELIZA DAVIS.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9226) to increase the pension of Mrs. Ann Eliza Davis; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARTIN M'LAUGHLIN.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8697) to increase the pension of Martin McLaughlin, a survivor of the Mexican war and late a private in Company D, Third United States Infantry; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. MARY JOHNSTON.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 3851) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary Johnston; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELISHA KENNEDY.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back with an amendment the bill (H. R. 3794) granting a pension to Elisha Kennedy; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

REBECCA MANLONE.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 9808) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Manlone; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM J. HEADY.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 9910) increasing the pension of William J. Heady; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SARAH PERMAN.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 9580) granting a pension to Sarah Perman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM N. ROBB.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9679) for the relief of William N. Robb; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printer.

BARTOLA THEBANT.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2629) to pension Bartola Thebant, a soldier in the Florida Seminole Indian war of 1849 and 1850; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN M'KERNAN.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1325) for the relief of John McKernan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

TITUS WILDER.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2064) granting a pension to Titus Wilder; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARGARET STAFFORD WORTH.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 867) granting a pension to Margaret Stafford Worth; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARTIN N. KELLOGG.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1556) granting a pension to Martin N. Kellogg; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. CATHARINE K. WHITTLESEY.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2274) granting a pension to Mrs. Catharine K. Whittlesey; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

H. A. MYERS.

Mr. LAWLER, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (S. 975) for the relief of H. A. Myers; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HEIRS OF MAURICE GRIVOT.

Mr. LAWLER also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (S. 204) for the relief of the heirs of Maurice Grivot; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HIGH EXPLOSIVES IN PROJECTILES.

Mr. LAIRD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back adversely the joint resolution (H. Res. 126) authorizing the use of certain Government property located at Fortress Monroe, Va., for the purpose of carrying on certain experiments in the use of high explosives in projectiles fired from ordinary guns with the ordinary service charge of black powder, and for other purposes; which was laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, reported, as a substitute for joint resolution H. Res. 126, a joint resolution (H. Res. 177) authorizing the use of certain Government property located at Fortress Monroe, Va., for the purpose of carrying on certain experiments in the use of high explosives in projectiles fired from ordinary guns with the ordinary charge of black powder and otherwise, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JACOB PITNER.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2371) granting a pension to Jacob Pitner; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GEORGE L. FLECH.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2372) restoring pension to George L. Flech; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. MARGARET PICKERING-COPELAND.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1678) granting a pension to Mrs. Margaret Pickering-Copeland; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MATTIE V. BOOTHE AND MARY M. BOOTHE.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2088) granting a pension to Mattie V. Boothe and Mary M. Boothe; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

DAVID HEINBACH.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1219) granting a pension to David Heinbach; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SAMUEL BROOKS.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 338) granting a pension to Samuel Brooks; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MAY C. JOHNSTON.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1504) granting a pension to May C. Johnston; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN B. TIMBERMAN.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2606) granting a pension to John B. Timberman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GEORGE W. FOGLE.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2333) granting a pension to George W. Fogle; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ANNA M. FREEMAN.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1136) granting a pension to Anna M. Freeman; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY J. BYRD.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2334) granting a pension to Mary J. Byrd; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SARAH C. ANDERSON AND OTHERS.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2370) granting a pension to Sarah C. Anderson and children under sixteen years of age; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calender, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, requested the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1948) to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River, in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendments House bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 92) for the relief of Morgan Rawls;

A bill (H. R. 1394) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase additional ground for the accommodation of Government offices in Council Bluffs, Iowa; and

A bill (H. R. 7938) to enlarge, improve, and make repairs upon the United States court-house and post-office building in Atlanta, Ga., and to appropriate money therefor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bills of the following titles, requested a conference with the House on said bills and amendments, and had appointed conferees as indicated:

A bill (H. R. 7783) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Knoxville, Tenn.; conferees, Mr. VEST, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. KENNA.

A bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor; conferees, Mr. BLAIR, Mr. WILSON of Iowa, and Mr. GEORGE.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 54) for the relief R. G. Combs and others;

A bill (S. 786) to provide a building for the use of the United States courts, post-office, custom office, and internal-revenue office at Vicksburg, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1978) for the erection of a public building in Paterson, N. J.;

A bill (S. 2278) for the improvement and enlargement of the public building at Petersburgh, Va.;

A bill (S. 2315) granting the right of way to the Yankton and Missouri Valley Railway Company through the Yankton Indian reservation in Dakota;

A bill (S. 2475) to increase the appropriation for the erection of a public building at Winona, Minn.;

A bill (S. 2481) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Louisville, Cincinnati and Virginia Railway Company;

A bill (S. 2546) to appropriate $12,000 for the completion of the public building at Peoria, Ill., and increasing the limit of the cost of said building;

A bill (S. 2674) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Nebraska City, Nebr., and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 2690) granting a pension to John Gallagher;

A bill (S. 2845) granting to the corporate authorities of the city of Tuscaloosa, in the State of Alabama, all the right, title, and interest of the United States to fractional sections 22 and 15, lying south of the Black Warrior River, in township 21 and range 10 west;

A bill (S. 2883) for the relief of S. H. Pearce;

A bill (S. 2941) to incorporate the National Academy of Dental Science; and

A bill (S. 2973) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 1661 of the Revised Statutes, making an annual appropriation to provide arms and equipments for the militia."

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. TURNER, of Georgia, in the chair.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the title of the first bill on the Calendar.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9345) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, this bill appropriates the sum of $60,035,840.74, while the amount estimated which will be provided by the Department from its own revenue, arising from postage and other sources, is $57,563,734.32. The cost of the service for the current year, as appears from the appropriation bill now in force, is $55,694,650.50, which is to be supplemented by the items in the deficiency bill passed during this session, amounting to $146,000, making a total appropriation for the current year of $55,840,650.15. The appropriations proposed by this bill for the year ending June 30, 1889, exceed those of the current year by the sum of $4,194,190.59, while the deficit in the revenues of the Department for 1889 will be $2,472,106.42.

The appropriations for 1889 it will be seen, therefore, exceed the appropriations for the current year by an unusually large sum, and it is therefore but proper that the House should understand the reasons for this increase. It is largely made up, sir, by an increase in the compensation of postmasters, pay of clerks in post-offices, and the free-delivery system. The compensation for postmasters for the fiscal year 1888 was $11,700,000, while the Sixth Auditor states that the expenditures for this item in 1887 will amount to $11,929,481.41, or an increase of $229,481.41 over and above the appropriations for 1888. So that we shall have a deficiency on that item for this current fiscal year.

It becomes necessary therefore, in estimating for the increase for the year 1889, to take into account the shortness of the estimate made for 1888, and it is but proper for me to state to the House that the estimates and the appropriations were not sufficient to meet the expenditures on account of the service, because of the extraordinarily large increase in mail matter. For instance, the rate of increase of revenue for 1876 was 3.26 per cent., while the increase for 1887 is more than 11 per cent., and the estimated increase for 1889 will be quite as large.

Mr. COX. Is that an average increase?

Mr. BLOUNT. It is unusually large.

This increased appropriation is larger than any known in the previous history of the service, and necessarily so. It could not have been anticipated when the estimates were made up.

Another large item of increase is in relation to the compensation of clerks in post-offices. There has been a good deal of complaint in relation to this matter for more than a year, perhaps for two years past. It has been justly made, without fault on the part of any one.

Mr. ROGERS. Will it interrupt my friend to make an inquiry there for information?

Mr. BLOUNT. No, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Do I understand the appropriation you are now discussing covers the current year, or does it look simply to the coming fiscal year?

Mr. BLOUNT. It is for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889.

Mr. ROGERS. And does not touch this year?

Mr. BLOUNT. Oh, no; not at all. In 1887 Congress provided a change in the mode of paying clerks in the money-order service. Up to that time they had been paid out of the fees of that service. Before the passage, however, of that law the appropriation bill had passed through this House on the old idea that the money-order clerks were paid out of the fees and the other clerks out of the general fund. After this had been done the statute to which I have referred provided that the clerks, money-order clerks, and all should be paid out of the compensation for clerks in the post-offices. The consequence was that the appropriation bill which passed necessarily took no account of this change of legislation, which occurred subsequently. In the following winter an estimate was made for a deficiency by reason of this change of law; and gentlemen who were in Congress at that time, and perhaps others now members, will remember that the bill providing for this deficiency failed to receive the President's signature, and hence there was not a sufficient fund.

In addition to that it was estimated, at the time of the change of the legislation so as to pay the clerks out of the compensation of clerks for the post-offices, that the consolidation would decrease the total amount to be used for both purposes, for the reason that the money-order clerk could be paid out of no other fund, because the fees could not be utilized for any other purpose than the money-order business, and *vice versa*.

This opinion was furnished by the head of the money-order division, whose long and large experience invited confidence. But, sir, it only shows that no matter how experienced an officer may be, the elements of the service are so uncertain and so changeable that there is likely to be mistake.

Again, sir, the increase of mail matter, as I have just stated, has been

unprecedented in the history of the country. The increase in the year 1886 over the year 1885 was 3.26 per cent., while the increase of 1887 over 1886 was over 11 per cent. So that it appears that by reason of two facts—first, a misapprehension as to the saving to be effected by the law; secondly, a misapprehension as to the increase of mail matter—there was thrust upon the Post-Office Department an amount of mail matter which could not be handled with facility and for which no person is responsible.

Now, the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads and the present Postmaster-General, fully appreciating the situation, or endeavoring to do it, feeling that the provision for handling the mail matter in the post-offices of the country had been inadequate, determined to ask for an additional appropriation in order to avoid a repetition of this trouble. And so on page 8 of the report accompanying this bill is to be found an estimate for an increase over the amount which had been estimated for in the report of the Postmaster-General of last year. The estimate in 1887 was $5,650,000; but considering the situation, the officer at present in charge of the Post-Office Department asked that the amount be increased to $6,000,000. There had been appropriated $5,450,000 for the current fiscal year; so that we have an increase of $550,000 for the item alone of compensation of clerks in post-offices; and we not only thought it was proper this increase should be given in order that the mails might be easily handled, but we further believe that by reason of the strain upon the appropriations there had been a reduction in allowances in the post-offices of the country, so that the amount was not adequate to the compensation of the clerks employed therein.

In the matter of light, rent, and fuel an increase was made of $50,000 over the appropriation in the bill for 1888; the expenditure has not been so much. During this present fiscal year, however, there has been provided, in addition to the appropriation, $25,000, and this unusual increase in the item of light, rent, and fuel was made because of the immense additions to the mails. It was found that in a great many cities of the country increased facilities in the way of post-offices were necessary, and the committee deemed that it was due to the service and due to the people of the country that there should be no constraint in the matter of a place for the purpose of depositing or distributing the mails.

Another item of increase is in relation to the compensation of postmasters of the third class, in the matter of allowing them rent, light, and fuel. It is well known that under the present subdivision we have first, second, third, and fourth class postmasters; that the first and second class are entitled to rent, light, and fuel; that the first, second, and third class postmasters are salaried officers, and the fourth class are paid commissions on receipts.

Now, sir, the fact that you gave the third-class postmaster a salary which appeared sufficient is utterly changed in its aspect when you come to deduct from that salary which you provided for him by law, the expense of the rent of a post-office building and of light and fuel for the same.

The Postmaster-General in his report has called attention to this matter. I will read from that report what is perhaps familiar to every gentleman in the House by reason of his experience with the postmasters in his section of the country. He says:

> Yet from the third-class postmaster, who has so much less than the others in nominal salary, is taken "even that which he hath." To him no allowance (except in a case which is no exception, that of the separating office) for rent, light, fuel, clerical service, stationery, or other outgo whatever is made, but all must be defrayed from his miscalled salary, which thus proves too often, instead of the apparently promised reward of labor, but the weak residuum of a well-nigh exhausted cup. The consequences are, first, injustice, more or less, to all postmasters of the third class, and frequent instances of grotesque inequality and unfairness in the proportion of labor and responsibility to net compensation; and, secondly, a resulting tendency to poorer provision and service in such offices, only counterbalanced by the pride and sense of duty of the officer.
>
> Salaries of the third class vary from $1,000, where gross receipts are $1,900 and not exceeding $2,100, to $1,900, where gross receipts reach $7,000 but not over $8,000; and immediately following, salaries of the second class rise from $2,000, for gross receipts of $8,000 and not over $9,000, to $2,900, for gross receipts of $35,000 or more and not exceeding $40,000. Thus, if the business of an office be between $7,900 and $8,000, the postmaster must bear the entire charges of it and have for himself only what shall be left of $1,900; while if the business be but $100 more the postmaster may take $2,000 net for his services, and these often more of mere easy supervision than actual office work. Instances have come to my attention where third-class postmasters with salaries of but $1,600 to $1,700 have been compelled, in order to provide such service as to satisfy their sense of personal honor in performance of public duty, to make an annual outlay of from $1,000 to 1,300, besides giving continuing personal labor. It is obvious, indeed, that so great is the difference between the decent provision of an office for the transaction of postal business yielding annually $7,000 or more and one yielding but from $1,900 to $2,100, it may be almost affirmed that as a third-class postmaster's business and salary increase his compensation diminishes; and it is to be safely asserted that, in a large majority of cases at least, his proportionable compensation (to labor and responsibility) will surely diminish if he fairly discharges his obligations to the service. Such a condition is neither creditable to the justice of the Government nor wisely conducive to the finished service which should be exacted of postmasters to the public.

Believing that the House would appreciate the force and justice of the criticisms made by the Postmaster-General in the extract which I have just read in relation to the present compensation of third-class postmasters, I asked unanimous consent on the 2d day of March of this year that the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads should be allowed to place in the Post-Office appropriation bill for consideration by the House a proposition authorizing allowances for rent, light, and fuel in third-class offices. That was agreed to, and the rule prohibiting new legislation on appropriation bills was thereby suspended, and the committee have accordingly inserted that provision in this bill.

Mr. DUNN. Does the provision include water-rates in cities?

Mr. BLOUNT. No, sir. A careful estimate was made, and it was found that the increased allowance for rent, light, and fuel in third-class offices would amount to $650,607. Heretofore, as I have already stated, rent, light, and fuel have been allowed only at first and second class offices, and the appropriation for that purpose in the bill is $550,000. It will be seen, therefore, that by this new provision we have more than doubled the total allowance in the bill for rent, light, and fuel. I think that what has been said in reference to the compensation of offices of the third class, the injustice of the Government, and the inefficiency of the service that results from getting incompetent men, will justify any gentleman in concluding that this branch of the postal service is of sufficient importance to authorize doubling, if need be, the appropriation for rent, light, and fuel; and, entertaining that view, the committee have not hesitated to report it in the bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Is there any provision made for increasing the pay of fourth-class postmasters?

Mr. BLOUNT. My friend asks me whether any provision is made in the bill for increasing the pay of fourth-class postmasters. I answer there is not; and I presume my friend would like to know the reason?

Mr. LANHAM. I would.

Mr. BLOUNT. The rules of this House prohibit new legislation on appropriation bills. I believe, and the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads believe, that there ought to be an increase of the compensation of that class of officers, and the matter is now under consideration by the committee. When the request was made for leave to insert an item for rent, light, and fuel, the necessity of it was so indisputable that there was no controversy about it, and so we ventured to ask unanimous consent to insert that appropriation; but the differences of opinion as to what the rate of compensation of fourth-class postmasters should be would necessarily involve some dispute, and the committee did not think that the House would be willing to give them authority to insert legislation on that subject in this bill.

Mr. SHIVELY. But the committee were unanimously in favor of a proposition to increase the compensation of fourth-class postmasters, were they not?

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I am somewhat embarrassed by the rule of the House when I am asked to state what the members of the committee were in favor of.

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BLOUNT. Certainly.

Mr. LIND. I will ask the chairman whether a resolution was not offered in the committee on this subject and made a matter of record there; and, if the answer of the chairman should be in the affirmative, then I should like to know whether it is any breach of the courtesy due to the committee, or against any rule of the House, to state upon this floor what that record is?

Mr. BLOUNT. I understand, Mr. Chairman, that the rules of the House forbid my stating what is going on in the committee, but, for the convenience of my friend, I will assume that what he says is true. At the same time I can see that even with that record, which can not change any rule of the House, the committee has no right to report one particle of new legislation in this appropriation bill, except by the consent of the House, as in the case of the item for rent, light, and fuel in third-class offices. I do not, however, think that there ought to be any uneasiness or haste in getting out to the country the disposition of the Committee on the Post-Offices and Post-Roads in reference to the compensation of fourth-class postmasters. I believe that it will not be a great while before we shall report some conclusion on that subject.

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to ask the gentleman—perhaps he has already stated it, but if so I did not hear the statement—what is the estimated deficiency for the coming year?

Mr. BLOUNT. The estimated deficiency for the coming year is $2,472,106.42. But that requires explanation. That is my own estimate, which I will explain in a moment.

The deficiency, as estimated by the Treasury Department, is $1,403,499.42, which I have increased on account of additional estimates made by the Post-Office Department, as appears on pages 8 and 22 of the report accompanying the bill, and on account of the allowance for rent, light, and fuel in third-class offices. This addition having been made, and assuming the estimate of the Treasury Department to be correct, there is a deficiency of $2,472,106.42. And if my friend will allow me, I wish to add that this is not all. I know this announcement will be painful to him; it is so to me. Some time ago there was passed through this House a bill reported from the Committee on Labor, fixing eight hours as the daily term of labor for letter-carriers. That bill has passed the Senate and gone to the President. If it should become a law, it will necessitate an increase of about $1,300,000 in this single item of the service; so that the increased cost of the service will be something over $3,700,000 for the next fiscal year.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope my friend will allow one further inquiry. In view of this deficiency of nearly $4,000,000 in the Post-Office Department, does the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads think it proper to increase in a very material degree the expenses of offices

of the third class, where the compensation is at present and has been for years reasonably fair?

Mr. BLOUNT. Does my friend mean to ask whether I think it right to make the allowance for rent, light, and fuel at third-class offices?

Mr. HOLMAN. In that particular field of expense, where the compensation is at least reasonable, does the committee think the expenditures should be materially increased, in view of this very considerable deficiency?

Mr. BLOUNT. If the facts justified the statement of my friend from Indiana that these postmasters are well paid, and that a very large deficiency is likely to occur, I would answer him that in my opinion this increase ought not to be made; but I will ask my friend whether he is not aware that the Postmaster-General, in two reports, has called the attention of Congress to the fact that the withholding of any allowance to third-class postmasters for rent, light, and fuel is a gross injustice to them and affects the efficiency of the service, by making the offices undesirable on account of the reduction of the nominal compensation, by reason of the expenses now paid by these officers for rent, light, and fuel.

Mr. HOLMAN. This is a subject, Mr. Chairman, with which all members of the House are familiar. The information is all around us.

Mr. DUNN. Let me give you, then, some information right there.

Mr. HOLMAN. Not now.

Mr. DUNN. Then you do not want the information which members have on this subject.

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly I do.

Mr. DUNN. Do you not think it is all wrong to cast the deficiency of one service upon another?

Mr. HOLMAN. I put it upon the ground the compensation of third-class postmasters should be reasonable and fair, but at the same time is it right and proper to increase in this particular bill a deficiency in the postal service already existing? I know my friend from Georgia and myself have been occupying that ground in former years, that the deficiency should not be increased.

Mr. MCCREARY rose.

Mr. BLOUNT. I will yield to the gentleman from Kentucky in a moment. The gentleman from Indiana refers to a change of ground on my part which he and I occupied in former years. I wish to say, sir, the change of ground has not been so great on my part as it has been on the part of the gentleman from Indiana, as I will indicate.

Mr. HOLMAN. I did not intend to have it implied by the remark which I made that there was any change in the position of the gentleman from Georgia. What I meant was simply this: That the gentleman and myself have insisted we would, as far as possible, make this Department of the Government self-supporting; that it should be self-supporting, and the postal deficiency, at least, should not reach large sums of money.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to say so far as this Department is not self-sustaining the gentleman from Indiana is as much responsible for it as any other gentleman in the United States. In the first place he has as much as any other person had to do with the reduction of the rate of postage from 3 cents a half-ounce to 2 cents an ounce on letters.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is true.

Mr. BLOUNT. And the gentleman from Indiana had as much to do as anybody else with the enormous reduction of postage on newspapers or second-class mail matter.

Mr. HOLMAN. My friend is right about that.

Mr. BLOUNT. Wait until I get through. Mr. Chairman, but for that legislation, to-day we would have an excess of receipts over expenditures amounting to several millions of dollars. I had no part in that legislation.

Mr. HOLMAN. You did not agree to that, I believe.

Mr. BLOUNT. I have not kept up with every little thing I did, and as to that I do not remember.

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not either.

Mr. BLOUNT. I am well assured that at the time it was regarded as a hasty matter. It had not been recommended by any Department of the Government. It had not been expected by any member of the House outside of that committee. There was no popular demand for it so far as I know. The gentleman and his associates agreed in reporting these reductions; and now my friend, because of these reductions, comes in here and criticises the rate of compensation to third-class postmasters.

Mr. HOLMAN. There is a deficiency.

Mr. DUNN. Does the gentleman think these third-class postmasters ought to pay it?

Mr. BLOUNT. My friend from Indiana has brought the matter up, and let me say that in 1878 I had the honor of reporting the Post-Office appropriation bill for that year. That was ten years ago. My friend from Indiana was on the subcommittee that made it up. I find the deficiency in the postal reductions at that time was over $4,000,000.

The increase in the expenditures for the whole service has reached about 60 per cent. The increase in the item of compensation to railroads has increased nearly 100 per cent. And during all this period, by reason of the reduction in the rates of postage, there has been a continued depreciation in the rates of compensation paid to postmasters throughout the country. And finding, sir, as we did, that with this mail service enormously increased the postmasters of the country in third-class offices are inadequately paid and the deficiency in the revenue was very small as compared with previous years, only a small percentage coming out of the Treasury of the United States, we deemed it an unreasonable, unjust, and improper thing to leave the compensation as stated by the Postmaster-General.

Mr. HOLMAN. The gentleman from Georgia refers, as the cause of the deficiency, to the reduction of postage on newspapers. The policy of those measures, it seems to me, has been vindicated by experience. They were proper measures, and neither my friend nor any other member of the House would be in favor of going back to the old rates.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does the gentleman say I am in favor of going back?

Mr. HOLMAN. No; but, on the contrary, that neither my friend nor any other member in the House proposes to go back to the old rates of postage. I admit those two measures were made by the Committee on Appropriations upon a general appropriation bill. And the whole point I wish to make—for I have always admired the course of my friend in regard to this bill, not only while in charge of it as chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, when he had charge of it in the Committee on Appropriations—the only point I desire to make and the only criticism is this, that while the Post-Office Department is so well administered as it now is, and of that fact there is no shadow of doubt, it never was better administered in the whole history of the country than now, everywhere and in every class, first, second, third, and fourth—I submit then, in view of that condition of affairs, whether it is a proper thing now to increase the compensation of any class of postmasters while this large deficiency exists.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to submit an inquiry to my friend from Indiana in this very connection. He has, I believe, some third-class postmasters in his district?

Mr. HOLMAN. Yes; a great many.

Mr. BLOUNT. And by reason of that fact the gentleman is doubtless informed as to whether they regard their compensation as proper and sufficient or not. I ask, then, if he has any information as to those offices in his district which would justify Congress in withholding an allowance for rent, light, and fuel to these men?

Mr. HOLMAN. I am aware that the third-class postmasters claim that they are not adequately paid; and besides that, they should be allowed rent, light, and fuel. But at the same time, while the administration of the office in all of its departments is so satisfactory, I insist that this large deficit in its revenues should first be made up before such increases are allowed.

Mr. BLOUNT. And the gentleman does not think, then, the allowance ought to be made?

Mr. HOLMAN. I have simply made the suggestion owing to the present condition of the revenues of the Department.

Mr. BLOUNT. But I would like to know whether the proposition of the committee meets his approval or not.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am not prepared to say whether it should be done. The point is——

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, I am prepared to say, as a member of the committee, and it meets their approval after a careful investigation: and I think my friend from Indiana ought not to take up our time, for we have considered it.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am not prepared to express a positive opinion on that point, as I have said, only to the extent that at this time I think the increase ought not to be made.

Mr. BLOUNT. My friend does not express an opinion——

Mr. HOLMAN. I express an opinion as clearly as I can at the present time. I have stated that in my judgment it was not wise to make this increase until the deficiency existing has been removed. I will not, however, make the point of order upon the proposition.

Mr. BLOUNT. But my friend can move to strike it out if he thinks it is wrong.

Mr. HOLMAN. I shall not make the motion unless there is a prospect of its being carried.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman can try it.

Mr. MCCREARY. Will the gentleman from Georgia permit me to ask a question? Have not the second-class postmasters been allowed rent, fuel, and lights for some time past?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCCREARY. Now, if the third-class postmasters have been furnishing office-room, is it not proper that they should also have an allowance for rent, light, and fuel?

Mr. HOLMAN. Why not extend it to the fourth class?

Mr. MCCREARY. Because they rarely furnish office-room.

Mr. BLOUNT. In answer to the gentleman from Kentucky, the Postmaster-General shows now, and has time and again urged upon Congress, the necessity for making this allowance; and we did not feel, charged as we are by the House with the interest of that great service—we did not feel that we could properly afford to neglect to consider that recommendation or fail to report an honest conclusion to the House in

that connection in the interest of the service, even if we should be subjected to criticism that we were not as economical as we might have been.

I think, Mr. Chairman, that I have referred to the principal items of increase embodied in this bill. While there are some other items asked for by supplementary reports, they are mainly of such small amounts that I do not think them of sufficient importance to postpone the further consideration of the bill to discuss them, because they can be explained under the five-minute rule. I do not, therefore, desire to make further comments upon the bill unless some gentleman wishes information in regard to certain portions of it.

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. What is the increase for clerk-hire in this bill over the current appropriation?

Mr. BLOUNT. The appropriation in the present bill for compensation of clerks in post-offices is $5,950,000. In addition to that there is an item of $50,000 allowance to clerks for extra work, making a total of $6,000,000 as against $5,450,000 appropriated by the bill of the current year.

Mr. ROGERS. I would like to ask the gentleman if he thinks this increase, which is something less than $600,000, is a sufficient increase to meet the increased demands of the service.

Mr. BLOUNT. The committee are of the impression that it is sufficient?

Mr. ROGERS. Do you think it will meet the increased demands of the service in that line?

Mr. BLOUNT. In that connection permit me to say that being conscious from experience and by communication with my associates on this floor, as well as from other sources, of the demands for increase in this branch of the service, as I have stated, and that the amount appropriated for clerks in post-offices was not sufficient, and that it was the point in the whole service of which just complaint might be made above all others, I invited the attention of the Postmaster-General to the matter, who fully appreciating its importance took up the whole subject and has gone into it most carefully, and another and second estimate was made in addition to the one contained in the Book of Estimates for the purpose of making ample provision to meet all the requirements of this branch of the service.

Mr. ROGERS. Is this the appropriation recommended by the Postmaster-General?

Mr. BLOUNT. This is the appropriation recommended by the present Postmaster-General. And I wish to say, so far as I am concerned, and so far as I have an opinion as to the disposition of the committee, we are not willing to withhold one single dollar where it is needed for the distribution of the mails of this country.

Mr. COX. If the gentleman does not object to being interrupted——

Mr. BLOUNT. Not at all.

Mr. COX. I would like to ask him whether or not he has made disposition for a proper classification of the railway clerks and the postal clerks so as to give them adequate compensation according to certain bills which have been sent to his committee, or whether he reserves that until proper information from the Department shall have come to him, and whether there is any prospect of making that reform in our service?

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, those bills have been referred to a subcommittee, and I am not authorized at this time, under the rules of the House, to make any statement as to their condition.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman state to us that there is a reasonable prospect of success? I think the Postmaster-General would favor every one of them. I do not, however, wish to press the gentleman from Georgia to make any statement he does not desire to make.

Mr. BLOUNT. I wish to say this to the members of this House. There never was such a clamor for increase of salaries encountered by any party from the beginning of this Government as we are having at this time. There is an organization among the clerks in post-offices and an organization of railway clerks; and they do not, as a general rule, come before committees for the purpose of stating the system of compensation they desire and the reasons for it, but they are in the habit in these latter days of formulating their bills and placing them in the hands of some prominent member of this House. Such a bill takes his name, and in this way we are expected to be driven to conclusions and resort to improper methods of legislation.

I wish to say, so far as I am concerned, I am not concluded by the action of any body of officers as to what compensation they wish to have in the future. I represent not the office-holders alone of this country, but the great masses of the people in the land who pay the taxes, and for one I shall withstand as far as lies in my power any unreasonable increase of salaries.

Mr. COX. I wish to ask the gentleman from Georgia if the Postmaster-General does not favor the increase of the compensation of railway clerks, and whether all this remarkable withstanding of his would not require him to withstand the Postmaster-General also?

Mr. BLOUNT. I have more trouble in withstanding the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] than I have in withstanding the Postmaster-General. [Laughter]. I will say that has been the case whenever it came to the compensation of letter-carriers and other office-holders in New York City.

Mr. COX. I am in favor of popular arrangements by which people will be paid their *quid pro quo*.

Mr. BLOUNT. No doubt of it. But I would be glad, speaking of those of us who see fit to make economical arrangements, if the gentleman from New York would stand with us here and not fight us, and then clamor hereafter over the results of his own action.

Mr. COX. I think I have always been with the gentleman from Georgia on economical arrangements.

Mr. BLOUNT. I take back what I suggested.

Mr. COX. I was sure you would.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman from Georgia yield to me for a question?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, sir.

Mr. McMILLIN. Is it not the fact that what the gentleman from New York asks is prohibited by a rule of the House from being put on an appropriation bill?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, sir; and that is my trouble. I propose to have it done in some other way, if it is to be done.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman proposes—

> To make assurance doubly sure
> And take a bond of fate.

According to Shakespeare or Bacon.

Mr. BLOUNT. I reserve the balance of my time. I desire to know if any gentleman desires to discuss the bill in general debate?

Mr. BINGHAM. I did not understand the proposition of the gentleman from Georgia as to time.

Mr. BLOUNT. The proposition is to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] what time he wants. I know he is altogether reasonable.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman concede two hours of time on this side?

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope my friend will not ask that much.

Mr. BINGHAM. I only want five or ten minutes myself; but several gentlemen on this side desire time. The gentleman on my right desires to be heard; the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND], my colleague on the committee, desires some time. I do not think gentlemen on this side would be disposed to agree to any proposition giving less time than two hours. As to the bill itself, I give it my hearty, unqualified approval.

Mr. BLOUNT. I submit to my friend from Pennsylvania that it is now late in the session, and we have passed but few appropriation bills; and there is a desire now to reach the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. As this bill carries $60,000,000, certainly two hours' discussion of it, in view of the declarations which have been made, can not be objected to.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does the gentleman mean two hours on other subjects?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Is not the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] entitled to time in his own right?

Mr. BLOUNT. I have no desire to cut off members of the committee. What does the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations say about it?

Mr. RANDALL. I will answer that question. I do not want to interfere with what is right as to the discussion of this bill, but I hope the gentleman from Georgia will limit the time as much as he can properly do, because the Committee on Appropriations are anxious to proceed and finish as speedily as possible the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. BLOUNT. I appreciate what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] says, and while I want to be agreeable I doubt very much whether I ought to consent to four hours of general debate.

Mr. BINGHAM. This is a bill carrying $60,000,000, and certainly two hours for discussion on the Republican side is not an unreasonable time to ask.

Mr. BLOUNT. My friend [Mr. BINGHAM] has already stated that the bill and everything in it are all right.

Mr. BINGHAM. I was speaking only for myself when I said that.

Mr. COX. All that is in it may be all right, but we want some more things in it which will be equally right. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOUNT. The best way to accomplish that object is to offer them as amendments when the bill is under consideration by paragraphs.

Mr. COX. I wish to ask the gentleman now whether, if I should move as amendments the bills which I have proposed for the classification of the railway mail clerks, and for the classification of clerks in first-class offices, he will make the point of order on me? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not want to assume that my friend would make such a proposition as that.

Mr. COX. I want to save time. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not assume that my friend would make such a proposition as that, because if he has investigated the matter and knows all that is necessary to be known about it he has withheld the information from the committee, and the Post-Office Department itself has not been able to furnish us the data necessary to reach a conclusion.

Mr. COX. It has in relation to one of the bills.

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, we have not got the information in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] will be recognized as entitled to the floor, unless some arrangement is made with regard to the time.

Mr. BLOUNT. I have been using my time endeavoring to arrive at such an arrangement.

Mr. BINGHAM. I desire to say to the chairman of the committee that if I am recognized I am recognized for an hour.

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes; but I know that when my friend sees that I am using my time for the purpose of reaching a conclusion with reference to the disposition of the time, he will not want to defeat that effort.

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no; I wish to say to the chairman that while there seems to be some indisposition on his part to concede two hours to this side for discussion my friends that are around me here are asking for more time.

Mr. BLOUNT. I would like to know whether any gentleman on this side of the House desires to discuss the bill.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I do, Mr. Chairman. I should like to have about a half hour.

Mr. BLOUNT. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that four hours be allowed for general debate, including the time that has already been used—two hours on either side. I ask unanimous consent that that be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] asks unanimous consent that general debate on this bill be limited to four hours, including the time that has been already occupied.

Mr. BLOUNT. Which is one hour, as I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The proposition would limit the general debate to three hours from this time.

Mr. BINGHAM. One hour having been already consumed by the other side.

Mr. BLOUNT. Oh, yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so understands. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I do not wish to object, Mr. Chairman, but I should like to know how the time is to be disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the indication already given and under the practice of the House, the Chair would feel bound to allot two hours of the time to the other side, and one hour to the committee reporting the bill; one hour having already been consumed on that side.

Mr. DOCKERY. I wish to say that I have already made a request of the chairman for recognition as a member of the subcommittee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] is recognized.

Mr. ROGERS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. Did the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] use his full hour?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] used his entire hour except about three minutes, which has been consumed in this discussion.

Mr. BLOUNT. But I understood, Mr. Chairman, that that would not be counted against me.

The CHAIRMAN. Then there are three minutes remaining of the gentleman's hour.

Mr. ROGERS. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] has three minutes remaining, and he yields that to me before the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] takes the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. With the consent, then, of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] for three minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I asked the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] whether he regarded the increased appropriation proposed in this bill for clerk-hire for the coming fiscal year as adequate to the increase and growth of the service. To that question my friend from Georgia made a response in the greater portion of which I heartily concur—a response in substance that many of these office-holders organize, get up their own bills, and make their own requests, and occasionally undertake to conclude our judgment as to what is right. I wish now to say that, so far as concerns this branch of the service to which I now particularly address myself, I do not know of any co-operation whatever; and while I hope that this increased appropriation for clerk-hire will meet adequately the demand of the service, and while I am gratified that the Department has given this matter careful consideration, I do sincerely hope that the experience of the current fiscal year with reference to this branch of the service, more particularly in the Western and rapidly developing districts of the country, will not be necessary during the coming fiscal year.

I can say—and I say it from personal knowledge—that in at least one post-office of my district the clerks have been compelled either to resign or else to work from 4 or 5 o'clock in the morning until 10, 11, 12, and even as late as 1 o'clock at night, day after day, depending on the arrival of the trains, Sundays included. I do not believe that such a condition of things should exist in this branch of the service, which affects so closely the convenience and comfort of the people throughout the land. Time after time clerks in that office have resigned and gone out of the service, because they were unwilling to undergo the hardships incident to their positions; and the retirement of officers in this way has operated to the detriment of the service, for there is no branch of the public business which requires to a greater extent skilled labor than do the post-offices of the country in the distribution of the mails.

I do not mean to say that this condition of things has been universal; but in those districts where the country is developing rapidly and population increasing by the thousands and ten thousands annually, it is almost impossible for the Department to make accurate estimates or for Congress to make exactly proper appropriations. Sometimes the gross receipts at a particular office may increase $500, $1,000, $2,000, or even $3,000 in a single quarter; yet the same number of clerks, without additional assistance or increase of salary, must go on discharging the duties of the service until the end of the quarter enables a readjustment of clerk-hire adequate to the demands of the public business. Heretofore proper allowances have not been made to meet such necessary and indispensable expenses. I hope this bill will do so. I am glad that the Post-Office Committee of the House and the Postmaster-General have given the subject such full and careful consideration.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, it had not been my purpose to enter into the general discussion covering this bill as a whole or its particular paragraphs. It comes from the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, I believe, with their unanimous approval. It embraces appropriations of more than $60,000,000; and I am gratified to state that the estimates which were submitted by the preceding Postmaster-General have been revised by the present head of the Post-Office Department; and to my mind the results of this revision will tend to promote the efficiency of the service and the convenience of the people.

I think, therefore, that the bill in its entirety should receive the approval of this House. If the provisions of the bill were under my control, and if I should make any change in them, it would be in the direction of larger appropriation in order that the postal facilities of the people might be increased. I would not at this time adopt cheaper rates of postage, though, notwithstanding the utterance of the chairman of the committee [Mr. BLOUNT], I believe the people of the country have welcomed with heartiness and thorough indorsement every change in recent years in the direction of reduction of postage, either upon local or domestic correspondence or upon printed matter.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman did not understand me as saying that the people of the country did not approve what had been done in that respect?

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, no; but the gentleman referred to that as a cause of the existing deficiency, and that is the point I desire to discuss.

Mr. BLOUNT. But I was not complaining of the deficiency; it is smaller now than it was ten years ago.

Mr. BINGHAM. I grant that. In reference to this deficiency, if the Government of the United States would pay its own postage on the matter which to-day goes through the mails free there would not be a single cent of deficiency in the administration of the Post-Office Department. I need go into no elaboration or detail as to this statement; the facts and figures are well known. The postage of the Government on matter sent under frank or in penalty-envelopes amounts to $3,000,000 annually, perhaps more.

A MEMBER. Do you favor a change of that system?

Mr. BINGHAM. No, sir; I would not change the existing system; I approve it.

This bill, wisely, to my mind, increases beyond the general percentage of increase the allowance made to post-office clerks. I trust that the present Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads will report a bill now before it for consideration, whereby this important class of postal employés, embracing upward of 5,000 subordinates, will in the future have a classification and a fixed compensation. To-day the average compensation of the post-office clerk will not exceed $500 per annum.

This bill, however, by virtue of the re-examination of the estimates which had been made by the predecessor of the present Postmaster-General, wisely allows a larger compensation to this body of subordinates; but it will not give them the classification which is so necessary and in other Departments of the Government so common.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Are we to understand that the committee found itself unable to redress these grievances in the present bill?

Mr. BINGHAM. They could not be met in the present bill, because of the rules of the House.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. And a bill is now pending in the committee to do justice in this respect?

Mr. BINGHAM. A bill with that object in view is now before the committee.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I make this inquiry because all of us have received numerous letters in that behalf.

Mr. BINGHAM. This bill, by virtue of the unanimous consent of

the House—and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], could have made objection, this being, according to my recollection, the only occasion when an appropriation bill under the present rules has been allowed to come into the House incorporating new legislation—this bill takes the body of third-class postmasters, upwards of two thousand, and absolutely increases their compensation to the extent of $650,000. To that increase I have given and give here my hearty approval.

I believe in the general principle of paying subordinates of the Government well. As I have stated before, if I could add to it I would add in the way of giving larger compensation to several of the subordinate divisions of the postal service covered by the paragraphs of this bill.

This bill is also liberal in another respect. By virtue of the recent enactment in this House and in the other, and which is now pending before the President of the United States for his signature, there is a subordinate force, called technically letter-carriers, who by the adoption of the eight-hour law will have their compensation increased to the amount of a million and a half of dollars annually, or will enable the administration to so divide the work that an additional force can be employed in that service. To that proposition, covering as it does a million and a half dollars, I give my hearty indorsement, for the reason the constituency I represent individually and the great body of the people who get the benefit of the letter-carrier delivery will have a better and more efficient service.

Mr. Chairman, reference has been made to the compensation of postmasters under the law of 1883. The first, second, and third class postmasters did not, under that law, have any increased compensation except in the cases of some six or eight postmasters of the first class in cities like Baltimore, Chicago, Cincinnati, Boston, and other large cities, where they were increased $2,000—added to their compensation of $4,000. The average compensation under the law of 1883 to third-class postmasters was about the same as the old law, but the great body of the postmasters of the fourth class, by the reduction in the rate of postage from 3 cents to 2 cents, the average was made necessarily in their schedule of allowance that their compensation might be determined on. I state now, as I stated then, when that was under discussion, it in no wise reduces the compensation of postmasters of the fourth class, but in many cases increases it. Mr. Chairman, I simply desire to reiterate and then reserve the balance of my time, that this bill is intelligent, that it is a good bill, that it ought to pass without change and in its entirety. I think under the Postmaster-General it will give the country the opportunity for the very best administration of the postal service. I give my hearty approval to it, with the qualification if I could make any change I would change it in giving larger compensation to the subordinate force, and by making large appropriation to increase, if possible, the efficiency of the service.

I yield now for fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND].

Mr. LIND. Mr. Chairman, I had not intended to say anything in addition to what has been so well said by the chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads; but there are so many employés in the postal service, who have an organized and active lobby—I believe I am justified to call it such—who appear before the committee and before the House, and who have been prompt to take hold of every opportunity to advance their interests, that I believe I am justified and that it is my duty to speak in favor of a class which is not organized, and which has not assailed us in the committee nor clamored for an increase of pay on the floor of the House—a class with which we are all individually familiar, especially those who represent agricultural districts, as I do—and to ask from this House that this class shall receive a reasonable and at least adequate compensation for the duties they discharge to the Government and to the people. I have reference, Mr. Chairman, to the fourth-class postmasters.

As has been stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], the clerks of first-class offices have been relieved by increased allowances for clerk-hire. Third-class postmasters have been given an ample allowance for rent, fuel, and clerk-hire. This is right, and I approve of it most heartily. Letter-carriers have also been relieved recently by a bill which has passed both Houses of Congress, and is now pending before the President for his approval, by which the eight-hour law is made applicable to them. By that bill, if it is approved by the President and becomes a law, their compensation will be almost doubled.

But the large class referred to, who render as faithful and honest service as any under the Government, numbering some fifty thousand throughout the country, who have rightful claims, but whose claims have been studiously disregarded, have as yet secured no recognition or consideration. I am familiar with their situation in my district. There are twenty counties in my district, and ten times the number of fourth-class offices that there is of the other. Politically I have no interest in them. I have no voice in their appointment or retention in office. My sole object is to secure for them, if possible, reasonable and adequate compensation for the services they render.

Take a farmer out in the country who does not clamor for the post-office, who does not want it, but who consents to act for the accommodation of his neighbors and friends, and opens his house to the public for that purpose, is he not entitled to some consideration? Mr. Chairman, he must keep his house open every day, at all hours of the day, for three hundred and sixty-five days in the year, and he frequently carries the letters and delivers them himself at the railway station without pay. In muddy weather or pleasant his doors have to be open, and the result of hours of labor at scrubbing and cleaning by the farmer's wife is frequently demolished in a few minutes. What does he get for all this trouble and annoyance? He gets the magnificent sum of, say, $12 a year.

Is any member of this House, is any member of this committee willing to say that that is adequate compensation? Any proposition to increase that by an increased percentage would not help him. You might give him the entire amount of the stamps that he legitimately sells and cancels at his office, and he would be but little, if any, better off. The only remedy is to give him a salary of, say, $5 a quarter—a small fixed amount in addition to his ordinary compensation by percentage.

I submit, gentlemen of the committee, that this is but fair and reasonable, and if you have any regard for the fourth-class postmasters, for the farmer postmasters all over this land, who perform more onerous duties for the compensation they receive than any other class of persons in the public service, you will not refuse the consent which I shall submit to embody such a proposition in this bill. I believe the suggestion, or rather the request for unanimous consent to insert such a provision in the bill, will not be and can not reasonably be objected to. I understand a gentleman from the State of Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE], also from the West, and who understands and appreciates the situation, will offer an amendment of this character, and I yield now out of my time for the purpose of permitting him to present the amendment at the desk, and have it read for the information of the House, so that all may understand it when this unanimous consent is asked for.

Mr. BLOUNT. My friend does not propose to offer an amendment at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman that it would not be in order now to offer an amendment.

Mr. LIND. I desire to have it read for information. I suggest that the amendment be now read, and I shall ask unanimous consent at the proper time to offer it. I therefore request to have it read in my time if the gentleman will send it up to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. MCRAE submitted the following proposed amendment, which the Clerk read:

Amend by adding a new section, in these words:

"That there shall be allowed and paid to each postmaster of the fourth class $5 for each quarter, in addition to the compensation allowed under existing law."

Mr. LIND. Now, it will be noticed by the committee that all we suggest, all that we ask in behalf of the fourth-class postmasters is an increase of $5 a quarter or $20 a year.

Mr. BLOUNT. Allow me to interrupt the gentleman to ask a question in order that there may be no misunderstanding. He does not offer that amendment at this time?

Mr. LIND. I have given notice that I shall ask unanimous consent to offer it.

Mr. BLOUNT. That is as I understood it; but it was suggested by some gentlemen around me that it was considered as a pending amendment, and in order that there might be no misapprehension I wanted to confirm my own understanding.

Mr. LIND. I made the statement that I should ask consent to offer it at the proper time. Of course I appreciate the rules of the House, and know that it would not be in order to offer it now.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that that is but a reasonable request and that it is the least that could be asked. I would also ask the attention of the committee to the fact that this involves no computation. Its effect is direct and the amount easily ascertained. We know exactly what amount of money it will take, and where it will go, and to what extent it will afford relief. The reason it should be adopted in that form is this: As long as you pay a compensation to the fourth-class postmasters upon the basis of a percentage on cancellations you can not help them by increasing that percentage, because the allowance of 100 per cent. would yield the postmaster only $5, if that is the amount of his cancellations in the quarter, and that would be the full extent of his compensation.

According to the best judgment of the members of the committee who are disposed to stand by the fourth-class postmasters, we think it ought to be made in the form suggested, by way of a specific sum. In cases, then, where a postmaster gets only $12 a year his compensation would be increased to $32 by this allowance. Does any one say that is too much? In cases where they get $20 a quarter they would get $25 a quarter by this plan. Now, as a matter of justice, as a matter of good government, and for the encouragement of these people to serve the people and the Government in the future as faithfully as they have served them in the past, I make this request in their behalf. You have helped the first-class postmasters, you have helped the second-class and third-class postmasters; why not also, I ask, help this class, who merit it more than either of the other classes?

Mr. DOCKERY. Will my friend permit me to ask him to state when

this rate of compensation to fourth-class postmasters was fixed by law? There seems evidently to be some inequality in it, and I desire to fix the date of the passage of the law.

Mr. LIND. I apprehend the object of the question. It was fixed by a Republican administration; there is no question about that. But, as I said awhile ago, I do not ask this in behalf of Republicans; I do not know that there is a Republican postmaster in my district, but I ask it on behalf of the men who deserve it, and the patrons of the post-office as well. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. LIND. I will yield to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] four minutes, reserving one minute for myself.

Mr. McRAE. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Minnesota, but at this juncture I do not desire to submit any remarks. I will offer the amendment at the proper time. I yield back to the gentleman the time he has so generously given me.

Mr. LIND. I yield the floor.

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield twenty-five minutes to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT].

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to submit some remarks on the bill (H. R. 3259) to enable the people to name their postmasters.

Mr. Chairman, this bill relates only to fourth-class postmasters, and all it undertakes to do is to provide the means whereby the people may advise the Postmaster-General in the appointment of postmasters of that class.

This is no new principle in our administration.

The Postmaster-General has always professed to be advised by the people in the selection of these officers. He receives and considers, or professes to, petitions and counter-petitions, and the advice also of Representatives in Congress who are in accord with the Administration, and of the local committees, national and State, when the Representative is not so in accord; and these Representatives and committees always profess to be controlled by the wishes of the people, though it is true that with them "the people" are only those who are of their way of thinking politically. Another thing is also true, and that is that appointments are actually made in accordance with the wishes of these Representatives and committees, with but little reference to petitions or remonstrances furnished by the people. Seldom, if ever, does the Postmaster-General disregard the wishes of these men in the appointment of these officers. And so it happens that if they have "friends to reward or enemies to punish" they are at perfect liberty to do this, even though they foist upon the people some one for postmaster distasteful to the whole community. Thus do we see that while the present system all the time recognizes the right of the people to control in this matter, their wishes may at any time be defeated by the "local boss," whom this system is admirably calculated to produce, who, while he all the time professes to be acting for the interests of the people, is really acting for his own interests and has for fourth-class postmaster whomsoever he will, and from this decision of the "local boss" there is no appeal; for, from the very nature of the present system, which fails to communicate with certainty the wishes of the people to the Postmaster-General, he must rely upon some one of supposed local knowledge for his information.

Entirely different from this star-chamber proceeding is the appointment of all other postmasters, whose nomination by the President is subject to the action of the Senate, and thus within reach of the people if the nomination has their disapproval.

Now, far more than these Presidential postmasters, with whose clerks the details are principally left, does the fourth-class postmaster come in contact with the people.

Indeed, there is no other official throughout our whole system, national, State, and municipal, brought into such close and constant business relations with the people as the fourth-class postmaster, who has to deal personally with almost every man, woman, and child within the delivery of his office, himself receiving from the hands of the people the mail sent by them and delivering into their hands the mail received by them, and himself answering patiently and civilly, or petulantly and impertinently, the thousand and one annoying questions asked by the anxious or the uninformed. He is, to an extent unknown to any other officer under our whole complex American system, the servant of the people, and all will admit that in his appointment the people ought to be consulted.

It must also be admitted that if through some practicable system they were in fact consulted, as they are now only in form, it would create with this officer a feeling of responsibility to the people, who are his real patrons and employers, a feeling of civility towards them, to which he is now too often a stranger, nestling as he does beneath the protecting wing of some member of Congress or political committee, to whom, under the present system, he feels his principal obligation. In short, no one will deny the right of the people to a voice in the selection of this officer. No one will say but that they are entitled to some legal system under which they can with certainty make their choice known to the Postmaster-General and have that choice respected. Now, this bill proposes to do precisely this; nothing more and nothing less. Should it become a law it would not take the power of appointment from the Postmaster-General nor in any way affect the accountability of the postmaster to the Post-Office Department, which should, of course, not be disturbed.

The power of removal is still left absolute in the Postmaster-General; and the power of appointment is only limited by the qualification for the postmaster prescribed by the bill, namely, that the person appointed shall have the approval of the people, none other being eligible; and it is believed that the machinery of the bill is complete for the conveyance of this approval to the Postmaster-General.

Now, to this feature of the bill which prescribes this qualification the particular attention of the committee is invited, as this is the only provision which by any possibility can be construed into an invasion of the power of appointment alleged to be vested by the Constitution in the Postmaster-General.

Now, right here is the whole of the supposed constitutional question involved in this bill, namely, that the Constitution gives the power of appointment wholly to the Postmaster-General.

To begin with, if that provision of the Constitution relating to this subject be examined it will be seen that the Constitution vests the Postmaster-General with no power whatever on this subject. Here is the whole clause:

He (the President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur; and he shall nominate, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint embassadors, other public ministers, and consuls, judges of the Supreme Court, and all other officers of the United States whose appointments are not otherwise provided for, and which shall be established by law; but the Congress may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper in the President alone, in the courts of law, or with heads of Departments.

From the foregoing it will be seen that the only officer vested by the Constitution with power over Federal appointments is the President, and that the power is not absolute even in him, but is subject to the action of the Senate.

But the Constitution does clothe Congress with power to—

Vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they may think proper with the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of Departments.

And under this grant of power Congress has vested the appointment of these minor postmasters in the Postmaster-General; so that his authority comes wholly from an act of Congress, and not at all, except indirectly, from the Constitution.

It must be admitted that Congress, having conferred this authority, may at any time revoke it by a repealing act. Now, if it may do this may it not do less than this by prescribing the manner in which the Postmaster-General shall exercise the power? Most certainly, unless there be something in the Constitution forbidding it; but there is nothing. By the terms of the Constitution it is left wholly to the discretion of Congress whether it will vest the Postmaster-General with this power, and is left equally to its discretion to define the way in which that power shall be exercised. Does it not follow, then, that it may prescribe qualifications and determine the eligibility of persons to be appointed? Now, this is all that this bill proposes to do. It simply provides that the appointee shall not be eligible to the appointment nor qualified to hold the office unless first recommended by a majority of the legal voters residing within the delivery of the office.

It is precisely like saying that the appointee shall himself reside within the delivery of the office, and this Congress has already said. It prescribed this qualification by the very act vesting the appointment in the Postmaster-General, in the following language:

Every postmaster shall reside within the delivery of the office to which he is appointed. (Sec. 3831, Revised Statutes.)

Thus do we see that Congress has already prescribed a qualification for the postmaster, a very proper one, too; and may they not now prescribe another, an equally proper one, namely, that he must, to be eligible, receive the approval of a majority of the legal voters residing within the delivery of the office?

It should here be kept in mind that the bill does not declare that the Postmaster-General shall appoint whoever may be thus recommended. Were it so to provide I admit it would then present a grave constitutional question, for it would then practically vest the power of appointment in the people instead of in the head of the Post-Office Department, whereas the Constitution does not authorize Congress to do the former thing, but does authorize it to do the latter.

Then keep in mind that the bill in terms recognizes the constitutional power of the Postmaster-General to decline to appoint the person so recommended, not only once and again, but as often as he chooses, and thus is his judgment and will left free to go through the whole population within the delivery of the office if he chooses; but we have seen that he can not go outside of the delivery without violating a law already on the statute-book, which no one has ever thought to claim was unconstitutional. Practically, however, the Postmaster-General would seldom, if ever, refuse to appoint the person named by the people. He would be only too glad to give them the postmaster of their choice. And I have called attention to this power still left in the Postmaster-General, not because he would be likely to have occasion to ex-

ercise it, but in order to show that the provisions of the bill are entirely within the rule laid down by Akerman, Attorney-General, in his opinion of August 31, 1871, and of Legaré, Attorney-General, therein cited, of which the present civil-service law is a notable illustration, namely, that Congress may prescribe qualifications for all those minor officers whose appointment the Constitution authorizes it to vest in the President, in the courts, or in the heads of Departments, and may limit the appointing power to such as possess the requisite qualifications.

The reason for this is obvious. The Constitution gives the Senate revisory power over all Federal appointments. It was the design of the framers of the Constitution not to confer autocratic power upon any one in the matter of appointments to office, and so the right was reserved to the Senate to set aside the will of the President and reject his choice if they should think best. Now, when the Senate, as a co-ordinate branch of Congress, consents to vest certain appointments in the heads of Departments, is it not competent for them to stipulate, as a sort of equivalent for this surrender of their revisory power over appointments, that the appointees shall possess certain qualifications, such, for instance, as that postmasters shall have the approval of the patrons of the office?

The fathers thought it wise to leave the will of the President in appointments to office under control of the Senate, and so within reach of the people. And who will say that it is unwise or unreasonable or unconstitutional for the Senate, when it clothes the Postmaster-General with power to appoint postmasters, and confers upon him all the power they had, to say that he shall appoint such as shall have the approval of the people whom they serve? This would certainly be in harmony with all the analogies and traditions of our system, in which the central thought is the conservation of popular rights. But enough! I do not believe the constitutionality of this bill will be seriously questioned. It is evident that it can in no way make less effective the postal service.

Its fairness to the people and its practicability must be admitted. We have also seen that the practical tendency of it would be to make the postmaster more attentive and obliging. But of far more consequence still is the fact that it would take out of politics, at once and forever, fifty two thousand offices, fully one-half of that immense army of men whose employment is put in jeopardy by every Presidential election.

I have no time to enter at length upon the consideration of the problem presented by the vast and ever-increasing civil service of this great and growing country. It must suffice to say that the contemplative, prudent mind views with alarm, if not with disgust, that feature of our system which makes the stake contended for in Presidential elections not so much who shall be President as who shall hold the one hundred and odd thousand offices which the successful candidate distributes among his supporters, precisely as in early, semi-barbarous times the victorious general distributed among his followers the spoils of conquest.

Very many of the very best men in the Republic consider it a great scandal that this, the most enlightened and progressive people on the face of the globe, should be found in this evening of the nineteenth century administering their civil service upon no better principle than that which governs the savage tribes in the distribution of plunder captured in war; a principle, too, which even in war all civilized nations long since outgrew.

But I must not enter upon the discussion of civil-service reform. Theoretically, all are civil-service reformers. Both of the great political parties have repeatedly declared for it in their platforms, and Presidential candidates always proclaim it in their letters of acceptance. Now, why is this? It is because there is with the whole American people a strong feeling that something ought to be done to eliminate from Presidential elections the immense civil patronage which now extends to more than one hundred thousand men, and carries with it in profits and emoluments more than $100,000,000 annually, making a total money value of patronage to the supporters of the successful candidate of more than $400,000,000. Think of it! And is it any wonder that there is a widespread feeling that the choice of Chief Executive of this great American people should not be coupled with considerations which appeal so powerfully to the selfishness and cupidity of those who make the choice, that as much as possible the choice should be kept free from all mercenary motives and made to depend upon questions of administrative policy, of foreign and domestic trade; of the public defense, of internal improvements, of tariff and taxation, and revenue and finance?

These are really the questions that should govern the people in the choice of President. But add to these the question of who shall fill one hundred thousand offices, with several times that number of aspirants for them, all active according to their expectations, and with four hundred million dollars in the pool, and tell me which will control most in the choice, these great questions of public policy or the offices? All will admit that the capture of the offices is altogether too much of an issue in, and intensifies too much, our Presidential elections, which ought to result in the calm, deliberate choice of the best man, coupled with the best political principles.

Now, this bill, if it should become a law, would strike out of the Presidential problem at a single blow fifty-two thousand of these offices, and the very ones, too, over which the scramble is most disgraceful, because appointments to them are made in the most irresponsible manner. They are also the very offices which enter most largely into the Presidential contest, scattered as they are over the whole country and carrying as they do the greedy spirit of conquest into every hamlet throughout the land.

What other machine, in fact, equals the post-office in the small country village or at the cross-roads in the manufacture of politics? Each Presidential election hatches half a dozen aspirants in each party for every such office. And after the Kilkenny contest is over he gets the office at the cross-roads who has burnt the most powder and gets the best hold upon the "local boss." And so at last there is an outcome of the Presidential election.

Now, for this periodic scandal this bill offers a perfect cure. Its appeal is to statesmanship, and not at all to partisanship. There is, in fact, no party politics in it, and it might well enough be named "A bill to take the fourth-class post-office out of politics." If any advantage will accrue by the enactment of the bill at this time it will be to the party now in possession of the offices, for it would not disturb present incumbents unless a majority of the people so demanded. Wholly disconnect these offices from Presidential elections, as this bill proposes, and the certain tendency would, as I believe, be to disregard politics in the choice of persons to fill them. But if it should work otherwise in some communities, as it might, it would allow the people to have a postmaster of like politics with themselves, and so illustrate the doctrine of home rule and popular rights instead of forcing upon such people, as the present system does, an officer of political sentiments offensive to them.

I said a moment ago that theoretically we are all civil-service reformers, as indeed we are, not excepting the President. But practically it is difficult to resist the importunities of place-hunters, and equally difficult to withstand the temptation to use the officers to advance personal ends.

Now the chief excellence of this bill is that it treats of civil-service reform fundamentally. It removes altogether the temptation to use the officers in politics by placing them absolutely beyond the reach of President or Representative or "local boss," and thus as to 52,000 of them makes certain the reform demanded by all.

I repeat, this bill is non-partisan; and if a law it would make one-half the offices non-partisan also. But should it fail of this, it would be just as fair to one party as the other; with no advantage to either, except to the Democrats, as already shown, which, as a Republican, I am willing to concede for the sake of the law.

Mr. Chairman, we are on the eve of an important Presidential election. The two great parties are already maneuvering for position, and on every side may be seen premonitory symptoms of the coming struggle. Now, let us as representatives of the people, without regard to party, testify to the sincerity of our civil-service-reform professions, so frequently made, by passing this bill in the interest of the people, who demand it, and who know how to appreciate it.

If, however, notwithstanding the many reasons, all of a high character and in the interest of good government, which urge this reform, it should be determined by the majority to still keep in the Presidential pool these 52,000 offices and gamble, as heretofore, for the whole stake, all the minority can do is to play the game and play it to win. But one thing is certain: when the campaign is over and the result ascertained, one or the other of the two great parties will be sorry that this bill did not become a law. One or the other will have a crying spell. Now is the time for both parties to avoid this contingency by uniting in its passage, and thus be fair each toward the other, fair towards the people, and fair towards this great reform. [Applause.]

NATIONAL GRANGE, PATRONS OF HUSBANDRY,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., February 10, 1888.

SIR: Observing that you have introduced in Congress a bill making fourth-class postmasters elective, I have the honor to submit the following extract from proceedings of the twenty-first session of the National Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, held at Lansing, Mich., November 16 to 24, 1887.

From the committee on resolutions:

"Your committee has examined a resolution asking the National Grange to favor a change in the law so that postmasters may be elected by the people directly interested, and we recommend its adoption."

On motion the report was concurred in.

Respectfully,

[SEAL.] JOHN TRIMBLE,
Secretary National Grange.

Hon. WM. W. GROUT, M. C.

A bill (H. R. 3259) to enable the people to name their postmasters.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That no person whose appointment as postmaster to any post-office of the United States is now or hereafter may be vested by Congress in the head of the Post-Office Department shall be eligible to such appointment or qualified to hold such office unless first recommended by a majority of the legal voters for electors of President and Vice-President who are patrons of such office and reside within its delivery, by a vote in open meeting warned for that purpose; and any person who receives mail matter at more than one post-office shall be allowed to vote for postmaster for that office only nearest to which by the usual traveled way he has his legal residence.

SEC. 2. That within sixty days after this act shall become a law the Postmaster-General shall send every postmaster of the class named in the first section a copy thereof, who shall post the same in some conspicuous place in said post-office. Said postmaster shall also, within sixty days thereafter, forward to the Postmaster-General a complete list of the patrons of said office who are legal voters and reside within its delivery, and shall also enter in a book, always to be kept in said post-office and open to public inspection, such list; and it shall be the duty of the person holding such post-office to correct quarterly upon said book such list, and transmit a statement of such corrections with the quarterly returns required of such postmaster by the Post-Office Department. If any postmaster, after receiving a copy of this law from the Postmaster-General, shall refuse or neglect for more than sixty days to forward the list of resident patrons herein required, or shall fail to transmit with his quarterly returns the required corrections of said list, it shall disqualify him for longer holding such post-office.

SEC. 3. That whenever a majority of the resident patrons of any post-office of the class named in this act shall sign a request to the Postmaster-General asking the privilege of expressing under this act their choice for postmaster, or if any postmaster shall fail to forward the list or the quarterly corrections of said list as required by section 2, it shall be the duty of the Postmaster-General to forthwith issue to some person not a resident patron of said office, and when practicable to a commissioner of the circuit court of the district within which said office is located, his warrant authorizing him to warn a meeting of the resident patrons of such office by posting a notification of time, place, and purpose of meeting in a conspicuous place in said post-office, giving not less than five nor more than twenty days' notice thereof. The person named in said warrant shall have authority to preside and preserve order in such meeting, and shall determine all questions that may arise therein touching the right of any person to vote in accordance with the laws of the State or Territory in which said office is located. He shall open said meeting at the time named in the warning, and shall receive and count in open meeting the ballots that may be cast, and shall keep, or cause to be kept, a list of the persons casting them, and upon the first ballot shall keep the box open two hours; and when upon the first or any succeeding ballot any person shall receive a majority of all the votes cast, the presiding officer shall forthwith make return to the Postmaster-General of the result, transmitting to him the ballots and the list of persons casting them; and for such service shall be allowed as compensation the sum of $5 and 5 cents for each mile traveled. If the Postmaster-General should decline to appoint the person so nominated, he shall forthwith notify the person who presided at said meeting, who shall hold another meeting as hereinbefore prescribed; and repeated meetings shall be held till some person is nominated whom the Postmaster-General will appoint: *Provided*, That it shall not be lawful for the Postmaster-General to refuse to appoint the person so nominated by the patrons of such office for political or party reasons.

I desire to print in the RECORD as part of my remarks a copy of the bill, because it has not been very well understood; and also the action of the National Grange of Patrons of Husbandry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Vermont asks unanimous consent to be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask to amend that so that the proposition shall be that any gentleman who desires to print his remarks in the RECORD be permitted to do so.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman means any gentleman who speaks in the debate.

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that any gentleman who takes part in the debate may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. ADAMS. On page 2 of this bill we find the appropriation proposed by the committee for the free-delivery service. The bill appropriates for the free-delivery service $6,000,000. The question is whether that is an adequate appropriation. What does the committee say about it? We find that on page 3 of their report they say this:

The bill proposes for 1889 an increase of $777,500 over that of 1888. This is not due so much to a proposed increase in the service as to the operation of the following acts, embraced in sections 631, 632, and 633 of the Postal Laws and Regulations, as follows:

Then the committee quotes those laws, and concludes with the following sentence:

It will be seen that increase of salary by promotion has much to do with this increased amount.

Now, what do the officials of the Department say? On page 15 of the report, or rather of the document at large, which includes the appendix, there is a letter from J. F. Bates, superintendent free-delivery system, in which he says justly—

It will require at least $6,000,000 to provide for legal obligations already incurred with no provision—

And I ask the attention of the committee particularly to these words—

with no provision made for increased incidental expenses, additional carriers, or extension of the service to additional cities.

There has been a large addition to the number of free-delivery cities in the last year—I admit that—and when I appealed for a further modification of the law that fact was named as an objection to my request. It is no objection at all.

I have not time to do more than refer to the particular case which has attracted my attention to this subject.

My Congressional district includes a part of the city of Chicago and is in the part of Cook County which lies around Chicago. It includes among other things a municipality which in 1880 was a village of 6,300 souls. That village has now grown to a city of 43,000 people; and yet under existing law it cannot have a free-delivery system. The reason is the law we passed last year required the Postmaster-General to establish that system in cities of over 50,000 inhabitants, but permitted him to do so in cities which had 10,000 inhabitants by the census of 1880, or paid $10,000 of gross revenue.

I will admit this city in my district forms an exceptional case; but this is the exceptional case, that a city of 43,000 persons can not have the free-delivery system simply because it has grown from a population of 6,300 to 43,000 since the census of 1880 was made.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOCKERY. Does not the fact that there is not at that point $10,000 of gross postal revenue show that the people there do their business at Chicago?

Mr. ADAMS. It shows that a certain number of them do business at Chicago. I will make an explanation as to that, although it will consume part of my ten minutes, and I hope some gentleman will give me some additional time. This city has grown up from a village which consisted in an aggregation of villages, each with its small post-office. There are five little post-offices there, which the business people who have their residences there disdain to use, simply because they can go into Chicago, rather than walk a quarter of a mile to the post-office. But if we had the free-delivery system there the annual revenue which now, as my friend from Missouri says, does not amount to $10,000, would, I have no doubt, immediately spring to $15,000 or $20,000, and the fact that under those circumstances the gross revenue does not amount to $10,000 does not show that that large community does not suffer from the state of the law.

Now, I do not pretend that in this bill I can get the modification of that law; but, Mr. Chairman, suppose I could devise a bill which this House were willing to pass by which that city of mine could be brought within the operation of the law, it would do very little good if the appropriations were insufficient, and they are admitted to be insufficient, if Colonel Bates's letter is accurate in which he says it will take $6,000,000.

My impression is that some gentlemen of this House regard the free-delivery system as a luxury, a mere convenience for the residents of the cities or the districts in which it is applied. To my mind it is more an industrial agent by which the wealth of the whole country as well as of the particular district to which it is applied can be increased. A very large part of the mails which my constituents might receive under the free-delivery system would consist of business correspondence.

There are stores and manufactories there. Some of the residents, of course, do business in the city of Chicago, but there is a large amount of local business done which can be greatly facilitated by the free-delivery system, and the wealth of the community be thereby increased. I mention this merely as an exceptional case; but I have no doubt that within the growing regions of the Northwest there are many cities and other municipalities in the same condition as the city of Lake View, and my only object in discussing the point now is to say that I think the committee ought not, for the sake of a mere appearance of economy, to appropriate only a sum sufficient to carry on the existing system in the existing places where it is now applied under the existing law, making no provision for its extension.

The fact that many cities have been added during the last year to the free-delivery list furnishes no argument whatever against this proposition, and I am particularly interested in the subject, inasmuch as I hope, either by some sort of bill (I have already introduced one) or by some new construction of the regulations of the Department, to bring that city in my Congressional district within the law. If it can be brought within the law, I think it unreasonable that there should not be an appropriation sufficient to meet the requirements of the case. The appropriation of a few hundred thousand dollars more will not affect the prosperity of the country in an unfavorable way, and if it does increase the apparent size or the real size of the postal appropriation bill, I am sure that the business people of this country will regard that rather in the light of economy than in the light of extravagance. I yield the floor back to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM].

Mr. BINGHAM. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has six minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. BINGHAM. If the gentleman on the other side will allow me, I will reserve that time.

Mr. DOCKERY. Of course it is the desire on this side to close the debate. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MONTGOMERY] desires to occupy a few minutes——

Mr. BINGHAM. All that I ask is the privilege of reserving the six minutes.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is all right. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MONTGOMERY] desires to address the committee, and if I can be recognized I will yield him fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield fifteen minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Commit-

tee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, which had charge of this bill and which framed and reported it, I am glad to hear that there is no opposition to the bill itself. I wish to say on behalf of that committee that in framing this appropriation bill and in dealing with legislation referring to the postal service there has been no disposition anywhere to economize in such a way as to affect injuriously the mail service of the country.

So far as the increased appropriations in the bill are concerned, especially the increase which gives additional compensation in an indirect way to third-class postmasters by making them allowances, or permitting the Post-Office Department to do so, on account of rent, lights, and fuel, I believe that it meets the hearty indorsement of every member of that committee. My only objection to the bill is that it does not go far enough in the direction of that liberality with which I believe the postal system of the country ought to be treated. While the bill does, by a provision which by the unanimous consent of the House has been ingrafted upon it, undertake to relieve one set of officers, the third-class postmasters, unfortunately that unanimous consent did not go far enough to permit us to relieve another class, the fourth-class postmasters, whom I believe to be more deserving of relief and in a worse condition than those who are relieved by the bill. According to the report of the Postmaster-General, there are 1,864 third-class postmasters in this country.

Mr. McCREARY. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. McCREARY. Can the gentleman tell us how many fourth-class postmasters there are in the United States?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Over 52,000; yes, 53,053 on the 1st of last October.

Mr. McCREARY. How much is it proposed now to pay them extra in addition to what they at present receive?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. There is no proposition of that kind in this bill—no provision for them. That is my objection to it.

Mr. McCREARY. Not in this bill; but I understood that there was some amendment which was to be offered.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The amendment to which the gentleman refers, which can be offered only by unanimous consent, proposed to increase their compensation by allowing them $5 a quarter, or $20 a year each, in addition to the compensation they now receive. That will make an aggregate of about $1,060,000.

Mr. McCREARY. If it will not interrupt the gentleman, I want to say that the mail service comes nearer to the people than any other branch of the public service, and that I think there ought to be some increase made in the compensation of the fourth-class postmasters.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. On that subject I simply desire to say that $20 to each of those postmasters will amount to a little over a million dollars, and will give some little relief to over fifty-three thousand fourth-class postmasters, who, I think, are the worst compensated officers connected with the Post-Office Department or its service.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Mississippi. The worst in the world.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes; I will say the worst in the world, where there is any pretense to pay at all. Now, Mr. Chairman, this committee has voted without any hesitation $650,000 of additional compensation to 1,864 third-class postmasters, and if the House stands now upon a question of unanimous consent, or upon any other ground, refusing to give these fifty-three thousand fourth-class postmasters (who are almost thirty times as numerous as the class that the bill proposes to relieve) the comparatively small sum of $1,000,000, considerably less than double what is allowed to these 1,864 third-class postmasters, then I say this House will be condemned in its management of this bill and in its management and control of the post-office affairs of the country.

It will seem strange to them, as it seems strange to me, that when no one was found to object to legislation on this bill giving third-class postmasters annually over $350 each of additional compensation in clerk-hire, light, and fuel, there should be found any one to object to a proposition to give to fourth-class postmasters the small sum of $20 a year in addition to the unfair and inadequate compensation they now receive.

I have no desire, of course, to antagonize this bill; but I feel that at this late stage of the session any relief to the fourth-class postmasters must be obtained in the same manner as relief is given to third-class postmasters, by ingrafting the proper legislation on this bill. An effort to obtain this relief by a new bill to be reported hereafter from the committee would probably result in failure for want of time to pass the bill this session. And whether this amendment be the appropriate measure of relief or not, it certainly is little enough, and does not interfere with the method of payment now prevailing in reference to fourth-class postmasters; it does not interfere with the compensation based upon percentage of cancellation; the proposition is simply to give the sum of $20 a year as compensation in addition to that which is now given. In other words, if a postmaster now gets $10 a year—a very common case in my district, and I presume in the districts of many gentlemen on this floor—this proposition would give him $30 a year. If a postmaster receives $50 annually his compensation will be increased to $70, giving to each only an aggregate increase of $20 per year.

While there has been some complaint here—and I will not say that in some cases it is not a just complaint—that there has been a disposition on the part of various officers, high and low, seeking an increase of compensation, to organize a united movement in that direction and flood this House with petitions, yet, however much some gentlemen may object to these petitions, we should carefully examine them with the view of ascertaining whether there be merit and justice in the demands which are made. We should examine these applications for increased compensation fairly and impartially, and should consider only the question whether or not relief, such as can be properly granted, is asked. And I wish to say now that whatever may have been the number of petitions poured into that petition-box, I do not believe a juster complaint has ever come from any people than that which has come from the fourth-class postmasters in their demand for some increase of compensation for the service which they render to those people who receive less benefits under the postal system than any other people in the country. At the cross-roads post-offices and the post-offices in the small hamlets and towns the postmasters in many cases do not receive for the attention which they give in receiving and delivering the mails more than $10, $15, $20, $30, or $40 a year.

Mr. Chairman, I listened to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS] with reference to the extension of the free-delivery system to his town, and I heard him before our committee. I appreciate the condition of postal affairs existing at his home, and I desire to advance the mail facilities of his people; but the misfortune with reference to the postal system of this country is that we pay attention almost exclusively to those people who seek to have their mails delivered at their doors, it may be, before they are up in the mornings, so that they can, if they choose, read their mail matter in their beds; and we make too little effort in the way of extending the benefits of the postal system to the people scattered through the rural districts, who are glad to get their mail by riding 3, 4, and 5 miles through the mud or dust to a country post-office.

Mr. LIND. Yes, in some cases 15 miles.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Yes, in places 15 miles.

Mr. Chairman, this may be the last opportunity I will have this session to say a word for the improvement of the mail service in the rural districts or to argue the claims of their postmasters—always belonging to the fourth class—for fairer treatment and better compensation. But I will say that while objection may defeat this amendment, these fourth-class postmasters and the people in the rural districts where they serve and their Representatives in this House will not cease to clamor through the petition-box and on this floor till fairer treatment has been accorded them than they are receiving under existing law.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I advocate seeks only to relieve a hardship at post-offices where all that the people ask is that the postmaster may deliver their mails when they call for them. I am having trouble now, and I have no doubt many other members on this floor are having trouble, in finding men in the rural districts who will accept these small post-offices and render this service to the people at the pitiful compensation now allowed, based on the amount of cancellations during the year, amounting often to less than $10, $15, or $20.

I appeal to the House to recognize this as an opportunity to do justice to these humble postmasters. I believe that so far as this session of Congress is concerned we have now our only opportunity of doing justice in this respect to a class of persons who, I believe, have the most meritorious claim for increase of salary that has been presented to this Congress.

Mr. DOCKERY. I reserve that portion of my time—five minutes, I understand—which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MONTGOMERY] has not occupied. I now yield the floor in order that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] may go on.

Mr. PETERS. I yield twenty minutes to my colleague [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, as will be remembered by many members, I offered early in this session a resolution calling upon the Postmaster-General for information concerning what we in the West thought insufficient and unsatisfactory mail service. After some delay that resolution was reported back to the House and favorably acted upon. The Postmaster-General was thus called upon for information; and a report from him on the subject was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads; but it has never been brought to the attention of the House. This is my excuse for saying on this occasion some things which I had hoped to say in connection with that report.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman will permit me to say that the matter to which he refers has not been reported back by reason of the protracted tariff debate. It is the purpose of the committee to report it back at an early day.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, Mr. Chairman, if it will be reported back at an early day and an opportunity then given to make the suggestions I thought of making on the present occasion, I am quite willing to defer until that time what I contemplated saying. I would prefer to say it in connection with that resolution; but thinking that perhaps in consequence of the crowded condition of business that resolution and re-

port might not be again brought to the attention of the House, I had contemplated making at this time some remarks on that subject.

Mr. BLOUNT. I have not interrupted the gentleman from Kansas to draw him away from his purpose at all, but merely to make that statement in justice to the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. If it is the purpose of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads to report to the House the resolution and report, and I will have the opportunity to discuss them, I do not care to take up the time now.

Mr. BINGHAM. When reported can not the gentleman discuss the resolution as a privileged matter?

Mr. PERKINS. No, I do not think it is a privileged matter.

Mr. BLOUNT. I will say that if the business of the House will permit at that time there will be no disposition on the part of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads to cut off debate.

Mr. PERKINS. I would have much preferred, of course, to have discussed the subject while the resolution was pending before the House, but under the circumstances I will do so now while I have the floor for that purpose.

The bill before the House is, in my judgment, commendable as far as it goes. The only criticism I have to make of the bill is that it does not make appropriations as liberally, for the great West particularly, as the people of that country think ought to be made.

There has been much complaint in the section of country from which I come of the present mail service. Whether that is in consequence of insufficient or inadequate appropriation or whether it is because of the political change in the offices and the employés designated to do the work, or whether from bad management or not, I am not prepared to say, except as I shall argue from the facts I shall present that the appropriation made for that service is not sufficient. That, however, may not be the only explanation of it.

I am inclined to think there is some large portion due and to be charged to inexperienced men and bad management resulting from changes incident to the change of administration and to the present management of the Post-Office Department. I do not make any complaint of the general superintendent of the railway mail service. I think he has tried to do his duty, to do the best he could, in order to give to the people of the West efficient and satisfactory service. Nor do I wish to complain of that excellent officer and accomplished gentleman, the First Assistant Postmaster-General. He is the man, in my judgment, who ought to have been appointed Postmaster-General instead of bringing here from the State of Michigan a man to look after the political necessities of the Administration by looking after its political extremities.

But, sir, I do think the management of the Post-Office Department has been partisan in its character, parsimonious in its allowances, palsied in its execution. It is because of this so much complaint is made by the country generally, and particularly by the people I represent in part; and yet at the same time I wish to do justice to the officers I have mentioned, who have done the very best they could to give the people satisfactory service.

On the 1st day of July, 1886, there were 123,745.45 miles of railway mail service; on the 1st day of January of the present year there were 136,207.72 miles. Thus showing in a period of eighteen months an increase of 12,462 miles of railway mail service, or a little over 10 per cent. increase in the entire railway mail service of the country. Notwithstanding this increase in the miles of service we find from the bill before us an increase of only 5 per cent. for railway postal-clerk service.

In other words, the last appropriation bill carried for postal clerks $4,990,240.62, while the present bill only carries $5,246,790.21, making, as I have suggested, an increase of only 5 per cent., while the increase in the railway mail service is over 10 per cent. Thus it necessarily follows that this increase is not in keeping with the growth and extension of the service and the requirements of the people served.

Mr. BINGHAM. I think the gentleman is confounding the increase in the postal service with the postal-car service.

Mr. PERKINS. No, I am speaking of the appropriation for the postal-clerk service. I have shown that while the increase in the railway mail service has been more than 10 per cent., the increase in the railway postal-clerk service has been only 5 per cent.

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman is speaking of the postal railway service generally, while this refers to the postal-car service. It is for the postal-car service $2,000,000 is appropriated.

Mr. PERKINS. I am speaking of the appropriation for postal railway clerks and comparing it with the railway mail service.

Mr. DOCKERY. I think, as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], the gentleman is confusing one service with the other.

Mr. PERKINS. But the railway postal clerks are employed in distributing the mails in the railway mail service.

Mr. BINGHAM. Yes; but in that branch of it known as the postal-car service.

Mr. PERKINS. Very well; call it the postal-car service. As I understand there are 136,000 miles of postal-car service, and the increase has been 10 per cent., while by the provisions of this bill the increase for clerical assistance is but 5 per cent., a totally inadequate increase.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. BLOUNT. Is it not true that a large part of the railway mail service is made up of pouch matter?

Mr. PERKINS. Some portions of it is; not the larger part of it by any means, because in the West, where much of this increased service has been given, on almost all of the new lines railway mail service has been extended, and postal-clerkship service given.

Mr. BLOUNT. It only shows that they have been liberal in making provision for your part of the country.

Mr. PERKINS. What we complain of is that the service was not given as soon as it should have been and in many instances not efficient service, but in almost all instances the railway postal service has been given in some form on these new lines, and I say this in justice to the Administration.

MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. Chairman, the railway mail service is divided into nine geographical divisions. The sixth division comprises Wisconsin, Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Minnesota, the upper peninsula of Michigan, Dakota and Wyoming Territories, with James E. White superintendent, headquarters Chicago, Ill.

The seventh division comprises Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, and the Indian Territory, with R. M. Thomas superintendent, headquarters, St. Louis, Mo.

Thus we see that Nebraska is in the sixth and Kansas in the seventh divisions.

I have in my hand a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 14, containing the speech of Senator REAGAN, recently delivered, in defense of this Administration. It contains a number of tables and statements that must have been furnished him by the Post-Office Department, and hence I accept them as official.

From these tables I find that during the nineteen months ending January 31 of the present year the railway postal service was extended in the United States 12,462.52 miles. Of this extension the sixth division, embracing Nebraska, received 4,541.36 miles, and the seventh division, embracing the State of Kansas, received 5,283.36 miles, making for the two divisions 9,824.72, and leaving for the seven remaining divisions 2,637.85 miles of new or additional railway mail service.

From the report of the Postmaster-General now before us I find that on the 1st day of July, 1885, there were 4,387 railway postal clerks in the service, and from the same source I find that on January 1, 1888, there were 4,988, an increase in that period of 601 clerks.

Of this increase I find that the sixth and seventh divisions combined, embracing Nebraska and Kansas, received 334.

Thus we see that while in a period of nineteen months the two divisions embracing the States of Nebraska and Kansas got almost 80 per cent. of the increase in the miles of the railway postal service, in a period of thirty months they got but 55 per cent. of the increase in postal clerks to do the work.

Again from the tables furnished we learn that in the first, second, third, fourth, fifth, eighth, and ninth divisions, where in a period of nineteen months ending January 31, 1888, there were but 2,637.85 miles of new railway mail service added, they were given 187 additional clerks to do the work, while in the sixth and seventh divisions there were added 9,824.72 miles of railway mail service during the same period, while but 228 additional clerks were given to do the work. On this basis it will be seen that if 187 additional clerks were reasonable for the 2,637.85 miles of new service, the sixth and seventh divisions, where there was the increase of 9,824.72 miles of service, should have had a trifle over 700, and Kansas and Nebraska alone should have had 350; instead of a small share of the 228 that were allotted to the fifteen States and Territories comprising the sixth and seventh divisions.

It will not do to say in answer to or explanation of this discrimination that the work was heaviest in these divisions, and that for such reason the appointments were more in proportion to the miles of new service than in the Kansas and Nebraska divisions, for it is shown by the tables furnished that in those divisions each clerk handled on an average during the two years ending June 30, 1887, 180,640 more pieces of mail matter than were handled on the average by the clerks of the other seven divisions; and we find that in the Kansas and Nebraska divisions that on an average one clerk is furnished for each 3,309 miles of mail service, while in the other divisions combined the average is one clerk to every 2,627 miles of service.

Again, for the purpose of showing how my own State has been treated by this administration, I will quote further from the tables furnished Senator REAGAN:

There were on the 30th day of June, 1887, 9,217.25 miles of star-route service in Kansas, and 6,174.38 miles of railroad service, making in the aggregate 15,391.63 miles of mail service, and the distance annually traveled on these lines was 9,102,645.25 miles.

In the sister State of Nebraska there were at the same time 5,841.52 miles of star route service and 4,253.20 miles of railroad service, making

in the aggregate 10,094.72 miles of mail service, and the distance traveled annually on these lines was 5,524,758.63 miles.

We find that for this service there was paid in Nebraska $1,014,551.07, while for almost 68 per cent. more service in Kansas there was only paid $88[illegible]074.42. In other words, that for carrying the mail in Nebraska there is paid 18.38 cents per mile, while in Kansas but 9.8 cents per mile is paid.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly.

Mr. DOCKERY. Does the gentleman attribute any purpose anywhere in the administration of the Department to discriminate in favor of Nebraska as against Kansas?

Mr. PERKINS. I do not; but I am calling attention to this remarkable discrimination we find between these two States in the way of compensation for carrying the mail.

But let us pursue our figures further.

PRESIDENTIAL OFFICES.

We find from the last annual report of the Postmaster-General that in Arkansas, a Democratic State, with five members of Congress, the Government of the United States received during the last fiscal year in postal receipts from the Presidential offices $115,478.19, and that there was allowed for its collection by this administration 43 per cent. of the amount received.

In Nebraska, a Republican State, with only three members of Congress, there was received in the same time and in the same way, and from the same source, $486,720.88, and for its collection only 33 per cent. of the amount received was allowed.

In Mississippi, a Democratic State, with seven members of Congress, the Government of the United States received during the last fiscal year in postal receipts from the Presidential offices $108,611.83, and for its collection there was allowed by this administration 43 per cent. of the amount received. In Minnesota, a Republican State, with only five members of Congress, there was received in the same time and in the same way and from the same source $765,039.08, and for its collection only 35 per cent. of the amount received was allowed.

In Kentucky, a Democratic State, with eleven members of Congress, the Government of the United States received during the last fiscal year in postal receipts from the Presidential offices $466,105.35, and for its collection there was allowed by this administration 42 per cent. of the amount received. In Michigan, a Republican State, with the same number of Congressmen, there was received in the same way and in the same time and from the same source $1,114,944.87, and for its collection only 37 per cent. of the amount received was allowed.

Mr. DOCKERY. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. PERKINS. Well, I have but a very few moments.

Mr. DOCKERY. I would like to get in another inquiry in this connection.

Mr. PERKINS. Very well, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOCKERY. As the gentleman is referring to percentages seemingly based on political considerations, he will be fair enough I know to state that the percentages to which he refers are fixed by law, and are applicable to all parts of the United States, the law making no discrimination.

Mr. PERKINS. Then why do not the figures carry out the same results in all the States? The gentleman well knows that in allowances for clerk-hire, rent of offices, fuel, lights, etc., there is much discretion in the Post-Office Department.

In Georgia, a Democratic State, with ten members of Congress, the Government of the United States received during the last fiscal year in postal receipts from the Presidential offices $358,021.43, and for its collection there was allowed by this Administration 39 per cent. of the amount received.

In Kansas, a Republican State, with only seven members of Congress, there was received in the same way and in the same time and from the same source $716,919.73, and for its collection only 36 per cent. of the amount received was allowed.

In New Mexico, a Democratic Territory, which my friend SPRINGER thinks should be admitted into the Union as a State, the Government of the United States received during the last fiscal year in postal receipts from the Presidential offices $38,142.16, and for its collection there was allowed by this Administration 46 per cent. of the amount received.

In Dakota, a Republican Territory, which my friend SPRINGER thinks should not be admitted into the Union as a State unless coupled with some other Territory, there was received in the same time and in the same way and from the same source $212,451.45, and for its collection only 42 per cent. of the amount received was allowed.

But let us look a little further. In the first session of the Forty-ninth Congress there was an appropriation of $296,000 for necessary and special mail facilities on the trunk railroad lines of the country. This, I find, was almost entirely exhausted in the South. I will furnish for the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a table found in the last annual report of the Postmaster-General, showing the expenditure of this special appropriation. From this table it will appear that the East and North got $62,647.06, the South $233,340.47, and the West not a dollar:

Tabular statement showing the disposition of the appropriation for special facilities on trunk lines.

Termini.	Railroad company.	Leave.	Arrive.	Miles.	In transit.	Speed per hour.	Pay.
					H. M.	*Miles.*	
New York—Springfield	New York, New Hampshire and Hartford.	New York 5.01 a. m	Springfield 10.25 a. m	136.00	5 24	25.29	$17,647.05
New York—Albany	New York Central and Hudson River.	New York 4.35 a. m	Albany 8.20 a. m	144.00	3 45	38.40	25,000.00
Philadelphia—Bay View	Philadelphia, Wilmington and Baltimore.	Philadelphia 7.20 a. m	Bay View 9.32 a. m	91.80	2 12	41.25	20,000.00
Bay View—Quantico	Baltimore and Potomac	Bay View 9.32 a. m	Quantico 12.05 p. m	79.80	2 33	31.29	21,900.00
Quantico—Richmond	Richmond, Frederick and Potomac.	Quantico 12.08 p. m	Richmond 2.39 p. m	81.50	2 31	32.58	17,419.20
Richmond—Petersburgh	Richmond and Petersburgh	Richmond 2.48 p. m	Petersburgh 3.25	23.39	0 37	37.92	4,268.67
Petersburgh—Weldon	Petersburgh	Petersburgh 3.27 p. m	Weldon 5.18 p. m	64.00	1 51	34.59	11,680.00
Weldon—Wilmington	Wilmington and Weldon	Weldon 5.38 p. m	Wilmington 9.55 p. m	162.07	4 17	38.30	29,577.77
Wilmington—Florence	Wilmington, Columbia and Augusta.	Wilmington 10.10 p. m	Florence 1.15 a. m	110.00	3 05	35.67	20,075.00
Florence—Charleston Junction.	Northeastern	Florence 1.30 a. m	Charleston Junction 4.40 a. m	95.00	3 10	30.00	17,337.50
Charleston Junction—Savannah.	Charleston and Savannah	Charleston Junction *3 a. m	Savannah 6.41 a. m	108.00	3 41	29.31	19,710.00
Savannah—Jacksonville	Savannah, Florida and Western.	Savannah 7.06 a. m	Jacksonville 12 noon	171.50	4 54	34.79	31,298.75
Jacksonville—Tampa	Jacksonville, Tampa and Key West and South Florida.	Jacksonville 12.30 p. m	Tampa 9 p. m	242.57	8 30	28.53	44,269.02
Baltimore—Hagerstown	Western Maryland	Baltimore 4.40 a. m	Hagerstown 7.45 a. m	86.60	3 05	28.08	15,804.50
Total				1,596.23			295,987.53

* Change to Central time, one hour slower than Eastern standard.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Can I have an extension of my time?

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope the gentleman will permit me to make a single remark. I want to say that this was recommended by several Republican administrations, that it has obtained a long time in the service. The item of special facilities and the purpose of allowing this condition of postal affairs was to reach Cuba, commencing with Springfield, Mass., and going all along the line.

Mr. PERKINS. But the first appropriation was made after the incoming of the Democratic administration.

Mr. BLOUNT. Oh, no.

Mr. PERKINS. I think so.

Mr. BINGHAM. No, sir; it has been made since 1878.

Mr. PERKINS. This special appropriation?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes; and I am certain, for I have tried to fight it off for years.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not say it should be stricken off. I am not arguing that more is given to one section than should be given, or that the people are willing that it should be stricken down, but I argue that in our section there is not that attention given to the necessary increase in facilities which should be given in accordance with the growing necessities and wants of the people.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have not given these figures and tables for the purpose of showing or arguing that some sections or divisions of our country are getting more of the current expenditures than they need or more than the people are willing should be appropriated for their

accommodation and good service. But I have called attention to these figures for the purpose of showing all—Republican and sinner alike—that in that great and growing section of the country for which I speak the mail service is and must necessarily be bad and insufficient, that in that great and marvelous West where such wonderful growth and development have been witnessed, where communities are settled in a day, and empires are born in a night, this Administration has been lagging and indifferent, and has not kept pace with the wants and necessities of the people or the demands of the public service.

Competent and experienced men have been set aside and stricken down that political workers might be provided for, and the efficiency of the service and the necessities of the people have been held for naught in the intense desire of this Department to make a showing of economy that would help the political necessities of this Administration. In many sections of the great West almost the only tangible evidence the people have that the Government of the United States is an actual organized reality is the semi or tri weekly appearance of the buckboard with its mail-carrier bringing the newspapers and letters from loved ones in the older and more favored sections of the country.

And notwithstanding the growth of this section of our common country, its rapid increase in population, its new communities, its progressive activities, its multiplied and constantly increassing necessities, it is the boast of the Postmaster-General in his last annual report that while he has been compelled to give the people more miles of star route service than heretofore, he has done it with such niggardly allowances that it does not cost the people of the United States as much as when there were fewer people to be served and less miles of star routes to be traveled.

Mr. Chairman, in view of these incontrovertible facts, is it any wonder that the people complain and, particularly in the West, denounce the administration of the Post-Office Department as partisan, parsimonious, and palsied, and ask that there shall be some conception and appreciation of their necessities, and some fair effort made to meet the demands of the public service? They do not believe in the doctrine of "innocuous desuetude" when applied to the mail service of the country, and in no section, no hamlet has there been a demand that the appropriations for this important branch of the public service shall be less, or that the Post-Office Department shall be self-sustaining. I do not know what to say better than to quote briefly from a speech delivered on the 28th of February by Senator PADDOCK, of Nebraska, upon this same subject:

> Mr. President, the average American citizen is a man of broad views, strong in purpose, intensely patriotic, aggressive, and enterprising. He is proud of his country and its institutions; he demands of the governing power that it shall be the aggregate personification of what he himself is, and the party having the responsibility of administration which refuses great opportunities when properly presented, to increase the wealth, the prosperity, the power, and the glory of the Republic, and spends its time in trying to save a few dollars in the purchase of tape and tabs and wrapping paper, will surely come to grief when the people, who are the sovereign, can reach it through the ballot-box.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PERKINS. I have here a number of letters which I wanted to read. Some of them are from postal clerks showing the work imposed on them in that section of the country.

Mr. DOCKERY. I hope the gentleman will include the papers he refers to in his remarks as printed.

Mr. PERKINS. I shall, unless I can get another opportunity further on in the debate. This is not a matter of politics with us. Complaints come from wholesale merchants, clergymen, bankers, lawyers, newspapers, and Democratic editors.

I will insert a letter from a Democratic wholesale merchant of the city of Fort Scott:

> FORT SCOTT, KANS., *February* 17, 1888.
>
> DEAR SIR: I attach a couple of envelopes returned to me yesterday. I have removed the contents, which were important to my customer, W. K. Shaw, and have again forwarded them. If this was the first time such a thing had happened would not complain, but for a year past has been a weekly, if not daily, occurrence. You will notice letters were mailed at this office January 16, destined for Harris, Kans., a station on Kansas, Nebraska and Dakota Railroad, about 40 miles from this point, and after a month's delay thrown back into post-office box without any seeming attempt being made to get them to their proper destination. Instead of getting to Harris were sent to Horace; one received there on January 17 and other some time in February, and after a month's delay in one case and a fortnight in other, postmaster at Horace awakens to the fact that they were not intended for his office. Will you please place where proper inquiries can be made as to whom are the parties at fault? These miscarriages have been the cause of considerable misunderstanding between Mr. Shaw and myself, and intend to remain silent no longer. Trusting you may find time to start proper inquiries,
>
> Remain, yours respectfully,
>
> ISAAC STADDEN, *Merchant.*
>
> Hon. B. W. PERKINS,
> *Washington, D. C.*

Mr. PETERS. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. LODGE. The criticisms which have been made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] on this bill can very largely be met by amendments to the appropriations, either increasing them or changing their distribution. I wish that the criticism which I have to make could be met in the same way. But I am afraid that the only chance for the improvement I desire is that it should be made somewhere else. Moreover, the first criticism that I have to make is that the committee does not seem to have paid attention to the recommendations of the Postmaster-General; and I shall take for the text of the little I have to say the statement that Mr. Vilas made in his report for last year, that the aggregate effect of the present relations with the railroads was to impose an excessive charge upon the Treasury of the United States.

We have in this bill $17,000,000 appropriated for the railway service. Every form of freight transportation and passenger transportation has fallen very greatly in the last ten years. I have some figures here which show a reduction in freight rates of from 60 to 20 per cent. on all the leading lines in all the principal sections of the country. It is the same case—not so large a reduction, but still a reduction of 20 or 30 per cent.—in the passenger service.

Let me read these statistics:

	Per cent. reduction.
Lake Shore, 1872–'83	47
New York Central, 1872–'83	43
Burlington, Cedar Rapids and Northern, 1877–'82	62
Chicago and Northwestern, 1872–'86	58
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, 1872–'86	56
Illinois Central, 1872–'82	34.4
Erie, 1873–'80	43
Chicago and Alton, 1874–'87	56
All railroads in Michigan, 1874–'83	27
All-rail rate on wheat, Chicago to New York, 1874–'83	44
Boston and Lowell, 1879–'84	30
Eastern, 1879–'84	17
New York and New England, 1879–'84	51
New York, New Haven and Hartford, 1879–'84	17

The following are some reductions in the charges per passenger per mile:

	Per cent. of reduction.
Chicago and Northwestern, 1877–'86	10
Chicago, Milwaukee and St. Paul, 1877–'86	24.5
Illinois Central, 1872–'82	23.7
Chicago and Alton, 1874–'87	37
All Massachusetts roads, 1876–'83	20

These figures are taken from various railroad reports and can, of course, be much extended. They have been brought together and classified also by Mr. Edward Atkinson in some recent articles which appeared, I think, in the Century magazine.

In that period there have been two reductions—one of 5 and one of 10 per cent.—by the Government; but these reductions have been more than made up by the additional expenses of the railway postal-car service, for which $2,000,000 is paid. We propose to pay $2,000,000 for the postal-car service, and Mr. Vilas says in his report that these cars can be built for $1,600,000 by the Government and run for $250,000. We are paying, in other words, a rental of 125 per cent. for the postal-cars in the service of the Government; and we are paying that in addition to weight rates to the railroads that no private shipper would think of paying for one moment or that the railroads would think of demanding.

I know it is said in reply that the railroads give us extra facilities, that they put our cars upon fast trains, and that they carry a certain number of postal clerks in those cars. But even if we make all those allowances, I believe we are still paying from five to six millions more than we ought to pay to the railroads, and that that amount might just as well be turned in to the Government, thus enabling us to reduce the rates of postage, or increase the pay of employés, or improve the service throughout the country.

The suggestions I have taken are drawn from Mr. Vilas's report of last year. I will now give a single instance which he mentions of the exorbitant prices exacted by the railroads for transportation of the mails. To one railroad they pay $504,000 for railway mail service and $59,000 for the use of cars which can be built for $17,500. Now, it does not seem to me it can be right or that it is for the interest of the postal service or of the country to pay such rates as that. There is one instance in particular which shows how the Government is treated and how the people suffer by the exactions of the railroads which comes immediately under my own notice in my own State.

I refer to the mail facilities between New York and Boston, where there is an immense business doing all the time. There we have no proper fast-mail facilities. The New York, New Haven and Hartford Railroad, which controls the entry into New York of all the Eastern business, refuses to allow a fast-mail train except at a price which is perfectly exorbitant. I do not blame the Department in the least for refusing to pay them; but I, and every member from New England, have sent to the Post-Office Department this year a mass of petitions from all the business men, merchants and manufacturers, of New England, asking to have this thing remedied, and it is a burden and an evil which should be remedied without delay.

This is simply one of the glaring injustices which arise from the present relation between the Government and the railroads, and I am surprised, after the way in which the Postmaster-General has called the attention of the committee to this condition of affairs, that we are still left to pay nineteen millions for this railway service, seventeen millions for the service and two millions for the postal-cars, while in many parts of this country we are unable to get even the fast-mail service which they pretend to give us under these clauses in return for this great expenditure of money.

Mr. BLOUNT. Does the gentleman complain that the committee does not violate the rules of this House by proposing an amendment

of the law in reference to the compensation of railroads for mail service?

Mr. LODGE. I understand perfectly well that the committee can not do that on an appropriation bill; but I think, nevertheless, that new legislation might well have been introduced to remedy the evils which I have pointed out. If it has been introduced it has escaped my notice.

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, it has been.

Mr. LODGE. I beg the gentleman's pardon, then. I did not know of it, and have not seen it. There is some new legislation in the bill, but it does not affect the points that I have raised.

Mr. BLOUNT. The gentleman claims to have a good deal of statistical information in regard to the reduction that has been made in the charges for transporting everything else carried by the railways during the past few years, and I beg to say to the gentleman, on behalf of the committee, that they will be very glad to have that information, and that they concur with him entirely in the views he has expressed in relation to the compensation paid to the railroads.

Mr. PETERS. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention to one feature of this bill, namely, the increased compensation which it provides for postmasters of the third class. That compensation appears to be for "light, rent, and fuel," but I think it will be generally conceded that that is only another name for increasing the salaries of this class of public officers. I wish in connection with that to call attention to a new system that has grown up under this Administration.

I do not think it has ever before happened in the history of this Government that appointees holding office under the Administration and receiving salaries from the public Treasury have held a national convention and passed resolutions asking for an increase of their own salaries. This, I think, is the first instance of that kind we have ever had in this country, and I desire in this way to call public attention to it. This proposed increase amounts to about $650,000, and I do not think it is at all necessary. We have not heard it said, I believe, that there was any very great difficulty found in getting men to fill these offices of third-class postmasters. The fact is that there never has been such a clamorous demand for these offices as there has been under this Administration, and I was sorry to find the chairman of the committee [Mr. BLOUNT], after denouncing that clamor in regard to other matters, yield complacently to this demand, which has been made in a more offensive way than any other.

Mr. BLOUNT. I am sure the gentleman does not wish to do me injustice, and I wish to say to him that I have never in any place assented to the propositions in the bill reported by the convention of postmasters.

Mr. KERR. You have assented to one demand which they made—the demand for an increase of the compensation of third-class postmasters.

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes; and the gentleman was in his seat when I asked unanimous consent for that and obtained it, and he did not object.

Mr. KERR. I did not hear the request or I should have objected to it. It was spoken in a quiet tone of voice. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLOUNT. Not at all. I stood here in my place and made the request so plainly that no gentleman who was present could have failed to hear it.

Mr. KERR. Well, I did not hear it. But, aside from that, this increase is incorporated in the report of the committee; so it is hardly fair for the gentleman to say that he asked unanimous consent and no objection was made, when he has affirmatively recommended it in his report. This appropriation has been recommended in compliance with the demand of the Democratic postmasters in convention assembled.

Mr. BLOUNT. Let me say to the gentleman that that has not been done at the demand of the postmasters. It is a measure which has been recommended by two Postmasters-General, and by one of them, a Republican, before this Administration came in.

Mr. KERR. Yes; and I call attention to the fact that when this was recommended by a Republican Postmaster-General it was refused. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] rose and objected, and the appropriation was refused; but when a Democratic Postmaster-General makes the recommendation it is acquiesced in. Now, I believe in making appropriations for the facilitation of the carriage of the mails, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] have both been pleading for the recognition of the demands and necessities of the mail-transportation service. So far as that is concerned it is quite proper, but now when prices are going down, when gentlemen on the other side say that prices are continually being lowered, I say there is no excuse for this proposed increase of the salaries of the officials recently appointed by this Administration.

Mr. PETERS. The people do not understand that, according to the rules of this House for the consideration of appropriation bills, it is impossible to legislate—in other words, that it is impossible to ingraft upon an appropriation bill any new law unless it be done by unanimous consent. The fact that the people do not understand this question frequently brings to members of Congress, as well as to the petition-box in this House, a large number of complaints in the form of resolutions and requests. I have always seriously doubted the utility of such a rule. I, for one, have never been afraid of the decision of the majority of this House, provided we can get the majority in such a position as to hold them responsible. I do not believe in shirking responsibility, either political or otherwise; and one great trouble about this rule of the House is that it divides and scatters responsibility. One member may get up and make an objection, and you can not fasten the responsibility for the defeat of legislation upon any party or organization. That one individual has no responsibility as a politician, because party organizations are made up of aggregations of individuals. A party is an intangible and invisible thing—something that we can not see or feel. I know Republicans sometimes think that the Democratic party has been so rank that we could smell it, but there is some question about that.

Mr. STRUBLE. Oh, no; the gentleman is mistaken. [Laughter.]

Mr. PETERS. I am speaking of their virtuous attitude at present.

I say that I have often doubted the utility of the rule of the House which allows one objection to defeat legislation which might be ingrafted upon an appropriation bill. For instance, we have had gentlemen on both sides of the House arguing in favor of this legislation for the relief of fourth-class postmasters. I know, if I know anything in relation to the sentiment of this House, that a majority of the House is in favor of the very relief which has been spoken of by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MONTGOMERY], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE], and by members on this side of the House. Yet by reason of our rule of legislation a majority of this House can not ingraft on this bill what they believe ought to be placed there.

I do not intend to go into an extended argument in relation to the merits of this claim by fourth-class postmasters. I differ from my friend from Iowa [Mr. KERR], who has just spoken. I believe there are three parties to this question of office-holding: the first is the office-holder, the second the Government, and the third the public; and the fact is that this third party, the public, has really a greater interest in the efficient management of the office than the other two parties combined.

Now, it has been urged here that the provision suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas will increase the annual expenses of the Post-Office Department $1,040,000. I say that the people have never found fault with liberal expenditures in the Post-Office Department if, as a result, they have enjoyed efficient postal service. I have never heard any fault found with any provision of legislation which tended to make the postal service more efficient, and for the reason that no other Department of the Government reaches so near to the hearthstone of every family in our country as does the Post-Office Department.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman think that increasing the appropriations and giving in this bill $60,000,000 for the service of the Department will make that service effective?

Mr. PETERS. I will answer that in this way: I am aware that the administration of the Post-Office Department is in a different position now from that which was occupied by Republican administrations. Whenever an estimate was made by a Republican administration the appropriation bills never appropriated the full amount of that estimate. The gentleman from Illinois, who has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations, knows it to have been a fact that these estimates made by a Republican administration were always cut down. But this is not the case now, nor was it the case in the Forty-ninth Congress. The Post-Office Committee, which now has charge of this appropriation bill, has been liberal, and in both the first and second sessions of the Forty-ninth Congress appropriated almost the entire amount of the estimate made by the Post-Office Department; and this bill appropriates almost the entire estimate.

A MEMBER. And the committee has added to the estimate.

Mr. PETERS. Yes, as the gentleman suggests, an addition has been made to the estimates. That of course is in relation to an item which was not perhaps called directly to the attention of the Postmaster-General.

Now, I believe in appropriating just what the Department estimates as necessary; and then I believe in holding the Department strictly accountable for furnishing efficient service. If, after a fair trial, it does not furnish efficient service, it ought to be condemned not only on this floor, but throughout the country.

Mr. BELDEN. That is just what has been done. The present service is condemned throughout the country.

Mr. STRUBLE. What does the gentleman from Kansas say in reply to that?

Mr. PETERS. I do not propose to stand up here and argue that we have had efficient service. There are too many complaints in the section of country from which I come to allow me to stand up here and in the face of my friend from Iowa [Mr. STRUBLE] and my friend from New York [Mr. BELDEN] say that we have had an efficient service under the appropriations which have been made.

But I had not intended in the present argument to enter into that question at all. That has been dwelt upon by my colleague [Mr. PERKINS] perhaps with sufficient fullness. The thought I am trying to impress upon the House is this: Here is a bill which appropriates every dollar that has been asked by the Post-Office Department, and if we do not have efficient service, we shall know where the responsibility rests. Until recently the responsibility in this respect was divided. Republican administrations made certain estimates, and the Democratic Committee on Appropriations and a Democratic House refused to

appropriate the full amount of those estimates. Hence the Department could come in and say, "The amount you appropriated was not sufficient." Now, the point I wish to clinch in this mattter is that in the future I do not wish to hear from the Post-Office Department or from any official of the Department any such complaint as, "We are unable to grant your reasonable request because of the lack of appropriation." In regard to this question of clerk-hire, time and again within the last few years, when we have gone to the Department with reasonable requests for clerk-hire, we have been met with the assertion that the appropriations were not sufficient.

They have said when the appropriation is exhausted they can not supply clerk-hire to postmasters in post-offices of the second class. Now, we are all acquainted with the plan which has been adopted of apportioning what was left of the appropriation. We know post-offices needing $600 have it cut down to $400. Then the Post-Office Department, and the people perhaps hold your postmasters responsible for efficient service, when the Government itself has failed to give them the necessary appropriation for the purpose. If the Government expects efficient service, of course it is necessary to give the postmasters the money which the Government itself admits is required to provide that efficient service, and I do not wish to hear anything more of that kind of complaint from the Post-Office Department hereafter on this point, because the Post-Office Committee has given to the Post-Office Department all it asked for clerk-hire and for these other purposes which are deemed necessary.

When we go to the Post-Office Department with a request from the second-class offices or from the third-class offices, a reasonable request in favor of additional clerk-hire, I wish to have that clerk-hire granted, and I do not want to be met with the statement that the appropriation is exhausted and that the clerk-hire can not be given. If there is not appropriation enough for that purpose, I wish to say the Post-Office Department itself is responsible for the deficiency. It is that Department itself which is responsible because of its failure to estimate a sufficient sum of money to carry on the postal service of the country.

I have only one word more to say in relation to these fourth-class postmasters. I presume, Mr. Chairman, that I have a larger number of fourth-class postmasters in my district than there are in any other Congressional district in the United States. I have thirty-six counties in my district, all of them agricultural counties, and occupied by a population chiefly engaged in agricultural pursuits. No one will doubt, therefore, that I have in that district, as I have stated, a larger number of fourth-class postmasters than there are in any other district in the United States.

Now, these fourth-class postmasters do not hold those offices because they want them. On the contrary, the great difficulty is, in a large number of instances in my district, at least, to get men who will take the offices. And why? Because the compensation amounts to nothing. The only way we can get men to take these offices is by assuring them that it is demanded for the convenience of their neighbors and for the good of the neighborhood in which they live.

Why, sir, I have had offices discontinued in my district and the people of the neighborhood deprived of the mail service because no one could be found who was willing to take charge of the post-office. For this reason no man will make a public thoroughfare of his house and submit to the inconvenience, even for the good of the neighborhood, by having the post-office established there.

And, sir, because there was no one to take the post-office, for that reason the post-office was discontinued, and the people were deprived of the mail facilities and conveniences which they are entitled to under the law.

I know the proposition of my friend from Arkansas does not increase the compensation of these fourth-class postmasters to any alarming extent. Twenty dollars per annum is not a sum calculated to scare any member upon this floor.

The only object of such an amendment is to give to the fourth-class postmaster a sufficient amount of money with which to keep his house cleared from the dirt necessarily incident to the administration of a post-office.

Oh, but you say, the revenue of these fourth-class post-offices will not justify anything of that kind. I say you might as well abolish these post-offices on that ground, because there are few of them that furnish any excess of revenue over receipts. That is not the ground upon which the Post-Office Department was founded. It was not intended as a money-making scheme by the Government; it was not intended by our fathers to be established as a scheme to bring money into the Treasury of the United States, but it was intended simply and solely to bring within reach of the people of the United States the great conveniences of the postal system.

As I said awhile ago, the appropriations which are made for the support of that Department are paid by the people themselves. They are not involuntary, but they are paid voluntarily and willingly by the people of the United States themselves. They furnish the money not only to carry on the Post-Office Department, but to carry on the Government itself.

I care not, therefore, whether the revenues be sufficient or not, whatever is necessary for the efficiency of the postal service should be provided. I do not care whether it will take a large sum of money or a small sum of money, I am in favor of appropriating whatever is required in excess of the revenues to make the postal service efficient.

Now, I have said about all I care to say upon this bill. I am glad that we have succeeded in getting in an appropriation to provide for rent, light, and fuel to third-class postmasters throughout the United States. I have had some ludicrous illustrations under the old system of the inequalities of that law. I had one post-office in my district where the postmaster paid out $150 in addition to the amount of his salary in order to carry on efficiently the business of his office, besides giving his own time. Why was it? It was because the rapidly increased business of the office was so unexpected, so marvelous, you may say, that the Post-Office Department was not able to keep pace with it.

I do not blame the Post-Office Department except in this: that there is too much inclination—and it is the only criticism I shall make upon the Department—there is too much inclination to measure this whole United States of ours by the business of one or two States. There does not seem to be a disposition on the part of the officials, at least some of them connected with the Post-Office Department, to take into account the wonderful, the almost marvelous growth of some portions of this country and some of the States, and add to their postal facilities in proportion to their growth as much as their increasing business and population demands. A little larger scope to the imagination, if you please, of these officials, a little broader view of business matters would give a much more efficient service in Texas, Kansas, Nebraska, and in many of the Territories.

How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. WARNER. If the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] will permit me a remark——

Mr. PETERS. Certainly.

Mr. WARNER. In the line of the observations made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] I wish to call attention to a great injustice done the city of Kansas, one of the leading cities and commercial centers of the nation. To illustrate, I find that the amount allowed the post-office in the city of Brooklyn for the last fiscal year for expenses was equal to 64 per cent. of the gross receipts of that office, while the amount allowed to the post-office in my city (the city of Kansas) was only 29 per cent. of its gross receipts.

Why this wide difference? I do not know that the amount allowed the post-office in Brooklyn is too large, but I do know that the allowance to the city of Kansas is totally inadequate to furnish the necessary clerks and letter-carriers to properly transact the business of that office. When application is made to the Post-Office Department for an additional allowance to meet the pressing demands on the office in my city, the answer received is that the appropriation has been allotted to the various offices, and we must patiently wait until the next appropriation is made. Would it not be well for the Post-Office Department in making allowances and estimates for the expenses of the various post-offices of the country to take into consideration the reasonable needs of such a growing city as the city of Kansas?

Mr. PETERS. That is a question for the executive and not the legislative department of the Government.

Mr. WARNER. That is true; but I hope through the legislative to reach the executive or administrative department, that a like injustice may not be done my city in the future.

To show the justness of my criticisms and to show that great injustice has been done my city, I submit the following table, giving the per cent. of expenses to the gross receipts:

	Per cent.		Per cent.
Kansas City	29	Detroit, Mich	52
Mobile, Ala	48	Minneapolis, Minn	37
San Francisco, Cal	41	St. Louis, Mo	43
Denver, Colo	37	St. Joseph, Mo	36
Wilmington, Del	46	Omaha, Nebr	29
Jacksonville, Fla	47	Newark, N. J	49
Atlanta, Ga	33	Albany, N. Y	58
Chicago, Ill	38	Brooklyn, N. Y	64
Indianapolis, Ind	41	Cincinnati, Ohio	39
Des Moines, Iowa	36	Philadelphia, Pa	43
Louisville, Ky	40	Providence, R. I	57
Topeka, Kans	32	Memphis, Tenn	32
Portland, Me	39	Galveston, Tex	43
Baltimore, Md	46	Richmond, Va	44
Boston, Mass	39	Milwaukee, Wis	59

Mr. PETERS. The gentleman would not claim, however, that they could be remedied by this bill.

Mr. WARNER. No. I am simply desirous of placing the matter before the committee.

Mr. PETERS. Because it is a question of administration and not of regulation.

Mr. STRUBLE. You should propound that to the Post-Office Department.

Mr. WARNER. I have done so.

Mr. DOCKERY. Perhaps it might be accounted for because of the difference in the Representatives from the two cities the gentleman compares.

Mr. WARNER. Yes; it may be that Brooklyn is represented by a Democrat, and therefore gets 64 per cent. That may be the reason, I will admit.

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not give that as a reason, but merely throw out the suggestion.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman builded better than he knew. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. DOCKERY. I believe the gentleman from Pennsylvania has six minutes remaining.

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not care to occupy further time.

Mr. BELDEN. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield to me, I wish to make a brief suggestion.

Mr. BINGHAM. I will yield a portion of the time.

Mr. BELDEN. The trouble, in my opinion, is in this connection, not where the gentleman is living or what city he may represent, but it is the civil-service reform of the present Administration [laughter] that makes all the trouble in the postal service; and I would like to inquire if the committee has anything to offer, or if it has any power to amend the bill so as to require that letter-carriers shall be able to read and write [laughter], or that postal clerks that distribute the mails from Chicago to New York, and who must keep track of the post-offices so as to distribute the mails without error, if they can make the appropriation so as to require the appointment of people who can read and write, and not have to discharge them and take back the old ones.

I believe, Mr. Chairman, that is where the difficulty lies. I do not believe that any of them get too much salary. I do not find fault with that; but in my own city I know that for some time there has been a post-office maintained contrary to law in the same building and in the same room where liquor is sold, because if they added that post-office to the General Post-Office it would come under the provisions of the civil-service rules in regard to the employment of two clerks.

Now that is the difficulty in appropriating money for the officials who come under the civil service system. I approve of the civil-service myself, but do not like the kind they are giving us; and I should like to ingraft something on this bill if it can be done to meet the trouble by which they may change their mode of civil-service appointments in this respect.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I have simply this to state with reference to the proposed amendment increasing the compensation of postmasters of the fourth class. That body of subordinate officials of the Government numbers upwards of 52,000. It has a classification as to compensation that runs from $10 or $12, which I believe is the lowest, up to $1,000 a year.

The increase of $5 a quarter would, to my mind, be a gratuity to many and unjust to many. Twenty dollars to a man who does a work of $900 under the law would, to my mind, be a very different proposal from $20 to a man who, under the law, does work amounting to $12. A bill of that character is before the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads. The proposition of $20 means an increase of over a million dollars in the money cost of the service, I think in many cases unjustly applied, while in many other cases it might be justly applied.

Let that legislation come up after careful revision by the committee based on estimates by the Department. We then can have legislation upon it for the future. But to fix a sum of $20 in this bill would be simply a gift of $20 for this year.

I do not propose to suggest anything pertaining to politics on the one side or the other in the administration of this Department. I simply desire to state that the bill before the committee will receive full consideration. But the adding of a million dollars on this bill I do not think would be a measure of legislative justice.

Mr. DOCKERY. I believe that I have fifty minutes of my time remaining; but in view of the lateness of the hour and the fact that there is really no issue between us, I do not feel like trespassing upon the patience of the House to the full extent of the fifty minutes, and probably I will not do so.

So far as I have heard, no objection has been made to any item carried in this bill except the item suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR]. That gentleman is the only one on either side who has objected to any item that the bill carries, but complaint has been made that the bill does not carry items that ought to find a place in it. He objects to the allowance of rent, light, and fuel to third-class postmasters on the ground that the Democratic party has pledged the country and the House to a policy of economy.

I want to say to that gentleman, if he is the real friend of economy, and I do not question that—if he desires that the policy of economy shall find expression in the legislation of our appropriation bills, he must stand with the Democratic party in demanding a reduction of taxation. I do not propose to discuss the tariff question at this time, but the gentleman's objection suggests the condition that confronts us. Nearly all of the questionable propositions before Congress, and which clamor for consideration, are the logical results of the appalling surplus in the Federal Treasury, that to-day aggregates the enormous sum of $136,000,000. Sir, you need not expect frugality in expenditure—though that criticism does not apply to this bill—neither party of this country can expect honest and economical government if this surplus is to continue to accumulate in the Federal Treasury.

Mr. KERR. Can the gentleman from Missouri claim that there is a surplus after paying our national debt of a billion and a quarter?

Mr. DOCKERY. I claim there is a surplus so long as there is no indebtedness of the United States subject to payment and so long as we have to tax the people of this country to buy Government bonds at 27 per cent. premium.

Mr. KERR. If you had bought them a year ago, you would not have had to pay any such premium.

Mr. DOCKERY. If the gentleman will consult the quotations in the New York stock market one year ago, he will see the error of that observation.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is no politics involved in this measure. This is a business bill, in which my friend from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] and my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] have a common interest with the Democratic party. What the people of both parties desire is the best possible mail service at the least possible cost; but if they have to go either to the extreme of parsimony or to the extreme of extravagance they would prefer, in my judgment, the extreme of extravagance. But there is, and can be, no necessity for trenching upon either extreme.

I want now to refer briefly to the proposition presented by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] and indorsed by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] and other gentlemen on the floor. This proposition looks to an annual compensation of $20 to the 52,281 fourth-class postmasters, without any regard whatever to the business of the office or the service rendered by the postmasters, and, as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], increases the total annual salaries of that class in the sum of $1,045,620. Now, Mr. Chairman, from some investigation of this question I am forced to the conclusion that perhaps a large number of these postal employés are inadequately compensated. But a measure going to the extent of fixing the salaries of more than fifty thousand postmasters and involving a large expenditure of the people's money should, in my opinion, first receive the careful consideration of the Post-Office Committee, and that committee now have a proposition before them looking to the redress of the grievances of which this class of public servants complain.

Mr. LIND. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. LIND. I wish to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that other officers serving the United States who are paid by commissions also receive salaries? I will instance the receivers of public moneys, who get a fixed salary of $500 per annum in addition to the fees and commissions allowed by law.

Mr. DOCKERY. I believe that is so.

Mr. LIND. Now, if that is true, where is the injustice, where is the unreasonableness, as the gentleman puts it, of allowing a fourth-class postmaster a fixed salary of $20 per annum, or $5 per quarter, in addition to the commissions which he is allowed, when those commissions in the majority of instances are necessarily and absolutely inadequate, particularly when they do not exceed $12 a year?

Mr. DOCKERY. I am not familiar with the principles upon which is based the compensation allowed to receivers of public moneys, but I suppose that the $500 is intended to compensate them for a certain service which they are required to render, and that the additional compensation is contingent upon the business of the office.

Mr. LIND. Not at all. The gentleman is in error.

Mr. DOCKERY. Well, Mr. Chairman, I want to say to the gentleman that I would not under any circumstances consent to a basis of compensation that was arbitrary, that did not carry with it the idea of paying for the service actually rendered. The gentleman of course does not intend to be unfair, but he submits a proposition which is manifestly unjust as between this class of officials. He proposes to give a postmaster whose office does a business of only $12 a year a salary of $20, while at the same time he would give a postmaster who does a business of $600 or $700 a year no greater compensation. Now, sir, I insist that whatever remuneration is allowed this class of public officers ought to be based upon the service actually rendered to the Government.

Mr. LIND. So it is.

Mr. DOCKERY. If the postmaster does not render annually more than $20 worth of service to the Government, do not pay him more; but if he renders services worth $1,000, pay him $1,000.

Mr. PETERS. I wish to say to the gentleman that the object of this $5 a quarter is to pay the officer, not for any service he may render to the Government, but for the inconvenience to which he is subjected in furnishing office-room for the business of the Government.

Mr. DOCKERY. Then it is a matter of convenience, and not a matter of salary.

Mr. PETERS. A matter of convenience to the Government.

Mr. DOCKERY. Then, sir, it is proposed to contribute more than $1,000,000 annually for the "convenience" of 52,281 office-holders. If that is the basis on which the proposition rests I shall oppose it, both as a member of the committee and in the House.

Mr. PETERS. I beg to correct the gentleman. It is not for the "convenience" of the 52,000 office-holders, but for the convenience of 60,000,000 of people who are parties in interest.

Mr. DOCKERY. Well, the whole question of "convenience" must twine and cluster around the service actually rendered by the postmaster to the Government and the people.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. If no "convenience" and no compensation is to be allowed to fourth-class postmasters for "rent, light, and fuel," why is it that we so readily give $650,000 for the relief of only 1,864 third-class postmasters who rank just a little above the others?

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not intend that my colleague on the committee or any gentleman on this floor shall put me in an attitude of opposition to any just compensation which may be due to these fourth-class postmasters. My criticism is not based upon the ground that they have no grievances; it is directed against the proposition to raise their compensation without any regard to the service they render to the Government.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Any criticism which the gentleman makes on the proposition for the relief of the fourth-class postmasters will apply with much more force and effect to the third-class postmasters to whom you make an extra allowance of $350 a year each in this bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I have had a little experience and the Democratic members have had a little experience relating in some measure to this question which our Republican friends have not had for somewhat over three years [laughter], and that is that a good many of the 50,000 fourth-class postmasters are quite anxious to get and to keep these positions, not for the sake of the $20 "convenience" suggested by the gentleman from Kansas, nor yet for the compensation received under the present law, but because of the fact that the location of the post-office is ofttimes an inducement to draw trade, and thus serve as an adjunct to the business of the postmaster.

Mr. LIND. Yes; and to draw dirt to a farmer's house.

Mr. DOCKERY. Well, I do not know how it may be in Minnesota, but within the limits of the ten counties of my Congressional district I do not now recall a single post-office located in a farmer's house. I do not say that there are none, but I do not recall one.

Mr. PETERS. In answer to the last observation of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], I will say that two-thirds of the post-offices in our country are located in farmers' houses.

Mr. DOCKERY. Well, Mr. Chairman, Missouri is an older State and better settled, perhaps, than Kansas, and I have no doubt that my friend's observation is correct. But, Mr. Chairman, I insist that whether the office be located in a farmer's house or elsewhere, the compensation of postmasters, as well as all other Federal officials, should only go to the value of the service that is actually rendered to the Government. At the suggestion of my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], I desire to call attention to the present law fixing the compensation of fourth-class postmasters, which will be found on page 199 of the Postal Laws and Regulations. It is as follows:

SEC. 459. Compensation of Fourth-Class Postmasters.—That the compensation of postmasters of the fourth class shall be fixed upon the basis of the whole of the box rents collected at their offices and commissions upon the amount of canceled postage-due stamps (provided for in section 270 of the revised laws and regulations, edition of 1879 [section 557], and on postage stamps, official stamps, stamped envelopes, postal-cards, and newspaper and periodical stamps canceled on matter actually mailed at their offices, and on amounts received from waste paper, dead newspapers, printed matter, and twine sold, at the following rates, namely: On the first $50 or less per quarter, 100 per cent.; on the next $100 or less per quarter, 60 per cent.; on the next $200 or less per quarter, 50 per cent.; and on all the balance, 40 per cent., the same to be ascertained and allowed by the Auditor of the Treasury for the Post-Office Department in the settlement of the accounts of such postmasters upon their sworn quarterly returns: *Provided*, That when the compensation of any postmaster of this class shall reach $250 for four consecutive quarters each, exclusive of commissions on money-order business, and when the returns to the Auditor for four consecutive quarters shall show him to be entitled to a compensation in excess of $250 per quarter, the Auditor shall report such fact to the Postmaster-General, who shall assign the office to its proper class, and fix the salary of the postmaster as provided by section 1 of this act: *Provided further*, That in no case shall there be allowed to any postmaster of this class a compensation greater than $250 in any one of the first three quarters of any fiscal year, exclusive of money-order commissions, and in the last quarter of each fiscal year there shall be allowed such further sum as he may be entitled to under the provisions of this act, not exceeding for the whole fiscal year the sum of $1,000, exclusive of money-order commissions. (Act of March 3, 1883, sec. 2, 22 Stats., 602.)

Mr. BINGHAM. With the permission of the gentleman from Missouri, I desire to state that at every fourth-class post-office where the business done in the way of cancellation of stamps amounts to $50 a year the postmaster gets every cent of that amount, the Government up to that point getting no return whatever for all its work in the transmission of the mails.

Mr. McRAE. I would like the gentleman to state whether the postmaster's pay, under that law, has any relation to the labor performed by him; whether it is not based upon the sales of stamps, which may be very small, and upon nothing else.

Mr. BINGHAM. The compensation is based upon the cancellation of stamps, not the sale.

Mr. McRAE. Well, cancellation of stamps; I correct my statement in that respect.

Mr. BINGHAM. The compensation is based upon everything which is specified in detail in the statute.

Mr. McRAE. But it is not based upon the amount of labor performed, as the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] would lead the House to suppose. The postmaster may open and distribute the mails twice a day for six days in the week, and if he only cancels 10 cents' worth of stamps his compensation is only 10 cents.

Mr. BINGHAM. That might be the fact where there are two daily mails, but in many places that is not the case.

Mr. McRAE. And in many places it is.

Mr. BINGHAM. Up to $50 a postmaster of the fourth class receives compensation equal to the face value of all stamps canceled by him.

Mr. McRAE. But the compensation is not in proportion to the work performed by the officer.

Mr. BINGHAM. He gets everything up to that amount.

Mr. DOCKERY. The cancellation of the stamps is the gauge by which the labor of the postmaster is determined.

Mr. McRAE. Is that a fair gauge?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly it is, just as in the third-class offices the sale of stamps is the gauge by which the labor and compensation are there determined.

Mr. TAULBEE. I wish to ask the gentleman from Missouri whether or not it is a fact that the principal part of the labor of fourth-class postmasters, especially when the office is a distributing office, consists in the separation of mail matter which is in the first instance deposited at other offices and the stamps canceled there?

Mr. DOCKERY. I am obliged to the gentleman for that suggestion, because it directs my attention to one provision of this bill which I wish to notice. A complaint, which in my opinion has every element of justice, comes from a great many fourth-class offices that have during the last fiscal year done "separating business," that is, business not originating at their own offices, but in transit. This bill relieves that complaint by making an appropriation of $550,000 in excess of the appropriation of last year, which will enable the Postmaster-General to furnish relief to all these fourth-class postmasters who do "separating business."

Mr. TAULBEE. I have not carefully examined that provision of the bill, but I wish to know whether the matter of compensation for clerk-hire in distributing or separating mail is left discretionary with the Post-Office Department, or is it made the duty of the Postmaster-General to see that proper compensation is paid at these separating-offices?

Mr. DOCKERY. It is left discretionary, as it always has been. To change the method which has obtained in the Department for years past in that respect would of course require some new provision of law. And right there, in my opinion, there is necessary a reform contemplated by another bill which has been reported by the Post-Office Committee, and will be reached in due time.

Mr. TAULBEE. Now, if the gentleman will allow me one observation in reference to these fourth-class postmasters, I shall not interrupt him further. The difficulty in the rural offices of the district which I represent is in inducing persons to hold those offices. Men who are asked to accept them say that the office involves a responsibility which they do not wish to assume for the meager compensation allowed; and in my district there have been as many as thirty offices at one time which no one could be found to accept, and for which the Post-Office Department was unable to find persons who would take the positions, the complaint being the insufficiency of the compensation. In consequence of the inability to induce men to accept the appointments many of the offices have been discontinued; and at many places in my district to my personal knowledge the citizens of the neighborhood pay the postmaster a regular compensation for the services he performs.

Mr. DOCKERY. That may be true——

Mr. TAULBEE. Of course it is true.

Mr. DOCKERY. No question as to that. But wherever offices have been discontinued on that account you will probably find that in every instance the community is so sparsely settled that the business of the office is necessarily limited.

Mr. LIND. I wish to ask one question, and I will make it very brief. Has it ever come to the knowledge of the gentleman from Missouri that one of the principal reasons why the incumbents of these fourth-class country offices have so little remuneration is that the farmers as a rule mail their letters in the towns and villages to which their business frequently calls them, and thus the local postmaster is prevented from making anything out of the cancellation of the stamps? In view of this practice, which can not be prohibited by law, I say that these postmasters ought to receive some compensation independent of the cancellation of stamps. At present in many cases they distribute the mails for a community, but get no benefit from the cancellation of the stamps on the letters which those people mail.

Mr. DOCKERY. I have no doubt that there is force and significance in the observation of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND]; but, as a result of the limited investigation I have been able to make on this question, I will state that one of the principal reasons for complaint is the fact that the fourth-class postmasters are compensated on the basis of the face value of the stamps they cancel——

Mr. LIND. And in many cases they do not get a chance to cancel the stamps.

Mr. DOCKERY. They get a certain per cent. of the value of the canceled stamps, and the reduction of postage from 3 to 2 cents has of course operated to decrease their compensation. But I must hasten on, and in concluding my observations on this point will simply add

that the Post-Office Committee, in connection with the Post-Office Department, are now endeavoring to mature some legislation that will afford relief to this very worthy class of Government employés.

Mr. Chairman, I regretted to hear the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS], in the discussion of this bill, make observations political in their bias and tendency, and, I may add, sectional in their nature. I sincerely regret these observations, because, in my opinion, they do injustice both to the gentleman's head and to his heart. The postal laws of the United States are uniform in their operation, and but very little discretion is allowed to any officer of the Post-Office Department. In the discriminations and distinctions which the gentleman sought to find he must have included clerk-hire, for which about $6,000,000 is appropriated in this bill; and this is the only item of any moment in this bill, carrying $60,000,000, which permits discretion to any officer of the Department. When the gentleman from Kansas made his statements he must have known that the officer who now disburses the appropriation for clerk-hire is one of the hold-over Republican clerks of the last administration.

A MEMBER. Turn him out! [Laughter.]

Mr. DOCKERY. There are no objections on my part. This fact also suggests an error in the views of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BELDEN]. He seemed to think that the only trouble connected with the administration of the Post-Office Department arises from the peculiar sort of civil-service reform now in vogue. I admire the newborn zeal of the Republican party in behalf of civil-service reform, and have only to regret that affection so touchingly tender should have not been manifested prior to the 4th of March, 1885.

But, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BELDEN] further insisted that the great need of the postal service in New York was the appointment of letter-carriers, and other employés, who could "read and write." I do not desire to embarrass the postal service of New York with any such regulation as that. [Laughter.] Of course there would be no trouble from such a provision as applicable to Missouri, Illinois, Kansas, or the Western States generally; but I do not ask any iron-clad restriction that would necessarily embarrass the New York postal service, and especially the district from which the gentleman hails. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to be driven into a discussion of "civil service reform" in this connection, and will leave that question with the single observation that I did not favor the civil service law when it was enacted under Republican rule, for the reason that I think any administration of the Government ought to be in the hands of its friends. If that position is obnoxious, as suggested by the remarks of the gentleman from Vermont, in his proposition to elect postmasters, then, gentlemen, make the most of it. I believe the party in power should be responsible to the people, and have the privilege of selecting its own agents to conduct the affairs of the Government.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BINGHAM. In view of the gentleman's utterances, and to show that he is in perfect accord with his party, I desire to state that every first, second, and third class postmaster appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, has been changed with the exception of less than two hundred; and of the fifty-two odd thousand fourth-class postmasters in the United States, forty-five thousand have been changed during the present Administration.

Mr. DOCKERY. I am delighted to hear the statement of the gentleman, but can not yield now for a speech.

Mr. BINGHAM. I simply desired to state that the present Administration (since the gentleman has seen proper to discuss politics) is thoroughly in accord with the sentiments he has just expressed.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman will bear me witness that I did not begin the discussion of politics. I only responded to remarks made by other gentlemen. I want to say that the gentleman from Pennsylvania can not force me into any position of seeming antagonism to the Administration. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman is perfectly consistent with his utterances, I have no doubt.

Mr. DOCKERY. Our friends are quite right, as suggested by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] in a recent debate. Get your laugh in now; but wait until November comes and you will find all the wings of the Democratic party "flapping together," and we will re-elect Grover Cleveland President of the United States by an overwhelming majority. [Applause.]

Mr. KERR. And on his civil-service platform, too?

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, I suppose so. [Laughter on the Republican side.] There will be no trouble about that, gentlemen, and you can make yourselves perfectly content.

But the gentleman from Pennsylvania well knows that in the conduct of the mail service, especially the railway postal service—and if I am not stating the proposition correctly I invite him to challenge the statement here and now—it has been essentially a non-partisan service.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is true; but——

Mr. DOCKERY. I am very much obliged to the gentleman for confirming my statement.

Mr. BINGHAM. But not with reference to the subordinate officials of the Department. I was talking to the gentleman in response to his suggestion about that particular branch of the service, indicated by postmasters of the class I have named. I have invited his attention to the number of postmasters that have been removed of the various classes. If, however, the gentleman wants to go into the other question of the subordinate officials of the Department, I am perfectly willing and ready to meet him now or at any other time.

Mr. DOCKERY. I only wanted the gentleman to indorse my statement, and I hardly think it necessary to pursue the subject further. I will not do so except to state that the intent, spirit, and purpose which bristles in the observations of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] are not, in my judgment, warranted by anything which has occurred in the management of the Post-Office Department. I assert that there has been no discrimination whatever against the State of Kansas in favor of Nebraska.

Mr. BINGHAM rose.

Mr. DOCKERY. Well, the gentleman has made his statement, and I beg to be allowed to proceed.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. DOCKERY. One at a time. I can not yield now. I repeat, there has been no discrimination whatever against Kansas. There have been complaints, some of them possibly well founded, because that young State is striding forward in the march of progress, and is destined to become one of the greatest States of the Union; and it is only to be expected, and in fact inevitable, that there should be some complaints because of the rapid and unprecedented growth of that section of country.

But when the gentleman intimates that this Administration has been sectional in its conduct of the Post-Office Department and has discriminated in the least against that State or against any State, he does not, in my opinion, do justice either to his great ability or to the generous, manly impulses which usually control his action.

The administration of the Post-Office Department has been subjected to one criticism by the other side, and that I will not speak of further than simply to give it a passing notice. It has been claimed that the late Postmaster-General, Mr. Vilas, has gone to the extreme of parsimony in the conduct of the Department. But, so far as I am advised, I do not believe that the statement has any foundation whatever in fact.

Mr. PERKINS. I gave the figures to substantiate what I said.

Mr. DOCKERY. But the gentleman can not afford to be unfair in the presentation of figures, or in any wise misstate the position of his opponents, or seek to put them in an attitude they do not properly occupy.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman now allow me to interrupt him for a moment?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. I simply confined my first inquiry to postmasters appointed by the President. The gentleman from Missouri has called attention to the wise administation by that Department of the postal-car clerk system. I wish to impress upon the gentleman that he knows that is a classified service running from $800 to $1,400 per annum; and I make this response to him with reference to that, that every man without a single exception on the probationary roll of that service and every man receiving the $800 compensation which comes to him after six months' service has been changed by the Post-Office Department; every man in the lowest grade, without an exception, has been changed; only those men have been retained who have had such experience that any administration without regard to partisanship could not and would not change that portion of the force; but where they dared to do so they have changed the force.

Mr. DOCKERY. I am sorry to interrupt the gentleman from Pennsylvania when he is paying so eloquent a tribute to the civil-service reform policy of the Administration, but I only yielded for a question, not a speech.

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman, I presume, did not hear my last words, that they had only refrained from changing where they did not dare to change.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, let me make this declaration in reply to the gentleman, not only as applying to the postal Department, but as applying to all others, that there is no duty discharged by any citizen of this Republic that some other citizen can not discharge equally as well. [Applause.]

Mr. BINGHAM. After experience he would become qualified.

Mr. DOCKERY. We will get the experience; you give us the opportunity. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, I regret that this debate has drifted away from the real question presented to the House for consideration, and that is the business proposition of carrying the mails in the speediest and most satisfactory manner to our people. In this connection I ask to indorse the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as it relates to the compensation now paid to the railroads of the country, and the necessity for its revision. I agree with him fully, and I believe every member of the Post-Office Committee agrees with him, that some readjustment of the mail pay to railroads should be made and made speedily in the interest of both the people and of the Government.

And now, Mr. Chairman, I believe I have discussed all the propositions that have been presented by the various gentlemen who have preceded me. The Post-Office Committee have increased the appropriation for the ensuing fiscal year $4,341,190.59. They recommend this additional sum because the service requires it. The country is growing and developing with marvelous rapidity. New lines of railway are being projected, and especially in the West and South, despite some adverse influences, are there almost everywhere evidences of thrift and enterprise.

To keep pace with this spirit of enterprise we are compelled to increase the appropriations so as to send the mails to our people. I agree with what the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] has said. The committee have given the Post-Office Department every dollar they have asked, and I concur in the proposition of the gentleman, that the House and the country have now a right to hold that Department to a proper and efficient administration of the service. And if they do not give it, then the Republican party will have the right to complain; but, sir, they are of such a complaining nature I would not have it understood that all the complaints they make are well founded. I am inclined to think that after November their complaining will intensify, and that they will, perhaps, not be prepared to render us full justice.

Mr. PETERS. We have been long suffering thus far under your administration.

Mr. DOCKERY. I know you have been "suffering" ever since the 4th of March, 1885 [laughter], and there has been a suffering and complaining spirit all along the line of the Republican party, and according to present indications there is no prospect that that suffering is to cease at an early date.

Mr. PETERS. If the gentleman from Missouri had to make his living by prophecy, it occurs to me he would make a mighty poor living.

Mr. DOCKERY. I will put my gifts in that direction against those of the gentleman from Kansas at any time.

Mr. Chairman, how much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has twelve minutes of his time remaining.

Mr. DOCKERY. I yield the twelve minutes remaining to the chairman of the committee [Mr. BLOUNT].

Mr. BLOUNT. There have been some criticisms made with reference to the mail service in the Northwest and West, especially in Kansas and Nebraska. There have always been, and always will be, complaints about the mail service in all the States of this Union under any administration. Such complaints are always made by the people without regard to parties. The truth is the records of the Department show that while there are complaints at this time of the service in the State of Kansas—I select that State simply because gentlemen representing it on this floor have alluded to it—the fact, I say, is that while there are complaints of the service in that State, the complaints are not so great as they have been at other times; not so great as they have been during a Republican administration of the Post Office.

Those complaints were made by Republicans and by Republican newspapers, just as at this time there are complaints made in some sections of the country by Democrats and by Democratic newspapers. The fact is, the public are sensitive in reference to the mail service, and their complaints we shall always have with us.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] claims that there has been undue advantage given to the South over the section of the country in which he lives. Upon that point I shall ask to have inserted in the RECORD the answer of the Postmaster-General to those complaints. I do not care to take the time to have it read now; but, as the question has been raised in this discussion, I shall add it as a supplement to my remarks.

Furthermore, the gentleman says, referring to the special facility fund, which commences at Springfield and goes down along the Atlantic coast to Tampa with a view of connecting into Cuba, and which was suggested by the Northeastern section of the country—the gentleman says that most of that fund is expended in the South.

I wish to call his attention to page 395 of the last report of the Postmaster-General in reference to the fast mail from Pittsburgh to Kansas City. While the expenditure there was not designated as a "special facility fund," there was a massing of the mails and a reweighing of them, which resulted in an increased outlay on the part of the Government to the amount of $250,000—a sum a good deal larger than this fund which the gentleman claims has gone principally to the South and which was designed to facilitate the transmission of the mails through that section of the country, and has done so.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to ask the gentleman whether any extra compensation was given for the carrying of that mail to Kansas City?

Mr. BLOUNT. Why, certainly. Under the law the reweighing does not necessarily take place more than once every four years; but the Postmaster-General, in view of a contract to give an increased speed and greater facilities, agreed that those mails should be massed and reweighed, and the result was to take out of the Treasury $250,000 extra for that service, making a deficiency this year.

Mr. PERKINS. Does not the Postmaster-General show in his last annual report that no extra compensation is paid for the carrying of the fast mails to Kansas City?

Mr. BLOUNT. No, sir. On the contrary he shows that extra compensation was paid in the way I have stated.

Mr. PERKINS. The mail was carried; but, if I recollect right, he says explicitly that no extra compensation was paid for the service.

Mr. BLOUNT. Well, I have referred the gentleman to page 395 of the report, showing the contract that was made, and the gentleman can examine it at his leisure.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I desire to say, and if there is no objection I now ask that the general debate be considered as concluded.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The following is the letter of the Postmaster-General referred to in Mr. BLOUNT's remarks:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March —, 1888.

SIR: I have received the following resolution adopted by the House of Representatives on the 10th of February, ultimo:

"*Resolved*, That the Postmaster-General be directed to inquire into and inform the House of Representatives of the cause and foundation of the grievances complained of in the subjoined editorial, taken from the Capital, a daily paper published at Topeka, Kans., under date of January 11, 1888, and also to inform the House whether the alleged complaint prevailing in the West against the present unsatisfactory mail service results from the appointment of inexperienced and incapable employés, or from inadequate and insufficient appropriations to meet the wants of the Post-Office Department and the needs of the people, or whether it results from other causes, and if so, what; and also, that the Postmaster-General be directed to further inquire and inform the House of Representatives what, if any, improvements or extensions have been made in the mail service of the West during the last three years.

"THE MAIL SERVICE OF KANSAS.

"Never at any time in the history of Kansas has there been in the United States mail service such an utter disregard of the rights of the people as at this time. Notwithstanding the great increase in population, the stupid attempt on the part of the Administration to make a record for economy has cut down the clerical force necessary to properly distribute the mails at large offices and in the mail trains, and it is consequently too small to do the work. Tons of mail matter pass through Kansas on the trains westward that can not be disposed of by the force allowed by the Post-Office Department. The result is that it is carried past the towns where it belongs and brought back after two or three days' absence in Colorado and New Mexico. It is not the fault of the railway clerks, because the Department asks of them a task that it is not possible for them to perform.

"The people of Kansas have been patient and the press has been lenient over this Democratic folly. Mails going west are so heavy that men working to the extent of their strength, doing more than double duty, can not handle them. Appeals to the Department at Washington for adequate help to take care of this important public service are unheeded. The railway mail service through Kansas has become criminally neglectful, and it is time this attempt of the Democratic party to make capital by a show of false economy should be brought to the attention of Congress. In reply to continued appeals for the Department to send a man to examine the railway mail service in Kansas an agent came, and overlooking the tons of mail that could not be distributed in time to be thrown off at the towns where it belonged he succeeded in having two or three clerks fined for not having the regulation gold-lace band on their cans, and thus civil-service reform was indorsed and the record of the party for economy maintained."

In compliance with said resolution, I respectfully report to the House of Representatives that the subject upon which inquiry and information are directed has received my careful consideration.

The alleged "grievance" referred to in the resolution is that—

"Notwithstanding the great increase in population, the stupid attempt on the part of the Administration to make a record for economy has cut down the clerical force necessary to properly distribute the mails at large offices and in the mail trains, and it is consequently too small to do the work; [that] tons of mail matter pass through Kansas on the trains westward that can not be disposed of by the force allowed by the Post-Office Department. The result is that it is carried past the towns where it belongs, and brought back after two or three days' absence in Colorado or New Mexico."

KANSAS.

It is alleged that "the railway mail service through Kansas has become criminally neglectful," and that appeals to the Department are unheeded.

Careful inquiry and close examination of the complaints made from time to time to the Department, or through the several divisions of the railway mail service, as to the service in Kansas, and generally in the region west of the Mississippi, fail to disclose any tenable ground for the complaint quoted in the resolution. In no section of the country embraced in the system of the railway mail service has there been, during the past three years, more prompt and liberal response on the part of the Department to the needs of the people in respect of mail service.

On the 30th of June, 1885, there were 121,032 miles of railroad covered by the railway mail service. June 30, 1886, this mileage had increased to 123,355; June 30, 1887, to 130,949, and on the 31st of January, 1888, to over 136,207 miles; an increase since June 30, 1885, of 15,175 miles. Of this increase during the year ended June 30, 1886, 206 miles were added in Kansas. During the year ended June 30, 1887, Kansas received 1,353.06 miles of new railway mail service; and since that date up to January 31, 1888, 1,350.66.

The total increase in Kansas alone since June 30, 1885, has been 2,949.72 miles, or 19.44 per cent. of the increase of the entire country, and of this, 2,753.72 miles have been added in the last nineteen months.

The establishment of so large an amount of new service over new railroads has, of course, rendered necessary the appointment and assignment to duty thereon of a large number of railway postal clerks or their transfer from other lines, or, in many instances, the extension of runs of those previously employed over the new road added to the service.

The number of railway postal clerks employed in the entire service June 30, 1885, was 4,387. The number so employed June 30, 1886, was 4,573; June 30, 1887, 4,851, which had risen on the 31st January, 1888, to 4,988, making a total increase since June 30, 1885, of 601.

Of the whole increase of 601 in the entire country, 200 clerks have been added to the force employed in the seventh division, in which Kansas is situated, since June 30, 1885.

Practically one-third of the additional clerks whose employment has been required by the railway development of the country in the past thirty-one months have been assigned to duty in the division of the railway mail service which embraces Missouri, Kansas, Arkansas, Texas, Colorado, New Mexico, and the Indian Territory.

In the establishment of so much new service, involving as it does new connections, changes of schedule, rearrangement of mail routes, and to a considerable extent new schemes for distribution, the establishment of requisite mail service, and the necessary employment of numerous clerks without previous service, it would be unexampled in human experience if some errors did not occur resulting in occasional delays of specific articles of mail matter, or their miscarriage. It is due to the men engaged in this laborious service to state that there is no warrant for the charge that there is derangement, demoralization, or deterioration of the service, or any part of it, resulting from incompetence or inexperience on their part. The complaints made to the Department and to the division headquarters of the railway mail service are, moreover, less frequent than formerly, and are steadily diminishing in number and frequency. Greater accuracy and higher efficiency is the continuous record from March 4, 1885.

The resolution requires information as to whether the alleged complaints, referred to therein, "result from the appointment of inexperienced and incapable employés."

INEXPERIENCED EMPLOYÉS.

In response to this branch of the inquiry, I respectfully submit that in no instance where the specific complaint has been brought to the attention of the Department from the western divisions of the railway mail service, has incompetency or inexperience of railway postal clerks or clerks in post-offices caused any embarrassment to the service or impairment of its general efficiency.

The results of the tests, by which the efficiency of clerks in the railway mail service have been for some years tried and their competency proved, present a very favorable exhibit for the efficiency of the present service.

The following table gives the average percentage in correctness in case examinations of railway postal clerks for the past six fiscal years:

Year ended June 30—	Permanent clerks.	Probationers.
	Per cent.	*Per cent.*
1882	77.05	80.49
1883	87.46	89.37
1884	78.19	81.44
1885	82.23	83.11
1886	81.61	82.68
1887	87.50	89.34

These examinations are thorough tests of fitness of a clerk for the discharge of his duty, as they fully measure his knowledge, the quickness and accuracy of his memory and accuracy of rapid distribution of mail matter so as to forward or dispatch it by the most direct or expeditious route to its destination. They are conducted by the same excellent method adopted prior to 1885, and the results computed and arrived at in the same manner and on the same basis, so that the examinations are accurate and infallible comparative tests of efficiency.

By these it is demonstrated that there is not only a steady improvement in the accuracy and competency of the permanent appointees, but that the probationers or new appointees for the past three years have been of a high order of efficiency and passed a better examination at the expiration of their probationary period by a very considerable percentage than is recorded for the like results in the three years previous to June 30, 1884.

Inquiry as to the statistics for the sixth and seventh divisions (embracing the Western and Northwestern section of the country) discloses that the railway postal clerks in these divisions have not fallen behind, but kept fully abreast of the general average, and that their percentage of correct work, both as to permanent and probationary clerks, is over 10 per cent. above the general average of the three years ended June 30, 1884. This is shown by the following tables compiled from official reports:

Case examinations of railway postal clerks during probation, 1882 to 1887, inclusive.

[Sixth and seventh divisions only.]

Division.	Year ended June 30—	Probationary appointees.	Examinations.	Cards handled.	Cards correct.	Cards incorrect.	Cards not known.	Average per cent. correct.	Probationers who received permanent appointments.	Average per cent. correct during probation made by those permanently appointed.
Sixth	1882	(*)	105	91,505	58,045	6,785	25,675	63.66	(*)	(*)
	1883	235	459	435,573	368,938	24,359	42,276	84.70	139	93.93
	1884	238	459	402,409	347,408	27,052	27,949	86.92	143	86.32
	1885	322	510	457,140	360,119	62,051	34,970	78.77	96	85.51
	1886	365	954	931,850	741,506	110,807	79,537	79.00	216	80.01
	1887	291	743	860,117	676,912	123,604	59,601	78.69	178	82.32
Seventh	1882	145	316	198,897	164,418	20,627	13,852	82.66	70	88.77
	1883	208	533	351,279	282,833	40,935	27,511	80.51	127	86.70
	1884	177	426	287,105	220,805	29,299	37,002	76.90	89	88.44
	1885	246	548	367,037	285,415	36,554	45,068	77.76	74	86.29
	1886	175	574	417,383	356,007	38,711	22,665	85.29	132	88.63
	1887	229	751	551,053	453,398	59,875	37,780	82.27	134	87.27

* Not reported.

Case examinations of permanent railway postal clerks, 1882 to 1887, inclusive.

[Sixth and seventh divisions only.]

Division.	Year ended June 30.	Examinations.	Cards handled.	Cards correct.	Cards incorrect.	Cards not known.	Average per cent. correct.
Sixth	1882	213	244,279	227,454	9,311	7,514	93.11
	1883	300	334,228	318,364	9,447	6,417	95.25
	1884	564	693,239	651,788	23,311	18,143	94.02
	1885	861	1,183,495	1,107,816	31,437	44,242	93.60
	1886	417	502,996	480,212	4,466	18,318	95.47
	1887	698	965,522	911,523	19,006	34,993	94.40
Seventh	1882	252	195,172	170,993	17,163	7,016	87.60
	1883	954	615,692	568,589	37,936	9,167	92.34
	1884	890	563,003	516,293	31,862	14,848	91.79
	1885	819	655,298	615,213	37,647	2,438	93.88
	1886	1,009	823,882	774,966	39,983	8,933	94.06
	1887	1,077	701,004	657,179	35,431	7,394	93.74

When it is considered that the service in the region embraced in these divisions has undergone almost constant change; that new routes have been constantly opening or extending; that new, rival, and competing roads have in many cases confused and embarrassed the service by their refusal to make proper connections—and to this cause alone is attributable most of the complaint against the railway mail service, although entirely beyond the departmental control—and that the clerks have been constantly required to adapt their work to new and shifting conditions, their record for correctness and efficiency becomes quite remarkable. Their service, as well in bulk and volume of mail matter as in the intricacy and multiplication of routes, has become much more difficult, demanding a far higher degree of knowledge, skill, and activity.

THE ALLEGED CUTTING DOWN OF CLERICAL FORCE IN KANSAS POST-OFFICES.

This inquiry involves the sufficiency of allowances for the clerical force in post-offices.

Full general information upon this subject, and an exhaustive discussion of the faults of the present system of making allowances, may be found in the report of the Postmaster-General for 1887, the consideration of which I earnestly commend to Congress.

From the following compilation it will be seen that the principal or largest post-offices of Kansas have been generously dealt with in the matter of allowances for clerk-hire, as compared with others, in the apportionment of the appropriation for that branch of the service.

Post-offices.	Year.	Gross receipts.	Salary.	Clerk hire.	Per cent. of expenses to gross receipts.
Abilene	1884	$7,932.54	$1,900.00	$400.00	29
	1885	8,437.15	1,900.00	400.00	27
	1886	9,229.30	2,000.00	400.00	26
	1887	10,241.66	2,000.00	700.00	28
Atchison	1884	25,408.08	2,750.00	4,500.00	54
	1885	26,417.14	2,700.00	4,041.66	49
	1886	27,344.79	2,700.00	3,861.54	47
	1887	31,521.21	2,700.00	4,000.00	42
Emporia	1884	16,489.68	2,500.00	1,500.00	29
	1885	19,442.80	2,500.00	1,700.00	27
	1886	19,252.52	2,500.00	1,700.00	25
	1887	20,350.38	2,500.00	1,700.00	24
Parsons	1884	9,840.65	2,200.00	1,200.00	56
	1885	9,521.80	2,100.00	1,400.00	44
	1886	9,388.45	2,200.00	1,300.00	44
	1887	10,291.60	2,100.00	1,200.00	38
Topeka *	1884	51,790.15	3,000.00	6,813.14	32
	1885	60,857.52	3,100.00	7,225.00	29
	1886	60,910.60	3,100.00	8,075.00	35
	1887	68,488.90	3,200.00	9,055.00	32
Wichita	1884	16,525.76	2,500.00	2,200.00	32
	1885	21,213.99	2,400.00	2,432.88	34
	1886	27,021.37	2,500.00	2,600.00	21
	1887	41,271.60	2,700.00	4,407.50	28
Lawrence	1884	22,074.60	2,550.00	3,650.55	33
	1885	23,030.28	2,600.00	3,400.00	35
	1886	22,675.61	2,600.00	3,808.90	54
	1887	24,943.73	2,600.00	3,600.00	51
Leavenworth	1884	28,927.01	2,850.00	3,970.93	50
	1885	28,412.78	2,800.00	4,280.00	48
	1886	29,019.13	2,700.00	4,226.50	47
	1887	29,435.79	2,700.00	4,280.00	49

* No rent paid.

Post-offices.	Year.	Gross receipts.	Salary.	Clerk hire.	Per cent. of expenses to gross receipts.
Ottawa	1884	9,543.53	2,125.00	689.28	33
	1885	10,602.33	2,100.00	720.00	30
	1886	10,996.81	2,200.00	960.00	32
	1887	11,943.95	2,300.00	1,200.00	33
Wyandotte	1884	14,308.70	2,275.00	798.00	26
	1885	11,900.91	2,274.73	947.00	33
	1886	15,199.55	2,400.00	1,332.62	29
	1887	16,878.26	2,400.00	1,534.44	28

From this table it appears that the allowances for clerk-hire in Kansas have not been "cut down," but for the most part largely increased; and the cause for complaint on this score, like those upon the others named in the article quoted in the resolution, falls with them.

In passing, I may say on the general subject of allowances for the expenses of post-offices that the unexampled increase and the continuing increase of business prosperity of the country during the past three years, which has shown itself in almost phenomenal demonstration in parts of the country, has exceeded the limit of any estimate by the Congress or by the Department, based as such estimates of increase have been on the previous history of the country in respect of this subject. There is undoubted need of largely-increased allowances at such places, but the want of power and of means to meet it ought not to be the subject of criticism.

The failure to promptly move for a remedy in cases that are without precedent and which could not have been foreseen in the light of experience would be blameworthy; but the charge of such neglect can not justly rest upon this Department. Action upon the earnest and repeated recommendations of my predecessors, and notably those of my immediate predecessor, would have lessened if it had not entirely prevented even such evils. But finding them existing the Department has promptly given such relief as was within its resources, and urgently called for the further means which the emergency demanded and demands.

I shall have the honor to submit some further recommendations to the House on this suject in another form and in another connection.

TONS OF MAIL MATTER NOT HANDLED.

The statement is made that—

"Tons of mail pass through Kansas on the trains westward that can not be disposed of by the force allowed by the Post-Office Department, the result being that it is carried by where it belongs and brought back after two or three days' absence in Colorado and Mexico. Mails going west are so heavy that men working to the extent of their strength, doing more than double duty, can not handle them."

A careful examination of the trip reports of the clerks in the seventh division for the months of October, November, and December, 1887, and January and February, 1888, shows that this statement is without foundation. No unworked Kansas mails were taken into Colorado or New Mexico during the months stated, and these being the heaviest months in the year, the assertion can safely be made that the charge is unwarranted. Owing to the severity of the winter, which was quite beyond the control of the Department, connections both at St. Louis and Kansas City have frequently been missed, the result being that clerks on the next outgoing trains had double mail connections, and occasionally in those cases some mail for the towns within 75 or 100 miles of the head of a run have been carried by and returned by next train.

The records of the Kansas City and Pueblo railway post-office day line for the months of December and January show that on six days during the former month, *i. e.*, on the 1st, 16th, 18th, 22d, 23d, and 24th, some paper mail was carried into Dodge City, Kans., and returned by next train, and on December 23 the night line on the same route carried by 29 sacks of newspapers. On January 22 the day line took in 10 sacks of unworked newspapers, and these are the only Kansas papers on this, the heaviest route in the State, which have been carried as far west as Dodge City, between October 1 and February 27, 1888. It may also be stated that during the early part of January, and before the introduction of this resolution, the fact that this unworked mail was carried so far west had been brought to the attention of the Department and steps taken to remedy it by having the clerks put to work in the car at Kansas City three hours before departure of the train; and since this change has gone into effect no mails have been carried by, even where double connections had to be met.

The records of the Department show that this question of double connections had always caused more or less disturbance to the mails, but owing to steps which have been within the last year taken to provide double crews for double connections, the disturbance has greatly decreased.

UNHEEDED APPEALS.

"Appeals to the Department at Washington for adequate help to take care of this important service are unheeded."

This statement is without foundation. Every call for additional help in any part of the service has been promptly investigated, and additional clerks supplied wherever necessary. At no time since the inception of the service, as shown by the records of this Department, have calls for clerical force been as promptly and fully met as during the past year.

FORMER COMPLAINTS FROM THE SAME SOURCES.

By the terms of the resolution I am directed to inquire as to the cause and foundation of the grievances, etc., contained in the article appended thereto.

In the absence of specific complaint to the Department, or to its officials charged with the investigation of amendment of defects in the railway mail service, except in a few instances, and in the course of inquiry, I have consulted the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, upon which a few complaint have lately been spread.

In the RECORD of January 31 last the following appears:

"KANSAS CITY, MO., *January* 25, 1888.

"DEAR SIR: Is it possible to bring to bear such pressure, by means of a Senate committee on investigation of Western mail service in Missouri and Kansas, as will rectify the present demoralized condition of said service?

"Our relations to this service are such that we suffer more, perhaps, than any other line of business and know more of its delinquencies than those engaged in other vocations.

"I can say, after eighteen years' continuous labor in this one office, with full facilities for learning as to general efficiency of the mail service, that it was never so bad nor so badly administered as during the past year, and that the tendency at this time is toward a down grade. Can you give this attention and bring it before the people in such manner as to lead to a reform?

"Very respectfully,

"J. A. MANN,

"*Secretary and Business Manager Kansas City Journal.*

"Hon. P. B. PLUMB,
"*Washington, D. C.*"

Complaints from this source, as appear from the files of the Department, were quite frequent in times past.

On the 28th of August, 1882, the same person wrote as follows:

"KANSAS CITY, MO., *August* 28, 1882.

"Mr. R. W. CAMP,
"*Chief Head Clerk, R. M. S., Kansas City:*

"'And can these things be, and not overcome us like a summer cloud?'

"Butler, Austin, Warrensburgh, Pleasant Hill packages for news-dealers all lost on the 24th and 25th August.

"They left this office in time for the mails; were delivered at the Kansas City post-office promptly.

"You will extend to the United States mail service our unbounded thanks that they did not lose the whole d——d mail on that day.

"Respectfully,

"JOURNAL COMPANY,
"J. A. MANN, *Secretary.*"

It appears that these and numerous similar complaints from the same writer did not produce satisfactory results, and that he had ceased to be grateful for a service that did not lose his entire mail, and in the issue of the Kansas City Journal of September 13, 1882, the following appeared:

"Had the 'star-route' trials included investigation of postal matters in this region, no one connected with that department of the Government service in Missouri or Kansas would have been convicted of 'expediting' the mails, whatever other delinquency might have been unearthed. From all quarters come complaints of such gross mistakes, such incompetency, that public protest can no longer be avoided.

"Sample instances can be given like the following: Twelve days elapsed between the day of postmark on a letter mailed within 85 miles of Kansas City, and plainly addressed, before it is delivered to its destination here. Whole packages go wandering about from day to day off their proper routes, yet no penalty or disability attaches to the delinquents. Indeed, the delinquents are carefully never found. A package of Journals is placed in the Kansas City post-office each morning addressed to a news-dealer, Lathrop, Mo., in ample time for the early mail. Here is the record for three consecutive days: That of September 7, received at Lathrop on morning of the 8th, and were marked, 'Missent.' "Package of the 8th in some way arrived at Lathrop on the 9th in the evening. This had been meandering about the country and was returned, marked 'Carried by.' Package to same address of the 9th was carried past its destination and returned same night, but no marks of delinquency on this, for the reason, presumably, that getting to its destination only twelve hours late, it was thought prompt enough to meet the wants of the most exacting. On a late occasion the whole of our mails for the line of the Missouri Pacific Railroad and tributaries were missent, as confessed by the post-office officials, but to heal the wound thus given we were assured that the Times mail was scattered in like manner.

"Upon certain lines like the Hannibal and St. Joseph, complaints of single papers and packages, especially of the weekly journal, are so frequent that we can not refer to half the cases. These weekly journals are invariably in the Kansas City post-office on Wednesday, yet often reach points but 50 or 100 miles from Kansas City on Friday or even on Saturday.

"So far as known, though dozens of these complaints have been referred to those having charge of mail matters in the past few months, not one case of discipline has eventuated.

"There should be some remedy and some indemnity. The Journal within a week lost a paying daily subscriber of four years' standing because he could no longer get his paper with either promptness or regularity. Another within a few days reported that he got but four papers out of seven the week previous. The complaints, we take it, are true representatives of the facts as they are, but in the face of it all invariably it results in 'nobody to blame.'

"Publishers usually fear to make any exposure lest in the slam-bang methods of handling their mails revenge be taken, parcels burst, and every trivial advantage be taken of a moment's lateness, slight indistinctness of an address, to say nothing of intentional abusos of their matter. There are many ways in which a complaining publisher can be placed at a disadvantage and the offender not be technically amenable.

"Here is the occasion for reform, and that reform will be best attained by a more careful supervision on the part of superintending officials, the placing a more strictly personal responsibility on employés, and a penalty of suspension or dismissal for well-authenticated cases of carelessness or inefficiency."

On the 19th of October, 1882, the same writer still further criticises the service:

"KANSAS CITY, MO., *October* 19, 1882.

"Col. E. W. WARFIELD,
"*Superintendent Seventh Division Railway Mail Service:*

"The inclosed postal of F. P. Morlan, postmaster, Dayton, Cass County, Missouri, refers to a fact from which we are made to suffer continually.

"The papers to which he refers is the Weekly Journal. Now, that edition of our paper is in the Kansas City post-office every week with rare exception by 2 p. m. Wednesdays. Seldom do they get it into the mails until Thursday evening and oftener Friday morning. There is an inefficiency about getting this weekly mail out of this city. They assume that it don't make any difference about when a weekly goes out; it frequently lays in the Kansas City post-office eighteen to thirty-six hours.

"One pretext is that they have not force enough to work the Journal and Times weeklies received on Wednesdays and in time to go out on Thursday morning's mails, so take their time to it, and the consequence is that the weeklies of both offices go out Friday mornings, or about thirty hours after being received at the Kansas City post-office.

"Do you think such a state of affairs creditable to a first-class office?

"Respectfully,

"JOURNAL COMPANY.
"J. A. MANN, *Secretary.*"

Later, on the 5th of November, 1882, the business manager of this same Journal sarcastically comments upon the management of the service in these words:

"KANSAS CITY, MO., *November* 5, 1882.

"Col. E. W. WARFIELD,
"*Superintendent Seventh Division, R. M. S., St. Louis, Mo.:*

"Your report and that of all subordinates for 30th November is remarkably clever, stupendously so. You can reach a most definite conclusion in reference to a matter of which we were, from an accident, painfully aware at the time. If you could be half as expert in finding out why all that part of our mails on the next day—when we were on time—including the entire lists for subscribers and dealers west of Harrisonville on the Missouri Pacific, including such points as Paola, Ottawa, Burlington, Emporia. All were missed, and from that day to this have missed about every other day.

"There is a nut for you to crack, and we may say your report is anxiously looked for. Here's a chance to do some work that will be of value.

"Respectfully,

"JOURNAL COMPANY,
"J. A. MANN, *Secretary.*"

Again, on the 7th December, 1882, he again found it necessary to make public complaint, as follows:

"The St. Joseph Gazette complains that the Kansas City papers quite often do not reach there until they are twenty-four hours old. We can return the compliment. Only yesterday the St. Joseph papers were delivered to us thirty hours after their publication. Of course, there is not excuse for this save the carelessness or inefficiency of the men who handle the mail on the cars. They often carry papers and letters past their destination and deliver them on their return trip. If there is too much mail matter for one agent to handle, the Department should furnish an assistant. If there is only work for one, and the agent fails to perform his duty, he should be dismissed. That is all there is to it. It is the people who pay for mail service, and they are entitled to prompt service."

Still failing to secure as efficient service as he deemed desirable, the same journal of the 27th February, 1883, contained the following editorial, from which it appears, according to this authority, that the railway-mail service had then degenerated into a nuisance:

"'The mail service in the matter of the delivery of the Kansas City dailies in this city is a double-distilled nuisance. More disappointment, and consequent profanity, is directly chargeable to the slip-shod manner in which these dailies are not delivered here than to all other irritating influences combined. In the first place with the laudable purpose of giving us the advantage of the earlier time schedule of train arrivals on the Missouri Pacific, the chief postal clerk arranged to send the Kansas City dailies over that route, but after some months of vexation and bother we have failed to perceive any improvement. In the first place a good portion of the time the Missouri Pacific train is late, sometimes not arriving until after the Santa Fé express, and quite as frequently the packages of papers are *non est* when it does get in. And not infrequently neither road brings the packages, as witness yesterday, when the Kansas City papers failed to come at all. Nobody seems to know who or what is to blame, and we would gently suggest to the newspaper managers at Kawsmouth the propriety of a thorough investigation.'

"'The Kansas City dailies failed to arrive on the Missouri Pacific yesterday. Newsmen are seriously considering the policy of discontinuing the purchase of these papers, as under present circumstances they generally remain on their hands. A little bit of business enterprise manifested on the part of the management at Kansas City, it seems to us, might easily regulate this matter. Our people are not desperately anxious to pay for old back numbers of Kawsmouth journals.'

"We reluctantly republish the above article taken from the editorial columns of the Ottawa (Kans.) Republican. Every effort that the managers of the newspapers at Kansas City could possibly exert has been put forth to secure to our patrons a prompt, faithful, and regular service of the Kansas City papers at all the points lying along the Missouri Pacific Railroad, trains over which leave this city at 4.15 a. m. We have appealed to the chief clerk of the mail service, and he has devoted much time and pains to remedy this evil, but without much success. We are told that when the train by accident gets off late from Kansas City the train from Holden, which crosses this early train at Harrisonville, pulls out even when the Kansas City train is in sight, leaving all the mails for Osawatomie, Ottawa, and the towns along the line behind for a day.

"We have aided in having an application filed with the chief officer of the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company in St. Louis, setting forth our trials and delays and asking aid. The results are not yet apparent.

"At the beginning of the dispatch of the new 'Texas express' from this city we made great efforts to place our paper in the new field. In thirty days the complaints of delays of an entire day were so frequent that 60 per cent. of the mail at first sent out was turned back upon the old routes, which do not leave the city until four or five hours later in the morning, while new subscribers rapidly disappeared because they could not get their papers regularly.

"From every source in Kansas where the Missouri Pacific extends there comes bitter complaints of the mails. Late, late, always late, from one to twenty-four hours. We have hitherto borne this annoyance and positive loss—for it is a serious loss to the Kansas City morning papers—without public complaint; but when our patrons take up the cry and charge the fault at our doors we must state the facts in self-defense, if nothing more. The one thing which would make our hearts glad and our patrons happy would be a regular mail service along the line on this road which could be run on time for thirty consecutive days."

The above complaints are certainly quite as bitter in tone and more specific in detail than any now appearing. They warrant at least the conclusion that censure of the mail service is not a new topic for editorial writing in that region of the country.

COMPLAINTS INVESTIGATED.

On the 31st of January last the following was spread upon the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date at page 828, being a quotation from the Abilene (Kansas) Gazette:

"The time has come, in fact it came long ago, for the United Saates Posta lauthorities to do something for the Western mail service. We do not know whether the rank service which we have been receiving is due to incompetency or lack of sufficient help; but one thing we do know, and that is it is about as weak as the people are going to stand by and accept without kicking vigorously. Day after day, week in and week out, this office has received numerous and repeated complaints of failure to receive papers. We have traced the matter down and find it is due to the rotten mail service. We are possessed of ordinary patience; but the time has gone by for us longer to remain silent. Yesterday morning at 3.30 the greatest outrage that has ever been perpetrated upon a daily newspaper in Kansas since the State was admitted into the Union was served the Gazette by the route agent who worked the mail going west on train No. 203, either through ignorance, drunkenness, imbecility, or maliciousness, we know not which."

The grounds for this complaint were at the time promptly investigated, and it was ascertained that the refusal to receive the matter referred to was that the clerk had acted in conformity with the laws and regulations, as the matter was not accompanied by a proper certificate of the postmaster that the postage had been prepaid.

Complaint was made by the Omaha Republican of the inefficiency of the mail service in Nebraska. A full investigation demonstrated the fact that the errors complained of were not chargeable to the postal service, but rested solely in the office of the paper whose publisher made complaint.

As an illustration of the inconsiderate nature of the attacks made upon the mail service, the following, recently published editorially in the Western School Journal, at Topeka, Kans., may be cited:

"When the mail was carried in a lumbering stage-coach and distributed once or twice a month, people were confident that it would some time reach its destination. To-day all is uncertainty; mail may and it may not reach the parties for whom it was intended. Subscribers have written us concerning their subscriptions, their letters were promptly answered, and in a few days they came back to us marked "Returned to writer." The only way we can reach people in such cases is to write to the county superintendent and request him to deliver our letters. If there is a business or newspaper man in the State who has not had cause to deplore the wretched condition of our mail service we would like to know it."

Upon the publication of this complaint the superintendent of the seventh division, under the general instructions of this Department to all division superintendents to promptly investigate the subject of any complaints in their respective divisions and report, requested the publisher to furnish specific grounds of complaint, that the defects in the mail service with respect to his publication might be traced out and amended. The publisher furnished sixty cases of alleged failure of subscribers to receive the paper. All these were carefully investigated, and the report thereon proves that with two or three exceptions of failure or delay in receiving copies the complaints were groundless. The failures in the residue of the cases, where any were found, resulted from removal of subscribers from one office to another, or from misdirection in address, or other mistake of the publisher.

The same publisher also submitted, to substantiate his complaints, thirteen cases in which letters or postal-cards had been sent out by him and returned marked "Returned to writer." In every case it was found upon examination that the letters or cards had been returned because unclaimed, and that in not one was the postal service in fault.

THE STAR-ROUTE SERVICE IN KANSAS.

Turning now to the star-route service in Kansas, there has been a decrease in the routes of this class of service of 1,548 miles since 1884. For this number of miles taken off, nearly 3,000 miles of railroad service have been added, and there are 9,217.25 miles of mail routes in this State. In 1884 there were 10,566 miles of star routes and an annual travel of 3,590,428 miles. On June 30, 1887, there was an annual travel, on 1,548 miles less of routes, of 3,220,538.50. The mileage by star routes is nearly the same as in 1884, but the miles of railroad service traveled annually in that State have swelled from 4,919,265 in 1884 to 5,882,086.75 in 1887.

THE INCREASE OF THE RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE IN THE WESTERN STATES AND TERRITORIES.

The following table presents the increase in the railroad service in the Western States and Territories and in expenditure therefor during the past three years:

Statement showing the number of messenger routes established and discontinued in the States and Territories named below for the period from July 1, 1886, to January 31, 1888.

States and Territories.	Routes established.	Routes discontinued.	Net increase.	Net decrease.
Texas	40	13	27	.....
Kansas	110	27	83	.....
Nebraska	23	10	13	.....
Dakota Territory	18	18	.....	.....
Montana Territory	3	4	.....	1
Wyoming Territory	.....	1	.....	1
Colorado	7	7	.....	.....
Arizona Territory	2	.....	2	.....
Utah Territory	.....	4	.....	4
Idaho Territory	2	3	.....	1
Washington Territory	11	5	6	.....
Oregon	20	8	12	.....
California	14	8	6	.....
Total	250	108	149 7	7
Total net increase	.....	.....	142	.....

Statement showing increase or decrease in the railroad service in the Western States and Territories, Texas to California, inclusive, from June 30, 1885, to January 31 1888, in length of routes and annual rate of expenditure, and from June 30, 1885, to June 30, 1887, in number of miles traveled per annum.

LENGTH OF ROUTES.

States.	Increase, June 30, 1885, to June 30, 1886.	June 30, 1886, to June 30, 1887.		June 30, 1887, to January 31, 1888.		Increase, June 30, 1885, to Jan. 31, 1888.
		Increase.	Decrease.	Increase.	Decrease.	
	Miles.	*Miles.*	*Miles.*	*Miles.*	*Miles.*	*Miles.*
Texas	271	603.46	.....	591.24	.....	1,465.70
Indian Territory	4	.12	.....	321.91	.....	326.03
Kansas	206	1,393.38	.....	1,350.66	.....	2,950.04
Nebraska	319	754.20	.....	560.88	.....	1,634.08
Dakota	113	448.89	.....	1,046.56	.....	1,608.45
Montana	.....	.09	.....	124.42	.....	124.51
Wyoming	.....	.....	.66	103.26	.....	102.60
Colorado	16	7.76	.....	368.45	.....	392.21
New Mexico	.....	112.58	.....	.....	.....	112.58
Arizona	.....	75.56	.....	35.78	.....	111.34

Statement showing increase or decrease in the railroad service in the Western States and Territories, Texas to California, inclusive, etc.—Continued.

LENGTH OF ROUTES.

States.	Increase, June 30, 1885, to June 30, 1886.	June 30, 1886, to June 30, 1887.		June 30, 1887, to January 31, 1888.		Increase, June 30, 1885, to Jan. 31, 1888.
		Increase.	Decrease.	Increase.	Decrease.	
	Miles.	*Miles.*	*Miles.*	*Miles.*	*Miles.*	*Miles.*
Utah	4	2.57			3.90	2.67
Idaho		13.89		112.30		126.19
Washington	49	138.27		172.43		359.70
Oregon		268.51				268.51
Nevada		.91				.91
California	163	219.28		183.92		566.20
Total	1,145	4,039.47	.66	4,971.81	3.90	10,151.72
		.66		3.90		
		4,038.81		4,967.91		

Annual rate of expenditure.

States.	June 30, 1885, to June 30, 1886.		June 30, 1886, to June 30, 1887.		June 30, 1887, to January 31, 1888.		June 30, 1885, to January 31, 1888.	
	Increase.	Decrease.	Increase.	Decrease.	Increase.	Decrease.	Increase.	Decrease.
Texas	$21,412		$120,711.98		$3,444.64		$145,568.62	
Indian Territory	144		11.64				155.64	
Kansas	1,672		118,942.74		41,668.01		162,312.75	
Nebraska	5,494		130,657.65		42,443.55		178,595.20	
Dakota	15,924		25,731.76		3,595.55		45,251.31	
Montana	596			$710.64				$114.64
Wyoming	13,496		9,224.70				22,720.70	
Colorado		$810	3,685.95		23.94		2,899.89	
New Mexico			39,246.86				39,246.86	
Arizona			10,992.02				10,992.02	
Utah	2,449		181.62			$226.74		2,544.12
Idaho	1,118		416.29				1,604.29	
Washington	3,813		7,878.47				11,691.47	
Oregon	19,235		21,206.53				40,441.53	
Nevada				3,686.30				3,686.30
California	7,704		67,001.87			280.59	74,425.28	
Total	90,678	3,309	555,890.08	4,396.94	91,205.69	507.33	735,905.56	6,345.06
	3,309		4,396.94		507.33		6,345.06	
	87,369		551,493.14		90,698.36		729,560.50	

Number of miles traveled per annum.

States.	June 30, 1885, to June 30, 1886.		June 30, 1886, to June 30, 1887.		June 30, 1885, to June 30, 1887.	
	Increase.	Decrease.	Increase.	Decrease.	Increase.	Decrease.
	Miles.	*Miles.*	*Miles.*	*Miles.*	*Miles.*	*Miles.*
Texas	74,297		721,153.88		795,450.88	
Indian Territory	7,714		234.94		7,948.94	
Kansas		*344,184	1,153,556.75		809,372.75	
Nebraska	197,959		588,529.36		786,488.36	
Dakota	97,273		450,238.68		547,511.68	
Montana	3,733		401.70		4,134.70	
Wyoming			57,232.20		57,232.20	
Colorado		24,508	4,640.79			19,867.21
New Mexico			60,156.64		60,156.64	
Arizona	20,785		35,481.52		56,266.52	
Utah	2,434			8,339.09		5,905.09
Idaho			8,673.30		8,673.30	
Washington		5,946	145,751.38		139,805.38	
Oregon	23,091		172,938.01		196,029.01	
Nevada				140,898.20		140,898.20
California	143,647		452,693.31		596,340.31	
Total	570,933	374,638	3,851,682.52	149,237.29	4,065,410.73	166,670.50
	374,638		149,237.29		166,670.50	
	196,295		3,702,445.23		3,898,740.23	

*This decrease is owing to a reduction on the Union Pacific Railway—Kansas City to Denver, 639.82 miles—from fourteen to six trips a week, making a reduction of 532,330 miles on that route. An increase of 188,146 miles on the residue of the service in Kansas leaves a net decrease of 344,184 miles.

Since January 31, 1888, there has been ordered 554.17 miles of railroad service in Kansas and 503.59 miles in Nebraska.

ALLEGED DISCRIMINATION AGAINST THE SIXTH AND SEVENTH DIVISIONS.

Within the direction of the resolution to report as to complaints, it becomes my duty to notice certain statements recently made upon the floor of the Senate, and hence appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I find it there stated in substance that there has been unfair discrimination against the sixth and seventh divisions, and that the increase there made in facilities, in post-offices, clerks, and railway postal clerks, "has been inadequate to the needs of that rapidly-growing and prosperous section," and the fault for this state of things is laid at the door of the Post-Office Department.

The effort has been made to prove by the statistics of mail matter handled that the railway postal clerks in these two divisions named are overworked and required to handle more matter than in the other divisions; and from these statistics the deduction is drawn that a much larger number of clerks should be employed on the lines in these divisions.

The incorrectness of this deduction to show deterioration of service at the present time, or an inferior service to that heretofore furnished, or that clerks are overworked in these two divisions, is made manifest by a comparison of the same kind of work for the last four years.

Pieces of mail handled by railway postal clerks.

Fiscal year ended June 30—	Pieces of ordinary and registered matter handled by all clerks.	Pieces of ordinary and registered matter handled by sixth division.	Pieces of ordinary and registered matter handled by seventh division.	General average of pieces handled by each clerk.	Average number of pieces handled by each clerk in sixth division.	Average number of pieces handled by each clerk in seventh division.
1884	4,536,697,326	909,921,798	750,150,390	1,266,173	1,172,579	1,708,600
1885	4,964,673,577	997,235,111	775,663,955	1,249,918	1,159,576	1,545,167
1886	5,345,846,044	1,076,420,505	842,743,544	1,295,649	1,178,993	1,552,261
1887	5,851,394,057	1,194,704,246	940,003,613	1,328,956	1,226,596	1,482,696

According to the above table it appears that the average per clerk of pieces of all kinds of mail matter handled for the sixth and seventh divisions, during the years 1884 and 1885, was 1,396,497, while the general average number of pieces handled by clerks in the service for the same period was 1,258,043. This was an average per clerk, for each of the sixth and seventh divisions of 138,454 pieces over the general average; while for the years 1886 and 1887 the average per clerk in the entire service was 1,812,302 pieces, and for the sixth and seventh divisions 1,355,128, thus demonstrating that the difference of 138,454 pieces per clerk between the sixth and seventh divisions and the general average of the entire service has been decreased to 43,826, drawing them closer to the general average by 94,628 pieces.

It is thereby conclusively shown, so far as these statistics are of value, that each clerk in these two divisions was required to do more work, as compared with other divisions, and more work, in fact, in 1884 and 1885 than in 1886 and 1887; and that the burden put upon him in the last two years is less than he was required to bear in 1884 and 1885.

In the showing of the total pieces of ordinary mail handled during the fiscal year ended June 30, 1886, by clerks in the sixth and seventh divisions, lately printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the 29th of February, 1888 (page 1605), a mistake is made in stating that 1,923,501,190 pieces were handled by clerks in those divisions, and the clerks in all other divisions combined 3,406,000,285. The statement should be: Pieces of ordinary mail handled by clerks in the sixth and seventh divisions, 1,913,521,190, and total pieces of ordinary mail handled by clerks in other divisions, 3,416,000,285. Taking 10,000,000 pieces from clerks in the several divisions and adding them to clerks in the sixth and seventh divisions affects the averages very materially; therefore the percentages there given are worthless.

The statement here following shows the total pieces of ordinary mail handled in each of the divisions for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1884, 1885, 1886, and 1887, and also in another table the number of clerks and the average number of pieces handled by each clerk in the several divisions. This shows that in the sixth division the average of pieces handled by each clerk is below the average handled per clerk in all the divisions.

Year.	General average of all clerks at work on lines.	Average for clerks in sixth division.
1884	1,266,173	1,172,579
1885	1,249,918	1,159,576
1886	1,295,649	1,178,993
1887	1,328,956	1,226,566

Pieces of mail matter handled by railway postal clerks on the railway post-office lines.

	Fiscal year ended June 30—			
	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.
Pieces of ordinary and registered matter handled by the—				
First division	374,126,409	399,217,377	439,174,168	456,858,792
Second division	545,479,831	613,037,720	668,532,998	732,694,273
Third division	227,036,743	260,450,932	269,011,616	300,146,764
Fourth division	314,271,182	364,400,272	380,148,408	421,127,138
Fifth division	787,503,270	879,320,603	935,263,134	1,027,182,501
Sixth division	909,921,798	997,235,111	1,076,420,505	1,194,704,246
Seventh division	750,150,390	775,663,955	842,743,544	949,033,613
Eighth division	132,269,740	163,417,258	175,215,653	182,891,234
Ninth division	495,910,853	511,770,349	559,336,018	595,965,496
Total pieces handled	4,536,697,326	4,964,673,577	5,345,846,044	5,851,394,057

Number of clerks and average number of pieces handled.

	Fiscal year ended June 30—			
	1884.	1885.	1886.	1887.
First division:				
Number of clerks	328	357	360	363
Pieces	1,140,629	1,118,743	1,219,928	1,258,565
Second division:				
Number of clerks	488	524	537	555
Pieces	1,113,689	1,170,034	1,244,940	1,320,170
Third division:				
Number of clerks	198	230	239	244
Pieces	1,146,645	1,132,396	1,125,570	1,229,107
Fourth division:				
Number of clerks	219	267	263	313
Pieces	1,435,029	1,396,169	1,445,400	1,345,453
Fifth division:				
Number of clerks	638	685	717	746
Pieces	1,234,331	1,283,680	1,304,411	1,376,919
Sixth division:				
Number of clerks	776	860	913	974
Pieces	1,172,579	1,159,576	1,178,993	1,226,566
Seventh division:				
Number of clerks	439	502	550	634
Pieces	1,708,690	1,545,147	1,532,261	1,482,656
Eighth division:				
Number of clerks	107	152	118	126
Pieces	1,236,166	1,238,008	1,484,873	1,441,089
Ninth division:				
Number of clerks	360	421	429	448
Pieces	1,271,566	1,215,606	1,303,813	1,330,279
General average of all clerks at work on lines.				
Number of clerks	3,583	3,972	4,126	4,402
Pieces	1,266,173	1,249,918	1,295,649	1,328,956

Certainly these tables show that the clerks in the sixth division are not (on the basis of pieces of mail handled) taxed beyond that of clerks in other divisions. The seventh division has for each of the four years named been considerably above the average. In 1884, the general average being 1,266,173, the seventh division averaged 1,708,690. In 1885 the general average was 1,249,918, while the seventh division averaged 1,545,147. In 1886 the general average was 1,295,649, while the seventh division averaged 1,532,261; and for the year 1887 the general average was 1,328,956 while the seventh division averaged 1,482,656.

It will thus be seen that instead of the clerks in the seventh division being overtaxed in 1887, as compared with other divisions, the discrimination was much less than it had been for any of the years under review. But this basis of measuring the work of clerks is unfair. Some divisions have short lines, where clerks travel but 60 or 90 miles and work nothing but local mail, and their record would tend to bring down the general average of that division. And it should also be borne in mind that on the heavier lines, where most of the mail is handled, there are employed helpers, who do not distribute, but merely act as assistants to the regular distributing clerks, bringing in the mail and setting it upon the table ready for distribution.

It must be admitted by any one informed, or at all familiar with the service, that few lines in the West are so heavy that these helpers are needed; therefore, the percentage of distributers to clerks employed is much larger than it is in some of the other divisions where these men are engaged. As, for instance, in the ninth division, which embraces the heavy mail line between New York and Chicago, more helpers are needed than on any other line in the country, the result being that the average pieces handled by this line, as shown in the above tables, is considerably less than in the seventh division, while the men connected with the service all admit that more pieces per distributer are handled on that line than, perhaps, any other in the country.

These statistics, however, are of little value as a basis to determine the question of discrimination between the several divisions, as several other conditions must be considered.

In the New England and other Eastern and Central States are many short routes where clerks run but 50, 60, to 80 miles per day, and naturally the average number of pieces handled by these clerks is lower than is that on any of the through lines or those more important. This would largely account for the difference; but another reason is found, namely, that most of the mail for these States in the Western divisions if separated before it reaches those divisions, and most of it handled by them merely local, where but few separations are needed, and a clerk can handle more than where there is separating for an entire State.

The ninth division, which embraces the State of Michigan (except the Upper Peninsula) and the fast mail between New York and Chicago, made the highest average of any division in the service.

CLOSED-POUCH SERVICE.

It has also been argued in the Senate "that in the matter of closed pouches handled daily" for the same period (1887) the clerks in the sixth and seventh divisions handled 2,895, as against 2,789 in all other divisions except the first and second.

I respectfully intimate that this argument is fallacious, when I state the fact that railway postal clerks do not handle closed pouches. The closed-pouch service is performed on railroads where railway postal clerks are not employed and the pouches are handled by railroad employés.

Complaint has been made in the Senate, as appears from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, that the increase of railway postal clerks in the sixth and seventh divisions has not kept pace with the relative increase of mileage of new roads on which service has been placed, and that had these divisions received a quota of clerks proportionate to their increase in mileage they would have been assigned 700 clerks instead of 228.

The reasoning is specious which reaches such a conclusion from such premises, illustrating the danger of drawing conclusions from statistics without regard to qualifying conditions.

Clerical force in the railway mail service can not be assigned upon the basis of mileage.

The proportion of clerks must be greatest where the mails are heaviest and among the dense populations where post-offices are most frequent upon the routes. For instance, on the New York and Chicago railway post-office, 986 miles long, there are employed 316 clerks, or 1 clerk for every 3 miles of road; while on the Omaha and Ogden, the heaviest line running through Nebraska, 1,035 miles long, are required but 39 clerks, or 1 to every 30 miles. Were the two lines furnished the same working force, or a force on the mileage basis, at least 250 clerks on the latter road would be constantly idle.

The older and more thickly-settled portions of the country send more mail to the newer districts than they receive in return; therefore more clerks are required to handle this concentrated volume of outgoing mail than are required on Western lines.

This one reason will show that the theory of distribution of clerks upon the basis of road mileage is not tenable, and it is especially so in the far Western States on account of the well-known fact that they traverse vast plains and mountain regions where there are few settlements, and therefore it is very seldom that more than one clerk is required, or can be employed, to a car, where in the older and thickly-settled States from two to twelve clerks are needed to perform the service.

A few cases may be cited to prove the correctness of this statement. For instance, on the Manitoba road, in Dakota, the distance between Towner and Minot is 46 miles, there being no intervening post-offices; between Minot and Williston, 120 miles; Williston to Fort Buford, 25 miles; Fort Buford to Poplar Creek Agency, 60 miles; Poplar Creek Agency to Wolf Point, 22 miles; Wolf Point to Fort Assinaboine, 210 miles; Fort Assinaboine to Fort Benton, 72 miles. A case in point may be cited in Nebraska, where the Burlington and Missouri River Railroad has built an extension from Anselmo to Whitman, a distance of 99 miles, without an intervening post-office.

Another case which may be cited is that of the Union Pacific, building across Southern Kansas to Pueblo, Colo., where there are but very few offices. Also the Kansas Division of the Union Pacific Railroad between Weskan, in Wallace County, Kansas, and Denver, Colo. The distance between Weskan, Kans., and Cheyenne, Wyo., is 31 miles; Cheyenne to Kit Carson, 25 miles; Kit Carson to Hugo, 47½ miles, etc.; but perhaps more to the point than any other line, as it affects the statistics under review, is that of the lines built last summer through Indian Territory: that of the Atchison, Topeka and Santa Fé, between Arkansas City, Kans., and Purcell, Ind. T., a distance of 141 miles, without an intervening post-office; yet the service on this line was needed for the purpose of expediting through mails between Kansas and Texas. Or, to reach the same conclusion in a different form, the Postmaster-General's report for 1887 shows that on June 30, 1887, there were 14,350.5 miles of railroad in the United States on which closed-pouch service was being performed without the aid of accompanying clerks, and of this amount the sixth and seventh divisions had 5,667, or over 39 per cent. of the whole. This is about the same percentage as in 1885 and 1886.

A few years ago, when there were but few leading railroad centers west of Chicago, it was not necessary to separate the mails for the Western States until they reached the Mississippi River, but owing to the recent progress it was found that the mails for certain localities might be advanced by sending them over one of several roads, and to take advantage of this it was necessary to have the mails separated as far east as possible, and to meet this growing want the lines east of St. Louis and Chicago were strengthened up so as to have the mails for Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Dakota, Nebraska, Kansas, and Texas separated before reaching the Mississippi River, and so well was this policy found to work that it has been continued with advantage to the service.

This, with the explanation above given of the mileage basis, and the average handling of mail matter per clerk, shows the fallaciousness of the argument urged to prove unjust discrimination against the sixth and seventh divisions.

NEBRASKA.

The mail service in Nebraska has been the subject of animadversion in some of the journals of that State and on the floor of the Senate.

The following recently appeared in a Nebraska newspaper and was sent to the Department:

"Senator MANDERSON, of Nebraska, in speaking on Senator PALMER's resolution calling upon the Post-Office Committee of the Senate to investigate the deficiencies of the railway mail service in the West and South, called attention to the defective character of the service throughout Nebraska. He said there had been 1,100 miles of railroad built during the last year in the State, and that along these lines new communities have sprung into life, and that thriving towns are dependent upon postal facilities for their well-being. He was in daily receipt of letters complaining of the imperfect service both on railroads and at local places, especially at distributing points. Not only the press of the country, but citizens in all branches of occupation were clamoring for a remedy of the evils.

"Let our citizens now suffering from mail inconvenience write to our Representatives and Senators in Congress and request them to use their influence in securing a railway mail service for ourselves in common with thousands of

others along the line of the B. and M. (Burlington and Missouri River) from Curtis, Nebr., to Cheyenne, Wyo. If the people interested do not at once move in this matter and let the powers that be at Washington know there is some one in this country we will be a year hence, Micawber-like, waiting for something to turn up with our weekly mail from Sterling. A number of good-sized towns in Nebraska are in that condition to-day. With railroad facilities for more than a year past they get a weekly mail by the grace of the great and benevolent Government of the United States."

The following statement of facts, accompanied by the correspondence, will show the injustice of the specific complaint here made:

Effort had long previously been made by the Department to establish service on the railroad therein designated, and when this complaint appeared the matter was referred to the division superintendent at Chicago to ascertain the cause of delay. On February 14, instant, the superintendent replied:

"The B. & M. Co. is entirely responsible for the delay in recommendation for service on the road between Grant, Nebr., and Cheyenne, Wyo., as we have written them several times for diagrams and information concerning the road, and have been informed that the same would be furnished as soon as possible. We have written the general manager again to-day."

On the 13th of February, instant, the general manager writes:

"Referring to your telegram to-day in regard to information requested some time ago, relative to proposed route from Grant to Cheyenne:

"This matter has been at a standstill, owing to the fact that our stations up there are few and far apart, and we deemed it advisable to wait till a better showing could be made before completing the distance circular for officials at Washington and furnishing similar data asked for by you.

"We will endeavor to get things in shape before long, and you may rest assured there will be no unnecessary delay in the matter."

From the above it will be seen that the Department had done its utmost to establish the service on this road, but that the railroad company, for reasons of its own, not desiring to take up the service at that time, had neglected to inform the Department as to the necessary data, or to signify its readiness to perform the service.

This instance aptly illustrates the criticisms which are often made in regard to the establishment of new service. As soon as application is made, or a line of road approaches completion, it is the due course of business for the Department to send to the proper officer of the railroad company a request for necessary information as to distance, statistics, trips, time-tables, etc., to the end that an order may be intelligently made for placing the service thereon.

During the interval between the application and the action of the company signifying its readiness to take up the service, the community along the new line of road suffer some inconvenience from delays for which the Department is not in fault. Complaints thus arising are used as the basis of indiscriminate censure of the postal service and always have been. There is nothing new in connection with such complaints except in the use to which they have been put.

CONCLUSION.

From a careful examination of the reports touching the Railway Mail Service; upon the testimony of those connected with it for many years and familiar with its growth and workings; in view of the general satisfaction expressed with it by the people of all sections; from the diminishing number of complaints made in respect to it, no less than upon the statistical demonstration made as a part of the system and as a gauge of its efficiency, I unhesitatingly assert that the entire mail service, not only in Kansas but throughout the entire West and the whole field of its operations, is in better and more efficient condition at the present time than it has ever been before.

Very respectfully,

DON M. DICKINSON,
Postmaster-General.

Hon. JOHN G. CARLISLE,
Speaker House of Representatives.

Mr. BLOUNT. I now ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill by sections.

The Clerk read as follows:

For light, rent, and fuel to post-offices of the third class, $650,607.

Mr. KERR. I move to strike out lines 24 and 25, the paragraph just read.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say a word about that. As I understand it, this provision proposes a large increase of expenditure for the benefit of a small number of postmasters; small, I mean, compared with the total number. I know it has been claimed at several conventions that this is a proper increase, and I believe we have all been deluged with letters on the subject.

Of course gentlemen understand that during all these years these third-class postmasters have held these offices without any increased compensation; and I suspect most of the gentlemen on the other side understand that, notwithstanding this great demand for an increase, in every instance where one third-class postmaster has been appointed there have been a dozen people anxious to be appointed; and I suspect, further, that our friends are not quite so happy and peaceful about the appointment of the successful ones and the failure of the unsuccessful ones as they pretend to be. But, however that may be, I was somewhat amused to hear the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] say that the trouble all came from the large surplus in the Treasury, and that you could not have an economical and honest conduct of the Government with a surplus in the Treasury.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] the other day said here in the presence of the Baptist brethren, and called on them to witness, that it would be "as easy to run a powder-house in hell" as to have an honest and economical administration of the Government with a large surplus in the Treasury. And now to-day comes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] with this same excuse of the surplus, and proposes to increase these salaries to an amount of over half a million dollars.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. COX], too, rises here to-day and proposes other legislation in connection with this bill which will necessitate another large expenditure, and he criticises the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the committee [Mr. BLOUNT], because that proposed legislation of his is not in a more forward state. So that when the ordinary Democrat gets up here and begins to talk about the surplus and about it being impossible to run the Government economically with a large surplus in the Treasury, we are to understand that he is getting ready to roll up his sleeves and run his hand into the Treasury and pull some of the surplus out for the benefit of his party friends. [Laughter.] Now, gentlemen, I do not think that you are bound to do all these things just on account of the surplus. [Laughter.]

We might continue to buy bonds, and we had better buy bonds even at the present premium than expend money on salaries which perhaps may be of doubtful propriety.

Mr. DOCKERY. Does the gentleman object to that item?

Mr. CANNON. I doubt its propriety. It may be that in some few instances there ought to be additional compensation in cases of this kind; but during all the years of the past the tendency has been to cut down rather than increase appropriations in this respect. Now you make an increase. If you are determined to make these increases (you are responsible for them, and I suppose you are willing to bear the responsibility), at least be consistent and quit prating about "economy," and when you take money from the Treasury quit giving the excuse that the surplus makes you feel wicked and extravagant.

Mr. BLOUNT. I do not care to enter into any political discussion on this matter. I have already stated reasons which I regard as sufficient to justify the insertion of this item by the committee. But my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] remarks that for the first time there is a proposition here to make allowance for rent, light, and fuel at third-class post-offices.

Mr. CANNON. This is the first appropriation of this kind, as I understand.

Mr. BLOUNT. In the Forty-eighth Congress, when we had a Republican administration, and when the gentleman from Illinois was on the committee, a provision was put in the Post-Office appropriation bill authorizing the allowance for light, rent, and fuel to third-class postmasters; but the language was unfortunate, and it applied to one year only. But the Department was authorized to use funds for that purpose, and some contracts were made and some rent allowed. This is all I desire to say in reply to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. The action of which the gentleman speaks, as I recollect, was action taken not by the committee which prepared the bill, but in the House, by way of amendment; and that proposition bore no appropriation.

Mr. BLOUNT. If the action was taken in the House, could not the gentleman have prevented it by a point of order?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, I do not recollect the particular circumstances; but if the proposition was adopted in the House and was subject to a point of order, I certainly would have made the point if present. But I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that that proposition bore no appropriation; and even if the gentleman's statement is correct, it furnishes no excuse for this extravagant proposition.

Mr. BLOUNT. Nor did I give it in that way, but simply in reply to the gentleman's statement that this had never been done before.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] has expired.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move to amend by striking out the last word. The gentleman says that the provision to which I referred carried no appropriation. I reply, it was provided that part of the appropriation made in the bill might be used for that purpose.

Mr. CANNON. Was it so used?

Mr. BLOUNT. Some of it was. There are some contracts in existence now.

Mr. CANNON. When did it go into effect?

Mr. BLOUNT. It went into effect during a Republican administration, during the Forty-eighth Congress.

Mr. CANNON. Who offered the amendment?

Mr. BLOUNT. Oh, I do not remember that. The way in which it happened to be brought to my mind was that the matter was investigated to see whether the language of that provision would apply generally, or was confined to that particular year.

Mr. CANNON. I am told by a gentleman whose recollection is clear upon the matter that the provision to which the gentleman refers was made at the second session of the Forty-eighth Congress, and went into effect substantially, so far as it had any effect, with the commencement of this Administration.

Mr. BLOUNT. It was passed the year before, when you did not know who would have control of the administration.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; it was at the second session of the Forty-eighth Congress. The provision, imperfect as it was, was adopted after the election of President Cleveland. But let that matter be as it may, I say to the gentlemen on the other side, do right about this matter. This item carries an appropriation of more than $600,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The *pro forma* amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] will be considered as withdrawn. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR] to strike out the line last read.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 25 of the bill, add the following:

"That there shall be allowed and paid to each postmaster of the fourth class $5 for each quarter, in addition to the compensation allowed under existing law."

Mr. BLOUNT. I raise the point that this is new legislation and out of order on an appropriation bill.

Mr. KERR. I hope the gentleman will not press that point of order.

Mr. BLOUNT. There are several propositions which have been referred by the House to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads for our consideration, with the view of having our conclusions reported to the House. Under the circumstances, I deem it my duty to raise the question of order that this amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill, and is contrary to the rules of the House. I think the rule on this subject was wisely adopted. It has a history here in connection with our legislation on appropriation bills. So far as I am concerned, I propose to enforce what I believe to be a wise rule not only in reference to this matter, but all along the line.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. McRAE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, if the clause now pending in this bill, and to which this is offered as an amendment, be appropriate legislation in an appropriation bill, then any amendment which is germane to that clause is in order. There is no law in existence which authorizes the allowance of rent, light, and fuel to postmasters of the third class. By some kind of parliamentary tactics a provision providing for such has been reported by the committee to the House and is a part of this bill. While that is a just and wise provision, it is nevertheless new legislation. I presume the clause is properly in the bill or it would be stricken out. It benefits one class of postmasters, while my amendment seeks to benefit another equally as meritorious. I am not responsible for the infraction of the wise rule that my friend from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] now invokes. Finding new legislation on the bill, I want to simply enlarge it so as to make it just to all classes of postmasters. I want all treated alike.

If, then, new legislation to the extent proposed by the committee is in order on the bill, certainly anything which may be germane to such new legislation if considered independent of the appropriation bill is also in order. Certainly no one will deny that if the proposition to allow rent, fuel, and lights to the postmasters of the third class was pending alone my amendment would be in order. We may make any changes we desire as to the amount appropriated and extend the allowance to another class with or without limitation, and as the honorable gentleman is responsible for the new legislation being here, he ought not to be heard on a point of order against legislation of the same character and more meritorious. The right to enact legislation on this bill carries with it the right to enact just and proper legislation.

I insist further, Mr. Chairman, that the point comes too late, because the amendment has already been discussed on its merits by several members of the committee, some for and some against it, as well as other gentlemen.

It has been the subject of discussion for more than an hour, and I believe under the rules of the House after we have proceeded to the discussion of an amendment a point of order can not be made against it. Does not the point, then, come too late?

Mr. ROGERS. Will my colleague permit me to make a suggestion? and it is that the provision which comes from the committee was reported by the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. McRAE. I understand that.

Mr. ROGERS. It is properly therefore before the House.

Mr. McRAE. Yes, I am aware of that. It is before the House by unanimous consent and can not be taken away except in the same way or by a vote, and being here is the subject of amendment. When I say it is here by some sort of parliamentary tactics, I do not mean to say that it has not been brought fairly and properly before the House. It has a standing, but is not exempt from the fair and legitimate amendments that it would otherwise be subject to. There is no waiver of the right of amendment in the order allowing it to come here. Neither the phraseology nor the amount to be appropriated was agreed upon when the consent was given. The consent must have the effect to abrogate the rule prohibiting legislation on an appropriation bill so far as allowances to postmasters are concerned. If the point of order is overruled, I will then notice some of the criticisms of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM] that have been made upon the amendment. It would hardly be fair to do so in discussing the point of order.

Mr. BINGHAM. I was out of the House at the moment, and I would like to know what remark the gentleman made in reference to me.

Mr. McRAE. When the point of order has been decided I will come to the discussion of the point to which I have just referred. I do not wish, however, further to digress from the point of order to enter upon the discussion of the merits of the amendment, as you did. I will say, however, that the increase I propose is not what it should be, but all I hope for now.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask for the decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the order to the House allowing by unanimous consent this amendment to be made by the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads may be allowed to place in the Post-Office appropriation bill for consideration by the House a proposition authorizing allowances for rent, light, and fuel in third-class offices.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment is not covered by the consent granted by the House, and it is therefore obnoxious to the point of order. The Chair does not feel at liberty to go beyond the order the House made, and does not feel at liberty to hold it can be enlarged by the committee, and therefore is bound to sustain the point of order.

Mr. McRAE. I ask then for unanimous consent to offer my amendment.

Mr. BLOUNT. I object.

Mr. McRAE. Then I move to insert "fourth" after "third," so as to extend this section to postmasters of the fourth class without reference to the twenty-dollar allowance only covering rent, fuel, and lights.

Mr. ADAMS. In my opinion, Mr. Chairman, the introduction of this amendment by unanimous consent does not withdraw it from the operation of the usual rules of the House, but they are applicable as it the proposition came before the House regularly in order. When a proposition which could not have been offered to the bill by reason of a rule of the House is admitted by unanimous consent, it seems to me rather strange to say that proposition can not be amended in any particular. Suppose there is a provision in lines 24 and 25 for light and fuel of the post-offices of third-class, ought not that to be subject to the point of order? Is that what goes into the bill by unanimous consent? I think the gentleman himself would shrink from the conclusion you can amend the amount, and I do not see why, if you can amend the amount, you can not amend any part of the proposition. If the proposition is before the House, it is subject to the same amendment as if it were properly in the bill, and if in the bill it would be subject to amendment in every particular in which gentlemen might desire to amend it. The rule of the House only applies to the propriety of offering amendments, but when once admitted it is relieved from the operation of the point of order, and is subject to amendment as in other cases.

The CHAIRMAN. It was incumbent upon the House to have included, on motion of the gentleman from Georgia, postmasters of the fourth class as well as postmasters of the third class, if it was intended to cover them. The Chair therefore thinks the proposition to include fourth-class postmasters is a new proposition not covered by the unanimous consent of the House, and is therefore subject to the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Postmaster-General may hereafter allow rent, light, and fuel at offices of the third class, in the same manner he does now at offices of the first and second classes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making an inquiry. I wish to know whether this clause is discretionary or mandatory.

Mr. BLOUNT. It is just the language used in reference to the first and second class offices. It is presumed that the Postmaster-General will exercise his discretion and perform his duty in making the proper allowances.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I understand the practice under that language has been, in the case of the first and second class offices, to make this allowance uniformly.

Mr. BLOUNT. That is true; but the language selected here was designed to accomplish in the third class offices what was granted to the others.

Mr. BUCHANAN. My reason for making the inquiry is this: That to my personal knowledge such an allowance would be unjust to the Government in some cases, and in other instances the allowance of such an item would be unjust to the postmaster; and it seems to me the language should be amended to make it discretionary with the Postmaster-General.

Mr. BLOUNT. I think that is just what it does now.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In order to save time I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment, and move to insert what I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 26, after the words "Postmaster-General," insert "in his discretion;" so that it will read:

"The Postmaster-General, in his discretion, may hereafter allow rent, light, and fuel at offices of the third class," etc.

Mr. BLOUNT. I see no objection, Mr. Chairman, to that amendment.

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

For miscellaneous and incidental items for the first and second class post-offices, including furniture, $100,000.

For free-delivery service, $6,000,000.

Mr. ADAMS. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 32, page 2, strike out the words "six million dollars," and insert "six million two hundred thousand dollars."

Mr. ADAMS. The letter of Colonel Bates, superintendent of the free-delivery system, to which I alluded in the general debate, found on page 15 of the committee's report, states that the sum necessary, in his judgment, is $6,189,166.65, which is very nearly the sum I propose to insert; and he says that this amount will be needed to provide for legal obligations already incurred, if no provision is made for increased incidental expenses, additional carriers, or the extension of the service to additional cities.

I call attention to the need of extending the service to additional cities, and I desire also to call attention to the words used by the superintendent, "additional carriers." I live in a section of the country, and my district is in a part of the country, where we have suffered from an insufficient number of carriers ever since the service has been organized. The district I represent is partly in the city of Chicago and partly outside of it. In that city the administration has made a certain allowance for Chicago at the beginning of the fiscal year, and the needs of the city have always outrun the apportionment, and consequently we have always suffered. Here, then, is a request for an appropriation by the gentleman in charge of that Department. I do not understand why the committee decides to appropriate only enough money to meet the obligations already incurred, without providing for additional service. I do not understand why they did not appropriate money for additional carriers, and I know that in my own section of the country additional carriers are required in every large town; nor do I understand why they did not provide for additional cities. But leaving that altogether out of the question, it seems to me they should come up to the estimates of Colonel Bates, and grant the amount necessary to meet the requirements of the service.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, the estimate referred to by my friend from Illinois who has just taken his seat was made by a subordinate officer of the Government, and not by the responsible head of the Department; but the Postmaster-General, the present incumbent of that office, as well as his predecessor, having made an examination of the estimates of that officer, state that they regard them as excessive. On page 264 of the report of the Postmaster-General, in commenting upon this estimate, Mr. Vilas, then Postmaster-General, uses this language:

I have given greater pains to estimate this item with satisfaction than all the others together. The accompanying estimate submitted appears to me inadmissibly excessive and to ask for a larger expenditure than ought now to be awarded to this branch of the service, and much beyond its necessities. I have reviewed it with all the information obtainable from the books of the free-delivery division, and think a safer estimate can be reached by another process, partly following that of the estimate submitted.

And the present Postmaster-General has seen fit to increase the estimate made by his predecessor to the amount of $100,000.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is right.

Mr. BLOUNT. He says:

I have the honor to transmit the report of the superintendent of the free-delivery system on this subject. I am satisfied, however, that for the reasons clearly stated by my predecessor (Annual Report for 1887, page 265), from the data now at hand, and which were not at his command, the increase of free-delivery offices can be fairly well provided for with the following amendment to the item, which I submit, so as to read as follows:

For free-delivery service..... $6,000,000

The estimate of his predecessor was $5,900,000, and this is increased, as I have said, to the extent of $100,000.

Now, the gentleman would not hold any administration responsible for estimates made by its subordinate officials, especially when they have been revised and corrected by the head of the Department. It never has been regarded as conclusive in making such appropriations; but, on the contrary, it has always been the custom to take the revised estimates of the heads of the Departments in preference.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, sir.

Mr. ADAMS. It is not a question of responsibility, but of accuracy of information. The present Postmaster-General has not been in office for a long time; and here you have a subordinate officer who has been long in charge of that department, and who goes into a detailed estimate of the sums he regards as necessary, which estimate appears on page 15 of the report.

Mr. BLOUNT. I can show my friend that reports of subordinate officers of a Department generally urge more than the head of a Department is willing to assent to, for reasons satisfactory to them.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman indicate what the reason is?

Mr. BLOUNT. I will say it is of such a nature that it can not be readily stated. The Postmaster-General has come as near it as I think might well be. The gentleman from Illinois, to arrive at a correct conclusion, would have to go through the same processes as the Postmaster-General has done. He says:

I have reviewed it with all the information obtainable from the books of the free-delivery division, and think a safer estimate can be reached by another process, partly following that of the estimate submitted.

And then he goes on to give it.

Mr. ADAMS. Does the Postmaster-General give a detailed estimate?

Mr. BLOUNT. He does.

Mr. ADAMS. How much does he allow for additional carriers?

Mr. MACDONALD. Does the gentleman from Illinois claim to know that the amount is insufficient?

Mr. ADAMS. I know the appropriation has been insufficient in my part of the country for the past ten years.

Mr. BLOUNT. I can not just now give the detailed figures which the gentleman from Illinois asks for; but as I have said, the Postmaster-General has seen fit to add $100,000 to the conclusion reached by his predecessor and considers that sufficient.

Mr. DOCKERY. I want to say this to the gentleman from Illinois: If the bill which has just passed both Houses and is now pending before the President, reducing the hours for letter-carriers, should receive the President's approval, this entire item would probably have to be reduced in the Senate or somewhere. And if the gentleman from Illinois can show to the Postmaster-General that the estimate is incorrect, he will be ready and prompt, I have no doubt, to correct it.

Mr. ADAMS. I move to strike out the last word, merely for the purpose of occupying the floor for one minute more. One thing I know is, that for ten years past the business men of Chicago have not had carriers enough. The gentleman refers me to the body at the other end of the Capitol——

Mr. BLOUNT. I did not.

Mr. ADAMS. I refer to a remark of his colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY].

Mr. DOCKERY. I think the gentleman misunderstood me.

Mr. ADAMS. I think that was the legitimate inference from the remark of the gentleman from Missouri. But that does not consist with my idea of responsibility as a member of this House.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman misunderstood the scope of my observation, which was rather in the nature of an aside remark. I said the bill which passed the House and is now pending before the President, reducing the number of hours of letter-carriers, if it should become a law, would require some revision of this item at some point.

Mr. ADAMS. It appears the bill referred to is before the President for his signature—that this House passed a law, that the Senate assented to it, and that it only awaits the signature of the Executive. The presumption is it will receive that signature; and the gentlemen ought to have taken that into account in fixing the amount of the appropriation. But it appears clearly from the remarks of the gentleman from Missouri that they have not taken it into account. They say if that bill becomes law this item will have to be revised.

Mr. BINGHAM. We could not, in preparing the appropriation bill, take cognizance of that bill until it was a law.

Mr. ADAMS. You could appropriate $6,200,000. Would any of that money be lost if the bill referred to should fail to become a law?

Mr. BLOUNT. I have not referred the gentleman from Illinois to the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. ADAMS. I did not mean to say that the gentleman from Georgia did, but his colleague on the committee seemed to do so.

Mr. BLOUNT. The Department has made the estimate and regards it as a reasonable one. I do not know, Mr. Chairman, of any better guide than the estimate of the Department. I think it quite a mistake to attempt to give any Department any more money than they ask for.

I have in mind a remarkable instance of bad results of such action on the part of the House of Representatives.

I remember quite well when the Post-Office Department asked for a given sum for star-route service and the House voted half a million of dollars more than the estimates. The Second Assistant Postmaster-General refused to use it. He thought it should not be used. The next House voted a million of dollars; and then the expeditions were changed under the loose administration of the Post-Office Department by the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, Mr. Brady; but the House of Representatives, I will say in fairness to him, was largely responsible for his loose administration.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask the gentleman from Georgia whether he infers from that fact that the present administration would abuse an additional appropriation of $200,000?

Mr. BLOUNT. Not at all. I simply meant, by way of illustrating my opinion, that it is proper to assume that the head of a Department has the best judgment about what is needed for the efficiency of the service.

My friend from Illinois says the people of Chicago have not had service enough, and that they have not been content with the service they have had. Now, sir, I presume we shall never reach a period when the people will not want better facilities.

Mr. ADAMS. I presume not.

Mr. BLOUNT. So in reference to the star service and the steamboat service there is a constant request for better facilities, and we are getting them all the while; and I am glad we are getting them. As our revenues increase, and as the business of the country increases, we get more money and make more appropriations.

A MEMBER. But you do not keep up with the procession.

Mr. BLOUNT. We are going very rapidly in that way until we have now the best service in the world; and I think we can afford to be conservative and not give more than the Department asks.

The CHAIRMAN. The question was taken on the amendment of

Mr. ADAMS, and the Chairman declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask for a division.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask that the amendment be again reported.

The amendment was again read, and it was then rejected—ayes 27, noes 69.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inland mail transportation, namely: Inland transportation by star routes, $5,400,000.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out "five million four hundred thousand" and insert "six million." I offer this amendment, being fully aware of the fact that the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads has allowed in this bill all that has been recommended by the Department. I do it, Mr. Chairman, because I have some knowledge of the kind of service that the people get in the remote parts of the country. I know personally that in many portions of the country where the mail ought to go twice or three times a week it goes only once a week, and often irregularly.

I know also that there are a great many applications for new offices that are not granted; I suppose it is because the Department has no money for carrying the mails to them. They are established as specials and soon discontinued, because no one will serve as postmaster if he must, in addition to giving his services, carry the mails for nothing. Now, sir, in order to make the Post-Office Department self-sustaining, if that must be done, it is important to establish a post-office in every community where the people will agree to maintain it, and the Government ought to carry the mail to every part of the country. There is nothing else that Congress can do that so aids the advancement and prosperity of a new and undeveloped country. Newspapers follow the mails and they are the best educators of the common people Congress can provide. The school-house and church follow soon after the establishment of the post-office. Communities grow, and cities and civilization in turn follow, and the revenues are thus increased.

It will not be satisfactory to the people to say that they have as good service as they had last year and the year before. They demand better and ought to have it. The amendment will put the money at the disposal of the Department, and if it is not used for legitimate purposes it will be covered into the Treasury again without loss. There can be no abuse of this appropriation. All contracts must be let to the lowest bidder. Nobody can be hurt by the appropriation, but if it is used as I hope it will be, a large part of the country will most certainly be benefited by it.

Something is expected by the section of country from which I come and by the people all over the Southern and Western States, where they have to submit to the inconvenience of having only a weekly mail and sometimes none at all. We want better service in the outlying parts of the country, and we think the Government which can give six or seven mails a day to the people who live along the railroads and can pay extravagant prices for a free-delivery system for the people in the cities ought at least to give the people on the frontiers an opportunity to have reasonable mail facilities.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE]. The amount appropriated in this bill is precisely the same that was appropriated last year for this object. The star-route service in the Territory which I represent is utterly inadequate to supply the needs of the people. There are a number of routes which ought to be established there, and at least half of those in operation ought to be increased. The same condition of affairs exist in other Territories. These Territories are rapidly filling up, and are entitled to proper mail facilities. It often happens that a settlement will spring up on account of mining or agriculture which is at least sixty or seventy miles from any postal route, and invariably when we undertake to get service we are confronted with the statement that there is a lack of funds for the purpose.

The appropriation last year was so small for star-routes that the increase of service was made dependent upon the amount of revenue derived from the offices, which is altogether unfair to a sparsely settled country which is rapidly growing and settling up. We in the Territories do not object to the fact that you in the East have your mail brought to your doors, nor do I think that the people of the East would object at all if we had mail facilities which were in some way equal to or commensurate with the wants and needs of our people.

Mr. SYMES. Mr. Chairman, there is great need of the additional appropriation provided for in the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE]. It is a well-known fact, sir, all over the Western and Southwestern, and Northwestern country that the members of Congress are continually beset and importuned to secure the establishment of post-offices and mail routes for the accommodation of the new settlements that are continually springing up.

In my State, for instance—and the same remark would apply all over the Western country—the discovery of a valuable mineral deposit leads to the establishment of a new mining camp. In a very short time thousands of people go there. They have no post-office facilities, and they make up purses among themselves for the purpose of paying stage lines and mail-carriers during the time that they are importuning the Post-Office Department for the establishment of a service to which they are entitled. It would seem that when men go off as pioneers into a thinly-settled country where the roads are bad, and where they have so many of the hard-ships of life to contend with, they ought not to be compelled to contribute practically, as they do, to the postal fund of the United States for the purpose of securing mail facilities for themselves and their families.

When we importune the Department, as we are continually doing, until the answer we receive is that there are not sufficient funds for the extension of the mail service, and, therefore, the Department must be excused from establishing the post-offices and the mail routes which are desired. Why, sir, a strip of country about 100 miles wide and 300 miles long, extending from the western line of Kansas and Nebraska 100 miles into the State of Colorado has been settled up almost entirely during the past three years by farmers or grangers, so called. Towns have sprung up as if by magic, and to my knowledge purses are continually made up for the purpose of paying for mail service, and the Department is being constantly importuned for additional mail routes and additional post-offices. We hear the answer that there are not sufficient funds. And, sir, the late Postmaster-General who recently occupied that position—a gentleman for whom I have the greatest respect—really took the position in his decisions and investigations that if a new post-office was established and a new mail route provided the revenue derived from that office should bear some relation to the expense of carrying the mail from one town to another, across the country, away from the railroads. I submit that such is not the proper rule; that it is the duty of the Government to provide postal facilities for its people, and that the surplus revenues derived from the cities should be used to furnish this additional service. I certainly hope the House will adopt the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted on the *pro forma* amendment of the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS]. The amendment, if there be no objection, will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. PERKINS. I move to amend by striking out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to say just what amount should be appropriated for this service, but as suggested by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. DUBOIS] the amount carried in this bill for this service is the same appropriated in the last annual appropriation bill.

The Postmaster-General, in his report, states that the miles over which this service extends increase rapidly each year in consequence of the wonderful growth of our Western country, yet it is the boast of his report and the boast of his administration that he compels this work to be done so economically, so parsimoniously, that the service does not cost the people as much as it did when our population was smaller and there were fewer miles of star routes. In my judgment, this is not what the people of the United States are asking. While they do not desire extravagant service, while they are not asking wasteful expenditure of the public money, they are willing that these pioneers who have gone out upon the Western prairies, and are building up settlements there, should get decent postal service from their Government. It is not the demand or wish of the people that such communities should be discriminated against and their postal service impaired by parsimony.

Let me illustrate. My attention was directed to a little star route in the State of Nebraska, going out from the town of Fremont, situated on a railroad line. That star route, established to accommodate a little rural community, was transferred; the route to Fremont was discontinued and was carried to another point less convenient to the people, the roads being bad and crossing streams without bridges, so that at high water the service could not be carried on at all. This change was made in order to save $1 a year to the Government of the United States. And the service was not restored to the original route to Fremont until the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. DORSEY] assured the Department that he would pay the $1 difference himself. [Laughter.]

Now, are the people of the United States asking for such service as that? It is because of such service that they complain; it is in consequence of such service that the people in all the West, without regard to party, are making complaints and condemning the present administration of the Post-Office Department.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I am quite sure that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] is not serious in the statement he has just made; and I do not need to reply to it. The idea that the Postmaster-General, for the sake of saving $1 a year, would change a star route so as to inflict upon the people inconveniences in the manner described is so incredible that it occurs to me inquiry at the Department would disclose some different state of facts from what the gentleman has assumed.

Now, sir, it has been said that the appropriations have not been sufficient. I wish to ask your attention to page 387, where this language is to be found:

The appropriation for the last fiscal year was $5,850,000. The sum actually expended was $5,119,649.30, leaving an unexpended balance of $730,350.70.

Yet, sir, you are invited to increase the appropriation because heretofore they have been too penurious to provide for the service.

I do not know, sir, but some subordinate officers may tell my friend they do not have money enough, but the answer is ready to his hand in this report from which I have just quoted. It is there further stated:

A comparison with the last annual report shows for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1887, an increase of 615 routes, of 1,041,563.27 miles traveled per annum, and a decrease of $252,647.57 in annual rate of expenditure.

This shows us what we are all aware of, that while the expenses of living are decreasing, while the rates of transmitting by steam-boats and railway are less than they were and are getting cheaper all the time, with the same amount of money we can add to the postal service instead of decreasing it. In the light of this statement there were over $730,000 of unexpended balance of appropriation; in the light of the fact we have made contracts cheaper, and that we can do more with the same amount of money, and when we give the same appropriation for the star routes we gave last year, I ask whether the estimate of the Postmaster-General is not only liberal, but generous?

I say to my friends on this side of the House I am as eager as they can possibly be for this service, and I trust they will not join their voices with the gentlemen on the other side when this condition which I have stated exists and when all the money has been appropriated necessary for the efficiency of the service.

Furthermore, there has been more liberality in the star-route service in my opinion than during any period other than that period of extravagance under General Brady, for which, in my judgment, the two Houses which increased the appropriation bill beyond what the head of the Post-Office Department had asked are in part responsible. They are responsible, even as this House would be responsible if it adopted this proposition to-day.

My friend from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] well said, give to the Department what it asks, and then if the service is insufficient we should hold the Department responsible.

Mr. STOCKDALE. Is the appropriation here proposed the same as that of last year?

Mr. BLOUNT. It is.

Mr. STOCKDALE. What was the appropriation for last year?

Mr. BLOUNT. The appropriation for the last fiscal year covered by the report of the Postmaster-General was $5,850,000, and of that sum there was an unexpended balance of $730,600 and over. It is also shown, as I have said, there was an increase of 615 routes of 1,031,563 miles traveled per annum and a decrease of $252,647.57 in annual rate of expenditure.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCKINNEY took the floor, and yielded his time to Mr. BLOUNT.

Mr. BLOUNT. The statement from the Department is that there is abundance of money at the Department, and to spare, for this purpose during the fiscal year, and if any subordinate official of the Government states otherwise he does not do it by authority of the head of the Department. The annual rate of expenditure for all the star-route service in operation on July 1, 1887, was $5,040,790.97, being $58,742 46 less than on June 30, 1887.

I trust, then, that if gentlemen on this side of the House find they can not get the service in their respective districts they will understand hereafter that it is not because the money is not there.

Mr. MCRAE. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in proposing the amendment to increase the amount for the star-route service, I did not at that time, and do not now, intend to make any complaint against the head of the Post-Office Department or any of the officials of the Department. I have a very high regard for both the present Postmaster-General and his predecessor. They are good officers and shall have my hearty support, but I know the wants and necessities of my constituents better than they do.

I have no complaint to make against the general management of that Department whatever; but, as I said in the beginning, I know that we have not the service in the South and West that we are entitled to. I know that applications have been piling up here from my State and from other States around us for better service and for new post-offices which have been disregarded because the people will not be satisfied with special offices and special service. In short, my people are not satisfied to take only such service as the revenues will give them. I want Congress by an increase of this item in this bill to say to the Post-Office Department that we are not entirely satisfied with the service as far as the star routes are concerned. I want to emphasize my protest against some of the refusals to increase the service in rural districts and the establishment of new offices where the public necessities require them, as well as my protest against the practice of granting special offices or none at all.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] says that four or five hundred thousand dollars have been covered into the Treasury from the appropriations of 1886. That only shows that the committee has given enough for the kind of service we have now, but I say that is not sufficient. He may be satisfied, but I am not.

While it fixes the responsibility, as the gentleman would have it, upon the Department, it does not remedy what I seek to remedy, that is, to get new post-offices wherever they are needed and wherever the people can and will maintain them; and so I hope the increase will be allowed.

It will cost, I repeat, nothing to the Government if it is not used, and it is simply an intimation that we want a better service, and will give them the money for it, and thus put on the Department the responsibility for a failure to establish it. A refusal to give an increase is to say that we are satisfied with the present inefficient service.

I understand that the appropriation for the last two years is the same as that proposed by this bill. Certainly we do not expect this to so remain. We know that our country is improving and the population increasing all the time; we all know that the demands of the people are greater now than they were two years ago, and we ought to expect the service to cost more. I personally know that my people have not had the service they need and which I want them to have, and I propose to protest against insufficient appropriations, and, intend to kick (to use a homely phrase) until it is given to them. I do not care who it hurts or against whom the criticism may apply; I propose that my constituents shall have good mail facilities or know the reason why they do not. If the Department will abandon the idea of making the service self-sustaining we will have no more trouble. Why should it be? No other Department is. The increase I propose only amounts to 1 cent per capita of our population, besides other large increases have been allowed for other purposes.

Mr. PETERS. I have no objection, Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Arkansas "kicking" against the Administration or against the administration of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General all he pleases, but I do object to his "kicking" against the allowance made by the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Now, as has been stated by the chairman of the committee, we have allowed the amount of the estimates made by the Postmaster-General, and as has also been shown by the chairman of the committee, the appropriations are in excess of the amounts used. If that be so, why then certainly there is no cause for the additional amount proposed by the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas. As I stated before, the Post-Office Committee are liberal in preparing the bill. It has given to the Post-Office Department all it asked in the estimates. It has given to the Second Assistant Postmaster-General all the Postmaster-General asked for the administration of that Department, and if that amount has not been used that is not the fault of the Post-Office Committee, neither is it the fault of the members, perhaps. His appeal, then, must not be made to the House, but to the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, and that is where his speech should be made.

In other words, the money is there to create the service and to carry it on for the gentleman from Arkansas and his people This House has given it to them. It has given it to the Department. It has given all the Department asked. The Department had not asked all that was given in the fiscal year, and, I repeat, the gentleman can make his speech to the Second Assistant Postmaster-General. I am aware of the fact, and it has been the case in my own experience, that I have gone there and asked an increase of service in my district and it has not been given by what seemed to me a desire to be too economical and to look to the economic features of administration rather than to giving to the people efficient service.

But that is not the question to talk about here. It is a question to talk about to the Second Assistant Postmaster-General. And I propose hereafter, whenever I go to him to get a service increased as I think it ought to be, to get a service increased in any line in my district, or to ask him for a new line, I will not take the answer from him that there is no appropriation, and that he must look out to see that he does not exceed the appropriation. But he must answer me squarely that the service is not needed. If I can show the service is needed I will hold him responsible for his lack of judgment in relation to what the service needs. Therefore the criticism which the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] makes is not proper on this floor, but should be addressed to the Second Assistant Postmaster-General himself.

Mr. MCRAE. I move to strike out the first word, in order to say a word in reply to the gentleman from Kansas. I have no grievance against the Department. It has done a great deal for my district as compared with what the last administration did; but there is still much to be done. My district has neither been neglected nor discriminated against. I am asking a better service for the whole country. I shall not consult the gentleman as to where I shall make my criticism.

I want the best possible service for my people, and shall demand of this House the money to enable the Department to give it and then insist that it be granted. I have asked for every increase of service that my constituents have indicated they wanted and for the establishment of every office they have indicated they would maintain. A great many of them have been established; many of them as specials. That kind of service is not what I want, and not what the people have a right to expect. It is almost nothing, and can not be justified if the appropriation is sufficient to give service. The mail service is about all the benefit that some of our people derive from the Government, and it ought to be as complete as possible. I do not care whether the Department is self-sustaining or not if to make it so we must submit to inefficient service. The United States are amply able to carry the mails into every neighborhood within their limits and should do so; and I want the House to say by the adoption of this amendment that it expects it to be done. I am willing to trust the present Postmaster-General to get the service if we give him the money. The present appropriation will give us what we have had, but we are not satisfied with that.

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope the gentleman from Arkansas, in view of the statistics he has been furnished with, will withdraw his amendment.

Mr. MCRAE. I do not withdraw it. I am satisfied that the amount you propose is not sufficient to give the country the service it needs.

During the last two years there have been established over one hundred new offices in my district, and as many more ought to be established. Permanent service ought to be given at once to every special office. In exulting over our magnificent railway and carrier service we must not forget the people in the country.

Mr. CAREY. Although the Post-Office Department may not have expended during the last fiscal year all the money appropriated for carrying the mails on the star routes, I think it safe to say that if it had expended all that was appropriated and a million dollars more the country would not have been supplied with better mail facilities than were really demanded. There is no one here who represents a Western constituency or who represents a section of the country which is growing rapidly, but is daily importuned to use every influence to have the Post-Office Department increase existing service and to put service on new routes. The increased appropriation proposed by the gentleman from Arkansas would not more than cover the star-route service if a liberal policy should be followed that will be required in the United States during the next fiscal year.

The theory that the Post-Office Department should be self-sustaining, I believe is an erroneous one. If the appropriations are expended honestly there should not be any apology required for the large amount expended, but explanations should be required when all the people of this broad land are not adequately provided with mail facilities. The head of that Department can not be expected to make contracts for the transportation of the mails on the star routes in excess of the appropriations. While the making of these contracts is within his discretion, he must be governed in its exercise by the amount of money at his command.

In the last annual report of the Postmaster-General he says:

The star-route transportation merited and has received a rigid and judicious scrutiny, resulting in many changes productive of more efficiency and marked reduction of cost. The sound principle that the mail accommodations should fairly meet all justifiable demands and reasonable wants has been fairly observed; but excessive and unnecessary charges have been curtailed, routes remodeled to provide as good and often better service at less cost, and in some instances, where no adequate results followed, given up altogether, and new contracts have been obtained at the annual lettings for better prices.

These changes may have resulted in the saving of money, but they have not always been to the advantage of the people supplied with mail. An abandonment or a reduction of an established service in most cases works a great hardship. A weekly service may be better than none, but in a country rapidly growing it is very unsatisfactory. On long routes it often takes from three to four weeks to get an answer to a communication. Especially is this the case where the day following the arrival of the mail the return mail is sent out.

To illustrate, I will give an instance. The people in the northern part of Fremont County, Wyoming Territory, were notified through the mail, as is required by the law, of the increase of their assessments on the tax-roll. These notices went over a route supplied with a weekly service. It so happened that the notices were mailed just too late to catch the outgoing mail; nearly three weeks elapsed before the answers of those affected by the notices could reach the county commissioners. It was too late, under the provisions of the law, for the parties to protect their rights.

In some instances the mails are transported by private contributions. I do not believe the service should be dependent in any sense upon the amount of stamps canceled. The very low postage requires five thousand letters of ordinary weight to produce $100. This is a large number of letters, but $100 is but a small percentage of the cost of a star route 100 miles long, even for a weekly service.

There are many post-offices in this country to-day that are called special offices that have no service beyond that which is contracted for by the postmaster, which is only dependent upon the revenue at the office. We all know that in many instances that amounts to little or nothing in comparison with the actual cost of the service.

I believe the policy should be to give every settlement, though it may not contain but fifteen or twenty souls, mail facilities, not for their convenience alone, but for the convenience of all the people of the United States.

An injustice, not an intentional one, is done to the West and South by the manner in which the books are kept in the Post-Office Department. For instance, the trans-continental mails are carried through the Territory of Wyoming for nearly 500 miles over the Union Pacific Railroad and all the cost of that service on the mileage in that Territory is charged to Wyoming. This makes a large deficit.

Each year for the last twenty years there has been a large deficit. The receipts are not equal to the expenditures, and they will not be as long as this country continues to grow. This deficit is a deficit made by the whole country, and not by any particular States and Territories. Post-offices and post-routes are for the advantage of the people of the entire country. From the report of the Postmaster-General, it appears that in ten States only out of forty-eight States and Territories the receipts were in excess of the expenditures. These States for the most part are those of which the population of the cities therein is a very important part of the entire population; the distances are very short and the mails very large. While these States and cities may not be so much interested in the star-route service as the localities the service supplies, they do reap great benefits from it as they reach out for new trade and business in a sparsely-settled and growing country.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why this amendment should not be adopted. From what we have heard from members on this floor, the people in the Western Territories evidently have not got the mail facilities they are entitled to. The Postmaster-General possibly may not have been at fault in the past, because he may not have known what the wants of the people were, but after the debate here to-day he will be in fault if he does not supply those wants in the future. Possibly he may have felt it would be to his credit if he denied those people the facilities they were entitled to, in order to make a good showing for his Department, but I do not place conduct of that kind to the credit of any official. He has no right to pinch and scrimp the people in their necessities in order to make a showing for his Department. That is not what he was appointed for. He was appointed to serve the interests of the whole country, and that can not be done by adopting a penny-wise pound-foolish policy. The Post-Office Department should be liberal in furnishing to the people the mail facilities which they require, and it has not been so. It is worse, I know, in the West than in the Eastern or Middle States, but even in my own State I have had complaints on this very subject from people who have either failed to get the postal accommodations they required or have got them very grudgingly. And, Mr. Chairman, even if it is true that the Department does not need this money, there will be no risk in this House appropriating it. Even if the Postmaster-General should adhere to the plan he has pursued in the past, and should fail to grant the people these facilities, still we run no risk in voting this appropriation. I think, sir, from what we have heard from gentlemen representing the Western States and Territories, that the money is needed and that it should be applied to this purpose as fast as the people make application for increased mail facilities. The argument of the chairman of the committee himself is sufficient to show that the appropriation should be made.

He says himself there are $400,000 here carried over from last year. That being true, is there any reason against making the appropriation again, to have it again carried over if it is not used? The money is lying in the Treasury doing nothing, and it will do no less by being put to the credit of the Post-Office Department. Therefore, sir, I am in favor of the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. CAREY. I withdraw the formal amendment.

The question was taken upon the amendment of Mr. McRAE; and it was rejected—ayes 27, noes 57.

The Clerk read as follows:

For inland transportation by steam-boat routes, $450,000.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I have been requested by gentlemen who desire to do some business in the House to move that the committee do now rise; so I make that motion.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. McMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. TURNER, of Georgia, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9345) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ARREARS OF PENSION.

Mr. WALKER, by unanimous consent, filed the views of the minority of the Committee on Invalid Pensions on the bill (H. R. 9961) in relation to arrears of pension, and they were ordered to be printed with the report of the committee.

WASHINGTON'S HEADQUARTERS, NEWBURGH, N. Y.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the House from the further consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk, and put it upon its passage.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secret ry of War be, and he is hereby, requested to transmit to this House copies of all reports made to him by the engineers of the War Department, or others, relating to the present condition of the work on the monument at Washington's headquarters in the city of Newburgh, State of New York, and any other information relating to the same in possession of his Department, together with any recommendation he may deem proper to make in relation to the completion thereof according to the plans adopted therefor by the joint committee of the Senate of the United States and this House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. BACON moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JOHN POWERS.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revoke the order sending the bill (H. R. 6800) for the relief of John Powers to the Committee on Military Affairs, and I move that the amendment of the Senate be concurred in.

Mr. RANDALL. Let the bill be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to remove from the record of John Powers, late a member of Elgin

Battery, Illinois Light Artillery, any charge of desertion that may exist against him as a member of said Elgin Battery and issue to him an honorable discharge, subject to the laws and regulations of the War Department.

The amendment of the Senate was read, as follows:

Page 1, strike out all after "discharge," in line 5, down to the end of the bill, and insert "as of date of November 19, 1862."

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois, moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment of the Senate was concurred in; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

SALES OF CONVICT-MADE GOODS.

Mr. BLAND entered a motion to reconsider the vote by which the House yesterday ordered the previous question upon the engrossment and third reading of the bill (H. R. 8716) to protect free labor and the industries in which it is employed from the injurious effects of convict labor by confining the sale of the goods, wares, and merchandise manufactured by convict labor to the State in which they are produced.

HENRY S. FRENCH.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 591) for the relief of the estate of Henry S. French, and that it be now put on its passage. The bill proposes merely to refer a claim to the Court of Claims for adjudication. It does not appropriate any money.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the legal representatives of Henry S. French, deceased, late of Nashville, Tenn., be, and are hereby, authorized to bring suit in the Court of Claims for the recovery of the net proceeds of 230 bales of cotton taken at Jonesborough, Ga., in September, 1864, by General William G. Le Duc, by order of General Sherman, and turned over to the Treasury agent, and by him sold, and the proceeds paid into the Treasury of the United States; and for this purpose jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon said court to hear and determine and render judgment in conformity with the rights of the respective parties; also to review the decision of the Southern Claims Commission for the value of one hundred bales of cotton used for hospital purposes at the battle of Jonesborough, Ga., and render judgment thereon; and the said court shall further consider any evidence that may have been taken under the direction of the Southern Claims Commission in regard to such claims, with authority on the part of the United States or the claimants to take additional testimony under the rules of said court: *Provided*, That an appeal shall lie in said cause from said court to the Supreme Court, as in other cases.

The amendment reported by the Committee on War Claims was read, as follows:

Strike out, in lines 13 to 17, the words "also to review the decision of the Southern Claims Commission for the value of 100 bales of cotton used for hospital purposes at the battle of Jonesborough, Ga., and render judgment thereon," and insert "said judgment to be paid out of the captured and abandoned property fund."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request for the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. KERR. I ask for the reading of the report.

Mr. TAULBEE. That will defeat the bill, as the report can not be read before the hour for adjournment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. We are not willing to pass a bill of this kind without knowing what it is. I ask that the report be printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOLMAN. I think the report ought to be read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The reading of the report is demanded. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the House, pursuant to its order, stands adjourned until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. J. A. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 10114) to pension John P. Swenson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 10115) for the relief of Mrs. Susan Dickenson, widow of Wesley Dickenson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10116) for the benefit of R. M. Sanderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GIFFORD: A bill (H. R. 10117) for the relief of Joseph Bissonette—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. GROUT: A bill (H. R. 10118) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Holmes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HIRES: A bill (H. R. 10119) granting a pension to Horatio M. Ellison—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANDES: A bill (H. R. 10120) to increase the pension of James M. Gullett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 10121) granting a pension to Sarah A. Mason—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MATSON: A bill (H. R. 10122) granting a pension to Margaret Quinton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY: A bill (H. R. 10123) for the relief of the Bloomfield Baptist Church, at Bloomfield, Nelson County, Kentucky—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10124) granting a pension to Magdalene Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10125) for the relief of Bloomfield Lodge No 57, Free and Accepted Masons, of Bloomfield, Ky.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 10126) for the relief of the minor children of Joseph Sawyer, deceased—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PIDCOCK: A bill (H. R. 10127) granting a pension to James McKeever—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. D. STEWART: A bill (H. R. 10128) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a railroad bridge by the Birmingham, Atlantic Air Line Railroad, and Banking and Navigation Company across the Oconee River, in Laurens County, State of Georgia—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10129) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a railroad bridge by the Birmingham, Atlantic and Air Line Railroad, and Banking and Navigation Company across the Ogechee River, in —— county, near the city of Savannah, Ga.—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10130) for the relief of John S. May—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WADE: A bill (H. R. 10131) for the relief of Warren W. Munday—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10132) for the relief of John. M. Layton—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10133) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Harpool—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILKINSON: A bill (H. R. 10134) for the relief of Mrs. G. L. B. Deschapelles, of Louisiana, or her heirs—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MACDONALD: A bill (H. R. 10135) to increase the pension of Sterne H. Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. J. A. ANDERSON: Four petitions of citizens of Salina, Kans., for the payment of Indian depredations on the frontier—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. BLAND: Petition of Susan Dickerson, widow of Wesley Dickerson, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of William C. Wester, of Granger County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHEADLE: Petition of Charles Schiffbauer and Frank P. Schiffbauer, for payment of their claim against Pawnee Indian agency—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CROUSE: Petition of employés of the Government Printing Office, for relief—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. DORSEY: Petition of the Constitutional Defense Association of America, in relation to public schools—to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. HEARD: Affidavits to accompany House bill for the relief of T. J. Nicholson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOUK: Evidence of Mary L. Collins in favor of John H. Norwood—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Abram Bird, private Company B, Ninth Regiment Tennessee Cavalry, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Robert F. Galyon, and of John W. Mosier, administrator of Joseph Hamilton, of Jefferson County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Alza S. Roach, late of Company F, First Regiment Tennessee Cavalry Volunteers, United States Army, for restoration to pension-rolls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Thomas J. Mason, and of son of Ebenezer Johnson, of Loudon County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUNTER: Petition of William S. Latham, of Clifty, Ky., and many others, urging the repeal of the limitation of arrears-of-pension act, and other legislation favorable to soldiers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of V. B. Smith and 31 others, citizens of La Fayette County, Mississippi, in favor of pure food—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOOLE: Petition of Joseph Roth, of Bozeman, Mont., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WADE: Petition of Warren W. Munday, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. R. WHITING: Petition of A. G. Kent and 30 others, citizens of Barry County, and of H. Baldwin and 41 others, citizens of Washtenaw County, Michigan, in favor of pure food, etc.—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Memorial of the Board of Transportation of Nebraska, recommending the passage of House bill 8367—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Franklin Institute, of Philadelphia, Pa., recommending the preparation and publication of classified abridgments of letters patent, similar to those issued by the British patent office—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of the Philadelphia Board of Trade, that if any reduction is made in the rate of duty on sugar that proper reduction be made in the rate of duty on molasses testing not above 56 degrees by the polariscope—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The following petitions in favor of House bill 9716, for the better protection of free labor from convict labor, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Labor:

By Mr. BUCHANAN: Of citizens of New Jersey.

By Mr. BURROWS: Of citizens of Michigan.

By Mr. CANDLER: Of W. H. Price and others, citizens of Gainesville, Ga.

By Mr. HOUK: Of Local Assembly No. 4845, Knights of Labor, of Knoxville, Tenn.

By My KERR: Of Local Assembly, Knights of Labor, of Marshalltown, Iowa.

By Mr. LONG: Of Puritan Assembly, No. 4316, Knights of Labor, of Rockland, Mass.

By Mr. PUGSLEY: Of Knights of Labor of Greenfield, Ohio.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. GRIMES: Of J. M. Couch & Co. and other citizens of Senoia, Ga.

By Mr. JACKSON: Of druggists of New Brighton, Pa.

By Mr. LONG: Of George M. Hooper and 10 others, citizens of Bridgewater, Mass.

By Mr. PENINGTON: Of Walter G. Coverdale, of Delaware.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. J. A. ANDERSON: Of 15 citizens of Central, and of 25 citizens of Solomon City, Kans.

By Mr. BELMONT: Of citizens of Glen Cove, N. Y.

By Mr. VANDEVER: Of citizens of Orange, Cal.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. J. A. ANDERSON: Of citizens of Albia and of Rosedale, Kans.

By Mr. NUTTING: Of citizens of Newark and of citizens of Oswego County, New York.

Also, of citizens of West Monroe, N. Y.

By Mr. VOORHEES: Of citizens of Oak Harbor, Wash.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. J. A. ANDERSON: Of 10 citizens, and of 70 citizens of Ottawa County, Kansas.

By Mr. GROUT: Of U. S. Grant Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of West Randolph, Vt.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. J. A. ANDERSON: Of 101 citizens of Cloud County, and o 93 citizens of Clay County, Kansas.

By Mr. ROWLAND: Of 48 citizens of Stanley County, North Carolina.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *May* 24, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of May 14, 1888, decisions rendered by the Treasury Department regarding duty on lead ores containing gold or silver; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 2351) for the relief of Harrison Swango was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

UNVEILING OF GARIBALDI'S STATUE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the executive committee on inauguration ceremonies of Garibaldi monument, extending to the Senate and House of Representatives an invitation to attend the unveiling of the statue of Garibaldi on the 4th of June next, in New York City; which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BROWN presented a petition of sundry druggists and physicians of Georgia, praying for the repeal of those portions of the internal-revenue law classing druggists as liquor dealers and imposing a tax on alcohol used in the arts and in medicine; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Little Falls, Minn., praying that an appropriation of $50,000 be made for the improvement of the Mississippi River between Little Falls and Brainerd, Minn.; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. VANCE presented the petition of 50 citizens of Iredell County, North Carolina, praying for certain amendments of the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4320) to authorize the construction of a gravel or macadamized road from the city of New Berne, N. C., to the national cemetery near said city, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the petition of citizens of Junction City, Oregon, praying for the correction of the military record of M. J. Gilstrap, of Oregon, have instructed me to report it adversely, recommending that the prayer of the petition be not granted. There is no evidence to sustain it.

The report was agreed to, and the committee were discharged from the further consideration of the petition.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2914) for the relief of August Thieman, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 7688) granting a pension to John Glenning;

A bill (H. R. 7115) granting a pension to William Scott; and

A bill (H. R. 6574) for the relief of William Compton.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2598) for the relief of Rev. Smith P. Gannage, reported adversely thereon, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. ALLISON. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to report favorably, with sundry amendments, the bill (H. R. 9788) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes. I give notice that I shall ask the Senate to-morrow, Friday, to consider the bill, and I hope for that purpose, if no other, the Senate will be in session to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Meanwhile the bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. ALLISON. At the request of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES], who is necessarily absent from the Senate to-day, I report from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 8565) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes; and I give notice in his behalf that at the earliest possible moment the Senate will be asked to consider the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. HOAR, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 353) for the relief of William T. Crump, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. VEST, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2527) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Red River of the North by the Duluth, Rainy Lake River and Southwestern Railway Company, reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7564) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Chattanooga, Tenn., reported it with amendments.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8623) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at or near Guntersville, Ala., and for other purposes, reported it with amendments.

Mr. CHANDLER (on behalf of Mr. CAMERON) submitted a report to accompany the bill (S. 2925) in relation to cadets at the Naval Academy, heretofore reported.

REPORT ON THE MISSISSIPPI AND ITS TRIBUTARIES.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am directed by the Committee on Printing,

to whom was referred the resolution submitted by myself on the 22d instant, to report it favorably without amendment; and I ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That there be printed in pamphlet form for use of the Senate 3,000 copies of the report on the Mississippi and its tributaries, being Part V of the internal-commerce report for 1887, of the Bureau of Statistics, Treasury Department.

WOMAN SUFFRAGE HEARINGS.

Mr. MANDERSON. I am also instructed by the Committee on Printing, to whom was referred the resolution submitted by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL] April 2, 1888, in relation to hearings before the Woman Suffrage Committee, to report it favorably with an amendment filling the blank with the insertion of the figures "10,000." I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the arguments before the Committee on Woman Suffrage April 2, 1888, be printed for the use of the Senate, and that —— extra copies be printed.

The amendment reported by the Committee on Printing was to fill the blank before the word "extra" by inserting "10,000;" so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the arguments before the Committee on Woman Suffrage April 2, 1888, be printed for the use of the Senate, and that 10,000 extra copies be printed.

Mr. MANDERSON. The cost of printing the 10,000 extra copies o the arguments will be $154. The Committee on Printing, succumbing to the wish of the Select Committee on Woman Suffrage, report in favor of filling the blank with the number indicated.

Mr. BROWN. I desire to ask the Senator from Nebraska if there is not a minority report in that case?

Mr. MANDERSON. It is not a report.

Mr. COCKRELL. I will state to the Senator from Georgia that this is not a report, but simply arguments before the committee.

Mr. BROWN. I misunderstood the matter. I thought it would include a report of the committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. No, just the arguments that were presented.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Printing.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. HISCOCK introduced a bill (S. 3018) granting an increase of pension to John N. Bovee; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 3019) for the relief of Frederick Pehon; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. MANDERSON. On behalf of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER], who is absent from the Chamber on business of the Senate, I submit an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor bill, which I move be referred to the Committee on Commerce and printed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEWART submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DAVIS submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 786) to provide a building for the use of the United States courts, post-office, custom-office, and internal-revenue office at Vicksburg, Miss.;

A bill (S. 2481) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Louisville, Cincinnati and Virginia Railway Company; and

A bill (S. 2883) for the relief of S. H. Pearce.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1978) for the erection of a public building in Paterson, N. J., with amendments in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2216) for the relief of Thomas A. Osborn.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6800) for the relief of John Powers.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. O'NEILL of Missouri, Mr. FRENCH, and Mr. BUCHANAN managers at the conference on its part.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 8843) to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia, so as to make inauguration day a holiday within said District; and

A bill (H. R. 8989) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (S. 325) granting to the Billings, Clark's Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company the right of way through the Crow Indian reservation;

A bill (S. 339) granting a pension to Eliza Douglass;

A bill (S. 626) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Franklin, alias McKee;

A bill (S. 737) granting a pension to Berry Day;

A bill (S. 739) granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger;

A bill (S. 1298) granting a pension to Mary Gammell;

A bill (S. 1300) granting a pension to Cordelia R. Jones;

A bill (S. 1477) granting a pension to Harlow B. Hyde;

A bill (S. 1478) granting a pension to George W. Peavey;

A bill (S. 2651) to remove the political disabilities of John Rutledge, of South Carolina;

A bill (S. 2901) granting to the Milwaukee, Lake Shore and Western Railway Company the right of way through the Lac de Flambeau Indian reservation, in the State of Wisconsin;

A bill (H. R. 92) for the relief of Morgan Rawls;

A bill (H. R. 1394) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase additional grounds for the accommodation of Government offices in Council Bluffs, Iowa;

A bill (H. R. 4467) for the erection of a public building at Bar Harbor, in Maine; and

A bill (H. R. 7938) to enlarge, improve, and make repairs upon the United States court-house and post-office building in Atlanta, Ga., and to appropriate money therefor.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS FOR POST-OFFICE PURPOSES.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business, that order is closed, and the Calendar under Rule VIII being in order, the Secretary will report the first bill on the Calendar.

The CHIEF CLERK. Order of Business 1101, a bill (S. 2762) to provide for the erection of public buildings for post-offices in towns and cities where the post-office receipts for three years preceding have exceeded $3,000 annually.

THE VETO POWER.

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent to call up the joint resolution (S. R. 80) proposing an amendment to subdivisions 2 and 3 of section 7 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Calendar under Rule VIII being in order, the Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution indicated by him.

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand that is for the purpose of submitting some remarks.

Mr. SHERMAN. With the leave of the Senator from Nevada, so that no one may be taken by surprise, I give notice that as soon as he is through with his remarks I shall move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. That will be, I suppose, about half past 1.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution indicated by the Senator from Nevada? The Chair hears no objection, and the joint resolution is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, the proposition embodied in the resolution is to so amend the Constitution that only a majority vote in the two Houses, instead of a two-thirds vote, shall be required to pass a bill over the veto of the President.

It was well said by John Locke that "wherever law ends tyranny begins;" and I will add that tyranny and discretion begin and end at the same point. They are synonymous. Tyranny is government by discretion; freedom is government by law.

No man ever lived who could be safely intrusted with the liberties of the people. No people ever surrendered their liberties to one man who did not eventually lose them. If the people desire liberty, they must preserve it in their own keeping; if they deposit it with another, it is sure to be embezzled.

The veto power is the most striking illustration of the irresistible desire in human nature to appropriate the liberties of the people when confided to the keeping of one man. The plebeians of ancient Rome,

at the instigation of Sicinius, two hundred years after the founding of that city, congregated at Mount Sacre, a few miles from the city, and refused to return unless the patricians would give them some guaranty of protection from oppression. A compromise was made whereby the plebeians were allowed to elect magistrates, called tribunes, who should have the power to protect the people from the oppression of their superiors by the utterance of the word "veto," which stayed the passage of any law, the execution of any sentence, the levying of any tax, the enlistment of any troops, and, in short, arrested the entire machinery of the government. The exercise of this imperial function, designed in the beginning to protect the people from their oppressors, was beneficial for a time, but resulted in converting the republic into a despotism.

During the five hundred years of the Roman republic, which was converted into an empire about the commencement of the Christian era, fourteen dictators were created, largely by the veto power exercised by the tribunes. The last dictator, Octavius Cæsar, became emperor under the name of Augustus. The common people of Rome, called plebeians, confided their liberties to the tribunes for the purpose of resisting the oppressions of the patricians, and the tribunes finally absorbed in their own persons the rights and liberties of both plebeians and patricians.

The power to prevent the enactment of laws and to suspend the execution of existing laws has been known for twenty-five hundred years as the veto power. It is an essential element of despotism.

It was incorporated in our Constitution on the false assumption that every President of the United States would exercise it, if at all, with extreme caution, so as not to interfere with the legislative department. It was proposed by Mr. Randolph, of Virginia, in the constitutional convention, to confer this power jointly upon "the Executive and a convenient number of the national judiciary." This proposition was rejected. Mr. Gerry, of Massachusetts, then proposed a qualified veto, whereby a bill might be passed "by —— parts of each branch of the National Legislature," over the objections of the Executive. Mr. Wilson, of Pennsylvania, and Alexander Hamilton, of New York, moved to strike out that portion of Mr. Gerry's proposition which permitted the National Legislature to pass a bill over the veto, "so as to give the Executive an absolute negative on the laws." "There was no danger, they thought, of such a power being too much exercised. It was mentioned by Colonel Hamilton that the King of Great Britain had not exerted his negative since the revolution. Mr. Gerry sees no necessity for so great a control over the legislature, as the best men in the community would be comprised in the two branches of it." (See Elliot's Debates on the Constitution, volume 5, pages 151–2.)

Franklin, Sherman, Madison, Butler, Bedford, and Mason participated in the debate, and were each opposed to an absolute veto. Dr. Franklin said:

> He was sorry to differ from his colleague, for whom he had a very great respect, on any occasion, but he could not help it on this. He had had some experience of this check in the executive on the legislature, under the proprietary government of Pennsylvania. The negative of the governor was constantly made use of to extort money. No good law whatever could be passed without a private bargain with him. An increase of his salary, or some donation, was always made a condition, till at last it became the regular practice to have orders in his favor, on the treasury, presented along with the bills to be signed, so that he might actually receive the former before he should sign the latter. When the Indians were scalping the Western people, and notice of it arrived, the concurrence of the governor in the means of self-defense could not be got till it was agreed that his estate should be exempted from taxation; so that the people were to fight for the security of his property, whilst he was to bear no share of the burden. This was a mischievous sort of check. If the executive was to have a council, such a power would be less objectionable. It was true the King of Great Britain had not, as was said, exerted his negative since the revolution; but that matter was easily explained. The bribes and emoluments now given to the members of Parliament rendered it unnecessary, everything being done according to the will of the ministers. He was afraid, if a negative should be given, as proposed, that more power and money would be demanded, till at last enough would be got to influence and bribe the legislature into a complete subjection to the will of the executive.—*Id.*, page 152.

Roger Sherman very justly remarked that he—

> Was against enabling any one man to stop the will of the whole. No one man could be found so far above all the rest in wisdom. He thought we ought to avail ourselves of his wisdom in revising laws, but not permit him to overrule the decided and cool opinions of the legislature.—*Id.*, page 152.

In the course of the debate Dr. Franklin further said:

> The first man put at the helm will be a good one. Nobody knows what sort may come afterwards. The executive will be always increasing here, as elsewhere, till it ends in a monarchy.—*Id.*, page 154.

Finally a majority of the States gave the veto power to the President, subject to be overruled by a two-thirds vote of both branches of the National Legislature.

A very small part of the debate on this vital provision has been preserved, but sufficient remains to show that Hamilton and others, who desired a strong executive, if not a king, succeeded in retaining the veto power in its present form by assuming that it would never be abused, because it had not been exercised by the King of Great Britain since the revolution.

It seems strange that the framers of the Constitution, endowed as they were with almost prophetic vision, were misled by such arguments. They were certainly familiar with the struggles commenced in the eleventh century between the kings and the barons, and continued between the kings and Parliament until the revolution and the execution of Charles I in 1649. They knew that for nearly five hundred years the people of England had struggled against royal prerogatives, of which the veto power and the power to dispense with the execution of the laws (originally a part of the veto power) were most obnoxious and that the revolution had practically changed the constitution of Great Britain so that the power to make laws was in fact executed by Parliament alone, and the veto power, by common consent, was abandoned.

The non-use of this power by the kings of Great Britain after it had been practically wrested from them by the revolution, was a poor reason for supposing the power itself harmless for evil. The warning of Dr. Franklin was prophetic. The first man was "a good one." Several that came after were also good. But the executive power has increased here, as elsewhere, until the President has more individual power than the sovereign of any constitutional monarchy in the civilized world.

From the time of the adoption of the Constitution to the 4th of March, 1885, when President Cleveland was inaugurated, the whole number of vetoes of all his predecessors was only one hundred and thirty-three. President Cleveland in a little over three years has vetoed one hundred and seventy-four, and has "pocketed" or refused to sign fifty bills which were presented to him within the last ten days of a session of Congress. The suggestion that many of these vetoed bills were for small pensions to soldiers or widows of soldiers is not a satisfactory reason for the exercise of arbitrary power against the deliberate judgment of a majority of Congress; on the contrary, such legislation may be just as meritorious as any other.

The use of the veto power in ordinary matters of legislation was never contemplated by the framers of the Constitution. Such a suggestion would have been regarded as extremely absurd. In article 73 of the Federalist, Alexander Hamilton discusses at length the veto power and maintains that it was only intended to be used in great emergencies to protect the constitutional rights of the Executive, or to prevent the evident and palpable sacrifice of the public interest, and that there was not the least danger that it would be used under other circumstances. No bill vetoed by the present Executive either by returning it to the House in which it originated, with his objections, or by neglecting to sign it in the last ten days of a session, can be cited which involved a constitutional or an unusually important question of any kind. No case suggested by Alexander Hamilton or any other member of the Constitutional Convention as proper for the exercise of the veto power has arisen since the inauguration of President Cleveland; on the contrary, every bill passed by Congress which has failed to become a law by the action or non-action of the President depended upon matters of fact and discretion confided to Congress alone, as shown by the published debates of the framers of the Constitution.

Nor can it be said that any of these bills were of a partisan character. This was impossible under the organization of Congress since Mr. Cleveland became President, one House being Republican and the other Democratic. There is no pretense that the legislation vetoed by the President was the result of passion or prejudice, or was intended to aid either political party. The vetoes of the President rest solely upon the assumption that it is the duty of the President to nullify every law for which he would not have voted as a member of Congress—an assumption not only of superior wisdom, honesty, and patriotism to both branches of Congress, but also that the Executive, with his multifarious duties, has a better opportunity to ascertain facts and judge of the necessities of every section of this vast country than the Representatives of the people elected for that purpose and supplied at the expense of the Government with committee-rooms, clerks, and all the appliances necessary to conduct the legislation in conformity with the complicated wants of our great and growing country. If he is right, why have a Congress? If the Executive is also the legislative department, we have no further use for Congress. How different the position taken by the early Presidents!

The contrast between Washington and Cleveland is well illustrated by the fact that Washington during the eight years of his administration vetoed only two bills, one because it was manifestly in conflict with the Constitution and the other on account of an oversight of Congress, while President Cleveland in three years of his administration vetoed more than one hundred times that number.

The contrast between Lincoln and Cleveland in respect to the exercise of this kingly prerogative is equally marked. Mr. Lincoln sent but one veto to Congress, and that was simply to correct a manifest error in the bill.

President Cleveland pays no respect whatever to the example of Jefferson, whom the Democrats claim as the great progenitor of their party; on the contrary, he utterly repudiates the teachings of that great statesman. Jefferson occupied the Presidential chair for eight years, from March 4, 1801, to March 4, 1809, and did not in a single instance exercise the monarchial power of a veto. John Adams, John Quincy Adams, Martin Van Buren, Zachary Taylor, and Millard Fillmore followed the example of Jefferson and refrained from exercising the veto power. Harrison and Garfield died in office before a session of Congress commenced.

But times have changed and our form of Government has changed from democratic simplicity at its inception to a one-man power, re-

sponsive only to the necessities of party and the influence of money. The discretionary power exercised by the Executive by a misconstruction of the veto power, by loose provisions in the statutes, by the growing number and importance of official appointments, by forced constructions of statutes contrary to their obvious meaning, has clothed the Presidential office with many of the essential elements of the despot. Tyranny is nothing but unlimited discretion. A people governed by the unrestrained will of a sovereign have no liberties. The only distinction between the President of the United States and a tyrant consists in the limitations placed upon the discretion of the former by law. The removal, one by one, by the means above recited, of the limitations upon the Executive office intended by the Constitution and preserved in the early legislation of Congress has increased the power of that office until it overshadows the legislative and judicial departments, which by the Constitution were intended to be equal and independent.

The people of the United States do not realize the growing power of the Executive. There are more than one hundred thousand offices at his disposal. Formerly members of Congress had much to say with regard to the appointments of the officers in their districts or States. This has been prohibited by law, and the entire appointing power practically concentrated in the Executive. A member of Congress is not even allowed to give evidence as to the qualifications of an applicant for office. The President alone determines all questions relating to the appointments to office, either by himself or by a board called the "Civil Service Commission," appointed by him and removable at his pleasure.

The vast revenues collected from the people by taxes are practically used by the Administration as a private fund to augment the power of the Executive. This result is reached in part by legislation and in part by forced constructions of the laws.

The legislation of Congress, secured no matter how or by whom devised, permits the Administration to loan the accumulated funds in the Treasury to such national banks as may be in favor with the Executive, without interest or reward to the Government. And this power has been liberally exercised by the present Administration in loaning over $60,000,000 of the people's money to such national banks as enjoy the good fortune to find favor in the eyes of the Secretary of the Treasury.

The Administration also exercises the power, either legally or assumed, to use the revenues of the Government in the purchase of United States bonds at the enormous premium of over 27 per cent. from persons unknown to the public, but presumably well known to the Executive.

The Administration also possesses the enormous power to increase at pleasure the value of bonds and other securities for the payment of money, and to depress to an unlimited extent the products of labor and of the farm and the factory. This vast power is conferred on the Administration by the law which makes it discretionary with the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase and coin not less than two million nor more than four million dollars' worth of silver bullion per month. Unfortunately for the country, the Secretary of the Treasury exercises his discretion against the people and in favor of the bond-holding, moneyed aristocracy of the United States and Europe. If he had exercised this discretion in behalf of the people, there would have been three hundred millions more coin or coin certificates in circulation; the ruinous discount on silver would have been avoided; wheat and cotton would command from 40 to 50 per cent. more money in the market; United States bonds and other evidences of indebtedness would not be the only profitable investments in the United States; millions of laborers would not be out of employment; thrift, enterprise, and prosperity would exist where gloom and stagnation of business threaten universal bankruptcy, and there would be less surplus in the Treasury to enrich favorites and rob the people by paying enormous premiums in the purchase of bonds not yet due.

However people may differ as to the propriety of using silver as money, no one will deny that the discretionary power given to the executive department by the act of 1878 to expand or contract the currency to favor bondholders and creditors by making money dear, or to relieve the people from bankruptcy by the use of both metals, is an enormous power, and should never be trusted to the executive department of any goverument.

Few laws are passed by Congress affecting the collection or disbursement of the revenue which are sufficiently definite to restrain the administration from discriminating in favor of one class of persons against another, and conferring vast benefits upon the favored to the injury of others, including the United States. A few familiar examples showing how the revenue laws are construed will illustrate the manner in which the Executive exercises an almost unlimited discretion in favor of particular interests to the injury of others.

The tariff law of 1883 imposes a duty on load ore and lead dross in the following language.

Lead ore and lead dross, 1½ cents per pound.

There is no exception in the law. All lead ores and lead dross are included within the plain language of the statute. But silver ore is on the free-list, and the Secretary of the Treasury is called upon to decide whether silver ore containing lead shall be classed as silver ore and imported free of duty or be classed as lead ore and pay a duty of 1½ cents per pound. Under this law the Secretary of the Treasury rules that ores containing more value in silver than in lead shall be admitted free as silver ore.

This ruling practically repeals the law and admits all lead ore free of duty. Whatever the true rule may be, the law confers an enormous discretionary power on the Secretary. It is estimated that the importations of lead ore classed as silver ore under this ruling from 1884 to 1888 through El Paso alone amount to 95,849 tons, which would have yielded a revenue if classed as lead ore of $2,875,470. Large importations of lead ore classed as silver ore are also made through Laredo and Nogales and Baltimore and other ports, and the amount is constantly increasing. It will thus be seen that by this ruling, if erroneous, the Government is losing a vast amount of money which somebody is gaining.

India is a province of England and therefore near to the heart of the Treasury Department. It is a large exporter of wool to the United States. The tariff on wool was inconvenient to the producers of that commodity in India, but this inconvenience has been greatly mitigated by a ruling of the Treasury Department. The amount of duty collected on imported goods of all descriptions, wool included, is determined by the market price of the commodity in the country from which it is exported. For the purpose of fixing the price of imports so as to determine the amount of duty to be paid to the United States, the Director of the Mint is required to state the value of foreign coins in foreign countries, so that it can be determined at what price any given article imported was purchased in the country from which it was exported. The statement is as follows:

The value of foreign coin as expressed in the money of account of the United States shall be that of the pure metal of such coin of standard value; and the values of the standard coins in circulation of the various nations of the world shall be estimated annually by the Director of the Mint, and be proclaimed on the 1st day of January by the Secretary of the Treasury.—*Section 3564, Revised Statutes.*

It will be observed that the value of foreign coins is to be determined by the amount of pure metal in the standard coins of the various countries; but the Director of the Mint has established a different rule from that provided in the statutes, which, according to his letter to the Senate of May 4, 1888, is as follows:

In estimating the values of foreign coins in the case of countries of a single silver standard, the values of the monetary units, and consequently of the silver coins, are determined by ascertaining the market value of the pure silver in such units, based upon the mean price of silver in the London market for a period commencing October 1 and ending December 24 last preceding, as per daily cable dispatches to the Bureau of the Mint.

In the case of countries having the double standard the value of the bimetallic par is ascertained by comparing the amount of pure gold in a given unit with the pure gold in the unit of the United States.

He does not inform us what statute authorizes him to value the silver coins of one country according to one standard and those of another country according to another standard, nor why he takes the market price of silver bullion in London instead of the amount of pure silver, as required by the statute, as a criterion for fixing the value of foreign silver coins. But whatever his reasons may be, it so happens that he has hit upon a construction of the law which is very beneficial to India and other foreign countries from which wool and certain other commodities are imported.

The rupee is a silver coin of India, the unit of value and a full legal tender in that country. Its purchasing power in India has not been diminished by the demonetization of silver. It contains 165 grains of pure silver, or 181.5 grains of standard silver nine-tenths fine, and is worth, if valued according to the statute, 44½ cents of our money. The Director of the Mint, however, values it according to the fluctuations and speculative sales of silver bullion in the London market. By that process he deducts from the value of the rupee 11.3 cents, and instead of placing the true value, 44½ cents, on the rupee, he fixes it at only 32.2 cents, or a discount of 33⅓ per cent. This makes a like discount of 33⅓ per cent. for revenue purposes on the value of all raw wool imported from India.

The tariff law fixes a duty of 5 cents a pound on all raw wool valued at over 12 cents a pound. Wool valued at 12 cents a pound and less pays a duty of only 2½ cents a pound. The value of wool being fixed in India by the value of the rupee, the undervaluation of the rupee by the Director of the Mint causes a like undervaluation of the wool and brings it into a lower grade upon which there is a duty of only 2½ cents a pound. Wool imported into the United States during the last five years from India which cost in India over 12 cents a pound according to the true value of the rupee, was admitted as being worth 12 cents and below by reason of this undervaluation of the rupee, occasioning a loss to the United States of $895,883.09. For a like reason there was a loss on imported jute from India during the same period of $520,296.14; on dressed skins, $233,025.28; on gunny-bags, $456,356.92, making a total loss on imports from India during the last five years of $2,105,511.43. This loss to the United States was occasioned by the construction of the law by the Director of the Mint, and whatever reasons may be assigned in support of it, it will hardly be denied that equally sound arguments exist in favor of a construction which would have saved this large sum of money to the United States. This illustrates the vast discretionary power of the Executive.

This undervaluation of foreign coins produced a similar effect on the importations of wool from other countries, as will appear from the following table:

On imported wool from—	
Russia, 1884 to 1886, inclusive	$1,135,082.20
Mexico, 1884 to 1887, inclusive	158,714.37
Chili, 1883 to 1887, inclusive	213,891.21
Uruguay, 1885 to 1887, inclusive	696,955.68
Total	2,204,642.44
Add loss on imports of wool, etc., from India for last five years	2,105,511.43
Total loss	$4,310,153.87

It would be interesting to pursue this subject further, and, if it were possible, to exhibit for the consideration of the people the various rulings and discriminations of the Treasury Department, whereby special privileges are granted and merchant princes are created in the great city of New York and elsewhere at the expense of the people. But my purpose is already served. I do not desire in calling attention to the veto power to point out frauds on the revenue, but to show the almost unlimited discretionary power exercised by the Executive, and which he may use at his pleasure, to benefit his friends, or to destroy his enemies. This power is not confined to the administration of the revenue laws.

Nearly all land titles in the United States were obtained from the Government, still the Attorney-General assumes the authority to bring suits to set aside any land-patent issued by the Government, no matter when, and thereby and without a hearing cloud the title of any citizen to his land, and involve him in ruinous litigation, who shall incur the displeasure of the imperial power of the administration. An example of this extraordinary power, and the more extraordinary manner of its exercise, is found in the action of the Attorney-General in farming out to private parties the privilege to bring suits in the name of the United States to set aside land-patents in California which have been granted after years of litigation in tribunals created by Congress to carry into effect the terms of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. After thirty years of litigation the Mexican land grants in California have been settled and patents issued to land amounting in the aggregate to over 8,000,000 acres, now improved and inhabited by not less than 800,000 people. Under such circumstances it would be supposed that the Executive would have allowed the matter to rest until Congress should authorize further proceedings. But the Attorney-General has assumed the responsibility to authorize a large number of suits to set aside patents, some of which were issued more than thirty years ago, since which time the lands have passed into the hands of innocent purchasers and are inhabited by thousands of people. These suits will involve enormous expense, cloud the title of innocent purchasers for many years, and the United States will be the loser and not the gainer by the proceedings, as it has been in several suits of like character authorized by the Attorney-General and decided against the United States in every instance by the courts. It may, however, be beneficial for some political purpose or design of which the public are not informed.

Another example of the exercise of executive power is illustrated by the unsuccessful raid of the Attorney-General on the Bell Telephone Company. I have nothing to do with the motives of that distinguished officer in instituting these proceedings. I simply refer to this matter to show the growing tendency of the executive department to interfere with private rights.

The treaty-making power is also confided to the President. To what extent this vast power may be used to advance the ambitious projects of the Executive can well be imagined. The friendship and good offices of such a power as Great Britain might possibly be secured in a close political contest in this country by yielding to the selfish demands of our most formidable rival.

These are a few examples of the discretionary power of the President conferred by the Constitution, by misconceptions of that instrument, by unguarded laws, and usurped by forced constructions of statutes. Few tyrants ever had wider discretion. None ever had equal resources to enforce the tyranny of discretion.

Many of these evils might be remedied or checked by legislation, and the liberties of the people guarded by law if Congress had power to legislate against the will of the Executive. What hope is there for such legislation while it takes a two-thirds majority of each House of Congress to pass any law which the Executive opposes either on account of the law itself or on account of the attitude towards himself of the persons who advocate its passage?

It is not encouraging to conscientious members of Congress laboring to perfect bills in the interests of the people, to know that the President may send them back to Congress without his approval or throw them into the waste basket at the end of the session without investigation. The assumption of the Executive that he can evolve more knowledge from his inner consciousness while shut up in the White House in the ten days allotted to him to sign bills than the representatives of the people can acquire through all the avenues of information accessible to them, was never indulged in by the fathers of the Constitution.

A large majority of each House of Congress is to-day in favor of honest money, opposed to delegating the sovereign right to issue money to private corporations, and in favor of the free use of both gold and silver as money according to the sanction of the Constitution and the usages of all civilized nations for many hundred years previous to the demonetization of silver by the United States and Europe in the interest of the creditor class and for the development of the resources of India at the expense of the United States.

When the President called upon Congress for the power to speculate in bonds under the pretense of supplying the people with money by disbursing the surplus in the Treasury, the Senate by a vote of 38 to 13 consented to this request, with the condition that there should be no further contraction of the currency, and to prevent which the Secretary of the Treasury was required to purchase and coin silver to take the place of the national-bank currency retired in the purchase of bonds and under the operation of existing laws. The President refused to grant this small favor to the people. The bond-purchase bill was buried in the Committee on Ways and Means of the House, and the representatives of the people denied an opportunity to pass upon this small measure of relief. No proceeding has taken place more gratifying to the moneyed aristocracy of Europe and the governing money-trust of the United States than the scheme whereby an excuse to speculate in bonds was obtained by a naked resolution of the House, and all manner of redress denied to the people of the United States, who are loaded down with debt and struggling against impending ruin, forced upon them by contraction.

The spirit of the times and the animus of the powers that be are indicated by the language of the leading Democratic organ of this city. While I know it would be unjust to hold the President responsible for all that is written by his admirers, still I can not suppose that so able and faithful a journal as the Washington Post would intentionally misrepresent the views of the President of the United States. Without attaching too much importance to the editorials of the Post, I must be permitted to call the attention of the Senate to what this most devoted friend of the President says as to the purposes and designs of the Chief Magistrate of the nation, and the real reasons for his vetoes and other executive acts. In its issue of May 10 the following leading editorial appears:

NO MORE POLITICAL PRUDERY.

The tariff bill now pending in the House of Representatives might just as properly be called the Cleveland bill as the Mills bill. It is the response of the Democratic House, through the majority of the Ways and Means Committee, to the urgent demand of the Democratic President for a Democratic reduction of redundant revenues and needless taxation. It is, therefore, the Democratic party's bill, and no man calling himself a Democrat has a right to work for its defeat or decline to support it.

In all human associations men owe obligations to each other, and as individuals are bound to sacrifice something for the general good. The Democratic party had now reached a point where it can not afford to tolerate infidelity to the Democratic creed. And least of all things can it afford to have the Democratic Administration feeding at the public crib men who work in the vineyard of the enemy.

President Cleveland's tariff message is his platform for the Presidential campaign. He is responsible for the fact that loyalty to him and his party is inconsistent with the refusal of loyal support to the pending bill. The Post has, on many occasions, commended the President for his zeal in the cause of revenue reform. His sincerity is beyond question now, and will not be questioned in the future if he uses the power that he possesses to aid in carrying the bill through the House.

In plain terms, it is time to have done with political prudery and to let every so-called Democratic Representative understand that support of this bill is the test by which the Administration will try his Democracy. President Cleveland did not object when Federal prestige was used to unhorse RANDALL in Pennsylvania. Without the aid of the Administration Mr. RANDALL could not have been deposed. Is President Cleveland too fastidious to let Mr. MCADOO, of New Jersey, a close and doubtful State, understand that a Democratic Administration will not find corn for the oxen that plowed the Republican field? The same kind of fire that was built behind RANDALL in Pennsylvania should be used in the cases of MCADOO, FORAN, and any other so-called Democrat who declines to go with his party in the hour of need.

There are emergencies in politics as in war that try the mettle of commanders. Mr. Cleveland has done admirably in laying out the campaign. Will he suffer a repulse in the initial skirmish by reason of excessive fastidiousness? Or will he use the ample means in his power to insure victory?

The following day it gleefully rejoices over the misfortunes of Mr. SOWDEN, of Allentown, in its most facetious style. It says:

Monte-Christo Cleveland after the Sowden-Allentown veto: "ONE."

The others are quite handy, Mr. President—all within easy striking distance—MCADOO, FORAN, and all their jolly fellowship. Strike again, Mr. President, and strike hard. MCADOO will make a beautiful number "Two."

The haughty arrogance with which the Post proclaims in its issue of May 12 the doom of all recreant Democrats who manifest symptoms of conscience and a desire to represent their constituents, and who refuse to—

Crook the pregnant hinges of the knee,
Where thrift may follow fawning,

expresses better than words of mine the ample power of the Executive as understood by his faithful organ. In its issue of that day it says:

CALL THE ROLL.

* * * The thing is to pass the bill—

Meaning the Mills bill—

practically as it stands before the meeting of the Democratic national convention. The vote will demonstrate who are the traitors in the Democratic camp of whom we have heard so much.

Mr. SAMUEL J. RANDALL will not be one, however. He is to all intents and purposes a Pennsylvania Republican, and he makes no secret of his intention to voice the sentiments of his immediate constituency in all tariff matters. This is fair and square and upright, and no one was better satisfied with it than Mr. Cleveland himself when he took Mr. RANDALL at his word and deprived him of his Federal patronage at the same time. But Mr. RANDALL has a Democratic fol-

lowing, we are told—twelve good Democrats and true, who are owned by the Republican protectionists who do business in their districts. Who are these gentlemen? It is easy to pick out three in Mr. FORAN, of Ohio; Mr. MCADOO, of New Jersey; and the melancholy SOWDEN, of Allentown post-office; but who are the others?

It seems to us of great importance to know this before the St. Louis convention assembles. It will take the convention about twenty-four hours to renominate Mr. Cleveland, and then he will be so great a man that he need not scruple to take each Congressional backslider by the scruff of his neck and throw him out of the Democratic party. And he will not. The President respects himself, and he has quite made up his mind that his followers shall respect the issue upon which he has decided to fight the campaign. There is an Allentown for every SOWDEN. It only needs that the SOWDEN shall disclose himself in time.

The following also appeared in the same issue of the Post:

PRESIDENT CLEVELAND'S RESPONSIBILITY.

* * * By his own deliberate act he bound his own and his party's fortunes to a policy that is embodied in the pending tariff bill. He put his hand bravely to the plow and it turned a good Democratic furrow. His party does not expect him to look back.

Mr. Cleveland has it in his power to aid his friends in the House of Representatives in passing the Mills bill, the bill that exists as a response to his message; the bill that, coupled with his message, must be his and his party's platform in the Presidential campaign. As we said the other day, it is time to have done with political prudery and to get down to business; it is not a time for sentimentalism or fastidiousness, but for practical politics. There are men who, while enjoying the favor of the Democratic Administration, may be found working, with their coats off and sleeves rolled up, on the Republican side of the fence.

Let them look for their rewards to the party whose work they are doing.

Mr. SOWDEN ought to be able to appreciate the following item, which also appeared in the Post of May 12:

MR. SOWDEN'S CHANCES—HE IS LIKELY TO BE LEFT AT HOME NEXT YEAR.

The Republican Legislature of Pennsylvania has reapportioned the State so that the districts now represented by Representatives ERMENTROUT and SOWDEN are merged into one district, and one of the two gentlemen named can not come back to the next Congress. It looks as though Mr. SOWDEN would be left at home. During the present Congress he has been making himself as disagreeable as possible to the Democrats, and as inimical as he was capable of being to Democratic legislation. Of the several Pennsylvania Democrats who used to co-operate with Mr. RANDALL in opposing tariff reform, Mr. SOWDEN is the only one who has continued to anathematize the Mills tariff bill. And now he has been deprived by a Presidential veto of the influence that might accrue to him from the enactment of a law appropriating $100,000 for a new public building in his own town—Allentown.

In Mr. ERMENTROUT'S town a new public building is in course of erection. Mr. ERMENTROUT now freely declares his conviction that a tariff bill will pass the House this session. He even says, with regard to the free-wool clause, the most critical and important one in the bill, that the prospect of its adoption is improving; and Mr. ERMENTROUT, it is said, is in a fair way to be renominated and re-elected to Congress. "It is useless to kick against the dashboard," he says. "If you can't kick over it, better not kick at all."

The most exact statement of the situation, however, as understood by this devoted organ of the President, appears as the leading editorial in the issue of May 19, as follows:

DESTINY.

When Napoleon the First concluded to become Emperor of the French he crowned himself. It was an interesting scene. The Cathedral of Notre Dame was thronged with the greatest men and women in the world. There were kings and queens, princes, generals, statesmen, and scholars galore, all assembled to grace the triumph of the conqueror. First in place stood the Pope of Rome. He had come to crown the emperor.

When the critical moment arrived, however, Napoleon took the imperial crown and crowned himself. Pope Pius was but a spectator.

A similar scene will occur in the city of St. Louis on the 8th day of June, in this year of grace 1888. Mr. Grover Cleveland has summoned a national Democratic convention to renominate him for the Presidency of the United States, and eight hundred and twenty delegates will assemble to do his bidding. But they will really have nothing to do. When the time comes to vote it will be apparent to the veriest tyro among them that President Cleveland has already renominated himself. He is a man of destiny, and will do as men of destiny do. The Democratic nomination is his by right of conquest, and he will not condescend to receive it from any hands but his own.

Well, let it be so. This is a self-made country, and it is natural that it should fall down before a self-made man. But was there ever so thoroughly self-made a man as Grover Cleveland I.? We think not.

Mr. HAMPTON. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. STEWART. I would rather not be interrupted.

Mr. HAMPTON. I only wanted to give the comments of another Democratic newspaper.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator can do that after I get through. I decline to yield now.

The situation is forcibly stated in this article. No one denies Mr. Cleveland's absolute ownership of the Democratic party. Before reaching Washington he sent word to the Democratic members of the House to discard one of the precious metals, and in all things to do the bidding of Wall street. The refusal of patriotic Democrats to abandon their constituents and join the golden bondholding ring challenged the admiration of the country. The House of Representatives seemed to be an impregnable fortress against any assault from Wall street; but it has fallen. With a wave of the hand of Grover Cleveland I. that body was paralyzed so that it could not even utter the word "silver" when the Senate sent it the Beck amendment on the bond-purchasing bill. At this rate the growing power of this man of destiny has but to continue unresisted for another term of four years to so intrench Grover Cleveland I. in the White House that nothing but revolution can remove him.

I can hardly suppose the President dictated the language in the foregoing quotation, as he is in the habit of dictating the policy of Congress, but he undoubtedly inspired it and impressed it upon the plastic mind of the editor of the Post by the majesty of power by which he controls, subjugates, and tramples down not only the independence of his party in Congress but the customs and usages of the Government and the rights and privileges of the people. Napoleons may dazzle and captivate the people of France, but it will take years of misrule and oppression to subjugate the people of the United States and make them tamely submit to a dictator. While it must be admitted that the Chief Executive has absorbed and is exercising both the executive and legislative powers of the nation, and his example is forming a precedent and pointing the way to imperial power for other ambitious leaders who may follow him, he himself will hardly reach the goal of imperial sway enjoyed by the great Napoleon, which, according to the Post, his conduct so strikingly resembles. There is no doubt, however, that with the resources which the Executive has at his command any other people except the inhabitants of these United States would be deprived of their liberties. Never before in the hands of one man were such vast powers and resources intrusted by a confiding people.

It remains to be seen whether he will be able to fulfill the expectations of the Post by imitating Napoleon and crowning himself because he regards all others unworthy to perform that service.

The most alarming feature connected with the exercise of the veto power by the President is that it no longer attracts attention; on the contrary, the people are fast being educated to regard the Executive as the source of all power. The vetoes of the President are treated by the press as no more remarkable than the passage of bills through either House of Congress, while in the earlier and better days of the Republic the exercise of the veto power was regarded as most extraordinary. A hundred vetoes in a single session of Congress would have created a revolution in those days. Many leading journals of to-day congratulate the Executive on his independence in disregarding the acts of Congress in his almost daily vetoes of bills originating in a Democratic House or a Republican Senate, and subject to the scrutiny of Democratic as well as Republican committees. The idea that the king can do no wrong is not original with these journals. It has been preached during all the ages in every despotic government, and is a doctrine sacred to tyrants. "Long live the king!" "Hosannahs to the conquering hero!" have ever greeted the usurper in his triumphant march to imperial power. Our Republic is being converted into a monarchy on account of an oversight in framing the Constitution. Shall it be remedied?

It was not deemed possible by the founders of the Constitution to make a perfect instrument of government, or to provide against every scheme of oppression the enemies of liberty could devise to rob the people of free government, and consequently a mode of meeting emergencies as they might arise was provided in the Constitution by way of amending that instrument. Still there are persons who would not remedy defects in the fundamental law notwithstanding the liberties of the people were endangered, and would prefer tyranny with the letter of the Constitution as it was, to liberty preserved by perfecting that instrument so as to maintain the form of government designed by the fathers.

John Tyler, who became President by the death of General Harrison, vetoed ten bills during his administration, and his course has been condemned by posterity. His fifth veto aroused the indignation of a majority of Congress. A select House committee was appointed to take into consideration the reasons of the President in refusing his assent to the bill. John Quincy Adams, ex-President of the United States, who did not veto a bill during his administration, was made chairman of the committee. On August 16, 1842, Mr. Adams presented the report of the committee. It is a powerful arraignment of the President, and suggests that he ought to be impeached for his arbitrary and unjustifiable acts in usurping the power and thwarting the will of Congress. The remedy proposed, however, was not impeachment, but an amendment to the Constitution reducing the vote necessary to pass a bill over the veto of the President from two-thirds of each House to a majority, which is the proposition now under consideration. The concluding portion of the report, together with the amendment proposed, is as follows:

The power of the present Congress to enact laws essential to the welfare of the people has been struck with apoplexy by the Executive hand. Submission to his will is the only condition upon which he will permit them to act. For the enactment of a measure earnestly recommended by himself, he forbids their action, unless coupled with a condition declared by himself to be on a subject so totally different that he will not suffer them to be coupled in the same law. With that condition Congress can not comply. In this state of things he has assumed, as the committee fully believe, the exercise of the whole legislative power to himself, and is levying millions of money upon the people without any authority of law. But the final decision of this question depends neither upon legislative nor executive, but upon judicial authority, nor can the final decision of the Supreme Court upon it be pronounced before the close of the present Congress. In the mean time the abusive exercise of the constitutional power of the President to arrest the action of Congress upon measures vital to the welfare of the people, has wrought conviction upon the minds of a majority of the committee that the veto power itself must be restrained and modified by an amendment of the Constitution itself: a resolution for which they accordingly herewith respectfully report.

JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.
JOHN M. BOTTS.
JAMES COOPER.
K. RAYNER.
THOMAS J. CAMPBELL.
TRUMAN SMITH.
F. GRANGER.
H. S. LANE.
JEREMIAH MORROW.
H. A. PEARCE.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of both Houses concurring therein), That the following amendment of the Constitution of the United States, in the seventh section of the first article, be recommended to the Legislatures of the several States, which, on the adoption of the same by three-fourths of the said Legislatures, shall become part and parcel of the Constitution:

Instead of the words "two-thirds," twice repeated in the second paragraph of the said seventh section, substitute in both cases the words "a majority of the whole number." (See Congressional Globe, second session Twenty-seventh Congress, 1841-'42, page 896.)

If the amendment proposed by Mr. Adams had been adopted the legislative department of the Government to-day might be able to perform its legitimate functions, notwithstanding the vast accumulation of power in the hands of the Executive. It can not be supposed that bribery alone in the shape of offices and special privileges granted to members of Congress and their friends by an ambitious Executive could control a majority in either House of Congress. The check upon legislation, resulting from a reconsideration in Congress of a bill after a veto, would be sufficient to prevent hasty legislation. If, after hearing the reasons of the President, it should be the deliberate opinion of a majority of both Houses of Congress that a bill should become a law, no one-man power ought to exist in the Government to prevent it.

There is a growing sentiment in the States against the veto power. Nine of them have already qualified it so that a majority of the Legislature can pass a bill over the veto of the governor. They are Alabama, Arkansas, Connecticut, Indiana, Kentucky, New Jersey, Tennessee, Vermont, and West Virginia. Nebraska and Maryland have reduced the majority to three-fifths, while the governors of the States of Delaware, North Carolina, Ohio, and Rhode Island have no veto power conferred upon them by the constitutions of their States. No inconvenience has arisen in any of the States above named for lack of veto power in the governor.

It is absurd to suppose that one man in the White House charged with the multifarious duties of the Executive office can more deliberately examine legislation than the majority of Congress, aided by its committees with no other business but to perfect and pass laws. It is equally absurd to suppose that the one man in the White Honse absorbs and monopolizes all the honor and integrity of the nation.

The arguments in favor of lodging the veto power with the President alone are the same that have been used from time immemorial for placing all power in the hands of a king and regarding him as the fountain of law and justice. It was supposed that the plea of the divine right of kings had become obsolete in the United States and that in the place thereof the people had become sovereign; but the omnipotent sway of Executive power and the commendation it receives from a portion of the public press, remind us that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty," and that despotism is the necessary consequence of intrusting the liberties of the people to the safe-keeping of any one man, no matter by what name he be called, whether emperor, king, or president. However much he may be loved by the people the result is the same. Delegated power without a reservation of the right to recall it will never be voluntarily surrendered to the people. The first step in the way of reform in legislation and administration is to restore to Congress legislative power to the end that the people's representatives may defend the rights of their constituents, regardless of the frowns or smiles of an ambitious Executive.

I want it distinctly understood that I have no disposition to criticise the President on account of any unkind feeling towards him personally. On the contrary, I am forced to acknowledge the sagacity and skill with which he controls the heterogeneous masses of the Democratic party by a judicious use of the loaves and fishes. In many things that he is doing, and which I have criticised, he is but following in the footsteps of his recent predecessors. The trouble is that he disregards the restraints imposed upon him by the Constitution and the laws. The exercise of the great natural force with which he is endowed is concentrating the whole power of the Government in the Executive, and if not restrained must ultimately lead to a monarchy. The people admire courage, independence, audacity, and will. These qualities are possessed in a high degree by Mr. Cleveland. While they are guaranties of personal success, they are dangerous to popular liberty. They are the qualities which always increase Executive authority at the expense of the people.

The selection by Mr. Cleveland of the money kings and bondholding aristocracy of Europe and America as his allies proves his sagacity and shows his appreciation of the necessity for the use of money in accomplishing his Napoleonic schemes. If such associations do not arouse the people to action before it is too late, it will be because the boldness and daring of this man of destiny dazzles and blinds them.

In closing my remarks I will quote from a speech by Henry Clay made in the Senate in 1842 in protesting against the usurpations of John Tyler. It is as follows:

> Let me here say, in reply, that the ancient principles and mode of legislation which has ever prevailed from the foundation of this Government has been to fix first upon the general principles which are to guide us, and then to carry out these principles by detailed legislation. Such has ever been the course pursued, not only in the country from which we derive our legislative institutions, but our own. The memorable resolution offered in the British House of Commons by the celebrated Mr. Duning is no doubt familiar to the mind of every one—that "the power of the Crown (and it is equally true of our own Chief Magistrate) had increased, was increasing, and ought to be diminished."

The statement of Mr. Clay is verified by history. In the first quarter of a century after the inauguration of Washington there were six vetoes; in the second quarter, nineteen vetoes; in the third quarter, thirty-one vetoes, and in the fourth quarter, or the last twenty-four years to date, two hundred and fifty-five vetoes, more than two-thirds of which were made by Mr. Cleveland, in addition to his fifty pocket vetoes in the last Congress.

I submit that this is matter for serious consideration.

DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL.

The bill (H. R. 9989) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

INAUGURATION DAY IN THE DISTRICT.

The bill (H. R. 8843) to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia so as to make inauguration day a holiday within said District was read twice by its title.

Mr. DANIEL. Having casually examined the text of the bill, I find that it is almost identical in terms with Senate bill 2551, which has already been passed by the Senate. I therefore ask that the House bill be taken up and passed without reference to a committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that the bill be now considered. It will be read for information.

The bill was read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have it lie on the table for a few moments, so that I may look at it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will lie on the table for the present.

PENSION APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. ALLISON submitted the following report:

> The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5145) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, and 5, and agree to the same.
>
> That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$16,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.
>
> W. B. ALLISON,
> H. L. DAWES,
> A. P. GORMAN,
> *Managers on the part of the Senate.*
>
> M. A. FORAN,
> EDWARD J. GAY,
> JOHN D. LONG,
> *Managers on the part of the House.*

The report was concurred in.

COMMITTEE ON THE MEAT PRODUCT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* appointed Mr. VEST, Mr. PLUMB, Mr. MANDERSON, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. COKE as the select committee authorized by the resolution of the Senate of the 16th instant, providing for the appointment of a special committee to examine fully into all questions touching the meat product of the United States.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After two hours and forty minutes spent in executive session, the doors were reopened.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, moved that when the Senate adjourn it be to Monday next, and called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and being taken, resulted—yeas 23, nays 23; as follows:

YEAS—23.

Bate,	Faulkner,	Kenna,	Ransom,
Berry,	George,	McPherson,	Reagan,
Blodgett,	Gorman,	Morgan,	Saulsbury,
Call,	Gray,	Pasco,	Turpie,
Cockrell,	Hampton,	Payne,	Voorhees.
Daniel,	Jones of Arkansas,	Pugh,	

NAYS—23.

Aldrich,	Davis,	Hawley,	Platt,
Allison,	Dolph,	Hiscock,	Riddleberger,
Blair,	Edmunds,	Hoar,	Sherman,
Bowen,	Evarts,	Ingalls,	Stewart,
Chandler,	Farwell,	Jones of Nevada,	Stockbridge.
Cullom,	Frye,	Mitchell,	

ABSENT—33.

Beck,	Dawes,	Paddock,	Teller,
Blackburn,	Eustis,	Palmer,	Vance,
Brown,	Gibson,	Plumb,	Vest,
Butler,	Hale,	Quay,	Walthall,
Cameron,	Harris,	Sabin,	Wilson of Iowa,
Chace,	Hearst,	Sawyer,	Wilson of Md.
Coke,	Manderson,	Spooner,	
Colquitt,	Morrill,	Stanford,	

The following pairs were announced:
Mr. BROWN with Mr. SAWYER.
Mr. COKE with Mr. DAWES.
Mr. COLQUITT with Mr. CHACE.
Mr. BLACKBURN with Mr. MANDERSON.
Mr. EUSTIS with Mr. PADDOCK.
Mr. GIBSON with Mr. TELLER.
Mr. VEST with Mr. PLUMB.
Mr. WALTHALL with Mr. SPOONER.
Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, with Mr. WILSON, of Iowa.
Mr. HARRIS with Mr. MORRILL.
Mr. BECK with Mr. HALE.
So the motion was not agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 9345) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, May 25, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate May 17, 1888.

INDIAN AGENT.

James D. Jenkins, of Osage, Iowa, to be agent for the Indians of the Sisseton agency, in Dakota.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 22, 1888.

FOR APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY.

To be post chaplain.

Charles C. Pierce, of Pennsylvania, May 12, 1888.

FOR PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Corps of Engineers.

Capt. Charles E. L. B. Davis, to be major, April 7, 1888.
First Lieut. George McC. Derby, to be captain, April 7, 1888.
Second Lieut. William L. Sibert, to be first lieutenant, April 7, 1888.

FOR APPOINTMENT BY TRANSFER IN THE ARMY.

Second Lieut. Eugene W. Van C. Lucas, First Artillery, to be second lieutenant in the Corps of Engineers, May 14, 1888.

POSTMASTERS.

John Engle, to be postmaster at Hackensack, Bergen County, New Jersey.

James S. Mellick, to be postmaster at Dover, Morris County, New Jersey.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *May* 24, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CLAIM OF WILLIAM GARRETT.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting findings of fact by said court in the case of William Garrett *vs.* The United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

BRIDGE ACROSS TENNESSEE RIVER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 7783) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Knoxville, Tenn., the bill having been returned from the Senate with amendments and a request for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] asks unanimous consent that these amendments of the Senate be non-concurred in and the request for a conference agreed to. If there be no objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor, the bill having been returned from the Senate with amendments and a request for a conference.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I ask that the Senate amendments be non-concurred in and the request for a conference agreed to.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

ELIZA WRIGHT OWEN.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Eliza Wright Owen, the bill having been returned from the Senate with a message that the amendments of the House had been disagreed to.

Mr. MATSON. I move that this bill be referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT PATERSON, N. J.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 1978) for the erection of a public building in Paterson, N. J.

Mr. PHELPS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill; and I trust that no gentleman will be cruel enough to interpose a peremptory objection until the bill has been read and I have been allowed one or two minutes—not over two minutes—to show that this is one of the saddest among all these cases, and also one of the worthiest.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase, or acquire by condemnation proceedings or otherwise, a site for, and cause to be erected thereon, a suitable building, with fire-proof vaults therein, for the accommodation of the post-office and other Government offices, at the city of Paterson, N. J. The plans, specifications, and full estimates for said building shall be previously made and approved according to law, and shall not exceed for the site and building complete the sum of $125,000: *Provided*, That the site shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of not less than 40 feet, including streets and alleys; and no money appropriated for this purpose shall be available until a valid title to the site for said building shall be vested in the United States, nor until the State of New Jersey shall have ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of said State and the service of civil process therein.

SEC. 2. That the sum of $125,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be used and expended for the purpose provided in this act.

Mr. PHELPS. Mr. Speaker, if I did not inform the House, members could scarcely know that for six years I have waited to secure the passage of a bill such as this. My immediate predecessor introduced the bill and it was favorably reported to the House. That was in the Forty-seventh Congress, and the Republican party gave its approval. He died with "hope deferred." I took up his mantle; and a favorable report, duplicating that which he had obtained, was made in the Forty-eighth Congress, the Democrats being then in control, and recognizing the merits of the measure, and I waited.

A favorable report followed from the Forty-ninth Congress, and again I waited. We met in December. The Committee of this House in the Fiftieth Congress reported in my favor—and I still wait.

Six years of this suffering on my part and two years of vicarious suffering on the part of my predecessor, and this is the first time I have had an opportunity to test the wishes of the House on the proposition so frequently reported. Thus, Mr. Speaker, was my hope deferred! Ought I to be made to bear this any longer? [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. You want to pass the bill, do you not?

Mr. PHELPS. Yes, I want to pass it—very much.

Mr. SPRINGER. All right, then.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let the report be read.

The SPEAKER. This is a Senate bill, and there is no report accompanying it. There is a House report, however.

Mr. PHELPS. I can state to the gentleman in a very few minutes the facts embodied in the report. They make a story of wonderful growth and prosperity. Paterson is a swarming hive. It already has a population of 75,000, and is rapidly growing——

Mr. McMILLIN. I think this had better be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. PHELPS. Then it will not be reached, I fear, during the session. I hope the gentleman will not insist, at least until he hears the facts in reference to the case.

I have consumed one minute of the time I asked for, I presume; now let me consume the other minute in giving the reasons for this bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. I have no desire to interrupt the passage of the bill; but this committee has days for the consideration of its business. It has already spent some time in presenting its measures before the House, and I think this had better take the usual course.

Mr. PHELPS. The committee report the same bill identically, except as to the amount involved.

Mr. McMILLIN. What amount does the House bill propose?

Mr. PHELPS. The House bill proposes an appropriation of $80,000; the Senate bill fixes the amount at $125,000. In view of the extent of the population there, I think that $125,000 is only a proper appropriation; but I am willing, so great is my anxiety for prompt action in this matter, to accept the $80,000 fixed by the House bill; but I think the gentleman from Tennessee, if he will recognize the fact that this town has a population of 75,000, and is growing rapidly, will scarcely refuse me the sum given by the Senate.

Mr. McMILLIN. Is there a court there?

Mr. PHELPS. There is no court.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let us have the report read.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair has stated, there is no report accompanying the Senate bill. There is a report with the House bill.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let us have the House report read, then.

Mr. PHELPS. That can be read if the gentleman desires it, or if he does not insist upon it, I will make, as I suggested, a brief statement covering all the points.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think we had better have the report read. Let us see what we are doing here.

The report (by Mr. DIBBLE) was read, as follows:

They found that no city in the State was growing in population and business so rapidly as Paterson. It had in 1850 11,000; in 1860, 19,000; in 1870, 33,000; in 1885, 62,500 inhabitants, by actual census. The estimated population January 1, 1888, was 71,000.

Paterson has large manufacturing industries, among which are over one hundred silk enterprises, with 18,000 operatives, employing a capital of $15,000,000; large rolling-mills, machine-shops, iron bridge-building establishments; large jute, flax, cotton, and thread factories, and many smaller industries, representing a large outlay of capital, and in the aggregate giving employment to many thousands of hands.

There are three great railway lines entering the city, which carry to and from it over 150 tons of freight daily.

The gross receipts of the Paterson post-office are large and regularly increasing. The receipts for the year ending June, 1880, were $24,822.85; for the year ending June 30, 1887, $35,118.20 gross; $15,436 net. The receipts for three quarters of the year 1887 were $26,019.27, and the receipts on that basis for the present fiscal year will be over $40,000, which will make Paterson a first-class post-office. The large foreign population makes the international money-order business very large, to transact which requires more office accommodations.

The deputy collector of United States revenue at Paterson collects, as a tax on liquor sellers, tobacco and cigar manufacturers, $73,000 per annum, and seven breweries pay a malt-liquor tax of $18,000 per year. This amount is paid in Paterson alone, while there is collected here for the district a large additional sum.

In consideration of the foregoing facts, and especially the fact that Paterson pays into the United States Treasury about $300,000 a year, your committee would recommend the passage of the accompanying substitute for bill H. R. 624.

Mr. McMILLIN. It seems that there is need for a building there for a post-office, but at the same time it would appear that the amount fixed by the House bill is ample. The gentleman from New Jersey has indicated his willingness to accept that as the amount to be appropriated for this building. With that understanding I will not interpose any objection to the present consideration of the bill, not, however, with the view of getting it increased in a conference report, which is privileged, but with the understanding that the House stands by its action and recommendation.

Mr. PHELPS. I move, then, to amend the Senate bill by striking out "$125,000" and inserting "$80,000."

There being no objection, the bill was considered, the amendment agreed to, and the bill as amended ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed.

Mr. PHELPS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING, VICKSBURG, MISS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 786) to provide a building for the use of the United States courts, post-office, custom-office, and internal-revenue office at Vicksburg, Miss.; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I ask unanimous consent that the House take up that bill now for consideration, and in this connection, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi asks unanimous consent to take this bill up for present consideration.

The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause to be constructed a suitable building, with fire-proof vaults, at Vicksburg, in the State of Mississippi, for the accommodation of the United States courts, post-office, custom-office, and internal-revenue office, at a cost not exceeding $100,000, including cost of site; nor shall any site be purchased until estimates for the erection of a building which will furnish sufficient accommodations for the transaction of the public business, and which shall not exceed in cost the balance of the sum herein limited after the site shall have been purchased and paid for, shall have been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury; and no purchase of site, nor plan for said building, shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the said sum of $100,000 for site and building: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be expended until the plans, specifications, and full estimates for said building shall have been made according to law, and a valid title to the land for the site of said building shall be vested in the United States, and the State of Mississippi shall cede to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of said State and the service of any civil process therein: *And provided further*, That the site so purchased or acquired by condemnation proceedings shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of not less than 40 feet, including streets and alleys.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the report will be read.

Mr. CATCHINGS. Let me say to my friend from Indiana that the Senate bill is a fac-simile copy of the bill reported from the committee of the House, also that this precise bill passed the Senate in two Congresses and has been favorably reported upon twice by the House committee.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the House report will be read, at least.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I have no objection to the reading of the report, but I think I may probably be able to save the time of the House by making a statement as to what it embodies.

Mr. HOLMAN. Have you Federal courts there?

Mr. CATCHINGS. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. What is the population of the city?

Mr. CATCHINGS. It is now about 22,000, and is rapidly growing.

Mr. HOLMAN. How long have you had Federal courts established there?

Mr. CATCHINGS. They have been established for the last three years, and the business of the courts is constantly growing.

Mr. HOLMAN. I will suggest that possibly a smaller sum would be sufficient than that proposed by the bill.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I think not, and hope the gentleman will not press that point. Property is quite valuable there, building sites are difficult to obtain, and the gentleman knows that it is a hilly city and the site will necessarily involve a considerable outlay. I think the amount proposed here is as small an amount as could very well be applied to that purpose.

Mr. HOLMAN. Under the circumstances stated I will not interpose any objection.

Mr. BURROWS. Is there a report on the House bill?

The SPEAKER. There is.

Mr. BURROWS. I would like to hear that report read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read it.

The report (by Mr. DIBBLE) was read in part. In full it is as follows:

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1591) providing for a public building at Vicksburg, Miss., having had the same under consideration, beg leave to report as follows:

Vicksburg is situated on the Mississippi River, and is the largest and most important city in the State. It has now a population of about 20,000. It is the western terminus of the Vicksburg and Meridian Railway, and the eastern terminus of the Vicksburg, Shreveport and Pacific Railway, and the Louisville, New Orleans and Texas Railway, running from Memphis to New Orleans, passes directly through the city.

It is the northern terminus of a tri-weekly line of magnificent boats plying between New Orleans and Vicksburg, and the southern terminus of a tri-weekly line of boats plying between St. Louis and Vicksburg.

It is the home port of a numerous fleet of boats plying the Yazoo, Tallahatchee, Sunflower, Coldwater, Yallobusha, Big Black, and other rivers, tributaries of the Mississippi River. It is the market for between 70,000 and 80,000 bales of cotton, and handles in transit and otherwise about 200,000 bales.

Its commerce is about twenty millions. It has three banks, two foundries, saw-mills, planing-mills, oil-mills, sash, door, spoke, and blind factories, and very extensive lumber-yards.

The shops of the Louisville, New Orleans and Texas Railway have lately been located there, and will add largely to the business and population of the city. The shops of the Vicksburg and Meridian Railway are in part located there.

It has churches of all denominations, and the finest public schools in the State.

It has a telephone exchange, street railroads, and is lighted by electricity. It has two daily and three weekly newspapers. Most of the streets are handsomely graveled and all of them will soon be. A fine system of water-works is just about completed.

One of the largest and most beautiful of the national cemeteries is in the northern suburbs. The Government pays now for the post-office there $1,240 per annum, but it is small and wholly insufficient for the business. The receipts of the office for the fiscal year 1885 were $17,279.

It is a distributing office for a large area of country, and as new lines of railway are rapidly and continually increasing mail facilities the business of the office is rapidly increasing in volume and importance. A suitable building for the post-office could not be had there now for less than $3,000 per annum.

The Government maintains a signal office there, which costs $180 per annum; the offices of the Government engineers, located permanently there, cost $540 per annum. These offices are also small and insufficient.

There are also a collector of customs and a deputy revenue collector located there. Terms of the United States circuit and district courts are held regularly there, but under many disadvantages, as they are held in the building occupied by the State courts and by courtesy only.

The city of Vicksburg is steadily increasing in population, business, and wealth, and the expenses of the Government in maintaining its various offices there will soon be far greater than they are at present.

In view of the foregoing facts your committee unanimously recommend the passage of the bill with the following amendment, namely:

Strike out the words "twenty-five" in line 8 of the bill.

Mr. BURROWS (interrupting the reading). I have heard sufficient of the report to learn that Vicksburg has telephones, street railroads, and is lighted by electricity. I wish to know how much the Senate bill carries.

Mr. CATCHINGS. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. BURROWS. And how much does the House bill carry?

Mr. CATCHINGS. One hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. BURROWS. I think, in view of the condition of the streets and of the electric lights, it is more than fair that this bill should pass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. CHEADLE. I object.

Mr. CATCHINGS. I ask that the bill shall remain on the Speaker's table.

Some time subsequently,

Mr. CATCHINGS said: The gentleman from Indiana withdraws his objection to the bill for the public building at Vicksburg.

Mr. CHEADLE. I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there further objection to the request made by the gentleman from Mississippi? The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CATCHINGS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The corresponding House bill (H. R. 1591) was laid on the table.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House bills of the Senate of the following titles; which were severally read twice, and referred to the committees indicated:

The bill (S. 2475) to increase the appropriation for the erection of a public building at Winona, Minn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 2546) to appropriate $12,000 for the completion of the public building at Peoria, Ill., and increasing the limit of the cost of said building—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 2278) for the improvement and enlargement of the public building at Petersburgh, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 2315) granting the right of way to the Yankton and Missouri Valley Railway Company through the Yankton Indian reservation, in Dakota—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

BRIDGES ACROSS KENTUCKY RIVER.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 2481) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Louisville, Cincinnati and Virginia Railway Company; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. TAULBEE. I ask unanimous consent to consider this bill at the present time. The same bill has been reported by the House Committee on Commerce.

The SPEAKER. The bill will be read.

Mr. TAULBEE. I ask unanimous consent also that the reading of the bill be dispensed with, as it is in the exact form recommended by the Secretary of War and the Chief of Engineers. It is a bridge bill in the ordinary form.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky also requests unanimous consent to dispense with the reading of the bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask that the title of the bill be again read.

The title of the bill was again read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. TAULBEE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The corresponding House bill (H. R. 8769) was laid on the table.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House bills of the Senate of the following titles; which were severally read twice, and referred to the committees indicated:

The bill (S. 2674) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Nebraska City, Nebr., and for other purposes—to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 2690) granting a pension to John Gallagher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2845) granting to the corporate authorities of the city of Tuscaloosa, in the State of Alabama, all the right, title, and interest of the United States to fractional sections 22 and 15, lying south of the Black Warrior River, in township 21 and range 10 west—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The bill (S. 2941) to incorporate the National Academy of Dental Science—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 2973) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 1661 of the Revised Statutes, making an annual appropriation to provide arms and equipments for the militia—to the Committee on the Militia.

The bill (S. 54) for the relief R. G. Combs and others—to the Committee on Claims.

RETURN OF SENATE BILL.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a request from the Senate to return the bill (S. 1948) to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River, in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection this request will be granted, and the Clerk will be directed to return the bill to the Senate.

S. H. PEARCE.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (S. 2883) for the relief of S. H. Pearce; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. McRAE. I ask unanimous consent that that bill be now considered. It only involves $80, as a refund for an excess of purchase-money for certain property bought from the United States twenty years ago.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $80 be paid to S. H. Pearce, of Columbia County, Arkansas, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for excess of purchase-money paid by him for certain lands in said county.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McRAE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The corresponding House bill (H. R. 4482) was laid on the table.

ELEVENTH CENSUS.

On motion of Mr. COX, by unanimous consent, the bill (H. R. 1659) providing for taking the eleventh and subsequent censuses was recommitted to the Select Committee on the Eleventh Census.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

The SPEAKER appointed as managers of the conference on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses upon the amendments of the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor, Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, Mr. FRENCH, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. HAYDEN, on account of important business.

To Mr. LAIRD, for the remainder of this week, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 92) for the relief of Morgan Rawls;

A bill (H. R. 1394) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase additional grounds for the accommodation of Government offices in Council Bluffs, Iowa;

A bill (H. R. 4467) for the erection of a public building at Bar Harbor, in Maine;

A bill (H. R. 7938) to enlarge, improve, and make repairs upon the United States court-house and post-office building in Atlanta, Ga., and to appropriate money therefor;

A bill (S. 325) granting to the Billings, Clark's Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company the right of way through the Crow Indian reservation;

A bill (S. 339) granting a pension to Eliza Douglass;

A bill (S. 626) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Franklin, alias McKee;

A bill (S. 737) granting a pension to Berry Day;

A bill (S. 739) granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger;

A bill (S. 1298) granting a pension to Mary Gammell;

A bill (S. 1300) granting a pension to Cordelia R. Jones;

A bill (S. 1477) granting a pension to Harlow B. Hyde;

A bill (S. 1478) granting a pension to George W. Peavey;

A bill (S. 2651) to remove the political disabilities of John Rutledge, of South Carolina; and

A bill (S. 2901) granting to the Milwaukee, Lake Shore and Western Railway Company the right of way through the Lac de Flambeau Indian reservation in the State of Wisconsin.

INAUGURATION DAY.

Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the House Calendar the bill (H. R. 8043) and put it upon its passage. It is a bill to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes for the District of Columbia, so as to make inauguration day a holiday within said District.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to the District of Columbia, be, and the same hereby is, amended by adding to the days therein declared to be holidays within the said District that day upon which the President of the United States is inaugurated, otherwise called Inauguration Day, and that such day shall be a holiday for all the purposes mentioned in said section.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LEE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING, SACRAMENTO, CAL.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole House be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1554) to provide for the erection of a public building at Sacramento, Cal., and that it be now put upon its passage.

The bill was read.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, that seems to be rather an extraordinary bill, and I propose that it be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The SPEAKER. It has been reported from the committee and is now on the Calendar.

Mr. BLAND. Well, I think we have enough of these public buildings for the present, and therefore I object, and call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is called for. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move to dispense with the morning hour, with the understanding that gentlemen having reports to present may file them with the Clerk.

Mr. SPINOLA. I understand the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] consents to withdraw the call for the regular order temporarily so that I may ask for the consideration of a joint resolution which has been favorably reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BLAND. I understand that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SPINOLA] is obliged to leave the House, and I withdraw for a moment the call for the regular order.

ANNIVERSARY OF BATTLE OF GETTYSBURGH.

Mr. SPINOLA. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. Res. 169) appropriating $25,000 for the celebration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the battle of Gettysburgh.

The joint resolution was read.

Mr. BLAND. I very much dislike to object, but——

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I trust the gentleman will not object. This is to provide for a reunion of soldiers of the country—the survivors of the Army of Northern Virginia and the Army of the Potomac. The resolution comes from the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. KERR. I object.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I ask the gentleman to allow me to make a brief statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa has objected.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. But I trust he will give me time——

Mr. McMILLIN. I call for the regular order. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR] has objected to the consideration of this measure; therefore, let us go on with regular business.

Mr. TAULBEE. I have a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. A motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] is pending.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I understand the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR] consents to withdraw his objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee has demanded the regular order.

Mr. BLAND. I think we had better proceed with the regular business of the House.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] to dispense with the morning hour for the presentation of reports.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia now asks unanimous consent that gentlemen desiring to make reports may file them with the Clerk for reference to the appropriate Calendars. If there be no objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

FILING OF REPORTS.

The following reports were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

REVISED STATUTES, UNITED STATES.

Mr. COLLINS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back favorably the bill (S. 554) to amend Title LX, chapter 3, of the Revised Statutes of the United States; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES KELLEY.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2074) granting a pension to James Kelley; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SAMUEL E. WILSON.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8931) for the relief of Samuel E. Wilson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

DANIEL K. HARRIS.

Mr. MATSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9920) granting a pension to Daniel K. Harris; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

FLORA HEATH.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5529) granting a pension to Flora Heath; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

DOROTHEA RUOFF.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4825) granting a pension to Dorothea Ruoff; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARGARET J. M'QUARY.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8571) granting a pension to Margaret J. McQuary; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN K. THOMPSON.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9690) granting a pension to John K. Thompson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. MATSON also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back the following bills adversely; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 9036) granting a pension to Elizabeth Hallis;
A bill (H. R. 7475) granting a pension to Pauline T. Carpenter;
A bill (H. R. 5943) granting a pension to John Sheafer;
A bill (H. R. 2119) granting a pension to Ardenia Dillon;
A bill (H. R. 6063) granting a pension to Hila E. Geyer;
A bill (H. R. 4823) granting a pension to John A. Dean;
A bill (H. R. 7012) granting increase of pension to James M. Herrington;
A bill (H. R. 5364) granting a pension to Mary Whipple; and
A bill (H. R. 9139) granting a pension to Bridget Tole.

ARMS AND CARTRIDGES LOANED TO THE STATE OF OREGON.

Mr. LAWLER, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4447) to credit the Territory of Washington on the books of the Ordnance Department the sum of $12,387.57 for arms and cartridges loaned the State of Oregon; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

C. C. ROBERTS.

Mr. LAWLER also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 3557) for the relief of C. C. Roberts; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELIZABETH BAUER.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 981) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bauer; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BRIDGET WHITE.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2450) placing the name of Bridget White on the pension-rolls; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LENA NEWNINGER.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2452) placing the name of Lena Newninger on the pension-rolls; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JULIA B. M'COMB.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2087) granting a pension to Julia B. McComb; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BENJAMIN M. FISHER.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1314) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin M. Fisher; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RAILWAY THROUGH INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7186) to authorize the Leavenworth and Rio Grande Railway Company to construct and operate a railway through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced the adoption of the report of the committee of conference on the

disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the bill (H. R. 5445) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

VISITORS TO THE UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY.

The SPEAKER announced the appointment of the following gentlemen as the Board of Visitors to the United States Naval Academy: GEORGE D. WISE of Virginia, WILLIAM MCADOO of New Jersey, and CHARLES A. BOUTELLE of Maine.

VISITORS TO UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY.

The SPEAKER also announced the appointment of Mr. A. P. FITCH, of New York, on the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy, in lieu of Mr. STEELE, resigned.

THOMAS A. OSBORN.

Mr. TAULBEE submitted a report; which was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2216) for the relief of Thomas A. Osborn, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

W. P. TAULBEE,
C. H. MANSUR,
DANIEL KERR,
Managers on the part of the House.

JOHN. C. SPOONER,
GEORGE F. HOAR,
CHARLES J. FAULKNER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The following statement of the House conferees, submitted in accordance with the rule, was read:

Statement of conferees on the part of the House of Representatives, on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2214) for the relief of Thomas A. Osborn.

The conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment is as follows: Strike out all after "Osborn," in line 8, down to end of bill.

W. P. TAULBEE,
C. H. MANSUR,
DANIEL KERR,
Conferees on the part of the House.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope we shall have some explanation of this matter.

Mr. TAULBEE. I ask that the amendment of the Senate, which, if this report be adopted, will be concurred in, be read.

The Clerk read the amendment of the Senate, as follows:

Strike out the following:

"*Provided*, It shall be proven to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Treasury that said money was lost without fault or negligence upon the part of said Osborn."

Mr. TAULBEE. If any further explanation is desired, I am ready to give it.

The conference report was adopted.

Mr. TAULBEE moved to reconsider the vote by which the report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of further considering the Post-Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. TURNER, of Georgia, in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9345) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Chairman, I ask consent that we return to line 43 of the bill for the purpose of adopting an amendment, to insert after the word "hundred" the words "and eighty-two;" so as to make the appropriation for the star-route service $5,482,000 instead of $5,400,000.

Mr. BLOUNT. I object.

Mr. MCRAE. The sum which this amendment proposes to appropriate conforms to the estimate of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, whose duty it is to award these contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MCRAE] is not in order.

Mr. BLOUNT. Debate is not in order; and I do not care to go into any discussion now as to whether the item which we have passed is proper.

The Clerk read as follows:

For mail-messenger service, $900,000.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move to amend the clause just read by inserting, after the word "hundred," the words "and fifty;" so as to make the appropriation for the mail-messenger service $950,000. Some recent information furnished by the adjustment of accounts discloses that by the end of the fiscal year the sum which I now propose will be required; that the actual increase of the service will necessitate the expenditure of this amount. If there is any objection to the amendment I will have read several letters from the Department with reference to this matter.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD for the information of the Senate two letters in reference to the amendment just agreed to.

There being no objection, leave was granted.

The letters are as follows:

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., March 23, 1888.

SIR: In my letter of estimates of amounts to be appropriated for this office for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, dated October 21, 1887, I recommended that the appropriation for the mail-messenger service for the fiscal year should be $900,000, the same amount as the appropriation for the current year. That estimate was made on the basis of the service as reported to the 30th of September, 1887. Since the date of that letter I have carefully gone over this estimate of the service, and have noted the increases which have taken place, and have reached the conclusion that the sum there stated as necessary for the fiscal year 1888-'89 should be increased. From the report of the clerk in charge of the mail-messenger service I find that the increases during the last few months have been considerable, exceeding the expectations entertained by me at the time of my submission of the letter of estimates. During the month of February the increase was $11,109.35, and for the twenty-one days of this month the increase has been $7,107.08.

The rapid and extraordinary extension and increase in the railway mail service during the last six months has created a necessity for an increase in this mail-messenger service beyond any former experience of this office. The number of routes in operation on June 30, 1887, was 5,518. The net increase since that date up to March 21, in number of routes, is 259, and the increase in the rate of cost thereof has been $32,976.56.

The rate of cost of this service on the 30th of June, 1887, was	$829,548.81
The rate of cost on March 21, 1888, was	862,525.14
Being a net increase since June 30, 1887, of	32,976.33
The appropriation for mail-messenger service for the current fiscal year is	$900,000.00
The rate of cost of same to March 21, 1888, is	862,525.14
Leaving an unexpended balance on March 21, 1888, of	37,474.86

Should the increase for the ensuing three months be at the same rate as that of the present month of March and the preceding month of February, the whole of the appropriation would be more than exhausted by the end of the current fiscal year. We would then begin the fiscal year of 1888 with an expenditure larger than the appropriation asked for, which is the same in amount as the current year, to wit, $900,000.

While I do not anticipate that the increase per month in this service for the balance of the year will reach the average of the increase of the two months above mentioned, to wit, February and March, which average would be $9,108.21, still I am persuaded that the increase will be very considerable, and the appropriation mentioned in my letter of estimates of October 21, 1887, of $900,000 will not be adequate to meet the requirements of the service for the ensuing fiscal year.

Under these circumstances, I have the honor to request that a letter be addressed to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads of the House of Representatives asking that the appropriation for the mail messenger service for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1888, and ending June 30, 1889, be $950,000 instead of $900,000, as asked in said letter of estimates of October 21, 1887, being an increase of $50,000 on that estimate.

Very respectfully,

A. LEO KNOTT,
Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF SECOND ASSISTANT POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., May 14, 1888.

SIR: I inclose herewith a copy of a letter addressed to you under date of March 23, 1887, calling your attention to the unexpected and unprecedented increase in the rate of cost of the mail messenger service for the months of January and February of this year, and suggesting the necessity for revising the estimate for this branch of the service, submitted in my letter to the Postmaster-General under date of October 21, 1887.

In view of the facts then before the Department, I thought that the estimate of $900,000 per annum would be sufficient for the fiscal year beginning on the 1st of July, 1888, but the large increase in the extension of the railway mail service has brought with it a very large increase in the cost of the mail messenger service, as shown by the increase in the cost for the first two months of this year, and I had the honor to suggest, in said letter of March 23, last, the advisability of increasing the estimate to $950,000 for the next fiscal year.

In an interview with Hon. James H. Blount, chairman of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads of the House of Representatives, he informed me that the letter of March 23 had not reached him.

Upon referring to the books of the Department I find that the increase in the rate of cost for the month of March of the present year was $10,351.01, and for the month of April $10,098.76, showing that the increase spoken of in my letter of the 23d of March is likely to continue.

The average rate of increase per month last year was but $2,400.

It is apparent from the above statements that the increase for this year will be much in excess of that of last year, and enforces the necessity for an increase in the appropriation for the next fiscal year of at least the sum I have suggested, namely, $50,000, making the whole estimate $950,000 per annum.

I have the honor to request that the above facts be brought to the attention of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads of the House of Representatives.

Very respectfully,

A. LEO KNOTT,
Second Assistant Postmaster-General.

Hon. DON M. DICKINSON,
Postmaster-General.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of agent and assistants to distribute stamps, and expenses of agency, $8,000.

Mr. PERKINS. I was engaged for a moment in conversation with a member, and did not observe when the Clerk read lines 59, 60, and 61. I desire to offer an amendment to that clause, and I ask consent that we return to it.

Mr. BLOUNT. I must object. I have just objected to a similar request made by a gentleman on this side.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the pay of agents and assistants to distribute postal-cards, and expenses of agency, $7,800.

Mr. HOLMAN. I desire to make an inquiry in reference to a preceding paragraph.

Mr. BLOUNT. Which paragraph does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. HOLMAN. The paragraph preceding the one the Clerk is now reading.

Mr. BLOUNT. What line?

Mr. HOLMAN. It is in lines 75, 76, and 77, and I ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of agent and assistants to distribute stamped envelopes, newspaper wrappers, and letter-sheets, and expenses of agency, $16,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. It seems to me there is a remarkable increase in amount.

The CHAIRMAN. To what does the gentleman refer?

Mr. HOLMAN. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. BLOUNT. That is not a marked increase. The gentleman is mistaken. It is identically the sum appropriated for the present fiscal year.

Mr. HOLMAN. Sixteen thousand dollars.

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. Perhaps I am mistaken. I thought the whole appropriation was $8,000.

Mr. BLOUNT. We appropriated for the next fiscal year what has been appropriated for this fiscal year.

The Clerk read as follows:

For miscellaneous items, $1,000.

Mr. PERKINS. I move to strike out the last word. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to this bill in good faith asking for an additional appropriation for the postal-clerk service of the country.

As was stated by me yesterday, the amount appropriated for this fiscal year is $5,246,790.21. That is an increase over the appropriation of last year of $256,549.59. This is but an increase of 5 per cent., while the increase of the railway mail service has been substantially an increase of 10 per cent.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we of the great West know that we have not adequate and efficient service. I ask to have read a letter from one of these postal clerks running on the Missouri Pacific system from Hannibal, Mo., to the city of Denison, in the State of Texas, to show the overwork of the clerks and the unsatisfactory work on that line.

The Clerk read as follows:

DENISON, TEX., *February* 20, 1888.

SIR: Yours of 8th instant received. In reply I would say that the mail service in this the seventh division is in a very bad shape. In the first place, the superintendent, Thomas, knows nothing about the mail service on our line, which runs from Sedalia, Mo., to Denison, Tex. There is being carried into Denison almost every day from one to three thousand pounds of mail unworked. It is impossible for the present force to do the work even if they were all good and experienced men, but with one-fourth of the force that are new and inexperienced men it is so much worse. There are several of the men that are going to quit on the account they can not stand these hard runs. I have sent in my resignation, to take effect on the 1st day of April, 1888, so do not make my name public until after that time. I can not give you all the details on paper, for they are legions; but that the mails are not being worked up and properly dispatched is of daily occurrence. We have reported all failures, but the superintendent, Thomas, pays no attention to it. That he is the most complete failure is evident to new as well as old clerks, not only on this line but on all the main lines in his division. I see a Senator from Texas defending the Postmaster-General. If he knew the amount of mail that was detained by the small force on this line I think he would change his mind.

This mail (unworked) that I spoke of is delayed from twelve to twenty-four hours, and the men on the line are doing all it is possible for men to do to work and forward it, but they have double the mail they ought to have for the amount of men. Superintendent Thomas has ordered all old and new clerks alike for examination; that to the old men is as useless as the fifth wheel to a wagon, but he wants to make a big show and advertise his ability as civil servicer, but does not seem to care anything about the mail being worked. If there is anything further that I can do for you, write after my resignation takes effect. You make any information I have public and give the author of what I say, for I can prove all I have stated here and a great deal more that I can not think of now. Hoping this will be satisfactory,

I am yours, etc.,

WILEY ANDERSON.

B. W. PERKINS.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. I will withdraw the pending amendment, and move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman who wrote that letter which has just been read at the Clerk's desk was one of these clerks, and one of the most efficient in the service. He had served for years; was chief clerk of his car, and knows exactly what he is speaking about.

As I suggested yesterday, Mr. Chairman, the complaints which are made in reference to this matter are without distinction of class or party. The people ask for larger, better, and more efficient service. I have a bundle of papers here representing all organizations, all parties, and all classes of people, asking for this service. I should like to have them all read for the information of the House, but will have to content myself by asking to have read an extract from the Savannah News, whose political orthodoxy can not be doubted.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Savannah News.]

It is very sad to have to confess the fact, but every day is making it more apparent that the Republican administration of the Post-Office Department in this part of the country was much better than what our friends the Democrats are giving us.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. I next ask to have read an extract from the "Herald and Presbyter" of March 14, 1888, published at Cincinnati, Ohio. The Doctor Babb referred to is one of the editors, who has for fifteen years lived at or near San José, Cal.

The Herald and Presbyter, while owned, I believe, by Republicans, is in no sense a political or partisan sheet, and has about 20,000 subscribers.

The Clerk read as follows:

To Subscribers: We are having trouble with our mails, and would therefore caution subscribers about sending money without taking necessary precautions. We have failed to receive many letters during the past three months. Two letters have failed to reach us from Dr. Babb, the first failure in fifteen years. Last week his regular letter did not come, and this week we have not received the Sabbath-school lesson, and have substituted another. We hope this will not occur again. The safest way to remit money is by bank drafts, payable to our order or post-office money-orders.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask the Clerk to read an extract from the Chicago Tribune.

The Clerk read as follows:

PROVIDING AGAINST POSTAL BLUNDERS.

[Chicago Tribune.]

"You'll write me, John, of course?" said the wife of a Chicago man who was packing his valise for a journey East.

"Certainly, Maria," he replied. "I have already written several letters and deposited them in the post-office here, and as soon as I reach Philadelphia I shall mail you two or three more by special delivery. You know I am only to be away three weeks, and I am almost confident some of those letters will reach you before I return. Keep up a good heart, Maria. We are in the hands of a Democratic Administration, but the Lord reigns over all."

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. PERKINS. Here is an extract from the Abiline Gazette, which is ex-Governor Glick's paper. He is an ex-governor of my own State, and is the United States pension agent at Topeka. He is the only Democrat ever elected governor of Kansas; hence his orthodoxy can not be questioned. He is now engaged in manipulating the politics of the State in the interest of His Excellency Grover Cleveland.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. I will withdraw my amendment and move to strike out the last three words in order that I may complete my statement.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. PERKINS. I ask the Clerk to read an extract which I send up from Ex-Governor Glick's paper, The Abilene Gazette, of the 22d of January.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Glick's paper (Abilene Gazette) about 22d of January.]

RELIEF! RELIEF! RELIEF!

The time has come, in fact it came long ago, for the United States postal authorities to do something for the Western mail service. We do not know whether the rank service which we have been receiving is due to incompetency or lack of sufficient help, but one thing we do know, and that is, it is about as weak as the people are going to stand by and accept without kicking vigorously.

For months past pouch after pouch of mail has been carried beyond Abilene and returned on the next train from six to twelve hours late.

Day after day, week in and week out, this office has received numerous and repeated complaints of failure to receive papers. We have traced the matter down and find that it is due to the rotten mail service. We are possessed of ordinary patience, but the time has gone by for us to longer remain silent.

We have from time to time submitted calmly to the outrageous service which this Western country has received from the postal authorities.

We propose to do it no longer. From now on we are going to howl loud and long until relief of some kind is given us.

To Mr. R. M. Thomas, superintendent of the railway mail service, St. Louis, Mo.: Will you do something to relieve this disgraceful condition of affairs?

To Hon. Don M. Dickinson, Postmaster-General, Washington, D. C.: Can you stand by and see us suffer in this way without helping us?

To Grover Cleveland, President of the United States, Executive Mansion: We appeal lastly to you for advice and assistance. Exert your influence, give us a good postal service and we will do our best to carry Kansas for you in November.

To the Stoughton bottles Kansas is misrepresented by in Congress: Why do you stand idly by and see your constituents suffering for lack of postal facilities or incompetency of present employés? Why don't you make the Postmaster-General's life a dreary waste until you obtain relief for us?

Mr. PERKINS. Now, that is some excuse, coming from a representative Democratic organ of our State, for the motion which I made here, and to which such strenuous objection was made. In fact, Mr. Speaker, the members of our State have been charged with incompetency and with idleness because we do not and did not insist that the Administration should give better mail facilities and mail service to our people, because we do not make the life of the Postmaster-General a dreary waste until this better service is secured. [Laughter.] And yet on yesterday, when I contended for this thing in the interest of our people, I was charged with raising "sectional considerations" and "partisan issues."

Mr. Chairman, if we were given the powers of omnipotence we might

accomplish all asked of us, but without the power to perform miracles we can not hope to secure an efficient and satisfactory mail service with the Democratic party in power.

Why, sir, the complaint that I have made is universal. It is not political or partisan. It comes from all classes. It is to be ascribed almost entirely to the inefficiency of the mail service, and yet perhaps not entirely to that. My attention has been called to the case of a postmaster recently appointed in one of the districts of my own State which well illustrates some of our difficulties. For a number of days the postal clerk running on the train past that point received no mail whatever from that office, and not understanding the reason, one morning when the train was halting there he ran over to the post-office and asked the reason for this condition of things. He was coolly informed by the new appointee, the representative of this Administration, that the sack was not yet full and he was not ready to send it out. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

I heard of another case down in my friend's country, somewhere in Southwestern Missouri, who called upon the Administration at Washington for some postage-stamps, and they sent them to him in great blocks or sheets. He never had seen them in that form before, the two or three that he had had occasion to buy during the course of his lifetime at 2 or 3 cents each, the prevailing price, were always separated, and when they came to him in the form of sheets he concluded at once that they were circus posters [laughter], and hung one of them up on the door of his office and called his wife to look at it. He told her to come and see what the "durned fools had sent him from Washington; when he writ them for postage-stamps they sent him the circus posters." [Renewed laughter.] He told her, though, that he had never yet seen circus posters like them before; the circus riders were all exactly alike, and no place was given where the show was to come off. [Great laughter.]

Mr. WASHINGTON. Did that take place in the gentleman's own district?

Mr. PERKINS. No, sir; in the district of my friend from Missouri. [Renewed laughter.]

Now, some of the inefficiency in the mail service may be ascribed to such causes as that; and I have complaint after complaint from people all over the country because of the inadequacy of the mail service, and the inefficiency of those engaged in carrying it on.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. PERKINS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Can you give the name of the postmaster in Kansas and the other one in Missouri to whom you have referred? What are their names? I would like to know so that we can have the matter corrected.

Mr. PERKINS. I do not like to give away political secrets, though I have no doubt I could give their names if necessary.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Does not the gentleman know that those stories were made up here in the city, and for political purposes?

Mr. PERKINS. I saw them in the newspapers, and give them here by way of illustration to show the efficient men appointed to office by this Administration. Having seen them in the newspapers I give them as actual occurrences, not supposing the newspapers would tell anything but the truth, and particularly concerning this "reform Administration." [Laughter.]

Mr. WASHINGTON. I suppose the gentleman saw them in Republican newspapers.

Mr. PERKINS. There is nothing political about such complaints, they come from all classes and all sections, and now in the name of a long suffering, long enduring, but Christian, forbearing people, I ask for better service.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PERKINS. I will insert as a part of my remarks an extract from the Sedan Times-Journal, a paper published in my own district. The article appeared in the Times-Journal of the date of November 18, 1887:

JUST THE SAME.

The cussedness of our mail service remains just the same. Tuesday morning of this week a big mail arrived at this office. In the lot came 3 copies of the Chicago Daily Inter-Ocean, dated respectively the 9th, 11th, and 12th of November. Two copies of the Newton Republican, one dated the 10th and the other the 12th of November. Three copies of the Topeka Capital, one dated the 8th, one the 11th, and one the 12th of November. In our opinion there is positively no use to have any such "monkey work" as this. Take the Newton Republican for instance. It is printed in the morning in time for the early trains, and there is nothing on earth, except the utter carelessness or incompetency of the postal authorities, to prevent its arriving in Sedan on the evening of the day it is printed, yet it is invariably from two days to a week old when it arrives at Sedan. This is another thing for Colonel Vilas to give his attention to. The Kansas people are long-suffering and patient, and have no way to help themselves, but they will do some "mighty tall kicking" some time soon unless their mail service is medicated and lubricated and generally rejuvenated and regenerated.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I need only say that the newspaper attacks of the kind mentioned by the gentleman are common to all administrations, and that the record of this Department shows that even from Kansas the Democratic administration is freer from attacks even of Republican journals than the Republican administration was. I do not deem it, therefore, necessary or proper to go further in this matter. I think the House and the common sense of the country would suggest that if the gentleman desired to serve the people of Kansas by having these errors corrected he had better adopt the plan of going to the Department and making his complaints there, rather than parading them in the House.

I ask the Clerk to continue the reading of the bill.

Mr. TOOLE. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I can not permit this opportunity to pass without condemning the policy which puts it in the power of the Post-Office Department to deny to the people on the frontier the inestimable privileges and benefits of adequate mail service, and then to shield itself behind a doubtful authority of law or an inadequate appropriation. I speak only for Montana. We have seen office after office discontinued because no service was ever put on, or having been put on was discontinued because, forsooth, the amount realized from the cancellation of stamps was not sufficient to pay for the service.

Who ever expected the star-route service, which was designed to reach the remotest settlements on our frontier, to be self-sustaining or return a net revenue to the Government? No such rule of construction ever obtained to such an extent before, and who can sanction it now with an ample Treasury? If this is the legitimate result of a strict adherence to a platform declaring in favor of "government economically administered," I confess I never suspected it, and take this occasion to say that a declaration of principles so vapid and illusory needs some reformation. No such cheese-paring, parsimonious economy can be justified in times of general prosperity, and especially when the demands for increased and better service are greater than ever before. Compared with other benefits secured to us the mail service is paramount. It is, and ought to be, independent of politics; it is the people's service; the rich and the poor, the weak and the strong, the citizen and the stranger, are alike entitled to its benefits. The remotest part of this land where homes and settlements are planted should have reasonable facilities for the acquisition of that intelligence which the mails alone can furnish. No other blessing of this Government enters so largely into the contentment and prosperity of the people or is so potent in carrying the star of empire into the wilderness. It is the forerunner of civilization, the nucleus around which communities grow and prosper, and without which intellectual retrogression and moral decay are inevitable.

I want to put on record what the public estimate in Montana is of the present star-route service which is accorded us. Here is an extract from a paper published in the heart of an agricultural and stock-raising community in Montana, and which is a fair reflex of public sentiment upon the present policy:

When men saw the United States mail carried out beyond the settlements, they followed in its wake, for wherever it penetrated they could build homes and enjoy life to a reasonable degree. And though we of Montana came in advance even of the pony express and planted the germ of civilization far out from the frontier, nearly 1,000 miles west of the mails on the same latitude and 500 miles north of the overland, the Government was gracious and soon sent the overland mails to our relief, and for twenty years has stood ready to extend its lines as settlement has progressed, thus insuring a speedy and rapid development, and we have felt happy that we were a part of a government so watchful over the interest of the struggling pioneers in the far West and so ever ready to listen to their appeals and grant the request.

The distance to many of our homes has been lengthened into weeks. The great West has been made a thousand miles more remote, and we can see nothing so great after all about our boasted best government upon which the sun ever shone. The economic policy has ruined the star-route service and left those points not favored by a railroad practically out of the world. Had we never enjoyed the benefits of an expeditious service we might probably have been content with the miserable apology that is now called a mail service. But having once had a good service and our frontier homes having for these years been gladdened with the news of the world fresh and crisp, it is galling in the extreme to be turned back twenty years in the scale of progress.

The nation grew and prospered under the former system of service and we heard nothing of the Territories being a burden. But to-day while the present Administration is puzzling how to prevent the accumulation of millions in the national vaults the West is stinted with a beggarly service not half equal to the demands or to what it once enjoyed. And stranger still there are men and newspapers in our midst who are acquainted with all these facts who will say they indorse the present policy of the Administration. We believe in a judicious exercise of judgment in the distribution of the funds of the nation, but there is a vast difference between a wise and careful exercise of justice and the puritanic and parsimonious policy to which the country is now subjected. The people of the Territories having no voice in national affairs seem to have no rights that the powers at Washington are bound to respect, and there is certainly nothing in which it could make its neglect and total disregard more keenly felt than in the distribution of our mails.

Many of these things are plain and unvarnished truths and ought to be told, and the fact that I am in political accord with the majority of this House furnishes no excuse or justification for their suppression upon my part; but, upon the contrary, impels me to disclose them here and now in the earnest hope that justice to the people on the frontier shall no longer be delayed or denied and that the grievances complained of may be speedily remedied.

During the delivery of the foregoing the hammer fell.

Mr. ROGERS took the floor, and yielded his time to Mr. TOOLE, who then resumed and concluded his remarks as above.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. Chairman, every suggestion made by my friend from Montana applies with equal force to the Territory which I represent on this floor. In no branch of the public service has complaint been more widespread and universal than in connection with the mail service as now conducted in Washington Territory; and every day's mail comes to me freighted with complaints from every direction, that the mail service, as at present administered, does not begin to

afford the measure of relief to those people that they enjoyed under former administrations.

I submit, while I am in hearty accord with every suggestion looking to the reduction of public expenditures and an economical administration of the affairs of the Government, that it is unwise economy to strike at the people's service—the mail service—which is established not for the purpose of enriching the Government by reason of the revenues arising therefrom, but for the purpose of giving to the people the facilities which their business interests require.

I desire to say, Mr. Chairman, that the people of Washington Territory, a large proportion of them, were not born in that remote region of the Republic. They have peopled heretofore the States of this Union. They have enjoyed the benefits which attend upon State governments, and it is now especially trying to them to be deprived of those benefits which they have heretofore enjoyed. I have considered it right and proper that I should place myself on record in this connection and demand for the people I represent that measure of relief which their splendid resources and their rapidly increasing business interests so imperatively demand.

Mr. CANNON. As regards the postal service, the trouble is not in an insufficient amount of money being appropriated. Whatever trouble may exist, the appropriation at both sessions of the last Congress were far more liberal for the service all along the line than they have been since I have been coming to the House, a period dating back some twelve or fourteen years ago.

Now, I can readily see how the gentlemen upon the other side after a change of administration could claim with force that there should be a change in the offices; they could say that they are responsible, and being responsible they should have their friends in power. I am not here to combat that proposition as a general proposition. I believe, however, that it should have some exceptions; and the most marked exception to my mind ought to be made in connection with the postal administration of this country.

Mr. DOCKERY. Has not that exception applied under this Administration?

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman asks me whether that exception has not applied under this Administration. I answer by no manner of means. It is true when the Administration came into power it could not in the twinkling of an eye discharge the employés in the railway postal service; but it did discharge them as rapidly as possible, and more rapidly than the good of the service demanded. That is so in my section, and, I understand, it is so all over the country; and much of the trouble has come from the discharge of trained employés who understood their business, and of the appointment of new employés who had to be educated, and many of whom are slow of education.

Mr. DOCKERY. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that he differs from his colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BINGHAM], who conceded that the Administration was unpartisan in that Department.

Mr. BINGHAM. The gentleman is wrong in making that statement. I stated distinctly as to the $800-grade men, who are the lowest in the service, every man of them had been dismissed; but the higher-grade men, who required years of experience, have not been dismissed, because the Administration did not dare to dismiss them.

Mr. CANNON. I will say further that I am not familiar with the service east of the Alleghanies, but I know in my section the removals have been by the wholesale. Nobody ever heard me complain of that, except in so far as it affected the service. I think the Post-Office Committee might well devote its attention to legislation—the Democratic party being in power—that looks to making permanent during efficiency and good behavior the positions of the railway postal employés without reference to which party has the administration, because it is poor satisfaction to either a Democrat or Republican through the country when his letters and papers go astray and the service is in a bad fix to be told that the mails are manipulated by a Democratic or Republican postal employé.

We want good service. I will acknowledge that in the early months of this Administration some allowance might be made for them with reference to this service.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I would like to say just a few words more.

The *pro forma* amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. CANNON. I renew it. I know from complaints I heard in my section of the country until the time I came here, and from reports that have reached me since, there is but little, if any, improvement in this service. I know an instance myself where it took nearly thirty days for a letter to travel a distance of 30 miles in my own State; and I know of frequent instances where two, three, and four days after the mailing of a letter it has not been delivered, when it should have been delivered in one day. I know of business people in my section that are driven, in sending important business letters, to use the express company, because they dare not trust their important mail to the Post-Office Department. I know of several instances of that kind where considerable loss and great trouble has been brought upon the citizens by the imperfect mail service.

Therefore I say again to my friend from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] and other gentlemen that the trouble is not on account of the failure to appropriate sufficient money; but it is on account of improper and negligent administration. But I want to be fair about this matter. I am not here to say that if the Republican party had come in and the Democratic party had gone out three years ago there would have been no complaint. I am here to speak of the fact as it is; and I say you may talk and you may appropriate all you choose, but except you reach the Postmaster-General and have the methods of administration improved your talk and your appropriations will be in vain.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, we are having several subjects thrust upon us here, some of which demand a few words of reply. The allegation is made with reference to the mail service in the Territories that under the present Administration it has not been so good as it has been in the past. Unfortunately for the country it happens that the Territories are the field where were located the operations of Mr. Brady which brought so much scandal upon the Department, necessitating a reform and debarring any return to those methods. Beyond that, sir, I say that the service in that part of the country, since it has reached a healthy basis, has been gradually and steadily improving, as shown by the official report.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BLOUNT. I would be glad to, but I have no time, because I have to answer other criticisms that have been made. Mr. Chairman, my friend from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] rises here and, with all the authority of an official at the head of a Department, having at his command the reports of his subordinate officials in every branch of the service, announces an opinion as to the efficiency of postal employés. Now, if my friend did occupy the position of head of that Department and had the facilities for obtaining accurate information which that position would give him, I would cheerfully accept his conclusions.

I know his capacity, I know his integrity, I know his energy; but nevertheless, sir, I am quite certain that his information upon this subject is not so good as that of the gentleman at the head of the Department. I wish to tell him and the House now that the records show that in every section of the country there has been a gradual but decided improvement in the qualifications of the postal clerks. He has referred, and other gentlemen have referred, to the fact of new men being employed, and have intimated that that has resulted in a deterioration of the service. On the contrary, the records show that the standard of qualifications is higher now than at any previous time. The changes that have been made in the railway mail service have been made gradually, and there are a large number of employés now in that service who were in it when this Administration began.

But, sir, without reference to the political affiliations of postal employés, I say that the methods of examination adopted by a previous administration, and wisely adopted, establish the fact that the standard of merit is higher now than it ever was at any former period. Of course, sir, it is easy, and has been at any time in the history of the country easy for any of us, to tell of defects in the mail service. Negligent persons are sometimes employed in that service. I have myself known of errors that were very offensive to me and my own community, and they have occurred time and again for years past.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] has made a statement with reference to the improved character of the service; has he the figures to support that statement? I would rather have the figures than the mere statement.

Mr. BLOUNT. I will take pleasure in having them put into the RECORD. I did not anticipate that after this whole subject had been gone over, a political discussion would be started at this stage of the bill; if I had any such anticipation I would have had the figures at hand.

The statistics of case examinations and errors continue to show favorably the improving efficiency and discipline of the service and the correction of abuses therein. The record of probationers receiving permanent appointment is higher than for several years past, as shown by the following averages:

Year ended June 30—	Per cent.
1882	80.49
1883	80.37
1884	81.41
1885	83.11
1886	82.68
1887	85.34

Number of letters and pieces of other mail distributed in 1884	4,519,661,900
Number of errors made in the distribution of the same	1,167,223
Number of letters and pieces of other mail matter distributed to each error, 1884	3,872
Number of letters and pieces of other mail matter distributed to each error, 1883	4,153
Percentage of correct distribution, 1884	99.97+
Percentage of correct distribution, 1883	99.97+
Number of letters and pieces of other mail distributed during the fiscal year 1886	5,329,521,475
Number of errors made in the distribution of the same	1,260,443
Number of letters and pieces of other mail matter distributed to each error, 1886	4,228
Number of letters and pieces of other mail matter distributed to each error, 1885	5,574
Percentage of correct distribution, 1886	99.98—
Percentage of correct distribution, 1885	99.98+

In 1887 the number of pieces handled was 5,851,394,057, and the number of errors checked 1,734,617, being a correct distribution of 99.97 per cent. of all mail handled, or one error to every 3,373 pieces.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. ROGERS. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, there is a vast deal of clap-trap in all this discussion about removals from public office under the present Administration, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] ought to be better advised before he assumes the right to say just what removals have been made throughout the country. It has not been a great while since I called upon the Post-Office Department for a list of all the persons who were in the railway mail service in Arkansas, with a statement of when they were appointed and by whom, and I undertake to say here now, upon my recollection, for the statement is not at hand just now—upon the authority of that official statement, made to me by the Department in writing, that not a single solitary removal had been made up to that time under the present Administration of the postal clerks employed in that State.

Mr. COX. How long ago was that?

Mr. ROGERS. It has been some months—perhaps a year, but not a great while. And I state now upon my own knowledge of what is going on in Arkansas that there has been to my knowledge only one removal among the postal railway mail clerks—I mean among the old appointees—and he was a Democrat who was appointed, I presume, as a Republican under some former administration, but, I think, claims to have changed his politics, and was afterwards removed on the recommendation of the chief clerk, who is a Republican and who has been in the service for years and is now.

Mr. PERKINS. There are no complaints of the service in your State, are there?

Mr. ROGERS. I spoke on that subject yesterday. I am replying now to the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], and I say that he has no facts to justify his statement that the service in that State has been injured by the removal of the old clerks and the appointment of new ones, because no such facts exist. I know, of course, that in the extension of the railway mail system and in the general increase of the service which has taken place in that State new appointments have been made, not a great many of them, but I repeat that when I last examined the question there had been but one removal of an old appointee made. I thought I had the statement in my desk, but do not find it at the moment. The trouble has been that the superintendent of the service in that division was a man whose conduct indicated beyond all question, to my mind, that he did not intend that any Democrats should get in, even when they were appointed, if it could be prevented. That has been the fact, and everybody knows it.

Why, sir, a man from Missouri, recommended by a Republican Congressman, could get his appointment in six months, but under the administration of the officer to whom I refer, a first-honor man of the university of my State, a graduate of law, could not get his appointment in less than twelve months. His examination was all right, no fault to find with that, but there is something outside which prevented such men from coming up to the private standard of that superintendent. Thank God, his services have been dispensed with, and I hope the good work will go on until there is not a single man of that class left at the head of these divisions and controlling these appointments, with the power in his hands or right to say whether or not a man shall go into the service. This is all I have to say on that point.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, as this matter has been brought up, I ask to have printed with my remarks the following extract on the subject of removals, from the annual report of the Postmaster-General:

It may some time be required of this Department to undertake control of the most advanced and rapid modes of correspondence of modern device. I purpose no discussion of the subject, which has already attracted and must continue to enlist the general attention of the Congress to such an extent that discussion here could be of little additional value. It involves protracted argument upon not only the question of general expediency, but of the proper means of dealing justly with present conditions. Yet, if it shall happen that the difficulties yield to patient consideration, and the demands of the country for the best auxiliaries to its business facilities, it will be of supreme importance to the end to make wise provisions for a safe and satisfactory establishment of the requisite force of employés without dangerous increase of Federal power, and steps for improvement in the establishment of the postal service must be a beneficial beginning.

The present status (October 31, 1887) of the force is shown, so far as figures may show it, by the following recapitulation of changes during the time of my service in this office:

The whole number of clerks March 7, 1885, was		4,356
To which have been subsequently added		495
Making a total October 31, 1887		4,851
Of the clerks in service at the first date named—		
The number remaining is		2,271
The number gone is	2,085	
Appointments to new places	495	
Making the present number of my appointment		2,580
Total		4,851

To effect these changes, irrespectively of the 495 added clerks, it has been necessary to make appointments to the number of 3,138.

For vacancies occurring as follows:

By resignation		1,309
By removals:		
For partisanship	283	
For disciplinary causes	805	
		1,188
By death		84
By expiration of probationary appointments, recommended by division superintendents to be dropped		463
By expiration of probationary appointments made recently before March 7, 1885		152
		3,138
Add new appointments		495
Total number of appointments		3,633

Of the resignations, some were in anticipation of failure on probationary examinations, and some because unfitness had been disclosed by the regular examinations of clerks not on probation. On the 31st day of March, 1885, notice was given through the Daily Bulletin that—

"Railway postal clerks who have become efficient and valuable men, against whom no just complaint of neglect, inattention, or want of fidelity, honesty or efficiency can be brought, and who have not turned their attention to political labors during their service, need have no fear of being disturbed so long as they continue to render meritorious and faithful service."

Experience has strengthened the conviction of its expediency as a rule of service, and it has been faithfully observed. There may yet remain, doubtless, some within its exceptions the facts concerning whom have not been known.

Mr. Chairman, nearly one-half of the clerks who were in the service under the former administration remain still in the service. I believe there is scarcely another man in this land who, as head of the Post-Office Department, would have withstood party clamor and kept his enemies in service to the extent to which this has been done in that Department.

In reply to the gentlemen who are now parading these complaints, permit me to say that in my opinion the present Administration has done more toward the advancement of civil-service reform than any other in the history of this country. It has gone forward with an iron will, giving great offense sometimes among its own friends, but pursuing its policy steadily. If, here or there, the course of the Administration has not appeared entirely satisfactory to all, I wish to say that no administration can have its absolute will in this country. In Great Britain civil-service reform required one hundred years of struggle before it reached its present status. It was commenced by administrative efforts, the legislative branch always discontented and complaining. The present Administration of our own Government has suffered from complaints in this matter; but the wonder with me is not that there has been a failure to go beyond the law in reference to the civil service, but that so much has been done as we are aware of. In the light of the experience of other countries, I did not expect the progress which has been made in this direction. I trust that gentlemen will deal fairly in this matter, especially those who have seen fit to approve of the civil-service policy itself.

The removals among postal clerks have been remarkably few. Now, after the Administration has been in power nearly four years, about one-half or a little less than one-half of the old clerks remain in service, and the average rate of merit is increasing all the while. I, for one, am content with the record which the Administration has made in this respect. It did well when it complied with the law, and it was not required to go beyond it. When it went beyond it it did so amidst the grumblings of its own party and the laughter of the Republicans.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the *pro forma* amendments of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

OFFICE SUPERINTENDENT FOREIGN MAILS.

For transportation of foreign mails, $547,000.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of making an observation with reference to our foreign mail service. I wish to call the attention of the committee to the fact that of the $425,000 appropriated and paid during the last year for sea service postal transportation, less than $75,000 went to American vessels, and over $350,000 to foreign steam-ship lines. I did not rise for the purpose of complaining of the Post-Office Department because of this condition of things, but to call the attention of the Committee on Postal Affairs to the importance of early legislation which shall secure the encouragement and establishment of American steam-ship lines for postal communication. Gentlemen are aware that under the law as it now exists the Postmaster-General is not authorized in any case to go beyond the sea and inland postage in paying for the transportation of United States mail. On all those lines which connect with South America, with the West Indies, with the nearby countries with which we have communication by American steam-ship lines it is impossible with such compensation as this to permanently maintain such lines. The result has been that even of the small amount we have appropriated for postal service on steam-ship lines, more than four-fifths of it during the last year has gone to foreign steam-ship lines; and American steam-ship lines are being rapidly driven from the service.

Look for a moment at the compensation which is given to the American line running between New York and the ports of Brazil, amounting last year to less than $10,000. It is impossible in the nature of things that an American steam-ship line can be maintained when such paltry compensation as this is paid.

During the past year even Canada, with the aid of a subsidy by the

Canadian Government and a subsidy by the Government of Great Britain, the aggregate being $160,000 per annum, has placed in service a steam-ship line running from British Columbia to the ports of Japan and China. We are to-day paying to the American steam-ship lines running from San Francisco to the ports of Japan and China only the paltry sum of $10,000 against $160,000 paid by Canada and Great Britain for substantially the same service to a competing line, which, within three years, unless the Government of the United States shall deal more liberally with its steam-ship lines, will drive our steam-ship line from the service; and thus an American steam-ship line will disappear from the ocean.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to call attention for a single moment to what the nations of Europe have been doing while we have been refusing to pay even a paltry compensation. In 1885 France spent for her steam-ship service $5,152,000, Great Britain over $3,000,000, Italy $1,732,000, and even Brazil $1,472,000, and poor barbarian Japan nearly $300,000. Unless this Government speedily comes up to the level of its duty and encourages American steam-ship lines, within five years I predict the last American steam-ship line will have been driven from the ocean, and foreign steam-ship lines, supported by liberal pensions, will have taken their place.

I desire at this time simply to call the attention of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads to the fact that the chairman of that committee has at this session introduced a bill, which has been referred to that committee, and which I had hoped would have been reported long before this, authorizing the Postmaster-General to increase the compensation in such liberal measure as to encourage the establishment of American steam-ship lines and American postal communication, especially with the countries of South America, Central America, Mexico, and the West Indies.

I notice even during the last year the money we have expended has chiefly gone to foreign lines. The North German Lloyd Line has received $129,348, while the American Line, making nearly as much mileage, running from New York to the ports of Brazil, received less than $10,000. The Cunard Line from New York has received $70,000 during the past year; the White Star Line, $35,000; the Guion Line, $38,000, and the Inman Line, $12,736, etc.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware that on this bill it is not possible to have legislation that ought to be had, but such a bill is before the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads, and I appeal to the chairman of that committee and I appeal to the membership of that committee to no longer allow the measure to slumber in that committee, but to report it here in order that this Congress may be brought to consider the question as to whether this Government shall not do something worthy of its name, worthy of its prestige, worthy of its power, to encourage the establishment of American steam-ship lines.

I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maine complains that more is paid to foreign steam-ship lines for carrying the American mails than is paid to American vessels. Permit me to say, while that is true, the amount paid to American vessels is at a rate three times more than is paid to foreign vessels.

I will read a brief extract from the report of the Postmaster-General.

For conveyance of mails to ports to which American vessels do not ply, $363,-89.29.

For conveyance of mails to ports to which American vessels ply, $148,820.

We pay because we have not a ship going into those ports.

The policy of the gentleman's party has brought that about. The policy which obtains nowhere else on the face of the earth, except in America, amongst civilized nations, has had much to do with it. Italy, Russia, France, England, all the great continental powers allow any one of their citizens to go to any country on God's footstool and buy a ship where he can buy the cheapest and take that ship under its nationality, but the American Government refuses to do so. We can not build ships as cheaply as they can abroad, and in that condition of affairs how can it be expected, with such a policy as we have had, we shall carry the commerce of the world or secure any large portion of it?

The gentleman is right when he says that legislation must be had or we shall be swept from the ocean entirely. By our laws we have still left our coasting trade, but our policy must be changed if we expect to have American vessels ply on the ocean.

My friend's remedy is that while this can not be done, you shall go into the Treasury and take the money gathered from the people all over the land and pay, in addition to the commerce of the world, an additional sum to keep our vessels afloat. I do not care at this time to go into the discussion of that question as it is likely to come up hereafter; I shall therefore content myself with the few remarks I have made in the way of response.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move to strike out the last word. The observations of my friend from Georgia with reference to certain problems connected with the decline of our merchant marine in the foreign trade call upon me to make a single suggestion on the policy which this country has pursued with reference to the importation and registry of foreign-built vessels.

I have simply to say that the policy of restricting registry to vessels built in this country is that which has existed from the foundation of the Government—adopted originally on the recommendation of Washington himself, approved by Madison, approved by Jefferson, and by all the fathers of the Republic; a policy under which the merchant marine of the United States engaged in the foreign carrying trade had, until 1855, its highest prosperity. Now, certainly if during all that period the merchant marine of the United States had this continuous prosperity, why should it be argued to-day that a change of this policy would overcome difficulties which have caused a decline in our shipping in the foreign trade since 1855?

Mr. Chairman, it is not the first cost of the steam-ship or the sailing vessel which causes the difficulty in this regard. That difference is not so material in itself. The main difficulty is due to the higher expense of running our vessels after they are built.

I read the other day from the report of Consul Russell, at Liverpool, showing that, according to his investigations in November last, seamen, officers, stokers, all kinds of employés engaged upon steam-ships, received on American steam-ships 38 per cent. more in wages than was paid to similar men employed upon British steam-ships; and I also read from the same report the statement of this consul that it cost 27 per cent. more to feed our sailors and laborers upon American vessels than it did upon British vessels, simply because the American laborer demands better living than the foreigner.

Now, in view of these facts, Mr. Chairman, in relation to the matter, the remedy suggested by my friend from Georgia is certainly inadequate.

Here we have to face not only this difference in the cost of running the vessels, but we have to face a subvention or postal subsidy of $3,000,-000—a postal subsidy, for this is the language used in the reports of the British postmaster-general—which was paid to British vessels during the last fiscal year for the transportation of her mails.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLOUNT was recognized.

Mr. DINGLEY. I should like to be permitted to continue a few minutes longer.

Mr. GUENTHER was recognized, and yielded his time to Mr. DINGLEY.

Mr. DINGLEY. I repeat, Mr. Chairman, we have to face a subvention of $3,000,000 by the English Government for this mail service, as well as one of $5,000,000 on the part of France, and nearly $300,-000,000 paid by Italy. In the face of these facts, certainly if the Government of the United States shall look on and refuse to extend any assistance in this direction, refuse even to give the most meager compensation, it can not be otherwise than that the American steam-ship lines will eventually be driven from the sea. There is no help for it.

I say, therefore, to my friend from Georgia, without desiring to discuss other questions, upon which there may be differences of opinion, that he must see, and the members of the House must see, that unless this Government shall do at least as much for the American steam-ship lines as Great Britain, as Germany, as France, as Italy, and as other foreign governments are doing for theirs, that the day is not far distant when the American steam-ship lines will have been driven from the ocean. I was rejoiced, therefore, when I noticed that my friend from Georgia, who has usually taken the lead in opposition to liberal compensation to American steam-ship lines, in the early days of this session introduced a bill authorizing the Postmaster-General to give a more liberal compensation to American steam-ship lines for this service, and I trust the better feelings which led him to adopt that course will strengthen as he goes on and faces the exigencies before us.

One point further. My friend has suggested that we give American lines a larger compensation per letter than we give to foreign lines. That is true, but it should be borne in mind that the foreign steam-ship lines have taken possession of those routes on which there is the largest mail, and that a rate per letter which will give the North German line $124,000 for the transportation of mails, will give to the American lines making nearly as great mileage, running from New York to the ports of Brazil, only $10,000, because the mail happens to be less, notwithstanding the mileage is the same. Evidently such a basis of compensation is unjust. Indeed, in fixing compensation for transportation of mails on our other routes we have little regard to the number of letters to be transported, but to the length of the route. It costs no more for a steam-ship to carry a hundred sacks of mail than ten sacks.

Hence I want to call the attention of my friend from Georgia to the fact that the basis on which we are paying for foreign mail transportation by steam-ship lines to-day is to the great disadvantage of American lines, and to the advantage of foreign steam-ship lines; and I appeal to him and to the gentlemen who are members of the Post-Office Committee to see that there shall be some legislation reported to the House correcting this injustice and doing justice to American companies.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BLOUNT rose.

Mr. GUENTHER. I ask the gentleman from Georgia to yield to me for a minute.

Mr. BLOUNT. I want the time myself, and can not yield.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] has stated that our present navigation laws began with the administration of General Wash-

ington and have continued up to the present time, and that the prosperity of our shipping has grown out of that legislation. And yet, while it is true that shipping began to improve, and that about 1857 or 1858 we were the second in point of tonnage, I believe, of all the commercial nations of the world, the fact is we have gone down since that time until we carry but a small portion of commerce under that legislation, and the gentleman admonishes us that unless we do something else we will have no ships on the ocean.

Then this law is a failure. But the gentleman says the reason does not lie in the ships, but in the difference between the prices of labor. The difference, Mr. Chairman, in the prices of labor obtained in 1858 as well as it does now, so that does not account for it. The real fact here, Mr. Chairman, is this. The navigation laws could not regulate this thing. Circumstances that could not be controlled and that can not be controlled now, came into play; at that period we began to make iron vessels; they were stronger and speedier than the wooden vessels, and they took the place of them. That is the whole story, and it is so to-day; the labor question does not touch it. Those vessels can be built cheaper abroad, and other nationalities have understood it well. Where the prices of labor in their own countries, in Germany, Italy, France, and Russia, were lower than they were in England, they have still had to go to England where there is higher-priced labor in order to buy cheaper ships.

Mr. BINGHAM. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. BLOUNT. Certainly.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does not each one of these nations which buy their ships where they can buy them cheapest, does not each one of them pay an annual subsidy, amounting in England last year to $3,000,000?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes; that is true in part. But those nations found it absolutely necessary to go abroad to purchase their ships.

Now, let us see about this subsidy business. England, with her immense commerce, gave subsidies last year amounting to $3,175,819. Is it that which gives to Great Britain the command of the ocean? Only a few of her lines are subsidized, and the great body of them traverse the ocean parallel to those lines unaided, and they command the commerce of the world. They do so in spite of the subsidies to other lines that are traversing the ocean.

The same system applies to any of the other nations which subsidize their lines. The subsidized lines carry but a small fraction of their commerce. Their commerce is not taken by subsidized lines; it is taken in spite of them; and the unaided lines traverse the ocean side by side with subsidized lines and prosper.

Mr. HOLMAN. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. Is it not the fact that the Government of Great Britain has given subsidy to certain lines of vessels as a part of its colonial system?

Mr. BLOUNT. That is true; but we can not go into all these questions at this time. I want to call attention to this fact——

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DINGLEY was recognized, and yielded his time to Mr. BLOUNT.

Mr. BLOUNT. I only wish a moment more to finish a sentence. I want to call attention to the fact that the subsidized lines from Great Britain are so slow that the merchants of this country and of England are complaining because the mails are carried on the subsidized lines instead of on the swifter lines running to this country. They say the goods get here before the mails. That is what subsidy has done in facilitating mail transportation.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Do I understand the gentleman from Georgia to say that he knows of lines of steam-ships that are running successfully parallel with subsidized lines?

Mr. BLOUNT. Yes, sir; running from Europe to this country.

Mr. DOCKERY. I move to strike out the last word but three.

Mr. Chairman, I have no desire at this time to engage in what it must be evident to every member of this House is a profitless discussion. There is no proposition pending before the committee. But when a proposition is presented, as I apprehend it will be very soon when this bill is returned from the Senate, I propose to discuss at some length the business principles involved in the suggestions of the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY]. It is conceded by both sides of the House that that gentleman is particularly well informed on all matters relating to our merchant marine, and is usually extremely fair in debate.

But I must confess my surprise at the manner in which that very able gentleman has presented some of his propositions to-day. He stated that a certain line—I do not now recall its name—running from New York to some point in Europe, received $124,000 per annum, while another line, running from New York to Brazil, received only $10,000. He should have been frank enough to state that the line receiving $124,000, if it had been an American line carrying the American mails, would have received three times that sum. The lines to which he refers, the North German Lloyd and the Guion Lines, receive $1.27 and $1.39 per mile, respectively, as I now remember the figures; but they receive it simply because of the amount of mail they carry. The lines running to South America receive no compensation of a like total, because they carry but little mail for the United States.

Whether or not the compensation is adequate is a question I do not propose to discuss now; but the House and the committee will see at once the unfairness of the illustration offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY]. The law passed in 1858 discriminates, and discriminates properly, in favor of American lines by giving them sea and inland postage, while the foreign line receives only sea postage, and the gentleman is fully advised of that fact.

As to the causes that have led to the decline of the merchant marine, we will discuss those later on. They are grave; they should receive the attention of Congress, and when the time arrives I shall present my views on that question; but at this moment, and without any proposition pending, I shall not further trespass upon the indulgence of the committee.

Mr. DUNN. I did not intend to participate in this debate, and I should not have done so had not my distinguished colleague on the Shipping Committee [Mr. DINGLEY] brought into the discussion matters which would be more pertinent to one which is to come hereafter. He insists that we shall adhere to the system which he says was adopted by the advice of Washington and Jefferson for the benefit of American shipping. The gentleman will remember that they and the other statesmen of that day also advised the continuance of the African slave trade for the benefit of American shipping, and that the New England ship-owners and ship-builders insisted upon retaining it until 1808 for the benefit of the American merchant marine. Is the gentleman ready to return to that policy to promote and stimulate that interest?

They also advised the enactment of old obstructive bottomry laws of that date, prohibiting the importation of merchandise in other than American-built vessels. Is the gentleman willing to go back to them? The existing conditions which prompted those statesmen to advise that policy have passed away, and with them the policy of obstruction has passed away and been abandoned by all nations of the world except the United States, which still refuses registration to foreign-built vessels. The gentleman says that it is not the question of the cost of the ships which determines the amount of the carrying trade enjoyed by our vessels. I am not sure, Mr. Chairman, that statistics prove anything conclusively, but if they do, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] is very unfortunate in that statement, for it is a fact that vessels of the United States took and maintained the lead of all nations in the foreign carrying trade just so long as and no longer than we could build and have cheaper ships than the people of any other country. Taking the statistical tables we find that in 1821 wooden sailing vessels (the only sea-going vessels of that period) could be built in the United States at from $38 to $42 per ton of burden; the same vessel then cost $50 to $60 per registered ton in Great Britain. Vessels of the United States then carried 88.7 per cent of the foreign trade, and foreign vessels carried 11.3 per cent. of it. In 1845 the cost of building vessels (same class) in the United States was $45 to $50 per ton, and in England $60 to $65 per ton. Vessels of the United States then carried 81.7 per cent. of the foreign trade, and all foreign vessels carried 18.3 per cent. of that trade.

At this latter date England commenced building iron vessels, and could build them at a cost of $90 to $100 per ton.

In 1855 it cost $45 to $50 per ton to build wooden vessels in the United States, and in England it cost $65 to $70 per ton to build them, and $70 to $80 per ton to build iron vessels. At that time United States vessels carried 75 per cent. of the foreign trade and all foreign vessels carried 24.8 per cent. of it. At this date England commenced building iron and steel steamers and at a cost of $70 to $80 per ton.

In 1860 it cost $90 to $100 per ton to build iron vessels in the United States. In the short space of five years, under the influence of this changed condition of things, the per cent. of foreign trade carried in vessels of the United States had declined from 75 to 65 per cent., and that in foreign vessels had increased from 24 to 33 per cent. It is significant, at least, to note that this change from wooden vessels, which could be built cheapest in the United States, to iron vessels, which could be built cheapest in England, marked the commencement of the rapid transfer of the foreign carrying trade from vessels of the United States to those of England. If it be not cause and effect, it is at least a remarkable coincidence.

I will here call attention to the further significant fact that the cost of building iron vessels continued to steadily decline in England until now it costs $40 to $60 per ton to build iron vessels over there, while it still costs $75 per ton to build iron vessels in the United States. Vessels of the United States now carry 15 per cent. of the foreign trade, and foreign vessels carry 85 per cent. of it.

I will have printed as part of my remarks a table, from which I have gathered these facts, on page 90 of the report of the Commissioner of Navigation for the year 1887:

[See table on next page.]

It will be seen from this table that our percentage of the carrying trade increased steadily as long as we built the cheapest ships, and also in proportion as the rate of tariff taxation on cargoes decreased; and that it steadily and rapidly declined as the tariff went up and when the vessels in use could be built cheaper abroad than in this country.

Proportion of the foreign trade carried in American bottoms, the tonnage of vessels built, and their approximate cost.

Year.	Foreign trade.	Tariff on dutiable goods.	Carried in American vessels.	Carried in foreign vessels.	Vessels built in United States.	Vessels owned in United States.	Approximate cost of sailing ships per ton in the United States.		Approximate cost of sailing ships per ton in Great Britain.	
							Wood.	Iron.	Wood.	Iron.
	Tons.	*P. ct.*	*P. ct.*	*P. ct.*	*Tons.*	*Tons.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*	*Dollars.*
1821	593,825	30.99	88.7	11.3	57,275.12	1,298,958	38 to 44		50 to 60	
1825	665,409	50.54	92.3	7.7	116,464.43	1,423,111	38 to 45		50 to 60	
1826	696,221	49.26	92.5	7.5	130,373.67	1,534,191				
1829	592,859	54.18	89.5	10.5	79,408.62	1,260,798				
1830	537,563	61.69	89.9	10.1	58,563.45	1,191,776	42 to 45		55 to 60	
1831	538,136	47.38	86.5	13.5	85,556.58	1,267,846				
1832	614,121	42.96	83.1	16.9	144,544.16	1,439,453				
1833	648,869	38.25	83.8	16.2	161,492.30	1,606,151				
1834	749,378	40.19	83.0	17.0	118,389.84	1,798,997				
1835	788,173	40.38	84.5	15.5	75,107.89	1,824,941	40 to 47		55 to 65	
1836	753,094	34.94	84.3	15.7	116,230.41	1,822,102				
1837	683,205	29.18	82.6	17.4	125,913.58	1,896,686				
1839	702,400	31.77	84.3	15.7	125,260.69	2,096,479				
1840	762,858	34.59	82.9	17.1	121,203.86	2,180,764	45 to 48		60 to 65	
1842	800,080	35.09	80.0	20.0	129,806.30	2,092,391				
1843	856,930	29.19	77.1	22.9	63,888.24	2,158,603				
1844	900,471	36.88	78.6	21.4	103,537.29	2,280,096				
1845	904,476	34.45	81.7	18.3	146,042.46	2,417,092	45 to 50		60 to 65	80 to 100
1846	943,397	33.35	81.7	18.3	188,263.93	2,562,085				
1847	1,047,454	28.02	71.1	28.9	243,633.40	2,839,046				
1848	1,168,707	25.28	72.5	27.5	318,075.54	3,154,042				
1849	1,258,756	26.11	75.0	25.0	256,988.82	3,334,016				
1850	1,439,694	27.14	74.0	26.0	279,255.86	3,535,454	45 to 48		65 to 70	
1851	1,544,663	25.63	73.6	26.4	299,472.41	3,772,439				75 to 90
1852	1,705,650	27.38	72.8	27.2	355,356.19	4,138,440				
1853	1,910,471	25.93	74.0	26.0	427,494.79	4,407,010				
1854	2,151,918	25.61	71.8	28.2	536,046.13	4,802,902				
1855	2,348,358	26.82	74.5	25.5	583,450.04	5,212,001	45 to 50		65 to 70	70 to 80
1856	2,302,190	26.05	75.2	24.8	469,293.73	4,871,653				
1857	2,268,196	22.45	70.5	29.5	378,804.70	4,940,843				
1858	2,301,148	22.43	73.7	26.3	244,712.87	5,049,808				
1859	2,321,674	19.56	66.9	33.1	156,602.33	5,145,038				
1860	2,379,396	19.67	66.5	33.5	214,797.65	5,353,808	47 to 50	85 to 100	65 to 75	65 to 75
1861	2,496,894	18.84	65.2	34.8	233,194.35	5,539,813				
1862	2,173,537	36.20	50.0	50.0	175,075.84	5,112,164				
1863	1,926,886	32.62	41.4	58.6	311,045.81	5,155,056				
1864	1,486,749	34.60	27.5	72.5	415,740.64	4,986,400				
1865	1,518,359	47.56	27.7	72.3	394,523.11	5,095,782	48 to 55	80 to 100	70 to 75	65 to 75
1866	1,387,756	48.35	32.2	67.8	336,146.56	4,310,778				
1867	1,515,648	46.67	33.9	66.1	305,594.86	4,304,487				
1868	1,494,389	48.70	35.1	64.9	285,304.73	4,351,759				
1869	1,496,220	47.36	33.1	66.9	275,230.15	4,144,641				
1870	1,448,846	47.15	35.6	64.4	276,953.31	4,240,507	50 to 52	75 to 90	70 to 75	60 to 70
1871	1,363,652	44.50	31.9	68.1	273,226.51	4,282,607				
1872	1,359,040	41.47	29.1	70.9	209,052.22	4,437,747				
1873	1,378,533	38.50	26.3	73.7	359,245.76	4,696,027				
1874	1,389,815	38.61	27.1	72.9	432,725.17	4,800,652				
1875	1,515,598	40.69	26.2	73.8	297,638.79	4,853,732	50 to 52	75 to 80	70 to 75	60 to 65
1876	1,553,705	44.80	27.6	72.4	231,585.63	4,279,458				
1877	1,570,600	42.55	26.9	73.1	176,591.06	4,242,600				
1878	1,589,348	42.81	26.3	73.7	235,503.57	4,212,765				
1879	1,451,505	44.95	23.0	77.0	193,030.69	4,165,601				
1880	1,314,402	43.56	17.5	82.5	157,409.90	4,058,634	52 to 54	70 to 80	75 to 80	55 to 65
1881	1,297,635	43.25	16.2	83.8	280,458.64	3,990,734				
1882	1,259,492	42.70	15.9	84.1	282,269.73	4,165,953				
1883	1,269,681	42.64	16.3	83.7	265,429.91	4,235,487				
1884	1,276,972	41.70	17.5	82.5	225,514.00	4,271,229	50 to 55	65 to 75	75 to 80	50 to 60
1887							45 to 50			40 to 60

The gentleman says that it is the subsidies paid by England and other countries that have driven our vessels from the seas.

Mr. Chairman, Great Britain pays not one dollar of gratuitous subsidy. She pays only for service rendered in transporting her mails from the home country to her colonies, which belt the earth, and to foreign countries, where her commerce goes. Not a dollar of gratuitous subsidy does she pay. When the proper time comes I shall vote cheerfully for a more liberal policy on the part of our Government in regard to the transportation of foreign mails than that which is now in force; but, sir, to ask that this Government shall "see" the gratuitous subsidies of other governments, which have not accomplished the purposes for which they were granted, and "go them one better" is, in my judgment, a most unwise and pernicious as well as unconstitutional policy.

Subsidies will not accomplish the desired results. They have not done so. We have not been driven from the seas by subsidies. We were driven from the seas by high-tariff taxation on cargoes and by high-priced vessels long before any foreign nation paid a gratuitous subsidy. We were out of the competition before we were placed under that disadvantage. England has gained her ascendency without one dollar of gratuitous subsidy such as is asked for in the bill which has been introduced in this House, and such as France pays, such as Italy pays, such as Spain pays, and such as Germany pays only to her Japan and Chinese lines. That is a modern experiment, the result of which is not yet seen. So far as results can be seen it has proven most disastrous. In Italy and France some of the largest ship-building and ship-owning concerns have been brought into bankruptcy by this insecure and unreliable stimulus, the ever-recurring evil—overproduction.

Subsidies have not driven our people out of competition. This has resulted from a tariff which denies cargoes to our vessels. We may take out a cargo of our own manufactures or our productions of the soil, but we can not bring back a cargo at will, as English vessels can to their country. We must run a vessel costing 30 per cent. more than our foreign competitor, and we must go much of the time in ballast, because of the tax on our cargo, while the competitor's cargo is untaxed. High-priced vessels can not compete with low-priced vessels and untaxed cargoes.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HATCH obtained the floor and yielded his time to Mr. DUNN.

Mr. DUNN. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] for his courtesy.

Mr. Chairman, the tables which I have here show not only that the cargoes of American vessels increased in percentage from 1821 down to the time when Great Britain learned to build iron vessels at a lower price than we could build them, but that so long as we could build cheaper ships to supply the world's demand than any other nation the number of ships built in this country steadily increased. In 1813, responding to the world's demand for cheap ships, we built 364 sailing vessels at a cheaper price than they could be built elsewhere in the world. In 1855 we built 1,781 sailing vessels, a larger number than was built elsewhere in the world. Exactly as the tariff on cargoes went down, and so long as we could build the vessels needed by the world, the number of vessels built in this country increased, and the percentage of the carrying trade of the world which American vessels took went up, until we built 1,781 vessels in that year, and carried 75 per cent. of the foreign trade.

After 1860 the tax on cargoes of vessels commenced going up with us, and the cost of building iron vessels in this country was higher than elsewhere, while in Great Britain the cost of building iron vessels declined. Thus we lost in exactly that ratio. The number of vessels

which we constructed diminished until in 1887 it went down to 299 steam-vessels and 545 sailing vessels. During all that time the cost of building iron vessels in Great Britain went down from $80 to $100 per ton to $40 to $60 per ton. We commenced building iron vessels at $90 to $100 per ton, and to-day the cost with us is $75 to $80 per ton. In Great Britain the cost of constructing iron vessels has gone down from $75 per ton to $40 per ton. In this country the cost of building iron vessels is maintained at what it was nearly thirty years ago, while in England it has been reduced to one-half. Yet gentlemen express astonishment that the cheaper vessels and untaxed cargoes of Great Britain should have driven us from the sea, while we insist on adhering to high-priced vessels and highly-taxed cargoes. And I desire to say further that during all that time the disparity in the cost of sailing vessels has been as great as it is now, on account of difference in wages, etc.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY. I renew the *pro forma* amendment. Mr. Chairman, the suggestion made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] with reference to the basis of compensation for transportation of the mails by steamers seems to call upon me for a single word of explanation of what I have already said.

It should be borne in mind that under our laws the basis of payment for transportation of mails by steam-ship is the number of letters that may be carried. American vessels may receive per letter and per package more than foreign vessels do, but it will be observed that this basis of compensation is inevitably greatly to the disadvantage of steam-ship lines which happen to be American lines connecting with South American and Central American countries as against other lines running the same number of miles. For example, although an American line running from New York to Rio runs as many miles as the North German line, running from Europe to this country, yet it does not on this basis of compensation get one-twelfth the amount that the European line receives.

The point to which I desire to call the attention of my friend, the chairman of the committee, is that this basis of compensation is all wrong. It ought not to be on the basis per letter carried, but per mile of transportation. When we come to fix the compensation on our star routes we do not have regard to the fact whether one or two or three or four or a dozen sacks of mail matter are to be carried. That makes no difference in the cost of transportation, but we have regard to the distance to be traveled. A steam-ship running from New York to Brazil, in performing the same number of miles as the North German line of steam-ships to Europe from the city of New York, has the same expense in carrying ten sacks of mail that the North German line does in carrying a hundred.

What I wish to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to is the necessity of changing the basis of compensation in order to do justice to American steam-ship lines, and in order to establish a fair basis of compensation. That is the basis upon which we pay vehicles for transporting the mail on our star-routes.

A word in reference to one other point. I did not intend to trench on the question of free ships, but I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DUNN], who alleges that the cause of the decline of our merchant marine in the foreign trade has been the high tariffs, as he calls them, which have taken away their cargoes, to the fact that our foreign exports and imports, which make cargoes to be carried, have never increased so rapidly as since the war under what the gentleman calls the high-tariff system. The difficulty is not in want of cargoes, for there is an abundance of cargoes. If the American marine in the foreign trade had increased in proportion to the increase of our foreign trade we would have more than six times what we now have. It is not the want of cargoes to and from any country, but it is because the foreign vessels have seized our exports and imports instead of American vessels. That is the difficulty.

Gentlemen who charge that a change from the revenue tariff of 1846 has caused the decline in our foreign carrying trade should remember that the decline began in 1855 under the revenue tariff, and that it was as rapid in the six years before the war as in any six years since the war.

[Here the hammer fell.]

By unanimous consent the formal amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

For balance due foreign countries, $75,000.

Mr. ADAMS. I move to strike out "$75,000" and insert "$80,000."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to detain the House more than a few minutes in what my friend from Missouri called and what I myself may call a profitless discussion. But I can not permit to pass without challenge a statement which fell from the chairman of the committee a few moments ago. I understood him to say in reference to the efficiency of the postal service that but little complaint existed except in sections of the country associated with the star-route service.

Mr. BLOUNT. I admit there are complaints, and there always will be. I do not believe the service is perfect, or that it ever will be.

Mr. ADAMS. The confirmation of the statement of the gentleman from Georgia may be found in my own section of the country. It is a fact that complaints do exist in the city of Chicago. Ordinarily we might infer such complaints are owing to the malice of political opponents of the Administration. I will not go into the question whether the complaints are justifiable or not. I merely state the fact there are complaints, and that the newspaper in Chicago which has taken the most prominent part in making these complaints is not a Republican paper, but a Democratic paper, which is the enthusiastic supporter of Mr. Cleveland, and which will, so far as I know, support the nominee of the Democratic party for the Presidency.

So far as I am concerned personally I have always been treated with fairness by the officials of the Chicago post-office, and personally I have no complaints to make against them. But, sir, it is true there is dissatisfaction existing amongst the business men of that city. Fac-similes of letters have been published in that paper to show what mistakes have been made in reference to letters plainly addressed. There are other complaints. There may have been some changes in the *personnel* of that post-office, and there may be less complaint now—that is within a few weeks—than existed heretofore.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Is the gentleman referring to the Chicago post-office?

Mr. ADAMS. I am.

Mr. MCKINNEY. Let me inquire whether the Postmaster-General has not entirely reorganized that post-office?

Mr. ADAMS. I understand some changes have been made.

Mr. MCKINNEY. And have not the changes been made with the express purpose of doing away with the complaints to which the gentleman has referred?

Mr. ADAMS. I do not complain; I complain of nothing.

Mr. MCKINNEY. The complaints, then, you refer to as having been made by others, have they not been relieved by the action of the Postmaster-General?

Mr. ADAMS. The statement of the gentleman fully confirms what I have already stated, and I therefore need not proceed any further.

Mr. MCKINNEY. That is all we admit in that connection.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. You admit that you have been all wrong.

Mr. MCKINNEY. We admit that there has been some wrong, but not all wrong.

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to occupy the time of the committee for a few moments only. I want to call attention to some statements that have been made, especially by the gentlemen whose sections have been most benefited by the liberal policy of the present administration of the Post-Office Department. It is a remarkable fact that the principal complaints come from those sections which have received the most liberal treatment. I refer particularly to the complaints which we have heard from Illinois and Kansas.

Illinois has received an increase of expenditures during the period of nineteen months, beginning with the 1st day of July, 1886, and ending with the 1st day of January, 1888, of $62,713.20, there having been 1,045 and a fraction miles of new railroad service established in that State during that period.

Then, with reference to the State of Kansas, I desire to notice the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS], who seems to be a constitutional "kicker" against the administration of the Post-Office Department. It might be inferred from the statements of the gentleman on yesterday and again to-day that there has been a most parsimonious and illiberal policy pursued by the Post-Office Department in dealing with that State; but I find, sir, by reference to the report of the Postmaster-General, and by inquiry, that during the fiscal year from July 1, 1886, to June 30, 1887, 1,393 miles of new railroad service was established in that State; and also that during the next seven months, from the 1st day of July, 1887, to the 31st day of January, 1888, 1,350 miles of new railway service was established, making a total in the nineteen months of 2,743 miles of new railroad service established in Kansas, at an increased annual cost to the Department of $164,623.20. Now, in addition to that, I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that expensive contracts have been made for fast-mail service largely for the benefit of the State of Kansas. In 1885 the Postmaster-General, by contract with the Burlington and Quincy Railroad Company, established a fast-mail service from Chicago to Omaha at an extra annual cost of $195,370.91. Before the fast-mail service was put on the cost of service on that line of railway was $174,968.69 per annum. The total cost, since the fast mail was put on, is $372,339.60.

Mr. PETERS. The gentleman does not want to charge that to Kansas?

Mr. ENLOE. The State of Kansas gets the benefit of it.

Mr. PETERS. Yes; but our fast mail service does not go over that line; it goes over the Missouri Pacific from St. Louis.

Mr. ENLOE. I will come to the other line presently. I have the authority of the Post-Office Department and the Postmaster-General himself for stating that this service was established, in a great measure, for the benefit of the States of Kansas and Nebraska, and these States are among the largest beneficiaries of the service. Since that mail line was established a reweighing of the mails took place, in March, 1887, which added to the annual cost $61,678, showing a total annual increase of cost for fast mails by the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad of $257,048.93.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this mail was expedited twenty-four hours, according to a statement of the Postmaster-General, and Kansas gets the benefit of the expedited service, enabling that State to get the Eastern mails twenty-four hours earlier than before. Again, on March 12, 1887, Postmaster-General Vilas contracted with the Pennsylvania and Missouri Pacific Railroads for a fast mail service from New York to Kansas City, via Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Columbus, Indianapolis, and St. Louis, at an annual increased cost of $199,395.20. This line expedites the mails to Kansas by from twelve to twenty-four hours, and all that great section of the country, from which these complaints seem to come spontaneously, gets the benefit.

The total cost of the messenger and transportation service in the United States is $29,806,518.87, of which Kansas gets, in round numbers, $888,000, or about 3 per cent. of the whole amount.

The increase of the postal clerks has been 603 in the nineteen months preceding January 31 last, and Kansas gets 150, or the lines working the Kansas mails, being 26 per cent. of the total increase of mail-messenger service.

There were applications from Kansas up to January 31, 1888, for new service on 400 miles of railway, but the railroad companies had not complied with the requirements of the law in returning the distance circulars so that the contracts could be made.

The increase, then, in the annual cost of the mail service to Kansas for the nineteen months to which I have referred amounts to $164,623.20. The cost of the messenger service of which Kansas gets the benefit is $111,358.75. The cost of the transportation service is $777,315.67. The total cost of the service, of which Kansas is the principal beneficiary, is $888,674.42. The annual excess of cost of this service in the State of Kansas over all postal-revenue receipts is $269,189.77. And I want to state right here in answer to the gentleman's charge that the administration of the Post-Office Department has been "partisan in its character, parsimonious in its allowances, and palsied in its execution," that such a charge comes with bad grace from Kansas. The difficulty in that region is attributable not to parsimony or illiberality, but it may be attributable to some extent to the fact that we have not been able to get Democrats into the railway-mail service out there.

It is the most difficult branch of the service in which to make a change, and I suspect that accounts for a good deal of the complaint, and for the charges of inefficiency in the service in that State. It is at least worth the trial of a change in the *personnel* of the service. The Democratic administration must bear the responsibility, and take the criticism and abuse for the inefficiency or neglect of these mail clerks, and if the administration must be criticised and condemned by the opposition, it should be criticised and condemned for the conduct of Democrats, and not of Republicans.

Mr. SYMES. The complaint made yesterday by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS], and by several other gentlemen from Western States and myself, was that there was a deficiency and inefficiency in the star-route service. It is no answer to that statement to say that on account of the additional railroads built in Kansas or other States there has been an extension of the service on the railroads. The substance of the complaint was that where towns are growing up very fast, where perhaps there will be ten towns in one county started in the course of three months, containing from 100 to 500 people, where post-offices should be established and the star-route service put on, the Second Assistant Postmaster-General, pursuing the picayune five-cent economy characteristic of many branches of this Administration, haggles and higgles and counts the cost month after month and almost year after year; while these citizens are paying for the mails being brought to themselves and their families out of their own pockets. That was the substance of the charge gentlemen made here yesterday on both sides of the House on this proposition.

Mr. PERKINS. And again this morning.

Mr. SYMES. Yes; and now the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] attempts to answer that proposition and that charge of inefficiency in the star-route service of the railroads by getting up and reading statistics from the Department to show that the mail service has been extended where railroads have been built.

Mr. ENLOE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. SYMES. Yes, sir.

Mr. ENLOE. Has not the mail service been frequently extended in Kansas and other Western States——

Mr. SYMES. Does the gentleman refer to the star-route service?

Mr. ENLOE. I refer to the railway mail service at points between which there is no intermediate population. Is not the Government paying a great deal to deliver the mail to people who pay very little of the expense of its delivery?

Mr. SYMES. I understand, of course, that the service is extended over lines of railroad after those lines of railroad are completed. They are mostly lines which extend from one Western metropolis to another and as regards the extension of the service to stations on the railroad, I have not heard any particular complaint. The Post-Office authorities could not help doing that. It would be absurd and ridiculous in the extreme to stand up and defend the Department for efficient service because it drops the mail bags as the train stops at the different stations after another great line of railroad in the course of progress in that country has been completed.

But let me be specific in the complaint, and it can not be answered in the way the gentleman from Tennessee attempted to answer it. In my own State in the past three years at least fifty prominent country towns have sprung up as large as many important towns in the South and in New England and other Eastern States. They have grown up as by magic; and I say every one of those towns has needed star-route service connected with the new railroad stations or these new extended lines of railroad as much as letter-carriers are needed in Washington or the little star-route service throughout the old State of Maryland, and the Department has been negligent in granting the amount required.

My complaint is plain. It is that when the Second Assistant Postmaster-General has received petitions of scores of citizens, of hundreds of citizens, yea, of thousands of citizens, his answer has been, "I am doing the best I can with the money appropriated by Congress to aid me in establishing this new service, and there is a great deficiency in the revenues of the service in your State——

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SYMES. I desire to say just a word or two more. I do not wish to trouble the House on this further than is necessary to have it understood——

Mr. PETERS rose.

Mr. BLOUNT. If some understanding can not be come to, I will move that the committee rise in order to close debate.

Mr. SYMES. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment, and will take another opportunity to complete my remarks.

Mr. BLOUNT. How much time do the gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Colorado desire?

Mr. PETERS. I desire to be recognized for, say, three minutes.

Mr. SYMES. I shall be satisfied with another five minutes.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask unanimous consent that after these two gentlemen have spoken debate shall close on the pending paragraph.

There was no objection.

Mr. SYMES. I am very glad that I opened up this question with other gentlemen in the House yesterday; for I desire to say I have been mistaken, and Western men generally and members from the Northwest and Southwest have been mistaken, in the information that has been given them by the Second Assistant Postmaster-General. I had presumed it was for want of appropriations by the Post-Office Committee that the star-route service in the West was so insufficient and inefficient. But I found by the statements of the gentleman from Kansas on the committee [Mr. PETERS], of the distinguished chairman of the committee, and of other gentlemen as to the amount of money remaining now at the service of the Department, that I had been mistaken. I want to put the responsibility where it belongs; and I am satisfied, taking the words of these gentlemen in this House, that it belongs on the back of the picayune Second Assistant Postmaster-General. He has made statement after statement, as I have been informed by gentlemen—and I have had communications to the same effect myself—and made excuses for not extending the star-route service where it is needed, which have been equivocal and erroneous and very great mistakes in the lightest way of putting it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, what was the object of that? Why have the citizens of the West, the Southwest, and the Northwest been paying out of their own pockets for having the mails delivered to their towns and their families, instead of this great Government doing it for them? The Second Assistant Postmaster-General is probably not so much to blame after all. The subordinate officers in any great department, in any great machine, whether it be political, civil, or of any other character, generally follow what they understand to be the policy of the head. It was given out by the ex-Postmaster-General, it was given out by this Administration, it is illustrated throughout the whole course of the Administration that a 5-cent picayune economy is the order of the day. We are treated one day to a speech from a leading Democrat and a message from the President, telling us that we are on the verge of a great maelstrom of ruin because we have so much money in the Treasury, and the next day we have a veto from the President for the protection of the money in the Treasury, even going so far as to veto a bill which relieves a poor little postmaster to the extent of a few hundred dollars, which he has paid out for extra clerk-hire, and for which, in the judgment of a committee of this House and of the House itself, as shown by its action in passing the bill, relief ought to be granted, and following that a veto of a bill granting a pension to a crippled ex-soldier.

Passing down from the head through all the Departments you find that character of men who, in Western language, are quick to "catch on" to what they understand to be the spirit governing the heads of the Departments in which they are engaged, and many a Republican office-holder in the Departments has figured up some bit of 5-cent economy for the benefit of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General to show him that he would not be justified in extending this or that star route because it would not pay, while all the time the pioneers upon your frontier are paying the expenses of carrying some of the mails out of their own pockets.

Mr. RAYNER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him, how does the administration of the Second Assistant Postmaster-General compare with the administration of his almost immediate predecessor, who came very near going to jail, and who, if justice had been meted out, would be in prison at this time?

Mr. SYMES. Mr. Chairman, the ingenious criminal lawyer always tries to divert attention from a statement of fact, a pertinent illustration, or a legitimate deduction, by asking a question entirely foreign to the matter under discussion——

Mr. RAYNER. If the gentleman will permit me, instead of being an ingenious criminal lawyer, I have not tried a criminal case in ten years, and the ingenuity of the criminal lawyer is shown in attempting to acquit Mr. Brady here of the charges which were established against him.

Mr. SYMES. Well, I take it back, then. The gentleman is able and ingenious, any way, and would be so if he were defending a criminal.

My complaint in behalf of the people who are settling up the great West is plain and true, and it has not been answered——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to reply briefly to some statements made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] in relation to the benefit which Kansas is supposed to receive from the fast-mail service to which he has alluded. He first spoke of the fast-mail service which has been established upon the Chicago, Burlington and Quincy route to Omaha, and when I called his attention to the fact that Kansas as a State was not particularly interested in that service he presented a statement from the Post-Office Department which seemed to contradict that view. Any one familiar with the geography of the Western country would know that the expedition of the mail service to Omaha would affect but a very small portion of the State of Kansas, and that only the portion along the northern border.

The only fast-mail service that is really of any benefit to the State of Kansas is that which has been alluded to, which runs over the Missouri Pacific to Kansas City. But the gentleman here again, either designedly or otherwise, misstates the situation of affairs. He seems to have overlooked the fact that there is a large portion of the United States beyond Kansas, and that this fast-mail service is not for the benefit of Kansas at all, although that State may be and probably is benefited by it to some extent. Kansas has increased in population 600,000 since the census of 1880. Of those 600,000 people a great many have gone in from other States and made their homes there, thus necessitating a large increase in the extent of the mail service. But the fact that these fast mails are of as much advantage to the Pacific Slope and to all of the Territories in the Western portion of the country seems to have entirely escaped the attention of the gentleman.

Mr. PERKINS. I will ask my colleague, was not that fast-mail service of which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE] spoke established for the benefit of the Pacific coast mail and the China mail, and not at all for Kansas or Nebraska?

Mr. PETERS. Almost entirely.

Mr. PERKINS. Exclusively.

Mr. ENLOE. I wish the gentleman would give his authority for that statement.

Mr. PETERS. It was established in order to expedite the Pacific and China mail and the mails for the Territories beyond. Of course incidentally it did prove of benefit to the people; but that was not the real object or purpose of putting on the service. I am free to say that if there had been no country beyond Kansas that fast mail would not have been established, and if it had been established under such circumstances it might well have been open to criticism. But in addition to what I have stated I know from personal observation how the business works. I have been in the mail-cars from Kansas City west, and I know that very often it has not been possible to freight the mails on those trans-continental lines in the postal cars, but they were placed in the express-car, and after a certain portion of them had been distributed going through Kansas then the remainder were put in the mail-car.

The trouble has not arisen from the fact that appropriations have not been sufficient, or from the fact that we have not had fast mails. The trouble has arisen from the management and the working of the mail service in the mail-cars, and it is about that that the complaints come, when they come at all.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House debate is exhausted, and the question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BLOUNT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to return to page 2, line 17, and insert, after the word "thousand," the word "dollars."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move that the committee rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that it pass as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. TURNER, of Georgia, reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9345) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and had instructed him to report the same back with the recommendation that it pass with amendments.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask that the amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole be voted on in gross.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If no separate vote be demanded, the amendments will be voted on together.

The amendments reported from the Committee of the Whole were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BLOUNT moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 6800) for the relief of John Powers; and

A bill (H. R. 2216) for the relief of Thomas A. Osborn.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. FORNEY. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. BLOUNT in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the title of the bill first in order.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9377) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

INTERNATIONAL MARINE CONFERENCE.

Mr. BELMONT. The gentleman in charge of the bill first in order has agreed to yield for a few moments that I may bring up a bill already passed by the Senate which it is very desirable the House should dispose of at once. It is a bill providing for an international maritime conference, and is a measure of great importance. It has been recommended in a special message of the President and in a report from the Navy Department. It has also the approval of all or nearly all of the maritime associations and commercial exchanges in the country.

Mr. FORNEY. I have no objection to the consideration of the measure referred to by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BELMONT] if it does not take any time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the title of the bill which the gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to bring up.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 1851) providing for an international marine conference to secure greater safety for life and property at sea.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. Let us hear it read. How much time will it take?

Mr. BELMONT. It is a bill which has already been passed by the Senate. It provides merely for an international maritime conference.

Mr. CANNON. I suppose it will have to be read, at any rate.

Mr. BELMONT. I am instructed by the Committee on Foreign Affairs to move a substitute.

Mr. CANNON. Then let us hear the substitute.

Mr. BELMONT. Let the substitute be read.

The substitute proposed by the Committee on Foreign Relations was read.

Mr. FORNEY (during the reading). I think this bill will take some time for its consideration, and I must object.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is an important measure, involving the safety of human life at sea.

Mr. FORNEY. If it will give rise to no debate, I do not object.

Mr. DINGLEY. I believe no time will be occupied in its consideration.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. As soon as the bill has been read I think the Committee of the Whole will agree to it.

Mr. BELMONT. If when the reading of the substitute is concluded there is any objection, I will not press the proposition.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the substitute.

Mr. BELMONT. Mr. Chairman, I think that this proposition needs but a very brief explanation. I had the honor, early in the session, of introducing the bill which it is now proposed to substitute for the Senate bill. There has been nothing done to establish an international code of marine signals since 1856. Fast steamers are now engaged in commerce and the passenger traffic of the country, and the necessity for some change in the old signals has become pressing. This has been made apparent on many occasions. The necessity for an improved sys-

tem of fog-signals for both sailing and steam vessels is universally recognized, as stated in the report accompanying the House bill:

Numberless disasters at sea in foggy weather sufficiently attest the fact that the international "rule of the road" now in force is inadequate, especially in regard to steam-ships. They are now required to give in fogs a prolonged blast of the steam whistle every two minutes. This indicates their proximity, but gives no clew to the direction in which either vessel is steering. Moreover, two steamers, a mile apart and moving at half speed, could meet within the two minutes' interval provided by the signals.

This was clearly shown in the recent collision of the steamships Britannic and Celtic, belonging to the same line and sailing under the same general instructions. It was demonstrated that the Britannic could have only given the same signal to port as is now the standing signal to be given under all circumstances in foggy weather. The naval court which investigated that disaster emphatically condemned as insufficient the present system of signaling in fogs, and recommended the adoption of some more effective plan.

Mr. CANNON. When is it proposed to hold this conference?

Mr. BELMONT. In October next; and it is necessary that the appropriation should be made now, in time to make suitable preparations.

Mr. GUENTHER. I would like to ask the gentleman to explain the difference between the substitute and the original bill.

Mr. BELMONT. The Senate bill provides an expenditure of $30,000. It seemed to the House committee that $20,000 would be sufficient. The Senate bill provided that the United States delegates should receive the same compensation and allowances as members of the House of Representatives, which seemed to the House committee not sufficiently explicit; and in the amendment they suggest that the delegates should be compensated at the rate of $5,000 per annum.

Mr. DINGLEY. Is the balance substantially the same?

Mr. BELMONT. Substantially the same. I move that the bill be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it be adopted.

In this connection I ask consent to insert a list of commercial bodies which have passed resolutions in favor of the proposed conference:

THE MARITIME ASSOCIATION OF THE PORT OF NEW YORK,
New York, February 27, 1888.

DEAR SIR: In compliance with your request, I beg to hand you herewith list of 72 commercial exchanges which have recommended your measure for an international marine conference.

In addition to the memorials already sent, I beg to inclose memorials from the Cotton Exchanges of New York, Mobile, and Birmingham Ala.; Chambers of Commerce of San Francisco and Wilmington, N. C.; Boards of Trade of Newark, Kansas City, McKeesport, Denver, Los Angeles, St. Joseph, and Omaha; New York, Mercantile and Mechanics and Traders' Exchanges and Brewers' Board of Trade; New Orleans (La.) Sugar Planters' Association, Mechanics, Dealers and Lumbermen's Exchange; Sioux City Jobbers and Manufacturers' Association; St. Paul Jobbers' Union; Detroit Mechanics and Manufacturers' Exchange; and Cleveland Board of Lumber Dealers, asking the enactment of the measure.

It will be remembered that the subject has been favorably recommended to Congress by the President, and been commended by the Department of State, Navy Department, Bureau of Navigation, Signal Service, and, we are informed, by the New Jersey Legislature.

Very respectfully, yours,

F. W. HOUGHTON,
Superintendent.

Hon. PERRY BELMONT.

House of Representatives bill No. 6551, introduced by Hon. PERRY BELMONT, "providing for an international marine conference to secure greater safety at sea," has been supported by the following commercial bodies, namely:

Alabama—Mobile: Chamber of Commerce, Cotton Exchange; Birmingham: Chamber of Commerce.

California—Los Angeles: Board of Trade; San Francisco: Chamber of Commerce, Merchants' Exchange.

Colorado—Denver: Chamber of Commerce and Board of Trade.

Connecticut—Bridgeport: Board of Trade; New Haven: Chamber of Commerce.

Florida—Jacksonville: Board of Trade.

Georgia—Savannah: Cotton Exchange.

Illinois—Chicago: Citizens' Association.

Iowa—Sioux City: Jobbers and Manufacturers' Association.

Kansas—Fort Scott: Board of Trade; Wichita, Board of Trade.

Louisiana—New Orleans: Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association, Mechanics, Dealers, and Lumbermen's Exchange, Chamber of Commerce, Louisiana Sugar-Planters' Association, Board of Underwriters.

Maryland—Baltimore: Merchants' Exchange, Board of Trade, Corn and Flour Exchange.

Massachusetts—Boston: Fish Bureau, Chamber of Commerce, Merchants' Club, National Board of Trade.

Michigan—Detroit: Merchants and Manufacturers' Exchange, Board of Trade.

Maine—Portland: Board of Trade, Merchants' Exchange.

Minnesota—St. Paul: Chamber of Commerce, Jobbers' Union; Minneapolis: Jobbers' Association; Duluth: Chamber of Commerce; Mankato: Board of Trade.

Mississippi—Vicksburg: Cotton Exchange.

Missouri—St. Joseph: Board of Trade; St. Louis: Merchants' Exchange; Kansas City: Board of Trade.

Nebraska—Omaha: Board of Trade.

New Jersey—Newark: Board of Trade.

New York—New York: the Maritime Association of the port of New York, Mechanics and Traders' Exchange, Cotton Exchange, Lager Beer Brewers' Board of Trade, Building and Material Exchange, Produce Exchange, Mercantile Exchange.

New Hampshire—Portsmouth: Board of Trade.

North Carolina—Wilmington: Chamber of Commerce, Produce Exchange.

Ohio—Cleveland: Board of Lumber Dealers, Vessel-Owners' Association; Toledo: Produce Exchange; Cleveland: Board of Trade.

Pennsylvania—Titusville: Merchants and Manufacturers' Association; Philadelphia: Maritime Exchange, Board of Trade, Commercial Exchange, Grocers and Importers' Exchange, Vessel and Captains' Association, Drug Exchange; McKeesport: Board of Trade.

Rhode Island—Westerly: Business Men's Association; Providence: Mechanics' Exchange.

South Carolina—Charleston: Charleston Exchange.

Tennessee—Nashville: Merchants' Exchange.

Utah—Salt Lake City: Chamber of Commerce.

Virginia—Norfolk: Merchants' and Manufacturers' Exchanges; Cotton Exchange; Richmond: Chamber of Commerce.

Wisconsin—Milwaukee: Chamber of Commerce.

Also commended by the President of the United States, Department of State, Navy Department, Bureau of Navigation, United States Signal Service, Legislature of New Jersey.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first paragraph of the substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and requested to invite the Government of each marine nation to send delegates to a marine conference that shall assemble in the city of Washington on the 1st day of October, in the year 1888, or at such other time and place as he may designate, to appoint five delegates, one of whom shall be an officer of the United States Navy and one an official of the Life-Saving Service, to represent the United States at said marine conference, and to fill vacancies in their number."

SEC. 2. That it shall be the object of said marine conference to revise and amend the "Rule of the Road at Sea" and the "International Code of Flag and Night Signals;" to adopt a uniform system of marine signals, or other means of plainly indicating the direction in which vessels are moving in fog, mist, falling snow, and thick weather, and at night; to compare and discuss the various systems employed for the saving of life and property from shipwreck, for reporting, marking, and removing dangerous wrecks or obstructions to navigation, for designating vessels, for conveying to mariners and persons interested in shipping warnings of approaching storms, of dangers to navigation, of changes in lights, buoys, and other day and night marks, and other important information; and to formulate and submit for ratification to the Governments of all maritime nations proper international regulations for the prevention of collisions and other avoidable disasters.

SEC. 3. That the sum of $20,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, for the necessary expenses of said marine conference, including the pay and allowances of the representatives of the United States therein, which shall be at the rate of $5,000 per annum, and actual necessary expenses of such delegates as are not salaried officers of the United States, and the latter shall be allowed their actual necessary expenses. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to provide the conference with such facilities as may be deemed necessary.

SEC. 4. That it shall be the duty of the Secretary of State to transmit to Congress a detailed statement of the expenditures incurred under the provisions of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the gentleman will explain how this money is to be expended.

Mr. BELMONT. Partly in the salaries of the delegates and partly in the preparations necessary for receiving the delegates from all other maritime nations. The expenditures are to be made under the direction of the Secretary of State, and under the terms of this bill he must account to the House for the same.

Mr. GUENTHER. Are those gentlemen who are delegates on the part of the United States going to receive two salaries, $5,000 as fixed by the bill and their salary as naval officers?

Mr. BELMONT. No; the delegate who is to represent the Navy and the one who is to represent the Life-Saving Department of the Government are to serve without pay, but to have their necessary expenses paid.

Mr. HOLMAN. Is there any intimation as to what the pay of the others will be?

Mr. BELMONT. Five thousand dollars per annum during the term of their service.

Mr. HOLMAN. For what length of time are they to be engaged? This conference being called to consider a single subject, it would seem it would not require a considerable length of time.

Mr. BELMONT. I can not say how long the conference will be in session.

Mr. DINGLEY. I think the conference of 1856, if the gentleman will pardon me, was in session only about three weeks.

Mr. RANDALL. I presume it will be in conference until the $20,000 is expended.

Mr. HOLMAN. That amount seems unnecessarily large.

Mr. RANDALL. I would like to ask a single question in this connection of the gentleman from New York; that is, supposing this conference should provide certain rules and regulations, how are those rules and regulations to be enforced?

Mr. BELMONT. By international agreement, just as the rules which were adopted in 1856 are enforced. The gentleman must be aware that nothing has been done since that period, and therefore this conference is to be held.

Mr. RANDALL. Are the rules of 1856 in force?

Mr. BELMONT. As to flag signals. The result of that obsolete system is that when fast-sailing vessels are passing each other at sea it becomes almost impossible to make out the signals according to the present system. One of the important objects of this conference would be to establish signals for use at sea during fogs. At present it is impossible to indicate anything more than the near proximity of a fast-going steamer. There is nothing to show the direction of its course; and this has been the cause of a great many collisions which are occurring constantly.

Mr. DUNN. If the gentleman from New York will allow me one moment, I will answer the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania more specifically. These international rules of the road or code of signals are not in force until adopted by all the maritime nations of the world and the licensed officers of vessels, inspection officers, and

all the admiralty courts of the world enforce them against all the vessels of all nations. Until a few years ago our Government was in the attitude of having our vessels subject to these international rules without having given notice to our mercantile marine of what the rules were, and the courts held that they were bound by them. The courts were constantly deciding questions involving damages under rules of which notice had never been given by the enactment of a statute adopting them.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think, in view of the statement made by the gentleman from New York, that half the sum named in the bill would be ample. I suggest that the sum should be $10,000.

Mr. MCADOO. Say $12,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. I move to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$10,000" in the first line of section 3.

Mr. MACDONALD. I move to make the amount $15,000.

Mr. BELMONT. I do not feel authorized to accept the amendment, but I think the committee might vote on it.

The question being taken on the amendment offered by Mr. MACDONALD, to make the amount $15,000, it was not agreed to.

The question being taken on the amendment offered by Mr. HOLMAN, to make the amount $10,000, the Chairman stated that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. HOLMAN. I call for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 41, noes 46.

Mr. HOLMAN. I will have to raise the question of a quorum, unless my friend from New York will agree to my proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. A quorum not having voted, the Chair appoints as tellers the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. BELMONT].

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 48, noes 77.

Mr. HOLMAN. I withdraw the point as to a quorum with the understanding that a vote shall be taken on $15,000.

So (further count not being called for) the amendment of Mr. HOLMAN was not agreed to.

Mr. HOLMAN. I now ask that a vote be taken on $15,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That can only be done by unanimous consent, that motion having been already voted upon.

Mr. BELMONT. I agree to that proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana and the gentleman from New York ask unanimous consent that the committee may vote again on the proposition to insert $15,000. Is there objection? The Chairs hears none.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. I would like to have that part of the bill which relates to salaries again read.

Objection was made.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. I desire to ask the gentleman from New York if the salaries of the representatives of this Government are fixed by the bill at $5,000.

Mr. BELMONT. I have already stated to the committee that the delegates who are to receive compensation are to receive $5,000 per annum. Those who serve under the appointment of the Secretary of the Navy to represent the Navy Department and Life-Saving Service, being already officials of the Government are to serve without pay.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. How many officials of the Government are to serve without pay?

Mr. BELMONT. Three.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman from New York permit me to ask him if this is to take further argument or debate?

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. I do not propose to debate it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] to insert $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. I did not object to the amendment which has just been acted upon; but I suppose I can offer a new amendment, which is to reduce salaries.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is too late. The paragraph to which he refers has been passed. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. Do I understand the Chair to rule that an amendment to reduce the amount of salaries is out of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The amount of the salaries was fixed in the preceding paragraph. The bill is being considered by paragraphs and the paragraph referred to has been passed. The question is on agreeing to the substitute.

The substitute was agreed to; and the bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside and reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 9377) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

There was no objection.

Mr. FORNEY. What time do gentlemen on the other side desire for general debate?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Gentlemen on this side want an hour and twenty minutes. Perhaps so much time will not be occupied.

Mr. FORNEY. I have no objection to that; this side having the same amount of time, if it desires.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to one hour and twenty minutes on each side. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORNEY. The bill now under consideration is accompanied with a report which shows the changes that have been made in the current law. There is very little difference between the bill which the committee has reported and the current law. The amount which is embraced in this bill is estimated by the clerk to be $20,472,394.35. The current law is $20,681,640.67. There is, therefore, a reduction of something over $209,000.

In the report it is shown that there is an increase of salaried officers to the number of fifty-five, but there is really only an increase of seventeen. The apparently larger increase arises from the fact that certain employés of the Signal Office hitherto paid out of a general appropriation are now provided for specifically.

There is no new legislation in this bill except where it is proposed that the law library shall be kept open every day as long as either House of Congress is in session. That is the law now, but to avoid any necessity of repetition in each bill it is proposed to place it in that way.

There is also another change that is proposed, which comes under the heading of "Standard weights and measures." It is proposed there to provide that—

> Such necessary repairs and adjustments shall be made to the standards furnished to the several States and Territories as may be requested by the governors thereof, and also to standard weights and measures that have been or may hereafter be supplied to United States custom-houses and other offices of the United States, under act of Congress, when requested by the Secretary of the Treasury.

The necessity for this arises from the fact that in some of the States the standard weights and measures have been injured and there is no existing law authorizing the repair of the same. I believe that is the case in New Jersey and New Mexico.

Under the head of the "Senate" there is really no change proposed from the current law. There is an apparent reduction of some $37,000, but that arises from the fact that the next session will be the short session.

Under the head of "House of Representatives" certain light changes are made in regard to the salaries of the Clerk, the Sergeant-at-Arms, and the Doorkeeper. The salaries are increased $500 each, but in fact these officers receive no more pay under this bill than under the current law. The Clerk is entitled under the existing law to some $1,200 for horse-hire, carriage, etc., and that allowance has been reduced to $700. The Sergeant-at-Arms is entitled under the present law to an allowance of $500 for a horse and wagon, and the Doorkeeper has a like allowance of $1,100. The committee have reduced each of these sums by $500, so that instead of providing for an increase of the salaries of these officers the result may prove to be an actual reduction of their compensation, because they will be required to show how they have expended the money. We have added to the provision the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary," which will require an account to be rendered to the Comptroller of the amount expended in the public service.

I desire, however, to call the attention of the committee to a change which has been made in regard to the preparing of a general index to the Journals of Congress. At the present time we have one clerk and an assistant engaged in this work. The clerk receives $2,500 and his assistant $2,000. At the rate the work is going on the general index will not be completed in less than sixteen years. They have now reached the Nineteenth Congress, and possibly by the end of this year they will have reached the Twenty-fifth. It is proposed by this bill that the force for that work shall be increased. We propose to give the clerk eight assistants, with salaries amounting in the aggregate to $8,000 per annum, and it is supposed that it will take four years to complete the index. If this is a work that is desirable at all, it certainly ought to be completed within four years.

These are the principal changes in the bill. There are some slight changes in the Treasury Department. There is a reduction of force in some bureaus and an increase elsewhere. For instance, there is a reduction in the force in the division of customs, and there is also a consolidation of divisions under one head to be called the "miscellaneous division." There is a reduction of the force from 18 to 10. The aggregate cost of the 18 is $27,680. The aggregate cost of the 10 is $15,120.

There are some slight changes in the office of the Supervising Architect, in the office of the Second Comptroller, and in the Treasurer's office, all of which are set forth in the report.

There is also a slight change made in the independent treasury at New York. The force in the office of the Assistant Treasurer is rear-

ranged. This is done in accordance with the request of the Assistant Treasurer and upon the recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury.

There is really no increase in the aggregate amount which is appropriated for the current fiscal year; but it is expected that by this rearrangement the service will be rendered more efficient.

In the War Department there is considerable reduction of force in the Quartermaster-General's Office. That office has also been reorganized, but this has been done in accordance with the wishes of the Quartermaster-General. The force is reduced to the extent of twenty-three persons, making a difference of $18,915 in the aggregate salaries.

There are other slight changes in the War Department—none of any great importance.

The Navy Department has been reorganized under the supervision of the Secretary of the Navy. There is no change in the number and salaries of the officers, except in the Bureau of Ordnance, where we have given an assistant draughtsman at $1,400, one clerk of class 1, and one copyist, and in the Bureau of Provisions and Clothing, where one additional clerk of class 4 and four clerks of class 1 are provided for. This increase of force is believed to be necessary from the fact that at this time the Navy Department is building some thirteen ships.

In the Interior Department there are some changes, principally in the General Land Office, the additional force numbering some twenty-eight persons. This includes ten principal examiners of land claims and contests at $2,000 each. The work in that branch of the office is behind, and this increase is made for the purpose of settling contests now pending. In the Land Office there are also fifteen additional clerks provided for.

There has also been a change in the Patent Office, where we increase the force. That is a self-sustaining office, and the committee thought it necessary to allow two additional principal examiners at $2,400 each, ten additional clerks of class 1, and one draughtsman at $1,000.

In the Post-Office Department there is a slight increase of clerical force; this addition, which embraces about ten persons, being due to the fact that the service of that Department has been enlarging annually.

I will reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH obtained the floor, and yielded to Mr. CANNON.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say only a word at this time touching this bill. It contains some items to which, as the consideration of the measure progresses under the five-minute rule, I desire to call attention. All I wish to say now is that the apparent reduction in this bill of $209,246.32 upon the appropriations in the law of 1888 is only apparent, not real. This bill is in effect the same as the law for the current year. I hold in my hand a statement showing the items in the law for the present year which have not been estimated for or required for the coming fiscal year, or which are transferred for consideration to another bill.

The first item is leave-of-absence pay in the Engraving and Printing Bureau, $17,000. This item, which is embraced in the appropriations for the current year, does not appear in this bill providing for the next fiscal year, having been transferred to the sundry civil bill. An item of $5,900 for assay office at St. Louis, Mo., is dropped out of the present bill, because, in the judgment of the committee, that office is no longer needed. In the law for the present year there is an item of $60,000 for furniture for the new State, War, and Navy Department buildings; and, of course, no such item is embraced in the present bill, because those buildings have been furnished. Another item, $1,500 for unveiling Garfield's statue, which was appropriated for in the last bill, does not, of course, require to be repeated. An item of $6,000 in the bill of last year for subsistence of agents of Quartermaster-General's office does not appear in the bill now before the House, because that work has been done and those agents are no longer necessary. Then there is the appropriation of $4,000 for the biennial register, which drops out of this bill because the work is not required except in alternate years. An item of $2,500 for education of feeble-minded children is omitted from this bill, and will appear in the sundry civil bill. The same may be said in regard to the item of $25,000 for education in Alaska. That item, I presume, will appear in the sundry civil bill; at least it is reserved for consideration in connection with that bill. An item of $10,000 for marriage and divorce statistics is omitted from this bill, because that work has been accomplished under the appropriation made for the present year. The item of $12,000 for clerk-hire at pensions agencies drops out of this bill, because an appropriation for that purpose has been made in the pension appropriation bill; and the same remark may be made in regard to an item of $3,000 for stationery for pension agencies.

The reduction in expenses of the Senate because of the short session is $37,094.02. This reduction occurs, of course, in alternate years; and the appropriations in the present bill are decreased to that amount, because the session of the Senate during the next fiscal year will be a short one. Then there is a reduction of expenses of the House because of the short session amounting to $19,021.10. The aggregate amount of these items is $203,015.02, which, being deducted from $209.246.32, the apparent reduction in the bill now before the House, makes the actual reduction $6,231.20. Amendments have been authorized by the Committee on Appropriations, to be proposed in Committee of the Whole, which are more than sufficient to make up this amount of six thousand and odd dollars. I publish as a part of my remarks the statement to which I referred:

Apparent reduction of the bill as reported to the House for 1889, under the law for 1888		$209,246.32
Items in the last law not estimated for or required for 1889, or which were transferred for consideration to another bill:		
Leave-of-absence pay, Engraving and Printing Bureau	$17,000.00	
Assay office, St. Louis, Mo	5,900.00	
Furniture for new State, War, and Navy buildings	60,000.00	
Unveiling Garfield's statue	1,500.00	
Subsistence of agents of Quartermaster-General's office	6,000.00	
Biennial Register	4,000.00	
Education of feeble-minded children	2,500.00	
Education in Alaska	25,000.00	
Marriage and divorce statistics	10,000.00	
Clerk-hire at pension agencies	12,000.00	
Stationery for pension agencies	3,000.00	
Reduction in expenses of Senate because of short session	37,094.02	
Reduction in expenses of House because of short session	19,021.10	
		203,015.12
Actual reduction		6,231.20

I do not know whether it was material for me to go over these items. Perhaps I might have contented myself with stating that the bill is in the main a continuation of the law for the present fiscal year. Having made these remarks, I reserve what further I may desire to say until we come to consider the specific items of the bill.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Mr. Chairman, how much of my time has the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] occupied?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. CUMMINGS). Ten minutes.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I yield for twenty minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOOTHMAN].

Mr. BOOTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Accounts reported, on February 21, 1888, the following resolution as a substitute for the bill H. R. 5632, which had been introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. TAULBEE], relating to the salaries of messengers and other employés of the House stationed at the various doors of the House. I will ask the Clerk to read the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Appropriations be, and it hereby is, requested to report in the forthcoming legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill an item appropriating the sum of $4,582 to be expended in equalizing the salaries of the following employés of the House, namely:

Five persons in attendance at the north door of the House.
Four persons in attendance at the east door of the House.
Three persons in attendance at the west door of the House.
Four persons in attendance at the east lobby door of the House.
Four persons in attendance at the west lobby door of the House.
One person in attendance at the seal room of the House.
One person acting as captain of House pages.
One person in attendance at the ladies' reception room of the House.
Seven persons in attendance at the north gallery doors of the House.
Three persons in attendance at the south gallery doors of the House.
Four persons in attendance at the west gallery doors of the House.
Six persons in attendance at the east gallery doors of the House.

In all, forty-three persons; and that such sum shall be expended so as to make the whole pay of said employés equal to $100 each per month for the time they are so employed.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. That resolution was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and placed upon the Calendar. It will appear from the reading of the resolution that if this legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill be passed before that resolution is called up it will practically render it nugatory and of no effect. There is nothing, then, to be done if this appropriation is passed, so far as that resolution is concerned.

I call attention to this matter at this time for the purpose of saying in the hearing of the House that when the proper time arrives I will move to incorporate in the pending appropriation bill an increase of these salaries, if it may so be called, amounting to some $4,600. I will say in passing that so far as seeking any political advantage in this matter is concerned, it can not be charged against me, because each one who is to be benefited by the passage of this resolution belongs to the other side of the House. But, as this matter was introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. TAULBEE] and referred to the Committee on Accounts, we believed, in the spirit of fairness, this House could not consistently with its dignity ask one man to do the work that another man is doing for two or three hundred dollars less per year.

The situation of these House messengers is just this: At the north door there are two men employed at $1,200 per annum, two at $1,000 a year, and one man at $720—each of these men doing exactly the same work, each presumably having the same amount of financial responsibility to take care of.

Certainly no man who is fair minded will say $1,200 is too much money to pay an employé of the House of Representatives who is required to give all his time and attention to his work. These employés when the House is in session, as we know, are compelled to be in attendance night and day, and when the House is not in session they are required to take care of committee-rooms.

Now, take the next door, the west door. There are three persons in attendance there—one man at $720, one at $900, and one at $1,000,

all doing the same work, putting in the same number of hours, and employed in the same way. At the east door there are four men employed, all at $1,200 a year. At the east lobby door two men are employed at $1,200 a year and one at $1,000. At the east gallery door there are four men employed at $1,200 a year., one at $1,000, and one at $67 per month. At the ladies' reception-room, one man at $800, having as much to do as any of these other men; one man at the seal-room at $1,200; four men at the west lobby door at $1,200 each; three men at the north gallery door at $1,200 each, one man at $1,000, one man at $900, one man at $840, and one man at $67 per month; at the south gallery door, three at $1,200 each; at the west gallery door, three at $1,200 and one at $1,000.

Now, no man can consider this situation of affairs—these men performing the same work and putting in the same number of hours—without coming to the conclusion that they should receive the same salary. Either each should be reduced from $1,200, or all should be put at $1,200. I believe no man can say justly that any one of these men gets too much who receives $1,200 a year. There should therefore be no reduction, but they should all be brought up to the $1,200 basis.

Now, it is necessary, if this change is to be wrought and this equalization take place, that it be done at once. The only objection, I suppose, that may possibly be urged is that it will be introducing new legislation upon an appropriation bill. I think that point of order will not lie against it. I am very sure it will not, and I propose at the proper time to offer amendments to the bill, which, in order that they may be understood, I shall now point out and indicate the places where I shall ask to insert them as changes in the bill.

On page 14, after the word "at," in line 9, I shall propose to amend the bill by striking out the words "one thousand" and insert "twelve hundred."

In line 21, on page 14, strike out the word "ten" and insert "eight;" and after the word "each," first occurring in line 22, on page 14, insert the following, "and two folders employed at the west door of the House and the north lobby door of the House, at $1,200 each."

Strike out the word "five," in line 22, on page 14, and insert "three;" and after the word "each," last occurring in said line 22, insert "and two folders, one employed at the north gallery door and one at the ladies' reception-room of the House, at $1,200 each."

Strike out the word "three," in line 23 on page 14, and insert "one;" and after the word "each," in line 24 on said page, insert "and two folders during the session, one employed at the east gallery door of the House and one at the north gallery door of the House, at $100 per month each."

Strike out the word "fifteen," in line 24 of page 14, and insert "thirteen;" and after the word "each," in line 25 of said page, insert "and two folders, one employed at the north door of the House and one at the west door of the House, at $1,200 each."

The effect, Mr. Chairman, of these amendments would be to give to the men employed here a salary at the rate of $100 a month for the time employed—that is, those who are employed annually, and those employed for the session, at the rate of $100 a month. I think it but fair and just to the employés of the House that this action should be taken.

It does seem to me that the proper and economic principle upon which our friends on the other side are holding themselves out to the country, and on which they claim to be running this Administration, will not be infringed by paying to these men, who have certainly worked hard enough to earn the money, an equal amount of wages for an equal amount of work.

That is all I desire to say now, and I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I yield now ten minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, when the present Administration came into existence, it found itself confronted by a difficulty as great, perhaps greater, than ever was met by any administration upon its advent to power. Coming in as it did upon its professions of devotion to civil-service reform, and meeting, as it did, the hungry and almost desperate crowd of those who for twenty-five years had been deprived even of the husks of office, it had a great perplexity confronting it. With the head of the Government writing pleasing letters to George William Curtis, with those immediately in charge of the Departments of the Government seeking to placate the hungry hordes which streamed in from every direction to the capital, the task of pleasing all was not an easy one, and, while upon the part of the President of the United States these professions of his devotion to the cause of civil-service reform remained unabated in their frequency and force, yet some means had to be devised by which those immediately in charge of the Department might do something to avert the consequences of the ever-rising and swelling tide of discontent. A circular was put forward by the head of at least one of the Departments of the Government trying to provide a new method of securing the displacing of officials and replacing them by those who were true to the faith.

The Postmaster-General (not the present one) sent his invitation all through the country to the hungry brethren, requesting them to file charges against officials of the last administration against whose name heretofore no word of suspicion had ever been breathed, whose places were needed for hungry applicants, and whose removal it was feared would offend the "Mugwumps." I stand in my place here to-day and say that there are in the Departments of this Government, as the result of this policy, piled up affidavits almost by the ton against men whose records are as pure and whose private characters are as upright as are the records and the characters of those who invited the charges against them. These affidavits are filed there in vast quantities, I say, and their contents are kept secret from the men affected by them. The persons charged are not allowed to see or examine the charges to prepare answers to show their utter and abominable falsehoods. These charges remain there in the archives of this Government, perhaps at some future time to rise up and blast the fair names of honest men when the facts which could now be produced to show their falsity will be beyond the power of men to gather together.

In the last Congress I introduced a bill to provide for simple justice to the men whose names had been thus aspersed. It was never reported. At the first opportunity afforded in the House at its present session I reintroduced that bill, to wit, on the 4th day of January last. It is, as its title reads, "to afford persons in the civil service of the United States Government an opportunity to inspect charges which may be filed against them, and to reply thereto, and for other purposes." Before reading the bill I will simply say that it asks no reinstatement of the men removed on those secret charges filed in this surreptitious manner, but simply provides that they shall be made acquainted with the matter of the charges, and have the right to file counter affidavits proving their falsity, to remain on record with the charges.

The bill is as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1628) to afford persons in the civil service of the United States Government an opportunity to inspect charges which may be filed against them, and to reply thereto, and for other purposes.

Whereas it has become a common practice to file in the various Departments of the General Government charges affecting the personal and official integrity of persons employed in or under the supervision of said Departments, and such persons have been denied inspection of said charges and afforded no opportunity to reply thereto, but such charges remain in the archives of the Government, liable hereafter to be produced at a time when the proof of their falsity may have passed beyond the reach of the persons affected thereby: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act any person now or heretofore employed in the civil service of the Government of the United States against whom charges affecting his personal character or official action shall have been heretofore filed in any Department of the Government, shall have full opportunity to inspect the same, and make copies thereof, and to file his answer thereto with accompanying affidavits and proofs.

SEC. 2. That hereafter no head of a Department, chief of bureau or division, or other official in the civil service of the United States shall file, or order filed, or allow to be filed, or to remain on file, in the archives of such Department, bureau, or division, any charge affecting unfavorably the personal character or official action of any person employed in the civil service of the United States Government, unless the said charge shall be first verified by the oath of the person making said charge; and within five days after the filing of such charge, so verified, the official immediately in charge of such Department, bureau, or division, shall cause a copy of said charge and verification to be mailed to the post-office address of the person against whom said charge is made, or served personally upon said person, and shall allow such person to inspect said original charge and verification, to take a copy thereof, if he shall so desire, and shall receive and annex to such charge, and file, the answer which such person so charged shall make thereto, together with such accompanying affidavits and proofs in relation thereto which such person so charged shall offer for filing: *Provided, however*, That this section shall not apply to the case of any official against whom criminal proceedings for official misconduct shall have been actually commenced, until after the actual arrest of such person.

SEC. 3. That any person offending against the provisions of this act shall be deemed to be guilty of a misdemeanor, and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $5,000.

This bill is in the interest of fair play and of common justice. That bill, sir, sleeps the sleep of the just in the room of the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service. It has not yet been reported. I suppose the committee has been so busy endeavoring to discover the last vestige of civil-service reform under the present Administration that it has had no time as yet to consider the merits of this bill.

I stand in my place in the American Congress to-day and denounce this proceeding on the part of the Government as un-American, unfair, and unjust, and I ask that some steps be taken by the people's representatives to provide some means to innocent persons whereby these charges may be met, whereby the replies to them may be placed in the same archives in which the charges are placed, and remain there as their refutation. I repeat, the bill does not contemplate a reinstatement of the men removed upon these charges. It provides simply that they may be allowed a safeguard against the aspersion of their name and their honor hereafter.

Why should not that be done? That these charges are there I know personally. I have read some of them. Personally I know that some of them are as false as the foulest aspersions against the brightest and purest characters can ever be. There are charges there affecting gentlemen in my own State, whose reputation at home has never been breathed against and whose official records were of the best. Men whom I know to be the soul of honor and of official probity are charged there with malfeasance in office, and with almost every impropriety spoken of in the English language, and to my personal knowledge falsely so charged; and they, when removed, were complimented upon their excellent records.

The practice of receiving these charges, filing them, and refusing an inspection of their contents, and all opportunity to the persons thus charged to file for the protection of their honor and fair name hereafter the proof

with them of their falsity, I stand here to denounce as one of the most outrageous invasions of common right and common fairness ever witnessed in any land or in any age. I do not complain of the removal of these men from office. I only ask that it be done in a fair and honorable manner. I do not ask that these men who have been removed upon false charges preferred by hungry sneaks should be reinstated. The Administration in power is charged with the conduct of Government and will be held responsible for the results, and in my judgment it is entitled to have its own agents. But I do demand that they have the privilege this bill gives them and which the sense of fairness of the American people, if the people had their say, would instantly accord them.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I yield twenty minutes to the gentleman from Dakota [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the committee and of some other people to that portion of the bill which appropriates money to support the Territorial government of Dakota. The amount carried in the bill is $66,000, in round numbers, and some people labor under the impression that this amount pays a considerable portion of the expenses of our Territorial government, and I wish, as far as possible, to remove that impresion.

The necessary expenses of the Territorial government of Dakota for the year 1888 will aggregate $600,000, and of this amount the people of the Territory pay out of their own pockets over $550,000. The amount carried in the bill for this purpose is largely in excess of the necessary amount for other years, owing to a session of our Legislature, which will convene in January next. Our Legislature meets biennially. The average amount appropriated by the General Government for this purpose is about $35,000. The people of Dakota pay the sum of about $550,000 for the support of the Territorial government; also pay into the United States Treasury annually over one hundred thousand, the proceeds of internal-revenue taxation, and pay to Federal Territorial officials, in the way of fees, salaries, etc., about $15,000 per annum. In addition to all these we pay annually about $2,600,000 for the support of our common schools.

The governor of the Territory, all of our judges, and the secretary of the Territory are appointed by the President. The judges, in turn, appoint the clerks of all the courts in the Territory, and the governor appoints nearly one hundred officials. Among these are those who disburse every dollar of the money our people pay towards the support of their Territorial government. Not an officer of their selection handles a dollar of the Territorial funds. The governor appoints those who make contracts for the support, enlargement, or construction of all public institutions, and every cent of the Territorial money that our people pay goes through the hands of appointees of the governor.

True to the principles of the Democratic platform, our present governor was appointed from New York. I might add that at least two-thirds of these officials would not be in offices to-day had the people the right of selection. If the expense of carrying the transcontinental mail over the Northern Pacific and Manitoba lines of railway was not charged to our postal expenditures, the mail service of the Territory would pay an excess of nearly $20,000 over and above its cost. The average annual appropriation by the General Government of about $35,000 is a spoonful of sugar thrown to 600,000 people to compensate them for the miserable, carpet-bag, Territorial government that is imposed upon them.

The amount carried in this bill should be largely increased or stricken out altogether. So far as the wishes of the people of Dakota are concerned, they would much rather it would be stricken out than that it should be presented as an excuse for denying us self-government and home rule. If the Government would remit to us the amount that we pay annually into the United States Treasury we would cheerfully assume the responsibility of our Territorial government. The idea that this mere pretense should be made of supporting our Territorial government is simply ridiculous.

We have in Dakota in flourishing condition two universities, two insane asylums, three normal schools, an agricultural college, a school of mines, and, I might add for the benefit of those who violate the law, two strong penitentiaries. We have placed a common-school education within the reach of every child and an education of the higher grades within the reach of very many of our youth.

This average appropriation of $35,000 annually is the compensation our people receive for being dominated and tyrannized over by nonresident officials, many of whom have no interest whatever in our affairs, except to draw their salaries. It is what we receive for having no voice in our national affairs; it is what we receive for paying a hundred thousand dollars annually into the United States Treasury; it is what we receive for being the subjects of a violation of the Constitution of the United States of solemn treaty obligations and acts of Congress.

If it would be any benefit to the people of the United States to be relieved from the burden of this appropriation, the people of Dakota would most cheerfully assume it. We believe if our affairs could be managed by officers of our selection the money we pay would be much more economically disbursed and used, which would far more than compensate us for the amount of this appropriation. Not an officer of our Territory who disburses any portion of the Territorial money is responsible to the people for his official acts. Every one is appointed by the governor, and nearly every one is a politician, and is found hovering around caucuses and conventions at every opportunity.

But few people who live outside of a Territory understand the condition of the people thereof in relation to this matter of Territorial government. The Territorial government is a mockery and delusion. The officers are generally appointed as a reward for some political service to the administration.

My limited time will not permit me to present anything like a full description of the disadvantages of the Territorial government. Permit me to say that the six hundred thousand people in Dakota are heartily tired of it and would gladly relieve the people of the United States from the burden of the pittance annually appropriated by the General Government towards supporting a governmental Territory.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Mr. Chairman, the proposition to admit a new State into the Union involves certain general principles which have received much consideration during the decades in which this Union of ours has grown from a baker's dozen of struggling States, with 3,000,000 of people, to a great Republic of thirty-nine States (one only thereof now seeking her constitutional right of admission to the Union), with an aggregate population of over 60,000,000. These principles have been clearly defined and stated during the debates incident to the formal ceremonies of admitting into the Union the twenty-five States that have been created since the Federal Constitution was formally ratified; and during the more recent debates upon the pending bill for the admission of the new State of Dakota have been restated with great force and clearness. When Michigan was asserting her right to admission, that great apostle of State rights, Mr. Calhoun, said:

> Ours is a Federal Republic, a Union of States. Michigan is a State, a State in course of admission, differing only from the other States in her Federal relations. She is declared to be a State in the most solemn manner by your own act.

Calhoun opposed the admission of Michigan because he believed that the act would constitute the admission of a power in the Federal Government that would destroy the last vestige of State rights and give the complete control of all the States to Federal authority. Nevertheless, Michigan was admitted into the Union just twenty-four days after that eminent statesman made those declarations.

Relating to the admission of South Dakota we have from the Committee on Territories the majority and minority reports known as No. 709, presented February 24, to accompany House bill 1679, entitled "A bill to provide for the admission of South Dakota into the Union and for the organization of the Territory of North Dakota." We have also report No. 710, accompanying House bill 1942, entitled "A bill to provide for the formation and admission into the Union of the State of North Dakota, and for other purposes," being purely an enabling act, embracing the views of the majority and minority of your committee.

We have before us also Report No. 1025, accompanying House bill 8466, a bill to provide an enabling act for Dakota, Montana, Washington, and New Mexico, which report embraces the views at length of both the majority and minority of the committee.

In the Forty-ninth Congress the Committee on Territories of both Houses of Congress made reports relative to the admission of South Dakota, and the documents known as Report No. 2577, upon House bill 8120, and Report No. 2578, to accompany Senate bill 967, were both submitted May 25, 1886.

These several reports are commended to the careful consideration of this House because they throw considerable light upon the subjects to which they relate and reveal something of the motives underlying the opposition to the immediate admission of South Dakota. My honored friend from Illinois, Mr. SPRINGER, whose able pen indited, I presume, the reports presented by him, takes strong grounds upon the questions at issue. He, speaking for the alleged majority of the committee in the reports last referred to, tells the people of Dakota that—

> The question as to whether the Territory should be admitted as a whole or subdivided into two or more States or Territories is not remitted * * * to the people of that Territory, that being a question * * * in which the people of all the country are equally interested.

Further—

> That they have neither the area, the population, nor the legal right to be admitted into the Union other than as one State.

By such declaration it is, in effect, asserted that the 600,000 people of Dakota have no right or capacity for self-government, for home rule. He asserts, in substance, that the people within a proposed State have no right or power to create a State only as consented to or ratified by the people without the proposed State. I desire just here to place before the House and recall to my honored friend's mind certain other declarations of his, involving, to my mind, the same identical principles; declarations that redound vastly more to his patriotism than the sentiments already quoted. Writing to Mr. Ford, editor of the Irish World, the gentleman says:

> I take pleasure in complying with your request for an expression of my views on the Irish question. Every lover of liberty throughout the world is in sympathy with Mr. Parnell and his compatriots in Parliament in their demand for

home rule for Ireland. Americans, more perhaps than others, share this feeling. The London Times and other Tory organs demand "the maintenance of the integrity of the empire," which is but another name for English rule over the Irish people without their consent. This presents a vital issue—home rule against foreign rule, freedom against slavery. I am for home rule, freedom, and Parnell.

Yours, very truly,

WILLIAM M. SPRINGER, M. C.,
of Illinois.

These are sentiments worthy of an American statesman; but now the gentleman declares in effect to the new State of Dakota as she stands before Congress with her 77,000 square miles of territory and her 350,000 children—all stalwart American citizens—asking recognition of her constitutional right of home rule: "Every lover of liberty throughout the world rejects the demand of Dakota and her people for home rule for that State. The Congress of the United States in general, and the majority of the Committee on the Territories in particular, more than others perhaps, share this feeling. The report of the so-called majority demand the integrity of the nation outside your State, and insist upon the right of the people of all the country who are equally interested to rule you without your consent because you have neither the area, the population, nor the legal right to exercise home rule. Foreign rule for Dakota. Vassalage for her people. I am not for home rule or freedom in the State of Dakota, though I am for Ireland."

Such, if I mistake not, is the logic of my distinguished friend from Illinois, but let us hope that he will in the end be willing to concede to the new State of South Dakota what we all with him wish for down-trodden Ireland.

The present condition of affairs in that region has been embalmed in verse. This is not a quotation from the report of the so-called majority before referred to, but is given for the benefit of my friend from Illinois:

"Thus departed Hiawatha
To the land of the Dakotas,
To the land of handsome women,
Striding over moor and meadow,
Through interminable forests,
Through uninterrupted silence;
Never thought he of the railroads,
But on foot he tramped it slowly,
Till he reached far-off Dakota,
That would be a State but can not,
Can not be a State at present
For the House is Democratic,
And Dakota begs to differ;
So out in the cold they thrust it,
And its very cold and frigid—
Very cold, says Hiawatha,
As he shook himself and shivered,
Very cold is this Dakota,
Uncle Sam rejects it coldly,
So 'tis cold to Uncle Sammy,
Sends him down the blizzard roaring,
Howling, shrieking, swearing, tearing,
Freezing all the world before it,
Making ice of all the rivers,
Burying under snow the cities,
Forcing all men's teeth to chatter,
For its icy breath is colder
Than thermometer can measure,
Colder than the arctic circle,
Cold it is unutterable.
Thus spoke Hiawatha, shivering
As the blizzard surged around him,
That's what ails far-off Dakota;
In the cold we've shoved Dakota,
And Dakota's getting even;
She would be a State, but can not,
But she beats us on the blizzard."

It may be safely asserted that the admission of every new State into the Union, from Kentucky in 1791 down to Colorado in 1875, was antagonized upon grounds and for reasons as strong or stronger than those we now hear, at all events urged with distinguished ability by eminent statesmen equal in patriotism to the able gentlemen who feel constrained to lift their voices in opposition to the admission of South Dakota at this time.

In weighing the evidence adduced in the present case, both in my capacity as a member of the Committee on Territories and in the honorable position as a member from the Empire State upon this floor, I conceive it to be our duty to act in a candid, non-partisan, and impartial manner, remembering that our votes affect the interests and involve the rights of nearly a half million people, who have, in a spirit of loyalty, created of themselves and their 77,000 square miles of territory a new State, and now desire to be admitted to equal rights under the Constitution of their fathers into the sisterhood of States.

We are to deal, Mr. Chairman, with great and sacred interests. In my judgment we sit here in the capacity of a great court of equity, governed in our deliberations, as we should be, by well-settled principles which demand application at our hands, by our decree, with regard solely for the rights of those concerned as by the facts may appear just and equitable.

The original purpose of the union of States, as declared by our forefathers, was—

to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

Unto Congress was reserved the power to admit new States into this Union. Congress has the—

power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territories belonging to the United States.

Congress has no power to create a new State, but may admit a new State into this Union, and shall guaranty such State when into the Union a republican form of government.

The people, and they only, who shall exercise the power to resolve accordingly, may create a new State, and when they come presenting a proper state of facts, a case in equity, and petition Congress for admission into the Union, I submit most earnestly that it is the duty of this court of equity to admit the new State. It is the right of such State to be admitted without delay and to be guarantied a republican form of government, to the end that justice may be established, domestic tranquillity insured, common defense provided, general welfare promoted, and the blessings of liberty secured to themselves and their posterity. There is clearly a mutuality of obligations.

If all needful and requisite conditions are complied with; if, as I have stated, a complete case in equity is presented, so that it is made manifest that a "new State" in the sense implied by those words exists, I submit they have a right to be admitted into the Union. Congress is in duty bound to grant the prayer of the petitioners and admit the new State. To refuse is a denial of justice to the people of such State, a denial of a clear constitutional right.

In my judgment, our duty is the same as if the Constitution had in so many words provided that whenever a new State shall be formed and present to Congress a constitution republican in form, with evidence that the people thereof possess the intelligence, capacity, resources, and various qualifications necessary to maintain themselves as a State, and that they have voluntarily pledged themselves to fidelity to the Constitution of the United States, and to assume and discharge all the duties and obligations of statehood, then and in such case it shall be the duty of Congress to admit such new State immediately on an equality with the original thirteen States.

The benefits in such case are mutual. To deny the right is like a parent refusing to accept the stalwart son that comes with the ability to bear a share of the burdens theretofore borne by the parent alone, and to deny and reject that mutual strength and protection which comes through union.

Were we threatened with foreign invasion, and the danger impending of losing some part of our domain embraced in either of the States whose borders are washed by the waters of either ocean, could we reach out and call on the hardy men who have made the vast plains of the Northwest blossom like the rose, and say you are not capable of self-government, unworthy of statehood, have no place in our Union of States, but you may come and help us repel the invader that threatens a part of the Union.

Having said this much in a general way, let us, Mr. Chairman, consider the facts as now presented with regard to Dakota. It appears that the people residing in that portion of the Territory which lies south of the forty-sixth parallel of north latitude have framed and adopted a State constitution—that they have organized the machinery of a State government and through their authorized agents presented such constitution to Congress and now ask admission into the Union. The power to admit this State into the Union exists, as I have said, alone with Congress, and the question that confronts us is: Is it proper to do so? As I have stated, it is the duty of Congress to admit new States when the requisite conditions exist. That such is true is apparent from the provisions of the Constitution which, by giving such authority contemplates the exercise thereof in proper cases.

Therefore the question which demands our first consideration is: Do the conditions exist in the present case which should prompt the performance of that duty? This involves other questions which may be classified as follows:

First. Have the people of the proposed State, in an orderly and authoritative manner, expressed their desire to become clothed with the power of State government?

Second. Have they proceeded in a justifiable and regular way to place themselves in condition for admission?

Third. Are the constitution and State government which they have adopted and organized republican in form?

Fourth. Do such conditions exist as to area, population, production, resources, morals, lawful and orderly practices, as will assure the existence and continuance of a permanent State government?

If all these propositions are affirmatively established, then beyond question it is the duty as well as within the power of Congress to admit Dakota into the Union.

Certain facts appear to be established and are undisputed, namely, that at the Territorial Legislative Assembly for the Territory of Dakota, held at the capital of said Territory in February, 1885, a law was duly enacted, with the approval of the governor, calling a constitutional convention for all that portion of Dakota south of the forty-sixth parallel; providing for its assemblage, the payment of its expenses, and the conducting of an election thereunder; that delegates were apportioned to each county, aggregating in number 111; that an election of such delegates was duly held throughout such part of Dakota in June

following, and in September thereafter, on the day and at the place appointed by the law, the convention duly assembled; that it duly organized, and, during a session of eighteen days, drafted a constitution, provided for its submission to a vote of the people, and for the election of the officers specified in such constitution; that on the 3d day of November succeeding such constitution was ratified by a vote of the people, 25,226 voters in favor thereof to 6,565 against it; that State officers, a Legislature, and members of Congress were duly elected; that thereafter, in December next ensuing, at the temporary capitol of the State, pursuant to the schedule of the said constitution, the State Legislature assembled and elected two persons as United States Senators. By such schedule the governor, the Senators, and the members of the House of Representatives thus elected, together with two other persons, were constituted a committee to present such constitution to this Congress and ask admission for the new State into the Union. That those gentlemen have performed their duty. Thus far all the proceedings must be admitted as regular and orderly, and they evidently seem to be a clear manifestation, in an authoritative way, of the desire of the people of the State of Dakota for admission into the Union. The regularity of this mode of seeking admission can not be successfully questioned. Twenty-five States have been admitted since the adoption of the Federal Constitution. Of this number, twelve have been admitted under proceedings, in principle, the same as taken by Dakota, namely: Tennessee, Kentucky, Florida, Maine, Vermont, Michigan, Arkansas, Wisconsin, Iowa, Kansas, California, and Oregon. In some of the cases of the States just named the direct question of the regularity of the mode of proceedings by which admission was demanded was in issue, thoroughly debated, and the propriety and validity of so proceeding affirmed in both Houses of Congress by large majorities.

Some of the ablest statesmen that ever graced the legislative halls of the nation participated in those discussions. It would seem that this question is clearly and unquestionably foreclosed and settled by such precedents. It would seem that such grounds, if ever firm enough whereon to found an argument, were forever swept away by the floods of eloquence which in those days carried into the Union the States named. May it not be asserted that it is too late for Congress to question the propriety of the proceedings taken by Dakota? I think so.

An examination of the constitution discloses that it and the State government thereunder are republican in form. Whether the domestic policies proposed to be enforced are wise or unwise, whether they meet with our approval or disapproval as individuals, are not questions for us to consider. The people who have adopted the constitution, with those who may hereafter voluntarily share with them in the benefits to be derived from the State government, are alone the ones to be benefited or injured by such policies.

So long as there is nothing therein that affects the general welfare of the people of all the States, or which would tend to render the State an undesirable member of the Federal Union, the Constitution clothes Congress with no power to object to the admission of the State because we individually may differ with the people of that State regarding such policies.

The important inquiry relates to the ability of those people to become a permanent and enduring and successful member of the United States of America.

The proposed area is 77,000 square miles. This will constitute a State the eighth in size in our Union and nearly equal to any one of three of the seven largest ones. In this connection it may be of interest to notice the areas of the several States, beginning with the largest and numbering them in their order:

Table showing the areas of the several States in their order, beginning with the largest.

No.	State.	Square miles.	No.	State.	Square miles.
1	Texas	265,780	21	Louisiana	48,720
2	California	158,360	22	Mississippi	46,810
3	Nevada	110,700	23	Pennsylvania	45,215
4	Colorado	103,925	24	Virginia	42,450
5	Oregon	96,030	25	Tennessee	42,050
6	Minnesota	83,365	26	Ohio	41,060
7	Kansas	82,080	27	Kentucky	40,400
8	Dakota	77,000	28	Indiana	36,350
9	Nebraska	76,855	29	Maine	33,040
10	Missouri	69,415	30	South Carolina	30,570
11	Georgia	59,475	31	West Virginia	24,780
12	Michigan	58,915	32	Maryland	12,210
13	Florida	58,680	33	Vermont	9,565
14	Illinois	56,650	34	New Hampshire	9,305
15	Wisconsin	56,040	35	Massachusetts	8,315
16	Iowa	56,025	36	New Jersey	7,815
17	Arkansas	53,850	37	Connecticut	4,990
18	Alabama	52,250	38	Delaware	2,050
19	North Carolina	52,250	39	Rhode Island	1,250
20	New York	49,170			

As a matter of further interest, I beg to invite attention to the historical and statistical table of the United States and Territories, showing the areas in acres, etc., the date of organization of Territories, date of admission of new States into the Union, with the statutory reference for each, in the order of their creation and admission.

The thirteen original States.	Ratified the Constitution.	Area of the original States.	
		In square miles.	In acres.
New Hampshire	June 21, 1788	9,305	5,955,200
Massachusetts	Feb. 6, 1788	8,315	5,321,600
Rhode Island	May 29, 1790	1,250	800,000
Connecticut	Jan. 9, 1788	4,990	3,193,600
New York	July 26, 1788	49,170	31,468,800
New Jersey	Dec. 18, 1787	7,815	5,001,600
Pennsylvania	Dec. 12, 1787	45,215	28,937,600
Delaware	Dec. 7, 1787	2,050	1,312,000
Maryland	Apr. 28, 1788	12,210	7,814,400
Virginia	June 25, 1788	42,450	27,168,000
North Carolina	Nov. 21, 1789	52,250	33,440,000
South Carolina	May 23, 1788	30,570	19,564,800
Georgia	Jan. 2, 1788	59,475	38,064,000

Organization and area of Territories.

Territories.	Act organizing Territory.	United States Statutes.		Area of the Territories.	
		Vol.	Page.	Square miles.	Acres.
New Mexico	Sept. 9, 1850	9	446	122,580	78,451,200
Utah	Sept. 9, 1850	9	453	84,970	54,380,800
Washington	Mar. 2, 1853	10	172	69,180	44,275,200
Dakota	Mar. 2, 1861	12	239	149,100	95,424,000
Arizona	Feb. 24, 1863	12	664	113,020	72,332,800
Idaho	Mar. 3, 1863	12	808	84,800	54,272,000
Montana	May 26, 1864	13	85	146,080	93,491,200
Wyoming	July 25, 1868	15	178	97,890	62,649,600
Indian*	June 30, 1834	4	729	64,690	41,401,600
District of Columbia*	July 16, 1790 / Mar. 3, 1791	1 / 1	130 / 214	70†	44,800
Alaska	July 27, 1868	15	240	577,300	365,529,600
Total				1,509,770	

*No Territorial government.
†Reduced from 100 to 70 square miles by recession of part to Virginia, in 1846.
The whole area of the States and Territories, including water surface of lakes and rivers, is nearly equal to 4,000,000 square miles.

It will be seen that South Dakota as a State is equal to the combined areas of several of the States, and if precedent shall govern, if the wisdom heretofore displayed by the nation shall prevail with us, Dakota must be regarded as ample in area to constitute a strong, substantial, permanent State. But, it is well said, area alone is not sufficient; capacity for production is essential. That capacity in Dakota's case is well known and will not be controverted. It has productive soil throughout its entire extent; it is traversed by no considerable mountain ranges; it is well watered; it is within the parallels of latitude where nearly all the necessary products for the maintenance of the human race can be readily produced.

What are the facts as shown by the most recent census? These are some of them. It has 50,237 farms in actual operation, with an average of 194 acres each. It has 3,754,864 acres of land under actual improvement and cultivation. In 1884 it raised 7,553,030 bushels of corn, 12,829,578 bushels of wheat, 2,257,491 bushels of flax, 11,783,727 bushels of oats. It had then 142,321 horses and mules, 584,510 head of cattle, 205,985 sheep, 250,916 hogs. These figures are given by the official census made in June, 1885, under the act of Congress authorizing the same. That census discloses also the following interesting facts:

Value of farms	$87,131,050
Value of live-stock	25,950,022
Value of farm products for 1884	17,095,805

It will be seen that these figures are those given for 1884, as the census was taken in June, 1885, and related, of course, to the previous year. In a community growing so rapidly as that it is fair to presume that the increase was very large during the past years (1885, 1886, and 1887). It is claimed by parties who are familiar with the condition of the Territory, that by reason of the increase and the enhanced price of farm products for 1885, 1886, and 1887, the values may reasonably be estimated at 50 per cent. over the census just referred to.

The assessed valuation for taxation of property for 1885, exclusive of railroads, which are taxed upon their gross earnings, as shown by the auditor's report, was $63,570,197. The number of miles of railroad in the State of Dakota is something over 1,650. It appears that at the close of the year 1887 there were in operation and in course of completion over 4,000 miles of railroad, an increase of about 100 per cent. in a little over two years.

It should be borne in mind, too, that these assessed valuations being as they are, for taxation purposes only, like many of the States, are much below the actual value. It would seem to be the case here, for,

States admitted.	Act organizing Territory.	United States Statutes. Volume.	United States Statutes. Page.	Act admitting State.	United States Statutes. Volume.	United States Statutes. Page.	Admission took effect.	Area of admitted States and Territories. In square miles.	Area of admitted States and Territories. In acres.
Kentucky	Out of Virginia	.....	.....	Feb. 4, 1791	1	189	June 1, 1792	40,400	25,856,000
Vermont	Out of New Hampshire and New York	.....	.....	Feb. 18, 1791	1	191	Mar. 4, 1791	9,565	6,121,600
Tennessee	Out of North Carolina	.....	.....	June 1, 1796	1	491	June 1, 1796	42,050	26,912,000
Ohio	Ordinance 1787	1	5	Apr. 30, 1802	2	173	Nov. 29, 1802	41,060	26,278,400
Louisiana	March 3, 1805	2	331	Apr. 8, 1812	2	701	Apr. 30, 1812	48,720	31,180,800
Indiana	May 7, 1800	2	58	Dec. 11, 1816	3	399	Dec. 11, 1816	36,650	23,264,000
Mississippi	April 7, 1798	1	549	Dec. 10, 1817	3	472	Dec. 10, 1817	46,810	29,958,400
Illinois	February 3, 1809	2	514	Dec. 3, 1818	3	536	Dec. 3, 1818	56,650	36,256,000
Alabama	March 3, 1817	3	371	Dec. 14, 1819	3	608	Dec. 14, 1819	52,250	33,440,000
Maine	Out of Massachusetts	.....	.....	Mar. 3, 1820	3	544	Mar. 15, 1820	33,040	21,145,600
Missouri	June 4, 1812	2	743	Mar. 2, 1821	3	645	Aug. 10, 1821	69,415	44,425,600
Arkansas	March 2, 1819	3	493	June 15, 1836	5	50	June 15, 1836	53,850	34,464,000
Michigan	January 11, 1805	2	309	Jan. 26, 1837	5	144	Jan. 26, 1837	58,915	37,705,600
Florida	March 30, 1822	3	654	Mar. 3, 1845	5	742	Mar. 3, 1845	58,680	37,555,200
Iowa	June 12, 1838	5	235	Mar. 3, 1845	5	742	Dec. 28, 1846	56,025	35,856,000
Texas	Annexed	5	797	Mar. 1, 1845	9	108	Dec. 29, 1845	265,780	170,099,200
Wisconsin	April 20, 1836	5	10	Mar. 3, 1847	9	178	May 29, 1848	56,040	35,865,600
California	From Mexico	.....	.....	Sept. 9, 1850	9	452	Sept. 9, 1850	158,360	101,350,400
Minnesota	March 3, 1849	9	403	May 4, 1858	11	285	May 11, 1858	83,365	53,353,600
Oregon	August 14, 1848	9	323	Feb. 14, 1859	11	383	Feb. 14, 1859	96,030	61,459,200
Kansas	May 30, 1854	10	277	Jan. 29, 1861	12	126	Jan. 29, 1861	82,080	52,531,200
West Virginia	Out of Virginia	.....	.....	Dec. 31, 1862	12	633	June 19, 1863	24,780	15,859,200
Nevada	March 2, 1861	12	209	Mar. 21, 1864	13	30	Oct. 31, 1864	110,700	70,848,000
Nebraska	May 30, 1854	10	277	Feb. 9, 1867	14	391	Mar. 1, 1867	76,855	49,187,200
Colorado	February 28, 1861	12	172	Mar. 3, 1875	18	474	Aug. 1, 1876	103,925	66,512,000

by the auditor's report made in the fall of 1885, the valuations per acre of land and the value per head of animals are given as follows:

Land per acre	$3.55
Horses per head	46.57
Mules per head	56.47
Cattle per head	14.09
Sheep per head	1.15
Swine per head	2.09

A good mode of ascertaining the permanency of resources is to consider the amount of capital employed in banking, and this also exhibits the faith which the people themselves have in their future. It appears that there were in the fall of 1885 in the State 26 national banks, employing a capital of $1,525,000, with an aggregate surplus of $375,000; since then the figures are largely increased. That the people expended for school purposes in 1885 $1,200,000. That they maintained in 1884, as appears by the report of the superintendent of public instruction, 1,535 schools, and had at that time 1,340 schoolhouses, and that the number of colleges, universities, and normal schools in the State is 12. The records of the Post-Office Department disclose the fact that they had, in 1885, 606 post-offices, 33 of which are Presidential offices, more in number than those of any one of thirteen States now in the Union. It appears, further, that the postal revenue for that portion of the Territory included in the new State for the year ending June 30, 1885, amounted to $225,802.23, while the record shows that on the 1st of January, 1888, the increase in all these figures was nearly 100 per cent.

The people of the new State, it appears, have also made preparation for statehood, having full and complete machinery for charitable and penal institutions, erected and maintained at their own cost and expense, namely, a penitentiary, an insane hospital, and an asylum for the deaf, dumb, and blind. It must be conceded that with all this array of facts, which have at no time been questioned, that the area, resources, and wealth of the new State are entirely sufficient to convince any that the State comes fully armed and equipped with all that is requisite to entitle her to a full share of the rights, benefits, and privileges guarantied by the Constitution, and to enable her to bear more than a full proportion of the burdens incident to membership in the family of States. Her population is, as appears by the census taken in June, 1885, 263,553, and admitted by all to be now not less than 400,000, certainly all that may with reason or justice be demanded of any new State applying for admission into the Union.

It is largely more than was possessed by any other State upon emerging from a Territorial condition to statehood, and the only States which have been admitted out of the twenty-five which had a larger population than Dakota are those which were formed from other States or admitted by compact and treaty.

The present basis of representation in the House of Representatives is 151,911. No State ever organized from the public domain had at the time of admission anything like the present population of South Dakota. I reproduce here a table showing the ratio of representation and the population at date of admission of all the States.

State.	Date of admission.	Representative ratio on previous census.	Population by previous census. Free.	Slave.	Total.	Population when admitted. Free.	Slave.	Total.	Population by following census.	Rate per cent. of increase during decade of admission.
Vermont	1791	33,000	85,425	.....	85,425	85,425	.....	85,425	154,446	80
Kentucky	1792	33,000	61,247	12,430	73,677	61,247	12,430	73,677	220,955	200
Tennessee	1796	33,000	32,274	3,417	35,691	*60,000	*7,000	*67,000	105,602	195
Ohio	1802	33,000	45,365	.....	45,365	45,365	.....	45,365	230,760	408
Louisiana	1812	35,000	41,896	34,660	76,556	41,896	34,660	76,556	152,923	100
Indiana	1816	35,000	24,520	.....	24,520	63,897	.....	63,897	147,178	500
Mississippi	1817	35,000	23,264	17,088	40,352	45,441	30,061	75,512	75,448	463
	1819	35,000							127,901	
Alabama	1818	35,000	12,282	.....	12,282	34,620	.....	34,620	55,162	350
Illinois	1820	35,000	228,705	.....	228,705	298,269	.....	298,269	399,445	33
Maine	1821	40,000	56,335	10,222	66,557	56,335	10,222	66,557	140,444	111
Missouri	1836	47,700	25,812	4,576	30,388	*33,000	*9,240	52,240	97,574	221
Arkansas	1837	47,700	31,639	.....	31,639	*65,000	.....	*65,000	212,267	570
Michigan	1837	47,700	28,760	25,717	54,477	*34,000	*30,000	*64,000	87,445	60
Florida	1845	70,680	.....	.....	.....	*105,000	*38,000	*143,000	212,592	.....
Texas	1845	70,680	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Iowa	1846	70,680	43,112	.....	43,112	78,819	.....	78,819	192,214	345
Wisconsin	1848	70,680	30,945	.....	30,945	*180,000	.....	*180,000	305,391	886
California	1850	93,423	92,597	.....	92,597	92,597	.....	92,597	379,994	310
Minnesota	1858	93,423	6,077	.....	6,077	*120,000	.....	*120,000	172,023	2,750
Oregon	1859	93,423	13,294	.....	13,294	*50,000	.....	*50,000	62,465	294
Kansas	1861	127,381	107,206	.....	107,206	107,206	.....	107,206	364,399	240
West Virginia	1863	127,381	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	*350,000	442,014	.....
Nevada	1864	127,381	6,857	.....	6,857	*40,000	.....	*40,000	42,491	520
Nebraska	1867	127,381	28,841	.....	28,841	*100,000	.....	*100,000	122,993	322
Colorado	1876	131,425	39,864	.....	39,864	*100,000	.....	*100,000	194,640	388

*Estimated.

In the way of population the most careful research will fail to show that more population has ever been required as a condition for admission than sufficient to entitle the people to one Representative in the lower House of Congress. This number at the last apportionment was a little less than 152,000, so that in Dakota's case there exists not only a unit of population sufficient for one Representative, but under the rule adopted by Congress in making such apportionment Dakota is clearly entitled to two members of the House of Representatives. Having, then, complied with all the conditions which have ever been required, or which can reasonably be required, of a people seeking to emerge from a condition of Territorial government to that of a State government; having sought in vain for the invitation through an enabling act, as extended to half of the States heretofore admitted, and now having come, as I have said, thoroughly armed and equipped as a State, presenting in one hand her constitution, thoroughly republican in form, and exhibiting in the other hand facts and statistics proving that her resources are ample to feed the world, and, I say, with no controversy existing with reference to such facts, what objection can be urged against Dakota's immediate admission?

It is said, first, that she has proceeded in her application for admission in an irregular and revolutionary method; second, that the State has been organized out of a portion only of the great Territory of Dakota. This Territory was organized subsequent to the admission of the States of Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, which were carved out successively and admitted as States from territory including what is now the Territory of Dakota.

Let us examine these propositions and ascertain if the objections made are at all tenable. It will be borne in mind that twenty-five States have been admitted since the Constitution was adopted by the thirteen original States. Of the twenty-five, Texas was admitted under a treaty compact, it being at the time an independent sovereign state; West Virginia was admitted by virtue of the power to consent to a division of one State into two or more States; Maine was admitted by the consent of Massachusetts, of which it formed a part; Vermont was admitted by the consent of the contiguous States of New Hampshire and New York, which made some claim to it; Louisiana was admitted under the treaty with France, but was already an organized community.

Twenty States, therefore, are all that have been admitted into the Union from the Territories belonging to the United States, exclusive of Louisiana. Some of these have been admitted without any previous Territorial organization. One-half of them had previous enabling acts and the remaining half had no such acts, or at least none under which proceedings were taken to organize themselves into States and make application for admission. The method pursued by Dakota is precisely identical in principle with that pursued by Tennessee, Iowa, Michigan, Arkansas, Wisconsin, California, Oregon, Kansas, Florida, and Kentucky. Thus it is shown that one-half of all the States admitted into the Union from the outlying and unorganized territories belonging to the United States pursued the same identical course which the people of Dakota have pursued in their efforts to obtain admission of their State. Can it, then, be claimed with reason that Dakota has pursued any irregular method, since she has followed the precedents which have been approved by Congress in one-half of all the States admitted from Territories? Upon principle are not these precedents just as binding upon Congress as those where the other method was pursued? What, I ask, is an enabling act but a mere invitation to the people of a portion of the territory of the United States to organize themselves into a State and apply for admission into the Union?

I have said Congress can not make a State. It has the power to admit new States, not to create them. Congress organizes Territorial governments solely under the authority of the Constitution, which gives the right "to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the Territories or other property belonging to the United States." The people alone can organize the State. It must be their work. No other power or tribunal can do it for them. The power is reserved to Congress to admit new States.

Congress may clothe a community in a Territory with the forms of laws under which they may proceed to organize for themselves a constitution and State government, and all the effect which the law of Congress has upon the subject is merely to throw around their proceedings such forms of law as will allow and direct an orderly movement of the people to the desired end. If Congress neglects or refuses to thus directly furnish such community with the forms of law—the invitation—under which these proceedings may be had, may not the local legislative authority perform that, or may not the people themselves in their primary capacity assemble in public convention, frame and adopt a constitution, organize a State government, and demand admission of the new State thus formed into the Union? Either method is clearly regular.

The power of Congress, I submit, is merely to determine whether all the conditions exist which entitle the new State to admission, and having determined affirmatively, it is the duty of Congress to grant without delay the admission which a fair construction of the Constitution in its letter and spirit evidently entitles them to. It appears that for seven years—ever since the session of Congress in 1879—those people have been appealing to Congress to invite them, by its legislation, to do that which they have finally proceeded to do in the absence of such an enabling act, because it was denied them by Congress; and in the exercise of their rights as American citizens they have in an orderly and regular method, in accordance with recognized precedents, created a new State. Every step taken, every act done, all their proceedings are conceded to be orderly, regular, methodical; their constitution republican in form, their State organization and government complete in all things, their representatives here in respectful waiting, ready to co-operate in the great work of administering the affairs of the great American Union, and through their duly accredited representatives the new State, of right, I say, demand admission into the Union. Congress, under the power conferred by the Constitution, could do no more if the new State had been created after the security of an enabling act. Can the clear right of these people to be clothed with the power of local self-government and to be allowed to form an integral part of the American Union be denied with equity because they have pursued the methods sanctioned by Congress in one half of the cases instead of those pursued in the other half?

Upon the question of the admission of the southern portion of the Territory only and the taking from the entire Territory of this part to form a State, it would seem there should no difficulty arise.

The policy of the Government from its earliest history has been to form States of medium size, and that policy has never been departed from except under peculiar circumstances—circumstances which necessarily took the cases out of the general rule.

When the Government of the United States was in its infancy, even before the formation and adoption of the Constitution, we find this policy enforced by those who were the founders of that Government. After the close of the Revolutionary war there was found a great outlying territory not incorporated or included in any State, lying east of the Mississippi River and north, as well as south, of the Ohio River. Claims of ownership to this territory or some portions of it were made by several of the States. Virginia seemed to have the strongest claim to the largest portion. Her patriotic people were willing to yield that claim for the benefit of all the States, but only upon condition.

First. That such Territory should not be kept for any considerable time in a colonial condition. The wrongs pertaining to colonial existence, then happily righted, were too recent and too fresh in the minds of the people of the new nation to allow the thought to be entertained for one moment that a people could be kept outside of the Union in a state of dependency when they were in a condition to exercise the rights of sovereign statehood.

Again, the areas of the States already in the Union were familiar to them, and so we find that by the compact under which patriotic Virginia ceded her claims to the territory northwest of the Ohio River she imposed the condition that in all that territory whenever 60,000 free inhabitants should assemble and become permanent citizens that they should have the absolute right to form for themselves a constitution and State government republican in form, and should be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States. More than that, we find that the condition was imposed that no great State in area overshadowing the other States should be formed thereout, but that such territory should be divided into not less than three States and not more than five. It appears that in following the provisions of such compact four States have been formed, namely, the great States of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois. In forming the States of Kentucky and Tennessee and o Mississippi and Alabama, the same policy with reference to area has been adhered to.

When the country lying west of the Mississippi River was acquired from France all that portion which included the States of Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, and the Territory of Dakota had the like provisions of the ordinance of 1787 extended to it, and the States of Missouri, Arkansas, Iowa, Wisconsin, Kansas, Minnesota, and Nebraska followed in the same line of policy.

Now, what have been the exceptions? First, the State of Texas. As we have seen, that State was admitted by treaty compact. It was itself an Empire or State. Its people exercised their own sovereign will upon the subject of admission, but it appears further in that compact whenever by their own volition they may choose to adopt the policy which theretofore governed the United States in the admission of new States, they are at liberty to do so, and may separate into five sovereign States if they will. California, Colorado, and Nevada are, apparently, exceptions. In each of those States the area, exclusive of mountain ranges, which are not and can not for many years become inhabitable, is less than the area of the new State of Dakota.

Dakota is one vast fertile plain, capable in all its parts of producing in unlimited amount the cereals which support human life. It can and will be made no doubt one continued series of farms. Its people are and always will be largely an agricultural people, with her business and manufacturing interests based upon the pursuits of agriculture. Why should the policy, the universal policy of the Government be departed from in this instance and those people be coerced by Congress into accepting boundaries for their State which they have so clearly demonstrated are distasteful to and not desired by them?

If the people select such areas and boundaries as will constitute a

strong and substantial State and by so doing do not interfere with any governmental policy of the United States, why should they not be permitted such selection? They are the ones who are in interest. The carving out of this great Territory the new State of South Dakota leaves ample territory to support a Territorial government and for the formation of another great and powerful State in the process of time.

But it is said these people have not made this selection. Certainly individual statements count for but little. Organized expressions disclose popular will. Upon almost any subject that may be mentioned individuals may and do differ, but when a community through its organized voice speaks its will it should be regarded. Now it appears, and is uncontradicted, that as early as 1871 the Legislature of the Territory asked Congress to divide the Territory on the parallel of latitude which has been agreed upon by them in creating the new State. That petition has been followed by others from every legislative assembly, composed of delegates from all portions of the Territory, from that day to the present. It appears that not one word of remonstrance has been heard. Two constitutional conventions have been provided for by legislative enactments for South Dakota alone, one following the other at the succeeding session. Down to the very last opportunity as late as the session of their Legislature in 1885, there was presented to Congress a memorial passed unanimously in both houses praying for the same line of division.

Necessarily, through so many years of effort, this must have been a subject of discussion. If this is not an expression of the people's will, Congress would have been advised of it in some orderly and authoritative manner. Individuals may have questioned the policy or propriety of such division, but, if so, they have not been in sufficient numerical strength to make themselves felt anywhere.

It is undisputed, also, that both political parties at every session of their Territorial conventions, where all the people of all the Territory were represented, have in every succeeding biennial year pronounced the same desire for division, and down to the last assemblages of either party resolutions to that effect were reported from their committees and adopted, as appears, without a single voice dissenting. And it further appears that twice have constitutions for South Dakota been adopted by an overwhelming majority. It appears, moreover, that this will of the people has been clearly manifested, by their Legislatures providing for a double set of government buildings, one for North and one for South Dakota.

Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been spent in providing for and in anticipation of the division which they have so earnestly prayed for and which they had every reason to believe would be vouchsafed them as of right. It is shown that fifteen separate enactments have been passed relating to such government buildings, wherein provisions have been made for each division to assume and pay the indebtedness incurred for such building; that such legislation is spread over a period of six years, and was enacted by three separate legislatures. If it were not the universal popular will that such division should be had, can it be conceived that those persons selected by the people, and the only ones selected by the people in their Territorial government, would, term after term, expend the people's money in making preparations for division? Clearly it was unnecessary to duplicate their penal and charitable institutions in so young a community except for the purpose of providing for this universally-demanded division.

But it is said objections are made by some of the people to division. No remonstrances have been presented to Congress. It will not, it can not, be contended that if any considerable number of Dakotians, much more, if a majority thereof, objected to the division as made that such objections would not have been presented before the two Houses of Congress in a most emphatic form.

On the contrary, with the exception of a few gentlemen who by their own acknowledgment were here in the interest of one locality, which interest was based upon some supposed benefit to accrue by the selection in the act of their town and locality for the seat of government, not one word has reached the ear of Congress or of any committee thereof from any source that the people are not in accord with the will as expressed through all their organized assemblages that have convened for the last fifteen years.

If the expression had been once or even twice made, it might be claimed that the opportunity to raise the issue and have it fairly tested was wanting, but when for so long a period and under every circumstance that will has been expressed in all the ways open to them except by popular vote, no one can reasonably doubt the desire of those people. A popular vote upon that question was had last fall and a clear majority gave expression in favor of division. We are invited by the authorized agents of the new State in the memorial which has been presented to put this question to a popular vote of all the people of the whole Territory, and to make the taking effect of the act of admission depend upon an affirative vote on that question.

But I submit that Congress ought not and would not sanction the admission of the whole Territory as one State. The people of a proposed State carved out of the territory of the United States ought to be permitted to select such area and boundaries as will assure a strong, substantial, permanent State. Beyond that Congress should itself determine how many States shall be carved out of a given region of country. The new State is large enough. If objection there be, it lies in its being too large. It appears that in selecting such area the precedents immediately surrounding their State under similar conditions have been very closely followed, and wisely so, in my opinion. It is axiomatic that a small State, with its government close to the people, can be and is governed better and with greater economy than a large State. Too large a State has been said to be dangerous to the American Union. Its independence of the fellowship of its sister States is too keenly felt. A great empire might feel itself capable of protecting its own interest as a sovereignty. It might feel no want of that mutual protection which is the guaranty and the safeguard of the American Union. In legislating upon this matter of the admission of a new State it is wise to remember that we are legislating for all time. If we err now, our mistake is likely to be impossible of correction. It can not be denied that either portion of this Territory, when divided upon the parallel of latitude proposed, will make two States eventually sufficient in area to constitute very powerful commonwealths.

No voice, Mr. Chairman, comes to us from that great Territory asking to be habilitated with statehood except from that portion which had framed its constitution and organized its State government. On the contrary, at several successive sessions of Congress, representatives, from both sections, in large numbers have visited the Capitol and have urged upon Congress the division of the Territory upon the forty-ninth parallel, or upon the seventh standard parallel, and the admission of the southern part as a State. In my opinion we have no power, and we should have no inclination, to force upon any people the formation of a State government. The people of the new State of South Dakota do desire to be at once clothed with the powers and privileges and charged with the duties and obligations of a State in the Union.

The people of the other portions of the Territory have asked that they be continued under a Territorial government. What right have we, or why ought we to so legislate as to thwart their wishes? They are the ones whose desires should be consulted, and so long, which is here apparent, as it is not detrimental to the general welfare of the nation they should be permitted to determine for themselves their own destiny. There are no reasons which can with equity be urged for the organization of such an immense area into one commonwealth, but many exist in favor of the small area. The proposed dividing line seems to me to be a natural one, and separates two compact symmetrical and homogeneous communities.

The lines of immigration and communication are all along the same parallels of latitude, and necessarily must always remain so. The great systems of railway communications have been constructed with a view to this division. Even the Christian denominations have in their preparations for the future prosecution of their labors for humanity had regard for the present division. This division seems to be demanded by all the circumstances and conditions surrounding those people, and by the welfare as well of the other States of the Union.

The able and exhaustive report upon this subject made by the honorable the Senate Committee on Territories to accompany Senate bill No. 967, in the Forty-ninth Congress, and laid upon the tables of the members of this House, embraces many features and covers many other points to which I may not recur because my time will not permit. I invite its careful perusal and consideration by the House. One other subject has been a matter of some discussion. It is and ever should be the policy of the Government to have the Territories organized into States and admitted into the Union as soon as the conditions therein will justify.

Chief-Justice Taney said:

A Territory is acquired to become a State, and not to be held as a colony and governed by Congress with absolute authority.

Territorial governments are organized as matters of necessity, because the people are too few in number and too scant in resources to maintain a State government. These governments are contrary to the spirit of our American Constitution. They are to be tolerated and continued only so long as that necessity exists.

The three millions of American people rebelled against the exercise of the same identical powers by Great Britain over them which the Government exercises over the Territories. They complained, and were by the world justified in complaining, that they were kept in a state of semi-vassalage. They had their governor appointed by a foreign tribunal; so have the Territories. They had their judges appointed by the same foreign tribunals; so have the Territories. They had their local legislatures, which enacted laws for them, subject to the revision of the same foreign agency, and so have the Territories. They were taxed without representation; so are the Territories. Laws were made for them by a tribunal in which they had no voice, and in which they could exercise no influence except such as one citizen may, by petition and argument, exercise over another; so have the Territories. They dared the force of the most powerful nation on the face of the earth to be rid of these evils. They were rid of them, and it never was contemplated that, in this day and generation, they should impose upon their fellow-citizens the same evils which had been imposed in those days by their fellow-citizens upon them. It will be a happy solution of many difficulties in legislation when all the outlying Territories may be populated, created into States, and admitted into the Union. The necessity for Territorial governments is unquestioned, but no effort

should be made to constitute it an enduring evil anywhere. It is unjust to the new State to reject it. It is a self-imposed wrong upon the old States so keep her out, and to do so can not be defended on any ground.

Representative Grow said, in January, 1857, in reporting the enabling act for Oregon: "Gentlemen seem much averse to giving this authority, which is a mere matter of form, as the people of the Territory can meet in their assemblies and form a constitution and send it here as well without this authority as with it;" and Representative Jones of Tennessee said: "That is exactly my opinion."

Our own Seward, of honored memory, in the California case said (and it should be remembered that she came without an enabling act):

> Shall California be received? I answer yes. Let California come in. Every new State, whether she comes from the East or from the West, every new State coming from whatever part of the continent she may is always welcome. But California, that comes from the clime where the West dies away into the rising East; California, which bounds at once the empire and the continent; California, the youthful queen of the Pacific in her robes of freedom gorgeously inlaid with gold, is doubly welcome.

And so, Mr. Chairman, I say, welcome, thrice welcome South Dakota! She comes bearing in her arms the horn of plenty, promising abundance to her sister States West, South, and East. Her's is the heart of the great Northwest, that beats true to the music of liberty. She comes instructed in the correct countersign, "The Constitution and the Union," and this Congress, being on guard, can do no prouder, grander act than "pass her into the very heart of the citadel of the American Union."

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. In order that the iniquity of this Democratic Ephraim may be more fully uncovered, I yield ten minutes to my friend from Iowa [Mr. KERR].

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I rise more particularly to controvert the views presented by one member of the committee on this side of the House. I think we ought not to discourage Democratic economy, and the Republican members of the committee certainly should not favor increasing the salaries of the officers connected with this House. When we are told that there are five doorkeepers at one door, four at another, two or three at another, and so on at the various stations around this Hall, it seems to me the principles of economy might eliminate a considerable portion of this number and leave us still perfectly safe in our deliberations.

But certainly there is no necessity for increasing salaries. The gentlemen whom we have at our doors appear to be a very satisfactory class of officers; the quality of their service seems to be very good, and the salaries now paid, having been sufficient to secure the services of competent men, it seems to me it would be an imputation on those gentlemen for any one to ask that their salaries be increased, on the theory that an increase of salary is necessary to secure competent officials.

I wish, also, to call attention to a remark made by the gentleman from Dakota [Mr. GIFFORD], in regard to one of the policies which was promised in the last Democratic platform and which has been entirely disregarded by the present Administration. In the national Democratic platform, as the record shows, there was a provision declaring that the people of the Territories should be governed by men selected from the body of the local community.

This provision has been entirely ignored, and those great Territories of the West are to-day governed almost entirely by officers selected from other portions of the country, the positions having been distributed so as to reward Democratic partisans in various States of the East. This is a direct violation of the pledge made on behalf of the Democratic Administration in the last national platform, and I desire to call attention to it in connection with that extraordinary bill which has been reported to the House providing for the admission into the Union of four States at once. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], who has brought in that bill, seems to be anxious to restore the old rule which prevailed in the practice of our Government for about half a century, that no State from the northern section of the country should be admitted into the Union unless at the same time, and in order to counterbalance its vote, a State from the southern section of the Union was admitted.

This bill is reported here with the knowledge that one of its main features—the admission of the whole State of Dakota—has been repudiated by a popular vote of that Territory, which declared in favor of division. In spite of that vote, in spite of the fact that South Dakota contains an area larger by one-half than the average of the States now in the Union, we are asked to vote for this omnibus bill, involving the old theory which prevailed in this country, or else we must keep South Dakota out of the Union until another administration. What is the purpose of this? That a Democratic administration may still have, for the reward of its party favorites, the disposal of the patronage of the great Territories of the West? This is what we may fairly infer from the policy pursued by the present Administration.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. They are afraid of the electoral vote.

Mr. KERR. Yes, I presume that is another consideration which enters into the case. The Territory of South Dakota would be entitled, according to the principles which were referred to by the gentleman from New York, to 3 votes in this body, and to 5 votes in the electoral college, which might determine the next Presidential election. Yet this omnibus bill is reported in order that the wish of the people may be restrained——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to bring into this discussion any reference to the Territorial question; but my friend from New York [Mr. BAKER], a member of the Committee on the Territories, and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR], have seen fit to enter into a discussion of that question; hence I feel it my duty to state what I understand to be the position of this side of the House in regard to the admission of new Territories into the Union.

The gentleman from New York, as well as the gentleman from Iowa, seemed to be of opinion that this side of the House is endeavoring to keep out of the Union the Territory of Dakota for the sole reason that, if admitted into the Union as a State, she would vote the Republican ticket, and that we do not desire to admit any Republican Territory unless at the same time a Democratic Territory be admitted to counterbalance it. So far as regards the admission of Dakota into the Union, I want to call the attention of both sides of the House to the fact that the only party in this House or in the Territory of Dakota that is favoring the admission of Dakota into the Union at this time as a State is the Democratic party.

Gentlemen on the other side point to the fact there are five or six hundred thousand inhabitants in Dakota and ask, are not these inhabitants entitled to admission into the Union? They seem to think we are trying to keep them out. That is not the issue presented by gentlemen on the other side of the House. They are not anxious for the admission of Dakota into the Union as a State. They are opposing its admission into the Union. Their contention is for a division of Dakota into two parts and for the admission of the southern part into the Union as a State. All through their discussions and in the newspapers the Republican party and the Republicans especially in Dakota have taken the position that they desire Dakota to remain in a Territorial condition. They resist her admission into the Union as a whole, desiring that she should remain in a Territorial condition until she can be admitted as two States.

What is their claim for division based upon? Gentlemen say the people of Dakota desire a division. I say the people of Dakota do not, in my opinion, desire a division at this time. I am authorized to say that by the last expression of opinion of the people of that Territory. I am speaking of popular votes and not of Republican conventions.

There was a popular vote held in Dakota in November, 1887—that is, last November. In pursuance of an act of the Legislature of the Territory, the question was submitted to the people of Dakota as to whether they desired a division of the Territory or not. At the same time there was submitted the question of local option. The object was to draw out a large vote at that election. Great efforts were made by those favoring a division of the Territory to obtain a large vote and a large majority in favor of a division of the Territory. At that election there were cast 37,784 votes in favor of a division of the Territory, and 32,913 against the division of the Territory, making a majority in the whole Territory of 4,781 in favor of the division.

The official returns of that election are given in one of the reports submitted by the Committee on Territories to this House (Report 1025, page 23).

There were cast at that election about 70,000 votes in the aggregate. At the election for Delegate to Congress the year before there were polled an aggregate of 104,000 votes in the Territory. There were undoubtedly more votes in the Territory of Dakota in 1887, a year afterwards, than there were before at the election for Delegate to Congress. If we deduct from the number of votes the number voting for division in 1887 we find 67,000 were opposed to division of the Territory, or were so indifferent as to the result as not to turn out and cast their vote.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. It is not true. The theory is that those not voting were in favor of this majority proposition—that is, for the division of the Territory.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am speaking of the people of Dakota, who are said to be so much in favor of division. If they desired to divide the Territory they would not be so indifferent as not to come out when that was the question submitted to them for their vote. They would not be so indifferent as to remain at home. The presumption therefore is that those who remained at home were not in favor of the division of the Territory or were indifferent upon the subject.

Mr. WARNER. Will my friend permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; I always yield to the genial gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WARNER. Did it not appear before the Committee on Territories that the Republican and Democratic conventions which nominated Delegates to Congress passed resolutions in favor of the division of Dakota?

Mr. SPRINGER. The Democratic convention of 1886 passed a resolution in favor of submitting the question of division to a vote of the people.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. That is, they did not mean to stand up to it unless it went their way. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. If, therefore, we are to be guided as to the admission of Dakota by the wishes of the people themselves, a large majority of the people are evidently either indifferent to division or are opposed to it.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Now, will my friend pardon me for a moment? Does the gentleman pretend, as to those who remained away from the polls, that their remaining away would indicate their opposition to the questions presented?

Mr. SPRINGER. I have not stated that. I stated that the majority of the people of Dakota were either indifferent to the question presented or are opposed to the division of the Territory. To be more accurate, 32,000 voted against division and 34,000 were so indifferent about it as not to vote at all.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. And the gentleman holds, then, that although both parties had submitted the proposition to a convention and an election, that a majority of that election should not bind?

Mr. SPRINGER. A majority of those who voted, I have already said, did vote—a majority of 4,781—in favor of a division. I am quite aware of that, but the point I make——

Mr. STRUBLE. Permit me a moment in this connection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly.

Mr. STRUBLE. Upon the fact that both parties in the Territory had theretofore favored division, is it not fairer to assume that the people who staid away upon the report of both conventions did so presuming the proposition would be carried, and were therefore in favor of the proposition?

Mr. SPRINGER. No. Both parties did not favor division in 1886 or 1887. The Republicans generally favored division, but the Democrats generally opposed division. Hence we have no right to assume anything as to the opinion of the people, or to presume what they would have done except what is clear from their own action. What the people who did not go to the election would have done we can not say.

Mr. REED. But you draw a certain inference.

Mr. SPRINGER. Based on certain facts. I infer——

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Does the gentleman——

Mr. SPRINGER. Let me proceed for a moment. I infer that the people who did not go to the polls were indifferent as to the question of division, and hence that the majority of the people were either indifferent or opposed to division.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Although both parties resolved in favor of it in convention? Was it not a fair presumption that both parties were in favor of it after they had done that? And where a majority of the people voted on the proposition submitted, and carried it, is that not conclusive?

Mr. SPRINGER. The Republican party resolved in favor of division; the Democratic convention in 1886, as I understand it, resolved only in favor of submitting the question of division to a vote of the people. The Democratic party in the Territory was at that time divided on the question, and an agreement to submit the question to a popular vote was reached.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Well, even so—a majority of the people voted in favor of it.

Mr. SYMES. Is it not a fact that the Democratic candidate for Congress, who was against the division, and made his canvass for the Democratic nomination against the question of division, was defeated, and the Democratic candidate was nominated who advocated the division?

Mr. SPRINGER. Oh, yes; your side stocked the cards on us and defeated our candidate. [Laughter.]

Mr. SYMES. Does the gentleman think, then, that a few Republicans are running the Democratic party out there?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. We do not exactly understand the reference the gentleman has made to stocking the cards.

Mr. SPRINGER. The question of division in the Territory of Dakota is not so much of a partisan question there as it is outside of the Territory. There are many Democrats in the Territory who favor division, and many Republicans there who are opposed to it. It is not strictly a partisan question there. These questions are controlled in many instances by the localities in which gentlemen live. Many of the ablest and most pronounced Republicans in the Territory are opposed to division, and a few Democrats of some prominence are in favor of division.

Mr. SYMES. But let the gentleman answer this question: Did not the Territorial Democratic convention vote down with a whoop the man who was making his canvass for nomination against the division, and vote up with a whoop the man who advocated it, and did they not resolve for division in that platform?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, sir; I do not so understand it. It is true that the candidate who favored division was nominated. But the convention adopted a resolution in favor of submitting to the people the question of division of the Territory. That is what was done.

Mr. SYMES. And the people carried it by 5,000 majority.

Mr. GEAR. Will the gentleman from Illinois permit me a moment? The gentleman stated that the division of Dakota was not as much a partisan question inside of the Territory as outside of it. Does the gentleman mean that it is a partisan question here?

Mr. SPRINGER. So it seems from what gentlemen on your side say, and the report of the Committee on Territories would seem to indicate that we were divided on that line.

Mr. GEAR. I only wanted to get the gentleman's opinion.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Let me ask the gentleman if that vote had gone the other way, and yet in the face of that vote we had opposed the admission of Dakota, would he have found any wisdom in that?

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly not. But there is another feature to which I wish to call the attention of the committee. The gentlemen on the other side favor a proposition to divide the Territory of Dakota into two parts, and to create two governments where there is now but one. I understand that in all the operations of government in creating divisions of that character, you must consult both parties or both sides as to the new government you are to create. It was proposed in 1860 by certain gentlemen in the South that they would go off by themselves and set up an independent and a separate government. The North opposed that idea and insisted upon them remaining in the Union, taking the view that one part of the Union had no right to withdraw from the other and set up a separate and independent government for itself.

In one-half geographically of the Territory of Dakota the people, or certain counties, if you please, desire to withdraw from the Territory as a whole and set up a separate government for themselves. The question was submitted to the whole people of the Territory.

Mr. STRUBLE. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. Has this principle ever been applied heretofore?

Mr. SPRINGER. In that election, as will be seen by the map which I hold before me, the whole of the people in the northern part of the Territory, the people who were to constitute North Dakota hereafter, voted (except as to two counties) against the division; and two tiers of counties on the south of the line also voted against division. The people in the counties in the Territory indicated in dark on this map voted for division. The other counties voted against it or not at all. Less than one-third of the area of the Territory voted for divison. In the proposed Territory of North Dakota there was a majority of 10,000 of the people who voted at that election against the proposition to set them off in a government by themselves. There were 15,000 in South Dakota in favor of a division of the Territory and for a separate government.

Now I ask in all fairness whether the people of North Dakota have not as much right to decide for themselves whether they will remain in a State or Territorial government with the whole of Dakota, as the people of South Dakota have to decide whether they want to secede from the Union and set up for themselves?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does the gentleman think honestly that that is on a parallel with the occurrences of 1861?

Mr. SPRINGER. When a portion of the people of any government desire to withdraw and set up for themselves I see a parallel to the occurrences of 1861. The people of South Dakota have no more right to demand a separate government than the people of the Southern States had to withdraw from the Union and be set off as a separate government by themselves. There is an overwhelming majority in North Dakota in opposition to the division of the Territory; and we owe just as much deference to the wishes of the people of Northern Dakota, who want to live in the whole of Dakota, as we do to the people of Southern Dakota, who want the Territory divided and to set up for themselves.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Was the question submitted to all these people to be tested by a popular vote?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; and the people of South Dakota voted for a division but the people of North Dakota voted against it.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. What right has the gentleman from Illinois to assume that those who did not vote at all were against the division?

Mr SPRINGER. The majority were either against it, or indifferent to the result.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. We have heard it asserted for ten years that in the case of an election to this House we have no right to assume any such thing. When gentlemen have appeared here with a certificate based upon only a few hundred votes in some districts gentlemen have asserted the contrary. They said that those who staid at home were presumed to be in favor of the gentlemen who held the certificates. If the rule held good there it ought to hold good here.

Mr. SPRINGER. All that does not change the fact that the people of North Dakota had 10,000 majority against a division of the Territory and against being set off by themselves. And you have no right to regard the wishes of one section of the Territory and disregard the wishes of the other.

Mr. REED. How can you regard the wishes of both, if one wants a division and the other is opposed to it?

Mr. SPRINGER. In that case the better course is to maintain the *status quo*.

Mr. REED. The *status quo* can not be maintained. This is merely a territorial division, temporary in its nature, and understood to be such.

Mr. SPRINGER. The Republican party made the present boundaries of Dakota, and now they are dissatisfied with their own work, as

they are with many other things they have done, when the results are presented to their cooler judgment. The *status quo* will be maintained whether you are dissatisfied with your work or not.

Mr. SYMES. But no more dissatisfied than with the fact that the people did not go to the polls and did not vote for division, because they were given to understand by Cleveland office-holders that the Territory must come in as a whole or remain in a territorial condition—the most accursed form of government there is—for the next ten years.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. That will not hold good longer than the next 4th of March.

Mr. SYMES. Some people are idiotic enough to think Cleveland will be re-elected. Reasonable men, however, have a different opinion.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman will change his mind in November next. He will then find he was very much mistaken about that, as he was mistaken about it four years ago. He will find that Cleveland will be elected and Dakota will not be divided.

Mr. SYMES. It will not be divided until the Republican party does it the year after next.

Mr. SPRINGER. Gentlemen say that the area of the Territory entitles it to be divided. The question of population is only temporary. In a short time the people that are moving westward will have settled up all our great Territories and there will be no longer any waste or desert places there, except in mountain regions. The people are moving to the West, and in a few years Montana, Washington, Idaho, Wyoming, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, and I hope Oklahoma, will be settled with a vast and teeming population. Therefore, as I have said, the question of population is only of temporary concern; but the question of area will remain forever.

Now, if you propose to divide Dakota because she has 149,000 square miles, you must also divide Montana, which has only 3,000 square miles less than Dakota. And if it is to be your policy to make hereafter no larger political divisions than South Dakota would be, with an area of 77,000 square miles, then I call your attention to the fact that in the Territories of New Mexico and Arizona there is an aggregate of 245,000 square miles, which would make three States of 81,000 square miles, each larger by 4,000 or 5,000 square miles than South or North Dakota would be. So, if you are to enter upon the policy of not admitting States that have an area of more than 77,000 square miles, as in the case of South Dakota, you must carry out that policy with reference to Montana, which is Democratic, and which should be divided into two States, and with reference to Arizona and New Mexico, which are Democratic, and which would make three States, and also with reference to Utah and Idaho, which would make three States.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to ask you one. [Laughter.] I want to ask you whether you propose to carry out that policy and to apply your rule of division to Democratic as well as to Republican Territories.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. We never jump a stile until we get to it. Now, let me ask my friend a question. If this vote had gone just as it did and South Dakota had been reliably Democratic, so as to send two Democratic Senators to the Senate of the United States, would you have opposed its admission? Look up now and answer. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. I would. [Great laughter.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. He does not even blush! [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. I knew that he would be equal to the occasion. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Now, I will put a question to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] and to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], who can answer almost any conundrum that may be propounded. If both North and South Dakota had Democratic majorities, would you be in favor of the division of the Territory?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Yes, sir, I would [laughter]; and I have so asserted heretofore; but the fact is my way and not yours.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then will you be in favor of dividing Montana?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Whenever a like condition of things is presented I will be consistent.

Mr. SPRINGER. Ah! But you can make the conditions by legislation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No, you can not. You must have the population.

Mr. BAKER. Have we not agreed unanimously in the Committee on Territories in favor of bills for the admission of Montana and Washington at their express request?

Mr. STRUBLE. And have there been any requests from them for a division?

Mr. SYMES. And are they not represented on this floor by Democratic delegates?

Mr. SPRINGER. But I am speaking of the future and of our future policy. Gentlemen seem to think that this is a matter which rests entirely with the Territories. I deny it.

Mr. REED. You assert it when it comes to dividing them, but deny it when it comes to uniting them. Why do you not stick to one theory or the other?

Mr. SPRINGER. I have never said——

Mr. STRUBLE. Should not Congress consult the wishes of the people of the Territory?

Mr. SPRINGER. That depends upon whether the wishes of the people of the Territory are in accordance with sound public policy or not.

Mr. STRUBLE. Oh, it does!

Mr. SPRINGER. It does, very much indeed. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STRUBLE] this question: If the people of Florida desired to have that State divided into two States, would you consent to that? Answer me that question! Look me in the face! Do not blush! [Laughter.]

Mr. STRUBLE. I will do so, and I will keep on looking right at you. [Laughter.] I say, first, that Florida is a State now, and therefore there is no parallel. I say, next, that whenever any large Territory like Dakota wishes to be divided, and it appears to be for the interest of the country and the interest of her people that she should be, I will be in favor of it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Oh, yes; I put in the same "if" in my answer; whenever it is for the good of the country I am for it also. But the gentleman knows very well that if it were Florida, a sovereign State of the Union, that desired to be divided into two parts, he would oppose it; and why? Because, he would say, that would give the present State of Florida four United States Senators.

Mr. STRUBLE. There is no parallel between the two cases.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. The trouble with my friend is that when he is asked——

Mr. SYMES. Will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me for an inquiry?

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly.

Mr. SYMES. I understand the gentleman from Illinois claims to be an humble follower of that great oracle of the Democracy, Stephen A. Douglas, and I believe the gentleman was in favor of the "squatter-sovereignty" doctrine of that eminent Democrat. Oh, shade of Douglas! what becomes of your influence when your followers get up here and deny to the people of a great Territory the right to have a voice on a question like this?

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me a question?

Mr. SPRINGER. I would like to have time to answer some of these questions.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I wish to ask whether we can have unanimous consent now to vote on the South Dakota bill?

Mr. SPRINGER. I would be very glad to accommodate the gentleman; and I would also like an opportunity to answer some of these questions.

Mr. Chairman, the truth is that the Republicans are opposed to the admission of Dakota into the Union, notwithstanding she has a population of over 500,000, and would make a grand State if admitted, as the people of the Territory desire she should be, as one State.

Several MEMBERS. That is not what she desires.

Mr. SPRINGER. But gentlemen representing the Republican party insist upon outraging the feelings of the people of North Dakota, insist on violating their express wishes, and propose to regard only the wishes of the people of South Dakota.

Now, I have been advised—I want to give you, my friends, a little bit of private information which has come to me—I have been advised by gentlemen living in the northern part of Dakota that if we will in the first place admit into the Union as a State South Dakota, and afterward North Dakota, North Dakota will be Democratic, and thus there will be an offset for the Republicanism of South Dakota.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Why do you not do it then?

Mr. SPRINGER. To all such seductive suggestions I have turned a deaf ear. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.] I am not here playing upon the chess-board of politics for the sake of making a Democratic State or a Republican State. My friends here on the Republican side can see nothing in this question but a Republican State of South Dakota and a Republican State of North Dakota, with two United States Senators from each. That is as far as their political horizon extends; there is where they rest all their hopes in this matter. But were the people of Dakota allowed to express their wishes there would be a majority ranging up into the tens of thousands in favor of their coming into the Union as one State. I believe it is the interest of the people of Dakota to come in as one State.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. They do not think so.

Mr. SPRINGER. A majority of the people of that Territory do think so; yet gentlemen here on the other side resist, for partisan purposes, all importunities on the part of the people of Dakota to come here as one State.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. We are ready for a vote on that question; let us vote on admitting Dakota as one State.

Mr. SPRINGER. For the sake of getting four Senators where there should be only two, gentlemen would outrage the voice of that people and keep them out of the Union.

Now, gentlemen say that Dakota should be admitted into the Union because of her population. According to the last census, according to

the best estimate, the population of Dakota is over 500,000; say it is 600,000. If gentlemen will look at the census of 1880 they will find the average population of the States of this Union is 1,300,000. And there are thirty States in the Union——

Mr. BAKER, of New York. What was the population when those States were admitted into the Union.

Mr. SPRINGER. I am talking of to-day. The gentleman asks me to go back to the past; I wish to get him up to the present. [Laughter and applause.] I say, Mr. Chairman, there are thirty States in this Union to-day which have an average of over a million of population. The gentleman is trying to bring a Territory into this Union as a State with an aggregate population of only about one-third of the average population of the existing States.

Mr. REED. What was the population of those States when admitted?

Mr. SPRINGER. The population of some of the States was very small when they were admitted into the Union. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have never got beyond the time when Illinois was admitted into the Union with 34,000 population and Dakota was organized with six or seven thousand people. [Laughter and applause.] In the mean while they do not seem to realize that this is a great and growing country; that we had then but few States, while we now have thirty-eight States with a population of 60,000,000, and growing at the rate of 1,000,000 every year. [Great applause.] I look more to the future of our country than to mere partisan views. [Applause and laughter.] I look upon our Territories as future States, as great States when admitted into the Union; and no little rotten boroughs like Nevada with only 62,000 inhabitants, should ever be admitted as States into the Union.

A MEMBER. Full fledged.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes; as my friend says, full fledged. [Laughter and applause.] I have great hopes of the future of this Union. I am in favor of the admission of every Territory into the Union as a State whenever it shall have the requisite population. I will do everything in my power in that direction. I expect to devote the remainder of my political life as a Representative in this House to aiding these Territories in getting into the Union as sovereign States. Dakota will come into the Union at the proper time and in the proper way; and I tell you gentlemen on the other side that you will then be in favor of it.

A MEMBER. And Utah, too.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, at the proper time and in good shape.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have but a few words to add to what I have already said. Gentlemen do not seem to realize the fact that what are called the waste places of the West, the arid plains, are now being rapidly settled by farming communities. I make the assertion that every acre of arid land from the base of the Rocky Mountains to the one hundredth parallel of latitude will be reclaimed and devoted to agriculture, and that it will produce the necessaries which go to the support of mankind with less of human effort than were required to subdue the forests of Ohio and Pennsylvania. [Applause.] It will not be many years—twenty-five years from this time—until you will find there will be a dense agricultural population clear across the plains to the foot of the Rocky Mountains, on the plains of New Mexico and Arizona and Southern California. You will find all these places, once supposed to be desert and worthless, reclaimed and occupied by a population of hundreds of thousands of industrious, rich, and happy people. [Applause.]

The future of this country, Mr. Chairman, can hardly be imagined. It is to-day only in its infancy. The great possibilities of these Territories do not seem to be realized by gentlemen on the other side. At the proper time I wish to see them come into the Union as great States to take their part with the other States of the Union in legislating for the whole people in Congress, and to take their part in the election of President of the United States. I want them to assume and exercise all the powers, responsibilities, and perform all the duties of the original States, and upon an equality with them. [Applause.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I have but a word to say in the time remaining to me. I do not think our Democratic brethren treat my friend from Illinois fairly. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Oh, yes, they do; I am not complaining.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. When there is a duty to perform about which they hesitate, they are very apt to devolve it upon my honorable friend. [Renewed laughter.] Now I want to defend him.

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not need it.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I asked him if the question of the division of Dakota had been by the resolution of the two political parties submitted to a direct vote of the people of that Territory, and a clear majority of 5,000 had voted for the division, and South Dakota had been reliably Democratic, and my friend knew that on her admission into the Union as a State two Democratic Senators would be elected to the United States Senate, thus securing for the Democratic party the control of that body, would he vote to exclude her? And, further, I asked him if he could say yes to that question without blushing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, he did say "yes," and I want to say in his defense that he did blush. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Oh, no; not any more than you did when you said the other thing.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I had no occasion to blush.

I want to say, touching the statements made by him in reference to Dakota, the question of division and whether she, South Dakota, should be admitted to the Union, was submitted to the people by Democratic approval as well as Republican desire; and by what may be regarded as an overwhelming majority the people voted to divide the Territory; and when they knocked at this door for admission to the sisterhood of States the question is, not, "have you the requisite qualifications and elements of a State?" but the question by my friend upon the other side is "what will be the political complexion of the Senators and Representatives you will send to the National Congress?"

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman does himself a gross injustice when he asserts that he would oppose the admission of South Dakota, situated as she is and approved as she is upon the vote taken, if she asked admission here, being at the same time reliably Democratic. I know he would not, though he may have a present impression that he would.

Mr. SPRINGER. I know I would.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. You would?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Well, if that is so, you are greatly misunderstood on both sides of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. That frequently happens. I am not unaccustomed to being misunderstood.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. There would be, in the first place, no possible excuse for my friend to do so. There would not stand in your way any reason for opposing it; and least of all any political reason. I do not say such conditions would not influence my action in some measure, and I feel satisfied they would influence the course of the honorable gentleman. The gentleman hopes the time will come when we can rise above such considerations.

The gentleman says politics has nothing to do with it, and yet every Federal official in Dakota worked assiduously from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof on the day of the election to secure votes against the division of the Territory and against Southern Dakota applying for admission into the Union.

There, Mr. Chairman, is a great State on the threshold of the Union, a Territory with larger population than Illinois and all the States formed out of the Northwest Territory had at the time they were severally admitted into the Union, waiting to come in, and having as good and high claims to admission as had either of the States mentioned. The question is purely a political one.

I agree in the shuffling of the political cards that you hold the advantage and we can not help ourselves. You are so situated that you can spurn Dakota. I do not know how long that condition will maintain.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Until next November. [Laughter.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman permit me a moment?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Has not the admission of all the new States for years past been recognized by consent of all parties as a political question?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. And is not this the first time that any statesman has ever risen above party considerations in such a matter? [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. It is probably the first time that any gentleman has asserted that he was able absolutely to rise above it. No gentleman does rise above it. We all may vary a little from the direct line, prompted by political association. But my friend does himself great injustice in asserting that no trade of politics controls him in his actions.

Mr. GUENTHER. But everybody laughed when he said that.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Undoubtedly, everybody laughed.

My Democratic friends hold the coign of vantage against us, since they can keep the young State out of the Union and we are powerless to prevent them from so doing. But when they assert there is a presumption that thirty or twenty or ten thousand voters who staid away from the polls would have opposed the division of the Territory or the admission of South Dakota as a State they place themselves in an awkward position as contrasted with their attitude in regard to elections in the South.

When my friend from Mississippi said they had occasionally to fire a cannon in some districts to announce to the colored voters that election day was approaching, there lurked somewhere in our make-up a suspicion that there was something wrong in such districts when the vote returned was so small. But honorable gentlemen stood up and said, "You are mistaken. If those people had been opposed to the election of any one of us they would have been at the polls to cast their ballots against us. They remained away because they were satisfied."

Here all the people of Dakota, speaking through their conventions, said: "Submit this to a vote of the people who are to be affected." The question was submitted and an overwhelming majority voted for the admission. We have presented a bill to carry out the wishes of those people; but unfortunately they do not wear the badge of modern Democracy. Gentlemen, your politics may keep Dakota out of the Union. Your deliberate, patriotic judgment never will be that your action is just on other grounds.

I want to say one thing touching this bill reported by the Commit-

tee on Appropriations. It has been prepared with a desire to meet the public interest fairly. The only point at which our friends on the other side have stumbled is when they have been placed face to face with the proposition to uphold the ladder on which they climbed into power. Having climbed up, they desire to remain. Realizing that a man may be compelled to climb down the same ladder on which he climbed up, they very deliberately kick the ladder from under them and say, "Here we are to stay."

The bill has been carefully and honestly prepared with a desire to meet the wants of the Government economically administered. The only deflection from that right line is in the case I have adverted to. The cause of that deflection is palpably observable. There they are in the same position of my friend from Illinois when he stands face to face with Southern Dakota claiming admission to the Union, but not wearing the badge of modern Democracy.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman from Alabama yield me five minutes more?

Mr. FORNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. SPRINGER. My friend from Ohio seems to think that his side of the House alone is actuated by non-partisan and patriotic motives in this matter, and that on this side of the House we are simply seeking for an advantage in a political sense; and that if the new States were to be Democratic we would be willing to admit the Territory as two States.

The contrary is true. Suppose—and in this supposition I am not indulging in the improbable—suppose that the next Congress shall be returned with a large majority of Democrats in this body and in the Senate of the United States, and that Mr. Cleveland shall be re-elected—a matter easy to suppose because it is sure to happen. What in that case might happen under the policy these gentlemen have advocated? It might occur to mere partisans on this side of the House that such a condition furnished us an opportunity to perpetuate our political ascendency indefinitely in this country. How could it be done? By carving out of the Territories fifteen or twenty new States, any one of which would be as large as Pennsylvania and three times as large as Massachusetts.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Can not that be done to-day as in the case of Texas, which under the compact is entitled to be divided into four States?

Mr. SPRINGER. I know that with the consent of Texas four other States may be carved out of that State. It is simply a matter of legislative discretion. Texas is now, I understand, opposed to any division of her territory. But if there should be a change of sentiment in Texas, and it should be announced some day that Texas had decided to demand such a division, the gentleman over there would be stricken with terror, more appalling than if threatened with a cyclone.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Rather a blizzard.

Mr. SPRINGER. It would have the same effect upon them. But suppose we should conceive the idea when in power in both branches of Congress and with a Democratic President that the time had come when we should perpetuate the ascendency of our party by bringing fifteen or twenty more States into the Union and thus adding thirty or forty new Senators to the body at the other end of the Capitol, would you not think that a little partisan? Yet it would be justified by the course the gentlemen on the other side are now pursuing.

I say to you, I say to your friends in Dakota and all over the country, that the safety of the Republican party in the future lies in preserving the existing political divisions. If you ever break down the barriers and insist upon bringing a dozen or twenty new States into the Union, you will—

> But teach
> Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return
> To plague the inventor—

As did the division of old Virginia into Virginia and West Virginia.

It is your party which will have to bear the consequences of that political blunder. For my own part, I am opposed to such divisions now and hereafter, and you may yet come and implore my assistance to aid in preventing such policies governing in the future. I offer my services now, and I will aid you then as I am doing now. I want to maintain the existing divisions in the Territories and in the States to maintain the autonomy of all, believing that their boundaries are wisely made, and that if allowed to remain as they are they will serve the best interests of the whole people in the future and for all time to come. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, I expect to be unavoidably absent from the House for some time and avail myself of this opportunity to submit some observations respecting the mineral lands of the United States, and which are only applicable to the bill under consideration in so far as they may show the propriety of increasing the salaries of the land officers, who are proposed to be charged with new duties and new responsibilities by the following amendment which I have proposed to the public-land bill:

That in order to determine what lands may lawfully be selected, certified, or patented under grants made by Congress to each and every of the several land-grant railroads of the United States, and to which patent has not heretofore issued, such railroad company or corporation shall, by its agent thereto authorized in writing, file with the register and receiver of the land office in which such land is situated an affidavit that the land claimed or selected and each legal subdivision thereof is non-mineral in character as contemplated by the grant, and that the affiant has made a personal inspection of said land; and thereupon the register and receiver of the land office in which said land is situated shall cause to be published in a newspaper of general circulation, published nearest the land so claimed or selected, for four successive weeks, a notice that such affidavit has been filed, and at any time within thirty days thereafter any citizen of the State or Territory within which said land is situated may deny the allegation of non-mineral in said affidavit upon oath; and thereupon the same proceedings shall be had and obtain as in other contested cases, including the right of appeal by either party, but the burden of proving the non-mineral character of the land shall be upon the railroad company; and in all such contests it shall be sufficient to reject the claim or selection of any railroad company if it appears from the proof that the land contains lodes of mineral-bearing matter, which does not pass by the grant, whether it has been worked or not, or whether it will pay or not to work at the time of the contest. As between the railroad company and the Government any and all land that bears mineral which does not pass by the grant, or gold in placer form in such appreciable quantities as to render it in any sense valuable so as to be likely to be sought out for its mineral qualities, shall be considered within the exception made by Congress, and shall be considered mineral lands.

There is a wide-spread, well-founded, and impending danger of the mineral lands of the United States falling into the hands of the several land-grant railroads of this country, and in my opinion the only certain and speedy remedy against that which rises to the dignity of a national calamity is embodied in the foregoing amendment and rests only with Congress. Without stopping to inquire into or question the propriety of granting subsidies in one form or another to aid in the construction of railroads, it will be conceded that whenever public lands have been granted for such purposes the settled, fixed, and determined policy of this Government as expressed in every grant and all of its legislation has been to reserve the mineral lands.

It was designed that such should be open to development and exploration by the citizens of this country, and to that end the most liberal laws have been enacted by Congress. To secure this, Congress has provided for the acquisition of two kinds of title, one by purchase and patent, the other a possessory title which can be kept alive and perfect by the occupant doing the necessary representation work annually upon his claim, thus giving to the man with money and the prospector without money the same opportunity to avail themselves of the beneficent provisions of the law. In the Western States and Territories thousands of individuals have sought to avail themselves of this law and have until lately felt secure in their possessory titles, but are suddenly aroused to a realization of the fact that they are about to be despoiled of their properties by the rapacity and greed of these land-grant railroads. Of course it requires the most flagrant violations of law and in some instances the most unscrupulous resort to perjury to accomplish this outrage, but it has been and is being done constantly. I am led to make these observations from facts that are notoriously known to exist in Montana, Idaho, Arizona, and California.

Lately the people of Montana, the greatest mineral producer of any of the States and Territories, seeing the notorious and flagrant frauds which were then being practiced upon the United States and upon bona fide mining claimants by the Northern Pacific Railroad Company in the matter of railroad selections, in procuring the certification to it, as agricultural, lands which are mineral in character, comprising well-known and valuable mines, became alarmed at such audacity, and in a convention held for the purpose of devising ways and means to bring the matter to the attention of Congress, adopted the following preamble and resolutions:

Whereas in the act of Congress approved July 2, 1864, entitled "An act granting lands to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from Lake Superior to Puget Sound, on the Pacific coast, by the northern route," section 3 reads as follows:

"SEC. 3. And it is further enacted that there be, and hereby is, granted to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, its successors and assigns, for the purpose of aiding in the construction of said railroad and telegraph line to the Pacific coast, and to secure the safe and speedy transportation of mails, troops, munitions of war, and public stores, over the route of said line of railway, every alternate section of public land, not mineral, designated by odd numbers, to the number of twenty alternate sections per mile, on each side of said railroad line, as said company may adopt, through the Territories of the United States, and ten alternate sections per mile on each side of said railroad whenever it passes through any State, and whenever on the line thereof the United States have full title, not reserved, sold, granted, or otherwise appropriated, and free from pre-emption, or other claims or rights, at the time the line of said railroad is definitely fixed and a plat thereof filed in the office of the Commissioner of the General Land Office; and whenever, prior to said time, any of the said sections, or parts of sections, shall have been granted, sold, reserved, occupied by homestead settlers, or pre-emption, or otherwise disposed of, other lands shall be selected by said company in lieu thereof, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, in alternate sections, and designated by odd numbers, not more than 10 miles beyond the limits of said alternate sections: *Provided*, That if said route shall be found upon the line of any other railroad route, to aid in the construction of which lands have been heretofore granted by the United States, as far as the routes are upon the same general line, the amount of land heretofore granted shall be deducted from the amount granted by this act: *Provided further*, That the railroad company receiving the previous grant of land may assign their interest to said Northern Pacific Railroad Company, or may consolidate, confederate, and associate with said company upon the terms named in the first section of this act: *Provided further*, That all mineral lands be, and the same are hereby, excluded from the operations of this act, and in lieu thereof a like quantity of unoccupied and unappropriated agricultural lands, in odd-numbered sections, nearest to the line of said road, may be selected as above provided: *And provided further*, That the word 'mineral,' when it occurs in this act, shall not be held to include iron or coal: *And provided further*, That no money shall be drawn from the Treasury of the United States to aid in the construction of the said Northern Pacific Railroad;" and

Whereas the Territory of Montana, in so far as the same is included within the limits of said grant, is composed almost exclusively of mineral lands, which have been, and are now being, explored, located, and improved under the mining laws of the United States; and

Whereas the said railroad company has heretofore made, and is still continuing to make, selections of lands within this Territory under said section 3, and are in such selections including large tracts of land which are notoriously mineral, and in many cases were actually being worked as mining claims at the time of such selection; and

Whereas the said railroad company has been enabled to make such selections and procure certificates from the local land offices in the respective land districts by virtue of reports made on the character of the lands selected by incompetent or misdirected individuals, who have, in the presence of open and notorious facts to the contrary, apparent on the ground, certified mining claims, being actually worked at the time, to local land offices as non-mineral lands; and

Whereas under instructions from a former Secretary of the Interior or Commissioner of the General Land Office surveys of public lands have been made in the Territory of Montana without any reference to their character as being mineral or non-mineral lands, and that under such instructions a large portion of the mineral lands of this Territory have been returned either as mountainous timber land, without any reference whatever to their mineral character, or in some other classification which does not in any manner, directly or indirectly refer to the mineral character of the land; and

Whereas it is a manifest fact that but a small fraction of the mineral claims located and worked under the laws of the United States have been surveyed, except as included in general township surveys, and that no survey of mineral lands, as such, occurs until an application for a patent is made by the owner or locator of a mining claim; and

Whereas a report submitted to the surveyor-general in pursuance of instructions would present and have presented fragmentary, false, and unreliable information as to the character of the lands reported upon; and

Whereas under these reports the local land office has been deceived, imposed upon, and misled as to the character of the lands designated and selected by said Northern Pacific Railroad Company; and

Whereas it has come to our knowledge that the agents and servants of the said Northern Pacific Railroad Company, authorized and directed to examine the land prior to the designation and selection by the company, have reported to said company land as non-mineral land, when, in truth and in fact, both placer and quartz mining have been, in many instances, in active progress on the land reported upon at the time of the examination; and

Whereas under the laws of the United States homestead and pre-emption and all other claimants seeking titles to lands under the general laws of the United States relating to non-mineral lands within the Territory of Montana are required, under pains and penalties of perjury, at the time of making application, to make an affidavit and submit proofs to the register and receiver of the local land office, setting forth clearly the non-mineral character of the land for which an agricultural patent is sought; and

Whereas we are informed and believe that the said Northern Pacific Railroad Company is not now, nor has it ever been, required to make any showing whatever as to the non-mineral character of the land which it designates and selects, further than the gratuitous oath by the land commissioner of said railroad company to the effect that the land designated and selected is the character of land contemplated by section 3 of the aforesaid act of Congress, to which said railroad company is entitled; and

Whereas it is a well-known fact that said land commissioner has made such statements, under oath, to the register and receiver of the Helena land office, with reference to vast quantities of land which were, at the time of making and swearing to such statement, openly, notoriously, and universally known throughout the Territory of Montana to be mineral lands, and upon which said land mining claims had been located, and were, at the time of such statement by said land commissioner, being actually worked with profit as mining claims; and

Whereas in our opinion it is not only the interest of the people of the Territory of Montana but the inherent right of all the citizens of the United States to have the mineral lands of the public domain left free from clouds of private ownership for full, free, and unlimited exploration by any and all citizens under the laws of the United States relating to mineral lands; and

Whereas in our opinion the laws of the United States, and the rules and regulations prescribed by the Department of the Interior, governing the selection of land by the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, are palpably defective, and that the preservation of the mineral lands of the public domain within the land grant of the said railroad company requires immediate action on the part of Congress and the Interior Department in the enactment of such laws, rules, and regulations as will distinctly define mineral lands, as referred to in section 3 of said act aforesaid, and prescribe such forms for said railroad company to comply with, in the designation and selection of their lands, as may prevent the acquisition of title by said company to mineral lands in the public domain; and

Whereas we are informed by the Interior Department that patents may be issued to the lands already selected and designated by said railroad company before any action can be taken by Congress in the premises, unless proofs are presented and filed with the Secretary of the Interior setting forth the mineral character of the lands heretofore selected and designated by said railroad company; and

Whereas under and by virtue of the certificate of the local land office the said Northern Pacific Railroad Company claims title to said lands without the formality of proof or the necessity of procuring a patent, and has heretofore paid taxes upon the lands selected, and otherwise asserted rights of ownership, thus at least creating a cloud upon the title to all the mineral lands included within their grant, which have been selected and designated by them, and upon the other hand they have made no effort whatever to perfect their title to those lands within the Territory of Montana which are well known to be agricultural in their character.

THE RESOLUTIONS.

Now, therefore, we, the citizens of Montana Territory, in convention assembled, do hereby resolve that we view with alarm and regard as an impending public calamity the threatened acquisition of title by the said Northern Pacific Railroad Company of the mineral lands of the United States included within the limits of the grant made to said railroad company; and

Be it further resolved, That a central committee, consisting of five persons, to be known as the "citizens' executive committee," be, by the president of this convention, appointed, with full power and authority from this convention to appoint such subcommittees in the various counties and mining districts of the Territory as they may deem necessary; that such central committee be further empowered to employ such professional or other skilled assistance as they may deem necessary to execute fully and effectively the powers hereby delegated; and that such committee be further empowered, and it is hereby directed, to prepare and forward to the Department of the Interior, with the least possible delay, in such form as they may deem most efficient, setting forth the mineral character of the lands heretofore designated and selected by the Northern Pacific Railroad Company in the Territory of Montana, and likewise of all other lands included within the land grant to said railroad company, with a protest, in such form as to them may seem most efficient, against the issuance of patent or the delivery of other evidence of title to said Northern Pacific Railroad Company to any and all mineral lands in said Territory; and

Further, The said "citizens' executive committee" is directed and empowered to present to the President of the United States, to our Delegate in Congress, the Secretary of the Interior, the President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and the chairmen of the respective committees on Territories in the Senate and House of Representatives, a memorial embodying these resolutions, together with a statement of such facts as they may deem relevant and material, and a draught of such law as in their opinion would prove most effective in the premises, if passed by Congress, concluding with a prayer for such legislative and executive action as in the opinion of the Government would most effectively conduce to a fair and just allotment to the said Northern Pacific Railroad Company of lands to which they are entitled within the terms of the grant aforesaid, while at the same time preserving to the citizens of the United States all the mineral lands within the Territory of Montana; and

Be it further resolved, That the president of this convention appoint, and he is hereby authorized and directed to appoint, a committee of three persons, to be designated and known as the "finance committee," which said finance committee shall have power, and it is hereby authorized, to appoint subcommittees in the various counties and mining districts of the Territory, and to make such collections of money, directly or through such subcommittees, from time to time as may be necessary to carry out and execute the purposes of this convention; and said finance committee is hereby directed to keep accurate books of account, showing the sum of money collected from time to time and from what source, and to disburse the same upon the order of the chairman of the executive committee, taking his receipt for such money so paid, which said receipt shall state the purpose for which the money has been or is to be expended; and the said finance committee is further directed to deliver to the president of this convention a report of all moneys received and disbursed by said committee, which said report shall be filed at least once in each month, or whenever called for by the president of the convention; and

Be it further resolved, That the chairman of said executive committee be, and he is hereby, directed to report on the first day of each and every month to the chairman of the finance committee all moneys received and disbursed by him, and to file, when practicable, vouchers for such expenditures, which said vouchers so filed with the chairman of the finance committee shall be by him transmitted, with his report, to the president of the convention; and

Be it further resolved, That the president of this convention be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to fill any vacancy which may at any time occur by death, resignation, or otherwise, either in the executive or finance committee, and to call at any time he may think proper on the chairman of either of the committees for a report as to any matter coming within the purview of their respective duties; and

Be it further resolved, That when this convention adjourns it shall adjourn subject to the call of its president.

R. B. SMITH, *Chairman*,
W. W. MORRIS,
T. H. CARTER,
JOHN W. STANTON,
JOS. H. HARPER,
T. SCHEITZER,
W. J. MCCORMICK,
S. F. RALSTON,
NATHANIEL MERRIMAN,
O. B. O'BANNON,
L. ROTWITT,
J. W. PLUMMER,
H. G. McINTYRE,
T. G. MERRILL,
Committee on Resolutions.

We hereby certify that the above is a correct copy of the preamble and resolutions adopted by the Citizens' "Mineral Land Convention" of Montana, held at Helena, Mont., the 7th and 8th days of February, 1888.

THOMAS G. MERRILL,
JOHN W. BUSKIN,
ROBERT S. KELLEY,
EDWIN H. IRVINE,
JOHN S. HARRIS,
Citizens' Executive Committee.

No question has agitated the people of Montana more since its organization as a Territory than this bold attempt to secure a monopoly of the unpatented mineral lands. It is not a question of mere local importance; it rises to the character and dignity of national consideration. It affects directly the production of our precious metals. Aside from being a fraud upon the Government, the possession by the railroad company withdraws these lands from development and exploration by the citizen and holds them for speculative purposes. Hundreds of affidavits have lately been filed in the Interior Department by trustworthy citizens of Montana, men of the highest character, showing the shameful operations of this company respecting the mineral lands of Montana. I submit the following as fair samples of hundreds of affidavits showing that mineral lands have been certified to that company as agricultural lands:

TERRITORY OF MONTANA, *County of Deer Lodge, ss:*

I. N. Fox, James B. McMasten, E. P. Mills, James Cunn, William Hufreich, H. B. Ross, R. S. Kelley, William M. Thompson, David C. Irvine, H. B. Davis, Addison Smith, John Bulenberg, and R. T. Harris, being severally duly sworn, each for himself says: That he is a citizen of the United States and a resident of the town of Deer Lodge in the above-named county and Territory; that he is acquainted with the lands in townships Nos. 5 and 6 north of range No. 8 west, Montana meridian; that to his certain knowledge there were about one hundred mines and mining locations now situated in said townships; that said mines and locations are scattered through sections 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 in township 5 north, range 8 west, and sections 19, 20, 21, 22, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, and 34 in township 6 north, range 8 west in said township.

(Signed by above named.)

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 25th day of February, 1888.

LUCIEN W. WOOLFOLK,
Notary Public.

Accompanying a large number of these affidavits was the following letter from Hon. R. S. Kelley, United States marshal for Montana:

DEER LODGE, MONT., *March* 13, 1888.

DEAR SIR: At the suggestion of prominent citizens of Deer Lodge County who believe you to be the proper person to present to the Interior Department the proofs of the mineral character of the lands in this county which have been certified to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company as agricultural and timber lands, I take the liberty of sending you such proofs relating to the mountainous district between Deer Lodge and Butte City, known as the Cariboo, Cottonwood, and Orofino districts, and ask that such action be taken by you as may seem best to prevent this very rich and extensive mineral land from falling into the hands of the railroad corporation, who are making extraordinary efforts to secure it, in violation of the spirit of their land grant.

The tracing of a map, prepared by Henry Davis, esq., United States mineral surveyor, herewith inclosed, made from actual surveys completed within the month of February last, does not show all the mineral locations in these dis-

tricts, as it is impossible, on account of the high altitude and the great depth of snow, to take them all in. Enough, however, has been given to show the positive mineral character of all the mountainous country between this place and Butte City.

In this connection it might be proper to state that some of the richest quartz deposits in Deer Lodge County are in this district, and very many of the mines have been worked continuously for the past two years, and are deemed of great value for their mineral deposits.

The affidavits herewith inclosed you will recognize as being made by our most worthy citizens, who are perfectly familiar with the country embraced in the above-named districts, and who are now engaged in mining and developing the same. Montana is nothing without her mines; with them, and an unclouded title, she is the richest Territory in the world. It is our duty to the present generation and to our posterity to save this vast mineral region from falling into the hands of a soulless corporation. It would be criminal on the part of Congress, after such facts are presented, to fail to pass a law which will prevent the acquisition of the mineral lands of Montana by the Northern Pacific Railroad Company. Please acknowledge receipt of inclosed papers, and make such suggestions in the premises as you may deem fit.

Very respectfully yours,

R. S. KELLEY.

Hon. J. K. TOOLE, *Washington, D. C.*

The following is one of the number of affidavits recently received by T. G. Merrill about the Montana mineral lands. It bears the signature of A. W. Tanner and was subscribed and sworn to before Charles H. C. Coble:

Albert W. Tanner, being duly sworn, deposes and says that he is a resident at Red Bluff, Madison County, Territory of Montana; that he owns and possesses in township 3 south, range 1 east, a two-story stone house 32 by 44 feet, on the ground which is my residence at this time. This house was built in the year 1867. Two hundred and fifty feet east of my house is a lode claim owned by R. H. Foster, who has a tunnel 170 feet to a shaft where he is taking out ore at this date. West of my house 340 feet is the tunnel and lode claim of J. L. Miniss, which has been located for several years, and a large amount of ore has been and is being taken out at this present time. L. B. Olds and C. H. Peck located a quartz vein about 120 feet west of my house and located my house inside of their lines, and notified me through their attorney, H. N. Blake, not to occupy, possess, or make any improvements on the same.

I gave L. B. Olds $135 and C. H. Peck $132.50 as a compromise to save trouble and acquire their rights. (My house was built in 1868, many years before Olds & Peck's location was made.) Now, said H. N. Blake, who is attorney for the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, says he has bought this same section 7, township 3 south, range 1 east, and claims it as agricultural ground, and asks of me to pay him $300 for a quit-claim deed to the ground my house is on. There are to my certain knowledge seven mineral locations (and the town of Red Bluff) on this same section 7, which are claimed valuable; that township 3 south, range 1 east, township 3 south, range 2 east, township 4 south, range 1 east, township 4 south, range 2 east, embracing 92,160 acres, and that in said four townships there is not to exceed 2,000 acres of agricultural ground, leaving 90,000 acres rolling, mountainous mineral lands, and are so considered. I also own and possess in township 3 south, range 2 east, surveyed placer mineral lands in sections 18, 17, 20, 22, 29, 28, 33, and 34. There are several other mineral locations in said townships, and it is in main mineral lands.

The following is from the Helena Independent:

MINERAL LANDS—ANOTHER LETTER SHOWING HOW THE RAILWAY HAS TAKEN STEPS TO GET THE PROPERTY OF THE HONEST TOILER.

T. C. Merrill has just received the following among other letters and proofs regarding the mineral lands from J. J. Lown, of Red Bluff, Mont.:

I wish to give you a brief history of section 7, township 3 south, range 1 east, in which the town of Red Bluff is situated. There are locations made of two quartz mines on three sides of this town, north, east and west. Miners are at work on these mines now, improving and developing the same, and have been for years. On the mines located in this section where the town of Red Bluff is, there has been thousands of dollars expended in their development, and at the present time R. H. Foster, James Muncies, Gannis & Co., and many more are at work on these quartz mines and have been for years. Some of these mines are located in town and the hills back of town are nearly covered with locations. Many of these mines look very flattering and the owners are delighted and pleased with the prospect already obtained and value them very much.

Of all these mines located and situated in section 7, not one is patented or surveyed, and this very section Judge Henry N. Blake has bought and holds a deed from the Northern Pacific Railroad and the same is recorded in the Madison County recorder's office. The Northern Pacific had an expert here some two or three years ago, and he could not help seeing the location and development of the mines in this section. He could not help seeing the miners daily toiling and working, thinking all the time they were developing their own mines and property. But without the least warning their mines are sold beneath their very feet. They find they have no mines nor no homes after many years of toil and hardship that no one but a miner and prospector knows before their mines are developed enough to place a value on them. All these hardships must be endured and the bravest and most courageous of our citizens go forth and prospect in these rough and ragged mountains across the steep and rocky cañons. The hardships and privations they endure are a strain on the strongest constitutions.

After many hard struggles he is rewarded by a rich find, and sets himself at work to develop his discovery, and before he has time (being a poor man) to do the necessary $500 worth of work, and nearly as much more to pay the other expenses for a patent, the Northern Pacific Railroad Company takes his mine from him. Now all this has been done by the prospector and the Northern Pacific Railroad Company in this very section.

Judge Blake told me himself that he was looking after the interest of the Northern Pacific in this county. He furthermore told me he would "show them who owns the ground where the town is when I get ready." These were his words to me.

We the undersigned residents of Red Bluff, do sanction Mr. J. J. Lown's letter: Thomas J. McKee, Amber J. Arnold, A. W. Tanner, R. H. Foster, J. M. Bellise, G. W. Pope, Charles Holdman, H. U. Foster, E. B. Jackson, William Reese, John F. Haskins, Henry Henselbecker, Aaron Flynn, Henry Matheson, Jacob H. May, George F. Badgett, Daniel O'Shea, John M. Bayliss, W. P. Grannis, William R. Reed, John C. Kelleher, O. Laswell.

The lands described in the foregoing affidavits are lands which have been certified to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company as agricultural, and for which they are now asking patents from the United States. Is it surprising, then, that the people under whose eyes these outrages are being perpetrated should feel the greatest concern about this matter? Every day new proofs and affidavits, showing the extent to which these frauds are being perpetrated, are being filed in the Interior Department, and every day brings petitions from the people asking Congress for relief. The latest is as follows:

To his Excellency the President of the United States and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your petitioners most respectfully submit that they are all citizens of the United States, or have declared their intention to become such, and are all residents of the Territory of Montana.

That they are all interested in the protection and development of the mineral resources of said Territory.

That the Northern Pacific Railroad Company claim nearly all the odd-numbered sections of the surveyed portion of the mineral lands of said Territory bearing gold, silver, lead, or copper, and has already caused the same to be certified to itself for patent by the United States land officers in said Territory.

That said certification has been based upon certain plats made by the deputy United States surveyors, and now on file in the respective United States land offices in said Territory, showing these lands so certified to be non-mineral in their character; which said plats are erroneous, in that they designate large quantities of mineral land as agricultural, mountainous, and mountainous timber lands.

That under the present acts of Congress and the various decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States construing such acts, there is little, if any, hope of correcting the existing errors and of preventing said railroad company from acquiring title to these lands.

That only within a few years has quartz mining proved to be a paying industry in Montana, and therefore the lands bearing the precious metals are to a large extent undeveloped.

That millions of dollars are now invested and being invested in the development of such resources, the benefit of which will inure to the said railroad company, if it is permitted to acquire title to the lands already certified to and to which it is not entitled.

That unless relief is granted, said railroad company will soon acquire the absolute title to nearly one-half of the mineral land of this Territory.

That the acquirement of title to these lands by the said railroad company would not only work irreparable injury to the industries of the Territory of Montana, and materially retard its progress, but would deprive all citizens of the United States of the right given them by the statutes to locate and appropriate our mineral lands, and would create one of the most colossal monopolies that has ever existed.

Now, therefore, we most respectfully and earnestly pray that such legislation be had as will preserve the mineral lands of the Territory of Montana, bearing the precious metals, to the citizens of the United States, and prevent the Northern Pacific Railroad Company from acquiring any lands to which it is not clearly entitled under its grant.

JAMES H. MILLS,	JAMES K. PETTY,
A. D. HOSE,	H. RICHARDSON,
FRANK H. SHAW,	R. T. KENNON,
E. P. MILLS,	THOMAS STRANG,
J. H. MILLER,	J. H. BUXTON,
CHAS. S. BALLENGER,	R. N. TIBBETTS,
B. SHEFFIELD,	J. H. WILDMAN,
C. J. McSHERRY,	THOMAS STUART,
E. S. STACKPOLE,	JOS. M. BAILEY,
VICTOR HAIG,	E. W. WENTWORTH,
WM. COLEMAN,	CHAS. P. H. BULENBERG,
B. J. MARS,	MOSES MINARD,
HENRY S. NEAL,	C. CUMMINGS,
W. E. BOLINGER,	THOMAS ASPLING,
JOHN J. KING,	THOS. M. CONNIFF,
M. BIERS,	N. H. CONNOLLY,
J. D. PETERSON,	C. A. FOGARTY,
PETER LANSING,	JAMES S. SHEHAN,
JAKOB HANSEN,	J. E. VAN GRADY,
R. T. HARRIS,	HARRY PETERSON,
GEORGE COCKRELL,	GEO. H. BELL,
W. F. STANLEY,	EMIL HANSEN,
J. H. TITCOMB,	JAMES B. McMASTER,
BENNETT BROS. CO.,	PHIL. E. EVANS,
THOMAS MORY,	GEO. W. CARLTON,
GEORGE S. MILLER,	C. G. GLASS,
THOMAS F. WARD,	WILBUR N. AYLESWORTH,
W. W. HIGGINS,	J. E. ENRIGHT,
J. M. HARTWELL,	D. H. McFARLAND,
E. L. RINAUD,	FRED. B. FOX,
EDW. METLANDER,	J. F. STRANHAL,
MYERS BOLINGER,	P. BADER,
E. BLANEY,	A. KLEINSCHMIDT & CO.,
CHAS. D. KENYO,	W. F. WILLIAMS,
L. W. WOOLFOLK,	

Deer Lodge.

Information is abundant and from other sources quite as reliable to show that the most stringent legislation is demanded to preserve our mineral as a heritage to the people. It is true that the Interior Department is using every effort possible to protect the Government and the citizen against fraud and imposition under a provision of law authorizing the Commissioner of the Land Office, with the advice of the Secretary of the Interior, to make regulations to carry out the general laws, but it is doubted whether ample authority exists. In order to show you to what extent these frauds have obtained in other localities, and the great perplexities and difficulties that have arisen out of a proper solution of the question, I submit the following letters from the honorable Commissioner of the Land Office:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, April 22, 1886.

SIR: I inclose a draft of a proposed circular designed to extend the operation of the circular of September 23, 1880, a copy of which I inclose, with the preceding circular of April 27, 1880. The circular itself fully sets out, I think, the necessity for its issue, but it is necessary to add that the frauds upon the United States and upon bona fide mining claimants permitted by the present regulations are notorious and flagrant, particularly in the matter of railroad selections. As evidence that the evils under consideration are not recent or exaggerated, but have long been an embarrassment to this office, I refer to pages 32-42 of the General Land Office Report for 1872, a copy of which I inclose.

In a case now before me patents issued in April, 1885, to the Central Pacific Railroad Company for large tracts of land in a township which, according to information since received, is filled with mineral and mining claims. Only scattered portions are shown to be mineral by the surveyor-general's return, made in 1871. The railroad company in making its selections carefully avoided every one of the tracts so designated, probably because a contrary course would

precipitate a hearing before the local officers, that would bring the well-known mineral character of the land to the attention of the Department. It is alleged that the land so patented contains mines 400 feet deep. In a case recently brought to your attention forty-two mines are said to be in active operation upon two sections selected by the same company, one at least having been worked since 1855.

To ask the Government to rest its case upon evidence found to be so untrustworthy is like asking it to dispose of all the lands in California upon knowledge of their character acquired before 1849, ignoring all subsequent discoveries and developments. Where patents have erroneously issued upon such returns, the Government is bound to recover by expensive proceedings in the courts the title wrongfully parted with, in order to fulfill its obligations to mineral claimants relying upon their possessory titles under section 2322 Revised Statutes. Such a suit I had occasion to recommend by my letter of the 17th ultimo, in case of the Lowell Hill Placer Mine.

The provision of the proposed circular which requires an official examination of the land is intended to be applied in well-known mineral regions, such as the recognized "mineral belt" of California, in which the natural presumption is against the non-mineral character of the land. It is merely an application of the circular of September 22, 1882, to agricultural claims and is necessary because the interests of the Government would not be sufficiently protected by publication alone. I am informed that the railroad companies are securing patents to large tracts of mineral lands under compromises with the owners of mining claims, by which the company deeds to the miners the lands covered by their claim, reserving to itself the remainder. By this means the miners secure the legal title at an expense much less than the cost of obtaining mineral patents, but the Government is defrauded of its fees and the price of the land under the mining laws, $2.50 and $5 per acre.

I think that ample authority for the proposed regulations is found in section 2478, Revised Statutes. Certainly if the power of the Department to demand publication not required by statute is conceded to have been rightfully exercised in the issue of the circular of September 23, 1880, it is competent for the Department to extend that demand to all the cases affected by the proposed circular, the present discrimination being shown to be based upon unreliable evidence. For requiring an official determination of the character of the land at the expense of the claimant a precedent exists in the circular of September 22, 1882, now in force.

The whole object of the proposed circular is to permit the United States to dispose of their lands, not upon information acquired twenty or thirty years ago, which, although it may have been correct at the time, is not so now, not upon information which the public officers know to be contrary to the facts, but upon the report of sworn agents, made at the time of the negotiations for sale. The present practice is one which no business man would employ in his private affairs, and I recommend that it be properly reformed.

Very respectfully,

WM. A. J. SPARKS, *Commissioner.*

Hon. L. Q. C. LAMAR,
Secretary of the Interior.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, June 25, 1887.

SIR: In the matter of the application, dated the 2d ultimo, of Henry Beard, esq., attorney for the Central Pacific Railroad Company, asking the direction of the Department as to certain lands in the Sacramento land district, California, selected by said company, I have the honor to submit the following report in compliance with your letter of the 13th ultimo.

Said company made selections under act of July 1, 1862, and act amendatory thereof, approved July 2, 1864, as follows:

List 9, August 27, 1885.
List 10, October 30, 1885.
List 13, February 15, 1886.
List 14, March 10, 1886.
List 15, April 7, 1886.
List 16, May 10, 1886.
List 17, June 12, 1886.
List 18, August 13, 1886.
List 19, September 9, 1886.
List 20, October 11, 1886.
List 21, November 5, 1886.
List 22, December 8, 1886.
List 23, December 8, 1886.
List 24, December 21, 1886.

Aggregating 222,844.57 acres.

From these lists a list of 194,050.14 acres, designated as clear list No. 50, was made up and, on March 19, 1887, referred for examination to the mineral division; and on April 6, 1887, the register and receiver at Sacramento were instructed as follows:

"The affidavits submitted as to the non-mineral character of the lands described in the inclosed list, 194,050.14 acres, being a part of the lands embraced in selection lists 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 24, by the Central Pacific Railroad Company, is not satisfactory.

"Affidavits substantially as required in agricultural cases generally in your district (form 4-062) must be furnished.

"See letter N to your office of September 20, 1872, relating to the matter of non-mineral affidavits thereafter to be required.

"The affidavits here required of the company may be made by any duly authorized agent, but proof of his appointment must be filed in each case.

"Notify the company hereof and promptly forward any evidence submitted." (See Exhibits A and AA.)

It is the requirement in this letter that Mr. Beard complains of. He charges that the procedure is "unusual, unauthorized, and impracticable."

The propriety of this requirement will be shown by a brief review of the reasons which controlled the action of this office and the Department in 1871, and the causes which led up to the present practice under which the requirement complained of was made.

On the 24th of November, 1871, the honorable Secretary of the Interior, upon report made by this office and a request for authority to withdraw from disposal as agricultural lands certain townships and parts of townships in the mineral region, which had been surveyed and returned as agricultural lands, but which were believed to be mineral in character, authorized this office to make the necessary withdrawal, and to instruct the local officers not to permit any of the tracts which may be withdrawn to be entered as agricultural land, unless the non-mineral character of the same should first be fully and clearly established by competent testimony. Under this authority from the Department withdrawals were made of a large number of townships in December, 1871, and in January, 1872, and later. (See General Land Office circular of June 17, 1872, marked Exhibit B, setting out in full the reason for such withdrawals.)

On the 20th of September, 1872, the register and receiver at Sacramento were instructed not to allow any entry under the homestead, pre-emption, or other agricultural land law of Congress, until the applicant for patent had filed a non-mineral affidavit of the form transmitted, and fully describing the tract sought to be entered. (See Exhibit C.) This general requirement has never been recalled.

On the 16th of April, 1880, this office, in a report to the honorable Secretary, reviewed at considerable length the reasons for these withdrawals and the effect of requiring evidence as to the character of land in the manner indicated therein, and in this report the Commissioner recommended that the "policy and practice of throwing the burden of proof upon agricultural claimants be reversed; that the applicant for such entry be required to make the non-mineral affidavit required as aforesaid, and that this be deemed sufficient in the absence of the alleged mineral character of his claim," etc., and recommended also that the withdrawals theretofore made be revoked. (See Exhibit D.) By letter of 22d of April, 1880, the honorable Secretary approved this recommendation, and thereupon this office issued circular dated April 27, 1880, revoking the withdrawals referred to and directing that when any party applies to enter any tract under any of the laws relating to agricultural lands he will be required to make the usual non-mineral affidavit which, in the absence of any allegation that the land is mineral, will be deemed sufficient, etc. (See Exhibit E.)

By circular of September 23, 1880, where application is made to enter or select as agricultural land, under any act of Congress other than the pre-emption or homestead acts, lands returned as mineral by the surveyor-general, applicant is required at date of final proof, location, or selection to publish for thirty days a notice describing the land applied for, etc. This circular likewise requires, after publication of notice and where no affidavits alleging the mineral character of the land have been filed, the filing of a proper non-mineral affidavit. (See Exhibit F.)

Since the making of those regulations experience has demonstrated the vital importance of requiring the filing of the usual non-mineral affidavit in all cases where patents are sought under the agricultural-land laws for lands situated in the mineral regions, although such lands may have been returned by the surveyor-general as agricultural in character.

The frequency with which this office is called upon to aid in restoring to the public domain mineral lands patented to railroad companies and the many protests received against pending selections of lands in the States and Territories where the United States mining laws are in operation urge the necessity of a careful examination of every tract, although returned by the surveyor-general as agricultural, and the requirement of evidence of the non-mineral character, in strict accordance with the law and departmental regulations.

The honorable Secretary of the Interior in his letter of January 31, 1881 (see Exhibit G), addressed to this office, concerning certain examination made by Special Agent Goucher, of lands in California, expressed the opinion that "if the land contains lodes of mineral-bearing matter, then it is mineral land, whether it has been worked or not, or whether it will pay to work or not at this time. As between the railroad company and the Government, I think any and all land that bears mineral or gold in placer form in such appreciable quantities as to render it in any sense valuable, so as to be likely to be sought out for its mineral qualities, is within the spirit of the exception made by Congress and should be considered mineral land. As between the settler and Government a more liberal policy may be adopted; that is, to determine whether the land is more valuable for mining than agricultural and other purposes of settlement and use in the first instance, and if it is so found it may properly go to the settler. * * * But it can hardly be supposed that in making a donation to the railroad company of public land the Government intended to adopt the same liberal policy as toward the settler. At all events, mineral land is reserved, and whether the land is or is not mineral ought not to be left to the report of the surveyor-general, but should be determined as any other question of fact."

I also inclose copy of appointment by the Central Pacific Railroad Company of an agent "to take and subscribe any and all non-mineral affidavits," dated April 15, 1887, which paper, with the non-mineral affidavits therein referred to (form 4062), were filed in this office in response to call made in office letter of March 7, 1887, and without objection.

It would appear, therefore, that in certain cases only is it "impracticable" to comply with the requirements.

In my letter to you of the 22d of April, 1886, inclosing the draught of a proposed circular, I endeavored to point out the notorious and flagrant frauds which have been practiced upon the United States and upon bona fide mining claimants, particularly in the matter of railroad selections, in taking up and entering as agricultural lands, which are really mineral in character, comprising well known and valuable mines. Experience has shown that the returns of the surveyor-general, in a great number of cases are so indefinite or erroneous as to be of very little value for the purpose of determining the character of the land; and these additional regulations were prepared with a view to prevent a continuation of the fraudulent practices mentioned. (See Exhibits H and K.)

I also inclose copy of my letter of February 28, 1887, to the register and receiver at Los Angeles, Cal., (Exhibit L), in the matter of the motion of Mr. Henry Beard for a reconsideration of my decision of December 23, 1886, requiring non-mineral affidavits as to certain lands selected by the Southern Pacific Railroad Company in lists 21, 30, 31, and 34. This letter sets out more fully than said decision of December 23 the reason for this requirement, and why a compliance therewith is not only proper but practicable.

The requirement of non-mineral affidavits in cases of selections by the State of lands returned as agricultural has also been incorporated into the circular prescribing regulations for making school indemnity selections in lieu of mineral lands in sections 16 and 36, in the State of Colorado, approved by the Department May 2 last. The fourth section of this circular expressly requires that "In all cases the selected tracts must be covered by non-mineral affidavits made by the selecting agent of the State," etc. (See Exhibit M.)

Although the requirement complained of may not have been strictly enforced heretofore in cases of railroad selections, yet I can conceive of no reason why the usual non-mineral affidavit required of settlers and other claimants under laws providing for the disposal of agricultural lands, in the States and Territories where the United States mining laws are operative, should not also be required in cases of railroad selections therein.

Although the general withdrawals made in 1871-'72, etc., were subsequently revoked, yet the great safeguard—the requirement that claimants shall file the usual non-mineral affidavit—was retained.

Experience has demonstrated the great importance of this requirement, and public policy, in my opinion, demands its strict enforcement in cases of railroad selections. Certainly a more liberal policy in this respect was never intended in dealing with railroad selections than has been adopted in cases of individual settlers and other claimants.

Regarding the statements of Mr. Beard that, referring to the lands in question, seven-eighths of the land is situated on the mountain divide, on the east slope of the Sierra Nevadas, regions in which there are no mineral lands, I submit the following table:

The 194,050.14 acres embraced in clear list No. 50 cover portions of 36 townships.

In 12 of the 36 townships portions were returned as mineral by the surveyor-general.

In 12 of the 36 townships all the lands were withdrawn as mineral, being situate in the mineral belt.

In 15 of the 36 townships the segregation plats in this office show mining claims.

Number of mining claims shown in these 15 townships, 142.

In one township, 17 north, 11 east, which was returned by the Surveyor-Gen-

eral as agricultural, there are twenty-six mining claims, many of which have been patented. In this township the company has selected 3,869.16 acres.

Of the thirty-six townships, twenty-four contain tracts which have at one time or another been held or reserved by this office as mineral, and more than half of the lands in clear list 50 are situate in these twenty-four townships.

The above table shows only the facts disclosed by the records of this office and does not show mining claims held and worked under the local laws, but not reported to this office, of which there are no doubt many.

The selections made include tracts adjoining mining claims and lots made by segregation of mining claims.

It appears that instead of the greater portion being in "regions in which there are no mineral lands," 109,233.31 acres of the 194,660.14 acres are in a mineral region.

Touching the regulations of 1867 and 1879, referred to by Mr. Beard (page 4 of petition), it is held by this office that the said circular of April 27 and September 23, 1880, and the mining circular of October 31, 1881, supersede all prior circular instructions in the matter.

This apparent conflict of circular instruction accounts for the few cases referred to as having heretofore been passed without requiring the "usual non-mineral affidavit."

For a time following the revocation of the withdrawals by said circular of April 27, 1880, railroad selections for lands not returned as mineral were not referred to the mineral division, but passed to patent under the proofs required by the regulations of 1867 and 1879 from the railroad division in which they were received and filed. Such cases, however, now go to the mineral division, where the non-mineral affidavit (form 4-062) is required in all alike.

I inclose copies of the various letters, circulars, etc., referred to above as Exhibits A, AA, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, K, L, and M.

Concluding, I have the honor to state that two cases involving the same question as that here reported upon are now before you on appeal from the action of this office in requiring similar non-mineral affidavits, namely: Appeal by the Atlantic and Pacific Railroad Company, case of selection lists 1, 2, and 3 Prescott, Ariz., land district, forwarded March 18, 1887, and appeal by the Southern Pacific Railroad Company, case of selection lists 21, 30, 31, and 34, Los Angeles, Cal., land district, forwarded March 29, 1887.

Very respectfully,

W. A. J. SPARKS,
Commissioner.

Hon. L. Q. C. LAMAR,
Secretary of the Interior.

And now, sir, as confirmatory of all that has been said respecting the danger of mineral lands falling into the hands of the railroads, and to place fairly before the country the position assumed by the railroad company, I present the letter of Mr. Thomas F. Oakes, vice-president and general manager of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company:

MR. OAKES SPEAKS—THE NORTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD AND MONTANA MINERAL LANDS.

[St. Paul Globe.]

To the Editor of the Globe:

An article which appeared in your paper of Saturday, under the head of "Robbing the Territories," conveys an erroneous impression to readers as to the action of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company in the matter of mineral lands lying within its grant in Montana. You speak of the "rapacity of the railroads" and intimate that this company is asserting title to lands which do not rightfully belong to it. Will you permit me to state the facts as they are? The company has a grant extending through Montana from east to west, for the entire length of the Territory. Lands known to contain minerals are exempted by the granting act from the operation of the grant. Mark the phraseology:

"Lands known to contain minerals," not lands supposed to contain minerals, or lands which may at some time in the future be found to contain minerals. The grant is not to be suspended indefinitely waiting for miners and prospectors to make explorations, but when the Government surveys are made such of the sections included in the granting act as at that time are not known to contain mineral are patented to the company. That settles the matter so far as title to those sections is concerned, and no future discovery of minerals invalidates the title. This is not only law but equity and common sense. Montana has been searched for the precious metals for more than a quarter of a century. The Northern Pacific was built through the Territory five years ago.

The Government surveys progress very slowly, and as fast as they are made it is only fair that the railroad company should receive title to the lands Congress enacted that it should have, in order that it may sell them and that the settlement of the country may not be longer retarded.

Minerals may possibly be found on any section of the Northern Pacific grant on the entire mountain district traversed by the road in the Territory, a belt of country 300 miles long. It would be manifestly unjust to the company, and highly detrimental to the interests of the Territory, if the whole grant for that distance would be withheld from sale and settlement for many years, perchance for another quarter of a century, until every remote chance and possibility of gold, silver, or copper being found upon it is determined in the negative. Yet this is the position your article appears to assume.

I desire to say in conclusion that the Northern Pacific Company is not seeking title to a single acre of land in Montana that does not lawfully belong to it; that it is guilty of no "rapacity" in act or intent, but, on the contrary, is patient and long-suffering, waiting year after year for the Government to make surveys which it agreed to make long ago, so that it can obtain the land which Congress said it should have as soon as its road was completed.

Yours truly,

T. F. OAKES,
Vice-President and General Manager.

ST. PAUL, *March* 5, 1888.

It is boldly asserted here that only lands "known to contain minerals" are excepted from the grant. It is a settled rule of construction that whatever is included in the exception is excluded from the grant, and hence it becomes necessary to see what the exception is.

"Provided further that all mineral lands ('not known to contain mineral' as claimed) be, and the same are hereby, excluded from the operation of this act," etc., "and provided further that the word 'mineral' where it occurs in this act shall not be held to include iron or coal." If the position of the railroad company could be maintained, the result would follow that in the States and Territories through which a land-grant road passes all the land within the limits of the grant would pass to the company which was not actually developed and worked as a mining claim. The proposition is astounding, and its enforcement would be a crime against the citizen which no subsequent remedial legislation could ever paliate or excuse. It was intended that mineral lands should be reserved. The difficulty is that Congress having failed to define what constitutes "mineral land," as contemplated by the statute, the question is left largely to the discretion of the courts or the land officers, as the case may be. To carry out this intention I insist that it is the duty of Congress to define what shall constitute mineral land, within the meaning of the statute, as between the Government and the railroad company. In no other way can there ever be a rule of decision which will be uniform in its operation in the mining States and Territories whereby the Government and the citizen will be protected against the fraud and imposition of these powerful companies.

While it is true that additional requirements are made by which it must be shown that the claim contains "valuable mineral deposits" before the Government will dispose of any of its mineral lands, so reserved, yet as against the railroad, a deposit of any of the precious minerals except iron and coal deprives it of any status as a claimant.

Any other rule would fritter away the reservations in the grant, destroy the utility of the act of 1872, and utterly subvert the policy of the Government in dealing out mining claims in small portions, by means of which vast contributions will be made to the wealth of the citizen, instead of compelling him at all future times upon discovering and developing valuable mineral deposits upon these odd sections of land to capitulate at a disadvantage with a stupendous corporation, and finally purchase upon such terms and subject to such conditions and amenable to such servitudes as it might see proper to impose.

It was never intended that all of the great mineral wealth of this country falling within the limits of land grants, which was undiscovered at the time the grant attached, should be given away to railroad companies, who would be permitted to stifle the development of our mineral resources by withholding the lands from the prospector and compelling the citizen to purchase at a sum far in excess of the Government price.

Being thus reserved by all of its legislation, they should be kept for all time, a continuous field for the prospector and the miner, who will be stimulated in the pursuits of his labor. It was never intended that the occupants of these lands should be subject to the caprice of such corporations and deprived of his possessions, because, forsooth, at some moment in its development it would not pay, at present prices and under present conditions, the actual cost of extracting the precious minerals from it.

It will not be presumed that Congress intended to unduly circumscribe the rights of the miner in a mining country in the realization of his reasonable expectations, but on the contrary afford to him every reasonable facility in the pursuit of so expensive and hazardous an occupation.

This comports more with the duty of Government, is more in keeping with its legislation upon the subject, and should not be allowed to be frittered away by judicial construction in the very heart of its richest mineral belt.

The following letter from Mr. Thomas G. Merrill, chairman of the Montana Mineral Land Association, is of interest in this connection. It is as follows:

MONTANA MINERAL LAND ASSOCIATION,
Helena, Mont., March 29, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Yours of the 16th ultimo was received and contents noted, and on the 3d instant we sent you an official copy of the preamble and resolutions adopted by the mineral land convention, which met in Helena February 7, 1888.

Inclosed please find petitions to Congress in relation to the mineral lands of Montana, which we hope you will have read to the House. We also inclose Vice-President Oakes's letter to the St. Paul Globe, which you may not have seen.

You will see by this letter that the Northern Pacific Railroad Company claim all the odd sections of our mountainous mineral lands, and consider their title perfect as soon as these lands are surveyed, only excepting known mineral lands (which simply means mining claims), known to the grantor, which is the Government, and you know the only mines or mining claims known to the Government are those patented or surveyed for a patent by a United States deputy mineral surveyor.

This would give to this railroad company more than nine-tenths of all the discovered and recorded gold and silver mining claims on the odd sections within the limits of their grant, and forever withdraw about one-half of all our mineral land from further prospecting and exploration by our prospectors and miners, and will stop to a large extent prospecting on the even sections, as the corners are obliterated and the section lines in most cases are not marked so that the prospector could tell whether he was on an even or an odd section, and the hundreds of thousands of dollars which have been expended on the unpatented or unsurveyed mining claims in the odd-numbered sections will be lost to their owners if these mines become the property of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company. Permit us also to call your attention to the fact that the wording on which Mr. Oakes lays so much stress, "lands known to contain mineral," does not occur in the act granting these lands. You will at once see the absurdity of most of his other statements, as to the injury to the territory if these lands are not given to the railroad company, and the justice, equity, and common sense to this patient, long-suffering company that they should not be compelled to wait any longer for these lands that were never granted to them.

We will only say as to the statement that these mountains have been prospected for twenty-five years; that there were discovered and recorded in the county records of Lewis and Clarke County, during the last year, eight hundred and twenty-six mining claims bearing gold, silver, lead, or copper, which is three hundred more than were ever discovered in any previous year, and yet Lewis and Clarke County has been as well prospected as any county in the Territory in former years.

We have already sent to the Secretary of the Interior a large number of affidavits as to the mineral character of the mountainous lands of Montana, and we propose to have affidavits by competent persons showing that all our mountainous lands are mineral. Will send you to-day blue prints of the counties in which there are mountainous mineral lands within the land grant, showing the lands certified to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company for patent, which is

almost one-half of the entire amount surveyed, and much of this land you will certainly know is mineral land, and should be classed as such.

The decisions of the higher courts, based on the present acts of Congress, are that mineral lands are mines or mining claims with ore which carries the precious or useful metals in paying quantities, which gives the foundation to the claim of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company, and thus the only relief we have is an act of Congress either setting aside the mountainous mineral districts of Montana, where gold, silver, copper, or lead are found as mineral lands, and compelling the Northern Pacific Railroad Company in these lands to make at least the same non-mineral proof as a private citizen is compelled to make if he desires to locate a homestead. We inclose you a copy of the reservation of the Northern Pacific Railroad Company in the deeds from them, and we ask you to see if this clause, except as to iron and coal, can not be placed in all patents hereafter issued to them. If this can be done it will secure the mineral lands to our people. Please send us the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Very respectfully, yours,

THOMAS G. MERRILL, *Chairman.*
JOHN S. HARRIS, *Secretary.*

Hon. J. K. TOOLE, M. C., *Washington, D. C.*

I am not one of those who would disturb these corporations in the enjoyment of a single right which is theirs under the law, but as a representative of the most extensive and richest mineral district of this country, I am here to insist and see to it if I can that nothing shall pass by these grants except such as was intended by Congress. And to prevent this and the serious consequences which will surely ensue requires speedy action upon the part of Congress. It is high time that the law with its beak and claw should take hold of these corporations, creatures of its own unholy creation, and give them such a vigorous shaking as will compel them to let go that which is not their own.

The amendment proposed by me imposes no hardships or unnecessary burdens on them. It is in keeping with the spirit and intention of the grants, and if adopted will afford ample facilities for an honest and fair certification of all lands falling within the limits of railroad grants to the companies entitled to the same, and preserve to the people of this country the right to prospect for and develop the hidden wealth of this land unrestrained and unfettered by corporate control and dictation.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. FORNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. BLOUNT, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration the bill (S. 1851) to provide for an international marine conference for securing greater safety for life and property at sea, and had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that it do pass with certain amendments; also, that they had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9377) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and had come to no resolution thereon.

INTERNATIONAL MARINE CONFERENCE.

Mr. BELMONT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question upon the Senate bill which has just been reported from the Committee of the Whole, being the bill (S. 1851) to provide for an international marine conference for securing greater safety for life and property at sea.

The previous question was ordered.

The amendments recommended by the Committee of the Whole were adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BELMONT moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

INVALID PENSIONS.

Mr. GAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a privileged report.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill of the House (H. R. 5445) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreemet to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, and 5, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$16,000;" and the Senate agree to the same.

M. A. FORAN,
EDWARD J. GAY,
JOHN D. LONG,
Managers on the part of the House.
WILLIAM B. ALLISON,
HENRY L. DAWES,
A. P. GORMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The conferees on the part of the House submitted the following statement:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5445) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, submit the following written statement:

The effect of the action recommended in the accompanying report will, if it is ratified by the two Houses, pass the bill as it was amended by the Senate, except that the amount for stationery and other necessary expenses for the pension agencies will be $16,000 instead of $18,000, as proposed by a Senate amendment.

The bill as agreed upon in conference appropriates $81,758,000.

M. A. FORAN,
EDWARD J. GAY,
JOHN D. LONG,
Managers on the part of the House.

THOMAS W. LORD.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole be discharged from the further consideration of the bill which I send to the desk, and that it be now put upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint First Lieut. Thomas W. Lord, United States Army, retired, a captain on the retired-list of the Army, with the retired pay of that grade from the date of such appointment.

The report (by Mr. STEELE) is as follows:

The Committee on Military Affairs, having carefully considered House bill No. 409, report it back with the recomendation that it be favorably considered.

Lieutenant Lord entered the service a mere boy early in the war and served faithfully upon the active-list either in the volunteer or regular service for over twenty-five years. He was severely wounded at Chancellorsville in 1863, which resulted in the loss of his left leg and injury to his right foot, and was brevetted for gallantry at said battle. He was appointed a lieutenant, Forty-third Veteran Reserve Corps, in 1863, which regiment was consolidated with the Twentieth United States Infantry in 1869, and Lieutenant Lord was retained in the service as a first lieutenant and as regimental quartermaster until August 25, 1887, when he was placed upon the retired-list. Had he been allowed to remain in the service six days more a vacancy would have occurred and Lord entitled to promotion as captain; but had he remained, under the ruling of the President, Mr. Lord would not have been promoted, because of his being recommended for retirement some years ago on account of the loss of his leg in battle.

Now, while your committee agree with the President that officers who, on account of wounds or disabilities incurred in the service, had better be placed upon the retired-list, it thinks that where officers have performed gallant and meritorious service, and have been retained in active service for over twenty years, and have performed said service efficiently, as several of Lieutenant Lord's superior officers say of him, "with unusual efficiency," they should not be retired upon the eve of a merited promotion.

There are before your committee many letters from officers of distinction commending Lieutenant Lord for his bravery, efficiency, integrity, and sobriety.

In view of all the foregoing facts, your committee urge favorable action on the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BURROWS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JOHN CURTIN KENT.

Mr. BELMONT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk. I do not think there will be any opposition to it.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Whereas John Curtin Kent, a naturalized citizen of the United States, has been convicted of complicity with one Dr. Gallinger in an alleged dynamite plot in England, and is now suffering a term of imprisonment therefor in Milbank penitentiary in London; and

Whereas it is reported by the United States consul-general in London that the conviction of the said Curtin Kent was contrary to the charge of the judge who presided at the trial, and is believed to have been obtained on insufficient or improperly considered evidence; and

Whereas it appears that the fact of the American citizenship of the said Curtin Kent was not made known at the trial of his case, and therefore proper representation could not be made on his behalf:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be, and is hereby, instructed to inquire into the facts of the case of the said Curtin Kent and to report thereon to the House.

The resolution was adopted.

Mr. BELMONT moved to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The hour of 5 o'clock p. m. having arrived, the House adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BINGHAM: A bill (H. R. 10136) for the relief of Thomas Sinclair & Son—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. T. M. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 10137) for the relief of Francis A. Field—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10138) for the benefit of James Doolin—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10139) placing the name of Joel B. Ellis on the roll of Company H, Thirteenth Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KETCHAM: A bill (H. R. 10140) for the relief of Ann Maher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. G. M. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 10141) for the relief of John W. Story—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. J. B. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 10142) removing the charge of desertion against Charles Sweet—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. J. R. WHITING: A bill (H. R. 10143) granting a pension to Nelson Fisher—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. YODER: A bill (H. R. 10144) for the relief of James McMullin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JACKSON: A bill (H. R. 10145) for the relief of S. S. McFerran—to the Committee on Claims.

Change in the reference of a bill improperly referred was made in the following case, namely:

A bill (S. 42) for the relief of Capt. Nicholas J. Bigley—from the Committee on Claims to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BINGHAM: Memorial of the Philadelphia (Pa.) Board of Trade, protesting against the Mills tariff bill in relation to reduction of duty on sugar and molasses—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GEAR: Petition of J. M. Stinson and 96 others, citizens of Jefferson County, Iowa, for the Territorial organization of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. J. S. HENDERSON: Petition of Dr. S. W. Stevenson and 50 others, citizens and firms of Iredell County, North Carolina, in favor of amending the interstate-commerce act so as to protect the people from the oppressions of the railroad companies—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of the Blackwell's Durham Co-operative Company and other firms, of Durham, N. C., and elsewhere, favoring the repeal of all licenses and restrictions on the sale of tobacco, and that the tax be reduced to 2 cents per pound on manufactured tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of employés of the Government Printing Office, for relief—to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. HOUK: Petition of heir of Richard Hayworth, of Jefferson County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORROW: Resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of San Francisco, Cal., in favor of action by Congress asserting the policy of maintaining the independence of the islands of the Pacific not already dominated by European powers—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CHARLES O'NEILL: Memorial of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., favoring the bill to incorporate the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of numerous citizens of Franklin County, Arkansas, relating to the amendment of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. G. M. THOMAS: Petition of John S. May, with affidavits to be filed with bill No. 10130, for his relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. A. C. THOMPSON: Petition of 77 citizens of the Eleventh district of Ohio, for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. J. R. WHITING: Petition of Nelson Fisher, late private Company G, First Regiment Michigan Volunteers, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Inland, of Ionia and Kent Counties, and of Ingham County, Michigan, in favor of pure food—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WHITTHORNE: Petition of Rachael Ewing, of Williamson County, Tennessee, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILKINSON: Petition of J. Sambola, J. J. Reuss, and others, for the restoration of the duty on macaroni and vermicelli—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

The following petitions in favor of House bill 9716, for the better protection of free labor from convict labor, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Labor:

By Mr. C. H. ALLEN: Of Knights of Labor of Baldwinville, Mass.

By Mr. BOWEN: Of B. F. Sharpe and others, citizens of Virginia.

By Mr. T. M. BROWNE: Of Local Assembly No. 3243, Knights of Labor, of Connersville, Ind.

By Mr. LONG: Of Thomas Lynch and 15 others, citizens of Brockton, Mass.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Of Local Assembly No. 9006, Knights of Labor, of Stevens Point, Wis.—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. VANCE: Of workmen of New Britain, Conn.

The following petition for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists was received and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. KEAN: Of William Gale, of Westfield, N. J.

The following petition for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, was received and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Of L. M. Jewett and others, of Ohio—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. GOFF: Of W. H. Ramsey and others, of Doddridge County, West Virginia.

By Mr. GROUT: Of Abel Slayton and 25 others, citizens of Felchville, Vt.

By Mr. JACKSON: Of 33 farmers of Washington County, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. CLARDY: Of 98 citizens of St. Louis County, Missouri.

By Mr. S. I. HOPKINS (by request): Of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Woman Suffrage Association.

The following petition for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. CLARDY: Of George W. Mahn and 80 others, citizens of Hazel Run, Mo.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *May* 25, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 9345) making appropriations for the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT PATERSON, N. J.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1978) for the erection of a public building at Paterson, N. J., which were in lines 9 and 22, to reduce the amount of the appropriation from $125,000 to $80,000.

Mr. WALTHALL. On behalf of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MCPHERSON], who is absent, I move that the Senate non-concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives, and ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. SPOONER, Mr. QUAY, and Mr. VEST were appointed.

Mr. MCPHERSON subsequently said: I desire to ask for a reconsideration of the vote by which the Senate non-concurred in the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1978) for the erection of a public building in Paterson, N. J., and ordered a conference thereon. I desire to have the Senate concur in the House amendments.

Mr. WALTHALL. I made the motion for a committee of conference on behalf of the Senator from New Jersey in his absence.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I understand that, but it was a mistake on my part.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The action of the Senate refusing to concur in the amendments made to the bill by the House of Representatives will be reconsidered, if there be no objection; and the Senator from New Jersey now moves that the Senate concur in the amendments made to the bill by the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, presented the petition of S. L. Banks, of Wheatland, Iowa, praying for the passage of an act granting him a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHERMAN presented four memorials of Local Assemblies, Nos. 6825, 303, 3435, and 4857, of the Knights of Labor, in the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the granting of civil pensions; which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VEST presented a petition of the faculty of Washington University at St. Louis, Mo., praying for the passage of a bill establishing a bureau of harbors and water ways; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DANIEL presented the petition of Thomas William Lion, at the National Soldiers' Home, Wisconsin, praying to be allowed a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of W. A. Wilson and other citizens of Christiansburgh and other places in Virginia, and a petition of E. B. Spencer and other citizens of Virginia, praying for the repeal of that portion of the internal-revenue law classing druggists as liquor dealers, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PASCO presented the petition of R. Sumner and others, sureties on the bond of R. J. Marshall, late postmaster at Fort Dade, Fla., praying to be reimbursed for money paid by them as such sureties; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also presented certain petitions of tobacco manufacturers of Key West, Fla., praying for the imposition of increased duties on imported stripped and stemmed tobacco; which were referrrd to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask that bill (S. 2549) for the relief of Belle R. Clements, Order of Business 1262, reported adversely on the 8th of May, 1888, by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. PADDOCK], may be recommitted, together with the report of the Committee on Pensions, and I desire to present in this connection an additional petition from Mrs. Mary I. Clements, and additional evidence, and trust that they may be referred to the committee, and that there will be full, fair, and favorable consideration of the additional evidence and facts.

Mr. PADDOCK. I am very glad that the Senator has made that proposition. It is one I should have made myself.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions, with the additional evidence introduced by the Senator from Missouri.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 8722) granting a pension to Jessie M. Barthauer;
A bill (H. R. 7857) to increase the pension of Henry L. Potter;
A bill (H. R. 8400) for the relief of Lydia Burridge;
A bill (H. R. 8174) granting a pension to Ellen Sexton; and
A bill (H. R. 8884) granting a pension to Emily McClure.

Mr. DANIEL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1291) for the erection of a public building at the city of Staunton, Va., reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1365) for the erection of a public building for the use of the custom-house and post-office at Newport News, in the district of Yorktown, Virginia, and making an appropriation therefor, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2774) authorizing the Richmond and Danville Railroad Company to lay tracks, etc., in the District of Columbia, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1631) to incorporate the Washington and Sandy Spring Narrow-Gauge Railroad and Street Railway Company, reported it with amendments.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5870) to amend the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia for the protection of girls and for the punishment of the crime of rape, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. MANDERSON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill for the relief of W. H. Rader, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 600) increasing the pension of Mary Minor Hoxey;
A bill (H. R. 6973) for the relief of Enoch Weathers;
A bill (H. R. 6577) granting a pension to Abigail Sullivan;
A bill (H. R. 7944) granting a pension to Ann V. Ferguson; and
A bill (H. R. 8159) granting a pension to Jane Brown Dunn.

Mr. HOAR, from the Committee on the Library, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2986) to incorporate the American Historical Association, reported it without amendment.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I ask leave of the Senate to state that yesterday the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], from the Committee on Claims, reported back the bill (S. 353) for the relief of William T. Crump, proposing to give the beneficiary $5,000 for certain services alleged to have been rendered by him. I was not in the Senate at the time, and I desire to give notice that a minority of the Committee on Claims are opposed to the passage of the bill and may at some future time present their views to the Senate to be considered with the majority report.

Mr. HOAR. I understood that some members of the committee were opposed to the bill, but I was not aware that they desired to make a written minority report. If they do, I think my report had better be withdrawn so that the two can be in one document. It is much more convenient to the Senate to have them together.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I prefer that that course should be taken.

Mr. HOAR. Very well. I will have my report withdrawn, unless it has gone to the Printer, so that a withdrawal would be too late.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the report submitted by him upon the bill indicated may be withdrawn.

Mr. HOAR. I will ascertain before doing that whether the report has been printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The matter will be passed over for the present.

Mr. HOAR subsequently moved to reconsider the order for the printing of the report, and the motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. FARWELL. I am instructed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 537) to provide for the confinement of inebriates in the Government Hospital for the Insane, to report it favorably without amendment.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I ask unanimous consent that the bill reported by my friend from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL], providing for the confinement of inebriates at St. Elizabeth's for the time being, may be now considered. The bill was considered at the last session on a favorable report and passed unanimously by the Senate, and I think it extremely desirable that it should reach the House of Representatives as early as possible. As it is precisely the same measure that the Senate has once favorably and without division passed upon, I ask unanimous consent that it be now considered.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill having been this day reported, the Senator from Vermont asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed now to consider the same. Is there objection?

Mr. HOAR. Let the bill be read at length for information.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read for information.

The bill was read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOAR. I think the bill had better lie over. It presents a very important constitutional question as it stands.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 860) for the relief of Alfred Head, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 3020) for the relief of John H. Claus; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 3021) granting a pension to Carrie V. Miller; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, introduced a bill (S. 3022) granting a pension to G. L. Banks; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3023) granting a pension to Elijah M. Kinzey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3024) granting a pension to Lewis H. Linville; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. GULLOM introduced a bill (S. 3025) to provide for the reconstruction of the Government dam at the Rock Island Arsenal, and for the immediate construction of a temporary dam to furnish water-power for said arsenal; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 3026) to amend an act entitled "An act to make persons charged with crimes and offenses competent witnesses in the United States and Territorial courts," approved March 16, 1878; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REGISTER OF LABOR.

Mr. TURPIE introduced a bill (S. 3027) to provide for the making, publication, and distribution of the "Register of Labor" therein named; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. TURPIE. I ask leave at this time to explain briefly the provisions of the bill as now offered.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. TURPIE. It is herein provided that the Commissioner of Labor shall be authorized and directed to make out a list of the names of persons of excellence in their vicinity in any line of skilled labor or mechanism actually engaged in the manual work of their respective callings, and that such list be distributed generally, as therein provided, the object being to give to the persons whose names appear therein and to the entire list as representatives of very large classes of our fellow-citizens that prestige indescribable, yet very effective, which is imparted to any object either connected with or related to the General Government, the constituted authorities in the administration of public affairs.

The bill does not deal in detail with the methods. The successful administration of a Department, and especially a new one, must depend much more upon management than upon legislation.

It is made the duty of the Commissioner of Labor to publish this list. We must confide in some one for that purpose, if the policy be adopted. We have confided in him as to much greater powers than those provided for in the bill now offered. One of the sections of the bill reported by the Committee on Education and Labor and passed the other day by the Senate directs that officer to procure information concerning and to make a report relating to the effect upon prices, wages, and productions of that class of new creations called trusts, and combinations of capital and labor. I do not conceive of duties any more difficult or delicate than those imposed by the section in the bill already passed by the Senate. Certainly they are much more arduous, much more laborious, much more responsible than any of the labors imposed upon him by the provisions of the bill now offered.

This bill is a modification of an amendment which I had the honor to offer the other day to the bill reported by the honorable Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] as chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor. I took the liberty, as the amendment could only appear in print as a portion of my remarks, to modify it before it was printed, to obviate some objections made then upon the occasion of its first presentation.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] was of the opinion that the amendment then offered made no limitation as to the publication, and that millions might be published. Under the present bill the number is limited to a number equal to that of the Army and Navy Registers, and the same provision is made with respect to the size and contents.

These provisions thus submitted are reasonable. They will commend themselves as such to any Senators who may have the slightest inclination to favor legislation of this character.

The honorable Senator from New Hampshire made very earnest opposition to the adoption of the amendment on the ground that its adoption might endanger the passage of the Department of Labor bill, or, at least, retard it—perhaps defeat it altogether. That objection is certainly obviated by making the subject-matter, as in the present bill, one of an independent measure.

Allow me to say in passing that the honorable Senator from New Hampshire labored under a grave misapprehension in supposing that this amendment was by me offered as a facetious amendment to the Department of Labor bill. It may only be the very keen sense of humor of the honorable Senator which could detect anything like facetiousness in the amendment as first offered, in the bill now proposed, or in any of the remarks made in support of either. Give me leave, however, to prevent all possible misconstruction in future, to say that the measure now offered is a serious proposition, and that it very nearly relates to a subject-matter of very serious gravity and of most important concern.

It was not my intention the other day to cast any ridicule whatever upon the Army and Navy Registers, as was then intimated upon this floor, but only to contrast sharply the well-known, established, and long-accustomed usage of this Government in the recognition which it has given to the arts of destruction in the various bureaus and departments of the War and Navy, with the recognition, late, tardy, even now seemingly reluctant, bestowed upon the arts of construction, the useful arts of peace, the practice of which has been so glorious and beneficent upon the civic life and growth of the Republic.

In publishing the Army and Navy Registers, however, we only copy others. I believe every Government in the world issues a similar publication. In passing this bill providing for the publication of the Labor Register we shall act without precedent and without example. I do not think there is any other Government in the world which makes such a publication, or anything like it; nor do I think there is any other Government in the world which makes the pretense, a very lofty pretension, eternally emphasized, forever emblazoned in gigantic italics, that this is a Government of, for, and by the people. If it be such, why may we not do somewhat more for the people, even of this kind, than that which is required or directed by the policy of other nations?

This, indeed, may be considered a very little thing. It may lead to something greater. It may be considered so insignificant as not to justify a second mention here in this presence. I admit that I may have been guilty of that solecism. Even though it be a trifle, we must remember trifles may be done with a grace which shall make them large.

I move the reference of the bill to the Committee on Education and Labor, and I trust it will have a favorable and early consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

RELIGION AND SCHOOLS.

Mr. BLAIR introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 86) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States respecting establishments of religion and free public schools; which was read the first time by its title.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask that the joint resolution may be read at length and lie on the table.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, and ordered to lie on the table, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be, and hereby is, proposed to the States, to become valid when ratified by the Legislatures of three-fourths of the States, as provided in the Constitution:

"ARTICLE —.

"SECTION 1. No State shall ever make or maintain any law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

"SEC. 2. Each State in this Union shall establish and maintain a system of free public schools adequate for the education of all the children living therein between the ages of six and sixteen years, inclusive, in the common branches of knowledge, and in virtue, morality, and the principles of the Christian religion. But no money raised by taxation imposed by law, or any money or other property or credit belonging to any municipal organization or to any State or to the United States, shall ever be appropriated, applied, or given to the use or purposes of any school, institution, corporation, or person whereby instruction or training shall be given in the doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances peculiar to any sect, denomination, organization, or society being or claiming to be religious in its character; nor shall such peculiar doctrines, tenets, belief, ceremonials, or observances be taught or inculcated in the free public schools.

"SEC. 3. To the end that each State, the United States, and all the people thereof, may have and preserve governments republican in form and in substance, the United States shall guaranty to every State and to the people of every State and of the United States the support and maintenance of such a system of free public schools as is herein provided.

"SEC. 4. Congress shall enforce this article by legislation when necessary."

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. HOAR submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Post-Office appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. CALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FARWELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia; which was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. EDMUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Post-Office appropriation bill, relating to Central and South American mail facilities; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. EDMUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill, relating to the Congo Commission; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. EDMUNDS submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill, relating to the Congo agent and consular-general; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BERRY submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL DAM.

Mr. CULLOM submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate as soon as practicable, whatever information may be in possession of the War Department in relation to the destruction of the Government dam at the Rock Island Arsenal by the recent floods in the Mississippi River, and as to the damages resulting therefrom, and the effect of the destruction of said dam upon the operations of the arsenal and the factories and saw-mills at Moline and Rock Island; and also to submit to the Senate without delay an estimate of the amount necessary for the reconstruction of said dam, and for the immediate construction of a temporary dam which will restore the water-power and log harbor, and which can be used as a coffer-dam when the permanent dam is reconstructed.

STATE BONDS HELD BY THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, and am led to do it by seeing the Indian appropriation bill reported with a pretty heavy amount of appropriations for interest on trust-fund stocks, many of which are, I have understood, the stocks of States that do not pay the interest. I think it desirable that the Committee on Indian Affairs should make inquiry into that subject, and see how the matter stands. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Indian Affairs be, and it hereby is, instructed to examine into the condition of the bonds of any and every State held by the United States or under its authority, either in trust or otherwise, and to report the respective amounts of such bonds of each State, and if overdue how long overdue, and the amount of arrears of interest thereon, and also whether there is now any legal method of enforcing payment thereof, and if not, whether any such method can be devised, and to report by bill or otherwise.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5445) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1851) providing for an international marine conference to secure greater safety for life and property at sea, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 409) for the relief of Thomas W. Lord; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also returned to the Senate, in compliance with its request, the bill (S. 1948) to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River, in the Choctaw Nation, Near Fort Smith, Ark.

HETTIE K. PAINTER.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. PADDOCK. I ask unanimous consent to make a conference report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to submit a conference report.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection, but I supposed the morning business was through.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The conference report submitted by the Senator from Nebraska will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3839) granting a pension to Hettie K. Painter, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House concur in the Senate amendment to the said bill.

ALGERNON S. PADDOCK,
C. K. DAVIS,
D. TURPIE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
J. L. CHIPMAN,
C. FRENCH,
E. N. MORRILL,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like to hear the report explained. It is impossible to understand it by the mere reading.

Mr. PADDOCK. It is a pension case——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair suggests to the Senator from Nebraska that the conference report can not be submitted without the papers, which do not appear in the hands of the clerks.

Mr. PADDOCK. I supposed the papers were on the Secretary's desk. That being the case, I withdraw the report.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Then the report should not be made here until the papers come over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report is not in order, and is withdrawn.

CUSTOMS AND OTHER DEFICIENCIES.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 9788.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] has moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am willing to yield, this being an appropriation bill, but I give notice that after the bill is disposed of I shall again submit my motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9788) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read.

Mr. ALLISON. Let the bill be read for amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. For amendment. The amendments of the Committee on Appropriations will be acted on as they are reached in the reading of the bill.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to defray the expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, in addition to the amount heretofore appropriated, the sum of $450,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be expended by, or under the direction of, the Secretary of the Treasury, who is authorized to cause to be paid therefrom the full compensation which the employés in the customs-revenue service would have been entitled to receive had no order been made reducing their compensation in consequence of an estimated deficiency in the appropriation.

Mr. EDMUNDS. If the bill is being read for amendment, I should like to have the Senator from Iowa explain, before the reading proceeds further, how it happens that $450,000 are wanted to pay employés compensation which would be due but for some order. I think the Senate would be glad to know what the facts about that are.

Mr. BECK. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to explain why the committee struck out the next paragraph.

Mr. ALLISON. The appropriation for the payment of the expenses of collecting the customs revenue is a permanent appropriation of five and a half million dollars, payable semi-annually; that is, one-half the appropriation is available at the beginning of each half year.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Under a standing law?

Mr. ALLISON. It is under a standing law. It is under section 3687 of the Revised Statutes. That appropriation at its present amount was originally made in 1871. For many years it has been found insufficient to pay the necessary employés in collecting the customs revenue. The Secretary in his last annual report called attention to this and to the necessity of increasing this appropriation.

Section 3687 is as follows:

SEC. 3687. There is appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,750,000 for the expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for each half year, in addition to such sums as may be received from fines, penalties, and forfeitures connected with the customs, and from fees paid into the Treasury by customs officers, and from storage, cartage, drayage, labor, and services.

That appropriation has been found in the last two or three years to be less than is necessary for the payment of those who are engaged in collecting the customs revenue.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator if he has the figures to show how much the deficiency has been for the last two or three or four years, per year?

Mr. ALLISON. Last year it was $233,000 in round numbers. This year the Secretary states that it will be $450,000. One reason why the deficiency is growing larger is found in the fact that the fees contemplated in that section of the Revised Statutes have been gradually repealed. I think the entire amount of the fees for the current fiscal year is less than $200,000. By various acts that have been passed from time to time we have gradually removed the fees that collectors of customs were formerly accustomed to receive.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator if there is not some report from the Secretary of the Treasury which shows specifically the diminution of these sources of revenue and the causes therefor, and, as it is supposed, of the increase of the expenses under another head, so as to require an increase of the standing appropriation?

Mr. ALLISON. There is a full statement found in House of Representatives report, No. 2024, made at this session, and also in the last annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury, an extract from which I have before me. The Secretary in his annual report states:

By changes in the statutes since that date—

That is since 1871—

By changes in the statutes since that date the first two accounts have greatly fallen off, while the last one has responded to the increase of business, and the exhibit for the fiscal year 1887 is as follows:

From fines, penalties, and forfeitures	$160,205.41
From fees of customs officers	144,817.53
From storage, cartage, etc	748,014.92
Total	1,053,037.86

That sum, of course, was added to the $5,500,000 provided in the statutes. These items of fees, fines, penalties, etc., have been reduced so that they amount to only $1,053,637.86.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Reduced from non-collection or from changes in the law?

Mr. ALLISON. The amount from storage, cartage, etc., being one of the items, has been increased to $748,014.92 from $409,587.69. The fees of customs officers have been reduced by law, by various statutes, to $144,817.53, as against $585,887.69, a large reduction. Fines, penalties, and forfeitures, which in 1871 amounted to $952,579.86, are reduced to $160,205.41 in 1887.

I will say here that there are practically no revenues coming in now from fines, penalties, and forfeitures. Since the act of 1874, called the anti-moiety act, there has been a constant, gradual reduction of receipts from that source, there being now practically no fines, penalties, and forfeitures as compared with the old time.

Mr. EDMUNDS. But how is that accounted for? Is it because the importers and smugglers have ceased their unlawful transactions, or because there is no stimulus to the officers of the United States to hunt them out and bring them to punishment?

Mr. ALLISON. It is the result of various causes. One section of the statute to which I have referred is repealed in our undervaluation law, whereby the burden of proof is put on the man who is charged with fraud. The law now requires that the jury shall specially find that the importer was guilty of fraud. Perhaps there will never be a conviction under such a law. These fines have been gradually reduced, so that it is necessary I think that the sum here provided should be appropriated in addition to the amount now available for the purpose of collecting the customs revenues.

The Secretary of the Treasury on the 1st of April, or perhaps about the last of March, issued an order reducing the pay of a large number of employés at the various custom-houses 40 per cent., in order to keep the expenditure within the appropriation.

Mr. SHERMAN. Does not the Secretary of the Treasury advise the continuance of the old mode of appropriating for the collection of the revenue—a gross appropriation for the whole service?

Mr. ALLISON. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. My own impression is that the idea of itemizing the appropriation for this particular branch of the service, or indeed any branch of the service, and fixing specific salaries and so on, is all wrong. I think the Committee on Appropriations would relieve themselves from a great deal of trouble and relieve the Department of a great deal of expense in keeping the various accounts of itemized appropriations, if instead of that system they would report general appropriations, and those to a great extent of a permanent character.

Mr. ALLISON. The House of Representatives in this bill propos

to repeal section 3687 of the Revised Statutes, which makes a permanent appropriation for collecting the customs revenue.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is precisely what I wished to call attention to.

Mr. ALLISON. We recommend, and I think for substantial reasons, that this ought not to be done.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is right.

Mr. ALLISON. The Committee on Appropriations, after investigating this subject, recommend the striking out of lines 16 to 26 inclusive, for the reason that we think this change, if made at all, should be made before this section of the Revised Statutes is repealed, so that we shall not be left without the necessary means to collect the revenue. If we repeal the section of the Revised Statutes making this permanent appropriation without at the same time providing an appropriation for collecting the revenue, it will rest then with the House of Representatives or with the Senate to stop the collection of the revenue by withholding the necessary appropriations. Therefore the committee recommend that these lines be stricken out.

Mr. McPHERSON. May I ask the Senator from Iowa a question?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. McPHERSON. I ask if the Treasury Department has furnished the Committee on Appropriations an itemized statement as to the particular objects to which the appropriation is applied; or has the Committee on Appropriations not appropriated heretofore what the Department asked for?

Mr. ALLISON. For this particular service, for the collection of the customs revenue, there is provided a permanent appropriation, originally made at the present amount in 1871. We do not appropriate for collecting the customs in the annual appropriation bills; but there is a gross sum appropriated in bulk permanently. That sum has been found inadequate to pay for the necessary service in making these collections.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if he can tell us what would be the statistical comparison from year to year in respect of the amount of fees, fines, penalties, and forfeitures; the fees of customs officers, the fees for storage, cartage, etc., from 1871 when that law of permanent appropriation was established down to this time? Is there anything which will enable the Senate or any member of it to see how the practical operation of this law has worked from year to year?

The Secretary of the Treasury in his last report only compares the year 1870-'71 with the year 1886-'87, showing a reduction of receipts from these sources of fines, penalties, and forfeitures, fees of customs officers, storage, cartage, etc., of $895,017.38. That compares two different years that are sixteen years apart. Now, how was it during that period, or for the last six or eight or ten years? Is there anything to show that this diminution in the collection of fines, penalties, forfeitures, fees, etc., has arisen from the legislation of Congress putting questions between the United States and the importers and informers, etc., in a different attitude from what they were before, and thus leaving us to infer that it was the legislation which has produced this diminution, or is it some want of administration? That is what I should like to find out.

Mr. ALLISON. I have not before me at this moment a statistical table showing the amounts received annually from fines, penalties, and forfeitures, but I venture to state from my general knowledge of the subject that it will appear—and if any Senator will send for the reports of the Secretary of the Treasury for 1876, 1877, and 1878, for illustration, which would be ten years ago—it will be found that the receipts from fines, penalties, and forfeitures fell down immediately after the legislation of 1874. I do not believe that under any administration any considerable sum will be realized from fines, penalties, and forfeitures until we change our customs laws.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator one other question?

Mr. ALLISON. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I ask when we first began to make this appropriation additional to the permanent appropriation, and by what amount? What year did we begin to have these special deficiency bills for this purpose, and how much in each year have we appropriated thereby?

Mr. ALLISON. I have not the data to answer fully on that subject for each particular year. We have appropriated for a number of years small sums. Last year I know the appropriation was in round numbers $235,000. Not only these receipts from fines, penalties, and forfeitures have been falling off, but the fees of customs officers have been decreased since the legislation of 1883 respecting the fees and charges made on our vessels. Up to that time the collectors and surveyors of the small ports received fees from charges upon vessels, tonnage, etc., but by the act of 1883, or perhaps 1884, all these fees were repealed, so that the fees of customs officers have been largely reduced from year to year since that time.

The Secretary of the Treasury submitted a table, which is in the report of the House committee, beginning with the year 1884, showing the cost of the collection of revenue from customs, or rather the percentage of the cost as compared with the amount collected, showing a constant diminution of that percentage for the last few years. For 1887 it was 3.12 per cent., and for 1888 it is put at 2.98 per cent., even with this additional appropriation of $450,000. I did not anticipate that there would be required a detailed statement of these appropriations for this period. I can have it made up if the Senator desires to have entire accuracy in regard to this bill, and furnish later in the day a detailed statement.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I should like to see just how the amount is made up.

Mr. ALLISON. From a general knowledge of this subject, I am satisfied that these amounts have been constantly diminishing, while the expenses of collecting the revenue have been constantly increasing in amount.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Can the Senator at the same time put into his statement the total amount of increase of customs business? Naturally, with such an increase, if the force was not raised before, there might be expected to be an increase in the number of persons employed. Can he put into that statement figures showing the whole number of persons employed in the revenue service of every kind for the last ten years, year by year, so that we may see whether the force employed has kept pace with, or fallen behind, or outstretched the supposed increase of business?

Mr. ALLISON. I am afraid all that can not be obtained within a very short time. I ask that the bill may be considered as respects the other items at this time.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Very well; let us pass over this point for the time being.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The reading will proceed.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I should like to have a general statement as to the causes of the increase in the cost of the collection of the revenue over any previous time, if such be the fact. If the cost of collection is in excess of what it has heretofore been, it might be the subject of inquiry; but I understand from the Senator from Iowa that the Secretary of the Treasury states that the cost is less now than it has been heretofore by percentages. Therefore I can see no reason for going into a list of the number of employés, etc. If the revenues are collected at a less cost than formerly, it ought to be satisfactory to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I do not think, with great respect to my friend from Delaware, that that answer would precisely meet the whole of the case. If the revenues of the United States for the last year should have suddenly increased by, for illustration, $50,000,000, supposing the expenditures to have been $5,000,000 for collection and the expenses had risen by $1,000,000 when there were $50,000,000 more coming in, the percentage of cost would be less than it was before; but that would not prove at all that there was no extravagance in the administration of 1874—of course there has been none during this Administration; we all understand that; but as to the administration of 1874 it would not prove at all that they had not been extravagant in employing too many persons. The percentage argument, therefore, would be fallacious.

Mr. ALLISON. I am satisfied that for the last ten or twelve years there has been a constant increase in the amount of revenue, and therefore a constant diminution of the percentage of the cost of collecting it, because during all this time substantially the same force has been engaged. So I do not think that the suggestion of the Senator from Delaware will meet the suggestion made by the Senator from Vermont.

But I want to say another thing to the Senator from Delaware, that a permanent appropriation for the collection of our revenue from customs has existed for more than fifty years, and taking the amount collected since 1861 there has been a most marked diminution. Under the tariff of 1857 and under the tariff of 1846 it cost $4,000,000 per annum to collect the revenue, in round numbers, running along the same appropriation from year to year during all that period of time. However, I will furnish the Senator from Vermont and the Senate a full statement of the receipts from fines, penalties, and forfeitures, etc., and also a full statement of the cost from year to year since 1874, as I understand the Senator desires.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The reading of the bill will proceed. The Chair understands the Senator from Iowa to ask that the reading be resumed at section 2.

Mr. ALLISON. No, sir; at line 16 of section 1.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment there proposed will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. The Committee on Appropriations report an amendment in section 1, to strike out the clause from line 16 to line 26, inclusive, as follows:

That section 3687 of the Revised Statutes, appropriating, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,750,000 for the expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for each half year in addition to such sums as may be received from fines, penalties, and forfeitures connected with the customs, and from fees paid into the Treasury by customs officers, and from storage, cartage, drayage, labor, and services, be, and the same is hereby, repealed, to take effect from and after June 30, 1889.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] withdraws his objection to the consideration of the first section if the committee will furnish the detailed statement he called for in the nature of a report. We shall do so.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The reading will proceed.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the bill.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, at the end of section 3, to add to the bill:

Senate:

For contingent expenses for fiscal year 1888, namely: For postage stamps for the office of the Secretary of the Senate, $25.

For expenses of maintaining and equipping horses and mail-wagons for carrying the mails, $1,000.

For materials for folding, $2,000.

For folding speeches and pamphlets, at a rate not exceeding $1 per thousand, $4,000.

For fuel, oil, and cotton waste, and advertising for heating apparatus, $3,500.

For furniture and repairs of furniture, $3,000.

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, $6,000.

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, for fiscal year 1887, $920.37.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was to add:

House of Representatives:

For contingent expenses for fiscal year 1888, namely: For materials for folding, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CULLOM. Pending that motion I ask the Senator to yield to me for a motion. I desire to move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield for that purpose?

Mr. HOAR. Yes, sir.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] moves that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 409) for the relief of Thomas W. Lord was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

AMENDMENT TO RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. DANIEL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

INTERNATIONAL MARINE CONFERENCE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1851) providing for an international marine conference to secure greater safety for life and property at sea.

On motion of Mr. FRYE, it was

Resolved, That the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the said bill, and ask a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

By unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the President *pro tempore*.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* appointed Mr. EDMUNDS, Mr. FRYE, and Mr. MORGAN.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After four hours and twenty-five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, May 28, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *May* 25, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by Mr. ROGERS, as Speaker *pro tempore*, who directed the reading of the following:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *May* 25, 1888.

Hon. JOHN H. ROGERS, of Arkansas, is hereby designated to preside as Speaker *pro tempore* at the session of to-day.

JOHN G. CARLISLE, *Speaker*.

JOHN B. CLARK, Jr.,
Clerk of House of Representatives.

Prayer was offered by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JUDICIAL EXPENSES IN UTAH.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimates of deficiencies in the appropriations for expenses of the United States courts and of Territorial courts in Utah; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

WAR CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House letters from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting copies of findings of fact in the cases of the following named claimants against the United States: W. M. Hawkins, Louisa Schrader, Harriet Jones, administratrix; Abner Lewis, James W. Allen, administrator, and Joshua Baker; which were severally referred to the Committee on War Claims.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. SAWYER, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. DOUGHERTY, for one week, on account of important business.

BRIDGE ACROSS TENNESSEE RIVER.

Mr. HOUK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday morning, during my absence in the Committee on Elections, the bill (H. R. 7783) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Knoxville, Tenn., was laid before the House with certain amendments of the Senate, which were non-concurred in. As those amendments were merely formal, I move to reconsider the vote by which they were non-concurred in. I desire to have the amendments concurred in.

Mr. FORNEY. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The motion to reconsider will be entered, but the call for the regular order prevents action upon that motion now. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. I have a privileged report.

Mr. FORNEY. Of course I do not desire to interfere with privileged reports.

IMPROVEMENT OF MOUTH OF BRAZOS RIVER.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The report sent to the desk by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. STEWART] will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rivers and Harbors, having duly considered the bill referred to it entitled "A bill for the improvement of the mouth of Brazos River, in Texas," report the same back to the House with the recommendation that it lie on the table; and in lieu thereof they report a substitute, which accompanies this report, and recommend the passage of the substitute.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. On what ground does the gentleman from Texas claim that this is a privileged report?

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. It is a report from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, which has the right to report at any time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the opinion of the Chair this is not a privileged report.

Mr. STEWART, of Texas. I ask that, at any rate, the report be accepted. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] has given way for it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order has been demanded.

ELIZA WRIGHT OWEN.

Mr. HERMANN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. In the early part of yesterday's session, during my absence, the bill (S. 42) granting a pension to Eliza Wright Owen, which was returned from the Senate with a request for a conference as to certain House amendments, was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. I now wish to inquire whether that was the proper course under the rules; whether a conference should not have been granted, as a matter of course, in accordance with the request of the Senate?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill took its regular course. If the gentleman had been present, he might have asked for a conference; but in his absence the bill was referred, in accordance with the usual parliamentary course.

Mr. HERMANN. Well, Mr. Speaker, if it be now in order, and if there be no objection, I will now ask, inasmuch as I was not present yesterday morning——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. No request for unanimous consent is now in order, the regular order having been demanded. The regular order is the call of committees.

FILING OF REPORTS.

Mr. LANHAM. I ask unanimous consent that the call of committees for reports be dispensed with, and that gentlemen having reports to make may file them with the Clerk.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the call of committees for reports will be dispensed with, and leave will be granted that reports of a private nature (this being Friday) may be filed with the Clerk for reference to the appropriate Calendars. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The following reports were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. WALKER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 78) granting a pension to La Fayette Franklin; and

A bill (H. R. 8473) for the relief of Tarrell W. Young.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. THOMPSON, of California, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2126) to pension Winemah Riddell; and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA AND SAMUEL STRONG.

Mr. GROUT, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported back favorably the bill (S. 26) to arbitrate and settle the question at issue between the District of Columbia and Samuel Strong; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ALLARD & CROZIER.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 10029) for the relief of Allard & Crozier; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

OBSTRUCTION TO NAVIGATION BROAD CREEK, DELAWARE.

Mr. PHELAN, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2123) to authorize the removal of an obstruction to the navigation of Broad Creek, in the State of Delaware; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. LANHAM. I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering business on the Private Calendar.

Mr. RANDALL. I hope that motion will not prevail. The contest to-day is between private business and the legislative appropriation bill. If this motion be voted down we can proceed with the appropriation bill.

Mr. LANHAM. This question is not debatable, I believe.

Mr. RANDALL. I do not wish to debate it further. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Debate is not in order.

The motion of Mr. LANHAM was rejected, there being—ayes 34, noes 58.

Mr. FORNEY. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that under our rules we have a second morning hour, which has for some time past been persistently ignored. I would like to know whether it is not necessary to dispense with that before the motion of the gentleman from Alabama can be entertained.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. There is no second hour on Friday.

The motion of Mr. FORNEY was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. BLOUNT in the chair, and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9377) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL.

The CHAIRMAN. Of the time remaining for general debate the gentleman from Ohio has seven minutes and the gentleman from Alabama fifteen.

Mr. FORNEY. We do not wish any further debate, and I now ask that the bill be read by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the first paragraph of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

That the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, for the objects hereinafter expressed, namely.

Mr. NELSON. I make the point of order against so much of the clause contained in the fifth line of the paragraph just read as is expressed in the words "in full compensation." I make the point of order on the ground that it changes existing law.

There are several items of appropriation in this bill, as I understand, that lessen the salaries paid to public officials by existing law; and the result of the adoption of the words to which I have called attention would fix the compensation of these officials at a different rate than that provided by the existing law wherever the salary is cut down by this bill. The words to which I have referred, therefore, I think should be stricken out, and against them I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be that the point of order to which the gentleman refers would be applicable to certain paragraphs of the bill as they are reached, where the changes to which he refers in salary are made. When such paragraphs are reached the gentleman can interpose the point of order, and the Chair will rule upon it.

Mr. RANDALL. I would like to say a word in this connection. It is due to this House to say that the effect of the point of order, if sustained, would be to involve the Government probably in a great number of lawsuits, to the extent perhaps of two hundred or more, and involve seventy-odd thousand dollars. If the gentleman from Minnesota takes the responsibility in that connection, I do not know that I have any reason to complain of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has made no ruling as yet upon the point of order submitted.

Mr. RANDALL. It is the existing law to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has stated that it may be as the paragraphs of the bill are reached the point of order would be applicable to them where salaries are changed.

The Clerk read as follows:

For mileage of Senators, $33,000.

For compensation of the officers, clerks, messengers, and others in the service of the Senate, $370,308.80, namely.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of inquiring whether in this paragraph the item of appropriation is included for the compensation of clerks to Senators?

Mr. FORNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Then we are not to have the farce of last year repeated?

Mr. FORNEY. The gentleman can move to strike it out if he so desires.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of secretary: For Secretary of the Senate, $5,000, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund of the Senate, and for compensation as disbursing officer of salaries of Senators, $250; hire of horse and wagon for the Secretary's office, $700, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. TAULBEE. I desire to inquire of the gentleman in charge of the bill whether or not the amount appropriated here for hire of horse and wagon for the Secretary's office, $700, "or so much thereof as may be necessary," is in the customary form. I believe in the appropriation bills generally the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary" for this item have not been heretofore used. If the committee have assurances that the amount appropriated in the bill is sufficient for the service, I think the proviso is proper; otherwise it is not proper, for the reason that it might impair the service, unless the officer will agree to do the work for the amount in gross. The item as embodied here will require an itemized account.

Mr. FORNEY. The bill makes provision, as the gentleman will observe, for the expenses of the Senate for the approaching short session. The committee are satisfied that the amount appropriated will be sufficient after conference with this officer.

Mr. RANDALL. And heretofore no vouchers have been presented for this service.

Mr. TAULBEE. I only desired to know the facts.

The Clerk read as follows:

Document-room: For superintendent of the document-room (Amzi Smith), $3,000; two assistants in document-room, at $1,440 each; one clerk to superintendent of document-room, $1,440; one page in document-room, $960; in all, $8,220.

Mr. TAULBEE. I would like to inquire the object of the committee in inserting the name of the official in charge of the document-room at this point?

Mr. FORNEY. The Senate insist upon it, and have for seven or eight years past. He is an old and trusted employé, whose services they consider indispensable. If stricken out here it will be inserted in the Senate and insisted upon as an amendment to the bill.

Mr. TAULBEE. I move to strike it out, and I desire to make a few observations in that connection.

Mr. HOLMAN. The gentleman can make the point of order upon it.

Mr. TAULBEE. I do make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is now too late to interpose the point of order.

Mr. TAULBEE. I have, of course, the utmost respect for the opinion of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman had engaged in a colloquy with the gentleman from Alabama before submitting the question of order.

Mr. TAULBEE. I thought I had simply inquired the object of the provision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the point of order is too late; but, unless there be objection, will hear the gentleman briefly upon it. The only object of the Chair is to facilitate the consideration of the bill.

Mr. RANDALL. I object to going back.

Mr. TAULBEE. Then I move to strike out the name of the official, and in that connection desire to offer these brief observations.

I do not regard the services of any man as indispensable for the proper execution of any public office in this country. I do not think that we ought in this case or in any other case to fasten upon the service of the country any one particular man, for the reason that he might, after the passage of the bill, for instance, prove incompetent by sickness or from any other cause, and that would certainly embarrass the disbursing officer of this fund. I do not understand that the services of any man are indispensable to the execution of the duties of any particular office. I do not believe there is any man in this country who is alone competent to discharge the functions of any public office under our system.

This is a system of favoritism which has been carried on both in the Senate and in the House of Representatives for a number of years. I think it is time we were dispensing with such foolishness, if I may be indulged in that expression. I do not wish to be unparliamentary in my language in regard to the committee or disrespectful to them; but I think every man ought to stand on an equal footing in the matter of office-holding in this country. I believe this is a system of civil-service reform which goes beyond any theory which has been advocated by the most sanguine adherent of that system; and I think we ought to quit this way of doing things and strike this name out of this bill. If the officer who has control of this appointment sees proper to retain this man I have nothing to say; but I think it ought to be left optional with the heads of Departments and bureaus who are held responsible for the duties of their officers to select their own appointees.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman from Kentucky may be entirely right as to what is the proper rule in this matter. Nevertheless the Senate has always claimed the absolute right to resist the least interference with the manner of payment, the amount of payment, and the number of employés in that body. It is idle to strike this out for it will be inserted by the Senate, as has been the case for years, as stated by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY].

Mr. TAULBEE. May I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question?

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAULBEE. Has the gentleman from Pennsylvania any assurance that the present Senate insists on the retention of this name in the appropriation bill?

Mr. RANDALL. I have. The Senate is composed mostly of the same members, and so far as I know will take the same course in the future as in the past. I know their character for sufferance—I say that with all respect to the Senate.

Mr. TAULBEE. I believe, even if it is true that the Senate will insist on this, the House should not assume the responsibility in anticipation of the action of the Senate with reference to a matter so flagrant as this, in contradiction to every theory which the gentleman from Pennsylvania would dare to advocate on this floor or before the country.

The question being taken on Mr. TAULBEE'S amendment, the Chairman stated that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. TAULBEE. I call for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 10, noes 49.

So (further count not being called for) the amendment was not agreed to.

The Clerk read the following paragraph:

Capitol police:

For one captain, $1,600; three lieutenants, $1,200; twenty-two privates, $1,100 each; and eight watchmen, at $900 each; in all, $36,600, one half to be disbursed by the Secretary of the Senate and the other half to be disbursed by the Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Mr. TAULBEE. I wish to inquire if the present salaries of the watchmen of the Capitol police are fixed by law?

Mr. RANDALL. In reply to the gentleman from Kentucky, I will say that all salaries of employés connected with the House and Senate are fixed by the appropriation act.

Mr. TAULBEE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to amend this section by striking out in line 21, "$900" and inserting "$1,000."

The amendment was not agreed to.

The Clerk read the following paragraph under the heading "House of Representatives."

For mileage, $110,624.

Mr. TAULBEE. I move to amend by inserting, after the word "dollars," in line 11, the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary for actual necessary traveling expenses."

Mr. FORNEY. I make the point of order that there is no law providing for the proposition in this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read the following paragraph:

Office of the Clerk: For Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, $5,000; and for hire of horses and wagons and cartage for the use of Clerk's office, $700, or so much thereof as may be necessary; for Chief Clerk, Journal Clerk, and two reading clerks, at $3,600 each, and for the journal clerk for preparing Digest of the Rules, $1,000 per annum; tally clerk, $3,000; for printing and bill clerk, and disbursing clerk, at $2,500 each; for file clerk, and enrolling clerk, at $2,250 each; for assistant disbursing clerk, assistant enrolling clerk, resolution and petition clerk, newspaper clerk, index clerk, superintendent of document-room, and librarian, at $2,000 each; for distributing clerk, stationery clerk, and two assistant librarians, at $1,800 each; for one book-keeper and seven clerks, including three clerks to index private claims, at $1,600 each; for document clerk and locksmith, at $1,440 each; two messengers in the House library, at $1,314 each; one telegraph operator, one assistant to the file clerk, and two laborers in Clerk's document-room, at $900 each; one page, one laborer in bath-room, and four laborers, at $720 each; one assistant journal clerk, at $6 per day during the session, $726; one assistant index clerk, during the session and three months after its close, two hundred and eleven days, at $6 per day, $1,266; one messenger-boy in chief clerk's room, $300; in all, $83,320.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 21 insert the following: "Messenger to the Speaker, $1,000."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. In speaking to this amendment I desire to say just a word. This relates to the pay of the messenger who attends uniformly at the Speaker's room. The messenger there at present is merely a laborer who is detailed to that service, and, unlike other messengers, has other duties to perform. It is customary to make a small appropriation each year in the deficiency bill to supplement the laborer's pay of this messenger. But the Speaker believes that his messenger ought to be put upon a proper footing. He desires to have this messenger specially assigned to his room. The amount stated in my amendment is the proper and usual pay of messengers. Of course where the service is necessary this ought to be provided for as it is in every other instance.

Mr. FORNEY. We have allowed for thirty-two messengers, and given the Speaker a clerk at $1,600. We do not think any provision ought to be made for any additional messenger.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. That list does not include a messenger for the Speaker's room. If the gentleman has allowed for too many messengers in this bill, he ought to cut the number down. This is not one of those thirty-two messengers.

Mr. FORNEY. We think that thirty-two messengers are sufficient.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. If the gentleman has given too many laborers or too many messengers, let him cut the number down, but he should not cut off from the Speaker's room a messenger who is necessary for the transaction of our business. There can be no reason why we should not provide for this messenger, unless it be that he is a messenger for the Speaker's room or for some other reason that I can not imagine.

Mr. TAULBEE. Mr. Chairman, I am entirely in accord with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE]. I find in the Departments of this Government this state of facts existing: That persons are found working at desks alongside of each other, performing precisely the same work, some of them being paid $1,600 a year and others as low as $900, some of them even less than that; and the prevailing rule seems to be that those who get the most pay do the least work. Now, none of us believe that that is right. I believe that in the public service, as in private employments, individuals ought to be paid in accordance with the kind and amount of the work which they perform, and I know of no better way to impress the Departments of the Government with the sentiments of Congress in that respect than by conforming to it ourselves. I find that in the service of this House there are persons who are carried on the pay-rolls as laborers and are assigned to duty as messengers. Now, if it be a fact that the duty of a messenger is more onerous than the duty of a laborer and that a messenger is entitled to greater compensation than a laborer, then I see no reason why a person should be borne on the rolls as a laborer and assigned to duty as a messenger.

If, on the other hand, the duties of a messenger are not so difficult as those of a laborer, or that they are not entitled to more pay, then certainly we ought to reduce the compensation of the messengers. Now, in this case, the messenger to the Speaker's room is carried on the rolls as a laborer, and if his services are not found to be necessary among the laborers, then I say we ought to reduce the number of laborers, and put him on the roll as a messenger and give him a messenger's pay. I think it is time for this House to set an example in this matter and to conform to what we all concede to be the proper rule for the Departments. I hope the amendment will be adopted, and also that another amendment will be adopted reducing the number of laborers by one.

Mr. HOLMAN. A single word, Mr. Chairman. Of course, the committee would respect the views of the Speaker of the House in regard to the number of persons necessary to be employed in connection with the discharge of the duties of his office; but I do not understand that the Speaker himself recommends this, else I take it for granted that it would have been inserted by the Committee on Appropriations. But, sir, I wish to call attention to the fact that at the very threshold of the appropriations for the House of Representatives we are beginning to increase the compensation and the number of employés. Already the bill contains an additional clerk for the Speaker. He now has two. Over the existing law for the current year there is an increase of one clerk at $1,600, and it is now proposed to add another clerk at $1,000. The suggestion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. TAULBEE], that the laborer's roll be decreased by one, I predict will not be carried out.

The number of employés will not be reduced. I wish it could be, but I do not indulge that hope. This is simply a proposition to add another to the list of the employés of this House. I have no doubt that the House was surprised to hear the statement made a few days ago by a gentleman on the other side as to the number of persons employed at the several doors of this Chamber. That the number of employés of the House is beyond the wants of the public service is too obvious, and I do not believe that the Speaker of the House would desire to see the number increased.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, I understand that the person in question is now borne upon the rolls as a laborer, and that this is simply a proposition to transfer him to the messengers' roll.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is not the proposition.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. That is the fact.

Mr. BURROWS. I understand that that is the case, and that this is merely a proposition to change this man from one roll to another.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] propose to reduce the number of laborers?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Of course it ought to be done if there are too many of them; but we are not at that part of the bill now.

Mr. HOLMAN. But does the gentleman propose to move that amendment?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I leave that to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY], who has charge of the bill. I will certainly vote for it if he thinks there are too many laborers. I have not looked into the subject myself.

Mr. BURROWS. This amendment simply proposes to change this messenger from the laborers' to the messengers' roll—and certainly the Speaker of this House ought to be provided with a regular messenger.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] says he does not think the Speaker desires this. Of course I would not offer an amendment of this kind without asking the Speaker if he did desire it, and when the amendment was sent to me by his private secretary I did ask him and he said that he did wish this change made.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, under the present arrangement every year when the deficiency bill comes up we pay this same "laborer" $300 extra for messenger work; so that it simply resolves itself into making two bites of one cherry. If you are going to have this man do messenger work the practical business way is to pay him as a messenger and put him on the roll of messengers.

Mr. RANDALL. In fact, this does not involve an increase of this man's pay. He has served for many years in the capacity of messenger under Speakers of both political parties. He is a valuable man, and I do not know that the committee object to giving him adequate compensation, whatever the House may think to be right. But if this is to be done and this position as messenger is to be made a permanent one, there ought to be a decrease in the number of laborers; and for one I would prefer to have it understood now that such a decrease shall be made.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Of course the bill ought to be made harmonious in that respect; I presume the committee will take care of that matter. As has been remarked, the effect of this amendment is simply to give this man the same amount of money that we have in fact been voting him annually heretofore.

Mr. PETERS. I understand that this man is now on the laborers' roll at the regular rate of laborers' compensation; but that we are in the habit of giving him in the annual deficiency bill the difference between a laborer's pay and that which he would receive as a messenger. If that is the case, why not provide for the compensation in this bill at $1,000, the amount which he is actually paid each year?

Mr. RANDALL. He now performs laborer's work in addition to serving as messenger. The effect of this proposition may be to relieve him from his duty as a laborer.

The amendment of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, was agreed to.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I ask that the aggregate sum named at the close of the paragraph be increased to conform to the amendment just adopted.

Mr. FORNEY. It is the business of the Clerk to make corrections of that kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The change suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas will be made.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Chaplain of the House, $900.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I move to amend the clause just read by striking out "$900" and inserting "$1,000." I do not think this proposition needs any discussion. Gentlemen of the House who know the circumstances in which our Chaplain is situated, and his disability, must realize the propriety of increasing the present salary of $900 to $1,000. I hope this increase will be granted without any hesitation.

Mr. SPRINGER. Make it $1,200.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. At the suggestion of the gentleman on the other side [Mr. SPRINGER] I modify my amendment so as to make the salary $1,200. I think that is what it ought to be, and it is the amount which I originally intended to propose.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think it ought to be $1,200.

Mr. CANNON. Why not make it $1,500?

A MEMBER. Why not $2,000?

Another MEMBER. Because we can get all the prayers we require for $1,200.

Mr. SPRINGER. The salary was fixed at $900 with the idea that Congress should always employ some clergyman having a congregation in this city. This is entirely a religious question, and I hope gentlemen will look at it in the light which becomes us. We have now the benefit of the services of a most able and excellent gentleman as Chaplain, one who is an honor to this House and to the profession which he has adopted. I hope the House will not hesitate to make the salary adequate to the position.

It is well known to members that during the last winter our present Chaplain suffered great affliction by reason of long sickness, which entailed upon him large and unexpected expenses. He is now quite advanced in years, and may not be able to be with us very much longer. I think we should feel it our duty to give him at least the compensation which is now proposed.

Mr. CANNON. I wish to say only a word. When my colleague [Mr. SPRINGER] undertakes to do something religious I do not think we should interpose any obstruction. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Certainly not.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. I am heartily in favor of this increase, both because I think it right in itself and also because of the high character of the gentleman who is now acting as our Chaplain. But I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois, who has been here longer than most of us, how it happens that this salary has thus far been only $900. There must have been some reason for it.

Mr. SPRINGER. I stated that the salary had been fixed at that amount in the expectation that we should employ as Chaplain some clergyman having a congregation in this city, this sum being merely an addition to his regular salary. The effect has been generally to compel the House to make a selection under that restriction. But our present Chaplain has no congregation here; he is entirely dependent upon his compensation from Congress and upon the lectures which he delivers in vacation.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana. Is it understood that we are to pay this increase because of the increased necessity for prayer?

Mr. SPRINGER. There is a great necessity for it.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana. An increased necessity?

Mr. SPRINGER. Gentlemen have no idea of the great power required to bring salvation to such a body as this.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I wish to inquire whether, if this increase be now agreed to, the salary will continue at the increased rate hereafter when there may be some other Chaplain.

Mr. FORNEY. I admit that we have a most excellent Chaplain; but the salary for this officer for the last twenty-five years has been $900.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have not got through with my statement. I am trying to find out whether this amendment if adopted will operate as a permanent increase of the Chaplain's salary——

Several MEMBERS. Of course.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Or will it only continue for the year to which the bill applies?

Mr. SPRINGER. It can be fixed every year.

Mr. STRUBLE. But never decreased.

Mr. GROSVENOR. My own expectation is that the next House of Representatives will not require as much praying as this.

Mr. SPRINGER. Then we will let you select your own Chaplain and pay him out of your own pockets. It will not require much to pay for the services he will render. [Laughter.]

Mr. FORNEY. This salary has been $900 for the last twenty-five years. Now, if we increase the salary you must bear in mind that the increase will apply to the short session which is coming. We give now $900 for the four months, and I think that is a good salary. This bill only provides for the short session—four months.

Mr. HOLMAN. Three months really.

Mr. FORNEY. And he gets over $200 a month. That we regard as fair compensation.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be adopted, as I think it is a very proper one. It can not be expected that we can secure the services of a Chaplain of great ability for a compensation of $900 a year. Chaplains in ordinary churches do not get less than from $1,500 to $5,000 a year.

Mr. STRUBLE. Does the gentleman regard it as essential that the Chaplain of this House should be a man of very great ability?

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. It is just as proper that we should have a Chaplain of ability for the House of Representatives as for a church; probably more so. I do not see why we should not secure the services of a thoroughly able man.

Both sides will be better for having a sufficient appropriation for the purpose of securing the prayers of a competent person, and of course if they do not do any good they will not do any harm.

Mr. STRUBLE. I quite agree with the gentleman that it is proper to have a Chaplain; the only question, as I understand the gentleman's position, is whether the man who is to be employed for that service is to be able to make acceptable prayers.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. Well, it would certainly be better to have a man who was capable of doing so; and I think $900 is not sufficient to secure the services of a man of much ability to fill the position. Besides that, we should remember that if the Chaplain is to be here, as is usually the case during the session, four, or five, or six days in the week, that his duties in that connection will be as great in the aggregate as the duties of a preacher who attends church only once a week. I would be in favor of increasing the amount above the $1,200 proposed, but as that has been suggested I hope it will be adopted. The Chaplain that we have is most worthy of this advance, and needs it very much in consequence of his recent sickness.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. In answer to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STRUBLE] I desire to say that I had a good deal to do with schools in my day, and my experience has shown that it always takes a higher

order of ability to deal with an immature mind than is usually supposed. Applying that rule to this House, I think it is necessary that the Chaplain should be a man of considerable ability. [Laughter.]

Mr. STRUBLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out something, for the purpose of saying a word. [Laughter.]

I have no intention or desire of being understood as opposing a proper compensation to be paid to the Chaplain of the House; and I will concede what my friend from Indiana says, and agree with him, that the present gentleman who is officiating as Chaplain is in a condition to be entitled to our sympathy. I sympathize with him most deeply and appreciate his ability as Chaplain of the House. He is not only a man of intelligence, ability, and great learning, but a man of very great eloquence, and a man who is concise and of great brevity in his prayers. [Laughter.] I use the term to indicate conciseness of expression. He is conscientious in the discharge of his duty, and if I were called upon to vote personally for the benefit of the Chaplain of the House I would feel like voting an increase to this gentleman of from $1,200 to $1,500. But while he is the present occupant of that position, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the time will come when there will be a change, and possibly a man of less ability and better able to get along with a lower salary will be appointed.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan. And with a different religion.

Mr. STRUBLE. I do not say that. I do not think it is a matter that has any bearing upon this question; but I think it is well to continue the old rule for the present.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I know that all gentlemen in this House appreciate the qualities of the present Chaplain, and if we were not legislating on a great appropriation bill and at the very threshold of the bill, but were permitted to do what our own feelings would prompt, as a matter of favoritism, there would be little question that the proposition to increase this salary would meet with favor. But I know that a gentleman of the high character of the Chaplain of the House would not consent that members of this body should forget their duties to the country in the way of granting this increase as a matter of favoritism to him, and I do not believe that the constituency of my friend from Illinois would consent that at the very threshold of this great bill, carrying almost all the salaries of the Government, this departure should be made which will lay the foundation for a wide increase of all the salaries covered by the bill.

This salary has remained at the present rate for more than twenty-five years. It has always been satisfactory, and the office has always been filled by gentlemen of high standing and character. I hope that the House will not begin here at the threshold of this bill, according to the feelings of gentlemen and their sympathies, to increase a salary which is now high enough. The salaries of the employés of this House are all far beyond the average salaries paid in this country at the present time. Besides that, this appropriation is but for three months. Three hundred dollars a month is a pretty high salary, as carried by this bill, and yet it is proposed to increase it. As the appropriation stands in the bill the Chaplain will receive $10 a day for every day he renders any service to the House. I hope the increase, then, will not be made, but I do hope that if the committee determine to increase this salary or any other, it will provide that the increase shall be confined to the time during which the office shall be held by the present incumbent.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to say just one word in reply to my friend from Indiana. I am willing to take the responsibility before my constituents of voting the sum of money that is necessary for a proper salary to the Chaplain. I know the council of Jacksonville, Ill., if they wanted a chaplain, would be willing to pay him the necessary salary.

Mr. STRUBLE. Is that a Democratic town?

Mr. SPRINGER. No; it is largely Republican.

Mr. TAULBEE. Could you get a competent chaplain for that money?

Mr. SPRINGER. They would be willing, I feel assured, to pay for the services of a man so competent as this gentleman a salary on which he could live. There is no danger of setting a wrong precedent. I will say to the gentleman from Indiana that what relates to this office can not relate to any other. There is no other blind man led here every morning to perform his duties. It is an exceptional case. There never will be another, and I hope this will not be made a precedent. It will not be, and gentlemen need not be so afraid of increasing the salaries paid by this Government. The increase of $300 will not hurt you, and it will be a great benefit to him.

Mr. DOCKERY. I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. I understood the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] to say that this salary has been fixed at $900 for the last half a century.

Mr. RANDALL. It was so fixed in 1871; and it was always the same before that year, so far as we know.

Mr. DOCKERY. And this is a proposition to increase the salary?

Mr. SPRINGER. The reason is that hitherto we have been employing clergymen who had charges in this city, and the salary we voted was in addition to the compensation the clergyman received as the pastor of his church. But in this instance we have selected a man who had no other duty.

Mr. OATES. Then do you put this proposed increase of salary on the ground of mere charity?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, sir; I hold it is the duty of this House to provide itself with a Chaplain. The clergyman selected, although not participating in the deliberations of the House, must be here every day to perform the duty for which he is appointed. And if we require the service of a Chaplain we should pay him for that service. He must be here all the time. He can not go off on a lecturing tour; he can not visit his home in Illinois; he must be here; and for that reason he ought to be properly paid.

Mr. OATES. If it is a mere charity, let us put our hands in our own pockets and make up this amount.

Mr. SPRINGER. It is not a mere charity. There are many gentlemen in this city who would like to have this place at half the salary. We wanted a man of ability; we got him, and we are willing to pay him.

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to make this remark, that the Chaplain has never appeared before the Committee on Appropriations by letter or in person to ask an increase of salary.

Mr. SPRINGER. He has never asked me either to propose this increase. He is too modest to do so. I rest his case on his merits.

Mr. ROGERS. I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. We have too much disorder.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order is well taken. The Chair asks gentlemen to aid in preserving order.

Mr. FORNEY. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] asked if the salary of the Chaplain had not been $900 for the last fifty years. I will state to the gentleman that the appropriation act for 1871 fixed the salary of the Chaplain of the House at $900; and I presume that was the salary for a number of years prior to that. I may remark also that this is a salary given in a certain sense for a period of four months. There is a law which permits the Chaplain to draw the whole amount of his salary after four months' service.

Mr. KERR. I dislike to make any objection to this proposed increase of salary, because I know the great worth of the gentleman who is our Chaplain. He has been known for nearly half a century as one of the most worthy men in this country. But I do not think the service he has to perform is such as to require a compensation more than has been hitherto allowed.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] has shown a commendable interest in the Chaplain. I suppose he is a resident of that gentleman's district, and I do not wonder at his interest in his behalf. But we can not have chaplains from all of our districts, and I am a little surprised that the gentleman from Illinois, with all his professions with regard for economy, should go so far as to press this claim simply because the gentleman who is our Chaplain is a former constituent of his, a former resident of his district.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I offered this amendment without reference to the gentleman from Illinois. I had no conversation with him or with anybody else in regard to it. But when I saw in this bill that the Chaplain was only receiving a salary of $900 I was very much astonished. I do not think it is creditable to this House to give to the Chaplain such a salary. When gentlemen desire to practice economy with an overflowing Treasury, the surplus in which threatens to imperil the business interests of the country, I think the place to begin is not with the salary of the blind Chaplain. I think it ought to be $1,200. The Speaker's messenger is paid $1,000, and there are messengers in all the Departments of the Government getting from $1,000 to $1,500, and certainly I think $1,200 is not too much to pay our Chaplain.

Mr. KERR. Has there been any proposition to return to the principles of economy in regard to any of the offices? Has not the tendency been rather in the other direction?

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. That does not make any difference. The argument is all the more against the gentleman. If we have not heretofore begun to practice economy that is no reason why we should begin here and now. This gentleman lives in a distant State; he receives no mileage; he is required to be here day after day; and I say it is a wrong, a hardship, an injustice, to ask him, in view of his services, to receive a less sum than $1,200. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR, and there were—ayes 72, noes 72.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The point being made that no quorum has voted, the Chair will appoint to act as tellers the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY].

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 81, noes 82.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I move to strike out the words "nine hundred" and insert "eleven hundred."

The question was taken on the amendment, and the Chairman declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 27, noes 65.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. No quorum has voted.

The CHAIRMAN. The point being made that no quorum has voted,

the Chair will appoint to act as tellers the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY].

The tellers took their places, but before the count was completed,

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR said: Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the point of no quorum and move that the amount be made $1,000. That was my original motion.

The CHAIRMAN. What motion does the gentleman make?

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I modify my motion so as to strike out "nine hundred" and insert "one thousand."

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR, and the Chairman declared that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. I ask for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 47, noes 70.

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order having been made that no quorum has voted, the Chair will appoint to act as tellers the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY].

The committee divided, but before the count was completed Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR withdrew the point of no quorum.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Clerk: For Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, $5,000; and for hire of horses and wagons and cartage for the use of the Clerk's office, $700, or so much thereof as may be necessary; for Chief Clerk, Journal Clerk, and two reading clerks, at $3,600 each, and for the Journal clerk for preparing Digest of the Rules, $1,000 per annum; tally clerk, $3,000; for printing and bill clerk, and disbursing clerk, at $2,500 each; for file clerk and enrolling clerk, at $2,250 each; for assistant disbursing clerk, assistant enrolling clerk, resolution and petition clerk, newspaper clerk, index clerk, superintendent of document-room, and librarian, at $2,000 each; for distributing clerk, stationery clerk, and two assistant librarians, at $1,800 each; for one book-keeper and seven clerks, including three clerks to index private claims, at $1,600 each; for document clerk and locksmith, at $1,440 each; two messengers in the House library, at $1,314 each; one telegraph operator, one assistant to the file clerk, and two laborers in Clerk's document-room, at $900 each; one page, one laborer in the bath-room, and four laborers, at $720 each; one assistant Journal clerk, at $6——

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend on page 10, line 5, by striking out "for the Journal Clerk," and inserting "for a clerk to be designated by the Speaker."

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. WHEELER] has an amendment which comes in before that, and which I would like to have taken in connection with the prior paragraph.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I send up an amendment which I desire to offer.

The amendment was read, as follows:

In line 25, page 10, and in lines 1 and 2, page 11, strike out the words "at six dollars per day during the session, seven hundred and twenty-six dollars," and insert in lieu thereof the words "at eighteen hundred dollars."

Mr. HOLMAN. If that is subject to the point of order, I wish to reserve the point.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I am as much opposed as the most economical member of this House to tolerating an increase of salary in any case where the purpose or the effect is to give additional pay for work which can be properly done at the compensation heretofore provided in appropriation bills of this character, and I would not have offered the amendment were it not that it seems to be conceded that the amount paid the assistant Journal clerk is entirely out of proportion to the work and responsibility which attaches to the position.

In the Forty-third Congress the salary of this official was $3,000. In that Congress 5,050 bills were introduced and 711 reports made thereon; in all, 5,761. In the Forty-seventh Congress 8,055 bills were introduced and 2,044 reports were submitted; in all, 10,099. In the Forty-eighth Congress the bills increased to 8,637 and reports 2,692, in all 11,329. In the Forty-ninth Congress 11,510 bills were introduced and reports were made upon 4,181 of said bills; in all, 15,691. It will therefore be observed that the keeping of the Journal in the Forty-ninth Congress involved three times the labor that was required in the Forty-third Congress. In this Congress we have already introduced 10,066 bills, and the reports some days ago numbered 2,217.

I mention these facts to show the increase of the work connected with the Journal, and the absolute necessity of employing a clerk of the highest capability. I have just consulted with the distinguished chairman of the committee, and also with the gentleman [Mr. FORNEY] who has charge of the bill, and I feel authorized to say that they fully recognize the inadequacy of this official's compensation. After the bill now being considered was reported to the House, General Clark, our efficient clerk, addressed a letter to the committee, a paragraph of which I will read:

The bill recently reported from your committee provides for an assistant Journal Clerk, to be paid at a rate which, in my opinion, is entirely inadequate to the character and amount of work performed.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HOLMAN. I still reserve my point of order.

Mr. ROGERS obtained the floor and yielded his time to Mr. WHEELER.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for his courtesy in giving me time to explain the necessity for the amendment.

The Clerk of the House, with the experience of three Congresses as Clerk and double that number as a Member, gives his views upon this subject very clearly. In his letter to the Appropriation Committee he says:

I take this method of suggesting that the time has come when the rapid increase of the public business requires a higher rate of compensation than that provided in the bill.

If General Clark is right in this, and I believe the Committee on Appropriations do not question his opinion on this subject, it seems that now is the time to rectify what really appears to have been an inadvertence in the preparation of the bill. I will read further from the letter. General Clark says:

The position is one of great responsibility and labor, requiring the utmost accuracy and detail, and many hours of writing, a great deal of which must necessarily be performed after the adjournment of the House.

The Journal often reaches from forty to sixty pages of manuscript, nearly all of which is prepared by the assistant Journal clerk, the time of the Journal Clerk being constantly required upon the floor of the House.

This work has to be done by one man. It is a character of work which admits of no delay, and must be done with the most scrupulous accuracy.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. If this salary should not be increased, is there any danger that the gentleman who now occupies the position will resign? [Laughter.]

Mr. WHEELER. In reply to my friend who makes this inquiry I would state that I am informed that the gentleman who now performs the duty of assistant Journal clerk has been induced to remain by assurances that all proper efforts would be made to secure the permanent salary which is embodied in the pending amendment. We are credibly informed that the pay as appropriated by the bill as it now stands will not retain in our service that experience and capability the person intrusted with this important duty should possess.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. I can bring a man here who will be glad to do the work for the present pay.

Mr. WHEELER. I will bet that the man my friend refers to can not do it. [Laughter.] We can get plenty of men who will come here and accept the position and go through the form, but I beg to assure the gentleman from North Carolina that although his friend may be a most excellent and capable gentleman he might fall far short of compassing the work which attaches to this position.

The letter which I hold in my hand gives us some information on this point. In speaking further on the duties of the assistant Journal clerk, it says:

The duties require not only the exercise of intelligence, but also experience on the part of the clerk, and unless an increase is made the probability is that frequent changes will have to be made, to the great detriment of the public service.

It has also been urged with some force that this position should be provided with a fixed salary, as the incumbent is required to do considerable work after Congress adjourns, which is not the case, so far as I can learn, with others, who, like the assistant Journal clerk, are on the session's roll.

I can not do better than to read General Clark's words. He says:

After the adjournment of Congress much time is required in putting in order the large amount of business incident to the closing days of the session, such as verifying the reports of conference committees, reading and correcting proof, preparing the points of order for insertion at the end of the printed Journal, preparing the manuscript Journal for the binding, etc.

We must keep the Journal of the House in capable and experienced hands. There must be no doubt or question to the verity of the proceedings as recorded in the Journal of the House; a mistake, particularly at the close of the session, might become a matter of most serious consequence. Intelligence and capability are indispensable, and experience should be added when attainable.

I do not care to give this matter any more extended discussion.

Mr. HOLMAN. I still reserve my point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, as we are likely to be flooded with amendments touching the compensation of House employés, I wish to speak generally on that point now. I know how difficult it is to resist the applications of those who are daily associated with us in the public employ. I experience this perhaps as much as any other member of the House, for I can say truthfully that I have been the recipient of as much courtesy from officers here as can possibly have been the case with any other member, and I feel the obligation on my part thus created. But I think in matters of this kind we ought not to be governed by friendship or sentiment.

Now, I wish to state the fact that the cost of the service of the employés in the English House of Commons is but one-half what this House pays its employés.

A MEMBER. "Cheap foreign labor!"

Mr. RANDALL. In other words, while the amount paid by the House of Commons of Great Britain is $240,000, we pay for similar service $510,000; yet the membership of the House of Commons is double in numbers that of this House. I only mention this under a supposition that perhaps "Jeffersonian simplicity" may have some lodgment in the minds of members as contrasted with the demands of royalty.

Mr. SPRINGER. Jefferson was opposed to royalty, and it was through his efforts, with those of others, that we separated from Great Britain. And I hope we shall never get back to British standards in questions of government.

Mr. RANDALL. As to the matter immediately under consideration, the committee read and carefully considered the letter of the Clerk of the House, and were rather disposed to adopt some equalization between the salary of the Journal Clerk and the compensation of his assistant. The Journal Clerk's compensation is $4,600—within $400 of what a member of this House receives. That includes, of course, $1,000 for the preparation of the digest. The young man who is now acting as assistant Journal clerk receives upon an average, $1,100 annually. I believe if the committee had felt called upon to make a change some of us, at least, would have agreed to raise the salary of the assistant and reduce that of the Journal Clerk. I do not believe we should increase the aggregate now paid for the work in connection with the Journal. Five thousand six hundred dollars or $5,700 is a very large amount of money to be paid for journalizing the proceedings of this House. The work of the assistant Journal clerk, I am free to say, is about as arduous, though it may not be so responsible, as that of the Journal Clerk. The latter officer, if I understand correctly, does that portion of the service which is open to our observation here in the House, while the assistant Journal clerk, after the daily adjournment, makes up the Journal in the form to be read the next morning. I do not hesitate to say that, in my judgment, this young man who is acting as assistant Journal clerk receives too little pay, while I believe the compensation of the Journal Clerk, including its different forms of payment, is too large.

If I should be allowed to move an amendment to the amendment to reduce the Journal Clerk what we increase the other, I believe it would meet the justice of the case and be fair play all round.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to present the point of order I have raised. I do it under the third clause of Rule XXI of the House. It is not pretended, Mr. Chairman, this employé is provided for by any general law. The employment is provided for on an appropriation bill, and has been since the office was created. So there is no law on the subject except the law of the appropriation bill, the law of the current year. In view of that fact I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the language of the third clause of the twenty-first rule:

3. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress.

I think the Chair has uniformly held the terms "except for public works and objects already in progress"—that those terms have no relation to the employés of the House. So the whole objection turns on the first clause of this paragraph:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.

If there is any law it is the law of the current year. There can not be any other law. There is no other law. It seems to me to be impossible to rule this expenditure is authorized by law, inasmuch as the only law in force makes a different provision for compensating this employé of the House. The proposition is so clear it is not necessary to discuss it, and it seems to me that a mere statement of the question is sufficient.

Mr. WHEELER. I hardly think it is necessary to make any reply to the position taken upon the point of order by my friend from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN]. There is no law fixing the salary of assistant Journal clerk. The authority for his appointment, and the authority for appropriations to pay his salary come to us by virtue of the constitutional provision in reference to the House of Representatives, and that necessarily involves the right on the part of the House to employ such clerical force as Congress in its wisdom may find necessary for its proper organization and the efficient conduct of its business.

I understand that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] relies upon section 3 of Rule XXI, which I will read:

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriation for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

The amendment is not obnoxious to the first part of the rule I have read. The law does not provide any salary for this official, and if an amendment is not in order fixing a salary, then with equal force the section in the bill sought to be amended would also be subject to a point of order, because it is just as much a violation of the rule to report a bill for an expenditure not previously authorized by law as it is to lodge an amendment for such an expenditure. This shows that section 3 does not at all apply to this class of cases.

The language which follows sustains this view. It clearly indicates that the first part of the clause refers to public works and for expenditures of that character. But the gentleman says that the appropriation bill which provided the salaries of the officers for this current year is the law, and that there can not be any other law in this matter, and therefore he insists that to change the amount from that appropriated for this current year would be a change of existing law. Suppose we had failed to pass an appropriation bill for this current year, then, according to the position assumed there would be no law authorizing any appropriations whatever for assistant Journal clerk, and therefore we could be inhibited from making any appropriation for this purpose.

It seems to me this shows that the amendment should be allowed and the point of order overruled.

Mr. TARSNEY. Mr. Chairman, at the Forty-ninth Congress this same question was raised. It was then contended by members on the floor of the House that amendments of this kind were not in order, because they changed existing law.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am not claiming they change existing law, but that it is provided by law.

Mr. TARSNEY. Then we provide, if we are in favor of it, that it shall continue as the law until the expiration of the appropriation bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. The current bill is the law in this case.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to address myself for a short time to the point of order which has been raised. By an examination of the statutes it will be found that many of the officers and employés of the House are provided for in appropriation bills passed in years since 1879. In 1879 I believe there were five messengers provided for, but since that time the number has grown from five to twenty-three, and they have all been provided for in appropriation bills, and if this point of order has never been raised before it seems to me the precedent is against the construction of the rule asked for.

Mr. RANDALL. I do not know what we can be governed by unless it be the current law making the appropriation.

Mr. TARSNEY. There is no other law.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. If the Chair please, there is no other law, except the existing appropriation act. That does not apply to the fiscal year commencing the 1st of July, 1888, and running to the 30th of June, 1889.

A MEMBER. Then there would be no law authorizing the appropriation.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. Then we would be in the position of having these officers here during this session of Congress provided for and paid under an appropriation bill, and no power in the House to provide for the payment of the same officers for the next year, no matter how imperative the necessity for such payment might be, unless we went to the trouble of passing a general law. The precedents are all against that construction. We are providing now for a period commencing on the 1st of July next and ending on the 1st of July, 1889. The proposed law at this time does not provide for the existence of these offices. It is intended simply to provide pay for offices already created. It is in the line of existing law. They are officers of the House, and we are providing for the salaries of these officers by this law. Therefore the point of order does not lie.

Mr. CANNON. Is it not true, Mr. Chairman, that the Constitution of the United States established the rule and regulations in this matter for the House of Representatives? There is no general law declaring how many employés there shall be, but as the necessity arises for the employment of these officers they are provided under the power granted in the Constitution.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Indiana I would say this: The point raised is not that we have not the power to create the office, but that we have not the power to provide for the increased pay for the next year in the present appropriation bill. I am contending that this office already exists by virtue of law. There is no question but that Congress has the power to provide for the office under its general legislative powers; but the question presented here is whether we can provide for the increased pay asked in this bill. It seems to me that we are providing for payments authorized by existing law, and that the point of order can not lie against the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The point made by the gentleman from Indiana is on a proposition to increase the salary of the assistant Journal clerk of the House.

Mr. HOLMAN. If the Chair will permit an interruption, I hope the amendment will be read against which I have made the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. This is a proposition to increase the salary of the assistant Journal clerk of the House of Representatives on an appropriation bill. The gentleman from Indiana insists that this proposition is in violation of the third clause of Rule XXI—that it changes existing law.

Mr. HOLMAN. If the Chair will pardon me, my point of order is that there is no law authorizing this expenditure, in the language of the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not want to make a ruling on the subject without being aware of the gentleman's exact point. Does the gentleman from Indiana not recognize the fact that there are duties devolving upon the assistant Journal clerk for which provision may be made in this bill?

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly they are provided by law; but this is simply an increase of compensation not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN. So the Chair understood, and was about to rule in regard to the point made by the gentleman.

If that be true, it necessarily comes under the subdivision 3 of Rule XXI, providing that no provision changing existing law shall be incorporated in any general appropriation bill, etc.

Mr. HOLMAN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would prefer to proceed without interruption for the present.

In the Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, and Forty-sixth Congresses time and again this question was raised and sustained, and it has been frequently so decided since. It has generally been held that where there was any general law fixing a salary, that that law governs in relation to this rule; that where there had been no salary fixed by law, other than in an appropriation bill, that the salary therein stated indicated the purpose of Congress as to what it should be, and that any effort to change it after it was once indicated by the House on an appropriation bill was in violation of the rule and subject to the objection here raised.

The Chair holds that the point of order is well taken; and the Clerk will continue to read.

Mr. COX. I move to strike out in line 5, page 10, the words "for the Journal Clerk for preparing the Digest to the Rules" and insert "for a clerk to be designated by the Speaker."

Mr. HOLMAN. I reserve the point of order on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. HOLMAN. That it is a change of the existing law.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I do not think the point of order is well taken. Let me say in this connection——

Mr. RANDALL. I would like to have the point of order decided.

Mr. COX. I will not take up much time.

Mr. RANDALL. I do not speak personally; but the gentleman will understand the importance of having these questions decided promptly and without debate as far as practicable.

Mr. COX. Let me state that this amendment does not raise the pay of the clerk provided for here, nor does it make a new office. It simply gives to the Speaker of the House the right to designate a clerk who shall make out the annual Digest. The Speaker evidently is the man of all others who is most competent to select the proper person for that duty; and if it be that the pay of the Journal Clerk is too much, which has been suggested for other reasons about which I make no comment one way or the other or complaint, for I have none to make, and make no point upon the salary, then this salary can be amended.

Mr. RANDALL. Let me interrupt the gentleman for a moment. The gentleman understands that the Journal Clerk is the best person to make this selection. He is certainly best fitted for the performance of that duty.

Mr. HOLMAN. And he has always performed it heretofore.

Mr. RANDALL. And satisfactorily.

Mr. COX. But nevertheless it can scarcely be doubted that the Speaker is the proper person to indicate the clerk to do this duty. The Speaker is most closely connected with these questions of order, and he should be permitted to select the person who is to journalize them.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask a ruling on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk will read.

Mr. COX. I did not understand the Chair to give any reason for sustaining the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not. It is not necessary. But the Chair will give a reason, that there is no authority of law for it, and under the rules of the House it is not in order—under Rule XXI—for it creates a new office.

Mr. COX. Very well.

Mr. CANNON. I move the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "operator," in line 21, on page 10, insert "$1,200;" so that it will read "one telegraph operator, $1,200."

Mr. HOLMAN. I will reserve the point of order upon this, as I wish to ask the question if that is to supply a mere omission?

Mr. CANNON. I will state to the gentleman what it is. The telegraph operator out here, the Department operator for the House, now gets $900 a year, while the Senate operator gets $1,200. This man has two or three times the amount of work to do that the Senate operator has. I have been requested by a number of parties to offer this amendment, and I believe it is a just and proper one.

Mr. FORNEY. I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that $900 for three months' work during the next session is pretty good pay.

Mr. CANNON. Well, this is the salary for short session and long session, year in and year out. He can not get employment outside while thus engaged.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read the following paragraph:

Indexing Journals of Congress: For clerk to prepare the general index to the Journals of Congress, under resolution of June 18, 1878, $2,500, and for the following assistants under his direction, to be appointed by the Committee on Rules, namely: Two at $1,200 each, four at $1,000 each, and two at $800 each; in all, $10,500.

Mr. TARSNEY. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] interrupted me when I was on the floor to offer an amendment to the preceding paragraph. I ask unanimous consent to go back and offer an amendment on page 10 so as to insert in line 4 the word "tally clerk."

The CHAIRMAN. That can only be done by unanimous consent. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to return to page 10, line 4, and offer the amendment which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 10, line 4, after the words "Journal Clerk," insert "tally clerk;" so that it will read:

"For Chief Clerk, Journal Clerk, tally clerk, and two reading clerks, at $3,000 each.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to returning to that paragraph?

Mr. RANDALL. That is part of the flood.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania objects.

Mr. TARSNEY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania does not object.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. RANDALL. I do not.

Mr. HOLMAN. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. TARSNEY. I will state the reason why I offer the amendment. In the last appropriation bill the tally clerk of this House was provided for by the salary fixed in that bill. That was at the rate of $3,000, as I remember. Since that time, and during this Congress, additional work has been placed upon him. He is now required to make an index of all the Calendars of this House. There is not a harder-worked man than the man who sits at that desk, designated as the tally clerk. I simply ask in the spirit of equalization that he shall be placed on an equality with the others who sit at the desk with him. I thoroughly agree with my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] that when a man accepts a position connected with the House at a fixed salary he should be bound to perform the duties which at the time of his acceptance pertained to that office.

Mr. RANDALL. I did not make that argument.

Mr. TARSNEY. But if in the course of the performance of his duties additional burdens are placed on his shoulders, then additional compensation commensurate with that additional service should be awarded him. It is in that spirit, and in that spirit only, that I offer this amendment in justice to a hard-worked officer of this House.

Mr. RANDALL. I want to repeat what I said once before: While I do not seek to lower the salaries of those officials at the desk, I do not want to raise them. I know their qualifications are of a peculiar character as regards some of them, and especially the reading clerks. But these officials are liberally paid. They are only on duty while the House is in session. When the House adjourns they can put on their hats and go hence; and when the final adjournment takes place they can pack their trunks and go home. There is no real merit, in my judgment, in the proposition at this time of year to demand an increase in those salaries for the short session.

Mr. TARSNEY. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania, when are these indexes made? It is not while the House is in session. They are made when the gentleman from Pennsylvania and I are asleep, many of them.

Mr. PETERS. I want to call further attention to a fact which my friend from Michigan [Mr. TARSNEY] has already emphasized. Prior to the time that the tally clerk was required to index the Calendars of the House, it may be true, as stated, that after the adjournment of the House the tally clerk had nothing to do. But now that additional work is imposed upon him, and it is certainly no light task to index such a Calendar as we have now, and which, as I understand, is reprinted twice a week.

The indexing of the Calendar, especially after the middle of the first session, from that time on, and during the second session, is a laborious task, requiring a man of considerable ability to perform it properly. I know those who have been familiar with the Calendar during this session have realized the great convenience which the index to the Calendar has been to them as members of Congress and for the dispatch of business in this House. It seems to me that with this additional work placed on the tally clerk it is no more than right that his compensation should be increased.

Mr. RANDALL. I understand the point of order is pending.

Mr. TARSNEY. I did not know that any point of order had been raised.

Mr. HOLMAN. I reserved the point of order.

Mr. TARSNEY. What is the point of order? Is it that the amendment changes existing law?

Mr. HOLMAN. It is that the amendment makes an appropriation not authorized by law.

Mr. TARSNEY. During last session, when the legislative appropriation bill, or a bill of like character, was under consideration in this House, and the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] was in the chair, this same question was raised, and the Chair then ruled that the appropriation bill was not a general law within the meaning of the language of that rule. And neither is it.

I concede that where Congress has passed a law which is intended as a perpetual law, which stands until it is repealed, and which does not expire by its own limitation, that is a general law which can not, under the rule, be changed by an amendment in a bill like this. But, sir, we are here dealing with an existing condition of things, simply making an appropriation to pay expenses for what we have on hand, and who tells me that this is the "existing law?" This bill, if it passes, as it certainly will, does not become operative until the 1st day of July next. It does not change in the slightest degree the compensation that any

employé of this House is receiving under the last appropriation bill that we passed.

This is a special law intended to apply only for twelve months, beginning on the 1st day of July and ending on the 30th day of June next. This is not a general law. This is not the "existing law" that is contemplated in the rule, and it was so held, and properly held, last year by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER], sitting in the chair which you, sir, now occupy. Here is the ruling. I refer to page 2423 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

It seems that there is no general law fixing this salary, and it must be carried in the appropriation bill. Therefore it is not for the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House to fix it, and he will submit the question to the committee.

And he did submit it to the committee.

Now, I raise this point because if the ruling made by the Chair is to stand as the law of this House, then, sir, this House has no power, but the Committee on Appropriations possesses all the power that was delegated to the entire House of Representatives. The Committee on Appropriations, consisting of fifteen members, may go into their committee-room and there fix the salary of any employé of this House and bring their bill in here, and every Representative from every other part of the country has his lips sealed because under such a ruling he can not even offer an amendment to the edict of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RANDALL. The action of the committee is regulated by law and by the rules of this House.

Mr. TARSNEY. The salaries are regulated only by the appropriation bills coming from the Appropriations Committee, and against such a usurpation of power I, for one, as a Representative, protest and say that it is not right. I say we should have the right to offer amendments to every section of the bill, whether we belong to one committee or another, and I say this with the utmost deference and respect for the gentlemen composing the Committee on Appropriations. I know that they have labored hard and labored earnestly, and exercised their best judgment in reference to this matter, but of course the doctrine of infallibility does not apply even to the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I want to be heard for a moment on the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. I call for a decision.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bills——

Mr. RANDALL. I ask for a decision on the point of order. The gentleman has already spoken.

Mr. PETERS. I have not spoken on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not care to have the debate protracted very much on the question of order.

Mr. PETERS. I think the Chair will bear me out that I do not occupy very much time in that way.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is not reflecting upon the gentleman at all; the Chair will be glad to hear him.

Mr. PETERS. The position of tally clerk has been created by an appropriation bill and is recognized by the bill. This office, therefore, is in a different position from the one upon which the Chair ruled a few minutes ago. The difference is that additional duties have been placed upon this official. Now, certainly, it can not be contended that if this House sees fit, by custom or by law, to increase the duties of one of its officials, the House is still debarred under the rule from increasing the compensation of that official. I do not think that such was the intent or spirit of the rule, and therefore I do not think that this case comes within the ruling which the Chair made awhile ago upon the other case. That is the point to which I wish to direct the attention of the Chair.

Mr. TARSNEY. It is an entirely different question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to say that whatever embarrassment may have arisen in the matter of legislation upon appropriation bills, the House itself in the fixing of its rules is responsible for it. If there is anything unreasonable or tyrannical in the rules the fault lies not with the Chair, but with the House itself. This question is an old one. It has been ruled on time and again from the Forty-fourth Congress down to the present, and almost uniformly it has been held that this provision refers not only to legislation relating to the fixing of a salary generally, but also to such provisions contained in appropriation bills; that is, that the necessity of the service existing, and the appropriation bill having fixed the salary, that was an indication to the Committee on Appropriations and to the House of what the compensation should be; and that the Committee on Appropriations could not report a different provision, nor could any member offer such a provision by way of an amendment to the bill in the House.

The Committee on Appropriations, it is complained, have some extraordinary power. Certainly the Chair was misunderstood if such was assumed to be his opinion. In saying that the appropriation bill fixed salaries, the Chair did not refer to the bill under consideration, but to the appropriation bills of the preceding year which had become law. The Chair is quite aware that the gentleman from Illinois, as presiding officer during the last Congress, made a different ruling; but the Chair is also aware that that ruling was exceptional, the decision having been in general the other way. Therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BURNES. For the purpose of addressing an inquiry to the gentleman having charge of this bill, I desire to submit a point of order upon the paragraph just read. I find there a provision for a clerk to prepare a general index to the Journals of Congress; and I find also provision for certain assistants—eight in number, I believe. It is provided, I observe, that these assistant clerks are to be appointed by the Committee on Rules. It has been suggested that this is a change of existing law, and, if so, I wish to ask the reason for the change. I have reserved a point of order in order that I may decide upon the explanation which may be made whether to press the point or not.

Mr. RANDALL. The main object on the part of the committee was to secure the completion of this work in four years, instead of allowing it to be extended over sixteen years under the provision already adopted. The official who was originally selected by the Committee on Rules stated, I believe, that with his present force it would take sixteen years to do this work. The original plan for the work was introduced in this House by Hon. Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, upon a resolution from the Committee on Rules; and the work has always been under the direction of that committee. That is the reason the selection of these clerks was left to the Committee on Rules. If there is any other committee more competent to supervise or direct this work than the Committee on Rules, it is desirable the change should be made; but it was the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations (I myself taking very little part in the matter, as my associates will recollect, because, being a member of the Committee on Rules, I felt some delicacy in regard to it); it was the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations that as the work had heretofore been done under the direction of the Committee on Rules, it would be best to continue in their hands the control of it in the future.

Mr. HOLMAN. My recollection is that in the appropriation bill for the present year, on account of there not being proper responsibility on the part of the persons employed, the provision placing the work under the direction of the Committee on Rules was omitted.

Mr. RANDALL. There has never been any legislation connected with this matter except to execute the original resolution by providing pay for those employed in this work. It has now taken eleven years to do the work of indexing the first twenty-five Congresses.

Mr. HOLMAN. We provided for a clerk and assistant, I believe.

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. They were subject only to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOLMAN. And it was thought desirable that they should be under the direction of the Clerk of the House. Hence, as will be found, I think, upon examination, the provision which contemplated continuing those officers under the control of the Committee on Rules was omitted, and another was adopted which placed them under the direction of the Clerk of the House.

Mr. RANDALL. I do not know that the Clerk of the House seeks to enlarge his power in this respect. I am not aware, however, that the Committee on Rules cares anything about the matter.

Mr. HOLMAN. The provision was not even suggested by the Clerk of the House; but it was thought desirable that there should be some responsible officer to have charge of the work.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, I do not see that anybody is more responsible than the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HOLMAN. But they are not always in session; that is the trouble.

Mr. FORNEY. The Speaker of the House is the head of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BURNES. While I am of opinion that this provision is subject to a point of order, I do not see that anything better can be done than to accept it under the circumstances. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I shall not make the point.

Mr. RANDALL. I concede that the provision is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clerks and messengers to committees: For clerk to the Committee on Ways and Means, $3,000; assistant clerk, $1,600; messenger, $1,000; clerk to the Committee on Appropriations, $3,000; assistant clerk, $1,600; messenger, $1,000; clerk to Committee on Agriculture, clerk to the Committee on Claims, clerk to the Committee on Commerce, clerk to the Committee on the District of Columbia, clerk to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, clerk to the Committee on Indian Affairs, clerk to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, clerk to the Committee on the Judiciary, clerk to the Committee on Military Affairs, clerk to the Committee on Naval Affairs, clerk to the Committee on the Public Lands, clerk to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, clerk to the Committee on War Claims; clerk to continue Digest of Claims under resolution of the House adopted March —, 1888; clerk to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads; clerk to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and clerk to the Committee on Elections, at $2,000 each; assistant clerk to the Committee on War Claims, $1,200; in all $46,400.

Mr. LANHAM. I move to amend by inserting after the word "dollars," in line 1, page 13, these words:

Assistant clerk to the Committee on Claims, $1,200: *Provided*, That the pay heretofore allowed such assistant clerk for the session shall cease on June 30, 1888.

Mr. RANDALL. I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, we already have, under a resolution of the House, an assistant clerk of the Committee on Claims, who is paid at the rate of $6 per day. The object of this amendment is to make this assistant an annual clerk. This, I take it, will operate ultimately as a reduction of expenditure. If Congress should be in session for eight months, this assistant clerk, whose per diem compensation is never refused because of the vast amount of labor required at his hands, would receive $1,440 in a single year, and for a session of nine months $1,620. Under this amendment, the salary of the assistant would be $1,200 a year instead of $6 per day, or $180 per month during the session. As I have suggested, this amendment would, in my judgment, be really in the interest of economy. I do not think any point of order ought to be urged against it.

Mr. RANDALL. There is now no law authorizing the employment of this officer as an annual clerk. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For clerk to the Committee on the Census from July 1, 1888, to March 4, 1889, at the rate of $2,000 per annum, $1,351.90.

Mr. COX. I move to strike out on page 13 of the bill, commencing with the words "from July first, eighteen hundred and eighty-eight, to March fourth, eighteen hundred and eighty-nine," and in line 6 the words "one thousand three hundred and fifty-one dollars and ninety cents," so the paragraph will read, "For clerk to the Committee on the Census, two thousand dollars."

Mr. FORNEY. We have followed the instructions of the Committee on Accounts in this matter.

Mr. RANDALL. Just as they said.

Mr. COX. This only extends from the 4th of March to the 1st of July. There is no objection to that.

Mr. RANDALL. Oh, yes, there is.

Mr. COX. It is an oversight; I thought it was in the bill.

Mr. RANDALL. It is not an oversight.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For thirty-nine clerks to committees, at $6 each per day during the session, $28,314.

Mr. McRAE. I move to strike out "at $6 each per day" and insert "$100 per month."

Mr. RANDALL. I make the point of order on that amendment.

Mr. HOLMAN. Why, this is a reduction.

Mr. RANDALL. I do not know of any law fixing these clerks at an annual salary.

The CHAIRMAN. If that be the amendment the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. McRAE. My amendment does not propose to give these clerks an annual salary. I only seek a reduction in their pay. They may be worth $6 per day if they had anything to do; but many of the committees they are supposed to serve do nothing, and, with the best of feelings towards the clerks, I think $100 per month enough for the work.

Mr. RANDALL. But does not the amendment make them annual?

Mr. McRAE. Certainly not; it merely strikes out the words "at $6 each per day" and inserts "at $100 per month," so it will then read, "For thirty-nine clerks to committees, at $100 per month during the session." Instead of giving them $6 a day, I propose to give them a hundred dollars a month during the session. That is all I intend, and that I am sure will be the effect of the amendment if adopted, as I trust it will be.

Mr. RANDALL. In that case I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order being withdrawn, the gentleman from Arkansas is entitled to the floor on his amendment.

Mr. McRAE. My amendment simply provides that instead of paying the session committee clerks $6 a day during the session, they shall be paid $100 a month during the session. I propose it purely as a measure of reform in the item of expenses. We pay too much money for committee clerks. I want to stop it.

Mr. TAULBEE. I thought the point of order had been made against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. It was made, but afterwards withdrawn, and the gentleman from Arkansas is now discussing his amendment.

Mr. TAULBEE. I did not catch what the Chair stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated that the point of order had been made and withdrawn, and the gentleman was now occupying the floor discussing the amendment.

Mr. TAULBEE. I renew the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is too late. The gentleman from Arkansas is on the floor explaining his amendment.

Mr. TAULBEE. At what time was it in order to renew the point? I did not understand the gentleman from Arkansas took the floor for discussion of his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so stated, that he took the floor for that purpose.

Mr. TAULBEE. If I had understood that to be his purpose I should have renewed the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas sent up his amendment, and it was read, when the gentleman from Pennsylvania rose to a question of order. After some discussion, the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdrew his point of order, and the Chair then recognized the gentleman from Arkansas to discuss his amendment. If the gentleman from Kentucky was not giving attention it is not the fault of the Chair.

Mr. TAULBEE. If the Chair pleases, I was giving attention to it, and as soon as I understood the point of order had been withdrawn I rose and renewed it.

Mr. BLAND. The amendment reduces the salaries of these clerks.

Mr. ROGERS. I rise to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. ROGERS. The chairman of the Committee of the Whole, I think, is evidently laboring under a misapprehension of the fact, and is unwittingly doing the gentleman from Kentucky an injustice. When the gentleman from Pennsylvania found there was no point of order and he withdrew it, then the gentleman from Kentucky rose and renewed the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. But the Chair had recognized the gentleman from Arkansas, and he was proceeding to explain his amendment.

Mr. TAULBEE. I rise to a point of order. I wished to ascertain from the gentleman from Arkansas the purpose for which he first rose, for the reason I wished to enter another point of order. But I did not wish to lose my right to recognition for the purpose of doing so.

Mr. McRAE. I am willing to waive time as to the point of order made by the gentleman from Kentucky so as to relieve the Chair from embarrassment. I will submit the matter to the judgment of the Chair after it has heard my friend from Kentucky on the point he seeks to make.

Mr. TAULBEE. I ask to have the report of the Official Reporter read, so as to see what did occur when I rose to renew the point of order when withdrawn by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state to the gentleman that is not necessary, as the point of order has been withdrawn. The Chair recognizes the gentleman on his point of order.

Mr. TAULBEE. Do I understand the Chair to withdraw his ruling deciding that my point of order came too late?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas states that there is no objection to waiving the time on the point of order that the gentleman from Kentucky was too late.

Mr. McRAE. I waive the time on the point of order, provided the gentleman from Kentucky comes at once to the point. I do not want to occupy the time of the committee in having the notes of the Reporter written out and read. The Chair is correct in the statement made.

Mr. TAULBEE. I always come directly to the point. [Laughter.]

Mr. McRAE. Then I hope the gentleman will maintain his record in that respect, and not consume time by having other matter read. I am in earnest about this matter.

Mr. TAULBEE. I did not call for the reading of the official notes for the purpose of consuming time, but because I did not understand the Chair to withdraw the ruling by which I was taken off the floor.

My point of order, Mr. Chairman, is this, that this provision of the bill now under consideration makes an appropriation for the payment of the clerks appointed under a resolution of this House, passed by the House, and the employés so provided for are clerks and acting as such, and are paid as such under existing law. The amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas to that extent changes existing law. Now, that is all I have to say.

Mr. McRAE. I think it is unnecessary to say anything against the point of order. I remember we had a little experience about these clerks when we proceeded to organize the present House of Representatives at the beginning of this session. I did my best to have the salaries fixed at that time, but was voted down, because it was said the per diem had been fixed until July 1, 1888. I predicted then just what we have now. With this kind of dealing we can never get rid of these clerks nor reduce their pay. It is a waste of money, and should be stopped.

This bill, of course, fixes the salaries for the next session, or rather for the year beginning July 1, 1888. The bill under which we are now operating—the current appropriation bill—provides for the pay of some of these clerks for the present session, or until June 30, and no longer. They will get their pay at $6 per day until that time, even if we pass this. It was definitely stated in the debate on the resolution by which some of them were provided that no provision was made for their payment beyond the current fiscal year. There was no authority to make any contract beyond that time, and of course we have the right to control the amount of compensation, or to dispense with them entirely if we desire to do so. They took their positions with the distinct understanding that there was no payment provided for them beyond this fiscal year, and should not be heard to complain now. Believing that we can get competent clerks to do all the work of the committees interested at the rate I have suggested, $100 a month, I hope the amendment will be adopted. I think the point of order against the amendment ought to be overruled.

Mr. CRAIN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. McRAE. Certainly.

Mr. CRAIN. If you can not increase a salary in this appropriation bill—a salary that is fixed by existing law——

Mr. McRAE. There is no existing law fixing these salaries. If you do not pass this bill you have no law and no clerks after the 30th of June. Even the number of clerks is not the same as in the current law.

Mr. TAULBEE. The same may be said of the salary of every official of this Government.

Mr. CRAIN. The question I want to ask is, if you can not increase a salary fixed by law, whether you can reduce it?

Mr. BURNES. Yes; that is in the direct line of economy.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to know if there has been any order of the House as to the amount to be paid these clerks?

Mr. TAULBEE. I answer the Chair and state that there is. There was a resolution providing for their payment.

Mr. McRAE. Where is it?

Mr. FORNEY. I think the gentleman from Kentucky is correct. The resolution providing for these clerks provided also for their compensation.

Mr. TAULBEE. I have not the resolution before me, but the gentlemen on the Appropriations Committee, who have had the matter in charge, know this to be the case. They have considered it and in connection with this bill, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL], as well as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY], are ready to corroborate what I say.

Mr. McRAE. I undertake to say that there is nothing whatever except the current appropriation bill which fixes the salary, and names thirty or thirty-one, instead of thirty-nine. There may possibly have been in the resolution of the House a provision fixing it, but I do not understand that to be existing law within the meaning of the rule. It is simply a House resolution and was not concurred in by the Senate, and has nothing to do with the compensation except for such as are paid out of the contingent fund; even that depends for its continuance on this bill.

Mr. TAULBEE. And I undertake to say that the resolution providing for the appointment of the assistant clerks and fixing their duties, where assistant clerks are appointed, and for session clerks, when appointed, does fix the time of their appointment, the term of their service, and the rate of compensation, and I am unwilling to agree with the gentleman from Arkansas that the resolution so providing for these things is not the existing law for the purposes of this bill.

Mr. FORNEY. I think the gentleman from Kentucky is correct. The resolution came from the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. TAULBEE. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORNEY. And fixed the rate of compensation.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. McCREARY. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry. Are we now discussing the point of order or are we discussing the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. BLAND. I rise for the purpose of discussing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order of the gentleman from Kentucky is under discussion, but in connection with it the question is raised whether or not the House has ordered or fixed the sums to be paid to these officials.

Mr. TAULBEE. And I make the further point that the point of order should be disposed of before the merits of the amendment are discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule upon the point of order, but desires information from the gentleman in charge of this bill on this point: whether or not this House has by resolution determined that the amounts fixed in this bill are the salaries to be paid to these clerks.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FORNEY. We know the fact that the Committee on Accounts assigned thirty-nine assistant clerks to these various committees, and that the salaries were fixed at $6 a day, each, during the session.

Mr. McRAE. I would like to ask the gentleman if he knows the resolution provides for a rate of $6 a day, and if he is willing to say that it fixes the per diem and term of service and provides for the whole of the thirty-nine? I think you will find it only provides for such as are to be paid out of the contingent fund. If the resolution providing for this is existing law, then the bill violates the rule by changing this law so as to provide for payment otherwise. It will fix permanently upon the House eight more clerks. Some of them serve committees with almost nothing to do. Other employés of the House work for $100 per month and some for less, and they work hard, too.

Mr. TAULBEE. I desire to answer for the gentleman. I hold in my hand one of the resolutions authorizing the appointment of a clerk for this session, and I will send it to the Clerk's desk that it may be read. In this resolution the compensation is fixed at $6 a day. I have a distinct recollection also as to the resolution under which the other session clerks are appointed; and I think I am not mistaken in saying the compensation for each of them is fixed at $6 per day.

Mr. SOWDEN. Why do you not send for the other resolution?

Mr. TAULBEE. I can not obtain it at this moment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has informed me that he has sent for the other resolution, which can be read when it comes in.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Claims be authorized, during this session only, until further ordered by the House, to employ an assistant clerk, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, at the rate of $6 per day.

Mr. McRAE. That resolution provides for payment out of the contingent fund. I undertake to say that the resolution providing for the payment of clerks authorized by the current appropriation bill does not say anything about $6 a day, and if it does it can have no binding effect, because we only had authority to employ thirty or thirty-one clerks until June 30, and the resolution only apportioned these to so many committees.

The CHAIRMAN. In the doubtful condition of the information connected with the resolution, the Chair will entertain the amendment.

Mr. McCREARY. As I understand, the Chair has overruled the point of order, and the amendment to reduce the amount payable to these committee clerks to $100 per month is now before the committee. I think that for the House to adopt that amendment at present would be treating the persons who are now acting as clerks of committees unfairly.

The general law which I have now before me provides for thirty-one clerks to committees at $6 each per day during the session. That is the general law. I dare say that every clerk who was appointed and who came here to enter upon the discharge of his duties, accepting a compensation of $6 a day, has been drawing it ever since he qualified and entered upon the discharge of his duties. As these gentlemen left their homes and their various avocations and came here relying upon this statute that they would get $6 a day, and as they have been drawing that amount, I think it would be unjust to these gentlemen in the middle of the session to allow them only $100 a month, or a little over one-half of what they accepted.

I believe, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas should be voted down. I am in favor always of economy; but certainly the day has not arrived under our Government when a man should be induced to take a position as an officer and then, while discharging his duties faithfully, have his salary reduced nearly one-half.

It may be added also that $6 per day has been the rate paid to the clerks of committees for many years; and there is no necessity now for that economy which reduces the pay one-half and puts it at an amount that I do not believe you can obtain good clerks for.

Mr. RANDALL. There is one point in connection with this item to which I desire to draw the attention of the committee. It increases the number of clerks provided for from thirty-one to thirty-nine. That arises from the resolutions which have been adopted in this House adding eight clerks to the number provided for in the current law. This is done because the committee believe the entire number of clerks to committees should appear in the law, and that part should not be paid out of the annual appropriation and part out of the contingent fund.

Mr. TAULBEE. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania allow me?

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAULBEE. I believe this does increase the number of clerks beyond the number actually employed.

Mr. RANDALL. It does not increase the number of clerks, but the bill provides for thirty-nine clerks, to be paid out of this appropriation, increasing the amount $5,808. It does not increase the number actually, but makes provision that they shall not hereafter be paid out of the contingent fund.

Mr. BUCHANAN. This proposed amendment does no injustice to any one. The clerks are now employed by virtue of different resolutions which provide that their employment shall be for this session only at $6 per day. This House proposes to carry out that contract. The bill under consideration provides for the compensation of committee clerks for the next session. For the next session we have no contract with them, and we have a perfect right to put the rate of compensation at $6 per day, or at $100 a month, as we think fit. There is no vested right, and I doubt very much whether there is any reason at all for the employment of those thirty-nine clerks for the coming session. Everybody knows the Calendar has more bills upon it than will be acted upon.

Mr. McCREARY. Will the gentleman permit me to interrupt him?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have only got five minutes, and I have to talk fast. Everybody knows, I say, that the Calendar has more bills on it than will be acted upon, and that there will be practically no work done in those committees during the next session.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I fully agree with the gentleman from Kentucky on this question. I think it would be little less than an outrage to attempt to reduce the salaries of these gentlemen employed as clerks. Clearly it was understood when they were employed that they were to have $6 a day——

Mr. BUCHANAN. Well, we are giving it to them.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. Yes; but it applies to the next session just the same as to this.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Not at all. There is no authority for saying that. There is no contract with them for next session.

Mr. McCREARY. The gentleman from New Jersey is mistaken. These gentlemen are employed for the Fiftieth Congress, including both sessions.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. It was understood that their employment extended through both sessions of Congress, otherwise you could not have employed them. They could not be hired to be buffeted around in that way any more than a member of Congress could. Their salaries are just like the salaries of members. They extend through both sessions.

Mr. BUCHANAN. But we are elected for two sessions.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. And they are appointed for two sessions. I do not think that any proposition to reduce their salaries is admissible. When I heard the amendment in the first place I was in favor of it, because I thought it was a proposition to increase the salaries; but when I found that it was designed to cut them off by paying them only during the working days of the session I was opposed to it, and I am opposed to it. A motion to increase these salaries might be admissible, but a motion to decrease the salaries, in the face of the terms of the employment of these men is unfair and wrong, and I hope it will be promptly voted down.

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. McRAE, and the Chair announced that it was rejected—ayes 11, noes 44.

Mr. McRAE. No quorum.

Mr. McCREARY. I make the point that the result has been announced.

The CHAIRMAN. The announcement of the result disclosed the fact that there was no quorum voting. The point being made, the Chair will appoint the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] to act as tellers.

Mr. McRAE. If I can have a vote in the House on this question, I will withdraw the point.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw the point of "no quorum?"

Mr. McRAE. I do not unless they will accept my proposition to have a vote on this in the House.

Mr. TAULBEE. I hope the gentleman will withdraw the point.

The CHAIRMAN. The tellers will take their places.

Mr. McRAE withdrew the point of "no quorum," and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Doorkeeper: For Doorkeeper, $3,500; and for hire of horses, feed, repair of wagon and harness, $600, or so much thereof as may be necessary; assistant doorkeeper, superintendent of document-room, assistant superintendent of document-room, and Department messenger, at $2,000 each; one employé, $1,500; document file clerk, $1,400; assistant document file clerk, under resolution of December 19, 1881, $1,314; clerk for Doorkeeper and janitor, at $1,200 each; nine messengers, including the messenger to the reporters' gallery, at $1,200 each; nine messengers, at $1,000 each; seven laborers, at $720 each; two laborers in the water-closet, at $720 each; three laborers, including two in the cloak-rooms, at $900 each; female attendant in ladies' retiring-room, $900; superintendent of the folding-room, $2,000; three clerks in the folding-room, one at $1,800 and two at $1,200 each; one foreman, $1,500; one messenger, $1,200; one folder in the sealing-room, $1,200; one page, $500; one laborer, $900; ten folders, at $960 each; five folders, at $840 each; three folders, during the session, at $70 per month each; and fifteen folders, at $720 each; one night watchman, $900; one driver, $900; fourteen messengers on the soldiers' roll, at $1,200 each; two chief pages, at $900 each; thirty-three pages, boys not under fourteen years of age, during the session, including two riding pages, one telephone page, and one telegraph page, at $2.50 per day each; two messengers, during the session, at $70 per month each; ten laborers, during the session, at $60 per month each; six laborers known as cloak-room men, during the session, at $50 per month each; in all, $117,476.50.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to raise the point of order against the provision in lines 20 and 21, which increases the salary of the Doorkeeper $500 above the amount in the last bill. I think that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; and if this Committee of the Whole can not make any change in last year's appropriation bill to increase or decrease a salary, neither can the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. FORNEY. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that this proposed increase is offset by the decrease of the allowance for horse-hire.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I know that, but, as I have said, what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; and if the Committee of the Whole House can not increase any salary upon this bill, but must conform in all particulars to the bill of last year, I can not see how under any reading of the rule it does not apply equally to the Committee on Appropriations; so that the committee are bound to adhere strictly to the law of last year. In other words, they become mere clerks to rewrite the law of last year as regards the salaries contained in this bill.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, the proposed change may be subject to the point of order, but it is proper to give the reason which prompted the committee in making it. The change is exactly in the same line as that which is made in reference to the salaries of the Clerk of the House and the Sergeant-at-Arms. The committee found on investigation that the Doorkeeper was receiving $1,100 for horse-hire, and that he was actually expending for that service only $600; the remaining $500 being an addition by indirection to the emoluments of his office. The committee did not feel at liberty to decrease his emoluments, so they made this change, with a provision which requires him to account to the proper auditing officers of the Treasury for the amount which is allowed for horse-hire. I think the change is in the line of good policy, because it secures strict responsibility for the money expended in that way by these officers. But I concede, of course, that it may still be subject to the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I wish to ask the gentleman a question for information. Under the course pursued heretofore, has it been the practice of the Doorkeeper to receive this $1,100 for horse-hire without being required to account for the expenditure of it?

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, sir; and the First Comptroller decided that he had no power over the expenditure of that $1,100; so that it was in effect a perquisite, and that is the arrangement which we propose to break up.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks business will be facilitated by a prompt ruling. The point of order made by the gentleman from Tennessee is sustained.

Mr. WASHINGTON. The point of order having been sustained, I now move to amend by striking out "$500," in line 21, so as to make the clause read, "for Doorkeeper, $3,000."

Mr. HOLMAN. I understand that the effect of the ruling of the Chair was to leave this salary at $3,000 instead of $3,500.

Mr. WASHINGTON. The point of order having been sustained, I think it proper this amendment should be entertained.

The CHAIRMAN. It does not appear to the Chair a matter of much moment whether the $500 goes out under the ruling of the Chair or by a direct vote of the Committee of the Whole. The Chair's ruling in effect is that the salary of $3,500 is contrary to existing law.

Mr. RANDALL. I want the Committee of the Whole to understand that the effect of the amendment is to make a cut of $500 upon the salary of the Doorkeeper. I do not think the House wants to do that, and I do not understand that to be the object of the gentleman from Tennessee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee raised the question of order that the amount of salary allowed the Doorkeeper in this bill was not in accordance with existing law; and the Chair sustained the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. The Chair was no doubt right.

The CHAIRMAN. Therefore this increase of compensation goes out.

Mr. RANDALL. Does the whole sum go out, or only the amount in excess of the existing law?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule that the $500 increase upon the salary allowed by law goes out.

Mr. TAULBEE. Then the $3,000 will stand.

The Clerk was proceeding to read the bill, when

Mr. OUTHWAITE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was under the impression that this paragraph in relation to the office of Doorkeeper had been read when the question of order was raised. But the Clerk now informs the Chair that he was in error. Therefore the paragraph will now be read, after which the Chair will entertain any points or propositions which may be presented.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I desire to offer some amendments to the paragraph.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. This paragraph contains the clause "and for hire of horses, feed, repair of wagon and harness, $600." Is it in order to move an amendment to that clause now?

The CHAIRMAN. The paragraph must first be read. The Chair supposed it had been read when the gentleman from Tennessee raised the point of order which has been ruled upon.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I desire to make a point of order as to a part of the language in this paragraph, and also to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will be recognized for that purpose in due time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Doorkeeper: For Doorkeeper, $3,500; and for hire of horses, feed, repair of wagon and harness, $600, or so much thereof as may be necessary; assistant doorkeeper, superintendent of document-room, assistant superintendent of document room, and Department messenger, at $2,000 each; one employé, $1,500; document file clerk, $1,400; assistant document file clerk, under resolution of December 19, 1881, $1,314; clerk for Doorkeeper, and janitor, at $1,200 each; nine messengers, including the messenger to the reporters' gallery, at $1,200 each; nine messengers, at $1,000 each; seven laborers, at $720 each; two laborers in the water-closet, at $720 each; three laborers, including two in the cloak-rooms, at $900 each; female attendant in ladies' retiring-room, $900; superintendent of the folding-room, $2,000; three clerks in the folding-room, one at $1,800 and two at $1,200 each; one foreman, $1,500; one messenger, $1,200; one folder in the sealing room, $1,200; one page, $500; one laborer, $900; ten folders, at $960 each; five folders, at $840 each; three folders, during the session, at $70 per month each; and fifteen folders, at $720 each; one night watchman, $900; one driver, $900; fourteen messengers on the soldiers' roll, at $1,200 each; two chief pages, at $900 each; thirty-three pages, boys not under fourteen years of age, during the session, including two riding pages, one telephone page, and one telegraph page, at $2.50 per day each; two messengers, during the session, at $70 per month each; ten laborers, during the session, at $60 per month each; six laborers, known as cloak-room men, during the session, at $50 per month each; in all, $117,476.50.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I desire to raise a question of order

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I now desire to submit a proposition.

Mr. FORNEY. I wish to offer an amendment to perfect this paragraph.

Mr. TAULBEE. Before amendments are offered I desire to reserve a point of order on this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Points of order will be reserved, but the amendment sent up by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] will be acted on, if there be no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 9, page 14, strike out the word "seven" where it first occurs and insert "six;" so as to read: "six laborers, at $720 each."

Mr. FORNEY. This change is made to conform to the action of the Committee of the Whole this morning in raising to the rank of messenger a man who, while holding the position of laborer, has in fact acted as a messenger to the Speaker.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORNEY. On behalf of the committee I desire to offer a further amendment, to strike out "fourteen," in line 4, page 15, and insert "twelve."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I now make a point of order against the word "six," in line 22, and also against the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary," in lines 22 and 23. My point is that these portions of the paragraph are out of order as contrary to existing law. If it be necessary, I desire to amend by inserting "eleven" instead of "six;" so as to make the bill conform to existing law. If the Chair should sustain the point of order against the word "six" and should decide that the effect of ruling out that word is to insert the word "eleven," in conformity with existing law, then of course no amendment will be necessary.

Mr. RANDALL. The clause "or so much thereof as may be necessary" is, I believe, in order. It has been decided that the committee has power to introduce restrictions upon expenditures provided for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the control of this matter is not left with the committee, but that the Comptroller has ruled that this sum is a part of the salary of this position as much so as if so designated. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TAULBEE. I would like to call the attention of the Chair to the language of the decision of the First Comptroller, to which reference has just been made. I had occasion to examine that decision very closely, and, if I recollect correctly, the construction of the Comptroller was based on the phraseology of the then current appropriation law. As I understand, there is no law fixing this item of expenditure as part of the compensation of the Doorkeeper, except that the former appropriation bill provided that $1,100 should be applied for this purpose; and the present appropriation bill has restricted that expenditure by language which has heretofore been considered as not obnoxious to the rule which prohibits new legislation on general appropriation bills.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. Does the Chair hold that the Committee has not the power to make the change from $1,100 to $600?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair remembers well that in the Forty-fourth Congress there was a change of salary in reference to this office; and this amount, which was then fixed, was understood to be a part of the salary allowed to this officer, so that he was required to make no account of the particular sums expended by him under this item. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Does the decision of the Chair result in the introduction of the word "eleven" instead of the word "six?"

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled out the sum named in the bill, and it is now in order to move an amendment covering that point.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I move to amend by inserting the word "eleven" before the word "hundred," so as to make the appropriation conform, as I understand, to the ruling of the Chair and to the intention of the law upon the statute-book, which was that the Doorkeeper should receive this amount of $1,100.

Mr. PAYSON. I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 22, on page 13, strike out "600" and insert "1,100;" so as to read: "For hire of horses, feed, repair of wagon and harness, $1,100."

Mr. PAYSON. Is an amendment to that amendment in order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. PAYSON. Why?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already stated that, according to his information, the accounting officers of the Treasury have uniformly treated this item of $1,100 as a part of the salary of this official, so that he does not render any account of the particular expenditures in connection therewith.

Mr. PAYSON. But if this is an amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio under the rules of the House, why is it not subject to amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio first raised the question of order that this item for the Doorkeeper as inserted in the bill was not in accordance with the statute. The Chair sustained the point; and hence the amount proposed in the bill went out. There being then no provision for the amount required by law, the gentleman from Ohio moved an amendment in accordance with existing law. Any amendment differing from that, the Chair holds, would be in violation of the rules. Whatever reasonableness or unreasonableness may attach to a decision which is necessitated by the rules, the Chair is not responsible for it.

Mr. PAYSON. In order to present the question, I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio by striking out "11" and inserting "6."

Mr. OUTHWAITE. On that I make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Chair sustains it.

Mr. TAULBEE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. If the law fixes the compensation of the Doorkeeper at $3,000, and also allows a perquisite of $1,100 for certain expenditures, is it in order under the rules of the House to provide in a general appropriation bill for the payment to that officer of a less sum than is provided for by existing law as his salary?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not rule on any supposed case, but only on amendments as they are offered.

Mr. TAULBEE. This is not a "supposed case," but is connected with the point now under consideration.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I believe the Chair has ruled the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio as in order, and therefore before the committee. On that point I wish to say that the Committee on Appropriations, who have investigated this question, have reported $600 as amply sufficient to enable the Doorkeeper to provide for "hire of horses, feed, repair of wagon, and harness." Some examination of this matter was made at the beginning of this session, when it was insisted by many members that $1,100 was an excessive allowance for these purposes, and they undertook to show that a former Doorkeeper had done the work for less money, and because he had saved a small amount in this way he was accused of embezzlement and fraud. Now, if this work was done for $600, I say this Committee of the Whole, in justice to itself, and in justice to the country, ought not to appropriate $1,100, but ought to save $500 for the Treasury. This sum, which we can save on this item, ought not to go to the Doorkeeper, whoever he may be, Democrat or Republican. We ought not, because of the wording of a previous law, to make this sum $1,100, when it has been demonstrated that a less sum is sufficient for this purpose. Referring to past appropriation bills, we find that the salary of the Doorkeeper has been raised and lowered from time to time according to the discretion of Congress. In 1878 the Doorkeeper's salary was only $2,500. This bill, as it came before us, proposed to make the salary $3,500. Where is the necessity for this increase? Have the duties of the Doorkeeper increased? Have his responsibilities increased? Has the amount of his work increased? Let gentlemen answer those questions for themselves. In 1885 the law fixed this salary at $3,000, and that has since been the amount. I insist that it is sufficient to-day, but I do not object to allowing the Doorkeeper in addition the $600 which the Committee on Appropriations say is sufficient to pay for horse-hire, etc. It seems to me proper to pass the appropriation in this shape.

Mr. RANDALL. The committee thought that $600 was adequate, and that $1,100 gave an emolument which came by indirection.

Mr. McCREARY. Which was not intended.

Mr. HOLMAN. Certainly not.

The question recurred on Mr. OUTHWAITE'S amendment.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 27, noes 55.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No quorum has voted. I do not think the House understands this is doing the Doorkeeper an injustice. [Cries of "Order!"]

Several MEMBERS. Debate is not in order.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. It cuts down his salary $600.

The CHAIRMAN appointed as tellers Mr. FORNEY and Mr. OUTHWAITE.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 59, noes 42.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I withdraw my point of order that there is no quorum, if nobody objects.

Mr. WILLIAMS renewed the point of order, but afterward withdrew it.

The CHAIRMAN. The tellers now report—ayes 59, noes 42.

So Mr. OUTHWAITE'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I move, after the word "at," in line 9, page 14, to strike out the words "one thousand dollars" and insert "one thousand two hundred dollars;" so it will read:

Nine messengers, at $1,200 each.

Mr. KERR. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, against that amendment. I understand the present law provides for $1,000 only. I make the point of order that it changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I move, then, to strike out the last word. Certainly, if the Democrats of the House of Representatives can afford to continue this injustice against their own employés, the Republicans can afford to permit them to do so.

I wish to reply to the criticism made yesterday in the course of the debate by my friend, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KERR], to the effect that he regarded it as the duty of the Republicans of the Committee on Accounts to refrain from offering any such amendments or recommending such action in the House. He said that it was not good politics, or that seemed to be the gist of his criticism.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that, so far as my limited experience is concerned, I have yet to learn that anything is gained by loading a cannon for the purpose of destroying a tom-tit. [Laughter.]

Judging from the debate which has been carried on here for the last month, it seems to be agreed that the great questions of protection and free trade and revenue reform and reduction in the surplus revenue are to be the issues in the coming Presidential campaign before the country, and it is barely possible in the discussion of these great questions that there will be dropped out of sight any question of a reasonable increase in the salaries of the messengers and other employés of the House of Representatives. It does not seem to me that this latter question is broad enough upon which to base a national issue and a national campaign, nor does it seem to me to be essential to the great doctrine of public economy that injustice should be perpetuated by this House against its own officers. Nor do I believe that the American people are in favor of economy which degenerates into niggardliness. [Applause.]

That is all I have to say.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say to the gentleman there is one principle of the Republican party which he does not seem to be much in favor of, and that is economy in the public expenditures.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. In all the essentials of Republican principles I think I can say with truth that I have never been found wanting. But I am not in favor of the kind of economy which the gentleman from Iowa mistakes for a Republican principle.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I raise the point of order on the words on the fifteenth page, beginning with the third line, "boys not under fourteen years of age," as they propose new legislation in this bill.

Mr. RANDALL rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] moved an amendment to this very item which was entertained and agreed to by the House.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The Chair will remember that as to these words in this paragraph I reserved the point of order. I have been unable to obtain the floor to state my point of order until the present moment. I did not hear the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has no doubt that is true.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is true.

The CHAIRMAN. But the Chair is bound to rule as he has done. No doubt if the gentleman had heard it in the confusion he would have raised the point.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What amendment was inserted?

The CHAIRMAN. Twelve instead of fourteen.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I raise the point of order on the remaining words "not under years of age," and on that point of order I desire to be heard.

Mr. FORNEY. That portion of the bill has already been amended.

The CHAIRMAN. But the gentleman from New Jersey raises a new question of order, which he will state.

Mr. DOCKERY. The point of order evidently comes too late. It is not a substantive proposition. The words left do not make good sense standing alone.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will the Chair indicate some way that I could have made the point of order sooner? I announced my intention of reserving the point of order upon the paragraph when it was first read, as the Chair will remember.

Mr. FORNEY. The gentleman should have made the point of order when the amendment was offered by myself.

Mr. BUCHANAN. But I had not the floor for that purpose. I reserved the point of order, and supposed that reservation would be regarded.

I will submit to this now; but I give notice now that it shall not be done again.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state that there was no disposition whatever to prevent the gentleman from presenting his point of order. When the gentleman from Alabama moved to amend the paragraph, if the gentleman from New Jersey had heard it and made his point of order, the Chair would have entertained it.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am not seeking to find fault with the Chair. The Chair undoubtedly performed its duty.

The Clerk read as follows;

Office of Postmaster: For Postmaster, $2,500; first assistant postmaster, $2,000; ten messengers, including messenger to superintend transportation of mails, at $1,200 each; three messengers during the session, at $900 each; four messengers, at $100 per month each during the session; and one laborer, at $720; in all, $21,220.

For hire of horses and mail-wagons for carrying the mails, $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. TAULBEE. I make the point of order against the provision contained in lines 22 and 23—

For hire of horses and mail-wagons for carrying the mails, $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary—

That it changes existing law.

Mr. RANDALL. I hope the gentleman will not do that. He does not want us to contract for just $5,000, when by competition we may be able to get it done for $4,000.

Mr. TAULBEE. I would say, in reference to that, Mr. Chairman, that the point of order which I have made goes to the effect that the language of this clause should conform to the former appropriation bill; and it does not necessarily involve the expenditure of any additional sum, if the point of order is sustained.

Mr. RANDALL. The object of this is to have this work done by contract, and at the lowest possible rate. Now there is no power to do this unless the language employed here is used. It may be done for $4,500 or $4,000, as I have said, and I hope the gentleman will not insist upon his objection.

Mr. TAULBEE. I wish to say, in reference to the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that this item of expenditure is amply guarded by the phraseology of the clause itself.

Mr. RANDALL. It is now as clear as language can make it.

Mr. TAULBEE. The provision that my point of order would strike out relates to the words "five thousand dollars."

Mr. HOLMAN. But that is the law now.

Mr. RANDALL. In the last appropriation it was this sum.

Mr. TAULBEE. But it recurs to the former law of the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. But, as I have said, that provides for $5,000.

Mr. FORNEY. The idea here is to provide for competition, so as to reduce the cost.

Mr. TAULBEE. On the suggestion of gentlemen around me I will withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Official Reporters: For one Chief Official Reporter, $6,000; and for four Official Reporters of the proceedings and debates of the House, at $5,000 each; messenger to the Official Reporters, $1,000; in all, $27,000.

Mr. FORNEY. By direction of the committee I offer the amendment which I send to the desk to come in after the words "twenty-seven thousand dollars," just read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert:

"Stenographers to committees: For two stenographers to committees, at $4,000 each, $8,000."

Mr. KERR. I desire to ask the member of the committee in charge of this bill whether this is a copy of the existing law?

Mr. FORNEY. It is.

Mr. RANDALL. In making up the bill the committee are required to comply with the existing law under the rule.

Mr. TAULBEE. I desire to make the point of order upon the amendment for the purpose of asking the gentleman who offered it to what committees these are to be assigned.

Mr. RANDALL. To all committees having need for them.

Mr. HOLMAN. The Speaker assigns them to such committees as require their services.

Mr. FORNEY. Any committee that has need for that service can employ these stenographers.

Mr. TAULBEE. I withdraw the point of order.

The question recurring upon the amendment of Mr. FORNEY, it was agreed to.

Mr. BURNES. I move to strike out, in line 2, the words "messenger to the Official Reporters," and in lieu thereof to insert the words "one Assistant Official Reporter under the Chief Official Reporter." The amount is left as it is in the bill, the only change proposed being one of phraseology. Mr. Philip McElhone, the incumbent of this office, is a young gentleman of education and special skill as a shorthand writer. He is perfectly competent to fill the position of Assistant Official Reporter under the Chief Official Reporter. He is familiar with the rules and business of the House, and is daily engaged in noting the filing and disposition of reports of committees. It would seem to be fair if he is to make this his profession he should receive the proper designation of Assistant Official Reporter with the hope and expectation of standing in the line of promotion by experience and ability to the higher position.

The membership of the House has largely increased, and there has been a corresponding increase in the business transacted, yet the Official Reporters remain the same while their duties continue to be of the most onerous, difficult, and responsible character. It would only seem to be just that the Chief Official Reporter should have this one assistant to afford him some relief in the discharge of his labors.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For miscellaneous items and expenses of special and select committees, including compensation at such a rate as may be fixed by the Committee on Accounts, but not exceeding $1.50 per printed page: To stenographers to committees, to be appointed by the Speaker on the application of committees, $20,000.

Mr. FORNEY. I move the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 16, line 16, strike out all after the word "committees" down to and including line 20, and insert "$20,000."

Mr. FORNEY. This makes the paragraph conform to the amendment just adopted.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For Botanic Garden: For superintendent, $1,800; for assistants and laborers, under the direction of the Joint Library Committee of Congress, $9,900; for three additional laborers, at $1.25 per day each, $1,173.75; in all, $12,873.75.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I move to amend by striking out, in line 22, the word "twenty-five" and insert in lieu thereof the word "fifty;" so that it will read:

Three additional laborers, at $1.50 per day each.

Mr. FORNEY. I make the point of order that this changes existing law.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I hope the gentleman will allow me to be heard upon this amendment.

Mr. FORNEY. I think we had better proceed with the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must rule upon the point of order which is insisted upon by the gentleman in charge of the bill.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I move to strike out the last word. Of course I believe the present occupant of the chair considers himself right in his decision. Still it looks to me like a farce to ask the members of the House to sit here and go through this bill, which merely re-enacts the law passed by the last Congress—to listen to the reading of this bill and not be able to make a single amendment, even where it might appear proper to every member of this House. I believe that this decision of the Chair is wrong. And while I do not feel called upon myself to appeal from the decision of the Chair, I do hope that some other member, more versed than I am in parliamentary law, will at this stage of the consideration of the bill discuss the parliamentary question involved, and after discussion demand an appeal from the decision of the Chair.

In the consideration of this bill the ruling of the Chair in the Forty-ninth Congress was different, and, in my judgment, correct. Here is an amendment to pay a laborer $1.50 per day, the least that is paid for similar work in most of the cities. In New York and my own city the pay for the same kind of labor is often even more than that. To make a point of order on an amendment which will have the effect of only adding $234.75 to the total amount appropriated, raising the wages of men underpaid 25 cents per day, I will say, is rather a small piece of business on the part of the gentleman who made the point of order. I hope he will withdraw it in the interest of fair play to the wage-worker. We certainly ought to ask no man to work for this Government for the paltry sum of $1.25 per day.

Mr. FORNEY. I will state to the gentleman that laborers in my part of the country get less than $1.25 a day.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I now withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. PAYSON. I renew the substantial amendment made by the gentleman from New Jersey, to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "fifty." I ask the Clerk to read the paragraph as it would be so amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

For three additional laborers, at $1.50 a day each.

Mr. FORNEY. I make the point of order upon that amendment.

Mr. PAYSON. On the point of order I desire to say a few words.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. PAYSON. I was not present when the point of order was originally decided by the Chair, holding that these amendments were not in order. As I understand the ruling of the Chair—and if incorrect in that understanding I desire to be corrected—as I understand, the ruling of the Chair is tantamount to holding that whenever an appropriation bill is adopted by the House of Representatives, that is a continuing law for this country as long as the Government shall stand and the rules of the House shall not be changed. The rule of the House which it is claimed is impaired or infringed upon by this amendment, as I understand it, is this, that an amendment to an appropriation bill which changes existing law shall not be in order.

The point which will be urged against this amendment is that, under existing law, whatever laborers are employed in the Botanic Garden can only receive $1.25 per day. The error in that argument is that the provision in existing law ceases and is limited by the expiration of the pending year. I agree as to any laborer now employed in the Botanic Garden; his wages for the current year can not be reduced below $1.25, because a rule of the House provides that existing law shall not be changed in an appropriation bill. I submit to the Chair with all deference, and yet with earnest confidence, that the only existing law with reference to these men who are working for a dollar and a quarter a day at the Botanic Garden is the appropriation bill for the present year. When the present year shall end, when the 30th of June shall roll around, that is the end, not only of the law, but of the power to employ those men.

What is the existing law with reference to the men provided for or about to be provided for in this bill? There is none. This committee is making a law with reference to those men. That will be the law whenever what we do in committee shall be approved by the House.

It seems to me the statement of the proposition is the strongest argument we can have with reference to it. In this precise case what are we asked to do? By this bill and by the pending proposition we are asked to authorize the superintendent of the Botanic Garden after the 1st day of July to appoint three men. Except for the provisions of the bill we are now considering, he has no power to employ these men. He would be as powerless in regard to it as the President of the United States or any citizen of the Union. But in the law which we are proposing to enact, to become operative at the beginning of the next fiscal year, we provide for the details and say that three men shall be employed under the provisions of this bill and that those men when thus employed under this authority shall be paid $1.25 a day. I say that Congress has the power to order that those men shall be paid $1.50 a day. Suppose something should happen requiring that their services should be dispensed with (and I am in ignorance now how many are employed there)—suppose there should be an exigency of the service requiring, in the judgment of Congress, the employment of four men, or half a dozen men, it seems to me to go without saying that this Congress, looking at the necessities of the future as to the employés of the Botanic Garden, has the power to say not only what they shall be paid, but how many shall be employed. Otherwise it all comes back to the proposition, under the ruling of the Chair, that until there shall be a change in the rules of this House the annual appropriation bill fixes the status of every condition of employment under this Government as long as the nation shall stand, which to me is an utter absurdity.

A MEMBER. This appropriation commences in the future.

Mr. PAYSON. Of course it must commence in the future, because the "existing law" in connection with appropriations is simply the current law for the current fiscal year. What can be said against the proposition that there is no "existing law" as to the number of men that shall be employed in the Botanic Gardens after the 1st day of July or as to what they shall be paid?

Mr. REED. And the last House fixes all the expenditures of the present House.

Mr. PAYSON. Yes; and the First Congress of the United States fixes them for all time, on that theory.

Mr. REED. The House fixes it and deprives itself of the right to change it. I always thought the rule was absurd any way.

Mr. PAYSON. But this goes far beyond the rule. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I have made myself understood, I do not desire to say anything further at the outset; but the matter seems to me to be so clear that if the Chair insists upon its ruling I think the rule ought to be changed——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can but rule as the Chair thinks correct in the matter and as has been ruled heretofore. The Chair thinks, however, that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON] states the ruling very much more strongly than the Chair intended it, or than has ever been ruled. The gentleman says that under the ruling the number of employés at the Botanic Garden could not be added to; and so the gentleman might lead on and say that there could not be any increase in the number of employés in any Department. The Chair never meant to announce any such opinion.

Mr. PAYSON. Then let me make a parliamentary inquiry for the purpose of understanding the ruling of the Chair. Does the Chair hold that it would be in order to move to increase the number of employés under the present appropriation bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair holds that it is perfectly competent for the Committee on Appropriations, when they find that the Government needs an additional number of employés, to provide for them in the bill, as has always been done.

Mr. PAYSON. That is not the question I asked the Chair. My question was as to the power of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union may do the same thing.

Mr. PAYSON. Then if the committee can make that change as to the number of employés, why may it not do the same with reference to their pay?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not care to get into a colloquy with the gentleman.

Mr. PAYSON. It is not a colloquy. I am making a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already given his views in stating his ruling.

Mr. REED. But does not the Chair perceive that the same line of reasoning which allows an increase in the number can also allow a change in the compensation?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think so.

Mr. REED. Because they are both a change of existing law, if one of them is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not think so.

Mr. PAYSON. With all due respect to the Chair, I must ask the ruling of the committee on this point.

Mr. REED. The whole thing has its origin in a folly which has been prevalent in the House for ten or a dozen years past, the idea that the House of Representatives—its majority—is not to be trusted with

the power to fix salaries; that it may lower them, but it may not raise them—an idea which always seemed to me to be a logical and practical absurdity, which never could justify itself to any intelligent person.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not ruled that the committee may lower salaries, but not raise them. The Chair has simply held that it is restrained by the rules of the House from any discretion in the matter of what shall go into appropriation bills in relation to the compensation of employés. When the compensation of any number of employés shall be once ascertained, then the salary has been fixed, and that is an indication of the legislative will.

Mr. REED. Will the Chair permit me a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair prefers not to make any ruling until the gentleman concludes. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. REED. Merely one suggestion. The point is, I suppose, as to "existing law." Now, the appropriation bill covers only a certain time, a certain year. How, then, can it be "existing law" with regard to an appropriation bill which proposes to cover another year? There has always been my difficulty about calling these appropriation bills existing law. I can understand that where a statute has deliberately fixed for all future time, until repealed, the salary of an office, it would be a violation of existing law for the House, under its present rules, to permit a change upon an appropriation bill. But where there is only an appropriation bill, which is existing law for the time being, and can not be the existing law *quoad* the time to which the appropriation bill is to apply, I can not see how a point under the rules can be based upon a mere temporary provision in such prior law. This is the point I wished to bring before the Chair. I have not been attending to the present discussion, and very possibly the same point has been already made.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. The provision of the rule is that "no appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be offered as an amendment thereto, for an expenditure not previously authorized by law." Now, I wish to inquire whether the Committee on Appropriations may report to this House in an appropriation bill matter which would not be proper by way of amendment in the Committee of the Whole?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks not.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I understood the ruling of the Chair was the other way.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chairman, upon examining this bill very carefully yesterday, I was very much surprised to find that any committee of this House should in a bill like this propose that men working in a city like Washington should receive for their work only $1.25 a day. I take it upon myself to say that there is no member of this House, however economically he may manage his expenditures, who is not called upon to take out of his pocket daily for merely incidental expenses $1.25; yet we propose this sum as the whole per diem compensation for men who are to labor for the Government.

Mr. FORNEY. I will remind the gentleman that the appropriation here proposed is the same that has been made heretofore.

Mr. LAWLER. That may be; but I take the position that this parsimonious way of paying the humbler employés of the Government is one of the causes of our troubles to-day. I have listened very patiently while gentlemen on this side and on the other side have recently, by their speeches on this floor, declared their feelings toward the toilers of the country; and I was gratified at the expressions which I heard uttered. But when I look over this bill, I can see the attempt to carry out right here in this city class legislation of the most objectionable character. Gentlemen here who find themselves scarcely able to live at a less expense than $4,000 or $5,000 a year, are so generous as to propose that the humble laborers of the Government shall support themselves and families on a compensation of $1.25 a day.

Now, I say to members of the House who during the last thirty days have been expressing themselves with so much feeling in behalf of the toilers of the country, that here is a splendid opportunity to show what we are willing to do practically in that direction; and I propose to put every member of this House on record. I say that these men ought to have $2 a day. [Applause.] It is a crying shame that members of this House who have some knowledge of the cost of living in this city of Washington, and who provide in other portions of this bill princely salaries for high officials of the Government, should ask any human being to work for the Government for $1.25 a day. I protest against it; and I ask that this allowance for men employed in the Botanical Garden be made $2 a day instead of $1.25. I ask unanimous consent of this Committee of the Whole that that change be made. I want to see any gentleman get up and object to it. [Laughter.]

Mr. TILLMAN. I object to it.

Mr. PAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I understand there is a question of order pending which must be decided before the proposition of my colleague [Mr. LAWLER] can be entertained. I assure him that he has my thorough sympathy in a great deal of what he has been saying——

Mr. LAWLER. I understood that the Chair rendered his opinion on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustained the point of order.

Mr. LONG. Under the Chair's ruling the question is, what is the existing law? That, I understand the Chair to say, is concluded, in the absence of a general statute, by the appropriation bill of last year. And, looking at the appropriation bill of last year, its provisions make the rate of wages $1.25 a day for the current fiscal year ending the 1st of July next, but there is no provision for the future. The existing law, therefore, is $1.25 a day until July 1, and nothing after that time. The Chair's ruling, therefore, leads to the absurdity, you can make no provision at all for the next year, because that would change existing law, which now provides nothing for next year. It is a *reductio ad absurdum*.

Mr. FORNEY. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. PAYSON. It might as well be decided now as at any other time. I insist on the motion to amend.

Mr. FORNEY. I have withdrawn the amendment.

Mr. PAYSON. The amendment I move is to increase the pay of these three men from $1.25 to $1.50 a day. Now, it does seem to me that is asking a great deal of the laboring men of this city who work for the Government and put in the necessary time to constitute a day's work and to receive the pay of only $1.25. It seems to me opposition to this simple increase to the laboring men of this country comes with poor grace from those who have no hesitancy whatever in increasing salaries ranging from $500 to $1,000 on the part of men upon whom are imposed the arduous duties of sitting and waiting at the different doors of this room and of the gallery. [Laughter.] The idea of economy, which seems to have been adopted in the Committee on Appropriations, is to cut down the wages of men who do actual work to $1.25 a day. I do not believe the House will sustain any such action, in view of appropriations contained in the pending bill.

Mr. RANDALL. The Committee on Appropriations do not anywhere cut down the wages of workingmen. On the contrary, in many places the wages of the laborers have been increased.

Mr. PAYSON. They certainly have not been increased in this instance.

Mr. FORNEY. There is a fund of $9,900 out of which laborers are paid, ranging from $1.50 to $3 a day each. These three additional laborers were provided for at $1.25 a day each, because the Superintendent of the Botanical Garden asked for their employment at that rate. Out of the slush fund of $9,900 he can pay $3 or $5 as he pleases, according to the service rendered; but I presume these three laborers are required to be permanently employed at $1.25 a day each. They are required to roll wheelbarrows and to do like work around the grounds.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I moved to strike out $1.25 and insert $1.50, because I did not think this economical House would agree to give $2 a day, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAWLER]; but I now move to strike out $1.25 and insert $2 a day. It must be remembered that expenses in the city of Washington are considerably higher than they are elsewhere or than they were here fifteen years ago. Rents have considerably increased in that time, and I do not see how it is possible for a man to get along for a less sum than $2 a day.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH].

The House divided; and there were—ayes 65, noes 20.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COBB. I move to amend by striking out the whole paragraph in reference to these three laborers at $2 a day; and I desire to state the reasons why I do so. This committee has already provided for the usual number of laborers under the appropriation of $9,900, and in making this provision it is to be presumed the committee which reported the bill understood the character and amount of labor necessary to be had, and provided in this sum adequate compensation therefor. It is to be presumed that the committee covered all the labor necessary to be performed at the Botanical Garden. Therefore, why is it necessary to put in a provision for three additional laborers as is done in this paragraph? Because I deem that to be unnecessary I have moved to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not know whether the gentleman from Alabama is actuated by motives of economy, or if he is against the allowance of this special amount being paid to these employés. There must have been a necessity for their getting into this bill, for I can promise my friend from Alabama that the committee who reported it never would have carried them in its pages if they had not deemed that necessity to exist. If I could understand the purpose that actuates my friend and the principles that govern him in moving to strike this out after the House of Representatives has made the increase that was asked for from $1.25 a day up to $2 a day, then I could respond to the gentleman's position.

Mr. COBB. I will state to the gentleman my object in making the motion. I am in favor of the employment of such labor as may be necessary at whatever pay is proper and right to be given for the services rendered. Under the provisions of this bill, immediately preceding the words which I propose to strike out, the power is given to the superintendent of the Botanical Garden to employ at any reasonable price or at the market price such labor as he may require, even if it costs three or five dollars a day. By the words I move to strike out he is limited, as to the three laborers, to the compensation named—$2 per day. He could not pay more, even if the market price demanded it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Do you know whether it is necessary or unnecessary to employ these additional laborers?

Mr. COBB. I know nothing in regard to the matter, except what I hear from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. LEHLBACH. But the committee say it is necessary. Now if they say it is not necessary to employ the three additional laborers, then strike that from the bill. But do not put the House in the false position (because they were generous enough to advance the rate of wages from $1.25 a day to $2 a day) of striking it out altogether from the bill, although the gentleman may be willing to do that. That would put the House in a false position.

Mr. COBB. No, the gentleman is putting me in a false position by assuming that I am opposed to the specified per diem pay. I am perfectly willing that these laborers, if employed at all, shall be paid the sum of $2 a day, as has just been determined by this House to be proper and right. I have no objection whatever to that. It is not opposition to such compensation that prompts me to submit the motion. But I do say that the superintendent ought to be allowed, under the preceding provisions of the bill, to go into the market and employ all needed labor at whatever price it commands, even if such price be $3 a day, and to employ just such labor as is necessary to carry on the work. It would be class legislation for the Government to give more for labor than it is reasonably worth—more than it commands in a fair market, uninfluenced by unusual surroundings or disturbances.

Mr. LAWLER. I want to say to the gentleman right here and now that the tax-payers of this country are paying millions of dollars for salaries of persons whose services we could get in the market at a much less rate, and save to the people of this country that large sum which we now expend.

This bill, which he gracefully votes for, proposes in some instances the payment of thousands of dollars a year in the way of salaries to certain individuals, and yet the gentleman proposes to strike from this very bill an item for the employment of three additional laborers at $2 per day.

Mr. Chairman, I have refrained from taking any very active part in the business during the present session up to this time, but I give notice that the agitation going on now in this country and all over it arises from the very condition of the class legislation which is found in such bills as this. I repeat that it is a crime and a shame that gentlemen who draw from the tax-payers of this country $5,000 for salary each year will ask a man to live on $1.25 a day in a city like Washington, or any other city in the United States, as a laborer or employé of this Government. On general principles I believe that no laborer ought to be employed under $2 a day.

But my issue is on the general principle involved without regard to the three men here at all. We are met always with the statement that "the city is filled with laborers, and let us take advantage of them and employ them at $1 a day or less if we can get them."

Gentlemen, that is all wrong. I know in my district there are gentlemen who would give $10,000, yea $20,000, to hold the position I am occupying here to-day [laughter], and they would make a present to some charitable institution of the salary of this office; and I believe the same can be applied to every district to-day in this country. Now, you pay a Congressman $5,000 a year, and we come here gracefully and draw our $5,000, like little men, and vote $5,000 here without question as salary for a few hours a day to other men, besides giving them carriage hire and feed for horse, and we give them servants, and take it all out of the blood of the man who is compelled to labor to beautify the city and keep it in a healthful and attractive condition, and ask him at the same time to render his services to the Government for a dollar and twenty-five or a dollar and fifty cents a day. I say this Congress must commence somewhere to make an equalization of all such things, and now is as good a time as ever, and this bill is the very place. Hence I hope the gentleman will not press his motion.

Mr. COBB. I would like to be heard for a moment in response to the gentleman. I do not propose, Mr. Chairman, to be placed in any false attitude in regard to the question here presented. I am perfectly willing to meet any responsibility that may be cast upon me as a member of this House by my action upon this or any other question. If the gentleman had paid attention to what I said, if, indeed, I have been fortunate enough to make myself understood, he would have found that it was not against, but absolutely in the interest of, the very laborers for whom he speaks, that I was arguing.

There is no limit necessary to be fixed here. Here is an appropriation which, it is to be presumed, is sufficient to cover all the labor that is reasonably necessary to be employed in and about this business. If it is necessary to employ labor, and if that labor is worth $3 a day, it is unjust to fix it in this bill at $2 a day.

Mr. LAWLER. Let me say to the gentleman that the superintendent made, as I understand, a statement to the Committee on Appropriations that it was necessary to have these three additional men.

Mr. COBB. The chairman of the committee has just said that the superintendent had this matter incorporated in a former appropriation bill out of abundant caution, lest, on account of some emergency, he would not have a sufficient appropriation to do the work in and about the botanical department. And on account of the emergency that might possibly happen—whether it has ever happened or not we are not informed—this provision for the employment of three laborers was put in the appropriation bill some years ago.

Now, I want to say that I am willing to strike out the whole section. I am opposed to this whole botanical business. I am opposed to this conservatory affair we have that does none of our constituents any good. What have we got here? We have something that we call the botanical department; and what does it do? You are permitted to go there if you have the time—I have not gone there yet, but they tell me such is the case—and you find stuck away under glass various and sundry kinds of flowers; some, I believe, they call orchids, that cost from $200 to $1,000 apiece.

What good they do to anybody I have not yet been informed. Where they are sent, if anywhere, I am not advised. As to who gets the benefit of them I know nothing. I do know, sir, that your constituents and mine who pay the costs of their cultivation receive no good from them. I know that fact well. So far as this whole thing is concerned I am unalterably opposed to it, and if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAWLER] is on the line of economy and for the protection of the interests of laborers, and of his constituents, I will cheerfully join with him in voting to strike this whole section out of the bill. This would be legislation in the direction of reducing taxation, or, at least, of economy in expenditure, which makes reduction of taxes possible and hence in the interest of labor.

Mr. LAWLER. What would then become of my colleague [Mr. SPRINGER] and his bouquet every day? [Laughter.]

Mr. COBB. Mr. Chairman, I am just informed why it is that this Botanic Garden is kept in existence. If the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAWLER] is correct it is for the purpose of supplying his colleague with the bouquets he wears on the lappel of his coat.

Mr. SPRINGER. I never got a bouquet there in my life.

Mr. COBB. The reason I do not make the motion to strike out the whole section is this: Some time ago I was talking to a gentleman on this floor and was asking about this flower business. Being a new member, and, like other new members, not used to these extra performances, and being in favor of and committed to retrenchment and reform, I asked him why it is we need a botanical department; what good it does to any body; especially what good does it do to my and his laboring constituents who never saw one of these elegant orchids or like expensively cultivated flowers?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MONTGOMERY was recognized and yielded his time to Mr. COBB.

Mr. COBB. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy. The gentleman I was talking to was an old member, who had been here many years. I asked him about all this, and I told him it did not seem to me to be exactly in the direction of retrenchment and reform. He was a Democrat, too. [Cries of "Name him!"] I told the gentleman that I was a very modest man. I assumed that. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. You are making a violent assumption.

Mr. COBB. Well, be that as it may, I asked the gentleman in consideration of my supposed modesty, to attack the useless business, or if he would not, as he seemed not disposed to do so, to advise me how best to proceed in making such attack. He suggested, "Wait until the appropriation bill comes in, and then you can get a chance at it; but I warn you to let it severely alone." I told him I felt constrained to make some effort in so good a cause, and that when the appropriation bill was reported I intended adopting his suggestion to move to strike out any appropriation for the botanical department, and thus starve it out. What do you suppose was his reply—the reply of a Democrat in favor of retrenchment and reform? He said, "If you do, you are a fool." [Great laughter.]

Mr. STRUBLE. Let the name of the genius be known.

Mr. COBB. He gave a good reason for his assertion. He said, "When I came into Congress I was just as green as you are." [Laughter.] He went on to say, "I thought just as you do, that a man ought to bring his common honesty with him when he comes into the House of Representatives, and not leave it all at home; and that he should look around to see what is best to be done to carry on the Government in the most economical manner consistent with the greatest efficiency in the service, and I thought about this thing, too, and I made this effort, and they laughed at me and called me just what I say you will be if you make the effort." [Laughter.] I asked him what was the use of the thing. "Well," he said, "the members are entitled to go there, the favorite ones—not every fellow" [laughter]—I found that out afterwards [laughter]—"they are entitled to go there, and get bouquets."

You see, Mr. Chairman, he was going upon the idea, and I expect it is a very just one, that a first-termer has not much standing in this House [laughter]; that there is not much use for him here until it is seen whether he is going to be indorsed by his constituents or not. And really I am not sure that my friend was very far wrong in such ideas, or that it is not assumed that the first-termer is a "fool" until it is ascertained whether his constituents think otherwise.

Mr. STRUBLE. That is, whether his constituents are fools. [Laughter.]

Mr. COBB. Perhaps so, only I can not consent that my constituents are entitled to such designation under any circumstances.

Mr. WEBER. Till they find out whether he is going to fight these appropriations.

Mr. COBB. Yes, sir; all improper appropriations.

Mr. WEBER. Well, you are all right from this time on.

Mr. COBB. I am just telling you what my friend told me about the uses of this concern—this Botanic Garden.

Mr. PETERS. You will have no trouble hereafter in obtaining flowers. [Laughter.]

Mr. COBB. No; that is one thing I am doing this speaking for. [Renewed laughter.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TAULBEE. I move to strike out the last word, and I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. COBB. Mr. Chairman, I do not want to consume the time of this committee unnecessarily, but I am not quite through telling what my friend told me about this garden.

Mr. LAWLER. Go ahead and tell it.

Mr. COBB. I do not believe I will tell the rest of it.

Mr. LAWLER. Oh, yes.

Mr. COBB. He was just giving me a history of the uses of the garden.

Mr. LAWLER. I want that information myself.

Mr. COBB. Well, he said, "There are beautiful bouquets that go out from that garden to favored members, but where they go after they reach the possession of the members I can not tell; only I know they do not go to members whose wives are with them." [Great laughter.]

Mr. FORNEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a pending motion by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. COBB] to strike out the paragraph.

Mr. COBB. I withdraw that, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion to strike out is withdrawn. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] can now send up his amendment.

Mr. FORNEY. I send the amendment to the desk, and ask to have it read.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 18, strike out all of line 21 and the lines following down to and including line 25, and in lieu thereof insert "$13,100."

Mr. FORNEY. The effect of that amendment will be this. Under the head of Botanic Garden is this provision:

For Botanic Garden: For superintendent, $1,800; for assistants and laborers, under the direction of the Joint Library Committee of Congress, $9,900; for three additional laborers, at $1.25 per day each, $1,173.75; in all, $12,873.75.

The committee will notice that this is all under the direction of the Joint Committee on the Library. By striking out what this amendment proposes to strike out there is given a net sum, so that the pay of the laborers will be under the control of the joint committee, and the amount embraces the pay of three laborers at $2 a day.

Mr. PAYSON. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire first of the gentleman having the bill in charge upon what per diem basis this computation as to the pay of the day laborers is founded?

Mr. FORNEY. That is to be left to the Joint Committee on the Library. But if the gentleman will notice, $9,900 is given for the pay of assistants and the laborers, under the direction of the Joint Library Committee. Now, in addition to that, the superintendent asked some time during the last Congress for an additional force of three laborers, at $1.25 a day, but the House has just decided that they should have $2 a day; so we have made a computation at that rate, and have increased the amount to that extent.

Mr. PAYSON. But the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Alabama does not place any restriction upon the committee as to the wages which shall be paid, though in the computation of the amount allowed $2 a day may have been the basis. To place the matter beyond question, I move this amendment:

Provided, That the wages of no day laborer shall be less than $2 per diem.

I offer this as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FORNEY. I think this matter should be left to the joint committee of Congress and to the superintendent.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Civil Service Commission:

For three commissioners, at $3,500 each; one chief examiner, $3,000; one secretary, $2,000; one clerk of class 4, who shall be a stenographer; one clerk of class 3; one clerk of class 2; one clerk of class 1; one clerk, at $1,000; two clerks, at $900 each; one messenger; and one laborer; in all, $25,800.

For necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the commission, $4,000.

Mr. TAULBEE (during the reading). I desire to inquire whether these salaries are in conformity with existing law.

Mr. HOLMAN. Exactly.

Mr. FORNEY. They correspond with the appropriation bill for the present year.

The Clerk having concluded the reading of the paragraphs,

Mr. McCOMAS said: I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 20, in line 9, strike out "one" and insert "two."

In line 10 strike out "one" and insert "two;" and also strike out "one," after the words "class one," and insert "two."

In line 16 strike out "$4,000" and insert "$5,000."

Mr. McCOMAS. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in this amendment is to give the Civil Service Commission three additional clerks, as asked for by the commission, and also $1,000 additional asked for by them as traveling expenses.

It will, perhaps, surprise members of the House when I remark that the last printed report of the Civil Service Commission was published in 1886. That was the year when President Cleveland, for the last time, commended the civil service, in his language, to "the jealous care of Congress." But since August, 1886, there has been a great change, and now the best avenue to the applause of the other side of the House is to throw up your hat and cry "To the victors belong the spoils!" This slogan brings down the Congressional applause across the aisle every time.

The President himself seems to be now so much concerned in other matters that unless we on this side of the Chamber, whose party inaugurated the civil-service reform, take care of it, it will be stabbed and wounded after it has been left for dead already by the Administration now in power. It is not dead, but will survive this spoils Administration, and triumph ultimately.

I send to the desk to be read an extract which I have marked, wherein with precision one of the noblest, one of the foremost Democrats of this country defines the relation of the President to revenue reform and to civil-service reform, to which the President no longer gives "jealous care."

The Clerk read as follows:

Finally, we think that the legitimate relations of the President to the two subjects of reform are not by any means identical. When he postpones the purification of the Federal service to advise Congress how to purify the tariff he neglects what is emphatically his own business to meddle in what is primarily the business of others. "Dr. Cleveland" is slighting his patient to obtrude his opinions on another physician. No doubt he ought to be called into consultation, and no doubt the other doctor has shown himself utterly incompetent, but this does not excuse him. He was elected as an executive officer; it is the duty of such an officer to choose faithful and competent subordinates; and however excellent may be the counsel he gives the National Legislature, if he abandons the public service to inefficiency and corruption while he urges it on them, he is committing a mortal sin to do a work of supererogation.

Mr. Chairman, this language, which appears in the Civil Service Reformer, published in Baltimore, I believe to be from the pen of one of the purest and best men in this country. It is, in my belief, the felicitous utterance of the ablest, though not the foremost, Democrat in Maryland.

Several MEMBERS on the Democratic side. Who is he?

Mr. McCOMAS. I have not named him. My belief does not warrant the use of his name. If you will inquire you will find out who he is and what he is, and that I have justly called him a Democrat. I am ready to whisper to my friends in private on the other side the name of this Democrat who justly says that the President is "committing a mortal sin" to do "a work of supererogation."

I ask favorable consideration for the amendment I have offered, to increase the number of clerks of the Civil Service Commission, which has not been able to have published any reports since August, 1886, and which now says that additional clerks are needed for the proper and prompt performance of the steadily-increasing clerical work of that Department. I wish to enable the members of this commission to investigate in different parts of the country the operation of Democratic civil-service reform; and in this connection I wish particularly to see the $1,000 additional appropriated for traveling expenses, so that the members of the commission may at least go to New York and find out how it was that in the campaign of 1885 Democratic custom-house officials raised a campaign fund of $2,000 in a raffle over the Widow McGinnis's pig. [Laughter.] I think this $1,000 will enable the commission to find out the paternity and proprietorship of that pig, and how assessments in the coming campaign can be raised by levies on office-holders, and how many dollars are to be subscribed for each pig in the various custom-houses this fall. In this investigation $1,000 may count for a great deal. I ask for a vote on my amendment. I hope to see it carried even in this House.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to discuss the amendment offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS], because I suppose it was not offered with any intention of having it adopted.

Mr. McCOMAS. With the desire, but not with the hope.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I presume they were offered in order to secure the opportunity of making the remarks which the gentleman has made. It is needless now to discuss the merits of the system.

It has been a disappointment to the partisan Republican politicians and editors that President Cleveland has faithfully and honestly carried out the civil-service law according to its letter and spirit, whereas the preceding Republican administration disregarded its provisions. [Applause.]

Gentlemen may criticise this statement, but I wish to give some figures which will satisfy this House and the country the present Administration has faithfully executed the law and that its action is in

commendable contrast with the action of the Republican party when it was in power. [Applause.]

This law was approved January 16, 1883. From January 16, 1883, to January 16, 1884, there were forty-eight appointments to places within the classified service in the Departments at Washington. From January 16, 1884, to January 15, 1885, there were four hundred and thirty-two, including ninety pension examiners not apportioned by the commission. This was during the preceding administration, and shows a greater number of appointments in one year than have been made in that service within any twelve months of the present Administration.

Then from January 16, 1885, to January 16, 1886, the first year of this Administration, including a month and a half of the former administration, there were in all two hundred and thirty-nine appointments, eighteen of these before the 4th of March, 1885. From January 16, 1886, to January 16, 1887, there were three hundred and ninety-one, and from January 16, 1887, to June 30, 1887, there were one hundred and fifty-five. From June 30, 1887, to May 24, 1888, there were three hundred and forty-one. The removals have been less than the numbers I have given, because these numbers indicate all appointments, whether to fill vacancies caused by removal, death, or resignation, or to fill new offices created by law.

Within the twelve months preceding the incoming of the present Administration, the last Republican administration made more removals than have been made in any one year under the existing Democratic Administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.] And that, too, after you had possession of the Government and control of all appointments throughout the country for twenty-five years. No stronger proof could be asked on the part of the people of the fidelity with which the President has executed the civil-service law. [Applause.]

It shows also an excess in the twelve months preceding the present Administration of removals of your own appointees, turning out those who held office and replacing them by others, no doubt of the same political faith. That period covered the Presidential campaign, during which it was necessary, I suppose, to reward those who were expected to work for the Republican cause. [Laughter.]

Mr. MCCOMAS rose.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The gentleman from Maryland will excuse me, as I have but a few moments, and have not a minute to spare.

There have been, since the civil-service law went into effect, appointments in the graded service in Washington in the Departments numbering sixteen hundred and seven. As I have already stated, that includes a little more than two years of the previous administration, during which about five hundred of these appointments were made. Allow for new positions created and vacancies by reason of death and resignation, and the actual removals fall far short of this number. Of the thousands of employés in all the Departments here, it is evident that there have been far less than one thousand removals within the classified service. This, I submit, is a very small number considering the kind of material by which the Departments had been largely filled during the twenty-five years of Republican rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. I will take the floor and yield my time to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am obliged to the gentleman from Arkansas for his courtesy.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see how the law was carried out under the preceding administration. When this Administration came into power, of the various boards of examiners not only in the city of Washing but in all the customs districts throughout the country, as well as in all the post-offices controlled by the civil-service law, and there are quite a number of them, there were only two boards upon which there was a single Democrat, one here and one in the city of Philadelphia.

The Secretaries were of the same party. Thus the officials requesting certification of eligibles and choosing therefrom, as well as those conducting the examinations, grading applicants, and certifying eligibles, were all of the same party. The excuse rendered for this state of things was that the law required the boards to be composed of persons in the service, and that suitable persons who were Democrats could not be found. This, I have no doubt, was true, for they were not admitted to the service. There was not even a pretense of fairness in this.

In the New York custom-house there were in the five years preceding 1882 sixteen hundred and seventy eight removals and appointments, which is a larger number than all the appointments which had been made in the departmental service here under the administration of this law on account of removals, deaths, and resignations.

The President has in good faith kept his pledges and executed the law and all that has been promised in relation to the civil service. We hear complaints about the removal of postmasters who are not controlled by this law, and I find that on yesterday the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] complained that papers were filed in the Departments here against officials of this class who were not allowed to see them in order to prepare and file answers. He denounced the practice as one of the most outrageous invasions of common right and common fairness ever witnessed in any land or in any age. This is no new practice. It has been the practice ever since the Government has existed. It is not peculiar to this Administration by any means.

He might go through the Departments, and if he took pains to look he would find that under all administrations charges have been filed and are on file, complaints in the archives against incumbents of offices; and it never was proposed, until the gentleman by his bill introduced here proposed it, to convert all of the Departments into courts to hear charges and answers of gentlemen contesting for places.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman will do me the justice to say that my bill does not propose to take anybody into court; and my experience and observation are diametrically opposite to what the gentleman states to be the fact.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The gentleman proposes in his bill to make a radical change, to break down this practice, and I say that the practice has been the same ever since the organization of the Government in regard to the filing of such charges.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And I repeat that my experience and observations are diametrically opposed to the gentleman's.

Mr. CLEMENTS. And the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS] a few moments ago alluded to some practices in 1875 in New York. Now, I want to read——

Mr. MCCOMAS. I said 1885.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I want to read some letters illustrating the Republican machine methods bearing date of 1885. I send one to the desk.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TAULBEE moved to strike out the last word, and yielded his time to Mr. CLEMENTS.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am very much obliged to the gentleman. I ask the Clerk to read now the letter I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

HEADQUARTERS REPUBLICAN STATE COMMITTEE,
Philadelphia, September 2, 1885.

DEAR SIR: We desire an early subscription to the State committee, and as liberal as you can afford to make it. If the Republicans of Pennsylvania win a decisive victory this year it will prevent any agitation or disastrous change of the tariff by the incoming Congress and pave the way for the overthrow of the Democratic State and national administrations. We propose to push the work of the State committee with the utmost vigor until election day. Please send your subscription as early as possible, by check, money-order, or call at headquarters.

Yours, very truly,

THOS. V. COOPER, *Chairman.*

Mr. CLEMENTS. I now ask him to read this one.

The Clerk read as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, *October 10, 1885.*

MY DEAR SIR: We ask you as an active and generous Republican to promptly aid the Republican State committee to whatever extent you may feel able. You can send by check, post-office order, or call in person at headquarters, St. Cloud Hotel, where a correct and private financial record is kept. Prompt aid will insure a victory in Pennsylvania, which, with that now surely promised in New York, will maintain Republican ascendency in the United States Senate, insure the election of our governor and Legislature next year, and pave the way to Republican supremacy in 1888.

Very truly, yours,

THOS. V. COOPER.

Mr. CLEMENTS. These letters were written to parties in the employ of the Government in the post-office and custom-house at Philadelphia. I have some letters here written to other employés, but I will not take the time of the committee to read more of them. The Republican party became so in the habit—under the system of "Jay Hubbellism," and sanctioned by the Republican committee of which Mr. HALE was a member (notwithstanding he proposes now to complain because the President made removals without the limits of civil service)—of assessing the employés of the Government from the least to the greatest, that when the civil-service act became a law and went into practical operation they did not cease their old habits; and I suppose to-day that the great majority of those remaining in the Departments at Washington and in the custom-houses and post-offices and other public offices throughout the country, who remain still loyal to the old party, are contributing their proportion to its success.

But simply because the President has seen proper to extend this law and the spirit of the law beyond the mere letter, but has made removals of postmasters and others, gentlemen have gone to great pains to collect data to show how many removals have been made. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS] just said that this law was passed by a Republican Congress; that it was their law. Why then complain that a Democratic President has seen proper to make removals which you did not embrace within the law? Why object to his carrying it out? Can the gentleman point to a single instance on the part of the present Administration where a violation of the law or any rule under it has taken place?

Mr. REED. Did he not write a letter extending the status somewhat?

Mr. CLEMENTS. What does the gentleman say?

Mr. REED. Did he not write a letter extending the status of the law somewhat? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. CLEMENTS. I understand——

Mr. REED. And about the same time he wrote the silver letter, you remember?

Mr. CLEMENTS. He did, and I will add that he did not say to Mr. Curtis, "Burn this letter." [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. REED. Now, will the gentleman answer my question? He has stated what he did not do. Will he state what he did do?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The President has written letters. What letter does the gentleman from Maine refer to?

Mr. REED. I have stated it. I spoke of the letter enlarging civil-service reform, and the silver letter dated about the same time.

Mr. CLEMENTS. The President did say that the spirit of this law could with great propriety be applied to officers without its limits, and he has extended its application so as to retain in office a large per cent. of the postmasters, postal clerks, and other officers. After the election of President Cleveland and before his inauguration the Republican administration changed the classification in the Departments, extending it upward and downward so as to include all employés as near as possible, but the propriety of this was not seen by them until after the election.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. McCOMAS. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS] is the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service Reform under the administration of President Cleveland. It was his office, and not mine, to introduce the amendment which I have sent to the desk, and yet my friend has not said one word in behalf of civil-service reform. Every word he has said has been in extenuation of the abuses of which I complain, and which this law was enacted to prevent. I care less which party was right or wrong long ago, and more to know which will do right to-day.

Mr. Chairman, my colleague on the Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the Civil Service Committee at the same time, the gentleman from Georgia, ought to be the first man to give this Civil Service Commission all the aid it needs; but he points away back yonder how, in some other year, some people were removed, and I may safely deny the accuracy, as I deny the relevancy, of his old Silurian excavation; but it is strange he forgets that President Cleveland, in the letter which he ought to have burned, in view of what has taken place since, said the benefits of the law should be extended and its usefulness increased, and commended it to the liberal care and jealous protection of Congress, and straightway proceeded to remove almost every Presidential postmaster, all of the lower-class postmasters except about 12 per cent., all the foreign ministers and secretaries of legation, nearly all the consuls, the collectors of customs, the naval officers of customs, the appraisers, the assistant treasurers of the subtreasuries, the collectors of internal revenue, the district attorneys, the Territorial governors, the pension agents nearly all swept clean—a change of 100,000 office-holders.

Mr. TAULBEE. Will the gentleman allow me?

Mr. McCOMAS. Wait a moment. Peace; be still! My friend from Georgia talks of one year—some years ago. I say in a whole century, even under Jackson and under Van Buren, there has not been such a clean sweep as under Cleveland of Federal officers, with this difference, that fifty years ago the clean sweep was with brutal frankness, while under Mr. Cleveland it is done under the phylactery of the most colossal hypocrisy that ever was worn by a lord high executioner.

Mr. O'NEILL of Missouri, Mr. McKINNEY, and Mr. TAULBEE rose to interrupt Mr. McCOMAS.

Mr. McCOMAS. One at a time, gentlemen.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. If your party should regain office, would you not be in favor of cleaning out every Democrat?

Mr. McCOMAS. No, sir; the good of the public I would place before the greed of the party. I hope and believe when the Republican platform is framed that the Republican party will indorse a candidate and a platform squarely and boldly in favor of civil-service reform and its extension to other offices. But you gentlemen who came into power under the cry "turn the rascals out," have deceived nobody but the dyspeptic Mugwumps who, believing first in free trade, bartered away for it civil-service reform. And so your President every day is committing mortal sin in abandoning civil service to tinker with the tariff to the destruction of American labor and American interests.

Mr. TAULBEE. Let me suggest to the gentleman——

Mr. McCOMAS. The suggestions of the gentleman from Kentucky are so frequent and so verbose that my five minutes would expire before he got them in.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS] has expired.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois, rose.

Mr. TAULBEE. I only wanted the floor long enough to suggest——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. It seems to me we are wandering a little from the proper line of debate on the amendment of my friend from Maryland. I confess to some little surprise at the argument made by the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service Reform. This amendment proposes to restore the amount claimed by the Civil Service Commission, in order that they may efficiently discharge their duty. The book of estimates before me shows they represented to the Committee on Appropriations that in order to properly discharge their duties and carry out this law in its spirit and in its letter it was necessary to have an appropriation of $36,160; and yet we find that the Committee on Appropriations, of which the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service Reform is a member, cut that appropriation down to a little over $25,000—less than three-quarters of the amount that was actually asked.

When the attention of the House is called to this fact, instead of the chairman of the committee, who, we would suppose, would desire to see this law carried out in its true spirit—instead of his getting up here and aiding his colleague on the Committee on Appropriations to have this amendment made, he opposes it, and attempts to evade the issue by claiming that the Republicans did something wrong some years ago.

Now, sir, in the trial of causes in court I never have known it to be regarded as a good defense for a criminal to say that somebody else had done the same thing that he was accused of doing. If the Republicans have not carried out the law, as these parties claim, why do not the Democrats live up to their own professions, made when they were voted into power, and carry out this law, as the Mugwumps were led to believe they would do when they aided them with their votes? Why does not the chairman of this committee help to carry out this law, by coming to the aid of the commissioners and voting this appropriation through? Look at the Calendars of this House. What day has been assigned to the Committee on Civil-Service Reform for the purpose of giving us better laws to aid this commission in weeding out the corruption that is showing itself every day under this Democratic Administration?

A MEMBER. Where?

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Where! On every hand; in the custom-house at New York, in Pennsylvania, in the State of Illinois. Why, look at the post-offices at Indianapolis and Philadelphia. Where! The trouble is that you can not find a Democratic office-holder who is carrying out this system as the party agreed to carry it out when Mr. Cleveland was placed in the executive chair. If the newspaper reports are to be believed, Mr. Cleveland's Federal office-holders have captured the State convention of Pennsylvania, and have muzzled the representatives of the people. The same thing has been done in the State of Illinois. The leader of the delegation to the St. Louis convention, where it is planned that the President is to be renominated, is a Federal office-holder. Yet this is a reform administration, and this is the way that the civil-service law is being carried out!

Mr. LAWLER. We will wipe out the law, if that will suit the gentleman any better. [Laughter.]

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] complains that a Democratic President has not enforced the civil-service law. The first civil-service law was passed during the administration of President Grant, and the Republicans, in charge of both Houses of Congress, afterwards repealed that law by refusing to appropriate money to carry it out. Thus failed that first attempt at civil-service reform. A Republican Committee on Appropriations starved it to death.

In this House a Democratic committee has reported an appropriation sufficient to carry out the law and enforce it as Democratic committees have done ever since a Democratic President came into office.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. If the gentleman will permit me to interrupt him, I find in the Book of Estimates, in a note, a statement as to the additional clerk-hire needed for the proper and prompt performance of the steadily-increasing clerical labor of the commission.

Mr. HERBERT. Yes, sir; and so the gentleman will find that every Department of this Government, I think I might say almost without exception, asks of Committees on Appropriations larger sums every year than it really needs or than it expects to get. The Democratic party is responsible to the country, and Democratic committees scarcely ever appropriate according to the extravagant estimates sent in, and so estimates are always sent in with a margin to cut down. But if enough was appropriated last year to carry out and enforce the law during the current year, and undoubtedly that is so, and if the committee recommends the same sum now, I fail to see how any gentleman can say we are failing to support the civil-service law.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. HERBERT. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Is it your understanding that the Appropriations Committee desired to carry out in all its letter and spirit the civil-service law, and made an appropriation with direct reference to that law?

Mr. HERBERT. I do not know what may have been the motive of the majority of the committee; I can only judge by their conduct, and this I do know: They have not done as a Republican Committee on Appropriations did under President Grant; they have not refused any appropriation at all for carrying out the civil-service law.

Mr. McCOMAS. Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT] now, under Cleveland, vote to give this Civil Service Commission what they want to carry out the law?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. We are talking about one thing and the gentleman from Alabama is talking about another thing. You, on that side, are always satisfied when your best comes up to our worst. [Laughter.] The point is that the Democratic party is not friendly to civil-service reform, whether real or not, and the appropriation, I submit, is not made equal to the requirements of the service; while I understood

my friend from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT] to say that he understood that the committee had made the appropriation deeming it full and ample to meet the proper requirements of the service.

Mr. HERBERT. I understand that this appropriation is the same as the appropriation of last year. That was sufficient to enable the commissioners and the President to carry out the law. You Republicans have been quarreling with the President ever since he came into power because he has disappointed you, because he has failed to verify your prediction that, like a Republican President and a Republican Congress, he would trample the law under foot.

Mr. O'FERRALL. And Democrats have complained of him on the same ground.

Mr. HERBERT. The Democrats have complained, some of them, that he did not go far enough in turning out the office-holders, but the Republicans have quarreled with him because he has enforced the law.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. If the Chair will recognize me, I will yield to my friend from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT].

Mr. HERBERT. But the people who have watched the President from the moment he took the oath to support the Constitution and the laws have been with him and are with him to-day.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. The experience of some members of this House on the Democratic side is that it is not safe to be anywhere else. [Laughter.]

Mr. HERBERT. The gentleman and his party will find next November that it is not safe for anybody to be against Mr. Cleveland who wants to be with the people.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I would like to ask the gentleman one question. If it was wrong for a Republican Congress not to give the full amount for civil-service reform ten years ago, will not the gentleman to-day vote to the Civil Service Commission in the pending bill the amount which they have asked and which my amendment proposes to give them?

Mr. HERBERT. I will vote enough to enable the President to administer the law faithfully and honestly, just as he has been doing ever since he took office.

Mr. MCCOMAS. The Civil Service Commissioners ask this sum.

Mr. HERBERT. No Committee on Appropriations can safely take the estimates of officials and appropriate the full amount asked. It is scarcely ever done.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Will the gentleman explain why it is that we have not been able to get any more civil-service reports since 1886?

Mr. HERBERT. I do not know, but I think a very satisfactory explanation has been given by the chairman of the Civil Service Committee [Mr. CLEMENTS].

Mr. DOCKERY. The Agricultural Report has not been published since that year either.

Mr. HERBERT. A great many reports are behind.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I presume there has been no civil-service report since 1886 because there has been nothing to report under the present commission.

Mr. HERBERT. The quarrel with the President all the time has been, not that he has not enforced the law as passed by Congress, but that he has not gone further and enforced something that is not the law.

A MEMBER. Do you mean the complaint on the Democratic side?

Mr. HERBERT. No; the quarrel on the part of gentlemen on the other side with Mr. Cleveland is that, as they choose to believe, he has not lived up to the construction they seek to put upon a letter he has written—a letter which the gentleman from Maine calls an enlargement of the statute made by the President.

Mr. MILLIKEN (to Mr. HERBERT). What is your quarrel with him?

Mr. HERBERT. None whatever. We do not quarrel with him at all.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. FORNEY. I hope we may be able to agree on some limit to this debate.

Mr. REED. I desire only five minutes.

Mr. FORNEY. Then I will ask that this debate be closed in five minutes.

Mr. HOLMAN. I would like to occupy five minutes.

Mr. FORNEY. Well, let it be agreed that the debate be closed in ten minutes.

Mr. REED. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS] would like to occupy five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. What proposition does the gentleman from Alabama make?

Mr. FORNEY. Well, I will not make any proposition at present.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I do not think gentlemen on the other side in their own minds deal quite fairly with the accusation made against them. I have no doubt they desire to do so; their failure results rather from confusion of mind than from wicked intention. [Laughter.] I can remember when there was no subject that seemed to penetrate the atmosphere with Democratic objection like civil service and civil-service reform. I can remember how gentlemen on the other side, in season and out of season, used to point to the melancholy spectacle of Federal office-holders participating in nominating conventions. I can remember when those gentlemen were in the habit of using language of the most violent reprobation in regard to the appointment or removal of any man for political reasons. On these questions they used to tear a passion to tatters on all occasions, and they asseverated that if they ever came into power that thing should end. They declared that it was for the interest of the Republic that it should end. Carrying out the language of their own virtuous oratory, the sincerity of which the President in his then innocent condition did not doubt [laughter], he proclaimed to the world that he intended to stop Federal office-holders from participating in this fashion in nominating conventions, not having a prophetic eye on the recent Pennsylvania convention [laughter], nor upon the New York convention, nor anything of that sort.

The accusation made against these gentlemen is—and I hope I shall not be unparliamentary—that their conduct compared with their declarations savors of hypocrisy. [Laughter.]

Now, what we point out is that after all their virtuous oratory, these gentlemen, as soon as they get into power, do precisely the same things about which they were so indignant before they got into power. They reiterate by saying, "You did it before the election." That is precisely the gravamen of their charge. It is precisely the thing they were to rectify. That is precisely the fault they were going to correct.

Now, when they commit precisely the fault which they themselves had reprobated they turn around and reiterate what they said before election, forgetting the position has entirely changed. [Laughter and applause.]

In other words, the pointed accusation, gentlemen, we make against you is that you maintain it is perfectly proper to do what you do because we did it, forgetting that the real issue is what you do compared with your own declarations. [Great laughter and applause.]

Now, there is the whole charge [renewed laughter], and I submit you can not get rid of it by repeating some of your old speeches, because your old speeches charge us with the fault, accompanied by the promise of correction on your part, a promise the non-fulfillment of which we point out. Now, there is the whole matter. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ADAMS. I wish to say a word about the last amendment proposed by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS], which relates solely to the traveling expenses of the Civil Service Commissioners. The last fifteen minutes has shown how easily a discussion of civil-service reform takes on a partisan character. I have been waiting patiently for fifteen minutes to let partisan discussion clear away in order that I might show that something might be said on the subject which did not consist in crimination or recrimination of any political party.

When a Republican Congress adopted this Pendleton bill, so called, its purpose was to substitute a new mode of appointing subordinate officers. How did we propose to make that substitution? Did we propose the President should make it? No; the President is too far from these clerks to exercise his judgment. Did we propose the members of his Cabinet should do it? No; for they were too far, and they had to trust to local boards.

Now, the course taken under that law was to provide for a board of Civil Service Commissioners. They might have provided for local boards of a non-partisan character. They decided not to do so. As the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS] said a few minutes ago, many of these local boards, even under Democratic administration, consist altogether of Republican partisan office-holders. The mode in which the law is executed depends on the fidelity with which those local boards act, and you can be sure of having nothing like consistency or even fidelity unless the general Board of Civil Service Commissioners can have adequate compensation for traveling expenses in order they may assume the responsibility of the whole matter. And therefore it is, if you are in favor of carrying out this experiment of the Pendleton bill in good faith you ought to appropriate at least for that Civil Service Commission the $5,000 they ask for traveling expenses. And the traveling expenses they need are not for junketing excursions. They are to examine the working of this system in the local boards, on the fidelity or lack of fidelity of, which depends the whole question of success or failure of the whole system. And therefore it is that every year for two or three years I have offered this particular amendment to this appropriation bill. And it seems to me, if regard be had to all that has been said in the last fifteen minutes, this increase should be made for the purpose I have indicated.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Only a word, Mr. Chairman, in this connection, and that is in relation to the merits of the amendment which has been suggested.

The first appropriation made for the support of the Civil Service Commission and to carry out the law was about $17,000. It has gone up from that time—and that was in the Forty-seventh Congress—until now the annual appropriations amount to about $25,000. Of course the Committee on Appropriations is not prepared to recommend the highest amount asked by the Department in relation to the various bureaus. This is one only among many instances where the full amount of the estimates has not been allowed.

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman from Georgia, as he is at the head of an important committee in connection with this subject, tell me whether in the judgment of that committee the Committee on Appropriations ought to have allowed the estimate of $5,000 for traveling expenses?

Mr. CLEMENTS. The question has not been before the committee.

Mr. ADAMS. It ought to have been.

Mr. CLEMENTS. And I can not speak from personal knowledge.

Mr. McCOMAS. Mr. Chairman, after full inquiry and examination, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations permit me to say that this allowance for traveling expenses of the board is in my opinion just and necessary and it ought to be allowed, and I make this statement without any reference to any partisan considerations which may enter into the question.

I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service Reform to co-operate with me in trying to have it passed.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. And let me state, as a member of the Committee on Civil Service Reform, that I will cheerfully co-operate and join hands with the chairman of the committee in trying to get it adopted.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, when this amendment was offered I reserved the question of order upon it; but on reflection it seems to me entirely proper that it should be waived, and a direct vote of the committee taken upon the proposition to increase the appropriations for this commission. I wish to say, going a little more into the details of the creation of the commission than the gentleman from Georgia, that the appropriation for 1884, the first general appropriation for this service, amounted in the aggregate to $23,300. My friend from Georgia referred only to the salaries fixed for the Commission when he spoke of $17,000 as being the first expenditure. That appropriation embraced three commissioners, one chief examiner, one secretary, one stenographer, and one messenger, and these were the only officers provided by the original law. That first appropriation also embraced $5,000 for traveling expenses.

The appropriation for the present fiscal year provides as follows: For three commissioners, one chief examiner, one secretary, one clerk of class 4, one clerk of class 3, one clerk of class 2, and one clerk of class 1, two at $900 each; one messenger, one laborer; and $4,000 for traveling expenses, making the entire appropriation for the commission, $29,800.

Now, it will be seen at once and at a glance that this is quite an unusual increase. I wish to mention to the committee also the fact that during both sessions of the last Congress this force was materially increased, and I think the commission has force enough to perform its duties at Washington. No further appropriations, I think, ought to be made. I had occasion during the last Congress, at both sessions, to look into the subject most carefully, and I think the appropriation of $4,000 for traveling expenses is quite ample.

One word more. The duties of the commission are well performed; that is my judgment, at least; and I think that no law has ever been placed upon the statute-books which has been carried out with more fidelity than this law. It applies, as all gentlemen know, to the classified clerks in the Departments, but not to any of the administrative offices; and the existing law is carried out by this Administration with a fidelity that may be characterized as absolutely without variation or shadow of turning. I think, therefore, that gentlemen who favor the law—I am not the champion of it by any means—ought to feel that the law has been carried out both in letter and spirit to an extent not even expected by its most ardent friends. A glance at all of the Departments here, showing their working, will demonstrate the fidelity with which it has been carried out.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, as everybody on both sides seems entirely favorable to the principle of civil-service reform, and as we have each of us been accusing the other of dereliction in regard to it as parties, I wish to call attention to one fact which this amendment reaches. This seems to be more than a mere question of money. I introduced a bill early in the session in this House for the extension of the civil-service law to certain additional offices. I did so because I believed that the advance of that reform, which I regard as clearly in the interests of the public business and of the public welfare, could only be achieved through legislation. I believe the only solid advance that has been made in regard to civil-service reform has been by legislation, and the Civil Service Commission appointed under that law.

I was told with regard to that bill, which now lies on the Calendar under an adverse report from the committee of which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS] is the chairman, that one objection to it was that there was ample power in the President and the Civil Service Commission to extend the present law to other offices; that it was merely an expression of the wish of Congress in the matter; but that they could not extend it to new offices, because they did not have the money to do it with. Therefore this proposed additional appropriation is simply a statement on the part of Congress that they believe that the civil-service law should be extended and maintained. And I think that was the language of both political platforms of both political parties in many conventions, State and national.

Therefore I hope to see this amendment prevail as a distinct advance in the line of civil-service reform.

Mr. HERBERT. I desire to say in reply to what fell from the gentleman from Maine that it was not the Democratic party that, before the passage of the present law, was loudest in its professions in favor of civil-service reform. The gentleman happened to be, as I was, a member of this House, when that bill was passed. It was in the first session of that Congress—I believe the Forty-eighth.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. The Forty-seventh.

Mr. HERBERT. In the first session of the Forty-eighth Congress, I think it was, a modest bill was reported by a Democratic committee simply making it unlawful to levy contributions upon office holders here in the Departments. The Republican party arrayed itself solidly against that bill and resorted to the parliamentary tactics—filibustered for weeks and weeks to prevent even that first step in the direction of civil-service reform.

Congress adjourned and we went before the country. That was the year when Mr. Cleveland was nominated for governor of the State of New York. That was the year when Jay Hubbell was chairman of the Congressional executive committee of the Republican party, and that was the year when the question of civil-service reform was submitted to the people in the elections. The result was that in the State of New York Grover Cleveland was elected governor by 192,000 votes. When we came back to the second session of that Congress our Republican friends showed that they had experienced a great change of heart. They went to work with great zeal in both ends of the Capitol and hurried through the bill that is now the law. They sent it to us from the Senate, and here Democrats and Republicans voted for it alike.

That is the history of this law; and the quarrel to-day of the Republicans is that Grover Cleveland has enforced the law which public opinion forced them to vote for. They predicted he would violate it, as they had done; but the gentleman from Georgia, the chairman of the Civil Service Committee, has challenged them to show, and the gentlemen on the other side failed to point out, a single instance in which the law has been violated under a Democratic Administration. The only charge is that Mr. Cleveland has not extended it as far as, in the opinion of his critics on the other side of this Chamber, he ought to have done because of some letter he has written. To that extent, and to that extent only, his offending goes.

It seems to me that is a perfectly fair statement of the situation. Sir, if I did not believe this appropriation sufficient I should be in favor of increasing it so as to carry out this law faithfully. The Democratic committee charged with this matter does not seek to destroy or emasculate the law, but has reported to the House what the gentleman from Indiana, long connected with appropriations and familiar with the necessities of this case, says is sufficient to enable the commissioners to enforce the law.

Mr. McCOMAS. I ask the gentleman from Alabama——

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. McCOMAS. I ask just a moment.

Mr. FORNEY. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. ROGERS having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. BLOUNT reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9377) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SACRAMENTO, CAL.

Mr. McKENNA. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Union Calendar, for present consideration, the bill (S. 1554) to increase the appropriation for the erection of a public building at Sacramento, Cal.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the amount heretofore fixed as the limit of cost for the erection of a public building by the United States Government at Sacramento, Cal., be, and the same is hereby, increased to $150,000, and that sum is hereby fixed as the limit of cost for the erection of said building, including site.

SEC. 2. That the officers of the United States Government having charge of the erection of public buildings are authorized and required to be governed by the limitation hereby prescribed in making contracts for the erection of said building.

SEC. 3. That the additional sum of $50,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be used and expended for the purposes provided in this act.

The bill was reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with the following amendments:

In section 1, line 6, strike out "$150,000" and insert "$200,000."
In section 3, line 1, strike out "$50,000" and insert "$100,000."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOLMAN rose.

Mr. McKENNA. I will state to the gentleman from Indiana that the bill as we propose to have it passed is the Senate bill making the limit $150,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. With the understanding that the amendment increasing the amount to $200,000 is withdrawn, I shall not object.

Mr. McKENNA. Mr. Speaker, it is understood that the amendments are withdrawn, and that the Senate bill shall be passed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the suggestion of the gentleman from California that the amendments be disagreed to and the question taken on the Senate bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McKENNA moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING, TALLAHASSEE, FLA.

Mr. DAVIDSON, of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole be discharged from the further consideration of the bill S. 1083, and that it be now put upon its passage. It is a bill for the erection of a public building at Tallahassee, Fla. I also ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with. It is exactly in the form prescribed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and it has been reported favorably by that committee. The bill passed the Senate, and was referred to the House committee and reported back favorably. There have been three reports in favor of this bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. Let the bill be read.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase, acquire by condemnation, or otherwise provide, a site for, and cause to be erected, a suitable building, with proper fireproof vaults therein, for the accommodation of the courts of the United States, post-office, land-office, internal-revenue offices, and other Government offices, at the city of Tallahassee, Fla. The site and building thereon, when completed, upon plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall not exceed the cost of $75,000, nor shall any site be purchased until estimates for the erection of a building which will furnish sufficient accommodations for the transaction of the public business, and which shall not exceed in cost the balance of the sum herein limited after the site shall have been purchased and paid for, shall have been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury; and no purchase of site nor plan for said building shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the sum of $75,000 for site and building: *Provided*, That no money to be appropriated for this purpose shall be available until a valid title to the site of said building shall be vested in the United States, to be approved by the Attorney-General, and until the State of Florida shall have ceded to the United States exclusive jurisdiction over the same, during the time the United States shall be or remain the owner thereof, for all purposes except the administration of the criminal laws of said State and the service of any civil process therein. And the sum of $75,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to be used and expended in the purchase of said site and toward the construction of said building: *Provided*, That the site shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of not less than 40 feet, including streets and alleys around the same.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DAVIDSON, of Florida, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

DEFICIENCY BILL.

Mr. BURNES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 9788) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes, returned from the Senate with amendments, be taken up, the amendments non-concurred in, and the bill and amendments recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. REED. I object.

The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the House took a recess, under the order, until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House reassembled at 8 o'clock p. m., Mr. ROGERS in the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*.

JESSE DICKEY.

Mr. DOCKERY, by unanimous consent, called up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 9682) increasing the pension of Jesse Dickey.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension of Jesse Dickey, late of Captain Johnson's Company Illinois Mounted Volunteers, Black Hawk war, to $12 per month.

The report (by Mr. BANKHEAD) is as follows:

The claimant is now a pensioner of the United States at the rate of $6 per month for a gunshot wound of the right thigh, which he received while in the military service of the United States, in the Black Hawk war of 1832. He is in his seventy-ninth year, has no source of income except his small pension, and has an aged wife dependent upon him. A large number of his townsmen join in a petition to Congress setting forth his indigent condition and the necessity for relief. The old man is severely disabled by his wound, and by hernia and hydrocele.

Your committee report back the bill to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DOCKERY moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JOHN F. HUCKABA.

Mr. WHITTHORNE, by unanimous consent, called up for consideration the bill (H. R. 9200) granting a pension to John F. Huckaba.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John F. Huckaba, a private of Company H, Second Regiment of Tennessee Mounted Infantry.

The report (by Mr. HUNTER) is as follows:

The claimant made application to the Pension Office for pension, and the same was rejected on the ground that the soldier was not properly in the service of the United States when the wound for which he claimed a pension was incurred, and that the same was not incurred in the service and in line of duty.

The facts in the case, as gathered from the papers before the committee, are as follows:

In August, 1863, John F. Huckaba enlisted in a military organization then being formed under the direction of Andrew Johnson, then military governor of the State of Tennessee. The organization was under control of Capt. Thomas J. Crypert, and was designated as the Second Tennessee Mounted Militia Infantry. He was sworn into service by Captain Crypert, and shortly after, before said force had arrived at Nashville, where they were to be mustered in, he was sent out with a scouting party by order of said Captain Crypert, and while out in the discharge of his duty as a scout he accidentally received a severe wound in his left hand by the accidental discharge of his own gun while dismounting from his horse. He presented himself at Nashville for muster, but owing to the crippled condition of his hand he was refused the privilege of being mustered into said service.

Thomas J. Crypert testifies that he was captain of Company A, Second Tennessee Mounted Infantry; that he is acquainted with John F. Huckaba; that he enlisted him in the service of the United States and swore him into said service while making up said regiment, about the month of August, 1863, under the authority of Andrew Johnson, military governor of Tennessee; that after he was enlisted and sworn he went with him and other enlisted men to Corinth, Miss., then a United States military post, and drew a gun and ammunition and part of a uniform. Soon thereafter, say about September 8, 1863, the said John F. Huckaba was sent on a scout in Wayne County, Tennessee, he thinks by his own order, with other enlisted men belonging to the organization, and while on said scout he was severely wounded in the left hand, which wound, the captain says, "was reported to me as having been made by an accidental shot from his own gun. His wound has almost entirely deprived him of the use of his hand permanently. He had not been mustered into the service at the time he received said wound, but soon thereafter he presented himself, with others, for muster at Nashville, Tenn., but, owing to the crippled condition of his hand, he was rejected. While enlisting men for the regiment it was necessary for the enlisted men to remain together in a body and perform duty as soldiers for their mutual protection before they were mustered into the service, as the enemy were in that part of the country at that time.

Isaac H. Goble, a member of said company and regiment, testifies as follows: "Some time after enlistment I was ordered to take five or six men with me and go on a scout, and the said John F. Huckaba was one of the men sent with me on that duty. While in the line of his duty he received a severe wound through his left hand by the accidental discharge of his own gun. I was present when he received the wound; the same was received while in the act of dismounting from his horse, and was purely accidental. The wound shattered the bones of his hand, and he has ever since been almost totally deprived of the use of that hand on account of the wound."

James F. Goble, who was a member of said company and regiment, and who was one of the number in said scout, testifies that Huckaba was also one of the number on said scout, and was wounded as stated by Captain Crypet, Isaac H. Goble, and others. He was present and saw Huckaba when the accident occurred.

The committee believe that the evidence warrants the conclusion that the soldier was a member of the military organization, as stated, that he was in line of duty when the accident for which he asks relief occurred, and that said accident occurred as stated. The committee believe this to be a meritorious case, and therefore submit a favorable report and recommend the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WHITTHORNE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

FLORA C. ANDREWS.

Mr. WILLIAMS, by unanimous consent, called up for consideration a bill (H. R. 8771) to place the name of Mrs. Flora C. Andrews on the pension-roll.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension law, the name of Mrs. Flora Andrews, widow of Samuel D. Andrews, deceased, late a private in Company C, Forty-fourth Regiment of Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

The report (by Mr. YODER) is as follows:

Samuel D. Andrews, the husband of Flora C. Andrews, enlisted in Company C, Forty-fourth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, on the 15th day of September, 1861, and was borne on the company rolls as Simon D. Andrews, and was discharged from the service of the United States on the 25th day of January, 1863, on surgeon's certificate of disability, reciting that he had done no duty for a month, and had had a cough for six months and was suffering from phthisis pulmonalis. The soldier's discharge recited that he was discharged by reason of phthisis pulmonalis.

Mr. Andrews filed an application for pension April 2, 1880, and he was granted a pension certificate from the 26th day of January, 1863, and ending November 16, 1881. Said certificate is on file with papers in the case, which certificate was subsequently revised to end January 26, 1868. His first certificate was granted the 11th day of February, 1885, and when the same was revised the soldier ap

plied for restoration to pension-rolls April 16, 1886. On July 14, 1885, the medical board gave him no rating; nevertheless the soldier died November 3, 1886, and his attending physician, Dr. E. C. Cruner, of Dayton, a physician of high character and large practice, states in the affidavit filed in the papers that Samuel D. Andrews died from the effects of a deposit of tuberculous matter in the intestine glands, causing inflammation, ulceration, and rupture of the bowels, and that he is convinced that the deceased was suffering with a tuberculous deposit in the lungs, and that he was an undoubted sufferer from phthisis pulmonalis, and that deposit in the intestinal glands was of the same nature, causing inflammation and rupture.

Dr. Green, who attended shortly after his discharge from the Army, testified that in 1863 he examined the soldier, and that he was very much emaciated, and that he had chronic pneumonia, with marked evidence of "caseation in one or possibly both lungs." Although the soldier in a measure recovered his health, yet the evidence shows that up to the day of his death he had a cough, weakness, difficulty of breathing, and many of the certain indications of lung disease, and from the fact that he was discharged for phthisis pulmonalis, and that he died from the effects of tuberculous matters in the intestinal glands, and from the further fact that after a thorough investigation the Pension Office found a pensionable disability from date of discharge to November, 1881, your committee are satisfied that the deceased soldier suffered from phthisis pulmonalis in greater or less degree from date of his discharge until the day of his death, and that his death was the result of the same disease, and do therefore recommend the passage of the accompanying bill.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

AURELIA P. HALL.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, by unanimous consent, called up for consideration the bill (H. R. 9487) granting a pension to Mrs. Aurelia P. Hall, with an amendment.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Aurelia P. Hall, mother of Wilson S. Gilliland, deceased, late a private in Company A, Third Ohio Infantry Volunteers; also of Company C, Fourteenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and still later of Company C, Fourteenth Infantry, United States Army.

The report (by Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio) is as follows:

That the beneficiary of this bill, Mrs. Aurelia P. Hall, of Vineland, N. J., is the mother of Wilson S. Gilliland, who, when about seventeen years of age, enlisted in Company A, Third Ohio Volunteer Infantry, on the 13th day of June, 1861, and served until the 21st day of June, 1864, when he was honorably discharged, and who afterwards, on the 27th day of September, 1864, enlisted in Company C, Fourteenth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and served until the 3d day of June, 1865, when he was again honorably discharged.

Claimant was twice married, and at the enlistment and during the service of her said son was living with her second husband, Albert G. Hall, who was an invalid, and could contribute but little to her support or to the support of her children. She had four children, younger than the soldier, who remained at home with her, the eldest of whom was only about sixteen years of age when the soldier enlisted. During his service and afterwards the soldier contributed largely to the support of claimant and his brothers and sisters who resided with her, and she was in great measure dependent upon him.

After the war the soldier married, but his wife soon separated from him and remarried, although not divorced, but she afterwards instituted a suit for divorce, which was pending at the time of the soldier's death.

After his marriage and some time in the year 1870 the soldier enlisted in Company G, Fourteenth United States Infantry, and died in July, 1871, at Fort D. A. Russell, Wyo. During his service in the war of the rebellion he contracted chronic diarrhea which continued during the remainder of his life, and contributed materially to his death.

The claimant is now nearly seventy years of age and in needy circumstances, and your committee, in view of the facts above stated, recommend the passage of the bill, with an amendment striking out the letter "C," in the last clause of the bill, and inserting the letter "G;" so that this clause will read "and still later of Company G, Fourteenth Infantry, United States Army."

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

RUTH ANN PORTER.

Mr. HOLMAN, by unanimous consent, called up for consideration the bill (H. R. 9321) granting a pension to Ruth Ann Porter, with an amendment.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of Ruth Ann Porter, dependent sister of George H. Porter, late a private in Company D, Third Regiment of Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, on the pension-roll, and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) is as follows:

The claimant under this bill is a dependent sister, for which class no provision is made in the general laws, but which Congress has recognized in many private bills which have received executive approval.

This case is one of exceptional merit, the fact being that claimant's three brothers, upon whom her mother and herself were dependent, enlisted in the Union Army at the same time. One was killed in the battle of the Wilderness, another was wounded and died at Douglas Hospital, Washington, after undergoing a second amputation of the leg, and the remaining one came home completely broken down and dissipated, after which he left home in search of health, and has not been heard of for eighteen years, and is undoubtedly dead. The mother was pensioned. She has since died, and the daughter asks that the pension be continued to her. Claimant's memorial and an affidavit from William S. Holman, jr., a son of Hon. William S. Holman, are herewith appended:

"STATE OF INDIANA, *County of Dearborn, ss:*

"On this 12th day of March, 1888, personally appeared before me, a notary public in and for the county and State aforesaid, Ruth E. Porter, a resident of Aurora, Dearborn County, Indiana, aged forty-one years, and who, being duly sworn, makes the following statement in order to procure a pension by special act of Congress as dependent sister: I have resided in the city of Aurora, Ind., during my entire life; my father died in 1849, leaving surviving my mother and eight children, consisting of three girls and five boys. My father was not possessed of any real estate and but little personal property. The eldest child was a daughter, and who married the same year that my father died; the next eldest was a son, who died in 1854, and my mother was thus thrown upon her own individual exertions and that of her remaining sons to obtain a means of subsistence, and by the united labor of the family we managed to gain a living.

"In July, 1861, my three remaining brothers, George H. Porter, Benjamin F. Porter, and Gillett A. Porter, all enlisted in Company D, Third Indiana Cavalry, thus leaving my mother with a family of two daughters and one grandson. I was then about twelve years of age, and my remaining sister and my mother were compelled to provide for the family by their own labor and the help of my brothers in service, as myself and the grandson were too young to assist in obtaining a means of subsistence. My mother, however, received contributions from all of my brothers while in the Army, and these contributions were absolutely necessary for the support of the family, as we lived in rented property, and we had no means of subsistence except the labor of my mother and sister, as before stated. My brother Gillett was mortally wounded May 30, 1864, and died June 1, 1864, and my brother George H. was wounded in action May 5, 1864, and died at Douglas Hospital, Washington, D. C., June 4, 1864, from amputation of leg. My other brother, Benjamin F., served out his time, but came out of the Army in feeble health. My mother was thus left in very destitute circumstances, as my brother George was the main dependence of the family.

"My mother was pensioned on account of the death and service of my brother George H., under certificate No. 72235; my mother died January 24, 1882. My only remaining sister married in 1865, and died in 1878 at Memphis, Tenn., leaving a daughter eight years of age, that was sent to my mother to care for. The said child is now with me, and is an invalid, and I and the said daughter of my sister are all that remain of our family, as I have not seen my brother Benjamin for eighteen years. I have always been in very delicate health, and am nearly all of the time under the doctor's care, and I have been compelled to gain a subsistence by sewing, which has so injured my health and my eyesight has become affected by working after night, that I fear that I will be compelled to abandon my only means of subsistence. And I make this true statement of facts believing that a grateful Government will be willing to admit a claim to which I think I am justly entitled, having been deprived of the natural and only means of support by the loss of my brothers in the Army.

"If I was in good health I would not ask anything of the Government. My mother was confined to her bed in last sickness for six months, and I had to give up my sewing to attend her, and we had no money except as her quarterly allowance of pension came to hand. I can furnish testimony of neighbors to corroborate these statements. I am in very destitute circumstances, and make this appeal in my dire necessity, and hope that I do not plead in vain.

"Miss RUTH E. PORTER.

"STATE OF INDIANA, *Dearborn County, ss:*

"On this the 12th day of March, 1888, before me, Benjamin Vail, jr., a notary public within and for the county and State aforesaid, personally came Ruth E. Porter, a person of lawful age, well known to me to be reputable and entitled to credit, who, being by me first duly sworn according to law, made oath to the foregoing statement and subscribed to the same in my presence.

"Witness my hand and notarial seal.

"[SEAL.] BENJ. VAIL, JR., *Notary Public.*

"William S. Holman, jr., first being duly sworn, says: I have resided in and near Aurora, Ind., for more than thirty-five years. I have been acquainted with Ruth Porter for about fifteen years; I have known of her and her family for more than twenty years. She had three brothers in the Union Army during the late war. Two of her said brothers, George Porter and Gillett Porter, never returned, having died or been killed while in the said service, as I have been informed and believe. The other brother, becoming intemperate in habits, has for many years failed to do anything for the support of his said sister.

"My especial attention was directed to this family about the time Ruth Porter's mother, Mrs. Sarah Porter, obtained a pension from the Government on account of the death of her said sons, or one of them. That at the time of Mrs. Sarah Porter's death, and for a longtime previous thereto, she and her said daughter Ruth were entirely dependent upon said pension and the charity of friends for their support. That since the death of Mrs. Sarah Porter, who departed this life on the 24th day of January, 1882, her said daughter Ruth has had a bitter struggle for existence. That she has only been able to obtain necessary food, shelter, and clothing through aid of charitable persons. That she has made every effort possible towards self-support. That she has been in feeble health for many years, and is unable to perform continuous labor.

"That so far as her strength would permit she engaged in sewing, but that recently her eyesight has failed to such an extent she is able to accomplish but little. That she is in destitute circumstances. That she owns no real estate, and that her personal property will not exceed in value $25. That she is a lady of refinement, of high moral character, and of strict integrity. That she is destitute by reason of the death of her said two brothers, who lost their lives in the service of their country, she being dependent upon them for support. That she is in every way worthy of aid; and further deponent saith not.

"WM. S. HOLMAN, JR.

"Subscribed and sworn to before me this 31st day of March, 1888.

"[SEAL.] BENJ. VAIL, JR., *Notary Public.*"

Your committee are in possession of other affidavits, from leading citizens of Indiana, setting forth the necessities of claimant, and urging that the pension be granted. As before said, we regard the case as one of great merit, and therefore recommend that the bill be passed, after being amended by striking out the words "subject to the conditions and limitations of the pension laws," and inserting instead thereof the words, "and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month."

The amendment of the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HOLMAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

WEBSTER C. WEBB.

Mr. HUNTER, by unanimous consent, called up for consideration the bill (H. R. 9284) granting a pension to Webster C. Webb.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Webster C. Webb, late a private of Company H, Seventieth Regiment of Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry.

The report (by Mr. HUNTER) is as follows:

It is shown by the proof on file in this case that claimant enlisted at Brownsville, Edmonson County, Kentucky, in September, 1864, and was at the same time elected a second lieutenant of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment of Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry.

In this capacity he continued to serve until the 23d day of February, 1865, when he resigned because of some misunderstanding with the colonel, Samuel Johnson, and on the same day he enlisted and was duly mustered into the United States service as a private in Company H of said regiment to serve one year, and on the 20th day of September, 1865, he was honorably discharged at Louisville, Ky.

On the 7th day of August, 1876, he filed an application for pension, because of disability resulting from a wound received and a disease contracted in the service, and alleged in his declaration that in January, 1865, at or near Nebo, in the county of Hopkins and State of Kentucky, he was wounded in a battle with the rebels by a pistol ball passing through his arm between the elbow and shoulder, and that he contracted small-pox in the month of March, 1865, at Russellville, Ky.

He filed an affidavit from T. W. Campbell, who was lieutenant-colonel of the regiment, and who is now a resident of Louisville, Ky., who states under date of September 29, 1876, as follows:

"I, T. W. Campbell, late lieutenant-colonel of the Seventeenth Regiment of Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, state that Webster C. Webb, in January, 1865, was acting second lieutenant of Company G, commanded by Capt. J. A. Studevant; that while so acting was attacked by a company of rebel soldiers at Bruce's Mills, in Hopkins County, Kentucky, and while so engaged was wounded in the right arm and taken prisoner and paroled by them. I further state that in a few hours after the attack was made upon Company G I was on the ground in pursuit of the rebels; I also state that while the said Webb was in the service and under my immediate command, he was attacked with small-pox; that I visited his tent in the field at Russellville, Ky., several times, having had the disease several years before myself. I further state that I have no interest, direct or indirect, in any claim the said Webb may have for pension or anything else."

Also affidavits of John W. Webb and William M. Stice, army comrades of claimant, who state:

"That they were members of Company G, Seventeenth Regiment of Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry; that they were present on the —— day of January, 1865, and engaged in action with Lieut. W. C. Webb at Bruce's Mills, near the Hopkinsville County line, Kentucky; that while we were engaged in a fight with a portion of the rebel General Lyon's command, commanded by Walker Taylor, the said W. C. Webb was wounded in the right arm, above the elbow, by a gunshot or pistol wound. That we have no interest in the claim made by said Webb for pension."

John L. Skaggs, who was orderly sergeant of claimant's company, and Samuel E. Sanders, a member of the same, under oath, state as follows:

"That they have known Webster C. Webb for thirty years; that at the time and for many years prior to enlistment, as also ever since discharge to the present time, they have been close neighbors to said Webb and intimately acquainted with him. That said Webb was elected by their Company G as second lieutenant of said company in its original organization; that they know that at the time of enlistment and at the time of entering the service of the United States Webb was a stout, healthy man, free from any disease whatever as they verily believe, and free from small-pox or any of its deleterious effects.

"That on or about the 3d day of March, 1865, they were in camp at Russellville, Ky., and were messmates of said Webb, and tented with him; that he became sick, and that this affiant, Samuel E. Sanders, waited upon him until he became apprehensive that he was taking small-pox, when we sent Lieut. Col. T. W. Campbell, of our regiment, who had had small-pox previously, and Colonel Campbell pronounced it small-pox, and we then had Webb sent away out into the cedars, and placed in a tent, where he remained until his recovery. That Dr. Randolph, who preser bed for him, is dead. That our post-office address is Brownsvil e, Ky., and that we have no interest in the claim."

James Lindsay, a neighbor of claimant, states:

"That he has been acquainted with Webster C. Webb ever since his boyhood, during which time he has lived a neighbor to him. That at the date of his enlistment he was sound and free from diseases of all kinds and was considered a stout and healthy man. That at the date of his discharge, September, 1865, he came home suffering with an affection of the scalp, having had small-pox while in the service, and was not sound and well at date of his return home; had an ulcerous affection of the scalp and some disease of kidneys. I do not think he has been sound and well since his discharge, and it is my opinion that he has not been able to perform more than one-third manual labor."

Dr. John R. Roof, of Brownsville, Ky., states, under oath, as follows:

"That he has given the following medical advice and treatment to Webster C. Webb, late second lieutenant of Company G, Seventeenth Kentucky Cavalry Volunteers: Said Webster C. Webb came under my treatment and observation some time in the month of September, 1865, at or some time after his discharge. He was then suffering with albuminuria, caused by small-pox. The scalp was ulcerated, and I continued to treat and prescribe for his disease, occasionally, ever since; but I have no memoranda by which to fix exact dates and duration of all treatment rendered in his case, but know that he has been more or less disabled for the performance of manual labor, on account of said albuminuria and affection of scalp, which has become chronic ever since his discharge, and I am satisfied from his appearance and physical condition in general that he has been disabled at least one-third of the time from the performance of manual labor. I also knew him before enlistment, and regarded him as being sound and free from said diseases or any predisposition thereto; and I am not concerned in the claim."

Dr. Claiborne J. Watton, United States examining surgeon at Munfordville, Hart County, Ky., made an official examination of claimant on the 3d day of November, 1876, and states:

"Gunshot wound in right arm; ball entered the middle of arm, back portion, passing forward and inward, and curving on inner aspects of the arm, wounding the triceps and biceps muscles. There is pitting at the points of ingress and egress, and he represents that his arm upon hard manual labor becomes useless, and from this cause his disability is one-fourth. He is pitted severely from small-pox, and represents that his knees occasionally swell upon exerting himself physically. He looks debilitated, and is from this condition one-fourth disabled."

Dr. William T. Wilkins, United States examining surgeon at Bowling Green, Ky., also made an official examination of claimant on the 31st day of May, 1882, and states:

"There are quite a number of large scars over the head, arms, and legs, from which applicant states that in warm weather these scars break open and discharge matter that is very offensive. There is also considerable inflammation of both kidneys."

This claim was rejected by the Pension Office on the 7th day of July, 1882, on the ground that the wound was received and the disease contracted prior to enlistment.

While it is true that claimant's trouble originated before he was regularly mustered into the United States service, the fact remains that he was enrolled, performed military duty, participated in battle, and was at all times ready to be mustered from September, 1864, to February, 1865, during which time his disabilities occurred. He should not be permitted to suffer from the failure of the mustering officer to discharge his duty.

Your committee therefore make this favorable report, and recommend the passage of the bill with the following amendment: Strike out the word "private" in the sixth line and insert in lieu thereof "second lieutenant," and after the word "cavalry" in the seventh line add "and grant him a pension of $17 per month."

Mr. MATSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the bill read again.

The bill was again read.

Mr. MATSON. I can not understand, Mr. Speaker, from the reading of the report why we should undertake to fix the rate of pension in this bill. It is contrary to the rule of the committee and to the rules of the House. The proper thing to do is to treat this applicant the same as others are treated, and let his rating be fixed by a board of examining surgeons. The reason he comes to Congress at all is that he was not mustered in, and that point is covered by the bill, which gives him the right to go and be examined and rated by the board like other applicants. There is no reason why we should undertake arbitrarily to fix the rate. We are not competent to fix it properly, because we can not judge of the disability. I therefore move that the amendment fixing the rate at $17 per month be not agreed to.

The amendment was rejected.

Another amendment recommended by the committee, striking out the words "a private" and inserting in lieu thereof "second lieutenant," was agreed to.

Also an amendment striking out "Seventieth" and substituting "Seventeenth" before the word "Regiment."

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. HUNTER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MRS. MARY L. CLEVELAND.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to present to the House a bill which I think of great merit. It is for the benefit of Mrs. Mary L. Cleveland. This lady is now eighty-one years old. Her husband was a captain in the war of 1812. She is unable, without assistance, to get out of bed or to dress herself. She is now dependent on the bounty of her grandchildren, who are unable to support her. The committee has made a unanimous report in her favor. I have never but once this session asked for the passage of any bill for my district, and I hope there will be no objection to my request.

Mr. MATSON. I do not object if it can be agreed that the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the other side [Mr. O'NEILL] be recognized for a similar request, immediately after this bill is disposed of. I think this is due to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, in view of his long service in the House, as a similar courtesy has been extended to my colleague [Mr. HOLMAN].

Mr. NELSON. I wish to suggest here and now that inasmuch as we have started upon this proceeding the only proper course is to give us all a chance on the same plan, or else stop the proceeding right now.

Mr. MATSON. Then we will stop it right now.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Oh, no; we ought not to stop it "right now." [Laughter.] I think we are getting along very comfortably, and if we proceed in this way we shall no doubt pass a great many bills. I do not feel under the necessity of making a statement like that made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN], that I am not very well, for I am feeling right well to-night, and can stay here a long while; but at the same time I would like to reach some bills in which I feel a particular interest.

Mr. NELSON. I do not want to be understood as objecting.

Mr. GALLINGER and others called for the regular order.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MATSON. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of pension business on the Private Calendar.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. DOCKERY in the chair.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask that the bills on the Calendar be read by title in their order, commencing where we left off last Friday night, and that unless the consideration of a bill be called for when its title is read the bill be passed over informally, retaining its place on the Calendar.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. SPOONER]

asks unanimous consent that bills on the Private Calendar be called over by title in their order, beginning where business was suspended at the session of last Friday night——

Mr. BRYCE. I object.

Mr. SPOONER. Then I ask that the Clerk commence with the beginning of the Calendar, and that the call be conducted in the manner I have just proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island now asks unanimous consent that bills on the Calendar be called over by title in their order, and that when the consideration of a bill is not asked for it be passed over informally, retaining its place on the Calendar. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MRS. D. P. WOODBURY.

The first business on the Private Calendar was the bill (H. R. 5961) to increase the pension now paid to Mrs. D. P. Woodbury.

Mr. BRYCE. I ask for the consideration of this bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension now paid Mrs. D. P. Woodbury, widow of General D. P. Woodbury, to the sum of $50 per month from and after the passage of this act.

Mr. CHEADLE. I shall object to the passage of this bill at the present time. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. BRYCE] desires to have it go over, to be voted on in a full House, I am willing. I do not want to be compelled to call for a quorum at the beginning of this evening's session.

Mr. BRYCE. I am willing that the bill should go over until the 28th instant, upon the same conditions which have been applied to bills of a similar character—in other words, that the previous question be ordered, the right to offer amendments being reserved, and that debate be limited to thirty minutes—fifteen minutes on each side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that this bill be fixed as a special order for the 28th instant, after the bills of similar character which have already been fixed for that time, that the previous question be considered as ordered, the right to offer amendments being reserved, and that fifteen minutes on each side be allowed at that time for debate.

Mr. McMILLIN. I must object to that, because I know it is desired that on Monday next we shall go on with the tariff bill. I would not object to fixing the consideration of this bill for to-morrow or for any other day when it would not interfere with the tariff bill.

Mr. BRYCE. This bill has already been up several times——

Mr. McMILLIN. I understand that; and I have no objection to assigning for its consideration any time when it will not interfere with the business of the Committee on Ways and Means. If the gentleman wants the bill to come up to-morrow, all right; but I know it is the desire that next week we shall go on with revenue bills, which are, I think, of paramount importance.

Mr. BRYCE. I ask, then, that the consideration of the bill be fixed for to-morrow under the conditions already stated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the previous question be regarded as ordered on this bill, and that it come up for consideration immediately after the reading of the Journal to-morrow morning; that the right to offer amendments be reserved, and that fifteen minutes' debate be allowed on each side.

Mr. PETERS. Other bills which have been objected to have been fixed for Monday, the 28th instant. Why should this bill have precedence over those?

Mr. MATSON. I wish to know, Mr. Chairman, whether the Committee of the Whole can make an order of the kind proposed so as to bind the House.

The CHAIRMAN. This would be simply in the nature of a recommendation to the House. Is there objection to the proposition which has just been stated by the Chair? The Chair hears none; and that order is made.

EVALINA P. BROWN.

The next business on the Private Calendar (the consideration of which was asked) was the bill (H. R. 7025) granting a pension to Evalina P. Brown.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Evalina P. Brown, widow of Jacob L. Brown, late private of Company A, Third Regiment North Carolina Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. WALKER) is as follows:

The bill was introduced by the writer of this report, in accordance with the recommendations of the honorable Commissioner of Pensions contained in his letter of January 13, 1888, that the claim of Evalina P. Brown, although meritorious, can not be allowed by the Pension Bureau, and should receive the favorable consideration of Congress.

The facts in the case, as shown by the papers submitted by the Pension Bureau, are as follows:

Claimant's husband, Jacob L. Brown, about August 1, 1864, at Strawberry Plains, Tenn., enlisted under Lieut. John W. Edwards, in Company A, Third North Carolina Infantry. After his enlistment he was employed as recruiting officer, and sent into Carter County, Tennessee, from which he returned about August 15, 1864, with some sixty or seventy men, to Guernsey Cove, Tenn., the place of meeting agreed upon with said Lieutenant Edwards.

Brown was again sent out for more recruits, having in the mean time been promised a commission in Company D of said regiment; but while out on this trip was killed by Confederates; and therefore his name was not taken up on the rolls of the command at the time of its final muster.

The soldier's name not being borne on the rolls of the Adjutant-General's Office, the Pension Bureau is estopped from the favorable consideration of the widow's claim.

The widow has not remarried, and the Commissioner of Pensions, after special examination, believing the claim to be meritorious, has presented the same, as heretofore stated, under the provision of joint resolution of May 29, 1830, for the consideration of Congress.

Your committee, after full consideration of the evidence presented, concur in the opinion of the Commissioner of Pensions, and therefore report favorably on the bill, and ask that the same do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

HIRAM M. GOSS.

The next business on the Private Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. CHIPMAN) was the bill (H. R. 6810) for the relief of Hiram M. Goss.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Hiram M. Goss, late of Company A, Ninety-fourth Regiment New York Infantry, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6810) for the relief of Hiram M. Goss, have examined the case, and find that he enlisted October 23, 1861, and was discharged at Carver Hospital, Washington, D. C., July 9, 1862, for disability. He applied for a pension in March, 1886, on the ground that in May, 1862, while detailed as a teamster engaged in hauling supplies from the depot to camp at Fredericksburgh, Va., a barrel of pork fell from his load and that the effort made by him to reload it caused a rupture in his right side. The claim was rejected because he did not show that the injury was incurred in the line of duty. He testified that he was entirely alone when the accident happened, and when in consequence of it he suddenly felt a sharp pain and sick as his stomach he did not know what was the matter. His drove team about a week after this, but, being unable to lift anything, was ordered back to the command. He told some of his comrades his trouble, and was informed by them that it was a breach or hernia.

The records in the office of the Adjutant-General show his enlistment as a private in Company A, Ninty-fourth New York Volunteers, his enrollment October 23, 1861, and his presence until April 30, 1862; that he was absent in May and June sick, at Alexandria, and was discharged at Carver Hospital July 9, 1862, for disability.

The records of the Surgeon-General's Office show that he was admitted to Carver Hospital June 12, 1862, but not the nature of his illness. The certificate of disability under which he was discharged sets forth that he was incapable of performing military service because of direct inguinal hernia.

Edward B. Saunders, De France Green, and Horace Green all testify that he was a sound, vigorous man when he enlisted, and afflicted with hernia after his discharge. Their testimony shows that they knew him from infancy up to his enlistment; worked, ran, wrestled, and played with him during boyhood and manhood, bathing with him hundreds of times, and that they knew that when he enlisted he was sound and healthy and free from hernia or other disability, but that when he came out of the service he told them he was suffering from hernia. These men certainly had every opportunity to know his physical condition before he enlisted. The examining surgeon (J. T. Keates) reports that he has hernia now and one-half incapacitated from obtaining his living by manual labor. The claimant himself testifies that he was stripped naked and thoroughly examined physically when he enlisted.

It appears, then, that he had no hernia when he enlisted, but did have it when discharged. Should he be denied a pension because in the course of his duty he was alone when he was injured? That certainly would be very hard if he tells the truth.

The committee recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JULIA WELCH.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. Chairman, I did not observe that the Clerk had passed over on the Calendar the bill (H. R. 8291) granting a pension to Julia Welch. I ask its present consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be read.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, at the rate prescribed by existing provisions of law, the name of Julia Welch, widow of James H. Welch, late private Company A, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry.

The report (by Mr. LANE) is as follows:

The soldier enlisted in the Army on the 4th of January, 1861, and he was discharged therefrom on surgeon's certificate of disability May 29, 1866, and at the time of his enlistment he was a sound, able-bodied man, and when he returned from the Army he was greatly emaciated and debilitated and suffering from chronic diarrhea and heart disease, and that his disease continued to affect his general health and disabled him from performance of manual labor to the date of his death, February 24, 1884. The claim was rejected on the ground that the soldier's death was not due to his army service.

The testimony shows that the soldier contracted chronic diarrhea and heart disease in the Army, and he was treated for this disease to the date of his death, and while he died from lung disease the testimony warrants the conclusion that it was the result of chronic diarrhea, and therefore the result of his army service.

And the testimony further shows that the widow is poor, and she has no person legally bound to support her, and that she is dependent upon her own exertions for her living.

In view of all the facts of this case, the committee recommend that said bill do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

PETER C. CHEEKS.

The next business on the Private Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. BACON) was the bill (H. R. 7093) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Cheeks.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Peter C. Cheeks, late a private of the United States Marine Corps, at the rate of $72 per month, in lieu of the amount ($50) per month he is now receiving.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) is as follows:

The committee find that Cheeks is now receiving $50 per month, on account of consumption of the lungs, as a pension, and applied in 1886 for an increase, which was refused because he was not on the pension-rolls at the time of the passage of the act of June 16, 1890. The examining board, September 25, 1886, passing on his application for relief, find that he is in the last stages of consumption, and so disabled as to require the constant aid of an attendant. Since then he has lingered along a mere physical wreck, and is now in condition of so great feebleness that the prolongation of his life is a cause of wonder.

We recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

LOVINA J. REEVES.

The next business on the Private Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. MILLIKEN) was the bill (H. R. 813) granting a pension to Mrs. Lovina J. Reeves.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. Lovina J. Reeves, of Ellsworth, Me., widow of the late Forest Reeves, late of Company M, First Maine Cavalry.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) is as follows:

This claim was favorably reported by the committee of the Forty-ninth Congress, but was not reached on the Calendar. The facts seem to be that Forest Reeves, the soldier upon whose service this claim is based, was pensioned on account of gunshot wound in right arm, received while serving as private in Company M, First Maine Cavalry. He died July 19, 1879, in the Worcester (Mass.) Lunatic Asylum, where he had been placed on account of insanity. Claim was rejected "on ground that the soldier's fatal disease (insanity) was not predisposed or excited by the gunshot wound of left arm, for which he was pensioned, nor in any manner chargeable to his military service."

The gunshot wound for which Reeves was pensioned is described as inflicted "by a spent ball, which entered on the inner aspect of the left arm, midway between axilla and elbow, and passing upward and backward lodged behind the triceps muscle, where it can now be felt."

Four special examiners worked upon this case and procured a large amount of testimony. Much of it tends to show that soldier had considerable trouble with his wounded arm, which pained him for years at the point where the ball could be felt, and that during his last years the pain extended to his neck and head. He gradually lost his faculties, and some months before he died it became necessary to send him to the asylum.

Dr. Eastman, superintendent of the asylum, says:

"It is very probable the ball hereinbefore mentioned may have produced such injury to the nerves near and among which it passed and remained as led to or hastened the development in the spinal cord and in the brain of the disease which was the pathological cause of his insanity."

In 1884 Dr. Hood, medical referee of the Pension Office, expressed the opinion that, "giving the claimant the benefit of the doubt, with recorded evidence, it appears the claim should be allowed and the widow pensioned;" but subsequent to this Dr. Hood's opinion was overruled and the claim rejected. With the history of Reeves's disability, as disclosed in many affidavits before us, as well as the medical opinions on file favorable to the claim, your committee feel justified in resolving all doubts in favor of the widow, and therefore report the bill back with a recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

THOMAS BENSON.

The next business on the Private Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. MILLIKEN) was the bill (H. R. 6070) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Benson.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Thomas Benson, late a private in Company A, Thirty-second Regiment Maine Volunteers, and pay him a pension at the rate of $35 per month, in lieu of the amount he is now receiving.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) is as follows:

This case was favorably reported by both the committees of the Senate and House of the Forty-ninth Congress, but was not reached for consideration. It appears that soldier served as a private in Company A, Thirty-second Maine Volunteers. He applied at the Pension Office and was granted a pension under the provisions of the general laws at the rate of $24 per month, for amputation of left leg, from March 3, 1883.

He files a petition with your committee asking for an increase on the ground that, in addition to the loss of his left leg below the knee, for which he is now receiving all that is allowed by the provisions of the general law, he also has a shell wound in the right hip, some 8 inches long and 3 inches deep, which is so near the spine that it affects that and the kidneys, and also his right leg and foot. His petition is signed by many neighbors, who ask that his claim be allowed, and the fact of this additional injury and increased disability is fully established. Claimant is poor and unable to labor to support his family.

Your committee report the bill back favorably, with a recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MARQUIS D. DAVIS.

The next business on the Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. TOWNSHEND) was the bill (H. R. 722) for the relief of Marquis D. Davis.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Marquis D. Davis, late a private in Company B, Eighty-ninth Regiment of Illinois Infantry Volunteers, at the rate of $8 per month.

The report (by Mr. LANE) was read, as follows:

The record shows that the soldier was mustered into service in Company B, Eighty-ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, August 13, 1862, at Camp Douglas, and while in the line of duty was ruptured and sent home by the officer in charge, with the understanding that his name should be erased from the roll; and his pension was rejected in the Pension Office on the ground that he was never enrolled in the service of the United States.

There can be no question but this soldier served in the Army, and six or seven witnesses testify in the record that the soldier was a sound man when he entered the Army.

The examining surgeon, R. Poindexter, certifies in the record that he examined the soldier for disability from scrotal hernia of left side, and he says in his opinion that soldier received his disability in the service and in the line of duty and that the disability is permanent, and in the opinion of the doctor the soldier is one-half disabled from performing manual labor.

It does not appear why the soldier's name is not on the rolls of the Army, but it is certain that he served in the Army, and while in line of duty and under orders of his comman ler, while drilling, was ruptured, and was injured to such an extent that he was entirely unable to perform the duty of a soldier, and that the soldier was sent home by the officer of the company.

This fact is sustained by the testimony of several of his comrades, and there can be no doubt about the fact of his service and that he received the injury complained of in the line of duty.

The committee therefore recommend that the bill do pass, with an amendment striking out all after "volunteers," in the seventh line of said bill.

The amendment recommended by the committee was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JAMES W. HARRIMAN.

The next business on the Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin) was the bill (H. R. 618) granting a pension to James W. Harriman.

The bill is follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James W. Harriman, late of Company E, First Regiment Maine Cavalry Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. SAWYER) was read, as follows:

The Adjutant-General, United States Army, reports the soldier to have enlisted December 9, 1861, in Company E, First Maine Cavalry, and was captured in action at Middletown, Md., May 24, 1862, and so borne on the rolls until November and December, 1862, when he is reported present for duty. The rolls for May and June, 1863, show him as absent sick, and same to October, 1863, when he was transferred to the Veteran Reserve Corps—cause not stated—and discharged December, 9, 1864.

The Surgeon-General, United States Army, reports the soldier as follows: Admitted to hospital, Washington, D. C., June 14, 1863, and transferred to Portsmouth Grove, R. I., July 3, 1863, where he was treated for hematuria until February 3, 1864, when he was returned to duty.

The soldier declares that at the battle of Chancellorsville, Va., May 2, 1863, he incurred double inguinal hernia from constant horseback riding, and was ordered to hospital because of his inability to ride. That no examination was made by the surgeon, at either hospital, where he was treated for some bladder trouble and other complaints, to ascertain what his true condition was.

Capt. George W. Hassey testifies that near Chancellorsville, Va., the soldier was injured while in the saddle, and in the line of duty; that he saw him immediately after he was injured, and remembers the fact well, but is unable to state in what part of the body; that he was sent to the hospital for treatment for the injury.

The claimant, unfortunately, can not furnish the affidavit of officers or comrades, showing incurrence of hernia in the service, because of the death of his captain and of Lieutenant Ellis, and because of his inability to find a comrade who is conversant with the facts.

The soldier was discharged December 9, 1834, and subsequently went to Wisconsin, where he arrived January 3, 1865, and got employment as cook in a lumber camp because of his inability to do any heavy lifting.

E. Miner, Necedah, Wis., testifies that he procured a truss for the soldier in January, 1865, and purchased another some two years later.

H. L. Nye and P. R. Stivins testify that they have been acquainted with soldier since 1865; never knew him to do any heavy labor; when he came to Wisconsin he got employment as cook in a lumber camp, and they understood that the reason he could not labor was on account of rupture; that he frequently complained of pains, and trouble generally ascribed to rupture.

The claim was rejected by the Pension Office November 25, 1881, on the ground that there was no record of hernia, and the inability of the claimant to furnish testimony of incurrence in the service.

In view of the fact that some eighteen months elapsed between the date of enlistment and the date the injury was received leads to the presumption that he was sound at the date he entered the service, and as it is shown that he suffered from the cause alleged (rupture) at the date of his discharge, and a truss was purchased for him within thirty days from the date of his discharge, and the United States examining surgeon sets forth in his report that in his opinion the disability was incurred in the service of the United States, we therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ELIZABETH SMITH.

The next business on the Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. MORRILL) was the bill (H. R. 6478) granting a pension to Elizabeth Smith.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension act, the name of Elizabeth Smith, dependent mother of George Harbaugh, late of Company H, Fifty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) is as follows:

The evidence submitted to your committee in support of this bill shows that Elizabeth Smith is the mother of George Harbaugh, late of Company H, Fifty-fifth Pennsylvania Volunteers. The father of the soldier died long prior to the war, and the mother remarried. Her second husband also died prior to the war. During the war the soldier supported his mother, who was then dependent.

In February, 1864, soldier while at home on a furlough was married, and after his return to the Army he was, a few months afterwards, wounded in action in front of Petersburgh, from the effects of which he died at Fortress Monroe July 11, 1864.

The widow received a pension until 1869, when she re-married. No one is now receiving a pension on account of the soldier's death. As long as he lived he contributed liberally to her support. She is now destitute, and for three years worked for 75 cents a week to support herself. She is now nearly seventy years old, and through the infirmities of age is unable longer to earn a support.

Your committee feel that the general laws ought to be so amended as to include cases of this class, but in the absence of general legislation they recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

LOUISE PAUL.

The next business on the Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. LAFFOON) was the bill (S. 749) granting a pension to Louise Paul.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Louise Paul, widow of Brig. Gen. Gabriel R. Paul, United States Army, and to pay her a pension of $100 a month, in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

Mr. CHEADLE. I will give notice to the gentleman that, unless this goes over to a full House, I shall be compelled to raise the question of a quorum on its passage.

Mr. LAFFOON. Then I ask that it be permitted to go over under the restrictions that have heretofore applied to such bills. I ask that its consideration be fixed for to-morrow, that the previous question be considered as ordered on its passage, and that the usual debate be had on each side for fifteen minutes.

Mr. CHIPMAN. That it take the same course as the Woodbury bill.

Mr. LAFFOON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Let us have the report read.

Mr. CHEADLE. I do not ask the reading of the report, as the bill is not now to be considered.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Very well; since it is not proposed to consider it now.

Mr. LAFFOON. I ask that the report be printed in the RECORD and that the bill go over until to-morrow with the conditions annexed that I have suggested.

Mr. CHEADLE. And let the usual order be made that the previous question be considered as ordered upon the passage of the bill; that fifteen minutes' debate on each side be allowed, and that it go over until to-morow morning, subject, however, to the right of amendment.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The report (by Mr. HUNTER) is as follows:

It appears that by act of Congress approved August 4, 1886, a pension was given to Mrs. Paul as the widow of Brig. Gen. Gabriel R. Paul, United States Army, at the rate of $50 per month. It now appears that Mrs. Paul applies for an increase of pension.

The committee, in considering this application, have had their attention called to the following official statement of facts in support of said application:

"Statement of facts in support of a bill to grant a pension to Louise Paul, widow of Brig. Gen. G. R. Paul, United States Army.

"Brig. Gen. Gabriel R. Paul was born in St. Louis, Mo., appointed to West Point from that State, and graduated in July, 1834. From 1834 to 1839 he was on frontier duty, and in 1839 was engaged in the Florida war. From 1339 to 1842 he was on recruiting duty, and in 1842 was in the war against the Seminole Indians, a camp of whom he surprised near Tampa Bay. He served with distinction throughout the Mexican war, having taken part in the defense of Fort Brown, the battle of Monterey, siege of Vera Cruz, the battle of Cerro Gordo (where he was wounded), Contreras, Churubusco, and Molino del Rey. He led the storming party at Chapultepec, which captured the enemy's flag, and was for this act of gallantry brevetted major. For his service in Mexico he was presented by the citizens of St. Louis with a sword. From 1848 to 1850 he was in garrison at Fort Leavenworth, 1850-'51 at Jefferson Barracks, and in 1851-'52 on frontier duty at Corpus Christi, Tex.

"In 1852 he served with the Rio Grande expedition, in which he captured Carvajal and his gang of desperadoes. He was also in the Utah expedition of 1858-'59-'60, and was engaged in the surprise and capture of a camp of hostile Indians on Spanish Fork. He was actively engaged in the late war, having rendered valuable service in New Mexico in 1861-'62. Subsequently he served with the Army of the Potomac, taking part in the battles of Fredericksburgh and Chancellorsville and in its Pennsylvania campaign. At the battle of Gettysburgh, while in command of a brigade, he was seriously wounded, a bullet entering his head about 1½ inches behind the right eye and on a level with it, passing through his head and emerging through the left socket, carrying the left eye with it.

"Thus in an instant the vision of both eyes was completely destroyed, and at the same time the senses of smell and of hearing were greatly impaired. From the effects of this wound he suffered acutely ever after in the shape of violent attacks of pain in the head and of epilepsy, necessitating the constant presence of an attendant. During the last few years of his life these epileptic attacks became very frequent, not only daily, but sometimes to the number of six during the day and night. It was in one of these attacks of unusual severity, and the direct consequence of it, that he died, as shown by the report of the attending army surgeon, a certified copy of which is appended hereto.

"The career of General Paul was a series of gallant exploits in his country's defense, covering a period of nearly thirty years of actual service in the field, and embracing the Florida wars, the Mexican war, and closing with the battle of Gettysburgh, where his sight was completely destroyed. In recognition of his gallantry on this occasion he was presented by the Twenty-ninth New Jersey Volunteers with a handsome jeweled sword, and was brevetted brigadier-general. In February, 1865, he was retired from active service 'for disability resulting from wounds received in line of duty,' and was assigned to duty at the Soldiers' Home, Washington, D. C., until June, 1865, when he was placed in charge of the Military Asylum at Harrodsburgh, Ky. Here he remained until December 20, 1866. This was his last duty.

"He died in this city on the 5th of May, 1886, having been in the service fifty-one years and ten months. His widow, Mrs. Louise Paul, is much in need, and asks that relief which the bill recently introduced by Senator HAWLEY provides—a relief for which there are very many precedents.

"Respectfully submitted.

"R. A. MARMION,
"*United States Navy.*"

"[Office of the attending surgeon, United States Army, No. 1733 G street, N. W.]

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *May* 5, 1886.

"SIR: I have the honor to report that Brig. Gen. Gabriel R. Paul, U. S. A., retired, died at his residence in this city at 10 o'clock this morning.

"The cause of death was coma, following on an epileptiform convulsion, the result of a wound received at the battle of Gettysburgh, Pa.

"I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

"R. M. O'REILLY,
"*Assistant Surgeon, U. S. Army.*

"The ADJUTANT-GENERAL, U. S. A.,
"*Washington, D. C.*

"A true copy.

"R. A. MARMION,
"*Surgeon, U. S. Navy.*

"WASHINGTON, D. C., *May* 25, 1886."

"WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
"*Washington, May* 26, 1886.

"Statement of the military service of Gabriel R. Paul, late of the United States Army, compiled from the records of this office.

"He was a cadet at the United States Military Academy from July 1, 1829, to July 1, 1834, when graduated, and appointed brevet second lieutenant Seventh Infantry; promoted second lieutenant December 4, 1834; first lieutenant October 26, 1836; captain April 19, 1846; major Eighth Infantry April 22, 1861; lieutenant-colonel April 25, 1862, and colonel Fourteenth Infantry September 13, 1864; was retired as colonel February 16, 1865, and with rank of brigadier-general July 28, 1866.

"He was mustered in as colonel, Fourth New Mexico Infantry, December 9, 1861, and honorably mustered out May 31, 1862; was appointed brigadier-general of volunteers September 5, 1862, which expired by constitutional limitation March 4, 1863; he was reappointed brigadier-general of volunteers April 18, 1863, and honorably mustered out of the volunteer service September 1, 1866.

"He received the brevets of major September 13, 1847, 'for gallant and meritorious conduct in the battle of Chapultepec,' and of brigadier-general, United States Army, February 23, 1865, 'for gallant and meritorious services in the battle of Gettysburgh, Pa.'

"He was on graduating leave to October 15, 1834; with his regiment at Forts Arbuckle and Gibson, Ind. T., to February 7, 1839; in the Florida war to (on recruiting service from March, 1840, to June 17, 1842) October 23, 1842; on leave to December 7, 1842; with regiment at Fort Brooke, Fla., to March 30, 1843; at New Orleans and Baton Rouge Barracks, La., to June, 1844, and at Pass Christian, Miss., to October 6, 1844; on leave to November 13, 1844; with regiment at New Orleans Barracks, La., and at Pass Christian, Miss., to April 22, 1846; in the war with Mexico to July, 1848, and at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to September 18, 1848; on recruiting service to August 29, 1850; with regiment at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., to September 15, 1850; *en route* to Santa Fé, N. Mex., and return to October 26, 1850; at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to April 17, 1851; at Corpus Christi, Tex., to January 3, 1852, and at Ringgold Barracks, Tex., to July 25, 1853; on leave to February 18, 1854; with regiment at Fort Belknap, Tex., to February 13, 1858; at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to May 26, 1858, and on the Utah expedition, and at Camp Floyd, Utah, to April 21, 1859; on leave to July 22, 1859; on detached service with recruits to October 8, 1859; with regiment at Camp Floyd, Utah, to May 16, 1860; at Albuquerque, N. Mex., to February 28, 1861, and at Fort Fillmore, N. Mex., to June, 1861; instructing volunteers at Fort Union, N. Mex., and from December 9, 1861, commanding the Fourth New Mexico Volunteers at that post to April 6, 1862; and in the field, New Mexico, to May 31, 1862, when honorably mustered out as colonel of that regiment; acting inspector-general of General Casey's Provisional Brigades, in the defenses of Washington, D. C., from August 12 to September, 1862; commanding Third Brigade, First Division, First Corps, Army of the Potomac, from October 14, 1862, to July 1, 1863, when severely wounded at the battle of Gettysburgh, Pa.; absent on account of wounds to February 16, 1865, when he was retired as colonel for loss of sight, resulting from wounds received in action, and with rank of brigadier-general, under act of July 28, 1866; was in charge of the military asylum at Harrodsburgh, Ky., from June 13, 1865, to December 20, 1866, from which date he was unemployed to May 5, 1886, when he died at Washington, D. C. By a resolution of Congress, approved April 12, 1870, he was granted the full pay and allowances of brigadier-general.

"R. C. DRUM, *Adjutant-General.*

"A true copy.

"O. D. GREENE,
"*Assistant Adjutant-General.*"

And, in connection with the foregoing, the statement made by Mrs. Paul that owing to the condition of General Paul from the time of his receiving his severe wound it was "such as to entirely disable him from the management of his business," and that "he was so helpless as to need constant attendance," and that "the necessary expenses of his family took up all of General Paul's pay, so that at his death nothing had been saved," and that his widow and daughter are entirely dependent on such pension as may be granted by Congress.

These allegations are supported by the certificate of Dr. O'Reilly, surgeon, United States Army (see Exhibit A), and by other testimony. General Paul was a helpless invalid almost from the date of his wound, received at the battle of Gettysburgh, requiring the constant attention of his wife, and therefore neither one was able either to contribute to an estate or save one. The amount of increase asked for is barely sufficient to secure the object Congress originally had in view in the allowance of a pension by the act of August 4, referred to; and believing this case to be one of exceptional merit and in the line of policy adopted by the Government, this committee recommend that the prayer of the petitioner be granted, and submit the accompanying bill, recommending its passage.

[Office of the attending surgeon, United States Army, No. 1733 G street, N. W.]

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January* 31, 1887.

SENATOR: As medical attendant for several years on the family of the late Brig. Gen. Gabriel R. Paul, I became well acquainted with their financial affairs. As you are probably aware, General Paul's condition, resulting from a severe wound, was such as to entirely disable him from the management of his business, and he was so helpless as to need constant attendance. The necessary expenses of the family took up all of General Paul's pay, so that at his death nothing had been saved. I believe that Mrs. and Miss Paul are entirely dependent on such pension as may be granted by Congress.

I am, Senator, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

A. M. O'REILLY, M. D.,
United States Army.

Hon. W. C. WHITTHORNE,
United States Senator.

CULLEN W. GREEN.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. SHIVELY) was the bill (H. R. 3537) granting a pension to Cullen W. Green.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Cullen W. Green, late of Company I, Forty-fourth Indiana Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MATSON) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3537) granting a pension to Cullen W. Green, have considered the same, and now submit the following report:

Cullen W. Green was enrolled January 10, 1862, in Company I of the Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Infantry Volunteers, and was honorably discharged June 23, 1865.

He filed application for pension March 30, 1880, alleging that at the battle of Mission Ridge, Tennessee, about September 20, 1863, he was ruptured on the left side by straining and overexertion in going down the side of the mountain.

The claim was rejected on the ground of there being no record of the alleged rupture, having received no treatment in service, and claimant being unable to furnish evidence of its incurrence in line of duty, or the testimony of persons who saw the same prior to his discharge.

There is abundance of evidence in the affirmative, and none in the negative, that the soldier at the time of enlistment was a healthy man and free from hernia. The reason there is no medical record or that he is unable to furnish the evidence of comrades is because it was incurred when he was captured at the battle of Chickamauga, Tenn. He was ruptured on the 19th or 20th of September, 1863, at the battle of Chickamauga, while retreating down from the summit of Mission Ridge.

Immediately, the same day, after suffering the injury, he was taken prisoner and confined in Libby Prison about six months. From Libby Prison he was taken to Macon, Ga., and from there to Savannah; from Savannah to Charleston, S. C., and from Charleston to Columbia, and was retained a prisoner of war until March, 1865, when he was paroled and sent to Columbus, Ohio, and was, some time in May, 1865, exchanged and returned to the Forty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, and was then soon mustered out on account of expiration of term of service. He received no treatment in the Army excepting such as was given him while in the hands of the Confederates. Since his discharge he has been treated for hernia by Dr. R. J. Hagerty, lately deceased, and has received no treatment from any other physician for said complaint. At the time said soldier received said injury he was but twenty years old and did not know what rupture was, and he did not have an opportunity while a prisoner of war to gain any medical information in regard to it.

C. G. Conn testifies as follows:

"I was a prisoner of war and confined at Columbia, S. C., with Lieut. C. W. Green. The said C. W. Green complained of hernia during our imprisonment, and at times seemed to suffer very much from it. I have also been acquainted with him since his return home from the war, and do not consider him capable of enduring severe manual labor. I was also intimately acquainted with him before his enlistment, and am satisfied that at that time he was sound and free from the alleged disability."

E. P. Willard and S. P. Wilcox testify that—

"They have known claimant for about eleven years; that he has not been able to perform manual labor to the extent of a full man's labor, and they believe his disability is the result of rupture or hernia on left side."

Henry C. Dodge, assistant surgeon Seventy-fourth Indiana Volunteers, testifies that—

"In 1872 claimant bought a truss of affiant, and stated that he had tried for a long time to obtain a truss which would hold his hernia in a safe position; that he then stated that he incurred it while being hurried as a prisoner of war down toward the rear of enemy's line."

The examining surgeon, Dr P. D. Harding, says: "Cullen W. Green has a direct inguinal hernia of the left side, which causes a tumor the size of a pheasant's egg. He wears a well-fitting truss and suffers but little when the truss is worn."

After a careful examination of all the evidence in this case, and taking into consideration all the circumstances surrounding the soldier during his long imprisonment, making it impossible for him to furnish such medical and other evidence in regard to his disability as is required by the existing laws and the rules of the Pension Office, the committee are of the opinion that this is a meritorious case, and that the relief asked for in the bill ought to be granted.

We therefore submit a favorable report, and recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

JOANNA BARRY.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana) was the bill (H. R. 4653) to grant a pension to Joanna Barry.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-rolls the name of Joanna Barry, widow of Lieut. John Barry, late of Company C, First United States Cavalry, subject to the provisions and limitations of the general pension laws.

The report (by Mr. MATSON) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4653) granting a pension to Joanna Barry, have considered the same, and now submit the following report:

John Barry, husband of Joanna Barry, was pensioned at the rate of $7 per month for chronic rheumatism. The widow filed claim for pension, alleging that soldier died from the effects of the disease for which he was pensioned. The claim was rejected on the ground that it was not proved that the diseases which caused the husband's death were connected as results with his military service.

Dr. Frank Hyatt, the physician who attended the soldier during his last illness, testifies that the immediate cause of his death was stricture of the œsophagus and pneumonia; that the pneumonia was of but one day's duration and hastened his death but little, if any, as the patient was in a moribund condition when it supervened, and he had been expecting him to die for several days; that he believes the stricture of the œsophagus was the immediate cause of his death, and that this stricture was caused by its muscular fibers being the seat of rheumatic inflammation, leading to contraction of that canal; that for several days he was unable to swallow anything solid, and was able to swallow only the smallest amount of liquid; that there was no cancerous cachexia and no symptoms or history of syphilis; that Dr. Basil Morris stated that Captain Barry had contracted rheumatism in the service and had been afflicted with it continuously from discharge; that his limbs were drawn out of shape by it, and, in his opinion, the stricture which caused his death was due to his rheumatic condition.

The only evidence against the testimony of the attending physician is the opinion of the medical referee, which, in the opinion of the committee, is not of sufficient weight, in a pathological sense, to cause a rejection of the claim.

The committee therefore submit a favorable report, and recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

ANNA M. THIELE.

The next pension bill called up for consideration (by Mr. MATSON) was the bill (H. R. 6976) for the relief of Anna M. Thiele.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is informed that this bill can not be found at this moment by the Clerk.

Mr. MATSON. I was under the distinct impression that that bill was passed some weeks ago.

The CHAIRMAN. For the present it will be passed over, and the Clerk will make inquiry as to the fact.

JOHN SHINE.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. FORD) was the bill (H. R. 5544) granting a pension to John Shine.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-rolls the name of John Shine, late of Company L, Seventh Regiment Michigan Cavalry, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5544) granting a pension to John Shine, having considered the same, submit the following report:

Shine served in Company L, Seventh Regiment Michigan Cavalry, during the war of the rebellion, and afterwards applied for a pension on account of an injury to his left leg, alleging that it was received in the line of duty. The Bureau of Pensions rejected his application on the ground of "claimant's inability to furnish evidence to show that the alleged injury was received in the line of duty; the evidence strongly indicates that it existed prior to his enlistment."

It apears from Shine's affidavit that he was on temporary picket duty in 1864 with other men, who were unknown to him, and while on such temporary duty his horse was shot, and fell upon his leg, severely injuring him. That he (Shine) is utterly unable to ascertain the whereabouts and furnish the testimony of those who would be prepared to testify to his receiving the injury, because their names and residences are entirely unknown to him. This statement, if believed, would apparently account for his "inability to furnish evidence to show that the alleged injury was received in the line of duty."

As to Shine's reputation for truth and veracity, and as to the existence of his injury prior to enlistment, a number of affidavits have been submitted to the committee, as follows:

Alexander Gillett testifies that—

"He has known Shine for thirty years, and that just prior to his enlistment 'he was called the best workingman in the township of Paris,' where he resided; that Shine returned from the war very lame, saying his horse had been shot and had fallen on him; that his lameness has grown worse of late years, until now he is unable to work; that his reputation for truth and veracity is good."

Charles Yanson testifies that—

"He knew Shine well before his enlistment; that he worked for Shine on his farm, and that Shine was in good physical health, and was not troubled with lameness; that after Shine returned from the war he was lame, and accounted for his lameness by saying his horse had been shot and had fallen on his leg; that Shine bears a good reputation for truth and veracity."

James Dennis, in an affidavit submitted to the committee, states that—

"He has known Shine thirty years, and that when Shine enlisted he was, to all appearances, a healthy man. That when Shine came home from the war he was lame and said his horse had been shot and had fallen upon him. That Shine's reputation for truth is good."

Samuel Langdon testifies that—

"He has known Shine for fifteen years, and that he is an honest man in his dealings with others, and among his neighbors enjoys a good reputation, and is a man whose statements can be relied on fully."

Isaac D. Hazen testifies that—

"He has known Shine well for thirty years, and that he was in good physical health at the time he enlisted; that immediately after Shine came home from the Army affiant saw him, and he was lame in one of his legs, and stated it had been caused by his horse falling on him after being shot; that Shine's lameness has increased ever since, until now he is unable to work; also, that affiant believes Shine's statements in regard to his injury in the service are true; that he is a man of truth and veracity, and bears a good reputation in the neighborhood where he resides."

Dr. John Brady, late assistant surgeon, United States Army, testifies that—

"He was Shine's physician before the war, and that he has no reason to know that he was unsound; that since the termination of the civil war Shine has been an invalid in consequence of an injury to the left knee-joint, and at present he is a permanent invalid."

Dr. Oscar H. Chipman testifies that—

"He was formerly a surgeon in the United States Army and made a physical examination of Shine at the time he enlisted, and that he was a sound, healthy man at that time; that after the war he examined Shine, and found he had an injury to his left leg."

The record in the Surgeon-General's Office discloses the fact that Shine was admitted to the post hospital, Cliffburne Barracks, October 16, 1863, with a contused wound of the knee, and was discharged from the service November 6, 1863.

In view of the above the committee recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

PLEMAN COOK.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. FORD) was the bill (H. R. 5177) granting a pension to Pleman Cook.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Pleman Cook,

late of Company D, Sixth Ohio Cavalry Volunteers, subject to the laws regulating pensions.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill H. R. 5177, having considered the same, beg leave to submit the following report:

Pleman Cook enlisted as a private in Company D, Sixth Regiment Ohio Cavalry, November 2, 1861, and served until the close of the war, being honorably discharged June 27, 1865. On June 28, 1880, he applied for a pension on the ground of hernia in the left groin. On October 14, 1885, his application was rejected by the Department on the ground of "inability of claimant to furnish testimony showing the existence of hernia while he was in the service."

From the testimony submitted to the Pension Department and to the committee, it appears, overwhelmingly, that Cook, at the time of enlistment, was a sound, healthy, able-bodied man, with no hernia or any indication of one. That he served faithfully until the close of the war. That in 1864, at Culpeper, Va., after long-continued and arduous duty in the saddle, upon dismounting, he felt a sharp, smarting pain in the left groin; that after resting awhile upon his back the pain ceased. That he was troubled from time to time thenceforward with the same smarting pain, and that when it came on he was obliged to lie down for awhile because it was so severe he could not continue on duty. That notwithstanding the fact that this pain gave him a good deal of trouble he did not go to a hospital, but continued on duty, although somewhat disabled, until the close of the war. That upon returning home he attempted to work upon his father's farm; that at once, to wit, the second day after he arrived home, a hernia appeared in his left groin, right at the point where he experienced this pain, which hernia has continued ever since.

Taking the conceded circumstances into account, they tend directly to corroborate Cook's statement. That he was an able-bodied man at the time of enlistment there can be no question. That he was ruptured two days after arriving home while performing only ordinary farm work would be a surprising circumstance were it not taken in connection with his statement of injury in the service, the symptoms of which correspond directly with those of hernia.

Cook is now an inmate of the Michigan Soldiers' Home, is paralyzed in his lower limbs, and his rupture has become enlarged. The committee think he should be given the benefit of all doubts, if any exist, and believe that a fair construction of the testimony submitted to them warrants the committee recommending the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation.

GEORGE W. CROOP.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut) was the bill (H. R. 8256) granting a pension to George W. Croop.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George W. Croop, late a private of Company A, Thirty-ninth Illinois Infantry.

The report (by Mr. CHIPMAN) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8256) granting a pension to George W. Croop, find that he was enrolled as a private in Company A, Thirty-ninth Regiment Illinois Infantry, entered the service on September 16, 1861, and was discharged for disability July 21, 1862. He claims that the disability was chronic diarrhea, incurred in the service, and that he has suffered from it ever since. His claim for pension was rejected because he could not ascertain the address of comrades who served with him, and because, too, the hospital record does not show the exact nature of his disability. He avers that he was in regimental hospital. He was sixty-seven years of age in May, 1883, when he applied for pension, and is now about seventy-one years. His comrades and others petition for a pension on account of his destitute circumstances.

We recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ADELAIDE L. JESSUP.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. LODGE) was the bill (H. R. 2475) granting a pension to Adelaide L. Jessup.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Adelaide L. Jessup, daughter of Robert W. Jessup, late a private in Company K, Seventh Regiment United States Veteran Volunteers, for a pension as minor child of a soldier who died in service.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions recommended the following amendment:

In line 8 strike out the words "for a pension as minor child of a soldier who died in service" and insert "and pay her a pension at the rate of $18 per month, such payments to be made to her legally constituted guardian."

The report (by Mr. FRENCH) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 2475) granting a pension to Adelaide L. Jessup, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

The beneficiary named in the bill is the daughter of Robert W. Jessup, who served as private in Company K, Seventh United States Veteran Volunteers, and was at date of his death, July 21, 1887, a pensioner at the rate of $30 per month. He left no wife surviving. Adelaide L. Jessup is an imbecile, and, having passed the age of sixteen years, is no longer entitled to pension. She is left without means of support, and taken care of at the present time by her only sister, who has been appointed her guardian, but whose financial condition is such as to preclude the possibility of a proper maintenance of this unfortunate woman.

These facts are shown by the certificate of the proper court and the affidavits of credible witnesses who are fully acquainted with all the circumstances surrounding the case.

Congress, in similar cases, has given relief to the helpless and dependent relatives of deceased soldiers, not provided for in the general laws governing the granting of pensions.

The soldier's helpless condition for over twenty years after discharge made it impossible for him to leave any means out of which to maintain his daughter, who, by reason of her unfortunate condition, is herself unable to earn anything towards her support.

Following this liberal action on the part of Congress, your committee report favorably on the accompanying bill, and ask that it do pass, amended, however, by striking out all after the word "Volunteers," in line 8, and insert instead the words "and pay her a pension at the rate of $18 per month, such payments to be made to her legally-constituted guardian."

The amendment was agreed to; and the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ISABELLA F. DYKE.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. LONG) was the bill (H. R. 8694) granting a pension to Isabella F. Dyke.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Isabella F. Dyke, mother of the late Edward G. Dyke, late second lieutenant of Company F, Thirty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions recommended the following amendment:

In lines 6 and 7 strike out the words "late second lieutenant of Company F, Thirty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers," and insert "late first lieutenant and adjutant, Thirty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers."

The report (by Mr. FRENCH) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8694) granting a pension to Isabella F. Dyke, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Isabella F. Dyke is the mother of Edward G. Dyke, who served in Company F, Thirty-eighth Massachusetts Volunteers, and as adjutant of the regiment from August 12, 1862, until May 17, 1865. He contracted disease of lungs while serving as first lieutenant and adjutant, for which he was pensioned at the time of his death, October 10, 1886, at the rate of $30 per month. He left surviving him a widow, who was also pensioned, but left no minor child surviving him. The widow died after the allowance of her claim.

Because of the fact that the soldier left surviving him a widow his mother is not pensionable under existing laws.

It appears, however, from the sworn statement of the chairman of the board of selectmen of Plymouth, Mass., where the mother resides, and others, that she was dependent upon the soldier during his lifetime for her support; that she is seventy-one years of age, in feeble health, nearly blind, and without property or income, and now dependent upon the charity of her friends. Her husband died thirty years ago.

Congress in similar cases has granted relief to the poor and aged parents of soldiers who died of disease contracted in the service, and who are, for reasons heretofore stated, debarred from the benefits of the general pension laws.

The case under consideration is equally meritorious, and therefore your committee report favorably on the accompanying bill, and ask that it do pass, amended, however, by striking out all after the words "Edward G. Dyke," in line 6, and inserting therein instead the words "late first lieutenant and adjutant Thirty-eighth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers."

The amendment was agreed to; and the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

TILLMAN FAUX.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. LEHLBACH) was the bill (H. R. 5378) for the relief of Tillman Faux.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Tillman Faux, late a private in Company E, Two hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. PIDCOCK) was read in part.

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the report be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The report in full is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5378) for the relief of Tillman Faux, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Tillman Faux enlisted in Company E, One hundred and thirty-second Pennsylvania Volunteers, August 7, 1862, and was discharged therefrom May 24, 1863. He again enrolled in Company I, Thirty-fifth Pennsylvania Militia, June 29, 1863, and served in the Gettysburgh campaign until mustered out, August 7, 1863. On the 7th of September, 1864, he again enlisted in Company E, Two hundred and tenth Pennsylvania Volunteers, and served until mustered out, May 30, 1865.

He applied for pension December 8, 1879, on account of rupture of left side alleged to have been incurred about April 1, 1865, near Appomattox Court-House, Va., by the pulling out of a stake to which the surgeon's horse was picketed. This claim has been rejected on the ground that there is no record of the injury, and the parol evidence is not deemed sufficient to establish origin in the service and line of duty, and the rejection was affirmed by the Secretary of the Interior.

The claim has been specially examined, and although none of the witnesses examined were present at the time of the injury (claimant then being on detail at brigade headquarters), a number of comrades testify that they saw the rupture shortly thereafter and while yet in service, and were then informed that it was incurred under the circumstances now related by claimant. The divorced wife of claimant, strongly prejudiced against him, testifies that upon his return home in 1865 he wore a truss, and then informed her that he was ruptured while pulling a stake by order of the surgeon.

The special examiner, in finally submitting the case, says:

"The evidence now on file is not, to my mind, altogether satisfactory, yet I believe other and better can not be furnished. * * * There is a record of wound of right foot about the time he claims to have been ruptured. All this is against him; yet the preponderance of evidence is in his favor. Claim must be admitted or rejected. Doubts should be resolved in his favor. From the evidence secured by Special Examiners Chreyter and Vosburgh, I am inclined to the belief that this claim has merit. Under the liberal practice of the office, I can but recommend that it be allowed."

The Secretary of the Interior, in his decision, likewise refers to the record of treatment for confused wound of foot about the time of injury or rupture alleged, and says that the Department is at a loss to determine why claimant's hospital

record should notice contused wound of foot and fail to mention hernia. He further says:

"The claim bears marks of merit, and further investigation might establish it, but as it now stands it is involved in doubts that are too thick to be solved by the Department."

The record of contused wound instead of hernia seems to your committee to be satisfactorily explained. Claimant, in the morning of the day on which he was ruptured by the pulling up of the stake to which the surgeon's horse was picketed, while driving the same stake into the ground, accidentally struck his foot on the instep with the pole of the ax, which did not seem to hurt him much, but afterwards swelled up and troubled him for some time. It was really the more serious of the two injuries received on that day; hence the record of the wound instead of the hernia. The reputation of the claimant is of the highest order, as attested by his employers and neighbors.

From all the evidence in the case it appears to the satisfaction of your committee that claimant was sound at enlistment; that he received an injury while in service which resulted in rupture of left side, and that he has been a constant sufferer therefrom ever since.

The accompanying bill is therefore returned with the recommendation that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

FRIEDERICKE RAFF.

The next pension bill on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin) was the bill (H. R. 927) for the relief of Friedericke Raff.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Friedericke Raff, widow of the late Theodore Raff, a private in Battery K, Second Regiment United States Artillery.

The report (by Mr. PIDCOCK) was read in part.

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the report be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MATSON. I object.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the report, which is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 927) for the relief of Friedericke Raff, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

Friedericke Raff is the widow of Theodore Raff, who served as private in Company K, Second United States Artillery, from February 11, 1859, to February 10, 1864, and died of hydrops, November 24, 1882. He was a pensioner for gunshot wound of abdomen. The widow's claim has been rejected on the ground that the fatal disease was not due to the wound, nor in any other way chargeable to the soldier's military service.

The medical examinations show that ball entered midway between umbilicus and anterior superior spinous process of ilium; made exit over ninth rib near spine.

Charles W. Hagen, late surgeon Fifty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteers, and a prominent physician of Newark, N. J., testifies that he was acquainted with the soldier for ten years prior to his death, and treated him for six years. The wound was immediately beneath the liver. Since 1876 Raff was subject to frequent attacks of hepatitis, peritonitis, enteritis. The liver was enlarged and the patient had an outspoken icterus. In 1880 his condition became critical, the patient was extremely emaciated and anemic, the heart's action became irregular, and anasarca was soon followed by general dropsy. The disease from which the soldier died was hepatitis, which was followed by cirrhosis and general hydrops.

Soldier was also treated for neuralgia and rheumatism while in service, and medical examination shows a rheumatic condition for six years prior to death.

The statement of the family physician should not be ignored in the consideration of the widow's claim. The wound unquestionably appears as a factor in the cause of the soldier's death. Its close proximity to the seat of the disease necessarily suggests a close relation to the fatal disease, if not the direct cause. This is the opinion of the attending physician, and he being skilled in his profession and of good repute, no good reason appears why Congress should not accept the same and grant the relief asked for.

Your committee, therefore, report favorably on the accompanying bill, and ask that it do pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

FRANKLIN LONG.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. MORRILL) was the bill (H. R. 5114) granting a pension to Franklin Long.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Franklin Long, of Havana, Kans., late of Company A, Sixty-first Illinois Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) is as follows:

This soldier enlisted in Company A, Sixty-first Illinois Regiment, January 16, 1862, and was discharged February 7, 1865. He applied for a pension, alleging wound of foot by accidental discharge of his own pistol on the 7th of June, 1864. The claim was rejected on the ground that claimant was not in line of duty when the wound was received. The case is clearly stated by the chief of the western division as follows:

"Maj. Daniel Grass testifies in his own handwriting that claimant was a teamster, and on June 7, 1864, near Little Rock, Ark., while in the line of his duty as a soldier, accidentally shot himself with a revolving pistol in the great toe of right foot; that his knowledge of the above facts are derived from seeing claimant shortly after incurrence. Affiant replies to office letter to the same effect. Credibility is of the best. Comrade W. D. Holland testifies to having been present at the time the accident occurred. In reply to office letter he says that claimant accidentally received a pistol wound through great toe, as told in his affidavit; thinks it was in spring of 1864: credibility is good.

"Comrade R. L. Horen testifies that claimant was a teamster, and about June 7, 1864, near Little Rock, Ark., about sundown, while in the line of his duty, claimant accidentally shot himself in the great toe of his right foot, with a revolving pistol, while cleaning the same; that he was personally present and saw claimant shoot himself as above described. In a letter he says that he thinks it was at Duvall's Bluff, on White River; that claimant was sitting in the hind end of a wagon-bed cleaning his revolver; that he (the affiant) stepped aside for something, and he heard the shot, turned and saw the claimant before his shoe was taken off, and it was stated that it went off accidentally; that it went through the toe; that claimant had been out with a scout or piloting a scout. Credibility of the best. Comrade John S. Marshall testifies to having been an eye-witness to the occurrence. There is a record of wound by the Adjutant-General and Surgeon-General.

"This claim, it seems to me, is fully proven, both as to origin and line of duty, and the testimony of the major and one comrade shows that claimant was acting as teamster."

The only point that your committee can conceive of as affording ground for rejection is as to the propriety of claimant's carrying a revolver. He could hardly be expected, as a teamster driving a six-mule team, to carry a piece of light artillery or even a Sharp's rifle or a heavy musket. If allowed to carry arms at all it could only be a revolver or some weapon which would not interfere with his duties in managing his team. If allowed to carry the weapon it was perfectly proper for him to keep it in proper condition for effective use.

Again and again your committee have held that wounds received as this one unquestionably was should be considered as received in line of duty. They therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with a recommendation that it do pass.

MARY FLORA.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. MORRILL) was a bill (H. R. 6006) granting a pension to Mary Flora.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary Flora, now of Ellinwood, Kans., dependent mother of Daniel Flora, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth Indiana Infantry Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) is as follows:

The beneficiary named in the bill is the mother of Daniel Flora, late of Company I, Thirty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteers. Her claim for pension has been rejected by the Pension Bureau on the ground that soldier's fatal disease—disease of brain—is, in the opinion of the medical referee, not chargeable to his military service.

The following facts are shown by the papers now before your committee:

Daniel Flora enlisted in the above-described command February 3, 1862, and served until honorably discharged, April 4, 1865. In the spring after his enlistment he had the measles, which, according to the testimony of his officer and comrades, affected his spine and kidneys, as was evident from his frequent complaints. The records of the War Department also show treatment for congestion of the lungs in February, 1864, and for diarrhea at intervals thereafter until discharge. Upon his return to his former home in Monroe County, Indiana, he was totally unfit for the performance of manual labor, and continued so until his removal to Iowa in 1867, where his parents then resided.

Dr. H. W. Miser, a physician of over twenty-five years' practice, testifies that he commenced treating the soldier in the fall of 1867. On examination he found him suffering from considerable tenderness along the spine, more particularly in the lumbar region, with pain over kidneys; treated soldier once or twice a week for two or three months, when he apparently improved. But after an exposure to a rain-storm he got worse and took to his bed. Affiant, upon examination, found inflammation all along the spine, which extended upward till it involved the brain, and he died a raving maniac on the 3d of July, 1868.

The dependence upon the soldier prior to his enlistment, as well as the needy condition of claimant, is clearly established. Her husband has been for many years totally unfit for manual labor, and neither he nor the claimant is possessed of any property affording any income.

After a careful examination of all the evidence in the case it is the opinion of your committee that the soldier's fatal disease is clearly traceable to his military service, and therefore report favorably on the accompanying bill, and ask that it do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

HENRY P. ALEXANDER.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. MORRILL) was the bill (H. R. 2234) granting a pension to Henry P. Alexander.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the name of Henry P. Alexander, late of Company F, One hundred and sixty-ninth Ohio Volunteers, be placed on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) is as follows:

The records show that Henry P. Alexander was enrolled on the 2d day of May, 1864, in Company F, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio National Guards, and mustered as a private May 15, 1864. He alleges in a claim filed for pension January 27, 1882, that while stationed and lying idle at Fort Ethan Allen, Va., July 27, 1864, he voluntered to go on picket duty in the place of a recruit whose name he has forgotten; that he went on duty early in the morning with other soldiers, strangers, there being none of his company in the squad; that he remained all day and into the night, when it began to rain; that while he was on his post, sitting on some poles on the opposite side of the road from the squad, with woolen and rubber blankets fastened over his shoulders, his gun accidentally discharged and shot off the index and middle fingers.

He is unable to furnish the evidence of any of his comrades, as he was alone at the time the accident occurred.

Charles Thompson, captain Company F, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment, testifies that claimant was a good and faithful soldier; that he was shot by the accidental discharge of his own gun July 17, 1864; that the shot took effect in the index and middle fingers of right hand, removing said fingers at the second joints.

Dr. Sardis P. Taylor, surgeon, testifies that while acting as surgeon at Fort Ethan Allen, July 17, 1864, he dressed a gunshot wound of the first and second fingers of claimant's right hand; that affiant believes he lost said fingers from the accidental discharge of his own gun.

The claim for pension was rejected on the ground of claimant's inability to furnish evidence showing under what circumstances the wound was received, or that he was on duty or in line of duty at the time.

The committee believe the evidence is sufficient to warrant the conclusion that the soldier was in line of duty when the accident occurred, and so believing, we submit a favorable report, and recommend the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

STEPHEN SCHIEDEL.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. MORRILL) was the bill (S. 1015) granting a pension to Stephen Schiedel.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Stephen Schiedel, late of Company D, First Regiment Missouri Light Artillery.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) is as follows:

Stephen Schiedel, the claimant under this bill, made application for pension March 20, 1880, alleging as a basis for his claim that at Corinth, Miss., about June, 1862, while loading logs, of which they were to build their quarters, he sprained his back by overlifting, being obliged to hold one end of a log, the other end having slipped down, falling upon a lever, which flew up and hit him on the left shoulder, injuring the same; that he was treated by regimental surgeon and in the hospital at Corinth, Miss., and at Huntsville, Ala., and by doctors at Hamburgh, N. Y., and Hubbard, Ohio. The claim was rejected by the Commissioner of Pensions June 30, 1883, on the ground "that the evidence, the sources of which appeared to be exhausted, fails to show origin of injury to back and left shoulder in the service and line of duty."

The claimant in an affidavit states that he can not furnish the testimony of officers who knew of his injury for the reason that both the captain and lieutenant are dead; can not furnish the affidavit of the regimental surgeon who treated him, as he became a colonel and was killed; that the two other surgeons, whose names and whereabouts he can not give, treated him at different times.

The soundness of claimant prior to enlistment is established beyond any reasonable doubt. Two comrades testify to incurrence of the disability in the service, both being present at the time and witnessed the accident.

The testimony of his neighbors since his discharge uniformly shows continuance, and that "he complained almost all the time of his lame back and shoulder."

Dr. Julian Harmon, examining surgeon at Warren, Ohio, reporting the results of his examination, gives it as his opinion that "the claimant is three-eighths incapacitated for obtaining his subsistence by manual labor from the cause above stated, injury to back and left shoulder."

The board at Cleveland, Ohio, August 30, 1882, report that his disability is three-eighths total.

Claimant was examined at Youngstown, Ohio, March 22, 1883, by Examining Surgeon J. McCurdy, who finds "the formation of his shoulders perfect, but there is a low but distinct creaking in left shoulder-joint, indicating low form of inflammation following injury or chronic rheumatism. Rating, $4, or one-half." After his examination he rates him at total, or $8.

The War Department records show that Stephen Schiedel was enrolled October 21, 1861, in Company C, First Missouri Artillery, and was mustered out October 29, 1864.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be laid aside to be reported to the House with a recommendation that it do pass.

GEORGE W. SCHELL.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. MORRILL) was the bill (S. 625) granting a pension to George W. Schell.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George W. Schell, late of Company D, Thirty-seventh Regiment of Iowa Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 625) granting a pension to George W. Schell, submit the following report:

The following report from the Committee on Pensions in the Senate sets forth the facts in the case and is adopted with the recommendation that the bill do pass:

[Senate Report.]

Claimant enlisted as a private in Company D, Thirty-seventh Iowa Volunteer Infantry, September 23, 1862, and was discharged May 24, 1865, and has not since been employed in the military or naval service. He was pensioned for disability on account of chronic diarrhea, January 24, 1883, at the rate of $2 per month, commencing May 25, 1865, and ending September 26, 1869, disability having ceased.

On the 4th day of May, 1885, claimant made application for pension on account of total blindness of left eye and great impairment of vision of right eye, making it impossible for him to distinguish objects at a distance of 1 foot from his eyes. Said disability he alleges was contracted under the following circumstances: While a member of Company D, Thirty-seventh Iowa Volunteer Infantry, in the service and in the line of his military duty at Memphis, Tenn., August 29, 1864, he, with his company, was employed in guarding military stores, then being transported from Memphis to various points along the line; being compelled to ride upon the top of the cars, was greatly exposed to the burning rays of the sun, causing pain in his eye; that his eyes were also affected by straining while on guard duty dark nights in his efforts to recognize passing objects.

The claim was rejected April 17, 1886, on the ground of no record, no medical or other competent evidence showing origin of sunstroke or existence of disease of eyes in the service, or continuance of said disease from discharge to 1877. Claimant alleges loss of left eye in 1877, and of right eye in 1880—probably due to old age, being now seventy years old.

The testimony on file is in substance as follows: Claimant states that he was perfectly sound at the date of his enlistment, and especially free from any disease or affection of his eyes; that he could see to read the finest print; that all of his relatives possessed good eye-sight; that his eyes began to fail about July 1, 1864, while on picket duty at Memphis, Tenn.; that he first felt great dizziness, accompanied by headache, with pain in the region of his temples and across his forehead and over his eyes, causing for the time being almost total blindness; that he was treated in no hospital, but continued on duty, and that his eyes have affected him from 1864 to the present time; that he was detailed to assist about the regimental quartermaster's department at Cincinnati, Ohio; that upon going to work his sight had become so impaired that he could neither see to weigh upon the scales or to read and write without the use of eye-glasses, which he purchased; that whenever he worked in a stooping position, causing his blood to become heated, he would feel an oppressive sensation about his temples, and blindness would come over him; that from the date of incurrence to 1877 the loss of sight gradually increased, and that in 1877 the sight of his left eye became wholly extinct; that his eyes were examined by Professor Holby, of Iowa City, Iowa, who gave him no encouragement as to good results from medical treatment; that the sight of his right eye continually declined to the year 1880, at which time he became unable to distinguish one object from another; that his eyes were examined by one Professor Smythe, of Lawrence, Kans., who gave him no encouragement in the hope of bettering his sight by medical treatment; that from the date of his discharge to 1880 he had performed some manual labor at his occupation of raising small fruit, but since the last-mentioned time he has been wholly disqualified for manual labor on account of his alleged disability, and dependent upon the labor of two small boys for the support of himself and family; that he is unable to furnish medical testimony showing treatment of his disability while in the service; that he will be compelled to rely upon the testimony of his lieutenant, who had personal knowledge of the facts in the case, as to origin, and his neighbors' testimony as to continuance; that he gave up all he had in defense of his country, and that his children are deprived of the opportunity for education by reason of the fact that they are compelled to labor to support him.

Prentice Ransom, first lieutenant and quartermaster of the Thirty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, testifies that up to June, 1864, claimant's eye-sight was unimpaired; that said regiment was on picket duty at Memphis, Tenn., guarding supplies sent by railroad; that the weather was excessively hot, and that claimant by riding on box-cars in the hot sun became dizzy, as he was informed by claimant, a day or two afterwards; that from this period of time his eye-sight began to fail him and he was compelled to use glasses to see to read or write; that he frequently saw claimant from the date of his discharge to the date of his removal to Kansas, and that his eye-sight continued to fail him, causing almost total blindness in one eye.

Robert Taylor, sergeant Company H, Thirty-seventh Iowa Volunteer Infantry, testifies that claimant's eye-sight was good up to about July 1, 1864, at which time it became impaired by doing guard duty at Memphis, Tenn., by exposure to the hot sun from the top of the cars; that claimant's eye-sight gradually grew worse from that time, until now he has entirely lost the sight of his left eye, and the sight of his right eye is so dim that he can not distinguish objects; that the facts testified to are from personal knowledge.

James P. Johnson, commissary sergeant, Thirty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, testifies that, in 1864, while claimant was in the service, his eyes became diseased; that he can not now state just what the disease was called. He substantiates this statement when questioned by a special examiner of the Bureau of Pensions.

Wesley E. Platt testifies to a continuance of loss of eye-sight from 1880 to 1885.

Frederick Theobold testifies to prior soundness and continuance of impaired vision from 1865 to 1879.

Augustus W. Dales testifies to continuance of loss of eye-sight from 1873 to the present time.

The following-named citizens of Douglas County, Kansas, in their petition to the honorable Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, state that claimant is totally unable to perform manual labor of any kind, owing to severe blindness; that he is very feeble, being sixty-nine years of age, and is entirely without means of support; that his disability developed very gradually, and that it will be impossible for him to prove its origin in the service, as his officers and comrades took no notice of it at the time; that claimant is a reputable citizen, temperate in all of his habits, and given to no excesses of any kind; that they therefore respectfully request the passage of a special act granting claimant an invalid pension, commencing, if possible, from November 1, 1880, the date he became totally blind.

L. J. Warden, postmaster; M. Summerfield, clerk district court; E. Jones; James N. Davis; Robert Taylor; J. S. Crew; A. T. Hannald, register of deeds; J. W. Watts; M. D. Greenlee, deputy clerk of the court; Paul R. Brooks, treasurer of the county; W. W. Fluke; G. H. Murdock; J. D. Bowersock, mayor; Theodore Gardiner; W. E. Benson; D. R. Prentice, chief of police; Alfred Whitman; M. Tisdale; Jacob House; Joel S. White, county clerk; R. D. Mason; J. G. Barber; J. P. Harris; John Barber; R. Carpenter; R. Storm; J. N. Roberts, representative sixteenth district.

Claimant is rated by the board of United States examining surgeons at Topeka, Kans., for total blindness of both eyes.

The statement of Robert Taylor before a special examiner of the Bureau of Pensions, that he had no knowledge of claimant's blindness in the service, should not be regarded as adverse testimony, from the fact that the evidence in the case shows that claimant's disability was of gradual development, beginning in 1864, and resulting in total blindness of left eye in 1877, and of the right eye in 1880. It is clearly shown by the evidence on file in the claim that the applicant for pension was free from impaired vision till about July 1, 1864, and from that date his sight began to fail him and continued to grow worse, resulting in total blindness of left eye in 1877, and of total blindness of right eye in 1880.

The facts in the case warrant favorable action, and the committee therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MICHAEL LANE.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. MORRILL) was the bill (S. 1286) granting a pension to Michael Lane.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Michael Lane, late of Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas State Militia.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1286) granting a pension to Michael Lane, submit the following report:

Michael Lane first enlisted March 25, 1863, as a private in Company M, Second Regiment Nebraska Cavalry, at Nemaha City, Nebr., for nine months. Served full time, was mustered out with his company, receiving an honorable discharge December 23, 1863.

In his declaration for pension he alleges that he enlisted October 8, 1864, in Company H, Nineteenth Regiment Kansas State Militia; that on or about October 24, 1864, he contracted hernia upon the right side of the lower part of his abdomen of an inguinal character, caused by his horse falling upon him while he was in the line of his duty as a soldier in full pursuit of the retreating enemy; his horse being upon the gallop struck his forefeet into a prairie-wolf hole, causing said horse to turn a complete summersault, claimant falling under him; that he was not treated in any hospital.

The War Department reports his service in the Second Nebraska Cavalry, and says the Nineteenth Kansas Militia is unknown to the Department.

The adjutant-general of Kansas reports that Michael Lane was enrolled August, 1864, in Leavenworth County by Capt. E. Moore, and ordered into active Kansas State militia service as private in Company H, Nineteenth Kansas Volunteer Militia, on the 8th day of October, 1864, at Leavenworth, by Governor Carney, under a proclamation issued in pursuance of a general order issued by Major-General Curtis, United States Army, commanding department, and that he was relieved from duty October 25, 1864, by order of the governor.

Two comrades testify as to incurrence and continuance. The board of examining surgeons at Topeka, Kans., under date of July 1, 1885, find a direct right hernia as large as an orange; rings dilated 1½ by 1¼ inches; borders of rings soft and patulous; unable to retain hernia with truss because of size and patulous condition of parts; and rate him for rupture on right side at total.

In a petition accompanying the bill the claimant states that he is now seventy-three years of age; that these services were rendered and his disability incurred during the Price raid in 1864, when the Kansas militia was under the command of an officer of the United States Army.

In view of the fact of his extreme age and the twenty-four years of consiant suffering from this painful disability, we think Michael Lane's name should be placed on the pension-roll, and therefore recommend the passage of this bill.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MARGARET M. COLLINS.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar called up for consideration (by Mr. MORRILL) was the bill (S. 1286) granting a pension to Margaret M. Collins.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Margaret M. Collins, mother of John B. Collins, deceased, late of Company D, Fourteenth Regiment of Kansas Volunteers.

The Clerk proceeded to read the report.

Mr. MORRILL (before the conclusion of the reading). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the report be dispensed with. This is the case of a dependent mother, the soldier having died in the service.

Mr. MATSON. I object.

The report was read in full, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1015 granting a pension to Margaret M. Collins, submit the following report:

The claimant is Margaret M. Collins, dependent mother of John B. Collins, late a private of Company D, Fourteenth Kansas Volunteer Cavalry, who enlisted August 2, 1863, and died of typhoid fever in regimental hospital at Fort Smith, Ark., August 29, 1864.

The claim was rejected October 15, 1885, on the ground that the claimant was not dependent upon nor supported by the soldier prior to and at time of soldier's death, it appearing in evidence in special examiner's report that her husband was then able to and did render her a comfortable support.

The evidence shows that the soldier was son of the claimant, never married, and left no widow or children surviving him.

The evidence is absolutely conclusive that this mother is now sixty-three years of age, penniless, and with her husband dependent on others for support.

Your committee, following the established rules that have governed them in this class of cases, recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. MATSON (at 10 o'clock p. m.). I move that the committee rise.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. MACDONALD. I suggest to the gentlemen on the other side that this motion should be agreed to. Last Friday evening it took very nearly all the time between the rising of the committee and the hour fixed for adjournment to dispose of the bills reported from the Committee of the Whole.

The motion was not agreed to; there being—ayes 11, noes 13.

STEPHEN C. LOBDILL.

The next business on the Private Calendar (called up by Mr. MACDONALD) was the bill (S. 760) granting a pension to Stephen C. Lobdill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Stephen C. Lobdill, late of Company G, Twenty-fourth Ohio Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The report of the Pension Committee in the Senate sets forth fully and clearly the evidence in this case.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

SENATE REPORT.

Stephen C. Lobdill enlisted June 6, 1861, for three years, as private in Company G, Twenty-fourth Ohio Volunteers, and was discharged for disability June 9, 1862. He filed a claim for pension October 25, 1869, alleging that while in line of duty at Cheat Mountain, West Virginia, on or about August 2, 1861, and engaged with the command in building breastworks, he was ruptured while lifting a heavy log.

Joseph Reamer testifies that he was with claimant at Cheat Mountain, West Virginia, working on breastworks; was lifting on the same log with him, and heard claimant cry out; saw him within an hour in the hospital tent.

August Thomas was also with him at the same time, lifting and piling heavy logs; says claimant fainted when rupture occurred; helped carry him to hospital tent; his suffering was acute. Up to the time of rupture he was a man of wonderful physical development, having shown no indication of ill health. He passed a rigid physical examination with affiant at Camp Chase, being stripped.

These accounts of the incurrence of the rupture are corroborated by Comrades Hettel, Myers, and Hughes.

Not recovering from the rupture, the claimant was discharged June 9, 1862, on surgeon's certificate of disability, which stated: "Umbilical hernia; he has been entirely unfit for duty since the 12th day of July, 1861. He has had it for many years."

The last clause of this surgeon's certificate, through the efforts of the Pension Office to establish its truth, has cost the claimant his pension for the past eighteen years. It is alleged on behalf of the claimant that this clause is untrue; that his rupture originated as detailed; that the surgeon made the statement on his own responsibility and without knowledge of the facts.

To prove his sound health and freedom from rupture before enlistment there is the testimony of Dr. W. J. Clary, who was the family physician of claimant's mother and grandfather, and who testifies that he knew claimant for five years before enlistment. Claimant lived with his grandfather, and was perfectly sound and free from hernia. He was a remarkably strong boy. If he had been so affected, the witness, from his relations with the family, must have known the fact. Never heard it spoken of.

Franklin Murphy and Isaac Smith knew claimant one from infancy, and the other for ten years before enlistment; claimant had worked for both at various times up to his enlistment, and both testify to claimant's soundness.

C. M. Lake and Joseph Weeks testify that they played with him when a boy, and worked with him when a man, and never heard of his having a rupture up to his enlistment. J. N. Griffin testifies to his soundness, having known him intimately. H. J. Scouton testifies that he knew him intimately before enlistment, being often with him, and that just after claimant's enlistment he was in bathing with him, and knows he was free from rupture; six comrades testify that he was sound at enlistment and up to the time he was injured, as he claims, five of whom positively state that at enlistment he was subjected to a thorough examination, while naked, with them and in their presence, which would certainly have resulted in his rejection had rupture existed. In all some thirteen witnesses testify explicitly to this point of prior soundness, from the personal knowledge derived from intimate acquaintance. In addition to all this is the acceptance of claimant into service as a sound man and the fact that he is a man of high standing in his community, where his statements are received with confidence and respect.

The only evidence in the case to sustain the surgeon's certificate is the statement of Laura Haff, a cousin of the claimant, who says she had heard his mother say that he had this difficulty from boyhood. The witness testifies from hearsay, and not from personal knowledge.

On a careful review of the testimony in this case, it is difficult to understand, from any known standard of the value of evidence, on what meritorious ground the claim under consideration was rejected, or why its affirmance was delayed beyond the necessary limit of office routine. There is no reason to doubt the receipt of the injury in service and in the line of duty, nor that it is of pensionable degree and continuous to the present time.

The committee recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

Mr. MATSON. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker *pro tempore* having resumed the chair, Mr. DOCKERY reported that the Committee of the Whole House, having had under consideration the Private Calendar, had directed him to report sundry bills with various recommendations.

BILLS PASSED.

House bills of the following titles, reported without amendment, were severally ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, they were accordingly read the third time, and passed:

A bill (H. R. 7025) granting a pension to Evalina P. Brown;
A bill (H. R. 6840) for the relief of Hiram M. Goss;
A bill (H. R. 8291) granting a pension to Julia Welch;
A bill (H. R. 7693) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Checks;
A bill (H. R. 813) granting a pension to Mrs. Lovina J. Reeves;
A bill (H. R. 6070) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Benson;
A bill (H. R. 618) granting a pension to James W. Harriman;
A bill (H. R. 6478) granting a pension to Elizabeth Smith;
A bill (H. R. 3537) granting a pension to Cullen W. Green;
A bill (H. R. 4653) granting a pension to Joanna Barry;
A bill (H. R. 5544) granting a pension to John Shine;
A bill (H. R. 5177) granting a pension to Pleman Cook;
A bill (H. R. 8256) granting a pension to George W. Croop;
A bill (H. R. 5378) for the relief of Tillman Faux;
A bill (H. R. 927) for the relief of Friedericke Raff;
A bill (H. R. 5114) granting a pension to Franklin Long;
A bill (H. R. 6006) granting a pension to Mary Flora; and
A bill (H. R. 2234) granting a pension to Henry P. Alexander.

House bills of the following titles, reported from the Committee of the Whole House with amendments, were taken up, the amendments agreed to, the bills as amended severally ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed:

A bill (H. R. 722) for the relief of Marquis D. Davis;
A bill (H. R. 2475) granting a pension to Adelaide L. Jessup; and
A bill (H. R. 8694) granting a pension to Isabella F. Dyke.

Senate bills of the following titles, reported from the Committee of the Whole House without amendment, were severally ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed:

A bill (S. 1017) granting a pension to Stephen Schiedel;
A bill (S. 625) granting a pension to George W. Schell;
A bill (S. 1286) granting a pension to Michael Lane;
A bill (S. 1015) granting a pension to Margaret M. Collins; and
A bill (S. 760) granting a pension to Stephen C. Lobdill.

MRS. D. P. WOODBURY.

The bill (H. R. 5961) to increase the pension now paid to Mrs. D. P. Woodbury was taken up.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. This bill is now before the House on the question of its engrossment and third reading. It has been reported from the Committee of the Whole House with the recommendation that it go over until to-morrow morning, that the previous question be considered as ordered, the right to offer amendments being reserved, and that debate be allowed for fifteen minutes on each side. If there be no objection, the order recommended by the Committee of the Whole House will be agreed to.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

LOUISE PAUL.

The bill (S. 749) granting a pension to Louise Paul was taken up, ordered to a third reading, and read the third time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. This bill has been reported from the Committee of the Whole House with a recommendation that it go over until to-morrow morning, that the previous question be considered as ordered, the right to offer amendments being reserved, and that debate be allowed for fifteen minutes on each side.

Mr. MATSON. I believe I must object to this order unless the substance and the number of the amendments be stated now. In justice to the House we ought to have some understanding how much time is to be occupied upon the bill.

Mr. DOCKERY. The entire debate is not to occupy more than fifteen minutes on each side; and the offering of amendments will not extend the time for debate.

Mr. MATSON. If it be understood that the offering of amendments is not to give the right to additional debate, I will not object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That is the understanding of the Chair. If there be no objection, the order recommended by the Committee of the Whole House will be made. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MATSON. I move to reconsider the vote by which the several bills reported from the Committee of the Whole House have been passed; and also move that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MARY L. CLEVELAND.

Mr. McCREARY. I move, by unanimous consent, that the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9877) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Cleveland.

There being no objection, the motion was agreed to.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the limitations and provisions of the pension laws, the name of Mary L. Cleveland, widow of John H. Cleveland, a soldier of the war of 1812, at the rate of $25 per month, in lieu of the amount now received by her under the law.

The report (by Mr. BLISS) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9877) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Cleveland, have considered the same, and report as follows:

The husband of the claimant, John D. Cleveland, served in Capt. Conrad Saxe's company, Vermont militia, from July 15, 1812, to December 8, 1812. The widow is now drawing pension under the act of March 9, 1878, at $12 per month. She applies for increase to $25 per month.

Her physicians, Drs. C. S. Abell and A. D. Price, gentlemen of credibility and truth, certify that she is now over eighty years of age, and in very feeble health, being unable to walk or to arise from her chair when sitting, or to dress herself. She has no property of any kind, and is entirely dependent upon two grandchildren, who are financially unable to render her proper assistance.

The committee recommend that the bill do pass.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCREARY moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to recorsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MARTHA B. PERRY.

Mr. GROUT. I move, by unanimous consent, that the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4100) granting a pension to Martha B. Perry.

There being no objection, the motion was agreed to.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to place upon the pension-roll the name of Martha B. Perry, foster-mother of Charles H. Perry, late of Company G, Fourth Vermont Volunteers, deceased, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4100) granting a pension to Martha B. Perry, having considered the same, report as follows:

Charles H. Perry enlisted as a private in Company G, Fourth Vermont Volunteers, in the early part of the war, and served continuously until June 5, 1864, on which day he was killed in battle at Cold Harbor, Virginia.

The claimant is the foster-mother of soldier, but as such can not secure pension through the regular channel. The evidence shows that claimant tenderly cared for soldier from the age of four years, at which date she became the second wife of his father. It also appears from letters of soldier filed with your committee that during his army service he contributed to the support of his foster mother, addressing her in the most affectionate terms. Claimant is seventy-five years of age and in destitute circumstances. If she had been the natural mother of soldier she would long ago have been pensioned, and as the evidence conclusively shows that she was to him, from the tender age of four years, everything that a natural mother could have been, it brings the case directly within the rule laid down by Congress in a great many cases which have already become laws by special act.

Your committee recommend that the bill be amended by substituting the word "place" for the word "put," in the fourth line, by substituting the words "foster-mother" for the word "widow," in the fifth line, and by adding after the word "laws," in the seventh line, the words "and pay her a pension at the rate of $12 per month," and that as thus amended the bill do pass.

The amendments of the committee were agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GROUT moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MRS. JEANNIE STONE.

Mr. ROBERTSON. I move to take up and concur in the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 401) granting a pension to Mrs. Jeannie Stone.

There was no objection, and the bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to Mrs. Jeannie Stone, widow of General Charles P. Stone, a pension, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The Senate amendment was read, as follows:

Add at the end of the bill "at the rate of $50 a month."

Mr. ROBERTSON. The bill came from the Senate amended as indicated, and was referred to the Committee on Pensions, and as I understand that committee recommended concurrence.

The amendment of the Senate was concurred in.

Mr. ROBERTSON moved to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was concurred in; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

CYNTHIA WITHERELL.

Mr. MOFFITT. I move, by unanimous consent, that the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3868) granting a pension to Cynthia Witherell.

There being no objection, the motion was agreed to.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to place the name of Cynthia Witherell, widow of David J. Witherell, late of Captain Thumway's company of New York Militia, war of 1812, on the pension-rolls, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The report (by Mr. BLISS) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3868) granting a pension to Cynthia Witherell, have considered the same, and beg leave to report as follows:

Cynthia Witherell, the claimant, is the widow of David J. Witherell, who served in the war of 1812 as a soldier in Capt. Duty Shumway's company, in Colonel Adams's regiment New York Militia.

In her petition to Congress, and in her application before the Pension Office, she declared that her husband had served for a period sufficient to warrant her a pension under the act approved March 9, 1878. The Pension Bureau rejected her claim on the ground of the insufficient period of service, it having appeared by a report from the honorable Third Auditor, United States Treasury Department, that Witherell had been paid only for a period of eleven days, namely, from the 11th to the 22d day of September, 1814, while the act referred to requires a service of fourteen days.

Your committee have obtained from the adjutant-general of the State of New York the information that the rolls in his office show, as a fact, that Witherell enlisted in the company and regiment mentioned on the 8th day of September, 1814, for the period of sixteen days.

These reports of the auditor and adjutant-general of the State satisfy your committee that the man actually served a period of fifteen days, and the statement of the Third Auditor in the case shows that the regiment went as far as Burlington, Vt., to meet the invasion of the British.

There is on file before your committee the testimony of the leading citizens and local officers of the town in which the claimant resides showing that she is held in high esteem, but is in a needy condition. Her age is now seventy-two years.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. MOFFITT. I move to correct the name "Thumway" so it will read "Shumway."

The amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MOFFITT moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JOHN G. MERRITT.

Mr. MACDONALD. I move, by unanimous consent, that the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2738) granting an increase of pension to John G. Merritt.

There being no objection, the motion was agreed to.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of John G. Merritt, late sergeant of Company K, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension of $45 per month, in lieu of the pension he now receives.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2738) granting an increase of pension to John G. Merritt, submit the following report:

The report of the Senate Committee on Pensions is herewith adopted and the passage of the bill recommended.

[Senate Report No. 1113, Fiftieth Congress, first session.]

The following report was made by your committee on this case during the Forty-fifth Congress, and a bill was passed then, giving claimant a pension of $24 a month, which he is now receiving under that act. He now asks that this pension be increased to $45 per month on account of increased disability, the grounds for which are set forth in the following statements:

Mr. John G. Merritt, late a sergeant in Company K, First Regiment of Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, was pensioned at $18 per month for shell wound of the left leg below the knee.

He filed an application for increase, alleging that the wounded limb is gradually wasting and is the source of constant and severe pain, and that his disability is equivalent to the loss of the limb for purposes of manual labor.

He was examined May 25, 1878, by the board of examining surgeons, Washington, D. C., who find "shell wounds of left leg, fracture of tibia and fibula just below the middle third; cicatrices large and adherent, and great deformity; leg shortened 4 inches; ankle-joint swollen, motion impaired; evident loss of strength, causing great lameness, equivalent to loss of hand or foot."

The claim was rejected on the ground that he is now receiving the highest pension allowed by law for disabilities of a like nature.

He claims that his limb, in the condition it now is, is as useless as though it had been amputated at or above the knee-joint, and asks that this special act be passed increasing his pension to $24 per month.

The committee regard the claim of the applicant as sustained by the evidence, and recommend the passage of the bill.

To the honorable Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your petitioner, John G. Merritt, of the State of Minnesota, respectfully represents that being a soldier of the First Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, in the late war of the rebellion, was severely wounded while engaged with his regiment in the battle of Bull Run, in the State of Virginia, on the 21st of July, 1861.

I was wounded in my left leg below the knee. The leg is 4 inches shorter than the right one and entirely useless so far as manual labor is concerned; is constantly swollen and inflamed (see medical examination) and very much shrunken in size from knee to hip joint. The wound has discharged constantly for the last ten or twelve years, and has to be dressed daily, and at times requires constant attention from my wife or one of my children, and during the last ten years I have undergone five surgical operations, giving me temporary but not permanent relief. My suffering is great and constant.

I now receive as a pension but $24 per month, and I consider myself entitled, on account of increasing disability, to receive the same amount as those pensioners who have had their limbs amputated above the knee and are prevented the use of an artificial limb.

JOHN G. MERRITT.

APRIL 20, 1888.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April* 17, 1888.

I hereby certify that I have examined Mr. John G. Merritt, and find that he is suffering from necrosis of the bones of the left leg, the result of gunshot wound fracturing both bones. The leg is deformed, shortened, and painful, with chronic ulcers about the seat of injury. He has undergone several serious operations without relief, one of which I performed myself about four years ago. The condition is incurable and he would probably be better off with the leg amputated.

J. FORD THOMPSON, M. D.,
804 Seventeenth street.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April* 16, 1888.

This will certify that I have been called upon to render professional services to Capt. J. G. Merritt, late sergeant of Company K, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteers, and find after a careful examination that he is suffering from the effects of a gunshot wound of the left leg below the knee.

The wound is still open and at times becomes very much swollen and inflamed, and within the last few years has frequently discharged pieces of dead bone, and I believe that unless an improvement takes place, which is not warranted by the present condition, an amputation will be necessary.

By the constant absorption of septic matter his health has been very much broken down.

There is also an atrophy or shrinking in the size of the limb, it being by measurement 2 inches less in circumference than the right, and as a consequence a corresponding weakness. His sufferings at times are intense.

J. W. BAYNE, M. D.,
Late Acting Assistant Surgeon, United States Army.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MACDONALD moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JENNIE HART MULLANY.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I move, by unanimous consent, that the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2346) granting an increase of pension to Jennie Hart Mullany.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Jennie Hart Mullany, widow of J. R. Madison Mullany, late rear-admiral in the United States Navy, and pay her at the rate of $50, in lieu of that which she is now receiving.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I move by unanimous consent that this bill go over to be acted on with other bills on the 28th instant, and under like conditions.

A MEMBER. No; but to-morrow.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania can not be here to-morrow.

The motion of Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania, was agreed to; and the bill was accordingly postponed until the 28th instant.

Mr. DOCKERY. Subject to like conditions as in the other cases.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Of course.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of 10.30 p. m. having arrived, in accordance with previous order the Chair declares the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. ABBOTT: A bill (H. R. 10146) for the relief of J. Q. St. Clair—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CROUSE: A bill (H. R. 10147) for the relief of Thomas W. Nash—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GEAR: A bill (H. R. 10148) granting a pension to Cecilia White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOUK: A bill (H. R. 10149) for the relief of John T. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: A bill (H. R. 10150) for the relief of Thomas Nelson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 10151) to authorize the Adjutant-General of the Army to place the name of William M. Runkel on the roll of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10152) granting a pension to William M. Runkel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTON: A bill (H. R. 10153) granting a restoration and increase of pension to George Searles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10154) granting a pension to William J. Eyer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10155) granting a pension to Emma A. Walk—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 10156) granting a pension to Nicholas P. McCracken—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RAYNER: A bill (H. R. 10157) for the relief of Rachel Walcott—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROMEIS: A bill (H. R. 10158) granting a pension to Mrs. L. P. Dickinson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERMAN: A bill (H. R. 10159) granting a pension to Jenny Buell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: A bill (H. R. 10160) to pension Harrison Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10161) granting a pension to J. N. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCULLOGH: A bill (H. R. 10162) granting a pension to Susan Young—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10163) granting a pension to Hermon R. Tyson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10164) for the relief of Frank Roach—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of heir of John Easley, of Hamblen County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAREY: Petition of certain citizens of Wyoming, for payment of Indian depredation claims—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: Petition of Julia D. Porterfield, of Warren County, Mississippi, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GAY: Papers in the case of Josephine Carlin, of Louisiana—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Victoria Keller, and of Helari Carlin, of Louisiana, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOUK: Memorial of John T. Smith, of the First Tennessee Cavalry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LYMAN: Petition of Mary B. Maynard, widow of W. W. Maynard, of Council Bluffs, Iowa, for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. McCOMAS: Petition of J. R. Garrott, of Weaverton, and of Harvey Wilson, Westernport, Md., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of James F. Poole, and of Laura C. Wilson, widow of Richard T. Wilson, of Montgomery County, Maryland, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of William Jennings, of Charles R. Gregory, administrator of T. Barnett, and of Old Town Methodist Episcopal Church, for payment of their war claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NELSON: Petition of farmers of Dakota, to place farm-machinery on the free-list—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of the Territorial Council of the Public Land Strip, for relief—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Resolution of the Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, Wis., relative to the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CHARLES STEWART: Petition of C. E. Irbell and 71 citizens of Grimes County, Texas, in favor of pure food—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: Petition asking a pension for Harrison Graham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition asking that a pension be granted to J. N. Jordan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The following petitions in favor of House bill 9716, for the better protection of free labor from convict labor, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Labor:

By Mr. GEST: Of Knights of Labor of Moline, Ill.
By Mr. McCULLOGH: Of Knights of Labor of Smithfield, Pa.
By Mr. NICHOLS: Of Knights of Labor of Raleigh, N. C.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. GOFF: Of D. W. Jones and others, of Daniel M. Bughley and others, and of C. L. Wolverton and others, of West Virginia.
By Mr. PHELPS: Of farmers of New Jersey.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *May* 26, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

DEFICIENCY IN APPROPRIATIONS FOR COLLECTING REVENUE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 9788) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriations for the expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask that this be committed to the Committee on Appropriations, and that the amendments be ordered to be printed.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 5445) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 786) to provide a building for the United States courts, post-office, custom-office, and internal-revenue office at Vicksburg, Miss.;

A bill (S. 2345) authorizing the construction of bridges across the Cape Fear River, Black River, and the Northeast River, in the State of North Carolina;

A bill (S. 2481) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Louisville, Cincinnati and Virginia Railway Company;

A bill (S. 2883) for the relief of S. H. Pierce; and

A bill (S. 1747) to authorize the sale of a tract of land in the military reservation of Fort Leavenworth, in the State of Kansas.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. FORNEY. I demand the regular order.

Mr. DIBBLE. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for a moment to ask the appointment of a conference committee.

Mr. FORNEY. Very well; I will yield for that purpose.

PUBLIC BUILDING, BAY CITY, MICH.

Mr. DIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Senate have amended the House bill No. 7263 and requested a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes thereon. I am instructed by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to recommend non-concurrence in the Senate amendments, and to agree to the conference asked.

Mr. PAYSON. What is the bill?

The SPEAKER. The title will be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7263) for the erection of a public building at Bay City, Mich.

There being no objection, the motion of Mr. DIBBLE was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will announce the conferees during the day.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. FORNEY. I renew the demand for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to state that by reference to the Journal it is ascertained that certain bills, acted upon at the evening sessions of the House, have come over under the operation of the previous question. These bills are the unfinished business, and the first thing in order will be to dispose of that unfinished business.

Mr. MATSON. I ask unanimous consent that the bills which come over by reason of the previous question having been ordered upon them last evening, as well as the bills which came over with the previous question ordered, and the consideration of which was fixed by unanimous consent for next Monday, be postponed until the 19th day of June. The reason that I make this suggestion is that the appropriation bills are pressing now, and the Ways and Means Committee desire the time for the consideration of revenue bills. The bills to which I refer are private pension bills, and can be considered and disposed of at any time. I fix the 19th of June, because at that time the House will likely be in a condition of truce, so far as political matters are concerned.

Mr. DIBBLE. I would suggest to the gentleman that that day is already set apart by special order of the House.

Mr. MATSON. Then I will say the 20th of June.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. Let me suggest to the gentleman that the 19th of June is the date of the Republican convention, and as probably quite a number will be absent from the House, it is not likely they can be here on the 20th.

Mr. DINGLEY. Suppose the gentleman from Indiana suggests the 5th of June, as perhaps it will suit gentlemen better than the day fixed. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I withdraw the suggestion I made.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the bills coming over from last evening as unfinished business, and those which have been postponed until next Monday, may be all postponed until the 20th day of June, immediately after the reading of the Journal.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana. Will the gentleman consent to substitute the 6th day of June?

Mr. MATSON. The reason I fix the 20th, as I have suggested, is that probably more Republicans are going to Chicago than Democrats to St. Louis, and the House will certainly be in a condition of truce so far as politics are concerned. There will not be any special business pressing, and these bills can be taken up and disposed of at that time. I understand that but few Democrats are going to St. Louis.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will again submit the request of the gentleman from Indiana, that these bills be postponed until the 20th day of June, the previous question ordered, and the same conditions applying as now apply. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. FORNEY. I move to dispense with the morning hour for the call of committees, and if that is carried will ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to make may hand them in at the desk.

The motion to dispense with the morning hour was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to allowing reports from committees to be handed in at the desk?

There was no objection.

FILING OF REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

The following reports of committees were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

BRAZOS RIVER.

Mr. STEWART, of Texas, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, reported the bill (H. R. 10165) for the improvement of the Brazos River; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MILITIAMEN.

Mr. MORRILL, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported with amendment the bill (S. 1529) to amend paragraph 3 of section 4693 of the Revised Statutes, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, NEW LONDON, CONN.

Mr. SOWDEN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1846) for the erection of a public building at New London, Conn.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR STORES AND SUPPLIES.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported a bill (H. R. 10166) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies taken and used by the United States Army, as reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1883, known as the Bowman act; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSTON, CENTRAL ARKANSAS AND NORTHERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. PHELAN, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 9420) authorizing the Houston, Central Arkansas and Northern Railway Company to construct and maintain bridges across Bayou Bartholomew and across Ouachita, Red, Little, and Sabine Rivers, in Louisiana; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MACON, TUSCALOOSA AND BIRMINGHAM RAILROAD COMPANY.

Mr. PHELAN, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back the bill (H. R. 9612) to authorize the Macon, Tuscaloosa and Birmingham Railroad Company to build a bridge across the Tombigbee River, in Alabama; which was laid on the table.

He also, from the same committee, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 9611) to authorize the Macon, Tuscaloosa and Birmingham Railroad Company to build a bridge across the Black Warrior River in

Alabama; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. FORNEY. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] will take the chair.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask unanimous consent that debate be limited on the pending paragraph to ten minutes.

Mr. TRACEY. I object.

Mr. FORNEY. I wish to submit a motion, then, to limit debate.

The SPEAKER. That can only be done now by unanimous consent, as the House has determined to go into Committee of the Whole.

The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. BLOUNT in the chair.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Civil Service Commission:

For three commissioners, at $3,500 each; one chief examiner, $3,000; one secretary, $2,000; one clerk of class 4, who shall be a stenographer; one clerk of class 3; one clerk of class 2; one clerk of class 1; one clerk, at $1,000; two clerks, at $900 each; one messenger; and one laborer; in all, $25,800.

For necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the commission, $4,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the pending amendment, offered by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 20, in line 9, strike out "one" and insert "two."

In line 10 strike out "one" and insert "two;" and also strike out "one," after the words "class one," and insert "two."

In line 16 strike out "$4,000" and insert "$5,000."

Mr. FORNEY. I move that the committee rise, my object being to have debate limited on the pending paragraph.

Mr. CANNON. If my colleague will allow me, I think there can be an agreement made to limit the debate to ten minutes.

Mr. FORNEY. I am willing to agree to that. I only want some limit to the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending paragraph and amendment be limited to ten minutes.

Mr. ENLOE. I should like to have five minutes.

Mr. FORNEY. Then let the time allowed be twenty minutes.

Mr. CANNON. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that debate on the pending paragraph and the amendments thereto be limited to twenty minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. TRACEY. Mr. Chairman, it is with extreme reluctance that I presume to dissent from this portion of the report of the Appropriations Committee and to urge the adoption of the amendments proposed by the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS]. But, after examining the question, I am satisfied that the estimates made by the commissioners for more clerks and the sum of $5,000 for traveling expenses are very moderate and absolutely necessary to a proper performance of its duties by the commission.

I am convinced that with the present force it has been impossible to complete the figuring required to arrive at the standing of persons on the eligible lists, within a reasonable time, and most annoying delays, inflicting hardship on applicants, have been unavoidable.

The item of $5,000 is not excessive for traveling expenses. Fixed dates are now announced for the examiners being in attendance throughout the entire country, and the commissioners claim that their careful calculations show that a smaller sum will cripple their efforts to hold examinations.

Mr. Chairman, during the discussion of this bill yesterday a commendable spirit of emulation was shown by gentlemen on both sides of the House in endeavoring to prove that an early interest had been taken by their respective parties in the reform of the civil service.

A few days ago, when making remarks in favor of tariff reform, I quoted words of the late Samuel J. Tilden, when I sought to show that the Democratic party had consistently and actively favored reduction of the tariff during the past twenty years. I would like now to read an extract from Mr. Tilden's letter of acceptance in 1876:

The convention justly affirms that reform is necessary in the civil service, necessary to its purification, necessary to its economy and its efficiency, necessary in order that the ordinary employment of the public may not be "a prize fought for at the ballot-box, a brief reward of party zeal, instead of posts of honor assigned for proved competency and held for fidelity in the public employ."

Two evils infest the official service of the Federal Government. One is the prevalent and demoralizing notion that the public service exists not for the business and benefit of the whole people, but for the interest of the office-holders, who are in truth but the servants of the people. Under the influence of this pernicious error public employments have been multiplied, the numbers of those gathered into the ranks of office-holders have been steadily increased beyond any possible requirement of the public business, while inefficiency, peculation, fraud, and malversation of the public funds, from the highest places of power to the lowest, have overspread the whole service like a leprosy.

And in a speech after the Presidential election, at Governor Robinson's inauguration, January, 1877, he said:

To recall the government of this State to the pure condition in which a generation ago you and I knew it; to remove the fungus growths which in evil times had overspread its administration and legislation; to lighten the intolerable burdens upon the people; to improve institutions and laws; systematically to call into the civil service, whether by appointment or election, men of higher ideas of official life, of better training, and of more general culture, thus attaining a class inferior in the arts of political competition, but superior in capacities for public usefulness—these are noble objects. They had to be pursued through stormy conflicts with selfish interests an fixed habits. Our support was an unfaltering trust in the people, if the prospects of real reform could be made visible; our inspiration was a belief that nothing worth saving could be lost if only our work did not fail.

* * * * * * *

A genuine reform in the civil service has thus been realized which could not be the product of any mere legislation without the effective co-operation of the men conducting the actual administration. I have traced these results, approved by the people at the last two elections in this State, because they encourage the aspirations of the community for a better government, and tend to inspire a noble ambition in all rising men to compete for honors and power by appealing to the best moral forces of human society.

A further reason for increasing the clerical force of the commission is to enable the President to extend the classified list. Gentlemen yesterday criticised him for not doing so. Permit me to read extracts from the letter addressed to the Civil Service Commission by the President. I will have the entire letter printed in the RECORD.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *Washington, March 21, 1885.*

To the United States Civil Service Commission:

GENTLEMEN: I desire to make a suggestion regarding subdivision (C), General Rule III, of the Amended Civil-Service Rules promulgated February 2, 1883. It provides for the promotion of an employé in a Department who is below or outside of the classified service, to a place within said classified service in the same Department, upon the request of the appointing officer, upon the recommendation of the commission and approval of the President, after a competitive examination, in case such person has served continuously for two years in the place from which it is proposed to promote him, and "because of his faithfulness and efficiency in the position occupied by him, and because of his qualifications for the place to which the appointing officer desires his promotion."

It has occurred to me that this provision must be executed with caution, to avoid the application of it to cases not intended and the undue relaxation of the general purposes and restrictions of the civil-service law.

Non-competitive examinations are the exceptions to the plan of the act, and the rules permitting the same should be strictly construed. The cases arising under the exception above recited should be very few, and when presented they should precisely meet all the requirements specified, and should be supported by facts which will develop the basis and reason of application of the appointing officer, and which will commend them to the judgment of the commission and the President. The sole purpose of the provision is to benefit the public service, and it should never be permitted to operate as an evasion of the main feature of the law, which is competitive examinations.

As these cases will first be presented to the commission for recommendation, I have to request that you will formulate a plan by which their merits can be tested. This will naturally involve a statement of all the facts deemed necessary for the determination of such applications, including the kind of work which has been done by the person proposed for promotion, and the considerations upon which the allegations of the "faithfulness," "efficiency," and "qualifications" mentioned in the rule are predicated.

What has already been written naturally suggests another very important subject to which I invite your attention.

The desirability of the rule which I have commented upon would be nearly if not entirely removed, and other difficulties which now embarrass the execution of the civil-service law would be obviated if there was a better and uniform classification of the employés in the different Departments. The importance of this is entirely obvious. The present imperfect classifications, hastily made, apparently with but little care for uniformity, and promulgated after the last Presidential election and prior to the installation of the present Administration, should not have been permitted to continue until this time.

It appears that in the War Department the employés were divided on the 15th day of November, 1884, into eight classes and subclasses, embracing those earning annual salaries from $900 to $2,000.

The Navy Department was classified November 22, 1884, and its employés were divided in seven classes and subclasses, embracing those who received annual salaries from $720 to $1,800.

In the Interior Department the classification was made on the 6th day of December, 1884. It consists of eight classes and subclasses and embraces employés receiving annual salaries from $720 to $2,000.

On the 2d day of January, 1885, a classification of the employés in the Treasury Department was made, consisting of six classes and subclasses, including those earning annual salaries from $900 to $1,800.

In the Post-Office Department the employés were classified on the 6th day of February, 1885, into nine classes and subclasses, embracing persons earning annual salaries from $720 to $2,000.

On the 12th day of December, 1884, the Bureau of Agriculture was classified in a manner different from all the other Departments and presenting features peculiar to itself.

It seems that the only classification in the Department of State and the Department of Justice is that provided for by section 163 of the Revised Statutes, which directs that the employés in the several Departments shall be divided into four classes. It appears that no more definite classification has been made in these Departments.

I wish the Commission would revise these classifications and submit to me a plan which will as far as possible make them uniform, and which will especially remedy the present condition which permits of persons to enter a grade in the service in one Department without any examination, which in another Department can only be entered after passing such examination. This, I think, should be done by extending the limits of the classified service rather than by contracting them.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

It is evident the President is not to blame for delay. He awaits action on the part of the commissioners, and they are delayed by want of necessary means, which Congress can alone supply.

While glad to aid gentlemen of the other side in their efforts to assist the President in carrying out the law, I rejoice that an opportu-

nity has been given me to demonstrate the good faith of the Executive and his consistency of action.

Mr. McCOMAS. Will you vote with the Republicans in this matter?

Mr. TRACEY. I will vote for the amendment.

Mr. WHITTHORNE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the time is to be equally divided between the two sides.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. The gentleman who has just resumed his seat favored the amendment. I oppose it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WHITTHORNE] is recognized.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. I regret very much that the chairman of the Committee on Civil Service Reform is not present. I had it in view to ask him what number of licentiates the Civil Service Commission show to be eligible to ask permission to become applicants for positions. According to my general information they are numbered by multiplied thousands, and yet the chairman of the committee states that during the last three years but about eleven hundred appointments have been made under the civil-service regulations.

Now, Mr. Chairman, looking at this matter as a simple business proposition, if the Civil Service Commission have before them we will say ten, fifteen, or twenty thousand licentiates authorized to apply for positions, what is the necessity for having that number multiplied. Is there any good reason for it? I submit to the business judgment of the House there is not.

Again, sir, the effect of multiplying this number of parties examined by the board is to demoralize the young men and the young women of this country. You will take them away from the legitimate avocations of life and put them on the anxious seat or the mourners' bench as applicants for office, which is doing the young men and young women of this country gross injustice.

I am happy to say that I was one of those in this House who voted against this law. I believed then, as I believe now, that it is anti-republican and anti-democratic in its tendencies. I believe that with its growth it will become a sore on the body-politic, full of mischief and full of danger to the theory on which our Government was built and constructed.

Mr. Chairman, having said this I deem it proper to say further, standing as I do as one of the complainants against this Administration for not putting more Democrats in office, that I have reason to admire the fidelity of the President of the United States to the pledges made in his letter and to his course in the execution of what he found to be the law of the land. I know, in my own personal experience, that when I have appealed to him for the removal of officials because they were Republicans he has stood immovable. As regards my own State of Tennessee not a single removal has he made of any Presidential appointee for political reasons; he has waited until under the law the term of the officer expired; and to-day there is still remaining a monument of Democratic clemency, a postmaster in Winchester, in the district represented by my colleague [Mr. RICHARDSON].

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Allow me a question.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Was there any charge of inefficiency against those men?

Mr. WHITTHORNE. I take it for granted the presumption of inefficiency exists when the office-holder is a Republican.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. That is just what I wanted the gentleman to state.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. You will find me perfectly frank, for I believe that at the ballot-box the voice of the people of the United States is heard, and then and there they assert their sovereignty in the effort to preserve the character of our institutions. [Applause.] It is at their desire that the Democrats have obtained the administration of this Government, and anybody, Civil Service Commission or otherwise, that stands between them and their voice and judgment is, in my opinion, working contrary to the theory of our Government. [Applause.] Yet I commend the President for his faithful execution of the laws as we passed them.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I commend your frankness, and if all Democrats were equally frank there would be less trouble.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. If you ever come into power, which God forbid, act upon the principle I have enunciated. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ADAMS. Let us begin by admitting, for the sake of argument, everything the gentleman from Tennessee has said is exactly true. It is an argument, perhaps, in favor of abolishing this law. It is not an argument against the adoption of this amendment.

He says that large numbers of young Americans have been debauched by becoming candidates for places under this law. Was there not an equal number that became candidates for places under the former system? Is the debauchery less in one case than in the other? But admit that the whole system should be abolished, the question is as to the mode in which that should be done. There are two ways. One is to bring in a bill to abolish the law; and we on this side would certainly respect gentlemen on the other side for their frankness if they would introduce and have a vote upon such a bill. But we know perfectly well that they will do nothing of the kind. In conversation, in confidential communication, they may intimate their distrust of the system; but in public all that they will do is to refuse adequate appropriations for carrying out the law. An adequate appropriation for carrying out the law is an appropriation adequate to ascertain whether the local boards do their duty, for the whole work under this law is done by the local boards. Gentlemen praise the President for his consistency and his firmness in supporting the law. It is not the President that makes the law a success; it is not even the Board of Civil Service Commissioners, except so far as that board can see to it that the local boards which actually conduct the examinations conduct them in good faith. These local boards act all over the country. They are sometimes members of one party and sometimes members of the other. What assurance have we that they do their duty in the premises? What assurance have we that one and the same system is followed in Chicago, in Cincinnati, and in other great cities of the country? We have no assurance except this, that over all these local boards is a Board of Civil Service Commissioners to supervise their action and correct their mistakes.

The gentleman from Indiana yesterday came down to the question, but did not meet it when he said that $4,000 was an ample appropriation for the traveling expenses of the Civil Service Commissioners. How did he know that? He gave us no reason. The commissioners themselves say they need $5,000 for this particular purpose; and this particular purpose is of the essence of the whole system. If the commissioners be allowed all the appropriation they ask within reason, in order to see that the system in its practical bearings is carried out, then, and not till then, can gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House claim that they have treated the system in good faith. What they should do is to treat it in good faith. Give these commissioners ample means, so that we may find out whether the system is a success or a failure; and if we find out that it is a failure, let us frankly say so, abolish the law, and go back to the old system, for, Mr. Chairman, I believe that an honest "spoils" system is far better than an alleged "civil-service" system which is accused or suspected of insincerity from one end of the country to the other. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman, I am not particularly enamored of this civil-service law; but I rise to speak in behalf of this paragraph as it stands and against the increase. I desire, however, to call attention to some statements made here yesterday, particularly by the gentleman from Maine, who charged upon the Democratic party that it was insincere, that it was practicing hypocrisy and deception upon the country under the pretense of enforcing civil-service reform. I want to call attention to a comparison which may be made between the Democratic administration of a civil-service law and a Republican administration of such a law. It might be inferred from the frankness and freedom and cordiality with which the gentleman brings his charge of insincerity and hypocrisy against the Democratic party, that it comes from a pure source, and that the gentleman's party is not open to any such charge.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to state here that the history of the Republican party shows that, in dealing with this civil-service law, if there is hypocrisy upon the Democratic side, which I deny, so far as the bona fides of the President and his executive officers is concerned, there is infinitely more upon the Republican side in their administration of this law after they passed it. I call attention to the fact that in 1879, they passed a law providing that all executive officers and employés of the United States not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, should be prohibited from requesting, or giving to, or receiving from, any other officer or employé of the Government any money or property, or other thing of value for political purposes; and this law provided for the punishment by discharge and by fine of any person so offending. The section of the act of August 10, 1879, to which I refer, reads as follows:

That all executive officers or employés of the United States not appointed by the President, with the advice and consent of the Senate, are prohibited from requesting, giving to, or receiving from any other officer or employé of the Government any money or property, or other thing of value for political purposes; and any such officer or employé who shall offend against the provisions of this section shall be at once discharged from the service of the United States, and he shall also be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and on conviction thereof shall be fined in a sum not exceeding $500.

Now, in 1880, after that law was passed, in the railway mail service, which is supposed to be the freest of any Department of the civil service of the Government from political influences, the Republican party sent out its notices of political assessments, its notices to employés to pay over their "voluntary contributions," and when some of them refused to pay there was an agent sent out who was in the employ of the Government, receiving pay from the Government, supposed to be discharging public duties, whose business it was to force from employés in that branch of the service, by threats of discharge, the assessments which they had refused to contribute.

Mr. KERR. Does the gentleman deny that that is being done now?

Mr. ENLOE. I do; and I challenge the production of the proof.

Mr. HOUK. Let the gentleman produce his proof.

Mr. ENLOE. I can produce it.

Mr. HOUK. We demand the proof.

Mr. ENLOE. I will produce it.

Mr. KERR. Look at the New York papers.

Mr. ENLOE. I do not take any newspaper as evidence on this matter. Any statement which I make I am ready to establish by the record; and I ask gentlemen on the other side to produce proof of the same kind.

Mr. KERR. A letter has been published (I have a copy of it) from Mr. Hunter, chairman of the State central committee of the Democratic party of Iowa, levying a certain sum upon each postmaster in the State. That letter has been published, and never denied to my knowledge.

Mr. ENLOE. Let the gentleman produce the letter, and establish his charge. We will not try this question on newspaper statements. I submit here the proof of the statement which the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. HOUK] challenges. Mr. James E. White, superintendent of the railway mail service at Chicago, who is, I suppose, good Republican authority, and if he is not he ought to be, in a letter addressed to Hon. Thomas E. Nash, general superintendent of the railway mail service, testifies as follows:

[Receiving political contributions—Personal—Dictated by J. E. W.—F.]

CHICAGO, ILL., *May* 14, 1888.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your favor of the 10th instant—subject, receiving political contributions from E. M. Wilcox—I have the honor to state that your letter conveyed to me the first and only information I have ever received that such collections had been made and receipted for in my name.

It had been customary for the national committee to assess employés of the Government and to send to each employé a request to forward to the secretary of said committee a certain sum named therein. These requests were not responded to unanimously, and the national committee sent a list of the delinquents to the State central committee with instructions to collect. The secretary of the State central committee sent for me and requested me to make the collections from clerks in this service. I declined to do so, and for one year, in which these assessments were made, the State central committee employed James McDowell to make the collections; and for another K. K. Jones, of Quincy, Ill.; and for one of the years, evidently 1880, H. J. Skeels, who was an employé of this service, detailed to duty in this office under an arrangement made between himself and the secretary of the State central committee.

Never since my connection with this service, nor at any other time, have I solicited or received contributions for political purposes, nor authorized any one to do so, nor to use my name in any way with such transactions.

Mr. Wilcox was removed for being a member of the Brotherhood of Railway Postal Clerks.

As soon as I can find Mr. Skeels I will secure a statement from him.

Very respectfully,

JAMES E. WHITE, *Superintendent.*

Hon. THOMAS E. NASH,
General Superintendent R. M. S., Washington, D. C.

Mr. H. J. Skeels is the patriotic and pure representative of the real and true civil-service reform policy of the immaculate and irreproachable Republican party, as exemplified in 1880. This man, who was merely an agent and a superserviceable tool of the Republican administration, performing this unholy, disgraceful, and unlawful work for his party to promote Republican success by corruption at the ballot-box in Indiana and elsewhere, was a beautiful exemplification of the sincerity and the purity of civil-service reform administration under Republican rule. Here is his genuine and original receipt for $23 forced from a delinquent employé in the railway mail service, who no doubt needed the money to buy bread and clothes for his wife and children.

It reads:

CHICAGO, ILL., *October* 1, 1880.

Received of E. M. Wilcox $23, contribution to the National Republican Committee.

JAMES E. WHITE,
By H. J. SKEELS.

It will be noted that he omits to put in the receipt that patriotic word, "Voluntary." To that extent it is an honest receipt, because the very fact that Wilcox, with others, had refused to pay the assessment caused him to be detailed at the Government's expense to collect this money—caused him to be detailed to duty when it appears from the letter of his superior officer he had no other duty to perform. It will be observed again that he uses the name of James E. White without authority, for the purpose of extorting the money from the poor, hard-worked subordinate, and to make it appear that he had the authority of the superintendent to get this money or to take the official head of the recalcitrant employé.

He did not have the authority of James E. White, but he had the authority of the general superintendent of the railway mail service at that time, or the authority of the head of the Post-Office Department, and the headsman's ax which he carried would have taken the head of James E. White, superintendent, as easily as it would have taken that of the poor clerk, Wilcox. That was Republican purity in the civil service in 1880, under the act of 1879, when civil-service reform was in its infancy; but the urgency of the demands for new two-dollar bills in Indiana about that time may extenuate the offense in Republican estimation. If the plea of confession and avoidance is to be relied on by the gentlemen who make this charge of insincerity and hypocrisy against Democratic administration of this law, if it is expected that the country will be willing to believe that its administrative methods improved after the passage of the act of January 16, 1883, and that it gave signs of true repentance before death, I will meet that supposition with the statement that I can produce evidence that it died an unrepentant sinner so far as its civil service record is concerned. The Republican charges against the Democratic Administration are general, indefinite, and unsubstantial, the impassioned utterances of swift witnesses, who are encouraged by wicked imaginings to make unfounded charges, trusting to accident for proof, or to popular credulity for vindication. The charges I make are specific, substantial, and sustained by indisputable facts.

I have now only five minutes, and I can not submit to interruptions.

I make the charge, and I am prepared to make the proof by written evidence, bearing the date of the transaction, that at Cincinnati, Ohio, in 1884, in the dying hour of the grand old party of civil-service reform for the sake of the offices it held and of political assessments to raise a corruption fund to secure a further lease of power for the non-civil-service office-holders as well as for those protected by the civil-service statutes, this party of promises, in which the "Mugwumps" and the civil-service reformers are invited to rest their hopes, did then levy contributions on the railway mail clerks, and, true to its history and its practices, it forced unwilling patriots to stand and deliver their "voluntary contributions" for political purposes. The act of 1879 was a salve to the Republican conscience for the premeditated crimes of 1880, and the act of 1883 no doubt served the same purpose to the crimes against the civil-service law in 1884. The amount collected at Cincinnati and paid over to various persons was $888, and some of this money went to gentlemen who violated section 81 of the Postal Laws and Regulations in receiving it, and possibly the criminal law in using it. That section reads as follows:

That no officer, clerk, or other person in the service of the United States shall, directly or indirectly, give or hand over to any other officer, clerk, or person in the service of the United States, or to any Senator or Member of the House of Representatives, or Territorial Delegate, any money or other valuable thing on account of or to be applied to the promotion of any political object whatever.

If a bill of particulars of this charge is demanded I have the proof, and it would make decidedly interesting reading.

So far as the attitude of the Democratic party on this question is concerned, I believe, speaking for myself, that the correct doctrine in regard to it is laid down in a letter addressed by the Postmaster-General to the postmaster at Cedar Rapids, Iowa. I believe this to be a correct exposition of true civil-service reform. Under Republican administration we had interference by Federal officials in conventions, in caucuses, in conventions of the party, and at the polls, that disgraced the civil service of the country. The letter is my idea of the true Democratic doctrine.

POST-OFFICE DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF THE POSTMASTER-GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., May 9, 1888.

DEAR SIR: I have received your communication of the 4th instant. In times past American citizenship was debauched, free expression of the people at caucus, convention, and election throttled, and the public service scandalized by the direct and corrupt influence of Federal officials at meetings of the people called for nominating purposes and at the succeeding Federal, State, county, and even municipal elections.

It seems to me that it should not be necessary, and to the credit of Federal officials under this Administration it has not been, save with rare exceptions, to warn individuals against practicing these abuses or against affording a semblance of the evil.

At the same time it should be equally well understood, and there should be no misapprehension in regard to it, that it is not and has not been the sentiment of any one connected with the Administration that because a man holds a Federal office he is thereby deprived of any of the privileges of citizenship or practically disfranchised. He is expected to exercise the plain and simple rights of an American citizen. While he must not neglect the public business to engage in partisan work, and must remember that he is in office to serve the citizens of all parties, and that these privileges are not enlarged by office-holding, and while there is no policy forbidding his attending a caucus or a convention of his party, or forbidding the exercise of his individual influence as a citizen in favor of the views which he holds in the same manner as if he were not in office, yet, in view of the disgraceful abuses heretofore adverted to, it is a matter which suggests itself to the good taste and judgment of sensible men whether the indecencies heretofore practiced should even seem to be imitated by the appearance of Federal officials of this Administration at conventions.

Respectfully yours,

DON M. DICKINSON,
Postmaster-General

ALEXANDER CHARLES, Esq.,
Postmaster, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

Mr. MCCOMAS. I have listened carefully to the gentleman's remarks, but I can not tell whether he is more anxious to stop these things in 1880 or 1888. [Laughter.]

Mr. ENLOE. Well, sir, I want to show to the country that if it expects these abuses to be stopped at all, it must look to the Democratic party to stop them, and not to the party that comes here with professions of this sort, in violation of its own practices. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The twenty minutes allowed for debate on this paragraph have expired.

Mr. ADAMS. I believe I had one minute which I did not occupy. I yield it to the gentleman.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Gentlemen on the other side make the old argument of the kettle calling the pot black. They have already admitted by the remarks of the two gentlemen on that side who have occupied the floor this morning that the Democratic party in 1884 was elected on a false pretense in its advocacy and support of civil-service reform. Now, since they have come to a position in which they are willing to confess, let them give force to their confession of the false pretense of

1884 by making a motion to strike out all of this bill relating to the appropriation for civil-service reform, and thereby starve out of existence the law.

I do not desire, Mr. Chairman, to occupy the attention of the House further upon a matter the hypocrisy of which has been shown to some extent by both parties. I believe——

[Here the hammer fell.]

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. McCOMAS, as already read, there were—ayes 58, noes 50.

Mr. HOLMAN. No quorum.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. McCOMAS were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 81, noes 71.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPINOLA (during the count by tellers) said: Mr. Chairman, I have just come into the House, and I would like to understand what this question is.

The CHAIRMAN stated the amendment.

Mr. SPINOLA. I understand this is a question of what is called "civil-service reform." I wish to be recorded in the negative—against that relic of Federalism. [Laughter.]

The count by tellers was resumed, and the result announced as above stated.

Mr. FORNEY. I find that in a part of the bill already passed we have provided for only two elevators, when four should have been provided for. I therefore ask unanimous consent to go back in order to adopt the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 11, in lines 19 to and including 21, strike out "two conductors of the elevator, at $1,100 each" and insert in lieu thereof "four conductors of the elevators, at $1,100, who shall be under the supervision and direction of the Architect of the Capitol;" and on page 12, in lines 1 and 2, in lieu of the sum proposed, insert "$16,480."

There being no objection, the amendment was considered, and adopted.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, I was not present when my colleague [Mr. WHITTHORNE] made his remarks in regard to "civil service reform." We are all in favor of "civil service reform" in Tennessee, but we have improved upon it very much down there. We have a new method which beats the system of Jay Hubbell "all hollow." I send to the Clerk to be read a letter from the chairman of the Democratic executive committee, notifying a Republican commissioner how he was expected to vote at the election, and that if he did not vote to suit the Democracy they would withhold business from him. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I would like to have the chairman of the Civil Service Committee listen to this letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

BLACKWATER, TENN., *December* 6, 1887.

DEAR SIR: The State Democratic executive committee requires me to ascertain what steps you intend to take in the next Presidential and gubernatorial contest, and I know of no better way to find out than to write you, hoping to hear from you on this subject at an early day. The party is willing to give, to gain strength, but otherwise say business will be withheld.

It is none of my business what steps you intend to take, I am only acting in obedience to the command of the party to which I belong.

With due regards I am, very respectfully.

J. R. M. DAVIS,
Secretary Hancock County Democratic Executive Committee.

S. WILLIAMS,
United States Commissioner, Xenophen, Tenn.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, there is evidence of what we may expect in the coming Presidential canvass in the State of Tennessee. Commissioner Williams was appointed by Judge Jackson, and is one of the very best men in the district; a man of high character, a gallant ex-Confederate soldier, an old whig, who had changed his opinions on the tariff. There is notice served upon him directly as to his appointments. If he did not do so and so all business would be withheld from him. That is the spirit of the Democracy in my State. It is evidence, I say, of the sort of reform we are living under in the State of Tennessee at the present time.

Mr. STRUBLE. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. I do not know the parties referred to.

Mr. BUTLER. I do.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. But I may say that I am gratified the thing is working. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER. Of course, if it works in your direction. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. FORNEY's amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE.

For compensation of the Secretary of State, $8,000; First Assistant Secretary of State, $4,500; two Assistant Secretaries of State, at $3,500 each; for chief clerk, $2,750; for six Chiefs of Bureau and one translator, at $2,100 each; stenographer to the Secretary, $1,800; eleven clerks of class four; four clerks of class three; seven clerks of class two; fourteen clerks of class one; four clerks, at $1,000 each; and ten clerks, at $900 each; one messenger, two assistant messengers, one packer at $720; ten laborers, one telegraph operator, $1,200; in all, $115,350.

For proof-reading the laws of the United States and reports of Congress, including boxes and transportation of the same, $1,280.

Mr. LAWLER. I wish to ask how much the ten laborers provided for in this paragraph get as wages? What is their compensation?

Mr. FORNEY. Six hundred and sixty dollars each.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT.

Secretary's Office: For compensation of the Secretary of the Treasury, $8,000; two Assistant Secretaries of the Treasury, at $4,500 each; clerk to the Secretary, $2,400; two private secretaries, one to each Assistant Secretary, at $1,800 each; Government actuary, under the control of the Treasury Department, $2,250; one clerk, at $1,200; one copyist; three messengers; two assistant messengers; in all, $31,310.

Office of chief clerk and superintendent: For chief clerk, including $200 as superintendent of Treasury building, $3,000; assistant superintendent of Treasury building, $2,100; an inspector of electric-light plants, gas, and fixtures for all public buildings under control of the Treasury Department, $1,800; four clerks of class 4; additional to one clerk of class 4 as book-keeper, $100; two clerks of class 3; three clerks of class 2; three clerks of class 1; one clerk, at $1,000; one messenger; two assistant messengers; one storekeeper, $1,200; one telegraph operator, $1,200; three elevator conductors, at $720 each; one engineer, $1,400; one assistant engineer, $1,000; two assistant engineers, at $720 each; one locksmith and electrician, $1,200; three firemen; five firemen, at $900 each; one coal-passer, $900; one captain of the watch, $1,400; two lieutenants of the watch, at $900 each; fifty-eight watchmen; one foreman of laborers, $1,000; one skilled laborer, male, at $840; three skilled laborers, male, at $720 each; twenty-six laborers; ten laborers, at $500 each; one laborer, at $480; two laborers, at $360 each; ninety charwomen; one foreman of cabinet-shop, $1,200; one draughtsman, $1,000; one cabinet-maker, $900; eight cabinet-makers, at $840 each; in all, $147,880.

Mr. FORNEY. I move the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 23, after the word "hundred" insert "and forty;" in line 24 strike out "eight hundred and forty" and insert "nine hundred;" and on page 24, lines 1 and 2, strike out "forty-seven thousand eight hundred and eighty" and insert "forty-eight thousand four hundred."

Mr. HOLMAN. I reserve the point of order on that amendment.

Mr. PENINGTON. I wish to make a point of order on the paragraph just read.

Mr. HOLMAN. I have reserved my point of order.

Mr. PENINGTON. My point of order will affect the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PENINGTON. On page 23 one foreman of cabinet-shop is provided at $1,200. Under the appropriation bills heretofore enacted this foreman was paid at the rate of $5 a day. I move to strike out "$1,200" and insert "$5 per day" in conformity with the law.

Mr. HOLMAN. I thought the gentleman rose to make a point of order.

Mr. FORNEY. I understood the gentleman to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Delaware will again state his point of order.

Mr. PENINGTON. My point of order is that this bill provides for one foreman of cabinet-shop, $1,200. I propose that this shall be amended so as to read "$5 a day," in accordance with existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the former law?

Mr. PENINGTON. Five dollars a day.

Mr. FORNEY. There is no law regulating the employés of the cabinet-shop. We found there were sixteen paid out of the general fund, at salaries regulated by the Secretary of the Treasury. The committee decided to change this provision and have reduced the number to eleven, with a foreman, at $1,200 a year; one draughtsman, at $1,000; one cabinet-maker, at $900, and eight cabinet-makers, at $840 each.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asks the gentleman whether the pay now is at the rate of $5 per diem?

Mr. PENINGTON. It is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FORNEY. I will state that the object of my amendment is to give these men the usual thirty days' leave of absence. Under the law now they do not get any leave. There is no existing law fixing their compensation.

Mr. PENINGTON. I understood the Chair to sustain my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did sustain the point of order.

Mr. PENINGTON. I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The vote will first be taken on the amendment of the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. FORNEY's amendment was again read.

Mr. CANNON. I rise to a point of order. The proposition is to make a certain number of cabinet-makers, at $900.

Mr. FORNEY. This is done by the committee.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman interferes with the scheme of the committee. These men get per diem pay. When they work they get so much per day; and when they do not work they get no pay. The committee now propose to make them annual employés, fixing their salary for the year on the basis of the per diem salary.

Mr. FORNEY. And giving them the thirty days' leave.

Mr. CANNON. Oh, certainly; allowing them the thirty days' leave of absence, with sick leave, etc.

Now, the gentleman from Delaware comes in and makes his point of order that he wants them to have $5 a day, and as heretofore provided, taking one part of the committee's suggestion and embodying with it another of his own. If that be so, and the scheme of the com-

mittee is to be entirely defeated, then there is nothing left to do but to make the further point of order when he comes in and seeks in that manner to gain that advantage. Here is his point of order, which the Chair will sustain, which defeats the committee's proposition. Now, the committee's proposition must stand or fall as a whole; and therefore when he makes his motion to make these $900 annual employés, which gives thirty days' leave and sick leave, I make the same point of order against him.

Mr. HOLMAN. The point of order is undoubtedly well taken; and I would suggest to the gentleman from Delaware, in view of that fact, that he substitute the language of the present law.

Mr. PENINGTON. My point of order was only on the foreman of the cabinet-shop. It did not extend beyond that or cover the ground which the gentleman from Illinois seems to assume.

Mr. CANNON. I make the point of order upon the balance of the proposition, for the reason that I am not willing that the gentleman shall take a part of the committee's scheme in this regard and a part of his own.

The CHAIRMAN. Is the point of order on the amendment of the gentleman from Delaware, or on this paragraph of the bill itself?

Mr. CANNON. It is on the amendment and the bill both. If you propose to have any of these men per diem employés, I say let the law stand as it is.

I am content, if the gentleman will take the committee's proposition, to have the change made here; but I do object to making such a condition as he proposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be compelled to rule as heretofore in relation to such matters where the compensation is sought to be increased. Where the compensation has once been ascertained by law, an amendment which seeks to raise it is certainly obnoxious to the rule.

Mr. FORNEY. Then, of course, the whole provision goes out. If the gentleman is willing to have that done, I am content.

Mr. HOLMAN. In view of the ruling, would it not be proper——

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman appeal from the ruling?

Mr. HOLMAN. No; I was only going to make a suggestion.

The CHAIRMAN. We can not progress with the bill unless there be some substantive proposition pending. If the gentleman has an amendment to offer——

Mr. HOLMAN. I have an amendment. I move to insert what I send to the desk to fill the blank at this point.

The Clerk read as follows:

One foreman of cabinet-shop, at $5 per day; one draughtsman, at $4 per day; one cabinet-maker, at $3.50 per day; twelve cabinet-makers, at $3 per day each; one cabinet-maker, at $2 per day.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is simply the language of the present law. If, however, the gentleman from Alabama does not desire to fill the blank at this time I will not press the amendment.

Mr. FORNEY. I think the proposition which the committee has submitted is the proper one. That has been stricken out on the point of order, as I understand it. We have a cabinet-shop, and it was proposed to make this change for the benefit of the laborers there. But it seems that they are not satisfied. Now the gentleman can amend as he pleases; I do not care.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was adopted.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 23, line 19, strike out "one" and insert "three."

Mr. FORNEY. I make the point of order——

Mr. BUCHANAN. The Clerk has not read all the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in line 20, "two laborers, at $360."
Amend the footing to correspond.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I think if the gentleman from Alabama will hear me for a moment he will not insist.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that, as the point of order is raised, the Chair overrules it. It is perfectly competent for the committee to increase the number of employés in the public service whenever the exigencies of the public service may require it. The ruling heretofore made was with reference to increase of salaries. This presents a different proposition; and the Chair entertains the amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I offer the amendment to provide for these two laborers fixed in the bill at $360 each and one at $480 so as to provide for three at $480 each. I think that the United States Government should not establish a rate of wages of $360 a year for anybody who is competent to be employed in any avocation within the governmental service; and furthermore, the principal object of the amendment I have suggested is recognized in the second section of the bill where it is provided that where the rate of laborers' wages is not fixed by the bill it shall be $660 per annum, or equivalent to $2 per day. I suppose there is some subordinate work for these three laborers to do; but I do not, for one, want to vote for any appropriation bill that shall establish upon the statute-books the idea of fixing the wages of any laboring man at $360 per year. My proposition, therefore, s to raise this to $480, and even that is ridiculously small.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I think this committee ought to start in here with these laborers and follow out the rule of yesterday, making the compensation at $2 per day. Let it be distinctly understood that this is to be their pay; and I offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey fixing the amount at $660 for each of the men covered by the amendment he suggests.

Mr. FORNEY. I wish to state that the language in the bill is the same as in the bill of last year, and the appropriation is all that the Department asks. Under the existing circumstances different compensation is given to different laborers according to the time they are employed. Charwomen, for example, receive only $240, because they are only employed for two hours a day. They have to be there in the evening when the rooms are vacated in order to clean up. They get $20 a month and only work two hours a day. If the compensation is made $660 for all there would not be equal justice done. Certain laborers are employed who are required to work all day. The Department knows what is required in this way, and this has been the law for years. I think the proposition in the bill should remain as it is. There is really no change in the existing law. I still insist upon my point of order.

Mr. LAWLER. I think the Secretary of the Treasury should see to it that the laborers employed in his Department are kept at work, and divide the work so as to utilize the whole of the time of these men.

The CHAIRMAN. To save time the Chair will decide on the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama that the amendment is an increase of the allowance. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not understand whether the Chair's ruling applies to my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order relates only to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. LAWLER].

Mr. LAWLER. I withdraw my amendment, but will now state to the committee that when we reach the end of this bill I will offer an amendment to it making the pay to laborers employed by the United States Departments at Washington not less than $2 a day.

Mr. CANNON. I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of saying, if I can have the attention of the committee, that in the Forty-seventh Congress the Committee on Appropriations found a great number of employés, these particular employés being amongst them, that were paid from the contingent fund, and under the policy then adopted the Committee on Appropriations picked up these employés and placed them in the bill at an annual salary and Congress ratified that action. It has stood in that way since without complaint and without change in the estimates.

I know that in some of these Departments (I can not speak as to specific employés) some of the laborers only work a part of the day—the charwomen, for instance. I know in some of the Departments some of these small paid employés are boys not earning as much as the ordinary class of laborers, whose pay the statute fixes at $660 a year. And while I stand ready to vote proper and ample compensation, whatever it may be, for any employé of this Government, I doubt the good sense and propriety of shutting your eyes and without having any knowledge about it make these increases. Three hundred and sixty dollars a year is not much, yet it is $30 a month, and that is all that a farm-hand with a family in the agricultural States, a man who works through winter and summer and boards himself, can earn.

A MEMBER. More than he can earn.

Mr. CANNON. Somebody says more than he can earn. But be that as it may, whether these are boys or men working part of the day and having part of the day for something else I do not know; I know that class of employés are in the Departments, and in the absence of estimate and in the absence of complaint I for one will not be stampeded by my colleague from Illinois into voting for this amendment merely because the word "laborer" is used.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I did not offer this amendment without having previous knowledge. I did not offer it because the word "laborer" was in the bill. I offered it because I happened to know it was just and right, and should be adopted. For three years I have had the honor to be a member of the committee investigating these matters; and instead of its being, as asserted here, a matter of no complaint, great complaints and many have come to us with reference to the condition of these men in these Departments. We know what we are talking about when we say they are not compensated as they should be.

It has been said that they only work a portion of the day, but the gentleman making that statement qualified it by referring to charwomen. I want to say with reference to these men that they are docked for the time they do not work. That is the information before our committee. And it seems to me grossly inconsistent for a man who is in receipt of $5,000 a year from the General Government to get up here and oppose paying $480 to an employé of the Government, who does not do perhaps as valuable service for the Government, but who has as large a family to support, and as an American citizen is the peer of any other American citizen.

Mr. FORNEY. I desire to say that the recommendations of the

committee are based on the estimates made by the Treasury Department.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is the trouble——

Mr. FORNEY. I do not yield. The gentleman has had his time. I simply want the committee to know the status of affairs here. We have prepared this bill in accordance with the estimates made by the officials in the Treasury Department, and it is presumed they know what labor they require. They ask for one laborer at $480 and two laborers at $360 each. We all know that it is right that different prices should be given to laborers when one is required to work all the time and another is not.

As gentlemen here are so much concerned about the pay of laborers, I will say that I am willing for laborers to have liberal salaries; but of course some laborers ought not to have as much as others. The paragraph now before the committee embodies the wish of the Department in this respect.

The question having been taken on the amendment of Mr. BUCHANAN, there were—ayes 31, noes 58.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Simply because time is so limited, I will not call for a quorum; and at any rate a count by tellers would not demonstrate what is the fact, that the negative vote is almost wholly from the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The noes have it, and the amendment is not agreed to.

Mr. TAULBEE. I move to amend by inserting, in line 15, page 23, after the word "watchmen," the words "at nine hundred dollars."

Mr. FORNEY. The law now allows $720 to these employés. I make a point of order upon the amendment.

Mr. TAULBEE. It is only the appropriation bill, as I understand, that fixes that salary.

Mr. FORNEY. No, sir; it is the law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of warrants, estimates, and appropriations: For chief of division, $3,000; assistant chief of division, $2,400; estimate and digest clerk, $2,000; six clerks of class 4; three clerks of class 3; one clerk of class 2; four clerks of class 1, two clerks, at $1,000 each; one clerk, at $900; one assistant messenger, and one laborer; in all, $23,480.

Mr. LAWLER. I wish to inquire what is the pay of the laborer provided for in the paragraph just read.

Mr. FORNEY. Six hundred and sixty dollars. That is the amount fixed by law.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of appointments: For chief of division, $2,500; assistant chief of division, $2,000; one clerk of class 4; four clerks of class 3; two clerks of class 2; one clerk, at $1,000; two clerks, at $900 each; two copyists, at $840 each; one assistant messenger; two laborers; in all, $22,020.

Mr. FORNEY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, which proposes simply to give to the chief of division the salary to which he is really entitled under the law.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 21, on page 24, strike out "five hundred" and insert "seven hundred and fifty;" and in line 2, page 25, strike out "and twenty" and insert "two hundred and seventy."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of stationery, printing, and blanks: For chief of division, $2,500; four clerks of class 4; two clerks of class 3; three clerks of class 2; two clerks of class 1; two clerks, at $900 each; two messengers; two assistant messengers; one foreman of bindery, at $5 per day; four binders, at $4 per day each; and one sewer and folder, at $2.50 per day; in all, $31,799.

Mr. FORNEY. I offer an amendment for the purpose simply of making a correction of an amount named in this paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in line 25, page 26, "$99," and insert "$75.40."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of special agents: For assistant chief of division, $2,000; one clerk of class 3; three clerks of class 1; one clerk at $1,000; three clerks at $900 each, and one messenger; in all, $11,740.

Mr. FORNEY. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "thousand," in line 9, page 27, insert "four hundred;" and in line 12, on the same page, strike out "eleven thousand seven hundred and forty," and insert "twelve thousand one hundred and forty."

Mr. HOLMAN. Reserving a point of order, I wish to inquire whether this amendment is in accordance with existing law.

Mr. FORNEY. It is an increase upon the amount heretofore appropriated, but it has been asked for by the Department, and I am directed by the committee to propose it.

Mr. HOLMAN. I hope the gentleman from Alabama will explain the reasons for the increase.

Mr. FORNEY. All I know is that three or four successive Secretaries have at different times asked this increase, and a majority of the committee have now decided to give it. The statute authorizes eight assistant chiefs of division at a salary of $2,400 each, but there is only one at present. This amendment is really in accordance with law; and as I have said, the increased appropriation has been asked for by three or four successive Secretaries. This is all I know about the matter.

Mr. HOLMAN. This increase, I understand, is not authorized by the present law.

Mr. FORNEY. Yes, sir, it is, as will be seen by referring to page 396, volume 18, of the Statutes.

Mr. HOLMAN. The office is authorized, but is this salary authorized?

Mr. FORNEY. Yes, sir; it is authorized by the act of 1874, reorganizing the Treasury Department. This amendment does not go beyond what the law authorizes.

Mr. HOLMAN. I will not press the point of order.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

First Comptroller of the Treasury: For First Comptroller of the Treasury, $5,000; deputy comptroller, $2,700; four chiefs of division, at $2,100 each; seven clerks of class 4; eleven clerks of class 3; eleven clerks of class 2; eleven clerks of class 1; three clerks, at $1,600 each; and eight clerks, at $900 each; one skilled laborer, at $840; one messenger; and three laborers; in all, $88,760.

Mr. FORNEY. In accordance with the wishes of the First Comptroller of the Treasury, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, which is a reduction of the force.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 28, strike out "seven," in line 20, and insert "six;" in line 21, strike out "eleven" where it first occurs and insert "twelve;" and in line 2, page 29, strike out "seven" and insert "five."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Second Comptroller of the Treasury: For Second Comptroller of the Treasury, $5,000; deputy comptroller, $2,700; seven chiefs of division, at $2,100 each; nine clerks of class 4; ten clerks of class 3; ten clerks of class 2; ten clerks of class 1; two clerks, at $1,000 each; five clerks, at $900 each; one messenger; and three laborers; in all, $89,920.

For the additional force in the Second Comptroller's office rendered necessary by increase of work relating to pensions, namely: One clerk of class 4, $1,800.

Mr. FORNEY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk, which does not change the aggregate sum appropriated.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 29, strike out the word "nine," in line 7, and insert "ten;" and in lieu of the sum proposed in lines 10 and 11 insert "$91,720;" and strike out all of lines 12 to 15, inclusive.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

First Auditor: For the First Auditor of the Treasury, $3,600; deputy auditor, $2,250; four chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; seven clerks of class 4; ten clerks of class 3; eleven clerks of class 2; eighteen clerks of class 1; three clerks, at $1,000 each; four copyists and counters, at $900 each; two assistant messengers; and two laborers; in all, $88,810.

Mr. CRAIN. I make a point of order upon the amount appropriated in the paragraph just read for the salary of the First Auditor of the Treasury. I make this point upon the ground that the provision in the bill is a change of existing law. The law of the Forty-third Congress reorganizing the Treasury Department fixed the salary of the First Auditor at $4,000, and that is the existing law. In support of my point of order, I respectfully call the attention of the Chair to his decision, made yesterday, upon the point raised by the gentleman from Indiana. The Chair then said:

It has generally been held that where there was any general law fixing a salary, that law governs in relation to this rule; that where there had been no salary fixed by law, other than in an appropriation bill, that the salary therein stated indicated the purpose of Congress as to what it should be, and that any effort to change it after it was once indicated by the House on an appropriation bill was in violation of the rule and subject to the objection here raised.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand the statute which, as I said before, in reorganizing the Treasury Department fixed the salary of the First Auditor at $4,000. It has been held by some of the courts of this country, where the question has been raised, that a failure to appropriate the amount fixed by law as the salary of any officer does not change *ipso facto* that salary, but that the officer who claims the difference between the appropriation made and the salary fixed by the law is entitled to receive from the courts a judgment in his favor where the State allows a suit to be brought. It has also been held by the Court of Claims in two cases which were cited when the point of order was made against the gentleman from Indiana, who had control of this branch of the general appropriation bills, that the language "in full compensation," used in the bill, if not stricken out by a vote, or if not ruled out upon a point of order, fixed the salary for the current year. But it has nowhere been held that where the general statute fixes the salary of an office an appropriation bill appropriating a less amount for the officer whose salary is thus fixed can operate as a change of the salary, except in so far as it may affect the salary for the current year.

Mr. DOCKERY. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Texas whether the law to which he refers applies to the remaining Auditors of the Treasury Department.

Mr. CRAIN. That is not a question pertinent to my point of order.

Mr. FORNEY. In the Forty-fourth Congress the appropriation for this salary was reduced to $3,600; that was continued in the Forty-fifth and Forty-sixth Congresses, which were under Democratic rule. In the Forty-seventh Congress, when the Republicans had come into power, that provision was allowed to remain. In the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses, with the Democrats in power, it was still continued. I do not think it ought to be changed now.

Mr. CRAIN. The question is not whether it ought to be changed, but whether my point of order is well taken.

Mr. FORNEY. One of the pertinent questions here is, whether there ought to be a change in the amount? Ever since the Forty-fourth Congress the salary at the amount named in this bill has been continued under both political parties. I do not think the gentleman from Texas should now rise here and ask a change, simply because the First Auditor is now from the State of Texas.

Mr. CRAIN. From two States, Kentucky and Texas both.

Mr. BURNES. Mr. Chairman, in determining the point of order raised by my friend from Texas, there is, it seems to me, but one consideration to be entertained by the Chair, and that is purely a question of law. Does the appropriation of $3,600 change existing law? The gentleman from Texas makes the point of order that this is a proposition to change existing law; yet before he takes his seat he tells you that the courts of the country have decided that the failure to appropriate up to the amounts authorized by law does not operate as a repeal or change of the existing law, but that the law remains the same, and the officer may go into the Court of Claims and recover the difference between the amount appropriated and the amount authorized by law.

That is the sole question here; and I undertake to say that the Chair yesterday did not decide that question. On the other hand, other gentlemen when occupying the Chair have time and again decided that a failure to appropriate the full sum authorized by law to be paid is not subject to a point of order, is not obnoxious to the rule, because it does not operate as a change of existing law.

Mr. CRAIN. This is to be considered in connection with that provision in the opening paragraph of this bill, which says that the amounts appropriated in the bill shall be "in full compensation." There is, therefore, a change of existing law.

Mr. BURNES. The fact this provision is in, as stated by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN], "that the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, for the objects hereinafter expressed, namely, etc.," is one thing. There has not been a chance for a point of order. If the point of order had been made against those words, "in full compensation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889"——

Mr. MCKENNA. The Chair reserved his decision upon the point of order until the proper application had been made. It would have been made by myself.

Mr. BURNES. What became of it?

Mr. MCKENNA. The Chair reserved the point of order until the committee reached the point when it would apply.

Mr. BURNES. When the Chair is called upon to decide on that proposition I shall have no hesitation in saying the Chair can well sustain the point of order against this provision. I do not think there is any question about it.

It has been held time and again, continuously from the Forty-fourth Congress up to this hour, that an item in one of the appropriation bills is not a change of existing law as to the salary of an officer, but that by the introduction of the words "in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year," it may be made so. And if the gentleman had made the point of order on that proposition I would not have said a word. Nor will I do so when the Chair is called upon to pass upon that provision in the bill. But so far as the pending provision is concerned, in my judgment it is not subject to the point of order.

Mr. FORNEY. I have before me the current law. It says that the salary of the First Auditor of the Treasury shall be $3,600. Section 3 of the act declares that all acts or parts of acts inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama will send to the Chair the statute to which he has just referred.

Mr. FORNEY. That is the law fixing the salary of the First Auditor of the Treasury at $3,600 per annum.

Mr. CRAIN. This is the language of the bill: "For the First Auditor of the Treasury, $3,600, in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889." That is the language of the bill. While the words "in full compensation" do not appear in line 9 on page 30 they are retained in the bill, unless the point of order is made against them in connection with any specific appropriation. I understand when the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] raised the general point of order against the retention of this language in the statute the Chair held he would decide that question when it came properly before the committee for action. I say, while the language does not appear in line 9 on page 30, the appropriation for the First Auditor of the Treasury is to be construed in connection with that language, because it applies to every appropriation in the bill, and is as much a part of the bill as any other portion of it.

It has been said by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BURNES] that it has been uniformly held where a failure to appropriate the amount fixed by law was made by the Appropriation Committee of the House that did not operate as a change of existing law, but gentlemen will remember the Court of Claims has decided on this very point, that where the language "in full compensation" appears in the bill, that was a change of existing law, but where that language failed to appear in the appropriation bill then the claimant had his suit in the court against the Government.

The chairman of the Appropriations Committee yesterday said in response to the argument of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], in support of his point of order, that to sustain it would result in suits against the Government to the extent of $70,000. That is a poor argument against making proper appropriations for officers of the Government. If they receive too much, have the moral courage to bring in a general bill reorganizing the Department and pay them what you think their services are worth, but do not come in here and cut them off on the plea, because it happens to be an election year, we must go before the country with economical appropriations.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I understand when the fifth line of this bill was reached, "in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year," the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKENNA] made the point of order against those words, but the Chair reserved the point of order until the question arose. It seems to me, having reached that point, the Chair should rule on the words in the fifth line, if they are to be retained. Obviously the point of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] is well taken if those words remain.

Mr. CRAIN. But if the gentleman from Maine will permit me, that is not my point of order at all. My point of order is that under the bill as it now stands, with the words "in full compensation" in it, the appropriation of $3,600 herein contained is an absolute change of existing law.

Mr. DINGLEY. I call upon the Chair to rule upon the first point of order, that is the point made by the gentleman from Minnesota in the fifth line of the bill.

Mr. CRAIN. And I make the point of order upon the gentleman from Maine that there is a point of order pending before the committee.

Mr. DINGLEY. But the other was pending first.

Mr. HOLMAN. I submit that no point of order will apply to the salary of the First Auditor, as fixed in this bill. Such a point of order could not be presented now, for the simple reason that the Committee on Appropriations can of course report a less sum, or recommend a less sum in their bill than the amount provided by the general law, and it is within the power of the House to adopt the lesser sum. It can not go beyond that and adopt a larger sum than that fixed by the law, because that is prohibited by the rule.

But I submit that no point of order can be made upon the sum of $3,600 fixed here. All the gentleman can do is to move to increase the amount from $3,600 to $4,000——

Mr. CRAIN. And then the point of order would be made upon it that it was an increase.

Mr. HOLMAN. And then the point of order, when made, if made, the reply of the gentleman would be that $4,000 is the salary fixed by law.

Mr. CRAIN. Will the gentleman pardon an interruption?

Mr. HOLMAN. The Chair can not strike out the sum fixed by the Committee on Appropriations on the point of order, because——

Mr. CRAIN. Didn't they do it in the case of the Doorkeeper on yesterday?

Mr. HOLMAN. I am addressing the Chair, if my friend will allow me.

Mr. CRAIN. Excuse me.

Mr. HOLMAN. Because a little reflection will show that the proper and the only mode of reaching the point that the gentleman suggests is to move an increase of the amount, and the answer then comes that the amount proposed by the bill is now the existing law.

In its present shape, therefore, the point of order simply presents nothing on which the Chair could rule.

And, Mr. Chairman, with reference to this question, permit me to say——

Mr. MILLS. I ask the gentleman from Indiana to yield to me for a moment in order to move that the committee rise. I will state that an agreement was entered into the other day, subject, of course, to ratification by the House, that we would allow our friends on the other side to have the use of the Hall to-day at 1 o'clock, and that our side would have the use of it at 8 o'clock.

Mr. HOLMAN. Just one moment and I will yield.

I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the first clause of this bill, the present law, contains the provision that the salaries provided in it shall be in full compensation.

Mr. CRAIN. What law?

Mr. HOLMAN. The language of the current law under which we are now operating. It provides—

That the following sums be, and are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full compensation, etc.

And amongst the salaries fixed, following the clause which I have just read, is that providing compensation for the First Auditor of the Treasury. Now, the last clause of the statute——

The CHAIRMAN. To what statute does the gentleman refer?

Mr. HOLMAN. I refer now to the law of the current year. The last clause is:

And all acts and parts of acts in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. BURNES. That settles the matter.

Mr. HOLMAN. I undertake to say that the only legal construction that can be placed upon this language is that it repeals or suspends, giving the widest meaning to the use of the words I have quoted—it suspends the operation of the salary in any amount beyond that fixed in the bill itself; and the result is that there is no law now existing fixing the salary at $4,000.

Mr. PAYSON. No general law?

Mr. HOLMAN. No, sir; but there is an appropriation act which fixes it at $3,600. I hope the gentleman will not forget, either, that for twelve years this sum has been appropriated both by Democratic and Republican administrations.

Mr. CRAIN. And then there have been general deficiency bills to come in and supply the deficiency afterwards.

Mr. HOLMAN. The point is clear——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule upon the point of order.

Mr. HOLMAN. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair finds on the first page of the bill under consideration the following language:

That the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, for the objects hereinafter expressed, namely.

And amongst the salaries provided for in the bill is the one now under consideration, providing for the compensation of the First Auditor of the Treasury at $3,600. If this bill shall become a law the present statute fixing the salary of this officer at $4,000 would, under the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States, lapse for this year. Therefore the Chair holds that it is, and does operate as, a change of existing law, and sustains the point of order.

A statute has been sent to the Chair by way of answering this point; that is, the act making appropriations for the present fiscal year. The Chair desires to read the first clause of this act:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full compensation for the service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, etc.

And the last clause of that act provides—

That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent, etc., are hereby repealed.

Under the decision of the Supreme Court this is merely a suspension of that law for the fiscal year 1888, leaving the original statute standing.

The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. HOLMAN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. BLOUNT reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9377) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFERENCE COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the House on the bill (H. R. 7263) for the erection of a public building at Bay City, Mich., Mr. DIBBLE, Mr. NEWTON, and Mr. POST.

And then, on motion of Mr. MILLS (at 1 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicatd below:

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10167) to increase the pension of Nathaniel Crain—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEARD: A bill (H. R. 10168) for the relief of Martha W. Burke—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LAFFOON: A bill (H. R. 10169) for the relief of John J. Stodghill—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10170) for the relief of H. D. Boyle—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 10171) granting a pension to Rachel Rogers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LEE (by request): A bill (H. R. 10172) for the relief of the Mount Vernon Manufacturing Company of Virginia—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOFFITT: A bill (H. R. 10173) granting a pension to Catharine Mulligan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. D. STEWART (by request): A bill (H. R. 10174) for the relief of Margaret A. Danforth—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: A bill (H. R. 10175) to pension Sarah Hunt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10176) for the relief of Charles Bowen—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWER: Petition of Jane C. Guthrie, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Sarah S. Cox, and of Sarah S. Henderson, widow of Samuel Henderson, of Hawkins County, Tennessee—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAINE: Petition of Edward Bird, of Tooele City, Utah, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CATCHINGS: Petition of Michael K. White, of Bibb County, and of F. C. Henderson, of Warren County, Mississippi, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DORSEY: Petition of citizens of Sidney, Nebr., for the passage of the tonnage bill—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ERMENTROUT: Petition of Cornelius Schlappig and others, citizens of Berks County, Pennsylvania, for an amendment to the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McRAE: Petition of W. E. Thompson, administrator of Cordelia Mayberry, of Hot Springs, Ark., for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEAL: Petition of Martha A. Orment, of Bradley County, Tennessee, for arrears of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of Nelson Mullens, of Rutherford County; of Charles H. Edmondson, of Lincoln County, Tennessee, and of G. W. Garretts, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROMEIS: Memorials of Local Assemblies Nos. 4857, 4283, 10062, 2277, 1942, Knights of Labor, of Toledo; of Local Assembly No. 4151, of Neapolis; of No. 3435, of White House, and of No. 7751, of Curtis, Ohio, against granting pensions to civil officers of the Government—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Resolutions of the Chicago Medical Society, for removal of duty on all medicines, medical appliances, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolutions of the Lake Carriers' Association, for revision of the navigation laws—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STAHLNECKER: Petition of the Italian Chamber of Commerce of New York, favoring certain changes of the tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, communication from the Montana Mineral Land Association, opposing granting to the Northern Pacific Railroad Company land in Montana—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of citizens of the Fourteenth district of New York, for better legal protection of women and girls—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. J. D. STEWART (by request): Petition of J. B. Ozburn, son of John M. Ozburn, and of heirs of Joseph Hippman, of Georgia, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAULBEE: Petition for the relief of Arch. Hoofman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition for relief of Mary Shearer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of John Burger, of Careyville, and of F. C. Robb, of Greenup, Ky., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: Petition of Sarah Hunt, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WILKINS: Petition of Mrs. H. S. Hutson and 46 other women, of the Sixteenth district of Ohio, for better legal protection for women and girls—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The following petitions in favor of House bill 9716, for the better protection of free labor from convict labor, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Labor:

By Mr. BROWER: Of Knights of Labor of Greensborough, N. C.

By Mr. STAHLNECKER: Of Local Assembly No. 3510, Knights of Labor, of North Tarrytown, and of Local Assembly No. 7873, Knights of Labor, of Tarrytown, N. Y.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. GROUT: Petition of Allen Vaughn and 22 others, citizens of Bridgewater, Vt.

By Mr. POST: Of L. R. Taylor and other farmers of Knox County, Illinois.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Of citizens of Rosewood, Ill.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of

the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. A. R. ANDERSON: Of Simons Jarvis and 33 others, citizens of Goshen, Iowa.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Of ex-soldiers of Bath, Ill.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *May* 28, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of sundry citizens of McPherson County, Kansas, praying that certain amendments of the interstate-commerce law be made; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MANDERSON. I present a petition of the executive board of the National Farmers' Alliance, representing organized bodies of farmers in the United States, comprising an aggregate membership of over 1,400,000 persons, praying for the passage of the House bill organizing a department of agriculture. This is an extremely short petition, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. HARRIS. I object to printing memorials in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question then will be on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska that the petition be printed in the RECORD. It will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. Shall it be printed in the RECORD?

The motion was not agreed to.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of the Rock Island Business Men's Association, of Rock Island, Ill., praying that an appropriation be made for the immediate construction of a temporary dam to furnish water power for the Rock Island Arsenal; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

He also presented a petition of the executive board of the National Farmers' Alliance, officially signed, praying for the passage of the bill to create a department of agriculture, with a Cabinet minister at its head; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of the Chicago (Ill.) Medical Society, having a membership of 435 physicians, praying for the removal of the import duty from all medicines, medical and surgical appliances, and everything used in the diagnosis and treatment of disease; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of John H. Smith, of Washington, D. C., praying that he be allowed a pension for disease contracted while in service on the United States steamer Brandywine in 1861–'62; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHERMAN presented the petition of Fred. W. Snell, of Columbus, Ohio, praying remuneration for services rendered as telegraph operator during the war of the rebellion; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CAMERON presented the memorial of the Board of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa., remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on sugar as proposed by the Mills tariff bill, unless a corresponding reduction is made in the duty on molasses; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Pennsylvania, praying for the repeal of that portion of the internal-revenue law which classes druggists as liquor dealers, and for a reduction of the tax on spirits; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE presented the petition of Charles Scott, president of Hope College, and 20 other male citizens of Holland, Mich., praying for better legal protection for womanhood and girlhood, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of B. R. Hall, mayor of Taunton, Mass., Hanson & Sproad, D. H. Mason, Lowell A. Drown, and 34 other citizens of Taunton, Mass., praying that a pension be granted to John Carr; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS presented a petition of citizens of Ramsey County, Minnesota, and a petition of citizens of Pope County, Minnesota, praying that the interstate-commerce law be amended so as to allow the complainant the benefit of all fines and penalties imposed in cases arising thereunder; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Excelsior, Minn., praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a memorial of citizens of Duluth, Minn., remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill 1448 and House bill 4923, to dissolve the Corps of Army Engineers and to create a national bureau of water ways; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. PLUMB presented the petition of Cadmus Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Linn County, Kansas, praying for the passage of a bill providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

He also presented a memorial of citizens of Manhattan, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of what is known as the Palmer bill, for the creation of a new bureau of animal industry; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PLUMB. I present the petition of a large number of citizens of Ottawa County, Kansas, setting forth that the interstate-commerce law is being systematically violated, and asking that an amendment of it as set out in the petition may be made. I may say in presenting this petition that I have no doubt the law is systematically violated by railroad companies in the country, and that some very drastic amendment to the law will undoubtedly become necessary. I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McPHERSON. I present a petition of Labor Assembly No. 8219, Knights of Labor, in favor of the erection of a public building at Perth Amboy, N. J. The petitioners respectfully state that Perth Amboy was once the provincial capital of East New Jersey, and afterwards of the State, and is the largest seaport town, with the most commodious harbor of any in New Jersey; that the district of Perth Amboy was among the earliest established by the Federal Government, the first collector of the port and other officers having been appointed in August, 1789. They pray for a public building at that place for postal and other purposes. I move the reference of the petition to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL presented affidavits of James Walker, B. F. Thomas, Dr. W. W. Washburn, and Drs. Coe and Galbreath, to accompany the bill (S. 2836) granting a pension to William E. Taylor; which were rereferred to the Committee on Pensions.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PLUMB, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8191) to enlarge the powers and duties of the Department of Agriculture, and to create an Executive Department to be known as the Department of Agriculture, reported it with amendments.

Mr. MANDERSON. That is the bill for the passage of which I presented a petition of the National Farmers' Alliance a few minutes ago. I therefore ask that the petition lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8217) granting a pension to Raphael Fowler, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6531) to pension Leah Roark, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. PLATT, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 4423) relating to certain acts of the Twenty-seventh Legislative Assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1951) to prohibit members of Territorial Legislatures holding office, reported it with an amendment.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was recommitted the bill (S. 125) granting an increase of pension to William Bittinger, submitted an adverse report thereon, which was agreed to; and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. DAWES, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1361) to provide for the reduction of the Round Valley Indian reservation, in the State of California, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. COKE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2831) for improving the mouth of the Brazos River, Texas, reported it with amendments.

CATLENA LYMAN.

Mr. FARWELL. The Committee on Pensions reported the bill (S. 2626) granting a pension to Catlena Lyman adversely, and it was indefinitely postponed. I move that that action be reconsidered, and that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the order of indefinite postponement will be reconsidered, and the bill recommitted to the Committee on Pensions. The Chair hears no objection, and that order is made.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 618) granting a pension to James W. Harriman;

A bill (H. R. 722) for the relief of Marquis D. Davis;

A bill (H. R. 813) granting a pension to Mrs. Lovina J. Reeves;

A bill (H. R. 927) for the relief of Friedericke Raff;

A bill (H. R. 2234) granting a pension to Henry P. Alexander;

A bill (H. R. 2475) granting a pension to Adelaide L. Jessup;
A bill (H. R. 3537) granting a pension to Cullen W. Green;
A bill (H. R. 3868) granting a pension to Cynthia Witherell;
A bill (H. R. 4100) granting a pension to Martha B. Perry;
A bill (H. R. 4653) to grant a pension to Joanna Barry;
A bill (H. R. 5114) granting a pension to Franklin Long;
A bill (H. R. 5177) granting a pension to Pleman Cook;
A bill (H. R. 5378) for the relief of Tillman Faux;
A bill (H. R. 5544) granting a pension to John Shine;
A bill (H. R. 6006) granting a pension to Mary Flora;
A bill (H. R. 6070) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Benson;
A bill (H. R. 6478) granting a pension to Elizabeth Smith;
A bill (H. R. 6840) for the relief of Hiram M. Goss;
A bill (H. R. 7025) granting a pension to Evalina P. Brown;
A bill (H. R. 7693) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Cheeks;
A bill (H. R. 8256) granting a pension to George W. Croop;
A bill (H. R. 8291) granting a pension to Julia Welch;
A bill (H. R. 8694) granting a pension to Isabella F. Dyke;
A bill (H. R. 8771) to place the name of Mrs. Flora C. Andrews on the pension-roll;
A bill (H. 9200) granting a pension to John F. Huckaba;
A bill (H. R. 9284) granting a pension to Webster C. Webb;
A bill (H. R. 9321) granting a pension to Ruth Ann Porter;
A bill (H. R. 9187) granting a pension to Mrs. Aurelia P. Hall;
A bill (H. R. 9682) increasing the pension of Jesse Dickey; and
A bill (H. R. 9877) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Cleveland.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 401) granting a pension to Mrs. Jeannie Stone.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7263) for the erection of a public building at Bay City, Mich., agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the bill and the amendments thereto, and had appointed Mr. DIBBLE, Mr. NEWTON, and Mr. POST managers at the conference on its part.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 625) granting a pension to George W. Schell;
A bill (S. 760) granting a pension to Stephen C. Lobdill;
A bill (S. 1015) granting a pension to Margaret M. Collins;
A bill (S. 1017) granting a pension to Stephen Schiedel;
A bill (S. 1083) for the erection of a public building at Tallahassee, Fla.;
A bill (S. 1286) granting a pension to Michael Lane;
A bill (S. 1554) to increase the appropriation for the erection of the public building at Sacramento, Cal; and
A bill (S. 2738) granting an increase of pension to John G. Merritt.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (S. 786) to provide a building for the use of the United States courts, post-office, custom-office, and internal-revenue office at Vicksburg, Miss.;
A bill (S. 1747) to authorize the sale of a tract of land in the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth, in the State of Kansas;
A bill (S. 2345) authorizing the construction of bridges across the Cape Fear River, Black River, and the Northeast River, in the State of North Carolina;
A bill (S. 2481) to authorize the construction of bridges across the Kentucky River and its tributaries by the Louisville, Cincinnati and Virginia Railway Company;
A bill (S. 2883) for the relief of S. H. Pearce;
A bill (H. R. 2216) for the relief of Thomas A. Osborn;
A bill (H. R. 5445) making appropriations for the payment of invalid and other pensions of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes; and
A bill (H. R. 6800) for the relief of John Powers.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. VANCE introduced a bill (S. 3028) to extend the streets and avenues of the city of Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PLUMB introduced a bill (S. 3029) to provide for the erection of a memorial hall in Kansas; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (S. 3030) granting a pension to Mary J. Foster;
A bill (S. 3031) granting a pension to John G. Banks;
A bill (S. 3032) for the relief of Edward D. Stillson;
A bill (S. 3033) granting a pension to James H. Fox;
A bill (S. 3034) to grant an increase of pension to William E. Prince;
A bill (S. 3035) to grant a pension to William Thields; and
A bill (S. 3036) to grant a pension to William Lutz.

Mr. HARRIS introduced a bill (S. 3037) for the relief of the officers and soldiers of the Seventh Regiment Tennessee Infantry; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3038) for the relief of P. E. Parker; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3039) for the relief of John T. Robeson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. STEWART introduced a bill (S. 3040) for the relief of Wilber H. Graef & Co.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 3041) granting a pension to George Slack; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 3042) granting a pension to Mrs. Philena T. Carpenter; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3043) granting a pension to Samuel G. Whitley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3044) for the relief of Wiley W. Walk; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 3045) to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia, so as to make Good Friday a holiday within said District; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a bill (S. 3046) to place James T. Peale on the retired-list of the United States Army; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3047) granting increase of pension to William Bittinger; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3048) for the relief of Captain Theodore F. Kane, United States Navy; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3049) granting a pension to Christian Wanzel; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (S. 3050) granting a pension to John Dennert; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DAWES introduced a bill (S. 3051) for the relief of the freedmen in the Chickasaw Nation; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. HISCOCK introduced a bill (S. 3052) granting a pension to George W. Durfee; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PAY OF CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYÉS.

Mr. CULLOM. I introduce a joint resolution for immediate action.

The joint resolution (S. R. 87) authorizing and directing the payment of the salaries of the officers and employés of Congress for the month of May, 1888, was read the first time by its title.

Mr. CULLOM. I should like immediate action on that joint resolution, as the purpose is to pay the employés of the Senate and House of Representatives on the 29th instead of the 31st instant, in view of Decoration Day.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* If there be no objection, the joint resolution will be read the second time at length.

The joint resolution was read the second time at length, as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and they are hereby, authorized and directed to pay the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of May, 1888, on the 29th day of said month.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 21st instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 1877) granting a pension to Harriet L. Vaughan;
An act (S. 1912) granting an increase of pension to William Irving;
An act (S. 752) to grant a pension to Mrs. Elvira L. Johnson, widow of Commodore Philip C. Johnson;
An act (S. 555) to establish an additional land district in the State of Oregon; and

An act (S. 109) for the relief of Thomas H. Norton and James McLean.

The message also announced that the President had on the 24th instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 354) to provide for the survey of certain historic grounds, locations, and military works;

An act (S. 316) for the relief of Edward Fitzgerald;

An act (S. 475) for the relief of the estate of Thomas L. Price, deceased; and

An act (S. 1795) for the relief of the First National Bank of Marion, Iowa.

The message further announced that the President had on the 25th instant approved and signed the act (S. 5261) to remove the political disabilities of John Rutledge, of South Carolina.

The message also announced that the President had this day approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 850) granting certain lands in the Territory of Wyoming for public purposes;

An act (S. 331) granting a pension to John Kalbfleisch;

An act (S. 805) granting a pension to Melvina Greenwood;

An act (S. 816) granting a pension to Amastasia Walter;

An act (S. 860) granting a pension to Stephen Singleton;

An act (S. 1096) granting a pension to James Lucas;

An act (S. 1717) granting a pension to Emma Von Bernewitz;

An act (S. 2419) granting a pension to Lemuel R. Rea;

An act (S. 801) for the relief of Basile Champagne; and

An act (S. 39) to grant an increase of pension to Frederick Beno.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. MORRILL. Several changes have been made in the amendments to Senate bills 2615 and 2919, relating to steam-railroads in the District, which make it necessary for me to change somewhat the substitute first proposed by me. I offer the amendment with certain modifications, and I ask that it be printed and laid on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That order will be made.

Mr. SHERMAN. I also offer two amendments to the same bill—the railroad bill for this city.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendments will be received, laid on the table, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FAULKNER. I desire to submit two amendments intended to be proposed to the bill (H. R. 5870) to amend the Revised Statutes relating to the District of Columbia, for the protection of girls and for the punishment of the crime of rape, which bill I reported last Friday from the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendments will be received and laid on the table until the bill is reached for consideration.

Mr. CALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

RIVER AND HARBOR BILL.

Mr. FRYE. I am instructed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was recommitted the bill (H. R. 9859) making appropriations for the construction, repair, and preservation of certain public works on rivers and harbors, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments.

I desire to state for the information of the Senate that the bill as reported proposes to appropriate $21,388,783.77. The bill as passed by the House of Representatives appropriates $19,605,783.13, making a net increase in the bill as reported of $1,783,000.64.

I wish further to say in relation to this bill that it will be some considerable time before it can be called up for action, for the reason that the report, which is required by order of the Senate, can not possibly be printed in less than a week from the present time. Whenever the report is ready I shall then call up the bill for consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

THE VETO POWER—LAND-PATENT SUITS.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to call up Senate joint resolution No. 80, for the purpose of submitting some remarks.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of a joint resolution the title of which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. R. 80) proposing an amendment to subdivisions 2 and 3 of section 7 of Article I of the Constitution of the United States.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection, and the joint resolution is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Mr. President, on the last day but one on which the Senate was in session, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], in the course of some remarks, nominally upon the joint resolution now under consideration, made some charges which I think, owing to the fact that they were delivered in the Senate of the United States, deserve some consideration at my hands. I send to the desk to be read certain of that Senator's remarks on that occasion. The Chief Clerk will please read the part marked.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

I do not desire in calling attention to the veto power to point out frauds on the revenue, but to show the almost unlimited discretionary power exercised by the Executive, and which he may use at his pleasure, to benefit his friends or to destroy his enemies. This power is not confined to the administration of the revenue laws.

Nearly all land titles in the United States were obtained from the Government, still the Attorney-General assumes the authority to bring suits to set aside any land patent issued by the Government, no matter when, and thereby and without a hearing cloud the title of any citizen to his land, and involve him in ruinous litigation, who shall incur the displeasure of the imperial power of the Administration. An example of this extraordinary power, and the more extraordinary manner of its exercise, is found in the action of the Attorney-General in farming out to private parties the privilege to bring suits in the name of the United States to set aside land patents in California which have been granted after years of litigation in tribunals created by Congress to carry into effect the terms of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo. After thirty years of litigation the Mexican land grants in California have been settled and patents issued to land amounting in the aggregate to over 8,000,000 acres, now improved and inhabited by not less than 800,000 people.

Under such circumstances it would be supposed that the Executive would have allowed the matter to rest until Congress should authorize further proceedings. But the Attorney-General has assumed the responsibility to authorize a large number of suits to set aside patents, some of which were issued more than thirty years ago, since which time the lands have passed into the hands of innocent purchasers and are inhabited by thousands of people. These suits will involve enormous expense, cloud the title of innocent purchasers for many years, and the United States will be the loser and not the gainer by the proceedings, as it has been in several suits of like character authorized by the Attorney-General and decided against the United States in every instance by the courts. It may, however, be beneficial for some political purpose or design of which the public are not informed.

Another example of the exercise of Executive power is illustrated by the unsuccessful raid of the Attorney-General on the Bell Telephone Company. I have nothing to do with the motives of that distinguished officer in instituting these proceedings. I simply refer to this matter to show the growing tendency of the executive department to interfere with private rights.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Mr. President, if I had heard these remarks at the time they were uttered in the Senate, they would not have gone, as they did, into the RECORD unchallenged. The absolute refutation of every single imputation and aspersion that finds its place in the quotation just read by the Chief Clerk was in the hands of every Senator.

The Senator from Nevada himself had some weeks prior to that time introduced a resolution containing a number of questions addressed to the Attorney-General covering each one of these points. On Monday previous to the day on which his speech was delivered an answer from the Attorney-General had been received and the letter of transmittal had been read in the Senate. The document was not printed in the RECORD, but it was printed in document form and found its place on the desk of every Senator.

The Senator from Nevada, therefore, knew at the time he made these charges what the facts were in the case. I deem it due to the Attorney-General, due to the truth of history and to the dignity of the Senate, that the facts as they appear from the report of the Attorney-General shall go along with and as an antidote to the poison contained in the charges made by the Senator from Nevada.

With regard to the charge of suits brought by order of the Attorney-General for the purpose of clouding land titles, as made by the Senator, for the purpose, to use his own language, of involving "in ruinous litigation" those "who shall incur the displeasure of the imperial power of the Administration," the Attorney-General had given the truth, showing that there was absolutely no ground upon which it could stand, on page 2 of his reply, as follows:

It is to be remarked in this connection that all suits of the character referred to, and directed by this Department during the present Administration, have been begun after the request of the Interior Department.

But this fact did not deter the Senator from making the charge, and attributing evil motives to the Attorney-General.

The purposes, disgraceful in themselves, which the Senator from Nevada charges that the Attorney-General had in mind in organizing these suits must have originated with the Secretary of the Interior if at all, for each one of these suits, as reported by the Attorney-General, was brought by him at the request of the Secretary of the Interior. I presume that the Senator from Nevada would not in his place on last Thursday have charged that the distinguished gentleman who presided over the Department of the Interior from the inception of this Administration down to a short time ago could have been guilty of attempting to use his great office "to benefit his friends or to destroy his enemies," as the Senator from Nevada intimates the Attorney-General has done in this case, yet the fact remains that if there was any such purpose in the institution of these suits as the accomplishment of political ends, as the persecution of individuals, as the reward of friends, it must have originated with the Secretary of the Interior, who himself had in the first place recommended the suits to be brought.

Mr. President, whatever other Senators may do or say, the Senator from Nevada is estopped from charging that the Secretary of the Interior could have been guilty of any such motive. We all know that only a short time since the people of the United States were informed in a three-column interview published in a leading paper which went

out from that Senator (and it never, so far as I have ever heard, has been denied by him), that there could be no more eminent man and no man better fitted for the discharge of the functions of a higher position even than the one he occupied at that time than the distinguished gentleman who was then Secretary of the Interior. This being true, he certainly can not say that the bringing of these suits was an unjust exercise of authority.

When the Senator made the broad charge in this Chamber that the Attorney-General had an ulterior and disreputable purpose in view in bringing these suits, he knew that the responsibility rested with a man of whom he had said that he was not only fit for a position as a constitutional adviser of the President of the United States, but was fit for a higher position, and one requiring the greatest purity of character. It seems to me that this is a sufficient answer to any imputation cast by that Senator on the Attorney-General.

While the Senator from Nevada knew under what circumstances these suits were instituted he charges that the Attorney-General had "assumed" the authority of bringing these suits for the purposes, as he implies, of accomplishing personal and partisan ends.

Mr. President, there was no member of this body who knew better than the Senator from Nevada when he made the insinuation that there had been an improper assumption of authority on the part of the Attorney-General, that it was not true and would not be borne out by the law as it stands. The Supreme Court of the United States, in deciding the San Jacinto case, in which, if I am not mistaken, the Senator himself was of counsel, had gone over the question of the power of the Attorney-General, and had distinctly held that he had the right, and it was his duty in certain contingencies, to bring suits of this class; and the Attorney-General, in the response which was on the Senator's desk when he made this charge, distinctly said that no suits had been brought during his administration under the Government except those that came within the letter of the law as laid down by the Supreme Court of the United States.

These things he knew well, but as the charges he made go out in the RECORD uncontradicted and find their way into homes and among men who perhaps are not so familiar with the facts and the law of the case as the Senator from Nevada is, I have deemed it proper and right that the attention of the country should be called as publicly to the facts and law of the case as were the charges made by the distinguished Senator.

Mr. President, this assault is a most remarkable one. If it had been made in any other place than in the Senate of the United States and by any other person than a Senator representing a sovereign State, I would for one have passed it by as utterly beneath the dignity of contempt; I should not have thought it necessary to open my mouth or to say one word in defense of a man whose public career has been such as to command the respect of all who knew him. I am glad to believe that there are but few men living whose estimate of mankind is so low that they can believe that a President of the United States or one who by his eminence and ability has been considered fit to be called in as a constitutional adviser of a President could so far forget his own honor, his own integrity, and what is due to a great office as well as to his own personal self-respect, as to be willing to prostitute his office to the low level of assuming an authority which he did not possess for the purpose of clouding titles to lands of individuals who had incurred the displeasure of the Administration, or could be guilty of "farming" out a great privilege and a great duty that belonged to the Attorney-General of the United States. I say I am glad to believe that there are but few men in the United States whose estimate of mankind is so low as to suppose that eminent characters of this kind could be so degraded as to be guilty of such conduct as this.

A charge of this kind, not to recoil upon him who makes it, ought to be sustained by some sort of proof. There ought to be something or other, some sort of foundation on which to base charges of this kind when made, and they ought not to be made in the Senate by a representative of a great State, as in this case, without a shadow or a scintilla of fact on which they are to rest. The Senator stated in the extract which has been read, among other remarkable charges made, that—

> After thirty years of litigation the Mexican land grants in California have been settled and patents issued to land amounting in the aggregate to over 8,000,000 acres, now improved and inhabited by not less than 800,000 people. Under such circumstances it would be supposed that the Executive would have allowed the matter to rest until Congress should authorize further proceedings.

Mr. President, I am not blessed with a very strong voice and am not much accustomed to speaking, and would be glad, if possible, to have order while I say what I have to say.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Arkansas is entitled to the floor. The Chair appeals to Senators to be seated and to abstain from audible conversation. The Senator from Arkansas will proceed.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. It would occur to an unbiased observer if the fact exists that an Attorney-General is "farming" out the right to bring suits, or authorizing suits to be brought for the purpose of accomplishing political purposes, "to benefit his friends or to destroy his enemies," if he is directing suits to be brought which are to cloud the titles to 8,000,000 acres of land in California "without a hearing" for the purpose of punishing his enemies or rewarding his friends—if these things are true, as they are intimated in the extract which has been read at the desk, it would strike an unbiased observer as a little singular that neither one of those gentlemen who are commissioned by the great State of California to represent her upon this floor has thought it necessary to rise in his place and protest against such unwarranted, unjust, and outrageous exercises of executive authority. If these things are so it has been left to a Senator representing another State, a State in which not a single one of the suits of which complaint is made has been brought, to call attention to them. This Senator is the first man, and, so far as I know, the only man who has discovered this state of things, and they exist in a State not his own, which has two able representatives upon this floor, two men his equals in point of ability, his equals in point of reputation, his equals in point of dignity and of standing in this body. I leave the Senate to imagine why these men should sit here silent all the day long while the defense of the great State of California is left to rest alone in the hands of the distinguished Senator who comes here to represent the State of Nevada.

Mr. President, I am not familiar with the history of land litigation in California and in the West, but there is an impression prevailing all over this country that the old Spanish grants have been the bases of the most monstrous frauds. Small tracts of land granted by the Mexican Government have been made by fraud and perjury to spread out and cover tracts of country which render insignificant the old-time performance that we read of, of the adventurer who bought as much land as he could cover with a bull's hide and made it cover enough on which to build a city.

Whether these things are true I know not; but we do know that the report of the Attorney-General shows that whenever these suits have been directed to be brought it has been done at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, after the fullest investigation, as we all know, and when he himself believed that the exercise of his duty in that great office required that suits should be instituted to set aside patents in which the Government of the United States was bound to interpose for the purpose of seeing that justice was done.

The Senator from Nevada says that one would suppose these things would be left for Congressional action. The Supreme Court decided, and the Senator knows it, that if there was to be any restraint upon the action of the Attorney-General it was necessary that Congress should interpose and restrain it. I read two or three lines of the language of the decision of the court in the San Jacinto case:

> But it has often been said that the fact that the exercise of power may be abused is no sufficient reason for denying its existence, and if restrictions are to be placed upon the exercise of this authority by the Attorney-General, it is for the legislative body which created the office to enact them.

Until Congress shall see fit to enact a law which will limit the power and the duty of the Attorney-General and restrain his action in these matters, it is absolutely necessary that he shall exercise his discretion in bringing those suits whenever he believes that the interests of the public demand that they shall be brought.

As a complete and sufficient refutation of every charge and every insinuation contained in the speech of the Senator from Nevada, I send to the Secretary's desk, with the request that it be read, the letter of the Attorney-General in response to the resolution which was introduced, I believe, by the Senator from Nevada himself. It is a complete answer in every point, as it occurs to me, and is a sufficient response within itself to all he has said without a word of mine.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, *Washington, May* 19, 1888.

SIR: I acknowledge receipt of the resolution passed by the Senate on the 26th of March last in the words following:

"*Resolved*, That the Attorney-General be directed to inform the Senate—

"First. What suits to vacate land patents issued by the United States have been commenced by the direction of the Department of Justice, and are now pending in court, and the present status of the same.

"Second. What suits he has authorized to be commenced and which have not yet been entered in court.

"Third. What suits he has been requested by the Department of the Interior to commence, but upon which requests final action has not yet been taken.

"Fourth. What applications for the institution of such suits have been filed with him, and pending before him, or on reference to the Interior Department.

"Fifth. Whether any special counsel have been employed in the conduct of such suits or in any wise authorized to represent the United States therein; and if so, the names of such counsel, and whether the expenses of any such suits, in whole or in part, are paid by any parties other than the Government.

"Sixth. To what extent does the Department of Justice determine whether such suits ought to be commenced or whether they can be successfully maintained."

In reply thereto I beg leave to state that the inquiries contained in the resolution have required much examination and a great amount of labor, and no effort has been spared to make a prompt response, and a complete answer can not now be made, but I send such information as is at present in the possession of the Department.

The statement accompanying this communication, marked A, B, and C, will answer the first, second, and fifth interrogatories propounded in the resolution, except as to the compensation of special counsel by parties other than the Government, and upon this point I have no information.

In reply to the third inquiry, I would state that I have taken final action on all requests made by the Interior Department for the bringing of such suits.

In response to the fourth inquiry, as to what applications for the institution of such suits have been filed with me and are pending before me, or on reference to the Interior Department, I would state that there are no such applications.

It is to be remarked in this connection that all suits of the character referred to, and directed by this Department during the present administration, have been begun after the request of the Interior Department.

In answer to the sixth interrogatory, I reply that the Department of Justice, in passing upon the applications to bring such suits, gives much weight to the requests of the Interior Department, though it does not consider such requests as imperative or as conclusive, or that the Department of Justice is necessarily bound to bring such suits because of such requests.

The Department of Justice examines the case so far as to see whether the Government has an interest in the proceedings or a fraud has been practiced on the Government and operates to its prejudice, or the Government is under obligation to some individual to make his title good by setting aside the alleged fraudulent patent, or that the duty of the Government to the public requires such action; and if, upon such examination, the Department thinks there is just reason to believe that any or all of these things exist, the application is granted and the suit ordered to be brought.

The Department is not in possession of information in every case referred to sufficient to give the names of all the parties in possession of the lands and who claim to be innocent purchasers, and some of the suits have been delayed in part on account of the difficulty in getting the names of such parties.

Several letters from the Department to district attorneys, asking for information sought by the resolution, have not yet been answered, but replies are expected at an early day, and when received will be transmitted to the Senate to complete the response of the Department to such resolution.

Very respectfully,

A. H. GARLAND,
Attorney-General.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore of the United States Senate.*

A.—*Statement, by judicial districts, of what suits to vacate land patents issued by the United States have been commenced by the direction of the Department of Justice and are pending in court, and the present status of the same.*

Northern and middle Alabama: None.

Arizona:

February 21, 1887. United States *vs.* Michael Warmser. Continued to September term.

August 3, 1886. United States *vs.* Fordice Roper *et al.* Decree for plaintiff.

Eastern Arkansas: August 1, 1885. United States *vs.* J. C. Head, administrator of W. H. Bizzell *et al.* Evidence being taken.

Northern California:

July 11, 1878. United States *vs.* Central Pacific Railroad Company. Appealed to Supreme Court.

February 12, 1883. United States *vs.* State of California, Henry Curtner, *et al.* Submitted July 26, 1887.

October 29, 1883. United States *vs.* E. M. Rose. At issue.

May 23, 1883. United States *vs.* C. Helm. At issue.

January 23, 1884. United States *vs.* Central Pacific Railroad Company (seven suits). Appealed t Supreme Court.

May 11, 1885. United States *vs.* John Hancock *et al.* Appealed to Supreme Court.

November 3, 1884. United States *vs.* Central Pacific Railroad Company and John Wing. Pending.

July 24, 1885. United States *vs.* Matthew Raball. At issue.

March 15, 1886. United States *vs.* James B. Haggin *et al.* At issue.

June 28, 1886. United States *vs.* Central Pacific Railroad Company *et al.* Submitted February 6, 1886.

July 14, 1886. United States *vs.* Central Pacific Railroad Company *et al.* At issue.

November 23, 1885. United States *vs.* Central Pacific Railroad Company *et al.* At issue.

Colorado:

United States *vs.* Richard M. Johnson. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Daniel Van Dam *et al.* Awaiting decision.

United States *vs.* Prairie Cattle Company.

United States *vs.* Union Coal Company. Ready for submission to court.

April 13, 1887. United States *vs.* Trinidad Coal and Coke Company *et al.* Evidence not taken.

United States *vs.* Charles D. Chase *et al.* Not yet at issue.

United States *vs.* Jaffa Bros. Evidence not yet taken.

August 9, 1886. United States *vs.* H. M. Gilory *et al.* Not yet at issue.

April 13, 1887. United States *vs.* Trinidad Coal and Coke Company. Not yet at issue.

Idaho: None.

Dakota:

July 13, 1883. United States *ex rel.* J. J. Jackman *vs.* J. W. Plumer *et al.* At issue.

May 29, 1882. United States *vs.* Dudley J. Spaulding *et al.* (Eight suits) at issue.

Kansas: June 21, 1886. United States *vs.* Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railroad Company. On demurrer.

Western Louisiana: None.

Minnesota:

February 10, 1888. United States *vs.* Rollin Ryder, The C. U. Nelson Lumber Company, and C. P. Cogswell. Pending.

United States *vs.* Eug. Dugas, Banoinie and David Doucette. Pending.

Nebraska: April 18, 1887. United States *vs.* Albert W. Eaton. At issue.

United States *vs.* John P. Durand. At issue.

Nevada: None.

New Mexico:

November 27, 1885. United States *vs.* Ramon Lucero, Vicente Lopez, and Fernandez Olguin. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Fernandez Olguin, Augustin Quintana, and Vincente Lopez. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Manuel Sandoval and Pedro Sanchez. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Juan Griego and Pedro Sanchez. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Juan de Dios Sanchez and Pedro Sanchez. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Jesus Martin and Pedro Sanchez. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Francisco Martin and Pedro Sanchez. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Bartolo Martin and Pedro Sanchez. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Juan Martin and Pedro Sanchez. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Juan A. Guillen and Pedro Sanchez. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Narciso Martin and Pedro Sanchez. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Juan Pablo Sanchez and Pedro Sanchez. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Crisanto Sanchez and Pedro Sanchez. Evidence being taken.

New Mexico—Continued.

September 3, 1885. *United States *vs.* Maxwell Land-Grant Company *et al.* Pending on sufficiency of plea.

April 1, 1886. United States *vs.* Marcos Maetas. Process served; no answer filed.

April 5, 1886. United States *vs.* Rafael Y. Baca. Decree *pro confesso*; referred to master; awaiting report.

United States *vs.* Romero Martinez. Subpœna returned "not found."

United States *vs.* José A. Lopez and Pedro Sanchez. Evidence being taken.

United States *vs.* Luciano Baca. Brought for next term; process not returned.

July 14, 1886. United States *vs.* Richard Mitchell *et al.* Brought for next term; process not yet served.

United States *vs.* Samuel S. Robinson and Mimbres Mining Company. Continued April 5, 1888, with leave to amend bill.

Oregon: February 12, 1887. United States *vs.* Frank Huot. Pending.

Utah: February 26, 1883. United States *vs.* F. A. Nims *et al.* Pending. Referee's report overruled.

Washington Territory:

December 9, 1885. United States *vs.* D. E. Budd and J. R. Montgomery. Submitted under advisement.

United States *vs.* Lee Hoffman and J. B. Montgomery. Submitted under advisement.

United States *vs.* Edwin R. Budd and J. R. Montgomery. Submitted under advisement.

United States *vs.* George F. White. Submitted under advisement.

November 16, 1887. United States *vs.* Alex. S. Hughes. Answer not yet filed.

February 14, 1888. United States *vs.* Wm. L. Davis *et al.* To be heard in June, 1888.

Western Wisconsin: June 23, 1885. United States *vs.* James Stinson. Pending.

Wyoming:

October 29, 1883. United States *vs.* Phœbe W. Paddelford. Service made by publication: no pleadings filed by defendant yet.

October 6, 1886. United States *vs.* Jabez B. Simpson *et al.* Leave given to amend petition.

B.—*Statement, by judicial districts, of suits to cancel land patents authorized by the Attorney-General to be commenced, but which have not yet been entered in court.*

Northern and Middle Alabama: United States *vs.* Nicholas Abercrombie.

Arizona: None.

Eastern Arkansas: None.

Northern California:

†United States *vs.* San Raymundo Grant.

†United States *vs.* Las Pulgas Grant.

†United States *vs.* Rancho Corte de Madera del Presidio.

†United States *vs.* Buri-Buri Rancho.

†United States *vs.* Cañada de Guadalupe la Visitacion y Rodo Viejo.

United States *vs.* James D. Walker.

United States *vs.* State of California. Harriet and Sarah Harding.

United States *vs.* Michile Peirano.

United States *vs.* California and Oregon Railroad Company.

United States *vs.* Central Pacific Railroad Company.

United States *vs.* William Dinsmore.

United States *vs.* Robert C. Claiborne.

Colorado: United States *vs.* M. Beshoar *et al.*

Dakota:

United States *vs.* George McCorkle.

United States *vs.* Michael J. Brennan.

United States *vs.* William P. Farrell.

United States *vs.* Floyd D. Yaws.

Idaho: None.

Kansas: None.

Western Louisiana: None.

Minnesota: None.

Nebraska: United States *vs.* James E. Bader.

Nevada: None.

New Mexico: United States *vs.* Armendaris Grant.

Oregon: None.

Utah: None.

Washington Territory:

United States *vs.* Charles L. Large.

United States *vs.* Edward J. Darratt.

United States *vs.* Northern Pacific Railroad Company.

United States *vs.* Andrew Miller *et al.*

Western Wisconsin: None.

Wyoming: None.

C.—*Statement, by judicial districts, of counsel employed in the conduct of suits to cancel land-patents, or in any wise authorized to represent the United States therein, and whether the expenses of any such suits in whole or in part are paid by any parties other than the Government.*

Northern and Middle Alabama: None.

Arizona: United States *vs.* Fordice Roper *et al.* Goodrich & Smith, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.

Eastern Arkansas: None.

Northern California:

United States *vs.* State of California, Henry Curtner *et al.* Shafter, Parker, and Waterman, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.

United States *vs.* Central Pacific Railroad Company. D. M. Delmas and Michael Mullaney, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.

United States *vs.* John Hancock *et al.* Compensation to be determined by the Attorney-General, upon completion of services; Shirley C. Ward, special counsel.

United States *vs.* James B. Haggin *et al.* Hall McAllister, T. I. Bergin, E. G. Steteon, and R. E. Houghton, special counsel; no compen-ation from the Government.

United States *vs.* Central Pacific Railroad Company. Henry F. Crane, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.

United States *vs.* San Raymundo Grant. Wigginton, Stuart, and Van Schaick, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.

United States *vs.* Las Pulgas Grant. Wigginton, Stuart, and Van Schaick, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.

United States *vs.* Rancho Corte de Madeira del Presidio. P. D. Wigginton, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.

United States *vs.* Buri-Buri Rancho. Wigginton, Stuart, and Van Schaick, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.

---

*Since the preparation of the above information has been received that the plea is sustained, and the bill dismissed on the strength of the case in Colorado. An appeal to the Supreme Court has been directed.

†These are involved in these suits security for costs required, suits delayed in getting order for survey, and in getting names of parties.

Northern California—Continued.
United States vs. Canda de Guadalupe, etc. Wiggington, Stuart, and Van Schaick, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.
Colorado:
United States vs. Richard M. Johnson *et al.* Alexander Gullett, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.
United States vs. Union Coal Company. Thompson & Davis, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.
United States vs. Union Coal Company. Thompson & Davis, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.
Dakota: United States *ex rel.* J. J. Jackman vs. J. W. Plummer *et al.* Alexander Hughes, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.
Idaho: None.
Kansas: United States vs. Missouri, Kansas and Texas Railroad Company. John Martin, special counsel; no compensation from the United States.
Western Louisiana: None.
Minnesota: None.
Nebraska: None.
Nevada: None.
New Mexico: None.
Oregon: None.
Utah: United States vs. F. A. Nims *et al.* Hall & Marshal, special counsel; no compensation from the Government.
Washington Territory: None.
Western Wisconsin: None.
Wyoming: None.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. One word more and I have done. The Senator continues, after what has been commented on, as follows:

Another example of the exercise of the executive power is illustrated by the unsuccessful raid of the Attorney-General on the Bell Telephone Company. I have nothing to do with the motives of that distinguished officer in instituting these proceedings. I simply refer to this matter to show the growing tendency of the executive department to interfere with private rights.

That is a fair illustration of the lack of accurate information, or of the failure to state correctly what the record shows, that characterized the remarks of the distinguished Senator on the occasion referred to, and there is not a Senator here and not an intelligent man outside of the Chamber who does not know that the Attorney-General directed posuit against the Bell Telephone Company. Whatever may have been done in that matter it must always be known here and elsewhere that he had nothing to do with bringing those suits; that he had no connection, direct or indirect, with them. He positively refused not only to act in this matter, but refused even to talk about it to any one, leaving his junior officer, upon whom the responsibility rested, to do what was required by law to be done as he understood his sworn duty. The Attorney-General had absolutely nothing to do with it, and this was known to the distinguished Senator when he made the charge here that the Attorney-General had made an unsuccessful "raid" on the Bell Telephone Company. It is absolutely refuted by the facts of the case, and it is not worth while to call the attention of the Senate or anybody else to the absolute want of foundation for this charge.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I regard the Attorney-General, as I believe correctly, as the responsible law officer of the Government, and the decision of the Supreme Court to which the Senator has referred clothes him with that authority, and holds that he may in a proper case, he being the judge, institute proceedings to set aside land patents. I would not have called attention to the conduct of an official in the manner I did unless I believed that great wrong was being perpetrated upon innocent people, and I now ask the Secretary to read, with reference to this matter, a letter of the governor of California to start with, so that some idea of the injury that is being inflicted upon the people of California may be had, and so that my following remarks may be more readily understood.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT, STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Sacramento, Cal., September 27, 1887.

SIR: I herewith transmit for your consideration two petitions, one signed by one hundred and forty-three citizens, owners of and residents upon a Mexican land grant situated in San Mateo County, California, known as the Pulgas Grant, asking your Excellency to set aside an order of the Attorney-General permitting interested parties to commence proceedings to set aside the patent to said grant. The other is a petition to your Excellency, signed by the leading lawyers and law firms of California, stating various reasons, both of justice and of public policy, why certain suits, authorized to be commenced by the Attorney-General to set aside patents to Mexican land claims in California, should not be prosecuted.

By the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, whereby the United States acquired California and other territory, our Government undertook to respect and protect all property rights in the territory acquired. For the purpose of carrying this treaty into effect the United States created and selected its own tribunals, before which the owners of these titles were compelled to appear or forfeit their lands. The investigation of these titles before these tribunals occupied a period of about thirty years. The necessary expenses of these investigations imposed upon the claimants was such as to practically confiscate most of their lands. The United States was at all times represented by able counsel, and called to its aid settlers and others desiring to appropriate these lands. The parties now insisting upon reopening this investigation have already been heard and had their day in court.

There was great difficulty in arriving at an accurate determination in most of the cases on account of the lack of surveys and the imperfection of record descriptions of property during the period when these grants were made. A large portion of the evidence upon which the judgments and decisions of the courts confirming the grants, and of the Land Department in determining their location, were made necessarily rested in parol. Great difficulty existed in obtaining witnesses who could supply the necessary information in locating these grants. The inhabitants were few in number previous to the acquisition of the country. Many of these left rather than accept the changed condition of things; others were dispersed in the mines. From those that could be found all information was obtained that was possible at the time. It would be strange if, under such circumstances, all the decisions were correct. But it was necessary to determine these titles, and even an erroneous determination was better than no determination at all.

The treaty ceding this country to the United States was made in 1848, nearly forty years ago. Most of these Mexican grants were made many years prior to that time. Few, if any, of the persons who were familiar with the facts relating to the location of these Mexican grants are now living, and they must be old and infirm. The face of the country is changed from vast uncultivated stock ranges to cities, villages, vineyards, and farms. The ancient landmarks are generally obliterated. There is no possibility of relocating these grants by aid of oral testimony. The present occupants are purchasers in good faith from the patentees of the United States. More than half the population and at least two-thirds of the wealth of California are located upon these Mexican grants. By no possibility could a reinvestigation and redetermination of these titles result in any correction of errors in the former determination, but, on the contrary, would necessarily result in great injustice. The difficulties which attended the original investigations, as above stated, are certainly far greater at this time. An attempt on the part of the United States to reopen and relitigate these land claims has already created distrust in the stability of land titles in this State. The vast expenditures and unreasonable delays which paralyzed California for so many years in obtaining patents for these lands have made the people of this State very sensitive upon the question of land titles. The threatened renewal of this controversy is very damaging to the prosperity of California, and can by no means possibly result in any benefit to the United States or any citizen thereof.

I earnestly call your attention to the petitions herewith transmitted as expressions of the opinion of the most enlightened members of the bar of California, and also of the general facts involved in the proposed litigation.

Hoping that your excellency will give this matter special attention, I am,
Respectfully, your obedient servant,

R. W. WATERMAN, *Governor.*

To the PRESIDENT.

Mr. STEWART. I shall also print in my remarks the petition of the owners of the Pulgas grant, with their names, and also the petition of the members of the bar of California, so that the case may be made up in the RECORD:

PETITION OF OWNERS OF PULGAS GRANT.

To the President of the United States:

We, the undersigned, respectfully represent that we are the owners and occupants of lands within the grant heretofore surveyed and patented by the United States as the Las Pulgas grant, in San Mateo County, State of California; that the patent for said grant was issued by the United States on October 2, 1857, nearly thirty years ago; that upon the faith of said patent and the title granted thereby the undersigned have purchased and are now the owners of different parts of said grant; that we purchased lands in said grant without notice of any defect in said title, and have improved said land at great cost; that the towns of San Mateo, Redwood City, and Menlo Park are situated upon said grant, and that there are living upon the lands included in said grant about 5,000 people; that the taxable value of the property included within the limits of said grant is $5,572,880, as appears from the assessment-roll of said San Mateo County; that the improvements and personal property situate upon said grant are assessed for the purposes of taxation at the aggregate value of $1,764,640.

And your subscribers most respectfully represent that it is most unjust to the occupants and purchasers of lands in said grant to allow a suit to be brought in the name of the United States, as plaintiff, for the purpose of setting aside the survey of said grant upon which the patent was issued; that the United States has no interest whatever in such suit, and that said suit will be really brought in the interest of private persons for purposes of speculation.

And your subscribers further represent that even if facts existed which would justify any change in the survey of said grant as between the original owners of said grant and the owners of any adjoining grant, such reasons would in no event justify the disturbance of the Pulgas grant as against your petitioners, who are bona fide purchasers of the lands in said grant, without notice; that the bringing of said suit will cloud the titles to the lands in said grant, and will hinder and obstruct the further development of said lands, and will have a most depressing effect upon the general prosperity of the people now living upon and near said grant.

Your petitioners further represent that as appears from the papers on file in the matter of said Pulgas rancho, before the honorable the Secretary of the Interior, the survey of said rancho was made and its boundaries fixed by the surveyor-general of California, under the authority conferred by section 13 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to ascertain and settle the private land claims in the State of California," approved March 3, 1851 (United States Statutes at Large, volume 9, page 631); that in pursuance of the provisions of the above-mentioned section 13, the owners of the rancho "Canada de Raymundo," adjoining the said Pulgas rancho upon the west (and the predecessors in interest of the persons who are now seeking to use the name of the United States in a suit to set aside the survey of said Pulgas rancho) made application to the district judge of the United States for the district in which said lands were situated for an injunction to restrain the issuance of the patent for said Pulgas rancho; that said injunction was refused by said district judge; that thereafter the owners of said Pulgas rancho brought a suit in ejectment against the owners of title under the grant of said rancho "Canada de Raymundo," to reject them from the western portion of the Pulgas rancho as surveyed, the said "Canada de Raymundo" owners being in occupation of the lands and asserting title thereto under their grant; that said suit was brought in the circuit court of the United States for the northern district of California, and after a trial on the merits a judgment was therein entered in favor of the plaintiffs and owners of the Pulgas Rancho and against the defendants and owners of the Canada de Raymundo rancho; that upon writ of error said case was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States and there heard by said Supreme Court, which affirmed the judgment of the circuit court of California. The opinion of the Supreme Court is reported in 24 Howard, commencing at page 268. That in order to prevent the execution of the final judgment entered in the above-mentioned case, one James Morrison, having purchased an interest in the rancho Canada de Raymundo, brought a suit in equity in the United States circuit court for the district of California to restrain the marshal from serving the writ of restitution. Upon a full investigation and hearing the court refused the injunction.

Thereafter the above-mentioned suit in ejectment was commenced, and in order to finally quiet the title of said Pulgas rancho against the claims of the owners of the said rancho Canada de Raymundo, the owners of the first-mentioned grant brought a suit to quiet title against the owners of said rancho Canada de Raymundo in the district court of the Twelfth judicial district of the State of California; that in said suit all questions concerning the correctness of the boundary line between said ranchos were fully investigated and litigated, and that the trial of said suit resulted in final judgment in said district court in favor of the owners of said Pulgas rancho; that upon appeal to the supreme court of the State of California said judgment was affirmed; that the opinion of the said supreme court is reported in the twenty-sixth volume of Reports of California Supreme Court, commencing at page 616.

That in January or February, 1863, an application was made in the interest of the owners of said Canada de Raymundo rancho, addressed to the Attorney-General, asking for authority to use the name of the United States in a suit to be brought to set aside the patent of the Pulgas rancho. This communication was referred by the Attorney-General to the Secretary of the Interior, March 18, 1863, and by the Secretary of the Interior to the Land Department on March 21, 1863. On April 6, 1863, the Commissioner of the General Land Office made an elaborate report to the Secretary, upon which the Secretary of the Interior declined to recommend that the petition asked for be given, and thereupon the Attorney-General denied the application.

And your petitioners represent that the aforesaid application was made to and determined by officers who were familiar with Mexican land grants, and that the action of the then Secretary of the Interior and the then Attorney-General should now be regarded as a final adjudication upon the matters then determined, which determination should not now be set aside or disregarded; that in view of the above-mentioned litigation in the courts of the State and of the United States, and of the above-mentioned action of the Land Department of Government, your petitioners respectfully suggest that every presumption should be indulged in favor of the correctness of these decisions, and that they should not now be set aside after the lapse of nearly a quarter of a century, when many of the witnesses to the facts involved have died and much material testimony has been lost.

Your subscribers therefore respectfully request and petition that the President of the United States examine the papers on file in this matter before the honorable the Secretary of the Interior, and upon such examination that the President direct that no suit be brought in the name of the United States, as plaintiff, to vacate or set aside the survey of said grant, or change the boundary lines thereof in any way.

Your petitioners further represent that leave was granted to bring said suit on November 23, 1886, about six months ago, and that no suit has been commenced in pursuance to said leave; that the delay of commencing said suit after obtaining leave to bring the same in the name of the United States, as above stated, justifies the inference that the real object of the instigators of said suit is not to have a speedy or any determination of said suit, but to cloud the titles of lands in said grant for the purpose of speculation or compromise with the owners of said lands; that the delay which has ensued in bringing said suit is and ought to be sufficient ground for the vacation of the order which has heretofore been granted authorizing the bringing of said suit in the name of the United States.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

Robert Mills, S. L. Knight, G. H. Rice, George W. Looir, L. P. Blanchard, George C. Ross, Claus Hadler, Louis Jacobson, Chris Hynding, John H. Offerman, George Wentworth, John Poole, P. Cullen, J. Train, Saunders & Co., A. C. Madsen, P. Paulsen, Patt Cunningham, H. S. Douglass, M. F. Duff, J. R. Doyle, G. L. Macondray, Charles Ayres, A. Cook, George Bement, Leonard Fisher, W. A. Sampson, R. C. Welch, S. H. Frank & Co., Oliver McNally, B. D. Fisher, Robert Wisnom, C. Schuler, C. A. Janke, J. H. Brasche, Wm. Weston, Mrs. L. F. Murray, Mrs. M. C. McLelbane, W. A. Emmett, C. F. Janke, John Schmoll, M. Daley, W. T. Reid, T. G. Phelps, Valentine Hussey, Theodore Tongrey, Robert Johnson, Mrs. Meta Kugeler, John Mahony, Eleanor Watkins, James P. Dolan, Edw. F. Fitzpatrick, John H. Pearon, Paul Heitzeberg, Wm. Haaker, Mrs. B. McEvoy, Michael Dolan, G. L. Sampson, Wm. Halder, P. B. Casey, J. R. Godspeed, E. Scott, James Kelley, Peter Casey, P. Moran, Wm. C. Alt, Margaret Walker, Jas. D. Byrnes, Alvinza Hayward, G. W. Phelps, Peter Cronin, A. Gordon, John C. Edgar, E. Eikerenkotter, John Salem, A. Hanson, G. A. Thiel, Jacob Kriess, F. Botsch, Henry Horton, John H. Titus, John Stafford, D. W. Sampson, S. E. Davis, J. M. Vasques, William Hahl, J. W. M. Lean, M. Redmond, P. J. Maloney, E. E. Eyre, Faron D. Atherton, S. B. Gilbert, P. P. Chamberlain, F. W. Billing, D. C. Riddell, Jeremiah Sullivan, W. B. Cummings, Paschal d'Silva, M. Byrne, Chris Beck, Peter Hanson, Thomas Shine, S. Walkes, Thomas Henesy, John Manahan, John Murray, Moses Hopkins, J. Crowe, S. G. Stevens, W. J. Burn, B. A. Barney, Mrs. Carnduff, Matthew Coon, Mrs. Geraldine Cooley Frisbie, P. Savakrup, Chas. Kavanaugh, Thos. H. Perry, John Donald, Geo. H. Fisher, S. L. Goodhue, S. Rathbun, Thomas Fitzgerald, S. F. Henrioulley, Theod. Hippen, John Boland, Thos. Foley, J. R. R. Bickford, Margaret Burke, James Burke, K. O'Grady, Mary Leavey, G. T. Bollinger, D. E. Bare, M. J. O'Neill, B. F. Yount, B. A. Peckham, Wm. Broderick, John McClean, J. C. Maynard, E. Cummuns, Wm. Rowe, Geo. W. Sessions.

PETITION OF MEMBERS OF THE BAR.

To the President of the United States:

The undersigned, members of the bar of the supreme court of California, respectfully represent that the settlement and development of this State was, for a number of years after the Mexican conquest, greatly retarded by the unsettled condition of land titles, the larger part of the most accessible and valuable land being claimed under Spanish and Mexican grants; that after a litigation extending over a period of more than a quarter of a century, these grants were finally rejected, or confirmed and patented by the Government: that since their confirmation and patent we have regarded them as finally settled; that at this time probably more than one-half of the population of the State is located upon, and more than one-half the wealth embraced, in these grants; that the lands covered by them have almost entirely passed into the hands of purchasers under the patents; that any action on the part of the Government by which confidence in the stability of these titles is impaired, tends greatly to the injury of the people located upon them, and also to retard the prosperity of the State by preventing improvements and transfers of land.

We beg further to represent that Attorneys-General of the United States have during the past few years allowed the name of the United States to be used as plaintiff in suits brought to set aside a number of these patents; that five of these suits have already been tried and all decided adversely to the United States; that in three of which suits the decisions have been affirmed by the United States Supreme Court.

We beg further respectfully to represent that these Spanish and Mexican grants have been investigated on their merits by the land commission, a tribunal specially appointed to try them, and also by the United States Courts; that in the proceedings before these tribunals the United States were represented by able counsel, and that after confirmation these grants have been surveyed and patented by the sworn officers of the Government; that the witnesses whose testimony was given in these proceedings before the land commission and the courts are nearly all deceased or their whereabouts are unknown; that there is not at this time the same means of reaching a just decision as existed thirty years ago; that a relitigation of these cases at this time would, for the reasons above stated, most probably result in more error than could be discovered or corrected; that we believe, therefore, and most respectfully represent that the use of the name of the United States in these suits is against public policy, as it certainly is against the progress, prosperity, and happiness of the people of this State.

J. P. Hoge, D. M. Delmas, Hall McAllister, Newlands, Allen & Herrin, M. A. Wheaton, Hall & Rodgers, Cope & Boyd, Ben. Morgan, Geo. N. Williams, Mastick, Belcher & Mastick, S. W. Holladay, M. A. Edmonds, Sawyer & Burnett, James Mee, Olney, Chickering & Thomas, Pillsbury & Blanding, Langhorne & Miller, A. F. Morrison, James A. Waymire, J. F. Cowdery, H. D. Talcott, H. J. Tilden, Freeman, Bates & Rankin, Wm. Craig, Adley H. Cummins, A. A. Sargent, Wilson & Wilson, Jarboe, Harrison & Goodfellow, Edward R. Taylor, Fox & Kellogg, Louis T. Haggin, Garber, Thornton & Bishop, John A. Wright, Blake, Williams & Harrison, Otis & Hutchinson, David McClure, W. F. Goad, Gordon & Young, Wm. M. Stewart, Van Ness & Roche, Columbus Bartlett, John H. Boalt, Horace G. Platt, Wm. W. Morrow, Gunnison & Booth, Chas. E. Nougues, E. D. Wheeler, Wm. H. & Wm. B. Sharp, Edward J. Pringle, Oliver P. Evans.

Now, as is represented by the governor, by all the leading members of the bar of California, and by all the settlers, and it ought to be well known here, there has been nearly forty years of litigation to settle the land titles in California. Here are five cases reported by the Attorney-General wherein he authorized suits to be commenced some years ago and the suits have not yet been commenced, but he says he is going on with them, that he has authorized private counsel in California to commence the suits. There are many thousand people living on the lands which are bordering on San Francisco and some of the patents are more than thirty years old. The Attorney-General never has investigated the matter himself. He can not shift the responsibility upon the Interior Department. There is no time there to investigate. If the Secretaries have signed the recommendations of the subordinate officers, they have not examined them. There has been no notice to those people who are living on the lands and their titles are clouded by these suits brought thirty years after the patents were granted following long and laborious litigation.

There are over 8,000,000 acres of land patented, and suits may be brought against the whole. They were all contested, and there are plenty of men who will make complaints if they can get suits brought, because these suits are a terrible weapon. They cloud the title to the land, keep it out of the market, and destroy innocent parties who have invested their money and have their property tied up for a term of years. Here are five suits for five important grants immediately about San Francisco, named in this report. The proposed suits to be commenced, and which he says he is going to have commenced, are United States *vs.* San Raymundo Grant; United States *vs.* Las Pulgas Grant; United States *vs.* Rancho Corte de Madera del Presidio; United States *vs.* Buri-Buri Rancho; United States *vs.* Cañada de Guadalupe la Visitacion y Rodeo Viejo.

These grants include many of the most beautiful suburbs of San Francisco. The Attorney-General never has called on the citizens owning the grants to show cause why suits should not be begun. These protests have been sent in by the governor and by the leading members of the bar of California. The suits are delayed for years, and then the Attorney-General tells us he has authorized Wiggington, Stewart, and Van Shaick to prosecute free of charge, without compensation from the Government, without informing the Senate by whom or why they are compensated, and the United States is humiliated by going into court as a pauper, asking only to be saved harmless from costs. The Attorney-General has no right to place the United States in a position of calling for volunteer services of attorneys, and also of calling upon private parties to pay the costs if the United States has got any interest in the proceedings. The United States is able to employ its own attorneys and pay its own costs if its rights are involved.

The Attorney-General assumes that he is protecting the interests of the United States, because he required bonds for costs and secured the services of attorneys for nothing. It seems that any person who is willing to act as an informer and make a complaint against old land titles, against a community that has been settled on it for years, can get a hearing and have a suit brought against innocent parties and destroy them and tie up their property for years by giving bond to the United States that he will pay the costs. I say that in any suit which the United States ought to bring the United States is able to pay its own costs; and if it has not sufficient interest to pay its own costs it ought not to be used as an instrument of oppression to destroy the title of innocent parties.

I think there has been no outrage in the whole history of California equal to reopening this litigation. The title of every person who owns a foot of land derived from Mexican land grants is put in jeopardy. He does not know what day A, B, or C may be authorized by giving bond to commence suit and cloud his title. I say that the Attorney-General ought to have called on these parties and have given them some hearing before he proceeded in this arbitrary manner, and he can not shift the responsibility on the Interior Department. He is the responsible head of the Department of Justice. The Interior Department has no right or jurisdiction over the matter. After the patent has been granted the Interior Department has held over and over again that its jurisdiction has ceased. It has no more right to interfere after its jurisdiction has ceased and after patent has been issued than any other stranger to the proceedings.

A patent is the highest evidence of title that the Government of the

United States can give. After patent issued and actual residence upon these lands for over thirty years, the question of title is not pending in the Interior Department. That Department has no right to communicate with the Attorney-General on the subject. He only has a right to listen to the Interior Department in matters where that Department has jurisdiction. That Department has ruled over and over again that it can do nothing after a matter has been finally determined and a patent issued under the authority of a former Secretary of the Interior. If it has no jurisdiction it has no right to advise in the matter.

It is only in those matters that are *sub judice* in the Interior Department that it has a right to call on the Attorney-General for advice. Where it has no jurisdiction it has no right to call for or give advice. The Attorney-General alone has the power to instigate suits, and with the power rests the responsibility. This the Supreme Court has decided. In a proper case where the interests of the United States are to be protected, in a case where it is for the interest of the United States, this great power is conferred upon him and him alone. He is the only party having this jurisdiction; and I say with such enormous jurisdiction as this, if he brings suit against any citizen of the United States who has received a patent from the Government, no matter in what State, Congress has a right to inquire why he does it. Having such enormous power, it is not presumed that any Attorney-General would abuse it. The Supreme Court would not presume such abuse possible, or that an Attorney-General would exercise it without due caution and investigation, consequently did not deny its existence. If the Attorney-General had examined these cases and prosecuted them himself, or ordered their prosecution by attorneys paid by the Government and responsible to the Government, and not farm them out to Wiggington & Co. to harass innocent purchasers, the question would be different and would be what the Supreme Court intended when it recognized the existence of the power.

In the list of cases returned in the letter of the Attorney-General it appears that sixteen cases to set aside land-patents have been authorized where the attorneys bringing and conducting the suits are to receive no compensation from the Government, but he does not inform us whether he has required security for costs in other than the cases located immediately about the Bay of San Francisco.

Some ten years ago the Attorney-General inadvertently authorized one John B. Howard to bring several suits; in fact, clothed him with a kind of roving commission to bring suit to set aside patents. He brought the celebrated Thockmorten and Flint suits and several others. The courts below decided against him; the Supreme Court of the United States also decided against him and reprimanded the unlimited exercise of such power; they condemned the practice in the strongest possible terms. There have been five or six other suits, and they have all been lost. The United States have never gained one, and how should they gain one after these cases have been tried in the tribunals created under the Government with able counsel to defend the rights of the United States?

There was in the beginning a commission appointed consisting of eminent men. It was a commission against whom there never has been a word of scandal. R. Augustus Thompson, Hiland Hall, Alpheus Felch, and others of the very highest character composed the commission. Men higher in character were never appointed in any instance. They heard and determined all these California land claims. The cases were then turned over to the district court of the United States, and whoever desired could appear there and defend his title.

All these cases were then brought to the Supreme Court of the United States unless the Attorney-General stopped the appeals. It took affirmative action on the part of the Attorney-General to prevent their being sent to that court.

They came here; they went through this tribunal sitting in the Capitol; they were carefully examined. After this the location became an important matter. Surveys and locations were determined for a time by the Interior Department. The matter was then turned over to the courts, and then again back to the Interior Department, and after final decision no patent was ever issued until after long delay in determining the location of the grant. The average delay after the final decision was from ten to fifteen years in securing a patent. And finally, when it was all done and California commenced to prosper and the people commenced to buy their titles, and after six or eight hundred thousand people became innocent occupants on these lands, relying on the patent of the Government as the highest source of title, John Doe or Richard Roe, or whoever he may be, comes to the Interior Department and that Department sends a letter to the Attorney-General and the Attorney-General proceeds to authorize strangers to reopen all this and throw that growing country into despair and cloud its titles. The people there have relied on these titles. If they have borrowed money on them, or are under the necessity of disposing of their property to meet obligations, they are destroyed. The titles have been clouded now for about two years by the threat of the Attorney-General to bring the five suits above named. Before they can be finally decided it will take from five to ten years more. These lawyers who charge nothing to the Government realize the advantage of clouding the title to thousands of acres of the most valuable land in California, including her most beautiful towns and cities, for this long period. Why did not the people owning these lands have an opportunity to show cause why this should not be done?

I say that the Attorney-General is very remiss in this matter, and whatever he or his friends may think here, the people who know the facts—the 800,000 people living on these lands, who have bought them in good faith on the strength of the patent of the United States, after thirty or forty years' litigation in the tribunals appointed by the Government—have just reason for complaint. I say if their titles are to be ruthlessly clouded in this way they will feel aggrieved, and it is an exercise of power that no officer of the Government ought to assume without further action of Congress. I alluded to this matter myself; I regarded it as one of the greatest abuses of the time; for if there is anything essential to the prosperity, peace, and happiness of a community it is the settlement and stability of land titles; but if the patents when issued by the Government are to be treated so lightly as this Attorney-General does, from the list presented to us, what security or safety is there in a country claiming to be a government of law? Verily the Attorney-General is converting it into a government of tyrannical discretion.

I do not know the merits of the other cases. I only know the merits of those affecting the Spanish land claims.

The Senator thinks that I ought not to speak of this because it does not happen to be in the State of Nevada. I have a right to speak of it anywhere when it affects any citizen of the United States, whether he be in my State or elsewhere, and the Senator assumes the same right. These persons are citizens of the United States, and this is the Senate of the United States, and it is our duty to see that the laws are properly guarded, and that further legislation shall be had if it is necessary, that inquiry shall be had into its necessity. I know about these land titles. I have seen all this litigation. I know how it has been conducted and that the Senators from California concur with me. They are in full accord with me, and the Representatives from California, of all parties, are in full accord with me. There is not a citizen of California that has any interest in that country who is not in accord with me. We all want the general prosperity of the country, and I say that if land titles can be clouded by a suit by the Attorney-General to land occupied by thousands of men after thirty years of peaceable possession, after thirty years' ownership, after patent granted, without a hearing, this is a Government of discretion and not of law.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada what he understands to be the interest of those persons who give security to pay the costs. What interest have they in these proceedings?

Mr. STEWART. They expect to get the land; or, if they do not get the land, they expect that the owners of the land will buy them off, so that they will allow the suits to be discontinued.

Mr. TELLER. Does the Senator understand that these suits are instituted at the request of the persons who are now giving security for costs?

Mr. STEWART. Entirely at their request. There is no doubt about that.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. How does the Senator understand that?

Mr. STEWART. Because their petitions in the Land Department show it, because the same attorneys appear, and in the San Jacinto case the petition for the suit was made and security and lawyers employed by one Baker, of Los Angeles. During the whole trial no secret was made of this. Frequent propositions of compromise came from the same source. The United States had no more to do with this case than any other private litigation until it reached the Supreme Court, when the Solicitor-General appeared to give color to the proceedings. Baker was finally beaten in the Supreme Court. The Supreme Court advanced that very case on my petition, because the questions involved in it affected such vast interests. The judgment of the court below against the United States was affirmed.

If the rule laid down by the Supreme Court in that case had been followed by the Attorney-General the contemplated suits of which I complain would have been abandoned at once, and not commenced. We were in hopes that the Supreme Court would deny the power of the Attorney-General altogether, but it did not; it only qualified it. But it did not sanction the policy of the Attorney-General in authorizing private parties to prosecute their neighbors in the name of the United States. It said the Attorney-General had the power in a proper case where the United States was interested. That was all. These suits are to set aside patents on account of mislocation by the courts and the Interior Department, after exhaustive investigations in both tribunals. The validity of the patents has been affirmed by the Supreme Court of the United States. They must be located somewhere. The United States has sold all the surrounding land, and has no other place to locate them. How can the United States have any possible interest, then, in disturbing the inhabitants residing upon these lands? And if the United States is interested, why do third parties pay costs and prosecute them for nothing?

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Allow me to interrupt the Senator for an explanation.

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I had the letter of the Attorney General read at the Secretary's desk some time since for the purpose of trying to impress the Senate with the facts of the case, and to clear up the cir-

cumstances that surround it. The Attorney-General adds, on this very point on which the Senator is now commenting:

The Department of Justice examines the case so far as to see whether the Government has an interest in the proceedings or a fraud has been practiced on the Government and operates to its prejudice, or the Government is under obligation to some individual to make his title good by setting aside the alleged fraudulent patent, or that the duty of the Government to the public requires such action; and if, upon such examination, the Department thinks there is just reason to believe that any or all of these things exist, the application is granted and the suit ordered to be brought.

And, of course, it means "and not otherwise."

Mr. STEWART. Ah, let me say that in every case which has gone to the Supreme Court they have decided that this Government had no interest. They decided so in the San Jacinto case. These cases are not different. It is impossible for the Government to have an interest in disturbing these people and be placed under obligations to give them other lands. The whole pretense that the United States is interested is a sham. The real parties in interest are the parties that pay costs, hire counsel, and prosecute these suits for the benefit of themselves, and not the United States. Is the United States so poor, helpless, and friendless as to accept the charity of strangers in conducting official business in which the Government is interested? The Department knows that there are other claimants who have been beaten in the courts after repeated hearings. They are the parties who claim this land, and they are the parties who are bringing these suits, either with the expectation of holding the rod over a vast number of people and making them buy their peace or suffer the consequences. That is the situation. The appeals of the governor and leading attorneys of California were not sufficient to secure for the people of that State, the titles to whose homes are to be clouded by unjust litigation, a hearing before these suits were commenced.

This is the "stand and deliver" process. These people who are willing to levy blackmail are placed by the Attorney-General in the position of the robber. "Stand and deliver; sacrifice your property for ten years or buy me off;" and if the Attorney-General means to say that he has considered this, he is mistaken. He has given the matter no consideration. It is impossible. The parties owning these lands have had no hearing, and he knows it.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Nevada giving way, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator will allow me to make a few remarks on this matter. I shall occupy but a short time, not over five or ten minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I do not think that I can refrain longer from making the motion. I submit the motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business. This matter can come up again.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After three hours and thirty-four minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to inquire whether we are in legislative or executive session.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. In open executive session.

Mr. MORGAN. We do not need any legislative clerks or stenographers then. They are not officers of that session.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chief Clerk will read the resolution offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN].

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the injunction of secrecy be removed from all the proceedings of the Senate in reference to the treaty with Great Britain now under consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is the Senate ready for the question on agreeing to the resolution?

The resolution was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. BECK. I desire to ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment to the river and harbor bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to submit an amendment to the river and harbor bill. It will be received, if there is no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. As in legislative session?

Mr. HARRIS. This is not a legislative session.

Mr. MORGAN. The amendment can not be received then.

Mr. HARRIS. It is open executive session.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Kentucky asked unanimous consent.

Mr. HARRIS. Oh, by unanimous consent it can be done.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair received it by unanimous consent.

Mr. BECK. I desire to have the amendment referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be referred to the Committee on Commerce, and printed.

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent to ntroduce a resolution, and I ask for its immediate consideration. It is a resolution relating to an amendment to the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection? If there is none, the resolution will be read.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think it would be better to object to the reading of the resolution. We are now in executive session. The treaty is pending. The Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] is seeking the floor.

Mr. FRYE. I rise to address the Senate on the pending treaty.

Mr. CULLOM. It is now a late hour of the afternoon. I take it for granted the Senator from Maine would prefer not to proceed with his address to-night. So I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator to allow this resolution to be referred.

Mr. CULLOM. I have no objection to that, if it is in order.

Mr. CALL. I ask that it be read and referred.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the reception of a message from the House of Representatives?

Mr. HARRIS. Of course not.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears none. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. R. 87) authorizing and directing the payment of the salaries of the officers and employés of Congress for the month of May, 1888.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Mr. CULLOM. I insist on my motion to adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Illinois moves that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator withdraw the motion for a moment?

Mr. CULLOM. Certainly.

Mr. HOAR. I suppose in making up the Journal these matters which have passed by unanimous consent will be journalized as having taken place in ordinary legislative session.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. In legislative session.

Mr. HOAR. It will be so ordered by the Chair.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so recorded.

Mr. FRYE. Am I recognized as having the floor?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine is recognized as entitled to the floor on the pending treaty.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CULLOM. Let us adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Illinois moves that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. CALL. I understood the Senator from Illinois to consent that my resolution might be read and referred to a committee. I ask that that may be done. It will take but a moment.

Mr. CULLOM. If the resolution is before the Senate I have no objection to having it referred. I have no objection to anything being done in order.

Mr. MORGAN (to Mr. CULLOM). I wish to know whether we are to adjourn to meet in legislative or in executive session.

Mr. CULLOM. I suppose the Chair will state that. I suppose that when the Senate adjourns it will be to meet in legislative session to-morrow. I should like to inquire whether that will be the case or not?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is for the Senate to take such action as it pleases.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from Illinois to withhold his motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Illinois moves that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, May 29, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *May* 28, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

RECOMMITTED.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks that the bill H. R. 6300, which has been reported by the Committee on Invalid Pensions with an adverse report, be recommitted to that committee. In the absence of objection the bill will be recommitted.

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WEAVER. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill——

Mr. FORNEY. I demand the regular order.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I desire to make a privileged motion. I desire to have a rule adopted assigning one hour each day after the reading of the Journal for the consideration of business by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. That is not a privileged matter. It is a change of the rules of the House. It would require unanimous consent, but may be referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I desire to offer a resolution making that change of the rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will send it to the desk.

Mr. FORNEY. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. The motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TOWNSHEND] will be pending. The regular order is the call of States and Territories for the introduction of bills and resolutions.

NATIONAL INDUSTRIAL INSTITUTE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. FORNEY introduced a bill (H. R. 10177) to incorporate the trustees of the National Industrial Institute, in Washington, D. C.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Education, and ordered to be printed.

FELIX A. MATHEWS.

Mr. MCKENNA introduced a bill (H. R. 10178) for the relief of Felix A. Mathews; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

UNITED STATES DAM AT ROCK ISLAND ARSENAL.

Mr. GEST introduced a bill (H. R. 10179) for the rebuilding of the Government stone dam at Rock Island Arsenal, and for the immediate construction of a temporary dam; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GEST also submitted a resolution of inquiry addressed to the Secretary of War, concerning the destruction of the United States dam at Rock Island arsenal; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LODGE introduced a joint resolution (H. Res. 178) granting leave of absence without loss of pay to certain persons employed in the service of the United States; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

LIFE-SAVING SERVICE.

Mr. BUCHANAN presented a joint resolution of the Legislature of New Jersey, urging the enactment of a law providing for the relief of persons who lose their lives or become disabled in the Life-Saving Service of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, introduced a bill (H. R. 10180) to amend section 216 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

ATTORNEYS IN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Mr. CULBERSON (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 10181) to equalize the pay of attorneys in the Department of Justice; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Department of Justice, and ordered to be printed.

ASSIGNMENT OF BUSINESS.

Mr. CULBERSON submitted a resolution providing for the assignment of business; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

WITNESSES.

Mr. LEE (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 10182) to amend an act entitled "An act to make persons charged with crimes and offenses competent witnesses in the United States and Territorial courts," approved March 16, 1878, which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

LIGHT-HOUSE AT GREAT ROUND SHOAL.

Mr. DAVIS introduced a bill (H. R. 10183) to establish a light-ship off Great Round Shoal, near Nantucket, Mass.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

CO-OPERATION.

Mr. MORROW introduced a bill (H. R. 10184) to encourage co-operation and to provide for the formation of associations in the District of Columbia for the purpose of conducting any lawful business and dividing the profits among the members thereof; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. BROWER submitted a resolution to relieve the Committee on Ways and Means from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1695) to repeal the tax on tobacco, and to set apart Tuesday, June 12, for the consideration of said resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BROWER also submitted a resolution to relieve the Committee on Education from the further consideration of the bill (S. 371) for the establishment and temporary support of common schools, and to set apart June 26 for the consideration of said bill; which was referred to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I desire to offer for present consideration the resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections. But the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] has demanded the regular order.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I hope the gentleman will not urge the regular order against this resolution.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That after the reading of the Journal and the reference of business on the Speaker's table each day, there shall be one-half hour allowed for the consideration of measures on the Calendars by unanimous consent, and in recognizing members to ask unanimous consent for the consideration of business the Speaker shall proceed as follows: He shall call five names, beginning at the first name on the roll, and when they shall have been called he shall then call five names, beginning at the last name on the roll, alternating in this manner until every member shall have been called: *Provided*, That no member who has once been called shall be again recognized until every name shall have been called: *And provided further*, That the Speaker shall not entertain any motion for unanimous consent to consider any measure except during the half hour above provided.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. MILLS. Let it go to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I do not want it to go to the Committee on Rules. I withdraw the resolution.

POST-OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. RICHARDSON introduced a bill (H. R. 10185) to select a site and for the erection of a post-office building in the city of Washington, D. C.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

EX-SOLDIERS AND SAILORS.

Mr. CHEADLE (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 10186) to retire ex-soldiers and sailors who have been wounded in battle, after twenty-one years' service in the civil service, and providing salaries therefor; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Select Committee on Reform in the Civil Service, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. FORNEY. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of general appropriation bills, and I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to offer may be allowed to file them with the Clerk and have them referred in the usual manner.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I object. I tried all day Saturday to get a chance to report a bill which would not have taken more than a quarter of a minute, but I was knocked out in a way that savored more of brutality than anything else.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] accompanies his motion with a request for unanimous consent that members having reports to present may be allowed to hand them to the Clerk and have them referred to the appropriate committees.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I object. I offered to do that on Saturday, but I was refused an opportunity to present my report, and I insist now on the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] to dispense with the morning hour, which requires a two-thirds vote.

The question was taken by a *viva voce* vote, and the Speaker declared that he was unable to determine whether two-thirds had voted in the affirmative or not.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 70, noes 25.

Mr. GROSVENOR. No quorum, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] whether he will not withdraw his objection if consent is given that members may file their reports.

Mr. GROSVENOR. No, sir. I undertook on Saturday afternoon to make a report that I have been holding for more than a week, and I had been recognized by the Speaker for the purpose of presenting it, when the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] knocked me out as if I were a dumb brute rather than a man, and I then made up my mind that I would insist upon the regular order.

Mr. DIBBLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all members having reports to present may be permitted to file them with the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. That request was made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY], but the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] objected.

Mr. FORNEY. I withdraw my motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama withdraws his motion, and the Chair will call the committees.

WATER-RESERVE LANDS IN WISCONSIN.

Mr. GROSVENOR, from the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, re-

ported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (S. 1880) declaring that certain water-reserve lands in the State of Wisconsin are and have been subject to the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act granting to railroads the right of way through the public lands of the United States," approved March 3, 1875; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL CEMETERY, SALISBURY, N. C.

Mr. FORD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported, as a substitute for the bill H. R. 1706, to provide for grading and paving approaches to the national cemetery near Salisbury, N. C., a bill (H. R. 10187) to provide for grading and paving approaches to the national cemetery near Salisbury, N. C.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The original bill (H. R. 1706) was laid on the table.

PUBLIC BUILDING, TAUNTON, MASS.

Mr. SOWDEN, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported, as a substitute for the bill H. R. 7746, a bill (H. R. 10188) for the erection of a public building at Taunton, Mass.; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The original bill (H. R. 7746) was laid on the table.

ELIZABETH BAUER.

On motion of Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, the bill (S. 981) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bauer, previously reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, was recommitted to the committee.

ARREARS OF PENSIONS.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, by unanimous consent, filed the views of the minority of the Committee on Invalid Pension upon the bill (H. R. 9161) in relation to arrears of pensions; which were ordered to be printed with the report of the committee.

MALINDA HARDIN.

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 9729) granting a pension to Malinda Hardin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RALPH P. WILBORN.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 9733) granting a pension to Ralph P. Wilborn; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SARAH RIDDLE.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 9732) granting a pension to Sarah Riddle; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SECTION 4787, REVISED STATUTES.

On motion of Mr. MATSON, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7435) to amend section 4787 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and it was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MINOR CHILDREN OF JOSEPH SAWYER.

Mr. BLISS, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 10126) for the relief of the minor children of Joseph Sawyer, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BENJAMIN HENDERSON.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8923) for the relief of Benjamin Henderson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM THOMPSON.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 2222) granting a pension to William Thompson; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. LAURA HOOPER DENBY.

Mr. BLISS also, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1760) to increase the pension of Mrs. Laura Hooper Denby; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. HUTTON, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back bills of the following titles; which were laid on the table:

A bill (H. R. 1585) to amend the act entitled "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes," so as to dispense with the provision which requires that the claimant or widow of the officer or enlisted man shall be sixty-two years of age before they can claim the benefit of said act;

A bill (H. R. 1754) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war," approved January 29, 1887;

A bill (H. R. 2192) granting a pension to James M. Morgan's Iowa infantry and mounted volunteers;

A bill (H. R. 4371) to amend the pension laws by placing on the pension-rolls teamsters who were in active service during the Mexican war;

A bill (H. R. 4403) to amend section 2 of an act of Congress entitled "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1887;

A bill (H. R. 5036) to amend the act granting pensions to the surviving soldiers of the Mexican war;

A bill (H. R. 5620) granting pensions to teamsters employed in the Quartermaster's Department during the Mexican war;

A bill (H. R. 5678) amendatory of and supplementary to "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes," approved January 29, 1887;

A bill (H. R. 6112) granting a pension to all persons who served as teamsters in the military service of the United States during the Mexican war;

A bill (H. R. 6830) to place upon the pension-roll members of Gray's Battalion of United States Volunteers of the Mexican war;

A bill (H. R. 7224) to extend to certain volunteers in the Mexican war the benefit of the act of January 29, 1887, granting pensions to soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 7741) to amend the act entitled "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes," so as to dispense with the provision which requires that the claimant or widow of the officer or enlisted man shall be sixty-two years of age before they can claim the benefit of said act; and

A bill (H. R. 8379) to amend an act entitled "An act granting pensions to the soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war," approved January 29, 1887.

PENSIONS.

He also, from the same committee, reported, in the nature of a substitute for sundry bills, a bill (H. R. 10189) amendatory of and supplementary to an act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors of the Mexican war, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JESSE L. GARRETT.

Mr. BUTLER, from the Committee on Pensions, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 3908) increasing the pension of Jesse L. Garrett; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GERMAN LUTHERAN TRINITY CONGREGATION, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEMPHILL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1727) to grant to the trustees of the German Lutheran Trinity Congregation, of Washington, D. C., the right to sell a portion of their cemetery lands; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

DECISIONS ON PUBLIC LANDS AND PENSIONS.

Mr. RICHARDSON, from the Committee on Printing, reported back favorably the joint resolution (H. Res. 101) providing for the printing of the decisions of the Department of the Interior regarding public lands and pensions for sale; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

REPORT OF LIEUTENANT ROGERS ON PANAMA CANAL.

Mr. RICHARDSON also, from the Committee on Printing, reported back favorably a resolution introduced by Mr. WHITTHORNE February 17, 1888, providing for printing the report of Lieut. Charles C. Rogers, United States Navy, on the Panama Canal; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MAPS OF THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. RICHARDSON also, from the Committee on Printing, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 6652) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to cause to be printed maps of the United States in book form; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF GEORGE M'DOUGALL.

On motion of Mr. FORNEY, by unanimous consent, the Committee

on Appropriations was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1171) for the relief of the legal representatives of George McDougall, deceased; and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 10190) providing for an Assistant Secretary of War; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, NORFOLK, VA.

Mr. SOWDEN, by unanimous consent, reported back favorably from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds the bill (S. 2164) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Norfolk, in the State of Virginia; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN C. FRÉMONT.

Mr. SPINOLA, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9919) authorizing the President to appoint and retire John C. Frémont as a major-general in the United States Army; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEELE. I ask unanimous consent to file the views of a minority of the Committee on Military Affairs on the bill just reported.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, leave will be granted to file the views of the minority, to be printed with the report of the committee.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

REFUND OF NATIONAL DEBT.

Mr. PLUMB, by unanimous consent (by request) introduced a bill (H. R. 10191) to provide for issuing bonds to refund the national debt, and to amend the laws relating to national-bank issues; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. FORNEY. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. BLOUNT in the chair).

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of general appropriation bills. When the committee was last in session it had under consideration the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill; and the Clerk will report the pending paragraph.

Mr. CRAIN. Mr. Chairman, when the committee was last in session, I had made a point of order against that portion of the bill appropriating $3,600 for the salary of the First Auditor of the Treasury. That point of order being sustained, I presume its effect is to leave a blank in the appropriation, and the object of the amendment I now send to the desk is to insert in that blank the sum which is fixed by existing law for the compensation of that official.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 9, page 30, insert "four thousand" between the words "Treasury" and "dollars;" making it read, "First Auditor of the Treasury, $4,000."

Mr. FORNEY. I move to amend by striking out "four thousand" and inserting "three thousand six hundred."

Mr. CRAIN. Against that I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, the House seems to be in a strange state of confusion in connection with this subject. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Alabama, which is in harmony with the united judgment of the Committee on Appropriations, as far as we know, is to be debarred on the point of order from continuing the salary of the First Auditor at $3,600, which it has been since the Forty-fourth Congress. For more than twelve years the salary has been $3,600; but by ingenuity of points of order in this way we are compelled, as it were, against the judgment and recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations and, as I think, against public policy—we are driven to give $4,000 when we only desire to give $3,600. This is neither common sense, nor do I believe it is a logical construction of the rule.

Mr. DOCKERY. Before the gentleman from Pennsylvania takes his seat I wish to ask if the same point of order would not apply to all of these auditors?

Mr. RANDALL. It will, and not only to those but to some two hundred and thirty other salaries provided for in the bill.

Mr. HOLMAN. It would refer to all the salaries under the Government.

Mr. DOCKERY. It increases the salaries of these officials to the same amounts fixed in the appropriation bills by Republican Congresses.

Mr. CRAIN. I make the point of order that there is nothing before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs the attention of the Committee on the point of order.

First, the Chair desires to call the attention of the Committee to the first paragraph embodied in this bill:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums be, and the same are hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, for the objects hereinafter expressed—

Then, on page 30, one of the objects covered by the paragraph I have just read is expressed in these words:

For the First Auditor of the Treasury, $3,600.

Now, then, it is conceded in this debate that the general law prescribes what the salary of the First Auditor of the Treasury shall be, namely, $4,000. The effect of this provision of the bill, therefore, should it be adopted, for the next fiscal year will be to reduce the amount of that salary by the sum of $400 for the year.

The Supreme Court of the United States—and the Chair will simply refer to the decision without reading it—in the case of The United States *vs.* Fisher (109 United States Reports, page 143), presents this syllabus:

When Congress appropriates in full compensation for the salary of a public officer, the incumbent can not recover an additional sum in the Court of Claims, notwithstanding the prior statute fixes the salary at a larger amount than the sum so appropriated. In such case the earlier act is suspended for the time covered by the appropriation.

Now, then, the Chair understands that Rule XXI of the House prescribes that the Committee on Appropriations may not introduce legislation except with certain qualifications. In view of the fact that the rules of the preceding Congress permitted reductions in cases of salaries of employés, which reductions are inhibited by the present rules, the Chair can see no other purpose in the rule under which we are now operating than to restrain the Committee on Appropriations from increasing the salary of an official of the Government or decreasing it; and if, by reason of the rules of the House, there should seem to be something therein not strictly logical, or in the minds of some gentlemen, "wanting in common sense," the present occupant of the chair declines to be responsible.

Mr. HOLMAN. I reserve the right to appeal from that decision on the point of order.

Mr. CRAIN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. I would like to ask the attention of the Chair for a moment, whether the words "in full compensation" have been stricken from the bill on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. They are yet in the bill.

Mr. CRAIN. And that is the reason I make the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. Now is not the decision of the Supreme Court, cited by the Chair, exactly in harmony with the idea entertained by the committee, that the committee has a right to fix these salaries?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands it exactly the other way. The Chair understands the Supreme Court to decide that you may suspend the operation of the salary for a given year, and that such suspension is binding upon the incumbent of the office, where the bill provides that the salary so fixed shall be in full compensation.

Mr. RANDALL. I do not understand that these words in the bill are subject to the objection that they change existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. That is exactly the reason. They do change existing law. If the gentleman will take the words "in full compensation" and apply it to the salary of the First Auditor as fixed in the bill, he will see that it not only reduces the amount of the salary covered by the general statute in this bill, but it declares that that compensation shall be in full compensation for the year, and to that extent this appropriation bill for the next fiscal year repeals the statute.

Mr. RANDALL. We have been doing that for twelve years.

Mr. WEAVER. This rule has not existed for twelve years.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been stated that this has been done for ten or twelve years, but the Chair will state in this connection that under the rules of the House it was competent to reduce a salary until the rules of last Congress prohibited even that.

Mr. DUNN. Will the Chair permit me to make a statement in that connection?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. DUNN. I do not understand that the language "in full compensation" standing alone is a violation of the rules of the House; but when coupled with a paragraph which changes the salary fixed by law it is a violation of the rule; and when you strike out a paragraph changing a salary you have relieved the words from any obnoxious violation of the rule, and it does not appear to me that it is necessary for those words "in full compensation" to go out.

Mr. CRAIN. I do not want them to go out.

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DOCKERY. If the point of order now made against the words "in full compensation" should be sustained and they were stricken out, my inquiry is whether or not a point of order such as the gentle-

man from Texas has made as against this paragraph would then obtain?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not decide a case until it arises.

Mr. DOCKERY. I want to suggest this, whether in the interest of real economy, if the words "in full compensation" were stricken out, the House could then fix any amount it chose?

Mr. TAULBEE. Allow me——

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Has the point of order been disposed of by the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has made a ruling.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Then would it be in order for me to call for the regular order? I do so.

Mr. TAULBEE. The question I desire to ask the gentleman from Missouri is this——

Several members called for the regular order.

Mr. TAULBEE. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. HOLMAN. In connection with that appeal let me say this: You can not reduce the appropriation below the amount provided by general law.

Mr. ROGERS. I rise to a question of order. I was temporarily called out of the Hall. I would like the Chair to state again what the point was on which he ruled.

Mr. LONG. Before that is done may I make a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LONG. At the beginning of the five minutes' debate the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] raised the point of order that the words "in full compensation" were a change of existing law. I understood the Chair to respond that he would consider that question and determine it at a later stage in the bill. Has the Chair disposed of that point of order raised by the gentleman from Minnesota?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not made any decision on that point of order.

Mr. LONG. May I ask if that point of order is now pending? And if it is now reached for the first time, may we not ask for a ruling of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule upon that point of order directly, if the gentleman desires it.

Mr. LONG. I would certainly desire the determination of that point of order as being fundamental to the point of order now pending.

Mr. TAULBEE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to inquire of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LONG] whether or not in the event the point of order raised by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] to which he has referred in regard to the language in the first paragraph of the bill—whether, if that point of order should be sustained and those words should be stricken from the bill, then is it not a fact that under the ruling of the Chair heretofore the point of order raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] would be overruled?

Mr. LONG. That is my impression.

Mr. TAULBEE. I desire to ask, as a parliamentary question, if this deprives the First Auditor of the Treasury of the power of collecting before the Court of Claims $400 of his salary?

Mr. LONG. Not at all.

Mr. TAULBEE. Then is it real economy to do this?

Mr. MCCREARY. I am in favor of economy, and as a general rule I go with the Committee on Appropriations, because they generally digest and thoroughly examine everything which they bring into this House. But the question now is upon an appeal taken from the decision of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole; and the question for us to determine now is whether the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole has decided the point of order correctly. I contend that the decision of the Chair is in accordance with parliamentary law. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] made the point of order that the bill reported by the committee provides for a salary of only $3,600 for the next year as the compensation of the First Auditor. Now, sir, the general law, which I hold in my hand, provides that the pay of the First Auditor of the Treasury shall be $4,000 per annum.

That is, therefore, the general law. Now what are the rules of this House on that subject? Rule XXI, subsection 3, provides that—

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriation for such public works and objects as are already in progress; nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

This is a general appropriation bill which we are now considering, and the rules provide that no provision changing existing law shall be in order in any general appropriation bill. As the general law provides that the salary of the First Auditor shall be $4,000, I say that under the rules of this House the point of order made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] was well taken, and was properly sustained by the Chair.

Mr. HOLMAN. Then the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY] holds that we can not reduce an amount in an appropriation bill.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say a word in reference to the ruling of the Chair, from which I understand there has been an appeal. I speak only of the ruling, not of the propriety of the rule, nor of the propriety of the point of order. We may differ as to the propriety of the rule, which was changed in the last Congress and readopted in this Congress. Unquestionably, prior to the last Congress, for substantially ten years, this provision in the bill was in order; but when you have the rule changed so as to prohibit legislation of all kinds upon an appropriation bill, whether it reduces or whether it increases expenditures, when you consult the law, which fixes this salary of $4,000, and then consult the bill, which fixes the salary at $3,600 "in full compensation," there can be no question but that upon the point as presented the ruling of the Chair is correct.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to the effect of this point of order; but that does not blind me to the fact that the Chair is clearly correct in his ruling upon the point under the rules of the House as just cited by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MCCREARY]. When you take the two together, the provision that this is "in full compensation," and the salary of the First Auditor, as fixed by law—when those two things are taken together as the Chair has taken them, it is clear that no amendment changing existing law is in order upon this bill.

Mr. LONG. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LONG. Suppose the Chair should decide upon the point raised by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] that the words "in full compensation" must be stricken out, would the gentleman then claim that the point of order of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] should be sustained?

Mr. DOCKERY. In that case I do not think that the point of order would be well taken, and for that reason I made a parliamentary inquiry when the debate first began, not having been present when the House commenced the consideration of the bill, whether the Chair could not now decide the point of order raised by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], I understand, as affecting the words "in full compensation." If the words "in full compensation" are allowed to remain in the bill as applied to the salary of the First Auditor, I think the Chair is unquestionably correct, but if those words were struck out, I do not think the rule would stand.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I agree fully with the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], who has just taken his seat, as to the correctness of the ruling of the Chair. Furthermore, let me say the words "in full compensation" can not be struck out on a point of order, because they do not change existing law. Unless something follows those words which changes the compensation they are in accordance with existing law, because the presumption is that the committee will appropriate the amount prescribed by law. Suppose the committee had appropriated the amount provided by law, $4,000, and had also inserted the words "in full compensation," would those words have been subject to the point of order? Certainly not, because there would have been nothing in the bill changing existing law. In themselves, they are simply qualifying words, but being followed by the amount, "$3,600," the two things taken together do change existing law, and where the Chair, by sustaining the point of order, strikes out "$3,600," then they are in harmony and there is no change of existing law.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the appeal until the Chair decides on the first point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN].

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. HERBERT. I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry, in the first place, and to address myself to what I understand to be the pending point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no pending point of order. If the gentleman has a parliamentary inquiry to make, the Chair will hear him, but if he rises for the purpose of discussing the point of order, that matter has been disposed of.

Mr. HERBERT. I understood the Chair to say, in reply to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LONG], that a point of order had been made upon the words just cited when they were reached, and that the Chair had at that time reserved the point to be decided at the proper time. Did the Chair answer in that way?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not care to take up that matter just here, but will do so when it is reached in its order.

Mr. HERBERT. But my inquiry is, did the Chair answer in that way?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair announced that whenever the Committee of the Whole reached any section or paragraph of the bill which, coupled with the clause "in full compensation," would operate as a repeal of existing law, the Chair would consider the question.

Mr. HERBERT. Now, then——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not desire the discussion to go on in this irregular way. The pending question is on the amendment.

Mr. HERBERT. I desire to insist that that point of order does arise at this time, and to address myself to it.

Mr. CRAIN. I make the point of order that the words "in full compensation" can not now be stricken out on a point of order, because my amendment is in accordance with existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT]. The question is now on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas. All in favor of that amendment——

Mr. HERBERT. I address myself then to that amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. I understood the Chair to say that he would be ready to decide the point of order reserved as to the clause "in full compensation," whenever a decision should become necessary or desirable as bearing upon any point of order pending or likely to arise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so announced. The Chair thinks that he has in effect ruled already——

Mr. RANDALL. If the Chair has ruled on those words, will the Chair tell us whether they are left in or struck out?

Mr. HERBERT. What I insist is that this is the proper time——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order of the gentleman from Alabama. If, however, the House desires to understand the status of this matter the Chair will, notwithstanding it may not be exactly in order, state his views upon it.

Mr. HERBERT. But I desire to address myself to this point of order. I wish to insist—and I ask the Chair to hear me—that this is a proper time at which to decide upon the point first reserved by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] some days ago; and I wish the Chair to hear me on that point.

Mr. RANDALL. I understood the Chair to say a moment ago that he would make such a decision.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, if it be desired, will make an announcement at this time as to his views in reference to this matter.

Mr. PAYSON. I rise to a point of order. It is impossible to hear what the Chair is saying. This is an important matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that any opinion now——

Mr. HERBERT. I would like to be heard on this point of order before the Chair decides it.

The CHAIRMAN. The business of the House must proceed, and the Chair must exercise due discretion in the matter of hearing discussion.

Mr. HERBERT. I do not understand the Chair to have decided whether the words "in full compensation" shall be stricken out on a point of order or not. If the Chair has not decided that point, I wish to be heard upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. And the Chair is not willing to hear argument at this time.

Mr. TAULBEE. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I wish to know—and on this point I ask the attention of the gentleman from Alabama—whether the parliamentary status of this controversy is not that the point of order upon this clause of the bill fixing the compensation of the First Auditor at $3,600 was sustained by the Chair. Then the question recurred upon the amendment of the gentleman from Texas proposing to insert the words "four thousand dollars." I submit that that amendment is the pending business; and the words in the first clause of the bill, upon which the point of order of the gentleman from Minnesota was made, are not, when taken in connection with the pending amendment, obnoxious to the point of order, for they do not change existing law. Therefore the point of order insisted on by the gentleman from Alabama is not correctly taken.

Mr. HERBERT. The Chair has not heard my point yet.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asks gentlemen to hear him for a moment, so that this matter may be satisfactorily disposed of. The Chair is perfectly willing to hear the gentleman from Alabama in due time. If the question had been raised on the language "in full compensation" before the Chair had ruled on the amount, the Chair would have made a ruling as to that language in that connection. But that question was not presented for decision until after the Chair had made a ruling on the amount, and there is no change of existing law when the language "in full compensation" is used in connection with the amount of salary required by law. If, hereafter, when any salary shall have been reduced by the bill below the amount required by existing law, any gentleman shall see fit to raise that question of order the Chair will rule upon it. At present, there is nothing for the Chair to rule upon, and it would be a mere waste of time, when no question of order is pending, for the Chair to make a ruling.

Mr. DINGLEY. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry. Did I understand the Chair to say that no point of order was made against the words "in full compensation" until after the decision had been made on the question raised on the words "thirty-six hundred?" If that was the statement of the Chair, I desire to say that gentlemen made the point of order against the words "in full compensation," and the Chair reserved that point for decision until a particular salary should be reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The question was not raised in connection with this paragraph.

Mr. DINGLEY. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] made the point of order, and I renewed the point.

The CHAIRMAN. On this paragraph?

Mr. DINGLEY. On the words "in full compensation," as connected with this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman state that he made the point in connection with this paragraph as to the First Auditor?

Mr. DINGLEY. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not so remember; but, accepting the statement of the gentleman, the Chair is ready to rule on that question.

Mr. CANNON. I think the gentleman from Maine does not understand the position of the Chair. I believe the gentleman from Maine made the point of order on the words "in full compensation" when they were originally read.

Mr. DINGLEY. The point was made by the gentleman from Minnesota when the words were first read; but subsequently when the paragraph relating to the Auditor's salary was reached I called attention to the fact that the point of order had been made previously, and I then renewed it, because the Chair had intimated that he could not rule whether the words "in full compensation" were in order or not until the question was presented in connection with some amount named in the bill; and I asked for a ruling on the point of order thus presented.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not so remember the circumstances; but will, of course, accept the statement of the gentleman from Maine, and will now make a ruling on that question.

Mr. CRAIN. In connection with the statement of the gentleman from Maine, I wish to suggest that against the gentleman's point of order I made a point that the question of order raised by myself was the question before the House, whereupon the gentleman said that this point of order had precedence, because it had been raised originally by the gentleman from Minnesota. Therefore I say he has not made his point subsequently to the original point of order. That is about the correct statement, I believe.

Mr. DINGLEY. The point of order on the words "in full compensation for the service of the fiscal year" having been reserved until the first salary should be reached, when that was reached I asked the Chair to rule on the point of order raised against these words taken in connection with the salary reached.

Mr. CRAIN. I made the point of order when these words were first reached, as I think the gentleman from Maine will admit, because they were not in accordance with law, and the words "in full compensation" did not apply to them. I made the point that the law fixes this salary at $4,000 a year.

Mr. HERBERT. As I understand the Chair——

Mr. CRAIN. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRAIN. The gentleman from Maine assuming he made the point of order——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will not make an argument on the point of order.

Mr. CRAIN. No; I do not propose to make any argument. Now, assuming for the sake of argument that the gentleman from Maine made his point of order not with reference to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Minnesota, he admits that his point of order was made after the one made by me, and therefore when the Chair decided mine the point of order raised by the gentleman necessarily fell to the ground, there being nothing left to which it could be applied.

Mr. DINGLEY. My point of order was raised by the gentleman from Minnesota before the gentleman raised his point of order.

Mr. CRAIN. You made your point of order subsequently to mine.

Mr. DINGLEY. I renewed it, or rather called the attention of the Chair to it, after you made your point of order.

Mr. CRAIN. Therefore when the Chair ruled upon my point of order yours necessarily fell.

Mr. DINGLEY. By no means.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Maine state that his point of order was made subsequently to the point of order of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. DINGLEY. My point of order was made by the gentleman from Minnesota before that of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CRAIN. Your point of order was made subsequently to the point of order raised by me, and I think the record will show that to be the case.

Mr. DINGLEY. If the Chair will listen for a moment I will state the facts.

Mr. HERBERT. I believe I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend for a moment. The Chair wishes to understand the facts.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to state the facts as they occurred. When the amount of $3,600 was reached and the gentleman from Texas had made a point of order against it, I called the attention of the Chair to the fact that a point of order had been previously made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] against the words "in full compensation," and that the Chair had reserved that point of order until a distinct salary should be reached, and I added that inasmuch as such

a salary had been reached it was the duty of the Chair to decide the point of order raised by the gentleman from Minnesota and renewed by myself. Then the gentleman from Texas made the point that his point of order should be decided first. In the confusion which occurred I replied, but was not understood by the Chair, that my point had been raised by the gentleman from Minnesota and reserved, and therefore that it was the duty of the Chair to decide that point first.

Mr. CRAIN. The point raised by you?

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. HERBERT. After I was taken off the floor I was about to make reference to the argument which the gentleman from Maine has made. I desire to restate that proposition. I understand these two propositions when taken together are subject to a point of order. They are separated in the bill. Neither standing by itself is subject to the point of order. When the first proposition was reached that these sums should be in full compensation, a point of order was made and reserved by the Chair until there should come a proper time for its consideration. In other words, the Chair said it would reserve the point of order until it reached some point of the bill which fixed a different salary. When such a portion of the bill was reached then the gentleman from Texas made a point of order. His point of order would have been made by itself. The point of order would have been made at either end of the proposition, but at that time the gentleman from Maine rose and called the attention of the Chair to the fact that the point had been already reserved at a previous stage of the bill, and that he had made it. It could only have been made because it was reserved when that part of the bill was reached. It was first in point of fact, and so the gentleman from Maine would have been in order in reference to the reservation of the point of order by the gentleman from Maine. Therefore, coming first in time, it is first to be considered.

That is the point made by the gentleman from Maine, and it seems to me there can be no possible answer to it. Therefore the Chair should decide the point on the first words which limited these compensations.

Mr. BLAND. I want to ask unanimous consent that this matter be postponed until we get through with the bill.

Mr. PAYSON. I object.

Mr. BLAND. But the point of order is reserved.

Mr. CRAIN. I object; let us finish it now.

Mr. PAYSON. If I can have the attention of the committee for a moment I should be glad to be heard on this point. It seems to me that this matter is very simple when the parliamentary condition of the question is fairly understood by the committee. If I understand that parliamentary situation—and if I am incorrect in my impression I shall be very glad if the Chair will correct me—all points of order originally were reserved upon the bill in a general way, and subsequently the point of order was specially reserved by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] as against the provision embodied in the first paragraph of the bill making the payments therein contained "in full compensation" for the salary. Do I understand the matter as the Chair does?

Mr. MCKENNA. Will the gentleman allow me to correct him? There is just where he makes his first mistake.

Mr. PAYSON. If I am in error in that respect I would be glad to be corrected by the Chair, because all of the discussion is based upon the assumption that the gentleman from Minnesota reserved the point of order against the words to which I have referred, "in full compensation."

Mr. MCKENNA. The point of order was made directly against it, not reserved. I repeat that is where the gentleman makes his mistake.

Mr. PAYSON. I should be glad to have a statement from the Chair.

Mr. MCKENNA. The Chair said when the point of order was made directly that it was not, in the opinion of the Chair, the proper place to make it; but that when some point in the bill was reached to which it was applicable the point could be made and would be decided. This is the first paragraph, as I understand it, to which it is applicable.

Mr. PAYSON. Well, that is the same thing.

Mr. MCKENNA. No, sir; I think not. As the gentleman states it they are substantially different.

Mr. PAYSON. Now, I desire to call the attention of the Chair to the question of the reservation of this point of order and its bearing upon the remainder of the bill to which it is applicable. It is utterly immaterial whether or not the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] interposed his objection prior to or subsequent to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN], and for the reason that the provision for the payment of the salary of the First Auditor is the first provision to which the point of order may properly be applied, in my judgment, in consequence of this language in the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. MCKENNA. Now you are right.

Mr. PAYSON. Now, the Chair having reserved its decision on the point of order as against this provision in the first paragraph of the bill, to wit, the words "in full compensation," when a paragraph in the bill is reached against which that point of order can be made, the Chair is bound to consider all pending questions in reference to it. And if the decision of the question of order raised by the gentleman from Texas would be affected one way or the other by the point of order as against the first paragraph of the bill, then I hold that the Chair is bound to decide that question of order on the first paragraph of the bill, whether he be specially urged to do so or not; because, Mr. Chairman, if the provision of the bill—in full compensation—is retained in the bill, the decision of the Supreme Court to which the Chair has referred, and which is on the table before him, applies to the provision. If the words "in full compensation" are stricken from the bill, then the decision of the point of order would manifestly be based on a different ground, and another phase is presented. In either condition, therefore, I hold that the Chair is bound to decide the question of order which was reserved.

Mr. MCKENNA. I repeat that it was not reserved.

Mr. PAYSON. The Chair is bound to decide the point of order as a preliminary proceeding to the decision of any such question of order as the gentleman from Texas presents.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that we may avoid any controversy about what is an issue of fact by postponing this question until we reach the next item to which the point of order is applicable.

Mr. PAYSON. But this item is under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has disposed of the item so far as the amount is concerned.

Mr. PAYSON. Then let me make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PAYSON. Is it not in order when any point of order is reserved upon a paragraph that has been passed to ask the Chairman to rule upon the reserved question?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has just stated that he did not care to get into any controversy on a question of facts. The Chair did not understand it to be a reservation of a ruling upon the paragraph.

Mr. PAYSON. Does the Chair understand that any point of order is reserved?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the question of order was raised by the gentleman from Minnesota, but stated in response to the point that it would be better to leave it until some point was reached in the bill to which it applied.

Mr. PAYSON. I am not asking the judgment of the Chair as to what would be better, but I am asking as a matter of right, in order to avoid complications later on in the bill, as to whether it is not in order for any member of the committee to ask the judgment of the Chair, as a matter of right, at any time in the consideration of a bill, upon any reserved point of order? Upon that point I would like very much to have a statement from the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not consider this to be a matter of a reservation of the point of order——

Mr. TAULBEE. I desire to rise——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will suspend for the present. The Chair did not understand it to be a reservation of the question of order. But the gentleman from Minnesota made a point of order on the first paragraph, and the Chair, by way of suggestion, intimated that it might be better to leave that matter alone until some point in the bill was reached where the question in connection with the language there used might be brought up on a point of order.

Mr. WEAVER. I call for the regular order.

Mr. CRAIN. I desire to make a statement. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] will admit he made his point of order after mine was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to conclude his statement about this matter.

Mr. DINGLEY. If the Chair will permit me, I call attention to the fact that the point of order had been reserved on the words "in full compensation;" and when the gentleman from Texas raised the point of order as to this salary of $3,600 I suggested that the point of order which had been reserved should be decided first.

The CHAIRMAN. The question of order was decided in regard to the amendment of the gentleman from Texas; and the Chair thinks the committee may get out of any embarrassment in this matter, inasmuch as there are several other paragraphs to which this question would apply.

Mr. CRAIN. I ask for a vote on my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN].

Mr. DINGLEY. I would like to have it reported.

The CHAIRMAN. It is an amendment simply restoring the salary to the amount fixed by law.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is, to $4,000?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. DINGLEY. I want to say a word on that amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. I object to debate.

Mr. DINGLEY. I wish to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether $3,600 has not been the amount for ten years?

Mr. RANDALL. For twelve years.

Mr. DINGLEY. This is practically a proposition to pay this officer a salary of $400 more than has been paid hitherto.

Mr. CRAIN. And it is in accordance with existing law. The Committee on Appropriations have reduced the amount $400 below what is provided by law. I call for the regular order.

Mr. DINGLEY. I believe I have the floor, and I want to say, in order that the House may fully understand the question, that there are twenty or thirty officers for whom a salary of $4,000 is provided by law, but for more than ten years the amount appropriated and paid has been only $3,600. I remember some years ago, when we reached one of these items, the amount being $3,600, I made the point of order that the law provided $4,000. The point of order was overruled and the House voted to retain the salary at $3,600. I think we should either retain all those officers at $3,600 or advance them all to $4,000.

Mr. CANNON. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CRAIN. I make the point of order that the committee was dividing and debate is not in order.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman from Texas was heard on this question, and I want to be heard for a moment also.

I want the committee to understand what this proposition involves. I hold in my hand a list of all the officials for whom appropriations are recommended in this bill less than what is provided by law. The amount in the aggregate reaches $67,102. I want the committee to understand another very important fact that in this statement there are office-holders who receive salaries to-day and under the terms of this bill in the aggregate $8,200 more than is provided by law.

Let me give them to you. These Auditors were reduced ten years ago from $4,000 to $3,600. The Democratic economists did this in the Forty-fourth Congress, and the papers were full of illustrations showing the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL], as a great economist, in the act of making this legislation, cutting down the salaries of wicked Republican office-holders.

Mr. RANDALL. And I have not changed since.

Mr. CANNON. Since that time the gentleman from Pennsylvania has sat still in this House and seen creep back gradually restorations of the salaries of some of these men, but not as to the salaries of others. Let me give you a few of them. The Public Printer, according to the recommendation in this bill, will receive $500 more than the law provides; the Assistant Secretary of State, $1,000 more; the chief clerk in the State Department, $250 more; the receiving teller of the Assistant Treasurer, $200; the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, $1,000 more; the Commissioner of Pensions, $1,000 more; the chief clerk in the Land Office, $200 more; and so on.

I do not say they are getting too much; I do not think they are getting too much; but I want the committee to understand what the bill does as to all these salaries, so that you can act understandingly. If the gentlemen on the other side of the House have a mind to come and say now that the cut of ten or twelve years ago was ill advised, and that the campaign was mere thunder without any lightning, well and good; let them say it.

Now, before I sit down I call attention to one additional fact, namely, that the purchasing power of a dollar in the necessities of life is greater to-day than it was when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] won his victory throughout this country upon that reduction of $67,000. But, Mr. Chairman, I do not say that these men are getting enough. There is the law on the one hand, there is the practice of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the Democratic party on the other, which, however, is honored in the breach along the line as to many of these officials who are getting now $1,000 more than the law provides, and some of whom by this law get less than the law provides. It is your administration. They are your officials from the party standpoint, although officials for us all in point of fact, and it is for you to do what you please.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I am quite certain that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] does not desire to do me any injustice, and he will remember very distinctly—what I have a right to say here—that my action in the Committee on Appropriations as long as he and I have been there together has been almost uniformly in harmony with my action on this floor during the first session of the Forty-fourth Congress, with one exception, I think, where the salary of an officer of the Treasury Department was increased $400 upon the recommendation of four Secretaries of the Treasury. Therefore if there are increases of salaries in this bill, I do not think I ought to be held responsible, because I have been repeatedly outvoted in that connection in the committee, and I do not know whether the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] was not one of those who helped to outvote me. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. I do not think I was.

Mr. McCREARY. Mr. Chairman, this debate has taken a very wide range, and it is well, I think, for us now to come back to the real question before the committee. As I understand it, the bill reported by the Appropriations Committee did provide $3,600 as the salary of the First Auditor, and upon a point of order that has been stricken out, and now the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN] offers the amendment to give the Auditor $4,000, for the next year. Now, why does the gentleman from Texas offer the amendment to give the Auditor a salary of $4,000 for the ensuing year? He offers it, sir, because it is in accordance with the general law. I have in my hand the eighteenth volume of the Statutes, on page 397 of which I find it provided that the First Auditor of the Treasury shall receive a salary of $4,000.

Mr. RANDALL. That is conceded.

Mr. McCREARY. Now, Mr. Chairman, if we do not adopt this amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas, where does that leave the First Auditor? It leaves him without any salary.

Mr. FORNEY. It leaves him where he ought to be, without any salary.

Mr. CRAIN. He is just as well worth his salary as you are worth yours.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise——

Mr. McCREARY. I hold, Mr. Chairman, that it is the duty of the Appropriations Committee, under the general law, to bring in a bill making an appropriation for each officer authorized by law, and when you leave an officer without a salary at all you have not complied with the general law. Therefore, sir, I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FORNEY. But we have complied with the law that has existed ever since the Forty-fourth Congress. We have given him the same salary that the First Auditor has received in every Congress for the last ten years.

Mr. HOLMAN. For the last twelve years.

Mr. McCREARY. I want to say to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] that I do not blame him or the committee at all. I am not here to blame the committee. True, the committee did bring in a proposition to give this officer a salary of $3,600, but that is not in accordance with the general law. They have brought in a proposition which they say is in accordance with what has been done for several years back, and that is undoubtedly the case; but here we have the rule of the House and there we have the general law, and the proposition of the committee is not in accordance with the law. I do not blame the committee, but I hold that it is our duty as members of this House to stand by the general law and to stand by the parliamentary law which governs this House.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand that there is any question of order remaining to be decided at this time; but if there is, I hope the Chair will make the announcement and that this committee will deliver a vote which will clear the atmosphere of all the confusion that has arisen in this case.

As I understand the matter, these gentlemen whose friends here are clamorous for an increase of salaries accepted their offices—not only accepted but sought them—knowing that for several years past the appropriation bills had fixed the salaries at the rates contained in this bill. If there ever was an implied contract between appointee and Government it exists in this case. The effort made here is simply to increase the salaries of these officers by a technical ruling, which is forced upon the Chairman of the committee. Now the Chair has ruled correctly, and the effect of his ruling has been to strike out words changing a salary and to leave in the bill words providing that the sums appropriated herein shall be compensation in full. Thus the matter will stand all the way through, and if the friends of these officers insist on having the diminished salaries stricken out, I hope the Committee of the Whole will take them at their word and leave out the salaries.

Several MEMBERS. That is right.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is apparent that this law fixing the salary of the First Auditor at $4,000 per annum has been upon the statute-book for more than twelve years, and, as my colleague from Illinois has just stated, the Democratic party of the Forty-fourth Congress went before the country upon the issue of representing an economical principle in cutting down this salary from $4,000 to $3,600, and in making similar reductions of other salaries.

My colleague has expressed surprise at the attempt to restore the salary to $4,000. I confess I do not share that surprise. To my mind the case is perfectly clear; in other words, this is an illustration of the old couplet—

> When the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be;
> But when the devil grew well, the devil a monk was he.

[Laughter.]

The Democratic party in the Forty-fourth Congress was sick; that party desired to come into power, and it commenced clamoring for a reduction of the salaries of all these officers, from the First Auditor all along the line. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] was then in power; and, as he has just stated, he has been consistent from first to last. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania is no longer the Democratic party. A new generation of Democratic politicians has come upon the field, and in view of the restoration of their party to power they desire to have these salaries appropriated up to the highest legal limit, as indicated by various speeches which have been made here this morning.

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Chairman, when the present office-holders——

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I understand that the Committee of the Whole had commenced voting upon this amendment, and I make the point that discussion is out of order.

Mr. HERBERT. The discussion has been going on for some time, and if we had commenced voting that proceeding has been waived, and I am not to be taken off the floor by any such point.

Mr. Chairman, when these office-holders——

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, my question of order has not been decided.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was made, but the Chair did not understand it was insisted on at the time.

Mr. HERBERT. I hope the Chair will not take me off the floor.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will have to sustain the point of order. The question is on the amendment——

Mr. HERBERT. Does the Chair rule that I am out of order after all the discussion which has been going on for half an hour?

The CHAIRMAN. The discussion proceeded without the point of order being pressed. It is now insisted upon, and the Chair is compelled to rule upon it. The Chair has no desire to cut off the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama; but the point of order being insisted upon, the question is now on the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. CRAIN].

The question being taken on the amendment, there were—ayes 18, noes 78.

Mr. CRAIN. No quorum.

A MEMBER (to Mr. CRAIN). Do not raise that point.

Mr. CRAIN. I will raise it. This officer is entitled to what the law allows him.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. CRAIN and Mr. FORNEY were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 64, noes 99.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask unanimous consent that this salary be put in the bill at $3,600.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that $3,600 be inserted in the bill. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Second Auditor: For Second Auditor, $3,600; deputy auditor, $2,250; six chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; ten clerks of class 4; forty-two clerks of class 3; additional to one clerk of class 4 as disbursing clerk, $200; fifty-five clerks of class 2; forty-eight clerks of class 1; three clerks, at $1,000 each; one messenger; three assistant messengers; eight laborers; and two charwomen; in all, $249,610.

Mr. TAULBEE. I make a point of order upon these words in lines 10 and 11, on page 30:

Four chiefs of division, at $2,000 each.

This is a reduction, I understand, of $100 in each case.

The CHAIRMAN. That paragraph has been passed.

Mr. TAULBEE. I did not so understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read the next paragraph.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to some remarks made on Saturday last by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. ENLOE]. That gentleman challenged me to produce a certain letter which I said had been published, a letter issued on the 6th of October last by the chairman of the State central committee of the Democratic party of Iowa. I desire to have that letter read as part of my remarks.

The Clerk read as follows:

HEADQUARTERS DEMOCRATIC STATE COMMITTEE OF IOWA,
Hawkeye Club Rooms, Des Moines, Iowa, October 6, 1887.

MY DEAR SIR: Our committee is now actively engaged in perfecting our organization, arranging to send speakers, documents, and workers into different parts of the State, more especially in the close counties. You, as an intelligent Democrat, certainly must realize the importance of sustaining us in this work.

As you are receiving some of the fruits of our victory in 1884, I take the liberty to call on you for a voluntary contribution. Such a contribution at this time will be very acceptable and will be instrumental in a large degree in aiding us in paying obligations already contracted and carrying on campaign work that we have laid out.

There is also other important legitimate campaign work that we should do, provided we are furnished the requisite funds. You have undoubtedly observed that the Republican State committee are endeavoring to overwhelm us with speakers and workers, hoping thereby to regain their lost prestige in the State.

While you hold a Federal office it is not expected that you will engage in politics in an offensive way or to the neglect of your official duties; but, in the language of President Cleveland, "individual interest and activity in political affairs are by no means condemned. Office-holders are neither disfranchised nor forbidden the exercise of political privileges."

The question will naturally arise, how much should be contributed. Presidential postmasters are generally contributing from $25 to $50. Fourth-class postmasters, from $2 to $25; railway postal clerks, $10 to $15; members of pension examining boards, $10 to $15; and other Federal office-holders if proportion to the amount of salary received as compared with the officials named above. We make no demands nor assessments. Will you kindly reply to this communication at an early day?

I am, sincerely, yours,

EDW. H. HUNTER, *Chairman.*

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to have that letter published in connection with the recent letter which was sent by Don M. Dickinson, Postmaster-General, to Alexander Charles, of Cedar Rapids, in my district, in which he said that attending conventions and partisan work was not prohibited. And I wish to say, in addition, that this Mr. Charles who received this letter from Mr. Dickinson was secretary for the Democratic party in Iowa in the campaign of 1886, and that it would be as utterly impossible to tie the tide as to prevent Mr. Charles being an active partisan in any political campaign. These assessments if paid, and I presume they were, gave that party a campaign fund of from sixty to one hundred thousand dollars for the campaign of 1887.

I publish this letter in order to show the construction placed upon the duties of the Democratic office-holder, as shown by this letter of Mr. Hunter, are very similar to those permitted by the letter of Mr. Dickinson, in which the only restraint upon the Democratic officer is one of taste merely.

Mr. WEAVER. Well, what is there wrong about that?

Mr. KERR. The gentleman from Iowa asks what there is wrong about that. I do not think there is anything very wrong about it, only it ought to be considered in connection with the recent increase of salaries by the majority of this House and in respect to the false pretense which has been kept up by the Democratic party in this country since the inauguration of Mr. Cleveland, as it was in the campaign in which he was the candidate for President, in which there was the same profession of devotion to civil service-reform and universal denunciation of Republicans for favoring practices that they now follow without hesitation.

Mr. HOLMES. I will take the floor and yield my five minutes to my colleague.

Mr. KERR. I only wish one minute more in which to complete what I intended to say.

Mr. HOLMES. I will move to strike out the last two words, and yield the floor to my colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] on the right of the Chair was first recognized.

Mr. WEAVER. I have no objection to my colleague proceeding for a minute longer. I will yield one minute to him for that purpose out of my time.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say further in connection with this matter that the internal-revenue offices of the State of Iowa are held by men who run the Democratic party in my district; and that those officers, their deputies, and their clerks, who are Government officers by appointment of the President of the United States, do more to control conventions and in getting the people out than any others in my district.

Mr. MCKINNEY. And so they ought to.

Mr. KERR. The gentleman from New Hampshire, another civil-service reformer, says it is all right. I am glad these pretenses are being brought home to men on the other side of the House, and gentlemen like the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WHITTHORNE] are saying they have no regard for any such doctrine. I ask that the country's attention may be called to it in order that the Mugwumps in New York, who determined the last election and gave the Presidency to the present incumbent of the Presidential chair, may not again deceive the American people through any false pretenses.

Mr. WEAVER. I wish to say in reply to my colleague there is nothing in the civil-service rule or law that prohibits a Federal office-holder making a voluntary contribution to the party to which he belongs. Nor is there any impropriety in the chairman of a State committee writing a letter to Federal office-holders informing them if they are willing to contribute he would like to receive such contribution. And it comes with bad grace from the Republican party, which has in the last twenty-five years assessed every Federal office-holder and every State officer in Iowa peremptorily, and compelled them to make contributions under the penalty of quitting their offices unless they did—I say it comes with bad grace from the Republican party after such a record to make the objection they now do. In my judgment it is right to have these officers inform them they may or may not contribute, just as they please, to the expenses of their party at the election. It is right, and I defend it here without regard to the civil-service law. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. STEELE. Does the gentleman say it is right to tell these men their political heads will be cut off if they do not?

Mr. WEAVER. Certainly not; and there is nothing in the letter referred to of the kind indicated by the gentleman from Indiana. If I had the control of the machine, and had the authority, I would be far from retaining any one if he would not contribute his fair share of the election expenses. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. I renew the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rather like this "experience" meeting we are having here. I suppose our friends on the other side would call it a "love feast." I am glad to know that at last they have been permitted to testify according to their loves. I have heard in former years so much of hypocrisy upon this subject come from that side of the House, and I have also heard upon the stump so much of hypocrisy during the last campaign from that side of the House, emanating from their great chief, that I am very glad now to know they are testifying according to their loves.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] first says that he thinks it but right and proper that a Democratic official should have the right to contribute or not, just as he pleases, and without compulsion; and then goes on to say that if he had his way, no man should be appointed who would not contribute. Now, everybody who can read between the lines of these circulars knows that when a circular comes to an office-holder he understands, whatever its language may be, or what-

ever may appear upon its face, that he must contribute if he expects to hold his place. I am frank to say that I do not believe it is right; I believe it is bad policy, and when you made the allegation against the Republican party, and when in former years the Republican party made it against you when you were in power, there was some foundation in what was alleged, and there is some foundation to-day in what is alleged. True, an American citizen ought to have the right to contribute of his own free will to uphold those principles and policies that are close to his heart. Yet the contribution should not be wrung from him by a polite threat which amounts to "Your money or your office."

The mask is now thrown off, and Democrats and Mugwumps, under the lead of Cleveland, being in possession, propose to utilize all the Federal machinery in every way possible to stay in. And it is at least some gratification to know that in the campaign upon us this summer and fall that will be honest, or at least free from hypocrisy, touching these and, I hope, other matters.

Mr. BLAND. I want to move to postpone action on these political matters until the campaign begins. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON. Oh, the gentleman need not be afraid, he will have enough of this when the campaign does begin.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MCCREARY having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, a message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution (S. R. 87) authorizing and directing the payment of salaries of the officers and employés of Congress for the month of May, 1888.

Also, that the Senate disagreed to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1851) providing for an international marine conference to secure greater safety for life and property at sea, and asked a conference with the House thereon, and had appointed Mr. EDMUNDS, Mr. FRYE, and Mr. MORGAN as conferees on the part of the Senate.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Committee of the Whole resumed its session.

Mr. COMPTON. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to say a word upon this subject, but when the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] takes up the question of hypocrisy and charges it upon the Democratic party, as well as Democrats of this House, I feel, sir, that I owe it to my party and to myself and to his party to retaliate by saying that if there is a concern within the limits of this country, and a record made by any party within its history, which shows, when its condition is compared with its professions, hypocrisy and deceit and everything else unbecoming to a party, it is the record of the Republican party upon the question of civil-service reform.

Now, let us look back for a moment and make a little investigation. Where did this new love of which the gentleman from Illinois speaks—where did this grand spirit which took possession of the American people and demanded this civil-service reform come from, and when did it come?

Mr. STEELE. It came from the Democratic party.

Mr. COMPTON. No, sir; it came from the fact that, under Republican administrations of this Government, the civil service had become so notoriously corrupt and vile that public sentiment rose demanding reform, which demand resulted in the passing of the so-called civil-service law.

Mr. STRUBLE. Why do you denominate it the "so-called civil-service law?"

Mr. COMPTON. Now, Mr. Chairman, as is so often the case, public sentiment ran wild upon this subject, and out of that grew your civil-service law. I have no concealment. The hour never has been, from the time that bill was first put upon the Calendar and I read it, that I have not been heartily opposed to it. I have said so here and elsewhere. I am opposed to it on principle.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. COMPTON. No, sir. In the last twenty-four hours you had an evidence of what we said would be the result of the civil-service law. Here they are to-day demanding—what? Demanding additional clerks, demanding additional appropriations, enlarging their power; and the other result will come inevitably as this has done, namely, a civil pension-list, or you will fail to march up to the true consequences of the act itself.

Let there be no mistake about this. I speak for myself and not for my party. I say to you to-day I oppose the thing on principle. I will allow no man to say to me that he is more honestly in favor of an honest administration of the civil service than I am. I claim to be as much in favor of an honest administration of the civil service as any man living in this land. But I do not believe this is the road to reach that result. And I say to the Republican party that when they shall have done works mete for repentance, when they shall have wiped out their record while they had control of the Government in the matter of the administration of the civil service, when they shall have done away with that blot on the escutcheon of the country, men blazoning it from one end of the country to the other in the campaign which resulted in the seating of Hayes, when civil-service reform was the issue and it was said that in the event of seating Hayes and the continuance in power of the Republican party they would reform the civil service—let them show that they have kept faith and been true to their promises before they charge hypocrisy on my party; and let them wipe out from their records the fact that every scoundrel whose hand was black with perjury and with forgery, and by virtue of whose conduct Hayes was seated, was rewarded for his services. Not till then can the Republican party claim to be the party in favor of civil-service reform. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RANDALL. Now that we have had each side heard respecting civil service, I trust that civil service will be promoted by the prompt passage of this bill.

Mr. CANNON. I desire to say one word. I never do a member on this floor an injustice by a remark that I do not make haste to rectify it at the first opportunity, and so now I wish to say to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. COMPTON] that I did accuse the Democratic party of hypocrisy in its professions concerning the civil service, including the Executive, clear down. That was too broad a statement. The State of Maryland, so far as the Democratic party is concerned, does not deserve to be so accused, because I know in Maryland they have spit upon, denounced, and trampled under foot the civil-service law in a defiant, unlawful, but manly way right under the nose of the President. The chiefs of the party in Maryland, standing highest in his counsels while he was professing devotion to the civil-service law, were spitting upon it in the presence of the whole country, and with impunity. So I except the Democratic party in Maryland from my charge of hypocrisy. [Applause.]

Mr. PETERS. I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking a question. I would like to know if the appropriation made for the Second Auditor's office is equal to the estimate made by that official?

Mr. FORNEY. Yes. It is made in accordance with the wishes of the Second Auditor in every particular.

Mr. PETERS. Then if there is not sufficient force to bring up the work of that department the responsibility rests upon the head of that department himself.

Mr. FORNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. PETERS. I want to say in relation to all these investigations as to bounty and back pay that office is far behind. It is impossible to get a claim through and allowed by that department inside of nine to twelve months. It was for that reason that I called attention to the inquiry if the appropriation was equal to the estimate. And I now understand if there be any delay in that department the party who made the estimate must be held responsible. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

The Clerk read the following paragraph:

Fourth Auditor: For the Fourth Auditor, $3,600; deputy auditor, $2,250; three chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; two clerks of class 4; eleven clerks of class 3; seven clerks of class 2; seven clerks of class 1; three clerks, at $1,000 each; five clerks, at $900 each; two clerks, at $800 each; one assistant messenger, and two laborers; in all, $62,390.

Mr. FORNEY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 32, in line 14, strike out "eleven" and insert "thirteen;" strike out "seven" and insert "eight;" in line 15, strike out "seven" and insert "nine," and, in line 18, strike out "sixty-two" and insert "sixty-nine."

So that it will read "thirteen clerks of class 3, eight clerks of class 2, nine clerks of class 1; in all $69,390.

Mr. FORNEY. A recent decision of the Supreme Court requires this additional force.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of construction of standard weights and measures: For construction and verification of standard weights and measures, including metric standards for the custom-houses, other offices of the United States, and for the several States, and mural standards of length in Washington, D. C., the following, while actually employed, namely, one adjuster, at $5 per day; one mechanician, at $4 per day; one watchman; in all $3,546.

Mr. FORNEY. I desire to offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 40, strike out all after the word "Columbia," in line 21, down to and including line 25, and in lieu thereof insert "one adjuster, $1,500; one mechanician, $1,250; in all $3,470."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Director of the Mint: For one Director, $4,500; examiner, $2,300; computer, $2,200; assayer, $2,200; adjuster of accounts, $2,000; two clerks of class 3; two clerks of class 2, one of whom shall be a stenographer; three clerks of class 1; one translator, $1,200; one clerk, at $2,000; one copyist; one messenger; assistant in laboratory, $1,000; one helper, at $500; in all $28,240.

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk an amendment which I desire to offer to that paragraph.

The Clerk read the amendment, as follows:

Page 41, strike out "three," in line 18, and insert "five," and in line 19, strike out "two" and insert "five."

Page 42, line 3, strike out "two" and insert "seven."

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Chairman, these proposed changes are in accordance with the estimates contained in the Book of Estimates, and

also with the recommendations of the Director of the Mint, and they also have the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury. I ask the Clerk to read what I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Extract from letter of Director of the Mint of October 10, 1887.]

To the Secretary of the Treasury:

1. Bureau of the Mint: Increases have been submitted of $200 and $300, respectively, in the salaries of the examiner and computer, so as to fix the salary of each at $2,500 per annum, the same as in the case of the chief clerk of the assay office at New York, and of the principal mints. The efficiency of both officers, each in his own division of highly technical work, has been acquired by many years of arduous and faithful service.

[Extract from letter of Director of the Mint of October 22, 1886.]

To the Secretary of the Treasury:

I recommend that the salaries of the examiner and computer of this bureau be fixed at $2,500 per annum. In mint affairs these officials are to be regarded as experts, whose present salaries are not only unduly small, but are less than the salaries of the principal clerks of the mints, whose responsibility is far less.

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF THE MINT,
Washington, D. C., March 11, 1886.

SIR: I have the honor to invite your attention to my recommendation of November 5, 1885, namely, that the salaries of the examiner of mints and the computer of bullion of the bureau be increased from $2,300 and $2,200, respectively, and fixed at $2,500 per annum.

The duties of these officers of the Department are technical and arduous, and require such a knowledge of the business of the mints and assay offices as can be acquired only through experience and long service.

Both of the officers referred to have honorably served the Bureau of the Mint from near its organization, and for still longer periods in the Department.

The compensation recommended is the same as that received by the principal clerks of the larger institutions under the jurisdiction of this bureau.

I have the honor to urge upon your favorable consideration that this matter be brought to the attention of Congress.

Very respectfully,

JAMES P. KIMBALL,
Director of the Mint.

Hon. DANIEL MANNING,
Secretary of the Treasury.

[Extract from letter of Director of the Mint of November 5, 1885.]

To the Secretary of the Treasury:

A decrease of $1,000 is submitted in the estimate for the expenses of the Bureau of the Mint, from the discontinuance of one clerk. An increase of $200 in the salaries of the examiner and $300 in that of the computer is submitted so as to render the salaries of both these faithful and experienced officers $2,500.

Very respectfully,

JAS. P. KIMBALL, *Director.*

Mr. FORNEY. Mr. Chairman, I make no point upon those amendments. The Director of the Mint was very anxious that the increase should be made, but the committee did not feel that they had authority to make it. The committee had not the power, but of course the House has the power.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FORNEY. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FORAN], who is not present at this moment, desires to offer an amendment to this paragraph, and I ask unanimous consent that he may be permitted to return to it for that purpose.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Supervising Surgeon-General Marine Hospital Service: For Supervising Surgeon-Genera', $4,000: one surgeon, $3,000; one passed assistant surgeon, $1,800; one clerk, $1,800; five clerks, at $1,600 each; one clerk, $1,200; one hospital steward (employed as chemist), $1,200; six copyists; one messenger, at $600; one laborer, $480; and one laborer, $360; in all, $27,840, the same to be paid from the permanent appropriations for the Marine Hospital Service.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to that paragraph.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 43, line 3, strike out "one." at the end of the line, and insert "two." Add "s" to the word "laborer," in the beginning of the fourth line. In lines 4 and 5, strike out "and one laborer, $360."

Mr. RANDALL. I make the point of order on that amendment.

Mr. FORNEY. Yes, Mr. Chairman, the point of order is made on that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The same point was made the other day and was overruled.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to state that it is perfectly competent under the rule to increase or decrease the number of employés in any of the Departments upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say for the information of the committee that the other day I went carefully over this bill and found at the end of it a provision that where the pay of a laborer is not specifically stated in the bill it shall be $660, or, in round numbers, at the rate of $2 a day. I also found it provided in other places in the bill that the pay of some laborers should be $460 and of others $380. I draughted a series of amendments applicable to all those cases, and I offered one on Saturday, which was voted down. These amendments provide for transferring all the $360 men to the $480 class; and the reasons which I gave in support of the amendment I offered the other day I reiterate now. It is only a dollar a day that the bill proposes to give to these men, and the amendment would give them less than $1.50 a day for every working day. In opposition to my amendment it was stated that no estimates of this kind had been submitted. My answer to that is that the men occupying these very subordinate positions never get the ear of the gentleman high above them who makes out the estimates, but their complaints have come to other committees of this House, and these men have stated to us, and we believe it to be true, that it is impossible for them to live and support their families on $360 a year. There are only about a dozen of them included in the bill, and this good and great Government will spend only about a thousand dollars more for the next fiscal year if these amendments are adopted. Only about a thousand dollars more, and these men will be to that extent relieved from the most pinching kind of poverty.

It was also said here that men in private occupations, farm hands, receive less compensation than the bill allows these laborers; but it must not be forgotten that living in Washington is very expensive as compared with country places. House rent is double and treble what it is in rural communities, and these men have not the opportunity, which farm hands have, to buy their provisions at farmers' prices, but are compelled to purchase of the corner grocer at the highest retail prices. I happen to know from direct information that a number of men thus situated are on the point of actual starvation, and I stand here to-day to ask that this slight increase in their wages be given, and that this Government shall no longer set the example of paying less than a dollar a day for its labor. On the way to the Capitol this morning I interviewed a man who was working in the grounds. I asked him, "What is your pay?" He said, "Nominally I get $1.25 a day, but I am on only half the time, and they take out rainy days from that."

Sixty-two and a half cents a day on an average, and wet days deducted even from that! I say that it is not right. It may be economy, but it is not statesmanship, to crowd labor down to a point like that; and in the long run it is not even economy.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. I move to strike out the last word, for I want to say a little more on this question.

That this policy is not statesmanship is evident from other parts of the bill. In looking over the bill I find an appropriation for the Public Printer $500 per annum more than the statute law gives him; and that has been passed unobjected to. I find an appropriation for the Commissioner of Indian Affairs $1,000 in excess of what the statute law gives him. I find an appropriation for the Commissioner of Pensions $1,000 in excess of what the statute law gives him. I find an appropriation for the Deputy Commissioner of Pensions $1,100 in excess of what the statute law gives him.

If this committee can in these instances go above the point provided by the statute law, why may it not extend its helping hand to these unfortunate men who are so low in the scale of public employment?

Mr. RANDALL. Just one word. The Public Printer in this bill receives the same salary which he received last year. The Senate of the United States, during the time when Mr. Rounds held the office, in the Forty-seventh Congress, I think, insisted upon the salary being fixed at this amount. As to the salary of the Commissioner of Pensions, that was raised some time ago, and the committee simply appropriated what the officer had been receiving.

Mr. FORNEY. In addition to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] has just stated, I wish to say that the money from which this payment is made is a trust fund. The gentleman will observe at the end of the paragraph the words "this sum to be paid from the permanent appropriations for the Marine Hospital Service." The money for the purposes contemplated in this paragraph is raised by levying a tax or assessment upon the poor, unfortunate sailors, who receive even less money than the persons whom the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] is so anxious to provide for. I think, therefore, it would be wrong to make the increase proposed. We are not appropriating the money of this great Government, but money raised from the poor sailors. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. BUCHANAN. This amendment raises the wages of only one laborer, and I am sure that no sailor with a sailor's heart would object to it.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in view of what was stated the other day upon a question similar to this, I wish to say one word. If there be a man, with a family or without a family, who is working for the Government for $360 a year, and who in return for that salary puts in all his time, I am frank to say that we are paying such a one less than the ordinary pay for a laborer. If, however, the person employed at this rate be a boy, or if he be a man who gives only part of his time to the work of the Government, having the remainder of the time as his own, and suffering no deduction of pay because working only part of the time, then this compensation may be sufficient. I do not know what the facts are. These estimates, like all other estimates, are made by the heads of bureaus or divisions, who certify them to the Secretary of the Treasury. If the facts which the gentleman from New Jersey supposes to exist are really the facts, then this employé ought to receive larger wages. What the fact is I do not know.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. BUCHANAN, it was not agreed to; there being—ayes 39, noes 55.

Mr. LAWLER. I move that the pay of the laborer named in the pending paragraph be fixed at the rate of $2 a day.

Mr. FORNEY. This money does not come from the funds of the Government, but is paid by the sailors. If it were paid from Government funds, the gentleman's proposition might be all right.

Mr. LAWLER. I take it upon myself to say that if the truth were known it would be found that the laborer put down here at the lowest compensation is doing, most likely, the hardest labor in the institution.

Mr. FORNEY. Will the gentleman from Illinois inform us what this laborer does?

Mr. LAWLER. I ask the gentleman who reported this bill to state what this laborer does.

Mr. FORNEY. The Supervising Surgeon-General, Dr. Hamilton, has stated that this is all these laborers ought to receive. We give him in this bill every laborer he asks for and the amount that he asks for each. He is certainly disposed to take care of the interests of the institution. There may be some old lady or some boy who performs these duties as laborer. In that case, of course, the pay ought not to be "$2 a day and roast beef." [Laughter.]

Mr. LAWLER. The gentleman's information is not satisfactory. The very officer whom he has cited as making recommendations on this subject to the Committee on Appropriations recommends very gracefully that his own salary be fixed at $4,000 a year.

Mr. FORNEY. If the gentleman is not satisfied on that point, let him move to cut the salary down.

Mr. LAWLER. I am not asking to cut down salaries. My position is that $1 a day is not enough for a man with a family to live on in a city like this.

Mr. FORNEY. This laborer may be a boy.

Mr. LAWLER. I claim that now is a proper time for this House to increase items of this kind, and not be content with merely accepting the recommendation of a gentleman who asks that for his own salary $4,000 a year be appropriated. In the face of that recommendation in his own behalf he asks that this laborer be allowed but $1 a day.

I assume that gentlemen of the House, in a matter of this kind, mean to do justice. No one of us can refuse to admit that it is impossible for a man to live on $1 a day in this city. I am following on this bill a general principle. I do not think that any man in the employ of the Government to-day ought to be asked to live on a smaller sum than $2 a day.

We are told by men who are provided for in this bill that they can not get along on $2,800 and $2,200, and that is the ground upon which they ask for an increase, and yet when we ask in a purely humanitarian point of view that these laborers shall receive $2 a day objection is at once raised that it is wrong. I wish to say to gentlemen on this side of the House, as well as to gentlemen on the other side of the House, that if they really meant what they have said in their speeches, then they ought to vote for my amendment. I insist for one on making the wages of these laborers $2 a day.

Mr. FORNEY. This comes out of the sailors' fund.

The amendment was disagreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the assistant treasurer at Boston: For assistant treasurer, $5,000; for chief clerk, $2,500; paying teller, $2,500; assistant paying teller, $2,200; vault clerk, $2,000; receiving teller, $2,000; first book-keeper, $1,800; second book-keeper, $1,400; specie clerk, $1,800; assistant specie clerk, $1,500; money clerk, $1,500; coupon clerk and redemption clerk, at $1,400 each; receipt clerk and general clerk, at $1,200 each; assistant redemption clerk, $1,100; three clerks at $1,000 each; one clerk, $840; messenger and chief watchman, $1,060; two watchmen and janitors at $850 each; in all, $37,060.

Mr. FORNEY. I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 48, in line 2, strike out "two" and insert "three," and in line 4 strike out "and sixty" and insert "nine hundred and ten;" so it will read: "$37,910."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of assistant treasurer at Chicago: For assistant treasurer, $4,500; cashier, $2,500; paying teller, $1,800; book-keeper and receiving teller, at $1,500 each; three coin, coupon, and currency clerks, at $1,500 each; five clerks, $1,200 each; one messenger, $840; one janitor, $600; and three watchmen, $720 each; in all, $25,900.

Mr. LAWLER. In the Forty-ninth Congress efforts were made to increase this salary to $5,000 per annum, but they did not succeed. I now move that this salary be made $5,000.

The amendment was disagreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of assistant treasurer at New Orleans: For assistant treasurer, $4,500; cashier, $2,250; receiving-teller, $2,000; book-keeper, $1,500; one clerk, at $1,200; one coin and redemption clerk, $1,200; two clerks, at $1,000 each; porter, $500; one day-watchman, at $720; one night-watchman, at $720; in all, $16,590.

Mr. CANNON. I wish to call attention to the fact that here is a salary which has been increased $500 over what it has remained for the last ten years.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman can not hold me responsible for that.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I make the point of order against this salary.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois state that this is an increase of $500 over the present year?

Mr. CANNON. That is my impression.

Mr. RANDALL. That is so.

Mr. CANNON. The law, as I understand it, fixes the salary at $4,000, and this increases it to $4,500. I had the honor a few moments ago to submit some remarks about increasing these salaries beyond what they were fixed at by the Republican party when it was in power in this House.

Mr. FORNEY. What salary is the gentleman talking about?

Mr. CANNON. I am talking about the salary of assistant treasurer at New Orleans. This is an increase over the salary provided in the Forty-fourth Congress, and it has remained at that sum up to this hour. I am not saying this sum should not be $4,500 a year, but merely refreshing the minds of our friends on the other side of the House by calling their attention to the figures included in this bill and to ask them if they can explain to themselves and the country, if they desire to do so, why it is correct to pay the Sixth Auditor $4,000 a year, which is the salary provided by law, and the assistant treasurer at New Orleans $4,500, which is $500 more than is provided by the law.

Mr. FORNEY. The idea was to put the official here on an equality with St. Louis. It was simply an attempt to equalize these salaries, and we followed the Republican precedent for doing that. Philadelphia was put up on a par with Boston for the same reason.

Mr. RANDALL. And I opposed both of them.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been a question of order raised, and the Chair will be glad to have information from the gentleman as to what the law is on this point.

Mr. FORNEY. It is the statute. We have not gone beyond that.

The CHAIRMAN. The amount in the bill, the Chair understands, is in accordance with the general law fixing the salary?

Mr. FORNEY. It is.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. KERR. Then I move to strike out the $500, so as to let the salary stand at $4,000, just as it has been for a number of years.

The question was taken; and the Chair decided that the amendment was adopted.

Mr. GAY. I demand a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 39, noes 32.

Mr. TRACEY. No quorum.

Mr. CLARDY. I would like to have the amendment stated.

The amendment was again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist on the point of order?

Mr. TRACEY. I will withdraw it.

Mr. GAY. I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order being made, the Chair will order tellers.

Mr. GAY and Mr. KERR were appointed tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 53, noes 45.

So (no further count being demanded) the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of assistant treasurer at Philadelphia: For assistant treasurer, $5,000; for cashier and chief clerk, $2,500; book-keeper, $2,500; chief interest clerk and chief registered-interest clerk at $1,900 each; assistant book-keeper, $1,800; coin-teller, $1,700; redemption clerk and assistant coupon clerk, at $1,600 each; assistant registered-interest clerk, $1,500; assistant cashier and assistant coin-teller at $1,400 each; receiving teller, $1,300; assistant receiving teller, $1,200; superintendent, messenger, and chief watchman, $1,100; four female counters at $900 each; seven watchmen at $720 each; in all, $37,040.

Mr. FORNEY. I move to strike out, in line 4, the words "five thousand dollars" and insert "four thousand five hundred dollars." That increase was made on the same principle as the one at New Orleans, and on the same principle I think it should be stricken out as the other was.

Mr. RANDALL. I voted in committee against the increase in both cases.

Mr. FORNEY. This reduces the appropriation to what it is in the current law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of assistant treasurer at St. Louis: For assistant treasurer, $4,500; chief clerk and teller, $2,500; assistant teller, $1,800; book-keeper, $1,500; assistant book-keeper and one clerk, at $1,200 each; assistant coin clerk, at $1,000; messenger, $1,000; three watchmen, at $720 each; in all, $16,860.

Mr. FORNEY. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 52, line 3, after the word "each," insert "one clerk at $1,000," and in line 5, strike out "sixteen" and insert "seventeen."

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of assistant treasurer at San Francisco: For assistant treasurer, $4,500; cashier, $3,000; bookkeeper, $2,500; one chief clerk, $2,400; assistant cashier, receiving-teller, and assistant bookkeeper, at $2,000 each; coin-teller and one clerk, at $1,800 each; one clerk, $1,400; one messenger, $840; and four watchmen, at $720 each; in all, $27,120.

For compensation of special agents to examine the books, accounts, and money on hand at the several subtreasuries and depositaries, including national banks acting as depositaries, under the requirements of section 3649 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, also including examinations of cash accounts at mints, $4,000.

Mr. FORNEY. I move to amend, on page 52, line 24, by striking out "four" and inserting "five." This is recommended by the Department.

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mint at San Francisco, Cal.: For salary of superintendent, $4,500; assayer, melter and refiner, and coiner, at $3,000 each; chief clerk and cashier, $2,500 each; bookkeeper, abstract clerk, weigh clerk, and warrant clerk, assistant assayer, assistant melter and refiner, and assistant coiner, at $2,000 each; register of deposits, $2,000; cashier's clerk, $1,800; assayer's computing clerk, assistant weigh clerk, and superintendent's computing clerk, at $1,600 each; in all, $40,900.

For wages of workmen and adjusters, $170,000.

For incidental and contingent expenses, $40,000.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I desire to insert an amendment after the clause read by the Clerk, so as to precede the appropriations for the various assay offices. This is to provide for an assay office at St. Louis, Mo., which is omitted from the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Assay office at St. Louis, Mo.: For assayer in charge, $2,500; one clerk, $1,000; in all $3,500; for incidental and contingent expenses, including labor, $2,400.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. This, Mr. Chairman, is the present law which the officer in charge of this particular office is endeavoring to amend by omitting to include any appropriations for it. It is very remarkable that while the assay office at St. Louis, established about 1882, has continued year after year to increase its business from about $15,000 in 1882 to about one hundred and twenty-odd thousand dollars now, that notwithstanding this fact we have this same effort made every year to omit it from the appropriation bill. It is most extraordinary. There is no demand for such legislation. It is a matter of great convenience to our people; it serves the miners of New Mexico and Colorado (Southern), is provided for by law, and yet year by year the Representatives from that section must stand up here and demand a restoration for that assay office.

It is a little remarkable to find an officer in one branch of the Government so assiduously endeavoring to cut the throat of one division under him. It may be for the good of the service, but it is the most remarkable case of misplaced energy that I have ever known of in my life. [Laughter.] I repeat, it is the law; the Appropriations Committee should have provided for the law, and if Congress in its wisdom desires to dispense with this important branch of the service there should be a bill introduced in the regular way for a repeal of the law creating the assay office there.

It is in harmony with the decisions of the Chair. I do not understand that the committee object at all to this proposition. They have restored it before. I do not blame the committee for not inserting in the bill what was omitted by the Department. I am certain the House will not permit this injustice to the people of the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. FORNEY. I will read from the report of the Director of the Mint the reasons stated by the Department for the omission of this item:

Whatever may have been the purpose in establishing an assay office in St. Louis, this institution has failed to be of any considerable practical benefit to the mint service. Not being located in a mining section, it has likewise proved of little practical advantage to the mining industry of the United States.

The following table shows the business of the United States assay office at St. Louis since its establishment:

Operations of the United States assay office at St. Louis.

Fiscal year.	Earnings.	Expenditures.	Percentage of expenditures to deposits.
1882	$111.16	*$11,880.65	
1883	414.32	5,372.03	
1884	676.82	5,338.51	
1885	783.65	6,500.01	
1886	703.67	5,381.43	
1887	696.28	5,339.30	
Total	3,385.90	39,811.93	†9.1

*Includes $6,896.11 for fixtures. †Average.

In will be noticed that the value of the deposits during the six years ended June 30, 1887, was $438,041.58, of which the sum of $260,212.85 consisted of deposits of old jewelry, old coin, and miscellaneous material, and only $177,828.73 of new bullion of domestic production. About 60 per cent. of all the deposits consisted of old material of the class mentioned, and only 40 per cent. of new bullion.

The business of the present assay office is mainly of a character which pertains to private refineries, such as are found in all large cities.

The continuance of this assay office has long been considered by this bureau as an expenditure of public money, if not contrary to the purpose for which similar institutions are maintained by the Government, at least as an expenditure without corresponding benefit either to the mining industry or to the mint service of the Republic.

I have therefore deemed it my duty to omit an estimate of appropriations for the fiscal year 1889 for the support of the assay office at St. Louis. And it seems to be my present duty to suggest that the Department take the regular course to recommend that this assay office be abolished.

I do not think we should indulge in that luxury.

Mr. CLARDY. This assay office was established, as has been stated by the gentleman from Alabama, in 1882 through the intelligent and well-directed effort of my colleague [Mr. BLAND]. At each session of Congress since that time an appropriation has been made for its maintenance, not always, however, at the instance of the Committee on Appropriations. The omission of the item from the present bill is, I presume, pursuant to the suggestion, as has been said, of the Director of the Mint, which accompanies the annual report of the Secretary. This is not the first time that that officer has asked that that appropriation be withheld from this office and that the office be abolished.

In 1884 he appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations and insisted that the office should be discontinued, and that committee undertook to give practical effect to his suggestion by reporting a bill to the House with that item left out; but the Committee of the Whole, not thinking there was any fairness or justice or good sense in requiring the people of New Mexico and Arizona and other countries contiguous to St. Louis to send their gold and silver bullion to the city of Philadelphia to be assayed before it could be sent to New Orleans for coinage, overruled the action of the Committee on Appropriations and restored this item to the bill.

At that time, and I trust I may have the attention of the committee, this office did seem to be a very inconsiderable one. In 1883 there had been deposited of gold and silver bullion at St. Louis only the sum of $32,000, in round numbers. The amount deposited last year at this same office, in round numbers, was $111,000, and yet the Director of the Mint again asks that this office be discontinued. According to my friend from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY], this office is not self-supporting. The same argument, if carried out, would abolish nearly all these assay offices.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Would it not abolish this House?

Mr. CLARDY. Perhaps it would. It would abolish the assay office at Charlotte, N. C. I think it would abolish the office at Boisé City, Idaho. It is not expected the Government will make money out of these offices.

I want to say, recurring to a ruling of the Chair this morning on another question, we have a rule which precludes me from offering an amendment appropriating money for an office which has never been created. The object of that rule, if it has an object, is to prevent the enactment of immature legislation upon appropriation bills. The spirit of the rule would require the committee to report to this House and the House to make appropriations to sustain offices already created. In other words, I do not believe that the policy of that rule or the spirit of that rule would countenance a proposition to repeal a law creating an office by starving the officers.

If I have any time left, I yield to my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND].

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARDY] has expired.

Mr. BLAND rose.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that, for the information of the committee, the extract read by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] be read again.

The CHAIRMAN. That is not in order at this time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask that the Clerk read it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has not the floor for that purpose.

Mr. BLAND. I hold in my hand the act of 1881, which established this assay office at St. Louis. It was established in the old custom-house, a building belonging to the Government, which cost the Government no rent and no expense for the building or the office. The plant is all there; there is no expense for that, and the establishment was created by law and continued by law up to the present time.

There was a reason for the establishment of this assay office at St. Louis at the time the law was passed. The Director of the Mint at that time, Mr. Burchard, had great difficulty in procuring bullion for the New Orleans mint at the same price as he procured silver bullion for the Mint at Philadelphia. In other words, the bullion-holder charged the Government the extra cost of exporting the bullion from New York to New Orleans. Mr. Burchard told our Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures that with an assay office at St. Louis he could save the cost of transportation, the difference of cost being equivalent to the difference between the distance from St. Louis to New Orleans and the distance from New York to New Orleans; in other words, about $6,000 on every million of dollars coined. Now, there were $11,000,000 coined at New Orleans, and according to that estimate there would be a saving of $66,000 in the purchase of silver dollars by having this assay office. The fact that this assay office was located there has compelled bullion-holders to deliver at New York for the same price as at Philadelphia. That office was established there by recommendation of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures upon the recommendation of Mr. Burchard, Director of the Mint.

There was also a favorable report to this House of a proposition to establish a mint at St. Louis; and that is why these gentlemen are so hostile to the St. Louis assay office, especially the present Director of the Mint, who seems to be in the interest of Pennsylvania or the Philadelphia mint, as against the great Mississippi Valley. Twice these recommendations have come from the Committee on Appropriations, and once from the present Director of the Mint. I say when that assay office is abolished it will be time enough to refuse appropriations for it. But there is no proposition pending before Congress to abolish that office. This is a proposition to leave out the appropriation to continue the office in existence simply because it does not pay expenses. There is but one assay office in the country that does pay expenses, and that is the assay office at New York. The Office at Charlotte, N. C., does not pay expenses by $4,000.

The earnings at the Boisé City office are only $1,000, and the expenditures are over $7,000. The earnings at Charlotte are only $1,131.23, and the expenditures are $4,315.85. At St. Louis the deposits are $112,000, the earnings $666.28, and the expenses $5,339.

Mr. WARNER. Can my colleague inform the House whether the other two assay offices which those statistics show fail to pay expenses are provided for in the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Every one of them, except the St. Louis office.

Mr. WARNER. Can my colleague tell the reason why the St. Louis office should not be provided for as well as those others?

Mr. BLAND. There is no reason in the world, except that the Director of the Mint argues in favor of establishing more facilities for coinage in Philadelphia as against coinage in the great Mississippi Valley. It is a mint in the Mississippi Valley that he is striking at. He desires that the mint at Philadelphia shall be provided for and extended in order to do more coinage, and recommends the abolition of the St. Louis assay office because he fears there may be some conflict between the Mississippi Valley and the Atlantic seaboard on this question.

Mr. CLARDY. Let me remind my colleague that the assay office at Helena, Mont., pays only $3,000 in round numbers, while the expenses are $25,000.

Mr. WARNER. And that Montana office is provided for in the bill?

Mr. BLAND. Certainly. Every one of them except the St. Louis office.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to free the mind of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] from any apprehensions about the Philadelphia mint. I represent that mint in part, and I assure him I have never heard a whisper of opposition from that quarter to the St. Louis assay office. The committee omitted the appropriation for the St. Louis assay office because the persons who are charged with the administration of the laws and with the expenditure of money for these purposes have from year to year for several years past told us that there was no earthly use in having an assay office at St. Louis.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. And yet the business increases every year.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is mistaken. I want to correct his statement. No Director of the Mint has ever recommended this change to Congress except Mr. Kimball.

Mr. RANDALL. It has been recommended every year for four years past.

Mr. BLAND. The gentleman can not find any such recommendation from any Director of the Mint except Mr. Kimball.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, I think he is about as competent a man as any that has preceded him, and I do not believe he has any prejudice whatever against the St. Louis assay office. I am sure I have not, and I am sure no member of the Committee on Appropriations has any such prejudice. But there was no estimate for that office, and how could the Committee on Appropriations undertake to recommend an appropriation for this purpose when the men who are charged with the administration of the laws in relation to the mints have told us that it would be a waste of money?

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Chairman, I am at a loss, as is intimated by the question I asked my colleague a few moments ago, to understand why, if the other offices which have failed to pay expenses and which are located in much less important places financially, commercially, and geographically than St. Louis—I am at a loss, I say, to understand why they should be included in the bill and St. Louis be omitted. I had supposed, sir, that when the Congress of the United States created an office and fixed a salary for that office, and the office was filled by the appointing power, all the Appropriation Committee had to do was to appropriate the necessary money to carry on that office. I assume, Mr. Chairman, as to the gentlemen who have been appointed to the assay office in St. Louis, and whose salaries are fixed by law, that if there is a failure of appropriation by this bill they will have cause of action against the Government, and can go to the Court of Claims and enforce that action. I am glad to learn from the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations that there is no disposition to injure St. Louis or the West or the great Mississippi Valley.

It has been charged, Mr. Chairman, and with some show of reasonableness, that some parts of this administration have been carried on so as to favor New York and Pennsylvania and the other Eastern States as against the great Western States; and it is charged now that an important measure pending before this House strikes out every leading industry in the great State of Missouri while it protects those of other States. I have heard no good reason given why the assay office in the city of St. Louis should not be provided for.

Mr. HERBERT. There has a proposition come here, not recommended by the Committee on Appropriations, not asked for by the executive department of the Government, to spend some $25,000 for the benefit of the city of St. Louis.

Mr. HERBERT. A proposition is made here—not recommended by the Committee on Appropriations and not asked for by the Executive Department of the Government having this matter in charge—to spend some $25,000 in the city of St. Louis——

Mr. CLARDY, Mr. DOCKERY, and others. Oh, no; $6,000.

Mr. HERBERT. To spend $6,000 or $7,000 in the city of St. Louis. I can see a reason—whether a good one or not—why the Representatives from the State of Missouri, Democrats and Republicans, should rush forward in solid phalanx, and, although this office is of no use in the world according to the opinion of the Department, express their desire that this money be spent there. But I can not see any reason why the Representatives of other States than Missouri should vote away the people's money in this manner. It does seem to me——

Mr. CLARDY. The gentleman will permit me to say that we have there a building which is dedicated to this use—a building which cost a considerable amount of money; and the furniture and other appurtenances of the office cost alone some ten or twelve thousand dollars.

Mr. HERBERT. Notwithstanding all that, the Secretary of the Treasury, having no doubt taken all the facts into consideration, sends in here approvingly this recommendation of the Director of the Mint in favor of discontinuing the office. Yet the gentlemen here ask us to vote this money for a purpose which is utterly useless, according to the estimate of the appropriate administrative department of the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS obtained the floor.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. It is a piece of reckless——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. WILLIAMS] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to call the attention of the committee to a report in regard to the business at the St. Louis assay office during the last five or six years. In 1882 the earnings of that office were $111.16; the expenditures $11,880.65.

Mr. CLARDY. That was for the purchase of furniture for the office.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I hope the gentleman will keep quiet. It is the wounded dove that flutters.

In 1883 the earnings of the office were $414.32; the expenditures $5,372.03. In 1884 the earnings were $676.82; the expenditures $5,338.51. In 1885 the earnings were $783.65; the expenditures $6,500.01. In six years the earnings of that office have been $3,385.90; the expenditures $39,811.93.

Mr. CLARDY. Now will the gentleman read the earnings and expenditures of some of the other assay offices?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do not yield to the gentleman. The difference between the earnings and expenditures of that office during six years is more than $36,000. I read these figures in reply to my friend from Missouri [Mr. BLAND], whose clarion voice, ever since the assembling of this Congress, has been raised in favor of "retrenchment and reform." In view of the previous speeches of the gentleman and his present position, I am led to realize that "consistency is a jewel;" but it is not found in the lexicon of the gentleman from Missouri. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLAND. The same argument used by the gentleman who has just taken his seat would abolish every other assay office except the New York assay office. The St. Louis office comes as near paying expenses from its receipts as any of these offices. Let us abolish all of them, if we are going to abolish one.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I merely want to say to the committee that at the New York assay office, which has been mentioned here, the deposits last year were $61,000,000. The deposits at the St. Louis office last year were $112,000; the expenditures $5,300, and the earnings $696. At Helena the deposits were $1,449,000; the earnings, $3,600; the expenditures, $25,000.

It has always been the policy in mining regions of the country—at Helena, at Boisé, at Denver—to maintain these assay offices as a matter of convenience to the Government and also to the miner. This much encouragement has been believed to be due to the mining interests. I do not know whether there are mines down in the vicinity of St. Louis or not.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. The gentleman should know that the ores from all the New Mexico mines come to St. Louis.

Mr. BLAND. And the refiners at St. Louis refine over $4,000,000 worth of ores every year.

Mr. CANNON. The deposits at the St. Louis office in the year 1887 were $112,000 all told.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Is not that a great deal?

Mr. CANNON. The expenses in the same year were $5,300, and the earnings $696.

Now, I think there is good reason for continuing this assay office at St. Louis. I want to be fair. I rather like my friend from St. Louis [Mr. O'NEILL]. I am told that within the last few weeks there has been a change at that office; that the old assayer—I do not know whether he was a "blasted Republican" or not, but I suppose he was—has resigned or been removed, and that a new assayer, who, presumably, will conduct the office in the interest of the Democratic party, has been appointed. Now, if we do not make this appropriation there will not be a place for that man!

I live within a couple of hundred miles of St. Louis, and while most of my business relations are with Chicago, I once in awhile go down to St. Louis. What are we to do with this new official unless we continue this appropriation? It is true that Mr. Kimball, the Director of the Mint, says there is no use for this office; it is true that the earnings of the office last year were only $696; it is true there are no mines in the vicinity of that office; but it occurs to me that in the Mississippi Val-

ley (speaking kindly of my Democratic friends) that office is needed in their interest, at least in the interest of the assayer who holds the place.

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not wish to consume time further than to reply briefly to what might seem to be a very proper inference from the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HERBERT]. From that gentleman's observations, unless they were humorous (and I am advised that they were), he would appear to be impressed with the idea that the members of the delegation from the State of Missouri, regardless of politics, are supporting this item because of the fact that the assay office is located in Missouri. Now, as I understand, the members of our delegation are not mere politicians, but are imbued with the spirit of statesmanship. I am sure we would not insist upon a continuance of this office if we did not feel that the public service demands it. I sincerely hope the Committee of the Whole will vote to continue the appropriation.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, there were—ayes 40, noes 16.

Mr. RANDALL. No quorum has voted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. O'NEILL.]

Mr. RANDALL. I will not insist on the point of no quorum if we can have a vote in the House.

Mr. BLAND. Let us have a vote now; we might as well settle it now as at any other time.

Mr. RANDALL. If members do this they must do it on their own responsibility.

The CHAIRMAN. The tellers will take their places.

Mr. DOCKERY. I suggest that the point of no quorum be withdrawn, as one-fifth of the House will certainly be in favor of ordering the yeas and nays.

Mr. HERBERT. We ought to have a yea-and-nay vote, so as to show that those who wish to put this increase upon us come from the Republican side of the House.

Mr. DOCKERY. I beg pardon, this proposition did not come from the other side of the House.

Mr. HERBERT. The votes in favor of it come from the other side of the House.

Mr. RANDALL. I repeat my proposition, that if we are allowed a yea-and-nay vote in the House on this proposition I will withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I do not see why this should be an exceptionable case.

Mr. RANDALL. It is because it should be an exceptionable one.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Two-thirds are in favor of it.

Mr. RANDALL. I insist on my point.

Mr. BLAND. We will have a vote in the House on this proposition anyhow, and I ask my colleague to withdraw his objection and agree to a yea-and-nay vote in the House.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Does the gentleman withdraw his point of no quorum?

Mr. RANDALL. No, and I do not intend to do it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the Chair understand the gentleman to withdraw his point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. I do not. If we are allowed to have a vote upon this proposition in the House I will withdraw it. That is what I said in the beginning and that is what I have said all along, and I now repeat it.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. The gentleman can demand a yea-and-nay vote when we get into the House.

Mr. BLAND. We are willing to leave that to the House when the time comes.

Mr. RANDALL. I want a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. CLARDY. I suggest to my colleague to accept the proposition of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. It only takes one-fifth to order the yeas and nays, and if there are one-fifth opposed to this, they can order the yeas and nays in the House.

Mr. DOCKERY. We are not afraid of going upon the record.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Let the gentleman withdraw his point of no quorum.

The committee divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 119, noes 55.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Territory of Dakota: For salary of governor, $2,600; chief-justice and five associate judges, at $3,000 each; and secretary, at $1,800, $22,400.

For legislative expenses, namely: For per diem and mileage of twenty-four members of the council and forty-eight members of the house of representatives of the Legislative Assembly, $31,750; compensation of officers of Legislative Assembly, $3,060; printing, $3,750; stationery and blanks for secretary's office and for Legislative Assembly, fuel and lights, messenger and porter, and care of Government property, clerk in secretary's office, repairs and purchase of furniture, and incidental expenses, $4,300; in all, $42,860.

For contingent expenses, to be expended by the governor, $500.

Mr. GIFFORD. I wish to submit some remarks in response to what was said by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] the other day.

The CHAIRMAN. What amendment does the gentleman move?

Mr. GIFFORD. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. RANDALL. I understand there are a number of gentlemen who wish to be heard in reference to the provisions for the Territories contained in this bill, and I ask, by unanimous consent, the debate be limited to twenty minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I only wish to occupy a moment. I do not wish to occupy any more time than is necessary, and if I can secure unanimous consent to print my remarks in the RECORD I will be content.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SPRINGER. I also ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a reply to what the gentleman has to say.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. RANDALL. I now move that twenty minutes be allowed for debate on this Territorial question.

Mr. WARNER. I object. I do not think I will require more than ten minutes, but it may be that I shall need fifteen minutes or twenty minutes. I do not want to be cramped by any limitation.

Mr. RANDALL. I suggest, then, that the debate be limited to twenty minutes, ten minutes of which shall be given to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WARNER].

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. WARNER. I am content if I may be permitted to occupy ten or fifteen minutes myself; but I believe that there are other gentlemen who desire to be heard.

Mr. RANDALL. I want, if possible, to limit debate on this whole Territorial question.

Mr. WARNER. I could not consent to that.

Mr. DOCKERY. How much time do you want?

Mr. WARNER. I will say fifteen or twenty minutes, although it is possible I may not use more than ten minutes; still I would like to have that much time at my disposal.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, then, say thirty minutes in all—twenty minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WARNER. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the request to the committee. Is there objection to limiting debate on all paragraphs relating to the Territories and amendments thereto which may be presented to thirty minutes, of which time twenty minutes shall be allowed the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. CAREY. Do I understand that that applies to all the Territories?

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, sir; to all.

Mr. CAREY. I think that ought not to be done, then.

Mr. KERR. Do I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania to mean that the total time be so limited, or that there is to be that much time to each of the Territories?

Mr. RANDALL. For all the Territories.

Mr. GIFFORD. Before any motion is made limiting debate, I wish to make a point of order upon the first proposition embodied in this paragraph.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I submit to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that he had better confine his suggestion to Dakota and limit the debate upon that, as I believe we will save time by it.

Mr. RANDALL. I am willing, then, to fix thirty minutes for Dakota and ten minutes to the other Territories.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. But there are gentlemen here who desire to call attention to some matters connected with their Territories. I have no doubt we will save time by according to them a certain consideration in the matter and giving them some time in the discussion. I would suggest that the gentleman from Pennsylvania agree to fix thirty minutes for Dakota.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman from Dakota rises to a question of order.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to make the point of order upon that provision of the bill providing for the salary of the governor of the Territory of Dakota $2,600.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Dakota.

Mr. GIFFORD. My point of order is this: that the provision in the first paragraph which has been read, providing for the salary of the governor of Dakota at $2,600, is not in accordance with the existing law, and hence I make the point of order upon it. The law governing the salary of that official, permit me to call the attention of the Chair, will be found on page 327 of the Revised Statutes, section 1845, in the following words:

On and after the 10th day of July, 1873, the annual salary of the governors of the several Territories shall be $3,500.

And then goes on to provide for the salaries of secretaries, etc.

Now I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the sum of $2,600, as provided in this bill for that salary, is not a sufficient sum. The people of the Territory through its Legislature have appropriated the sum of $1,000, in addition to what was appropriated as a salary for the governor by the laws of Congress, not because they specially appreciated his services, but because they found that it was absolutely necessary, in order to properly conduct the business of the office, that he should have a private secretary; and if the statutory amount, fixed as the salary of

the governor, is appropriated, it will obviate the necessity of our people paying for a private secretary for the governor.

I state that substantially as the point of order.

Mr. BREWER. What does the existing statute provide?

Mr. GIFFORD. Thirty-five hundred dollars is his salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair wishes to know of the gentleman from Alabama what the existing law provides on this subject. The question of order is raised that the amount here fixed is not in accordance with the statute. Is that correct?

Mr. FORNEY. I understand that the salary, as provided by law, is $3,500, but it has been fixed at $2,600 for the past twelve years, and the committee did not propose to change the policy of the Democratic and Republican parties in that respect.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that this salary may have been put below the figure fixed by the statute in the appropriation bills for several years past, and placed there correctly, under the rules existing prior to the Forty-ninth Congress, which allowed amendments or provisions in appropriation bills to reduce expenditures in the manner suggested here, that is, by cutting down salaries; but the last Congress took from the Committee on Appropriations any authority to repeat that proceeding, and the Supreme Court of the United States have held that the several appropriation bills within the last ten years reducing the amount fixed by a permanent law are simply reductions *pro tanto*, and leave the general statute remaining. Therefore the Chair must determine under the rule of the House that this is new legislation and subject to the point of order.

The effect of the ruling will be to strike out the sum of $2,600.

Mr. GIFFORD. I move to fill the blank by inserting $3,500.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 44, noes 40.

Mr. FORNEY. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order being made that no quorum has voted, the Chair will order tellers.

Mr. FORNEY and Mr. GIFFORD were appointed tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 47, noes 61.

So, no further count being demanded, the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask unanimous consent to fill the blank with the sum of $2,600.

Mr. GIFFORD. If I have the right of objection, I shall object to that.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. I object on behalf of the Delegate from Dakota.

[Mr. WARNER withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. SPRINGER rose.

Mr. RANDALL. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. SPRINGER. I do not think I will need more than five minutes to answer everything the gentleman has said.

Mr. RANDALL. I will allow the gentleman five minutes with the understanding that when he has finished, the further discussion on this subject foreign to this bill shall then be closed.

Mr. STRUBLE. That is the way in which we inaugurate the tariff discussion.

Mr. CANNON. Wait until my colleague has concluded what he wishes to say and then we can tell about the closing of debate. I object until I have heard my colleague.

Mr. RANDALL. It is only right to give gentlemen time to reply.

Mr. CANNON. I think so, and therefore I think the debate should not be closed now.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. CANNON. Yes, I do for the present.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, this is the first time that I have ever heard it urged here on the floor of this House that the number of bushels of wheat or corn which might be raised in any particular locality was to be the test of the right of such locality to admission as one of the States of this Union. That, however, is the argument my friend from Missouri [Mr. WARNER] makes, and the reason he gives for opposing the admission of New Mexico as a State into the Union is that that Territory does not raise as much wheat and corn as Dakota does.

Mr. DORSEY. One of the reasons.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, one of the reasons; and he goes on to make a comparison between New Mexico and Dakota in regard to the amount of wheat and corn raised in these two Territories respectively.

If that is to be the standard adopted here, I will refer the gentleman to the State of Maine; and he will find that there were fewer bushels of corn raised in Maine in the census year 1880 than in New Mexico, and therefore on that ground Maine should be put out of the Union and allowed to remain out until she had increased her corn crop.

Mr. STRUBLE. That is heavy logic.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does that exhaust the mental effort? [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. No; but it exhausts the argument of my friend from Missouri.

Mr. REED. No doubt the gentleman from Illinois would like to keep Maine out. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Oh, no; not so long as the distinguished gentleman from Maine is sent here as a Representative from that State.

Mr. WARNER. I trust the gentleman will not misstate my argument.

Mr. REED. Oh, you can stand it. [Laughter.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Of course; anybody who could have stood the gentleman's argument on the tariff bill for an hour and a half the other day could stand my five minutes' talk, I am sure.

Now, then, I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri, and of gentlemen on the other side of the House generally, to the fact that thirteen years ago every member upon that side of the House, with one or two exceptions, voted to admit New Mexico into the Union as a State. Every Republican in the other end of the Capitol at that time also voted for her admission.

During the Forty-third Congress a bill to provide an enabling act for New Mexico passed the House, May 21, 1874, by a vote of 160 yeas to 54 nays, a majority of nearly three-fourths. At the second session of that Congress, on February 24, the same bill passed the Senate, with slight amendments changing the time for the elections, by a vote of yeas 32, nays 11, a majority of nearly three-fourths. It received almost the solid Republican vote of both Houses at that time.

Now, if you will look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 3, 1875, you will find that a motion was made to suspend the rules, concur in the Senate amendments to the bill, and thus to pass the bill to admit New Mexico into the Union as a State. The motion was made in this House on the last night of the session, and a yea-and-nay vote taken upon it, and every Republican in the House at that time, with only one exception, I believe, voted to admit New Mexico into the Union. The vote on suspension was—yeas 154, nays 87, not voting 47. It required a change of but 6 votes to have given the necessary two-thirds to adopt the motion.

Mr. STRUBLE. On thirty minutes' debate?

Mr. SPRINGER. No, sir; there was no debate——

Mr. CANNON. How did the Democrats vote?

Mr. SPRINGER. They generally voted in the negative, but a great many voted in the affirmative, of course, or the motion to suspend the rules could not have come within six votes of the number required to make the necessary two-thirds. Among those who voted in the affirmative, that is in favor of the admission of New Mexico into the Union, on the several votes in the House and in the Senate were every Republican Senator and Representative in that Congress with one or two exceptions, a very few exceptions at least. Among the Republicans in this House who voted in the affirmative were such well known leaders of the party as Messrs. Burchard, of Illinois; Benjamin F. Butler, of Massachusetts; Roderick R. Butler, of Tennessee; Conger, of Michigan; DAWES, of Massachusetts; Dunnell, of Minnesota; FARWELL, of Illinois; HARMER, of Pennsylvania; Hubbell, of Ohio: Casson, of Iowa; William Lawrence, of Ohio; Maynard, of Tennessee; McCrary, of Iowa; McNulta, of Illinois; Monroe, of Ohio, and many others.

Amongst those, also, who voted for the proposition at that time to admit New Mexico as a State I find the name of my genial friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]. I also find voting in the same way my genial friend and colleague from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. [Laughter.]

At the next session of Congress—the Forty-fourth Congress—a bill for the admission of New Mexico passed the Senate by a large majority, but failed in the House.

Mr. Chairman, New Mexico was thought worthy by the Republicans in that Congress to be admitted into this Union thirteen years ago, and received nearly a two-thirds vote, and almost the total vote of the Republicans of the House of Representatives. Why was she then deemed worthy of admission? I will tell gentlemen. The reason was because she had sent a Republican Delegate here, and gentlemen supposed therefore that she was reliably Republican. [Applause and laughter on the Democratic side.] And yet gentlemen are entirely non-partisan. They never have any party feeling in the admission of a State into the Union. Oh, no; it is entirely a non-political matter with them. There is no element of politics entering into it. Partisanism is the last thing they ever think of when considering the admission of new States into the Union. It is the last thing that ever occurs to the minds of our friends on the other side. But yet thirteen years ago the Territory of New Mexico, which raised so few bushels of wheat and corn and has so few school-houses now, was deemed well worthy of admission as one of the sisterhood of States. Why is she not now?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Well, she has gone backwards since then.

Mr. SPRINGER. She has not gone backwards since then, because the census shows that she has nearly doubled her population, and the minority of the committee in their views show that great advance has been made in recent years.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. They had no railroads then.

Mr. SPRINGER. No, they had no railroads then. But the Republicans are now all interested in keeping New Mexico out of the Union. The trouble with New Mexico is that the land titles there have been in dispute for many years and they are still in dispute. And some provision will have to be adopted by Congress to remove the clouds upon the titles which have rested upon them ever since the settlement of the Territory. That is the great impediment to its growth and development. Let us remove this impediment and the growth of New Mexico will compare favorably with the growth of any other Territory in this Union, and you will find that she will not be backward in development

of her resources, but worthy to take her place in the sisterhood of States as a great and powerful State. But the gentleman has said that a great portion of the land in New Mexico will not produce without irrigation.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TOWNSHEND took the floor and yielded to Mr. SPRINGER.

Mr. SPRINGER. I understood that I was to have ten minutes in my own right, according to the agreement. But I repeat, the gentleman said that a large portion of this land was valueless for agricultural purposes without irrigation. I concede it. But what of that? It is a fact that fully one-half of the inhabitants of the globe live and gather sustenance on lands that will not produce crops without irrigation; and in New Mexico in a very few years they will have an extensive system of irrigation; they will have reclamation of these vast wastes of arid lands, and then she will produce cereals not only for sustenance for her own population, but a surplus for exportation to foreign nations.

Mr. Chairman, I have no patience in listening to any person who tries to decry or belittle any portion of these United States, any portion of its people, or any portion of its territory. It is all good. It is all better than you will find anywhere else in the world. I am proud of it. I am proud to be a citizen of a country like this, and I want to hasten the time when all these Territories will be brought into the Union on an equal footing with the other States.

I am in favor of that, and I assert the only party in favor of the admission of Dakota into the Union as one State at this time is the Democratic party. And I am satisfied of this, for when it is proposed to admit Dakota as one State every member on the other side will vote against it. I know I am right in making that assertion. And yet gentlemen say we are keeping Dakota out of the Union. We are simply resisting her division into two parts, and in doing that we are carrying out the wishes of the people of the Territory.

Mr. STRUBLE. Oh, no.

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir; we are carrying out the wishes of the people of Dakota. Every county except two in North Dakota gave a majority against being set off by themselves; and we have as much right to regard the wishes of the people of North Dakota as we have to regard the wishes of a portion of the southern part of the Territory that desires now to be set off by itself and secede from the other.

Mr. REED. Secede! Does the gentleman understand the difference between the secession of the Territory and the secession of the Southern States?

Mr. SPRINGER. Precisely the same principle is involved.

Mr. REED. You are sincere in that statement?

Mr. SPRINGER. I am sincere and the gentleman from Maine is not. The gentleman from Maine is never sincere on a question of this kind. I never saw him sincere on a question where the interests of his party were involved. Nevertheless, he always assumes a sincerity which he denies to anybody else, especially on this side of the House.

The fact is that less than half the number of counties in the Territory of Dakota desire to be set up as a separate State by themselves, and three-fourths of the area of the whole Territory is resisting that movement. The Democratic party in this House is resisting that movement, and the Democratic party in the country will resist that movement at the election in November and in the next Congress.

I say to gentlemen on that side of the House and to the people of Dakota that never, so far as I am concerned and if I can prevent it, shall that Territory be dismembered and divided into two separate parts. It is the policy of the Democratic party to keep the Territory united; and in that policy we will be sustained not only by the people of Dakota, but by the people outside of Dakota. Those who shall resist her dismemberment will in after time be regarded as the benefactors of that State, and the people who shall hereafter inhabit that great and powerful State will rejoice in their union as we now rejoice in the Union of these States.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CANNON. My colleague [Mr. SPRINGER] has made one of the most effective speeches I have heard from him during all the long years of our service here. Let us see wherein lies the strength of his argument. He wanders back to the first Congress in which I served, in 1874, and speaks of its work. He says I voted to admit New Mexico at that time to the sisterhood of States. I recollect it very well. Colorado then knocked at the door for admission and was admitted, and well has she proven the wisdom of our action. At the same session New Mexico, substantially as well qualified then as now, knocked for admission. Upon the single proposition of admitting her I voted ay. Therefore, my colleague argues that his omnibus bill to admit New Mexico, Washington, Montana, and Dakota should pass.

Mr. SPRINGER. Oh, no; I did not say that at all.

Mr. CANNON. If my colleague's statement means anything, it means that. I did so vote. I may have been right or I may have been wrong; but I stand ready to vote in this Congress upon the question of the admission of New Mexico when she comes on her own merits and knocks singly for admission; when she comes saying, "Let me in; I attach no conditions to my admission." But when New Mexico comes and says, "I not only demand admission, but I also demand that the whole of Dakota shall only constitute one State, and I will tie myself onto that proposition and link with it the admission of Montana and Washington, and you shall take that proposition or nothing," I say by my vote no, no; let every tub stand on its own bottom; let each Territory stand upon its own merits.

Mr. Chairman, let us talk a minute about the proposal of my colleague in insisting that Dakota shall be admitted as one State or not admitted at all. Dakota is a magnificent body of land. Its area is 149,100 square miles, an area equal to that of New York, Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Vermont, New Jersey, Rhode Island, and one-fourth of Pennsylvania. These States send twenty Senators to the Congress of the United States and have twenty Senatorial electors in the electoral college. The greatest strain upon the Union in the near future is to come from the representation of the small States in the Senate being equal to that of the large States. Delaware, with but one Representative and no prospect of any more, is equal in the Senate to Illinois with her twenty Representatives, which are to constantly increase. I have an interest in the matter of the admission of Dakota. The whole Mississippi Valley has an interest in it. I say that Dakota shall not be admitted as one State only by my vote with but two representatives in the United States Senate, while the south half of that Territory alone has now, still in her swaddling clothes, a greater population than Rhode Island and Delaware combined, and has the capacity in the near future to support a population equal to all New England.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WARNER] has spoken of the wonderful development of Dakota, her production of wheat, corn, and oats. Her material progress has been wonderful, but I call my colleague's attention to the fact that Dakota's territory is situated in the latitudes where in all time men, strong, intelligent men, have been produced; men who have founded states and maintained civilizations.

Sir, the territory within Dakota should be so carved into States when admitted that each State in the near future will have something near an equal strength in the Senate of the United States with others of the larger States. The south half of Dakota, with the great Sioux reservation still wholly unsettled, has a population large enough for three Representatives. This population in every respect is equal to any population in the States. It is the very cream of the population from the States. Yet Dakota sits silent without representation. My colleague and his party have determined in caucus that she shall remain silent and without representation, in any event, until after the coming Presidential election, and even after that, unless she consents to come in as one State and at the same time drag with her the other three Territories. I am willing to go to the country with my colleague upon that issue. The Republican party is willing to go to the country upon that issue, and we will take the verdict of the country as to whether or no that kind of bulldozing shall obtain in the American Congress. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Mr. JOSEPH withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. RANDALL. I ask unanimous consent that debate on this paragraph be closed.

There being no objection, it was so ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Territory of Idaho: For salary of governor, $2,600; chief justice and two associate judges, at $3,000 each; and secretary, at $1,800, $13,400.

For legislative expenses, namely: For per diem of president and members of council, and of speaker and members of house of representatives, $8,880; per diem of employés of council and house of representatives, $3,000; mileage of members of council and house of representatives, $5,900; printing the laws and journals and incidental printing for Legislative Assembly, $3,200; stationery for use of Legislative Assembly, lamps, oils, brooms, and dusters for legislative halls and committee-rooms, rent of legislative halls and committee-rooms, extra clerk-hire for secretary's office during session of Legislature, fuel for secretary's office, extra messenger during session of Legislature, new files and desk, official printing and stationery, rent of office for secretary and clerk, library, department, and storage rooms, furniture for secretary's office, ice, clerk-hire, messenger, and porter, carpet and furniture for clerk's office, oil, lamps, brooms, and dusters, postage and rent of post-office box, seals, repairs to furniture, and incidental expenses, $5,815; in all, $26,855.

Mr. DUBOIS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend lines 1 and 2, page 60, by striking out two thousand six hundred and substituting three thousand five hundred.

Amend lines 4 and 5 by striking out one thousand eight hundred and inserting two thousand five hundred.

Amend lines 3 and 4, page 61, by striking out five hundred and inserting one thousand.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr Chairman, the salaries of the governers of the Territories, as fixed by law of Congress, is $3,500, and the salaries of secretaries of Territories is $2,500 per annum. This bill appropriates $2,600 for salary of governor, and $1,800 for salary of secretary.

For what particular reason the law has been disregarded it seems hard to determine. The cost of living in the Territories is greater than in the States, the Territory to be governed is much larger in extent, the traveling expenses are at least twice as great, and it does certainly seem as if Congress should appropriate the salaries as fixed by statute. The contingent fund of the governor, formerly $1,000, has been reduced to $500.

This sum is entirely inadequate. Out of the $500 the governor of my Territory has to pay clerk-hire, janitor, postage, lights, stationery, and all other expenses of the office. The statement which I have made

is applicable to every other Territory except Alaska. For some reason the committee have seen fit to give the governor of that Territory $3,000, and $2,000 for a contingent fund. I do not object to this, and think the sum not too large, but contend that it is an additional reason why the governors of the other Territories should have the amount fixed by law. It is not a fair argument to say these officers can sue the Government in the Court of Claims. It is not fair or just to compel them to go to this trouble and expense. They earn the salary named in my amendment, which is given them by statute.

The law of Congress gives only $28,000 per annum for the support of the Territory of Idaho, including the pay of the officers appointed by the President, and it occurs to me that Congress can fairly do nothing less than appropriate this sum.

The fact that the governor of Idaho is a Democrat makes no difference to me. By some mistake or oversight, or because the politicians from Kentucky, Indiana, and the "Sunny South" were not as alert as usual, he was appointed from the Territory, and in consequence is entirely satisfactory to all our people. His twenty years' residence in the Territory make his services peculiarly valuable to Idaho, as he understands her wants, and takes a pride in her prosperity. He surely should have the salary voted him, which Congress has deemed proper to fix by statute.

The secretary of the Territory is one of the few relics of civil service left in the country, and stands conspicuous as an illustrious example of that somewhat neglected policy. His political life will end, however, before he can enjoy the benefits of this amendment, if passed, and in candor I am contending for fairness toward his Democratic successor.

Mr. FORNEY. I only wish to say that we have given the Territory of Idaho all that is asked in the estimates.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. DUBOIS, there were—ayes 41, noes 53.

Mr. DUBOIS. No quorum.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. DUBOIS and Mr. FORNEY were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 41, noes 61.

Mr. DUBOIS. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next paragraph.

Mr. FORNEY. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. BLOUNT reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9377) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Agriculture, reported a bill (H. R. 10233) making an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I reserve all points of order on the bill just reported.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. All points of order will be reserved.

MILITARY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. TOWNSHEND, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported a bill (H. R. 10234) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I desire to reserve all points of order on the bill just reported.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from New Jersey reserves all points of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message, in writing, was received from the President of the United States, by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries.

The message further announced that the following bills had been presented to the President May 8, 1888, and not having been returned by him to the House of Congress in which they originated within the ten days prescribed by the Constitution, they had become laws without his approval:

An act (H. R. 1697) for the erection of a public building in the city of Asheville, N. C.; and

An act (H. R. 2664) for the relief of Francis Daniels.

The message further announced that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

An act (H. R. 8464) for the relief of Merchants' National Bank of Poughkeepsie, N. Y.;

An act (H. R. 7348) granting to the city of Grand Forks, Dak., the right to build two free bridges across Red River;

An act (H. R. 7319) for the relief of Emory R. Seward;

An act (H. R. 6831) to detach the county of Audrain, in the State of Missouri, from the eastern and attach it to the western judicial district of said State;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 148) to print 12,500 copies of the eulogies on Seth C. Moffatt, a Representative in Congress;

An act (H. R. 671) for the relief of the heirs of John S. Fillmore, deceased;

Joint resolution (H. Res. 95) to enable the President of the United States to extend to certain inhabitants of Japan a suitable recognition of their humane treatment of the survivors of the crew of the American bark Cashmere;

An act (H. R. 1473) authorizing the President of the United States to arrange a conference between the United States of America and the Republic of Mexico, Central and South America, Hayti, San Domingo, and the Empire of Brazil;

An act (H. R. 7936) to restore to the public domain a part of the Uintah Valley Indian reservation, in the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes;

An act (H. R. 4358) to increase the limit of cost for the public building in course of erection at Charleston, S. C.;

An act (H. R. 1645) to limit the hours that letter-carriers in cities shall be employed per day;

An act (H. R. 2699) for the relief of the heirs of the late Solomon Spitzer;

An act (H. R. 639) to authorize Commander John W. Philip, United States Navy, to accept a silver pitcher from the Government of the United States of Colombia;

An act (H. R. 5683) to authorize the commissioners of the District of Columbia to complete a contract for the sale of certain real estate of Job Barnard;

An act (H. R. 9793) authorizing a loan of arms and equipments to the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company; and

An act (H. R. 2928) granting a pension to William Lemons.

PAY OF CONGRESSIONAL EMPLOYÉS FOR MAY.

Mr. SPRINGER. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table a Senate joint resolution (S. R. 87) authorizing and directing the payment of the salaries of the officers and employés of Congress for the month of May, 1888.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The joint resolution will be read, subject to objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives be, and are hereby, authorized and directed to pay the officers and employés of the Senate and House of Representatives their respective salaries for the month of May, 1888, on the 29th day of said month.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered, read three times, and passed.

Mr. SPRINGER moved to reconsider the vote by which the joint resolution was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JAMES OBRION.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6602) for the relief of James Obrion, and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and is hereby, authorized and directed, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to pay to James Obrion, late a deputy collector of the first Tennessee district, the sum of $210.10, the amount paid by him under the direction of the collector in suppressing illicit distilleries in said district, as is fully shown by the records in the Internal-Revenue Office.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed.

Mr. BUTLER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

OBSTRUCTION TO NAVIGATION, BROAD CREEK, DELAWARE.

Mr. PENINGTON. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2123) to authorize the removal of an obstruction to the navigation of Broad Creek, in the State of Delaware, and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the bridge over Broad Creek, a navigable stream upon which improvements have been made by appropriations authorized by Congress, erected and maintained by the Delaware Railroad Company and its lessee, near the town of Laurel, in the State of Delaware, is hereby declared to

be an obstruction to the navigation of said Broad Creek and detrimental to the commerce thereof.

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to serve upon the said Delaware Railroad Company and its lessee, in the manner prescribed by the laws of the State of Delaware for the service of papers upon corporations, a notice in writing, requiring said company or its lessee, within three months from the time of such notice, to remove said obstruction by placing in said bridge and maintaining therein a draw of sufficient width and dimensions to admit the free and easy passage of all steam-boats and other vessels navigating said stream; and in case of refusal or neglect of said railroad company or its lessee to place in said bridge a suitable draw as required by the aforesaid notice, the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause a draw to be placed therein, and the cost and expense of such draw shall be a legal charge against the said railroad company and its lessee.

SEC. 3. That such sum of money as may be necessary to execute the provisions of this act by the Secretary of War is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to be paid out on the requisition of the Secretary of War.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I would like to know if that has been reported by any committee of this House.

Mr. PENINGTON. It has been reported by the Committee on Commerce. I ask that the report be read.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not demand the reading of the report; I only wanted to know if it had been reported by a committee.

Mr. PENINGTON. It has been reported by the Committee on Commerce, and has the indorsement of the Engineer-in-Chief of the War Department.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, and being read the third time, was passed.

Mr. PENINGTON moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

FORTS ROBINSON AND NIOBRARA, NEBR.

Mr. DORSEY. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 5654) to provide for the completion of quarters, barracks, and stables at Fort Robinson and Fort Niobrara, in the State of Nebraska.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANDALL. I object.

JOHN H. MARION.

Mr. SMITH, of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up for present consideration the bill (S. 1772) for the relief of John H. Marion.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That John H. Marion, of Prescott, Ariz., is hereby relieved from the payment of $1,042.45, claimed to be due from the said John H. Marion to the Government of the United States on account of the non-fulfillment of a contract for hay made with the chief quartermaster, Department of Arizona, dated Whipple Barracks, May 15, 1884.

Mr. HOLMAN. Let the report be read.

Mr. SMITH, of Arizona. I think if the gentleman will permit me I can make a brief statement that will satisfy him.

Mr. HOLMAN. Very well.

Mr. SMITH, of Arizona. This bill relieves this contractor from the difference in price between a lot of hay he undertook to furnish to the quartermaster and the price paid by the latter in open market for a different and better quality.

Marion contracted to deliver a quantity of gramma hay at a certain price; but owing to the drought he was unable to do so. Hay of the same quality could not be bought in the market for the same reason; and the same quantity of a better quality was bought, and he was charged with the difference in price. It is usually understood that owing to the difficulties of getting this hay in that arid region, all contracts reserve the exception that they will be complied with unless the act of Providence prevents their fulfillment. In this case it was impossible to comply with the contract, owing to the drought; and this bill is to relieve him from the payment of a sum claimed to be due on account of the non-fulfillment of the contract.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed.

Mr. HERBERT moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

And then (the hour of 5 o'clock having arrived) the Speaker *pro tempore* declared the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. ABBOTT (by request): A bill (H. R. 10192) authorizing the Aransas Improvement Company to secure deep water at Aransas Pass, or elsewhere on the Texas coast of the Gulf of Mexico, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BLAND: A bill (H. R. 10193) to pension Jesse Husson, soldier of the Mexican war—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 10194) for the relief of W. M. Henry—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10195) granting a pension to Isaac V. Lindsy—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 10196) for the relief of the Webb Manufacturing Company, Nashville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. J. E. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 10197) granting a pension to Hannah Cummins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10198) granting a pension to John E. Cook, alias John Elstun—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: A bill (H. R. 10199) for the relief of William E. Springstein—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10200) for the relief of Celia Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10201) for the relief of Ebin Platt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLEMENTS: A bill (H. R. 10202) for the relief of New Hope Baptist Church in Bartow County, Georgia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10203) for the relief of Nathan Light—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10204) for the relief of Frank J. Henderson, executor of William Henderson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DUBOIS: A bill (H. R. 10205) to amend the charter of the city of Lewiston, Idaho Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10206) for the benefit of Mrs. Jane Stewart, administratrix of Anderson Stewart, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GALLINGER: A bill (H. R. 10207) granting a pension to George A. Messer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEARD (by request): A bill (H. R. 10208) to authorize David W. Bouldin to present his claims against the Government to the Court of Claims for adjudication—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HUNTER: A bill (H. R. 10209) for the relief of Capt. James L. Strange—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. T. JOHNSTON: A bill (H. R. 10210) to increase the pension of Philip Thompson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LYNCH: A bill (H. R. 10211) for the relief of Sarah, Alicia, Mary, and Elizabeth Henry, sisters of the late John F. Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACDONALD: A bill (H. R. 10212) to amend an act granting a pension to John Etzell, approved March 3, 1879—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 10213) for the relief of Adolphus B. King—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MERRIMAN: A bill (H. R. 10214) granting a pension to Eliza Conway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10215) granting a pension to Heinrich Herget—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10216) granting a pension to William Fowler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10217) granting a pension to Amelia Hess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10218) for the relief of Richard Hamblin—to the Committee on Military Affairs

Also, a bill (H. R. 10219) for the relief of General John H. Gleason—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'FERRALL: A bill (H. R. 10220) for the relief of B. R. Walker, of Greene County, Virginia—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 10221) granting a pension to Samuel F. Webber—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULL: A bill (H. R. 10222) for the relief of the Society of the United Brethren in Christ, of Tyrone, Pa.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TURNER, of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 10223) for the relief of Mary P. Mullin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHIVELY: A bill (H. R. 10224) granting a pension to Elias H. Hall—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10225) granting a pension to John Wagner—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10226) granting a pension to Thompson L. Records—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10227) granting a pension to Joseph H. Heiser—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. A. C. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 10228) granting a pension to Samuel Sprodling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10229) granting a pension to George Wisecup—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10230) granting a pension to Dorcas Gibson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10231) granting a pension to Robert D. Neeley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10232) granting a pension to Mark O'Neill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. J. A. ANDERSON: Petition of August Joedicks, of Hanover, Kans., and of Jacob Augustine, of Mendota, Ill., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, resolutions of the Grand Army of the Republic of Kansas, for an appropriation of $200,000 for head-stones for graves of deceased soldiers and sailors—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of 25 citizens of Kansas and Nebraska for the Oklahoma bill—to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, petition of 25 citizens of Atlanta County, Kansas, for the amendment of the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BELMONT: Petition of merchants and shippers of New York, for the amendment of House bill 8830—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BOWDEN: Petition of John C. Neaville, of Virginia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BUCKALEW: Petition of Rev. M. W. Davis and 37 others, citizens of the Eleventh district of Pennsylvania, for prohibition in the District of Columbia—to the Select Committee on the Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Lewis White, for relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. J. E. CAMPBELL: Petition of Samuel Carter, for payment of his claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLEMENTS: Papers in the claims of E. H. Richardson, of William Henderson, of Robert M. Goodman, and of William F. Corbin, administrator of Laura Corbin, of Georgia—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of R. M. Goodman, of E. H. Richardson, of E. F. Hamilton, heir of Benjamin Hamilton; of John H. Gardner, administrator of Robert B. Gardner; of Samuel D. Holland, administrator of Archibald Holland; of administrator of Adam Neal, of estate of Laura Corbin, of Nathan Light, of F. J. Henderson, executor of William Henderson, and of Patrick Mansfield, of Georgia, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Petition of the Cadmus (Kans.) Grange, for the passage of the bill to elect United States Senators by the people—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GAY: Petition of citizens of Louisiana, against the passage of House bill No 4923 to create a national bureau of harbors and water ways—to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

Also, petition of Sidonie Dehahoussage, of Franklin, La., and of heirs of Romain Verdin, of St. Mary's Parish, Louisiana, for payment of their war claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRIMES: Petition of Garrett & Sons and others, citizens of Columbus, Ga., against the passage of the Butterworth and Dawes bills—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. J. T. JOHNSTON: Petition of Philip Thomas, of Company D, Seventy-first Regiment Indiana Volunteers, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES: Petition of heirs of Olivia Godbold, of Mobile County, Alabama, for reference of their claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: Petition of the Bartlett Clinical Club, of Milwaukee, Wis., for the removal of the duty from all medicine, surgical instruments, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAGAN: Petition of Hilel Marks, for relief—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LIND: Memorial of John A. Myers Post No. 60, of Minnesota, for the passage of the Burrows pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCOMAS: Petition of Charles M. Butler, heir of Elizabeth Butler, and of Eugenia T. Young, widow of Samuel C. Young, of Montgomery County, Maryland, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MACDONALD: Petition of citizens of Chippewa County, Minnesota, for amendment of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MAISH: Petition for the passage of a joint resolution granting right of way through the Arlington property, in Virginia—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MOORE: Petition of N. J. Hester, of Lexington, Lee County, Texas, for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. NELSON: Petition of citizens of Pope County, Minnesota, for amendment of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, resolutions of the Chamber of Commerce of Duluth, Minn., in favor of the Nicaragua Canal—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. OATES: Petition of the representatives of Manson Baker, of Midway, Ala., for relief—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'FERRALL: Petition of B. R. Walker, of Greene County, Virginia, for relief—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Mary J. Buncutter, widow of John H. Buncutter, late of Frederick County, Virginia, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PERKINS: Resolutions of the Grand Army of the Republic of Kansas, for an appropriation of $200,000 for headstones for soldiers' graves—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, evidence in support of House bill granting a pension to Anna Mabel Piferr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition for reference of claim of Wade H. Butler to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PLUMB: Petition of A. Hicks, for pay as a messenger in the Forty-fifth Congress—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROMEIS: Petition of R. C. Rice, of Oak Harbor, Ohio, for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. C. A. RUSSELL: Petition of Perry P. Wilson, of Putnam, Conn., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. A. C. THOMPSON: Petition of citizens of Scioto County, Ohio, for a pension to Samuel Sprodling—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The following petitions in favor of House bill 9716, for the better protection of free labor from convict labor, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Labor:

By Mr. BOWDEN: Of Knights of Labor, of Portsmouth, Va.

By Mr. HARMER: Of citizens of the Fifth district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. JOSEPH: Of citizens of Gallup, N. Mex.

By Mr. MONTGOMERY: Of workingmen of Rockport, Ky.

By Mr. SHIVELY: Of Knights of Labor of Michigan City, Ind.

The following petition for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists was received and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. CLEMENTS: Of druggists of Georgia.

The following petitions for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, were received and severally referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. DE LANO: Of W. L. Hoskins and 16 others, of Owego, Tioga County, New York.

By Mr. LA FOLLETTE: Of A. M. Daggett and others, of Madison, Wis.

By Mr. SOWDEN: Of Dr. A. J. Becker and others, citizens of the Tenth district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. WILBER: Of 32 citizens of Fly Creek, Otsego County, New York.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. E. P. ALLEN: Of T. G. Chandler and 37 others, citizens of the Second district of Michigan.

By Mr. BOWDEN: Of W. H. Brisby and others, of Tunstall's, Va.

By Mr. DE LANO: Of 30 citizens of Clockville, and of 24 citizens of Lockwood, N. Y.

By Mr. JACKSON: Of 24 farmers of Beaver County, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. J. E. CAMPBELL: Of 1,500 ex-soldiers of Greene County, Ohio.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: Of E. A. Loranger and others, ex-soldiers of Michigan.

By Mr. LIND: Of Thomas S. Brown and 33 others, ex-soldiers of Minnesota.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. GIFFORD: Of 175 citizens of Ransom and other counties, Dakota.

By Mr. RANDALL: Of 246 citizens of Philadelphia County, Pennsylvania.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *May* 29, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills, yesterday received from the House of Representatives, were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 618) granting a pension to James W. Harriman;
A bill (H. R. 722) for the relief of Marquis D. Davis;
A bill (H. R. 813) granting a pension to Mrs. Lovina J. Reeves;
A bill (H. R. 927) for the relief of Friedericke Raff;
A bill (H. R. 2234) granting a pension to Henry P. Alexander;
A bill (H. R. 2475) granting a pension to Adelaide L. Jessup;
A bill (H. R. 3537) granting a pension to Cullen W. Green;
A bill (H. R. 3868) granting a pension to Cynthia Witherell;
A bill (H. R. 4100) granting a pension to Martha B. Perry;
A bill (H. R. 4653) to grant a pension to Joanna Barry;
A bill (H. R. 5114) granting a pension to Franklin Long;
A bill (H. R. 5177) granting a pension to Plemen Cook;
A bill (H. R. 5378) for the relief of Tillman Faux;
A bill (H. R. 5544) granting a pension to John Shine;
A bill (H. R. 6006) granting a pension to Mary Flora;
A bill (H. R. 6070) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Benson;
A bill (H. R. 6478) granting a pension to Elizabeth Smith;
A bill (H. R. 6840) for the relief of Hiram M. Goss;
A bill (H. R. 7025) granting a pension to Evalina P. Brown;
A bill (H. R. 7693) granting an increase of pension to Peter C. Cheeks;
A bill (H. R. 8256) granting a pension to George W. Croop;
A bill (H. R. 8291) granting a pension to Julia Welch;
A bill (H. R. 8694) granting a pension to Isabella F. Dyke;
A bill (H. R. 8771) to place the name of Mrs. Flora C. Andrews on the pension-roll;
A bill (H. R. 9200) granting a pension to John F. Huckaba;
A bill (H. R. 9284) granting a pension to Webster C. Webb;
A bill (H. R. 9321) granting a pension to Ruth Ann Porter;
A bill (H. R. 9487) granting a pension to Mrs. Aurelia P. Hall;
A bill (H. R. 9682) increasing the pension of Jesse Dickey; and
A bill (H. R. 9877) granting an increase of pension to Mary L. Cleveland.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 6602) for the relief of James Obrion; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 1772) for the relief of John H. Marion; and
A bill (S. 2123) to authorize the removal of an obstruction to the navigation of Broad Creek, in the State of Delaware.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (S. 1978) for the erection of a public building in Paterson, N. J.;
A bill (S. 401) granting a pension to Jeannie Stone; and
Joint resolution (S. R. 87) authorizing and directing the payment of the salaries of the officers and employés of Congress for the month of May, 1888.

PUBLIC BUILDING IN YOUNGSTOWN—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 347, entitled "An act to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Youngstown, Ohio."

By the census of 1880 the population of Youngstown appears to be 15,435. It is claimed by those urging the erection of a public building there that its population has nearly doubled since that date. The amount appropriated in the bill herewith returned is $75,000. There does not seem to be any governmental purpose to which such a building could be properly devoted except the accommodation of the post-office.

I have listened to an unusual amount of personal representation in favor of this bill from parties whose desires I should be glad to meet on this or any other question. But none of them have insisted that there is any present governmental need of the proposed new building even for postal purposes. On the contrary I am informed that the post-office is at present well accommodated in quarters held under a lease which does not expire, I believe, until 1892. A letter addressed to the postmaster at Youngstown containing certain questions bearing upon the necessity of a new building failed to elicit a reply. This fact is very unusual and extraordinary, for the postmaster can almost always be relied upon to make an exhibit of the great necessity of larger quarters when a new public building is in prospect.

The fact was communicated to me early in the present session of the Congress that the aggregate sum of the appropriations contained in bills for the erection and extension of public buildings which had up to that time been referred to the House Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was about $37,000,000.

Of course this fact would have no particular relevancy if all the buildings asked for were necessary for the transaction of public business, as long as we have the money to pay for them. But inasmuch as a large number of the buildings proposed are unnecessary, and their erection would be wasteful and extravagant, beside furnishing precedents for further and more extended reckless expenditures of a like character, it seems to me that applications for new and expensive public buildings should be carefully scrutinized.

I am satisfied that the appropriation of $75,000 for a building at Youngstown is at present not justified.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 28, 1888.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, the people of the county in which Youngstown is situated, and the people of the State of Ohio, and I think of the whole country, will be very much surprised at the contents of this veto message. What our people like is impartiality. Here is one of the most flourishing, rapidly growing towns in the United States, full of thriving industries, with a large postal revenue, containing now probably 30,000 inhabitants, in the midst of a rapidly developing country, in a region where the people have many natural facilities, such as natural gas and other advantages for manufacturing, a population composed of all classes of producers, mechanics, miners, manufacturers, farmers, actively employed in a great diversity of industries, with a post-office yielding about $30,000 a year in actual receipts.

I venture to say that the President of the United States has signed over and over again bills providing for post-offices in cities of comparative insignificance. He has allowed bills to pass without his signature. He allowed a bill to pass to erect a public building at Portsmouth, in the State of Ohio, which does not contain the population of Youngstown.

The reasons given seem to me to be paltry, to use perhaps not a very polite phrase, but they are. He says he addressed a communication to the postmaster, and the postmaster did not reply. Why did he not turn out the postmaster, then, for failing in proper respect to his superior executive officer? Because the postmaster did not reply and give the information, therefore he vetoes a bill which affects the interests of every citizen of Youngstown. I have no doubt they can survive it; but I believe myself in the policy, and I am told the President favors a line of policy which will build post-offices in every town of four or five thousand inhabitants.

He has been quoted as being in favor of a bill reported by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, for which I intend to vote whenever it is amended and put in proper form. I would vote for such a bill; but the President vetoes a bill for a post-office building in this large and flourishing community, more than twice the size of many of the cities for which he has been willing to provide post-office buildings.

Mr. President, I do think that where the veto power is asserted on these local matters not affecting any question of constitutional power, not even affecting any question of discretionary power, in mere matters of detail like a bill providing for a post-office building or the like—when the veto power is asserted for the purpose of arresting the action of Congress on this class of bills, both Houses of Congress ought to rise and assert its power. Both Houses of Congress have by a unanimous vote passed this bill. They sent it to the President. The views which he utters in his veto message will not find weight with members of either House of Congress, because both Houses of Congress are committed to the policy of erecting public buildings in reasonable and proper places, and they have exercised that power over and over again.

Let Congress assert its power; and I speak in the utmost kindness for the President of the United States, for I feel nothing but kindness for him; I like him in many respects; but when he undertakes to put his veto power against both Houses of Congress, where the vote was unanimous and where the principle is clear and no mistake has been made, and where no reason is given for the veto, then Congress abnegates its power and surrenders its authority to pass laws if it sustains him, and the constitutional veto might as well be the absolute veto of a Roman emperor or the No of the Russian Czar, a perpetual veto rather than a mere motion to reconsider a bill, which the Constitution provides for doing, so that both Houses of Congress may, upon that reconsideration, with perfect kindness and sincerity, pass the bill notwithstanding the objections of the President.

I therefore ask that the bill lie upon the table unless some Senator wants to have it referred. There has been a full report giving all the details. I should like to have it lie on the table, and at some proper time I shall call it up in the hope that the Senate will pass it notwithstanding the veto.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, the course usually pursued in regard to vetoes sent us from the President of the United States is that the bill should go to the appropriate committee——

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to a reference if the Senator thinks fit.

Mr. VEST. And then let the bill be reported back to the Senate; and it seems to me the proper time for discussion would be then and not now.

I wish to say a word in reply to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. Upon that point will the Senator allow me?

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. SHERMAN. There have been very many such debates, and it is very common to have a veto message promptly debated, and indeed the Constitution contemplates that a bill so returned should be acted upon promptly.

Mr. ALLISON. The vote should be taken.

Mr. SHERMAN. The vote should be taken. I think that is the proper way.

Mr. VEST. I am not raising any point of order upon the remarks of the Senator from Ohio. Under the peculiar rules of the Senate, or rather the fact that there are hardly any rules to govern the Senate, the Senator from Ohio could discuss this question at any time after the bill was presented here. But it seems to me—and that is what I meant to say—that the appropriate time for discussion would be after the bill had gone back to the committee, and then was reported with their judgment upon it to the Senate for its action.

Now, Mr. President, I want to say a word in regard to this veto. I do not know whether I was present in committee when the bill was passed through the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and I do not undertake to say how I voted upon it. I know, and I make the confession very frankly, that I have voted or consented to the favorable report of bills like this from that committee under solicitation, strong solicitation, from my colleagues both in the other House and in the Senate.

I assert here to-day that the President of the United States has not been partial in the exercise of his vetoes in regard to public buildings. I say this the more frankly and freely because he exercised the veto in regard to a bill of this same character in my own State of Missouri, and he did it upon the express ground which he sets forth in this veto message, that the only claim for such a building was the fact that there was a post-office there, and the same reason applies to towns of the same size in every State in the Union.

If we are to assert the principle, if we are to establish the rule that every town of considerable size in the United States which has only a post-office is to have a public building, there is no necessity for reducing the tariff taxation of this country in order to get rid of the surplus in the Treasury.

Mr. DAWES. I should like to inquire of the Senator what is the principle upon which the bill is based that the Senator reported, I believe, or which his committee reported the other day, to build post-offices generally in every town where the postal receipts are $3,000 or over?

Mr. VEST. That bill is based upon the idea that in order to get rid of the present log-rolling system as to the construction of public buildings in the United States, we propose to give to the Post-Office Department the power to construct in all towns and cities of the United States where the gross amount of the postal revenue has been for three years preceding $3,000 an edifice for the use of the post-office which shall not cost more than $25,000.

Mr. DAWES. I wish to continue the inquiry.

Mr. VEST. Certainly.

Mr. DAWES. Would it not appear, then, that this veto rests upon a difference in method between enacting this law on its merits and enacting a general law?

Mr. VEST. I take it that no proposition is clearer than that the President of the United States is equally responsible with ourselves for the legislation of this country.

Mr. DAWES. That is not the inquiry. Nobody doubts that. Nobody doubts the power of the President——

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Ohio seemed to doubt it.

Mr. DAWES. If he deems it his duty to exercise that power, and he exercises it within his constitutional functions whenever he sees any reason; but the question is whether it is a proper exercise of the power of the veto simply because the method in which this bill has reached him is different from a method which he might prefer in a general bill that would bring them all in.

Mr. VEST. It is not a question of method; it is a question of the expenditure of the public money. Here is a bill that appropriates $100,000 for a post-office building alone, with no internal-revenue department even, with no accommodation needed for the judiciary, with nothing but simply postal accommodations in view.

Mr. PADDOCK. Seventy-five thousand dollars is the amount named in the bill.

Mr. VEST. The Senator from Ohio advances the extraordinary doctrine that the President of the United States, where both Houses of Congress have acted unanimously, should acquiesce in their action and in their judgment without inquiry upon his part, and he speaks of the Czar of Russia and the Sultan of Turkey and other examples of a similar character. The President of the United States is as much a portion of the legislative power as we are, and is as much responsible to our constituents. In the autonomy of our Government the Senate of the United States is a portion of the appointing power and the President of the United States a portion of the legislative power.

Mr. DAWES. Does the Senator mean to say that the President is as much a part of the legislative power as Congress, which can originate measures and can pass them in spite of him? Is he just as much a part of the legislative power as these two bodies who must, and who alone can, originate every legislative act that exists, and who have it in their power to pass it in spite of him? Is he just as much a part of the legislative power?

Mr. VEST. I commend to the Senator from Massachusetts his criticism in regard to method: I am discussing the question of power. It is true that the Congress of the United States originates legislation, but it is true that that legislation can not become effective without the approval of the President of the United States under the Constitution.

Mr. DAWES. Yes, it can.

Mr. VEST. How? We can pass it over his veto.

Mr. DAWES. Then would it not be effective?

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course, but that is another exercise of power under the Constitution. I am speaking now of the original action of the President in regard to the approval or disapproval of an act of Congress, and under the constitutional limitations he is as much a portion of the legislative power of this country as we ourselves.

Mr. DAWES. Does not the Senator observe the difference between a power to stop legislation and a power to legislate?

Mr. VEST. I recognize that to the fullest extent, and yet so far as the effect upon the people and their interests is concerned, the President of the United States by his approval of a bill becomes as much a portion of the legislative power as either House of Congress.

Mr. COKE. I suggest to the Senator from Missouri that he can not only approve and veto, but he can recommend legislation.

Mr. VEST. As a matter of course, he can originate to that extent by recommendation, and it is his constitutional duty to do so.

But I am not here to engage in any hair-splitting or refined arguments in regard to the difference between originating a bill and exercising the veto power against it. When the President approves a bill he joins in the legislative functions which we are exercising here to-day.

Under the theory of the Senator from Ohio the veto power is absolutely nullified. If both Houses of Congress concur with any unanimity in the passage of a measure, then the Senator from Ohio says that if the President vetoes it he becomes the Czar of Russia or the Sultan of Turkey.

Sir, the President of the United States is responsible to the people and to his oath of office as much as we are. In this particular case he thought the appropriation of $100,000 would be a waste of public money. He would have been a dishonest man if with that conviction he had put his executive approval upon the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. The Senator from Missouri is all wrong in his idea about the proper mode of dealing with a veto message. The old custom was when a veto message was sent to us to lay it on the table or to proceed to its immediate consideration. The Constitution seems to imply that that is the duty of the two branches, and when it was first proposed to refer a veto message to a committee it was considered as a substantial departure from the courtesy due to the President of the United States.

Mr. VEST. We have been doing it. All the pension vetoes were referred.

Mr. SHERMAN. I know, but only latterly. Here is what the Constitution provides:

> If he approve he shall sign it, but if not he shall return it, with his objections, to that House in which it shall have originated, who shall enter the objections at large on their Journal, and proceed to reconsider it.

Undoubtedly we may reconsider it through a committee in the ordinary forms of legislation, but that formerly was not the usual way, and very commonly the vote was at once taken, as the Constitution provided might be done.

Now, let me say another thing. I did not complain about the President so much, but I complained of Congress as giving a force to the President's veto which the Constitution did not contemplate. What is a veto? It is not what is considered a veto in Russia, or Austria, or countries of a despotic character, a veto, "I will not," or "I forbid," and that is the end of it. That is not the veto contemplated by the Constitution of the United States. It is simply a motion on the part of the President to ask Congress to reconsider a measure and pass again upon it, requiring a little greater majority to carry it over the veto, and that is all. It is nothing but a motion to reconsider. The President has no veto in the sense of a Russian or autocratic veto, but Congress has of late given to the President's veto superior power. The veto comes back here and then every Democrat is expected to rally around the standard of that veto, as if the veto message was a political document. That is what I object to.

I say now, that as this bill passed through both Houses of Congress after full consideration upon facts disclosed upon a report, a much stronger bill than dozens which have been signed by the President and others which have been passed by without signing, it is our duty to consider it upon its merits and not upon the merits of Grover Cleveland; and I say that upon the reasons given in that message considered by a Senator on the other side of the Chamber, he would not give them the weight of a straw. His talk about the sending to a postmaster and failing to get information—his talk about there being only a certain amount of population, 15,000 or 17,000, when there is now a population of 30,000 agreed on all hands, and it is an office that yields

$30,000 a year to the postal revenues of the country, in the midst of a large suburban population, with a great population engaged in many industries all around it, tributary to it for postal service.

Sir, there are more people within four miles of Youngstown, fivefold, than there are in Asheville, N. C., and Asheville has a post-office building. I do not know what the population of Asheville is, but I will venture to say that within the immediate postal delivery of Youngstown there are probably 30,000 people, among the most active and enterprising population on the globe, engaged in all branches of industry. Therefore, when it is the desire of these people to have a suitable place to carry on their postal service, and Congress responds to that demand upon reasons given, and the President overrules it, it seems to me the Senate of the United States ought to consider itself bound to decide that question upon its merits and not upon any political view it may take of Mr. Cleveland's right to make his veto final and conclusive or to give the constitutional veto, which requires only a few more votes than a majority to overthrow it, the force and finality of a ukase of the Czar of Russia.

Mr. VEST. If any additional argument were necessary in order to show the impropriety of these remarks on the part of the Senator from Ohio, he has just furnished that argument. He speaks now of Asheville, N. C., as a parallel case with this. The Senator ought to know that there are at Asheville, N. C., the United States courts and the internal-revenue department besides, neither of which is found at Youngstown, in the State of Ohio.

Mr. SHERMAN. What is the population of Asheville?

Mr. VEST. About 8,000 or 10,000.

Mr. VANCE. I will inform the Senator, if he will permit me, that the population of Asheville is 8,000. The President vetoed the first bill, passed by the last Congress and sent to him, and at this Congress the bill has been permitted to become a law without his signature.

Mr. PADDOCK. The gross postal receipts of Asheville for the last fiscal year were $10,135.89.

Mr. EDMUNDS. How much were the receipts at Youngstown?

Mr. PADDOCK. I do not know that I have the figures for Youngstown before me.

Mr. VEST. There are the United States courts and an internal-revenue department at Asheville. There is no parallel between the two cases. Let me say in regard to my own State of Missouri that we passed a bill here during the last Congress for the erection of a public building at Springfield, Mo., a place of 25,000 inhabitants, rapidly increasing, the metropolis of Southwest Missouri, considered to be advancing in population and wealth more rapidly than any other section of my State. The President vetoed the bill, and he vetoed it upon the ground that there was no necessity for a public building there except for postal accommodations. The Representative from that district then had passed a bill through the House of Representatives establishing a United States court there, and the bill became a law. The President at this session of Congress signed the same bill, because the objection that he made to it in the last Congress had been removed by the action of Congress itself.

I do not choose to waste my time, or that of the Senate, which is much more valuable, in answering epithets. I treat with contempt the allegation that I belong to the President of the United States or that I vote from political considerations to sustain him. I have opposed some of his appointments, but I take no credit for it. I am a Democrat, but I observe as far as I can my oath to support the Constitution and to preserve the interests of my constituency. I shall enter into no argument, but treat with the contempt it deserves the insinuation that I vote upon this bill or any other bill under the dictation of the President or from political motives. It is not true. The President of the United States is, I believe, an honest officer. He is entitled to his opinion. I endeavor to do my duty, and he endeavors to do his.

I might retort by pointing to the solid vote of the other side of this Chamber against the President at every opportunity. We are told that we vote to support him, and if I wanted to go into children's talk I would say "and you oppose him." But this sort of thing is unworthy the Senate of the United States.

I move that the bill and message be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri moves that the bill, with the accompanying message, be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I have no hesitation in voting to overrule the President's veto in a case which addressed itself to my judgment, either upon a public-building bill or in any other respect, but I do not think these criticisms of the President are well founded in this instance. I think the President is to be commended for the expression of his honest opinion and for his firmness in doing that which meets the approval of his judgment.

Now, what is the President required to do? To approve, to express his approval as the Executive of the country, uniting in its legislation, of the particular act of Congress. If in his honest judgment he does not approve it he is performing his constitutional duty in disapproving it; and although I might differ from him in opinion in the particular instance, I commend and admire him for his strong and honest and faithful performance of his duty according to his own opinion and his own judgment.

Mr. President, here is a question not of one public building but of $34,000,000 appropriated to the construction of public buildings. It is a policy in regard to which the President expresses his opinion, the policy of erecting public buildings in particular places according to population, or according to business. Who can defend or justify any policy for the appropriation of public money for the erection of a public building except upon the ground of the amount of public business to be transacted at the place?

These propositions are idle. If you regard population as the condition, you can have no public buildings in one-half of the cities of the Union. Many States are sparsely populated, others densely, and you can not administer a policy of this description in the erection of public buildings upon any other basis than in reference to the amount of public business which shall be done. Some limitation should be attached; and therefore there can be no propriety in this criticism of the President, and no force in the objection that we should not give proper and intelligent consideration to the reasons which he submits to us, and a fair judgment upon the objections which he has made.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] that the bill and accompanying message be referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The motion was agreed to.

DAVID A. SERVIS—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 820, entitled "An act granting a pension to David A. Servis."

The beneficiary named in this bill enlisted August 14, 1862, and was discharged June 8, 1865.

It is alleged that about the month of January, 1863, a comrade, by way of a joke, put powder into a pipe which the beneficiary was accustomed to smoke and covered it with tobacco, so that when he lighted it the powder exploded and injured his eyes. The report of the Senate committee states that it does not appear that "any notice was taken of this wanton act of his tent-mate."

There is no mention of any disability or injury in the record of the soldier's service. He seems to have served nearly two years and a half after the injury. He filed an application for a pension in May, 1885, more than twenty-two years thereafter.

Whatever may be the extent of the injury sustained, in regard to which the evidence is apparently quite meager, I can not see that it was such a result of military service as to entitle the applicant to a pension.

The utmost liberality to those who were in our Army hardly justifies a compensation by way of pension for injuries incurred in sport or pastime, or as the result of a practical joke.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 28, 1888.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Shall the bill pass notwithstanding the objections of the Executive? Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. PADDOCK. I move the reference of the bill and the message to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

ELISHA GRISWOLD—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 835, entitled "An act for the relief of Elisha Griswold."

The beneficiary named in this bill, which awards him a pension, enlisted in January, 1864, and was discharged February 12, 1866.

His claim for pension as developed in the report of the Senate Committee on Pensions is based upon the allegation that in January, 1866, he fell from a swing which had been put up in the building occupied as a barrack and struck on his head and shoulder.

The committee report in favor of the bill upon the grounds that the soldier was injured "while engaged in recreation," and that "such recreation is a necessary part of a soldier's life."

The beneficiary filed an application in January, 1880, and in support of such application he filed on the 16th day of July, 1886, an affidavit in which he testifies that at the time of the injury he was in prison at San Antonio, Tex., upon charges the character of which he could not ascertain, and that the swing from which he fell was erected by himself and others for pastime and exercise.

It will be seen that the injury complained of is alleged to have been sustained less than a month before his discharge. There is, however, no record of any disability.

His claim based upon this injury was, in my opinion, properly rejected as having no connection with his military service, and I think the facts in his case as herein detailed do not justify the award of a pension to him by special enactment.

On the 23d day of March, 1888, after the introduction of the bill herewith returned, the beneficiary, apparently having abandoned the claim upon which the bill is predicated, filed another application for a pension in the Pension Bureau, alleging that he contracted diarrhea and malarial poisoning in the service. This application is still pending.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 28, 1888.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. PADDOCK. I move that the bill, with the message, be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

ANNA MERTZ—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 1237, entitled "An act granting a pension to Anna Mertz."

The beneficiary named in this bill is the widow of Charles A. Mertz, who served in the Army as captain from April, 1862, to June, 1863, when he resigned on account of impaired health. It is stated in the committee's report that after his return from the Army he worked occasionally at his trade, though subject to attacks of very severe diarrhea, accompanied with acute catarrhal pains in the head and face, which he constantly attributed to his army service.

It is alleged that he had several times taken morphine under medical advice to allay pain caused by these attacks.

He did not apply for a pension.

On the 1st day of December, 1887, more than twenty-one years after his discharge from the Army, he died from an overdose of morphine self-administered, for the purpose, it is claimed, of alleviating his suffering.

I do not think that in this case the death of the soldier was so related to his military service as to entitle his widow to a pension.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 28, 1888.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. PADDOCK. I move the reference of the bill, with the message, to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLAIR. I merely wish to observe with regard to the merits of that bill, assuming them to be the same as stated in the veto message, that in a great many instances Congress has granted relief in just such cases.

The motion to refer the bill and message to the Committee on Pensions was agreed to.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War in response to a resolution of May 25, 1888, calling for information in relation to the destruction of the Government dam at the Rock Island Arsenal by the recent floods in the Mississippi, etc.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that the communication be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, in response to a resolution of May 22, 1888, calling for information as to the probable cost of a breakwater in the bay of Santa Monica, California; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. SABIN presented a petition of citizens of Chippewa County, Minnesota, praying for the passage of an amendment to the interstate-commerce law, providing that in case of all prosecutions commenced under it against any person or corporation for a violation of the act by a citizen of the United States, the complainant shall receive the benefit of any fines and penalties resulting therefrom; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. REAGAN presented a petition of citizens of Mason County, Texas, praying for legislation to prevent the manufacture and sale of adulterated articles and the use of misleading brands on food, medicines, and liquors; which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Madison County, Texas; a petition of citizens of Precinct No. 7, Fannin County, Texas; a petition of E. Martin and 15 citizens of Mason County, Texas; a petition of citizens of Johnson County, Texas; a petition of James Johnston and 15 citizens of Uvalde County, Texas, and a petition of the Asbury Farmers' Alliance No. 283, containing 60 members, of Hood County, Texas, praying that the work of the eradication of pleuro-pneumonia be continued under the Bureau of Animal Industry as at present organized, with a chief who shall be a veterinary surgeon; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DAWES. I present resolutions of the Boston Turnverein, an association of highly respectable citizens and residents of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts of foreign birth, protesting against the passage of the bill pending in this body to restrict immigration. I do not know the exact status of that bill, whether it has been reported or is still in committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is before the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair is informed.

Mr. DAWES. Then I move the reference of the resolutions to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PAYNE presented a petition of nine local assemblies of Knights of Labor of the State of Ohio, remonstrating against the passage of any bill granting civil pensions; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, presented a petition of citizens of White County, Arkansas, and a petition of citizens of Franklin County, Arkansas, praying that in view of the public disclosures of gross violations of the interstate-commerce law by the railway companies of the country, Congress will pass the necessary amendments to that law which will protect the public from such violations; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Arkansas, praying for the passage of a bill which will appropriate at least the amount placed in the river and harbor bill of the House for snagging operations in the Arkansas River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a letter of Harvey Lewis, of Little Rock, Ark., a practical steam-boat man, asking that an appropriation be made for the purpose of carrying on snagging operations in the Arkansas River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2847) granting a pension to Albert F. Jones;
A bill (S. 2689) granting a pension to Mrs. Sadie Scott;
A bill (S. 2853) granting a pension to Mary J. Mahoney;
A bill (S. 2819) granting an increase of pension to William W. Bliss;
A bill (S. 1901) granting a pension to Levi B. Smith; and
A bill (S. 2896) granting a pension to Joseph H. Welty.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of John F. Ryon, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-third Indiana Volunteers, praying for an increase of pension, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the committee were discharged from the further consideration of the petition.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1719) granting a pension to Levi B. Smith;
A bill (S. 2862) granting a pension to William M. Dean;
A bill (S. 2898) granting a pension to Sarah E. Boulter; and
A bill (S. 1427) granting an increase of pension to Elnathan Meade.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2833) granting a pension to Caspar Banke, of Portland, Oregon; and
A bill (H. R. 8281) for the relief of Lieut. James G. W. Hardy.

Mr. TURPIE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2437) granting a pension to James G. W. Hardy;
A bill (S. 2835) granting a pension to James Taggart;
A bill (S. 2817) for the relief of J. W. Mackey;
A bill (S. 2859) granting a pension to Alfred G. Romine;
A bill (S. 1429) granting a pension to Jane B. Dunn; and
A bill (S. 2812) for the relief of Eliza Douglass.

Mr. QUAY, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H. Res. 103) authorizing and directing the Department of Justice to transfer certain rooms which have been occupied by the United States courts and officials to the city of Utica, N. Y., reported it without amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the joint resolution (S. R. 79) permitting the public building authorized by act of Congress approved May 8, 1882, at Denver, Colo., to be located not less than 16 feet from any other building, instead of 40 feet, as provided in said act, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2539) to authorize and direct the purchase of part of a lot adjoining the Senate stables for their ventilation, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon

Mr. QUAY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1002) granting a pension to Thomas Todd;
A bill (S. 2880) granting an increase of pension to Adam Dennis; and
A bill (S. 2910) to increase the pension now paid to Elizabeth B. Smith, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Thomas Kilby Smith, United States Volunteers.

Mr. QUAY, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 33) for the relief of Thomas J. Miller, of Washington Territory, submitted an adverse report thereon.

Mr. DOLPH. That bill has twice passed the Senate. I ask that it be placed on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar with the adverse report.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2675) granting an increase of pension to Lieut. James R. Durham;

A bill (S. 2275) granting a pension to Mary Calvert Truxtun; and
A bill (H. R. 7097) granting a pension to Edmund Ryan.

Mr. PADDOCK, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2593) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah McNamara, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was recommitted the bill (S. 2549) for the relief of Belle R. Clements, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2874) granting a pension to George W. Padgett, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HARRIS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2742) to incorporate the Brightwood Railway Company of the District of Columbia, reported it with amendments.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was recommitted the bill (S. 1138) to reimburse the depositors of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company for losses incurred by the failure of said company, reported it with amendments.

Mr. BLODGETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2838) granting an increase of pension to Betsey A. Mower, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 4735) for the relief of Douglas Chapman;
A bill (H. R. 7642) granting a pension to Abbie R. Brown; and
A bill (H. R. 4864) to place the name of Jacob Behr on the pension-roll.

Mr. BLODGETT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was recommitted the bill (S. 2344) granting a pension to Minnie A. Bailey, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon, which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2770) granting a pension to Mary Peckham Rodman;
A bill (S. 2814) granting a pension to John O'Donnell;
A bill (S. 2834) granting a pension to Rebecca Craig; and
A bill (S. 2792) granting an increase of pension to Silas Parker.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2483) granting a pension to Catherine Tate, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1961) granting a pension to Catherine Tate, reported it adversely, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 8629) granting a pension to Mrs. Abba E. Jackson;
A bill (S. 889) granting a pension to Mary O. Hall;
A bill (H. R. 7721) granting a pension to Martha Linton;
A bill (H. R. 7974) granting a pension to Herman Rankins;
A bill (H. R. 7574) granting a pension to Frank Lewis;
A bill (H. R. 6770) granting a pension to Miss Carrie A. Luey; and
A bill (H. R. 5812) granting a pension to Catherine Tierney.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BLAIR introduced a bill (S. 3053) granting a pension to Mrs. Eleanor Henrietta Reid; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VEST (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3054) to abolish the police court and office of the justice of the peace in and for the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. FAULKNER introduced a bill (S. 3055) to equalize the pay of assistant attorneys in the Department of Justice; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. TELLER introduced a bill (S. 3056) to pay certain Indian depredation claims; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. McPHERSON introduced a bill (S. 3057) to increase the pension now paid to Mrs. D. P. Woodbury; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. BECK submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2952) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies taken and used by the United States Army, as reported by the Court of Claims, under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1883, known as the Bowman act; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MITCHELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Commerce.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT DENVER.

Mr. TELLER. The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds reported this morning a joint resolution to enable the architect to complete the public building at Denver. There is a report from the Supervising Architect, and I ask that the resolution be taken up.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will first conclude the call for morning business.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Mr. SHERMAN. I submit a resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the message of the President of February 20, 1888, transmitting a treaty between the United States and Great Britain, concerning the interpretation of the convention of October 20, 1818, signed at Washington February 15, 1888, together with the said treaty and accompanying documents, from which the injunction of secrecy has been removed, be printed.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is necessary to have the reprint. The copies have run out.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate do now proceed to the consideration of the treaty.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will receive further morning business.

IMPORTATION OF SILVER-LEAD ORES.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate whether silver-lead ores are being imported from any foreign country into the United States, and to what extent, and whether any duty is under the rulings of the Department collectible under existing law on the lead so imported in such ores, and to what amount; and whether any duty is being collected on any such silver-lead ores so imported into the United States, and if so, whether such importations are by the Department held and subjected to the duty of 20 per cent. ad valorem to which mineral substances in a crude state are subjected under existing law.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Senator if that is in addition to and for the purpose of eliciting information not contained in Executive Document 171, Fiftieth Congress, first session?

Mr. MITCHELL. My attention has not been called to that document, so I can not answer the question.

Mr. COCKRELL. I then ask that the resolution may go over, and I call the attention of the Senator from Oregon to this executive document in answer to a resolution heretofore introduced by him on the same subject.

Mr. MITCHELL. Not introduced by me.

Mr. COCKRELL. By some Senator.

Mr. MITCHELL. I ask, in view of that fact, that the resolution be printed and lie over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be printed and go over.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. TELLER. I ask that the little resolution to which I referred, and which was reported this morning, be taken up and passed.

Mr. SHERMAN. I appeal to my friend. According to the courtesies of the Senate, as the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] is ready to proceed, I think he ought to be allowed to proceed now.

Mr. TELLER. Then I will ask that the joint resolution be not printed. It is not worth while to print it, and I will call it up during the day.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The joint resolution will lie on the table without being printed.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the fisheries treaty.

MINISTER TO URUGUAY AND PARAGUAY.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator to allow me to offer a resolution for reference.

Mr. SHERMAN. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution of the Senator from Florida will be received and read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations be instructed to inquire and report as to the expediency of reporting an amendment to the consular and diplomatic bill (H. R. 6833) providing for an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Uruguay and Paraguay at a salary of $10,000 a year.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator ask for the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. CALL. Yes, sir.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to.

POTEAU RIVER BRIDGE IN ARKANSAS.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I ask the Senator from Ohio to yield to me for a moment for the purpose of making a few merely verbal corrections in a bill which has been recalled from the House of Representatives and is on the table of the Secretary.

Mr. SHERMAN. That, I suppose, is morning business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Arkansas asks

unanimous consent that the Senate proceed now to the consideration of a bill recalled from the House of Representatives, the title of which will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 1948) to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the vote of the Senate by which this bill was passed and also the vote by which it was ordered to a third reading will be reconsidered.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. For the purpose of making some corrections, I move to strike out the word "railway" where it appears and insert the word "bridge." The Secretary has a memorandum of the corrections.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 10, section 4, page 3, it is proposed to strike out "railway" and insert "bridge;" in line 22 to strike out "railroad" and insert "bridge;" and in the last line of the section to strike out the words "the railway" and insert the words "said bridge."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GRADE OF GENERAL.

Mr. SHERMAN. I renew my motion.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask consent to make a report from the Committee on Military Affairs. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs to report with an amendment the bill (S. 2210) to revive the grade of General in the United States Army.

Mr. President, I am greatly pleased to be authorized by the Committee on Military Affairs to report this bill favorably. Its purpose is to revive during the lifetime of the present Lieutenant-General of the Army the grade of General of the Army, with the provision that both those grades of rank shall cease with the life of Lieutenant-General Sheridan.

I will not take up the time of the Senate and refer to the sad occasion that makes this bill, as it seems to me, a proper one for the Senate to consider under a departure from its general rules that it shall go upon the Calendar with the report of the committee. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that the bill may now be considered.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the bill this morning reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, the title of which will be read by the Secretary.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2210) to revive the grade of General in the United States Army.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BERRY. I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Arkansas objects, and the bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask, then, that the bill be placed on the Calendar with the favorable report, and I will move its consideration at an early day or perhaps during this day.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Mr. SHERMAN. I renew my motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the fisheries treaty in open executive session.

Mr. MORGAN. I hope the Senator from Ohio will let me have a bill considered to build a railroad bridge across the Tennessee River.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have been compelled by the rule of courtesy, which has always prevailed, to deny yielding to others, and therefore I can not waive it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Alabama asks unanimous consent for the consideration of a bill, the title of which will be reported by the Secretary.

Mr. SHERMAN. I feel bound to object under the circumstances, as I have objected to others. I have no objection to the bill, but it can be taken up at some other time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question recurs on the motion of the Senator from Ohio, that the Senate do now proceed in open executive session to the consideration of the fisheries treaty.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senate is now in open executive session for the consideration of the fisheries treaty.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask for the reading of the minutes of the last open session of this kind.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the minutes of the last open executive session will be read by the Secretary.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Proceedings of the United States Senate in open executive session.

MONDAY, *May* 28, 1888.

In pursuance of a motion this day adopted in executive session, at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.—

The doors were opened, and the Senate in open executive session resumed the consideration of the treaty (Ex. M) between the United States and Great Britain, concerning the interpretation of the convention of October 20, 1818, signed at Washington February 15, 1888.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the injunction of secrecy be removed from all proceeding of the Senate in reference to the treaty with Great Britain now under consideration.

On motion by Mr. CULLOM, at 5 o'clock p. m., the Senate adjourned.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, what is the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question before the Senate is whether the Journal that has just been read shall be approved. If there be no motion to correct or amend the Journal just read, it will stand approved.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, what is the question?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question before the Senate is the consideration of the fisheries treaty. It having been read by articles in Committee of the Whole, it is open to amendment; and the Senator [Mr. FRYE] is entitled to the floor.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President——

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to know, Mr. President, whether or not the state of this treaty is such as will leave it open to amendment on the reading of the articles separately, or whether it is open to amendment generally?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The articles have been separately read in Committee of the Whole, and the Chair holds that it is now open to amendment article by article.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to submit a motion to postpone the further consideration of the treaty.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair can not receive that motion now, the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE] having been recognized as entitled to the floor.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, I was about to ask a courtesy from the Senator from Maine, which I anticipate will not be granted——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Alabama did not ask a courtesy of the Senator from Maine.

Mr. MORGAN. I was addressing the President and had not reached him yet. I now address the President, and ask the President if I may say to the Senator from Maine that I ask of him the courtesy to allow me to interpose a motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. FRYE. I can not.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine declines to yield.

Mr. MORGAN. I give notice, then, that on the conclusion of the Senator's remarks I will make that motion, to postpone, so that he can debate it if he chooses.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, the evolution from darkness to light, from closed doors to open doors, is, I admit, somewhat disturbing to me. I had reasonably equipped myself for a discussion with closed doors by such preparation as seemed to me necessary when addressing Senators alone, familiar with the subject. I now suddenly find myself compelled to invite into my confidence sixty millions of Abraham Lincoln's plain people of the Republic—people not like the Senators, familiar with the question—and I am aware that no adequate preparation has been made by me to meet this contingency. But, sir, I have no time in which to make it, and therefore I can do what only is left for me—throw myself upon your indulgence and theirs, and thus, if possible, blunt somewhat the sharp edge of criticism.

Mr. President, this is not a trifling question before the Senate to-day. It involves the dignity and the honor of a great republic and the rights of its citizens. It can not be belittled by localization; it can not be belittled by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] charging that it is a New England industry of but little account; that Yankee fishermen alone are interested; that the wrongs to be righted are only up in the Northeast. It can not be obscured by the President of the United States intimating that in the event this treaty is rejected he will resort to the law which Congress has enacted, not as the friends of the fishermen would require, not as they would advise, but in such way and such manner as would place in jeopardy and might destroy all the business interests of the great North all along the border; nor by the President writing to his district attorney in Massachusetts and calling his attention to the fact that there have been violations of the law in the importation of Canadian sailors; when thousands of railroad laborers have been imported within the last two years into New England, complaint has been made to his Attorney-General and evidence has been filed before him, presumably known to the President, and yet he preserves a profound silence; nor by proclamations by the honorable Secretary of State, nor by interviews furnished to the Boston Herald, nor by letters written by him to the Manhattan Club in New York when entertaining the distinguished diplomatist from abroad, in which he declared that every man who opposed the ratification of this treaty is either controlled by personal prejudice or partisanship or profound ignorance; nor by Administration papers flippantly and jeeringly suggesting that they had better buy up the Yankee fishermen and their smacks.

Mr. President, the question before the senate is, shall citizens of the United States, fishermen if you please, but citizens of the United States

still, be protected against injustice, wrong, and outrage, inflicted by a neighboring nation emboldened to it only because they rest under the ægis of a mighty power beyond the seas? That is the question to which the Senate must address itself now. Even these Yankee fishermen have entitled themselves to the respect of the United States Senate, to a lofty niche in the temple of Liberty.

Why, Mr. President, they did more to wrest from France these very waters outlined here on the two maps on the wall behind me than all the rest of the whole British Empire together, and in the war for our independence their services can not be overestimated. They fought on every deck of every ship that Paul Jones commanded. Take that picture, drawn by General Knox, of the fishermen of Marblehead—perhaps entitled to contempt in the United States Senate because they are fishermen of Marblehead—see our Revolutionary army on the banks of the river on that bitter cold night; before them a foaming, rushing, mighty stream; huge cakes of ice crashing together; Washington looking on in dismay, and finally demanding "Who shall take this army across the river?" and the fishermen of Marblehead, the fishermen of Marblehead alone to a man, stepping forward and piloting the army across the perilous pathway to glory, power, and independence.

In the war of 1812 the victories which we won on ocean and on lake were due largely to the prowess, the skill, and the patriotism of the Yankee fishermen. And in that last terrible struggle of this Republic for her life there was not a single deck of an American ship unmoistened by their blood.

Do Senators think that men who have made a history like this are entitled to be treated with contempt? Do Senators think that there is no duty on the part of this great Republic to listen to their cry? When they ask for bread will you give them a stone; for fish, a serpent?

If we have another war it will be on the ocean. Who will man our ships? Eighty-five per cent. of the sailors on ships in the foreign trade are foreigners, owing the Republic no allegiance, willing to render her no service. These fishermen are 80 per cent. American citizens, 65 per cent. American birth; inured to hardship, constantly exposed to the perils of the sea, brave, skillful, patriotic, they would respond to a man to the bugle-call of the country. Why should not the Republic stand by them when they are in peril, when they are suffering wrong at the hands of a foreign power?

Why, Mr. President, the greatness of a nation consists largely in its jealous care for its citizens, humble though they may be. King Theodore in 1863 or 1864 took Captain Cameron, an Englishman, prisoner, incarcerated him in the fortress of Magdala, on the top of a mountain 9,000 feet above the level of the sea. The Queen of Great Britain demanded his release; the king refused. Great Britain embarked at Bombay 4,000 British soldiers and 10,000 Sepoys, landed them on the coast, marched them 400 miles through swamps and morasses, under a burning sun, led them up the mountain heights, gave battle to the enemy, battered down the wall, took that citizen like a brand from the burning, carried him down across the swamps and marshes, placed him on board a ship, and carried him home to England. What a magnificent exhibition of power for just one citizen! It cost Great Britain millions and millions of dollars; it made General Napier Lord Napier, of Magdala.

In the presence of such an incident one is so lost in admiration as almost to forget the injustice and the wrongs that same great country inflicts day by day upon her own citizens within her own borders.

There are Senators here now listening to me who can remember how their pulses quivered when they read that modest report sent by Commander Ingraham from Smyrna: "I weighed my anchor; I drew to within half a cable's length of the Austrian brig of war. Near her was a 10-gun schooner and two armed merchantmen ready to assist her. I ran up the American flag, shotted my guns, and demanded this poor fellow, who had no more American citizenship than the filing of his intention to become one, and he was surrendered."

I tell you, Senators, incidents like that kindle the blood in every patriot's heart, and yet neither country did more than what her duty required. The country that neglects its citizen, that permits him to be outraged by a foreign power, has no right to call on him when her hour of peril comes.

Now, Mr. President, I declare, and I do it in all humility, that this great, powerful Republic has shamefully neglected the rights of these American fishermen, has refused to listen to their cries, has given them a stone when they asked for bread again and again.

After the war of independence we met to make a treaty of peace. There were bold, courageous men in the land who loved their country and were jealous for its honor. The result was a treaty by the terms of which every right of every fisherman, every right of this little feeble Republic was provided for; ay, more, Great Britain went even to the extent of surrendering to us the right to fish on banks that were from 40 to 300 miles from the shore. Generous Great Britain giving to us that over which she had no more control than she had over the waters of mid-ocean! She never surrendered that which was hers, nor one jot nor one tittle of it, without adequate and fully adequate compensation. But we received then in our weakness, in our infancy, all that any patriot would ask.

But the arrogance of Great Britain displayed in the conduct of those negotiations continued, and ere long we found her seizing our ships on the seas, searching them, taking off our sailors, compelling them to do her service until in 1812 we once more declared war against her, fought the war through and again were victorious. Again when the war was over we met to make a treaty of peace and Great Britain said, "You have forfeited by the war every right you ever had in these northeastern waters." We had men there, patriots, men of honor, and courage, who promptly, distinctly, and emphatically declared, "If you undertake to make that a provision in this treaty of peace, there shall be no peace." The result was that the treaty was entirely silent as to the fishery rights.

I call attention now, Mr. President, to the treaty of 1818, the provisions of which, I suppose, have been in force since the abrogation of the fishery clauses of the treaty of Washington. In the negotiation of this, England evinced neither magnanimity nor sentiment, and our commissioners neither sagacity nor courage. The times were not propitious for us. Waterloo had been fought; the allies had entered Paris; Napoleon had abdicated, and England was arrogant. We deliberately surrendered our fishery rights, and a blow was dealt that industry from which it has never recovered. By its terms England laid the foundation for ceaseless demands, and invited her colonies to the enactment of penal laws and the commission of outrages in their name which would disgrace any civilization.

I call attention to Article I:

> And the United States hereby renounce forever any liberty heretofore enjoyed or claimed by the inhabitants thereof to take, dry, or cure fish on or within 3 marine miles of any of the coasts, bays, creeks, or harbors of His Britannic Majesty's dominions in America, not included within the above-mentioned limits,

with a proviso that our fishermen might enter these bays, etc., for shelter or to repair damage, to purchase wood and take water, but for no other purpose whatever.

What did we secure by this treaty? It provided for a partition of rights; it provided that we should surrender I should say two-thirds of all the waters our men had fought for and wrested from France. But we did have courage enough to insist that if our fishermen were driven by stress of weather into any of these surrendered waters they should have shelter; if out of wood, they might purchase it; if their water-tanks were empty, they might fill them; if their vessels were out of repair, they might repair them, but we should resort to these waters "for no other purpose whatever."

Time wore on, the United States grew in power, in population, in importance, immensely in the extent of our market. Great Britain and Canada, too, looked at that market with avaricious eyes, and deliberately determined to possess themselves of it. There was no hesitation, no question of right, no regard for decency, no obligation of hospitality, but "Your market we propose to have." What for? So that the Canadian fishery fleet may be doubled or quadrupled, so that the Canadian sailors may be increased four, six, or eight times, so that when Great Britain needs sailors she shall know where to find the bravest and the best in all the wide world.

So Canada resorted to every conceivable outrage, perpetrated every imaginable wrong and injustice, drove our vessels to sea in storms when they had sought shelter; seized and searched them on the high seas even; placed armed men on board, practically making captives of their captains and crews in their own vessels, the American flag flying over them; tried them in the colonial courts on the testimony of colonial witnesses, and confiscated one after another; and this went on until indeed the perils of the sea on these Grand Banks were no greater than the dangers of the law on the shore.

Mr. Van Buren sent an American fleet into these waters. Mr. Franklin Pierce sent men-of-war there, and in the presence of our armed vessels our fishermen were protected in their rights, but when the vessels were withdrawn then the outrages commenced again. Great Britain sent a fleet into these waters to overawe the United States of America. She accomplished her purpose. She has a wonderful facility for doing that with us. She secured the treaty of 1854, known as the reciprocity treaty, under which we were permitted to fish within her waters, her fishermen in our waters, and free entry to our markets for their fish was permitted—all they wanted, and just what the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. SAULSBURY] and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. PAYNE] within two days have said on the floor of the Senate they shall have again if we do not ratify this treaty.

Mr. MORGAN. I take the liberty of denying that I said that.

Mr. PAYNE. The Senator from Maine will allow me a word.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PALMER in the chair). Does the Senator from Maine yield?

Mr. FRYE. I do.

Mr. PAYNE. I have not said any such thing on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. FRYE. And I suppose the Senator from Alabama will say the same.

Mr. MORGAN. No; I did not say what the Senator alleges that I said.

Mr. FRYE. I say that I listened to those three Senators and certainly heard each one of them give an intimation that unless this treaty was ratified we must look out lest free fish were incorporated in our tariff

laws, and the Senator from Alabama asked me if that would not settle this question, and I assured him that it undoubtedly would.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from Maine first makes an assertion as to what I said in executive session, of which there is no record of course—that I declared that in the event this treaty was not ratified Great Britain would make war upon the United States, that I made the threat. He then qualifies it and contradicts it, and says he understood me as intimating such a thing might take place. I leave the Senator with his own declaration as my vindication.

Mr. FRYE. I say the Senator talked about free fish, and asked me if that would not solve the question.

Mr. MORGAN. Because I had frequently heard the Senator from Maine say that it would.

Mr. FRYE. Now, does the Senator stand in his place and say that he did not intend that what he said about free fish should be regarded by us as an intimation that fish should be put on the free-list if the treaty was rejected?

Mr. MORGAN. I did not think it ever liable to happen, and I think you are opposed to it.

Mr. FRYE. Did not the Senator intend it for that purpose?

Mr. MORGAN. For the purpose of doing what—putting fish on the free-list?

Mr. FRYE. For the purpose of covertly making a threat that it would be done if the treaty was not ratified.

Mr. MORGAN. I said this, and I say it here in the Senate again, and the Senate have all heard me say it, that the Senator from Maine himself had asserted on frequent occasions that putting fish on the free-list, admitting them free of duty into this country, would solve the whole of this difficulty. I said, "Oh, no," that I had not made up my mind to vote for a proposition of that kind, but there were certain considerations that weighed in favor of fishermen which I thought did not apply to any other class of people at all, and I went on to define what they were. I admonished that side of the Chamber, and I respectfully do it again, that if you present the question to the people of the United States of going to war with Great Britain against the question of letting in fish free of duty, you have a dangerous issue before you. That is all.

Mr. FRYE. Precisely; and I ask no different reply than that from the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. MORGAN. You have got it now. That is all right.

Mr. FRYE. I say they obtained by the treaty of 1854 all they were after—free fish. That treaty continued in existence for twelve years. Our fleet in that time lost 100,000 tons and more than two thousand men; and their fleet increased over 160,000 tons, and their men, sailors, over three thousand in numbers. When the twelve years had passed we abrogated that treaty by more than a two-thirds vote in both Houses.

Mr. President, the moment the treaty was abrogated Canada adopted the license system. The first year she placed a tax upon our vessels of 50 cents a ton, to do what? Fifty cents a ton to enjoy every commercial privilege we ever asked for. Fifty cents a ton to fish in every foot of British waters at a time when the best mackerel-fishing in the whole world was found there, at a time when we only fished with hook and line, and when most of our mackerel were taken in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the Bay of Chaleurs, Fortune Bay, and these other bays; and yet the Senator from Alabama in his three days' speech called our attention to the generous, magnanimous, magnificent present Great Britain had just proffered us in the *modus vivendi*, and the President of the United States bowed before Great Britain in humble thankfulness and gratitude that she should bestow this immense favor upon our people. And what is the *modus vivendi?* You pay one dollar and a half a ton, and you shall have what? The right to fish in our waters? Oh, no, not at all. You shall have commercial privileges which you are entitled to to-day under the laws of Great Britain and the United States, commercial privileges which Secretary Bayard has insisted for two years we were entitled to, commercial privileges which their vessels have enjoyed in every part of the United States for the entire two years during which they have been committing these outrages on us.

Generous *modus vivendi!* They found that some of our fishermen paid the 50 cents, and next year they doubled it; a few paid that, and the next year they doubled it again; then the fishermen refused to pay. Once more the dogs of war were let loose; once more commenced these outrages; once more the poor, helpless fishermen, driven in a storm onto those shores, were treated with every conceivable act of inhumanity. They continued this course in season and out of season; there was no let-up; and the Congress of the United States was just on the point of passing a retaliatory law in response to a memorial from the fishermen of New England when once more we resorted to diplomacy in the treaty of 1871.

The treaty of 1871 was not to settle fishery difficulties primarily. It was entered into for what was regarded as a larger purpose even than that. We had a terrible conflict, and Great Britain clearly desired that this country should be cut in twain, that the experiment of a republic should fail forever. She wanted the Southern market, and without the slightest hesitation, without any regard for right, she went for it, knowing that she could only obtain it by dividing the Republic. She hastened to recognize belligerent rights on the part of the South. She joined with France in undertaking to build up a monarchy in Mexico which should be a perpetual menace to the Republic. She gave us ten days' notice in which to return Mason and Slidell, and started troops of war for Canada. She built cruisers, armed them, equipped them, manned them, sent them out upon the ocean to prey upon our commerce and to drive it from the seas. She prolonged the war at least two years from her unfriendliness to us, to us as a republic. When the war was over, and General Grant was President of the United States, our people who had been damaged by her cruisers sent in claims, and the President presented them.

Great Britain refused to pay, and our mighty, peace-loving President sent a message to his people saying to them, "Send me your bills and I will collect them in time;" and then negotiations for a treaty were entered upon, and the Alabama claims were its foundation. The fishery matter was subsidiary. The treaty was made finally; in it an article providing that if there was any balance due Canada for the privileges given us—the right to fish in her waters—we should pay, and that commissioners should be appointed to determine how much the payment should be. The treaty also provided that Canadian fish should have free entry to our markets. This of course, for it was the one thing Great Britain and Canada coveted.

Mr. MORGAN. I would call the attention of the Senator to the fact that on the 17th of July, 1870, when the tariff was under consideration, a bill was passed, when both branches of Congress were Republican, in which, without any treaty at all, it was provided that "fish, fresh, for immediate consumption" and "fish for bait" should be put on the free-list. That was not a treaty obligation. The Republicans conceded that to Great Britain without any treaty.

Mr. FRYE. Now, I suppose the Senator would like to lead me off from this discussion to that. "Fish, fresh, for immediate consumption" has a very familiar sound to me. In consequence of the refusal of this Administration to make any different construction from that heretofore had, the Canadians to-day are getting control of our fresh-fish market without paying any duty. I have not time now to discuss that question. It was only intended to apply to fish taken to-day consumed to-morrow. It did not apply to fresh fish frozen by modern processes and capable of being kept for six months or a year in good condition to send all over the United States. When that item was inserted in the tariff law, these foregoing processes, refrigerators on cars and on fishing vessels, were entirely unknown. There ought now to be a provision making such fish dutiable.

I say once more that the treaty of 1871 gave Great Britain a market, having obtained it by her own outrages upon us as a people. The fishery part of the treaty was due to Canadian outrages, while the Alabama claims part came from England's own acts of injustice. That treaty endured for twelve years. But before going on with that I wish to go back a bit. I said we appointed a commission, and I will say a few words in relation to that. We had for a commissioner a weak old man, no more fit to cope in diplomacy with Sir John A. Macdonald than Secretary Bayard was with Joseph Chamberlain and Sir Charles Tupper.

Mr. MORGAN. Who appointed him?

Mr. FRYE. A Republican President. The umpire appointed was Mr. Delfosse, a Belgian, practically controlled by Great Britain, as she well knew when he was appointed. They went to Halifax, as these plenipotentiaries sat here. They investigated and found that we must pay Great Britain or Canada $5,500,000 as the balance in her favor under the treaty. Mr. Delfosse determined it. He was the umpire with the casting vote. We paid it, but after paying it and within a very short time asked Great Britain to let us abrogate that treaty, and she refused, though we had paid the $5,500,000 for the whole twelve years. She still had a very good bargain, and would not give it up.

What more? During the twelve years we remitted in duty to Canada over $6,000,000, making $11,500,000 we paid for that attempt at diplomacy. What did we gain from it? We, during the whole twelve years, captured in British waters about $700,000 worth of fish, and to catch them cost us $1,200,000. The last three years of the treaty there were not a dozen American fishermen in British waters fishing, notwithstanding we had a right to go where we pleased.

Time fortunately rolled on, and the day came when notice could be given to terminate this iniquitous treaty so far as the fisheries were concerned. I believe I had the honor to recognize the fact that the day had come, and offered a resolution in the Senate instructing or requesting the President to give the requisite two years' notice for the abrogation of the fishery clauses. It passed the Senate unanimously. The President gave the notice, and in 1885, on the 1st day of July, we had no treaty for the fisheries except the treaty of 1818; all were abrogated.

If we had taken a manly course at that moment if this great Republic of 60,000,000 people had simply stood on its rights then and there, there would have been peace, there would have been quiet, all the rights we were entitled to we should have been enjoying to-day; but Secretary Bayard could not permit it. He has an itching palm for diplomacy. It delights his very soul to be engaged in a diplomatic correspondence. He was profoundly ignorant of the fishery matter then, as could be proved without the slightest difficulty if I had the

time to do it. I suppose he would admit it himself. There was a gentleman here, Sir Lionel West, the British minister, who was not ignorant, and he easily persuaded Secretary Bayard, honestly, too, so far as the Secretary was concerned, that it would be six months before Congress met, that it was right in the midst of a fishing season, that there would be conflict between the fishermen of the United States and of Canada, and very likely that might lead to a war with Great Britain, and he said, "What can I do? Anything you say," and he made a *modus vivendi*, clearly without any right to do it under the Constitution, which gave us the right for six months to fish in the British waters and them the right to fish in ours for the same length of time. But that was not the nub of the arrangement. It was this:

And the President of the United States shall recommend to Congress the appointment of a commission to settle fishery rights.

The President of the United States, in obedience to the behest of his Secretary of State, sent in his message to Congress the moment it met, recommending that Congress provide for a commission to settle fishery rights. I believe I then had the honor to offer another resolution that it was the sense of the United States Senate that we wanted no commission to settle fishery rights. I suppose the Senate then believed it had had enough of treaties, that the last one had given us sufficient not to desire another right away. That was sent to the Committee on Foreign Relations, reported unanimously, came back to the Senate, was discussed, deliberately acted upon, and unanimously passed, I believe.

Mr. MORGAN. That was not what was declared.

Mr. FRYE. I am not giving the exact language of the resolution; I am only giving from memory the spirit of it. If the Senator has the exact language I am entirely willing to adopt it.

Mr. MORGAN. It was entirely the other way. All that was declared in the resolution was that Congress had no right to appoint such a commission.

Mr. FRYE. That can not be so. I drew the resolution myself.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator has forgotten about it.

Mr. FRYE. I have not forgotten. I know that is not a correct statement of the resolution I offered.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator allow me to read it?

Mr. FRYE. I have it for myself now. I offered the following resolution.

Mr. MORGAN. I am talking about what the Senate passed.

Mr. FRYE. The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate the appointment of a commission, in which the Governments of the United States and Great Britain shall be represented, charged with the consideration and settlement of the fishing rights of the two Governments on the coasts of the United States and British North America, ought not to be provided for by Congress.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; "by Congress."

Mr. FRYE. There is no stress on that "by Congress," and nobody ever dreamed that the words "by Congress" were of any importance.

Mr. MORGAN. I will take the liberty of saying to the Senator here that that was the express ground on which it was placed in the debate; that it was the President's constitutional right to conduct negotiations, and that Congress had no right to settle questions that belonged to diplomacy. The resolution would not have gone through in any other form.

Mr. FRYE. For six months we had peace because we had the *modus vivendi*, but after that resolution was passed by the Senate the peace was at once interrupted, and in the next year and a half one hundred and twenty American vessels were seized in those waters on every conceivable pretense; they were driven to sea in storms; they were refused hospitality; they were treated so barbarously that your Democratic Secretary of the Treasury declared the treatment to be "brutal;" they were so brutal that every Senator here was at once an American; they were so brutal that every member of both Houses of Congress was an American, and party lines disappeared in the twinkling of an eye.

Now, in this open session, addressing the people as well as the Senate, I feel it necessary to reproduce a few of the outrages committed by Canada on our fishermen. I am not certain that if Senators on that side of the Chamber listen to the recitals once more they will feel conscience-stricken and vote to reject the treaty. They would have done it then. Now, see what Canada was doing to us in 1886. In the month of July, as the American schooners Shiloh and Julia Ellen were entering the harbor of Liverpool, Nova Scotia, the Canadian cruiser Terror, Captain Quigley, fired a gun across their bows to hasten their coming to, and placed an armed guard on board each vessel, who remained there until the vessels left the harbor, and that was when they were more than 4 miles from the shore and under no pretense whatever of fishing. Seventy-five years ago, if that had not been apologized for, there would have been a declaration of war.

More than 4 miles from shore an armed guard put on board, our captain and our sailors made prisoners of war on an American vessel with the American flag at the masthead.

The schooner Rattler, of Boston, fully laden and on the voyage home, sought shelter from stress of weather in Shelburne Harbor, Nova Scotia, was compelled to report at the custom-house and have a guard of armed men kept on board, there being no suspicion that she was intending to fish within the 3-mile shore-line. Sixty million people, a great, magnificent Republic, and a little country of 5,000,000 people putting an armed guard on board under the American flag without any suspicion of any violation of the law!

In August the Mollie Adams, of Gloucester, on the homeward voyage, full laden with fish from the fishing banks, was compelled to put into Port Mulgrave for water, and duly made report and entry at the custom-house. The water-tank had bursted on the voyage by reason of heavy weather. The captain asked leave to purchase two or three barrels to hold a supply of water for the crew on their homeward voyage of about 500 miles. The application was refused and his vessel threatened with seizure if barrels were so purchased. In consequence the vessel was compelled to put to sea with an insufficient supply of water, and in trying to make some other port to obtain a supply she encountered a severe gale, which swept away a deck-load of fish and destroyed two seine-boats.

Is any comment necessary? If that vessel under the same circumstances had penetrated any part of the waters of the Fiji Islands would they have refused her a tank of water?

Again: In July the schooner A. R. Crittenden, of Gloucester, on the homeward voyage from the open-sea fishing-grounds, while passing through the Strait of Canso, stopped at Steep Creek for water. The customs officer at that place boarded the vessel and notified the captain that if he took in water his vessel would be seized. He was compelled to sail without obtaining the needed supply and to put his crew on short allowance during the homeward voyage, notwithstanding the treaty of 1818 gave him a clear right to take water, and notwithstanding the dear Lord has given us all the right to take water—"a cup of cold water." Driven to sea because the poor fellow wanted water!

In October the collector at Shelburne, Nova Scotia, refused to allow Captain Rose, of the steamer Laura Sayward, to buy sufficient food for himself and crew to take them home, and retained his papers unnecessarily, thus compelling him to put to sea with an inadequate supply of provisions. The crew were put on hard-tack. Why, you may go onto one of the islands off the coast of China and say to those half-civilized people, "I am out of food, give me something to appease my hunger," and you would not expect to find men barbarous enough thereot anywhere else in the wide world to refuse. Yet these men were compelled to put to sea on short allowance.

In October Captain Tupper, of the schooner Jennie Seaverns, of Gloucester, was prevented by Captain Quigley, of the Canadian cutter Terror, from landing to visit his relatives in Liverpool, Nova Scotia. His relatives were forbidden to go on board his vessel by Captain Quigley, and an armed guard was placed on board to insure that he should not see his relatives nor they see him, making him practically a prisoner on his own vessel with the American flag floating at its masthead. No charge that he was fishing, no charge that he was violating the law.

Now take the Novelty. She is a fishing steamer, I should say of about 200 tons burden. She had been out to the Banks fishing. She came into Canadian waters not to fish there. Her coal fell short; she went in to purchase; the officer refused to allow her to do so; the captain appealed to the terms of the treaty; the reply was, "The treaty said 'wood,' not 'coal.'" And they would not let him have any coal. He appealed to the authorities in Ottawa, to whom a right of appeal is reserved in this wonderful treaty now under consideration, and the authorities at Ottawa replied that the treaty said "wood," and "you can not have coal." They threatened seizure, and the captain went home, giving up his trip entirely. Wood, not coal! There was not a vessel sailed the sea in 1818 that did not use wood, and hardly a vessel sails to-day that does. Fishermen do not use wood; they all use coal; and yet because the treaty of 1818 said "wood" they could not buy any other kind of fuel; and in this treaty which the President has sent here to the Senate, and heralded as generous and equitable, our commissioners have left "wood" to stand, and to-day, notwithstanding everybody uses coal, no one can get any in the Dominion of Canada for his fishing vessel. They might have obtained that concession for fuel, one would have supposed.

Take the case of the Caroline Vought. She was a fishing schooner from Boothbay, Me. In August, being on mackerel grounds, short of water, she ran into the port of Paspebiac, New Brunswick. A government steamer or cruiser was there. Captain Reid, ordered on board, stated his necessities; was directed to leave at once on penalty of seizure. Fortunately a storm came on and he caught sufficient rain-water to save his crew from death. He carried the American flag.

Now, take another case, and this is a very remarkable one, that of the Mollie Adams, commanded by Captain Solomon Jacobs. When off Mal Peque, Prince Edward's Island, in a heavy blow she fell in with the Canadian schooner Neskelita in distress. The Mollie Adams had her full load of fish. She stopped, as humanity demanded; she rescued seventeen men from this British schooner, took them on board, placed what material on the schooner she could save for them, what clothing they could, and sailed for a Canadian port. She was three days about this humane work, feeding seventeen men, British, besides her own. Captain Jacobs then ran into the harbor of Mal Peque. The captain of the Canadian cruiser Critic, which was lying there, boarded the Adams and was informed of the facts of the wreck and the condition of the crew. He refused to lend any assistance whatever.

Captain Jacobs asked permission to land some of the wrecked material he had on board, but was refused by the captain of the cruiser,

who told him if he did so he would seize him. None of the people on the shore would take the wrecked crew. They were still on Captain Jacobs's hands. Captain Jacobs finally took from his own pocket $60 and gave them to the wrecked crew to get home with.

But there is a bar in Mal Peque where a vessel drawing over 14 feet of water can not pass. Captain Jacobs's vessel drew 14 feet, and he was compelled to lay there some eight or ten days until a tide would come that should be sufficient to float his vessel over. The result was that when the opportunity came for Captain Jacobs to sail he had not a pound of flour on his vessel. These British sailors had eaten it all up. He put into Port Medway and asked permission of the collector to purchase half a barrel of flour or enough provisions to take his vessel and crew home. This was absolutely refused, and the collector threatened to seize his vessel if he purchased anything whatever. Captain Jacobs left without obtaining anything, went home, a distance of 300 miles, on short rations, and the last day he had not a single thing on his vessel for his crew to eat.

In the nineteeth century, nineteen hundred years almost after our dear Lord was born, by a country that claims to be civilized and Christianized, this terrible act of inhumanity was committed, and committed for but a single purpose, to get our markets and free fish; and the Senator from Alabama may wish to give it to them under stress like that.

One more case. I am not citing these cases because I think the Senators on the other side have never heard of them. I am citing them because I wish the American people to weigh your treaty with the threats and the outrageous acts which produced it. Take the Marion Grimes. In October the American vessel Marion Grimes, of Gloucester, Mass., Captain Landry, put into Port Shelburne in a terrible gale, anchored in the outer port, anchored in the first place she had safety in, 6 or 8 miles from the custom-house port, without the slightest intention of going into that. She laid there nearly the whole night. The storm abated. She hoisted her sails and started out for sea, when Captain Quigley, of the cruiser Terror, fired a shot across her bows, brought her to, went on board, took possession of her, told her that she must go to port, make entry, and report. He took her 6 miles out of her way when she had been not within 3 miles of the shore, and Captain Quigley knew that she was in there to escape the storm and for no other purpose whatever. He told them if she did not go in and report and enter she should be fined $400. She was fined $400 as it was, and the money was deposited to pay the fine.

Mr. PAYNE. It was remitted afterwards by the court in Canada.

Mr. FRYE. I doubt it. I do not know.

Mr. GRAY. Yes, it was.

Mr. PAYNE. Most of them have been remitted.

Mr. FRYE. No, sir; most of them have not been remitted.

Mr. PAYNE. I hope the Senator will be fair when he states these cases. He omits to state that the several acts were not committed by the direct authority of the Government of Canada, and that when they were brought before the Council of Canada in every instance they were either apologized for or remitted, so that the Government was not responsible for any act of outrage except under the general customs laws.

Mr. FRYE. There is not a case that I have here that the Government of Canada is not responsible for, and there is only one that she has ever apologized for.

Mr. PAYNE. We shall see.

Mr. FRYE. We shall see about it. I know the facts about as well as the Senator from Ohio. I am pretty familiar with them.

The Marian Grimes was fined $400. This fine was imposed by the urgency of Captain Quigley, of the Terror, and Captain Landry was informed that he would be detained at the port of Shelburne until a deposit to meet it was made.

While the vessel was in the custody of Captain Quigley, Captain Landry hoisted the American flag, hoisted it on an American vessel, on his own, as he had a right to do, and Captain Quigley ordered this American citizen to haul it down.

Mr. PAYNE. Please follow it up.

Mr. FRYE. Do not interrupt me now. I decline to be interrupted.

Mr. PAYNE. That is not fair.

Mr. FRYE. Captain Quigley ordered the American flag hauled down, and it was hauled down. Then, shortly afterwards, when Captain Landry was ready to sail, he hoisted the American flag once more on that American ship, as he had a right to do, and Captain Quigley came on board and with an oath took the halyards in his own hand, hauled down your flag, and you to-day, sir, are apologizing for him in the United States Senate. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

Mr. PAYNE. That is not true.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries must preserve order.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator wants me to say that an apology was made for that. A weak apology, readily accepted by a weak Administration, was made, but Captain Quigley kept his office as captain of the ship. He sailed afterwards through those waters and seized vessels as he met them bearing the American flag. Seventy-five years ago, if Captain Quigley had not been immediately displaced by his government there would have been a declaration of war. We made the declaration of war in 1812 for no offense that was any greater than that. They seized our vessels, I admit; they searched them and took our sailors; but they seized this vessel without right of law, and they tore down with their own hands the emblem of the sovereignty of a republic of sixty million people.

These were the outrages the American people were invited to in 1886. What was the result? You instructed your Committee on Foreign Relations to investigate this fishery matter. They investigated; they reported in due time a law for the protection of American citizens. It was reported to the Senate; the Senate considered it. It was a retaliatory law; it is just as well to call it so. The Senate considered it, deliberated upon it, discussed it. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] thought it was not sufficient. He proposed an amendment. He thought that under the circumstances we ought to have a law by which we could declare in a moment of time absolute non-intercourse with Canada. There was not a Senator in the American Senate who dreamed of voting against that law. There was not a Senator who did not believe that it ought to be enacted and enforced. The only difference of opinion was that the law did not go far enough in the opinion of some Democratic Senators.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives, Democratic in its make-up, with a Democratic chairman, reported another retaliatory bill at the same time, more drastic, more far-reaching, in which absolute non-intercourse could be declared in the twinkling of an eye. It was reported to the House. A distinguished Senator, sitting right here by me [Mr. REAGAN], advocated the passage of that or else of the earlier law some six months before, and while he is not a prophet nor the son of a prophet he saw with a vision then of an inspired one, for he told that House that we wanted no diplomacy, that every time we had resorted to it—I am not giving the Senator's words—we had been cheated by Great Britain; and certainly if we resorted to it once more we should be cheated once more. It was a prophet's vision. It has been resorted to once more, I say to the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN], and once more we are cheated.

That bill passed the House of Representatives with only one dissenting vote. The Senate was more conservative; believed then, as the Republican Senators believe now, that all that was necessary to stop these outrages was just to say to the Canadians: "If you do not let our vessels go into your ports we shall not let your vessels come into ours." That is all that the Republican side of the Senate wanted at any time. It is all that they ask now; and if that could be granted to-day it would stop the troubles on the Canadian coasts.

A committee of conference was had, and finally we reported a bill. It passed both Houses with one dissenting vote in each, and the one in the Senate only by a mistake.

That law provided that if Canada did not allow our vessels to go into her waters we directed the President to say that they could not come into ours. That is all there was about it; all we wanted; all that we asked. The law went further, and allowed the President to go further. I admit that he can take that law as it stands on the statute-book, if he pleases; disregard the advice of all the men who understand this matter and what is required, and absolutely stop all intercourse by car or otherwise between us and Canada, and jeopardize the business interests of the whole northern border, if he pleases.

There is one thing he ought to do if this treaty is rejected; use so much of that law as in the judgment of an honest man, not a partisan, in the judgment of an honest President, ought to be used to protect the people in those northeastern waters from outrage and injustice.

He in fact proceeded not at all under the law, though the outrages continued; and, on the contrary, the first thing we knew plenipotentiaries were appointed to make a treaty with Great Britain about these fishery matters, Mr. Bayard, Mr. Putnam, and Mr. Angell on our part. They proceeded to consider the question submitted. They sat here in Washington month after month, and I am not afraid to declare that they never consulted any fisherman or anybody who knew about the fisheries industry or was connected with it from the beginning of that negotiation down to its very close, though the American Fishery Union was here by an agent every day during the progress of the negotiations.

Mr. GRAY. You are mistaken, nevertheless.

Mr. FRYE. Can the Senator inform me what fisherman they consulted? Will he do so?

Mr. GRAY. No; I will not now. I can not give you the names; but I shall do so when the time comes.

Mr. FRYE. Did they consult the Fishery Union, which was located here in Washington during the whole time?

Mr. GRAY. I can not answer exactly as to that.

Mr. FRYE. They considered these questions for month after month here in the city of Washington. Mr. Chamberlain came over here from England, a perfect adept in the arts of diplomacy. He brought two other gentlemen as skilled as he. Sir Charles Tupper was here, one of the shrewdest and most cunning men on the American continent; a man who knew everything that Canada wanted; knew it himself as a boy knows his A B C's; and what followed? I never heard of any New England Representative or Senator being called in consultation or asked about this matter by these plenipotentiaries.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. FRYE. With pleasure.

Mr. PAYNE. I should like to know what the Senator has to say about Mr. Putnam?

Mr. FRYE. Why should I say anything about Mr. Putnam?

Mr. PAYNE. Was he not one of the negotiators?

Mr. FRYE. Yes. Why should I say anything about him?

Mr. PAYNE. Why should you not? You say the commission did not consult any person who knew anything about the fisheries. I am told that Mr. Putnam was very well acquainted with all that class of persons; that he had acted as attorney in suits for fishermen; and that probably no man in New England knew the fishery question better than Mr. Putnam, who is a lawyer of very high standing.

Mr. FRYE. That induces me to say something about Mr. Putnam. I think I know him a great deal better than the Senator from Ohio, and I think I esteem him a great deal more highly than the Senator does. Mr. Putnam and I have been close and warm friends for years. I had the honor to recommend him for circuit judge to a Republican President, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] joined with me in the recommendation. So the Senator dares not charge me with undertaking to do any injustice to Mr. Putnam.

Mr. PAYNE. No, I do not charge it, but you insinuated it.

Mr. FRYE. In regard to Mr. Putnam's knowledge of the fishery business I did not say anything. I said the commission never consulted any man who was familiar with the fishery question, nor any Senator or Representative from New England. I do not admit that Mr. Putnam was a man who knew more about the New England fisheries than any other man, and, in the presence of the treaty he agreed to, I deny it emphatically.

Mr. PAYNE. He was counsel in the David J. Adams case.

Mr. FRYE. Ah, yes; Mr. Putnam was counsel in the case of the David J. Adams, where one single question was presented—that of the right to buy bait. He was employed by the Democratic Administration as its attorney. How much general knowledge of this question he gained as attorney of the United States in one case I do not know. How far his investigations extended as to these waters I am not informed. What he knew about the headland theory I do not know. I could readily conceive that a lawyer might conduct a case where the one question was in regard to buying bait without knowing much about the great fishing questions of the Northeast. I have only to say further about Mr. Putnam that he is an honest man, a good lawyer, and the Democratic candidate for governor of Maine. I am sorry for him that he is going to be beaten, and that this issue will do as much to that end as anything else.

Mr. PAYNE. You are sorry?

Mr. FRYE. I said I am sorry for Mr. Putnam that he is going to be beaten. I am not expressing any sorrow over the prospective defeat of the Democratic party in my State. Its defeat there and in the country ought to produce only joy.

Mr. President, the commissioners occupied elegant positions here in Washington for two or three months; they were ornaments to society; orchids worth ten dollars apiece graced their magnificent tables; they lived like princes; they seemed to have much elegant leisure; indeed, as the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] suggests, they had so much leisure that they could hold up at any time for Sir Charles Tupper to go home and consult the Canadians as to what he had better do.

Mr. PAYNE. He went home for the holidays.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator from Ohio seems to have a very familiar knowledge of the inside working of the commission. I am afraid he has joined the British party in this matter.

What was the result? There it is. The mountain labored; there is the mouse. I have to say about that treaty that it is the most disgraceful, humiliating, and cowardly surrender the American Republic has ever been called upon to submit to, not excepting the treaty of 1818.

Mr. President, I find the air here exceedingly oppressive, and it is suggested to me by some Senators that I make a break in my speech, and that consent be given that I proceed to-morrow morning.

Mr. STEWART. I suggest that the Senate take a recess for twenty or thirty minutes, so as to allow the Chamber to cool off.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would suggest that the ventilation would be greatly improved by the opening of the doors leading from the galleries. If there be no objection, the Chair will order the Sergeant-at-Arms to open the doors.

Mr. STEWART. Let us take a recess.

Mr. FRYE. I would be pleased to take a recess for half an hour, if the Senate would consent.

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess for half an hour.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nevada asks unanimous consent that the Senate take a recess for thirty minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senate accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) took a recess for half an hour.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* (at 3 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.). The time of the recess having expired, the Senate resumes its session.

ADJOURNMENT OVER DECORATION DAY.

Mr. MANDERSON. With the consent of the Senator from Maine, I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Thursday next, in view of the fact that to-morrow is Memorial Day, declared a legal holiday by the laws of this country

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nebraska moves that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Thursday next. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to.

GRADE OF GENERAL.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that the bill which I reported this morning to revive the grade of General in the United States Army be now considered.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2210) to revive the grade of General in the United States Army, reported this morning. Is there objection?

Mr. SAULSBURY. I should like to inquire what the provision of the bill is.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read for information.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask that the amendment proposed by the Committee on Military Affairs as a substitute be read for the information of the Senate before the Senate is asked to give consent to its consideration.

Mr. SAULSBURY. I only wanted to know the substance of the measure proposed.

Mr. MANDERSON. The proposed substitute is very short and it will answer the inquiry of the Senator from Delaware, I think, more easily than I can state it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The substitute reported by the Committee on Military Affairs will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the grade of Lieutenant-General of the Army is hereby discontinued and is merged in the grade of General of the Army of the United States, which grade shall continue during the lifetime of the present Lieutenant-General of the Army, after which such grade shall also cease; and the President of the United States is hereby authorized to appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, a General of the Army of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the pay and allowances of the General be the same as heretofore allowed for that grade.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill? The Chair hears none. It is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and the question is upon agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, I objected to the consideration of the bill this morning, because I believe that it is a bill which ought not to pass. I objected for the further reason that I do not believe, under the circumstances surrounding it, that this is a proper time to legislate upon the subject. I think in the consideration of measures which are to be passed here we should appeal to the judgment and reason of Congress rather than to our sympathies or to any sympathy which may be excited by peculiar circumstances.

The only object and purpose of the bill that I can see is to give some $2,000, or about that, per annum—I do not know the precise sum—to the Lieutenant-General more than he is now receiving. I can see no necessity for the bill whatever. I can see no necessity for passing a special act creating the office of general in time of peace, an office to which General Sherman was appointed, and he is now upon the retired-list.

I think therefore that the bill ought not to be passed. I am opposed to it, and for that reason I objected to it this morning and object to it now, and I shall vote against it upon its passage; and upon its passage I shall ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. MANDERSON. Mr. President, I would very willingly allow this bill to pass to a vote of the Senate without a word in regard to it, but I can not sit silent after the suggestion of the Senator from Arkansas that the sole purpose of the bill is that there should be increased pay to the present Lieutenant-General of the Army of the United States. If that was its purpose, I would not be here to present it or to urge its consideration, and I do not believe that I would be authorized by the Committee on Military Affairs to present it to the Senate with a report favoring its passage. I do not believe that the Senate of the United States would be willing to pass it if that was its sole purpose.

I need not for a moment refer to the distinguished career of General Sheridan. It is too well known to a grateful American people, it is too well known to an admiring world, to make it necessary that I should take a moment's time in reciting it.

He is the last of the great central figures of the war of the rebellion. This distinguished honor, conferred by the Continental Congress upon General Washington, conferred by the Congress of the United States upon General Grant, and afterwards upon General Sherman, certainly should, in recognition of the great war services of General Sheridan and of his distinguished career as Commanding General of the Army since the war closed, be conferred by an appreciative people upon him.

The bill is not urged at this time that there may be advocacy or support brought to it on the ground of sympathy, but we place it on the ground of his high deserts and a proper recognition of his distinguished services by the Congress of the United States, representing a grateful people.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the Committee on Military Affairs.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Having been read three times, shall the bill pass?

Mr. BERRY. I ask for the yeas and nays upon the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Upon the passage of the bill the Senator from Arkansas asks that the yeas and nays may be entered on the Journal.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANDERSON (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL] is paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. We have arranged for the transfer of the pair, so that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] will be paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SABIN (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KENNA], but on this subject I feel at liberty to vote, believing that if the Senator from West Virginia were present he would vote "yea." I vote "yea."

Mr. BROWN (when Mr. SAWYER's name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SAWYER].

Mr. MANDERSON (when Mr. SPOONER's name was called). The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] is paired with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN]. The Senator from Wisconsin would vote "yea." I do not know how the Senator from Kentucky would vote, but I think he would also vote "yea," if he were present, and not paired.

Mr. TELLER (when his name was called). I am paired on political questions with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GIBSON]. I do not consider this to be a political question. I am satisfied that if the Senator from Louisiana were here he would vote "yea," and I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. VEST (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB], but I suppose he would vote "yea," and I shall vote. I vote "yea."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. PAYNE. On political questions I am paired with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. JONES], but I am assured that he would vote "yea" on the pending question. As I have no doubt he would vote "yea," I shall vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am generally paired with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. PUGH]. I do not see him here, and I see by the list he has not voted. I perceive that some of his associates on that side of the Chamber have voted in favor of the bill, as I should wish to do, but probably the only safe way for me is not to vote. I should vote "yea" but for the pair.

Mr. PADDOCK. I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS] on political questions. I am assured by some of his friends upon the other side that this is not to be considered a political question. I think myself if the Senator from Louisiana were here he would vote for the bill. I shall therefore vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS. I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE], but I have his permission to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. COCKRELL. I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY], who is absent from his seat to-day. I should vote "nay," and he would vote "yea."

Mr. PADDOCK. I announced my pair with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS], but, as I stated, I felt at liberty to vote on this proposition. However, on reflection, I have concluded that I had better withdraw my vote. I therefore withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Nebraska withdraws his vote.

Mr. EDMUNDS. My friend the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] does not know precisely how his colleague [Mr. PUGH] would vote, but he thinks I may be safely relieved from the pair, and I therefore vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 33, nays 7; as follows:

YEAS—33.

Allison,	Dawes,	Ingalls,	Stewart,
Beck,	Dolph,	Manderson,	Stockbridge,
Blair,	Edmunds,	Mitchell,	Teller,
Blodgett,	Evarts,	Morgan,	Vest,
Call,	Frye,	Morrill,	Walthall,
Chace,	George,	Palmer,	Wilson of Iowa.
Chandler,	Gray,	Payne,	
Cullom,	Hampton,	Sabin,	
Davis,	Hoar,	Sherman,	

NAYS—7.

Berry,	Harris,	Saulsbury,	Wilson of Md.
Coke,	Reagan,	Vance,	

ABSENT—36.

Aldrich,	Daniel,	Hiscock,	Pugh,
Bate,	Eustis,	Jones of Arkansas,	Quay,
Blackburn,	Farwell,	Jones of Nevada,	Ransom,
Bowen,	Faulkner,	Kenna,	Riddleberger,
Brown,	Gibson,	McPherson,	Sawyer,
Butler,	Gorman,	Paddock,	Spooner,
Cameron,	Hale,	Pasco,	Stanford,
Cockrell,	Hawley,	Platt,	Turpie,
Colquitt,	Hearst,	Plumb,	Voorhees,

So the bill was passed.

Mr. DANIEL. I should like to have my vote recorded on the passage of the bill. I wish to vote "yea."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The result of the vote having been announced, the Senator from Virginia asks unanimous consent that his vote may be recorded in the affirmative. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. It will be so recorded.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the fisheries treaty.

Mr. FRYE. I propose now, Mr. President, to call the attention of the Senate to the terms of the treaty itself.

The first eight articles relate entirely to delimitation. Who asked for delimitation? Who entered complaint that the fishermen in the Northeast could not tell where the 3-mile shore-line was or where bays 6 miles wide at their mouth were? Did this commission ever hear of any complaint? I am aware, sir, that Great Britain, about 1823, in the pursuit of her aggressiveness towards us, declared that these bays were to be measured from headland to headland. But I am equally aware that in less than six months after the claim was made she sent instructions to the colonial officers not to enforce it, and for the whole seventy years it never has been enforced, except in two instances, that of the Argus and the Washington.

The Washington was seized in 1843 in the Bay of Fundy fishing outside of the 3-mile shore-line. I am equally well aware that subsequently, when we made claim, and on the seizure of the Argus, the two seizures, the whole matter was referred to arbitrators; and that after hearing they determined that neither the Argus nor the Washington was within British waters. In other words, they determined that the claim made by Great Britain was not sustained by the law or by the treaties, and that this 3-mile shore-line and 6-mile bay were to control.

Mr. GRAY. I ask the Senator for information where I can find the arbitration or other proceedings where the case of the Argus was settled?

Mr. FRYE. I will refer the Senator to excellent authority.

Mr. GRAY. I do not desire to interrupt the Senator, but I ask for information.

Mr. FRYE. December, 1886, there was an *ad interim* arrangement proposed by the United States.

Mr. GRAY. On what page, please?

Mr. FRYE. Page 56; and there is the reply of Canada to it; and there also in the same column is the reply of Secretary Bayard to the Canadian reply. On page 59 Secretary Bayard says:

> In delivering judgment in the case of the Washington, the umpire considered the headland theory and pronounced it "new doctrine." He noted among other facts that one of the headlands of the Bay of Fundy was in the United States, but did not place the decision on that ground. And immediately in the next case, that of the Argus, heard by him and decided on the same day, he wholly discarded the headland theory and made an award in favor of the owners. The Argus was seized, not in the Bay of Fundy, but because (although more than 3 miles from land) she was found fishing within a line drawn from headland to headland, from Cow Bay to Cape North, on the northeast side of Cape Breton Island.

Very excellent authority, entirely satisfactory to Secretary Bayard in 1887; it settled Secretary Bayard's opinion after a year and a half of these outrages and after all these discussions touching the headland theory had ended.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. GRAY. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator from Maine except to get at the facts which are the basis of his argument. I have read the reference he has given me, in which Mr. Bayard speaks of the case of the Argus. I am under the impression that Secretary Bayard is mistaken in regard to the Argus being decided by the same commission which decided the case of the Washington. I ask him again if he can refer me to the arbitration proceeding.

Mr. TELLER rose.

Mr. GRAY. Perhaps the Senator from Colorado can do so.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will allow me I suggest that if he will examine the International Law Digest by Wharton, volume 3, page 305, he will be entirely satisfied that the Secretary made no mistake.

Mr. HOAR. The Senator will find it in the Report of Foreign Relations, book of 1854–'55.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Maine will pardon me; I only wanted the information.

Mr. HOAR. That contains the report of the commission. It is all set forth there.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, I say further that this theory of the head-

lands was never promulgated by Great Britain more than twice afterwards, and that I have given the only two instances in which it was ever enforced in seventy years. I am justified in affirming in the presence of the American people that it never was anything but a theory; and that when they undertook to make it anything higher than that they were beaten by a court agreed upon, and that settled it, and it should have remained settled forever, and would if Secretary Bayard somewhere or other, no man knoweth where, had not obtained new light later, and in July, 1887——

Mr. GRAY rose.

Mr. FRYE. No, it is a little too hard work, if the Senator will pardon me.

Mr. GRAY. All right. I only wanted to remind the Senator that the Bay of Fundy was settled and nothing else.

Mr. FRYE. The Argus was not in the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. GRAY. I am talking about the case of the Washington, the only case referred to.

Mr. FRYE. I referred the Senator to the case of the Argus, and I gave him the authority of the Secretary of State, who declared that it was settled and settled by the same court, by the same arbitration.

Mr. GRAY. Point out on the map where the case of the Argus was settled.

Mr. FRYE. No; I can not stop to do that.

Mr. TELLER. Here. [Indicating on the map.]

Mr. GRAY. Yes; I know where it was. I only wanted to have the Senator from Maine state it.

Mr. FRYE. I do not propose to be bothered.

Mr. GRAY. The Senator from Maine talks about the settlement of a principle. It was the settlement of one bay.

Mr. FRYE. One case I suppose does not settle the principle.

Mr. GRAY. No, it did not in that case, because it was settled on the ground that one of the headlands was in the United States.

Mr. FRYE. It was not.

Mr. GRAY. It was.

Mr. FRYE. The United States does not own one of the headlands of the bay where the Argus was seized.

Mr. GRAY. It was settled on that ground.

Mr. FRYE. And the Senator knows it, too.

Mr. GRAY. It was settled on that ground, I know that.

Mr. FRYE. Then the Senator knows more than his Secretary of State. I will admit that, if he wishes to have me do so.

Mr. GRAY. That is no argument. The Secretary is not here to answer.

Mr. FRYE. I want to call attention to another thing. In July, 1853, President Pierce sent a fleet into these waters, and Secretary Dobbin gave his instructions, and I presume he had as much light as anybody had then. President Pierce was certainly as good a lawyer as has ever been in the Presidential chair, and he came from New England, where they knew something about these matters. Secretary Dobbin gave his instructions to Commander Shubrick. I read from those instructions:

This restrictive construction on the part of Great Britain—

That is, the headland theory—

This restrictive construction on the part of Great Britain, you will perceive from a glance at the map, if strictly enforced, would exclude our fishing vessels from George's Bay, the Bay of Miramiche, the straits of Northumberland, and the large Bay of Chaleur, where the best mackerel are annually caught.

This proposed treaty excludes us from the whole.

Now, these are large, open bays, much more than 6 marine miles wide, and our fishing vessels can, with ease, enter and fish without ever approaching within 3 marine miles of the coast. The treaty does forbid their taking fish within 3 marine miles of the shore; and that restriction, unfavorable and inconvenient as it is to our fishermen, must be faithfully submitted to as long as this treaty exists. But the President entertains the opinion that our citizens, under the convention of 1818, have a right to enter the bays and harbors and to take fish there, provided they do not approach within 3 marine miles of the shore; and he further entertains the opinion that the clause which authorizes expressly the entering into bays and harbors "for the purpose of shelter, etc.," precludes the idea that it therein alluded to large, open bays, such as the Bay of Chaleur, which afford but little better "shelter" than the open sea, and confirms him in his opinion that the restriction was designed to be applicable to narrow, small bays and harbors, in which an entrance could not be effected without approaching "within 3 marine miles of the shore," but within which it was natural and proper that our fishermen should have the liberty to enter "for the purpose of shelter, etc."

The Senate must remember that the instructions Secretary Dobbin gave Commander Shubrick were given when a British fleet was in those waters, when he was sending an American fleet there, and when the President of the United States would not dare take any responsibility unless he had settled by careful observation the ground upon which he was standing, because if the commander of the British fleet was instructed to enforce the headland theory, and Commander Shubrick was instructed under President Pierce's views, then conflict was inevitable and war between the two countries would come. No better opinion, no opinion more carefully scrutinized, can possibly be conceived than one given by the President of the United States under those circumstances.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] says that there have been more than four hundred outrages in the history of this whole affair between us and Canada.

Mr. MORGAN. Seizures.

Mr. FRYE. Well, "seizures." I beg the Senator's pardon. I ought not to have called them outrages in view of the position of Senators on that side now. The Senator from Alabama said there had been more than four hundred seizures. There have been out of the four hundred only two made for fishing outside of the 3-mile shore line and bays 6 miles wide in the whole seventy years. Does the Senator from Alabama suppose that these Canadians would not resort to seizures outside of the 3-mile shore line if they believed that there was any such thing as the headland theory to be reduced to practice, or if they believed there was anything at all in the headland theory?

Mr. MORGAN. If the Senator——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Maine yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from Maine appeals to me.

Mr. FRYE. I think the Senator from Alabama will have ample time to reply to me.

Mr. MORGAN. If you do not want me to reply, then do not ask me any questions.

Mr. FRYE. I shall not ask you another one.

Now, take the Halifax commission. It is entirely evident that the Canadians in that commission resorted to the grossest exaggeration to increase the award of those arbitrators. In fact it has been charged by their own people that perjury was committed over and over again to that end. Why did they not claim that we were to be excluded from all the great bays from headland to headland, and then claim damages for not enforcing that exclusion? It would have doubled the amount of the award if that could have been sustained; and yet in all the proceedings before the Halifax commission no Canadian ever dreamed of making that claim; they confined it to the 3-mile shore-line and to bays 6 miles wide at their mouth.

Mr. BECK. Mr. President, I do not like to ask leave to interrupt the Senator from Maine, but as I heard him say that perhaps he was going away, and I may have something to say about this matter, I wish to state that I was once attached to a committee that looked into the fishery question, and made a report at the third session of the Fortieth Congress, a report signed by Mr. Butler, of Massachusetts, Mr. Poland, of Vermont, and myself, written by Mr. Butler, who knew more than any of us. I may have something to say about this matter, and I should like to have the Senator allow me to read to him now only a few lines of that report to Congress, written, as I say, by General Butler. The report stated that—

By the treaty of 1818 our fishermen were carelessly and causelessly deprived of the right which always had theretofore been enjoyed, and which was secured to them by the treaty of 1783 and of Ghent, of fishing as near the shore as they chose.

At the time of the treaty of 1818 mackerel fishing, now so large a portion of our fisheries, was in its infancy, and its importance unconsidered. The cod did not seek the shore, but where found in deeper waters. This, therefore, must have been the cause why our commissioners permitted an article to be inserted in the treaty of 1818 excluding our fishermen from fishing within a marine league of the shore of the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, and Prince Edward Island, getting in return only the right to land upon and fish around the shores of Newfoundland and Labrador. But even this exclusion of the 3-mile line from the shore would not have been so onerous had it not been for the construction put upon this restriction by the Crown lawyers in 1841, that that line, instead of following the indentations of the shore, should be drawn from headland to headland, thus excluding us from the principal bays along the shore, including Fundy and Chaleur, and by its literal interpretation excluding us from the Gut of Canso, the use of which materially shortens the voyages of our fishermen.

Mr. MORGAN. What is the date of that report?

Mr. BECK. It was made in 1870. Now, one suggestion, if the Senator from Maine will allow me—I beg his pardon. The outrages committed from 1886 to 1888 were great, but they were as great from 1818 to 1854 and from 1866 to 1870. The object of this treaty, as I understand it, is to make those outrages impossible in the future by a line of demarkation that will make it impossible to have them repeated. The contention of the British Government, as General Butler very well showed in this report, we can only get clear of by treaty, which will settle the question both as to the Gut of Canso and the headlands, and it seems to me to be an important thing to settle.

Mr. FRYE. I suppose if Great Britain contended that she owned the United States of America the Senator from Kentucky would say we must have a treaty in order to determine whether she did or not. She contended for the headland theory, and I so said; and I said further that the claim was determined against her by arbitrators.

Mr. BECK. Oh, no——

Mr. FRYE. I must decline to yield further.

Mr. BECK. Only one word and I shall not trouble the Senator more. I mean to say that it is better to settle difficulties between friendly nations important to each other by negotiations than by war.

Mr. FRYE. If you yield everything and they nothing, I deny that it is better.

Mr. BECK. I do——

Mr. FRYE. I say that a great republic like ours ought some time or other to stand for its rights.

Mr. BECK. I have only one more word to say. Loud sound does not mean sound argument, and at some time or other, perhaps, I may be allowed to speak, if not now.

Mr. FRYE. Has the Senator been interrupted in speaking?

Mr. BECK. Not at all,

Mr. FRYE. Has he not interjected everything he desired?

Mr. BECK. Yes; but——

Mr. FRYE. Why make that remark to me?

Mr. BECK. Because——

Mr. FRYE. The Senator has criticised my method of speaking. The Senator from Maine has a right to use his voice as he pleases.

Mr. BECK. The Senator from Maine has no right to assume that I mean to say we give up everything when the Canadian councils have denounced Great Britain for interfering and taking away everything from them by this very treaty. That is the very question; and I shall show that the best informed men there have denounced the treaty, in louder terms than the Senator from Maine, because everything has been surrendered by this treaty that they ever contended for.

Mr. FRYE. Sir Charles Tupper knows pretty well about this case.

Mr. BECK. That is all I have got to say now.

Mr. FRYE. I understand it is. I shall not yield to the Senator to make a speech.

Mr. BECK. I should not have interrupted the Senator if I had expected that such a response would have been made—that I am willing to give up everything. I deny it. I meant to say that this treaty settles things that ought to be settled——

Mr. FRYE. If the Senator is going to make another speech——

Mr. BECK. No, I am not.

Mr. FRYE. Will he be kind enough to allow me to proceed?

Mr. BECK. I shall not ask the Senator to yield to me again.

Mr. FRYE. Sir Charles Tupper says (and he made this treaty) in a speech to the Canadian Parliament, in which he was discussing the treaty:

For every word that I say in defense of the treaty to which I have put my hand and to which I ask the sanction of this House with the utmost confidence, every word that I say in support of it may be used to-morrow in the Senate of the United States, where support to the treaty may be more difficult to obtain than it is in the House of Commons of Canada. The House will therefore understand that on this occasion it can not be expected from me that I shall point out very elaborately the advantages accruing to Canada under the treaty to which we have placed our hands.

Having made that declaration to the Canadian Parliament, that his lips were practically closed against naming the advantages to Canada, as a matter of course they would not have been closed to stating the advantages which we had gained. Now, what does he say about the headland theory?

Mr. GRAY. What is the date of that? I am sorry to interrupt you, I am almost afraid to do so.

Mr. FRYE. April 10, 1888. I am not a very dangerous gentleman. Sir Charles Tupper says about the headland theory:

The Americans have maintained that what we termed our exclusive right to shut them out of all bays was not well founded in the treaty. They have maintained that they had an indefeasible right under that treaty to approach within 3 miles of the shore of any bay or indentation. My honorable friend—

Referring to Mr. Mitchell—

shakes his head, but I hold in my hand authorities, and I could give them to him by the score, in which they have again and again maintained that position and demanded that right.

Mr. Mitchell interrupted him, when Sir Charles Tupper said:

I can only say that nobody knows better than my honorable friend that Great Britain induced him to recall his regulations and instructions after he had issued them, and restricted his jurisdiction to within 3 miles of the shore.

There was also a dispatch from Lord Granville June 6, 1870, in reference to which Sir Charles Tupper said:

Now, under the pressure of this, as my honorable friend has stated, he changed his instructions in reference to the 10 miles and put in 6 miles, and forbade his officers to interfere with the American fishermen, not as in the first instructions he gave, if they were within 3 miles of the mouth of the bay, but only if they were within 3 miles of the shore, and he [Lord Granville] says:

"Until further instructed, therefore, you will not interfere with any American fishermen unless found within 3 miles of the shore, or within 3 miles of a line drawn across the mouth of a bay or creek, which, though in parts more than 6 miles wide, is less than 6 geographical miles in width at its mouth.

Here is the dispatch:

"Her Majesty's Government are fully aware that no step should be taken which should prejudge the question."

I want to draw the attention of the House to the fact that this was not a settled or concluded question; that it was not a question upon which the Governments of Great Britain and the United States had agreed or on which they had arrived at a common interpretation; and I want to draw my honorable friend's attention to the doubt that Her Majesty's Government had upon the subject.

Then he cites what they say. Sir Charles Tupper says again:

I think I have satisfied my honorable friend that, as far as Her Majesty's Government were concerned, while they maintained the abstract right under the treaty, they were unwilling to raise the question of bays, and the result is, as my honorable friend knows, that for the last thirty-four years, certainly since 1854—and I will not go further back than 1854—there has been no practical interference with American fishing vessels unless they were within 3 miles of the shore, in bays or elsewhere.

Again he says:

Therefore, as I said, we made the concession, not of anything that had been enforced practically by Canada, but the abstract right to exclude from bays that were more than 6 miles wide.

Here is a little item from the St. John Sun:

Every foot of coast waters over which Canada has ever exercised conclusive jurisdiction is confirmed to us by a treaty which the President's own commissioners have accepted as correct. Not only this, but certain bays from which Mr. Mitchell and other ministers did not exclude American fishermen are now admitted to be exclusively Canadian.

Then are official instructions—I have three which I might read—given by the officers of Great Britain to the Canadian officers that they must not undertake to enforce the headlands theory, but must deal strictly with violations of the law within 3 miles of the shore-line and within bays and harbors 6 miles wide.

Now how about the treaty, which the President says is such an excellent one? At the very outset our commissioners made a proposition, the same contained in Article III, as follows:

The 3 marine miles mentioned in Article I of the convention of October 20, 1818, shall be measured seaward from low-water mark; but at every bay, creek, or harbor, not otherwise specially provided for in this treaty, such 3 marine miles shall be measured seaward from a straight line drawn across the bay, creek, or harbor, in the part nearest the entrance at the first point where the width does not exceed 10 marine miles.

Secretary Bayard in 1887, in a citation which I have made, expressed the opinion explicitly that there was no ground on which the headland theory could rest, and yet in this diplomatic controversy our commissioners, says Sir Charles Tupper, made the proposition themselves that this should include bays 10 miles wide and 3 miles outside of that line; thus, so far as bays are concerned, actually duplicating the amount of excluded waters.

What next? After we had commenced yielding there was no point for our commissioners to stop at. Sir Charles Tupper pressed them, and what did he secure? He secured a provision which made excluded waters as follows:

Bay Chaleur, where the line is 16 miles. This bay is about 60 miles deep to where it narrows to 6 miles; good places in there to seine, and to hook and line mackerel; a herring fishery there; the British catch some cod there.

That is this great bay [indicating on the map]. There are places in it over 30 miles wide. I have been in places in it where you can see neither shore. I frequent this river emptying into the bay, and here the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. HAMPTON] has experienced that most blissful of all sensations, the capture of the king of fish, a salmon, with a fly and a fly-rod. That bay is over 70 miles long and averages 20 miles wide. Sir Charles Tupper induced our commissioners to make that excluded water.

Next the Bay of Miramachi where the line is 14 miles long. In this bay we are cut off from 6 miles of depth.

Egmont Bay, 15 miles long. The depth of bay we are excluded from is 7 miles.

Offstannes Bay, 19 miles long. The depth above the 3 miles from shore we are excluded from is 6 miles. Mackerel and halibut are in this bay. It is a good place for herring and squid for bait.

Fortune Bay, in Newfoundland. The line is 14 miles long between points. The depth we are excluded from is 46 miles. Herring and turbot are found here.

St. Charles Hamilton's Sound. The line is 16 miles long; depth of bay closed is 20 miles.

Barrington Bay, in Nova Scotia. The line is 10 miles; 3 miles outside will be 15 miles; depth of bay is about 3 miles. Fish: herring, halibut, mackerel, and squid are found there.

Chedabucto and St. Peter's Bay. The line is 10 miles in each case, or 20 miles in all; the 3-mile limit is the same; the depth we are excluded from is 26 miles. Fish: herring, squid, mackerel are there.

Mira Bay. The line is 7 miles. Three miles seaward is 8 miles; the newly excluded depth is 4 miles. Fish: halibut, codfish, herring, mackerel; a good place.

Placentia Bay, in Newfoundland. Length is to Red Island 9 miles; to Merasheen Island and mainland 11 miles, making 20 miles, 3 marine miles seaward, about the same; depth we are excluded from is 19 miles.

Long Island and Bryar Island, at St. Mary's Bay. The passage between Long Island and Bryar Island is a mile; from Bryar Island to St. Mary's shore is 10 miles; Bryar Island to there is 9 miles. The 3-mile line would be 2 miles longer. The depth excluded is 15 miles and over. Fish: mackerel, herring, codfish, pollock, and halibut.

This exclusion takes almost every bay around the whole Canadian coast of any manner of value. It does not take the Bay of Fundy, I admit, but it takes every other except two or three on the east coast of Newfoundland. What does that mean? Our fishermen never go near the eastern shore of Newfoundland, and Sir Charles Tupper knew it. Therefore he did not press for that exclusion; but if our fishermen had been in the habit of going there, Sir Charles would have obtained from these pliant commissioners every bay on the eastern coast without the slightest difficulty.

It does not stop there. What then? Article 5 of the treaty is as follows:

Nothing in this treaty shall be construed to include within the common waters any such interior portions of any bays, creeks, or harbors as can not be reached from the sea without passing within the 3 marine miles mentioned in article 1 of the convention of October 20, 1818.

Does the Senate know how many bays that takes? Does any Senator suppose that the commissioners knew how many bays that excludes us from? Sir Charles Tupper declines to say how many to the Canadian Parliament, and only uses one for illustration. I suppose under his theory it would not do to state the advantages Canada gained. It might be used in the United States Senate against the ratification of the treaty. That is a locality where the tides are all the way from 30 to 60 feet, sweeping in and out every six hours with the power of Niagara, with swift currents in the one direction and then in the other. Great bays are more likely there to have channels on either shore than in any other locality I know.

I say no Senator here knows how many bays that takes or from how much water it excludes us; but it is fair to presume, as Sir Charles Tupper says that was put in at his request, that he knew what advantage he was gaining by it.

But, say the Senators on the other side, especially the Senator from Delaware, your fishermen testified before the committee taking evidence that they had no desire to fish within the 3-mile shore-line, and therefore this delimitation is fairly excusable. The conclusion is an inference. I have to say in relation to that that no fisherman testified before our committee that he had no desire to fish within those delimited waters; no fisherman appeared before our committee who dreamed that America could ever furnish commissioners who would consent to the delimitation agreed upon in this treaty. No fisherman was ever asked the question whether or not he wished to fish in the Bay of Chaleur or in Miramichi or in Chedabucto Bay. No man can tell to-day how valuable fisheries may be next year or the year after in those bays. No man can tell to-day how soon the United States may determine that no fishing shall be done with the giant purse-seine. Then we should be compelled to go back to the old manner of fishing, hook and line, and these very waters might be made as valuable as they were thirty-five and forty years ago. To-day the bays 6 miles wide are utterly worthless to us.

But let me tell the Senators that there is something more serious in this delimitation than this mere question of whether or not we shall fish in the excluded waters. You have another article in this treaty which provides that if you put fish, etc., on the free-list we may have commercial rights. Senators know just as well as I do that the whole contest for seventy years has been for our market. Senators know as well as I do that all the outrages for the last fifty years have been committed for no purpose except to get our market. Your treaty does give it to them. If Congress refuse to do it, the same cause for outrages and insults will be left that existed the last two years, and what have you done by this treaty? You simply increase the peril; you simply have moved out the danger-line. Every bay 10 miles wide and 3 miles outside of that, every one of the great bays named is made dangerous grounds. It may be very easy for a fisherman to tell whether he is within the 3-mile shore-line or to discover whether or not he is in a bay not more than 6 miles wide; but let me say to Senators that when a bay is 10 miles wide and the line is 3 miles outside of that, when that bay is like the Bay of Chaleur, 17 miles wide or 21 miles wide, it is an entirely different thing for the fisherman to determine whether or not he has crossed that line and entered the perilous waters. It is almost an impossibility for him to do it. Six months of the fishing season there is a fog prevailing all over that section of the waters, not a dense fog, but a fog that would prevent any fisherman from seeing more than 4 to 5 miles at sea.

Now you adopt a tariff, leaving the duty on fish as it stands to-day; let the temptation to obtain our market still continue, the Canadians will repeat the outrages of 1886 and 1887, and you have given them by this treaty an opportunity tenfold greater to outrage and insult our fishermen, to seize and confiscate their vessels, than they had before.

Now I come to the ninth article. The ninth article is:

ARTICLE IX.

Nothing in this treaty shall interrupt or affect the free navigation of the Strait of Canso by fishing vessels of the United States.

And the President of the United States congratulates us in his message that at last the Strait of Canso is free and open. Why, sir, it never was closed in the history of the world, and no nation ever dared to close it, and no nation ever dreamed of closing it. It lies on this map here. It is the highway between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Atlantic Ocean. We have the right secured to us since 1783, ours to-day, around the Magdalen Islands, rigats on the easterly shores of the Gulf, and certainly we have rights in the broad Atlantic Ocean, and this strait is the open highway connecting our rights in the ocean and our rights in the bay. I say it never was closed, and no one ever dreamed of closing it.

That Article IX was put in the treaty because in this delimitation Sir Charles Tupper had induced the American commissioners to consent to yield the Bay of Chedabucto. That bay lies right across the mouth of the strait, and thus shuts out the Strait of Canso. And yet the President of the United States congratulates the American people that at last the Strait of Canso is free!

There were two vessels seized in the Strait of Canso in 1886, but the excuse was promptly given that they were lying-to and they thought they were preparing to fish.

ARTICLE X.

United States fishing vessels entering the bays or harbors referred to in Article I of this treaty shall conform to harbor regulations.

I should think they always had.

They need not report, enter, or clear, when putting into such bays or harbors for shelter or repairing damages.

Is not that an immense privilege to be granted to us? When a United States fishing vessel, under the treaty of 1818, puts into a harbor or bay for shelter she need not report and enter! There can not be found in the history of any civilized maritime nation in the whole world an instance where a vessel putting in for shelter was compelled to report and enter. No vessel is compelled to report and enter until she communicates with the shore, until she lands a man or a cargo or goes to the shore to buy or to ship or do something of that kind.

Mr. GRAY. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him a moment, to say that the laws of the United States require vessels to make entry and clear that have been within the limits of a port of entry over twenty-four or forty-eight hours.

Mr. FRYE. I supposed every Senator would understand that I referred to the twenty-four hours named in the article. I repeat again that there is not an instance to be found in the history of the civilized nations of the world where in less than twenty-four hours a vessel putting in for shelter is compelled to report, enter, and clear. In the United States I never knew of but one instance in forty-eight hours where it was compelled to be done, and that was in Boothbay after the Canadians had been committing these outrages on our vessels.

Mr. GRAY. That is the law.

Mr. FRYE. I know what the law is perfectly well.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator ought to state that law.

Mr. FRYE. What law?

Mr. MORGAN. The law of the United States on that subject.

Mr. FRYE. The law does not require you to report and enter until you have been there twenty-four hours.

Mr. MORGAN. No.

Mr. FRYE. All the advantage of this treaty is that you shall not report or enter until you are there twenty-four hours.

Mr. MORGAN. The same as our law exactly.

Mr. FRYE. Well, what then do you gain by the article?

Mr. MORGAN. We do not lose anything.

Mr. FRYE. If the Senator is going to take the ground that we ought to adopt the treaty because we do not gain or lose anything, that is another question. I supposed he advocated the treaty because we gained by it.

Mr. MORGAN. It is simply settling the matter by agreement.

Mr. FRYE. The treaty provides:

They shall not be liable in any such bays or harbors for compulsory pilotage; nor, when therein for the purpose of shelter, of repairing damages, of purchasing wood, or of obtaining water, shall they be liable for harbor dues, tonnage dues, buoy dues, light dues, or other similar dues.

Now, what an immense gain is contained in this concession! A poor fishing vessel driven by stress of weather for shelter into a Canadian port or harbor shall not be compelled to pay pilotage nor harbor dues or light dues.

Sir Charles Tupper said in relation to that, this is not much of a concession I admit, as we have no light dues in the Canadian Dominion. But the idea of compelling a vessel seeking shelter to pay pilotage!

Mr. GRAY. They have to pay it in our own bays.

Mr. FRYE. That is what I wanted to know, because we are relieved from paying compulsory pilotage by this article; and in another article, XII, all privileges that are conferred upon us in Canadian waters they are to enjoy in ours.

Now, let us see how it will turn out. In the Dominion of Canada there is no such thing as compulsory pilotage for vessels under 80 tons burden. The average fishermen are 80 tons and under. So our vessels of that size can not be compelled to pay compulsory pilotage fees in Canadian waters anyway. I never yet heard of a fisherman paying it in Canadian waters. I am not afraid to declare that no Senator on this floor ever heard any complaint that a fisherman of ours was compelled to pay compulsory pilotage in Canadian waters. Now, the vessels from Maine entering the harbors of the ten Southern States are compelled to pay compulsory pilotage, our coasters and our fishermen. Here is an article which relieves our fishermen, who never did pay compulsory pilotage, from it in Canadian ports, and another article giving Canadians the same rights and privileges in our ports. The result is that the Canadian vessels can enter ours, paying no pilotage, while our vessels of the same size entering the same ports must pay compulsory pilotage.

Article XI provides:

United States fishing vessels entering the ports, bays, and harbors of the eastern and northeastern coasts of Canada or of the coasts of Newfoundland, under stress of weather or other casualty, may unload, reload, transship, or sell, subject to customs laws and regulations, all fish on board, when such unloading, transshipment, or sale is made necessary as incidental to repairs, and may replenish outfits, provisions, and supplies damaged or lost by disaster; and in case of death or sickness shall be allowed all needful facilities, including the shipping of crews.

Sir Charles Tupper does not think that can be considered much of a concession to the United States. He says:

What would be thought of Canada if a vessel of the United States loaded with fresh mackerel or fish of any other description were driven by stress of weather, and perhaps in a sinking condition, and compelled to resort to a Canadian port, and if, instead of allowing her to transship her cargo, or sell it on paying the duty and go upon a marine slip for repairs, we said, "No, you must throw overboard the whole of your cargo, because we find you are not allowed to bring your fish into Canada?"

Sure enough, what would be said of Canada? And yet we have been compelled to make it an article in this treaty as a concession to the United States that when a poor fisherman driven by stress of weather to a Canadian port for repairs, with a mast or a spar blown away, part of her cargo thrown overboard in the storm and the rest liable to be destroyed by the weather, she can land the cargo and shall not be compelled to throw it away. Oh, that is valuable! I know the President congratulates his people that they have obtained this concession finally from Canada, and when I remember the poor Mollie Adams and her experience I think perhaps he may be right. But

there is not a civilized nation on the face of this earth, and no Senator can name one, in which it is necessary to make that a treaty obligation. It is a disgrace to a nation to-day in the nineteenth century that such should be an obligation or a right under a treaty.

Indeed, Articles X and XI give us that which no civilized nation on the face of the earth would deny to the vessel of any nation in distress. They give to us that which it is discreditable to any nation to make a right under a treaty. They give to us that which humanity and civilization as well as common decency demand shall be given without let or hindrance. They give to us no more than nor so much as the people on the islands off the coast of China recently gave our wrecked vessels, for which Congress returned them thanks; no more nor as much as the Esquimaux have given us again and again of their own free will and pleasure. They give to us almost in words what we compelled Algiers, piratical Algiers, seventy years ago to grant. I call your attention to Articles IX and X of the treaty with Algiers made in 1815:

Vessels of either of the contracting parties putting into ports of the other, and having need of provisions or other supplies, shall be furnished at the market price; and if any such vessel should so put in from a disaster at sea, and have occasion to repair, she shall be at liberty to land and re-embark her cargo without paying any customs or duties whatever; but in no case shall she be compelled to land her cargo.

Should a vessel of either of the contracting parties be cast on shore within the territories of the other, all proper assistance shall be given to her crew; no pillage shall be allowed; the property shall remain at the disposal of the owners; and, if reshipped on board of any vessel for exportation, no customs or duties whatever shall be required to be paid thereon, and the crew shall be protected and succored until they can be sent to their own country.

More favorable, better terms were secured from barbaric Algiers in 1815 than our commissioners secured in Articles X and XI of this treaty in this year of our Lord 1888.

Mr. MORGAN. Will the Senator allow me to ask him if there is a statute law on this subject?

Mr. FRYE. I prefer not to be interrupted again. I do not mean any disrespect to the Senator, but he must be aware that on such a hot day as this I am performing a very wearying duty.

Mr. MORGAN. I thought I would refer the Senator to section 389 of the Revised Statutes on that subject.

Mr. FRYE. The Senator has had time enough in the last three days to make any necessary references, I should think.

Article XII provides:

Fishing vessels of Canada and Newfoundland shall have on the Atlantic coast of the United States all the privileges reserved and secured by this treaty to United States fishing vessels in the aforesaid waters of Canada and Newfoundland.

What does that mean? Have they a right to fish in our bays that are outside of the 10-mile line? Can it mean anything else? It leaves the question in doubt. If they are to enjoy the same privileges here, then they have secured what they never had before. We limited them in the treaty of 1854 and in that of 1871. They could not fish below the thirty-sixth or thirty-ninth parallel of latitude. There is no limitation here. Have we opened up our bays to them? Is the Delaware Bay opened up to them? Is the Chesapeake Bay? We excluded them in 1854 and 1871 from our shell fisheries. We do not here. I am not at all sure that there are not privileges extended to them we shall find exceedingly troublesome in Delaware Bay, the Chesapeake Bay, and elsewhere.

Article XIII provides:

The Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall make regulations providing for the conspicuous exhibition by every United States fishing vessel of its official number on each bow; and any such vessel, required by law to have an official number, and failing to comply with such regulations, shall not be entitled to the licenses provided for in this treaty.

We determine by law how our vessels shall be recognized ourselves. We give to one vessel a register, to another an enrollment, to another a license, and it is our privilege to give to the registered vessel a license or an enrollment, and to the licensed vessel a register, and no nation has the right to say to us you can not do this thing. It is a matter for us to determine for ourselves; and yet these commissioners in this treaty have surrendered that right and have declared that our fishing vessels shall be known by a great mark on the bow which can be seen at a distance, pursued and harassed if you do not give them free fish. It was a shame for our commissioners to do that thing.

Article 14 contains all the legal amenities which have been commended to us. I wish to call the attention of Senators to them and see how they like them. The article provides that where a United States fishing vessel is fishing within the 3-mile shore limit the only penalty shall be forfeiture of the vessel and her cargo. They shall not hang the captain nor crucify the men. The Highland Light, the only vessel in the last two years taken for violating the law and fishing within the 3-mile shore-line, was tried and condemned; and what did she do? She caught enough mackerel within the 3-mile shore-line for a breakfast for the crew, and to-day she is a Canadian cruiser. So the first amenity under the treaty is that if one of our fishermen worth about $10,000, with a cargo worth perhaps $3,000 more, is caught within these delimited waters, the Bay of Chaleur, Fortune Bay, or any 10-mile bay, catching mackerel enough for the crew's breakfast, the crime shall not be punished by any greater penalty than the forfeiture of the $10,000 vessel and the $3,000 cargo. This is an amenity of the law. No wonder that the President and Secretary Bayard commend it!

One step further. If he is found within the 3-mile line preparing to fish, even though not fishing, even though not found catching, but only baiting his hook, only mending a seine, no greater penalty shall be exacted than the forfeiture of the vessel and the confiscation of the cargo. Is not that a blessed concession to us? Ought we not to be grateful for that?

Then it provides further that when the vessel and the cargo are in the hands of the seizing officer no bail shall be required—$10,000 worth of property in their hands and no bail for costs shall be required! Would not the Senator from Georgia think that the vessel and cargo were ample for costs?

Another amenity of the law is that the criminal shall have a speedy trial. Is there a civilized nation in the world that to-day does not provide in its laws for the speedy trial of criminals? That is an amenity.

Again it provides that "reasonable bail shall be accepted." Why did you not agree that unreasonable bail might be required? The idea of inserting in the article of a solemn treaty that only reasonable bail shall be required!

Mr. President, I wish now to consider—

ARTICLE XV.

Whenever the United States shall remove the duty from fish-oil, whale-oil, seal-oil, and fish of all kinds (except fish preserved in oil), being the produce of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of Canada and Newfoundland, including Labrador, as well as from the usual and necessary casks, barrels, kegs, cans, and other usual and necessary coverings containing the products above mentioned, the like products, being the produce of fisheries carried on by the fishermen of the United States, as well as the usual and necessary coverings of the same, as above described, shall be admitted free of duty into the Dominion of Canada and Newfoundland.

And upon such removal of duties, and while the aforesaid articles are allowed to be brought into the United States by British subjects, without duty being reimposed thereon, the privilege of entering the ports, bays, and harbors of the aforesaid coasts of Canada and Newfoundland shall be accorded to United States fishing vessels by annual licenses, free of charge, for the following purposes, namely:

1. The purchase of provisions, bait, ice, seines, lines, and all other supplies and outfits;
2. Transshipment of catch, for transport by any means of conveyance;
3. Shipping of crews.

Supplies shall not be obtained by barter, but bait may be so obtained.

This is the gist of the whole matter. The Canadians have greatly increased the perilous waters, the chances for seizure, etc. Now they propose to give us certain commercial privileges if we will pay for them by surrendering our market. If we ratify the treaty and do not make fish, etc., free, they still have such advantages that they feel sure to gain the prize.

What have we been contending for for a large number of years? What have we asked for in these waters? We have not contended since the abrogation of the treaty of 1871, and no man can be found to contend, that we have a right to fish within the 3-mile shore-line. No contention of that kind has been made by anybody, and the only vessel caught fishing within that line, the Highland Light, shows that we have not been there much. We have contended that since 1830, by proclamation of Andrew Jackson, by order of the British Council, we have been entitled to commercial rights and privileges in these bays, in these harbors, precisely as they have rights and privileges in our bays and our harbors. We have asked and they have refused absolutely to yield them the last two years.

Mr. President, I am not aware that during the whole history down to two years ago commercial privileges have been refused to us. There have been spasmodic attempts. Nova Scotia passed a law at one time, but it never was enforced. Newfoundland passed a law eight or ten years ago, providing that we should not buy bait. Great Britain refused to approve of it; and I am not aware that during the whole period down to the proclamation of the Canadian minister of marine, March 5, 1886, commercial privileges have been refused to us since they were accorded them in our ports under the proclamation of 1830. But since that proclamation of March 5, 1886, we have been denied all commercial privileges, and nearly all the seizures during the last two years have been made because our fishermen were trying to enjoy them.

Now, Mr. President, I must weary the Senate with some citations. The Canadian claim is that while by the treaty of 1818 we can go into their bays and harbors to obtain wood and water, for shelter and repairs, and for no other purpose whatever, the words "no other purpose whatever" absolutely exclude our fishing vessels from the commercial privileges which they yield readily to our commercial vessels. Our reply to that is: First. That our fishermen are commercial vessels. Long before the treaty of 1818 was made we had a law on the statute-book which provided for the equipping of our fishing vessels with "permits to touch and trade." Those papers gave them commercial character and entitled them to commercial privileges.

Secondly, I go further. I say that under the proclamation of Andrew Jackson, under the British order in council, under the act of Parliament of July, 1849, under the proclamation of President Taylor in 1849 or 1850, all vessels of the United States have the same rights and privileges in these Canadian waters, subject to the customs regulations of Canada, as their vessels have in our ports, etc. Without the "permit" they may not engage in merchandising, but they would not be excluded from buying flour or any other of the necessaries of life even

under the treaty of 1818. Why? Because in 1818 there was no such thing known as a commercial privilege in a Canadian port. There was not a commercial vessel in the whole United States that could press the waters there with her keel.

The only vessels that were permitted to go in there at all were fishing vessels; the only vessels that had any rights there were fishing vessels; the only ones that even had the right to go in for shelter, for wood, for water, for repairs, were American fishing vessels. Those were privileges granted to them over and above all other vessels of the United States and secured to them by the treaty of 1818; and therefore when we said "for no other purpose whatever," we did not yield up commercial privileges. We could not yield what had no existence in law or fact. That was an impossibility. They existed neither in law nor in fact, and they were not yielded by the treaty of 1818.

This is the view taken by Mr. Bayard. Secretary Bayard, May 10, 1886, in a statement of the case to Sir Lionel West, said:

But since the date of the treaty of 1818, a series of laws and regulations importantly affecting the trade between the North American Provinces of Great Britain and the United States have been, respectively, adopted by the two countries, and have led to amicable and mutually beneficial relations between their respective inhabitants.

This independent and yet concurrent action by the two governments had effected a gradual extension, from time to time, of the provisions of Article I of the convention of July 3, 1815, providing for reciprocal liberty of commerce between the United States and the territories of Great Britain in Europe, so as gradually to include the colonial possessions of Great Britain in North America and the West Indies within the results of that treaty.

President Jackson's proclamation of October 5, 1830, created a reciprocal commercial intercourse, on terms of perfect equality of flag, between this country and the British American dependencies, by repealing the navigation acts of April 18, 1818, May 15, 1820, and March 1, 1823, and admitting British vessels and their cargoes "to an entry in the ports of the United States from the islands, provinces, and colonies of Great Britain on or near the American continent, and north or east of the United States."

Again, Mr. Bayard said:

I ask you to consider the results of excluding American vessels, duly possessed of permits from their own Government, to touch and trade at Canadian ports as well as to engage in deep-sea fishing, from exercising freely the same customary and reasonable rights and privileges of trade in the ports of the British colonies as are freely allowed to British vessels in all the ports of the United States under the laws and regulations to which I have adverted.

Among these customary rights and privileges may be enumerated the purchase of ship-supplies of every nature, making repairs, the shipment of crews in whole or part, and the purchase of ice and bait for use in deep-sea fishing.

Concurrently, these usual rational and convenient privileges are freely extended to and are fully enjoyed by the Canadian merchant marine of all occupations, including fishermen, in the ports of the United States.

The question therefore arises whether such a construction is admissible as would convert the treaty of 1818 from being an instrumentality for the protection of the inshore fisheries along the described parts of the British American coast into a pretext or means of obstructing the business of deep-sea fishing by citizens of the United States, and of interrupting and destroying the commercial intercourse that since the treaty of 1818, and independent of any treaty whatever, has grown up and now exists under the concurrent and friendly laws and mercantile regulations of the respective countries.

I may recall to your attention the fact that a proposition to exclude the vessels of the United States engaged in fishing from carrying also merchandise was made by the British negotiators of the treaty of 1818, but being resisted by the American negotiators was abandoned. This fact would seem clearly to indicate that the business of fishing did not then, and does not now, disqualify a vessel from also trading in the regular ports of entry.

And so on; and yet Secretary Bayard has signed a treaty by which he compels us for those privileges which we have a right to, to pay at least a million dollars a year.

Again, the Secretary of State, December 8, 1886, says:

It will be observed in the course of this correspondence that notification has not failed to be duly given to the Government of Great Britain that compensation is expected for the loss and damage caused to American fishermen by the unwarrantable action of the local authorities of the Dominion of Canada, not merely by the summary seizure of their vessels and the exaction of heavy fines in advance of hearing or judgment, but for the curtailment of privileges to which they were justly entitled under commercial regulations as well as treaty stipulations, and the consequent interference with their legitimate voyages, whereby the natural profits of their industry were seriously diminished, and in many cases wholly destroyed.

Again, April 9, 1886:

I expect to attain such an understanding as will relieve our fishermen from all doubts or risk in the exercise of the ordinary commercial privileges of friendly ports, to which, under existing laws of both countries, I consider their citizens to be mutually entitled free from molestation.

Again:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, June 7, 1886.*

SIR: I have to-day received your letter dated the 5th instant, accompanied by the affidavit of the master of the fishing schooner Alice M. Jordan, of Gloucester, Mass., alleging the refusal by the collector of customs at the port of St. Andrews, New Brunswick, to allow the entry of said vessel, duly documented as a fishing vessel, with permission to touch and trade at any foreign port or place during her voyage, the object of such entry, as stated by the master of the schooner, being the purchase of certain merchandise.

Although not disclosed by the affidavits, I suppose the merchandise in question was fresh fish for use as bait in deep-sea fishing.

I have made instant representation, accompanied by earnest protest, to the British minister at this capital, *of this unlawful withholding of commercial rights* from an American vessel and her owners, and of the loss and damage thereby sustained, for which, as I have informed him, the Government of Great Britain will be held responsible.

On the 5th day of November, 1886, in a letter to Minister Phelps making propositions for negotiations, Mr. Bayard said:

The present memorandum also contains provisions for the usual commercial facilities allowed elsewhere for the promotion of legitimate trade, and no where more fully than in British ports and under the commercial policy of that nation. Such facilities can not, with any show of reason, be denied to American fishing vessels when plying their vocation in deep-sea fishing grounds in the localities open to them equally with other nationalities. The convention of 1818 inhibits the "taking, drying, or curing fish" by American fishermen in certain waters and on certain coasts, and when these are effected the inhibitory features are exhausted. Everything that may presumably guard against an infraction of these provisions will be recognized and obeyed by the Government of the United States, but should not be pressed beyond its natural force.

By its very terms and necessary intendment the same treaty recognizes the continuance permanently of the accustomed rights of American fishermen in those places not embraced in the renunciation of the treaty to prosecute the business as freely as did their forefathers. No construction of the convention of 1818 that strikes at or impedes the open-sea fishing by citizens of the United States can be accepted, nor should a treaty of friendship be tortured into a means of such offense, nor should such an end be accomplished by indirection. Therefore, by causing the same port regulations and commercial rights to be applied to vessels engaged therein as are enforced relative to other trading craft, we propose to prevent a ban from being put upon the lawful and regular business of open-sea fishing.

Take the case of the Alice M. Jordan, prohibited from buying bait. Mr. Bayard, under date June 7, 1886, says:

I earnestly protest against this unwarranted withholding of lawful commercial privileges from an American vessel and her owners, and for the loss and damage consequent thereon the Government of Great Britain will be held liable.

Again, July 10:

Such inhibition of usual and legitimate commercial contracts and intercourse is assuredly without warrant of law, and I draw your attention to it in order that the commercial rights of citizens of the United States may not be thus invaded and subjected to unfriendly discrimination.

Again, when the right to buy coal was denied the steamer Novelty, July 7, 1886:

Against this treatment I make instant and formal protest as an unwarranted interpretation and application of the treaty by the officers of the Dominion of Canada and the province of Nova Scotia, as an infraction of the laws of commercial and maritime intercourse existing between the two countries, and as a violation of hospitality, and for any loss or injury resulting therefrom the Government of Her Britannic Majesty will be held liable.

The Mollie Adams; September 10, 1886, Mr. Bayard says:

This inhospitable, indeed inhuman, conduct on the part of the customs officer in question should be severely reprimanded, and for the infraction of treaty rights and commercial privileges compensation equivalent to the injuries sustained will be claimed from Her Majesty's Government.

Now, consider a few extracts from the statement of our case made by our minister to England, Mr. Phelps, touching the seizure of the David J. Adams for buying bait, to Lord Roseberry, under date of June 2, 1886:

Recurring, then, to the only real question in the case, whether the vessel is to be forfeited for purchasing bait of an inhabitant of Nova Scotia, to be used in lawful fishing, it may be readily admitted that if the language of the treaty of 1818 is to be interpreted literally, rather than according to its spirit and plain intent, a vessel engaged in fishing would be prohibited from entering a Canadian port "for any purpose whatever" except to obtain wood or water, to repair damages, or to seek shelter. Such a literal construction is best refuted by considering its preposterous consequences. If a vessel enters a port to post a letter, or send a telegram, or buy a newspaper, to obtain a physician in case of illness, or a surgeon in case of accident, to land or bring off a passenger, or even to lend assistance to the inhabitants in fire, flood, or pestilence, it would, upon this construction, be held to violate the treaty stipulations maintained between two enlightened maritime and most friendly nations, whose ports are freely open to each other in all other places and under all other circumstances.

If a vessel is not engaged in fishing she may enter all ports; but if employed in fishing, not denied to be lawful, she is excluded, though on the most innocent errand. She may buy water, but not food or medicine; wood, but not coal. She may repair rigging, but not purchase a new rope, though the inhabitants are desirous to sell it. If she even entered the port (having no other business) to report herself to the custom-house, as the vessel in question is now seized for not doing, she would be equally within the interdiction of the treaty. If it be said these are extreme instances of violation of the treaty not likely to be insisted on, I reply that no one of them is more extreme than the one relied upon in this case.

He cites recognition in British official documents of the right of our fisherman to commercial privileges, as follows:

The exclusion of American fishermen from resorting to Canadian ports, except for the purpose of shelter, and of repairing damages therein, purchasing wood, and of obtaining water, might be warranted by the letter of the treaty of 1818, and by the terms of the imperial act 59 George III, chapter 38, but Her Majesty's Government feel bound to state that it seems to them an extreme measure, inconsistent with the general policy of the Empire, and they are disposed to concede this point to the United States Government under such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent smuggling and to guard against any substantial invasion of the exclusive rights of fishing which may be reserved to British subjects.

Judicial authority upon this question is to the same effect. That the purchase of bait by American fishermen in the provincial ports has been a common practice is well known. But in no case, so far as I can ascertain, has a seizure of an American vessel ever been enforced on the ground of the purchase of bait, or of any other supplies. On the hearing before the Halifax Fisheries Commission in 1877 this question was discussed, and no case could be produced of any such condemnation. Vessels shown to have been condemned were in all cases adjudged guilty either of fishing or preparing to fish within the prohibited limit. And in the case of the White Fawn, tried in the admiralty court of New Brunswick before Judge Hazen in 1870, I understand it to have been distinctly held that the purchase of bait, unless proved to have been in preparation for illegal fishing, was not a violation of the treaty, nor of any existing law, and afforded no ground for proceedings against the vessel.

June 18, 1886, Mr. Bayard warmly indorsed this presentation of our case.

I call attention now to the report of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, of which Mr. BELMONT was chairman. He says:

Your committee is of the opinion that the rightful area of our "American fisheries" has been reduced, and the quantity of fish—fresh, dried, cured, or salted—landed in the United States free of duty has been diminished, by the conduct of local officers in Canada. That conduct has been not only in violation of treaty stipulations and of international comity, but during the fishing

season just passed has been inhuman, as the message of the President clearly establishes.

Again:

Unless English words were in 1818 used in that article in an unusual sense, there is not a sentence or word therein that has reference to anything else than taking, drying, or curing fish by American fishermen on or within certain coasts, bays, creeks, or harbors therein described. No word or phrase mentioned alludes or refers to deep-sea fishing or ordinary commercial privileges. The restrictions refer only to fishing, or drying, or curing "in such bays or harbors."

* * * * * * *

The entire article referred to inshore fishing. No right and no liberty whatever, that might concern deep-sea fishermen, did the United States, by the treaty of 1818, renounce.

Again:

The treaty of 1818 furnishes no more excuse for the exclusion of a deep-sea fisherman from the port of Halifax, or any other open port of the Dominion of Canada, than for the exclusion by the Secretary of the Treasury of a deep-sea fisherman from entering the port of New York according to the forms of law and for the ordinary purposes of trade and commerce. The exclusion, if made, must be justified, if at all, for other reasons than any yet given by Canada.

I call attention to what the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Manning, said after an exhaustive examination of the subject; and I believe if Secretary Manning had lived this treaty never would have seen the light of day. He had both wisdom and courage. Secretary Manning, in September, 1886, said:

But the Canadian act, thus having the royal approval, was intended, as has been openly avowed, to forfeit any American fishing vessel which is found having entered Canadian waters or the port of Halifax to buy ice, bait, or other articles, or for any purpose other than shelter, repairs, wood, or water. The plea is that the treaty of 1818 permits and stipulates for such legislation. That we deny, and reply that such legislation is a repeal and annulment by England of the arrangement made in 1830, and to that repeal we are entitled to respond by a similar repeal of our own law, and by a refusal hereafter, and while debate or negotiation goes on, to confer hospitality, or any privileges whatever in our ports, on Canadian vessels or boats of any sort. A violation of comity may be looked upon as an unfriendly act, but not a cause for a just war. England may judge for herself of the nature and extent of the comity and courtesy she will show us. In the present case we do not propose retaliation; we simply respond: We, too, suspend comity and hospitality.

I call attention now to a statement if possible very much more important than any of these. July 12, 1887, after Secretary Bayard had had a year and a half in which to consider all these questions, after he had obtained all possible information, after he knew of the proclamation of the minister of marine of March 5, 1886, denying commercial privileges, after he had fully investigated the right of the minister of marine to issue that proclamation, after he had investigated all the Canadian laws, all their acts—after a full, careful, complete consideration of everything touching the contention, he wrote to Mr. Phelps as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, July* 12, 1887.

SIR: On March 24 last the Marquis of Salisbury made reply to your note to him of December 3, 1886, and communicated the views of the Canadian Government upon the *ad interim* arrangement proposed by the Government of the United States, under date of the 15th of November preceding, for the settlement of the fishery disputes.

This reply of his lordship and the "observations" of the Canadian authorities upon the proposal for an arrangement were conveyed in Mr. White's dispatch of March 30, and received at this Department April 11 last, when it had my immediate consideration.

And then he called his attention to his (Bayard's) observations on the Canadian observations, made at any rate as late as May or June, if not later, of 1887. I wish to call the careful attention of the Senate to what Mr. Bayard said. I want the Senate to hear it, because it is the final judgment of the Secretary of State.

The Secretary read as follows:

REPLY TO "OBSERVATIONS" ON PROPOSAL.

ART. IV. The treaty of 1818 related solely to fisheries. It was not a commercial convention, and no commercial privileges were renounced by it. It contains no reference to "ports," of which, it is believed, the only ones then existing were Halifax, in Nova Scotia, and possibly one or two more in the other provinces; and these ports were not until long afterwards opened, by reciprocal commercial regulations, to vessels of the United States engaged in trading.

The right to "obtain" (*i. e.*, take or fish for) bait was not insisted upon by the American negotiators, and was doubtless omitted from the treaty because, as it would have permitted fishing for that purpose, it was a partial reassertion of the right to fish within the limits as to which the right to take fish had already been expressly renounced.

The purchase of bait and other supplies by the American fishermen in the established ports of entry of Canada, as proposed in article 4, is not regarded as inconsistent with any of the provisions of the treaty of 1818; and in this relation it is pertinent to note the declaration of the Earl of Kimberly, in his letter of February 16, 1871, to Lord Lisgar, that "the exclusion of American fishermen from resorting to Canadian ports, except for the purpose of shelter and of repairing damages therein, purchasing wood, and obtaining water, might be warranted by the letter of the treaty of 1818 and by the terms of the imperial act 59, George III, chapter 38; but Her Majesty's Government feel bound to state that it seems to them an extreme measure inconsistent with the general policy of the empire, and they were disposed to concede this point to the United States Government under such restrictions as may be necessary to prevent smuggling and to guard against any substantial invasion of the exclusive rights of fishing which may be reserved to British subjects."

It is not contended that the right to purchase bait and supplies or any other privilege of trade was given by the treaty of 1818. Neither was any such right or privilege stipulated for or given by the treaty of 1854, nor by the treaty of Washington; and the Halifax commission decided in 1877 that it was not "competent" for that tribunal "to award compensation for commercial intercourse between the two countries, nor for purchasing bait, ice, supplies, etc., nor for permission to tranship cargoes in British waters." And yet this Government is not aware that during the existence of the treaty of 1854 or the treaty of Washington question was ever made of the right of American fishermen to purchase bait and other supplies in Canadian ports, or that such privileges were ever denied them.

Mr. FRYE. That was the deliberate conclusion of Secretary Bayard, as I say, after he had had a year and a half in which to consider all the laws and all the facts, and as such final judgment it was communicated by him to his minister in England, Mr. Phelps. It is a distinct, bold, brave declaration that, we are entitled now to commercial rights and commercial privileges in all the ports and all the harbors of the Dominion of Canada; and yet, in less than six months from the utterance of that declaration we find him agreeing to a treaty in which it is declared that we may have those privileges or a part of them by the payment of at least $1,000,000 a year!

Why do I say a million dollars a year? Under the treaty of 1871, where Canadian fish were admitted free of duty, the last year, 1884–'85, the duties we remitted on Canadian fish amounted to $700,000, and the business has been increasing ever since. Next year, with the same law, the duties would amount to a million dollars at least, and it will grow in all the future of the treaty under consideration, and yet we are to pay that million or million and a half of dollars every year for a permit to buy bait, ice, sails, cordage, etc., in Canadian ports.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from Maine says we are entitled to these commercial privileges. Are we entitled to them under the treaty or as a matter of comity?

Mr. FRYE. I mean that a sense of honor on our part and a recognition of reasonable duty to our citizens ought to compel us either to demand of Canada commercial rights and privileges in their ports or to refuse them the same privileges in ours. I admit it is no treaty right, and I have already stated how commercial privileges were provided for.

Mr. MORGAN. Why did not the Senator, for his party and himself, demand those rights to which we are entitled in 1878, instead of leaving it distinctly to the President? They left it to his discretion to demand them. The Senator from Massachusetts says, *sotto voce*, he never dreamed that the President would interpret the act in that way, and yet the President and the Secretary of State now for fifty-odd years have done the same thing.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Bayard did not do the same thing last summer.

Mr. MORGAN. And that, too, with the statute of 1850 on the statute-book authorizing them to demand reparation and retaliation.

Mr. FRYE. Mr. President, the lateness of the hour reminds me that it is about time for me to conclude. I have mislaid a paper which I wish to cite. I will ask the consent of the Senate that I may insert it in my remarks.

Mr. President, we do not acquire commercial privileges by this treaty unless we buy them. Now this is a complete surrender of the position which we have occupied for more than fifty years. We claimed these privileges and these rights. We have insisted upon their enjoyment. We have enjoyed them up to two years ago; and now here is a treaty which admits that Canada's refusal has been right and that we have been wrong; which admits, if we desire to enjoy these privileges, we must buy them of Canada instead of claiming them under the laws of Great Britain and of the United States.

Now, Mr. President, what will be our attitude with Canada hereafter? Can we ever retrace these steps? Can we ever go back to the position we occupied before these plenipotentiaries met? We stood then squarely on the American doctrine. Can we ever stand there again? The President says that the treaty is right. The Secretary of State, in his letter to the banquet in New York, declared that he obtained all that he desired and all that he sought.

What has become of our claims for damages presented to Great Britain over and over again by Secretary Bayard? This treaty drops out the very foundation of most of them. With what face can we ever again insist that, under Article XXIX of the treaty of Washington, we have the right to transship, transport in bond, rights Canada is to-day enjoying to the fullest extent under the same article, to her immense benefit and to our loss? How we are to be handicapped hereafter!

Here is what the St. John Sun said a week ago in relation to this:

The privileges of purchasing bait and transshipping cargo, the denial of which last year was characterized as gross brutality by a United States Cabinet minister, are no longer claimed by the United States Government.

The advantages of our present position will be sufficiently evident when the next controversy arises, which will be when the first American fisherman is prevented from doing something he wants to do. Should he be prevented from purchasing bait, forwarding supplies, or shipping a crew on our coast, the usual outcry will be raised, charges of brutal treatment and of uncivilized conduct will be made, and the President will be invited to retaliate by proclaiming non-intercourse. It will then be open to Mr. Foster to remind the Secretary of State that he has himself admitted the right of Canadians to do these things, and has agreed to a formal treaty recognizing that right. Nor will it be longer open to Mr. Bayard to use the language which he has rather freely employed heretofore, and which more clamorous politicians and less responsible men of his nation have used more freely than he. The President may retaliate, but if he does he will be retaliating to a nation which is doing what the President and his Cabinet and the President's chosen commissioners have admitted to be within the right of that nation to do.

The Montreal Gazette says of the treaty:

We secure every right for which we have contended in the correspondence of the last two years. The Americans are debarred from the "touch and trade" and transshipping privileges. We have obtained everything we ever claimed—the right to deny trading privileges to American fishing vessels, to prohibit the purchase of bait, ice, seines, lines, tackle, and other fishing outfit, the transshipment of cargo, and the shipping of seamen.

Again it says, under date of March 1:

If we have to revert to the condition of things which prevailed in 1886 and in 1887 there will be general regret, but at least Canadians can have this satisfaction, that in reverting to the treaty of 1818 we do so with our position infinitely strengthened by the formal acknowledgment on the part of President Cleveland and his Government that all our contentions are right.

Can there be any mistake about that position? Can they not, if we undertake to protect our fishermen, say to us, "Your own President and Secretary of State have declared in a treaty that you have no right to demand of us these privileges?" And there is something more serious than that. A year ago in the Senate and the House we were Americans, we were united for the rights of our citizens. No one dreamed of raising a political issue in relation to this question. No one discussed it as a party man. And where are we to-day? The President taking the side, practically, of the Canadians in this matter, the Secretary of State close by him if not a little ahead in the controversy, the great Democratic party of the country being arrayed on the side of the Canadian and against the American fishermen.

Mr. President, a most grievous wrong has been wrought by this treaty-making power. False steps have been taken which can never be retraced, and in the long future we shall never be permitted to stand where we stood one year ago in the Senate, asserting with one voice that we would defend the rights of American fishermen against Great Britain or any other power on the face of the earth. We surrender their rights. We have said in the solemn language of proclamation and message that the treaty here which yields them is just and fair, all that ought to be asked, and hereafter and forever our mouths are closed.

Again, Mr. President, I declare that this treaty is a dishonorable, humiliating, and cowardly surrender.

Mr. President, I thank the Senate for its generous indulgence and for its courteous attention. If, in the heat of speech, without notes, I have been betrayed into any intemperate words, I tender sincere apology.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President——

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. GRAY. It is not my purpose to detain the Senate more than a single moment.

Mr. SHERMAN. I want an understanding.

Mr. GRAY. I only want to call attention to a single point on which I wish to make a correction. The Senator from Maine, during the course of his very lengthy speech, took such short issue with me upon a matter of fact, and in the heat of his oratory was so emphatic in his contradiction as to a suggestion that I made, that I feel that it is due to myself before the Senate adjourns to-day to call his attention to the evidence to show that I had not made a mere random assertion, but was right in the assertion that I made and had authority for it.

The Senator in the course of his argument stated that the headland theory had been decided in two cases solemnly before arbitrators to have been an unfounded one on the part of Great Britain; that the whole headland contention or theory had been disposed of by those decisions. I asked the Senator if there was any decision before arbitrators or an umpire other than the case of the Washington and the Bay of Fundy.

He referred me to the case of the Argus, with which I thought I was familiar, which occurred on the upper northeast bend of another bay, but there was no such case decided by arbitrators, although the Secretary of State seems to have used language from which one might infer that he took the same view as the Senator from Maine and the Senator from Colorado; but Mr. Everett and Lord Aberdeen, in a correspondence after the case of the Washington, did settle a question that was included within the ruling in the case of the Washington; but there was no case brought to the attention of that claims commission which was decided on that point except the case of the Washington. I make that assertion, and I only ask Senators to look through the list of cases presented to that commission in order to confirm the truth of what I say.

I further stated that the case of the Washington settled no general principle applicable to all the bays in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, or Newfoundland, but was only applicable to that great arm of the sea called the Bay of Fundy, and was confined to that alone, and was placed mostly upon the ground that one of the headlands of that bay or arm of the sea was within the United States. There the Senator from Maine very flatly contradicted me, and I desire now to read a single paragraph of about six lines from the decision of the umpire, Mr. Joshua Bates, to confirm the truth of what I said.

One of the headlands—

Says Mr. Bates—

of the Bay of Fundy is in the United States, and ships bound for Passamaquoddy must sail through a large space of it. The island of Grand Menan (British) and Little Menan (American) are situated nearly on a line from headland to headland. These islands, as represented in all geographies, are situate in the Atlantic Ocean. The conclusion is, therefore, in my mind irresistible that the Bay of Fundy is not a British bay, nor a bay within the meaning of the word as used in the treaties of 1783 and 1818.

That was all I wished to say at this time in justification of the interruption which I made of the Senator from Maine during his speech, and I think I have presented absolute confirmation of the truth of the simple fact that I asserted.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President——

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator wish to take the floor on the treaty?

Mr. MORGAN. I wish to say a word.

Mr. SHERMAN. I should like to have an understanding.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair recognized the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY].

Mr. SHERMAN. Does the Senator wish the floor?

Mr. MORGAN. I ask the Senator to yield to me until I submit the motion of which I gave notice.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Delaware desire to retain the floor on the pending treaty?

Mr. GRAY. I do.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. GRAY. I do.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that the further consideration of this treaty be postponed until the Wednesday after the first Monday of December next.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Alabama moves that the further consideration of this treaty be postponed until the Wednesday after the first Monday of December next.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask the Senator from Delaware if it will be agreeable to him not to proceed with the consideration of the motion to postpone or the discussion of the treaty until next Monday? If so, I hope without any formal motion the matter may be postponed until Monday next.

Mr. GRAY. That will be agreeable to me.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will avoid confusion and facilitate the conduct of business if the Senate can proceed, when the executive business is concluded, to the consideration of legislative business by motion.

Mr. HOAR rose.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator rise to this question?

Mr. HOAR. Yes, sir. I rise to call the attention of the Senate and of the public, so far as this debate shall attract public attention, now to the fact that the Senator from Delaware seems to me to have a wrong notion from what he undertook to read from the decision of Mr. Bates as to the principle on which he proceeded. Mr. Bates says that the word "headlands" was entirely unknown in the law of nations until the treaty of 1818, and he further says that the treaty of 1783 provided for the line upon which fish should be dried and cured. It describes a line by the terms "on the bays, harbors, creeks, or shores." He says it is manifest that the words in the treaty of 1818, which are copied from the treaty of 1783, mean exactly the same thing, and that when a three-mile line is drawn from the spot on which you are to dry and cure fish, the question therefore turns, as far as the treaty stipulation goes, on the meaning given to "bays" in the treaty of 1783. By that treaty the Americans had no right to dry and cure fish except on the coasts, bays, harbors, and creeks. By the treaty of 1818 the American fishermen had a right to fish within 3 miles of the coast, bays, etc.

The treaty intended that the word "bay" or "bays" should have the same meaning in all cases; and no mention being made of headlands, no doubt the Washington in fishing 10 miles from the shore violated no stipulations of the treaty.

Then he goes on to say that one of the headlands of the Bay of Fundy is within American jurisdiction and the other in British jurisdiction, and he then says:

The conclusion is, therefore, in my mind irresistible that the Bay of Fundy is not a British bay, nor a bay within the meaning of the word as used in the treaties of 1783 and 1818.

Now, it is impossible to put into human language a declaration more absolute that Mr. Bates decides that the treaty of 1818 means 3 miles from the sinuosities of the shore, and that the words "bays, creeks, harbors, and coasts or shores," one being a description of the place where you may dry fish and the other being a description of the place where you may take fish, mean exactly the same thing.

Then came the case of the Argus, and if the Senator will refer to the volume in my hands, a report of the proceedings of that commission made to the American Government, he will find that on the same or the next day after this decision in the case of the Washington, the Argus was found to have been seized in a bay which was one of the bays where she was entitled to be. Mr. Joshua Bates awarded $18,000 as our damages for that.

Now, if I may be indulged a moment further, just look at this. Mr. Webster had said that the language of the treaty of 1818 was somewhat unfortunate, though he coupled it with an emphatic declaration that he believed in our right. Mr. Everett had done the same thing; but

the year 1853 was the close of Mr. Everett's diplomatic service, and Mr. Webster was dead and in his grave. In 1854 we made the treaty of reciprocity which lasted until 1866. In 1871 we made the second reciprocity arrangement which lasted until the present dispute began in 1885. So for all the purposes of this discussion with Great Britain, these two solemn judgments of these tribunals stand to-day. There have been five years when this question could possibly have been raised. Now, you have undertaken and you are undertaking when you stand here to argue the British side of this treaty, you gentlemen and your Administration——

Mr. GRAY. I am not arguing the British side.

Mr. HOAR. It is the British side, as I understand it. You gentlemen stand here and your Administration stands here in the face of a solemn treaty and a solemn adjudication as to what it means five years afterwards, and undertake when there is a dispute about something else to throw it all away and to exclude the United States from the very harbor which was the scene of one of the judgments.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, there is nothing that I so much deprecate in debate as assertions on one side against assertions on the other; and it was not my purpose at any time this afternoon to enter into an argument on this matter with the Senator from Massachusetts. I only again reiterate—and that was the sole object I had in rising before—that the matter of fact in regard to this subject, in regard to which I trespassed on the Senator from Maine in debate, was as to whether a ground of the decision of the umpire in the case of the Washington was that one of the headlands of the Bay of Fundy was within the United States. I will not reread that portion of the umpire's decision. I have already read it in the hearing of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. What virtue does it give to the statement of Mr. Bates that this is not only not a British bay, but that it is not a bay at all within the meaning of the first treaty; and the word "bay" means the same in both treaties?

Mr. GRAY. It is not at all pertinent to the object for which I rose, nor is the time sufficient now to go into that question on either side. I will endeavor to do so at some other time, and, so far as I may, satisfy the Senator from Massachusetts that the decision of the umpire in the case of the Washington settled no principle and undertook to settle no principle; that the umpire in that case acted as judges are prone to act and endeavored to confine himself within the four corners of the case and place himself upon the ground that the Bay of Fundy, which was the very thing in dispute, as to whether it was a bay within the meaning of the treaty of 1818 or not, was not such a bay, and upon the ground which I have already read to the Senate, that one of its headlands was within the United States.

Now, in regard to the Argus, I only deem it at all important on the question of accuracy. I again state, in this volume, which purports to contain all the decisions of the umpire and the decisions made under that claims commission, there is no case of the Argus found; but there was a correspondence between Mr. Everett and Lord Aberdeen in which that case was practically disposed of. That case of the Argus occurred within a line drawn on the north shore of Cape Breton from headland to headland here [indicating on the map]. The headland claimed at that time by Canada was this and this [indicating], and a line drawn from that headland to this [indicating] was the line claimed as the line of exclusion.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Delaware has not yielded the floor.

Mr. GRAY. The headland theory, so-called, is a matter of absolutely no importance in this debate, as when I shall have time I expect to be able to show. I think that will be apparent before this debate is through; and I trust it can be conducted without any trespassing on the one side or the other beyond those lines which protect the courtesy of debate; and I think it can be conducted without such flings as the Senator from Massachusetts chose to make in his interlocution here a moment ago that we were conducting or defending the British side of this debate. I think, sir, before we are through with this question it will be apparent that we are conducting the side of the people of the United States, and while I deprecate any allusion of that kind I think I shall be quite able to meet the Senator upon this arena and discuss the real merits and facts and law without resorting to prejudice or indulging in what I am compelled to think is something beneath the dignity of the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. President, I should be very sorry to be considered by the Senator from Delaware or anybody else as indulging in anything discourteous to him, for if there were no other consideration with reference to my own self-respect and sense of propriety which would prevent that, my profound respect for him as an example and model of all courtesy in Senatorial character would prevent it. The Senator may be quite sure there is no personal discourtesy.

But I think the Senator will admit that, in regard to this argument, the argument which he makes on these questions is the British argument, the headland theory, the theory about the bays. The argument which we contend for is the American argument, the American side. The view that the Secretary in debating with England took was the argument we now use, and England replied with the argument which the Senator now uses.

My honorable friend denied that there was any judgment in the matter of the Argus.

Mr. GRAY. I said I could find none in that volume.

Mr. HOAR. Here is one place where it is found.

RECAPITULATION.

Awards of moneys made under the convention for the adjustment of claims of February 8, 1853, in behalf of the United States claimants against the British Government.

Names of parties.	Amounts awarded.
* * * * *	* *
Schooner Argus, Doughty, master	$2,000
Schooner Washington	3,000

There is one place, but I will find a little more distinct place than that.

Mr. GRAY. Can the Senator find any place where it was discussed?

Mr. HOAR. I have seen a decision. There is one here. Whether I can find it in a moment I do not know.

Mr. GRAY. I will take the Senator's word for that. If he has seen it that is sufficient for me.

Mr. HOAR. Here it is. I have found it.

19. Schooner Argus, *Doughty, master*.

Presented March 14, 1854—Heard July 15 and August 1, and submitted—Disagreement of commissioners—Heard before umpire October 11, and submitted—Award of umpire.

For seizure of the above vessel on St. Ann's bank—

That little bay [indicating on the map] is called St. Ann's bay. So I presume the bank would be in line—

By the British revenue cruiser Sylph, and her removal to Sydney, where she was subsequently sold.

September 26.—The commissioners disagreed in said case, and the same was submitted to the umpire.

December 23.—The umpire awarded the sum of $2,000, in full of said claim, due the 15th of January, 1855.

Mr. GRAY. I have never seen that; and yet, if the Senator will pardon me, that is all, is it not, that there is of that case?

Mr. HOAR. I do not know but there is considerably more.

Mr. GRAY. Is there any opinion by the umpire or the commissioner who discusses the principles of headland limited exclusion?

Mr. HOAR. What could there be? It was within the headland, 3 miles from shore. Here is the master's reply. I have not the report open at the place. The Senator will find if he will look at the report of the British master of the vessel that seized it.

Mr. GRAY. I have seen that.

Mr. HOAR. He states where he found it.

Mr. GRAY. I have seen that.

Mr. HOAR. The letter of Lord Aberdeen accompanies it, and it was clearly within the headland; it was clearly a British bay if any of these things are British bays. The umpire, after deciding the Washington question, did not find it necessary to give a new judgment—a new opinion.

Mr. GRAY. That may be. I never denied that the case had not been settled; but I found no opinion of Mr. Bates, the umpire, or of the commission discussing that theory or making that a special case.

Mr. HOAR. Let me go a little further.

Mr. BECK. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. I have the floor, and do not yield.

Mr. GRAY. One moment more, if the Senator will pardon me. I have seen the statement of the master, and he claimed that he was 15 miles from the shore.

Mr. HOAR. Suppose he was, and in the bay?

Mr. GRAY. No, he did not claim that he was in the bay.

Mr. BECK. Mr. President——

Mr. HOAR. I have the floor.

Mr. BECK. I rose to ascertain who had the floor?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts has the floor.

Mr. BECK. Then I have no favor to ask.

Mr. HOAR. I do not wish to detain the Senate in this hot weather, but I think it my duty to have the facts settled now at the outset of this debate, that this question under the treaty of 1818 is settled by a solemn international arbitration and judgment. I affirm again, in spite of my honorable friend differing with me in opinion, that it seems to my mind as clear as daylight that the umpire in that case could not put into language a more specific assertion than the assertion he has made that he does not base his opinion upon the ground that Great Britain owns one of the headlands of the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. GRAY. He states it as the ground.

Mr. HOAR. I am making a statement now.

Mr. GRAY. I beg pardon.

Mr. HOAR. He states the fact that Great Britain owns one of the headlands. He also says the headland theory never has been heard of till now, and the language of the treaty of 1818 and the language of

the treaty of 1783 mean the same thing, and mean the shore-line, because 1783 must mean the shore-line for it is the spot where they dry fish. Therefore in summing up he says:

I decide that this is not a British bay, and I decide that it is not a bay at all within the meaning of the treaty of 1818.

There is the decision which applies to everything. Then he takes the Argus case, where Great Britain owns both headlands. Talking about 15 miles from shore; several of these bays are 50 or 60 miles, being where Great Britain owned both headlands. He goes on, without stating any new opinion, because it was not necessary as the old one covered it, to award by solemn judgment damages in the case of the Argus.

Mr. BECK. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Thursday next.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That motion has been already made and agreed to.

Mr. BECK. I had not heard it. None of us on this side heard it.

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President——

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I ask the Senator from Delaware to yield to me.

Mr. GRAY. I wish to occupy a single moment, and then I shall yield the floor entirely for to-day.

Mr. BECK. I desire to know when the motion was made and agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion was submitted by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. MANDERSON] and agreed to by the Senate upon a vote, shortly after the Senate reassembled after the expiration of the recess of thirty minutes which occurred during the speech of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE].

Mr. GRAY. Mr. President, I do not think it possible certainly this afternoon to have it settled, as the Senator from Massachusetts says he intends to have it settled before we go away from here, that the decision of the umpire in the case of the Washington settled not only the question submitted to the commissioners in that case, but settled the principle of the delimitation of the bays on all those coasts. I submit again to the Senate that the only case before the arbitration commission was the case of the Washington, seized within the *fauces terræ* of the Bay of Fundy.

Mr. HOAR. It was clear down right opposite Annapolis, Nova Scotia.

Mr. GRAY. Very well; it was within the *fauces terræ* a good ways, and the only case in regard to that bay whether for the purposes of that treaty it was a British bay; and in that short decision he stated as the grounds of his decision that here was an arm of the sea, as he called it, from 60 to 75 miles wide with one of its headlands in the United States, and then he concludes that under all these circumstances he can not consider this to be a British bay at all, and that there is no ground for the inference that the decision either in fact or in principle applies to any other bay than the bay which he was then considering.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands that the further consideration of the treaty is postponed until Monday next, by common consent.

Mr. HOAR. I ask unanimous consent, before that subject passes away, that the proceedings of the Senate in executive session, which by order of the Senate have been made public, so far as they are recorded upon the Journal, shall be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that the proceedings of the executive session from which the injunction of secrecy has been removed may be printed, so far as reported, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MORGAN. That relates back to the beginning of this proceeding?

Mr. HOAR. Certainly; merely what your resolution covered yesterday.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. BECK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Kentucky rise to the pending question?

Mr. BECK. Not in regard to the pending question, but I wish to say a word after that is disposed of.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair then understands that there is no objection, and that the proceedings of the open executive session as they occur will be printed in the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. HOAR. So far as reported.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. So far as reported, and from day to day.

Mr. MORGAN. I did not understand that as being the motion. I understood the motion to refer back to the initial part of the proceedings in executive session.

Mr. HOAR. Certainly, that was it.

Mr. MORGAN. And going all the way up.

Mr. HOAR. I meant to cover what the Senator from Alabama covered by his resolution yesterday. Of course the votes, the proceedings, and motions of the Senate are all journalized and are reported and of record.

Mr. MORGAN. All heretofore had.

Mr. HOAR. My request is that they may be printed in the RECORD from the beginning.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Then the motion practically is that the journal of the executive session be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. MORGAN. That is right.

Mr. HOAR. So far as the injunction of secrecy has been removed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. What disposition shall be made of the proceedings of the open executive session—the debates which occur from day to day?

Mr. MORGAN. That will be the subject of another motion, I suppose.

Mr. BECK. I heard the President of the Senate say a moment ago that this matter was postponed until Monday next.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair stated that by unanimous consent the Chair understood that it was postponed until Monday next, that being the desire of the Senator from Delaware [Mr. GRAY], who has the floor.

Mr. BECK. I desire to say, and that was my object in rising, that I suppose it is very well known that many gentlemen on this side who desire to take part in this debate will perhaps not be able to be here next week. For one I propose to go to the St. Louis convention, to be very plain about it, and so do a good many others; and if the debate is to go on next week in our absence, I assume that we shall not be authorized to go. I desire, if my wishes will have anything to do with it, that the debate may be postponed until next Monday week, so as to give us all a chance to be here to hear the debate and take part in it.

Mr. TELLER. I suppose the understanding was, when we agreed to open the doors, that the convenience of Senators should be served by the way the discussion should be proceeded with, and I do not presume that anybody is disposed to press the consideration of the treaty in the absence of a large number of Senators. I understood that the Senator from Delaware was willing to speak on Monday and that he preferred to do so.

Mr. BECK. I do not care to stop debate, but I desire to have an understanding that no action shall be taken on the treaty during the absence of Senators who wish to speak upon it. I should like very much to be here during the debate.

Mr. TELLER. I presume other Senators would like to discuss it and would be willing to discuss it perhaps in the absence of some Senators on the other side, but I suppose there might be an understanding that no vote should be taken on it in their absence.

Mr. HOAR. I understand that it is the desire of Senators on this side, so far as I have heard from them, to allow the Senator from Delaware to exercise his election as to the time when he will proceed.

Mr. BECK. All right.

Mr. TELLER. I wish to make an inquiry of the Chair. I understood myself that the record of to-day's proceedings in open executive session would be printed in the RECORD with to-day's legislative proceedings.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair supposed that to be included in the request of the Senator from Massachusetts, but upon making the suggestion the Senator from Alabama stated that would have to be provided for by another motion.

Mr. TELLER. Then I move that as this discussion proceeds the whole proceedings shall be published in the RECORD, the same as the legislative proceedings.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Colorado moves that the debates and proceedings in open executive session be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD from day to day. Is there objection? ["None."] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. Is it the understanding that the Senator from Delaware will proceed on Monday next?

Mr. GRAY. In deference to the wishes of gentlemen on my own side of the Chamber who desire to attend the convention which will assemble on the 5th of June, which is next Tuesday, I should be perfectly willing, and indeed it would be very agreeable to me to let the matter go over until the following Monday. Then we should have a full week for the discussion between the two conventions, when I suppose gentlemen on this side would like to have a similar *interim*. That would be an agreeable arrangement to me.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair then understands the Senator from Delaware to ask unanimous consent that the further consideration of the treaty be postponed until one week from next Monday, the 11th day of June. Is there objection?

Mr. CULLOM. What is the date?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Monday, the 11th day of June. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, rose.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is it the pleasure of the Senate now to proceed to the consideration of legislative business? It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the follow-

ing enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*:

A bill (S. 625) granting a pension to George W. Schell;

A bill (S. 760) granting a pension to Stephen C. Lobdill;

A bill (S. 1015) granting a pension to Margaret M. Collins;

A bill (S. 1017) granting a pension to Stephen Schiedel;

A bill (S. 1083) for the erection of a public building at Tallahassee, Fla.;

A bill (S. 1286) granting a pension to Michael Lane;

A bill (S. 1554) to increase the appropriation for the erection of the public building at Sacramento, Cal.; and

A bill (S. 2738) granting an increase of pension to John G. Merritt.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

Mr. BLODGETT (for Mr. MCPHERSON) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

DES MOINES RIVER LANDS.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I wish to ask the Senate for its unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 287) to quiet title of settlers on the Des Moines River lands, in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes, at the close of the formal morning business on Thursday next, day after to-morrow. I wish to state my reasons for making this request. It will be necessary for me to leave the city on Saturday morning, and I desire to have the bill taken up and acted on before I leave.

Mr. STEWART. I have no objection, provided the bill for the admission of Washington Territory can come up immediately thereafter.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I have no objection to that.

Mr. DAWES. It was the intention of the Committee on Appropriations to call up the Indian appropriation bill next Thursday.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I hope that the Senator from Massachusetts will not interpose an objection to my request. I have on two or three occasions permitted the bill to pass from its regular order so as to accommodate other Senators. As I have stated, it is necessary for me to be absent from the city, leaving on Saturday morning, and all I ask now is that the same courtesy shall be extended to me that I have extended to others in connection with this identical bill.

Mr. DAWES. So far as the Senator is concerned, and for the reason the Senator gives, of course I would not attempt to push the Indian appropriation bill before him, but the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] suggests that he will consent, provided he can come in with a bill which will certainly take a good deal of time immediately after the bill which the Senator from Iowa has in charge is disposed of.

Mr. STEWART. I should not antagonize the Washington Territory bill against the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. DAWES. Then I have nothing to say.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that on Thursday next, at the close of the formal morning business, the bill (S. 287) to quiet title of settlers on the Des Moines River lands, in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes, be taken up for consideration and proceeded with.

Mr. EVARTS. I am quite ready, in taking part in the debate on that question adversely to the views of the Senator from Iowa, that the consideration of the bill should be taken up on Thursday, but I am obliged to leave the city on Friday, and it is not for me to say that I would be willing to have it carried on through Friday, if the Senator wishes to go off on Saturday when I have my occasions to carry me off on Friday.

What will be the disposition of the Senate in regard to the bill when it is brought up, whether it is to be proceeded with to its close in disparagement of other measures, it is not for me to say; nor have I any desire to interfere with an opportunity to have the bill discussed; but I do not want to be prevented from asking that it may be laid over until some day after I return to the city.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. That will not be satisfactory to me. On two occasions, for the accommodation of the Senator from New York, I consented to the postponement of this bill, once when it was first reached in its regular order on the call of the Calendar, and again on a subsequent occasion. If the Senator from New York wishes to consume considerable time in the discussion of the bill, I am quite content that he shall open the discussion and occupy such time as he may please on Thursday, and I can give him the assurance now that, whether his argument shall be a long one or a short one, I shall not consume more than fifteen or twenty minutes in reply to him, and then I am willing and should be glad to have the Senate take the vote on the bill.

Mr. EVARTS. I have expressly stated that if it does not interfere with my opportunity to leave the city on Friday there shall be no interference with the discussion on my part.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I hope that the Senator will not interfere with my leaving the city on Saturday, inasmuch as on two other occasions I allowed the bill to be set aside in order that he might be accommodated.

Mr. EVARTS. I have agreed to that; but the Senator leaves after Friday and I am going to leave on Friday.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Very well. Perhaps there will not be a session on Friday.

Mr. EVARTS. I hope not.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I should like to get a vote on the bill this week.

Mr. EVARTS. I have not asked the Senator to put it off until Friday. I have only asked, if he brings it on, as he desires, on Thursday, and it is not completed on Thursday, that I am not to be cut off when I am obliged to go away on Friday.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. It will be completed on Thursday unless the Senator from New York occupies the whole day in its discussion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that on Thursday, at the conclusion of the formal morning business, the bill indicated by him shall be taken up and proceeded with until concluded. Is there objection?

Mr. BERRY. Some days ago the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] made an attack upon the Attorney-General of the United States. I tried yesterday to get the floor to reply for a space of time not exceeding fifteen minutes. I was cut off by a motion of the Senator from Ohio to go into executive session at that time. I desire to leave the city on Saturday, and I ask the Senator from Iowa to allow me fifteen minutes on Thursday morning, immediately after the conclusion of the morning business, before he takes up his bill, in order that I may submit those remarks.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I shall not object to that, Mr. President.

Mr. BERRY. With that understanding, of course I have no objection to the arrangement suggested.

Mr. STEWART. I shall not consent to that unless I can have fifteen minutes to reply. I shall be very glad to hear from the Senator from Arkansas, but I shall want to make a few remarks, which I have in store, on that occasion.

Mr. BERRY. The Senator from Nevada can have ample time on the succeeding day.

Mr. STEWART. I do not want to be put off. If I am to be attacked I want to reply at the time.

Mr. BERRY. I desire to make the remarks before I leave on Saturday.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I trust that the Senator from Arkansas will not interpose an objection to the order that I have asked. I would be entirely willing to accord him the fifteen minutes that he desires if it were not for the objection coming from the other quarter.

Mr. STEWART. I make no objection, but I demand my right to reply if attacked.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. BERRY. I am informed by Senators around me that it would be entirely proper for me to make any remarks that I desire upon the discussion of the bill referred to by the Senator from Iowa. If that be true, and the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BECK] tells me I have a right to do it, I shall with that understanding make no objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands, then, that the request of the Senator from Iowa is acceded to by unanimous consent.

VISITORS TO WEST POINT.

Mr. HOAR. The Chair did me the honor to appoint me one of the committee of the Senate to visit the Military Academy at West Point, from which I had hoped to derive great pleasure and instruction; but I find that it will not be possible for me to perform that service consistently with obligations to duties which are likely to occur here. I must therefore ask the Senate to be excused from that appointment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts declining service upon the Board of Visitors to attend the annual examination of cadets at the United States Military Academy, the Chair appoints the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] in his place.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 6602) for the relief of James Obrion was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri moves——

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand that a short executive session is desired. I will change the motion to a motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After two minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, May 31, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 29, 1888.

POSTMASTERS.

Berry Mitchell, to be postmaster at Auburn, in the county of Placer and State of California, in the place of John H. Wills, whose commission expires June 26, 1888.

Robert A. Meier, to be postmaster at Colorado Springs, in the county of El Paso and State of Colorado, in the place of Joel F. Love, resigned.

Jefferson T. Whitman, to be postmaster at Dalton, in the county of Whitfield and State of Georgia, in the place of Thomas H. Triplett, whose commission expired April 30, 1888.

Emma Walker, to be postmaster at Robinson, in the county of Crawford and State of Illinois, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1888.

Gilman L. Sleeper, to be postmaster at Haverhill, in the County of Essex and State of Massachusetts, in the place of William E. Blunt, whose commission expired May 15, 1888.

P. H. Carney, to be postmaster at Mankato, in the county of Blue Earth and State of Minnesota, in the place of James Cannon, resigned.

Byron Lemly, to be postmaster at Jackson, in the county of Hinds and State of Mississippi, in the place of Wirt Adams, deceased.

James A. Field, to be postmaster at Higginsville, in the county of La Fayette and State of Missouri, in the place of Homer Luce, resigned.

Julius L. Wind, to be postmaster at Harvard, in the county of Clay and State of Nebraska, in the place of Samuel C. Sloat, removed.

Gardner C. White, to be postmaster at Carson City, in the county of Ormsby and State of Nevada, in the place of Gardner C. White, whose commission expired May 9, 1888.

George E. Mecklem, to be postmaster at West Point, in the county of Orange and State of New York, in the place of Augusta B. Berard, whose commission expired March 12, 1888.

Henry Bristol, to be postmaster at Hudson, in the county of Summit and State of Ohio, in the place of S. S. Crawford, resigned.

Jacob Kreusch, to be postmaster at Celina, in the county of Mercer and State of Ohio, in the place of W. E. Touvelle, resigned.

Maxwell Cameron, to be postmaster at Corry, in the county of Erie and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Frank H. Button, removed.

Waterman J. Davis, to be postmaster at Port Allegany, in the county of McKean and State of Pennsylvania, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1888.

Simon States, to be postmaster at Everett, in the county of Bedford and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of William H. Whisel, whose commission expired April 30, 1888.

John C. Walton, to be postmaster at Kennett Square, in the county of Chester and State of Pennsylvania, in the place of Fannie C. Maxwell, whose commission expired April 30, 1888.

Thomas B. Southgate, to be postmaster at Corpus Christi, in the county of Nueces and State of Texas, in the place of James H. C. White, whose commission expired May 15, 1888.

C. A. McCabe, to be postmaster at Pomeroy, in the county of Garfield and Territory of Washington, the appointment of a postmaster for the said office having, by law, become vested in the President on and after April 1, 1888.

William C. Brawley, to be postmaster at Mauston, in the county of Juneau and State of Wisconsin, in the place of Thomas H. Naughtin, deceased.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

Twenty-fourth Regiment of Infantry.

First Lieut. Henry Wygant, to be captain, May 15, 1888, *vice* Leggett, deceased.

Second Lieut. Henry W. Hovey, to be first lieutenant, May 15, 1888, *vice* Wygant, promoted.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *May* 29, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

Mr. FORNEY. I demand the regular order.

VETO MESSAGE—J. E. PILCHER.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 330, entitled "An act for the relief of J. E. Pilcher."

This bill authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to the party named therein the sum of $305, being the amount of one bond of $100 and $305 in paper money of the Republic of Texas.

It is directed, however, that this money be paid out of the Texas indemnity fund.

This fund was created under a law passed on the 28th day of February, 1855, appropriating the sum of $7,750,000 to pay certain claims against the Republic of Texas. By the terms of said law a certain time was fixed within which such claims were to be presented to the Treasury Department.

Between the passage of said act and the year 1870 the sum of $7,648,786.73 was paid upon said claims, leaving of the money appropriated an unexpended balance of $101,213.27.

This balance was on the 30th day of June, 1877, carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury, pursuant to section 5 of chapter 328 of the laws of 1874.

Thus since that date, it seems, there has been no Texas indemnity fund, nor is there any such fund now from which the money mentioned in the bill herewith returned can be paid.

In this condition of affairs the proposed law could not be executed and would be of no possible use.

If the claims mentioned are such as should be paid by the United States, there appears to be no difficulty in making an appropriation for their payment from the general funds of the Government. I notice an item to meet a similar claim was inserted in a deficiency bill passed on the 7th day of July, 1884.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 26, 1888.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the committee had examined and found duly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (S. 1978) for the erection of a public building at Paterson, N. J.

A bill (H. R. 401) granting a pension to Mrs. Jeannie Stone; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 87) authorizing and directing the payment of the salaries of the officers and employés of Congress for the month of May, 1888.

JOSEPH W. M'CONNELL.

Mr. CHEADLE. I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 3544) granting a pension to Joseph W. McConnell, reported from the Committee on Invalid Pensions adversely, be placed upon the Calendar.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. FORNEY. I move to dispense with the morning hour for the call of committees for reports; and in connection with that, I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to make have leave to present them to the Clerk for reference to the appropriate Calendars.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection.

The question being taken on Mr. FORNEY'S motion to dispense with the call of committees for reports, it was agreed to (two-thirds voting in favor thereof).

FILING OF REPORTS.

The following reports were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

FRANK M. MARTIN.

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9113) granting a pension to Frank M. Martin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARTHA J. WARREN.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9160) granting a pension to Martha J. Warren; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM A. TAYLOR.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9159) granting a pension to William A. Taylor; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY REYNOLDS.

Mr. HUNTER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9462) restoring Mary Reynolds, widow of Lewis Reynolds, to the pension-roll; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ANN E. COONEY.

Mr. CHIPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1822) granting a pension to Ann E. Cooney; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NICHOLAS J. BIGLEY.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported a bill (H. R. 10235) for the relief of Nicholas J. Bigley; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM GARRETT.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, also, from the Committee on War Claims, reported a bill (H. R. 10236) for the relief of William Garrett; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RACHEL ROGERS.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 10171) granting a pension to Rachel Rogers; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JACOB F. JOSEPH.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2064) granting a pension to Jacob F. Joseph; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ANNA M. ARNOLD.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8075) granting a pension to Anna M. Arnold, widow of John Arnold; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ANN BRYAN.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8613) granting a pension to Ann Bryan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SARAH A. MASON.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 10121) granting a pension to Sarah A. Mason; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM S. SIMS.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with Senate amendments the bill (H. R. 2077) to place on the pension-roll the name of William S. Sims; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN C. ABBOTT.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2246) granting a pension to John C. Abbott; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH, MARIETTA, GA.

Mr. LAWLER, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6189) for the relief of the trustees of the Presbyterian church in Marietta, Ga.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORTS.

Mr. LANE, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely bills of the following titles; which were severally laid on the table, and the accompanying reports ordered to be printed:

A bill (H. R. 3574) to increase the pension of John Seiger;
A bill (H. R. 6722) for the relief of Sarah Jane Owen;
A bill (H. R. 3570) for the relief of Mary Kaylor;
A bill (H. R. 8294) granting increase of pension to Capt. Cecil Clay;
A bill (H. R. 7555) to place on the pension-roll and to pay Charles C. Merrick, late captain Company G, Fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, the same rate of pension from the date of his discharge as is to him allowed;
A bill (H. R. 1122) granting a pension to Barbara Lanfried; and
A bill (H. R. 2082) granting a pension to Silas W. Shutts.

BRIDGET A. MURPHY.

Mr. LANE also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely the bill (S. 2052) for the relief of Bridget A. Murphy; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. MARY F. DUNCAN.

Mr. PENINGTON, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 325) for the relief of Mrs. Mary F. Duncan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING, JEFFERSONVILLE, IND.

Mr. NEAL, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 5069) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to purchase certain real estate lying opposite the depot of the quartermaster's department at Jeffersonville, Ind., and to have erected thereon two buildings to be occupied by the military storekeepers on duty at said depot, the cost of said grounds and buildings not to exceed $25,000; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LABORATORY BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. DIBBLE, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 9083) to erect a suitable laboratory building in Washington, D. C.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH FOND DU LAC INDIAN RESERVATION.

Mr. NELSON, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 10112) granting to the Duluth and Winnepeg Railway Company the right of way through the Fond du Lac Indian reservation, in the State of Minnesota; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LOUISA Q. LOVELL AND OTHERS.

Mr. STOCKDALE, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 2544) for the relief of Louisa Q. Lovell and others; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PARIS, CHOCTAW AND LITTLE ROCK RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. PERRY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 10062) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct and operate a railway, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

HEIRS OF JOHN W. WEST.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 7365) for the relief of the heirs of John W. West; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompany report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN C. FRÉMONT.

Mr. STEELE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted the views of the minority of that committee on the bill (H. R. 9337) for the relief of John C. Frémont; which were ordered to be printed with the majority report.

ELIZA M. FERRIS, DECEASED.

Mr. McCULLOGH, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 1152) for the relief of the legal representatives of Eliza M. Ferris, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CHARLES E. HEDGES, DECEASED.

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 167) for the relief of Daniel T. Hedges and Edward B. Spalding, executors of Charles E. Hedges, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM E. WHEELER.

Mr. THOMPSON, of California, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably with amendment the bill (H. R. 2046) for the relief of William E. Wheeler; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM JACK.

Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 2776) granting a pension to William Jack; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MILITARY STORES FOR REGULARLY ENLISTED AND ACTIVE MILITIA.

Mr. McADOO, from the Committee on the Militia, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 1959) authorizing the Secretary of War to issue to the governor of the Territory of Montana military stores for the use of the regularly enlisted, organized, and uniformed active militia; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FORNEY. I now move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. BLOUNT in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill (H. R. 9377) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes. The Clerk will report the pending paragraph.

The Clerk read the following paragraph:

Territory of Montana: For salary of governor, $2,600; chief-justice and three associate judges, at $3,000 each; and secretary, at $1,800, $16,400.

Mr. TOOLE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend on line 6, page 61, by striking out the words "twenty-six hundred" and inserting "thirty-five hundred" in lieu thereof. Also amend by striking out the words "one thousand eight hundred," in line 8, same page, and insert "two thousand five hundred" in lieu thereof. Also strike out the word "sixteen," in line 8, and the words "thousand four hundred," in line 9, same page, and insert "eighteen thousand" in lieu thereof.

Mr. TOOLE. The Revised Statutes of the United States fix the salaries of governors at $3,500 and that of the secretaries at $2,500. This bill fixes the salaries at $2,600 and $1,800, respectively. The point of order has been made and sustained that such appropriations change existing law, and this being so it was not in the province of the Appropriation Committee to make the proposed change. The only excuse for this is that former committees have done the same thing. Everybody admits that the action of the committee is in derogation of law, is a plain and palpable violation of a positive statute. If this power shall be permitted to be exercised by the Appropriation Committee by mere sufferance indefinitely, then the exercise of this power will soon come to have the force and effect of law.

The maxim *obsta principiis* is especially applicable here. A principle once surrendered trembles at every new attack. These encroachments upon the general law by the indirect method employed in this bill ought to be resisted before the power of the Appropriations Committee becomes so formidable as to be alarming. While it is true, as before stated, that the Committee on Appropriations were never charged by law with the duty of establishing salaries, there may have been some plausibility in the action of the committee after assuming the power in decreasing the salaries of Territorial governors and secretaries twelve or fourteen years ago. At that time the Territories were sparsely settled and their duties were neither onerous nor especially responsible. In the days when this innovation was first made Territorial governors had little to do except to appoint notaries public and grant pardons.

Since that time the Territories have grown in population and wealth in a marvelous way. Montana at that time had less than 30,000 people and less than $20,000,000 of assessable property. It now has a population of over 200,000 and an assessable valuation of $100,000,000. The governor is invested with the veto, however, and charged with the responsibility of appointing many of our administrative officers. In his absence or inability to act the secretary becomes the acting governor. Waiving the question of the power to change existing law in an appropriation bill, I submit that the salaries reported are incommensurate with the duties and responsibilities of the officers named.

The question being taken on the amendment offered by Mr. TOOLE, it was not agreed to.

The Clerk read the following paragraph, under the heading "Territory of Utah:"

For expenses of the commission: For printing, stationery, clerk-hire, and office-rent, $10,000: *Provided*, That out of this sum the commission is hereby authorized to pay the secretary of the Territory, who is its secretary and disbursing agent, a reasonable sum for such service, not exceeding $300, for the fiscal year 1889.

Mr. FORNEY. I am directed by the Committee on Appropriations to offer the amendment which I send to the desk. The object is to reduce the expenditure to $7,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 63, strike out all of line 6 down to and including the word "dollars," in line 7, and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"For the following expenses of the commission, namely, for traveling expenses, printing, stationery, clerk-hire, and office-rent, $7,000."

Mr. FORNEY. The object of this amendment is to prevent the commission from paying their hotel bills out of this fund.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read the following paragraph:

Territory of Washington: For salary of governor, $2,600; chief-justice and three associate judges, at $3,000 each; and secretary, at $1,800, $16,400.

For legislative expenses, namely: For rent of secretary's office, hire of messenger, light, fuel, stationery, postage, office furniture, repairs, and other incidentals, $1,500.

For contingent expenses of the Territory, to be expended by the governor, $500.

Mr. VOORHEES. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 63 strike out all of lines 21 to 24, inclusive, and insert:

For legislative expenses of the twelfth biennial session of the Legislative Assembly of the Territory of Washington (which session is authorized to meet on the second Monday of January, 1889, at 12 o'clock noon, and each succeeding session shall meet biennially thereafter), namely, for per diem of members of the Territorial Legislature and officers thereof; for mileage; for repairing capitol building, legislative hall, council chamber; repairing furniture, carpets, and matting; and for fuel, stationery, and for other incidental expenses of the Legislature; legislative printing, rent of secretary's office, hire of messenger, light, fuel, stationery, office furniture, repairs, and other incidentals, $22,000.

Mr. VOORHEES. Mr. Chairman, under the law as it now stands, the next Legislative Assembly of Washington Territory, which will be elected at the next general election, is not authorized to meet until the first Monday in December, 1889. The purpose of this amendment is to make effectual the act of the Legislative Assembly, passed at its last session, providing that the next session of the Assembly, the twelfth biennial session, shall meet on the second Monday of January in 1889, at 12 o'clock noon. The effect is simply to enable the Assembly to meet at a reasonable time after its election in November, rather than compel it to wait thirteen or fourteen months. That is the only effect of the amendment, and it is necessary, as a matter of course, that the appropriation which in the ordinary course of events would be made in the next legislative appropriation bill shall be made now, in order that the act of the Legislative Assembly to which I have referred may be made effective. I am satisfied that there can be no objection to this amendment, and I sincerely hope that the House will consider it favorably.

Mr. FORNEY. The gentleman from Washington has stated the situation of affairs there, and it is a matter for the House to determine whether they will make the appropriation now or wait till next year. So far as I am concerned I have no objection to it.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Territory of Wyoming: For salary of governor, $2,600; chief-justice and two associate judges, at $3,000 each; and secretary, at $1,800, $13,400.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by striking out, in line 4, page 64, the words "two thousand six hundred," and insert in lieu thereof "three thousand five hundred." Also amend by striking out, in line 6, page 64, the words "one thousand eight hundred," and insert "two thousand five hundred."

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is the same as has been stated by the gentlemen who have preceded me in offering like amendments, applicable to the Territories of Dakota, Idaho, and Montana. The law of Congress fixes the salary of the governor at $3,500 and that of the secretary at $2,500. Section 1845 of the Revised Statutes of the United States is as follows:

From and after the 1st day of July, 1873, the annual salaries of the governors of the several Territories shall be $3,500 and the salaries of the secretaries shall be $2,500 each.

This law has not been changed. By an examination of this bill it will be found that a very small amount is to be appropriated for the contingent expenses of the Territory, and this bill reduces the salary of the governor to the extent of $1,000 and that of the secretary to the extent of $700. Every one who is acquainted with the Western Territories, which, on an average, are at least 2,000 miles from the Atlantic seaboard, knows how very expensive it is to live in that country. While all the Territorial officers of Wyoming are opposed to me in politics, yet this fact does not deter me from asking that the amendment be adopted as an act of simple justice. The governor and secretary are entitled to the salaries which are now fixed by law. There can be no good reason why these salaries should be reduced in this indirect way, and in a way not permitted by the rules of this House. By section 1855 of the Revised Statutes a Territorial Legislature is prohibited from increasing the compensation of the governor, secretary, and members of the Legislative Assembly. This law does not limit the Legislative Assembly in providing extra compensation to the judges. In most of the Territories this condition of things exists. The judges draw $3,000 salary from the United States Treasury and some extra compensation from the Territorial or county treasury in the Territory wherein they reside.

The Territorial Legislatures have increased the compensation of the judges without any importunity on the part of the judges. They have voted this extra compensation to each of the judges, amounting to from $1,000 to $2,500 additional annual salary, because they consider the salary paid by the United States too small to enable these men to live comfortably.

If the people of the Territories had the authority to do so I have no doubt provision would be made to increase the salary of the governor and that of the secretary to such an amount as would make their respective salaries equal, at least, to the amount fixed by the Revised Statutes. This Government is rich enough to pay its Territorial officers competent salaries. The people of the Territories have no voice in the selection of their officers. They should not be required to pay any part of the salaries, yet they are generous enough to do so if Congress fails to do its duty in this matter.

I hope, therefore, that the amendment will be adopted. The amendment will not make the salaries larger than they should be, and it will not change an existing law, but its adoption will be in strict conformity to the ruling made by the chairman of the committee yesterday.

Mr. FORNEY. Mr. Chairman, all I have to say about it is that the governor and secretary of Wyoming get the same salaries that have been allowed to the governor and secretary of Dakota and the other Territories.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For legislative expenses, namely: For rent, fuel, lights, stationery, postage, messenger, clerk, and incidental expenses of secretary's office; for new furniture and carpets in governor's and secretary's office in new capitol building, $2,000.

For contingent expenses of the Territory, to be expended by the governor, $500.

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to that paragraph.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend by adding to line 14, page 64, the following words:

"*Provided*, That the governor, secretary, and judges of the supreme court of each of the organized Territories, except Alaska, shall hereafter be appointed from the bona fide residents of the Territory wherein they are to serve."

Mr. FORNEY. I make the point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wyoming desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. CAREY. I ask the gentleman from Alabama to withdraw his point of order for one minute.

Mr. FORNEY. I will do so at the gentleman's request.

[Mr. CAREY withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I offer an amendment to come in in line 19 of the paragraph just read; to insert the words "four hundred" after the word "thousand;" so that it will read:

One disbursing clerk, at $2,400.

Mr. FORNEY. I make the point of order on that. We have given all the law allows.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I do not think that there is any law fixing this salary.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I wish the gentleman from Alabama would point me to any law fixing this salary.

Mr. RANDALL. The law of the appropriation bill of last year fixes the compensation in the absence of any permanent law.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. But that is not such a law, in my judgment, as is contemplated by the rule. If the salary is not fixed by any permanent law, it is wholly subject to such legislation as Congress may see proper to enact in that regard in an appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has sustained the point of order.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. But, if the Chair please, I make the point that there is no law fixing this salary.

The CHAIRMAN. This is not by any means a new ruling. The Chair has ruled in this same way more than once during the consideration of this bill.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Has the Chair heretofore held that the annual appropriation bills make such a provision of law as to lay the foundation for a point of order like this in the absence of any statute law upon the subject?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has so held: that, in the absence of any other law, the appropriation bill of the current year fixes the compensation.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. With all due respect to the Chair, it has been held over and over again that such is not the law contemplated by the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has some recollection of a number of rulings just the reverse of that.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the office of the Adjutant-General: One chief clerk, at $2,000; twenty-five clerks of class 4; thirty-five clerks of class 3; sixty-nine clerks of class 2; three hundred and fifty-nine clerks of class 1; sixteen clerks, at $1,000 each; five messengers; forty-five assistant messengers; three watchmen; three laborers; in all, $687,140: *Provided*, That one clerk of class 4, two clerks of class 2, and six clerks of class 1 shall be employed for the sole purpose of completing, with the necessary detail from the existing force, the regimental registers of the volunteer forces of the several States during the late war. And not less than two hundred of the clerks in the office of the Adjutant-General shall be exclusively engaged in preparing and making reports to expedite the settlement of pension applications and soldiers' claims.

Mr. PETERS. I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of asking if the appropriation for the support of the office of the Adjutant-General is equal to the estimates that have been made by the Department?

Mr. RANDALL. They are not.

Mr. FORNEY. So far as the clerical force is concerned they are.

Mr. PETERS. I wish to ask, in addition, if this provision requiring two hundred clerks in the office to be exclusively engaged in preparing and making reports to expedite the settlement of pension applications and soldiers' claims embraces the amount of force requested by the Department?

Mr. FORNEY. Yes, sir; it does. The only change made by the committee is that they asked for more messengers to wait upon them, and we gave them forty-five, which we thought was enough. The clerical force is just what was estimated for.

Mr. PETERS. Right here, Mr. Chairman, let me say the force asked by the Department has been asked for the purpose of bringing up the work of that Department. I think it is well known to those who have had experience in the Department that the work has been very much behind; and while there have been a vast number of calls upon the office for information as to the status of these claims, we have not been able to get any satisfaction.

I send to the Clerk's desk to be read a letter from the Adjutant-General in relation to a claim, which is a sample of the information which is frequently given to parties who make inquiry as to the status of claims pending in the Department.

The Clerk read as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT, ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,
Washington, May 26, 1888.

SIR: In reply to your reference to the claim of Capt. William B. Davis (Washington Court-House, Fayette County, Ohio), late of the Seventy-third Ohio Volunteers, for amendment of his military record under the provisions of the act approved June 3, 1884, and the act amendatory thereof, approved February 3, 1887, I have the honor to state that, in justice to all claimants under these acts, it has been found necessary to take up claims in the order of dates on which they were filed.

Unless, therefore, there is some urgent reason why the claim should be made special, such as the extreme sickness of the applicant or his impoverished condition, it can not be taken up out of its regular order.

I am, sir, very respectfully, your obedient servant,

R. C. DRUM, *Adjutant-General.*

Hon. SAMUEL R. PETERS,
House of Representatives.

Mr. PETERS. Now that, I repeat, is a sample of the information that we have been able to obtain from that Department in relation to claims pending before it. I do not blame the Department, because, as is well known, they have had an insufficient force in order to keep up with the current work. Of course that letter embodies no information that is of any satisfaction to any member of Congress or to the individual whose application is pending. We all know that these claims will not be taken up out of their order, and it is but little information to my friend Captain Davis, who had the corner of one of his shoulders shot away by a shell at Gettysburgh, to be informed that his claim will be taken up some time in the future; in the "sweet by and by," when it will be reached in its regular order.

There is an immense amount of comfort to the wounded soldier in information of that kind. I am glad we are now in a situation that during the coming fiscal year when an applicant calls at the Department, through his member of Congress or through any member of Congress, for information he may be able to get some definite information as to when the claim will be disposed of.

Wherever the responsibility rests for not obtaining the information, I am glad to know that hereafter during the next fiscal year when I call upon the Department for information I may expect to receive it, in place of having such an evasive reply as that which I have instanced and many others which might be instanced.

Mr. WARNER. I wish to ask the gentleman if it is not the fact that in that office they are now at work on the claims dating from December, 1884?

Mr. PETERS. That is the information which has been given me with reference to most of these cases; but in this instance they did not even give me that information.

Mr. DOCKERY. They have the work further up than that.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas withdraw the *pro forma* amendment?

Mr. PETERS I do.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I renew the amendment. I did not hear the first portion of the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas; but I suppose he refers to the condition of work in the Adjutant-General's Office. I made inquiry myself as to that, and I am informed by General Drum that he will be able in a short time to dispose of every case in that office. The difficulty arose from the fact that in the first six months after the passage of the bill referred to there was a gorge; a vast majority of the applications came in in that period. But the Department has now got these cases nearly all off its hands. There were not many that came in during the last year; and the Adjutant-General tells me that, without additional clerical force, he will in a short time be able to dispose of all the pending cases.

I am informed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the Surgeon-General's department is up with its work. I had in view to report from the Committee on Military Affairs a measure which had been referred to that committee looking to the very purpose the gentleman from Kansas has in view. We are all anxious these claims should be adjusted; but I am satisfied the Adjutant-General will be able to get along with the force he has at his disposal, and at the end of the present year he will have disposed of all the cases pending.

Mr. HOVEY. The information I have is quite the contrary of what has been stated by the gentleman from Illinois. I am informed that that office is three or four years in arrear of its work. I understand that is the fact in regard to it.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I tried to make the gentleman understand that the claims were brought in early after the passage of the act and that few cases have been brought in recently. The majority of the cases were put in during the first year.

Mr. HOVEY. I am informed they have not got beyond 1884, and at that rate ten years more will not finish the work.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I believe they have got beyond 1884.

Mr. HOVEY. I am told that ten thousand cases remain now unfinished, and that it will require ten years more to dispose of them at the rate the work is now proceeding.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Even if we agree to provide more clerks they could make no use of them unless you provided them with rooms and furniture.

Mr. HOVEY. Then provide the rooms and furniture

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I understand they are satisfied with the provision made here.

Mr. HOVEY. Of course the soldier needs nothing!

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I will ask my colleague whether he has seen General Drum?

Mr. HOVEY. I have letters from the Assistant Adjutant-General.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. If the gentleman will take the trouble to go to the office and see General Drum himself, I am satisfied he will convince him that no further legislation is necessary.

Mr. HOVEY. I have letters from that office, and if the gentleman wants to see them I will show them to him. I have letters from General Kelton in regard to that very matter.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

On page 65, line 13, strike out "forty-five" and insert "fifty-one;" so that it will read "fifty-one assistant messengers."

Mr. BOOTHMAN. In offering this amendment I desire to emphasize what has been said by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS]. Since this session commenced I have addressed numerous inquiries in pension claims to the Pension Office and have received as answer that the claims were awaiting replies to requests for information directed to the Adjutant-General, perhaps six or seven months before. I have no doubt that is a common experience on this side of the House. It is a state of things which should no longer exist.

I find the estimate for that office is for fifty-one assistant messengers, whereas the bill provides for forty-five. I suppose fifty-one assistant messengers is the number now provided by law; and I desire to make the point of order against the bill in that particular. I ask to have it restored to what the law now is in that regard. I think it improper to cut down the force of that office in any respect, when business therein is in the condition that it now appears to be.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask to have the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio read.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. FORNEY. Heretofore the Adjutant-General's force occupied several buildings and needed more messengers. All his force is now in the War and Navy Department, and we think it just and proper to cut down the number of assistant messengers from fifty-one to forty-five. This is not the clerical force, but these are messengers to wait on the clerks.

Mr. RANDALL. Every man has to have a servant in that building.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I ask whether this estimate of the Adjutant-General was furnished at the time when he occupied his present quarters.

Mr. FORNEY. When the estimate was made he was not occupying his present quarters, but had his force in several buildings. He is now located in the War, State, and Navy Department.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I would further inquire whether he has made any reduction of his estimate since the change?

Mr. FORNEY. I do not think he has.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. Then I think the law ought to stand as it was before.

Mr. RANDALL. The truth is, this reduction is not enough, it ought to be larger, but the Committee on Appropriations did not think it well to make too large a cut of this class of employés at this time.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I am entirely opposed to making any reduction that will affect the efficiency of that office.

Mr. RANDALL. You would not keep men there that were not required.

Mr. CANNON. I understand that the offices are now brought together in one building and that this force will probably be sufficient.

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. I do not think there will be any trouble about it.

Mr. RANDALL. Not at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order. The question is on the amendment.

On a division the amendment was rejected—ayes 3, noes 45.

Mr. CHEADLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order that I may ask the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] a question. I wish to ask him whether the clerical force in the Adjutant-General's Office according to the estimates for the next fiscal year is larger than the clerical force for the present fiscal year?

Mr. FORNEY. It is exactly the same, and in accordance with the estimates.

Mr. CHEADLE. Then, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to make this statement of fact: Every member who has any business with that office is well aware that upon all claims filed by ex-soldiers for a remuster, and for bounties and back pay, the office is three years and six months behindhand. They are now considering in that office claims that were filed in December, 1884, and I submit that if relief is ever to come to these claimants it ought to come during their lifetime, for it is no solace to a man who has a just claim against the Government to be told that he may have it considered and decided after waiting five years and a half, as they have to wait now. I submit, sir, that we ought to increase the clerical force of that office so as at least to enable it to keep the business not more than one year behind. One word more. This is my first term in Congress, and, of course, it is only about a year since I have had any business whatever with that Department, having begun to correspond with the office immediately after my election; and I want to state the fact that they are not two months further along now in the adjudication of these claims than they were in the fall of 1886, and my colleague, Mr. HOVEY, says that there are 10,000 claims of that character pending.

Mr. FORNEY. Yes; and there are 561 clerks in that office, and we think that is enough.

Mr. CHEADLE. But I submit to the gentleman that if those 561 clerks in a year's time have not gained on the calendar more than two months, and if the office is three years and a half behind with the work (as we know it is), some remedy ought to be found. I withdraw the formal amendment.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, the chief delay in the matter of soldiers' pensions arises in the Surgeon-General's Office, and it is not because of the lack of sufficient employés, but because of the condition of the records. In the Forty-Seventh Congress I had occasion to examine into that matter, and I found that the number of volumes of records in the office was over 11,000, and that they were unindexed. To find the record of any particular soldier in that office requires the manipulation of several of these unindexed records, and only a limited number of persons can examine them at the same time. I think the number of employés is sufficient, but the condition of the records is what causes the delay. Then, too, numbers of these records are being continually worn out and are in the hands of the binders for rebinding and in the hands of copyists to be recopied. I introduced a resolution in the Forty-seventh Congress looking to the indexing of all those records. I found that they could be indexed without interrupting the current business, and that at the end of three years the office would be in a position to get rid of all this confusion and delay, and would be able to dispense with two-thirds of the clerks now required; but it was not considered necessary to make the change, and the consequence is that we have been poking on in the way that has been described ever since. The indexing of those 11,000 volumes of records in the Surgeon-General's Office is absolutely necessary to the proper transaction of the business, yet nobody comes forward to make provision for it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I have not examined carefully the proposition of the Committee on Appropriations, and therefore I am not in a position to criticise their recommendation; but I want to supplement what has been said by my colleague [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR], that there is still another Department in which I have encountered vastly more delay in pension cases that have come under my care than in the Pensions Department itself. I refer to the Adjutant-General's Office, and I think it has been the experience of members of Congress generally that they have received more suggestions of delay, and have been oftener and longer put off by the Adjutant-General's Office than by the Pensions Office.

Now, I do not undertake to say that the Adjutant-General's Office is at all to blame for this. I do not know that there is in that office any lack of system or industry, although in regard to the latter I may have some suspicion. But I do know that there is something lacking there; and hence, having the interests of the soldiers as near to my heart as they are, I do not think it wise for me to run counter to the suggestion of the Committee on Appropriations, which looks simply to a result growing out of the change in the location of the bureaus of the Pension Department. I think wisdom calls upon us not only to provide the means for indexing the Surgeon-General's records, but to provide in some way that will be effective a reform in the Adjutant-General's Office.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the Surgeon-General's Office and the work in that office touching pensions, I understand that the force of the office is now substantially engaged upon current work.

Mr. FORNEY. That is what we understand.

Mr. CANNON. There was some delay up to probably a year or fifteen months ago, when the Surgeon-General's Office commenced doing extra work, and that extra work was done for some time by the force of clerks already in the office—trained clerks—and they caught up.

As to the propriety of reproducing the records in the Surgeon-General's Office, that matter has been from time to time inquired into. At one time there was a proposition to photolithograph the records; but that, on consideration, was thought not to be practicable. There is now in the Surgeon-General's Office substantially the same force of clerks as for five or six years past. In the Forty-seventh Congress, I believe—I do not undertake to speak with entire accuracy, but I think I am stating the date very nearly—the force of clerks in the Surgeon-General's Office, the Adjutant-General's Office, and the Pension Office was, upon the recommendation of the Committee on Appropriations, substantially doubled.

Mr. RANDALL. That was in 1882.

Mr. CANNON. That was done in 1882, upon an estimate that in three years the work could be brought up so that the office would then be engaged on current work and the force could be reduced. It has not been reduced.

So far as concerns the Adjutant's-General's Office there is a continuation of the same force. I understand that in pension work the Adjutant-General's Office is very nearly up—is doing something approaching current work, or has at least made very great gain in the last fifteen months. The clerks in that office have done extra work a part of that time; and I believe that the force in the Adjutant-General's Office, being a trained force and having access to the records being housed in the State, War, and Navy Department building, should be encouraged—ay, more, required to do extra work; and that, if necessary, we should do as we have done heretofore, give additional compensation for that extra work. We have done this in respect to the Treasury Department, and I believe it has been done in the War Department also. It is much better to do this than to grant an additional number of clerks.

My opinion is that in the Pension Office, the Surgeon-General's Office, and the Adjutant-General's Office the clerical force is as large as can work to advantage, and that if extra speed in the performance of the work is to be attained it must be by means of extra work of the existing force and a better administration. I think the existing force can work extra hours, and in that way bring up the business (as suggested by my friends from Indiana on this side and on the other); or at least can make great gain upon the present condition of business. I acknowledge that there is ground for complaint in regard to the present condition of the work; but I think the practical way to meet the case is in the administration; and as one member of the House I stand ready to give my vote in favor of additional compensation for such extra work. There has already been presented to the Committee on Appropriations a claim for pay for extra work in the Adjutant-General's Office—work done outside of regular hours—by the present trained force that can do more work in one hour than any raw force which might be put in could do in six hours. I propose to vote in favor of paying that extra compensation.

Mr. RANDALL. After the remarks of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], I do not think it necessary that anything further be said on the subject.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

State, War, and Navy Department Building:

Office of the superintendent: One clerk class 1, one chief engineer, at $1,200; eight assistant engineers, at $1,000 each; one captain of the watch, $1,200; two lieutenants of the watch, at $840 each; fifty-eight watchmen; one carpenter, $1,000; one machinist, at $900; one plumber, at $900; one painter, at $900; four skilled laborers, at $720 each; twenty-four firemen; ten conductors of elevators, at $720 each; twenty laborers; and eighty charwomen; in all, $118,520.

Mr. FORNEY. In order to correct a clerical error, I move to amend the paragraph just read by striking out, in line 23, the words "and twenty."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I move the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 12 strike out the word "two" and insert in lieu thereof the word "four."

In line 13, after the word "thousand," insert the words "two hundred."

In line 20, after the word "firemen," insert the words "at $900 each."

Mr. FORNEY. I make a point of order on that amendment. It proposes to increase salaries beyond the amounts fixed in the current law—the appropriation act passed last year.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask for a decision on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not care to hear discussion upon it. The Chair has ruled on this question before.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I move to amend by striking out the last word. This House ought to have the right in considering this bill of making such corrections as in its judgment are necessary to perfect it. The salary of the chief engineer of the State, War, and Navy Department building is $1,200. I would call the attention of the committee to the fact that the gentleman occupying this position is a master mechanic, and as such could easily command a salary in any private or municipal corporation of from $1,500 to $1,800.

Mr. FORNEY. Why does he not take it, then?

Mr. LEHLBACH. I submit that that is no argument why an amendment should not be introduced increasing his salary. Under this very bill services of similar nature are paid different rates, and it should be our purpose to make the pay of employés performing the same duties as nearly equal as possible. Let me call attention to the inconsistencies of this bill in this regard. The chief engineer of the Senate receives $2,160; the chief engineer of the House, doing exactly the same amount of work, if not more, having the same responsibility, receives $1,700, or $460 less than that received by the chief engineer of the Senate. The engineers of the Treasury Department, the Post-Office Department, and the two engineers in the Surgeon-General's Department receive $1,400 each, or $200 more than this bill provides for the chief engineer of the State, War, and Navy building, who has as much if not more work, and certainly far greater responsibility.

The State, War, and Navy Building is one of the finest and most complete public structures in the city of Washington. It has, I understand, forty boilers, many elevators, and about 40 miles of pipe, over which a constant supervision must be kept. The chief engineer and his assistants, whose salary under my amendment I have asked to be increased from $1,000 to $1,200, and the firemen, whose salary I have asked to be increased to $900, they being skilled mechanics, namely, plumbers, blacksmiths, bricklayers, tinsmiths, etc., who have been selected on account of their different trades, make all the repairs necessary in the building, all hands often working overtime, for which they receive no additional pay.

I wish to call the attention of the committee to another fact, that these men are employed every day in the week, and in fact a fireman in this building who is a skilled mechanic receives less per day than many a laborer provided for in this bill. It is only these inconsistencies in this bill to which I object. In many sections of the bill we find that firemen and workmen that are skilled have been allowed $900 and in some instances even more for their services. Why, then, should an exception be made in this case, doing evident injustice to deserving men?

I have been informed that the payment of bills to outside parties for repairs to this building, so vast in its size, does not amount to over $100 per annum, it only being necessary to call for outside help when the required tools and materials are not on hand. I do not hesitate here to emphatically state that any employé of this Government should have a right to demand at any time, without prejudice to himself, an increase of pay. I can not agree that the answer to be given to such an employé should be: If you are not satisfied there are plenty to take your place.

Mr. Chairman, I am satisfied that this House should have the power to correct the inconsistencies in this bill, and I therefore feel compelled to appeal from the decision of the Chair in order that this House may decide upon the matter itself.

Mr. RANDALL. The appeal comes too late. The gentleman moved to strike out the last word, and made his five-minute speech on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order comes too late.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This bill is not only inconsistent with itself in giving different compensations for like duties, but it is also inconsistent with the rules of the House and the law of the land. I wish to read the latter portion of clause 3 of Rule XXI, where it is provided:

Nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

Now, I hold in my hand a document printed at the expense of the Government, although not furnished to members of the House, and having on it the stamp of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, February 29, 1888, and which has therefore been in existence for several months. Now, I gather from this document that included in this bill there are one hundred and twenty-two direct violations of the rules. There are over one hundred and twenty-two direct violations of the rules of the House involved in this bill, and I take it, Mr. Chairman, that it is time this House should decide whether it makes its own rules or the Committee on Appropriations makes the rules for the House. It is for us to decide whether the rules having been passed upon shall not be binding on that committee but shall be binding on every one of the committees of this House.

I find by looking further through this document that there are two hundred and fifty salaries either increased or decreased over, not the amount placed in the last appropriation bill, but over the amount provided in the Revised Statutes or permanent law of the land. Now, then, if it is necessary to revise these statutes and reduce these salaries, let us do it in a proper manner by bringing in a bill rearranging salaries, but do not let us do it in violation of the rules of the House and in violation of the law of the land. As I have already stated this bill is not only inconsistent with itself, but is in palpable violation of the rules of the House and the law of the country.

I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 12, strike out "two" and insert "four;" in line 13, insert after the word "thousand" the words "two hundred;" in line 20, after the word "firemen," the words "at eight hundred and ninety dollars each."

Mr. RANDALL. I make the point of order against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order raised on the previous amendment was that it was a change of existing law. Does the gentleman make the point of order?

Mr. RANDALL. I do.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. PAYSON. What is the precise question?

The amendment was again read.

Mr. RANDALL. The last salary is different, but the other two are the same.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I will withdraw the other two.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will treat the amendment as one.

Mr. PAYSON. The point of order, I believe, is that the amendment is in violation of the third clause of Rule XXI. From that decision of

the Chair the gentleman from New Jersey appeals, and I would like to be heard on the appeal.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. PAYSON. The question here presented is substantially identical with the one upon which I submitted some observations to the House a few days ago. An examination of the remarks I then made only strengthens me now in the correctness of that position, that the decision of the Chair is incorrect upon this proposition. But feeling that perhaps on that occasion I did not make myself as thoroughly understood or make my remarks as explicit as I ought to have done, I venture an additional suggestion on the appeal now pending.

With the merits of the proposition here presented on the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey I am not concerned, but with the principle underlying the ruling of the Chair I am concerned, as I think the whole committee is concerned.

I think, Mr. Chairman, the fundamental mistake into which the Chair has fallen—and I say it with all due respect to the Chair—is this: The provision of the rule which is claimed as the basis of the decision is this:

Nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or in any amendment thereto.

The ruling of the Chair is based upon the assumption that existing law is whatever is found within the lids of either the general statute or of any special statute. My criticism upon the ruling is that the existing law under the rule I have quoted is exactly tantamount to general law. That is to say, applying that principle to the provisions of this bill wherever there is a general statute providing for the creation of an office and the fixing of a salary or the fixing of a salary in an office which has already been created and which is continuing in its terms, that, and that alone, is existing law within the purview of the rule; and wherever an annual provision or regulation as to salary is found in an appropriation bill that provision is the existing law only as to that appropriation bill, and expires with the expiration of the term for which the appropriation was made.

Carrying the idea further, and applying it to these twenty-four firemen provided for in this legislative appropriation bill, there is no existing law with reference to them at all. There is no existing law referring to them in any shape or in any form. It seems to me it is a very clear proposition then.

Mr. McKENNA. There is no statute providing for their employment?

Mr. PAYSON. No; the provisions as to these employés are found only in the continuing appropriation bills beginning and ending with each fiscal year, and it is the law and the law only for the time named in the bill. Making the appropriation, therefore, for these firemen and providing their salary is no violation of any existing law under the rule, for, as a matter of fact, the salary provided for in the legislative bill we are now enacting begins on the 1st of next July and continues for one year thereafter, which is a period beginning after the expiration of the current appropriation bill.

It seems to me, therefore, that here is just where the difficulty lies that has led the Chair into an error, and into making a decision based upon the existence of the current appropriation bill as existing law; whereas, as a matter of fact, this is a provision to go into effect in the future, applicable to an office as to which there is no regulation in the statute-books at all.

I think, therefore, gentlemen of the committee, that the judgment of the Chair ought not to stand as the judgment of the committee.

Mr. RANDALL. The judgment of the Chair has controlled the committee throughout its deliberations upon this bill, and has always been acquiesced in.

Mr. PAYSON. Because there has never been an appeal from the decision of the Chair. And I submit to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that by simply acquiescing in a mistaken decision of the Chair does not bind the committee now, when an appeal is taken and the direct question is presented.

Mr. RANDALL. I have no objection to having the issue made.

Mr. PAYSON. I would be glad to know the judgment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on the question.

Mr. RANDALL. When you come to vote on the question the gentleman will discover what my judgment is.

Mr. PAYSON. Has the gentleman from Pennsylvania any objection to expressing an opinion?

Mr. RANDALL. I will do so when the proper time comes, by my vote.

Mr. PAYSON. Then the committee will understand the attitude of the gentleman.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chairman, I believe if the committee had heard or paid attention to the representations made by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] in presenting this amendment as to the class of work done by these mechanics—for they may be termed such, I think—the Committee on Appropriations reporting this bill would have come to the conclusion that they work long, tedious hours and for a very small compensation; and it is only with those having the bill in charge now to consent that the alterations which have been suggested here may take place in order that justice may be done to these hard-worked men. I have reasoned with members of the committee, because I question the right or propriety of taking from members of Congress the privilege and authority of considering matters of this kind, and of being able to give proper consideration to the claims of men who are compelled to work every day in the week, called upon even at night, and who work often upon Sundays. They are entitled to it, and they should not be deterred by any technical construction of the rules of the House, or be prevented from offering suitable amendments to give them a reasonable compensation, certainly not less compensation than $2 a day; and when the head of a Department recommends a dollar and a half or a dollar a day for such service, such a recommendation should not be tolerated by members of Congress.

I, for one, propose to interpose my protest against such things. I say to this side of the House that we can not go before the country on such an issue. I say that we have claimed to be the friends of these people, and we are asked by the other side to meet them on this issue. Now, I insist that men who are competent firemen—they are not laborers, but have to go through a thorough examination for the purpose of obtaining these places in charge of the boilers, the same as engineers—ought to get at least $2 a day.

Mr. FORNEY. They get more than $2 a day.

Mr. LAWLER. They ought to get more than they do in this bill.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I want to correct the statement of the gentleman who has charge of the bill, because I believe he wants to pay fair wages. The pay of a fireman is $720 a year. They work seven days in a week and only get $1.97 per day. They are skilled mechanics, plumbers, blacksmiths, etc. I am satisfied if this amendment can be considered on its merits it will be agreed to.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. The other day when this point of order was raised I took the position now occupied by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON]. I thought then I was right, but not being certain, because I had not carefully examined the question, I did not appeal from the decision of the Chair. Having examined it more carefully, I have become confirmed in my opinion that I was right. The reason is this: This bill under consideration does not become law and will not become law until the first moment of the first day of July, 1888. The existing law that would be infringed by this amendment, if it does infringe any existing law, ends on the last moment of the last day of June, 1888. Therefore the adoption of such an amendment as is proposed has not changed any existing law, for it can only apply to the salary to be given for another year's work, for which there is no provision of law now existing.

If it was to create an office I admit that then it would be a change of existing law. But the office is now created, and the question that arises is how shall it be provided for as regards compensation for the next year. And any change in the amount in this bill to take effect on the first moment of the first day of July, 1888, would not be a change in the compensation existing now, which ends on the last moment of the last day of June, 1888. That is why I think the ruling of the Chair was against the principle of the rule and against the right of members.

Mr. SPRINGER. I desire to say just a word on the point of order. I think it should have been made in the early part of the consideration of this bill and then settled definitely. But as it is before the committee now on appeal, and I shall have to vote on that question of appeal, I desire to explain my vote to the committee, the decision of the Chair having been reiterated again and again.

Mr. PAYSON. Will my colleague allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir.

Mr. PAYSON. The same point was made early in the discussion of the bill, but was then withdrawn by the gentleman from Alabama having charge of the bill, thus preventing an appeal by myself.

Mr. SPRINGER. For the sake of convenience I think the decision should stand, as it furnishes some standard by which we may be guided in making these appropriations. But as a matter of law in carrying out the rules of the House I respectfully suggest that the Chair is mistaken in his ruling.

The gist of this matter is this: If there is a general law fixing the salaries of any officials or employés of the Government that law would be in force next year as well as this year; and any appropriation contrary to the provisions of that law would be a change of existing law, and if only for one year, as the existing appropriation bill is, it would be, *pro tanto*, a change for that time. But the general law would still stand thereafter, as held by the Supreme Court.

The test as to whether there is an existing law, and whether such an amendment is in contravention of existing law, is this: Suppose you fix a less sum than in the last appropriation bill, would the person receiving that sum be entitled to go into the Court of Claims to sue for the difference? In this case he would not. In the other case of the existence of a general law fixing the salary for the office, if the House should vote for less than the general law provided without repealing the general law, such a person would have a right to go into the Court of Claims and sue.

But in this case if you fix the compensation less than it was in the appropriation bill of last session, or if you fix it more, or if you do not fix it at all, the result will simply be that the person holding this office

from the 1st day of July must take whatever he can get; and if you vote nothing there will be no office left vacant; there will be simply nothing done on the subject; and the person holding the appointment will go out of office, because the office has been abolished and no pay has been fixed for it, and the thing dies forever. But if there be existing law he could go on and sue in the Court of Claims for his pay; but where the office is provided for only in an appropriation bill that is not the case. Hence this rule was intended to apply to cases like that, so as to require that the appropriation bill should comply with the existing law, and where there is no general statutory law on the subject there is no guide for the Committee on Appropriations, and they may either continue the service at a less or at a greater compensation for the ensuing year, or may abolish the office entirely.

If you make no appropriations of this kind in this bill, then the office and the employment will cease on the first day of July next. If you read the title of this bill you will see that it is a bill making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial departments of the Government from the 1st day of July next until the 30th of June thereafter, and that it is to be a law for that period and for no other. It is not a law to-day. It may be signed and approved by the President to-morrow, but still it is not the law; it does not take effect until the present appropriation bill has expired by limitation, and there is no conflict between a law that expires on the 30th of June and another that takes effect on that day, or after that day, for the ensuing year—no conflict whatever. Hence I think that an error has been made, and I regret that the appeal from the decision of the Chair was not taken earlier in the debate. I am very sorry indeed to be compelled to differ with the honorable gentleman who occupies the chair, but I assure him that I do so not from any personal feeling whatever, but because I think he is in error, and if I had the time I could cite several decisions made by myself while I occupied the position which the gentleman now occupies, which were in accordance with the views I have just presented.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I should like to ask the gentleman from Illinois whether the precedents sustain the view which he advocates here.

Mr. SPRINGER. I have made decisions myself in accordance with that view.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs leave to make a statement before submitting the appeal, in order that the reasons which actuated him in making his decision may be before the committee. It will be remembered that in the Forty-fourth Congress a rule was adopted providing that no legislation should be in order on an appropriation bill except such as reduced expenditures. That provision obtained through the Forty-fourth and Forty-fifth Congresses. In the Forty-sixth Congress the House changed the rule so as to abrogate the provision allowing legislation on appropriation bills where it retrenched expenditures generally and limited it to specific objects; as, for instance, where it reduced the amount of a salary or the amount to be appropriated by the bill. Many times during the Forty-fourth, Forty-fifth, and Forty-sixth Congresses, in cases where there was no general law regulating the salary of an office, the question was raised whether the amount ascertained in the appropriation law was contemplated as the legal salary, and throughout those years it was so held by the Chair, and that ruling was never appealed from, Congress after Congress acquiescing in the decision.

There is not an employé of the Senate or of the House carried in this bill whose employment rests on any other basis than an appropriation bill. There are very few of the officers in the employment of the Government whose employment rests on any other basis than an appropriation bill, and yet in the House of Representatives it has been held almost universally in Committee of the Whole that it was not competent for the Committee on Appropriations to change the salaries and amounts ascertained in the appropriation bills. Gentlemen seeking the purpose of the House in the adoption of the rule will find from its history that the object was to provide that a salary being once fixed the amount so fixed should be the salary attached to that office, and should not be varied with the varying opinions of any committee. The Chair in making its ruling has but conformed to nearly all of the rulings that have been made upon this point. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] has stated that when he has occupied the chair he has ruled otherwise. The Chair so understood, but preferred to follow the long line of decisions made by various other gentlemen in the very beginning of the history of the rule, and for a long period of years, rather than to accept the more recent opinion. The Chair will now submit the question, Shall the judgment of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

The question was taken by a *viva voce* vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is in doubt, and will appoint tellers.

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no. Take a rising vote.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 60, noes 31.

Mr. LEHLBACH. No quorum.

Several MEMBERS (to Mr. LEHLBACH). Oh, do not raise that point.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is his right, and he will exercise it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I insist on the point.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. LEHLBACH and Mr. FORNEY were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 85, noes 44.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. On this question the ayes are 85, the noes 44. The ayes have it; and the opinion of the Chair stands as the judgment of the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Contingent expenses of branch offices at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Portland, Oregon, including furniture, fuel, lights, rent and care of offices, car-fare and ferriage in visiting merchant vessels, freight, express, telegrams, and other necessary expenses incurred in collecting the latest information for the Pilot Chart, and for other purposes for which the offices were established, $8,000.

Mr. MORROW. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the paragraph just read and insert the following:

"For contingent expenses of branch offices, including furniture, fuel, lights, rent and care of offices, car-fare and ferriage in visiting merchant vessels, freight, express, telegrams, and other necessary expenses incurred in collecting the latest information for the Pilot Chart, and for other purposes for which the offices were established—at Boston, $1,500; New York, $5,500; Philadelphia, $1,500; Baltimore, $1,500; Norfolk, $1,500; New Orleans, $1,500; San Francisco, $1,500; Portland, Oregon, $1,500; in all, $15,500."

Mr. MORROW. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have submitted is for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of the branch offices of the Hydrographic Office, and is a matter of importance to the merchant-marine service and to the general operations of the Hydrographic Office. The necessity for this increased appropriation has been brought to the attention of members of the House by various commercial boards of the different cities of New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Baltimore, New Orleans, San Francisco, and other places. In San Francisco the Chamber of Commerce has called particular attention to the necessity for an increased appropriation for the branch office at that place; and I have no doubt that commercial bodies in the other cities have in the same manner directed attention to the insufficiency of the appropriations for other ports.

The bill proposes to add one hydrographic office on the east and one on the west to the existing number of branch offices, and these two additional offices are at Norfolk, Va., and Portland, Oregon. These two offices will require an additional appropriation of $1,500 each. The increase proposed in the amendment is for the purpose of covering the expenses of the present offices and including the two additional offices for furniture, fuel, lights, rent, car-fare, ferriage, freight, expressage, telegrams, etc., connected with the service at these various branch offices. The increase is from $8,000 to $15,500, making an appropriation of $5,000 for New York and $1,500 for seven other ports. I think that in no part of the public service provided for in this bill can an increase of appropriation be made with more advantage than in the service to which the amendment applies. This increased service is recommended by the Secretary of the Navy. In his last annual report he says:

The Hydrographer dwells on the usefulness of the branch offices in obtaining materials for the Pilot Chart and in other important works of the Hydrographic Office. Additional appropriations are necessary to maintain these offices on a proper footing, and the extraordinary solicitude felt by the maritime community in reference to them makes it highly desirable that their wants should be fully supplied. As an illustration of the remarkable extent of the work performed by these offices, it may be stated that during the past year visits were made under their direction to 15,000 vessels, 7,000 instruments were adjusted, 4,000 charts corrected, 19,000 Pilot Charts distributed; information was furnished on application to over 100,000 persons engaged in maritime pursuits, and 24,000 reports were collected and forwarded containing maritime information.

The Hydrographer in his report also calls attention to this matter in detail. His language is:

BRANCH OFFICES.

The work of the branch offices has been very satisfactory. The reports from each show a continual increase in the scope and value of their operations. All unite in testifying to the usefulness of the Pilot Chart and Weekly Supplement, which they have enabled the main office to place on their present footing.

The Boston office reports a scarcity of ice and fog reports on account of the fact that the steamers follow the safe route laid down on the Pilot Chart, and thus reduce the chance of meeting these obstructions to a minimum. The distribution of the Pilot Chart has been extended into the interior, many teachers now using it for purposes of instruction. The publication of the Notices to Mariners in the form of extracts has had good results and is commended, and the experience of this branch seems to show that the plan of distributing charts to shipmasters as a compensation for the keeping of meteorological journals might well be replaced by the issuance, under proper restrictions, of good instruments for the purpose of insuring better observations.

In the New York branch the cramped space referred to in last year's report has been relieved somewhat by an allowance on the part of the Maritime Association of additional room. This small increase has greatly facilitated the work. The effect of the dissemination of the value of oil as a means of safety during gales of wind at sea has been apparent. Many firms are now manufacturing a special oil for this purpose, and also devices for distributing the oil. At the instigation of the Light-House Board this branch has made an investigation also into the relative value of electric and oil lights for light-houses, and the establishment of an electric light on the hills of Navesink. Owing to the fact that New York is the principal seaport of the country, and that its configuration is peculiarly adapted to show the value of any system of lighting, it is a good point for such an examination, and thus the value of this investigation can scarcely be overestimated. The reports of ice and fogs were very numerous and much activity was displayed in stimulating the shipmasters to send them in. Through the energy of the officer in charge reports have been forwarded not only from all the American ports, but from Denmark, Germany, Norway, and Great Britain.

The subject of removing derelicts has received serious consideration. This branch has kept the main office continually informed of their position, and has never ceased to advise their destruction. The subject of tides in New York Har-

bor and vicinity has received much attention. The many questions referred to the branch offices for an opinion on this subject have been decided by consulting tables issued by the Coast and Geodetic Survey. The office is continually referred to by people desiring information upon all subjects, particularly such as refer to marine insurance, and the officers have been frequently called upon to give evidence before the courts of admiralty. The necessity of a uniform system of universal buoyage seems to grow more apparent every year. The importance of this subject seems to be impressed very forcibly upon the officer in charge of the New York branch office. The interesting report of this officer, which is appended, will repay a careful perusal.

The Philadelphia office reports that the efforts of that branch are appreciated and that the amount of information received is steadily increasing. Attention is again called to the sunken wrecks on the New Jersey and Delaware coasts, and especial attention is called to the wreck of the British steamer Brinkburn, which has been the means of seriously damaging several vessels which have run into it. In addition to the routine work of this branch a revision of Vancouver Island Pilot has been made, and a compilation of sailing directions for the Red Sea, Gulf of Aden, and Persian Gulf is now in progress.

The operations of the Baltimore branch were hampered during the latter part of the fiscal year through the lack of funds, but through the courtesy of the collector of customs and of the tug-boat owners most of the arrivals were visited by the boarding officer. This office is not situated in a very favorable location, and it is intended to remove it at the earliest possible moment. The officer in charge also makes the recommendation that American vessels should be supplied with instruments for taking observations. Many captains express a willingness to observe for the office, but are deterred from doing so from the fact that they have no proper instruments. This branch was influential in having a bell buoy moored off False Cape, where last year eight or nine steamers struck on the shoal. Since the bell buoy was placed there no report has been received of a vessel striking these shoals. Also, through the influence of this office, a mid-channel buoy was placed at the entrance of Chesapeake Bay, as a result of the danger of heavily-laden vessels touching at the head of the Middle Ground. In addition to other duties the compilation of the Navigation of the Caribbean Sea and Gulf of Mexico, volume 1, was finished, and the compilation of volume 5, Coasts and Islands of the Mediterranean Sea, is in progress.

The New Orleans branch has secured the co-operation of agents in Pensacola, Fla., and Galveston, Tex., and reports that they have been of great assistance in forwarding the work of the branch office. Knowledge of its purposes and objects seems to be pretty well disseminated throughout the Gulf ports, and accounts of its value to the maritime community there have been numerous and gratifying. As illustrating the general importance of these offices, the shipping agents of the various railroads at Kansas City, Mo., desiring information as to the temperature of the sea-water likely to be experienced by vessels going from New Orleans to Liverpool during each month in the year, communicated with the branch office for the purpose of getting the desired information. This enabled the railroad companies to consider the feasibility of making large shipments of salt meat to Liverpool by way of the port of New Orleans.

The San Francisco branch reports a considerable increase in the work over that of last year. The press of San Francisco has been very favorable to this work, and has been of great assistance in publishing items for the office and in calling attention to its facilities. The officer in charge seems to think that shipmasters do not consult the office as much as they should in the matter of aids to navigation, and recommends again that some pressure should be brought to bear upon the underwriters and ship-owners to urge the ship-masters to avail themselves of this privilege. The underwriters of San Francisco have already issued a circular on the subject. The issue of special bulletins for the Pacific coast was commenced in December, and has been highly appreciated by the shipping community. These are published from time to time as sufficient data accumulate, and contain accounts of all wrecks and of every obstruction and danger along the Pacific coast.

The officer in charge of this office, in obedience to orders from the Department, visited San Pedro, San Diego, Portland, and Port Townsend, and made an exhaustive report on the advisability of establishing a branch hydrographic office at each of these places. The charts of the coast of Mexico and Central America, resulting from the surveys of Commanders Philip and Clark, have been favorably received. The necessity of charts on a large scale of the Pacific coast of North America seems to be very great. "During the past winter the number of disasters on the coast of Oregon and Washington Territory and Vancouver Island, especially in the vicinity of Cape Flattery, has been unprecedented, and the loss of life and property has been very great." The commendations of the work of this branch have been very general, and exhibit a very satisfactory appreciation of the efforts of the Department to assist the maritime community on the Pacific coast.

The following is a summary of the work of the branch offices:

Vessels visited	15,607
Barometers and thermometers compared and adjusted	7,377
Charts corrected for captains	4,181
Pilot Charts distributed	19,425
Notices to Mariners distributed	188,060
Beacon and Buoy Lists distributed	11,733
Information furnished to different individuals	101,098
Reports forwarded on storms at sea, trade-wind limits, fog, ice, wrecks, water-spouts, buoys adrift, use of oil at sea, electric storms, unknown rocks and shoals, meteorological journals issued, pamphlets on the use of oil, etc., distributed, and general information on matters of interest to navigation	24,081

It thus appears from the testimony of these public officers connected with this service that these branch offices are performing a most important work for the merchant-marine service, and that this increased appropriation is necessary in order that the work may be still more effective. I hope the amendment will be adopted. The whole appropriation is a very small sum compared with the important service rendered to our vessels in information furnished concerning the dangers of navigation.

Mr. FORNEY. We have increased the appropriation in this item $2,000 beyond the appropriation made last year, and, I believe, $4,000 above that of the previous year. I think that the appropriation proposed, $8,000, is sufficient for all necessary purposes, and that no additional appropriation is required.

Mr. RANDALL. The proposition of the gentleman from California would increase the appropriation $4,000 beyond the estimate. As the gentleman from Alabama has stated, the committee, in the bill, has made an increase upon the appropriation of last year, and a still greater increase upon the appropriation of the previous year.

Mr. WILKINSON. Mr. Chairman, in reply to the statement just made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] that the amount of the proposed amendment exceeds the estimate furnished by the Department, I wish to state that the estimate to which he refers was sent in before a considerable amount of work had been turned over to this branch of the service from the Signal Service Bureau. Since this estimate was sent in all the marine meteorological work carried on by the Signal Service Bureau of the Army has been placed under the charge of the Hydrographic Office of the Navy.

Even without this additional work that has been turned over to this branch of the service, with the addition of new branch offices at Norfolk, Va., and at Portland, Oregon, and with the increased appreciation of the advantages of this service, and the rapidly enlarging sphere of its usefulness and its labors, it seems to me that the sum of $8,000 allotted by the committee is indeed an insufficient amount and bordering on parsimony. Sir, it is proposed with this sum to pay the "contingent expenses of branch offices at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Portland, Oregon, including furniture, fuel, lights, rent and care of offices, car fare and ferriage in visiting merchant vessels, freight, express, telegrams, and other necessary expenses incurred in collecting the latest information for the Pilot Chart, and for other purposes for which the offices were established."

The amendment proposed by the gentleman from California [Mr. MORROW] proposes to give the New York office the sum of $5,000, and all the other offices $1,500 each. Even this amount, I contend, is but a small appropriation for the work performed by the branch offices of this bureau, and for the benefits conferred by their researches, and for the valuable information which they ascertain and disseminate. One item that this appropriation is intended to cover is rent of offices. Sir, so small is the present appropriation that the branch office for this service at New Orleans (I know not how it is at the other ports) has to be furnished with an office free of rent by the Maritime Association of that city. All honor, sir, to the public spirit, the generosity, and the philanthropy of that association! But all shame to a Government too mean to furnish or pay for its own offices for the public service!

The branch of knowledge which this service utilizes and makes a study of was brought into great prominence by Maury. His patience, application, and matchless genius, from the data which he obtained, marked paths for commerce upon the ocean, and his text-books and his charts are now used throughout the civilized world.

Maury was the first to put into any tangible shape the mass of marine data furnished by just such collections as are now going on at the branch hydrographic offices, and as an instance of his work I cite a small portion of the results obtained by him, a very small part, comparatively speaking. I refer to the shortening of the old sailing route from New York to San Francisco from an average of one hundred and eighty days for all classes of ships to an average of one hundred and thirty days, a net saving of fifty days for each vessel. Why, Mr. Chairman, the saving of property and time and labor by that one result alone has been more than sufficient to pay all the expenses of the Hydrographic Office from its inception.

Sir, the result of such studies as to routes alone can be best conceived by quoting Maury's own words.

When one looks to seaward from the shore, and sees a ship disappear in the horizon as she gains an offing on a voyage to India, or the antipodes perhaps, the common idea is that she is bound over a trackless waste, and the chances of another ship, sailing with the same destination the next day or the next week, coming up and speaking with her on the 'pathless ocean," would, to most minds, seem slender indeed. Yet the truth is, the winds and the currents are now becoming to be so well understood that the navigator, like the backwoodsman in the wilderness, is enabled literally to "blaze his way" across the ocean; not, indeed, upon trees as in the wilderness, but upon the wings of the wind. The results of scientific inquiry have so taught him how to use these invisible carriers, that they, with the calm-belts of the air, serve as sign-boards to indicate to him the turnings, and forks, and crossings by the way.

This, Mr. Chairman, is a very important branch of the public service. Among the objects for which the branch offices of the hydrographic service have been established are to discover and to disseminate information as to the best tracks for steamers and sailing vessels upon the sea; to warn them of dangers of navigation, whether in the shape of rocks, shoals, partially submerged wrecks, or ice.

The following is a brief summary of the work of the branch offices:

Vessels visited	15,607
Barometers and thermometers compared and adjusted	7,377
Charts corrected for captains	4,181
Pilot Charts distributed	19,425
Notices to Mariners distributed	188,060
Beacon and Buoy Lists distributed	11,733
Information furnished to different individuals	101,098
Reports forwarded on storms at sea, trade-wind limits, fog, ice, wrecks, water-spouts, buoys adrift, use of oil at sea, electric storms, unknown rocks and shoals, meteorological journals issued, pamphlets on the use of oil, etc., distributed, and general information on matters of interest to navigation	24,081

Each branch office, Mr. Chairman, collects all the information possible of all matters likely to prove useful or interesting to sea-faring men, and sends the data on to the main office in Washington. There they are tabulated and digested, and such results as are valuable are then forwarded to all the branch offices for dissemination amongst the vessels that are in their own or neighboring ports.

Sir, the branch hydrographic offices are to the main office at Washington what the roots are to a tree; they furnish the sap which is

taken up by the trunk, assimilated by the active corps of assistants, who take the place of the sunshine in the growing plant, and is then sent back for distribution, bearing, like the green leaves brought back to that famous old navigator in the Ark, the glad tidings of comfort and safety to those who float upon the troubled bosom of the deep.

It is sometimes well, Mr. Chairman, "to see ourselves as others see us," and I quote from the Liverpool Journal of Commerce:

AMERICAN PILOT CHARTS OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC.

Maury, the American meteorologist, indicated a route for vessels bound from America to the West Indies, which was adopted; and, although more miles had to be sailed over, the winds were stronger, more favorable, and freer from calms. The time occupied on the passage was curtailed, and many thousands of dollars saved to America owing to Maury's accurate appreciation of possibilities. America's Hydrographic Office is following in the footsteps of Maury, and successfully sustains the rôle of philosopher, guide, and friend to shipmasters of all nations, in strict accordance with the maxim "the seas but join the nations they divide." Pilot charts of the North Atlantic Ocean are published every month by that department of the United States Navy. They are a most happy conception, and worthy of all praise. * * *

An examination of the American pilot charts before us shows they present graphically any information likely to prove useful to mariners. Drift of currents; prevailing winds for the current month and limit of the trades; tracks of cyclones experienced during the preceding month; position of last month's icebergs, field-ice and fog, and also the probable limit of ice and fog for the present month; drift of derelicts and their present position, and the prevalence of whales and waterspouts are all clearly defined. There are also the best routes between Europe and America for both sailing ships and steamers, and routes for sailers between both continents and the equator. * * * Copious notes are printed on the margins and land areas. Every wreck along the Atlantic seaboard is localized in plain words. A storm card is delineated for the northern hemisphere, with appropriate directions for handling ships in cyclones according to the new indraught theory. The use of oil in stilling troubled waters is strongly insisted on, and all information forwarded by captains regarding this principle is printed. * * * In short, a review of all the phenomena of the month just past are given, so that the seaman is put in possession of all the latest information in the handiest form. * * * The action of the American authorities towards the shipping frequenting her ports is most commendable in this respect. No expense is too great, no labor too arduous to insure the safety of the rich argosies that cross the Atlantic filled with costly merchandise or carrying eager hearts to seek their fortunes in all parts of the Union from New York to the cites of the Pacific Slope.

From the Army and Navy Gazette, of London, I quote:

The monthly pilot charts of the North Atlantic Ocean, published by the Hydrographic Office of the United States Navy Department, are invaluable. Not only do they contain an accurate track-chart, which every captain of a ship making trans-Atlantic voyages must find of use, but they also present graphically an immense quantity of information, brought up to date, which is of timely interest to mariners. The drifts of derelict ships or buoys are indicated, and such matters as the loss of the great raft, with notes on the best sailing routes and barometric comparisons, etc.

And, sir, to add the testimony of Germany to that of Great Britain, I give a translation from the Rostocker-Zeitung, published at Rostock, Germany, December 4, 1887:

PILOT CHARTS OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC OCEAN BY THE HYDROGRAPHIC OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C.

We have already called attention to these monthly charts at their first appearance in 1885. They have been bettered and enriched in the mean time, and especially do the latest numbers bring much new material that is valuable for the sailor; wherefore, we find it proper once more to direct the attention of our seafarers to this undertaking which the practical Americans have called into existence.

Besides the practical information on the sailing routes, the prevailing winds and their strength, the limits of the trades, the general ocean currents, the position of ice, derelicts, and drifting buoys, there is a large amount of other data in the later numbers, a knowledge of which is of great use to the shipmaster. We note next a new feature in the probable limit of those fogs off Newfoundland and Nantucket that so often embarrass seamen, and the avoidance of which should be the object of all. Guided by the desire to warn the navigator of all the dangers incident to the season, the Hydrographic Office has shown in its autumn numbers not only the paths of numerous West India hurricanes occurring at this season, but also given instructions as to their nature and peculiarities, as well as rules for the guidance of vessels that encounter them. Navigators are exhorted carefully to note the first signs of an approaching hurricane and to keep a sharp eye on the behavior of barometer, thermometer, wind, and weather.

When the approach of a storm is no longer doubtful it is recommended to heave-to and clew up everything in order to determine the probable bearing of the center, direction of the storm path, and the semicircle that the ship is in. If a ship does not heave-to it runs the risk of coming to false conclusions regarding the change in the direction of the wind, in connection with the fall of the barometer, since the change in the wind as observed while hove-to may be the opposite of the supposed change in a vessel making high speed. In regard to crossing the storm path the greatest care is enjoined.

When a vessel is forced to heave-to for heavy weather it should always do it on that tack that will allow the wind to be veering (aft) on the dangerous right-hand side. This is the starboard tack. It should then head away from the center and make what headway possible. In the manageable left semicircle heave-to on the port tack, in which position the ship heads in toward the center, and should therefore make as little headway as possible.

In running before the wind or crossing the path of the storm the wind should be kept well on the starboard side to get clear of the center. Two drawings accompany these directions in the September chart, one of which shows the circulation of the wind toward and around the center of a tropical cyclone in the northern hemisphere, while the other is intended for the practical use of navigators desiring to find the ship's position relative to the center of a tropical cyclone in the northern hemisphere from the direction of the wind and fall of the barometer.

Every chart contains a short weather forecast for the current month and a review of the past month. Besides this there is a mass of other useful items; changes in lights, new lights, the use of oil on the sea, wrecks dangerous to navigation, fishery notices, etc. The November chart brings, among other things, an article on the winter storms known as "*norles*," or northers, on the Gulf of Mexico, that is worthy of notice, as well as on the *harmattan*, that warm coast wind so frequently met from November to May off the northwest coast of Africa. The newly-instituted table of barometer normals in this number must prove extraordinarily useful to the trans-Atlantic sailor, since every marked or lasting difference between the corrected reading of the ship's barometer and the corresponding normal pressure in the table is a certain indication of a change in the weather.

The industry and care with which the Hydrographic Office at Washington (Chief of the Bureau of Navigation, J. R. Bartlett, U. S. N., Hydrographer) labors to supply the practical wants of all seamen on the North Atlantic Ocean can not be praised too highly, and at the same time can be acknowledged in no more fitting way on the part of seafarers than by an earnest endeavor to be of assistance to this office in its endeavors to collect data. The agencies of the Hydrographic Office are located in all the greater seaports of the United States. Our seamen will therefore work to their own interests as well as in those of their brethren in the craft when they contribute all their important observations on the Atlantic immediately, or as soon as possible, to the Hydrographic Office in Washington, or its agencies.

And now, sir, I wish to merely touch upon another point where the beneficent results of the researches of the Hydrographic Office have been felt. I refer to the formerly ridiculed idea of the efficacy of oil in storms. I quote from the margin of the Pilot Chart of last month a few of the many reports of the use of oil during the furious gale which raged along our shores barely two months ago:

THE USE OF OIL.

With the loss of the New York pilot-boats Phantom and Enchantress and the yacht Cythera fresh in mind, these reports can not fail to be of special interest, and should be carefully noted, not only by those to whom a seafaring life is a profession, but by every yachtman who is intending to cruise along the coast this summer.

Captain Sullivan, of the New York pilot-boat Caprice, reports off Sandy Hook the night of March 11, his vessel was boarded by combing seas which threw her on her beam-ends. He broke out oil-bags, stuffed them with oakum, rags, and anything he could lay his hands on, poured in a mixture of 1 gallon lard oil, 1 gallon paint oil, and 3 gallons petroleum (all he had on board), and punched them with a brad-awl. One of these he hung over the weather bow, and the other over the side abreast the weather main rigging, so as to just clear the water when on an even keel. He also rigged out two drags over the weather bow, each composed of 15 fathoms of chain on five fenders, held by 75 fathoms of hawser. After the oil was used no more water came on board, although before using it the sea was making a clean breach over the vessel. A breaking wave would rush towards her, meet the oil slick, the crest would quiet down, and the wave roll harmlessly past. He used the oil for thirty-six hours, and says it saved his vessel.

Pilot Partridge, of the pilot-boat Charles H. Marshall, was struck by the storm at 10.30 p. m. on the 11th, 10 miles east from Sandy Hook, wind WNW., with snow. Drifted to the eastward before the gale till the morning of the 13th, when came head to wind with anchor and 90 fathoms of chain, which held for twenty-four hours, the wind blowing 100 miles per hour. Used three oil-bags, and except for them thinks the vessel would have gone down.

The 88-ton steel schooner-yacht Iroquois passed Sandy Hook at 3 p. m. March 10, bound south. The night of the 11th she encountered the storm in all its fury east of Cape Henlopen, and a detailed report has been received from her sailing-master, Captain Norton, relative to the great success with which he used oil. At 10 a. m. it was blowing a most terrific gale, and the vessel was making too much headway for safety. Took in the reefed fore-staysail and fore-trysail, and put over a patent sea-drag, but the hawser carried away and he lost it. He then thought of a case of oil on board containing four 5-gallon cans. Made three bags of No. 5 cotton, large enough to hold about 2 gallons apiece. Put 2 quarts in each and hung them over the weather bow, but the oil congealed and would not run out through the holes he had made with a sail-needle. Then tried the oil through the pipes of the closet in the forecastle, near the bow, putting a few tablespoonfuls in the bowl and then pumping it out.

It was truly wonderful the effect it had on the sea. A huge comber would come down upon the vessel, threatening to bury her 20 feet deep. The comb would strike a patch of oil no larger than a common dining table, and in an instant the top of the sea was smooth and round, without even a wind ripple, and the little schooner would pop up on top of it as easy as a gull. He stood on the deck for more than an hour, watching the effect, and then went below, feeling that, so far as breaking waves were concerned, he was perfectly safe as long as the oil held out. The oil used in this case was a kind known as mineral sperm, a soft, greasy oil, which he thinks is the best. The yacht rode out the storm in perfect safety, without any damage, although both topmasts were on end and jib-boom out. Used 15 gallons of oil in thirty-six hours. Captain Norton has followed the sea for the past thirty years, seventeen of them as master, but never experienced a worse gale than this.

That our efforts are appreciated abroad is shown by the following extracts from a translation from the French "Le Filage de l'Huile, Par le Vice-Amiral G. Cloné," which is issued by Capt. W. J. L. Wharton, R. N., hydrographer to the British Admiralty. This paper states—

That the great effect produced by oil in smoothing troubled waters should have been so well known in times past as to have passed into a proverb, and yet that no general practical use of this effect should have been made until the last few years is a remarkable instance of the tardiness of mankind to apply the benefits that natural phenomena provide. To the Hydrographic Office of the United States is mainly due the credit of bringing into prominence and forcing on the notice of seamen in various publications the great importance of this property of oil under circumstances when life and property are endangered by breaking seas, and the extreme facility and trifling expense of its employment. Thanks to the efforts of the Americans, the facts are now well known to all English-speaking mariners, and many are the instances of the successful use of oil. Admiral Cloné, * * * drawing on the mass of experiences collected by the American office, and giving them due credit for their action, reports additional striking cases, etc.

Of other information collected by the branch offices, I give two specimen items of the derelicts and wreckage in the North Atlantic mentioned on the last monthly chart:

During the past six months fifty-one vessels are known to have met with disaster in the North Atlantic Ocean, their names having been reported. Of these vessels, there were two ships, twenty-three barks, three brigs, two brigantines, and twenty-one schooners. Classed according to nationalities, nineteen were British, sixteen American, five German, five Norwegian, four Italian, one Russian, and one Spanish. About ten of these vessels were disabled by the storm of December 18–19, 1887, and six by the great storm of March 11–14, 1888.

* * * * * * *

The length of time during which a derelict will remain afloat depends a great deal upon the nature of the cargo and the condition the vessel was in when abandoned. For instance, the Italian bark Vincenzo Perrotta, abandoned September 18, 1887, in latitude 36° 00′ N., longitude 54° 00′ W., has been reported eleven times, the last report being April 27, 1888, latitude 24° 31′ N., longitude 64° 50′ W. This vessel has been kept track of for seven months and nine days, and as she is still in a fair condition, and in a region frequented by vessels, it is not improbable that reports will continue to come in for some time to come.

The information furnished by these officers is valuable sometimes far inland in a way that we would scarcely suspect. I mention one in-

stance mentioned on page 8 of the last report of the Hydrographer, Commander J. R. Bartlett, United States Navy:

As illustrating the general importance of these offices, the shipping agents of the various railroads at Kansas City, Mo., desiring information as to the temperature of the sea water likely to be experienced by vessels going from New Orleans to Liverpool during each month in the year, communicated with the branch office for the purpose of getting the desired information, after having tried for two months to obtain it elsewhere. This enabled the railroad companies to consider the feasibility of making large shipments of salt meat to Liverpool by way of the port of New Orleans.

Mr. Chairman, the affairs of the Hydrographic Office are conducted by a corps of naval officers, but lately under the able administration of Commander Bartlett and now under the talented guidance of Lieut. George L. Dyer, and the indirect benefits derived from its agency should not be overlooked. By it naval officers are, in time of peace, given duties directly connected with their profession, and at the same time help with no puny hands to garner in the harvests of peace in those blessed intervals between the ravages of war; and their discoveries and their labors mutually assist the Navy and the merchant marine, while smoothing over the jealousies that have ever been felt between those great classes of seafaring men.

The information that these officers obtain and furnish is of incalculable value to every shipper, to every importer, to every marine insurance company, to every vessel-owner, to every man who has an interest in cheap transportation on the ocean. Safe transportation, sir, or anything tending to it, is no mean component of cheap transportation.

I am glad to say, Mr. Chairman, that there seems to have come a fresh impetus into this branch of our public service—a new and a better appreciation of the benefits that it brings and the safeguards that it bestows. It seems to me that there is a fresh endeavor and determination on the part of those charged with its conduct to make it worthy in the fullest degree of its noble aims.

Sir, I trust this body may dole out with no niggard hand the sums needed to conduct this service—may do naught to restrain the zeal, the patience, and the intelligence of these attempts to gather and reveal fresh knowledge about the ocean, about its calms, its favoring breezes and its storms, its currents and its icebergs, its rocks and its wrecks.

I have spoken, Mr. Chairman, of the importance of this service, as giving assistance by its information and its discoveries to the cheap transportation of our products and the welfare of our people on the land. But what of our people on the sea? How small, indeed, are the benefits that I have named compared with the safeguards which it furnishes or helps to furnish against loss of life from the dangers of the deep!

Amid the flash of the lightning and the howling of the storm how little is the cargo considered compared with the preservation of the lives of those on board the ship! And, sir, if the additional sum which this amendment proposes—insignificant as it is, in view of the importance and magnitude of the service to which it is to be applied—if this additional sum, by the information which it furnishes, saves one ship from wreck and one crew from drowning; ay, more, if by its means it were to save the life of but one worthy man—a life to his loved ones more precious far than ship or cargo—I should not deem this sum misapplied or appropriated to other than a worthy cause.

Mr. RANDALL. These officers have nothing to do with the hydrography of our coast. As I understand, these are merely bureaus of information gathered from vessels coming into ports as to matters to which the gentleman has alluded. I am entirely uninformed as to any transfer of the Signal Office to these bureaus, and I do not think any such transfer has taken place. If there has been any such law, it has not come to the knowledge of the committee. The proposition increases the money expended at the existing points and at the two which have been added—Norfolk, and Portland, Oregon. There is no necessity for any such increase.

Mr. FORNEY. It is increasing the contingent expenses.

Mr. FELTON. I understand the situation at San Francisco to be at the present time that the amount provided is only about one-half of what it ought to be in order to secure the efficient service which ought to be maintained at that port.

Mr. RANDALL. It is provided to maintain it at what it was heretofore.

Mr. FELTON. It merely adds $50 a month.

Mr. RANDALL. You want to double what it was last year, and what we have agreed to.

Mr. FELTON. It is for the purpose of making it effective. I think if the gentleman understood the position of matters he would not object to the appropriation.

Mr. RANDALL. The proposition is to increase it $9,000 from $6,000, and make it $15,000.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 49, noes 46.

Mr. RANDALL. No quorum.

Mr. MORROW. Let it be reported to the House with the understanding we shall have a yea-and-nay vote on it. I am willing to compromise on $10,000.

The CHAIRMAN appointed Mr. MORROW and Mr. FORNEY as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 85, noes 83.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.

For compensation of the Secretary of the Interior, $8,000; First Assistant Secretary, $4,500; Assistant Secretary, $4,000; chief clerk, $2,500, and $250 additional as superintendent of the Patent Office building; six members of a board of pension appeals, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior, at $2,000 each; two special inspectors connected with the administration of the public-land service, to be appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and to be subject to his direction, at $2,500 each; one superintendent of documents, $2,000; six clerks, chiefs of division, at $2,000 each, one of whom shall be disbursing clerk; for one private secretary to the Secretary of the Interior, $1,800; five clerks of class 4; one census clerk, $1,800; seven clerks of class 3; one clerk of class 3 (custodian), who shall give bond in such sum as the Secretary of the Interior may determine; one book-keeper for custodian, $1,200; eight clerks of class 2; thirteen clerks of class 1; two clerks of class 1, who shall be stenographers or typewriters; one returns-office clerk, $1,200; one female clerk, to be designated by the President, to sign land patents, $1,200; one clerk, at $1,200; four clerks at $1,000 each; two copyists at $900; one telephone operator, $600; seven copyists; three messengers; nine assistant messengers; fourteen laborers; two skilled mechanics, one at $900 and one at $720; two carpenters at $900 each; one laborer, at $600; four packers at $660 each; one conductor of elevator, at $720; four charwomen; for one captain of the watch, $1,000; forty watchmen; additional to two watchmen acting as lieutenants of watchmen, at $120 each; one engineer, $1,200; assistant engineer, $1,000; and six firemen; in all, $185,480.

Mr. PERKINS. I notice a reduction in the number of the members of the board of pension appeals. I should like to ask why, in the judgment of the Committee on Appropriations, there was any necessity for a reduction in that force from twelve to six?

Mr. FORNEY. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. PERKINS. Why is the board of pension appeals reduced from twelve to six?

Mr. CANNON. That work is all up and six are of no use.

Mr. RANDALL. They were provided for in the last law for one year only.

Mr. DOCKERY. That work is up and there is no necessity for any more.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I rise to a point of order in reference to the salaries here provided. The law fixes the salary at $3,500 and the bill increases it to $4,000.

Mr. FORNEY. That increase was made several years ago.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is an increase over the law.

Mr. FORNEY. I wish to say it was not done by our committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not care by whom it was done, it is in violation of the law upon the statute-book which fixes the salary at $3,500.

Mr. RANDALL. The law fixes the salary at $3,500; several years ago it was increased to $4,500.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to know of the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether the increase is simply on an appropriation bill, and but for one year, or whether there is any statute law upon the subject?

Mr. RANDALL. It is on an appropriation bill; and the gentleman from New Jersey is correct as to what the statute provides.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is bound to sustain the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I raise the further point of order, in line 5, on the words "two thousand five hundred dollars." The salary as fixed by the Revised Statutes is $2,200.

Mr. RANDALL. The statement of the gentleman from New Jersey is correct.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Certainly; I have the references here to the statute before me.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Again, in lines 13 and 14, I make the point of order on the words "two thousand dollars." The statute fixes it at $2,500.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Again, on page 82, in line 14, I raise the point of order on the words "one thousand dollars." The statute fixes the salary in this case at $1,200.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And in line 17 of the same page I make the point of order on the words "one thousand two hundred dollars." The statute fixes the salary at $1,400.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FORNEY. What amendment does the gentleman offer?

Mr. BUCHANAN. It is not my business to formulate the bill. I simply make these points of order.

Mr. FORNEY. The gentleman offers no amendment?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No, sir.

Mr. FORNEY. That leaves no salary; it simply takes the amount out and leaves a blank.

Mr. RANDALL. I move to insert the sums, respectively, recommended by the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And I raise the point of order against the amendment that it changes existing law, and is exactly the same as was recommended by the committee before, and which the Chair ruled to be out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must, of course, sustain the point of order. If the point of order applied to the original section it applies to the amendment, and for the same reason.

Mr. RANDALL. These salaries were fixed long ago under the control of a party not now in power in the Federal Government.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is very plain.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman from New Jersey ought to have been here then to make the point of order.

Mr. KERR. I move to insert the amounts fixed by the law.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I did not hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. FORNEY. You ought to have been here in the Forty-seventh or Forty-eighth Congress when these salaries were fixed, and to have made the point of order then.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I would ask if it would not be more proper at the correct time to move the recommittal of this bill to the Committee on Appropriations for the purpose of fixing the salaries as provided by law?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not entertain that question at all.

Mr. KERR. I move that the salary of the Assistant Secretary be fixed at $3,500.

Mr. RANDALL. I hope that will be voted down.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of Assistant Attorney-General: For one law clerk, at $2,750; one law clerk, at $2,500; one law clerk, at $2,250; thirteen law clerks, at $2,000 each; two clerks of class 3, one of whom shall act as stenographer; in all, $36,700.

Mr. PERKINS. I would like to suggest to the committee that as I understand this bill there is a reduction in the force here of two in number, but yet there is an increase of $4,000 in the amount. I would like to know how that is.

Mr. FORNEY. We give them three additional law clerks.

Mr. PERKINS. We made an appropriation last year for twenty clerks, which are provided in this office, and this bill gives but eighteen, still the amount of the appropriation is $4,000 more than it was last year.

Mr. FORNEY. I expect the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. PERKINS. I have the bill before me.

Mr. FORNEY. Last year there were but ten law clerks provided and this year there are fourteen, making an increase of $6,000.

Mr. PERKINS. But the total amount of the appropriation is increased.

Mr. CANNON. Yes, because there has been an increase in the number of law clerks.

Mr. FORNEY. And the number has been fixed just as the Department wanted.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I would like to move an amendment to line 14, on page 80, between the words "thousand" and "dollars," by the insertion of "eight hundred."

Mr. FORNEY. It is too late to make that amendment. That paragraph has been passed.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I think there can be no objection to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is objection made by the gentleman from Alabama.

The Clerk read the following paragraph:

General Land Office: For the Commissioner of the General Land Office, $4,000; one Assistant Commissioner, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall be authorized to sign such letters, papers, and documents and to perform such other duties as may be directed by the Commissioner, and shall act as Commissioner in the absence of that officer or in case of a vacancy in the office of Commissioner, $3,000; chief clerk, $2,250; two law clerks, at $2,200 each; three inspectors of surveyors-general and district land offices, at $2,000 each; recorder, $2,000; three principal clerks, at $1,800 each; two law examiners, at $2,000 each; ten principal examiners of land claims and contests, at $2,000 each; forty clerks of class 4; sixty clerks of class 3; seventy clerks of class 2; seventy-five clerks of class 1; fifty-five clerks, at $1,000 each; and fifty copyists, nine assistant messengers, twelve laborers, and six packers, at $720 each; in all, $525,770.

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether the Committee on Appropriations have provided for the full force asked by the Commissioner of the General Land Office?

Mr. RANDALL. What we have provided is satisfactory to the Department.

Mr. FORNEY. We have not given them the full force asked, but they are satisfied with the change made by the committee. They asked for one hundred and twenty-five additional clerks to bring up some work. We gave them an addition of twenty-four; and I think that is satisfactory to the Department.

Mr. DOCKERY. The reason that I made the inquiry was the fact that a little experience in that Department demonstrates that the office is very far behind with the public business.

Mr. FORNEY. We have endeavored to remedy that by giving them twenty-four additional clerks and also an increase of ten examiners of land claims.

Mr. PETERS. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] has made a part of the inquiry which I had desired to address to the gentleman who has charge of this bill. I understand the bill increases the force of the examiners to bring up the work of the office. But I understand, also, that the committee do not give the amount estimated by the Department as being necessary. Is that true?

Mr. FORNEY. The Department asked for one hundred and twenty-five clerks to bring up the work, which we did not think necessary at this time.

Mr. PETERS. I want to state as a matter of fact, ascertained by my observation and experience in connection with that Department, that the work of the General Land Office on all contested cases is about two years behind.

Mr. FORNEY. That is what we are trying to remedy.

Mr. PETERS. Yes; but you have only met the difficulty by a small drop. Wherever a case is appealed from the Commissioner of the General Land Office to the Secretary, that covers another delay of a year and a half. Then after the case is decided and finally passed upon by the Secretary of the Interior, still there is another delay of a year before the patent can be issued. Therefore the homesteader or pre-emptor who files his declaration upon public land for the purpose of obtaining title to 160 acres has to wait from four to six years before, in the ordinary routine of the clerical work of the Interior Department, he can hope to get a patent or the evidence of title to the land.

I say such conduct among a community that was not law abiding would create a revolution against any administration that would allow such a condition of affairs to exist.

In connection with this there has sprung up an abuse in the Western country that has ground down the homesteader or pre-emptor, and made it almost impossible for him to settle on his land, or to meet the various demands that have been made upon his purse by the blackmailers who have been sent out through that country.

Before I go further I wish to call attention to a resolution of inquiry that was addressed to the Interior Department through the Committee on Public Lands, and which, for some reason, as I am informed, has not yet been reported back to this House, although the resolution was introduced on the 6th of February, 1888.

The resolution is as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be requested to inform the House of Representatives:

First. How soon after the filing of an appeal in a land-contest case in the office of the Commissioner of the General Land Office is such case reached for hearing and consideration.

Second. If such cases are considered in the order of their filing.

Third. The cause of delay in the consideration of such cases, if there is any such delay.

Fourth. After an appeal is taken to the Secretary of the Interior in such cases, how soon is it reached for hearing and consideration?

Fifth. The cause of such delay, if any.

Sixth. How soon after final decision in such cases does patent issue?

Seventh. The cause of such delay, if any.

As I understand, that resolution was referred to the Secretary of the Interior. I am not advised as to whether he has reported upon it or not, but certainly I am at a loss now for accurate information as to the cause of this delay. But I assume as I have already assumed that it is for the lack of clerical force in this Department.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. CHEADLE was recognized, and yielded his time to Mr. PETERS.

Mr. PETERS. I have said, Mr. Chairman, that certain abuses have grown up in the Western country out of this delay in procuring patents. I send to the Clerk's desk to be read a portion of an editorial of the Anthony Journal, a newspaper published in my district. This will show to the House something of the great trouble that a homesteader or a pre-emptor has to go through to obtain title to his land, and some of the reasons why he needs relief, and why his work in the Land Department should be brought up so that every case should be considered without delay.

The Clerk read as follows:

A man who is well known in the community, the initial of his last name being Stone, was found at the shanty of one of the jumpers, where he was making his abiding place, he having sent his family to Missouri last fall, possibly that he might be the better able to assist the jumpers. A letter was found in the shanty where Mr. Stone resided addressed to Mr. Richardson, an agent of the Wichita land office, offering to divy with him in these cases of canceled entries. We are not yet ready to publish this letter, as we have several affidavits to accompany it, and more that will soon be ready. We have evidence enough now to snow that this man Stone is at the bottom of this claim-jumping business, and it is only because he is a cripple (whether because of the act of God or his own sin we do not know) that he is tolerated in the community. But a cripple is always safe from the righteous indignation of brave and honest men, and Mr. Stone knows that.

Oh, what a stigma upon the name of the fair county of Harper that men like Stone must be permitted to run at large to play the sneak upon honest men, and then become a witness against them in behalf of the United States Government! Great Heavens, has it come to this, that our Government, for the protection of which hundreds of thousands of brave men gave up their lives, is now engaged in the detestable business of hiring the lowest class of citizens to play the detective and manufacture evidence against poor but honest citizens of our country?

Mr. PETERS. Now, that editorial illustrates one of the evils that have grown up out of these delays. Men, knowing that there is no possibility of obtaining a patent for years from the Department, institute some contest proceeding. Many times, under a former administration of the General Land Office, it was done simply by sending an anonymous letter, in which it was charged that the pre empter or homesteader had not complied with the law, and upon the strength of that anonymous letter the man's title was held up for cancellation, and then these parties

would come to him and tell him that if he would pay him $50 they, being in the same boat with the Land Office, would get the title through and get rid of the contest proceedings. This, I say, is one of the evils that have grown up, and to which the people have submitted for a long period of years. I do not say that the practice was inaugurated under the present administration. It grew up, as I am frank to confess, through certain inspectors who were appointed under a Republican administration; but the evil has been steadily growing. Instead of decreasing, year after year it has been increasing steadily. Under the peculiar administration of a former Commissioner of the General Land Office these inspectors were increased, and the number of entries that were held up for cancellation has increased and the current work of the office has fallen more and more behind.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HUNTER was recognized, and yielded his time to Mr. PETERS.

Mr. PETERS. I wish to say further, Mr. Chairman, in justice to the present Commissioner of the General Land Office, that, being a man from the West, and knowing something about the needs of the people of the West, I believe, if he has the opportunity and the means given him, he will correct many of these evils, and will root out the system that has worked such great injustice to my people and to the people of the West generally. I say this in justice to the present Commissioner.

What I appeal for now is that this House shall give unanimous consent to put at the command of the present Commissioner of the General Land Office just what the estimates call for, in order that this work may be pushed forward so that a man can have his patent within a reasonable lifetime after he makes his proof at the Land Office. Under the ruling of the Chair, which has been sustained on an appeal, it would be useless to offer an amendment to this effect if the point of order were made against it, so I now ask unanimous consent that all of this paragraph in relation to the office of the Commissioner of the General Land Office be changed so as to correspond exactly with the estimates that have been made by the Department for the force that they think necessary. If this is done, then, after sufficient time has elapsed, if the office fails to catch up with the work we shall know where the responsibility lies.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS]?

Mr. RANDALL. I object. So far as I understand, the Commissioner of the General Land Office is content with the bill as it is.

Mr. PETERS. I have understood that the Secretary of the Interior and the Commissioner of the General Land Office said that if the force asked for by their estimates were granted, they would bring up this work and place it in such a position that these complaints could no longer be made against the Department. Now, if the Secretary of the Interior is satisfied with the provisions in this bill, and if the Commissioner of the General Land Office is satisfied with the provisions of the bill, then I have nothing further to say, because I shall know whom to hold responsible in the future. But I wish to be satisfied on that point. I wish to be satisfied that the Secretary of the Interior, who has gone to work with his sleeves up for the purpose of pushing forward this business, and the Commissioner of the General Land Office, who is likewise industrious and energetic and desirous of bringing up the work—I desire to be satisfied that they do receive in this bill all the appropriations they require in order to the proper performance of the work.

Mr. DOCKERY. I understand the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] to say that they are satisfied.

Mr. RANDALL. I did not say anything about the Secretary of the Interior, but I did say that the Commissioner of the General Land Office, Mr. Stockslager, was present in conference with our committee, and expressed himself as satisfied with the manner in which the bill was made up.

Mr. MCRAE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say that all the entries that have been made for public lands in one county in my district have been suspended, and all agricultural entries that could have been made for the last year have been referred to the Commissioner for investigation. That investigation has not been made, nor even begun yet, and if these officers have all the money they want, then there is no excuse for the delay. But if they say they have not got all they want, then I think that is a sufficient indication that they ought to have more. Four new inspectors will do but little good. Give them all they ask for. I hope the unanimous consent asked by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] will be granted. If not, I hope that a motion will be made, and I will take the responsibility of making it myself.

Mr. DOCKERY. I suggest to the gentleman that, on the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL], the motion is not necessary, because the gentleman from Pennsylvania states that the Commissioner of the General Land Office is satisfied with the bill as it is.

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, and I have since conferred with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who corroborates me in that.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I move a *pro forma* amendment for the purpose of saying that the increase in the General Land Office is twenty-four clerks at a cost of $38,720; and, while I am up, I will make another statement, which is that two or three years ago, under the last Commissioner of the General Land Office, I am informed that months and months of work performed by a corps of clerks was thrown away because the Commissioner of the General Land Office was overruled by his superior officer. Now they have promised more thorough administration in that office, and it is not increase of force that is needed in the Interior Department, but better administration.

I want to say further, that the Secretary of the Interior, under the power which he has to detail clerks from one bureau to another, has, I have no doubt, more than a sufficient force at his command to bring up every particle of work in every bureau in his Department, with clerks to spare.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the pending *pro forma* amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. I move *pro forma* to strike out the last word. I am quite willing and anxious to vote for every appropriation that will add to the efficiency of the General Land Office. As has been suggested by my colleague [Mr. PETERS], we in the West realize the importance of expeditious work in that Department; and as was suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, we also realize that until quite recently the labor in that Department was not to do the work, but to see how not to do it. In other words, boards were organized there for the purpose of embarrassing and delaying the settlers upon the public domain in their efforts to secure title to their homes. We know that immediately after the appointment and confirmation of the late lamented Andrew Jackson Sparks [laughter] orders were made by him suspending all entries in great sections of the country, and spies and informers were appointed and sent out to see whether some evidence could not be found to embarrass some poor homesteader or pre-emption claimant in the effort he was making to secure a title to a piece of Government land and a place to call his own. We in the West complained of this. It was not a partisan or political complaint; men of all parties interested themselves in the matter. The condemnation was almost universal, and the wrongs practiced affected an empire in extent and area. Yet we found no relief; we could not get the ear of the Department when we asked for justice, and no heed was given to our supplications. The work of embarrassment and destruction, the work of striking down the settlers and wrecking homes continued until that same Commissioner of the General Land Office rendered against a railroad company a decision of like character to those which he had made in regard to the rights of humble settlers. When he attempted to organize against a railroad company the same methods that he had adopted against settlers, he was then ordered by this Administration of reform to "step down and out."

But so long as he was content to perpetrate his practices to the injury only of the poor and unfortunate settlers, so long he was suffered by his superiors and by the President to remain in office. But when, in his determination to distinguish himself in some form, he placed himself in antagonism to a railroad company, then his resignation was demanded; and, as I have said, he was decapitated and compelled to "step down and out," and now there are none so poor as to do him reverence.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to withdraw the *pro forma* amendment I have offered, and to submit an amendment to insert after the word "each," in line 1, the words "to be appointed from the clerks now employed in the General Land Office." I am in favor of these examiners. I think they should be provided to do the work that has been suggested here expeditiously and well, so that the settlers may be relieved from embarrassment and difficulty, and I desire to say in justice to the present Commissioner that I believe he has some conception of the rights of the settlers and will be glad to organize his Department as efficiently as he can to dispatch business and to extend relief and justice to the pioneers who are making homes in the great West and building up new communities to contribute to the greatness and prosperity of our common country.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS].

Mr. FORNEY. I desire to make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. Certainly no point of order can be made against the amendment.

The Clerk read the amendment of Mr. PERKINS, as follows:

After the word "each," in line 1, page 84, insert "to be appointed from the clerks now employed in the General Land Office."

Mr. FORNEY. That would not increase the force.

Mr. RANDALL. That would not increase the force at all, unless you add, in some other part of the bill, a provision for ten additional clerks.

Mr. PERKINS. Well, I am willing the additional force shall be provided for in another portion of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. A point of order is pending.

Mr. PERKINS. Allow me one suggestion on the point of order. I understand the ruling has been consistent at all times that language intended to restrain or direct the method of expending an appropriation is not new legislation, and is in order. The purpose of this amendment is to designate the force from which these men shall be appointed. I think that they should be appointed from the force employed in the

General Land Office, so that we may have experienced and efficient men. The amendment, as I understand, is simply a limitation upon the appropriation, and is therefore in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. FORNEY] desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. FORNEY. No, sir.

Mr. RANDALL. This amendment changes existing law by imposing a restriction upon the power of the Secretary of the Interior, who now has full authority to make these appointments.

The CHAIRMAN. Upon the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] that the Secretary of the Interior under the present law has authority to make the appointments, and that the amendment is a restraint on that power, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. PERKINS. Will the Chair permit a suggestion?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has made a ruling.

Mr. PERKINS. The provision embraced in the bill is new legislation; it creates twelve additional examiners.

The CHAIRMAN. And that is perfectly competent. In an appropriation bill legislation may be adopted to increase the number of employés in any branch of the service.

Mr. PETERS. I have received since I was last upon the floor the letter of the Secretary of the Interior and the letter of the Commissioner of the General Land Office in reply to the resolution which I introduced on the 6th of February last, and I ask to have the letters printed in the RECORD.

The letters are as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
Washington, April 13, 1888.

SIR: I am in receipt of a resolution by the House of Representatives, of which the following is a copy:

Mr. STOCKDALE, from the Committee on the Public Lands, submitted the following; which was agreed to:

"*Resolved*, That the Secretary of the Interior be requested to inform the House of Representatives—

"1. How soon after the filing of an appeal in a land-contest case in the office of the Commissioner of the General Land Office is such case reached for hearing and consideration.

"2. If such cases are considered in the order of their filing.

"3. The cause of delay in the consideration of such cases, if there is any such delay.

"4. After an appeal is taken to the Secretary of the Interior in such cases, how soon is it reached for hearing and consideration.

"5. The cause of such delay, if any.

"6. How soon after final decision in such cases does patent issue.

"7. The cause of such delay, if any"

The first, second, third, sixth, and seventh inquiries relating to business transacted in the General Land Office, said resolution was referred to the Commissioner of the General Land Office, whose report thereon is herewith transmitted.

The Department is now disposing of the cases that came up on appeal from the General Land Office December, 1886, and the cases that came up January, 1887, will be reached during the month.

It is impossible to state with any degree of accuracy how soon a case can be reached after it reaches the Department on appeal from the Commissioner.

Under the rules of practice the appellee is allowed thirty days after the expiration of the sixty days allowed for appeal in which to file argument, and the appellant is allowed thirty days from service of said argument in which to file argument in reply. After this period the case is in order for trial, unless the time is extended by permission of the Secretary, upon notice to opposite party.

The following statement of the condition of the docket the number of clerks employed in the law division in the preparation of opinions, and the cases disposed of during the fiscal years ending July 1, 1885, July 1, 1886, and July 1, 1887, may enable the committee to make an approximate estimate of the time in which a case will be reached after the appeal is transmitted to the Department:

From July 1, 1884, to July 1, 1885:		From July 1, 1885, to July 1, 1886:	
Cases on hand July 1, 1884.....	398	Cases on hand July 1, 1885.....	989
Cases transmitted on appeal..	1,168	Cases transmitted on appeal..	1,366
	1,566		2,355
Disposed of during that period.....	577	Disposed of during that period.....	1,004
	989		1,351
Number of clerks employed..	9	Number of clerks employed..	8
From July 1, 1886, to July 1, 1887:		From July 1, 1887, to January 1, 1888:	
Cases on hand July 1, 1886....	1,351	Cases on hand July 1, 1887.....	2,681
Cases transmitted on appeal.	2,222	Cases transmitted on appeal..	637
	3,573		3,318
Disposed of during that period.....	892	Disposed of during that period.....	511
	2,681		2,807
Number of clerks employed..	8		

During the latter part of this period the law division was increased by the addition of three clerks, temporarily detailed from the board of pension appeals, but owing to the absence of others and the special work in the restoration of indemnity lands the working force on appeal cases was practically reduced.

From January 1, 1888, to March 1, 1888:		From March 1, 1888, to April 1, 1888:	
Cases on hand.....	2,807	Cases on hand.....	2,817
Cases transmitted on appeal..	210	Cases transmitted on appeal...	137
	3,017		2,954
Disposed of during that period.....	200	Disposed of during that period.....	269
	2,817		2,685
		Cases on hand April 1, 1888.....	2,685

The latter part of February the law division was increased by the addition of one clerk, and in the month of March by two additional clerks, so that the entire force, with the three now temporarily detailed from the board of pension appeals, numbers sixteen clerks.

From the foregoing it will be seen that the delay in the disposition of cases pending on appeal before the Department is owing to the increase of appeals from the General Land Office. It further appears that there has been no diminution of work in this division, but, on the contrary, a pro rata increase.

The average number of appeals per month from the General Land Office since January 1, 1888, is 116, and, with the present force, I think it may be reasonably assumed that from 200 to 250 cases will be disposed of per month; and it is confidently expected that a still greater number will be disposed of, and that within one year the arrears will be cleared away and cases decided as soon after appeal as the arguments shall be submitted, and considered with promptness.

The cases above referred to are commonly known as docket cases and do not include motions for review, certiorari, reports, and decisions upon applications to bring suit to cancel patents, and other current work of the Department, which makes up a large per cent. of the work of the law division.

The greater part of the time of one of the clerks is occupied in the preparation of the volume of land decisions, and the current work passing daily through the law division is sufficient to occupy the entire time of another.

Very respectfully,

WM. F. VILAS, *Secretary.*

THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., —— ——, 1888.

SIR: I am in receipt of the inclosed copy of a resolution of inquiry by the House of Representatives.

In response to such inquiries as pertain to the business of this office, I have the honor to submit the following report:

"1. How soon after the filing of an appeal in a land-contest case, in the office of the Commissioner of the General Land Office, is such case reached for hearing and consideration?"

We are now acting on cases of this class that were received in this office in the month of April, 1886. It may be stated, in general terms, that an appeal-contest case can not be reached for action, after it is filed in this office, in less than from twenty to twenty-four months.

"2. If such cases are considered in the order of their filing?"

Such cases are now considered in the order of their filing. Prior to the formation of the contest division, April 1, 1887, contests from different parts of the country were acted upon in different divisions and different sections of the same division. The result was that the cases from some States and Territories were acted on, probably, as soon as they were received in the office, while the same class of cases from other States and Territories were not reached for action for two or three years. On the formation of a division to take entire charge of all contests on public lands, the cases then on file, and all that have since been received, were sent to that division. There they are docketed in the order of the date of their filing here, and are taken up for decision in the same order. This is an inflexible rule, admitting of almost no possible exception.

"3. The cause of delay in the consideration of such cases, if there is any such delay."

In order to give an intelligent explanation of the delay in acting on these cases it will be necessary to consider the character of this work, the great increase in it, and the action of this office in reference to its condition.

An erroneous impression exists in many quarters that a contest between individuals over a tract of public land is purely a personal matter, and one in which the Government has no interest. This might have been true prior to the passage of the act of May 14, 1880 (21 Stat., 140) the second section of which gives to any one who successfully contests and "procures the cancellation of any preemption, homestead, or timber-culture entry" a preference right of entering the tract covered by the canceled entry. This provision of the statute, together with the rules of practice adopted by the Department in pursuance thereof, has caused a great increase in contest business; and the majority of the cases arise upon affidavits by persons who themselves have no claim to the tracts involved, but who charge fraud, illegality, or a failure to comply with the law on the claimants.

These charges are such as would be investigated by this office in the interest of the Government, through special agents, if the contestants did not furnish the evidence of the same, at their own expense, after allowing full opportunity to the claimants to be heard. Thus it will be seen that in the great bulk of contests the Government is the directly interested party, the contestant being the informer, who, as a reward for the service he renders and the expense he incurs, is awarded an opportunity, for a limited time, to enter the tract himself, if the entry is canceled.

Contests are divided into two classes, appealed and unappealed. If no appeal is taken from the decision of the local land officers, their finding is final in the absence of any exceptions recognized by the rules of practice. A careful examination, however, of the record in such cases is required in this office, for no entry can be canceled on such a proceeding unless it affirmatively appears from the record that the office has obtained jurisdiction of the claimant by proper service of notice of hearing, and that due opportunity to appeal has been allowed, with notice of the decision.

On the 10th of December, 1886, the following communication with reference to contest-business in this office, in connection with other matters, was transmitted through honorable Secretary Lamar to the Forty-ninth Congress:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, GENERAL LAND OFFICE,
"*Washington, D. C., December 10, 1886.*

"SIR: With a view to the better administration of the business of this office, and to the end that it may receive intelligent consideration, which its importance to the persons directly interested, as well as the whole public, demands, I am constrained to make the following recommendation in addition to those contained in my annual report, namely:

"That provisions be made in the appropriation bill for the current fiscal year for one additional chief of division, at an annual salary of $2,000, for the division of the board of review already organized. That a new division be created, to be known as the contest division, to be composed of one chief, at a salary of $2,500, and six members, at a salary of $2,000. * * *

"THE CONTEST DIVISION.

"It must be manifest to every thinking person that as the time approaches, as it is now rapidly approaching, when the desirable public lands open to original settlement, and filings have been made under the public-land laws, become more valuable, contests between disputants over titles to such lands must greatly increase, until in the near future the contested cases will become, if not the largest, the most important branch of the work of the Land Office.

"Under the present rules of practice adopted and promulgated by the Department, 'contests may be initiated by an adverse party or other person against a party to an entry, filing, or other claim under laws of Congress relating to the public lands for any sufficient cause affecting the legality or validity of the claim.'

"This liberal rule governing contests, together with the statute giving the successful contestant a preference right for thirty days after notice of decision in the case to enter the land, has also tended to increase the number of contests.

"An examination of the contest and the quasi-contest dockets in the several divisions develops the fact there has been in the past year a marked increase in the number of such cases filed. The large number of these cases remaining

unacted upon at the end of the financial year is proof conclusive that the force now engaged upon this work, which is all that can be spared for it without seriously interfering with the other branches of the work of the office, is totally inadequate to keep it up, and unless relief is given must rapidly accumulate.

"At the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1886, there remained unacted upon the following:

	Cases.
Division G	85
Division F	6,331
Division C	6,128
Division N	167
Division L	50
Division D	9
Total	12,770

"It needs no argument to convince any one that these cases, involving the title to property of immense value, in some cases reaching millions, which come before the office to be considered upon the written evidence taken by the registers and receivers, should be examined, the evidence weighed, and opinions prepared by men who have had training as lawyers.

"No private citizen would intrust such business to others than lawyers. It is proper to add that these questions are not always questions between claimants in which the Government has no interest. In a large number of cases the real question is whether any of the claimants have complied with the law and are entitled to the land. I feel that I can not too earnestly urge the importance of this matter.

"If, however, Congress in its wisdom should decline to provide for such division as I have requested, then I must earnestly urge an appropriation for a chief for a contest division, and I shall assign clerks in the office to such division, and make such progress in the work as my inadequate force will permit, trusting that the great necessity for the additional force I have felt constrained to ask for such division will be so apparent to Congress that it will not be long deferred.

"I respectfully request that you transmit this communication to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives, with such recommendations as you deem proper.

"Very respectfully,

"WM. A. J. SPARKS,
"*Commissioner.*

"Hon. L. Q. C. LAMAR,
"*Secretary of the Interior.*"

(See Land Office Report for 1887, pages 355, 356.)

In his annual report for 1887, Commissioner Sparks, after setting out the above communication in full, makes the following recommendation:

"It is to be hoped that the Fiftieth Congress will see the urgent need of taking action on the recommendations embraced in the foregoing letter. The division as at present constituted is made up largely of clerks that have had some experience in contest work; but with rare exceptions they are not men who have had the legal training which is almost indispensable to enable them to act judiciously in weighing evidence and on passing in intricate questions of practice or construing the many statutes, office regulations, and Department decisions bearing on the disposition of the public domain. In saying this it is not intended that the efficiency and valuable services of several of the clerks in the division shall be overlooked. Long experience in acting on contests has developed some very excellent clerks, who could not well be excelled. It is not desired that their service should be dispensed with, but that the clerks which it is recommended should be provided should be added to the division as constituted at present.

"The work of this division is a very important class of work. The property values involved in the contests now pending are enormous, and as the country settles up and land becomes more valuable these values will greatly increase. It may safely be asserted that the value of the property involved in the contest cases that come to the General Land Office in a single year very far exceeds the money values involved in the cases which go to the appellate court of any of the States of the Union in a year. Yet it would be considered very absurd to propose to place the decisions of causes in any appellate court of law in the hands of any but the best trained lawyers. Why should not the same rule apply to the decision of matters in this bureau, which involve the settlement of titles to many millions of acres of real estate? It is true that errors committed in the bureau may be corrected on appeal to the honorable Secretary, but a very small percentage of the decisions of the bureau are appealed from." (Annual Report, page 356.)

I shall refer to this recommendation again.

As no action was taken in the Forty-ninth Congress on the recommendation of December 10, 1886, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, on April 1, 1887, provided for the formation of a "board of contests," to which all contests involving private, cash, pre-emption, homestead, timber-culture, desert-land, timber-land, and donation entries of filings and scrip locations are transferred.

At the end of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1887, it was found that there had been received in the new division, by transfer from the old divisions and transmitted from the local offices throughout the country, 12,299 cases, of which 10,500, probably, were unappealed cases and the rest appeals. These were only cases that formerly belonged to the public-lands (C) and pre-emption (G) divisions, contests in the railroad, mineral, surveying, private-lands, and swamp-lands divisions being still retained in those divisions. As will be seen, the number of cases in Divisions C and G on June 30, 1886, was 6,213. On June 30, 1887, the total number of cases undisposed of was 11,378, showing an increase in one year of 5,165 cases.

On June 1, 1887, by order of honorable Secretary Lamar, the contest board was organized into a division and a fourth-class clerk assigned to duty as chief. The contest business of the division, briefly stated, is shown by the following statement:

Cases received up to June 30, 1887	12,299
Cases received since, to March 24, 1888	8,596
Total	20,895
Number of cases finally disposed of in contest division	12,631
Undisposed of March 24, 1888	8,264

Of this number, 2,300 (in round numbers) are appealed cases. About 200 unappealed and 300 appealed cases which have been decided, subject to appeal to the honorable Secretary, but not yet closed, are included in the above balance of 8,264. This shows a gain of 4,035 cases disposed of by the contest division within the current fiscal year, such a gain being made in the class of unappealed cases. This gain was made under the very unfavorable circumstances attending the organization of a new division in which vast accumulations of files had to be rearranged in crowded and inadequate space, new dockets prepared, and an entire system of disposing of the work provided for.

For about six months after the organization of the division very little was done toward acting on the appeal cases. This was owing to the fact that, as I think, my predecessor did not fully understand the magnitude of the contest work then in the office. These cases were suffered to accumulate for that length of time, and thus fell behind six months, being then already about eighteen months in arrears in some parts of the office.

Soon after taking charge of the office as Acting Commissioner, in November, 1887, I caused one additional room to be placed at the disposal of the chief of said division, and detailed an additional force from other parts of the office to work on these cases, so that they are now being decided as rapidly as they are being received. This could as well have been done in June, 1887, as in January, 1888. This detail was made, however, at the expense of other divisions of the office, whose work is also in arrears, and it is impossible to do more than to hold our own with the force now in the office.

I may here state that rapid gains are making in closing unappealed cases, which are about six months in arrears.

The work in contests is as well up as other classes of work in the office, and I call attention to the statements made in the annual report of the Land Office for 1887, on pages 99 to 107, inclusive, especially to the estimated force needed, as shown on page 106.

I concur heartily in the recommendations made in the communication of December 10, 1886. Indeed, it may not be improper for me to state that in my capacity as Assistant Commissioner I personally prepared said letter of December 10, 1886, and that I constantly urged upon the then Commissioner the great importance of the contest work in the office, and the necessity of making adequate arrangements for its proper dispatch, so far as he had the means under his control to do so.

I would therefore answer the third inquiry by stating that the cause of delay in deciding contest-appeal cases is almost entirely due to the totally inadequate force at my command to properly dispose of the accumulation of the work in the office. The fact is, that the work of the Land Office steadily increases from year to year, the space in the office becomes more and more crowded with records and files, so as to impede the work, and no corresponding increase is made in the clerical force.

No increase of clerical force in the office has been provided for since 1881, while the work of the office has increased, as is shown by the following statement of the number of matters requiring official consideration received each calendar year, beginning with 1884:

Year.	Matters received.	Per cent. increase.
1884	131,651	.6+
1885	132,483	.6+
1886	139,088	4.9+
1887	158,228	13.7+

Another cause of delay is found in the greater complication in the work of the Land Office, at present, than was formerly the case. The number of local offices has greatly increased, and intricate accounts must be kept and audited with each one. Many new acts of Congress are passed from year to year, making additional provisions or exceptions to the former modes of disposing of the public domain, all of which have been construed by the courts or the Departments and all of which must be carefully borne in mind in passing on the innumerable questions which arise in disposing of our work. As the public lands become scarcer they become much more valuable, and greater efforts are put forth to secure them, thus causing a very great increase in litigation, requiring the exercise of the quasi-judicial functions of the Commissioner and his subordinates, every possible legal point being raised and presented for decision by able lawyers, many of whom now make a speciality of land-law practice. It is this last phase of the question which forces upon our attention the imperative need of providing by law for the employment of trained lawyers to dispose of these legal questions as they arise, and to examine, weigh, and pass on the voluminous records of evidence taken in thousands of cases every year.

In the Patent Office, principal examiners at $2,400 a year each are provided for, while in the Land Office only two examiners at $2,000 a year each are provided for. The effect of the low salaries paid to the clerks in this bureau is that when a man becomes competent to deal with the more intricate questions which arise, he can usually obtain a position outside at a much higher compensation than he receives here, and the consequence is that many of the most competent clerks resign every year to accept outside employment. I am therefore constrained to refer again to the recommendations of December 10, 1886, on this point, and of my predecessor in his annual report, and to urge their vital importance upon Congress.

The fourth and fifth inquiries will be best answered by the honorable Secretary himself.

"6. How soon after final decision in such cases does patent issue?"

If the entry involved in the appeal to the honorable Secretary is one in which final proof has been made, and the decision of the Secretary sustains the entry and directs patent to issue, the same is issued at once, without further inquiry or delay in this office. If final proof has not been made on the entry or filing, and the Secretary's decision leaves it intact, dismissing the contest, such entry or filing stands like any other of its class, subject to final proof being made according to law, which is acted on in this office in its turn with other entries of the same class.

"7. The cause of such delay, if any."

As above shown, there is no delay in the issue of patent in cases that the honorable Secretary decides are ready for patent.

Respectfully,

S. M. STOCKSLAGER,
Commissioner.

Hon. WILLIAM F. VILAS,
Secretary of the Interior.

The Clerk read as follows:

Indian Office: For compensation of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, $4,000; assistant commissioner, who shall also perform the duties of chief clerk, $3,000; one financial clerk, at $2,000; chief of division, at $2,000; one principal bookkeeper, $1,800; five clerks of class 4, one of whom shall have charge of the educational division; eight clerks of class 3; one draughtsman, at $1,600; one stenographer, at $1,600; ten clerks of class 2; eighteen clerks of class 1; nine clerks, at $1,000 each; twelve copyists; one messenger; two assistant messengers; one laborer; one messenger-boy, at $360; and two charwomen; in all, $96,980.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I raise the point of order on these salaries. For compensation of Commissioner of Indian Affairs the salary is fixed at $4,000. By the Revised Statutes this salary is $3,000. I make the point of order that this increase of salary from $3,000 to $4,000 is in contravention of existing law. I make the point of order, as the committee does not seem to do it.

Mr. CANNON. What salary does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. BUCHANAN. The salary of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs.

Mr. FORNEY. There has been a change made in the salary of that office, and we have only kept it up to what it has been in the Forty-eighth and Forty-ninth Congresses.

Mr. RANDALL. Three thousand dollars is a small salary for the responsibility of that office.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I make the point of order that the salary provided can only be the salary of the statute.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. I will move to make the salary $4,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I raise the same point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. HOLMAN. The motion is to make the salary $4,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have made the point of order that the existing law provided only $3,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. Where does the gentleman find that?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I will cite the gentleman to the page of the Revised Statutes. It is page 78 where the existing law provides the salary for this office at $3,000.

The Clerk read as follows:

Pension Office: for compensation of the Commissioner of Pensions, $5,000; first deputy commissioner, $3,600; second deputy commissioner, $3,600; chief clerk, $2,250; assistant chief clerk, $2,000; medical referee, $3,000; assistant medical referee, $2,250; two qualified surgeons, who shall be experts in their profession, at $2,000 each; eighteen medical examiners, who shall be surgeons of education, skill, and experience in their profession, at $1,800 each; twelve chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; law clerk, $2,000; forty-five principal examiners, for review board, at $2,000 each; twenty-four assistant chiefs of division, at $1,800 each; three stenographers, at $1,600 each; seventy-four clerks of class 4; ninety-five clerks of class 3; three hundred and seventy-two clerks of class 2; three hundred and sixty-one clerks of class 1; two hundred clerks, at $1,000 each; one superintendent of buildings, $1,400; two engineers, at $1,200 each; eighty-five copyists; twenty-five messengers; twenty messenger-boys, at $400 each; one captain of the watch $840; three sergeants of the watch, at $750 each; twenty watchmen; three firemen; twenty-five laborers; and five charwomen, at $400 each; in all, $1,808,750.

Mr. CHEADLE. I do not rise for the purpose of making a point of order on the salaries in this section, but merely to call the attention of the committee to one item. In line 18 there is provided "two qualified surgeons, who shall be experts in their profession, at $2,000 each." Then the bill goes on and provides "eighteen medical examiners, who shall be surgeons of education, skill, and experience in their profession, at $1,800 each." These surgeons are authorized by law as fourth-class clerks, and their salary is fixed by law at $1,800 a year. I ask, by unanimous consent, to make their salaries $2,000 each, as provided in the case of the qualified surgeons provided for immediately preceding these $1,800 medical examiners in this bill.

My reason is this: The salary of these officers, as I have already stated, are regulated by law, being that of fourth-class clerks; but, as I have suggested, there is no good ground for giving two surgeons $2,000 a year and the others only $1,800 each. The qualifications and duties are the same and the salary should likewise be the same.

Mr. RANDALL. The point of order has been reserved.

Mr. CHEADLE. They require the same kind of education and experience, and they should be at the same salary. It is not necessary to argue that men of skill and education and competent to occupy these positions are not likely to remain long when the salary is only $1,800 a year, and as a consequence there are constant resignations of the experienced and best men, who should be retained. The objection against the present administration of the Pension Office is that the rating is not what it should be under the law, which is largely due, I hold, to the surgeons on this board.

Mr. RANDALL. I make the point of order that the statute fixes these salaries and the Committee on Appropriations has reported that salary in this bill which the amendment proposes to increase.

Mr. CHEADLE. The salary provided is that of fourth-class clerks, or $1,800. I have asked, by unanimous consent, that it be increased to $2,000.

Mr. HATCH. I suggest that we be allowed to have a vote on this proposition in the House.

Mr. RANDALL. I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment has been moved.

Mr. HATCH. I will move the amendment to make the salary $2,000.

Mr. RANDALL. I make the point of order on that amendment.

Mr. HATCH. What is the point of order?

Mr. RANDALL. My point of order is that where there is no statute, then in the absence of a statute the salary fixed by the appropriation bill prevails.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will allow me, I think there is such a statute.

Mr. RANDALL. I would be glad to have my attention called to it; I do not recollect it.

Mr. CANNON. The medical examiners were originally fourth-class clerks, and the Revised Statutes make provision for the first, second, third, and fourth class clerks at twelve, fourteen, sixteen, and eighteen hundred dollars. Now these are in fact fourth-class clerks, the designation being changed.

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, but there is no statute prescribing this particular character of service.

Mr. HATCH. Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania allow the committee to have a direct vote upon the amendment?

Mr. RANDALL. No.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, here is a class of experienced professional men who are surgeons and physicians, and some of them specialists, men of the very highest ability and learning that can be found in their professions, who have been induced to take these positions, and have been kept here on the ridiculously small salary of $1,800, when you pay hundreds and hundreds of men that amount for mere clerical work, and in many cases for work requiring but little mental capacity. There is no fairness or equity in it; and there is no reason in the world that I can see why the judgment of the committee should not be taken upon the proposition. Simply to say that they are clerks of the fourth class is no reason for keeping their salaries down to $1,800. Let the committee vote upon it, and express its judgment in that way.

Mr. RANDALL. The original plan designated these fourth-class clerks for a certain duty; then subsequently they came in and asked a change in their title. That change was granted. Now the salary is proposed to be increased in consequence of their being transferred from fourth-class clerks to medical examiners.

That always follows as a matter of course. I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. HATCH. Permit me a moment. I know that there are gentlemen who are now occupying those positions who are worth a great deal more to the Government than $1,800 a year. Competent persons employed for this service can effect a great saving to the Government. It is really a matter of economy; and it is an absolute shame to keep them on such a salary.

Mr. MATSON. Mr. Chairman, the point has been made, I understand, by the gentleman from Missouri, as well as by my colleague, that there is a discrimination between the pay of these officials. In other words the two are paid at the rate of $2,000 a year, and eighteen are paid $1,800 a year. But there is a reason for that, as I understand the arrangement. The two who are paid $2,000 a year are required by law to be experts in their profession, and they are. One of them is an expert in diseases of the mind, as I remember a branch of that profession, which requires, of course, peculiar knowledge and great ability and skill. The other, I believe, is an expert in diseases of the eye.

Mr. RANDALL. An oculist.

Mr. MATSON. Which requires more than ordinary knowledge of surgery and medicine in that particular branch of the profession. For that reason the discrimination is made.

As to whether $1,800 a year is enough pay for that service, I do not propose to question or combat; but I only allude to the question of discrimination to show that the two who receive the additional pay are fully entitled to it.

Mr. HATCH. I do not question that they are entitled to additional pay. What I do claim is that there is not sufficient compensation for the others, if there is for them. I do not think there is. I know that they are efficient surgeons.

Now, the business of these men is to examine the records which come in from all parts of the country. They have to be skilled in their profession, and yet they are receiving but $1,800 a year. I do not know anything like it in the country.

Mr. RANDALL. Let us have a decision on the question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, I have had occasion recently to investigate to a certain extent the matter now pending before this committee. As the result of that investigation our committee are satisfied that the medical officers in the Pension Department were not only not paid enough for their services, but that there was not a sufficiently large number of them to do the work promptly, efficiently, and properly. Therefore that committee reported to the House a bill, which is now pending on the Calendar, recommending that the number of qualified surgeons be increased to three, and that their salaries should be increased from $2,000 to $2,500; also, that an additional force be added to the number of medical examiners and increasing their salary to $2,000.

We did this, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, after a very careful investigation, being satisfied that the work performed by them was of a better and higher order than could be done by any eighteen-hundred-dollar clerk under this Government. I hope the gentleman from Pennsylvania, though I admire the sturdiness with which he has stood by the report of his committee and defends the Treasury, will allow the increase of the salaries named here to be made, even if he will not suffer the number of examiners to be increased, as was asked for by the Commissioner of Pensions, whom I interviewed upon the subject quite recently.

Mr. RANDALL. I believe the Chair has sustained the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It did.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. ATKINSON. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend lines 16 and 17 of the pending paragraph by striking out "$3,600" and inserting "$3,600;" so that it will read: "One medical referee, $3,600."

Mr. ATKINSON rose.

Mr. RANDALL. The point of order is reserved.

Mr. ATKINSON. I do not think the amendment is subject to the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. Let the Chair cause the amendment to be read.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. RANDALL. That is an increase of salary. It adds $600 to the salary fixed by law.

Mr. ATKINSON. I take it that it is competent for this House to fix the salary of an officer at any figure it sees proper to fix it. The rule to which the gentleman from Pennsylvania refers, Rule XXI, provides that—

No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill or be in order as an amendment thereto for any expenditure not previously authorized by law.

But this sum is not appropriated in the appropriation bill. There is no salary fixed by law for this officer, but the salary which he receives has been fixed annually in the appropriation bills, and it was raised within my recollection—perhaps not more than three years ago—from $2,500 to $3,600 per annum; and if there be no law fixing this salary, and it is entirely dependent upon the pleasure of Congress as enacted in the appropriation bills, I take it that this point of order should not be sustained and that the House should vote upon the amendment which I propose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. LIND. I ask unanimous consent to recur to the portion of the bill covering the appropriations for the General Land Office.

Mr. RANDALL. We have passed from that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to return to that portion of the bill.

Mr. RANDALL. I object.

Mr. LIND. I move to strike out the last word of the pending paragraph for the purpose of explaining why I desire to return to the previous portion of the bill. If I am allowed to make a statement, I will say that this is a matter of urgency. At the time that that section was considered I was out asking for information from the General Land Office.

At the last session Congress passed an act directing and requiring the Commissioner of the General Land Office to proceed to the adjustment of railroad grants. In our State there are over half a million acres of land involved in these grants that have been erroneously certified to railroad companies; and there is only one clerk detailed for that work. He has not been at his desk for two weeks. The Commissioner of the General Land Office makes an estimate of $200,000 for that service. Perhaps that is too much. Possibly it is not more than is required. But not one cent of that estimate is allowed by the committee.

Over a year ago I presented an application on behalf of the settlers in my district who are now being proceeded against in ejectment suits by the railroad companies, asking the Government to intervene and order suits to be brought in its behalf as required by the act of Congress; yet nothing has been done. At my own expense I had some of the cases briefed to save work at the General Land Office, but yet final action has not been taken, though more than a year has elapsed. There is not a clerk to put to the work.

I submit it is not right nor proper for Congress to pass legislation of the character it did pass a year ago, and then make it nugatory by a refusal to pass an appropriation for carrying it out. When the Commissioner of the General Land Office makes an estimate for an item of $200,000 there must be some reason for it, and I think it merits a little consideration at the hands of this House.

In connection with this I may refer to the fact that it takes four and a half years to have a contest in regard to a piece of public land determined. The General Land Office is two years behind with its work on contests, and the Secretary of the Interior is eighteen months behind. Therefore when a poor settler living on a prairie claim in Dakota has a contest it takes four and a half years to find whether he or the contestant is to prevail. Last year business accumulated in the office to the number of 20,000 cases. The Commissioner of the General Land Office asked for twenty examiners. The committee allowed ten. These things are a crying evil, and the House can not afford to ignore in this way the just complaints of the people.

Mr. RANDALL. I am glad the gentleman from Minnesota has had the opportunity to state his case, but I prefer not to go back. The subject was fully discussed when that clause was under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania refuses to withdraw his objection to go back.

The Clerk read the following paragraph, under the heading "Pension Office:"

For an additional force of one hundred and fifty special examiners for one year, at a salary of $1,400 each, $210,000; and no person so appointed shall be employed in the State from which he is appointed; and any of those now employed in the Pension Office or as special examiners may be reappointed if they be found to be qualified.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 85, line 15, strike out "$2,250," and insert "$2,500;" so that it will read, "chief clerk, $2,500."

Mr. FORNEY. We have passed from that.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I understood the Chair to rule that any member desiring to offer an amendment should wait until the Clerk finished reading the section.

Mr. RANDALL. But we have passed from that paragraph.

Mr. DOCKERY. I know that the gentleman was waiting until what he considered the proper time to offer his amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks the gentleman from Tennessee should be recognized.

Mr FORNEY. I make the point of order against the gentleman's amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WASHINGTON. In support of that amendment which I have offered I wish to call attention to the fact that the salary of the chief clerk of the Pension Office was fixed in the Revised Statutes (page 7440) as far back as 1870, at $2,000. Since that time it has been increased to as much as $2,500. During the Forty-seventh and Forty-eighth Congresses, for four years, $2,500 was the pay of this chief clerk; but in the Forty-ninth Congress, first session, it was reduced to $2,250, at which sum it has stood for two years past, and my amendment simply intends to restore the salary to $2,500.

Mr. Chairman, if there is a chief clerk in any Department who deserves larger pay than this, it is the chief clerk of the Pension Office, who has under him 1,554 regular employés, more than three times as many as are under the chief clerk of any other Department, and whose duties and responsibilities have been increasing with the business of the Pension Bureau year by year. I am not seeking to delay the committee by making unnecessary remarks upon this subject, but I wish to emphasize the fact that here is a public servant who deserves more pay than he is receiving, because of the amount of work that he has to perform, the number of visitors he has to receive, the number of letters he has to answer, and the number of employés he has to supervise. When we find the chief clerk of the War Department, with only 89 employés under him, getting a salary of $2,500; the chief clerk of the Navy Department, with only 78 employés, getting a salary of $2,500; the chief clerk of the Interior Department (who is also superintendent of the building, getting a salary of $2,750; the chief clerk of the Geological Survey, with only 31 employés, getting a salary of $2,400, surely it stands to reason that the chief clerk of the Pension Office, who has 1,554 employés under him, must be worth more to the Government than $2,250.

Of course, under the rules of the House there is no opportunity to have a vote upon this proposition, but I again insist upon the point that if the Committee on Appropriations, in its secret sessions, has a right to raise or to lower these salaries, the Committee of the Whole ought certainly to have the same right. This committee, and this House, ought not to be shackled or gagged by any rule so as to prevent that. I withdraw the formal amendment, and shall append to my remarks a table showing the salaries of the chief clerks in the several bureaus and the number of employés under each, which will give some idea of the responsibility and the amount of work devolving upon each of these officials.

Department.	Salary of chief clerk.	Number of employés.
War Department	$2,700	89
Navy Department	2,500	78
Post-Office Department	2,500	17
First Assistant Postmaster-General	2,000	82
Second Assistant Postmaster-General	2,000	99
Third Assistant Postmaster-General	2,000	87
Agricultural Department	2,500	*107
Interior Department, chief clerk and superintendent of building	2,750	.....
General Land Office	2,250	377
Patent Office	2,250	372
Bureau of Education	1,800	27
Bureau of Labor	2,000	42
Geological Survey	2,400	31
Bureau of Pensions	2,250	*1,554

*Regular employés.

You will also observe that in the Interior Department in the largest bureau outside of the Pension Bureau (the Patent Office), there are but five hundred and seventy-two employés, and the chief clerk receives $2,250, and so on through the list.

Especial attention is invited to the bureaus in the Navy and War Departments regarding the number of employés in each of said bureaus.

Bureaus.	Salary of chief clerks.	Number of employés.
WAR DEPARTMENT.		
Adjutant-General's Office	$2,000	584
Bureau of Military Justice	1,800	11
Quartermaster-General's Office	2,000	138
Commissary-General's Office	2,000	38
Surgeon-General's Office	2,000	427
Paymaster-General's Office	2,000	47
Ordnance Office	2,000	36
Engineer's Office	2,000	17
NAVY DEPARTMENT.		
Bureau of Yards and Docks	1,800	9
Bureau of Equipment and Recruiting	1,800	12
Bureau of Navigation	1,800	10
Bureau of Ordnance	1,800	7
Bureau of Construction and Repair	1,800	10
Bureau of Steam-Engineering	1,800	9
Bureau of Provisions and Clothing	1,800	14
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	1,800	9

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, in order that I may ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether the force named in the bill at the foot of page 86 is in addition to the examiners who are now at work.

Mr. FORNEY. No, sir. The appropriation is to continue that force.

Mr. PARKER. Then I move to amend by striking out, in line 25, "one hundred and fifty" and inserting "two hundred;" so that it will read: "for an additional force of two hundred special examiners," etc.

Mr. Chairman, I make this motion for the reason that it is a well-known cause of complaint all over the country that cases are referred to special examiners and are delayed month after month, and in some instances, I believe, years, without report. That is a great wrong and injustice, for which there is no excuse, and it ought to be remedied.

Mr. OWEN. Let me ask the gentleman if it is not the ordinary rule that a special examiner does not make his report to the Pension Office for two years?

Mr. PARKER. I believe the gentleman's suggestion is correct.

Mr. OWEN. That is my experience.

Mr. PARKER. It is well known throughout the country, throughout the districts in the extreme North at least, that these examiners can not be found for months and months after parties have been notified that their cases have been referred to special examiners.

The inquiry is made of a member of Congress to ascertain what the trouble is—why the case is not heard. The member inquires at the Pension Department and the information is given that the case has been referred to a special examiner, who in due time will make his appearance and hear the case, and the delay continues. Thus men who periled their lives for the country, who with their families, are suffering for what they earned years ago in the great struggle, are debarred from having their cases heard and from receiving justice because of this delay or incapacity in the service of the special examiners.

I wish to suggest another thing. Study of the work of this department as now controlled by its present head has satisfied some men pretty thoroughly that it is the practice, if not the deliberate purpose, to examine and pass upon petty claims of 75 cents, $1.50, $2, and $4 per month, while the larger demands, the more important cases, which would take more money from the Treasury, are sent off over the country to special examiners and are thus delayed in their hearing and final action. This has become a vicious practice, known throughout the country to exist and charged upon the department. It is due to gentlemen who represent this Administration that an end should be put to this wrong.

Mr. PERKINS. Is not that the practice in every case which carries arrears?

Mr. PARKER. We understand—and in answer to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PERKINS] I emphasize it—that in very many instances, so many that the matter has attracted public attention, cases where the claimant, if a pension were granted, would be entitled under the law to arrears, have been sent to special examiners and are thus delayed, the applicants being thus robbed of their rights; and this is done with a regularity and repetition not creditable to the Administration.

Mr. MATSON. Mr. Chairman, the complaint made by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER] in regard to the administration of the Pension Office in reference to special examiners, is not, I think, well founded. That there is delay, and more delay, in that branch of the service than in others, I do not deny; nor could anything else be expected, because when a case is sent out to be specially examined it must, in nearly every instance, go into the hands of more than one examiner—in many cases into the hands of many examiners. There is delay in sending these claims back and forth to the different examiners. But I apprehend these claims are now being examined more rapidly in that branch of the service than they ever were before.

There is no need for this increase in the number of special examiners, because the Commissioner of Pensions under the general law has the right to detail as special examiners any number of clerks that he may think proper—there is no limit upon his authority in this respect—and clerks thus detailed are entitled to per diem compensation. The more numerous the cases that are sent out for special examination the less need there is for clerks in the office, and, as I have said, the Commissioner has the right under the law to send clerks from the office into the field for the purpose of making special examinations.

The committee, as I understand, has given the Commissioner all that he asks in this line, and I apprehend that the matters in regard to which the gentlemen on the other side, and perhaps all of us, to some extent, have heard complaints, can be readily excused when the circumstances are taken into consideration.

Sometimes, as the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER] himself has said, these claims involve large amounts of money. Now, if any claims are delayed, it would be most natural that this delay should attend claims of large amount. A fair and prudent Commissioner of Pensions would look carefully into a claim involving a large amount of money; and there should be no complaint of that. If an applicant presents a claim for a large sum he should not complain if he is asked to satisfy rigid requirements in the way of proof. It is not surprising that in cases involving large sums of money there should occur delay which does not occur in cases which are readily adjudicated in the office.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, it happens not merely in some cases, but in all cases sent to special examiners, that there is a delay of not less than two years. As the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MATSON] has said, when a case is sent to a special examiner to be completed, it is sent to not only one special examiner, but to as many special examiners as there are witnesses in different parts of the country. If there are a dozen witnesses in a case and these all reside in different parts of the country, then the case must go through the hands of a dozen special examiners before it is finally adjudicated by the Pension Department.

Another thing. For some reason—I will not undertake to say why—the number of cases referred to the special examination division has been largely increased. It may be because they are old cases, or because they are cases which draw arrears. Whatever the reason, we do know—those of us who have anything to do with the Pension Department—that the number of cases sent to the special examination division has very largely increased within the last year. If with the old force the work has been from one to three years behind, then certainly there is a crying demand for an increase of force. Hence the strong reason for the adoption of the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

In my judgment, special examiners will not bring the work of the Pension Department up to the current time in a year from this even with two hundred special examiners and there should not be another case.

As I have said, there are parties interested in the speedy determination of these cases, either for or against them. They want them settled. Many want, in case the decision is against them, to appeal to Congress for special enactment, and they can not do it until their cases have been passed upon. It is nothing but justice the Department should be given sufficient force to bring up this work so the complaint may not be continued to be made against them. It is a complaint injurious to the force in the Pension Office. It is to some extent unjust, but you can not do away with the complaint unless you bring the work up, and the only way to do that is by providing a sufficient force for that purpose.

Mr. CANNON. I will move a *pro forma* amendment for the purpose of saying a word.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MATSON] said that under the law there are in this Pension Office fifteen hundred clerks, any of whom may be detailed by the Commissioner to do the work of special examination.

There is one thing more to be said. In the Forty-seventh Congress we increased the force in the Pension Office over eight hundred under an estimate and under an assurance that in three years the work would be brought up to current business. Six years have passed since that time. And when the present Commissioner of Pensions was before the Committee on Appropriations a year ago he said that at the end of this year he would bring up the work so there would be nothing left but current business, and he would be prepared to recommend a decrease of one hundred and fifty clerks on this bill. Yet no decrease has been recommended.

Under this state of affairs, Mr. Chairman, let me say one other thing. The employés in the Pension Office and in kindred offices for the adjudication of pension claims cost between three and four millions of dollars annually. Do gentlemen take into account that at $100 a year how many pensioners one-half of this amount, $2,000,000, would pay. One-half of this force costs what would place upon the pension-roll 20,000 additional pensioners at $100 a year.

I am not up to make any political speech or to abuse anybody; but I am dealing with facts, and desire to say that, in my opinion, this immense force to adjudicate pension claims, partly from the want of proper legislation and partly from a desire to continue under pay from the Government, is rapidly becoming a force of employés which unneces-

sarily eats up a large amount annually that ought to be given to the soldiers of the late war. [Applause.]

So, when the proposition comes to increase this force of special examiners, with the fact that under the law referred to by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MATSON], the Commissioner can detail clerks for this special-examination work, I must say it does not meet with my approval.

I believe we would find a remedy, and if I had the power I would place every disabled Union soldier who was honorably discharged on the pension-roll at not less than $8 a month. [Applause on the Republican side.] That is the true remedy, and by passing such a law you would get rid of the vast number of men who merely march up the hill and down again throughout the country as employés of the Pension Office. [Renewed applause.]

By unanimous consent the *pro forma* amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, in further answer to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MATSON] and his statement that the Commissioner of Pensions has the power to detail clerks to do this work of special examination, I wish to say that that power has not been exercised, while the injury has been going on, and we are still without any remedy.

Mr. MATSON. Let me state, Mr. Chairman, that there are now about four hundred special examiners in the field, detailed clerks and others.

Mr. PARKER. How many?

Mr. MATSON. About four hundred.

Mr. PARKER. Four hundred detailed clerks?

Mr. MATSON. No, altogether.

Mr. PARKER. And we still find that relief does not come. The members of this House have a strong argument in their experience against the claim that there is an excess of clerks in this bureau. Under the familiar and pleasant rule of the former Commissioner of Pensions, Colonel Dudley, it was customary when a member of Congress went into the Pension Office for that Commissioner or one of his deputies to detail a clerk to examine the case called up with the member.

The points were readily gained and the skill and familiarity with the case of the person having it in charge was given for the benefit of the time of the member of Congress making the application and for the benfit of the pensioner. Now, however, we find all that condition of things changed. Every one who has recently gone to the third deputy's office, and who has asked for information in regard to a case, will agree that he does not receive the same attention there from the clerks of the division as formerly; but the case is sent up by a mere messenger, and one man in the room has to serve many members of Congress and others who come in on such business; and there is a peculiar and singular caution displayed as to the work that is being done, and as to the exhibition of the papers produced. A similar method obtains to some extent elsewhere.

The deputy commissioners are courteous and obliging, but the methods have been changed.

I understand the rule is absolute that the examiners having charge of a case in the divisions are not permitted to present the case to the member of Congress who wants information, but such information must come through other avenues. Therefore I have inferred that this low rating of the value of the time and convenience of members of Congress, and consequent action upon it, must be because there is such a pressure of work upon the clerks in the office, and that they have been so busy with the work there that they could not be detailed upon this special service.

One thing further, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say in the same line of expression as that used by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who has just taken his seat. I, too, believe that the true method of settling these questions is to pass a bill that shall give a per diem, and a liberal per diem, pension to every soldier who served in the war for any considerable period, or who was in any general engagement, or who suffered in a rebel prison. Let the money that is now being paid out to the clerks while they are making numberless inquiries and seeking testimony in strange places, and meantime withholding pensions and keeping back their payment, be paid out to the pensioners themselves, direct. Let the pensioners have the money and send the clerks about other business, and reduce the force in the bureau. By this short cut the people will do justice by the old soldiers and put an end to these unkind and unjust delays.

Mr. CONGER. I desire to make a *pro forma* amendment for the purpose of asking a question.

I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions this question: About how long does a case lie in the hands of a special examiner in your district before the attention of the claimant is called to it for examination?

Mr. MATSON. I do not know that I can answer the question specifically as to the exact time. I know, as far as my own experience in that district is concerned, that there has been commendable promptness in such cases.

And right here I just want to say, in response to what the gentleman from Kansas says, that these cases go into the hands of the special examiner and are held there for two years, that he is entirely mistaken.

Mr. CONGER. I asked the gentleman for the purpose of knowing how long these papers were allowed to lie in the hands of a special examiner, for the reason that my own experience has been that a considerable length of time has been so occupied.

Mr. MATSON. I suppose if he has other claims which have priority, or some special reason which prevents him from taking prompt action on a case when it is put in his hands, there may be some delay, and that circumstances may arise where cases would be allowed to lie over for some time. I do not know of any.

Mr. CONGER. I speak from experience in my own district where I have three cases that have come to my own knowledge within the last few weeks, in which the papers have been sent to the special examiners and have lain in their hands for a period of eighteen months before they have proceeded to make any sort of an examination in reference to them. Now it is possible that this may be peculiar to the State of Iowa for some reason—I do not say that it is political. But my friend from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] tells me that he has no complaint in his State. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MATSON] says that they are working the business up very closely in his State. So that I assume there must be some peculiar reason which we are unable to understand why in the States of Iowa and Kansas and Nebraska and other States of that particular persuasion there should be this neglect.

Mr. DINGLEY. Since the gentleman has referred to that, let me say to him that in my State there has been considerable complaint of delay. Papers have lain in the hands of special examiners for a year at a time.

Mr. CONGER. I do not complain of the failure to make a report in these cases, but of the failure to make an examination at all. I have three letters written to me from different parties within the last eighteen months reciting exactly the same thing, or that their cases were sent to the special examiner in the city of Des Moines, Iowa, on such a date—the first eighteen months ago; the next letter, referred to the same date, being written later, and yet no action was taken.

Now, I desire to correct the chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions in the statement just made by him in regard to the number of examiners in the field. I hold in my hand a letter written by the Commissioner of Pensions in which he says that but two hundred and seventy men are engaged in special examinations in that office and tells me where they are distributed, and from my knowledge of the location of a large majority of the soldiers in this country I am satisfied that the larger proportion of these men have been sent to such States as Indiana, Missouri, and to other States where——

Mr. PETERS. They can do political work. [Laughter.]

Mr. CONGER. Where they can do, if necessary, political work.

Mr. PETERS. What is the letter?

Mr. CONGER. I shall not read the letter, but ask to have it printed in the RECORD in this connection.

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

[Dictated.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, BUREAU OF PENSIONS.
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER,
Washington, D. C., April 20, 1888.

MY DEAR SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 14th instant, in which you request to be informed of the number of special examiners employed in this bureau and where the same are stationed, and in reply permit me to state that at this time there are two hundred and seventy men engaged upon such duty, distributed in the following manner:

In the western district, which comprises the States of Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, Colorado, Nevada, California, Oregon, and all the Territories except Dakota, New Mexico, and Indian, there are forty-six examiners.

In the Potomac district, which comprises that portion of Pennsylvania west of the Susquehanna River, the southern half of Ohio, that portion of Maryland west of the Chesapeake Bay, the District of Columbia, the States of Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, and that portion of Florida east of the Apalachicola River, there are fifty-three examiners.

In the Indiana district, which comprises the northern part of Ohio, the States of Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and the Territory of Dakota, and a portion of the work to be performed in Canada, there are sixty-seven examiners.

In the Missouri district, which comprises the States of Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, that portion of the State of Florida west of the Apalachicola River, Texas, Arkansas, Missouri, the Territory of New Mexico, and the Indian Territory, there are forty-two examiners.

In the Hudson district, which comprises that portion of Pennsylvania east of the Susquehanna River, that portion of the State of Maryland east of the Chesapeake Bay, the States of Delaware, New Jersey, New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Vermont, Maine, and a portion of the work performed in Canada, there are sixty-two examiners.

Hoping this will prove satisfactory, I am, very truly, yours,

JOHN C. BLACK, *Commissioner.*

Hon. E. H. CONGER, *House of Representatives.*

Mr. DOCKERY. I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of replying to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CONGER], who has been pleased to mention my name in connection with the question now under consideration.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of appropriating every dollar that is necessary to furnish a sufficient force not only in the department of special examinations, but also in all other departments of the Pension Bureau, so as to secure the speedy examination of pending claims. The Commissioner of Pensions ought to be the best judge of the force requisite, and I am quite willing to accept the judgment of the present efficient officer in charge of that great department.

Referring especially to the delay claimed to exist by the gentleman from New York, and emphasized by the remarks of the gentleman from Iowa, I desire to say that so far as I am advised there has been no complaint of that nature in the section of Missouri from which I come. I do not know how it is or why it is, but the examiners in my district are hold-over Republicans——

A MEMBER. That is the reason there is no complaint.

Mr. DOCKERY. But unfortunately for the gentleman from Iowa, if that be the reason, it controverts his statement wherein he asserted that the examiners sent to Indiana, Missouri, and other States were sent there to do political work.

But, Mr. Chairman, referring again to the alleged delay in the examination of pension cases, permit me to qualify my statement of a few moments since, for there was complaint perhaps for three months or more of last year. The examiner at that time was a "hold-over" official from the last administration, and the complaint had its origin in the illness of that very excellent gentleman, who was suffering from the effects of a bullet which had furrowed its way across his forehead. This battle-scarred veteran therefore, because of his injuries, was unable to do efficient work for the time stated, and, so far as I remember, this has been the only delay of which complaint might properly be made.

I do not think that the statement of the gentleman from Iowa, alleging political work by this class of officials, is warranted by anything that has ever come to my knowledge in Missouri. Sir, in my opinion, all questions relating to the proper care of disabled soldiers, their widows and orphans, are non-partisan, and should be so regarded.

And therefore it is I regret that our Republican friends so frequently indulge in partisan observations in the discussion of all matters relating to pensions.

Mr. Chairman, as I have stated, both of these special examiners in my section of Missouri are Republicans; but they have not engaged in political labors, neither do I believe that any Democrat on that force has been so employed. If any Democrat has neglected the interests of the soldiers by engaging in partisan labors he ought to be discharged, and I have full faith that such action will be taken whenever the fact is brought to the attention of the Commissioner.

Mr. DINGLEY. I wish to say in reference to the subject under consideration that I find in the State of Maine, which I have the honor in part to represent, that all of the cases that have been referred to the special examiners are on an average one year behind. When within a month or two I have called up cases that have been referred to special examiners eight months ago the response has come from the Pension Office that the cases will be considered by the examiners when they are reached in regular order, and in many cases where the reports have been made by special examiners they have been rereferred to examiners in other parts of the country and subjected to another delay of six or eight months—in some cases a year.

I do not know what is the reason of this; whether or not there are not sufficient officials to examine these cases more promptly than is indicated by what has occurred in my own State. But it seems to me to be the duty of the House to increase the number. If the difficulty has arisen from other causes it ought to be made known and the remedy applied.

The soldiers of this country deserving pensions ought not to be kept out of them month after month and year after year. I think it is the duty of this committee at this point to apply a remedy to these difficulties which I have suggested.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana, rose.

Mr. FORNEY. If we are to get through with this bill there ought to be some limit put upon this debate. I ask unanimous consent that debate on the pending paragraph be limited to five minutes.

Objection was made.

Mr. FORNEY. Then I ask unanimous consent that it be limited to ten minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. I wish to say a word on this pension business. As regards the provisions of this bill, as I have been in the House but a short time, I do not know all the features of it; but I am satisfied there is nothing to object to in the number of clerks in the Pension Department or the expenses in connection therewith. But I do certainly have objection to the way in which soldiers and their widows are kept out of their pensions.

As regards many of the soldiers in my own district, I have had the same experience as the gentleman from Iowa. I know of cases where there is a delay in their being settled of from eighteen months to two years after the cases had been placed in the hands of special examiners. I have in my mind one case especially, a soldier named Colonel Humphrey. He died over eighteen months ago. His widow applied for a pension. He had carried a bullet in his shoulder for fourteen years. It was finally extracted; but he afterwards met with an accident, breaking his limb, and his blood became poisoned, no doubt from his carrying that bullet so long. Mortification took place and he died. The case was referred to the medical examiners. The physicians of the town testified to the fact that the wound was the cause of his death, he having carried that bullet in the shoulder for so great a length of time. Yet the application of his poor widow, needing aid so much from the Government, was denied her.

Now, what sort of a way was that to treat a colonel of the Army or his widow, who needed the little pension that was due her? The case was sent to the special examiners in the field. They have had it in hand, and up to this time there is no report in her favor. I presume there will be by and by, but it is not a very pleasant thing for her to be kept waiting from month to month, depending, perhaps, upon the aid of friends and neighbors. I mention this as only one case illustrative of this pension business; and, Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that these evils will be remedied until we adopt a general pension law which will apply to every soldier, no matter what may have been the length of his service; a law like the Mexican pension bill. I was very glad when that was passed. The Congress which passed it deserved credit, and they deserved, also, credit for passing another pension law for the benefit of the Union soldiers. If that bill had been signed by the President, as the Mexican pension bill was, I am satisfied that we would have had less of this trouble about pension legislation; and until such a measure is passed we shall always have these difficulties. No matter how many examiners we appoint or how many clerks we employ, the same troubles will exist.

I know of a man who applied for a pension and his application was pending four years. Finally it was allowed, and he received a pension. He was a man who was physically disabled and in destitute circumstances. I met him and asked him, "Charley, did you get your pension?" "Yes," he said, "I got it." "How much is it?" I asked. He said it was $2 a month. He had had to pay his attorney $10 for getting the pension, so it took five months of his pension to pay the attorney's fee. Now, everybody knows that if a man is not worth more than $2 a month he is not worth anything. What we want is a general bill like that introduced by my colleague, Mr. HOVEY. If we do not pass that, then I hope the per diem bill will pass. Either one will be in the direction of justice to the soldiers, and, I am confident, will be acceptable to the people all over the land. If the arrears-of-pension bill were passed that would be of great help; but, in my judgment, a general pension law is the only effectual means of relieving the ex-soldiers of the Union and solving the pension problem.

Mr. ATKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is our duty to provide all practicable means for the speedy adjudication of pension cases. I do not complain, sir, of the present management of the Pension Office. I believe that it is conducted in an efficient way, and that the work that is done in the office is satisfactory. But, with the view of securing the earliest possible adjudication of pension claims, I believe we should increase the number of special examiners. It has been said by the gentleman from Indiana that many of the clerks may be detailed for special examiner work, but if that is done the efficiency of the office will be impaired just to that extent. On the other hand, if we increase the number of special examiners, the office force can remain as it is, and the cases can be disposed of with much greater rapidity.

I find upon reference to the annual report of the Commissioner of Pensions that only 19.2 per cent. of the applications for invalid pensions filed in 1886 have been allowed; that only 29 per cent. of the applications filed in 1885 have been allowed; that but 31 per cent. of the applications for original invalid pensions filed in 1884 have been allowed. An examination of this table discloses this fact: that the average allowances upon applications for original invalid pensions exceed 50 per cent., rising in one year as high as 88 per cent. of the applications filed during that year.

I take it, then, that amongst the applications filed in 1885, 1886, and 1887, and in the preceding years, there are a great number of claims that are entitled to allowance. Why should their admission be delayed? The answer will be that the cases are not yet made up; that they are not fully proved, and that therefore they can not be allowed; but my experience has been that the most effectual way of securing the proof of a pension claim is to put it into the hands of an intelligent special examiner, and let him go out amongst the witnesses and collect the testimony for himself.

It is an infinitely better way of proving up pension claims than relying upon *ex parte* affidavits, which may be drawn by any one at any cross-roads store. Many of the gentlemen who draw pension affidavits, whilst they mean very well indeed, do not succeed in bringing out the important and material facts that are within the knowledge of the witnesses, and within my own experience I have encountered many pension claims that could have been rendered complete by the testimony of witnesses whose statements were already filed, but whose testimony was inconclusive, because it had not been properly taken.

I believe that an increase in the number of special examiners will facilitate and hasten the allowance of these claims. Is it not, then, our duty to make this increase? I was struck by a remark once made in my hearing by a gentleman connected with a board of pension-examining surgeons. He said it seemed that the pension claims which were longest in securing an allowance were those of illiterate persons, and that intelligent people understand their rights and are generally able to prove their claims promptly, whilst the less intelligent do not always appreciate their rights under the pension laws, or are not so able to secure the testimony of their witnesses. Although this may not be generally true, it is obvious that the aid of a skillful pension examiner is of great value to a claimant for a pension——

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto is now, by unanimous consent, closed. The *pro forma* amendments will be considered as withdrawn. The question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER], which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 25 strike out "one hundred and fifty" and insert "two hundred."

The question being taken, there were—ayes 51, noes 68.

Mr. ATKINSON. No quorum.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. PARKER and Mr. FORNEY were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 31, noes 70.

Mr. ATKINSON. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For per diem in lieu of subsistence for one hundred and fifty additional special examiners above provided for, while traveling on duty, at a rate to be fixed by the Secretary of the Interior, not exceeding $3 per day, and for actual and necessary expenses for transportation, $190,000.

Mr. FORNEY. I am directed by the committee to offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "for," in line 8, page 87, insert, "and five special examiners or clerks detailed and acting as supervising examiners."

Mr. FARQUHAR. I hope the gentleman from Alabama will explain that amendment.

Mr. CANNON. What is the object of the amendment?

Mr. FORNEY. The object is to allow to five supervising examiners a per diem. The committee, after referring the matter to the Commissioner of Pensions and obtaining his approval of it, thought it right to recommend this amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I wish the gentleman would explain who these special examiners are, where they are on duty, what their present pay is, and how much additional this amendment will give them.

Mr. FORNEY. I think they are on duty here a portion of the time. They have charge of the five divisions of the country recognized by the Pension Department. I can not define what those divisions are.

Mr. CANNON. What is the pay of these officers now?

Mr. FORNEY. It ranges from $1,400 to $1,600.

Mr. CANNON. How much will this amendment add to their salary?

Mr. FORNEY. Three dollars a day—I suppose about $1,000 a year.

Mr. CANNON. Then the increase for each officer is about $1,000 annually?

Mr. FORNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. And they would draw this $1,600 extra whether on duty in the field or not?

Mr. FORNEY. Yes; but they are supposed to be in the field most of the time. This amendment puts them on an equal footing in this respect with their subordinates.

Mr. CANNON. Now that I understand the effect of the amendment I make a point of order upon it. I will state the point.

The law provides for clerks of classes 1, 2, 3, and 4. The officers named in this amendment are five special examiners—supervising examiners. Officers thus designated are not found in the law. Nowhere, so far as I know, does the statute speak of five supervising examiners. The truth is, as I understand, that five men who are clerks of class 3 or 4—probably class 4—and who receive salaries of $1,600 or $1,800 a year, are on duty in the city of Washington; they do not travel, but occupy a similar position to that of the head of a division, if you choose. This is a proposition to pay each one of these five men $3 a day—nominally for subsistence while they are away from home in the field, but really to add a thousand dollars a year to their salary.

It may be proper policy to pay these men more than $1,600 or $1,800 a year, but I want to know just how much more. If they ought to receive $2,000 a year, let us give it; if they ought to receive $2,200 a year, the same as the highest order of chiefs of division, let us give it. If they ought to receive $2,500 a year, let us give it; but let us know what we are giving. Therefore I make a point of order upon the amendment.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The gentleman's point is that there is no existing law authorizing this additional pay.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. I will state that if the gentleman from Alabama thinks these men, in view of the duties which they perform, are equivalent to heads of division, and will move to give them an annual salary of $2,200, I will not make a point of order upon the proposition.

Mr. FORNEY. I can not move that, because it would be a change of the law.

Mr. CANNON. This is a change of the law.

Mr. FORNEY. I will state that under the administration of Mr. Dudley as Commissioner there were twenty-one of these officers, but the present Commissioner reduced the number to five. Their office is really here, but they have to go backward and forward; and this amendment simply puts them on an equal footing in respect to per diem with men who are under them. It is nothing but fair that they should have their per diem.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. What does the gentleman say as to the amendment being in conformity with existing law?

Mr. FORNEY. The law authorizes special examiners.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. But it does not authorize this increase of their pay in this indirect way.

Mr. FORNEY. This is no indirect way. The amendment simply gives these men $3 a day for traveling expenses.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. While they remain here.

Mr. CANNON. I do not want any confusion about this matter. As I understand the law, these employés of the Government, whenever they go into the field to make examination, get $3 a day for subsistence without the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

They are now paid at the rate of $3 a day for every day, although every day is spent by them in their office, and that is an increase of over $1,000 a year.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. The duties of those men are in reference to some outlying State or Territory where they have to go to make these investigations.

Mr. CANNON. Not at all, sir; their position is in the Pension Office, pure and simple, the same as any other clerk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the addition is not designed for traveling expenses, but is in the nature of an increase of salary, these clerks receiving a dollar each day during the year, which is a change of law, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman thinks these men ought to have the same pay that other clerks or chiefs of divisions have who discharge similar duties, I have no objection.

Mr. KERR. I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

United States Patent Office: For compensation of the Commissioner of the Patent Office, $5,000; for assistant commissioner, $3,000; for chief clerk, $2,250; one law clerk, at $2,000; three examiners-in-chief, at $3,000 each; examiner of interferences, $2,500; thirty principal examiners, at $2,400 each; thirty-two first assistant examiners, at $1,800 each; thirty-six second assistant examiners, at $1,600 each; forty-one third assistant examiners, at $1,400 each; fifty fourth assistant examiners, at $1,200 each; one financial clerk, $2,000, who shall give bonds in such amount as the Secretary of the Interior may determine; one librarian, $2,000; three chiefs of division, at $2,000 each; three assistant chiefs of division, at $1,800 each; three clerks of class 4, one of whom shall act as application clerk; one machinist, $1,600; five clerks of class 3, one of whom shall be translator of languages; twelve clerks of class 2; fifty clerks of class 1; one skilled laborer, $1,200; three skilled draughtsmen, at $1,200 each; four draughtsmen, at $1,000 each; one messenger and property clerk, $1,000; twenty-five permanent clerks, at $1,000 each; five model attendants, at $1,000 each; ten model attendants, at $800 each; sixty copyists, five of whom may be copyists of drawings; four copyists, at $720 dollars each; ninety-two skilled laborers, at $720 each; forty-five laborers, at $600 each; forty laborers, at $480 each; fifteen messenger-boys, at $360 each; in all, $658,070.

For purchase of books, and expenses of transporting publications of patents issued by the Patent Office to foreign governments, $3,000.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I rise to another point of order. Page 87, lines 16 and 17, appropriates for chief clerk $2,250. The Revised Statutes fixes this salary, and I will say very properly, at $2,500 a year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I move to insert "$2,500," which is the amount provided in the law. He will get that or go without.

Mr. RANDALL. I move to insert "$2,250."

Mr. BUCHANAN. I object. We will see whether the law rules in this matter or the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman had $2,250 stricken out, and when I proposed to insert it again he said he should get $2,500 or go without, which seems to be inconsistent.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am responsible for my action and do not mean to be lectured when I propose to carry out the law.

Mr. RANDALL. It seems to me to be inconsistent because the gentleman can not get $2,500 he shall leave the office without any salary at all.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In lines 20 and 21, $2,400 each is the salary fixed for thirty principal examiners. The Revised Statutes gives them, and very properly, $2,500 each.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I move to fill the blank by inserting "$2,500."

The amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. RANDALL. I move to insert "$2,400."

Mr. BUCHANAN. I make the point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. Another case of inconsistency.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Another case of infraction of law by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

For photolithographing or otherwise producing plates for the Official Gazette, $44,000.

For photolithographing or otherwise producing copies of drawings of the weekly issues of patents, for producing copies of designs, trade-marks, and pending applications, and for the reproduction of exhausted copies; said photolithographing or otherwise producing plates and copies referred to in this and the preceding paragraph to be done under the supervision of the Commissioner of Patents and in the city of Washington, if it can there be done at reasonable rates; and the Commissioner of Patents, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, shall be authorized to make contracts therefor, $90,000.

For investigating the question of the public use or sale of inventions for two

years or more prior to filing applications for patents, and for expenses attending defense of suits instituted against the Commissioner of Patents, $500.

Bureau of Education: For the Commissioner of Education, $3,000; collector and compiler of statistics, $2,400; chief clerk, $1,800; two clerks of class 4; one statistician, $1,800; two clerks of class 3; one translator, $1,600; four clerks of class 2; six clerks of class 1; two clerks, at $1,000 each; seven copyists; one skilled laborer, $840; two copyists, at $800 each; one copyist, $720; one assistant messenger; two laborers; two laborers, at $480 each; one laborer, at $400; and one laborer, at $360; in all, $45,429.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 90, line 9, strike out "two," where it occurs near the end of the line; lines 10 and 11, strike out "one laborer at $400, and one laborer at $360;" and insert in line 9 "four" instead of "two."

Change footing to suit.

Mr. FORNEY. I make the point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have nothing to say in addition to what I have already said, except that in a preceding section the committee themselves have fixed the salary of messenger boys at $370, which is the sum proposed to be paid these laborers.

The CHAIRMAN declared the amendment to be disagreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I demand a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 44, noes 63.

So the amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. MATSON. I wish to make a point of order on this section against the words "chief clerk, $1,800." The permanent law fixes this salary at $2,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. MATSON. I move to insert "$2,000," and in support of that amendment I wish to say this is the only chief clerk who gets less than $2,000. Of course the chief clerk of the Bureau of Education has to be a well-educated man, and should receive the salary of $2,000 provided by the permanent law. If he were not the only one of that class whose salary has been reduced below $2,000 I would not ask for this amendment.

Mr. FORNEY. The chief clerks of the bureaus in the Navy Department get only $1,800.

Mr. MATSON. But they are not fixed by law at $2,000.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I ask the attention of the gentleman from Indiana for a moment, to state to him that I have a list here of some seven or eight chief clerks who get less than $2,000.

Mr. MATSON. But not by the statute law.

Mr. WASHINGTON. They get it on the appropriation bill of last year, which fixes the status of the salary for this House, according to the rulings of the Chair.

Mr. MATSON. That may be; but the amount I state is what the statute fixes for the office.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I hold in my hand a list of nine who are getting but $1,800.

Mr. McMILLIN. And the gentleman from Alabama has just stated that those in the Navy Department get but $1,800.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. The Chair has already ruled that the current bill fixes the salary; hence this is obnoxious to the point of order.

Mr. MATSON. I ask a vote on the amendment.

Mr. RANDALL. I do not think it is well to make the increase.

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Has the Chair ruled upon the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled upon it, and the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask unanimous consent now to insert $1,800.

Mr. CHEADLE. I object.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of buildings for the Interior Department, namely: For the Geological Survey, $10,000; for store-room for documents, $360; and for rent of buildings until not later than December 1, 1888, for the following offices: For the Bureau of Education, $1,667; Indian Office, $2,292; Bureau of Labor, $1,000; Railroad and General Land Office, $750; in all, $16,067.

Mr. FORNEY. I move to amend after line 13, by inserting the words "for rent of stables, not exceeding $600."

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

For surveyor-general of the Territory of Dakota, $2,000; and for the clerks in his office, $7,000; in all, $9,000.

Mr. GIFFORD. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 13, page 95, strike out "seven" and insert "nine,"

Mr. GIFFORD. The effect of the amendment will be to appropriate the amount fixed by the estimate.

Mr. FORNEY. What is the gentleman's statement?

Mr. GIFFORD. That it will raise the amount of the appropriation to the estimate made by the Department.

Mr. RANDALL. It is an increase over last year already.

Mr. FORNEY. Yes; we have increased the clerks there from three to seven, and the committee thought that was enough.

Mr. GIFFORD. If that be the case, then I should not insist upon the amendment.

Mr. FORNEY. That has been done.

Mr. GIFFORD. Then I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. SMITH, of Arizona. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend in line 21, page 94, by striking out "three thousand" and inserting "four thousand six hundred" in lieu thereof; also strike out the words "five thousand five," in same page and line, and insert "seven thousand one" in lieu thereof.

Mr. RANDALL. We have already passed that provision and I object to going back. I have no objection to the gentleman stating the purpose of the amendment.

Mr. SMITH, of Arizona. I would like to test the sense of the House on the amendment, because I think it is absolutely necessary.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania insist upon the point of order?

Mr. RANDALL. I do, because we will never get through with the bill if we go back in this way.

Mr. SMITH, of Arizona. Can a point of order be sustained when one can not hear the Clerk read the bill, owing to the confusion in the Hall? I was endeavoring to follow the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can only rule upon the point of order as made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and not on the situation.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of office for the surveyor-general, fuel, books, stationery, pay of messenger, and other incidental expenses, $1,500.

For surveyor-general of Minnesota, $1,800; and for the clerks in his office, $2,000; in all, $3,800.

Mr. LIND. I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of requesting the Clerk to read a communication received from the Commissioner of the General Land Office. I will state, Mr. Chairman, that this communication came to me within the past five minutes, in response to an inquiry I addressed to the Commissioner as to the condition of business in that office. I now ask the Clerk to read the communication.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT INTERIOR, *Washington, D. C., May 29, 1888.*

HON. JOHN LIND:

The present force in contest division, and public land division, C, is barely able to keep present arrears from increasing. It would require eighteen months in each of these divisions, with present force, to dispose of present accumulation, if no other cases came in. Recorder's division not more than two months behind. In pre-emption division 91,000 cases pending; with present force will dispose of about 15,000 per year.

The estimated number of cases received during this year, 50,000—a yearly increase of 800 per cent. since 1880. It will require five years to dispose of the accumulation, if no other cases should be received.

S. M. STOCKSLAGER,
Commissioner.

Mr. LIND. Now, Mr. Chairman, I renew my request to the committee——

Mr. RANDALL. And I repeat my objection.

Mr. LIND. I believe I am entitled to five minutes under the rule.

Mr. RANDALL. Is there any question before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman moved a *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. LIND. I did move to strike out.

I now repeat my request to the committee made a short time since, and state that it is not fair to the West, nor is it fair to this country, to cut down the estimate made by the Commissioner of the General Land Office to the amount of $200,000 and refuse his request of one hundred additional clerks when that office has now more work on hand than it can do in five years and business increasing at the rate of 800 per cent. per annum. It is unfair to the West. It is outrageous if it is anything.

Mr. Chairman, no one can deny the fact that this is without excuse. The poor devil living on a homestead claim in Dakota, if his claim is contested, will have to wait from four to five years before it can be ascertained whether he can hold his land or not. I repeat, it is outrageous. Is that a state of affairs that ought to prevail in a civilized community?

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; but in a Democratic Congress.

Mr. RANDALL. I object to going back.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman withdraw his amendment?

Mr. LIND. I do.

The Clerk read the following paragraph:

For surveyor-general of the Territory of Idaho, $2,500; and for the clerks in his office, $1,500; in all, $4,000.

Mr. DUBOIS. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend line 10, page 96, by striking out "one thousand five hundred" and inserting "three thousand;" and amend line 11 by striking out "one thousand five hundred" and inserting "three thousand."

Mr. FORNEY. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask that the amendment be again read.

The amendment was again read

Mr. FORNEY. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. DUBOIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer these amendments for the following reasons: There are only 10,350,554 acres of surveyed land in the Territory of Idaho out of 55,000,000 acres. There are hundreds and hundreds of ranchers living upon unsurveyed lands in the Territory,

who are besieging the Department daily for additional surveys. I am led to believe that the Appropriations Committee will make an appropriation in the sundry civil bill for this purpose. The appropriation will avail nothing unless there is sufficient force in the surveyor-general's office to work up the field-notes. This is a simple act of justice which I ask for in behalf of my growing Territory.

Mr. FORNEY. This, as regards the first amendment, is the same amount as was given in the bill last year, and no deficiency has been reported. As regards the second amendment, I will state that the amount which we give, $1,500, is all the Department has asked.

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment of Mr. DUBOIS, there were—ayes 49, noes 59.

So (further count not being called for) the amendment was not agreed to.

The Clerk read the following paragraph:

For surveyor-general of the Territory of Montana, $2,500; and for the clerks in his office, $6,000; in all, $8,500.

Mr. TOOLE. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend in line 22, page 96, by striking out "six thousand" and inserting "eight thousand" in lieu thereof, and by striking out the words "eight thousand five," in same line and same page, and inserting "ten thousand five" in lieu thereof.

Mr. TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is in keeping with the estimate of the Secretary of the Interior. If $8,000 was necessary when he made his estimate at the beginning of the session, it is much more so now. Since that a bill has passed Congress and become a law by which 17,500,000 acres of land, embraced within the Blackfoot-Indian reservation, have been thrown open to settlement under the homestead and desert-land law. Not one foot of this land has been surveyed. A railroad—the St. Paul, Minneapolis and Manitoba road—runs through this reservation for over 200 miles. On each side of that road and all over the ceded lands homesteaders have made and are making settlements. This question of clerk-hire is fundamental, and without an adequate force the amount hereafter to be appropriated in the sundry civil bill for the survey of public lands is not important. The force in the surveyor-general's office for the last year was wholy inadequate. The work of the office is a year behind. The result of this was that the money set aside for surveys in Montana last year was covered back into the Treasury. The reason was this: Contractors for doing the public surveys the year preceding took their contracts at the prices fixed by law upon the implied understanding that when the contracts were executed they would get their money. Their field-notes were required to be worked up in the surveyor-general's office and then transmitted to the General Land Office for examination and approval. Their pay was delayed over a year.

With this condition of affairs existing no applications for contracts were made the last year, and as before said, and for these reasons, no contracts were let, and the money intended for Montana was of no benefit to us. Unless this appropriation is increased we will experience the same thing again. I appeal to the gentlemen in charge of this bill to yield to this request. The settlement of lines and establishment of permanent boundaries in localities where settlements are made and are rapidly being made is of the greatest importance, and a failure to do so is sometimes freighted with the most serious consequences. Legal controversies arise out of it, personal encounters are not infrequent, and sometimes heavy costs and expenses are thereby entailed upon communities that are not able to bear them.

Mr. RANDALL. The Committee on Appropriations recommend an increase of $3,000 over last year, and we considered after reflection and inquiry that that was sufficient.

The amendment was disagreed to.

The Clerk read the following paragraph:

For surveyor-general of Oregon, $1,800; and for the clerks in his office, $3,000; in all, $4,800.

Mr. HERMANN. I desire to make a point of order as to the salary of the surveyor-general in this paragraph. The regular salary by the existing law in the Statutes at Large is $2,500. The appropriation for the Forty-eighth Congress, second session, as appears from the statutes of that year, 1883-'85, volume 23, gives the surveyor-general of Oregon $2,500, while this allowance is $1,800. Therefore I make the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. The statute fixes it at $2,500.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be compelled to rule as he has done in other cases and sustain the point of order.

Mr. HERMANN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I desire to submit an amendment, to fill the blank with $2,500.

Mr. RANDALL. I hope that amendment will not prevail. It will make the salary of that surveyor-general higher than the salary of any other.

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I desire the attention of the committee and of the Committee on Appropriations for a few minutes on this point. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] has just said that this amendment will make the salary of the surveyor-general of Oregon larger than that of any other. By referring to the present bill he will find that he is mistaken. For instance, he will find that the surveyor-general of the Territory of Idaho receives $2,500, that the surveyor-general of the Territory of Montana receives $2,500, and that several other surveyors-general of Territories receive $2,500, which is the maximum provided in the same law which allows $2,500 to the surveyor-general of Oregon.

Permit me to state further—and here again I ask the kind ear of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations—that this is not one of those cases where the salary has been continued at this figure for ten or twelve years. Every Republican surveyor-general of Oregon has received a salary of $2,500. The present officer was one of the first appointments under this Administration, and almost immediately after his appointment this decrease was made. When he accepted his appointment he accepted it in view of the general statute which provided a salary of $2,500. At the last Congress I offered an amendment to the pending clause in the then appropriation bill, but it was objected to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] on the ground that the surveyor-general of Oregon would have less business than usual, because the committee had failed to make an appropriation for the extension of surveys, although there are remaining in that great State at least 20,000,000 of acres yet to be surveyed. But, Mr. Chairman, that condition of things has been changed. Under the act of February 8, 1887, it is provided that allotments shall be made in the Indian reservations, and the Indians on three or four of those large reservations have signified their desire to have allotments made of their lands, and the Committee on Indian Affairs have submitted in their appropriation bill a clause which provides the sum of $100,000 for surveys and resurveys. It reads:

For surveys and resurveys under the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 8, 1887, to be repaid proportionately out of the proceeds of the sales of such lands as may be acquired from the Indians under the provisions of said act, $75,000; in all $100,000.

In the recommendations for these surveys are embraced three large Indian reservations in the State of Oregon, comprising an area far exceeding that of Connecticut. That will impose upon the surveyor-general of Oregon an immense amount of labor, and yet, in view of this labor, the small sum of $1,800 is to be continued in this bill as the salary of the surveyor-general. Now, I ask the Committee on Appropriations, and I particularly appeal to the chairman of that committee, whether it is not a gross injustice to a faithful officer, who is there to administer the law, and who does administer it——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HERMANN. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this State in whose behalf I am speaking is as large as New York and Pennsylvania combined. There are over 20,000,000 acres of her lands yet to be surveyed. The great incoming tide of immigration is covering the country, and the people are demanding a survey and a proper segregation of the public lands in order that they may settle upon them and obtain titles. You may remember, Mr. Chairman, that only a short time ago the Secretary of the Interior transmitted a communication, accompanied by petitions from all the land officers in that State, embracing five land districts, asking for an increased extension of the public surveys. That, I apprehend, will be received in a proper manner by the Committee on Appropriations, who will make a suitable appropriation for that purpose. That will again increase the duties of this office. So that I ask you gentlemen on both sides of the Chamber, every one of you, whether you will permit this officer, with these increased labors, to go on in the discharge of his duties upon the salary of $1,800, in the face of the law which, when he accepted the appointment under this Administration, provided a salary of $2,500. Is it right or just? Besides, he is required to keep his office in a city where the expense of living is necessarily high. Would any gentleman on either side of this House accept the responsibilities imposed upon this officer with the salary to which you propose to limit him? Mr. Chairman, I believe not. Therefore I appeal to both sides of the House to increase this appropriation, and to increase it in accordance with statutory law which was in force when he accepted the position.

I claim that this is an exceptional instance, the like of which has not been before presented to the House. In the name of justice and right, and upon the principles of ordinary business, I appeal to you to increase this appropriation. I would rather that this bill should not carry the appropriation of one dollar for this officer, so that we may go into the Senate and see whether we can not obtain there what the law justly gives him, than to have him cut down to the insignificant sum of $1,800—a sum which under all the circumstances he should not be asked to receive. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, the salary of this officer was cut down by the Senate. For two years the salary has been fixed at $1,800. To change it now would increase the salary of this officer over that of corresponding officers in Florida, Louisiana, and other States. None of these salaries are up to the general statute law. The gentleman's proposition is to increase this salary $700. I do not think this the proper season to make increases. Therefore I oppose the amendment.

Mr. HERMANN. The Secretary of the Interior, in the estimate which he submitted to the Committee on Appropriations, expressly asks that $2,500 be allowed as the salary of the surveyor-general of Oregon.

Mr. RANDALL. He makes a similar request as to all of these officers. We have not followed his recommendation in that respect.

Mr. HERMANN. Then I say that under the peculiar circumstances

which I have presented, and which the report of the Commissioner of the General Land Office confirms, this should be made an exceptional instance. This officer should have his salary increased in view of the increased labors and responsibilities now imposed upon him by an act passed by Congress at the present session.

Mr. RANDALL. As the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HERMANN] has appealed especially to this side in a party point of view, I only want to say that I do not know anything about such appeals as that; but if I did, I have more respect for the party than I have for any individual Democrat, and I do not want to see our party here increasing salaries.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, this is an "old, old story" to me. Our Democratic friends have the administration, and if they deliberately want to cut down this salary I presume they are the best judges in the matter. I think that a great many men now in office and drawing salaries (judging from what their party friends say about them, and in some instances from what I know about them myself) do not half earn the salaries that they get. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is to be commended for the position he takes in this matter; and certainly I shall not agonize to give these office-holders more salary than their Democratic friends think they are entitled to.

A remark has been made about increasing this salary in the Senate. While I am not a member of the Senate, I hope that these salaries will not be increased at the other end of the Capitol. You gentlemen here are the best judges of what these officers, your party friends, ought to be paid.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. HERMANN, there were—ayes 42, noes 63.

Mr. HERMANN. No quorum.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. HERMANN and Mr. FORNEY were appointed.

Mr. HERMANN. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask unanimous consent that this salary be fixed at $1,800.

Mr. HERMANN. I object to that. Let us give this man what is fair and right, or let us give him nothing.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For surveyor-general of the Territory of Wyoming, $2,500; and for the clerks in his office, $3,000; in all, $5,500.

Mr. CAREY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 17, page 98, strike out "$3,000" and insert "$5,000." In same line, strike out "5" and insert "7."

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is for the purpose of increasing the amount allowed for clerk-hire in the office of the surveyor-general of Wyoming from $3,000 to $5,000. I can not understand why any appropriations should be made for the offices of surveyors-general unless sufficient appropriations are also made for clerk-hire and for public surveys. I venture to make the statement, which I believe within the bounds of truth, that this Government during the last three years has expended in this manner a quarter of a million dollars, for which it has received no return whatever. It keeps up year after year the offices of surveyors-general, which are costing for salaries and incidental expenses more than $100,000 annually, while very little money is being expended for the survey of the public lands. I believe it high time that all of these offices were abolished, unless Congress shall make proper appropriation for the surveys of the public lands, and shall compel the Commissioner of the General Land Office to make contracts and cause surveys to be made, as demanded by the people.

I venture to assert that in every one of the Territories the surveyor-general for the last three years has had absolutely nothing to do. He has filled his office and employed one or two clerks in order to conform to the law, paid office rent and drew his salary. He has not been authorized to make contracts where the interests of the people have demanded that the surveys be extended.

Where Congress made small appropriations for the public surveys, Mr. Sparks, lately in charge of the General Land Office, on the theory bred in one of his hallucinations that he could suspend a law of Congress, failed to do his duty and cause contracts to be made within these appropriations. I offered the amendment believing it the smallest amount that should be appropriated for clerk-hire in the office of the surveyor-general of Wyoming if any work is to be done through that office during the next fiscal year. I sincerely hope at least a small amount will be placed in the sundry civil bill for the continuance of the public surveys in that Territory, so that this work may go on from year to year until all the lands are surveyed. To meet the needs of a growing country new surveys are demanded each year.

It is not the time to refuse these appropriations, or to deny to the people of all the Territories the amounts absolutely necessary for the public lands. If there have been imperfect surveys, as is believed by the General Land Office, then let them be retraced, let the money be expended in retracing the lines and making the necessary office corrections. I believe the people are entitled to the surveys, and that it is unsound policy either for the Democratic or Republican side of the House to refuse to comply with their wishes in regard to this important branch of the public service.

Mr. RANDALL. The amount that was appropriated for the current year is only $50,000. That amount will probably be given for the coming year for the surveys of the public lands. At least I do not know that it will be increased for the coming fiscal year. But I will say to the gentleman that we have increased for this Territory of Wyoming $1,500 in this bill, which we consider adequate.

Mr. CAREY. I move to strike out the last word.

I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for I failed to catch exactly what he said, to state again the amount that would probably be appropriated for the next fiscal year for the surveys of the public lands?

Mr. RANDALL. As far as I am able to judge, I do not think it will be increased over last year's appropriation of $50,000, if I remember correctly.

Mr. CAREY. Does the gentleman know what the estimates were?

Mr. RANDALL. The estimates, I am advised, are $300,000.

Mr. CAREY. Now, I will ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations what consistency there is in keeping alive the offices of surveyors-general and paying clerk-hire simply for the purpose of expending $50,000 a year?

Mr. RANDALL. I am inclined to the opinion that there is no propriety in keeping alive these offices of surveyors-general.

Mr. CAREY. Then I only want to say in reply to that that these appropriations have not been sufficient to meet the actual requirements of the public service and the demands of the Western people for an extension of the system of public-land surveys. A few years ago the Appropriation Committee did not deny adequate appropriations.

The Commissioner of the General Land Office has made his estimates, I believe, amounting to about $300,000. The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations says that the appropriation for the coming year will probably be $50,000 for all the States and Territories.

I do not believe in abandoning the offices of the surveyors-general until the surveys are completed, but as a good business proposition I believe it would be wise to expend some money in public surveys if these offices are to be maintained during the next fiscal year.

Mr. RANDALL. I want to say that the number of acres of land already surveyed and not disposed of in the various States and Territories is absolutely enormous; and if I remember correctly as to the gentleman's own Territory, there is a very large amount of surveyed lands not disposed of.

Mr. CAREY. And I wish to state in response that my Territory, though it is young, with a population of a hundred thousand people, has contributed to the overburdened Treasury of the United States over a million of dollars for public land, for which her people have only the receipts of the land offices, of which the Government itself has so destroyed the credit that not one cent can be borrowed on them.

Mr. RANDALL. Will the gentleman state how many acres there are in that Territory which have been surveyed and undisposed of? I do not now remember the exact number of acres.

Mr. CAREY. I can not state the exact number now from memory. It is a large number.

Mr. RANDALL. I will furnish it to the gentleman, as I have the statement here somewhere.

Mr. CAREY. But I know that I have received letter after letter asking me on behalf of my people to have these surveys extended where they have not been extended. There are many millions of acres not surveyed, and the people are settling upon them.

Mr. RANDALL. The committee will observe that this increases by $1,500 this appropriation over last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will treat the *pro forma* amendment of the gentleman from Wyoming as having been withdrawn, and the question recurs on the amendment submitted by him.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANDALL. I move that the committee now rise, and will state that my object is to ask the House to extend the time of adjournment beyond 5 o'clock, in order that we may be able to dispose of this bill during this session, and thus avoid an evening session.

Mr. PAYSON. Will the gentleman allow an inquiry? Is it the purpose of those having the bill in charge to move an adjournment over to-morrow if this bill passes?

Mr. MILLS. That is my purpose, as soon as the committee rises, to get the floor and make that motion.

Mr. PAYSON. Then I hope that there will be no objection to the suggestion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Could it not be done by unanimous consent?

Mr. RANDALL. No; it has to be done in the House. I want to get the extension so as to avoid coming back here to-night.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCCREARY having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. BLOUNT reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved bills of the following titles:

An act (H. R. 1640) changing the name of the port of Lamberton, in the District of Burlington, N. J., to the port of Trenton in said district;

An act (H. R. 9711) making an appropriation to enable the several Executive Departments of the Government and the Bureau of Agriculture, and the Smithsonian Institution, including the National Museum and Commission of Fish and Fisheries, to participate in the centennial exposition of the Ohio Valley, to be held at Cincinnati, Ohio, from July 4 to October 27, 1888;

An act (H. R. 2365) for the relief of William F. Thorne; and

An act (H. R. 484) for the relief of Thomas C. Dickey.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, informed the House that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 1948) to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark.; and

A bill (S. 2210) to revive the grade of General in the United States Army.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (S. 1286) granting a pension to Michael Lane;

A bill (S. 625) granting a pension to George W. Schell;

A bill (S. 760) granting a pension to Stephen C. Lobdell;

A bill (S. 1015) granting a pension to Margaret M. Collins;

A bill (S. 1554) to increase the appropriation for the erection of the public building at Sacramento, Cal.;

A bill (S. 2738) granting an increase of pension to John G. Merritt;

A bill (S. 1017) granting an increase of pension to Stephen C. Schiedel; and

A bill (S. 1083) for the erection of a public building at Tallahassee, Fla.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask unanimous consent that the hour of adjournment of the House to-day be extended beyond 5 o'clock, till the conclusion of this bill. My object is to avoid an evening session, if we can. The weather is very warm, and it would be unpleasant to come here at night.

A MEMBER. No other business to be taken up?

Mr. RANDALL. There will be no other business taken up.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT OVER.

Mr. MILLS. I move that when the House adjourns to-day it be to meet on Thursday next, to-morrow being Memorial Day.

The motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RANDALL. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Pending that I desire to submit a privileged report.

Mr. RANDALL. My motion is privileged.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. We can get through with this in one minute.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. RANDALL. I do not.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANDALL. I hope the gentleman will not interfere with the consideration of the pending bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is putting the question.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Can I not ask a question of the Speaker?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman can raise a question of order.

Mr. O'NIELL, of Missouri. It is a question of order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I was recognized by the Speaker, and submitted a privileged report. After that the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated he did not yield; but when he had finished his motion the Speaker then recognized me.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Missouri because he heard that gentleman address the Chair. He did not know whether he rose to a point of order or not. The Chair knew the gentleman was out of order unless the gentleman from Pennsylvania consented.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Then I will let the report lie there until we get through with this bill.

LEGISLATIVE, ETC., APPROPRIATION BILL.

The motion of Mr. RANDALL was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union (Mr. BLOUNT in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

The Clerk read the following paragraph:

Office of Assistant Attorney-General for the Post-Office Department: Law clerk, $2,500; one clerk of class 4; one clerk of class 3 (lease clerk); one clerk of class 2; in all, $7,300.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 1, page 99, strike out "one clerk" where those words first occur and insert "two clerks;" so that it will read "two clerks of class 4."

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I offer this amendment for the purpose of giving another clerk in this Department, who may act as a stenographer to the Assistant Attorney-General. We are assured by the information which has been received by the Post-Office Committee that this is very important to the Assistant Attorney-General for the Post-Office Department. The Committee on Appropriations, I suppose, thought this was not necessary. I do not know if they considered the point or not. I personally know that the Assistant Attorney-General for that Department is not able to discharge his duties without a clerk who can act as a stenographer. I do not believe the House will be disposed to refuse this reasonable request. An officer holding so important a position and having so much and such important work to do ought to have a stenographer. Most of the higher officers have, and I think all the chief officers who have a large amount of work to do ought to have stenographers in order that they may discharge their duties more rapidly and more satisfactorily to the people whom they serve.

When I have called on this Assistant Attorney-General—and I suppose other members of the Post-Office Committee have had the same experience, although I assume we would be more readily served than many other people—I say when I have called on him for opinions I have had to wait longer than I thought I ought to have waited. I am told that it results from the fact that there is not a sufficient force in the office to discharge its duties promptly, and that the difficulty will be remedied by giving the Assistant Attorney-General a stenographer.

Mr. FORNEY. In preparing this paragraph we followed the estimates submitted by the Department.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. One of the requests of that Department to the committee was that a stenographer be allowed for the office of the Assistant Attorney-General for the Post-Office Department. You will find that among the requests and recommendations of that office. I do not make this motion from captiousness, but because I am satisfied that this addition to the office is essential to its efficiency.

Mr. PETERS. I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if the Assistant Postmaster-General is not required to report upon all claims by postmasters against the Department for money stolen or lost?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. All losses of the Department and all questions where the construction of the law is involved are submitted to him. Many questions I have submitted myself, and I suppose every other member of the Post-Office Committee and many other members of the House have submitted legal questions to him—questions involving the law as applicable to the various complications arising in reference to our great postal system.

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire to ask my colleague on the committee if the duties of this officer have not been materially increased by a law just passed in this Congress and approved by the President, authorizing the Department to adjust claims of postmasters arising from the loss of postal funds.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. There is no question about that, and I am satisfied that the committee have overlooked the request for this stenographer, or else they would have made provision for him in the bill. I would much prefer to have unanimous consent to make the bill provide directly for a stenographer; but if that can not be done I would like to have an increase of the number of fourth-class clerks, one of whom should discharge the duties of a stenographer.

Mr. RANDALL. We have the original estimate and the supplemental estimate, and this proposed increase does not appear in either.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. The Post-Office Department sent to us a statement of the request.

Mr. RANDALL. But it does not appear in either the original or the supplemental estimate, so far as I can ascertain.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Well, I know that this officer is very anxious to have the provision made, and so is the Postmaster-General, and know his services are necessary. I was at the Department this morning, and they assured me of the importance of it and seemed to have an idea that the committee had considered it and by mistake or otherwise

had refused it. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I now, on my own responsibility, ask this committee to provide for this stenographer in one shape or another.

Mr. DOCKERY. Has any point of order been made against it?

Mr. MONTGOMERY. No; as drawn the amendment is not subject to the point of order. I would much prefer to ask unanimous consent that this stenographer be allowed, if I did not know it would meet objection.

Mr. FORNEY. I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact that in this very paragraph we allow for one clerk of class 3, who shall act as a stenographer and telegraph operator.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. That is for the Postmaster-General.

Mr. FORNEY. No; for the First Assistant Postmaster-General.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Well, the First Assistant's office and this office are entirely separate, so that the same stenographer could not possibly serve both.

The question was taken on the amendment; and it was agreed to—ayes 54, noes 31.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Chairman, before passing from this paragraph, I would like to have added a provision that this clerk be authorized to act as stenographer.

Mr. McMILLIN. Let the amendment be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Two clerks of class 4, one of whom shall be a stenographer.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, let us be exactly fair about this. A clerk of class 4 is appointed through the Civil Service Commission; a stenographer, I believe, is not. As to a clerk of class 4 who acts as a stenographer, I do not know whether he is appointed in that way or not.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I am trying to provide that he shall be required to take the civil-service examination as a stenographer.

Mr. PETERS. They usually do that. They are required to pass an examination particularly as stenographers.

Mr. CANNON. I make the point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not see but that it is competent for the committee to provide a stenographer, or to provide a clerk to discharge the duties of a stenographer, for any Department. We are continually providing appointees for the Departments for various purposes. The point of order is overruled.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For First Assistant Postmaster-General, $4,000; chief clerk, $2,000; chief of salary and allowance division, $2,200; chief of appointment division, $2,000; chief of bond division, $2,000; superintendent division post-office supplies, $2,000; superintendent of free delivery, $3,000; two clerks of class 4; twenty-two clerks of class 3; one clerk of class 3, to act as stenographer and Department telegraph operator; seven clerks of class 2; twenty-one clerks of class 1; nine clerks, at $1,600 each; two clerks at $900 each; five assistant messengers; seven laborers; in all $111,620.

Mr. FORNEY. I am directed by the committee to offer the amendment which I send to the desk, and to which I ask the attention of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. McCOMAS].

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 99, line 15, strike out "two hundred," and insert "four hundred." In line 16, after the word "thousand," insert "two hundred." In line 24, strike out "five," and insert "six." Page 100, line 2, strike out "$11,620," and insert "$12,640."

Mr. BUCHANAN. I make the point of order against that amendment that it names a figure above that in the last appropriation bill, and therefore changes existing law.

Mr. RANDALL. That is correct.

Mr. FORNEY. The point of the gentleman from New Jersey is made on the first and second amendments, not on the assistant messengers.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Not on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FORNEY. I ask that the amendment on which the point was not made be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 24, page 99, strike out "five," and insert "six."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LAWLER. I move to amend by inserting, after the word "thousand," in line 18, page 99, the words "five hundred;" so as to read:

Superintendent division post-office supplies, $2,500.

Mr. FORNEY. I make a point of order on that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his point.

Mr. FORNEY. The law does not authorize this increase.

Mr. LAWLER. I would like to ask the gentleman whether the law fixes this salary at the figure named in the bill. I know that it has been increased on one or two occasions.

Mr. FORNEY. The current law makes the salary $2,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Dead-letter office: For superintendent of dead-letter office, $2,250; one clerk of class 4, who shall be chief clerk; one clerk of class 4; three clerks of class 3; eleven clerks of class 2; twenty-four clerks of class 1, including eight female clerks; four clerks at $1,000 each; fifty-five clerks, at $900 each; six female clerks, at $720 each; one assistant messenger; two laborers; four female laborers, at $480 each; in all, $116,630.

Mr. DOCKERY. I desire to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill what salary the existing law provides for the superintendent of the dead-letter office.

Mr. PETERS. It is $2,500.

Mr. FORNEY. Yes, that is true; but $2,250, as named in the bill, is what has been appropriated for several years; and we do not see the propriety of changing it.

Mr. PETERS. Two thousand two hundred and fifty dollars was the amount appropriated for this salary prior to the office being made a separate bureau and while it was a branch of the office of the Third Assistant Postmaster-General. The office being now a separate bureau, I think the salary ought to be placed at what the law contemplates, $2,500.

Mr. FORNEY. I understand there is no amendment pending.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I make the point of order upon the amount named in the bill. The Postmaster-General in his report has recommended that $2,500, the salary fixed by law, be appropriated.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. The effect of this decision is to leave a blank for the amount.

Mr. PETERS. I move that $2,500 be inserted.

Mr. RANDALL. I hope that will be voted down.

The amendment of Mr. PETERS was not agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL. Now, I ask unanimous consent that $2,250 be inserted.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read:

The Clerk read as follows:

For office of disbursing clerk and superintendent of building: Disbursing clerk and superintendent, $2,100; one clerk of class 2, accountant; one clerk of class 1, storekeeper; one engineer, at $1,400; one assistant engineer, at $1,000; one fireman, who shall be a blacksmith, at $900; one fireman, who shall be a steam fitter, at $900; one conductor of elevator, $720; two firemen, at $720 each; one carpenter, at $1,200; one assistant carpenter, at $1,000; captain of the watch, at $1,000; nineteen watchmen; twenty laborers; one plumber, $900; one awning-maker, at $900; and fifteen charwomen; and for force in the additional building as follows: Four watchmen, three laborers, and three charwomen; in all, $52,120.

Mr. BURNES. I move a *pro forma* amendment for the purpose of making an inquiry of my colleague on the committee, the gentleman in charge of the bill. A very deserving gentleman who holds the position of awning-maker seems to be under the impression that some one has recommended an increase of his salary and that the amount in the bill is a reduction. I wish to ask my colleague whether any recommendation for an increase of this salary has been made, and whether there has been any reduction of the salary as paid for several years past?

Mr. FORNEY. The salary now is the same as it has been for several years, in fact ever since this man commenced making awnings for the Department.

Mr. BURNES. Is there any estimate for an increase of salary?

Mr. FORNEY. No, sir; there is not.

Mr. BURNES. That is all I desired to know. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 1, page 103, strike out "one" and insert "three;" so as to make the salary of the disbursing clerk and superintendent, $2,300.

Mr. CANNON. I thought I heard some gentleman make a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Does any gentleman make a point of order?

Mr. RANDALL. I think the statute fixes the salary at $2,300; but I hope the House will vote down the amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] concedes, my amendment is precisely in accordance with existing law; and this amount of salary ought to be given. This officer disburses over $800,000 a year. He is compelled to give bond to the amount of more than $4,000. Two thousand three hundred dollars is certainly a small enough salary for an office involving such work and responsibility.

Mr. KERR. Is not the amount named in the bill the salary which this officer has been receiving for a number of years?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do not care what he has been receiving. Our business is to legislate in accordance with existing law.

Mr. KERR. Is the gentleman anxious to have a Democratic appointee receive annually $200 more than his Republican predecessors received?

Mr. BUCHANAN. When the services of a Democratic appointee are worth $2,300 I am willing to give it.

Mr. KERR. And $200 more than the members of his own party are asking for him. Is that the gentleman's position?

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I have the sublimest admiration for a soul that can not rise above party in a matter of $200. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] The question is not whether this gentleman is a Republican or a Democrat, but whether the House will obey the law. The law gives him a salary of $2,300. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt, from the character of the service which this officer performs, and the amount of respon-

sibility resting upon him, that the sum which the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] has named in his amendment ought to be voted. But I obtained the floor particularly for the purpose of calling attention to an amendment which I offered, and which was ruled out on a point of order, increasing the salary of the disbursing clerk of the War Department. That officer disburses over $2,000,000 annually, and the salary allowed him in this bill is but $2,000. There is no law fixing that salary, and when the point of order was made against it, it was ruled out. I do not think it is fair, I do not think it is right, to impose upon those men such great responsibilities, and at the same time give them such meager salaries. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

The amendment was disagreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Office of the Solicitor of the Treasury: For compensation of the Solicitor of the Treasury, $4,500; assistant solicitor, $3,000; chief clerk, $2,000; three clerks of class 4; three clerks of class 3; four clerks of class 2; one assistant messenger; and one laborer; in all, $26,680.

Mr. BUCHANAN. In line 13 I make the point of order that the salary of the Solicitor of the Treasury is provided at $4,500, when, according to the Revised Statutes, it should be $4,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. FORNEY. I move to insert in the blank "$4,500."

Mr. BUCHANAN. The gentleman can not get unanimous consent to violate the law. I object.

Mr. HOLMAN. I understand the gentleman makes his point of order merely against the $500 increase over what is provided in the Revised Statutes. The bill provides $4,500 and the Revised Statutes make the salary $4,000. The gentleman makes his point of order against the $500, which I understand the Chair has sustained and ruled the $500 out.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I made my point of order against the $500 increase.

Mr. ROGERS. And that leaves $4,000.

Mr. HOLMAN. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so ruled.

The Clerk read as follows:

Court of Claims: For salaries of five judges of the Court of Claims, at $4,500 each; chief clerk, $3,000; one assistant clerk, $2,000; bailiff, $1,500; two clerks, at $1,200 each; and one messenger; in all, $32,240.

For stationery, books, fuel, and other miscellaneous expenses, $2,500.

For reporting the decisions of the court and superintending the printing of the twenty-third volume of the Reports of the Court of Claims, to be paid on the order of the court, $1,000; said sum to be paid to the reporter, notwithstanding section 1765 of the Revised Statutes, or section 3 of the act of June 20, 1874, chapter 328.

Mr. FORNEY. I have been directed by the Committee on Appropriations to move an increase from $2,500 to $3,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the pay of assistant messengers, firemen, watchmen, laborers, and charwomen provided for in this act, unless otherwise specially stated, shall be as follows: For assistant messengers, firemen, and watchmen, at the rate of $720 per annum each; for laborers, at the rate of $660 per annum each, and for charwomen, at the rate of $240 per annum each.

Mr. LAWLER. I move, in line 19, to strike out the words "unless otherwise stated."

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that on carefully looking over this bill I find there are some twenty or twenty-five laborers in reference to whom it is not mentioned what pay they are to get; but that is left to the heads of the Departments. By retaining these words in the bill it will only carry a few dollars in addition, and I believe it but just and right that these laborers should receive $2 a day all the way through.

Mr. FORNEY. This refers to some old women and boys, and the amount allowed of $340 or $360 is for the purpose of preventing them getting $660.

Mr. LAWLER. I wish to say, Mr. Chairman, that I have not in any way attempted to obstruct the passage of the bill in the hope that members would be willing to make a correction in reference to these matters when it was found to be necessary. I hope, therefore, they will allow these words to be stricken out, "unless otherwise specially ordered," so that all these laborers may receive a compensation of $2 a day. The trouble is these unfortunate laborers who receive per diem compensation are not allowed to come before the Committee on Appropriations and advocate their own claims.

Mr. RANDALL. Oh, yes, they are.

Mr. LAWLER. Well, I will say that you do not find them there advocating their claims.

Mr. RANDALL. The Committee on Appropriations hears everybody.

Mr. LAWLER. They would not be allowed to come to the Capitol by the Department officers for that purpose.

Mr. RANDALL. The committee never refuses anybody.

Mr. LAWLER. Now, my point is this. Men who get $1,800 and $3,000 a year are constantly besieging the halls of Congress to increase their compensation. When they ask me whether or not I would favor an increase of their salaries I tell them that I believe they now receive enough of compensation. But here are laborers who do not have the opportunity of importuning committees for an increase of their pay, and I ask on their behalf that these words shall be stricken out so that those to whom this limitation applies shall be included at $2 a day as well as the others. I do not demand an increase of compensation or salary for anybody, but I do ask, and I am sure there will be no objection to my request when it is properly understood, that these words shall be stricken out.

But I want to say that the matter involved is so small that on the ground of humanity, and I make the appeal on that score, these four words ought to be stricken out and allow these laborers to receive just the same as the other laborers in the employ of the United States Government in this city. If you gentlemen do not agree to strike that out then will your committee have any objection to this amendment, referring to the laborers wherever it occurs in the bill, and providing that their pay shall be in all cases equal to $2 a day?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RANDALL. I want to say in behalf of the Committee on Appropriations that we have listened more during this session in reference to matters in which labor was involved than ever before in my experience; and I do not know of anybody that has been kept away from us. The gentleman says that the superior officers over these laborers will not permit them to come. I do not know that to be the case. I do not think it is so. I have never heard of any such instance; though I do think if the superior officers in the various Departments of the Government would keep the clerks at home attending to their business, instead of rapping at the doors of the Appropriations Committee to increase salaries, it would be much more to the interest of the Government and far more agreeable to the members of that committee.

Mr. LEHLBACH. You say you have listened to more laborers during this session than ever before. Let me ask the gentleman if it did any good for them to have these hearings?

Mr. RANDALL. I will say that labor has been fairly and liberally treated by the committee. The estimates of the Departments have been taken into consideration in that regard, and liberality has been shown by the committee in treating the question.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I can not see it.

The CHAIRMAN. With a view of facilitating the consideration of the bill the Chair will ask if the gentleman insists upon the point of order, and if he does to be kind enough to inform the Chair exactly what the point is.

Mr. FORNEY. That it changes the amount carried by the bill, and is a change of existing law.

Mr. LAWLER. I will state, so as not to interfere with the passage of the bill, that I will withdraw that motion, and will offer an amendment to come in at the end of the section.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have an amendment which I desire to offer to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. That has precedence, and the Clerk will read the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 109, at the end of section 2, add: "And each charwoman shall be granted thirty days' leave of absence, with pay."

Mr. FORNEY. That is the law now.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Then it does not change existing law. It can do no harm to incorporate it here, for I will say that the law has not been enforced. It was absolutely violated last summer.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 16, noes 63.

So the amendment was rejected.

I now move the amendment I send to the desk to be added to section 2.

The Clerk read, as follows:

Add at the end of the section:

"*Provided*, That the pay of laborers wherever it occurs in the bill shall in all cases be equal to the rate of $2 per day."

Mr. FORNEY. I make the point of order upon that amendment. It changes existing law.

Mr. LAWLER. I would like to ask the gentleman this question: If that is the law, why do we find that your committee have reported less than $2 per day in this bill? If the law makes the pay $2 per day——

Mr. FORNEY. I did not say that.

Mr. LAWLER. What did you say?

Mr. FORNEY. I say that it changes existing law.

Mr. LAWLER. What law is changed?

Mr. CANNON. I think the point of order would be really that through the bill the different sections provide for the rates of compensation to be paid for the different classes of labor employed. These various sections have been considered and adopted. Now, then, if this amendment was to be considered, its effect would be to carry it back through all the various sections, and running through the entire bill, which have been passed over.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that possibly the effect of his amendment would not be beneficial to the laborers, for if he insists on the amendment it will militate against the laborer in some cases where the salary has been fixed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. LAWLER. I desire to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations a question. He raises the point of order against this amendment. Now, I ask, on what law point does he raise it?

My point is this; it may not be clear to the gentleman, but it is this: That he claims that this would work a change of existing law, as I understand him. He claims, however, that we are bound by the existing law. Now, if the pay of these laborers is fixed by any existing law, then what objection could there be in making an amendment fixing them all at the same rate? Why do you put some of them at $1.50 a day?

Mr. FORNEY. It changes the existing law and makes new law.

Mr. LAWLER. Then I will state to the gentleman that this bill itself, the framework of it from the Committee on Appropriations, makes provisions for the laborers needed at the rate I have fixed here, and if the amendment is out of order certainly some portions of the bill are out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will rule on the question of order.

Mr. LAWLER. I would want information from the committee on the point of order; and ask what objection there could be to incorporating that amendment? It would only apply to laborers that are not mentioned in the bill, and fixes the compensation that they are to get. How are we to know what is to be paid at all, whether it be 87 cents or a dollar and a shilling, or a dollar and a half a day, unless you fix the amount in the bill in some form?

Mr. RANDALL. Those who execute the law know.

Mr. LAWLER. If it is proposed to leave this to the discretion of the heads of Departments who recommend salaries of $4,000 and $5,000 for themselves and a dollar and a half a day to a man who has to support his family, then I say, as one member of this House, I am not willing to allow any such power to the head of a Department.

Mr. RANDALL. The head of a Department has no authority except what is in the law itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The discussion has been turning on the merits. The Chair will decide the point of order. Two grounds for raising the point of order upon this amendment have been stated. One has been stated by the gentleman from Alabama that the amendment changes existing law; the other by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] that it affects paragraphs which have already been passed. The Chair would prefer putting his ruling on the latter ground. The several paragraphs fixing the rates of compensation have been put to the committee and passed. The Chair rules the amendment out of order.

The Clerk read the third and last section of the bill, as follows:

SEC. 3. That all acts or parts of acts inconsistent or in conflict with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I raise the point of order against the whole of that section; and I do it on the ground that it changes existing law. In the first part of this bill certain moneys were appropriated in full compensation for the services of the officers. All through this bill are to be found appropriations less or greater than the amounts fixed by the Revised Statutes. Some were stricken out, but others remain. For instance, the salaries for the surveyors-general, fixed by the existing law, are different from the figures stated in the bill. But this section of the bill goes further and provides that all acts and parts of acts inconsistent with its provisions are repealed. The bill, therefore, is a repeal of those portions of the Revised Statutes which fixed these salaries, and therefore changes existing law and is obnoxious to the rule.

Mr. RANDALL. The same provision is in the present appropriation bill. It only fixes whatever the committee has agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It appears that the salaries of quite a number of officials have been entirely omitted from this bill, and if this became a law it would change the law which allows salaries. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. I move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCCREARY having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. BLOUNT reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9377) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments.

Mr. RANDALL. I move the previous question on the engrossment and third reading of the bill and the amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL moved to reconsider the vote just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL. There are some twenty salaries omitted by reason of points of order. I now, as in duty bound, ask that those blanks be filled by the amounts respectively recommended by the Committee on Appropriations and embraced in the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the blanks where salaries have been omitted be filled by the amounts recommended by the Committee on Appropriations. Is there objection?

Mr. GIFFORD. I object as regards Dakota Territory.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I object generally.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection is made.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I now ask unanimous consent that those blanks be filled by the amounts fixed in the Revised Statutes.

Mr. HOLMAN and Mr. RANDALL objected.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Shall the amendments be acted upon in gross or considered separately?

Mr. RANDALL. I ask for separate votes on the amendment relating to the Hydrographic Office, and also on the amendments as to the assay offices.

Mr. HOLMAN. I think the several amendments which increase the salaries above what was recommended in the bill had better be voted on separately.

Mr. RANDALL. It may be as well to take up the amendments *seriatim*.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 9, after the word "dollars," in the twentieth line, insert "messenger to the Speaker, $1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 11, strike out "two" and insert "four;" making it read "four conductors of the elevators," etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Also, in the twenty-first line, same page, after the word "each," an amendment making the elevator conductors under the supervision and direction of the Architect of the Capitol, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the only amendments that need be voted on separately are thus named by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and those that increase salaries. I suggest that all others be taken *nem. con.*

Mr. RANDALL. I do not know whether there is any amendment in the bill increasing salaries. I do not think there is, but my memory may be at fault in that particular.

Mr. HOLMAN. I do not myself recall to mind at this moment any increase of salaries above the amounts recommended by the committee, but I believe there are some. If in the memory of the gentleman having charge of this bill there are no increases of salary above the sums named in the bill, of course I do not ask a separate vote.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there is no objection, the amendments will be considered in gross, except those suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN].

Mr. HOLMAN. I would ask the gentleman in charge of the bill whether there are any amendments increasing salaries.

Mr. FORNEY. I do not remember any, but there may be.

Mr. SPRINGER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPRINGER. When this bill went to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union it had certain provisions in it with regard to certain salaries, that of the Fourth Auditor, for instance, and others. It comes back to the House with those stricken out. Now, the House is not informed whether they were stricken out on motion or by the decision of the Chairman of the committee; and if by the decision of the Chairman, they are still amendments which could have been corrected by an appeal to the committee, and the committee could have overruled the decision of the Chair. Therefore it occurs to me that these blanks, as they appear now, are amendments to the bill, and that if we refuse to concur in the amendments we thereby put back the sums that have been struck out.

Mr. RANDALL. That is a very interesting point, and I took occasion to confer with the Speaker *pro tempore* in regard to it awhile ago, but I was unable to conclude my conference with him, because at that moment I was called back to the floor.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is of the opinion that where a point of order was raised and a salary went out upon the point of order, that is not such an amendment as would be considered in the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is it not an amendment to the bill?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is not such an amendment as would be considered in the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. The bill went to the committee with certain sums fixed in it, and it comes back without anything at all in place of those sums.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understands that his view is in accordance with the uniform practice of the House.

Mr. MILLS. The Committee on Appropriations violated a rule of the House in putting the provision in the bill, and it has been stricken out. That is all.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is of opinion that where a provision was stricken out on the point of order, that is not such an amendment as would be considered in the House. The Chair understands that it is the desire of the House that the amendments shall be reported in gross, except those that have been objected to.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think a separate vote should be had on the increased appropriation for the Civil Service Commission.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] desires a separate vote on certain amendments.

Mr. RANDALL. Yes; on the amendment increasing the hydrographic appropriation.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Then, with the exception of the amendments referred to, the question will be upon the adoption of the amendments in gross.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to know what the exceptions are.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The amendment in relation to the Civil Service Commission and that in regard to the Hydrographic Office.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish also to make an exception of the paragraph in relation to the assay office in St. Louis.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The vote, then, will be on the remaining amendments.

The question was taken, and the remaining amendments were adopted.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will now report the first amendment on which a separate vote is asked.

The Clerk read as follows:

Under the head of "Civil Service Commission," page 20, strike out, in line 9, "one" and insert "two;" so as to read "two clerks of class 3."

In line 10 strike out "one" and insert "two;" so as to read "two clerks of class 2;" also strike out "one" and insert "two;" so as to read "two clerks at $1,000 each."

In line 16 strike out "4" and insert "5," so as to read, "For necessary traveling expenses, including those of examiners acting under the direction of the commission, $5,000."

The question being taken on the amendment, there were—ayes 37, noes 60.

Mr. KEAN, Mr. TRACEY, and others. No quorum.

Mr. RANDALL. If the point of "no quorum" is insisted upon, I shall be compelled to move that the House adjourn, as I do not want to incommode members by a call of the House.

Several MEMBERS. That is right; let us vote in a full House.

Mr. RANDALL. I know there is no quorum present; and if the point is insisted upon——

Mr. TRACEY. I shall insist upon it.

Mr. RANDALL. As the gentleman from New York [Mr. TRACEY] insists upon the point, I move that the House adjourn.

Mr. GROSVENOR. To what time does the gentleman propose to adjourn?

Mr. RANDALL. It has already been ordered, on motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS], that when the House adjourns to-day it will adjourn until Thursday next, thus dispensing with a meeting of the House to-morrow, on account of Decoration Day.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. Pending that, I desire to present a privileged report——

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. WASHINGTON. I rise to correct the RECORD.

Mr. HATCH. I make the point that under the order of the House extending to-day's session beyond 5 o'clock, no business other than the consideration of the appropriation bill can be transacted.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The pending question is on the motion to adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned, in accordance with its previous order, until Thursday next, at 11 o'clock a. m.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BACON: A bill (H. R. 10237) for the relief of James E. Kelsey and others—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BURNES: A bill (H. R. 10238) granting a pansion to Edwin A. Stormes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARUTH: A bill (H. R. 10239) for the relief of J. Edwin Pilcher—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10240) for the relief of J. Edwin Pilcher—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10241) increasing the pension of Richard Porter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DORSEY: A bill (H. R. 10242) granting a pension to Benjamin Hewitt—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10243) for the relief of Granville St. John—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRANGER (by request): A bill (H. R. 10244) granting a pension to Mrs. Betsy Lockwood—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 10245) granting an increase of pension to Hannibal Kimball—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOSEPH: A bill (H. R. 10246) for the relief of Oscar M. Brown—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM: A bill (H. R. 10247) granting a pension to Andrew J. Nials—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10248) for the relief of William Hughes and others—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10249) for the relief of R. L. Moore—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10250) for the relief of Arthur Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10251) for the relief of Thomas Jones—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STONE, of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 10252) for the relief of Henry L. Mitchell—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. THOMPSON, of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 10253) granting a pension to Emmanuel P. Steed—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WADE: A bill (H. R. 10254) for the relief of W. C. Wadlow—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WICKHAM: A bill (H. R. 10255) granting a pension to Elizabeth A. Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 10256) to place on the pension-roll the name of Lucy Wagor—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10257) to place on the pension-roll the name of Lewis McLouth—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10258) to place on the pension-roll the name of Cyrus Millins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10259) to place on the pension-roll the name of Sarah H. Plank—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10260) to place on the pension-roll the name of Charles A. Stockman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10261) to place on the pension-roll the name of Nathan P. Sherman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE, of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 10262) for the relief of Mrs. James Humply—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10263) for the relief of Henry J. K. Brosin—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McMILLIN: A bill (H. R. 10264) for the relief of Hester J. Mitchell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10265) for the relief of Dr. T. W. Fitts—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10266) for the relief of Jacob Wagoner—to the Committee on War Claims.

Changes in the reference of joint resolutions improperly referred were made in the following cases, namely:

Joint resolution (H. Res. 155) authorizing the erection of a statue to the late Maj. Gen. John A. Logan, etc.—from the Committee on Military Affairs to the Committee on the Library.

Also, joint resolution (H. Res. 162) making appropriation for the erection of a statue in the city of Washington to the memory of Maj. Gen. Winfield Scott Hancock—from the Committee on Military Affairs to the Committee on the Library.

Also, joint resolution (H. Res. 85) making appropriation for statues of Generals Shields and Logan—from the Committee on Military Affairs to the Committee on the Library.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. C. S. BAKER: Petition of the Real Estate Exchange of Rochester, N. Y., and others, in favor of the bill to reduce the rate of letter-postage to 1 cent an ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Board of Trade and Transportation of New York, in favor of the bill to reduce the rate of letter-postage to 1 cent an ounce—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BINGHAM: Paper in relation to the establishment of a Government system of telegraphy—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BOOTHMAN: Petition of Local Assembly No. 5853, and of 6825, Knights of Labor, of the Sixth district of Ohio, protesting against the granting of civil pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURROWS: Petition of J. Murray, of Mattawan, Mich., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BUTTERWORTH: Petition of John Hauck and a large number of other brewers of Cincinnati, Ohio, praying that the duty on rice be reduced or abolished—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers in the claim of Oscar M. Brown—to the Select Committee on Indian Depredation Claims.

By Mr. CARUTH: Papers relating to the claim of Richard Porter, for increase of pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COWLES: Petition of Mrs. A. L. Alexander, of North Carolina, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. A. C. DAVIDSON: Petition of Jesse H. Peoples, of James H. Lee, of George M. Campbell, of Joseph Blake, of John M. Leach, of James M. C. Bell, of William A. Kelley, of R. M. Martin, of Jasper N. Barnes, of Sarah J. Harrison, of William Wilson, of Robert Carlisle, of Benjamin Barnes, of Robert Willing, of Sarah A. English, of heirs of Henry Friday, and of Elizabeth Nell, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Philip S. Falford; of Thomas B. Pierce; of William Gill; of Aquilla M. Goodwin; of P. O. Grimes; of Reuben Price, and of John Shener, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GEST: Petition of the Business Men's Association, of Rock Island, Ill., for rebuilding of the Government dam at Rock Island arsenal—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARE: Petition of B. F. Potter, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAUGEN: Petition of Hannibal Kimball, for a pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERBERT: Petition of Adeline M. Willis, of Butler County, Alabama, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McMILLIN: Petition of Polly Brown, for removal of charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAISH: Petition for an appropriation to improve Government reservation No. 101, in the District of Columbia—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. MORROW: Resolutions of the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, against the free-ship bill—to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition of Thornton G. Ladd, of Tipton County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of officers of the revenue-marine service, for increased appropriations—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. SPRINGER: Petition of citizens of Nebraska, in favor of the Springer bill—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. STONE, of Missouri: Petition of W. E. Moore and others, in favor of a pension to W. J. McGlade—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAULBEE: Petition for the relief of John Kind—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition for the relief of members of Three Forks Battalion of Kentucky State militia—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. E. J. TURNER: Petition of H. Bearnes and others, of Mouument, Kans.

By Mr. WADE: Petition of John H. Roberson, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. W. L. WILSON: Petition of William H. Roberts, for reference of his war claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of B. L. Leisenning, of Charlestown, W. Va., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Jefferson County, West Virginia, in favor of pure food—to the Committee on Agriculture.

The following petitions in favor of House bill 9716, for the better protection of free labor from convict labor, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Labor:

By Mr. REED: Of Knights of Labor of Berwick, and of Yarmouthville, Me.

By Mr. PATTON: Of Daniel Lemon and 19 others, workingmen of the Twentieth district of Pennsylvania.

By Mr. J. D. TAYLOR: Of Knights of Labor of Bellaire, Ohio.

By Mr. YARDLEY: Of Knights of Labor of Pottstown, Pa.

The following petition for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists was received and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. SOWDEN: Petition of J. S. Lawall and others, citizens of the Tenth district of Pennsylvania.

The following petition for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, was received and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. SOWDEN: Of L. W. Mazril and others, citizens of the Tenth district of Pennsylvania.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. BOOTHMAN: Of Defiance County (Ohio) Pomona Grange.

By Mr. BUNNELL: Of farmers of Wayne County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. GOFF: Of David Garrison and others, and of Samuel L. Howell and others, of West Virginia.

By Mr. GROUT: Of Stephen Hovey and 35 others, of Grand Isle, Vt.

The following petition, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: Of William Moore and others, residents of Marion County, Illinois.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. BUNNELL: Of 161 citizens of Wayne County, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. BURNES: Of 83 citizens of Buchanan and Nodoway Counties, Missouri.

By Mr. DE LANO: Of 30 citizens of Chenango County, New York.

By Mr. GOFF: Of 135 citizens of Brooke County, West Virginia.

By Mr. E. J. TURNER: Of 142 citizens of Ellsworth County, and of 207 citizens of Jewell County, Kansas.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *May* 31, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented resolutions adopted by the Cadmus Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Cadmus, Linn County, Kansas, in favor of the passage of the bill making United States Senators elective by a direct vote of the people; which were referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. BUTLER. I present a communication from the governor of South Carolina, also from the superintendent of the penitentiary of that State, transmitting a protest against the passage of the bill in regard to the employment of convict labor. I move that the communication and accompanying papers be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, presented the petition of N. S. McKenty and 50 other male citizens of Lonaconing, Alleghany County, Maryland, praying for the better protection of womanhood and girlhood, and that the age of consent be raised to eighteen years; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MITCHELL presented a petition of the Board of Trade of the city of Pendleton, Oregon, praying for the early completion of the work of the allotment of the lands and sale of the remainder of the Umatilla reservation in the State of Oregon; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

He also presented a petition of members of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Oregon, praying that an appropriation of $200,000 be made for the erection of headstones over the graves of Union soldiers and sailors; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Portland (Me.) Clinical Society, praying for the removal of the import duty upon all medicines, medical and surgical appliances, and from articles used in the treatment and diagnosis of disease; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PLUMB presented a petition of the executive board of the National Farmers' Alliance, representing organized bodies of farmers in the United States comprising 1,400,000 members, praying for the passage of a bill establishing a department of agriculture with a Cabinet minister at its head; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask leave to present a large number of petitions which I have had placed on my desk. They are from Congressional districts in all parts of the country in large numbers, aggregating 7,755, more or less, names of adults, praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia. I do not know that it is any use to present them, for it seems to me the more the people petition for the less they get; but I present another bushel, which I move be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BLAIR presented a petition of the Baptist Ministers' Conference of Boston, Mass., praying for the passage of the bill for the better observance of Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. BERRY presented a petition of citizens of Arkansas, praying that an appropriation of $25,000 be made for the improvement of the channel of White River, in Arkansas, from Buffalo Shoals to Elbow Shoals, in that river; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. EVARTS presented the petition of Nicholas Martin, of New York, praying for the passage of a law extending the time of filing claims for arrears of pension beyond July 1, 1880, so that worthy claimants may secure arrears; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of W. L. Whipple and 17 other citizens of the United States residing at Teheran, the capital of Persia, praying that the diplomatic mission of the United States at Teheran be raised in grade from that of minister resident to envoy extraordinary, and that Mr. Spencer Pratt be promoted to that rank; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Maritime Association of the port of New York, remonstrating against any reduction in the duty on sugar as proposed by the so-called Mills tariff bill unless a proportionate reduction is made upon molasses; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. ALDRICH presented the petition of Rev. J. H. Carr and 40 other citizens of Greene, R. I., praying for the passage of the Platt bill to prohibit the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. VEST presented a memorial of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of the bill for the establishment of a bureau of harbors and water ways by Congress, and suggesting that the officers educated by the Government are the ones who should be especially charged with the improvement of rivers and harbors under appropriations made by Congress; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a resolution of the Medical Association of the State of Missouri, favoring the control and direction by Federal authority of external quarantine measures; which was referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. TELLER. The Committee on Mines and Mining have had under consideration the bill (S. 1030) to submit to the Court of Claims, for adjudication, the title of William McGarrahan to the mineral interests of the rancho Panoche Grande tract of land, in the State of California, and for other purposes, and have directed me to report a substitute for the bill, with a written report. The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. FAULKNER] desires to submit the views of the minority.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. FAULKNER. On behalf of the minority of the Committee on Mines and Mining, I submit an amendment to Senate bill 1030, which has just been reported by the majority of that committee, and I also submit the views of the minority to accompany the report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The views of the minority will be received and printed with the report.

Mr. WALTHALL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2250) for the relief of Lewis G. La Tour, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2869) for the relief of William Welsh, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. DAWES, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2266) to accept and ratify an agreement made with the Shoshone and Bannock Indians, for the surrender and relinquishment to the United States of a portion of the Fort Hall reservation, in the Territory of Idaho, for the purposes of a town site, and for the grant of a right of way through said reservation to the Utah and Northern Railway Company, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2992) to accept and ratify the agreement submitted by the Shoshones, Bannocks, and Sheepeaters of the Fort Hall and Lemhi reservations, in Idaho, May 14, 1880, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2582) for the relief of Elkanah Huddleston, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the petition of W. J. Moberly, late a first lieutenant in the Fourth United States Cavalry, submitted a report thereon, accompanied by the following resolution:

Be it resolved, That the claim of W. J. Moberly, late first lieutenant Fourth United States Cavalry, for $776.95, alleged to have been erroneously withheld from his salary as lieutenant aforesaid, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims for adjustment under the various provisions of law for such cases made and provided.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be placed on the Calendar.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Territories, to whom were referred the bill (S. 2821) relieving municipalities in the Territories in certain cases, and the bill (S. 2113) relieving municipalities in the Territories in certain cases, reported adversely thereon; and the bills were postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 3058) relieving municipalities in the Territories in certain cases; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 882) to correct the muster of and for the relief of George W. Davenport, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1284) for the relief of Sarah K. McLean, widow of the late Lieut. Col. Nathaniel H. McLean, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CULLOM, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1426) supplementary to the act of July 1, 1862, entitled "An act to aid in the construction of a railroad and telegraph line from the Missouri River to the Pacific Ocean, and to secure to the Government the use of the same for postal, military, and other purposes," and also of the act of July 2, 1864, and other acts amendatory of said first-named act, reported it with amendments.

Mr. COCKRELL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2384) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Loren W. Hastings, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 956) for the relief of the heirs of Christopher Cott, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. COCKRELL. On the bill (S. 1284) for the relief of Sarah K. McLean, widow of the late Lieut. Col. Nathaniel H. McLean, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] has heretofore submitted a report which embodies the views of the majority of the Committee on Military Affairs. I now submit a report on behalf of the minority of the committee, and I ask that the majority and minority reports be printed together.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The views of the minority will be received and printed in connection with the report of the committee previously filed in the case.

Mr. BROWN. The Committee on Foreign Relations instructs me to report back unfavorably the bill (S. 1953) to provide for the payment of the passage of General de Lafayette and family from France to the United States in 1824, as the "guest of the nation," etc. I will ask, however, that the bill be placed on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar, with the adverse report of the committee.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. PLUMB introduced a bill (S. 3059) granting a pension to Rachel Dixon, mother of James Dixon, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PALMER introduced a bill (S. 3060) providing a pension for Matilda C. King; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3061) for the relief of Emma McCallum; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3062) for the relief of Mary Ann Hough; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3063) for the relief of Levinia Robinson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BERRY introduced a bill (S. 3064) for the relief of the heirs at law of H. M. Woodyard, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. GORMAN introduced a bill (S. 3065) to incorporate the Underground Cable and Conduit Company of the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

AMENDMENTS TO CLAIMS BILL.

Mr. REAGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2952) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies taken and used by the United States Army, as reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1883, known as the "Bowman act;" which, with the certificate of the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims transmitting a certified copy of the findings of fact filed by the court May 31, 1887, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. MORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 2952) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies taken and used by the United States Army, as reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1883, known as the "Bowman act;" which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

SHENANDOAH RIVER IMPROVEMENTS.

Mr. FAULKNER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of War be requested to inform the Senate why he has failed to use the appropriation of $15,000, made by the act approved June 30, 1880, and the sum of $2,500 appropriated by the act approved March 3, 1881, for the improvement of the Shenandoah River in Virginia and West Virginia.

IMPORTATION OF SILVER-LEAD ORES.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there are no further resolutions, concurrent or other, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted by Mr. MITCHELL May 29, 1888, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to report to the Senate whatever silver-lead ores are being imported from any foreign country into the United States, and to what extent, and whether any duty

is under the rulings of the Department collectible under existing law on the lead so imported in such ores, and to what amount; and whether any duty is being collected on any such silver-lead ores so imported into the United States, and if so, whether such importations are by the Department held and subjected to the duty of 20 per cent. ad valorem to which mineral substances in a crude state are subjected under existing law.

Mr. MITCHELL. My attention has been called to a resolution substantially similar, which was submitted by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] some days ago calling for information, and I find that the information I desire is contained pretty fully in Executive Document No. 171. I therefore ask unanimous consent to withdraw the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

ROCK CREEK RAILWAY.

Mr. HARRIS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2017) to incorporate the Rock Creek Railway Company of the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, and agree to the same.

That the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and the Senate recede from the same.

ISHAM G. HARRIS,
C. B. FARWELL,
Conferees on the part of the Senate.
JNO. T. HEARD,
J. H. ROWELL,
BARNES COMPTON,
Conferees on the part of the House.

The report was concurred in.

ECKINGTON AND SOLDIERS' HOME RAILWAY.

Mr. HARRIS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6899) to incorporate the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "personal" before "taxes," in line 18, page 2; so as to read:

"And said company shall pay to the District of Columbia in lieu of taxes upon personal property, including cars and motive-power, each year 4 per cent. of its gross earnings," etc.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Amend section 8 so that it read:

"That the main line of said railway shall be commenced within three months and completed within twelve months from the passage of this act, and the branches of the same shall be completed within two years from the time First and Fourth streets and New York avenue shall be, respectively, graded; and if the said work on the main line shall not be so commenced and completed, then the privileges and powers herein granted shall be void."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 16, 17, and 18, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the words, "sell the same" in the Senate amendment, insert "after five days' notice;" so that it will read:

"SEC. 12. That all articles of value that may be inadvertently left in any of the cars or other vehicles of the said company shall be taken to its principal depot and entered in a book of record of unclaimed goods, which book shall be open to the inspection of the public, and if said property remain unclaimed for one year the company shall sell the same after five days' notice.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, and agree to the same.

That the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 29 and 30, and the Senate recede from the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same.

ISHAM G. HARRIS,
C. B. FARWELL,
Conferees on the part of the Senate.
JNO. J. HEMPHILL,
M. S. BREWER,
Conferees on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on concurring in the report.

Mr. VEST. I could not distinctly hear the action of the conferees with regard to the rate of taxation.

Mr. HARRIS. It is 4 per cent. upon the gross earnings.

Mr. VEST. Was that the provision in the bill as passed by the Senate?

Mr. HARRIS. That is the provision in all the bills we have passed at this session. The Senator will remember that when a former bill was under consideration that question was discussed at some length.

Mr. VEST. I recollect that.

Mr. HARRIS. The statement was then made that the District Committee was investigating the whole question of taxation upon street railroads, and that when it had arrived at a conclusion it would report a bill dealing with that general subject and settling it in respect to all the street railroads in the District.

Mr. VEST. This fixes a rate of 4 per cent. upon the gross earnings?

Mr. HARRIS. Yes, and that will be the rate until the general bill shall have been presented and passed.

Mr. BLACKBURN. I ask the Senator from Tennessee if this is a unanimous report?

Mr. HARRIS. Absolutely so.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on concurring in the report of the committee of conference.

The report was concurred in.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT DENVER.

Mr. TELLER. I desire to call up a joint resolution concerning the public building at Denver, which has the approval of the Treasury Department.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business, it is the duty of the Chair, under the previous order of the Senate, to lay before the Senate the bill (S. 287) to quiet title of settlers on the Des Moines River lands in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes. Does the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. TELLER. I ask the Senator from Iowa to yield. It will take only a moment to pass the joint resolution. It comes from the Treasury Department, and relates to a public building. It takes no money out of the Treasury.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I will yield if it takes no time.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution (S. R. 79) permitting the public building authorized by act of Congress approved May 8, 1882, at Denver, Colo., to be located not less than 16 feet from any other building, instead of 40 feet, as provided in said act.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH PUYALLUP RESERVATION.

Mr. DAWES. I ask the Senator from Iowa to yield to me.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. For what purpose?

Mr. DAWES. I ask the Senator to yield that I may call up a bill that will take no longer time than the reading of it.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I should like to give way, but I have been appealed to by so many Senators that if I continue yielding we shall have the afternoon consumed and have made no progress with the Des Moines River lands bill. I hope the Senator will excuse me. I am in hopes that we shall be able to conclude the consideration of the bill within a reasonable time.

Mr. DAWES. I have no right to ask the Senator to yield, but it would be a great accommodation to me for various reasons which I can not very well state.

Mr. MITCHELL. I join in the appeal. I hope the Senator from Iowa will allow the bill to be taken up. It is a local matter concerning the West. There will be no opposition, I judge.

Mr. DAWES. It is not on my own account that I ask the Senator to yield.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. How long a time will it take?

Mr. DAWES. As long as it will take to read a railroad bill.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I will yield.

Mr. DAWES. I am very much obliged to the Senator. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate consider the bill (S. 2807) to grant to the Puyallup Valley Railway Company a right of way through the Puyallup Indian reservation in Washington Territory.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. DAWES. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment which I submitted as intended to be proposed as a substitute to the whole bill may be read instead of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Puyallup Valley Railway Company, a corporation created under and by virtue of the laws of the Territory of Washington, be, and the same is hereby, invested and empowered with the right of locating, constructing, owning, equipping, operating, using, and maintaining a railway, telegraph, and telephone lines through the Puyallup Indian reservation, or such parts thereof as may be hereinafter designated in this act, said line to begin on the northwestern boundary of the said Indian reservation, near the city of Tacoma, running thence by the most practicable route through said reservation to the southeastern boundary thereof; thence to the town of Sumner, in said Territory of Washington, with the right to construct, use, and maintain such tracks, turn-outs, sidings, and extensions hereinafter mentioned as such company may deem necessary and to their interest to construct along, upon, and in connection with the right of way hereby granted. Before work is begun the definite line and location of said railway is to be submitted to and approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 2. That a right of way 66 feet in width through said Indian reservation, or the designated parts thereof, is hereby granted to the Puyallup Valley Railway Company, and a strip of land 133 feet in width, with a length of 2,000 feet, in addition to the right of way, is granted for such stations, sidings, or junctions as may be established by said railway company for the proper and convenient operating of said railroad, with the right to use such additional ground, where there are heavy cuts or fills, as may be necessary for the proper construction and maintenance of the road-bed; but ground taken or used for such purposes shall not exceed 50 feet in width on each side the right of way, or only as much thereof as may be included in such cuts and fills: *Provided*, That no part or parts of land included in these grants shall be used for any other pur-

poses than shall be necessary for the construction, maintenance, and convenient operation of said railroad, telegraph, and telephone lines: *Provided further*, That the consent of the Indians to said right of way upon the said Puyallup Indian reservation shall be obtained in such manner as the President of the United States may prescribe, before any right under this act shall accrue to said company: *And provided further*, That the location, construction, and operation of said road through said reservation shall be subject to such regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may provide.

SEC. 3. That before said railway shall be constructed through any land, claim, or improvement held by individual occupants, according to any treaties or laws of the United States, compensation shall be made such occupant or claimant for all property to be taken or damage done by reason of the construction of said railway. In case of failure to make satisfactory settlement with any such claimant, the just compensation shall be determined as provided for by the laws of Washington Territory, enacted for the settlement of like controversies in such cases. The amount of damages resulting to the Puyallup tribe of Indians in their tribal capacity by reason of the construction of said railway through such lands of the reservation as are not occupied in severalty, shall be ascertained and determined in such manner as the Secretary of the Interior may direct, and to be subject to his final approval: *Provided further*, That no right of any kind shall vest in said railway company in or to any part of the right of way herein provided for until plats thereof, made upon actual survey for the definite location of such railroads, and including the points for station buildings, depots, yards, machine-shops, side-tracks, turn-outs, and water-stations, shall be filed with and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, which approval shall be made in writing, and be open for the inspection of any party interested therein, and until the compensation aforesaid has been fixed and paid: *Provided*, That the amount of compensation which may ultimately be awarded or adjudged against said railway company in respect of such last-mentioned lands shall be paid to the Secretary of the Interior, to be by him expended on behalf of the tribe, for the benefit of their schools, or in such other manner as he shall deem best.

SEC. 4. That the maximum rate charged by the said railway company for the transportation of freight and passengers within the limits of the Indian reservation shall not exceed the rate charged for the same services in kind in the Territory of Washington; and Congress hereby reserves the right to regulate the charges for the freight and passengers on said railroad, and messages on said telegraph and telephone lines, until a State government or governments shall exist in the said Territory within the limits of which said railway, or a part thereof, shall be located: *Provided*, That the said railway company shall carry the United States mail at such price as Congress may by law provide, and until such rate is fixed by law the Postmaster-General may fix the rate of compensation: *And provided further*, That the passenger rates of fare shall not exceed 3 cents per mile where the distance is greater than 5 miles.

SEC. 5. That said company shall, as soon as the definite route and line of said railroad is located through said reservation, cause a map to be made showing such line and location, a copy of which shall be filed in the office of the Secretary of the Interior, and a copy shall also be filed in the office of the principal chief or governor of said tribe through which said road may have been located; and after the filing of said map of location no claim for subsequent settlement and improvement upon the right of way or additional grounds for depots, stations, sidings, or switches shall be valid as against said railroad company.

SEC. 6. That the officers, employés, and servants of said company necessary for the construction, operation, and management of said road, telegraph, and telephone lines shall be allowed to reside, while so engaged, upon the said right of way, but at the same time be subject to the provisions of the Indian intercourse laws and such rules and regulations as may be established by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance therewith.

SEC. 7. That the United States courts for the second judicial district of Washington Territory, and such other courts as may be authorized by Congress, shall have concurrent jurisdiction, without reference to the amount in controversy, over all cases arising between said railroad company and the tribe, as such, or individual members thereof, through whose territory said railway may be constructed; and the civil jurisdiction of said courts is extended within the limits of the said Puyallup Indian reservation, without distinction as to citizenship of parties interested, so far as it may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act and give effect to all its enactments.

SEC. 8. That said railway company shall construct and maintain continually all fences, road and highway crossings, and necessary bridges over said railway wherever such roads and highways do now or shall hereafter cross said right of way or may by proper authority be laid out across the same.

SEC. 9. That all mortgages or conveyances executed and operating on any portion of this railway that may be constructed in the said Puyallup Indian reservation shall be recorded in the Department of the Interior, and the record thereof shall be evidence and notice of the execution of the same, and shall convey all rights of property of said railroad company therein expressed. That said company shall not sell, assign, transfer, or mortgage this right of way for any purpose whatever until said road shall be completed: *Provided*, That the company may mortgage said franchise, together with the rolling-stock, for money to construct and complete said road: *And provided further*, That the right granted herein shall be lost and forfeited by said company unless the road is constructed and in running order within two years from the passage of this act.

SEC. 10. That Congress may at any time amend, add to, alter, or repeal this act.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEAM-RAILROADS IN THE DISTRICT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Senate bill 287 will be read as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. FAULKNER. I ask the courtesy of the Senator from Iowa to yield that I may make a request of the Senate for unanimous consent with reference to an order of business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Iowa yield for that purpose?

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. If it will not take any time; but I hope that afterwards I shall not be asked to yield any more, for we are consuming the afternoon.

Mr. FAULKNER. On the 15th of May the Senate fixed as a special order Senate bill 2919 to be considered on the 29th of May in connection with Senate bill 2615. With the concurrence of the Senator from Illinois [Mr. FARWELL] who has charge of Senate bill 2515, and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL], who anticipates speaking upon the questions involved in these bills, I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to fix as a special order for Tuesday, the 26th of June, both Senate bill 2919 and Senate bill 2615.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from West Virginia asks unanimous consent that the special order of assignment of Senate bill 2919 and Senate bill 2615 for the 29th instant may be changed to the 26th of June, and that the bills be made a special order for that day at 2 o'clock.

Mr. DAWES. What are the bills?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The titles of the bills will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2615) to authorize the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company to acquire and use real estate for railway purposes in the District of Columbia; and a bill (S. 2919) to define the route of steam-railroads in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to the notice being given, and that is all that is necessary. But to make the bills a special order might be an embarrassment to other business and would give no advantage. I can assure the Senator from West Virginia that a special order under the circumstances at so remote a period would give no advantage, but it might be an embarrassment to other business. If the Senator simply gives notice that at that time he will move to take up the bills, that will be sufficient. I should not like to have one of the bills made a special order, because as it stands I am very much opposed to it, and I do not like to consent to it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Senate bill 2919, the Chair will inform the Senator from Ohio, has already been assigned as a special order. The Senator from West Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend it from the 29th of May to the 26th of June.

Mr. HARRIS. It remaining of course a special order, but simply postponed till that day.

Mr. SHERMAN. If it is simply a motion to postpone, I have no objection; but I thought it had been postponed.

Mr. FAULKNER. No, it has not been postponed; and the order would come now following the special order already made. I simply want to postpone it now to a fixed day.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the change of the special order from the 29th of May to the 26th of June?

Mr. MORRILL. While I am ready to proceed with the discussion this morning, I shall make no objection to the proposition presented by the Senator from West Virginia.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the order of assignment is postponed until the 26th of June.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a Department of Labor.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

Mr. BLAIR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House agree to the amendments of the Senate to said bill.

H. W. BLAIR,
JAMES F. WILSON,
J. Z. GEORGE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JOHN J. O'NEILL,
JAMES BUCHANAN,
CARLOS FRENCH,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was concurred in.

DES MOINES RIVER LANDS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Senate bill 287 will now be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 287) to quiet title of settlers on the Des Moines River lands, in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with an amendment, in section 2, line 2, after the word "Attorney-General," to insert "as soon as practicable, and;" so as to read:

That it is hereby made the duty of the Attorney-General, as soon as practicable, and within three years after the passage of this act, to institute, or cause to be instituted, such suit or suits, either in law or equity, or both, as may be necessary and proper to assert and protect the title of the United States to said lands and remove all clouds from its title thereto; and until such suits shall be determined, and Congress shall so provide, no part of said lands shall be open for settlement or sale except as hereinbefore provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Mr. President——

Mr. EVARTS. The Senator will allow me a moment. As the Senator from Iowa has announced that he does not propose to occupy very much time in the discussion as it now appears to him, I would ask him whether he would not allow Senate bill 1469, that is now on the Calendar, and which was introduced by me, to be read for informa-

tion, as I shall desire it shall be done before I commence my argument.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I suppose it will not take any more time now than it will hereafter; so it may be read.

Mr. EVARTS. I ask that it may be read now, at the commencement of the argument on both sides.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Very well.

Mr. EVARTS. I ask, with the assent of the Senator from Iowa, that Senate bill 1469 may be read for information, as it enters into the discussion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read, if there be no objection.

The Secretary read the bill (S. 1469) for the relief of the settlers upon the lands along the Des Moines River, above the Raccoon Forks, in the State of Iowa, as follows:

Whereas in consequence of the indefiniteness of phraseology employed in an act granting certain lands to the Territory of Iowa in aid of the improvement of the navigation of the Des Moines River in said Territory, approved August 8, 1846, the Departments of the Government at different periods adopted different constructions of said act as to the extent of said grant, and in consequence of its doubtful meaning withdrew the lands which might be involved from settlement and entry; and

Whereas there resulted from said indefiniteness of language and the different constructions thereof and subsequent legislation of Congress in relation thereto a long and bitterly-contested litigation in the State and Federal courts as to the true meaning and effect of said act and subsequent legislation in connection with the various constructions thereof by the governmental Departments, between the grantees of the State of Iowa, claiming under said act of 1846 and the subsequent legislation, and settlers upon said lands, who asserted rights under the general laws of the United States providing for pre-emption and private entry of public lands; and

Whereas by a series of decisions in the Supreme Court of the United States running over a period of about twenty-eight years, and involving not less than twelve well-considered decisions, said litigation has been definitely determined in favor of the validity of the title of those claiming under the deed from the State of Iowa under said acts of Congress, and said court has expressly held that said title has passed from the United States and is now vested in said persons claiming under the State of Iowa, and that the said settlers never acquired any right, interest, or title in or to any of said lands; and

Whereas the settlers upon said lands, whose claims have been denied and held invalid in this litigation, are thus deprived of homes and tracts of land, with the improvements thereon and the accumulated values thereof, which they were induced to enter, occupy, and improve under what seemed the plain provision of the statute, fortified by the repeated and solemn decisions of the Departments, and are thus become the victims of inadequate and misleading legislation and administration, involving in many instances the results of the life-long toil and labor of those affected: Therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States will indemnify and pay to the settlers, or their heirs and legal representatives, who in good faith entered upon, for the purpose of purchasing, pre-empting, or securing homesteads upon any lands lying along the river Des Moines, in the State of Iowa, above and north of the Raccoon Forks, which were listed and certified to the State of Iowa under an act approved August 8, 1846, entitled "An act granting certain lands to the Territory of Iowa in aid of the improvement of the navigation of the Des Moines River in said Territory," and which said lands were afterwards, namely, on the 18th of May, 1858, sold and conveyed to the Des Moines Navigation and Railroad Company by an indenture of that date, signed by Ralph P. Low, governor, and attested by Elijah Sells, secretary of state, by John Davis, his deputy; and that the indemnity and compensation shall embrace:

First. Any and all moneys paid by said settlers to the Government for certificates of entry or patents, or both, including fees paid to the officers of the land offices in relation to the same.

Second. All reasonable sums paid by said settlers to the Des Moines Navigation and Railroad Company, or to its grantees, to purchase in the outstanding title and secure lands upon which they had settled or located, or which they had entered.

Third. Any direct and immediate damages or losses sustained by any of said settlers who have been unable to buy in said outstanding title, and have in consequence been dispossessed and lost their possession and improvements.

Fourth. Any other damages, losses, or injury sustained by said settlers, which, upon just and equitable consideration, ought to be the subject of indemnity.

SEC. 2. That this act shall not extend to any settlement upon or entry of any of said lands made after January 1, 1880.

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of enabling the Government to extend such indemnity and make compensation, the President of the United States is hereby authorized to appoint three commissioners, who shall ascertain the number of acres and, by appraisement or otherwise, the value thereof, exclusive of improvements; the separate value and character of the improvements of all such lands lying north of Raccoon Forks, on the Des Moines River, in the State of Iowa, and embraced in the aforesaid deed of May 18, 1858, from the State of Iowa to the Des Moines Navigation and Railroad Company; also what person or persons, as enterers or homestead pre-empters of any of said lands, have been evicted or dispossessed thereof, and have been compelled to purchase in the outstanding title, and the amount so paid; also who have been unable or unwilling to purchase in said title, and the extent and nature of the improvements lost, and any other data touching the rights of said parties which, in the judgment of the commissioners, should be considered in determining the measure and extent of indemnity. Said commissioners shall have regard to a report of a commission appointed under an act approved March 3, 1873, chapter 306, Statutes at Large, volume 17; and they shall report all the facts at the commencement of the next session of Congress.

SEC. 4. That said commissioners shall receive each $8 per day during the time they shall be actually engaged in said service.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Mr. President, the bill now before the Senate has been passed by this body three several times. It has been several times reported favorably from the Committee on Public Lands; it has been discussed exhaustively in this body, and, so far as I am concerned, I should be quite willing now to submit it to a vote of the Senate without further discussion. I am not disposed to weary the Senate by prolonged remarks, nor will I in any event trouble the Senate with prolonged remarks, nor will I inflict any at the present time. I shall wait to hear what may be said in opposition, and then in the briefest time possible present such opposing views as may occur to me proper at the time.

Mr. EVARTS. Mr. President, I am glad to see the Senate tolerably full for the consideration of this bill, for I would go further than the Senator from Iowa in saying that if the Senate will read this bill that is now under consideration and read the bill that I have proposed to settle these difficulties in an opposite and more beneficial mode, with a knowledge of what has been the judgment of the Supreme Court of the United States through an unbroken series of decisions for now many years, and its last conclusive judgment upon the points at issue, so late as a judgment in May, 1887, since the last debate and the last votes in Congress, I would be ready that the Senators should vote upon their own scrutiny and their own judgment of the nature and the character and the operation and the consequences of such legislation as this.

If there is to be debate that is to engage the attention of the Senate, we were entitled on the part of the learned Senator who presents this proposition to some justification for it. I am told that it rests so plainly upon its own intelligence, its own integrity, its own legality, and its own statesmanship, that, until something can be said against it, it is not necessary to support it. Now, what is there against it that on its face it shall thus be adopted by the Senate without any elucidation or any suggestion of argument or reason to sustain it? It has against it the Supreme Court of the United States in a series of decisions involving scrutiny and examination on every point in dispute that is brought up between these settlers in their opposing rights, and, as I say, in a judgment given in May, 1887, to which I shall call the attention of the Senate. After our votes, after our debates, there comes this judgment, and I appeal to every lawyer in the Senate to say that the same judgment must be given by that court after the passage of this act in any litigation that it may stimulate and encourage.

Besides that, we had originally, when the present Attorney-General was a member of the Senate and was on the Judiciary Committee, a report from the Judiciary Committee as to which, so far as my information goes, there was no dissent, and the point was there distinctly suggested and the determination explained.

The Senate Judiciary Committee of the Forty-sixth Congress reported adversely to the same bill as this, saying:

The more recent decisions (Wolsey *vs.* Chapman, 101 U. S. R., 755, and Litchfield *vs.* County of Webber, *ib.*, 773) approve the earlier cases on this subject already cited, and from them all it is clearly to be gathered that this matter has passed beyond the reach of Congress, and whatever rights the settlers seek to show or may wish to establish, they are not within any remedial legislation of Congress; they can not be affected by any act of Congress; in fact, it is a subject over which Congress has no jurisdiction.

In the session of the Senate in 1886 this same bill was passed, and the President, under a message communicating his disapproval of the bill, stated the legal and constitutional reasons why he could not give his approval to the bill. The Senate passed the bill over the veto, and it was lost in the other House, which gave heed to the observation of legal and constitutional objections to the bill. Now it is introduced here again.

Mr. President, it would be one thing to pass this bill by Congress if this bill could terminate the controversy, for there must be some end of litigation, and if it could not be reached by a summary and unjust determination, it might be argued—though I never should tolerate it for any support of mine—that there must be a determination.

On the contrary, this bill now proposed under the title given to it as "to quiet title of settlers on the Des Moines River lands, in the State of Iowa" is to breed and encourage and revive litigation. The kind operation of time has alleviated and mitigated and produced settlements and compromises and adjustments. Who does not know that whatever may be the individual rights and wrongs, grievances or injustices, the prolongation of litigation is to the prejudice of the whole neighborhood and of the State and of the credit and the justice of the Government? What good is it, that when there are two alternative modes by which there shall be a settlement—one through the law and the courts that must obey the law—the courts after all should not be suffered to adjust it? If the Government is to intervene, it should be not to prostrate the courts and the law and the rights that have grown up, but it should itself come to the succor of the suffering settlers who have been thrown, if you please, into disorder and into defeat and into controversy by its course of action.

When common owners of land give inconsistent titles to different grantees of the same land, the grantor must relieve the injured parties that have suffered from a double grant. And now when the United States is the common grantor through its inconsistent legislation, if it be, is asked to supervise and settle the conflicts, what is the remedy that this bill proposes? It proposes to give litigants a footing by this act that the law of the land does not give them. It proposes to break down the rights of the owners in possession under the grant that is to be brought in question; and they are to be brought into a new litigation with a champertous litigant, that champertous litigant being the United States of America. What becomes of that beneficent doctrine adopted in the country where possession and right were ever in conflict? That right was to be pursued at any length? No, but the benign doctrine of adverse possession applies, which we in the Eastern States have now reduced to twenty years; and in the State of Iowa, as I am informed, in common with the policy of all the new States, the doctrine adopted as to the rule of adverse possession in Iowa is ten years. Then title was given by the United States to the settlers in 1862 after this dispute as to what was the meaning of the earlier grant of 1846. What

becomes, under this bill, as I shall unfold it to the Senate, of the doctrine of adverse possession which is good in Iowa after ten years even without the basis of a title? And now there is to come along a litigant against whom adverse possession does not run and this lapse of time is not to prevail.

But besides, this bill, from one end to the other of it, is a mode, a contrivance, not only to give a new litigant, the United States, land which it has not nor by this bill proposes to get an inch of for itself, but to lay down for the courts of justice a rule of law between competing claimants to real estate that would be intolerable between private litigants under any possible circumstances.

Besides the benign rule of adverse possession to quiet title, what is greater and what more for the liberty and security of the subjects than the great rule of English real estate that a plaintiff must succeed by his own title and not by the defects of his adversaries? How benign, how useful that fundamental law! Powerful phrases! You can not secure land by picking flaws in the terre-tenant's title.

Now let me ask your attention to the bill. How does the United States, that has parted with every inch of this property, come into this settlement or quieting of titles? Under the pretension that now, today, it adds this land to the public domain. How else could it undertake to do it? If it did it to rob indiscriminately in pursuance of some policy of adding it to the public domain we might appreciate a general proposition which some one or other might think it was wise and just and honorable to adopt; but the bill only adds this land or any portion of it to the public domain in order that it may have a legal footing, as it is said, to dispute on the one side of these litigants and against the other, the bill not really proposing to give one inch of this property to the public domain. Is that a straightforward proposition? Is that creditable to a great government? Let me read:

That all the lands improperly certified to Iowa by the Department of the Interior, under the act of August 8, 1846, as referred to in the joint resolution of March 2, 1861, for which indemnity lands were selected and received by the State of Iowa, as provided in the act of 1862, are, and are hereby declared to be, public lands of the United States.

Whose house is safe anywhere if he can trace a title to the United States as a part of the public domain, as to which a law may not be passed to add that property to the public domain? It parted from the mass of the public domain by the grant, by the deed, by the statute of the United States; and now it coolly proposes to recur to that grant, having its root in the act of 1846, and culminating in two formal statutes settling all contravening claims in 1861 and 1862, and to add it by this fiat to the public domain. Unless you can do that, and unless you ought to do that, you can not receive the benefit of what are called the remedial processes of quieting title.

Supposing it stopped there and the land was to be ours, how would that stand before the Supreme Court of the United States? Let the United States get into possession before they undertake to distribute the land of which in every inch they are out of possession, and bound by the principles of the common law to protect the integrity of title, instead of which it is made a title pronounced, not vendible, but a champertous title. Am I wrong in saying that if the legislation stopped there, it would, against the decision or future action of the courts, be perfectly idle, though a very discreditable act? It does not propose that the United States shall really get an inch of this land. What does it propose to do?

Provided, That the title of all bona fide settlers under color of title from the State of Iowa and its grantees, or the United States and its grantees, which do not come in conflict with pre-emption or homestead claimants, are hereby ratified and confirmed and made valid.

Well, that subject has been in litigation through the courts on all these questions of conflict between pre-emption or homestead claimants that claim a better title than the possession under the laws of the United States and the grant it made. Those of these grantees that have no adverse claims are ratified; so the United States does not take them into the public domain. It proceeds further:

Provided further, That the claims of all persons who, with intent, in good faith to obtain title thereto under the pre-emption or homestead laws of the United States, entered or remained upon any tract of said land prior to January, 1880, not exceeding 160 acres—

Any pre-emption or homestead settler that in 1879 proclaimed that nte nt and that purpose is to override the intervening possession and occupation of the land from 1862 down to 1879—

are hereby confirmed and made valid in them, their heirs or their proper assigns, and upon due proof thereof, and payment of the usual price or fees, where the same has not been paid, shall be carried to patent.

In other words, as to this portion of land added to the public domain, there is to issue forth a new patent of the age and of the date that the transaction shall be completed; and now—

Provided further, That the title of all bona fide claimants under color of title from the State of Iowa and its grantees, or the United States and its grantees, which do not come in conflict with persons who, with intent, in good faith, to obtain the title thereto under the pre-emption or homestead laws of the United States, settled upon the said lands prior to January, 1880, are confirmed and made valid.

What is the circuity, not very rounded; what is the legal, the governmental conception that is proposed now for the action of the Senate? First, that all the lands which were described and separated from the public domain in 1846, and that have passed through these stages of approval and confirmation, shall now be added to the public domain, and thereupon it being at the disposition of the United States as *res nova* (for unless it be as *res nova* it has no power), it proceeds to say that these grantees under the laws of the United States of such ancient date, and of the State of Iowa under such ancient grant, if nobody questions their title for pre-emption or for homestead settlement intervening and overreaching—that is, overreaching if it was the property of the United States, but otherwise not—they shall be confirmed. But the rule is laid down for the Supreme Court of the United States, not what by law, what by action had ripened at any intervening day as a homestead settler's claim or a pre-emption claim shall be protected, but on the principle of its being now *res nova* for the United States with regard to homestead settlers and pre-emptioners for this particular block or region of land.

That the claims of all persons who, with intent, in good faith, to obtain title thereto under the pre-emption or homestead laws of the United States, entered or remained upon any tract of said land prior to January, 1880, not exceeding 160 acres, are hereby confirmed and made valid in them, their heirs or their proper assigns.

Nothing else but that they should have entered in good faith without any reference to the question whether the status of the ripening of title had been completed or not.

Now, further, as a *doucour*, I suppose, to these actual settlers and occupants that have been ousted by the propositions of law—

That the title of all bona fide claimants under color of title from the State of Iowa and its grantees, or the United States and its grantees, which do not come in conflict with persons who, with intent, in good faith, to obtain title thereto under the pre-emption or homestead laws of the United States, settled upon the said lands prior to January, 1880, are confirmed and made valid.

It is plain, then, that the basis of the validity of these provisions rests upon the proposition whether now this Government can add this land to the public domain. If it can add it, it can keep it. The question what it does with it does not touch the question whether it can do it, nor does it touch the question whether it should do it. No depredation upon the rights of others can be excused because the spoils are to be appropriated to a pious purpose.

My proposition is that it is utterly powerless for this Government to add this land to the public domain, and the Supreme Court will decide so just as much after the passage of the bill, and after the settlers have been deluded and kept going with litigation for some more years of anxiety, solicitude, and distress.

But what less injurious use could be made by the United States of land thus acquired than to apportion it contrary to the rules of law and of title that govern the land? How is this operation to be set agoing? If you stop with the section which I have read, the first section, then these litigants would have to commence their suits and try them as they have been doing, gaining or losing; but they have to proceed upon the ordinary rules that a claimant of property must show a title and must bear the burdens of his litigation of success or failure. What, then, do we say here to meet that disturbance of right between man and man under the laws of this land governing the title of real property?

SEC. 2. That it is hereby made the duty of the Attorney-General—

Is the Attorney-General at the suit of private litigants, is he to be at the suit of the United States when not an inch of land to be recovered is to belong to the Government?—

to institute, or cause to be instituted, such suit or suits, either in law or equity, or both, as may be necessary and proper to assert and protect the title of the United States to said lands and remove all clouds from its title thereto.

Then you are right back to the first clause that he is to stand upon the United States title to said land by virtue of this act of legislation, to add it to the public domain, "and remove all clouds" from the United States title, among them being the cloud of the statute of 1861 and the statute of 1862. An interesting occupation for an Attorney-General of the United States to go into the courts of the United States and say, "I, in the name of the United States, take these lands of all these numerous occupants and settlers and add them to the public domain of the United States, so as to remove anything that formed a cloud upon this title during this long interval between our grant and occupation of the lands;" or as I have said, if you can not take every inch from all you can not take any, and the use that you are going to make of it does not alter the legal proposition for the Government that after your Attorney-General has removed all cloud from the United States title in these lands then the United States is to give a new title of that date as of a new established right.

Let those who support this legislation see if they can take it out of these troubles which I deplore. They are dealing with a proposition which takes land that has been parted with forty years ago, at least so far as to have been the subject of honest claim, of honest occupation, of honest transactions on the part of the State of Iowa with those who undertook to improve its water ways, and in order to terminate any imperfect agitation of the title at an early day, in 1861, and again in 1862, we settled the whole matter of title.

Let us see what further:

And until such suits shall be determined, and Congress shall so provide, no part of said lands shall be open for settlement or sale except as hereinbefore provided.

That is, without a settlement by the courts of the validity of this act or confirmation by the courts of the title of the United States in these

parcels of land, the defendant, as he would be called in an ejectment suit, is no longer to have dominion over this land.

And in any suits so instituted any person or persons in possession of or claiming title to any tract or tracts of land under the United States involved in such suits may, at his or their expense, unite with the United States in the prosecution of such suits.

It may be a *qui tam* action, but I do not think we can have co-plaintiffs of the United States and of individuals.

Mr. President, such legislation as this is not to be reproached for wicked or perverse motives, but it is a desperate effort to accomplish a disentanglement, which disentanglement, if it is chargeable anywhere, is chargeable to this Government and this Government alone; and if there have been diverse pretensions as to what the true meaning and operation of the acts of Congress has been, so that an appeal has been necessary to the courts of justice, the courts have decided upon rules of law in favor of one as against the other, not upon general propositions, but upon the very action of A B against C D about the *locus in quo*, where all the reasons that should make a good defense and all the reasons that make a decree in favor of a plaintiff have been settled. After all this the lord paramount is now to come in, dispossess the tenant, and resume the land in point of law; and these alleged settlers are to take now *de novo* from the lord paramount such grants as he sees fit to make. If you pass such a law as this, who can complain that rights are insecure, that courts are untrustworthy, and the honor of the Government and the serene majesty of the Supreme Court of the United States is whistled down the wind in the Senate of the United States without undertaking to deliberate and inquire whether it will commit itself to any such scheme?

I do not know what my friend, the Senator from Iowa, who now supports this bill on the floor, a good lawyer, a good real-estate lawyer, and who knows the laws and the rules of the property titles there, can say to this. I ask, then, what becomes of the benign law in Iowa by which an adverse possession is, as I have said, reduced to ten years? Ten years in Iowa for a man who has the *pedis possessio*, as the law terms it, keep out every intruder unless he can show superior title; and are we now, after a lapse between 1862 and 1888, twenty-six years' possession, to say that the United States, against whom adverse possession does not run, is to intervene as the dominant proprietor and resume its original title? Will the honorable Senator and the promoters of this bill, who, I suppose, have considered what has happened about adverse possession, explain it? As I understand, this is a fiat of Congress that the title is changed by law from the possessors, those having the possession of the land, to the United States, to be passed by the United States to certain claimants.

Mr. President, I ask attention now to a bill which I had the honor to introduce and which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands while it was still burdened with this bill, 287, as my method of assuaging the misfortunes and quieting titles, that would not open, revamp, and restore controversy; and what is it? Reciting these difficulties, these statutes which bring us down to the enacting clause, it proceeds to declare—

That the United States—

And to this I ask the attention of the Senate—

That the United States will indemnify and pay to the settlers, or their heirs and legal representatives, who in good faith entered upon, for the purpose of purchasing, pre-empting, or securing homesteads upon any lands lying along the river Des Moines, in the State of Iowa, above and north of the Raccoon Forks, which were listed and certified to the State of Iowa under an act approved August 8, 1846, entitled "An act granting certain lands to the Territory of Iowa in aid of the improvement of the navigation of the Des Moines River in said Territory," and which said lands were afterwards, namely, on the 18th day of May, 1858, sold and conveyed to the Des Moines Navigation and Railroad Company by an indenture of that date, signed by Ralph P. Lowe, governor, and attested by Elijah Sells, secretary of state, by John Davis, his deputy, and that the indemnity and compensation shall embrace:

First. Any and all moneys paid by said settlers to the Government for certificates of entry or patents, or both, including fees paid to the officers of the land offices in relation to the same.

Second. All reasonable sums paid by said settlers to the Des Moines Navigation and Railroad Company, or to its grantees, to purchase in the outstanding title and secure lands upon which they had settled or located, or which they had entered.

Every one of them who attempted to secure title under the difficulties placed by the legislation of Congress that has secured a title by contract with the Des Moines Navigation Railroad Company shall be paid by the United States.

Third. Any direct and immediate damages or losses sustained by any of said settlers who have been unable to buy in said outstanding title, and have in consequence been dispossessed and lost their possession and improvements.

Fourth. Any other damages, losses, or injury sustained by said settlers, which, upon just and equitable consideration, ought to be the subject of indemnity.

SEC. 2. That this act shall not extend to any settlement upon or entry of any of said lands made after January 1, 1880.

Where a lord paramount having functions of government besides that of proprietorship comes in he should fulfill that obligation which belongs to government—that of doing justice. Under our great Constitution this great power of our Government before the majesty of its law must submit to the compulsion that the law of the land, as decreed by the great tribunal, shall ascertain and enforce the result of its judgment; but a higher and ampler and nobler function is under our control without violating or jostling the law of the land, without impairing or even questioning the vigor and the justice of the great tribunal, and I can not find anywhere that a doubt can be raised where the responsibility for the conclusion arises and where the remedy should be borne, at whatever inconvenience, except that it may result in some division of governmental responsibility between the United States of America and the State of Iowa, for every one of these settlers has a title under the State of Iowa under which he pays taxes year after year and now is paying taxes, and which the supreme court of Iowa has pronounced subject to taxation and collection.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand a very lucid and a very concise review of this whole subject, so far as its legal relations are concerned, as delivered in the case of Bullard *vs.* The Des Moines and Fort Dodge Railroad Company on the merits of the Des Moines River lands title in the Supreme Court of the United States, May 23, 1887, more than a year later than the veto of the President of the United States, that had put upon constitutional and just principles the condemnation of the act submitted to him. This judgment was delivered with the unanimous consent of that court by the great legal luminary who has so long administered justice from the Supreme Bench, as well to the admiration of the profession as of the country—that officer, peerless in character, in ability, in standing, Mr. Justice Miller, a greater honor to Iowa than any attempt to break down that judgment can be. I ask—for I will not read it—that it be printed as part of my remarks in the RECORD, that after this bill passes, if not before, it may be read by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BERRY in the chair). If there be no objection, the decision will be printed in the RECORD.

The decision is a follows:

Supreme Court of the United States.—No. 287.—October term, 1886.

Edward F. Bullard, plaintiff in error, *vs.* The Des Moines and Fort Dodge Railroad Company and Charles E. Whitehead, trustee of said company. In error to the supreme court of the State of Iowa. [May 23, 1887.]

Mr. Justice Miller delivered the opinion of the court.

This is a writ of error to the supreme court of the State of Iowa.

The case originated in a suit in equity brought in the district court of that State for the county of Humboldt by Edward F. Bullard, who is the appellant here. The object of the bill was to quiet or remove clouds upon the title of the plaintiff to certain lands in that State, to which the defendant filed an answer and cross-bill, asking that its own title might be declared to be good and established by the decree of the court. The district court of that county made a decree in favor of the defendant, which on appeal to the supreme court of the State was affirmed.

There were many questions considered in the State courts of which this court can take no jurisdiction. But the main question raised there, and the only one here, has relation to a subject which has been often considered by this court. It arises out of what is called the Des Moines River land grant, which was originally made by the Congress of the United States to the then Territory of Iowa. A short history of the matters growing out of that grant, with some references to the decisions of this court, will simplify the complex record presented in this case.

By the act of Congress of August 8, 1846 (9 U. S. Stat. at Large, page 77), there was "granted to the Territory of Iowa, for the purpose of aiding said Territory to improve the navigation of the Des Moines River from its mouth to the Raccoon Fork (so-called), in said Territory, one equal moiety in alternate sections of the public lands remaining unsold and not otherwise disposed of, encumbered, or appropriated, in a strip 5 miles in width on each side of said river, to be selected within said Territory by an agent or agents to be appointed by the governor thereof, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States."

Soon after the passage of this statute the State of Iowa created a board of public works to take charge of this river improvement under a system of slack-water navigation on that stream. The contract for the execution of the work came into the hands of a corporation called the Des Moines Navigation Company. The work progressed for a number of years, several dams and locks being built from the mouth of the river upwards, the means for paying the contractors coming solely from the sales of the lands granted to the State for that purpose. These lands, as the work went on and the money was needed, were certified to the State by the Secretary of the Treasury, and by it either sold to purchasers or conveyed to the contractors who did the work. The State made no appropriations and furnished no means from any other source than this for the prosecution of the enterprise.

So long as no request on the part of the State for the certification of lands lying above the mouth of the Raccoon Fork was made of the Secretary of the Treasury, no question arose as to the extent of the grant. Afterwards, however, when a demand was made upon that officer that such lands should be certified, he objected on the ground that the grant of lands did not extend beyond that point; that, as by the language of the statute making the grant it was "for the improvement of the Des Moines River from its mouth to the Raccoon Fork," it was not intended to grant lands lying above that point, although the same river ran through the entire length of the State, from near its northwestern corner in the Territory of Minnesota to the southeast corner, where it flows into the Mississippi River.

This question became the subject of active negotiations and controversy between the State of Iowa, through its governor and members of Congress, and the Treasury Department, as well as the Interior Department, which was created during this time and succeeded to the charge of this subject. Meanwhile one of the Secretaries certified to the State a part of the land in dispute, running to a certain range of townships above the Raccoon Fork. It may as well be stated here that the lands now in controversy were not among the lands so certified, but are among the odd sections lying north of those thus certified and within 5 miles of the Des Moines River.

On April 6, 1850, Secretary Ewing, while concurring with Attorney-General Crittenden in his opinion that the grant of 1846 did not extend above the Raccoon Fork, issued an order withholding all the lands then in controversy from market "until the close of the then session of Congress," which order has been continued ever since, in order to give the State the opportunity of petitioning for an extension of the grant by Congress. This court has decided in a number of cases, in regard to these lands, that this withdrawal operated to exclude from sale, purchase, or pre-emption all the lands in controversy, and unless the case we are about to consider constitutes an exception, it has never been revoked.

In 1856 Congress granted to the State of Iowa, for the purpose of aiding in the construction of several railroads across that State from the Mississippi to the Missouri River, every alternate section, as shown by odd numbers, of the lands on each side of said roads, each of which, when the line was fixed, crossed the Des Moines River and ran through the lands which the State claimed had been granted to it for the purpose of improving the navigation of that stream.

Pending this controversy between the State of Iowa and the authorities of the United States as to the extent of the grant, a suit was brought by one of these railroad companies, that the question might be decided by this court. The case is reported as the Dubuque and Pacific Railroad Company *vs.* Litchfield, 23 Howard, 66, decided in 1860, and it was held that the grant did not extend above the Raccoon Fork. As soon as this decision was made, the State, through its Congressional delegation, sought the action of the Congress of the United States to obtain the passage of an act which would secure the grant to the State and its grantees in the full extent, which they believed Congress had originally intended by the act of 1846. That the propriety of some action by Congress, and the demand for it was pressing, is obvious, when we consider that the Des Moines Navigation Company, under contract with the State, had spent large sums of money beyond what they had received from the State, and beyond the value of the lands certified to the State by the Secretary. The work, with all the materials and implements on hand, was suspended, and the danger of the works being swept away and ruined by floods in the river was imminent. The whole subject was before Congress, but, without waiting to dispose of it entirely, that body, by way of immediate relief, passed the following joint resolution, approved March 2, 1861 (12 U. S. Stat. at Large, 251):

"That all the title which the United States still retain in the tracts of land along the Des Moines River, and above the mouth of the Raccoon Fork thereof, in the State of Iowa, which have been certified to said State improperly by the Department of the Interior, as part of the grant by act of Congress approved August 8, 1846, and which is now held by bona fide purchasers under the State of Iowa, be, and the same is hereby, relinquished to the State of Iowa."

At the next session of Congress a statute was passed, approved July 12, 1862, which provided as follows:

"That the grant of lands to the then Territory of Iowa for the improvement of the Des Moines River made by the act of August 8, 1846, is hereby extended so as to include the alternate sections (designated by odd numbers) lying within 5 miles of said river, between the Raccoon Fork and the northern boundary of said State; such lands are to be held and applied in accordance with the provisions of the original grant, except that the consent of Congress is hereby given to the application of a portion thereof to aid in the construction of the Keokuk, Fort Des Moines and Minnesota Railroad, in accordance with the provisions of the act of the General Assembly of the State of Iowa, approved March 22, 1858, etc." (12 United States Statutes at Large, 543.)

By this joint resolution and this act of Congress the United States relieved so far as it could the misfortune of the construction of the grant to the Territory of Iowa of 1846, made by this court, and ratified the construction which had always been claimed by the State.

During all this controversy there remained the order of the Department having control of the matter, withdrawing all the lands in dispute from public sale, settlement, or pre-emption. This withdrawal was held to be effectual against the grant made by Congress to the railroad companies in 1856, because that act contained the following proviso:

"That any and all lands heretofore reserved to the United States, by any act of Congress, or in any other manner by competent authority, for the purpose of aiding in any object of internal improvement, or for any other purpose whatsoever, be, and the same are hereby, reserved to the United States from the operation of this act, except so far as it may be found necessary to locate the routes of said railroads through such reserved lands, in which case the right of way only shall be granted, subject to the approval of the President of the United States." (11 U. S. Stat. at Large, 9.)

See Walcott *vs.* Des Moines Company, 5 Wall., 681, and Williams *vs.* Baker, 17 *Id.*, 144, in which cases is also to be found a very full and clear recital of the history of this Des Moines grant controversy.

On May, 1860, the Commissioner of the General Land Office sent to the registers and receivers of that office at Des Moines and Fort Dodge the following printed notice:

"Notice is hereby given that the land along the Des Moines River, in Iowa, within the claimed limits of the Des Moines grant, in that State, above the mouth of the Raccoon Fork of said river, which has been reserved from sale heretofore on account of the claim of the State thereto, will continue reserved, for the time being, from sale or from location, by any species of scrip or warrants, notwithstanding the recent decision of the Supreme Court against the claim. This action is deemed necessary to afford time for Congress to consider, upon memorial or otherwise, the case of actual bona fide settlers holding under titles from the State, and to make such provision, by confirmation or adjustment of the claims of such settlers, as may appear to be right and proper.

"JOHN S. WILSON,
"*Commissioner of the General Land Office.*

"GENERAL LAND OFFICE, *May* 18, 1860."

It will thus be seen that, notwithstanding the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in the winter of 1860, the land office determined that the reservation of these lands should continue for the purpose of securing the very action by Congress which the State of Iowa was soliciting, and it is not disputed by counsel for the appellant in this case that this was a valid continuation of such reservation and that during its continuance the pre-emptions under which the plaintiff claims could not have been made. But it is argued that the joint resolution of 1861 terminated this condition of suspense, and in and of itself ended the withdrawal of these lands which had been established and continued since the controversy originated between the State and the Federal Government as to the extent of the grant. This is the only foundation on which plaintiff's title to the land in controversy in this case rests.

We do not think the joint resolution had the effect to end the reservation of these lands from public entry. Whether we consider the purpose of the original order, its long continuance, and that it has been held, in the face of an act of Congress granting lands for public purposes to the railroads already mentioned, to constitute such a withdrawal as that act excepts from the operations of the grant, and that up to the present time no pre-emptions or sales have been finally recognized as valid by the Department or by the courts, it would be very extraordinary if the joint resolution should have that effect. It does not purport to act upon all the matters which were in controversy between the State and the General Government. It certainly did not act upon all the claims and matters in question then pending before Congress in regard to these lands.

It was, indeed, a very limited disposition of a part of the matter, which Congress supposed might then be acted upon with safety without further investigation. It was simply the recognition of the title which had passed to the grantees of the State of Iowa in regard to the lands which had been certified by the proper authorities of the General Government to the State under the act of 1846, and which, by the decision in Dubuque and Pacific Railroad Company *vs.* Litchfield, had been held to be unwarranted by the statute. Congress, urgently pressed by parties who were innocent purchasers under the State, passed the resolution which went to this extent, in the last days of the session, securing to such purchasers, so far as the United States could do so, their title to the lands that they had bought under the sanction of this action of the Department.

The broader and larger question of the title to the lands within 5 miles of the Des Moines River, above Raccoon Fork, which had not been certified to the State, and which were declared by the decision of Dubuque and Pacific Railroad Company *vs.* Litchfield not to be included within the grant of 1846, Congress retained for further consideration, and, at its next session after this joint resolution was passed, it completely disposed of the whole subject, so far as it was within its power to do so, by validating the grant of 1846 to the full extent of the construction claimed by the State of Iowa. If the order of the Commissioner of the General Land Office of May 18, 1860, was in force up to the passage of the joint resolution, it is not possible to perceive why it terminated then. It was declared by the Commissioner that the order or notice was made to protect these lands from location by any species of scrip or warrant, notwithstanding the decision of the Supreme Court to afford time for Congress to further consider the case.

This is not the way in which a reservation from sale or pre-emption of public lands is removed. In almost every instance in which such a reservation is terminated there has been a proclamation by the President that the lands are open for entry or sale, and in most instances they have first been offered for sale at public auction. It can not be seen from anything in the joint resolution that Congress either considered the controversy ended or intended to remove the reservation instituted by the Department. Its immediate procedure at the next session to the full consideration of the whole subject shows that it had not ceased to deal with it; that the reason for this withdrawal or reservation continued as strongly as before, and it can not be doubted that the subject was before Congress, as well as before its committees, and that the act of July 12, 1862, was for the first time a conclusion and end of the matter so far as Congress was concerned.

The title of the plaintiff, therefore, rests upon settlements upon odd sections of land within 5 miles of the Des Moines River, which were reserved from sale or pre-emption at the time the settlements were made. Two of the settlements, which are the foundation of plaintiff's title, were made in May, 1862, only a few days before the passage of the act of July in the same year; and one of the settlements under which the plaintiff claims was made after the passage of that act. The title was transferred by that act to the State of Iowa for the original purposes of the grant of 1846.

The object of this bill is to have a declaration of the court that the title of the plaintiff under those settlements and pre-emptions is superior to the title conferred by Congress on the State of Iowa and her grantees under the act of July 12, 1862. If the lands were at the time of these settlements and pre-emption declarations effectually withdrawn from settlement, sale, or pre-emption, by the orders of the Department, which we have considered, there is an end of the plaintiff's title, for by that withdrawal or reservation the lands were reserved for another purpose, to which they were ultimately appropriated by the act of 1862, and no title could be initiated or established, because the Land Department had no right to grant it. This proposition, which we have fully discussed, will be found supported by the following decisions, which are decisive of the whole controversy: Dubuque and Pacific Railroad *vs.* Litchfield, 23 How., 66; Walcott *vs.* Des Moines Company, 5 Wall., 681; Homestead Company *vs.* Valley Railroad, 17 *id.*, 153; Williams *vs.* Baker, and Cedar Rapids Railroad Company *vs.* Des Moines Company, 17 *id.*, 144; Wolsey *vs.* Chapman, 101 U. S., 755; Dubuque *vs.* Des Moines Valley Railroad, 109 *id.*, 334.

The judgment of the supreme court of the State of Iowa, founded on the same view of the subject as above set forth, is therefore affirmed.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Mr. President, the legislation in which this controversy had its origin was passed by Congress in 1846. Along the weary lines of forty-two years this controversy has been wending its way. When the act making the original grant was passed, in August, 1846, Iowa was a Territory, but became a State before the close of the year. It became a State before the grantee attempted to assume rights of title under the legislation making this grant. The years that have passed have been weary ones to the settlers who are awaiting again the opinion of this body concerning the rights which they claim to have to their lands. They have never had an opportunity to appear in court and assert a title such as this bill proposes they shall have opportunity to present. The long line of cases referred to by the Senator from New York [Mr. EVARTS] originated in one wherein both plaintiff and defendant desired the same result, and, of course, got it, and from the judicial current then started have poured out all the other decisions to which the Senator from New York has referred. In none of those cases were the rights of these settlers presented; in not one of them was the United States a party, nor any other person entitled to present the title of these settlers as this bill provides. The purpose of this bill is to afford an opportunity for whatsoever rights these settlers may have to go to the courts of the United States for adjudication, and that is all there is of it.

Now, Mr. President, are there any considerations which should induce us to allow these men who for long years have resided on these lands, having gone upon them by invitation of the United States, to have definite determination of whatever rights they possess? The Senator from New York thinks it would be transcending all the rules of law whereby limitations fall upon rights and determine them, but he says it is true no limitation runs against the United States, and therefore this bill has been framed on purpose to allow an evasion to be practiced of that principle of law.

Mr. President, the bill simply provides the way and means whereby the United States can act in good faith towards the people invited by it to enter upon these lands to make their homes, and there they have been through a quarter of a century, and many of them more, making their farms, improving them, raising their children, and depending upon the good faith of the United States to protect them. The office of this bill is to offer opportunity thereto.

But, Mr. President, there is another question, and I come to it now because I do not wish to detain the Senate long in this discussion, and that is this: Can the United States or any other person, natural or artificial, make a grant when there is no competent grantee to receive it? Of course the Senator from New York will admit that that can not be done, and yet that was what was attempted to be done in this case. Before any of this land inured, even imperfectly, to the State of Iowa, a provision had been incorporated in the constitution of the State to which I wish to call the attention of the Senate. When the constitution of Iowa was formed in 1846 this provision was incorporated in it:

SEC. 7. The General Assembly shall not locate any of the public lands which have been or may be granted by Congress to this State, and the location of which may be given to the General Assembly, upon lands actually settled, without the consent of the occupant. The extent of the claim of such occupant so exempted shall not exceed 320 acres.

How was the State to acquire the land under this grant? By selection by authority of the General Assembly. Could the General Assembly select the land on which a settler resided? Not at all. Why? The constitution which created the General Assembly and all the officers of the State said, "You must not touch that land in making your selection." The State of Iowa was jealous of the right of the settler, of the hardy man who went there to aid in the upbuilding of that State, and therefore placed in her first constitution the declaration I have read. As the years went on, down to 1857, when a revision was had of the constitution of the State, care was taken by the revisers of that instrument and the people in the adoption of the revised constitution to preserve the clause which I have read from the original constitution.

Mr. President, could the General Assembly of Iowa, could the governor of Iowa, could any officer of the State, or all combined, select a tract of land on which a settler had planted himself? No. Then where remained the title to the land on which these settlers lived? In the United States. What do we ask by this bill? That the United States, having induced these settlers to go upon the land, shall now, through its own Department of Justice and in its own courts, institute a proceeding which shall make good the title it said these men should have.

Mr. VEST. With the Senator's permission, I wish to say that the position he takes, as I understand him now, is that the title did not pass to the State because of some provision of the State constitution.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I am speaking of the inability of the State under the terms of the constitution to select as a part of the lands embraced within the original grant those upon which settlers were located.

Mr. VEST. Mr. Justice Miller, in the decision to which the Senator from New York has referred, uses this language:

> The broader and larger questions of the title to the lands within 5 miles of the Des Moines River, above Raccoon Fork, which had not been certified to the State, and which were declared by the decision of Dubuque and Pacific Railroad Company *vs.* Litchfield not to be included within the grant of 1846, Congress retained for further consideration, and, at its next session after this joint resolution was passed, it completely disposed of the whole subject, so far as it was within its power to do so, by validating the grant of 1846 to the full extent of the construction claimed by the State of Iowa.

And then he emphasizes this with the further declaration—

> That the act of July 12, 1862, was, for the first time, a conclusion and end of the matter so far as Congress was concerned.
> The title of the plaintiff therefore rests upon settlements upon odd sections of land within 5 miles of the Des Moines River, which were reserved from sale or pre-emption at the time the settlements were made. Two of the settlements, which are the foundation of plaintiff's title, were made in May, 1862, only a few days before the passage of the act of July in the same year; and one of the settlements under which the plaintiff claims was made after the passage of that act. The title was transferred by that act to the State of Iowa for the original purposes of the grant of 1846.

If I understand that decision it says that by the act of 1862 all the title that the Government of the United States had in these lands was conveyed to the State of Iowa, and it is for that State to settle outstanding claims. If that be so, as the Supreme Court of the United States has determined, the question is settled, and it seems to me that ought to be the end of it. If I am mistaken I want to be corrected.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Mr. President, there is not one of the decided cases, nor the whole line together, that settles this question. As I stated at the outset, the first case was made up for the purpose of reaching a definite decision desired by both parties, and it was reached, and the cases have followed it on down since that time.

But even taking the statement of the Senator from Missouri to be exact in all its terms, I still insist that the question which I have presented never has been passed upon by the Supreme Court of the United States, and I want this question to go there in order that it may pass upon this identical point: How could Congress in 1861, 1862, or any other time confer upon the State of Iowa the right by its General Assembly, or by any of its officers, to take land in violation of that provision of the constitution of the States? Therefore when the grant was originally made I claim that so far as these lands were concerned Congress, in attempting to make a grant which would cover them, had no competent grantee to take them.

Now it is said that the State of Iowa through its governor conveyed under the directions of the Legislature all the rights, title, and interest which the State had in these lands above Raccoon Fork. So it did, but it could not convey by that deed any right to land which it could not acquire because of the operation and force of that provision of the State constitution; and so when the joint resolution of 1861 was passed, under which these adverse claimants insist they have title to the land because, they say, the conference of title by that joint resolution upon the State inured to their benefit under the deed made by Governor Lowe; but how could that be? How could Congress confer title on the State in that respect which would inure to the benefit of the supposed grantees in the deed of Governor Lowe when the State constitution itself declares that the Legislature shall not do it?

Mr. PUGH. I understand the position of the Senator to be that by the effect of the State constitution Iowa was incapable of becoming the grantee of these lands under the act of Congress of 1862, and that the act of Congress of 1862 did not divest the United States of the title to these lands because the State of Iowa was incapable of being invested with them on account of the State constitution.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. That is the point I make.

Mr. PUGH. And you contend that the title to these lands still remains in the Federal Government, and if the Supreme Court under this bill so decides, then these lands can be disposed of as was desired to be by the parties who had that original act passed.

Mr. VEST. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa a question. The last decision of the Supreme Court was by Judge Miller, a citizen of the State of Iowa, an eminent lawyer who had practiced in that State a number of years. That point is not stated in the Bullard case which he decided.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. I do not know why it was not done. I can possibly give the answer.

Mr. EVARTS. If the Senator will allow me——

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. EVARTS. He stated, as I understand it, that the decisions of the State courts of Iowa have sustained all these titles. Why should that have been overlooked in the Supreme Court?

Mr. VEST. I never heard of this constitutional question; I never read the constitution of Iowa about it; but it is a remarkable fact that Mr. Justice Miller, with the great popular excitement that existed in the State, for this has been a very irritating question there, as we all know, a citizen of the State and a prominent justice of the Supreme Court from that State, should have fallen over this provision of the constitution, together with all the lawyers, and never raised it at all, if it has the bearing the Senator says it has. I should like to hear that provision of the constitution of Iowa read again.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. It is as follows:

> The General Assembly shall not locate any of the public lands which have been or may be granted by Congress to this State, and the location of which may be given to the General Assembly, upon lands actually settled, without the consent of the occupant. The extent of the claim of such occupant so exempted shall not exceed 320 acres.

I do not know why that point was not pressed in the Bullard case, but I can answer why it was not decided. It was because it was not present in the record, I presume, and that is answer sufficient so far as the opinion of the court is concerned. If the issue was not presented, of course the court would not go out of its way to create it itself. But there is the constitution under which every officer in the State of Iowa, from the members of the General Assembly and the governor all the way down, was prohibited from interfering with the right of settlers upon the public lands.

How did these men go there? The executive department of the Government and the judicial department both decided that the grant of 1846 did not extend above the Raccoon Fork. Therefore settlers went upon those lands. The Interior Department had declared that the lands belonged to the public domain. Why, then, do not these men get their rights through the executive department of the Government? Simply because of a technicality which has met them at every step, and I will state what it is. The lands had been reserved from settlement. Therefore they were not open to pre-emption settlement, nor after 1862 to homestead settlement. Why? Because the Secretary of the Interior, at the time he declared them to be public lands, failed to revoke the order of reservation; and on that technicality these men are now deprived of the rights they otherwise would have had under the general land laws of the United States.

Now, will some person tell me how in law, notwithstanding the decisions the Senator from New York has referred to, an officer of the State of Iowa could select from the public lands within that grant as portions of it those upon which settlers were residing? I do not care how many decisions there have been; I want on behalf of these settlers a proceeding which will place before that court that question among the others which may be raised, and let the Supreme Court say on review of this whole transaction whether the General Assembly of Iowa or any of her officers can or could, in the face of that provision of the Constitution, deprive these settlers of their rights by selecting the lands on which they were residing as part of those granted under the act of 1864 to the State.

The Senator from New York admits that there are strong equities existing in favor of these settlers, and he provides in his bill a method for the ascertainment of actual damage suffered by them and a reimbursement from the Treasury of the United States. Why does he not apply the principle of reimbursement for damages suffered to the Des Moines River Navigation and Railroad Company? If they have rights, if they have reasonable grounds to believe that they were exempted by the Government, why should they not take the indemnity that he provides, and let the hardy settlers upon those lands have their homes?

But, Mr. President, that proposition is not made. It is only that the men who a quarter of a century and more ago, and those who under like circumstances at later dates have acquired rights, shall leave their homes and possessions and shall give up the results of their long years of toil, shall have all of the home sentiments and sympathies crushed out, and that they shall be turned out with a few miserable dollars doled out to them as the difference between their possessions as first occupied and the improvements they have made thereon.

The United States can not afford to put itself in that attitude. These men went there by its invitation. The State protected them in their occupation of the land by the provision of her constitution to which I have referred. It is often said that it is the duty of a government quite

as much to protect one citizen as a thousand. Why not then give to these people that protection? Why not open the doors of the courts, of its own courts, and let its Attorney-General enter those tribunals and present the issue which may save to these hardy people their homes?

Mr. President, I do not care to occupy more time just now, and unless some other occasion shall present itself during the progress of the debate I shall say no more, but will let this body vote again on the question. It has voted three times—on two occasions without division, on another by more than a two-thirds vote by yeas and nays in favor of this bill. Nothing is asked for these settlers but a judicial proceeding. Let them have it. It is their only chance. If the Government has misled them, let it do the best it can to protect them; but taking the case altogether, the operation of that provision of the State constitution, as well as other features of the case, I do not fear the result. Let the Supreme Court be called upon to determine definitely this exact issue.

Mr. BERRY. Mr. President, this bill was reported by the Committee on Public Lands during the last Congress, of which committee I was a member, and I had occasion at that time to examine its provisions rather closely. It had the unanimous report of the Committee on Public Lands. It passed the Senate by a large majority, passed the other House, was vetoed by the President, and failed to pass over the veto. It is practically, as I understand it, and probably literally, the same bill that was passed during the last Congress.

The object and purpose of the bill is to settle and quiet certain conflicting claims to lands in Iowa growing out of different grants, growing out of a misconstruction of a grant which, as the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] said, has been an irritating question in that State for a great many years, and will continue to be so until it is finally, definitely, and directly settled by the courts of the country.

The same objections urged to the passage of this bill are the objections urged by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] a few days ago to the institution of suits in the State of California. That is, it is objected that this bill ought not to pass because the courts of the country have already made decisions settling the titles in a certain way. It is objected further that it ought not to pass because it is alleged that the Government has no title, no interest whatever in this land, and it is simply using the name of the Government to give certain individuals a standing in court that they would not otherwise have.

These are the identical objections urged by the Senator from Nevada to the action of the Attorney-General in bringing suits in California, or suits that he proposes to bring. I think, however, that no one has questioned the motives of either the committee that reported this bill or the Senators from Iowa who so earnestly support it.

I therefore, in view of the similarity of the cases, take advantage of the present occasion to answer a few remarks made by the Senator from Nevada in reply to certain remarks made by my colleague [Mr. JONES, of Arkansas] a few days ago in the Senate. The Senator from Nevada avoided the issue made by my colleague and sought to make it appear to the Senate that the issue was whether the United States would, should, or ought to succeed in the proposed suits in California. The point made by my colleague was that the Attorney-General had the power to bring these suits; that it rested in his discretion whether or not they should be brought.

Nor did my colleague seek to throw the responsibility, as was asserted by the Senator from Nevada, upon the Interior Department. The Department of Justice takes the full responsibility. But my colleague referred to the fact that the action had been recommended by the Interior Department for the simple reason that such had been the practice under this Administration and former administrations, and for the further reason that it refuted the idea of any evil intent upon the part of the Attorney-General in bringing the suits. My colleague asserted that this discretion rested with the Attorney-General; and I now read from a recent decision of the Supreme Court of the United States to show that that assumption was authorized. The Supreme Court, in the case of the United States *vs.* Beebe and others, used the following language:

> The authority of the Attorney-General under the Constitution and laws of the United States to institute a suit in the name of the United States to set aside a patent alleged to have been obtained by fraud or other mistake, whenever denied by a specific pleading before this court, has been uniformly maintained. And it may now be accepted as settled that the United States can properly proceed by bill in equity to have a judicial decree of nullity and an order of cancellation of a patent issued in mistake or obtained by fraud where the Government has a direct interest or is under an obligation respecting the relief invoked.

The court further on used this language:

> The court below held that the bill in this case having been filed on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, for the declared purpose of having the questions which were being pressed upon the Land Department, in connection with the claims of the Philbrook heirs against the Government, determined by the judicial department, which claims were unsettled and important, the appeal to the court was proper. In this we think the learned judge is in full accord with the principle laid down by Mr. Justice Miller in the San Jacinto case.

It is directly and specifically decided there that the Attorney-General had a right to order these suits to be brought if in his judgment either of these facts laid down in this opinion existed in the case. If he has exercised that discretion improvidently I can see that the Senator from Nevada had a right to criticise his action in the premises and say that it does not fall within the case; but I deny that the Senator from Nevada has any right, without any proof whatever, to impute to the Attorney-General evil motives in bringing such suits.

It is true that private individuals, and sometimes the public press of the country, impute bad motives to public officers, and no public officer is so high that he escapes them. They have charged to the President of the United States, they have charged to Senators upon the floor of the Senate bad motives for their action in certain cases during the present session of Congress; but so long as such charges are made by private individuals or by partisan newspapers no one attaches any importance to it unless they produce evidence. But I assert again that unless the Senator from Nevada is furnished with proof that the Attorney-General in this California case was actuated by some bad motive—and the burden rests upon him to produce that proof—then he had no right to attack the Attorney-General's motives upon the floor of the Senate.

I do not believe that there is a single Senator upon the other side of the Chamber who served with the Attorney-General for the period of eight years that he was a member of this body who would be willing to impute to him any dishonest or dishonorable act. The distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS], who, perhaps, knew the Attorney-General as thoroughly as any man in the Senate—certainly as intimately as any one upon the other side of the Chamber—during the last Congress, when speaking of the Attorney-General, used the following language:

> The Attorney-General, for whose personal honesty and good intentions in every respect I have as great regard as I have for that of any man in the world.

I say such was the language used by the Senator from Vermont, who served with the Attorney-General upon committees in this body and who was intimately and thoroughly acquainted with every public act of his while he served here as a Senator.

Mr. Garland has been a citizen of the State from which I come for a period of more than fifty years. He has held many public positions of honor and trust, and during all that time nothing touching his good name has ever been alleged against him. Mr. Garland is recognized by the country at large as a lawyer who ranks with the best, as a patriotic and conservative statesman, as a representative of the people, whose interests he never betrayed, as a true gentleman, and an honest man, and such history will record him.

I rose simply to say that whoever in connection with these suits in California imputes to him any motive other than an honest desire to serve the Government, whose officer he is, faithfully and honestly and for the best interests of the whole people, does a gross injustice to a worthy official and an honest man.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I have no disposition to ascribe motives to any one, but I desire now, since this matter is again brought up, to state some facts showing the great hardship and injustice inflicted upon many citizens of this country by the official conduct of the Attorney-General. I regard it as a duty, not a pleasure, to say what I am about to say in reference to the Attorney-General, for I entertain for him none but kindly feelings. I first met him some twenty years ago and became well acquainted with him. He is a genial, pleasant man, but he is inflicting or allowing to be inflicted a great wrong upon a large number of people in California.

The cases to which I alluded are five in number. Four of them are of ancient date. In the two principal cases the patents were granted in 1857 and in 1859. In the case of the Las Pulgas Rancho the patent was granted October 2, 1857. The Cañada de Raimundo grant was dated July 19, 1859. These patents were granted after the claims had been confirmed by the courts, the United States having been represented, the settlers having had an opportunity to appear. Final decrees were had and then surveys were made by the surveyor-general after notice. These surveys were returned to the Interior Department for examination and approval, and were decided at a time when, I think, the Senators from Arkansas will admit the Commissioner of the General Land Office was at least a competent person. That person was Thomas A. Hendricks, who granted both of these patents. Mr. Thompson was Secretary of the Interior. They were granted, I say, after a hearing in that Department, after full notice to all the contestants.

Upon them are several large towns and villages. The water-works of San Francisco lie mostly upon those grants. San Mateo and Menlo Park are on these grants. There is not a settler upon them. In that they differ from the case under consideration. The case under consideration is for the protection of settlers who have been upon the land in Iowa for twenty-five, thirty, and forty years. The cases brought by the Attorney-General are cases where the lands have been settled for the last thirty years, under patents granted to a large number of people.

At whose instigation and why were these suits brought? I have examined the records in the Interior Department since the discussion the other day, and I find that the suits in all these five cases were ordered to be commenced on the application of J. W. Denver, his brother St. Clair Denver joining in one of them. It appears by the letter of the Attorney-General himself that these orders to bring suits were made not on the original request of the Interior Department, but on the application of General Denver. A letter which I copied in the Depart-

ment, and is a sample of all his returns to the Department in deciding to bring these suits, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, *Washington, November 23, 1886.*

SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of September 4, with its inclosures, relative to the application of J. W. Denver, attorney for the Coppinger claimants under the San Raimundo grant, for authority to use the name of the United States in legal proceedings to set aside a patent issued for the private land claim known as "Las Pulgas," San Mateo County, California, in order to secure the rectification of the survey thereof and of the San Raimundo grant.

The matter has been referred to the United States attorney for California, John T. Carey, esq., San Francisco, with instructions to institute the suit referred to, in accordance with your request.

Very respectfully,

A. H. GARLAND, *Attorney-General.*

The SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

These suits, as I said, were brought on the application of J. W. Denver. On looking further into the papers in the case I find that the real party in interest, the real prosecutor in these cases who caused these suits to be brought, is one R. S. Thornton. R. S. Thornton is a man well known in California as a leader in litigation. He has been here for the last twenty-five years attempting to pick flaws in titles and to get legislation. R. S. Thornton is the person for whom General Denver appears.

I find on file an application from R. S. Thornton to the Commissioner of the General Land Office to survey those towns and cities with a view of these proceedings. The Department declined to make the survey. The matter was referred to the Attorney-General, and the Attorney-General gave an opinion, which is on file in the Interior Department, that it was the duty of the Commissioner of the General Land Office to survey this private property which had been in the possession of citizens for a generation, and to use the funds appropriated by Congress for other purposes.

I say that it came with bad grace from Mr. Sparks, the late Commissioner of the General Land Office, to call on Congress for more appropriations for clerks to do the current business and represent, which is undoubtedly true, that there are from 12,000 to 15,000 undisputed cases of settlers desiring titles that could not be disposed of for want of force while he was using the money appropriated for that purpose to set aside patents issued by Mr. Hendricks thirty years ago.

I do not attribute it all to the Interior Department, because I think it emanates from a particular source in the Interior Department, and not from that Department generally. I want to exempt the Department as a general rule from this raid, but I say while they are clamoring for more clerks and more money they undertake to undo the work that was done by former administrations, including Democratic as well as Republican. They are trying to drive from their homes thousands of people instead of giving homes to those who are rightfully entitled to them under the laws of Congress.

That is the proceeding here, and that is not all. I hold in my hand a letter from the Attorney-General to myself with regard to this matter. After the trial in the San Jacinto case, in which I was an attorney, had been disposed of, I called on the Attorney-General and directed his attention to that decision. I had some pleasant conversation with him. He addressed me afterwards a note referring to it. It is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, *Washington, May 15, 1888.*

SIR: Since our conversation of yesterday relative to the suits heretofore directed in Northern California, in the matter of the patents to the Ranchos Raimundo and Las Pulgas, Buri-Buri, and others, I have gone over the papers with my law clerk, Mr. Robinson, and I find that the cases came to the Department with the urgent recommendations of the Secretary of the Interior that suits be brought to correct errors in the surveys and to annul or modify the patents.

From one cause and another the actions have not been commenced, but I have to-day taken steps to have them begun without further unnecessary delay and brought to a speedy judicial determination.

Very respectfully,

A. H. GARLAND, *Attorney-General.*

Hon. W. M. STEWART,
United States Senate.

So far from its being the Interior Department, it was R. S. Thornton who inaugurated this proceeding. In order that the date of these various grants and the persons to whom the grants were given may appear in my remarks, I shall incorporate a list of these five grants with their dates and the officers who made the grants.

Buri-Buri: Date of patent, October 17, 1872. Commissioner, Willis Drummond. Secretary of Interior, Delano. Attorney, J. W. Denver.

Las Pulgas Rancho: Date of patent, October 2, 1857. Commissioner, Thomas A. Hendricks. Secretary of Interior, Jacob Thompson. Attorney, Denver.

Cañada de Raimundo: Date of patent, July 19, 1859. Commissioner, Thomas A. Hendricks. Secretary of Interior, Jacob Thompson. Attorney, Denver.

Cañada de Guadalupe la Visitacion y Rodeo Viejo: Date of patent, September 22, 1865. Commissioner, James M. Edmunds. Secretary, O. H. Browning. Attorney, Denver.

Corte de Madera del Presidio: Date of patent, February 25, 1 85. Commissioner, MacFarland. Secretary, Teller. Attorneys, J. W. & A. St. Clair Denver. R. S. Thornton, "agent for self and also for Coppinger claimants."

In my former remarks are printed the letter of the governor of California and petition of the leading members of the bar and many citizens protesting against this arbitrary proceeding of the Attorney-General. The governor transmitted these protests to the President of the United States for his consideration, asking that these suits should not be brought, and that the order should be countermanded. The Attorney-General had all this before him, and he consults a law clerk, as shown by his letter to me, but tells the Senate in answer to a resolution of inquiry that it was done at the urgent solicitation of the Interior Department. I say the Interior Department has no more jurisdiction over the matter than I have. It has passed for nearly thirty years out of their jurisdiction, and there is nothing in the Interior Department to make the Attorney-General attempt to review cases that occurred a generation ago.

How can the Department now administer the law more intelligently than Thomas A. Hendricks did? Whatever else may be said of him, he was a clear-headed, conscientious lawyer. I served with him upon the Committee on Public Lands here. I learned from him much that I know of the public-land laws and the practice under them. I came here and he was my teacher in the public-land laws, and a faithful, intelligent teacher he was. Wherever he granted a patent you may be pretty certain that it is right. For this administration, after the witnesses are all dead, to go back and say after thirty years have intervened, and cities have grown up, and at the instigation of an irresponsible man, undertake to review that work and neglect the issuing of patents that are necessary, it seems to me only wants to be stated to be condemned.

I say it was the duty of the Attorney-General to have heard the parties, to have summoned those lawyers and let them meet this agitator, this lobbyist, R. S. Thornton, face to face before he threw a cloud upon the title of thousands of people which must last for a generation before it can be removed if it has to go through the courts. The Supreme Court kindly advanced the San Jacinto case that a precedent might be set, and a precedent was set that ought to put an end to these raids upon private rights.

I will allude to that case briefly, and the rule laid down, so as to show how far the Attorney-General in this case has departed from it. But before I proceed to that I wish to say one word further about the Interior Department. I do not wish to cast any unjust reflections upon any one. I do not believe the Interior Department as such is responsible for these suits. When these orders were first given several gentlemen came from California—I was here last year—friends of mine, met me, and desired to be introduced to the Interior Department officials with regard to the matter.

I went to the Interior Department with the gentlemen and saw Mr. Lamar and inquired about the orders to bring these suits. Mr. Lamar said that he had no knowledge of any such orders. We told him that they had certainly been issued. He sent for the papers and found that he had signed them. He had signed them as a matter of course in the routine of business. I wish to say with regard to this matter, that if the Secretary of the Interior undertook to read all the communications that are prepared by the various bureaus for him to sign, he could do no other business. In fact he has no time to read them and can not read them. An ex-Secretary of the Interior said that would be an impossibility; that the Secretary of the Interior can only refer a matter to the Attorney-General, where it is to be investigated. Mr. Lamar took no responsibility in the matter. It emanated from another source, it emanated lower down. He had no responsibility in the matter, and in proof of how he regards such investigations I hold in my hand a decision rendered by Mr. Justice Lamar very recently, in which he condemns in unmeasured terms the bringing of stale suits to discredit titles and using the name of the United States for the purpose of private suits and private litigation. I refer to the case of the United States *vs.* Charles Beebe and others, which arose in the State of Arkansas. The Senators from that State are undoubtedly more familiar with that case than I am, but it involves the same principle of using the name of the United States for the benefit of private individuals.

The following are Mr. Lamar's views upon this character of suits and the impropriety of the name of the United States being used to disturb patents issued more than a generation ago. After stating the facts of the case and the decisions conceding to the Attorney-General the naked power to bring the suit, Justice Lamar said:

It is insisted that here the State is a party, moving the contest, and setting up a right to have this survey certified, and that the tenant will not be protected by his possession, because the statute of limitations does not run against the State. We have decided, and the decision is sustained by unbroken masses of authority, that the statute of limitations does not run against the State. The answer, however, to this argument is this: The State of Georgia is not the real party to the proceeding. * * * The process is in the name of the State, but the right asserted is a private right; the issue is between two of the citizens of the State.

Applying these principles to this case, an inspection of the records shows that the Government, though in name the complainant, is not the real contestant party to the title or property in the land in controversy. It has no interest in the suit, and has no thing to gain from the relief prayed for, and nothing to lose if the relief is denied. The bill itself was filed in the name of the United States, and signed by the Attorney-General on the petition of private individuals, and the right asserted is a private right, which might have been asserted without the intervention of the United States at all.

In his letter to the United States district attorney upon the subject the Attorney-General directs that that officer shall sign his (the Attorney-General's) name to the bill, when the attorneys for the petitioners shall present such a bill, and file the same in the proper court, and that after the suit is commenced these attorneys for the petitioners will have the management of the case. Accordingly the subsequent proceedings in the case have been conducted exclusively by these attorneys, who, in the pleadings, describe themselves as attorneys for the petitioners and beneficiaries of the suit.

We are of the opinion that when the Government is a mere formal complainant in a suit, not for the purpose of asserting any public right or protecting any public interest, title, or property, but merely to form a conduit through whom one private person can conduct litigation against another private person, a court

of equity will not be restrained from administering the equities existing between the real parties by any exemption of the Government designed for the protection of the United States alone. The mere use of its name in a suit for the benefit of a private suitor can not extend its immunity as a sovereign government to said private suitor, whereby he can avoid and escape the scrutiny of a court of equity into the matters pleaded against him by the other party; nor stop the court from examining into and deciding the case according to the principles governing courts of equity in like cases between private litigants.

These principles, so far as they relate to general statutes of limitation, the laches of a party, and the lapse of time, have been rendered familiar to the legal mind by the oft-repeated enunciation and enforcement of them in the decisions of this court. According to these decisions, courts of equity in general recognize and give effect to the statute of limitations as a defense to an equitable right, when at law it would have been properly pleaded as a bar to a legal right. They refuse to interfere to give relief when there has been gross negligence in prosecuting a claim or where the lapse of time has been so long as to afford a clear presumption that the witnesses to the original transaction are dead, and the other means of proof have disappeared.

We think the court below justly and wisely applied the principle to the case under consideration in sustaining the demurrer and dismissing the bill. The rights of the Philbrook heirs, the real parties to this case, which are set up in this bill, originated in 1815. The acts of Beebe perpetrating the alleged fraud were prior to 1838. The alleged illegal action of the Land Department occurred in 1839. More than forty-five years ago the complainants in this bill could have instituted their action.

The death of the parties charged with the fraud, and also of most, if not all, of the witnesses having personal knowledge of the transaction, the fact that a city has been built upon the land in question, the occupation of large portions of it by hundreds of innocent purchasers, the homesteads of many families covering other portions of it, the uninterrupted possession maintained for more than a generation, all resting upon faith in the patent issued by the United States Government, constitute reasons more than sufficient for the refusal of the court to set aside such patent at the suit of a party who has so long slept upon his alleged rights. For the reasons herein stated, the decree of the court below is affirmed.

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir.

Mr. BERRY. I neglected to refer to that case as I intended to do. That was a case which arose in the city of Little Rock. The claim originated more than forty years ago. It involved 480 acres of land lying in the city of Little Rock and the title of persons who have been living in their homes and residing there for more than a quarter of a century. At the instance of Mr. Philbrook, the late Attorney-General, Mr. Brewster, directed the suit to be brought in the name of the United States. Notwithstanding these parties had held their titles and believed that they had a valid title for the period of forty years, the Attorney-General directed the suit to be brought in the name of Philbrook against the holders of the city of Little Rock. Although I have no doubt the people thought it was a hardship upon them to defend their homes, yet I do not think that even they ever imputed any evil motives to the late Attorney-General, Mr. Brewster, for directing that suit to be brought.

Mr. STEWART. What is the difference between that case and this? The people in the case I am considering are more numerous than in the town of Little Rock. They are living upon the lands, and they have lived upon them for a quarter of a century, and the suits are brought at the instigation of a lobbyist without a hearing. Is it not just as strong, would not the language of Justice Lamar apply to this case as well as to the Little Rock case in his condemnation?

But I condemn the action of Attorney-General Brewster. He set a very bad precedent. The San Jacinto case in which I was of counsel was instituted by him. A former Attorney-General some ten years ago tried a similar raid, and authorized, as I said the other day, one John B. Howard to make a general raid upon titles. Before I proceed to the San Jacinto case I want to call attention to what the Supreme Court said about John B. Howard's raid, to show what the Supreme Court thought of this kind of proceeding and to show that the Department is not following the courts, but is following the lobby. A celebrated case, one of John B. Howard's cases, is known as the Throckmorton case. Mr. Justice Miller, in discussing the propriety of the conduct of the Attorney-General in that case, said:

In the class of cases to which this belongs, however, the practice of the English and American courts has been to require the name of the Attorney-General as indorsing the suit before it will be entertained.

In explanation I would say that the Attorney-General authorized John B. Howard to appear for him, and he used the district attorney's name, authorizing him in that way, but the principle is the same.

The reason of this is obvious, namely, that in so important a matter as impeaching the grants of the Government, under its seal, its highest law officer should be consulted, and should give the support of his name and authority to the suit. He should also have control of it in every stage, so that if at any time during its progress he should become convinced that the proceeding is not well founded or is oppressive he may dismiss the bill.

I shall show how the present Attorney-General has disregarded this direction and suggestion of the Supreme Court.

There is appended to this record, though no part of it, a bond, given by some private persons to the United States, to save it harmless of costs in regard to this suit. If it is intended by this to show that the Attorney-General authorized this suit, it fails to prove it, though the bond recites that that officer had directed the district attorney to bring this suit.

It is not in this way that the then Attorney-General should have placed himself on the record as responsible for such a bill. In confirmation of this view, it does not appear that he or his successors have ever given the slightest attention to the case. At the argument of it before us no officer of the Government appeared. It would be a very dangerous doctrine, one threatening the title to millions of acres of and held by patents from the Government, if any man who has a grudge or claim against his neighbor can, by indemnifying the Government for costs, and furnishing the needed stimulus to a district attorney, institute a suit in chancery in the United States to declare the patent void.

It is essential, therefore, to such a suit that without special regard to form, but in some way which the court can recognize, it should appear that the Attorney-General has brought it himself, or given such order for its institution as will make him officially responsible for it and show his control of the cause. (98 U. S., pages 70, 71.)

Equally caustic remarks were made by other judges in the courts below, and for ten years the whole proceedings in this raid were quieted until Attorney-General Brewster authorized one or two suits. The San Jacinto suit was authorized before the present Attorney-General came into office. I was of counsel in the court below. The proceedings made it very oppressive to the parties. They were required to travel over California, and were made to spend $5,000 or $6,000 in taking testimony. After this was done, as attorney for the San Jacinto Company, I addressed a letter to the present Attorney-General and asked him to dismiss the suit. "No," he said.

Mr. BUTLER. Will the Senator from Nevada yield to me for one moment? I wish to make a motion.

Mr. STEWART. All right.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. BUTLER. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I hope my friend will not press that motion until the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] comes in.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, entered the Chamber.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Oh, here he is.

Mr. BUTLER. I am satisfied that the Senator from Iowa will not object to the motion.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I should like to say——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I understood that, but I ask unanimous consent to make a brief statement.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I should like to have the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] know of this motion. I think perhaps it is his intention to ask the Senate to consider an appropriation bill to-morrow. If that is the case, I should like to have him know of the motion before we vote on it.

Mr. BUTLER. He can learn of it afterwards.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I beg the Senator to withdraw the motion for a moment, until the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] comes in.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I have sent down to his committee-room for him.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is the motion withdrawn?

Mr. BUTLER. For the present. I am very much obliged to the Senator from Nevada for yielding.

THOMAS JORDAN.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. STEWART. Certainly.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I have here a disability bill which has been overlooked in the Committee on the Judiciary. There has been an accidental delay about it. I ask unanimous consent to report the bill at this time and put it on its passage.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. EDMUNDS. From the Committee on the Judiciary I report the bill (H. R. 6946) for the relief of Thomas Jordan, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be now considered.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to relieve Thomas Jordan, of the State of New York, of all political disabilities imposed upon him by the third section of the fourteenth amendment of the Constitution of the United States.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed (two-thirds of the Senators present voting in the affirmative).

INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. CULLOM. If the Senator from Nevada will yield to me, I simply desire to give notice, as I am compelled to leave the city to visit West Point, that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the formal morning business, I shall call up the bill (S. 2851) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, for the purpose of making some remarks upon it.

ESTATE OF JOSEPH H. MADDOX.

Mr. VOORHEES. I desire to state that the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL], whom I do not now see in his seat, some weeks ago called up a bill in which I feel an interest, it being the bill (S. 2201) for the relief of Laura E. Maddox, widow and executrix, and Robert Morrison, executor of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased. The bill then went over informally on the request of the Senator from Missouri [Mr. COCKRELL], who has told me—he told me yesterday—that at any time when it was called up he would have no objection to its passage. Consequently, as I have to leave the city in a day or two, to be gone about ten days, I venture to ask the Senate on this assurance to consider the

bill at this time. It was reported by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] from the Committee on Claims.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Indiana appeals to the Senator from Nevada to yield to him for the purpose of considering the bill indicated.

Mr. STEWART. I should like to finish my remarks.

Mr. VOORHEES. The bill was passed over informally and it ought to be passed by the Senate now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for that purpose?

Mr. STEWART. I will yield.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2201.

Mr. ALLISON. Subject to a call for the regular order at any time.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2201) for the relief of Laura E. Maddox, widow and executrix, and Robert Morrison, executor of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased. It proposes to refer to the accounting officers of the Treasury Department, for determination upon the evidence taken and now on file in the office of the clerk of the Court of Claims and in the War Department, and other competent evidence, all matters in relation to the agreement of Joseph H. Maddox and his associates, made with the supervising agent of the Treasury, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, for the delivery of tobacco and other property under the permit, safeguard, and orders of the President of the United States.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROPOSED ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. BUTLER. With the consent of the Senator from Nevada, I renew my motion that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. ALLISON. With the understanding, I hope, that the pending business can be disposed of to-day.

Mr. BUTLER. I have no doubt that can be done.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from South Carolina moves that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

Mr. DAWES. May I have the indulgence of the Senate for a moment?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the Senator from Massachusetts proceeding? The Chair hears none.

Mr. DAWES. I wish to state that the Committee on Appropriations are ready to go on with the Indian appropriation bill and have been for four or five days. If the Senate, with that fact before them, choose to adjourn over, of course they will do so. I am ready to bring up the appropriation bill to-morrow morning, or this afternoon, or at any time.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not think that anybody but the Appropriations Committee are ready to consider that bill; so I do not see what we would gain by remaining in session to-morrow. Many Senators are going away, and I am inclined to think that it would be time well spent to let the appropriation bill go over until Monday.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I wish to say in this connection that I want to go away on Saturday, and I should like to be here when the Indian appropriation bill is considered. It seems to me that the Senate could not pass to-morrow any more profitably than in disposing of a bill of that sort, which is absolutely necessary to be considered by the Senate at some time. I can see no necessity for an adjournment over, and I hope the Senate will continue in session. There are many bills of importance that a number of us want to have passed. We rested pretty well yesterday, and are in pretty good shape for work to-morrow.

Mr. BECK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Debate can proceed only by unanimous consent. The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Kentucky will proceed.

Mr. BECK. I only desire to say that there are several questions connected with the Indian appropriations, and the members of the Committee on Appropriations would like to be present when the bill is passed upon. I happen to be a member of that committee, and I believe we can pass that bill to-morrow if we are all here. Next week there may perhaps be some trouble.

Mr. VOORHEES (to Mr. BUTLER). You had better withdraw the motion.

Mr. BUTLER. Very well; I withdraw the motion, and commend my distinguished friends for their industry and attention to their duties.

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS.

Mr. BROWN. May I appeal to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. STEWART. I can not yield any further.

Mr. BROWN. I wish the Senator to yield to me long enough to give a notice. I shall not ask to take up any time.

Mr. STEWART. Very well.

Mr. BROWN. I simply wish to state that on the 2d of March, 1887, an act was passed, as the Senate will recollect, establishing experimental stations at the agricultural colleges in the different States. The act requires that the assent of the Legislature shall be given to the appropriations for each State. The Legislatures of some of the States failed to act in the matter, and on the 1st of July the appropriation lapses. As a short bill has passed the House of Representatives giving the governor the power to grant the assent where the Legislature is not in session, I simply wish to say that to-morrow morning at the end of the formal business I shall ask permission to call that bill up. There will be no discussion of it; there is no room for it. It simply proposes to empower the governor when the Legislature is not in session to give the notice of assent. I will not ask the Senate to allow me to take up the bill now.

DES MOINES RIVER LANDS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 287) to quiet title of settlers on the Des Moines River lands, in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, this enormous power in the hands of the Attorney-General is so liable to abuse that I doubted the existence of the power, and in the San Jacinto case I raised the question whether the power existed at all. The majority of the court held that it did exist, and thus described it:

> We are not insensible to the enormous power and its capacity for evil thus reposed in that department of the Government. Since the title to all of the land in more than half of the States and Territories of the Union depends upon patents from the Government of the United States, it is to be seen what a vast power is confided to the officer who may order the institution of suits to set aside every one of these patents; and if the doctrine that the United States in bringing such actions is not controlled by any statute of limitations or governed by the rule concerning laches be sound, of which we express no opinion at present, then the evil which may result would seem to be endless as well as enormous. But it has often been said that the fact that the exercise of power may be abused is no sufficient reason for denying its existence, and if restrictions are to be placed upon the exercise of this authority by the Attorney-General it is for the legislative body which created the office to enact them.

The court, however, did go on to suggest very many important restrictions, and laid down rules under which it would have been impossible for the Attorney-General to have brought these suits if he had adhered to the discharge of his duty. I will submit some further portions of this opinion, showing how utterly groundless this particular suit was, and the want of equity in it, and the admonitions of the court to the Attorney-General to bring no more suits of this kind. The following extracts will show the views of the majority of the court upon the merits of this class of litigation and the considerations which govern the Attorney-General:

> But we are of opinion that since the right of the Government of the United States to institute such a suit depends upon the same general principles which would authorize a private citizen to apply to a court of justice for relief against an instrument obtained from him by fraud or deceit, or any of those other practices which are admitted to justify a court in granting relief, the Government must show that, like the private individual, it has such an interest in the relief sought as entitles it to move in the matter.
>
> If it be a question of property a case must be made in which the court can afford a remedy in regard to that property; if it be a question of fraud which would render the instrument void, the fraud must operate to the prejudice of the United States; and if it is apparent that the suit is brought for the benefit of some third party, and that the United States has no pecuniary interest in the remedy sought, and is under no obligation to the party who will be benefited to sustain an action for his use; in short, if there does not appear any obligation on the part of the United States to the public, or to any individual, or any interest of its own, it can no more sustain such an action than any private person could under similar circumstances.
>
> In all the decisions to which we have just referred it is either expressed or implied that this interest or duty of the United States must exist as the foundation of the right of action. Of course this interest must be made to appear in the progress of the proceedings, either by pleading or evidence, and if there is a want of it, and the fact is manifest that the suit has actually been brought for the benefit of some third person, and that no obligation to the general public exists which requires the United States to bring it, then the suit must fail. In the case before us the bill itself leaves a fair implication that if this patent is set aside the title to the property will revert to the United States, together with the beneficial interest in it.
>
> It is argued in the brief that this is not true; that in fact the Government is but the instrument of one Baker, who married the widow of Abel Stearns, and that Stearns contested the correctness of this survey with others before the Land Department very actively and energetically, because he had such an interest in the land covered by it that if it was defeated he would become the equitable or beneficial owner of the land. This view is supported by some pretty strong testimony and by the fact that Baker was the man at whose instance the action was begun.
>
> When the Attorney-General required that a bond should be given to save the United States harmless with regard to the costs of these proceedings, Baker was the man who furnished the security and signed the bond himself. The condition inserted in that obligation recited "that whereas the Attorney-General of the United States of America has this day filed, at the request of the above-named R. S. Baker, a bill in equity in the name of and on behalf of the United States of America against the San Jacinto Tin Company. * * * Now, therefore, if the said Baker shall well and truly save the United States of America harmless from all costs and expenses which may be incurred by or against them in the prosecution of said suit to its final determination, and pay or cause to be paid on demand all such costs and expenses as may necessarily be incurred in such prosecution, then this obligation to be void." Taking all these circumstances together, it raises a very strong implication that Baker expected that if the patent was set aside his right to the land covered by it, or to a large part of it, would become paramount.
>
> But we are not so entirely satisfied of the want of interest of the United States in the whole or a part of the land which is covered by this patent as to justify us in saying that the bill in the present case ought to be dismissed on that ground.

The following comments of the court will show how these cases have been once decided, and the present attempt to relitigate them is sim-

ply to retry what was tried and determined by competent tribunal more than a quarter of a century ago:

The strongest argument against the commission of any fraud, and in favor of the correctness of the location of the grant by the survey, is to be found in the fact that it went through all the different offices in the land department to which it could possibly be taken, from its being filed by Thompson in the office of the surveyor-general up to its consideration by the Secretary of the Interior himself, and in all these offices ample time was given for careful examination, and an actual scrutiny of the matter was made by reason of the contest of Stearns, who succeeded in having the lines of the survey changed, so as to exclude property in which he was interested.

After this change was made, it was again brought before the Commissioner and argued by counsel on both sides, and considered in the light of all the facts which either party chose to bring before the office, and abundant time was given for its investigation. Mr. Wilson, the Commissioner, was a man of many years' experience in the class of cases to which this belongs, and which he was then called upon to decide. He made a full report, which is in the record, to the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. O. H. Browning, a lawyer of eminence and a man accustomed to weighing testimony, who, after having the case under consideration from May 22, 1867, to October 19 of the same year, made the following decision, which he referred back to the Commissioner of the General Land Office for execution:

"SIR: I have received your letter of the 22d May last, submitting for consideration the papers of the private land claim in California known as the 'Sobrante de San Jacinto,' and asking for instructions on the 'application for a patent to issue in accordance with the survey approved by the surveyor-general of California.' A careful examination of the papers and consideration of the arguments of counsel have led me to concur in your opinion that all the requirements of the law have been complied with, and that patent should issue in accorance with the survey."

We consider this examination of the case in the office of the Commissioner and its re-examination by the Secretary of the Interior as possessing the very strongest probative force in regard to the question of fraud, which was mooted before them, as well as the question of the proper location of the grant. No stronger evidence could be given of the honesty of Commissioner Wilson and his belief in the correctness of the survey than the fact of his reference of the whole matter to the Secretary of his own motion without any appeal by either party from his decision.

They had in the Land Office abundant materials for the investigation of all the matters in dispute; they had before them the interested parties, with all the evidence which they could collect, the records, the Mexican archives, and control of all the papers of the Government since the territory came into the possession of the United States, as well as ample time, more than this court has, to consider all these subjects. Very little that is new or that throws any light upon the questions at issue is now produced on the hearing of this case.

With regard to the question of fraud, we have no hesitation in saying that there is no such case made of intentional fraud, or actual fraud, committed upon the Government of the United States in this transaction as justifies the cancellation of the patent.

Mr. Justice Field also delivered an opinion in that case, concurring with the majority of the court in their decision that there was no merit in that suit, but dissenting from the majority as to the unlimited power of the Attorney-General to institute suits to set aside patents to land.

Separate opinion of Mr. Justice Field.

I concur in affirming the decree of the court below dismissing the bill in this case. The bill was filed to set aside a patent of the United States issued to Maria del Rosario Estudillo de Aguirre, and her heirs, for land situated in Southern California, in what is now known as San Bernardino County, granted to her by the Mexican government. The grant was of the *sobrante*, or surplus lands remaining within the boundaries of a tract called San Jacinto, after satisfying two previous grants.

The claim under it was presented to the board of land commissioners created by the act of Congress of March 3, 1851, to ascertain and settle private land claims in California, and was adjudged to be valid to the extent of 5 leagues. On appeal to the district court of the United States for the southern district of California, the claim was confirmed to the surplus land lying within the designated boundaries, not exceeding in extent 11 square leagues.

The case being brought to this court, the latter decree was affirmed. The judgment here was rendered at the December term, 1863. Then followed a protracted contest, accompanied with much feeling, for the location of the claim. There being within the San Jacinto tract a tin mine, then supposed to contain a rich body of metal, every step in the survey was contested. Witnesses were examined and repeated arguments made by counsel representing the parties for and against the location sought.

As there were no boundaries of the sobrante marked, by which the claim could be specifically designated, much was left to the judgment of the surveyor general, after having examined the topography of the country and heard the statements of witnesses familiar with it. The limitation made by the grant itself only required that the claim should be located within the exterior boundaries of the San Jacinto, and not encroach upon the land covered by the previous grants. In the determination of the survey and location several years were occupied.

The matter was at different times before all officers of the Land Department whose judgment could control any of the several steps of the proceedings, the United States surveyor-general for the State, the Commissioner of the General Land Office, and the Secretary of the Interior. Every objection now urged against the survey as ground for revoking the patent was taken before them, fully argued, and held to be untenable. At length, on the 26th day of October, 1867, a patent was issued to the claimants, from whom the defendant, the San Jacinto Tin Company, derives its title.

In April, 1883, after the company had been in possession of the property for nearly sixteen years, and after all the other land within the exterior boundaries of the San Jacinto tract had been patented to the previous grantees, or sold by the United States, so that if the location and survey on which the patent was issued could be set aside, there would be no land left to satisfy the grant without annulling titles which the United States had conveyed to other parties, this suit was brought. And it was not brought upon any new fact produced, or any new reason assigned why the original survey should be disturbed.

All the grounds of complaint presented for the new litigation had been urged and fully considered before. And as if convinced that no beneficial result could come to the United States from the reopening of the old controversy; as if afraid that the United States might be cast in the litigation, a bond was taken from one R. S. Baker, with sureties, to keep the United States harmless from all costs and expenses which might be incurred by or against them in the prosecution of the suit.

The original contest upon the survey was carried on, and the expenses of it borne by, one Abel Stearns. Since his death this R. S. Baker married the widow of Stearns, and has sought to retry the issues as to the survey which were decided and determined in the Land Department years before, when Abel Stearns was living.

The bond recites that "the Attorney-General of the United States of America has this day filed, at the request of the above-named R. S. Baker, a bill in equity in the name of and on behalf of said United States of America against the San Jacinto Tin Company" to vacate the patent. Not for the interest of the United States, not for the protection of their property, or to vindicate their honor, but at the request of a private litigant, the name and power of the United States are invoked by the Attorney-General to set aside a patent issued after a protracted contest upon the survey with the predecessor of this litigant.

If this were a solitary instance where the name and power of the United States have been used to serve the interests of private parties, it might be passed by with the simple statement of the facts. But, unfortunately, it is not a solitary instance. The records of this court show that it has been a frequent practice of the Department of Justice in authorizing suits for the cancellation of patents.

In United States *vs.* Throckmorton, which was here at the October term, 1878, it appeared that the district attorney of California was directed by the Attorney-General to bring suits to vacate patents for lands in that State, upon security being given by one John B. Howard, or a deposit made by him of a sufficient sum to defray the expenses which might be incurred in the litigation; and the bills filed upon such authority were not sworn to nor even authenticated by the signature of the Attorney-General. In this case the bill bears the signature of the Attorney-General in office at the time it was filed. His signature gives some assurance, which was wanting in the Throckmorton case, of his belief in its allegations, and that the suit is really brought by the United States to protect their rights, and not merely to promote the interests of private individuals.

In that and other cases brought on the authority of the Attorney-General, the patents embraced many thousand acres of land, and one of the judges holding the circuit court observed that "It is not to be supposed that if the Attorney-General were persuaded that so large and valuable a property belonged to the United States he would have made the assertion of its rights to depend upon the willingness or ability of private individuals to defray the expense of the litigation." (United States *vs.* Flint, 4 Sawyer, 83.)

In the present case the bill seeks, by setting aside a patent of the United States, to restore 11 leagues of land to the public domain; and yet, so doubtful did the Attorney-General appear to consider the rights of the United States to this vast tract, that he required from the party at whose instance the suit was brought a bond of indemnity against the expenses of the proceeding.

In commenting upon a similar bond, when the case of Throckmorton was here, the court, speaking by Mr. Justice Miller, said: "It would be a very dangerous doctrine, one threatening the title to millions of acres of land held by patent from the Government, if any man who has a grudge or a claim against his neighbor can, by indemnifying the Government for costs, and furnishing the needed stimulus to a district attorney, institute a suit in chancery in the [name of the] United States to declare the patent void.

It is essential, therefore, to such a suit that, without special regard to form, but in some way which the court can recognize, it should appear that the Attorney-General has brought it himself, or given such order for its institution as will make him officially responsible for it, and show his control of the cause." (98 U. S., 61, 71.) And yet this requirement does not seem to have been potential enough to induce such an examination of the rights of the United States as to justify in the present case the attempt to enforce them without security from private parties.

I can not admit that the Attorney-General can, at the request of private parties, rightfully allow the use of the name and power of the United States in proceedings for the annulment of patents, upon such parties executing a bond as security for costs, or upon any other stipulation of indemnity to them. If the United States have not sufficient interest in property to justify the expenses of proper litigation for its maintenance, they had much better let it go.

It would seem that Congress designed to put its mark of condemnation upon the practice of obtaining services from private parties, without incurring liabilities for them, such as was adopted in this case, when, on May 4, 1884, it declared that "hereafter no Department or officer of the United States shall accept voluntary service for the Government, or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in cases of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property." (23 U. S. Stats., 17.)

The language here used clearly indicates that the Government shall not, except in the emergencies mentioned, place itself under obligations to any one. The principle condemned is the same, whether the party rendering the service does so without any charge or because paid by other parties. The Government is forbidden to accept the service in either case.

It is not to be supposed that any head of the Department of Justice has or would intentionally lend the name and power of the Government to further private ends, and yet there is no practical difference between that course of procedure and the one adopted in this case. The opinion of the court shows above all controversy the utter groundlessness of the charges upon which it is sought to set aside the survey. A very little attention to the proceedings had before the Land Department in the contest upon that survey would have satisfied the Attorney-General of the futility of any attempt to disturb it, and it is not probable that he would have authorized any.

But independently of these considerations I can not assent to the position announced in the opinion of the court, that the Attorney-General has unlimited authority by virtue of his office to institute suits to set aside patents issued by the Government. He is the head of the Department of Justice, and as such he is charged with the superintendence and direction of all district attorneys of the United States, and generally of all litigation in which the United States are interested. He is also the legal adviser of the heads of the Executive Departments, and if they are fraudulently imposed upon in the discharge of their duties, or have mistaken the law, he may at their request take such legal proceedings as are necessary to correct their errors and revoke their action.

The legislation of Congress points out the infinite variety of cases where legal proceedings may be taken on behalf of the United States in the enforcement of their rights, the protection of their property, and the punishment of offenses, and wherever no authority is conferred by statute express or implied for the institution of suits, none in my judgment exists. Whenever Congress has felt it important that patents for lands should be revoked, either because of fraud in their issue or of breach of conditions in them, it has not failed to authorize legal proceedings for that purpose.

In a multitude of cases titles to lands, upon which whole communities live, rest upon patents of the United States. In several instances, cities having more than a hundred thousand people residing within their limits are built on land patented by the Government. I can not believe that it is within the power of the Attorney-General to be exercised at any time in the future, this generation or the next—as no statute of limitations runs against the Government—to institute suits to unsettle the title founded upon such patents, even where there are allegations of fraud in obtaining them.

There must be a time when such allegations will not be heeded. The examination into alleged frauds, when the patents are applied for, ought to close all controversy respecting them; clearly so, unless, upon newly-discovered evidence of the most convincing character, Congress should direct proceedings to be instituted to set aside the patents, and that result can be obtained without impairing the title of innocent parties. The power of the Attorney-General, if admitted when a single person holds title under a patent, may be exercised in cases where a whole community holds under a similar instrument.

If, without the authority of Congress, such proceedings may be instituted by him upon the repetition, as in this case, of old charges, or upon the unsupported statements of interested parties, a cloud may at any moment be cast upon the titles of a whole people, and there would be in his hands a tremendous weapon

of vexation and oppression. I can never assent to the position that there exists in any officer of the Government a power so liable to abuse and so dangerous to the peace of many communities.

I do not recognize the doctrine that the Attorney-General takes any power by virtue of his office except what the Constitution and the laws confer. The powers of the executive officers of England are not vested in the executive officers of the United States Government simply because they are called by similar names. It is the theory and, I may add, the glory of our institutions, that they are founded upon law, that no one can exercise any authority over the rights and interests of others except pursuant to and in the manner authorized by law.

In the case of The Floyd Acceptances (7 Wall., 676), speaking of the powers of an officer of the Government—in that case of the Secretary of War—this court said: "When this inquiry arises, Where are we to look for the authority of the officer? the answer which at once suggests itself to one familiar with the structure of our Government, in which all power is delegated, and is defined by law, constitutional or statutory, is that to one or both of these sources we must resort in every instance. We have no officers in this Government, from the President down to the most subordinate agent, who does not hold office under the law, with prescribed duties and limited authority."

If the Attorney-General possesses the powers ascribed to him, in the absence of any law defining them, we have this singular condition presented, that the owner of property derived from the United States by the most solemn instruments, holds his possession subject to the liability that it may be disturbed at any time by a suit of the Government, brought at the will of that officer, a not very creditable commentary on our institutions; but if the owner can trace his title to some other source, he may have a reasonable degree of certainty that he will not be unnecessarily disturbed.

Aside from the qualifications thus expressed to the views of the court, there is much in the opinion which gives me great satisfaction. It holds that in suits brought by the Government for relief against an instrument alleged to have been obtained by fraud or deceit, or any practice which would justify a court in granting relief, the Government must show, like a private individual, that it has such an interest in the relief sought as entitles it to move in the matter.

If it be a question of property, a case must be made in which the court can afford a remedy in regard to that property; if it be a question of fraud, which would render the instrument void, the fraud must operate to the prejudice of the United States; and if it is apparent that the suit is brought for the benefit of some third party, and that the United States have no pecuniary interest in the remedy sought, and are under no obligation to the party who will be benefited to sustain an action for his use; in short, if there does not appear any obligation on the part of the United States to the public, or to any individual, or any interest of their own, they can no more sustain such an action than any private person could under similar circumstances.

From this ruling some degree of peace and security may come to holders of titles derived by patent from the Government.

From the clear and full statement, in the opinion of the court, of the case and of the controversies before the Land Department, involving the same questions now presented, there can be but one conclusion, and that is that the decree below dismissing the bill was in consonance with justice and right.

But there was one limitation put upon the power of the Attorney-General by Congress which he has deliberately violated in ordering these suits. It is a plain, distinct, and deliberate violation of a plain statute which was passed in 1884, and is found in the twenty-third volume of Statutes, page 17, and reads as follows:

> And hereafter no Department or officer of the United States shall accept voluntary service for the Government or employ personal service in excess of that authorized by law, except in case of sudden emergency involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property.

I hold in my hand the reply of the Attorney-General to the resolution of the Senate, in which he tells us that he has employed in sixteen of these land cases attorneys numbering something over thirty, I think, because there were several employed in each case, counting the different members of the firms. He employed them as special counsel, with no compensation from the Government. He has received the volunteer services in sixteen important cases, involving land upon which more than 100,000 people lived, and he has employed that volunteer counsel in violation of the language of the statute, which says he shall not do it; and he has allowed them to harass their neighbors. They are volunteer counsel, against the language of the statute.

You can imagine the evil and the persecution that may result by allowing blackmailers to prosecute these cases. I will not so characterize them, but they might be blackmailers. One individual, Mr. Thornton, will be talking about compromise with these poor people. Mr. Thornton, who holds the keys to the situation, will be proposing compromises. These people will have a chance to buy their peace, and they will be compelled to do it or stand ten years of clouded title—ten years of expense and vexatious litigation, and they will be harassed by these attorneys who are appearing without compensation. Mr. Thornton signs himself as the agent of settlers when there are no settlers; as the agent of adverse claimants when they have been defeated for thirty years. I ask by what authority does the Attorney-General of the United States farm out the privilege to volunteer counsel to litigate the title of their neighbors and to place them under tribute in violation of law?

Mr. BERRY. Will the Senator allow me to answer that each one of those suits is under the charge of the district attorney? The Attorney-General has not "farmed out" the power to bring suits, and his reply does not so state. The Senator will see from the reply of the Attorney-General that it is done by the district attorney.

Mr. STEWART. I know the district attorney. I know in the San Jacinto case he never opened his mouth or knew anything about the case. I have talked with the present district attorney. He has no idea of prosecuting them in person, nor does the Attorney-General expect it of him. The idea of charging the district attorney with all these duties is absurd. Mr. Carey, the district attorney, has other duties. The army of volunteer lawyers will do the work, as in the Throckmorton and Flint cases, as they did in the San Jacinto case and in every other case where the Attorney-General has allowed them to appear in violation of the statute. The district attorney never will be heard of; he is a cipher. R. S. Thornton is the man who dictates the proceedings, who will dictate the compromises, and when R. S. Thornton is satisfied this great Government will be content and these cases will be dismissed.

The Attorney-General knows nothing at all about these cases. The application came from attorneys or it was done at the dictation of a lobbyist. The litigation is prosecuted with unrelenting greed by a gang of men who expect to make money out of it. Do you think these volunteer counsel are working for the United States on account of gratitude to the Government? There is no disguise about it. Mr. Thornton does not pretend that he is acting for the United States. He alleges that he is acting for private parties; the whole proceeding is for private parties and not for the United States.

I shall not weary the Senate by going into details; but with this enormous power the Senate can see what abuses may result. The cases I have presented are the grossest. The attempt on the part of this Administration to review proceedings that occurred away back in the fifties under other Democratic administrations, it seems to me, ought to be regarded by Democrats themselves as unwarranted and unjust. In the most important of these cases you are not opening the books on the Republicans; you are opening them on former Democratic administrations, and at the instigation of a lobbyist, and not on the investigation of any responsible party. The Attorney-General, notwithstanding the governor, notwithstanding the leading citizens representing these cases, consults his clerk and lets Thornton proceed.

I alluded to this matter to show the enormous power that is falling into the hands of the Executive. Did I not select a happy illustration? There are over 35,000,000 people living on land patented by the United States. The power asserted here is that the Attorney-General may bring suits against any of these men, and the power is also asserted by the Attorney-General to let other litigants use the name of the United States, to let any attorney who wants to force compromises go into these suits and use the name of the United States to harass the people. Is it possible that no title is yet settled in the United States? Is every title held up? That is the case if the practice of the Attorney-General shall prevail.

He furnishes no excuse for this power, except it be that the Supreme Court declares that the power to bring suit exists. Any man in Ohio, or Michigan, or Illinois, any man having a building in Chicago, is liable to be sued and voluntary attorneys employed to cloud his title, and after occupying property for a generation he will be compelled to go through the process of litigation in the courts. I ask, is not that an enormous power? Has it not been abused, and ought it not to be curtailed?

I allude to this, I say, as an example of the naked power to disturb every man's title, and there is nothing so sacred as title to land. There is nothing so necessary to the prosperity of a community. The Attorney-General declares that he has the power. He does not regard the restrictions, that there must be equity, that there must be right, that the United States must be directly interested, that there must be an equitable case. He does not regard the injunction that was given by the court, that he must do it himself. He does not regard the mandates of the law, that he shall take no volunteer service. Independent and alone he strikes a blow at the prosperity of a sovereign State, and tells us, "I do it because I have the power. I am the Attorney-General, and the Attorney-General can bring suit to set aside all patents."

I alluded, and I have been called to task for it, to the Pan-Electric business, not to criticise the conduct of the Attorney-General, but to illustrate the vast power there assumed. Since this discussion opened I have read the report of a committee of the House of Representatives, both the majority and the minority report, in examining this question, and I regard the case as a good illustration of the power assumed by the Attorney-General.

Mr. HARRIS. Will the Senator from Nevada allow me to ask him if he does not know that the Solicitor-General upon his oath stated that never a word had passed between himself and the Attorney-General upon that subject, and that the Attorney-General had stated the same fact in his deposition, that the subject had never been presented to the Attorney-General, that he had taken no action in respect to it, had never himself passed an opinion or given a direction; that the whole matter had come up in the absence of the Attorney-General, and the action that was taken was taken by the next officer in rank in that Department, the Solicitor-General, whose duty it was to act in the absence of the Attorney-General.

Mr. STEWART. How does that affect this enormous power which was used by the Department of Justice? I do not care what were the instruments in that Department which were put in operation, the power was exercised.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I should like to suggest to the Senator from Nevada that it does very materially affect the charge he made last week, reflecting personally on the Attorney-General, when he charged that the responsibility for the proceeding rested upon him alone.

Mr. STEWART. Very well; I have read these reports. The Attorney-General at the head of this Department had at all times power to stop these proceedings, whether he was there when they were initi-

ated or at any other time. He did not swear that he did not know of the proceedings. He did not swear that he did not know that the name of the United States was being used, and he, from the time that knowledge came to him, was responsible. I do not charge him with conspiracy or anything like that. I do not charge him as the minority of the House committee did, but I do charge that that Department, he at the head of it, used an unwarrantable power, a power that never should have been exercised by any executive officer. Whether the power in that case existed at all was a question of grave doubt.

The circuit court of Massachusetts and many other courts have held that no such power existed. I hold in my hand the opinion of Judge Colt in one of these cases, reviewing the whole matter. He says it never has been decided by the Supreme Court; but however that may be, admitting that the power exists by the laws, the laws ought to be changed.

What does it mean to bring suits to set aside patents that have been granted by the Government? The only reason assigned for bringing this suit was because it was a monopoly. What patent is not a monopoly? The Government by its laws decrees that a man who makes a useful invention shall have a monopoly of it as a reward. If all men have monopolies all patents ought to be set aside. But the courts hold that the merits of the patent are open to litigation on questions of infringement. A man's patent is worth no more than the courts will accord to it. It is open all the while to private litigation, and is litigated from question to question in all our courts.

But what propriety was there in the Department of Justice, whether at the head or the foot of it, or anybody connected with it, taking this action? It has brought hundreds of thousands of dollars of expense by this private litigation on the plea that it was the duty of the United States after having granted patents and having created a monopoly to brings suits to set aside those very patents, when private litigants could litigate the cases as well. I say it was a grand usurpation. It never ought to have been tolerated one moment, and it shows the vast discretion exercised by the Department of Justice, one arm of the executive power. First they declare that they have the power, and will exercise it at their volition, to set aside the land titles of 35,000,000 people, and they justify it because the power exists, without investigation, without a hearing. The next day they declare that they have the power and will exert it to set aside all patents granted by the Government to inventors, that litigation shall be prosecuted by the United States, and they employ counsel and engage volunteer counsel.

What a usurpation this is! I tell you the more we reflect, the more this thing is discussed, the more we learn about it, the more it will be seen that this raid on land patents by the Attorney-General's Office is an alarming feature of the times and is absorbing the rights of the people, disturbing their property, interfering with private rights and endangering the peace and liberties of the country, and it must be stopped. If there is to be no title to property of any kind except at the will and pleasure of the Attorney-General, this country is no longer free. No country is free that has no legal rights, and what legal rights has any citizen when a lobbyist may call upon the Attorney-General to attack his title to his home? What a mockery to be driving these people from their homes under pretense of reinvestigating titles determined by the courts and the Departments thirty years ago, while hundreds and thousands of others are kept from their homes for want of an appropriation to execute the laws!

These are matters for serious consideration, and I thank the Senators from Arkansas for renewing this subject. I hope they will continue the discussion until every feature of it is developed, and then they themselves will have done the country a service.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Mr. President, when I first called the attention of the Senate to the assault made by the Senator from Nevada on the Attorney-General, I did so because I believed the Attorney-General had been unjustly assailed, that he had been charged with motives in the discharge of public duty which were disgraceful to him if true.

The Senator from Nevada a few moments ago made a declaration which clearly marks the line of difference between him and me in our estimation of this question. He stated that there was nothing so sacred as title to land. I think that any man's good name and his honor are a long way above any such consideration as title to land. While I knew nothing of the facts involved in the order for suits to be brought to vacate patents to lands in California, and cared nothing especially about them, I did care for the good name and reputation of a man who I believed to be as spotless and as pure as any who ever lived on the face of the earth or ever served his country in this Chamber.

I am not inclined to enter into a discussion of the facts involved in the suits which have been brought by the Attorney-General, but we all know that in an opinion given by the Secretary of the Interior to the Attorney-General, when his opinion was asked about the propriety of ordering suits to set aide these patents, he stated certain facts in connection with the cases which are exceedingly important. In that opinion the Secretary of the Interior, giving the facts in the case of one of the grants mentioned by the Senator from Nevada to-day, the Las Pulgas grant, states that the claimants of that grant set up in a Mexican court a claim for about 8 leagues of land, and that the court decided against the claimants; that when the commission that the Senator spoke so highly of the other day was organized by the United States Government, they practically renewed their claim under that commission, and it was decided against them again.

The case was appealed then to the district court, and the district court decided that they were entitled to 4 square leagues of land, beginning at the mouth of the San Francisquito Creek, and running up the coast 4 leagues, and 1 league back from the shore. The case then came to the Supreme Court of the United States. That court said the limits of that grant could be fixed with mathematical certainty. In the face of and defiance of this fact the surveyor sent on the ground for the purpose of locating that grant in conformity with the finding of the Supreme Court of the United States made a survey embracing 8 instead of 4 square leagues. The Secretary of the Interior in his report to the Attorney-General states the facts I have mentioned; and if in obtaining a patent a fraud had been perpetrated upon that great Department, there was nobody who had a better right to ask that the courts should intervene for the purpose of setting aside the result of the fraud than the head of the Department.

The Secretary in his communication to the Attorney-General, after reciting many important facts, says:

> It would naturally be supposed that, in the light of all this, there could be no trouble in locating the western line of Las Pulgas, which, as the Supreme Court in Greer *vs.* Mezes, 24 Howard, 275, in speaking of the same grant, say, being of "the breadth of 1 league from the estuary or bay was a certain and definite boundary," "admitting of mathematical certainty." Yet, incredible as it may seem, under the final survey and patent of Las Pulgas, its western line is located some two leagues and a half west of the bay of San Francisco, and includes the greater part of the valley of Raymundo, notwithstanding the repeated decisions above cited to the contrary.
>
> Exactly how this western line was thus broadened from one to two leagues and a half, and the acreage of the grant correspondingly amplified, may never be known. But facts enough are disclosed to create the impression that in the first instance the grossest fraud was practiced in order to extend this line on the preliminary survey, and afterwards the same line was designedly adopted on the final survey and carried into patent.

Mr. STEWART. When was that patent issued?

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. In 1857.

Mr. STEWART. By whom?

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. By the Secretary of the Interior, I presume.

Mr. STEWART. Who was then the Commissioner of the General Land Office?

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I do not remember. I have not gone into the details. I have never been an attorney in this case or otherwise connected with it. I want to read a little more of what Mr. Lamar said in connection with this:

> Some time in 1883, after the death of Van Dorn, the protest against his survey, made and filed in 1854 by Greer—

A protest had been entered and filed with him which had not been sent up, as he was required under his oath to do, with the report to the Interior Department. That protest not having come here, the patent was issued, as the Senator says, in 1857. Then Mr. Lamar goes on:

> Some time in 1883, after the death of Van Dorn, the protest against his survey, made and filed in 1854 by Greer, and which had been abstracted from the records, was found among some papers in a house in which Van Dorn formerly lived. The Coppinger claimants holding this newly discovered evidence to be conclusive as to the fraudulent action of Van Dorn in said survey, and also being unable to obtain relief otherwise, have made the present application.

And with these facts staring us in the face, with the knowledge that a protest which had been filed in 1854 was suppressed and not forwarded by the surveyor, and with full knowledge that this matter has been contested day after day and step by step, year by year and continually from the time the patent was issued until this discovery of the stolen protest, we are gravely told in the Senate Chamber that an outrageous fraud like that should be allowed to stand because, forsooth, thirty years had intervened after the fraud was perpetrated before full proof of it could be had. This is not the first time this case has been here. In a report which I hold in my hand, made by Mr. Lewis, from the Committee on Public Lands, in the House of Representatives, he states that a bill proposing to open this case had been reported in the Forty-first, Forty-second, Forty-third, Forty-fifth, Forty-sixth, and Forty-seventh Congresses.

These people have been here constantly demanding relief. The Senator himself understands that for thirty years they have been in Congress and the courts constantly attempting to secure their rights. Any persons holding these lands know all this. The world has had full notice all the time.

The Senator intimates that the power of the lobby has been arrayed in this matter. That was the difficulty in passing the bill through Congress, I have no doubt, in all these years. I submit to the Senator, in view of the facts he has stated to-day, that the power of the lobby has been unquestionably great, and I thank God from what I am able to see of this case that there is a possibility that some court may soon be allowed to pass on all the facts of the case and determine whether the fraud shall be allowed to live simply because it was carried through so successfully and adroitly so many years ago—in 1854—as to be impossible of proof until now.

The Senator states that there are three or four villages on one of those grants. No man knows better than that Senator that those villages are all upon the uncontested part of the grant; that the land which

is contested has no villages on it. These people understand perfectly well that their villages are claimed. Nobody denies that the grantees are entitled to 4 square leagues of land, beginning at the mouth of San Francisquito Creek and going up the bay for 4 leagues.

I do not know anything about the personal matters the Senator has brought into this discussion. I leave them to him and others. I know nothing about them, but I do know that the record shows in one of these cases that one of the parties had made a contract in the first instance with a lawyer that one-half of the land recovered over and above the real limits of the grant should be his, the lawyer's. I can not remember the name. But there have been some other examinations into these matters. I take it that the Senator from Nevada will not suspect, and least of all will not charge, that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] would be likely to invoke the intervention of the courts in these matters for the purpose of benefiting the friends and punishing the enemies of this Administration. I take it that he would hardly intimate that the Senator from Kansas would be willing to open up one of these cases for the purpose of carrying out some beneficial purpose or design so far as this Administration is concerned.

I take it that that Senator would hardly be charged with any of the infamous purposes that the Senator from Nevada has seen fit to charge on the Attorney-General during this debate. And yet I hold in my hand a report made to the Senate of the United States by the Senator from Kansas, in which, after citing all the facts in one of these cases with great care and circumspection, and, in my opinion, clearly showing the justice and necessity for sending this case to the courts, concludes as follows:

From the foregoing statement of facts (which are not disputed by any of the parties to this controversy)—

This was one of the five cases, the Presidio case, called up the other day by the Senator as one of the monstrous cases—

From the foregoing statement of facts (which are not disputed by any of the parties to this controversy) the committee deduce the conclusion that the grant to Read was one of quantity, and for 1 league of land and no more, to be found within the boundaries of the judicial possession conferred upon Read by the alcalde; that the decree of the district court confirmed to Read's heirs but 1 league of land, limited to the boundaries of such judicial possession; that said grant did not include Peninsula Island nor the lower portion of Point Taburon, nor any of the swamp or tide lands now claimed and which have been awarded to the Read heirs by the latest decision of the Secretary of the Interior. The committee have no doubt of the correctness of the decision of Attorney-General Devens upon all the material points of controversy.

But the decision of the Secretary of the Interior is entitled to great weight.

Mr. STEWART. Who was Secretary of the Interior when that was issued?

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I do not remember now who made the different decisions.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to say a word about that case.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Certainly.

Mr. TELLER. That occurred while I was Secretary of the Interior. The Senate referred the matter to the Committee on Public Lands, and a subcommittee made that report, as I understand. The Senate and House of Representatives, the legislative department of the Government, did not interfere in the matter. It had been in the Land Office a long time, and it had received the adjudication of the Commissioner and of the preceding Commissioner and preceding Secretary of the Interior, and in accordance with the views of the office the patent issued, not in accordance with the views of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB], who had not in the first place any control whatever over it, who was not charged by law with the adjudication of it, while the Secretary of the Interior was. The Secretary of the Interior exercised a power conferred on him by statute.

I only say that the facts stated in that report are not properly stated. They are incorrect, not that they were intended to be so, but because the committee could not give that attention to the subject which the Department had given. There were at least two bushels, half a basketful, of documents that went to that committee.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I regret very much to hear the statement made by the Senator from Colorado, in whose rectitude I have the most absolute confidence. I regret it because of the five cases mentioned by the Senator from Nevada, the only one upon which there could be any room for debate as to whether there has been a deliberate fraud is the one that I have here now.

There was in this case alone perhaps room for doubt. This man Read had a ranch which was described by metes and bounds and then as a league of land. The question was whether it was a grant by boundaries or a grant by quantity. There would be fair room for doubt on that; no man could undertake to say which was correct and which was incorrect. I admit there was a question of doubt about that all the way through, and it was because it was the strongest case on the side the Senator contends for that I was reading it to show the extreme on one side and the extreme on the other. I am sorry that the Secretary says that this does not carry absolute verity with it, because it puts the best possible phase on the side that the Senator from Nevada has been attempting to present heretofore.

Mr. TELLER. I should say that undoubtedly that was a case which might have been decided either way; but the question was the one described in the deed and, of course, the Department had to take the best light it could get and act upon its best judgment, and not upon the judgment of a committee of this body.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Exactly so; and that is precisely what I have been saying, that in this case there might have been some room for doubt, and I intended to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that there were these two ideas, either one of which might govern as to this grant, but not as to the others. The Supreme Court has said the others could be determined accurately. They have been decided without variation, without a difference, by all the courts, as I understand the decisions, wherever the question has come up for consideration at all.

I will continue to the conclusion of the report of the Committee on Public Lands:

But while the committee have not been able to adopt the views of the Secretary of the Interior, they feel that the contrariety of opinion held upon the question of the extent of the grant to Read by the Attorney-General and the Secretary of the Interior creates a substantial doubt, which can most properly be settled by the adjudication of a court.

That was the point made by Mr. PLUMB. He took exactly the same opinion that the Senator from Colorado does now, and that the Attorney-General has, that there was a doubt about it, and that it would be better, that it was right and proper that a court should settle the question. It was one of those doubtful cases that could not very well be settled by an executive officer. With that conclusion I fully agree, and believe it was correct.

The committee continue:

The fact that a portion of the lands in controversy are claimed by grantees of the State of California; that patents have been issued to other portions; that still another portion is occupied by the Government as a military reservation, and that it is regarded as of great importance in a military point of view, and that settlers under the public-land laws of the United States went upon portions of the lands now claimed, but which were excluded by the first survey, and who so settled in the faith of the validity of said survey constitute cogent reasons why jurisdiction should be given to a proper court to determine speedily and finally the validity of all outstanding claims under or adverse to the grant.

The absolute fairness of that proposition addressed itself to a man of the standing, character, and ability, and absolute freedom from any desire to punish any of the enemies of this Administration that characterizes the Senator from Kansas. He concludes with these words:

The committee therefore report a bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States circuit court for California, and requiring suit to be instituted under the direction of the Attorney-General, to which all persons in interest shall be made parties, and under the decision in which all rights will be determined.

I simply cite this to show a fair sample of these cases, and that no man could undertake to say that they were not cases in which an Attorney-General acting honestly might believe that suits ought to be brought. There is no justification for the violent onslaught made by the Senator from Nevada on the character of the Attorney-General, for in these cases facts are well understood, and, as I said in the beginning, it was to defend the Attorney-General against these assaults—assaults against his character—that I rose rather than to advert to the facts of the cases.

I wish further to say a word as to the charge made by the Senator from Nevada that the right of the Attorney-General to bring those suits had been "farmed out." That has been repeated again and again. I can not believe that the Senator means to make that charge. I think he certainly has not stopped to weigh and consider the gravity of it. I do not think he will deliberately say that he believes the Attorney-General has "farmed out" any privilege. He certainly knows the meaning of that expression, and I can not believe he will be willing to have it understood that he deliberately means to make such a charge. But he says that such has been the case, and that these suits are authorized to be brought by private parties. My colleague stated the fact to be just now that no such suits have been instituted by private parties. All the suits have been brought by officers of the Government in every instance. They have not been brought in any other way, and I take it the Senator must be fully aware of the fact.

One main point in the complaint, in the beginning, was that these suits had been instituted without a hearing to the parties. To-day, in commenting on the enormity of the outrage alleged, he mentioned that he himself had presented the facts on the other side to the Attorney-General, and he read a letter from the Attorney-General in answer to one he had written to him. He said the facts had been laid before the President, and yet, he said, the suits had been instituted without notice to the parties. It is best for a man in making charges of this sort to stick to one side or the other. It is inconsistent to say in the first place that the parties had not been heard, and in the next that the facts had been presented, and then, in direct disregard of the facts, that the suits had been instituted.

But, Mr. President, I do not propose to detain the Senate. I only intended, as I said before, to call attention to the facts, and I only proposed to defend the Attorney-General from this charge of willful and deliberate intention to do wrong. I do not really think that the Senator believes the Attorney-General is guilty of it. I know he is not, and I am satisfied that the American people will free him from any such charge, no matter by whom or where made.

Mr. STEWART. I only want to make a few remarks further. I am perfectly aware that there is no title in California but what somebody will come here and say it is a fraud. I am perfectly aware of the

fact that charges of fraud were very numerous at the time these contests were going on before the courts and before the Departments. They were hard to determine, but they were settled as well as human skill and human honesty could do. After the death of the parties papers are brought here or said to be brought here. Who knows that they are genuine? Who knows that they are true? I do not believe a word of it.

About San Francisco the property was valuable and these cases were contested inch by inch in the courts and inch by inch before the Departments. Everybody was heard. These cases were contested thirty years ago, and it is very easy now to come in here and try them in Congress after they have had their day in the courts. It is very easy to come here with *ex parte* statements that are true or false, with no means of testing them, and I repeat, the interested parties had their hearing at the time, and it is scandalous to give serious consideration to manufactured *ex parte* statements to defeat titles adjudicated more than a quarter of a century ago, when all these matters were investigated. The assumption that Thomas A. Hendricks, with the witnesses still living, all parties before him, could not locate a survey in conformity with the decision of the Supreme Court as accurately as Commissioner Sparks after the witnesses are all dead is too absurd for serious consideration.

I called on the Attorney-General not to represent any fact, but to say to him that after the decision in the San Jacinto case it was my opinion (and I think it is the opinion of the Attorney-General) that these cases could do the Government no good, and they were disturbing the people. I know he is a good lawyer, he has the reputation of being so, and he knows he can not take property away from those people after thirty years of possession, after they have been allowed to occupy it as innocent purchasers. The parties who are attempting to get this land have had their day in court, and if there was fraud they should have brought suit years ago, and if they had superior Mexican land titles they could have urged them, this class of claims and pretenses having been announced by the Supreme Court as stale.

In the case of United States *vs.* Flint, to which we have so frequently referred, Mr. Justice Field said:

> Although, on grounds of wise public policy, no statute of limitations runs against the United States, and no laches in bringing a suit can be imputed to them, yet the facility with which the truth could originally have been shown by them if different from the finding made, the changed condition of the parties and of the property from lapse of time, the difficulty, from this cause, of meeting objections which might perhaps at the time have been readily explained, and the acquisition of interests by third parties upon faith of the decree, are elements which will always be considered by the court in determining whether it be equitable to grant the relief prayed. All the attendant circumstances of each case will be weighed, that no wrong be done to the citizen, though the Government be the suitor against him. (4 Sawy., 48, 49.)

And upon the same question of laches and delays, Judge Hoffman, in the case last cited, says:

> Nor is it necessary to determine whether the general principle that laches can not be imputed to the Government applies to cases of this nature. It may, however, be suggested as worthy of consideration whether, if the act of 1851 be construed as tacitly reserving to the United States the right to re-examine and reverse in other tribunals the decrees which that act declared should be conclusive, the second proceeding should not be regarded as a part of, or a sequel to, the first, and that in it, as in the first, the United States has consented to be bound by all the rules which control the rights of equal litigants before a court of justice.
>
> It may also be suggested whether it is not a fundamental and inherent principle of the court of equity, at whose hands relief is now sought, to refuse to interpose in behalf of stale demands, not because they are barred by the statute of limitations, nor because laches can be imputed to the complainant, but because from the lapse of time and the nature of the case it is probable that justice can not be done. If this be the true ground of the refusal of equity to interfere in such cases, no distinction can be drawn between suits by the Government and those brought by private persons. The ascertainment of the truth may be as impracticable in the one case as in the other. If this principle be applicable to any case where the Government is a party, it would seem to be so to the case at bar—so far at least as the allegations of the bill are to be proved by oral testimony. (*Ibid.*, p. 80.)

I call particular attention to the language of Judge Sawyer, who tried the case at bar in the court below, upon the point under consideration:

> It would, in our judgment, be inequitable at this late day, considering all the circumstances of the case, to vacate the patent, even if there had been some evidence of conspiracy and fraud on the part of the officers charged. When the United States enters a court as a litigant it waives its exemption from legal proceedings and stands upon the same footing with private individuals, and, therefore, if on consideration of all the circumstances of a given case it be inequitable to grant the relief prayed against a citizen, such relief will be refused by a court of equity, though the United States be the suitor. (United States *vs.* Flint, 4 Sawy., 43.)

These equitable considerations have no weight with the Attorney-General against the *ex parte* suggestions of R. S. Thornton or his attorneys.

The Attorney-General sees no difference between a fresh case and one upon which the Government and the interested parties have slept for a generation until the property has passed into the hands of innocent purchasers and the witnesses who might have testified to the facts are dead.

One case is as good as another for the purpose of extorting money from the inhabitants. We do not charge the Attorney-General with extortion, but we do charge him with placing third parties and volunteer counsel in position to exact contributions from innocent citizens of the United States.

The patent of the United States in these cases is simply a quitclaim deed of the United States; and it is expressly provided in the law that if there is any superior title the patent shall not interfere with it. They had their day in court, but they did not want to bear the expense of taking the responsibility. They knew that they could not recover on their title. They come here and seek Congress and seek the power of the Government to take the property of their neighbors and give it to them.

How did R. D. Thornton become an agent for lands worth millions and millions and occupied by thousands of people? He could undoubtedly go and impose on a committee when nobody was paying attention, when it was one-sided; but in these cases patents were not issued in the ordinary way. When the survey was filed there had to be published notices, there had to be time for contest, all the parties came in, and I say to you, thirty years ago, when the witnesses were living, when the facts could be proved, was a better time than now, and if the Attorney-General on irresponsible stories of interested parties is to bring suits and disturb titles there will be no peace in the country; there will be no prosperity.

These slanderous, outside, *ex parte* statements against deliberate determinations by competent officers, with the witnesses before them and the means of getting testimony—because this was no *ex parte* proceeding at all—to say that they can come here and that their *ex parte* scandals should be repeated to the Senate of the United States to damage the title of parties who have had land awarded to them by the solemn judgment of the Interior Department thirty years ago on investigation, is absolutely intolerable.

When you come to investigate those ancient titles you will find that they are well fortified. We have had a reference to one finally acted on in the last administration. There might be some excuse for bringing a suit to correct that, because the facts are within the memory of living men and there would not be so great a hardship; but here is a gentleman who was then Secretary of the Interior, and he tells you that he weighed the facts and did the best he could then. That recent case is not such an outrage as to disturb thousands of people upon an *ex parte* statement about what somebody found after somebody was dead.

I did not make any representations to the Attorney-General except that these people wanted to have their titles quieted; that to disturb the California titles was wrong, and he told me he was the attorney of the Interior Department and must do as they said. I find by his correspondence that he is acting on the suggestion of a lawyer, and lawyers sometimes make strange suggestions when they are employed on a given side.

I say that it only illustrates the enormous power that is in the hands of the Attorney-General to disturb the community; and if he has all this power, if all titles are subject to be disturbed at his will, both patents to land and patents to inventions, this is a country of discretion and not of law.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. Just one moment to add one fact which I am satisfied escaped the attention of the Senator from Nevada. He says these people have had their day in court. So they had. They had their day in a Mexican court, then in the district court, and after that in the Supreme Court of the United States; and in each one of these courts, and in the commission, which he forgot to mention, the decision was against their claim, and the purpose of the present suit by the Attorney-General is to confine their land to the boundary and limit set out in each one of those decisions, as to which they had their day in court. That is all there is of the case.

Mr. STEWART. Congress passed on that question twenty years ago.

Mr. BERRY. I wish to make one statement. The Senator from Nevada said that I had brought this matter up again to-day. The Senator made these charges. They were replied to by my colleague. He then responded to my colleague for I think three-quarters of an hour, and when he knew that I was going to reply at the time and place, he yielded to the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] over my protest to make a motion to go into executive session, and I had no opportunity until to-day to say what I have said. One other word only——

Mr. STEWART. I want to say a word about that.

Mr. BERRY. If there is nothing in this case whatever, if there is nothing in these suits, it seems somewhat strange to me that the Senator from Nevada is so chary of an investigation. It creates a suspicion that he is so familiar with the facts that he might know that if this investigation is made it will turn out that the suit was well brought.

Mr. STEWART. Would the Senator desire a suit brought against him and his right to his homestead investigated by the Supreme Court, and be compelled to pay costs and kept in court ten years?

Mr. BERRY. If there was an allegation that I obtained it from the United States through fraud I would court such an investigation, and I would scorn to hold the land after such fraud was established.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator assumes fraud, but he is not the inventor of the charge. The lobbyist was the inventor of it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The pending amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 2, line 2, after the word "Attorney-General," it is proposed to insert the words "as soon as practicable and;" so as to read:

> SEC. 2. That it is hereby made the duty of the Attorney-General, as soon as

practicable and within three years after the passage of this act, to institute, or cause to be instituted, such suit or suits, either in law or equity or both, as may be necessary and proper to assert and protect the title of the United States to said lands and remove all clouds from its title thereto.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair is advised that the amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. EVARTS. Mr. President, I regret very much that the consideration of the Des Moines bill should have been protracted before the Senate by a consideration which, while possibly germane in the general relation to the disturbance of titles by Government, has really no bearing on the merits of this case, and that its discussion carried the debaters into that, into matters of interest to them quite outside, as it seems to me, of any general discussion. I shall, however, now confine what I have to say to a very few words.

It is true, Mr. President, that one suggestion has been made by the Senator from Iowa, and only one that I can perceive, which at all disturbs the legal propositions I advanced against this bill, its method, its object, and its constitutionality; and that is that there has not itself been presented in the controversies between these competing interests and claimants a question of constitutional law arising in the State of Iowa under its constitution. I am unable to see if in any of these litigations that constitutional question of the State of Iowa was a bar to the title of the plaintiffs representing the Des Moines Navigation Company claimants, or to a defense, as the case might be, under the litigations as they arose on the part of the settlers claiming adversely to the grant from Iowa to the Des Moines Navigation Company, why it was not a necessary part of that litigation. In my judgment it is no part of the litigation; but if it could be, it was a question of law in Iowa. It did not at any time, nor does it now, affect at all the question of whether the legislation of Congress vested these lands in the State of Iowa, not whether the subordinate and subsequent grants of Iowa carried to a particular terre-tenant a title to a particular lot of land because of the action of Iowa being at variance with the constitution of Iowa.

Now, the Senator must understand that he can not contravene my proposition against this legislation unless he claims that by reason of this point all subordinate and subsequent action of that State did revest the property in the United States. Surely the United States parted with their title, and it is now asked by this legislation that they shall resume this property on the ground that the State had not power to receive it. Unless there can be found something in the legislation of the United States that interferes with the proposition I have stated, the proposition must be admitted.

What is this proposition? How does the controversy arise at all? In 1846 the grant was made by this Government to Iowa of certain lands bordering on the Des Moines River. Nobody in Iowa ever undertook to limit the extent of this Government's grant to that State. They wanted the grant to be extended up to the northern boundary. It was questionable whether the grant of 1846 carried it above Raccoon Fork. But Iowa did not contend that that statute did not carry it to the northern boundary; and when, after disputation on that subject on the part of United States authorities as to how far the grant went, and whether it did or did not stop at the Raccoon Fork—when finally the Supreme Court, in 1860, the first time the consideration of the act of Congress of 1846 came before them, decided that it did not go above the Raccoon Fork, what did the Iowa authorities do on the subject? I find a convenient form to read from Judge Miller's opinion, which I have put in a statement not to be disputed by any Iowa pretension:

As soon as this decision—

Made in 1860, which held that the grant did not extend above Raccoon Fork—

As soon as this decision was made the State, through its Congressional delegation, sought the action of the Congress of the United States to obtain the passage of an act which would secure the grant to the State and its grantees in the full extent which they believed Congress had originally intended by the act of 1846.

Then what did Congress do? It decided finally in 1862—

That the grant of lands to the then Territory of Iowa for the improvement of the Des Moines River made by the act of August 8, 1846, is hereby extended so as to include the alternate sections (designated by odd numbers) lying within 5 miles of said river, between the Raccoon Fork and the northern boundary of said State.

It extended from that time and with the intent and desire of Iowa that it should operate as from the date of 1846; and now when the execution by the Supreme Court of the United States, when by the execution of the supreme court of Iowa all these titles above Raccoon Fork are held to have passed by the operation of the law of 1862 and the joint resolution of 1861, what is brought against the Supreme Court's complete adjudication of every question of title? Why, it is said that there is a provision of the constitution of Iowa, which has been read and to which I call the attention of the Senate:

The General Assembly shall not locate any of the public lands which have been or may be granted by Congress to this State, and the location of which may be given to the General Assembly, upon lands actually settled, without the consent of the occupant.

And it is said that some legislation of Iowa has contravened their constitution in respect to the titles to particular parcels of land that are in controversy or in claim. Does the Senator say that when the Legislature of Iowa transgressed that clause of their constitution by attempting to vest in private owners some portion of the public land of the United States, that revested the title in the United States? Does any one contend for that?

Unless that is the contention, what escape is there from the proposition that the first and essential initial step in this legislation, to seize by fiat of this law every inch of property that was parted with in 1861 and 1862 and add it to the public domain, can not be taken; and now it is supposed that some technical difficulty has arisen in the agitation of these controversies. How should it be technical? It was the decision of all the State courts of Iowa, of all the Federal courts on every form of agitation, that this title was in Iowa so far as the United States was concerned, and that there did not remain any opportunity to claim it or make out title or pretension to anybody under other laws of the United States, or under any regulations or rules of law that could compete with that sovereign grant of this nation to the State; and then the lawful or unlawful grant, as it might be, of the State of Iowa subsequent to and following down the title that was conferred absolutely on that State, has no possible influence upon this proposition which I have made.

Mr. President, I hold in my hand an abstract showing the title and condition of the river lands up to January 5, 1888, as reported to the governor of the State of Iowa by the commission appointed by the fourteenth General Assembly. Here are nine pages, showing the title and deductions of the description following out every lot. A great part of them, I am glad to say, have been settled by decision or by concession, but distributed over through this mass of private litigants and private litigation each turning under the law of the land of Iowa respecting land titles and land protection, dispersed through this long catalogue (and I call the attention of the Senate to the fact), are in the second and third lines of vested interest in these several lots. Then there are mortgages made by mortgagors who received their titles from the title conferred by Iowa and by the United States, and mortgagees that have advanced their loans not to any party under the original grants or under any of the disputes or controversies, but to present holders, to the extent of $400,000. And, now, in the Senate, without any reference to these subsequent rights—not the least—it is proposed to come in and resume as a part of the public domain every inch that was parted with under the grant made years ago.

The bill then undertakes by reason of it being part of the public domain to rearrange and distribute according to its own sense of propriety and of the interests of the community these resumed lands of the public domain.

What becomes of the $400,000 of mortgages of which mortgagor and mortgagee are alike strangers to any of these considerations? Is there any reservation of them? Not the least. So far from disputing my proposition that this effort was to make a great champertous litigant of the United States to contravene its own grants, to ride down the defense of adverse possession, to ride down the title of a defendant who is to yield his land to the better title of a plaintiff, and not because of a flaw in his own, it is apparent that by this mere high act of legislation defendants are to be deprived of the right, and the plaintiffs to be clothed with complete and absolute right. Can that be done? Can it be useful to be done? But that is the purpose of the legislation itself. Now, what did the President say? I will read but a few words from his veto on that subject. On the point of comparing the method of the bill No. 287 and my method by the bill which I have introduced, the number of which is 1469, the President says:

It seems to me that all controversies which can hereafter arise between those claiming these lands have been fairly remitted to the State of Iowa, and that there they can be properly and safely left; and the Government, through its Attorney-General, should not be called upon to litigate the rights of private parties.

It is not pleasant to contemplate loss threatened to any party acting in good faith, caused by uncertainty in the language of laws or their conflicting interpretation; and if there are persons occupying these lands who labor under such disabilities as prevent them from appealing to the courts for a redress of their wrongs, a plain statute, directed simply to a remedy for such disabilities, would not be objectionable.

Should there be meritorious cases of hardship and loss, caused by an invitation on the part of the Government to settle upon lands apparently public, but to which no right nor lawful possession can be secured, it would be better, rather than to attempt a disturbance of titles already settled, to ascertain such losses and do equity by compensating the proper parties through an appropriation for that purpose.

A law to accomplish this very object was passed by Congress in the year 1873. Valuable proof is thus furnished by the only law ever passed upon the subject of the manner in which it was thought proper by the Congress at that time to meet the difficulties suggested by the bill now under consideration.

And now the Senator from Iowa asks me why I did not bring in a bill to indemnify the purchasers and holders under the Des Moines navigation grant. Has the Senator introduced any such proposition on his part? Has the State of Iowa, that has undertaken to grasp these lands, proposed to indemnify its grantees and their subsequent grantees? Not they. Instead of these two great, powerful, and wealthy governments, one of Iowa and one of the United States, between whom the fault of these misfortunes rests, proposing to undertake the solution of these difficulties and bear the burden, however great it may be, it is proposed to unsettle the question of title which the law has pronounced valid, and to unsettle and reverse litigations and adjudications, and do it in the name of the United States, to its great shame, without one penny of compensation to the parties injured thereby.

This is called a bill "to quiet title of settlers on the Des Moines River lands," and it begins by unsettling everything back to a date further than 1862, further than 1861, back to 1858, back to 1846, in reagitation of these settlers. Why did they not stop in this new agitation with cases already settled by decision? Why did they not make the decisions final that were made prior to 1880? There is the point. How is it that after 1880 there is to be considered an open possession by the United States of land that was open to pre-emption and homestead settlers so that settlers are to earn a title after that? I have never heard of it before. A new settler, a new claimant on the land, and it is intended that he shall have title though it had been conveyed after 1862, after Iowa, by its governor, by its Senators, by its Representatives, had asked that the title should be carried up to the northern boundary. Iowa has now no title to the lands here in question. If these lands are added to the public domain under this bill, you simply renew litigation arising out of what Iowa has done.

Mr. President, a very eminent lawyer in our State—I mean Mr. Thomas Addis Emmet, the great Irish lawyer, who came here and became a great American lawyer—said to some of the great lawyers in the city of New York fifty or sixty years ago, when they were complaining that law business was not prosperous, that litigation was not active, "let us," said Mr. Emmet, "let us get the Legislature to pass a law quieting title."

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Mr. President, the Senator from New York seems to have difficulty in understanding how it is that the State of Iowa did not take title under the act of 1846 to the land on which settlers had made claim. I might ask the Senator this question: Suppose that in the constitution of Iowa there was a provision declaring that it should be unlawful for the State to receive any grant of land whatsoever from the United States, and with that provision existing the Congress of the United States should have made a grant to the State of Iowa similar to the one that was made in the act of 1846, will the Senator contend that the State of Iowa derived title under a grant of that kind? In order to have a grant you must have a grantor who is competent to make the grant and a grantee who is competent to receive it; and if you do not have both, the thing attempted to be granted remains in the grantor and no title has passed.

Under the provision of the constitution of the State of Iowa it could not receive any land under any grant made by the United States on which there was a settler located. How did the State get its title under the act of 1846? Merely by force of the act? No, it required certain other things to be done; selections were to be made, the lists to be presented to the Secretary of the Interior, and by his action upon those lists the title was conveyed to the State of Iowa. The selection must be made before the lists were formulated and presented to the Secretary; and what does this provision of the constitution of Iowa say? It says:

> The General Assembly shall not locate any of the public lands which have been or may be granted by Congress to this State and the location of which may be given to the General Assembly upon lands actually settled, without the consent of the occupant.

The State of Iowa could not select and list those lands and take the title without the consent of the occupant, and every section or part of section embraced in the approved lists upon which a settler was located remained in the United States, because the State of Iowa was incompetent under its constitution to take it.

The Senator from New York says that if we allow this provision of the constitution of Iowa to control our action here, as it controls the action of the State, you are going to unsettle all the titles to lands embraced within the limits of that grant. We are going to do no such thing, Mr. President. On the contrary, the bill proposes to settle the controversies, for it provides—

> That the claims of all persons who, with intent, in good faith, to obtain title thereto under the pre-emption or homestead laws of the United States, entered or remained upon any tract of said land prior to January, 1880, not exceeding 160 acres, are hereby confirmed and made valid in them, their heirs, or their proper assigns, and upon due proof thereof, and payment of the usual price or fees, where the same has not been paid, shall be carried to patent: *Provided further*, That the title of all bona fide claimants under color of title from the State of Iowa and its grantees, or the United States and its grantees, which do not come in conflict with persons who, with intent, in good faith, to obtain title thereto under the pre-emption or homestead laws of the United States, settled upon the said lands prior to January, 1880, are confirmed and made valid.

So that the effect of the bill will be to cover all of the sections within the grant, first providing for a judicial determination as to who were entitled to receive title, and in all other cases where there is no conflict of claim the titles to be confirmed in the possessors. What we want in Iowa is a settlement of this controversy. The settlers ask it. They only ask that it may be a judicial settlement that shall terminate all controversy hereafter.

But the Senator from New York says that mortgages have been created and mortgagors and mortgagees are interested. Well, Mr. President, I suppose that on every tract of this land where a settler was located and in actual possession the conditions of the law relating thereto were embraced and were constructive notice to the people who issued the mortgages. And the fact is that the mortgages are largely held by the same class of persons; they were bought by speculators who made their arrangement with Iowa, never performed it, and today insist on turning these hardy settlers from their homes.

Now, Mr. President, I should like to have a vote on the bill in order that it may be determined and the Senate may pass to other matters, and to promote my convenience, which I have heretofore stated to the Senate, and which involves my absence from the city after Saturday next.

Mr. EVARTS. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa reiterates the point that there must be a grantor and a grantee. The United States is admitted to be a grantor. It is admitted, I suppose, that the State of Iowa is in its constitution a political corporate existence capable of taking a grant.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa. Not where its constitution has said that it shall not.

Mr. EVARTS. I have not said that. I have simply said that it can take a grant. Now, here is the initial act.

> By the act of Congress of August 8, 1846 (9 U. S. Stat. at Large, page 77), there was "granted to the Territory of Iowa, for the purpose of aiding said Territory to improve the navigation of the Des Moines River from its mouth to the Raccoon Fork (so called) in said Territory, one equal moiety, in alternate sections, of the public lands remaining unsold and not otherwise disposed of, encumbered, or appropriated, in a strip 5 miles in width on each side of said river, to be selected within said Territory by an agent or agents to be appointed by the governor thereof, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States."

Now, we have a good grantee and a good grantor, and a grantor that had a good title; and the only dispute raised was whether this grant stopped at the Raccoon Fork or went up to the northern boundary. Iowa always claimed that it went up to the boundary, and we extended it in 1862 up to the boundary. The Supreme Court has decided that these statutory grants vest in the State, by the operation of the law, property, and that the assignment of the special parcels of land is all that remains to be done, which is left to location, as it were, by a surveyor to determine the parcels. So this notion, this new-found rule of law, that Iowa did not take this or that parcel of land, although the governor, although the surveyor, although the Senators and the Representatives of Iowa took the patents from the Land Office and, therefore, those lands were left in the United States is a fallacy, because the lands had been parted with as between the United States and the State. It was the transaction of an allocation between that government and this; and if that State was responsible to any settler who should be ousted under that title it was a responsibility that the State was to answer.

Has the State of Iowa—I ask the attention of Senators to it—that now says it was not a grantee, ever offered to compensate those to whom it granted these lands? It received the consideration for them and is responsible to the litigants under its title, as we are responsible to the litigants under any responsibility of ours.

Mr. BLAIR. May I ask the Senator a question, as I do not know that I quite understand him? I understand him to say that the indemnification should in justice come from the State of Iowa rather than from the United States. Is that his position?

Mr. EVARTS. The indemnification to the settler should come either from Iowa or the United States. I submit, Mr. President, this situation for the action of the Senate. If this bill passes and is sanctioned in the other House and becomes a law by the approval of the President, it will remain one of your laws that is against the Constitution, and in the face of deliberate declarations of the Supreme Court of the United States by its own chosen jurist, Justice Miller, speaking for the whole court in this matter. It is decided, as the President has said to you, as the Judiciary Committee said to the Senate in the Forty-sixth Congress, it has passed out of the range of legislation, and now rests in the authority of the administration of law.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President——

Mr. VEST. Will the Senator permit me to submit a proposition? I expect to leave the city in the morning, and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. GORMAN] has been called away this afternoon. Yesterday he made a request that I should ask the Senate to take up a bill which, if not passed in the next few days, will amount to nothing. It is a bill extending the time for the construction of the bridge across the Kill-von-Kull by the Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company. The limitation which Congress put on the bill will expire in three or four days from this time. It is a matter, therefore, of extreme importance that the time should be extended. I think there is no opposition to it whatever.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri asks unanimous consent to consider the bill named by him.

Mr. EDMUNDS. May I ask the Senator from Missouri whether this involves the difficulty with the engineers about that water way?

Mr. VEST. Not at all.

Mr. EDMUNDS. It does not affect that question either way?

Mr. VEST. Not at all. That is now in the hands of the Committee on Commerce, who are examining into it. This simply extends, subject to their report, the time for the construction of the bridge.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let the bill be read for information.

Mr. ALLISON. I enter an objection now, which I will withdraw immediately after the passage of the pending bill.

Mr. EVARTS. This is obviously a bill that ought to be passed now, if there is no objection.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let us hear the bill read for information.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLISON. I object. I will withdraw the objection when the pending bill is passed. Let us settle the Des Moines land bill.

Mr. CALL. It is not my purpose to detain the Senate, but to say that I think this bill is one which ought to receive careful consideration as a remarkable case. The record here presents a case where citizens of the United States were in possession of part of the public domain under the protection of the laws of the United States, with the further guaranty of the constitutional provision of the State of Iowa that their possession should not be interfered with. That provision in the organic law of the State—that the State should have no power to acquire from the United States their land—was a provision of the organic law as wise as it was unusual. The law executed itself, and was notice to every one that the State of Iowa could not select this man's home under any grant from the United States, and yet it is claimed that the State did select it and conveyed it to others.

Now, what is the significance of those facts? We profess to have a republican government, a government of law, and yet the law is defied; and at whose instance is it defied in respect to these poor men upon an insignificant portion of the public domain, with the national power pledged to their protection, and with the sovereign power of the State in a constitutional provision surrounding their homesteads with the absolute guaranty that there shall be no power in the State organization to interfere with them? And yet it is done, and for thirty years these people, with this statement of facts literally true, can find no redress either in the courts or in the Congress of the United States.

Why, Mr. President, it seems to me that here is a question upon which there can be no argument on the other side, and I venture to say there can be no sound argument nor reasonable ground for it. The Government derives its power entirely from the people and its organic law, and if that organic law, as is clearly and unmistakably shown, has provided that the possession of the citizen, an actual settler upon the public lands of the United States, shall be guarantied to him, and that there shall be no power in the State government to interfere with it, who can doubt the effect and meaning of this language; and if a court, even if the Supreme Court of the country, shall undertake to pass judgment in defiance of the Constitution and the laws, and to assert that there is no such provision, and that this language has no such force and effect, what is the consequence?

Is there any function or power in the judicial department of the Government to overthrow the Constitution and nullify the laws, and make this then unlawful judgment not only binding on the property and on the parties in the particular case, but also on the legislative power and on the executive power of the Government? If so, the Government can easily be subverted, and a written Constitution is of no value and gives no protection to the people.

Is it binding upon the judgment of the co-ordinate Departments of the Government? Have we arrived at the point where it is openly maintained here that the decision of the Supreme Court destroys the Constitution and destroys our conscientious duty under oath to obey its provisions? There can be no such claim as that. But there have been hundreds of millions of acres of the public domain that have passed away, and all passed from the people and to those who are purchasers for profit, purchasers upon speculation, to great corporations and great organizations, and all the time and always the instrumentalities of government are found to be in favor of these great interests and opposed to the people.

I am in favor of protecting the interests of property, but I am not in favor of protecting the interests of property created under decisions of the courts which are unreasonable and not warranted by the law and by the Constitution. I would prefer to vote $10,000,000 and more out of the public Treasury to indemnify these persons, if by neglect or improper conduct of any of the Departments of the Government they have been injured in their property rights, than to take away from these settlers the homes that have been guarantied to them not only by the national law, but by the constitution of the State of Iowa. I wish, in giving my vote on this subject, to express in my place as a Senator my disapproval of that whole course of administration and of judicial action which has found a warrant where neither facts nor reason justify it to take away from the people their humble homes on the public domain in the supposed interest of great corporations or great associations of credit. No one will go farther than I in protecting the rights of property, but it should be at the expense of the National Treasury instead of at the expense of the poor people who make their homes on the public domain, under the pledge and guaranty of national authority that their homes shall be protected and guarantied to them.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Shall the bill pass?

Mr. EVARTS. On that question I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. HAWLEY (when his name was called). I am paired on this bill with the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH].

Mr. EVARTS (when Mr. HISCOCK'S name was called). My colleague [Mr. HISCOCK] was obliged to leave the Senate on some occasion, and is paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN]. My colleague, if present, would vote "nay," and the Senator from Texas, I understand, would vote "yea."

Mr. PADDOCK (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. EUSTIS].

Mr. WALTHALL (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. FARWELL (after having voted in the negative). I am paired with the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO], and withdraw my vote.

Mr. CHACE. I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. RANSOM].

Mr. HARRIS. Is the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] recorded?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. He is not recorded.

Mr. HARRIS. I withhold my vote. I do not know how that Senator would vote. I should vote "nay," if he were present.

Mr. FAULKNER (after having voted in the affirmative). I thought the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY] was present, but I find he is not present. I therefore ask leave to withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from West Virginia withdraws his vote.

Mr. FAULKNER. My colleague [Mr. KENNA] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SABIN].

Mr. BROWN (after having voted in the negative). I voted in this case supposing that, it not being a political question, there would be no pairs announced; but as pairs have been announced, I wish to state that I am paired with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SAWYER]. I therefore withdraw my vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Georgia withdraws his vote.

Mr. BOWEN. I have transferred my pair, and vote "yea."

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I was under the impression that the Senator from New York [Mr. HISCOCK] was paired with me.

Mr. EVARTS. No, with the Senator from Texas [Mr. REAGAN].

Mr. BECK. I announce my pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

The result was announced—yeas 28, nays 11; as follows:

YEAS—28.

Allison,	Coke,	Jones of Arkansas,	Saulsbury,
Bate,	Colquitt,	Manderson,	Sherman,
Berry,	Davis,	Mitchell,	Stewart,
Blair,	Dawes,	Palmer,	Stockbridge,
Bowen,	George,	Payne,	Teller,
Chandler,	Hoar,	Plumb,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Ingalis,	Pugh,	Wilson of Iowa.

NAYS—11.

Blackburn,	Edmunds,	Hampton,	Vest,
Cullom,	Evarts,	Morgan,	Wilson of Md.
Dolph,	Gray,	Vance,	

ABSENT—37.

Aldrich,	Farwell,	Jones of Nevada,	Riddleberger,
Beck,	Faulkner,	Kenna,	Sabin,
Blodgett,	Frye,	McPherson,	Sawyer,
Brown,	Gibson,	Morrill,	Spooner,
Butler,	Gorman,	Paddock,	Stanford,
Call,	Hale,	Pasco,	Turpie,
Cameron,	Harris,	Platt,	Walthall.
Chace,	Hawley,	Quay,	
Daniel,	Hearst,	Ransom,	
Eustis,	Hiscock,	Reagan,	

So the bill was passed.

CLAIMS FOR BOUNTY, BACK PAY, ETC.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to transmit to the Senate a statement of the amount due each claimant for bounty, back pay, and other allowances, whose claim has been allowed in whole or in part since the commencement of the present session of Congress, and not already reported by him to Congress.

BRIDGE ACROSS STATEN ISLAND SOUND.

Mr. VEST. I now ask the Senate to take up for consideration Order of Business 288, being House bill 5929.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5929) to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across Staten Island Sound. It provides that the further time of one year from and after the 16th day of June, 1888, shall be allowed to the Staten Island Rapid Transit Railroad Company and the Baltimore and New York Railroad Company, or either of them, to build the bridge across the Staten Island Sound or Arthur Kill, from New Jersey to Richmond County, New York, pursuant to the provisions of the act entitled "An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Staten Island Sound," known as Arthur Kill, and to establish the same as a post-road, passed the 16th day of June, 1886.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move to amend the bill by adding:

But this act shall have no other effect whatever than to operate as if the time herein mentioned had been embraced in the said act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. VEST. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment and ask for a conference with the House of Representatives thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. COKE, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. DOLPH were appointed.

TENNESSEE RIVER BRIDGE AT GUNTERSVILLE, ALA.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask the Senate to take up for consideration House bill 8623.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8623) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at or near Guntersville, Ala., and for other purposes.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 2, line 11, after the word "companies," to insert "upon such terms as may be agreed upon by the parties, and if they can not agree then as the same shall be determined by the Secretary of War;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That any bridge built under this act and subject to its limitations shall be a lawful structure and shall be recognized and known as a post-route, upon which also no higher charge shall be made for the transmission over the same of the mails, the troops, and the munitions of war of the United States, or passengers or freight passing over said bridge, than the rate per mile paid for the transportation over the railroad or public highways leading to the said bridge; and it shall enjoy the rights and privileges of other post-roads in the United States. And equal privileges in the use of said bridge shall be granted to all companies upon such terms as may be agreed upon by the parties, and if they can not agree then as the same shall be determined by the Secretary of War; and the United States shall have the right of way across said bridge and its approaches for postal-telegraph purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, line 31, before the word "court," to strike out "district" and insert "circuit;" and in line 32, after the words "Alabama in," to strike out "which" and insert "whose territorial jurisdiction;" so as to read:

No bridge shall be erected or maintained under the authority of this act which shall at any time substantially or materially obstruct the free navigation of said river; and if any bridge erected under such authority shall, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, obstruct such navigation, he is hereby authorized to cause such change or alteration of said bridge to be made as will effectually obviate such obstruction; and all such alterations shall be made and all such obstructions be removed at the expense of the owner or owners of said bridge; and in case of any litigation arising from any obstruction or alleged obstruction to the free navigation of said river caused or alleged to be caused by said bridge, the cause may be brought in the circuit court of the United States of the State of Alabama in whose territorial jurisdiction any portion of said obstruction or bridge may be located.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, line 17, after the word "built," to strike out—

And should any change be made in the plan of said bridge during the progress of construction, such change shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War,

And insert—

And if any change is required by the Secretary of War in the plan of said bridge, whilst the same is in process of construction, or after its completion, or if the entire removal of said bridge is required by him at any time, the cost of such change or removal shall be paid by the company owning or controlling said bridge.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. That any bridge authorized to be constructed under this act shall be built or located under and subject to such regulations for the security of navigation of said river as the Secretary of War shall prescribe; and to secure that object the said company or corporation shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawings of the bridge, and a map of the location, giving, for the space of 1 mile above and 1 mile below the proposed location, the topography of the banks of the river, the shore-lines at high and low water, the direction and strength of the currents at all stages, and the soundings, accurately showing the bed of the stream, the location of any other bridge or bridges, and shall furnish such other information as may be required for a full and satisfactory understanding of the subject; and until the said plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War the bridge shall not be built. And if any change is required by the Secretary of War in the plan of said bridge, whilst the same is in process of construction, or after its completion, or if the entire removal of said bridge is required by him at any time, the cost of such change or removal shall be paid by the company owning or controlling said bridge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MORGAN. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and ask for a conference.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. COKE, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. DOLPH were appointed.

EXECUTIVE BUSINESS.

Mr. BECK. I desire before the Senate adjourns to have a short executive session. I do not desire now to interfere with the bills which are being passed, but I hope before we adjourn we shall have an executive session.

SITE FOR NAVAL STATION ON PACIFIC COAST.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (S. R. 8) providing for the appointment of a commission to select a site for a naval station on the Pacific coast.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. CHANDLER. The reading of the preamble may be omitted, as it is reported to be stricken out.

The joint resolution was read.

The joint resolution was reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with an amendment, in section 2, line 2, before the words "thousand dollars," to insert "one;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That to defray the expenses of such commission the sum of $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, be, and the same is hereby, appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Instead of submitting remarks of my own on this important subject, I ask that the letter which I hold in my hand from the Admiral of the Navy may be inserted in the RECORD without reading. It is rather lengthy. I also submit a letter of the Secretary of the Navy in reply to one from me, to be printed in the same way.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon desires to have certain letters printed in the RECORD. There being no objection, it is so ordered.

The letters are as follows:

OFFICE OF THE ADMIRAL, *Washington, D. C., March 15, 1888.*

DEAR SIR: Any one who takes an interest in our possessions on the Northwest coast, especially in the inland waters, including the straits of Fuca, Puget Sound, etc., will observe that here is the grandest collection of islands, inlets, bays, and harbors that is to be found in the United States. The climate is unsurpassed and the productions of the surrounding country in lumber, coal, and other minerals are unexcelled. If it is desirable to establish a naval station on any part of our Pacific coast, this is undoubtedly the place. The Bay of San Francisco, California, is the only place on the coast where a navy-yard could be established without a vast expenditure for breakwaters, etc., except the waters of Puget Sound, and here nature has offered so many facilities that it would be sheer folly to look elsewhere.

The climate of that part of our country is much milder than in the corresponding latitudes on the eastern coast, where for one-fifth of the year very little work can be done owing to inclement weather. Nature has destined this region to be the future seat of a great population, and in a few years emigrants pushing their way to the Northwest will people this beautiful section and render it absolutely necessary that the Government should do something for its protection. The British, who are quick to improve important positions, have of late years given much attention to their naval establishment at Esquimalt, on Vancouver Island, which was originally selected at the time of the Crimean war.

The value of this station has been much enhanced by the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railroad. Every large gun that has been sent from England in the last three years for the heavy fortifications now being built has been transported over this road. All the stores, implements of war, machinery, in fact everything wanted for a navy is no longer shipped around Cape Horn, but is transmitted via the Canadian Pacific. This gives Great Britain a vast preponderance along the whole line of our Northwestern possessions, the command of the Strait of Fuca, Gulf of Georgia, Puget Sound, Admiralty Inlet, and Hood's Canal, placing at their mercy all that magnificent chain of islands, inlets, bays, and rivers for which this region is so famous.

So important has British Columbia become that already two great lines of steam-ships have been established from the terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railroad at Vancouver, one to Hong Kong and Japan, the other to Australia. One of these will flood the country with Chinese emigrants, and the other will bring a large and worthless population from Australia, which, settling in British Columbia and encroaching on our territory, that portion commanded by British guns will pass out of our hands. Hence it becomes of vital importance to establish in this region one of the largest naval depots, to say nothing of military posts, for the defense of the coast, which will confine intruders to their legitimate domain.

I do not hesitate to say that the late rapid movements of the British Government in strengthening their naval depot at Esquimalt, building heavy works commanding the Strait of Fuca, indicates a policy antagonistic to the United States, namely, to obtain possession of that territory which they claimed in 1858. At that time the British contended for the Strait of Rosario as a boundary, instead of the Strait of Haro, which would have given them the command of our entire Northwestern coast. Now, although the British have a prominent position, and actually control the islands eastward of the Strait of Haro, or Admiralty Inlet and Puget Sound, unless we are willing they should do so, these great inland waters, on our side offer a better position by far for defensive purposes than the navy-yard in California, and form a half-way house between California and Alaska, which, although popularly supposed to be a region of Arctic cold, is really a very valuable country.

Unfortunately the coast of Oregon does not offer any proper site for a navy-yard. The few harbors are inaccessible in bad weather, and it would cost a large amount to make them available. The bar of the Columbia River is the great obstacle in that quarter. Therefore, the only points north of California for this purpose are in the inland waters known under the general name of Puget Sound. In Admiralty Inlet a navy-yard could be established far beyond the reach of an enemy's guns, up straits easily defended by fortifications and torpedoes, and unassailable by any forces an enemy might attempt to land from ships of war.

For many years Great Britain has had an eye on the Sandwich Islands, which, if in her possession, would hold the same position in regard to our Northwestern coast that Bermuda holds to our Eastern coast; but having so far failed in her design in that quarter, she has now selected a site for a naval station which is a constant menace to our shores. England never does anything without an object. One motive is to get possession of the whole trade of China and Japan,

and have, via the Canadian Pacific Railroad, the shortest route to Europe. Another motive is to keep a large military and naval force to protect nominally what are called "British interests," but really to facilitate encroachments upon the territory of the United States. Here we permit a great and grasping rival to establish a powerful naval station right between us and our possessions in Alaska without taking any steps ourselves in the same direction.

The latter territory being so far away may not be regarded as important by the generality of our citizens, but it cost this country over $7,000,000; has a territory larger than California, Texas, and Colorado combined; contains the finest seal preserves; the finest salmon fisheries; inexhaustible supplies of other food-fishes, and magnificent timber, while gold is found and doubtless in future will be discovered in large quantities. The degree of cold in winter on the coast is not greater than that between Washington and New York. It is a healthy country and well worth retaining. Alaska can not depend for protection on a navy-yard as far distant as that at Mare Island. Indeed our whole coast from San Diego to Behring's Straits may be considered as wholly unprotected.

However, it is not materially different from the condition of our Atlantic coast. As a rule we give no protection to anything, and the 3,600,000 square miles of territory we have amassed depends alone for safety on that Providence which has heretofore looked out for creeping babies, drunken sailors, and the United States of America. Within a few years a commercial emporium must grow up at the western terminus of the Canadian Pacific Railroad, which will have the protection of the naval station at Vancouver Island with a fleet to command all the waters of Puget Sound, and, consequently, every harbor of our inland waters will be at the mercy of British guns should such a misfortune happen as a war between Great Britain and the United States.

When a nation holds valuable possessions she owes it to her people to give them all the protection necessary, unless, like Cicero, they may consider that peace on any terms is better than war, even although subjected to the greatest humiliation. If we take such a view of the case, we need give ourselves no trouble about protecting anything, and can adopt for our motto the old saying that everything comes to him who can afford to wait. Under this rule we have obtained great success, having waited so many years for the fortification of our coasts and the augmentation of our naval forces.

It is sometimes argued that we have already too many navy-yards, but such an idea is only advanced by those who do not comprehend the subject. Navy-yards are the foundation of a navy, and without them, especially under the present system of heavy armor clads, a naval force would be useless, for private citizens do not, as a rule, build docks sufficient to take eight and ten thousand ton ships out of the water. We have, in fact, only the following-named yards that can be of service at any time: Portsmouth, N. H., Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Norfolk, and Mare Island. All the others mentioned as "navy-yards" or naval stations can never be of any use. Some of them have never had a spade driven into them, and time has shown that Pensacola, the nearest approach to a navy-yard among our minor stations, is entirely useless in its present condition.

We make a poor showing on the Eastern and Southern coasts, but ten times worse on the Western coast, where in a distance of more than 5,000 miles there is but one navy-yard, badly equipped and with small yearly appropriations. Even the dry-dock, which was commenced many years ago, is not completed. As a strategic point a navy-yard in Puget Sound would be much more valuable than the one at Mare Island, because it would be in a central position. It could be built cheaper and be more easily defended, and, as I have said before, has all the materials necessary and at low rates. There are many points in Admiralty Inlet where positions could be found with 2 miles of water-front, if necessary, and instead of building heavy stone docks, the water-front need only be faced with piles and the largest ships-of-war would have plenty of water.

The dry-dock at Mare Island has, up to date, cost $3,000,000, and has been in process of construction for sixteen years. For that amount of money we could build in Puget Sound six dry-docks that would accommodate the largest vessels. No practical man with our present knowledge would think of building a stone dry-dock where timber was abundant, for it has been proved that a dry-dock of timber will answer all the purposes of a stone one and can be more easily repaired.

The Northwest coast is amply supplied with stone quarries from which the buildings could be erected, and all the materials brought by water directly to the site of the navy-yard. The idea of constructing a navy-yard in this region is not, as many might suppose, a political scheme. A number of the so-called "navy-yards" on the Eastern coasts were simply sops to Cerberus to gratify some faction or section. Hence they have never been of any particular service, nor ever will be in war or in peace; but a navy-yard on Puget Sound is an absolute necessity if we wish to maintain a position as a naval power or show any disposition to defend our territory against encroachment.

British statesmen have been much shrewder than our own, for it will be remembered that before the treaty regarding the boundary between the two countries was concluded, the former contended so warmly for the southern end of Vancouver's Island that the line was deflected in order to give it to them and with it the command of the Strait of Fuca, whereas had we insisted on the boundary line of 49° being continued to the ocean we should have both shores of the strait. In spite of our concession, the British subsequently claimed the Strait of Rosario as the main ship-channel and boundary between the mainland and Vancouver's Island, and it was almost a case of war because we declined to yield anything more. The Emperor of Germany as arbitrator decided the point in our favor, and the Strait of Haro is the settled boundary. No doubt the British will eventually fortify the Saturna Islands, off the southeastern point of Vancouver's Island, so that the Straits of Fuca and Haro will be hermetically sealed by British guns.

When the Russians owned Alaska, in the harbors of which they had several naval stations, Great Britain might naturally want a dock-yard hence to carry on war against Russian territory, with a place to retire in case of disaster. This was exactly what the English fleet did after being driven off by the Russians at Petropauloski. They went to Esquimalt and there refitted their vessels. Although the British considered Esquimalt a naval station as far back as the opening of the Crimean war, it is only within the last few years that they have devoted their attention to making it a great naval depot.

To-day a line of railroad all along the boundary of our territory is in operation capable of supplying any number of British posts, and at the end of it is a great naval depot that dominates our whole Northwestern coast. This is a piece of strategy worthy a great nation, and we can not help admiring the wisdom and energy which has designed and executed such a plan, while deprecating the consequences which would result to our unprotected frontier in case of war with so vigilant and powerful an enemy.

The nation with whom we would be most likely to go to war is Great Britain, for the boundary between the two nations is of such vast extent, a mere geographical line marked with piles of stones which time will soon obliterate, and we are so curiously interwoven that when Washington Territory begins to fill up and overflow and our people encroach on the territory of Great Britain, with their numerous Chinese inhabitants brought over in their lines of steamers, there will no doubt arise sufficient provocatives of war to which, if we remain in our present defenseless state, the British would not object.

The British Government witnesses with alarm the great advancement we are making in our territory, and the very fact of their building up a great naval station at Esquimalt, in connection with the Canadian Pacific Railroad, so heavily subsidized by them, shows an intent to which no one can take exception, but which must be considered an offensive act, for under present circumstances of peaceful relations between the two countries such extensive preparations do not seem to be necessary. England never fortifies a position without an intention to dominate over every place where her guns can reach, and hence where she undertakes to fortify the important points commanding the waters of a neighboring state it is incumbent on that state to do likewise.

There is no doubt of one thing. Great Britain has outwitted us in all this treaty matter by obtaining important points along the boundary of our territory. Had we adhered to our original demand of 54° 40′; Great Britain would not to-day have the Canadian Pacific Railroad, for she would have no seaport on the Northwest coast. Our shore-line would have been continuous from Lower California to Behring's Straits, but the statesmanship which secured in 1846 what properly belonged to the United States has done us an irreparable injury, and a competing line of railroad has been built and equipped in a manner exceeded by no other in the world.

"Upon the arrival of each train at Vancouver, the Pacific terminus, a steamer connects for Victoria, the capital of British Columbia. At either Vancouver or Victoria connection is made every day for the seaport towns on Puget Sound and in Oregon, and on nearly every day for San Francisco. At frequent intervals steamers depart for China and Japan, saving one-third in both time and distance over those sailing from San Francisco. Thus a new way around the world has been opened. Every fortnight a fine steamer leaves Vancouver for a tour of Alaska waters; sailing all the way in tranquil sounds and straits protected by outer islands, entering mountain-girdled fiords, and threading channels where glaciers dip into the surf—scenes beside which the shores of Norway have no comparison for grandeur."

Thus Great Britain has secured the shortest route to the East Indies—thirty days from Hong-Kong to Liverpool—through the Canadian snows and mountains, where it was never imagined the inhabitants had sufficient energy for such a gigantic undertaking, and which, indeed, would never have been accomplished but for British subsidies. While we, who started in the race for China, via the California Pacific Railroad, can not accomplish the distance from Hong-Kong to New York in less than thirty-four days. Our descendants will naturally wonder why our statesmen should have allowed a country which was ours by right to slip through their fingers; it is to be hoped that they will not have to wonder still more that the statesmen of to-day omitted to establish on the territory that still remains to us naval and military works that will defend our country from aggression and be a nucleus by which thousands of people will be attracted to the beautiful Northwest shores.

There is one essential in which the representatives of the people are very deficient, that is, in fortifying the principal points of our extensive coast and building naval depots at proper sites. Here is a case in point where a great naval depot should be established well up one of those capacious inlets where an enemy's guns can not reach, and where the station could be so well fortified below that no force of hostile ships could pass up to destroy it. To show how little attention we pay to such defenses, I inclose herewith an extract from my last annual report to the honorable Secretary of the Navy. It illustrates the pains taken by Great Britain to occupy the strongest points in her territories by military forces, and how much she does towards diverting desirable emigrants from the United States into her dominions, every man who settles under the British flag knowing that he is certain to be protected in all his rights. I also inclose herewith an extract from the report of Commander Charles Wilkes, commanding the United States exploring expedition (1840-'41). Commander Wilkes was an explorer of great ability, and gives an accurate picture of the country under discussion.

I have said more in this communication than may be pertinent to the subject of building a navy-yard on the Northwest coast, and hope you will excuse me if I have gone too far into the matter, and will attribute it to the interest I feel in this great project, and to a hope that it may awaken in the minds of others that feeling of loyalty to their country which has so distinguished you in this connection.

I have the honor to be, very respectfully,

DAVID D. PORTER,
Admiral United States Navy.

Hon. JOHN H. MITCHELL,
United States Senate.

[Extract from the report of the Admiral of the Navy to the Secretary of the Navy, 1887.]

We have so much to do in the way of building forts and ships and making guns for the land and naval defenses, and have so little time to do it all in, that it will be well to compare our national defenses with those of some other power, to show what others have done while we have been taking our repose. Our people seem to think that we are so far removed from Europe that we are beyond the reach of its armies and navies, forgetting that it is possible to step on board one of the great ocean greyhounds at New York on Monday morning and land in England on Saturday night; and although we might not be assailed quite so rapidly as that, the mere fact that it takes so little time under favorable circumstances to cross the Atlantic shows how short is the distance between ourselves and the possessors of the heaviest ships and guns.

We may keep clear of entangling alliances, but no matter what our desires may be, we can not avoid complications with foreign powers. We have an experience of this sort at the present time, and no one can tell whether the small cloud now gathering on the eastern horizon may not soon extend over the whole heavens. War often comes when least expected, and even when anticipated those who look forward to it can hardly realize that it is coming until it is upon them. For the event of war we are no more prepared than we were a year ago, although it is true we have made a beginning to repair simply the waste in our Navy for the last twenty-five years.

To show how little attention is paid to the defense of our coasts, I beg leave to exhibit to you, for the purpose of contrast, the weight that is attached to these matters abroad. The statement will show the country how much behindhand we are in regard to that on which our honor and safety depends as compared with those even who have less at stake than ourselves.

To take Great Britain as an example, with the coasts and harbors of the British Islands included, between latitude 5° and 59° north, and longitude 2° east and 11° west. The area of the British Islands is 115,840 square miles, while that of the United States is 3,602,990 square miles; that is, the size of these islands, the center of the imperial power, is thirty-one times less than the area of the United States. Please notice the difference in the care taken to protect the homes of British subjects from that given to guard the citizens of the United States, who, relying on the protection that they suppose will be afforded them, have built up great cities all along our coast and dotted the intermediate territory with homesteads, all of which are at the mercy of a foreign foe.

The geographical situation of the British islands gives them a guaranty of independence and protection to their inhabitants greater than any other people enjoy, but this would not avail were it not for the indomitable energy of the Britons, who, occupying a strong position in the first place, have left nothing undone to render it impregnable. The same reasons that exist for the elaborate defenses of Great Britain obtain in this country in an equal degree. We are very much alike in many respects, both being naturally great commercial nations, desirous to carry our products to every part of the world. Great Britain succeeding in all she undertakes, and we constantly failing for want of that governmental protection which every people have a right to claim.

Great Britain is separated from the continent of Europe by a wide moat, which enables her to defy attack. Her principal ports bristle with guns of the latest pattern, mounted on the most approved fortifications, while the moat and its surroundings are guarded by the following:

Class.	Number of vessels.	Number of guns.
Armored turret ships	26	171
Armored barbette ships	9	90
Armored casemate ships	10	157
Belted cruisers	8	93
Torpedo rams	2	2
Unarmored cruisers	62	724
Gun-vessels and cruising gunboats	65	271
Gunboats for coast and river service	40	64
Total	222	1,572

These embrace all classes from the 110-ton (16½ inch) to the 20-pounder howitzer. In addition the English navy is provided with 153 torpedo-vessels of all classes, some of which are armed with small rifled cannon (6-inch or less), and nearly all carry machine guns. It will be observed that no account is taken of the older classes of ships, of which, according to a French author, there are 339 steamers and 120 sailing ships fully capable of giving a good account of themselves.

The United States is separated from Europe by a wide moat, but this, instead of being a protection, is a disadvantage. The ocean affords a highway upon which, unseen until close upon us, an enemy can marshal his hosts and attack us in fifty vulnerable points at once. A war against us would terminate very quickly, as, without ships or guns, what could we do?

The forces charged with the defense of Great Britain's impregnable fortresses comprise the coast-guard fleet, the Channel fleet, and the land defenses, which are at all times ready for service, and are never permitted to fall off in strength or efficiency. This system may be compared to that of a city with policemen on their beats, while ours is like the old plan, where superannuated watchmen dozed away a night on a doorstep. The movable land forces of Great Britain are confined to special troops always ready to be forwarded to threatened points at short notice. The Channel fleet constitutes a reserve of heavy armor-clads, torpedo-vessels, and fast dispatch-vessels, ready at all times to proceed to any indicated point. Under these circumstances, the British can afford to await attack, while their naval forces elsewhere are ready to add their strength to these above mentioned. Any attempt made by a foreign power against the British Islands would probably result in the destruction of the attacking fleet, which might not even have the opportunity to bombard the land fortifications or throw destructive missiles into the seaboard cities.

[Extract from the report of Commander Charles Wilkes, commanding the United States Exploring Expedition. 1840-41.]

Nothing can surpass the beauty of these waters and their safety. Not a shoal exists within the straits of Juan de Fuca, Admiralty Inlet, or Hood's Canal that can in any way interrupt their navigation by a 74-gun ship. I venture nothing in saying that there is no country in the world that possesses waters equal to these; they cover an area of about 2,000 square miles. The shores of all its inlets and bays are remarkably bold, so much so that a ship's side would strike the shore before her keel would touch the ground.

The country by which these waters are surrounded is remarkably salubrious, and affords every advantage for the accommodation of a vast commercial and military marine, with convenience for docks, and a great many sites for towns and cities, at all times well supplied with water, and capable of being well provided with everything by the surrounding country, which is well adapted for agriculture.

The Straits of Juan de Fuca are 95 miles in length and have an average width of 11 miles. At the entrance (3 miles in width) no danger exists, and it may be safely navigated throughout.

No part of the world affords finer islands, sounds, or a greater number of harbors than are found within the Straits of Juan de Fuca, capable of receiving the largest class of vessels and without a danger in them that is not visible. From the rise and fall of the tide (18 feet), every facility is afforded for the erection of works for a great maritime nation.

The country also affords as many sites for water power as any other.

NAVY DEPARTMENT, *Washington, March* 16, 1888.

SIR: I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your letter requesting an expression of the views of this Department and such recommendation as it may deem advisable with reference to the propriety of the legislation contemplated by the resolution S. R. 8, a copy of which accompanies your letter, and which provides for the appointment of a commission to select a site for a naval station on the Pacific coast.

The duty of selecting a suitable site for an additional navy-yard at some point on that portion of the Pacific Coast which is embraced in the State of Oregon and the Territories of Washington and Alaska could, in the opinion of the Department, be satisfactorily performed in the manner indicated by the resolution, namely, by a commission composed of three competent naval officers, acting under instructions framed in accordance with the requirements of the resolution, whose duty it would be, among other things, to make a careful examination of the coast-line, the several indentations thereof, the comparative advantages or disadvantages of the several inlets, bays, or harbors existing on the coast with reference to the depth of water and the fluctuations of the tide, and also with reference to convenient access by land and speedy communication with interior points by rail. It is also probable that the performance of such duty would be greatly facilitated by the use of data heretofore obtained through the operations of the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

It may be proper to state, however, with reference to the navy-yards on the Atlantic coast of the United States, that the tendency of legislation in the recent past has been in the direction of decreasing rather than increasing their number, and that in accordance with this tendency and for the purpose of lessening expenditures in this branch of the public service, the policy of the Department has been and is to concentrate, so far as practicable, and at the most central, convenient, and available points, the heavy work requisite to be done at the yards, as well as the storage and distribution of stores and material for the use of the naval service. If the same policy be adopted in supplying the wants of the Pacific coast it may perhaps be found expedient, in view of the great natural advantages as to size, location, and access, possessed by the navy-yard at Mare Island, to concentrate at that yard, so far as practicable, the bulk of the work, material, and stores required for the naval service on the Pacific coast.

Very respectfully,

W. C. WHITNEY,
Secretary of the Navy.

Hon. JNO. H. MITCHELL,
United States Senate.

Mr. HOAR subsequently said: The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] obtained leave of the Senate just now to print in the RECORD, as part of his remarks, a very interesting letter from Admiral Porter, relating to the American and the British fortifications on the Pacific coast. I ask unanimous consent that it also be printed as a document for the use of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered if there be no objection.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was disagreed to.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business No. 1420, Senate bill 2986.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2986) to incorporate the American Historical Association.

Mr. HOAR. Mr. Bancroft, named as one of the incorporators, should be mentioned as a citizen of "Newport, in the State of Rhode Island," instead of "Washington, in the District of Columbia." I move that amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 4 it is proposed to strike out "Washington, in the District of Columbia," and insert "Newport, in the State of Rhode Island;" so as to read:

George Bancroft, of Newport, in the State of Rhode Island.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DOUGLAS CHAPMAN.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1451, House bill 4735.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4735) for the relief of Douglas Chapman. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Douglas Chapman, of Hot Spring County, Arkansas, late a private in Captain Wheeler's Company H, of the Third Regiment Infantry, United States Army, in the Seminole war of 1837, and that he be rated and receive such pension as is provided by the laws of the United States for persons engaged in the military service of the United States in the war of 1812.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TENNESSEE RIVER BRIDGE AT CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1402, House bill 7564.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7564) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Chattanooga, Tenn.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments. The first amendment was, in section 1, line 3, after the word "railway," to insert "a corporation created and;" in line 10, after the word "it," to strike out "may be" and insert "is;" and in line 13, after the word "company," to strike out "and the Secretary of War shall have the right, from time to time, to revise, prescribe, and determine such rates or tolls," and insert "and approved by the Secretary of War;" so as to make the section read:

That the Chattanooga Western Railway, a corporation created and organized under the laws of the State of Tennessee, be, and is hereby, authorized to construct and maintain a bridge, and approaches thereto, over the Tennessee River, at or near the city of Chattanooga, Tenn., in the county of Hamilton. Said bridge shall be constructed to provide for the passage of railway trains, and, at the option of the corporation by which it is built, may be used for the passage of wagons and vehicles of all kinds, for the transit of animals, and for foot passengers, for reasonable rates or tolls, to be fixed by said company and approved by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 3, after the word "and," where it occurs the second time, to strike out the word "it;" after the word "That," in line 4, to strike out the words "the bridge authorized to be constructed under this act shall be a lawful structure, and shall be recognized and known as a post-route, and the same is hereby declared to be a post-route, upon which also;" and in line 17, after the word "otherwise," to insert the word "so;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That any bridge built under this act and subject to its limitations shall be a lawful structure, and shall be recognized and known as a post-route, and shall enjoy the rights and privileges of other post-roads in the United States; that no higher charge shall be made for the transmission over the same of the mail, troops, and munitions of war of the United States, or for through railway passengers or freight passing over said bridge, than the rate per mile for their transmission over the railroad leading to said bridge, and equal privileges in the use of said bridge shall be granted to all telegraph companies, and the United States shall have the right of way across said bridge for postal-telegraph

purposes; that the said bridge shall be constructed either by draw, span, or otherwise, so that a free and unobstructed passage-way may be secured to all water craft navigating said river at the point aforesaid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, line 18, after the word "construction," to insert "so as to prevent or remove all substantial obstruction to the navigation of said river;" in line 20, after the word "the," to insert "approval of;" and in line 20, after the word "War," to insert "and if any litigation shall be had in regard to said bridge the same shall be in the circuit court of the United States in whose territorial jurisdiction said bridge, or any part thereof, is located;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That any bridge authorized to be constructed under this act shall be built and located under and subject to such regulations for the security of navigation of said river as the Secretary of War shall prescribe; and to secure that object the said company or corporation shall submit to the Secretary of War, for his examination and approval, a design and drawings of the bridge, and a map of the location, giving, for the space of 1 mile below and 1 mile above the proposed location, the topography of the banks of the river, the shore-lines at high and low water, the direction and strength of the current at all stages, and the soundings, accurately showing the bed of the stream, the location of any other bridge or bridges, and shall furnish such other information as may be required for a full and satisfactory understanding of the subject; and until the said plan and location of the bridge are approved by the Secretary of War the bridge shall not be built; and should any change be made in the plan of said bridge during the progress of construction, so as to prevent or remove all substantial obstruction to the navigation of said river, such change shall be subject to the approval of Secretary of War; and if any litigation shall be had in regard to said bridge, the same shall be in the circuit court of the United State in whose territorial jurisdiction said bridge, or any part thereof, is located.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 5, after the word "act," at the end of line 1, to strike out the words "so as to prevent or remove all material and substantial obstructions to the navigation of said river by the construction of said bridge;" and in line 6, after the word "act," to insert "or its entire removal;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 5. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved; and any alterations or changes that may be required by Congress in the bridge constructed under this act, or its entire removal, shall be made by the corporation owning or controlling the same at its own expense. Furthermore, if the construction of said bridge shall not be commenced within two and completed within four years after the passage of this act, all privileges conferred hereby, and this act, shall become null and void.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time, and passed.

Mr. HARRIS. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and ask a conference with the House of Representatives on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and that the Chair appoint the managers on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* appointed Mr. VEST, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. KENNA as the managers at the conference on the part of the Senate.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

Mr. CALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the Army appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate do now proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1358, House bill 7222.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The title of the bill will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7222) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish agricultural stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto."

The bill was read.

Mr. PLUMB. I think that bill should be subject to further scrutiny, and I shall object to its consideration now.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. CALL. I ask the Senator from Missouri to allow me to have a resolution adopted.

THE CALENDAR.

Mr. HARRIS. I wanted to ask the Senator from Missouri to withdraw his motion for a moment until I can ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that to-morrow immediately after the routine business of the morning hour the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] gave notice of a motion to proceed with the Indian appropriation bill to-morrow.

Mr. HARRIS. Then I will ask unanimous consent of the Senate that immediately after the consideration of that bill to-morrow the Senate proceed to the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII, beginning where we left off when the Calendar was last under consideration.

Mr. ALLISON. For how long?

Mr. HARRIS. For the remainder of the day.

Mr. ALLISON. That is satisfactory.

Mr. VOORHEES. The understanding, it seems to me, when we refused to adjourn over to Monday was that the Indian appropriation bill represented by the Senator from Massachusetts would be considered to-morrow.

Mr. HARRIS. This is to be after that.

Mr. VOORHEES. Very well, then I have nothing to say.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that to-morrow after the conclusion of the Indian appropriation bill the Senate proceed, for the remainder of the day, to the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I will agree to that with the understanding that one objection shall carry any matter over until the Senate shall be full.

Mr. HARRIS. Is not that provided by Rule VIII?

Mr. EDMUNDS. No, because a majority of the Senate may proceed to consideration notwithstanding an objection, and I wish it as a part of the unanimous consent that a single objection shall absolutely carry a case over to a full Senate.

Mr. HARRIS. I have no objection to the suggestion made by the Senator from Vermont.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The understanding, then, is that to-morrow after the conclusion of the Indian appropriation bill the Senate will resume the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII, one objection to carry a bill over.

Mr. HOAR. I desire to say that while I shall not now interpose an objection to the proposition made by the Senator from Vermont in consideration of the fact that many Senators desire to be absent on a public occasion, I think there ought to be some time pretty soon devoted to the Calendar in the ordinary way.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I agree to that.

Mr. HOAR. It is hardly fair that we should have these acts of legislation by unanimous consent and nothing else; and I therefore give notice that after the present occasion for this limitation has passed by, these two conventions, I shall insist on going to the Calendar under the Anthony rule in the ordinary way.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I think the Senator from Massachusetts is quite right. I only make this suggestion now under the apprehension that the Senate will be quite thin to-morrow.

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS.

Mr. BROWN. In the case of the bill just called up by me, the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] desires to make an amendment which he will have prepared by to-morrow morning. I shall ask leave, therefore, at the end of the routine business to-morrow morning to take it up, and I will accept his amendment.

Mr. CALL. I offer a resolution.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Has the Chair announced the understanding?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair has announced it.

ANASTASIA ISLAND.

Mr. CALL submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General of the United States is hereby directed to report to the Senate whether Anastasia Island, near St. Augustine, Fla., is the property of the United States, and whether the whole or any part is covered by any grant from Spain which has been confirmed and is recognized as valid by the United States under the treaty between Spain and the United States for the cession of the provinces of the East and West Floridas made in 1819.

Mr. HOAR. I should like to have that referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Let it go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will lie over and be printed.

Mr. HOAR. Perhaps the Senator from Florida will consent to have the resolution referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations. If I may be pardoned for making the suggestion, suppose the law officer of the Government should be of opinion that there was a doubt about our title or should give an opinion against it, it is hardly fair, if there is any contest about the title to an island with Spain off our coast, to have our title prejudiced by the opinion of the law officer in that way. It seems to me the resolution should first go to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CALL. Anastasia Island is now within our jurisdiction. It is within half a mile of St. Augustine. The only question is whether under a Spanish grant claimed to have been made it has or has not been confirmed, or belongs to the United States.

Mr. HOAR. But suppose the Attorney-General should be of opinion that it does not belong to the United States?

Mr. CALL. Then it belongs to a private citizen.

Mr. HOAR. There is no question of any foreign title?

Mr. CALL. None whatever.

Mr. HOAR. Then I withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will lie over under the rule and be printed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. COCKRELL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, June 1, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 31, 1888.

FOR PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

Tenth Regiment of Cavalry.

First Lieut. William Davis, jr., to be captain May 10, 1888, *vice* Smithers, retired from active service.

INDIAN INSPECTOR.

Thomas D. Marcum, of Catlettsburgh, Ky., to be an Indian Inspector.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

The Senate having, on the 29th instant, ordered that the Journals of all the proceedings of the Senate in executive session and confidential legislative session concerning the fisheries treaty with Great Britain, now under consideration, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, they are as follows:

Monday, May 28, 1888.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the injunction of secrecy be removed from all proceedings of the Senate in reference to the treaty with Great Britain now under consideration.

Tuesday, May 29, 1888.

On motion by Mr. HOAR,

Ordered, That the Journals of all the proceedings of the Senate in reference to the treaty with Great Britain, now under consideration, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

EXTRACTS FROM EXECUTIVE JOURNAL.

Monday, February 20, 1888.

A message was received from the President of the United States, transmitting a treaty (Ex. M) between the United States and Great Britain concerning the interpretation of the convention of October 20, 1818, signed at Washington February 15, 1888.

On motion by Mr. SHERMAN, the treaty was read the first time, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and, together with the message and accompanying documents, ordered to be printed in confidence for the use of the Senate.

Tuesday, February 21, 1888.

On motion by Mr. EDMUNDS, and by unanimous consent,

Ordered, That the injunction of secrecy be removed from the treaty (Ex. M) between the United States and Great Britain concerning the interpretation of the convention of October 20, 1818, signed at Washington, February 15, 1888.

On motion by Mr. FRYE, and by unanimous consent,

Ordered, That the said treaty, together with the message and accompanying protocols, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Monday, March 5, 1888.

The President *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, transmitting a letter from the Secretary of State in relation to the recent negotiations concerning American fishing interests.

The message was read.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted the following resolution for consideration:

Resolved, That the message of the President of the date of March 5, 1888, transmitting certain documents and correspondence in relation to the recent negotiations with Great Britain concerning American fishery interests in British North American waters, be printed, and that, under the direction of the Committee on Printing, all communications hitherto made by the President to the Senate upon the same subject-matter of date subsequent to the 4th day of March, 1885, be reprinted in connection with the documents transmitted by said message.

On motion by Mr. SHERMAN, the Senate proceeded, by unanimous consent, to consider the said resolution, and after debate, the resolution, having been modified by Mr. SHERMAN, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the message of the President of the date of March 5, 1888, transmitting certain documents and correspondence in relation to the recent negotiations with Great Britain concerning American fishing interests in British North American waters be printed, and that, under the direction of the Committee on Printing, all communications hitherto made by the President or the Secretary of State to either House upon the fisheries question, and in relation to the seizure of fishing vessels of the United States in the ports or waters of Great Britain or her dependencies, of date subsequent to the 4th day of March, 1877, be reprinted in connection with the documents transmitted by said message, including all the evidence taken before the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the reports thereon, and that the injunction of secrecy be removed from the documents proposed to be printed in this resolution. * * *

CONFIDENTIAL LEGISLATIVE PROCEEDINGS.

Tuesday, April 3, 1888.

The Senate having proceeded to the consideration of the resolution submitted by Mr. RIDDLEBERGER March 22, 1888, as follows:

Resolved, That so much of Rules XXXVI, XXXVII, and XXXVIII as provide for executive sessions be suspended during the consideration of the fisheries treaty, when the same shall be reported to the Senate—

And a motion to close the doors having been made and seconded, the President *pro tempore* directed the galleries to be cleared and the doors closed.

The order having been executed, the President *pro tempore* stated the question to be, Shall the consideration of the resolution be had with closed doors? and it was determined in the affirmative.

On motion by Mr. BUTLER to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, after debate, it was determined in the affirmative—yeas 41, nays 8.

On motion by Mr. SHERMAN, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present,

Those who voted in the affirmative are Messrs.—

Allison,	Colquitt,	Harris,	Saulsbury,
Bate,	Cullom,	Hawley,	Sherman,
Beck,	Davis,	Hiscock,	Spooner,
Berry,	Dawes,	Hoar,	Stockbridge,
Blackburn,	Dolph,	Ingalls,	Turpie,
Brown,	Edmunds,	Jones of Arkansas,	Vest,
Butler,	Faulkner,	McPherson,	Voorhees,
Call,	George,	Palmer,	Walthall.
Cameron,	Gorman,	Payne,	
Cockrell,	Gray,	Pugh,	
Coke,	Hampton,	Ransom,	

Those who voted in the negative are Messrs.—

Farwell,	Mitchell,	Plumb,	Stewart,
Frye,	Platt,	Sawyer,	Teller.

So the motion was agreed to; whereupon the doors were reopened.

EXTRACT FROM EXECUTIVE JOURNAL.

Tuesday, April 10, 1888.

Mr. HOAR presented a resolution adopted by the common council of the city of Gloucester, Mass., remonstrating against the ratification of the so-called fisheries treaty now pending before the United States Senate; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONFIDENTIAL LEGISLATIVE PROCEEDINGS.

Tuesday, April 17, 1888.

The following resolution, submitted by Mr. RIDDLEBERGER on the 16th instant, being under consideration, namely:

Resolved, That so much of Rules XXXVI, XXXVII, and XXXVIII as provide for executive sessions be suspended during the consideration of the fisheries treaty, when the same shall be reported to the Senate—

Mr. EDMUNDS submitted a motion that the doors be closed; and the same having been seconded, the President *pro tempore* directed the galleries to be cleared and the doors closed.

The order having been executed, the President *pro tempore* stated the question to be, Shall the consideration of the resolution be continued with closed doors? and it was determined in the affirmative, when, on motion by Mr. HARRIS, that the resolution be postponed indefinitely, it was determined in the affirmative; whereupon, on motion by Mr. EDMUNDS, the doors were reopened.

EXTRACTS FROM EXECUTIVE JOURNAL.

Monday, May 7, 1888.

Mr. EDMUNDS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom was referred, the 20th February, the treaty (Ex. M) between the United States and Great Britain concerning the interpretation of the convention of October 20, 1818, signed at Washington February 15, 1888, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a resolution for its ratification in the usual form, and a written adverse report thereon.

Mr. MORGAN, from the same committee, submitted the views of the minority on the same subject in writing; which, together with the report submitted by Mr. EDMUNDS, was ordered to be printed in confidence for the use of the Senate.

Thursday, May 10, 1888.

On motion by Mr. TELLER, and by unanimous consent—

Ordered, That the injunction of secrecy be removed from the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the views of the minority, upon the treaty (Ex. M) between the United States and Great Britain concerning the interpretation of the convention of October 20, 1818, signed at Washington, February 15, 1888.

CONFIDENTIAL LEGISLATIVE PROCEEDINGS.

Thursday, May 10, 1888.

The Senate having proceeded to the consideration of the following resolution submitted by Mr. HOAR April 19, 1888, and reported by Mr. SHERMAN from the Committee on Foreign Relations adversely, namely:

Resolved, That when the proposed treaty with Great Britain shall be under consideration the stenographic reporter shall be admitted and shall report the debates and proceedings, which may thereafter be made public if a majority of the Senate shall so order, except such portions thereof as it shall determine that the public interest requires shall be kept secret.

So much of the third clause of Rule XXXVI as conflicts with the resolution is suspended so far as necessary in order that the same shall take effect.

Mr. EDMUNDS moved that the doors be closed; and the motion having been seconded, the Presiding Officer directed the galleries to be cleared and the doors closed.

The order having been executed, the President *pro tempore* stated the question to be, Shall the consideration of the resolution be had with closed doors?

After debate, on motion by Mr. HOAR, and by unanimous consent,

Ordered, That the following resolution, submitted by Mr. RIDDLEBERGER March 22, 1888, be substituted for the one under consideration:

Resolved, That so much of Rules XXXVI, XXXVII, and XXXVIII as provide for executive sessions be suspended during the consideration of the fisheries treaty, when the same shall be reported to the Senate.

After debate on the question as to whether the resolution should be considered with closed doors,

On motion by Mr. MORGAN,

Ordered, That the further consideration of the question be postponed to Monday next, at 2 o'clock p. m., and at that hour the Presiding Officer direct the doors to be closed for the purpose.

On motion by Mr. SHERMAN, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Monday, May 14, 1888.

The hour of 2 o'clock p. m. having arrived, the President *pro tempore*, pursuant to the order of the 10th instant, directed the galleries to be cleared and the doors closed. The order having been executed, the Senate resumed the consideration of the question, Shall the consideration of the following resolution be had with closed doors?

Resolved, That so much of Rules XXXVI, XXXVII, XXXVIII as provide for executive sessions be suspended during the consideration of the fisheries treaty, when the same shall be reported to the Senate.

And, after debate, it was determined in the affirmative; and on the question to agree to the resolution, after debate, it was determined in the negative—yeas 3, nays 41.

On motion by Mr. SHERMAN, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present,

Those who voted in the affirmative are Messrs.—

Dawes,	Sherman,	Teller.

Those who voted in the negative are Messrs.—

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Hiscock,	Saulsbury,
Allison,	Davis,	Hoar,	Sawyer,
Bate,	Dolph,	Jones of Arkansas,	Spooner,
Berry,	Edmunds,	Morgan,	Turpie,
Blair,	Evarts,	Palmer,	Vance,
Brown,	Faulkner,	Pasco,	Walthall,
Butler,	George,	Pugh,	Wilson of Iowa,
Call,	Gray,	Quay,	Wilson of Md.
Chandler,	Hampton,	Ransom,	
Cockrell,	Harris,	Reagan,	
Coke,	Hawley,	Sabin,	

So the resolution was not agreed to.

On motion by Mr. HOAR, the Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution submitted by him to admit the stenographic reporter to report the debates and proceedings in the consideration of the proposed treaty with Great Britain; and having been amended on the motion of Mr. MORGAN,

On the question to agree to the resolution as amended as follows:

Resolved, That Denis F. Murphy, the Official Reporter of the Senate, and such assistants as may be necessary, to be appointed by the President *pro tempore* of the Senate, shall be, when sworn, executive officers of the Senate to take down the proceedings and debates upon the fisheries treaty with Great Britain, now pending in the Senate. And, when said treaty is under consideration, they shall be admitted to the executive sessions of the Senate.

The debates on said treaty, and the proceedings relating to the same, shall be taken down by said reporters, and printed in confidence for the use of the Senate, from time to time, during such discussion, and shall be filed in the secret archives of the Senate, subject to its order, and may thereafter be made public if the Senate shall so order, except such portions thereof as it shall determine that the public interest requires shall be kept secret.

So much of the third clause of Rule XXXVI as conflicts with the resolution is suspended so far as necessary in order that the same shall take effect;

After debate, on motion of Mr. TURPIE that the resolution lie on the table, it was determined in the affirmative—yeas 36, nays 10.

On motion by Mr. HOAR, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present,

Those who voted in the affirmative are Messrs.—

Allison,	Cullom,	Harris,	Reagan,
Bate,	Davis,	Hawley,	Sabin,
Berry,	Dolph,	Hiscock,	Sawyer,
Brown,	Edmunds,	Ingalls,	Stewart,
Butler,	Evarts,	Jones of Arkansas,	Teller,
Call,	Faulkner,	Palmer,	Turpie,
Chandler,	George,	Pasco,	Walthall,
Cockrell,	Gray,	Pugh,	Wilson of Md.
Coke,	Hampton,	Quay,	Wilson of Iowa.

Those who voted in the negative are Messrs.—

Aldrich,	Hoar,	Saulsbury,	Vance.
Blair,	Morgan,	Sherman,	
Dawes,	Ransom,	Spooner,	

So the motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. SHERMAN, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXTRACTS FROM EXECUTIVE JOURNAL.

Monday, May 14, 1888.

Mr. QUAY presented eight memorials of citizens of Scranton, Pa., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed fisheries treaty with Great Britain; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Tuesday, May 22, 1888.

The treaty (Ex. M) between the United States and Great Britain concerning the interpretation of the convention of October 20, 1818, signed at Washington, February 15, 1888, was read the second time, and considered as in Committee of the Whole.

On motion by Mr. HOAR that the further consideration thereof be had in open executive session, it was determined in the negative—yeas 28, nays 28.

On motion by Mr. MORGAN, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present—

Those who voted in the affirmative are Messrs.—

Aldrich,	Edmunds,	Manderson,	Riddleberger,
Allison,	Evarts,	Mitchell,	Sabin,
Blair,	Farwell,	Morrill,	Sherman,
Chandler,	Frye,	Paddock,	Spooner,
Davis,	Hawley,	Palmer,	Stewart,
Dawes,	Hiscock,	Platt,	Stockbridge,
Dolph,	Hoar,	Plumb,	Teller.

Those who voted in the negative are Messrs.—

Bate,	Coke,	Jones of Arkansas,	Reagan,
Beck,	Daniel,	Kenna,	Saulsbury,
Berry,	George,	McPherson	Turpie,
Blackburn,	Gray,	Morgan,	Vance,
Blodgett,	Hale,	Pasco,	Vest.
Call,	Hampton,	Pugh,	Voorhees,
Cockrell,	Harris,	Ransom,	Walthall.

During the roll-call the following pairs were announced:

Mr. SAWYER, in the affirmative, with Mr. BROWN, in the negative.

Mr. CAMERON, in the affirmative, with Mr. BUTLER, in the negative.

Mr. CHACE, in the affirmative, with Mr. COLQUITT, in the negative.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, in the affirmative, with Mr. PAYNE, in the negative.

Mr. QUAY, in the affirmative, with Mr. FAULKNER, in the negative.

Mr. BOWEN, in the affirmative, with Mr. GIBSON, in the negative.

Mr. WILSON, of Iowa, in the affirmative, with Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, in the negative.

Mr. CULLOM, in the affirmative, with Mr. GORMAN, in the negative.

Mr. INGALLS, in the affirmative, with Mr. EUSTIS, in the negative.

So the motion was not agreed to.

Wednesday, May 23, 1888.

The Senate resumed, as in Committee of the Whole, the consideration of the treaty (Ex. M) between the United States and Great Britain concerning the interpretation of the convention of October 20, 1818, signed at Washington February 15, 1888.

On motion by Mr. HOAR, that the further consideration thereof be had in open executive session,

Pending debate, on motion by Mr. SPOONER, at 1 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m., the doors were opened and the Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Thursday, May 24, 1888.

The Senate resumed, as in Committee of the Whole, the consideration of the treaty (Ex. M) between the United States and Great Britain concerning the interpretation of the convention of October 20, 1818, signed at Washington February 15, 1888, and the question being on the motion of Mr. HOAR that the further consideration thereof be had in open executive session,

Pending debate, on motion by Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, that the further consideration of the said motion be postponed until Monday next,

On motion by Mr. SHERMAN, at 4 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m., the doors were opened and the Senate adjourned.

Friday, May 25, 1888.

The Senate resumed, as in Committee of the Whole, the consideration of the treaty (Ex. M) between the United States and Great Britain concerning the interpretation of the convention of October 20, 1818, signed at Washington February 15, 1888, and the question being on the motion of Mr. JONES, of Arkansas, to postpone until Monday next the further consideration of the motion of Mr. HOAR, that the further consideration of the treaty be had in open executive session,

After debate, on motion by Mr. SAULSBURY, at 5 o'clock and 42 minutes p. m., the doors were reopened, and, in pursuance of a motion adopted in legislative session, the Senate adjourned until Monday next.

Monday, May 28, 1888.

The Senate resumed, as in Committee of the Whole, the consideration of the treaty (Ex. M) between the United States and Great Britain concerning the interpretation of the convention of October 20, 1818, signed at Washington February 15, 1888, and, the pending question being on the motion of Mr. HOAR that the further consideration thereof be had in open executive session,

On motion by Mr. SHERMAN, the yeas and nays were ordered by one-fifth of the Senators present.

After debate, Mr. MORGAN submitted a motion that the further consideration of the pending question be postponed to the Wednesday after the first Monday in December next.

The President *pro tempore* decided that the motion of Mr. HOAR being an incidental question arising out of and occurring in consequence of the pendency of the main question, the motion of Mr. MOR-

GAN to postpone its consideration to a day certain was out of order and could not be received.

From this decision of the President *pro tempore* Mr. MORGAN appealed to the Senate.

Pending which, on motion by Mr. HOAR, that the appeal be laid on the table, it was determined in the affirmative—yeas 21, nays 19.

On motion by Mr. MORGAN, the yeas and nays being desired by one-fifth of the Senators present,

Those who voted in the affirmative are Messrs.—

Allison,	Dawes,	Manderson,	Stewart,
Blair,	Dolph,	Mitchell,	Stockbridge,
Chace,	Edmunds,	Paddock,	Wilson of Iowa.
Chandler,	Evarts,	Platt,	
Cullom,	Hiscock,	Quay,	
Davis,	Hoar,	Sherman,	

Those who voted in the negative are Messrs.—

Bate,	George,	Morgan,	Turpie,
Berry,	Gray,	Pugh,	Voorhees,
Call,	Hampton,	Ransom,	Walthall,
Coke,	Jones of Arkansas,	Reagan,	Wilson of Md.
Faulkner,	McPherson,	Saulsbury,	

During the roll-call the following pairs were announced:

Mr. HALE, in the affirmative, with Mr. BECK, in the negative.

Mr. SAWYER, in the affirmative, with Mr. BROWN, in the negative.

Mr. HAWLEY, in the affirmative, with Mr. COCKRELL, in the negative.

Mr. ALDRICH, in the affirmative, with Mr. COLQUITT, in the negative.

Mr. MORRILL, in the affirmative, with Mr. HARRIS, in the negative.

Mr. SPOONER, in the affirmative, with Mr. BLACKBURN, in the negative.

Mr. PALMER, in the affirmative, with Mr. EUSTIS, in the negative.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, in the affirmative, with Mr. PAYNE, in the negative.

Mr. CAMERON, in the affirmative, with Mr. BUTLER, in the negative.

Mr. SABIN, in the affirmative, with Mr. KENNA, in the negative.

Mr. PLUMB, in the affirmative, with Mr. VEST, in the negative.

Mr. BOWEN, in the affirmative, with Mr. PASCO, in the negative.

Mr. TELLER, in the affirmative, with Mr. GIBSON, in the negative.

Mr. FARWELL, in the affirmative, with Mr. DANIEL, in the negative.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER, in the affirmative, with Mr. BLODGETT, in the negative.

Mr. FRYE, in the affirmative, with Mr. GORMAN, in the negative.

So the appeal was laid on the table.

Mr. MORGAN moved to amend the motion of Mr. HOAR by adding after the words "executive session" the words "on the Wednesday after the first Monday in December next."

The President *pro tempore* decided that for the reasons stated in the motion to postpone, the motion was not in order and could not be received.

Mr. MORGAN moved that the motion of Mr. HOAR be laid on the table.

The President *pro tempore* decided that for the reasons stated on the motion to postpone, the motion was not in order and could not be received.

The question recurring on the motion of Mr. HOAR, that the further consideration of the treaty be had in open executive session, it was determined in the affirmative—yeas 21, nays 19.

The yeas and nays having heretofore been ordered—

Those who voted in the affirmative are Messrs.—

Allison,	Dawes,	Manderson,	Stewart,
Blair,	Dolph,	Mitchell,	Stockbridge,
Chace,	Edmunds,	Paddock,	Wilson of Iowa.
Chandler,	Evarts,	Platt,	
Cullom,	Hiscock,	Quay,	
Davis,	Hoar,	Sherman,	

Those who voted in the negative are Messrs.—

Bate,	George,	Morgan,	Turpie,
Berry,	Gray,	Pugh,	Voorhees,
Call,	Hampton,	Ransom,	Walthall,
Coke,	Jones of Arkansas,	Reagan,	Wilson of Md.
Faulkner,	McPherson,	Saulsbury,	

During the roll-call the following pairs were announced:

Mr. HALE, in the affirmative, with Mr. BECK, in the negative.

Mr. CAMERON, in the affirmative, with Mr. BUTLER, in the negative.

Mr. BOWEN, in the affirmative, with Mr. PASCO, in the negative.

Mr. FARWELL, in the affirmative, with Mr. DANIEL, in the negative.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER, in the affirmative, with Mr. BLODGETT, in the negative.

Mr. SAWYER, in the affirmative, with Mr. BROWN, in the negative.

Mr. HAWLEY, in the affirmative, with Mr. COCKRELL, in the negative.

Mr. ALDRICH, in the affirmative, with Mr. COLQUITT, in the negative.

Mr. MORRILL, in the affirmative, with Mr. HARRIS, in the negative.

Mr INGALLS, in the affirmative, with Mr. EUSTIS, in the negative.

Mr. PALMER, in the affirmative, with Mr. VANCE, in the negative.

Mr. JONES, of Nevada, in the affirmative, with Mr. PAYNE, in the negative.

Mr. SPOONER, in the affirmative, with Mr. BLACKBURN, in the negative.

Mr. TELLER, in the affirmative, with Mr. GIBSON, in the negative.

Mr. PLUMB, in the affirmative, with Mr. VEST, in the negative.

Mr. SABIN, in the affirmative, with Mr. KENNA, in the negative.

Mr. FRYE, in the affirmative, with Mr. GORMAN, in the negative.

So the motion was agreed to.

Whereupon, the President *pro tempore* directed the doors to be opened; and, at 4 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m., the order having been executed, the Senate, in pursuance of the motion this day adopted in executive session, proceeded to consider the pending treaty (Ex. M) in open executive session.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *May* 31, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday last was read and approved.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RANDALL. I call for the regular order.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT COLUMBUS, GA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying bill, was, on motion of Mr. GRIMES, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 1275, entitled "An act for the erection of a public building at Columbus, Ga., and appropriating money therefor."

The city of Columbus, Ga., is undoubtedly a thriving, growing city. The only present necessity for a public building there is for the accommodation of its post-office. It is stated in the report of the House committee that the gross revenues of the office for the year ending June 30, 1887, were $16,700. The postmaster in a letter upon the subject makes the following statement: "I estimate the gross receipts at $17,500 for the fiscal year ending March 31, which will be an increase of nearly 7 per cent. over last year's receipts." There are nine persons employed in the post-office at present, including the postmaster. The present quarters are leased by the Government at an annual rent of $900. The postmaster represents that his accommodations are not adequate or convenient, and that instead of a space of 1,900 square feet which he now has, he should be provided with 2,500 square feet.

The population of the city in 1880 was 10,123. It is claimed that it is now about 20,000.

In my opinion the facts presented do not exhibit the necessity of the expenditure of $100,000 to afford the increased room for the post-office which may be desirable. I believe a private person would erect a building abundantly sufficient for all our postal needs in that city for many years to come for one-third of that sum.

Business prudence and good judgment seem to dictate that the erection of the proposed building should be delayed until its necessity is more manifest, and so that it can be better determined what expenditure for such a purpose will be justified by the continued growth of the city and the needs of the Government.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *May* 29, 1888.

CLAIM OF HEZEKIAH MYERS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the finding of facts in the case of Hezekiah Myers against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

MONUMENT AT WASHINGTON'S HEADQUARTERS, NEWBURGH, N. Y.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in compliance with a resolution of the House, a report upon the present condition of the monument at Washington's headquarters, Newburgh, N. Y.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri. I submit a conference report for present consideration.

The SPEAKER. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House agree to the amendments of the Senate.

JOHN J. O'NEILL,
JAMES BUCHANAN,
CARLOS FRENCH,
Managers on the part of the House.

HENRY W. BLAIR,
JAMES F. WILSON,
J. Z. GEORGE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The statement required by the rules was read, as follows:

The managers on the part of the House on H. R. 8560 submit the following statement in explanation of their report. The amendments of the Senate to said bill are formal in their character, being simply a change in the phrascology of the bill.

JOHN J. O'NEILL,
JAMES BUCHANAN,
CARLOS FRENCH,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee of conference.

The report was adopted.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, moved to reconsider the vote by which the report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. SPINOLA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPINOLA. I ask the Clerk to be kind enough to read the marked article which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

A WORTHY BILL BURIED BY MR. SPINOLA.

WASHINGTON, *May 23.*

General regret was expressed on the Republican side of the House to-day that Mr. SPINOLA, of New York, should simply have presented *pro forma*, as chairman of the subcommittee on Military Affairs, the bill for the placing of John C. Frémont on the retired-list as major-general. Republican members, had they known of the intention to present a favorable report at this time, would have asked unanimous consent for its present consideration, and would at least have placed on record by their own action their appreciation of the intrepid pioneer of the West and the first Republican candidate for the Presidency. Buried in the House Calendar the bill is not likely to be called up for action.

Mr. SPINOLA. Mr. Speaker, the article just read is from the New York Tribune, the political organ of the Republican party of this country, and the article as published is a gross falsification of the facts. There is not one solitary word of truth contained in that article from beginning to end as it there appears in the New York Tribune.

The facts of the case I intend the people of this country shall understand, and the organ of the Republican party shall not with impunity place any responsibility on my shoulders that I am not entitled to bear.

I wish to state, sir, to this House, and through this House to the people, the true condition of affairs. In the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I have the honor of being a member, the Democratic members of that committee voted unanimously to report this bill to the House, while the Republican members voted against it [applause on the Democratic side]; and, sir, when I was honored by the committee with the privilege of making that report to this House, I had no more than submitted my report in favor of placing General John C. Frémont on the retired-list than a Republican member on the other side rose in his place and asked consent to file a minority report accompanying the bill.

That fact alone, as every member here knows, would have prevented me or debarred me from the privilege of asking unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

This article purports to come from the Republican side of the House, and I propose, unless they purge themselves of responsibility for it, to hold that entire side accountable for the article. [Laughter.] "General regret," it is said, "was expressed on the Republican side of the House." That means, if it means anything, all the Republicans of that side; and they can not get away from that construction of it unless they individually rise and explain away their position. Now, then,——

Mr. REED. What is it all about?

Mr. SPINOLA. You will find what it is all about before I get through.

Mr. REED. I hope so.

Mr. SPINOLA. The Republican members of this House took the unsuspecting reporter of the New York Tribune, which is the Bible of that side of the House, and practiced upon him a fraud—innocent and unsuspecting as the reporter for the New York Tribune is, and unsophisticated, too, it would seem—and he communicated to Whitelaw Reid and his paper an unqualified falsehood, and he did it, as he states, under the advice of the Republican members of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I am willing to assume every particle of the responsibility that properly rests on me for every vote of mine and every action that I have ever assumed as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs of this House, and shall feel that responsibility in every vote that I may hereafter cast; but I will not submit to having placed upon my shoulders responsibility for that which belongs to another and for which I am not accountable. I want the people of this country to understand that the Republican side of the House, and the Republican party, are the men who have interfered with the early and unanimous passage of the bill to place General Frémont on the retired-list.

I have made this statement, sir, that it may go out to the people of this country, so that they may understand who has treated General Frémont in the manner that this article characterizes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, informed the House that the Senate had passed joint resolution and bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

Joint resolution (S. R. 79) permitting the public building authorized by act of Congress approved May 8, 1882, at Denver, Colo., to be located not less than 16 feet from any other building, instead of 40 feet, as provided in said act;

A bill (S. 2201) for the relief of Laura E. Maddox and Robert Morrison, executor of Joseph Maddox, deceased; and

A bill (S. 2807) to grant to the Puyallup Valley Railroad Company a right of way through the Puyallup Indian reservation in Washington Territory, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the bill (H. R. 6946) for the relief of Thomas Jordan.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to reports of committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the House of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 6899) to incorporate the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia; and

A bill (H. R. 2017) to incorporate the Rock Creek Railway Company of the District of Columbia.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. FORNEY. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the further consideration of the report of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union on the legislative appropriation bill.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the pending amendment on which a separate vote is asked.

The amendment in relation to additional clerks in the office of the Civil Service Commission was again reported.

Mr. RANDALL. If I understand correctly, this is an increase which was voted in by the Committee of the Whole House as to the Civil Service Commission?

The SPEAKER. That is the pending amendment, on which a vote will now be taken.

Mr. RANDALL. The committee recommend the same number that is provided in the current law.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 56, noes 45.

So, no further count being demanded, the amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read the next amendment, on which a separate vote was demanded, as follows:

After line 7, on page 56, insert the following:

"Assay office at St. Louis, Mo.: For assayer in charge, $2,500; one clerk, $1,000; in all, $3,500.

"For incidental and contingent expenses, including labor, $2,400."

Mr. RANDALL. This is an amendment making an appropriation for the St. Louis assay office.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I desire to know what is the full amount appropriated in the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment, the Speaker stated that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. RANDALL. I call for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 53, noes 45.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. No quorum.

The SPEAKER. The point of no quorum being made, the Chair will appoint tellers.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, there being—ayes 26, noes 53.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 106, nays 96, not voting 122; as follows:

YEAS—106.

Adams,	Farquhar,	McClammy,	Romeis,
Anderson, Iowa	Finley,	McCormick,	Rowland,
Baker, Ill.	Ford,	McCreary,	Ryan,
Barry,	Gay,	McCullogh,	Scott,
Bayne,	Gear,	McKenna,	Smith,
Biggs,	Grimes,	McKinley,	Spinola,
Bound,	Guenther,	McKinney,	Stahlnecker,
Bowden,	Harmer,	McMahon,	Steele,
Brown, Ohio	Hatch,	Milliken,	Stone, Mo.
Buchanan,	Haugen,	Montgomery,	Struble,
Bunnell,	Hayes,	Morrill,	Taulbee,
Burnes,	Heard,	Morrow,	Taylor, J. D., Ohio
Caruth,	Holmes,	Nelson,	Thomas, Ky.
Catchings,	Hovey,	Newton,	Thompson, Cal.
Cheadle,	Hunter,	Nichols,	Townshend,
Chipman,	Hutton,	O'Neill, Pa.	Turner, Kans.
Clardy,	Kean,	O'Neill, Mo.	Vance,
Cothran,	Ketcham,	Outhwaite,	Vandever,
Crain,	Laffoon,	Parker,	Walker,
Crouse,	Lagan,	Patton,	Warner,
Cummings,	Lane,	Payson,	White, N. Y.
Darlington,	Lawler,	Peel,	Whitthorne,
Davidson, Fla.	Lehlbach,	Phelan,	Wilkinson,
De Lano,	Lind,	Pugsley,	Wise,
Dingley,	Mansur,	Rayner,	Yoder.
Dockery,	Mason,	Robertson,	
Dunn,	Matson,	Rogers,	

NAYS—96.

Abbott,	Cobb,	Henderson, N. C.	McMillin,
Allen, Mass.	Cowles,	Herbert,	Mills,
Anderson, Miss.	Culberson,	Hiestand,	Moore,
Anderson, Kans.	Dalzell,	Hogg,	Morgan,
Atkinson,	Dibble,	Holman,	Neal,
Bankhead,	Dorsey,	Hopkins, Va.	Oates,
Blount,	Elliott,	Hudd,	O'Neall, Ind.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Ermentrout,	Jackson,	Osborne,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Fisher,	Johnston, Ind.	Penington,
Brewer,	Flood,	Johnston, N. C.	Perry,
Brower,	Foran,	Kennedy,	Randall,
Burnett,	Forney,	Kilgore,	Reed,
Burrows,	Fuller,	Landes,	Rice,
Butterworth,	Gest,	Lanham,	Russell, Mass.
Bynum,	Glass,	Lee,	Sayers,
Campbell, F., N. Y.	Goff,	Lodge,	Scull,
Campbell, Ohio	Grout,	Long,	Seney,
Cannon,	Hall,	Lyman,	Sherman,
Caswell,	Hare,	Maish,	Shively,
Clements,	Hemphill,	Martin,	Springer,

Stewart, Tex.	Taylor, E. B., Ohio	Turner, Ga.	Williams,
Stewart, Ga.	Thompson, Ohio	Weaver,	Wilson, Minn.
Stockdale,	Tillman,	Weber,	Wilson, W. Va.
Stone, Ky.	Tracey,	Whiting, Mass.	Woodburn.

NOT VOTING—122.

Allen, Mich.	Conger,	Hopkins, N. Y.	Richardson,
Allen, Miss.	Cooper,	Houk,	Rockwell,
Anderson, Ill.	Cox,	Howard,	Rowell,
Arnold,	Crisp,	Jones,	Russell, Conn.
Bacon,	Cutcheon,	Kelley,	Rusk,
Baker, N. Y.	Dargan,	Kerr,	Sawyer,
Barnes,	Davenport,	La Follette,	Seymour,
Belden,	Davidson, Ala.	Laidlaw,	Shaw,
Belmont,	Davis,	Laird,	Simmons,
Bingham,	Dougherty,	Latham,	Snyder,
Blanchard,	Dunham,	Lynch,	Sowden,
Bland,	Enloe,	Macdonald,	Spooner,
Bliss,	Felton,	Maffett,	Stephenson,
Boothman,	Fitch,	Mahoney,	Stewart, Vt.
Boutelle,	French,	McAdoo,	Symes,
Bowen,	Funston,	McComas,	Tarsney,
Browne, T. H. B., Va.	Gaines,	McShane,	Thomas, Ill.
Browne, Ind.	Gallinger,	Merriman,	Thomas, Wis.
Brown, J. R., Va.	Gibson,	Moffitt,	Wade,
Brumm,	Glover,	Morse,	Washington,
Bryce,	Granger,	Norwood,	West,
Buckalew,	Greenman,	Nutting,	Wheeler,
Butler,	Grosvenor,	O'Donnell,	White, Ind.
Campbell, T. J., N. Y.	Hayden,	O'Ferrall,	Whiting, Mich.
Candler,	Henderson, Iowa	Owen,	Wickham,
Carlton,	Henderson, Ill.	Perkins,	Wilber,
Clark,	Hermann,	Peters,	Wilkins,
Cockran,	Hires,	Phelps,	Yardley,
Cogswell,	Hitt,	Pidcock,	Yost.
Collins,	Hooker,	Plumb,	
Compton,	Hopkins, Ill.	Post,	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana. I did not reach the Hall until after my name had been passed. I was here during a part of the roll-call. I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. MCCREARY). To entitle the gentleman to vote it was necessary that he should have been in the Hall when his name was called.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana. I should have voted "no."

Mr. MCMILLIN. I move to dispense with the reading of the names.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, objected, but subsequently withdrew his objection.

The following pairs were announced until further notice:

Mr. MCSHANE with Mr. MCCOMAS.

Mr. RUSK with Mr. SEYMOUR.

Mr. MERRIMAN with Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa.

Mr. SIMMONS with Mr. DUNHAM.

Mr. TIMOTHY J. CAMPBELL with Mr. LAIDLAW.

Mr. WHITING, of Michigan, with Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Illinois, with Mr. CLARK.

Mr. BELMONT with Mr. SPOONER.

Mr. PIDCOCK with Mr. HAYDEN.

Mr. DOUGHERTY with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. TARSNEY with Mr. YOST.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois, with Mr. TOWNSHEND.

Mr. SHAW with Mr. LAIRD.

Mr. HOOKER with Mr. CUTCHEON.

Mr. GRANGER with Mr. ROCKWELL.

Mr. GLOVER with Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin.

Mr. NORWOOD with Mr. COOPER.

Mr. JONES with Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. GREENMAN with Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois.

Mr. WHITE, of New York, with Mr. COCKRAN.

For this day:

Mr. BRYCE with Mr. HOPKINS, of New York.

Mr. LATHAM with Mr. THOMAS H. B. BROWNE

Mr. BARNES with Mr. DAVIS.

Mr. DARGAN with Mr. HITT.

On this vote:

Mr. BLAND with Mr. ENLOE. Mr. BLAND would vote "ay" and Mr. ENLOE would vote "no."

Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. ROWELL.

Mr. WILKINS with Mr. BOUTELLE.

Mr. RICHARDSON with Mr. GALLINGER.

Mr. BURNETT with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. WASHINGTON with Mr. BAKER, of New York.

The result of the vote was then announced as above stated.

The Clerk read the next amendment on which a separate vote was demanded, as follows:

On page 77 strike out the following:

"Contingent expenses of branch offices at Boston, New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Norfolk, New Orleans, San Francisco, and Portland, Oregon, including furniture, fuel, lights, rent and care of offices, car-fare and ferriage in visiting merchant vessels, freight, express, telegrams, and other necessary expenses incurred in collecting the latest information for the Pilot Chart, and for other purposes for which the offices were established, $8,000."

And insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For contingent expenses of branch offices, including furniture, fuel, lights, rent and care of offices, car-fare and ferriage in visiting merchant vessels, freight, express, telegrams, and other necessary expenses incurred in collecting the latest information for the Pilot Chart, and for other purposes for which the offices were established—at Boston, $1,500; New York, $5,000; Philadelphia, $1,500; Baltimore, $1,500; Norfolk, $1,500; New Orleans, $1,500; San Francisco, $1,500; Portland, Oregon, $1,500; in all, $15,500."

Mr. RANDALL. That amendment is an increase of $4,500. I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That amount is absolutely needed.

Mr. MORROW. The amendment simply provides for the payment by the Government of expenses now paid by private enterprise. It should be adopted.

The question being put, there were—ayes 93, noes 51.

So (further count not being called for) the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL. I demand the previous question upon ordering the bill to be engrossed and read a third time.

The SPEAKER. That is pending.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time.

Mr. RANDALL. I now demand the previous question upon the passage of the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. RANDALL. Under the action of the Committee of the Whole House blanks have been left in this bill for forty-one salaries, thirty-nine or forty of which are increases and one or two are decreases. It is not proper that this bill should go to the Senate in that shape, but points of order were made, and the exact condition of the bill now is that there are forty-one blanks. The aggregate amounts in the respective paragraphs have not been changed; so that while the salaries are not fixed in the bill, the amounts include those salaries at the rates reported by the Committee on Appropriations, who were guided by the current law. I now ask unanimous consent that those blanks be filled in the manner I have indicated.

The SPEAKER. By inserting the amounts provided by law?

Mr. RANDALL. The amounts provided by the current law.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the blanks in this bill may be filled in the manner indicated by him. The amendments will be read, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 59, after "salary of governor," in line 6, insert "$2,600."
On page 81, after "assistant secretary," in line 4, insert "$4,000."
After "chief clerk," in line 5, insert "$2,500."
After "superintendent of documents," in line 13, insert "$2,000."
On page 82, after "captain of the watch," in lines 13 and 14, insert "$1,000."
After "one engineer," in line 16, insert "$1,200."
On page 84, after "Commissioner of Indian Affairs," in line 22, insert "$4,000."
On page 87, after "chief clerk," in line 16, insert "$2,250."
After "thirty principal examiners," in line 20, insert "$2,400."
On page 89, after "chief clerk," in line 24, insert "$1,800."
On page 97, line 20, after "surveyor-general of Oregon," insert "$1,800."
On page 108, after "Superintendent of Dead Letter Office," in lines 1 and 2, insert "$2,250."

Mr. RANDALL. Those amendments embrace exactly the amounts contained in the current law for these offices and they are in harmony with the recommendations of the Committee on Appropriations, who followed the law in framing that portion of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request for unanimous consent?

Mr. BUCHANAN. There is.

Mr. RANDALL. Then I move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions——

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, after the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I should be allowed to say a word.

Mr. RANDALL. I am making a motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] asks unanimous consent to make a statement. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. What I desire to say is that neither the Committee of the Whole nor this House is responsible for the present condition of this bill. The Committee on Appropriations are responsible for it because of their not obeying the rules of this House.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, the Committee on Appropriations will take all the odium that can be sent by the gentleman from New Jersey in their direction. I now move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report it back with those amendments.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I make the point of order upon that motion, for this reason——

Mr. RANDALL. Then, to save time, I move to recommit this bill; and on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. BUCHANAN. That is what you ought to have done in the first place.

Mr. RANDALL. I will find a way out, you may be sure.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have no doubt of it.

The motion to recommit was agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL. I move to reconsider.

The SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House the bill can not be brought back by a motion to reconsider.

A MEMBER. Regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. MILLS. I move to dispense with the morning hour.

The question was taken on the motion of Mr. MILLS, and 70 members voted in favor thereof.

The SPEAKER. It is evident that two-thirds have not voted in the affirmative, and the motion is not agreed to.

REMOVAL OF CAUSES FROM STATE COURTS, ETC.

Mr. CULBERSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back favorably the bill (S. 783) to correct the enrollment of an act approved March 3, 1887, entitled "An act to amend sections 1, 2, 3, and 10 of an act to determine the jurisdiction of the circuit courts of the United States and to regulate the removal of causes from State courts, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1875," which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL BANKS, ETC.

On motion of Mr. HENDERSON, of North Carolina, by unanimous consent, the Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1868) to repeal the proviso to section 12 of an act entitled "An act to enable national banking associations to extend their corporate existence, and for other purposes," approved July 12, 1882; and the same was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

WILLIAM P. GORDON.

Mr. MATSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported a bill (H. R. 10267) granting a pension to William P. Gordon; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

OLIVER M. FARRAND.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported a bill (H. R. 10268) for the relief of Oliver M. Farrand; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The call of committees was continued and concluded, no further reports being presented.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LAIDLAW, by unanimous consent, obtained leave of absence for the rest of the week.

TARIFF.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of bills raising revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union (Mr. SPRINGER in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House general debate on this bill has been closed. The bill will now be considered under clause 5 of Rule XXIII, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

When general debate is closed by order of the House, any member shall be allowed five minutes to explain any amendment he may offer, after which the member who shall first obtain the floor shall be allowed to speak five minutes in opposition to it, and there shall be no further debate thereon; but the same privilege of debate shall be allowed in favor of and against any amendment that may be offered to an amendment; and neither an amendment nor an amendment to an amendment shall be withdrawn by the mover thereof unless by the unanimous consent of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now read the first clause of the bill.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, this bill has never been read in full in Committee of the Whole——

The CHAIRMAN. The first reading of the bill was dispensed with; but that does not affect the operation of the rule which requires that it now be read and considered by sections or paragraphs. The Clerk will therefore read the first paragraph of the bill.

Mr. McKINLEY. I was about to ask, Mr. Chairman, that as the bill has never been read as a whole in committee, it now be read in full.

Mr. MILLS. The first reading of the bill was dispensed with when we first went into Committee of the Whole upon it.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill could only be read in full at this time by unanimous consent.

Mr. McKINLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, not having been read, shall now be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that this bill be now read at length. Is there objection?

Mr. MILLS. I object. Let the bill be read by paragraphs.

Mr. McKINLEY. I now ask for the reading of the report on the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in the nature of debate, and can only be done by unanimous consent or in the time of some gentleman who may be recognized for debate.

Mr. McKINLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the report of the majority and the views of the minority of the Committee on Ways and Means be now read.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. OATES. I object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now read the first paragraph of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the 1st day of July, 1888, the following articles mentioned in this section, when imported, shall be exempt from duty.

Mr. ADAMS. I desire to move an amendment to that paragraph.

Mr. MILLS. Let the paragraph be read through. No amendment is in order until the paragraph has been read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that the first paragraph of the bill, which prescribes the time when the bill shall take effect, has been read. The amendment sent to the desk by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS] will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 3 strike out "1st day of July, 1888," and insert "1st day of January, 1889."

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, we have had about a month of general debate on this bill, and now we come to questions of detail. It will be admitted, I think, on both sides of the House, that a bill making a radical change in the conditions under which any American industry is to be carried on will produce injury to some portion of our population. Gentlemen on the other side may claim that the injury is local and temporary, and that it is more than paid for by the ultimate good to be derived as they think by the people at large; we on this side may believe that the injury will be general and permanent. But we all agree that some persons will suffer to a certain extent for a certain time.

It is our duty as practical legislators to reduce that injury to a minimum. We must pay some regard to the vested interests of capital and the vested interests of labor. I have proposed an amendment changing the date at which the first section of the bill will take effect. I do so because of the great and unnecessary injury which will accrue even from the point of view of the gentlemen who support this bill to a large number of persons along the Northern border States, if the bill shall pass in its present form, who are engaged in the manufacture and sale of lumber, in the raising of vegetables, and in the manufacture of brick.

Take first the lumber business. I do not speak now of the abolition of the lumber duty. I assume that duty is to be abolished. The caucus has so decreed. There was no Democratic vote to be made for the bill in the caucus in striking out lumber from the free-list; otherwise we know it would have been stricken from the free-list. Nor do I make this amendment simply for the purpose of postponing the evil day when, as we on this side of the House believe, many American lumbermen will have to go to Canada in search of work or change occupation; and when the Wisconsin farmer shall lose the market of the logging camp. I propose it because I believe it is unfair to make so radical a change in any American industry in the very middle of the season in which that industry is carried on.

Mr. BLAND. What does the gentleman propose to do with the surplus in the Treasury which is now bankrupting the country? What does he propose to do with that?

Mr. ADAMS. If I proposed to reduce that surplus, I should not propose to do it by the passage of this bill, because the passage of this bill will not reduce the surplus.

I do not know how it is with the lumber business on the Pacific coast or in the Southern States, but in the Northern States the lumber business has an annual course as regular as farming. I say it is as unreasonable to bring about a radical change in that industry to take effect on the 1st of July as it would be to terminate a farm lease in midsummer when the crops are half grown.

The lumbering season in the Northwest begins with the beginning of winter. Men are sent into the logging camps as soon as the snow is on the ground. All or nearly all the logs are cut and piled along the streams before the ice breaks in spring. Then begins the logging drives. A large part or a certain part of the winter's cut of logs reaches the mill late in spring or early in summer. But low water sometimes prevents it. The largest logs, which form the choicest part of the winter's cut, are hung up along the logging streams and do not arrive at the mills until August or September or even later.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I will take the floor and yield my time to the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to say that under the rules it is made his duty to recognize first for five minutes some gentleman who desires to oppose the amendment, if any one shall rise for that purpose.

If there is no objection, the gentleman will proceed for another five minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. I desire to say nothing more than I have indicated in my opening remarks.

I say the logs arrive at the mills, or the choicest part of them, sometimes as late as August or September. The mill season begins almost as soon as the logging season is over, and the manufactured lumber from the mills begins to arrive in the Chicago market almost as soon as navigation opens, and the lumber vessels continue to arrive there until

the close of navigation in the fall. Of the 1,880,000,000 feet of lumber and the 687,000,000 of shingles which were received in the Chicago market during the last year, I venture to say more than one-half was received after the 1st day of July, the date on which this bill would take effect.

And let me state another further fact. All gentlemen familiar with the business will confirm the statement that all the lumber, or nearly all the lumber, cut in the course of the winter is cut and put on the market under contracts entered into during the latter part of the preceding year.

So that all the lumber that is now coming out of the woods and finding its way to the mills and from the mills to the Chicago market has been cut under contracts made before the lumbermen had any reasonable notice of the passage of this bill.

If placing lumber on the free-list will cause a decided fall in the price of lumber, those who have entered into contracts on the basis of existing laws will suffer far more severely if the change takes place in the middle of the lumbering season than if the change is postponed until the end of the present or beginning of the next lumbering year. That was the purpose of the amendment which I have proposed.

I have spoken of the lumbering business only; but the amendment proposed, and the reasoning with which it is supported, will apply equally, I think, to other articles that are embodied in the first section of the bill. Whether it will apply to flax and hemp I leave other gentlemen to discuss, but it will certainly apply to vegetables, and vegetables are placed upon the free-list by the terms of the pending bill. I maintain that in the interest of practical legislation, and in the interest of fair play, we ought rather to give to the farmers of the Northern border States, before the beginning of the season, fair notice that next year they must meet the competition of Canadian vegetables rather than to bring that competition to bear upon crops which had been put into the ground before they could possibly have had any reasonable notice of the provisions of this bill, or the prospects of its becoming a law. The same reasoning——

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ADAMS. I will move another amendment and withdraw the one I first sent to the desk.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has withdrawn the amendment and submits another, which the Clerk will read if there be no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 3 strike out "1st day of July, 1888," and insert "2d day of January, 1889."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I object to the time of the committee being consumed by amendments of that character.

Mr. ADAMS. I have not the slightest objection to the gentleman from Arkansas answering the points I have already made now, and will take my time later on.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. What I object to is having the time of the committee taken up by such amendments.

Mr. ADAMS. I have no objection, as I have said, to an answer from the gentleman now. I think I will find an opportunity to be heard later on.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. How much time did the gentleman desire?

Mr. ADAMS. I only desired to occupy about five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman proceeding for five minutes longer?

Mr. SPINOLA. I object. [Cries of "Go on!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that he may be permitted to consume five minutes longer.

Mr. SPINOLA and Mr. HARE objected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has heard no objection to the modification of the amendment.

Mr. SPINOLA. I have no objection to that.

Mr. ADAMS. I have no desire to press that point now.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, as I have indicated, I was entirely willing that the gentleman should have five minutes without interruption, but some gentleman interposed objection. It did seem to me, however, that the mode of getting time proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HOPKINS] was rather out of the usual way and not called for by the generous concessions and temper of this side of the House.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. It is quite impossible to hear the gentleman over here.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. It is partly my own fault. I am not able to throw my voice with strength enough to make it distinctly heard there.

The proposition of the gentleman, the essential point, is to defer the operation of the entire bill to the beginning of the next calendar year.

Mr. ADAMS. No, sir; only the first section.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. It affects, practically, the whole bill. The gentleman refers to the first section of the bill specifically.

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. That involves a great deal; and, I suppose, if we deem it necessary to make that change so far as this section is concerned, it would be deemed necessary to do it for substantially all of the other sections on the same ground. This involves, even on lumber, to defer all relief to the Treasury and the people. But on that point of particular safety I will state to the gentleman that in the bill of 1883 no such precaution was deemed necessary. It was not thought necessary then to so extend the time, and the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee do not deem it necessary as regards this class of imports now. It was considered necessary to defer the date with reference to the effect of the bill as applicable to certain articles; and it will be found, on page 26, that that part of the bill referring to jute and ramie and similar articles, such as sisal grass, goes into effect on the 1st of January next. This is necessary and just to the manufacturers of products out of these articles, who are now making autumn stocks. As regards the substitutes for hemp and the manufactures thereof, and of flax, it goes into effect on the 1st of July of next year, so as to provide against any possible ill effects upon crops that are now planted, and that can not be properly guarded by an earlier day. It will also be found that there is a provision on page 27 with reference to woolen manufactures, as they make their contracts in a way that would make it inconvenient and hurtful to have the bill go into effect on the 1st of July; and after full and ample conference with gentlemen engaged in these industries, we fixed upon October 1 as a suitable period when this provision should go into effect.

Then there is a further provision, at the bottom of page 27, with reference to the worsted feature of the woolen schedule. These are the ample adjustments recommended in the bill. It goes much further and is much more guarded than was the bill of 1883, of which you do not complain, and the committee see no occasion for further delay.

I will say further, no lumber manufacturer has suggested this. The people of my own State and of my own town are very large exporters to the lake ports. My own town ships very extensively to the city (Chicago) of the gentleman who has just spoken, and if there had been a particle of danger I think the very sagacious gentlemen engaged in that trade would have mentioned it to me.

Mr. ADAMS. Does the gentleman from Arkansas speak of the lumber business?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I do. That is an extensive business in my section.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ADAMS. I move to strike out the last word. So far as the act of 1883 is concerned I do not undertake to defend it. I was not in Congress then. The remarks of the gentleman from Arkansas as to the views he has received from Arkansas lumber manufacturers are characteristic of this bill and the way it is framed. For I expressly said in opening my remarks that they would not apply to lumber on the Pacific coast or lumber in the Southern States. I speak of the region of the country where the snow falls and the ice forms.

Mr. MORROW. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. ADAMS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MORROW. Do I understand the gentleman to say that in his judgment this length of time would not be necessary on the Pacific coast?

Mr. ADAMS. I did not say so. But I speak with reference to a part of the country with which I am more familiar.

Mr. MORROW. I suggest that the Pacific coast would require more time for this act to go into operation.

Mr. ADAMS. Then the amendment I have proposed is important for the whole country, except for the Southern States. I suggest the gentleman from Arkansas is in error in legislating for this entire country on the lumber business on the advice of the lumbermen of Arkansas.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. What I stated was that no lumbermen of any part of the country made this suggestion.

Mr. KELLEY. They had no opportunity.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, the same reasoning which I have used in reference to lumber will apply to the manufacture of brick. Brick is also put on the free-list in the first section of the bill. Why it was put there I can not understand. Can it be to cheapen brick to the consumer? Gentlemen must know that in the manufacture of brick the cost of the wages paid to labor forms a larger proportion of the total cost than in other industries. For instance last year in and about Chicago there was employed in all branches of manufacture a capital of $114,000,000. That capital paid wages to one hundred and thirty-four thousand laboring men. That is an average of about $850 per capita to each laboring man.

Now, how is it in the brickmaking business? There are three thousand brickmakers in Chicago, who made last year 44,000,000 bricks, worth $2,925,000. Yet the total capital in all the seventy-two brickyards in and about Chicago was only about $500,000. That is an average of only $167 of capital to each laboring man.

Now, putting brick on the free-list will bring Canada brick into competition with American brick or it will not. That is the dilemma. If it will not, what is the justification of the provision of this bill putting

brick on the free-list? How will it reduce the cost of brick to the consumer? And if it will, if Canada brick will be brought in competition with American brick by reason of the enactment of this law, gentlemen who are responsible for it can not lay the flattering unction to their souls that in making the change they are striking at the profits of capital. What they are striking at is the wages of labor.

But admit that brick should be put on the free-list; what I have to say is that the change in that business should take effect in the winter time and not right in the center of the busy season. Brick is a summer product. It can not be made safely in the spring so long as the nights are frosty. It can not be made in the fall when the early frosts begin. The great bulk of the 440,000,000 of brick made in Chicago last year was made in June, July, and August. The passage of this bill without the amendment I have proposed will bring about a radical change in the brickmaking business right in the middle of the season.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. ADAMS. I desire three minutes more.

Mr. BAYNE. If I am recognized I yield my time to the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that if no gentleman rises to oppose the amendment, the Chair will then recognize any other gentleman who rises.

Mr. BAYNE. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BAYNE. Is it the duty of the Chair to suggest all these difficulties if nobody rises to object to the gentleman from Illinois having the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not hear the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BAYNE. My inquiry was, is it the duty of the Chair to suggest these obstacles if nobody rises to oppose the gentleman from Illinois?

The CHAIRMAN. It is the duty of the Chair to enforce the rules in the committee, and it is the duty of the Chair to recognize any gentleman who desires to oppose this amendment. If any gentleman desires to oppose the amendment the Chair will recognize him; otherwise he will recognize the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BAYNE. But nobody rose except myself, and how did the Chair know but that I rose to oppose the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. How did the Chair know but some other gentleman desired to oppose the amendment?

Mr. BAYNE. Nobody else rose.

The CHAIRMAN. If gentlemen will be patient, they will find that all their rights will be preserved in the discussion of this bill.

Mr. BAYNE. I yield my five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] asks unanimous consent to yield five minutes' time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS]. Is there objection?

Mr. MACDONALD. I object.

Mr. HARE. I object.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. I understand that if one speech is made in favor of a proposed amendment and there is no speech against it, that ends the debate on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the end of the debate upon that amendment.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. That amendment is in order, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS] having, as the Chair understands, withdrawn his formal amendment.

Mr. KELLEY. I move a new amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS] had a formal amendment pending.

Mr. ADAMS. If there was a formal amendment, I withdraw it. I was not aware that I had made it.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] yielding to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS]?

Mr. HARE. I object.

Mr. MILLS. I hope my friend will withdraw his objection.

Mr. ADAMS. I move to strike out the last four words of my amendment.

Mr. KELLEY. I want to sustain my amendment. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is entitled to the floor.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, as there is nobody here to speak for the vast lumber interests of the Southern States [laughter], whose timber resources exceed those of the North now or at any past time, and whose mineral resources are immeasurably rich in comparison with those of the North, I wish to be heard for a few minutes in favor of maintaining the duty on these vast resources and the labor to be employed in utilizing them. In my own and other Northern States native timber was a charge upon the settlers' land, and had to be removed before crops could be grown. The forests had to be girdled, and the only reward for the labor of girdling and hewing them down was the potash that might be derived from their conflagration; but the forests of Alabama, Tennessee, Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and North Carolina, and of South Carolina from the Smoky and Blue Ridge Mountains to the sea, are every foot of value. As the world needs our Southern timber for furniture, for the embellishment of elegant buildings, and for all the uses to which it is adapted, it does not depend on protective duties as timber near the Canada line does.

Go to the summits of the Smoky Mountains and the Blue Ridge and you will find there the fir tree, growing in wild luxuriance and in magnificent dimensions—the same tree that you find so dwarfed in the extreme northern part of our continent that it may be potted and placed as an ornament in a lady's boudoir—and I plead with you not to impoverish the poor people of those mountain regions by impairing the demand for their labor on the lumber by reducing the value of these vast stores of lumber in the world's markets. Gentlemen of the South, you buried your iron and your coal for two centuries and refused to utilize it, but, in the name of the owners of the Southern forests, I beg you to emancipate this source of Southern and national industry and wealth. To pass this bill and carry it into effect one month from to-morrow will paralyze the capital and energy of the forest district of every State in the South by destroying its market in the Northern States, and I am pleading with you to believe that a new era has come to your States, in which labor is entitled to wages, and that the prosperity of the community is to come from the expenditure of the wages of well-paid labor. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman ——

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state further that when a gentleman who has not yet spoken desires to speak upon an amendment, the Chair must recognize him rather than any member who has already spoken. No gentleman has a right to speak twice until others desiring to speak have been heard.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I have been deeply touched by the appeal of the venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] in behalf of the lumber interest; and now, sir, I wish to submit an appeal in behalf of the citizens who dwell in the prairie States, and who must have lumber to build their homes, their barns, their granaries; and in connection with the appeal which I make in their behalf for cheap lumber, I want to protest against any action on the part of this House which may operate to fasten a lumber trust upon the farmers of my district in Iowa. [Applause.] Among the lumber producers for whom the gentleman has made his appeal there is no one of any considerable importance either North or South who has not joined the trust, the members of which are bound by a penalty under the rules of the association not to undersell each other, but to keep up the price at all hazards, robbing the people of my district and the consumers of the great prairie States of the West. These people are entitled to some consideration. I protest against this tariff on lumber; and I demand in the name of my constituents that lumber shall be on the free-list.

Mr. REED rose.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the *pro forma* amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be considered as withdrawn. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. REED. I move to strike out the first word. Mr. Chairman, it seems very appropriate just at this moment that something should be said as to the effect of these amendments with regard to lumber. The gentleman from a prairie State [Mr. WEAVER] has got himself into a condition of mind in regard to a "trust." He feels that somehow or other this bill will greatly cheapen lumber for his constituents. I am sorry to be obliged to say to him that a consideration of the figures involved would show him that such could not by any possibility be the case.

That portion of our lumber which is not produced in the United States is obtained solely from Canada. In the United States twenty-four thousand million feet of lumber are cut; the proportion imported from Canada is only about 2½ per cent., and it would be very difficult to make it 10 per cent. under the most favorable circumstances. Now, I do not expect to affect many of the members on the other side by the consideration I am about to submit; but I do say to them that if they were business men, with business education, they would see at once from these figures that there is no possibility of lessening the cost of lumber and material for houses by letting in Canada lumber. The sole effect of it will be that there will be just so much added to the price of Canada lumber, just so much added to the price of Canada "limits." This bill does not touch that; and the result will be that whatever amount of money may by reason of this bill fail to go into the Treasury of the United States will go into the pockets either of Canadian subjects or of American subjects who have had the wisdom to purchase lands in Canada—except on the Pacific coast, where, by competition with Chinese labor, it is quite possible some damage may be done to the American industry.

It is also a fact that in certain portions of the country near the Canadian line, and in certain spruce regions, there will be some injury done to the industry. But the total change to the advantage of the

consumer, even under the most favorable circumstances, will not for an instant countervail the injury which is sure to be done to the lumber business in various parts of the country. In other words, whatever cheapness, however slight, may result will only have the effect to injure the business and to injure men already concerned in it, and in the long run not conduce to cheap product.

The Democratic caucus, if the newspapers report its proceedings truly, has, in a great many instances outside of those recognized by the gentlemen who form the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means, recognized the fact that it is necessary to protect American industry, even in the extremest cases, where the very largest percentage is demanded.

What reason, what excuse can there be for refusing to a great industry which stretches clear across this continent the small protection which it now has, and refusing it upon the basis of giving planed lumber protection and denying it to sawed lumber? How in the world can it be made to appear that labor engaged in sawing is unworthy of attention while labor engaged in planing demands the assistance of the other side?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, the venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] and the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] can not both be right. The gentleman from Pennsylvania appeals to the committee not to destroy the lumber industry of this country. How can it destroy this industry if the other contention of the gentleman be correct that the price of lumber is not increased by the tariff? The gentleman from Maine contends that the price of lumber will not be affected. Then I ask what harm is there in placing lumber on the free-list? The speech of the gentleman from Maine is a complete contradiction of the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The gentlemen are both wrong. It will reduce the price without bankrupting anybody.

The gentleman from Maine took good care not to deny that the lumber interests are combined in a "trust" for the purpose of limiting the supply and controlling the prices of lumber. It is not only true—historically true, and I refer gentlemen to an article in the North American Review, by Mr. Lloyd, as far back as 1884, and to a recent work published by William B. Cook, of the New York bar; it is not only true that this lumber interest is engaged in a "trust" to limit the supply and control the price, but it is also true that they control the local dealers and require them to sell at a schedule price also.

And, sir, by reason of their further combination with the transportation monopolies, no man can engage in the lumber business without the consent of the lumber trust and the transportation companies, which together constitute one of the most unconscionable trusts ever organized in this or any other country. It is organized for the very purpose of plundering the people who are far removed from the great centers of lumber manufacture. I challenge the gentleman to deny before the American people that this lumber industry is engaged in a trust, the object of which is to absolutely determine who may and who may not deal in lumber, to limit the production, and to control the price—a criminal organization at common law, because in the nature of a conspiracy in restraint of trade.

Now, as an appeal has been made in behalf of these "trusts" by gentlemen on the other side of the House, I stand here and make my appeal in behalf of the people of the West who consume this lumber. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let this trust take its clutch from the throats of the people and quit robbing the consumer. Let them pay some respect to other people's industries, which are just as sacred and should be as inviolable as their own.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MILLS. This debate has drifted away from the original amendment moved by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS].

The CHAIRMAN. There is a formal amendment pending which must be withdrawn or voted on.

Mr. MILLS. Let it be withdrawn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and the formal amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. MILLS. This debate has drifted away from the amendment of my friend from Illinois. I want a vote on it. It has been discussed fully. Let us have a vote on the amendment and we can then get to the lumber interest and discuss it.

Mr. REED. We can discuss it here. We wish to express our views, and it is just as well to do so here as at another point.

Mr. MORROW. I move to strike out the first three words. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am ready to go as far as the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER], or any other gentleman, in legislation which will have for its purpose the destruction of all combinations or trusts, and I would do so in the interest of the people; but I do not understand that legislation which has for its purpose the destruction of all domestic competition can possibly result in destroying such combinations as are known as trusts. There is no trust that I know of in the production of lumber; but if there is a lumber trust in existence to-day, how can we deal with it in this bill? If we destroy our own American interest what do we do? We merely create a trust over the line in Canada which we could not possibly control, and which, with domestic competition out of the way, would be more grinding in its effect than any trusts which could be established in this country. But, as I have just said, I do not understand that there are any lumber trusts in this country.

Mr. WEAVER. Does the gentleman deny there is a redwood-lumber trust?

Mr. MORROW. I do deny there is any combination or trust of the sort indicated by the gentleman.

Mr. WEAVER. Does the gentleman deny there is a redwood-lumber trust?

Mr. MORROW. I do not know of any redwood-lumber trust. But suppose there is? Redwood lumber is not in active competition with the pine lumber of Canada.

Mr. WEAVER. I say there is such a lumber trust.

Mr. MORROW. I am not mistaken about my position, and I deny that the redwood-lumber interest of California comes into active competition with any other lumber interest; but the competition to which this bill relates in the removal of the duty on manufactured lumber is the pine-lumber interest.

Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman from Iowa should be compelled to give the authority for his statement.

Mr. MORROW. There are no lumber forests in my district, but the finest lumber in the world may be found in the First Congressional district of California, represented by my colleague [Mr. THOMPSON], and I will leave him to explain the extent of that interest.

Mr. BIGGS. I wish to say in reply to what my colleague has said that there is competition between redwood rustic and sugar-maple rustic.

Mr. MORROW. As I have already said, so far as I know there is no competition with other lumber on the part of redwood lumber.

Mr. WEAVER. I repeat what I have already said, that redwood lumber does come into competition with other lumber. Redwood lumber is used in finishing cars and inside work in houses.

Mr. MORROW. Now, I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the proposed amendment will be agreed to, so that this bill, if it is to become a law, shall not go into effect until the 2d day of January next. There are now four hundred vessels, representing a tonnage of 175,000 tons, engaged in transporting lumber on the Pacific coast. They have charters running from six months to a year, and perhaps for two or three years. If this law shall go into effect on the 1st day of July next, thirty days from now, it will destroy without sufficient notice the relations which the lumber interest has to the carrying trade on the Pacific coast. In behalf of those, therefore, engaged in this transportation business, I ask gentlemen on the other side to consent to amend this bill so that it will not take effect until the 2d day of January next. If that be done it will enable the people engaged in this carrying trade to adjust their affairs with the lumber men. There are vessels now on the ocean that will probably be affected by this bill. They have gone under contract or charter, and before their present voyages are completed you proposed to change the bases of the business in which they are engaged. It would seem to be only fair and proper under the circumstances to postpone the going into effect of this law until these vessels get into port and adjust their business to the proposed new conditions.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. MORROW. Yes, sir.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Do you claim that the going into effect of this bill will reduce the price of lumber?

Mr. MORROW. I am not speaking specially of the price of lumber, but I am speaking of the charters of these vessels engaged in the carrying of lumber, assuming that the duty will be removed.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Very well; how can it affect the lumber market?

Mr. MORROW. It is proposed by gentlemen on the other side to change the tariff on lumber, that is, by placing it on the free-list. The present rate of duty on sawed lumber is $2 per thousand feet. That will of course effect a change in the present status of the business. It will admit lumber free from Canada, and bring to California the lumber produced by Chinese labor in British Columbia and other places over the border.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. But if that does not reduce the price, I do not see what effect it can possibly have upon the business interests engaged in it.

Mr. MORROW. Why, it brings the cheap manufactured lumber of Canada into direct conflict and competition with our lumber manufactured by higher-priced labor. It affects the situation of the business and makes a complete change in the whole lumber business.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I have amongst my constituents a good many lumber manufacturers, as well as a very great number of lumber consumers, and I admit with the gentleman from California, who has just taken his seat, that the lumber manufacturers and other persons interested in this business have invested in it an immense amount of capital; but the question presented here——

Mr. MORROW. Will the gentleman permit a suggestion? I was talking particularly about the carrying trade. The transportation of lumber on the Pacific coast is by vessels.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I know, and I say in response to what the gentleman argues that if the bill goes into effect and does not reduce the price of lumber, as some on that side assert, it can not affect that business at all. It does not affect the question one way or the other.

But I do not wish to digress. I do not wish, either, to discuss the aspect of the case presented by my friend from Iowa who has spoken with reference to trusts. I leave that branch of the subject to him. I take the matter as it appears before me. The lumber industries have been appealing to this Congress ever since this session commenced, not to reduce the tariff on lumber, because as alleged they could not compete with the Canadian lumber. That has been their plea. This House have had more appeals in behalf of lumber than of any other industry so far as I know in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I live in the midst of the most extensive lumber interest in America, and I am not unacquainted with it, and I have never known an industry that has grown rich so fast. I can point to more men within my own knowledge that have become millionaires in this industry within twenty-five years, I am satisfied, than can be pointed out in any other similar industry in this country.

Mr. GUENTHER. They got rich because they owned the stumpage.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. But they first made their money to purchase the stumpage. They could not secure that until they had money enough to buy it.

Mr. GUENTHER. That has not been the case in my part.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I think the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. GUENTHER. Oh, no; they made it out of the pine lumber.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. But I do not wish, Mr. Chairman, to be interrupted. My time will not permit.

Allow me to say, sir, in this matter that the property invested in the lumber interest equally in my friend's district and in my locality within the last fifteen years has risen in value to an extent I am sure of not less than 300 to 500 per cent., whereas the property of the agricultural community, who are compelled to pay $2 a thousand feet to support and enrich this lumber interest, has not risen 1 per cent.

These are the facts for our consideration. And yet this tariff law compels the agriculturists, men who purchase from the lumber men, to pay a heavy tribute to them; and I repeat that within the last fifteen years this agricultural property has not risen 1 per cent. to match the increase of 300 to 500 per cent. which this protection has afforded to the lumber men. It is time that this condition of things was brought to an end. It is time that we stopped making these poor men support the millionaires. To keep up any longer this state of things is simply to legalize injustice, and although some of my best friends in the world are manufacturers of lumber, I can not vote to sustain this condition of things. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. FELTON. I move to strike out the last word. I desire to make one or two observations in reply to what the gentleman from Minnesota has just said in reply to my colleague. He asked if placing lumber on the free-list would reduce the price of lumber—referring, I suppose, to the Pacific coast. Yes, and it is for that reason I am opposed to the proposition. To put our lumber on the free-list would bring it into competition with lumber from British Columbia, the work on which is mainly supplied by Chinese labor at a much less price for labor than the citizens of the United States are getting at this time, thank God, and which I do not desire to see reduced.

As regards the statements of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER], I have no doubt he intends to be correct, and I do not dispute his statement; but I think he is mistaken when he asserts that there is a combine or trust on redwood lumber on the Pacific coast. I know of none. I have no knowledge of, and I believe there is no such thing as, a trust there in lumber of any kind, redwood or otherwise. Within my personal knowledge I recollect of several manufacturers of redwood and other lumber that are in no trusts. They carry on their business upon their own responsibilities as manufacturers.

But desiring to be fair to the House, I will state the competition in lumber on the Pacific coast, especially in redwood lumber, has been so severe at times that the weak men have been crowded out, not being able to compete with the stronger manufacturers. The result has been at times they have agreed on prices, and such agreements have lasted for a time, until the cupidity of some man interested gets the better of the others, and they go down. That has been the history of agreements with reference to lumber in California.

Mr. MILLS. In this question there is the side of the producer and the side of the consumer. The producer is interested in having a duty on lumber that he may have the benefit of an increased price. The consumer is interested in having lumber put upon the free-list that he may enjoy the privilege and right of purchasing his lumber at a lower rate. Now, if this duty increases the price to the consumer, it does him a wrong. If it does not increase the price of lumber to the consumer, it does no good to the producer. These gentlemen can hang on either horn of the dilemma they choose. But while we are considering the interests of the great lumber producers, who it is said cut and put on the market several millions of dollars of product each year, we ought to take into consideration the far greater number of our people who are interested in building their houses, their homes, their barns, their fences, and who have a right in order to protect the products of their labor to buy lumber as cheaply as they can purchase it in open market.

It has been stated that this lumber business is a trust. That statement is denied on this floor. I want to produce some witnesses from California to substantiate that charge. It has been stated that petitions were sent to the Committee on Ways and Means and were not considered. I want to give you a few statements from one at least that has been considered. I do not know whose constituency it is from. This petition is from Merced County, California. About one hundred and fifty of these gentlemen ask us to remove the duty on lumber, and for the following reasons:

First. A combination of lumbermen of this State have advanced the price of lumber more than $8 per thousand, to such an exorbitant figure that it has become a grievous burden upon the farmers and all other persons who are compelled to use it, particularly to colonizing immigrants. It will at once be recognized that this is a serious obstacle to California's progress.

Second. If placed on the free-list it would at least have a tendency to save some of our grand forests yet left from the ruthless devastation that has swept away millions of acres of the finest timber in the world.

Third. There is practically no revenue derived from the duty now imposed, the duty now imposed being so nearly prohibitory that but $224 was collected on lumber hewed and sawed during the year 1886.

Mr. REED. Was that petition read to the committee?

Mr. MILLS. It was in the committee I got it, and I suppose every member of the committee read it. The gentleman will hardly say he failed to discharge his duty by not reading the petitions coming up from the citizens of this country remonstrating against this great injustice?

Mr. BURROWS. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BURROWS. Is not that the only petition from the sixty millions of the people of the United States asking for the removal of the duty on lumber?

Mr. MILLS. The 171 Democrats in this House have been presenting such petitions from the sixty millions of our people asking to have the duty taken off.

Mr. BURROWS. Is that the only petition in favor of free lumber from sixty millions of people?

Mr. MILLS. It is very hard for sixty millions of people to go around and get up petitions, but it is very easy for these trusts and combinations to get up petitions and send them here. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BURROWS. There are fifty petitions against it for one in favor of the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, it is said that this tariff on lumber is in the interest of the laboring man who cuts down the timber, that all this immense benefit is to go into his pocket. Gentlemen do not plead for the capitalists who have their millions invested in this business. They have too few votes to make it worth while to plead in their name; but gentlemen plead here for the working people, and yet, sir, I am told that in California and in the Territories, where this business is carried on, they are importing Chinese labor to do that work.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MILLS. I have not completed what I desired to say.

Mr. REED. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be allowed to proceed.

Mr. MILLS. Go ahead. I will get all the time I want.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. FELTON, by unanimous consent, withdrew his formal amendment.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment, which is not a *pro forma* one, to the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Amend lines 3 and 4 by striking out "July" and inserting "November;" and by striking out "88" and inserting "89."

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I propose by this amendment to extend the time named in the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois from January, 1889, to November, 1889, and let this proposal to take the duty from lumber take effect November 1, 1889, instead of July 1, 1888, as proposed by this Mills bill. It may do in some localities to permit the act to take effect in January, 1889, if it is ever to take effect, but where the lumber is produced by other methods the intervening time is not long enough.

I heard the suggestion which came from the gentleman from Arkansas, and which seemed to indicate that that section of the committee were disposed to consider and respect no interests but their own. Two or three years ago I had occasion to learn something of the methods of lumbering in that part of the country. They lay down temporary railroad tracks through the timber and take their workmen and teams into the woods; they purchase their supplies for their men and their grain and hay for their cattle in the North and it is brought by rail. They move the lumber on short hauls from the stump to the railroad and take it directly to the mills; and thus, in a few days at most, they complete their conveyance of supplies, their cutting, their hauling, their sawing, and their transportation to the distributing point. In the Northeast, for instance in Northern New York, the system is very different.

There we have long rivers, up which the men go for perhaps a hundred miles into the forests, and it often takes two years to get down the stock. As early as October the makers of lumber start for the woods with their supplies. In October, November, and December they are cutting the logs and skidding them and getting them ready to haul. Then from the last of December on through January and later months they are hauling them onto the ice of the streams and connected still-waters.

When the ice breaks up in the spring the logs are run down through a period of sometimes two or three months, to the mills below, and it often happens on the long Northern rivers that a large proportion of the stock which is being run down will catch in the rapids, will stick upon the shoals, or will be delayed or stopped by reason of low water, so that it will not reach the mills where it is to be cut up until the next year. Then it is necessary to saw the logs, to dry the lumber, to put it in shape for the market by planing, etc., and to market it in the different cities of the East and South and West. Therefore it is necessary that this amendment, extending the time to November, 1889, shall be adopted, in order to protect the lumber which is now coming down those rapid rivers of the North, and therefore, sir, in good faith, I ask that this amendment be considered and voted upon.

Let me now notice another point. The gentleman who spoke last [Mr. MILLS] has told us that this change will make no particular difference to the manufacturers, and that the price of lumber will be cheapened to the consumer. As to the effect of the passage of this bill upon the price of lumber I wish to say a word. Probably the first effect of the bill, if enacted, will be to make lumber cheaper. Why? Because it will throw our markets open to the competition of the lumbermen of Canada with their accumulated stocks and their cheap timber. They have bought their timber lands for less money per acre than our men pay for stumpage per standard log upon the stump in the forest along the Raquette, the Grasse, the Oswegatchie, the Saranac, and the other Northern rivers. Therefore the lumbermen at the great mills at Ottawa, in Canada, where they have probably as magnificent a water-power as there is in use in the world, and Canadian lumbermen at other points will add to their accumulated stocks, and put their cheap labor at work and manufacture their cheaper timber into all forms of lumber and rapidly flood our markets with it, thus breaking down our present mill-owners and stopping lumbering operations upon our Northern rivers, and then when that effect is produced they will turn about and put up the price, and hold the consumer at their mercy, while Canadian farmers and tradesmen will get the benefit of supplying. Whatever else is done with the lumber clauses of this bill, time should be given to operators and to employers to adjust their plans to the threatened competition and the new order of things proposed.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to place on record the testimony of one more witness as to the benefits of protection to lumber.

A MEMBER. Is there one more? [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. MILLS. This witness is a constituent of my friend from Chicago. I cut his testimony out of a newspaper a few days ago, and I will now read it:

Mr. Blanchard is engaged in the lumber business, and tells, with delightful candor, to what extent, and why he is a protectionist:

"I am high tariff on lumber, but low tariff on copper, iron, wool, cotton, leather, glass, etc., and I will tell you why. I own timber land and sell stumpage; besides, I operate largely myself, and this tariff puts money into my pocket. I get $2 per thousand for my stumpage and $2 per thousand for my boards. I have just sold 5,000,000 feet of lumber. Now, $2 a thousand on 5,000,000 feet is just $10,000. That is the difference to me between high tariff and free lumber. I am high tariff on lumber, I am! This blessed tariff, they tell us, is all for the benefit of the American laborer. What do you suppose I did with the $10,000? Divide it with my workmen? Not a bit of it. I put it right into this calf-skin wallet, I did! Of all my workmen I am the only protected American laborer. Wages depend on supply and demand, my friends, and not on taxes. When you see two men after one boss, wages are low; when you see two bosses after one man, wages are high. That is the whole of it—the theory, principle, and practice."

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GUENTHER. Does the gentleman know that to be a genuine interview? Does he vouch for its genuineness?

Mr. MILLS. As I have said, I clipped it from a Chicago paper.

A MEMBER. You do not know by whom it was inspired?

Mr. MILLS. I can not tell anything about that. I do not know whether Mr. Blanchard lives there or not, but whoever he is, he tells the truth when he says that the $2 duty on lumber which we are now seeking to take off goes into the leather wallet of the lumber producer, who goes into the market and hires his wage-man at exactly the market price, and does not pay a cent more than the market price. Mr. Chairman, the tariff does not change human nature; it can not change the constitution of man. All that the tariff does is to increase the price of the property to the man who owns it. It does not increase the wages of the laborer; that is regulated alone by the amount of labor seeking employment and the amount of demand for its employment.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendment is now in order. The amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER] now pending is an amendment in the second degree.

Mr. BURROWS. Is not that withdrawn?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from New York is a substantial, not a formal, amendment. It will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend lines 3 and 4 by striking out "July, 1888," and inserting "November, 1889."

Mr. BOUTELLE. I move to amend by striking out "1889" and inserting "1890."

The CHAIRMAN. No further amendment is in order at this time.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Then I move a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must move a substitute for the whole proposition; he can not move it as an amendment to this amendment, which is already in the second degree. The Chair will call members' attention to the rule already read—clause 5, Rule XXIII—which will show that there is no further amendment in order at this time. The question is upon the amendment of the gentleman from New York.

Mr. PARKER. I ask that the paragraph be read as it will stand if amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That on and after the 1st day of November, 1889, the following articles mentioned in this section, when imported, shall be exempt from duty.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. PARKER to the amendment, it was not agreed to; there being—ayes 89, noes 134.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I move to amend the amendment by striking out "1889" and inserting "1890." [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. BOUTELLE. No; we will have some conversation before we vote, if the Chair pleases.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] has just stated to us with that positiveness of assertion which has characterized most of his deliverances upon the tariff question that the only possible effect of putting lumber on the free-list will be to lessen the price to the consumer, and that the only object in keeping the tariff on lumber is to increase the profit of the manufacturer.

Mr. MILLS. I trust that we shall have order. I desire to hear the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The House will be in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, as I was remarking, the gentleman from Texas has asserted with that directness and positiveness which have characterized his utterances upon this question that the tariff on lumber has only the effect of increasing the profits of the manufacturer without increasing the wages of the laborer. That statement was reiterated several times, and certainly I can not be mistaken in understanding its purport.

Now, it would be important to know, Mr. Chairman, with what standard the gentleman from Texas was making a comparison. He certainly could not have intended to make his comparison with the prices paid to Chinese labor, whose competition with the lumber mills of California this bill would invite; and if he intended to make his comparison with the prices paid lumbermen in New Brunswick and other portions of Canada, he is mistaken to a degree that can hardly be comprehended. Nothing is more thoroughly known among those who are familiar to-day with the lumber interests of the New England States than the fact that for years there has existed and to-day still exists a very wide disparity between the wages paid to labor on the one side and on the other of the Canadian line. I have the honor to represent a district with several hundred miles of frontier largely devoted to lumber interests, and this bill strikes a destructive blow at the most important industrial pursuits of my constituency.

The effect of the free-lumber feature of this bill is to strike down a business in which to-day we are paying to those brawny-armed sons of toil who are professed to be the special protégés of the champions of this bill all the way from 20 to 45 per cent. more than they receive across the line in Canada. And I would say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] that the most cursory examination of this subject can not fail to convince him that removing the duty on lumber and allowing free importation from the British provinces can not fail to have the effect of striking down the rate of wages paid on our side of the line.

The point sought to be made by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WILSON] in regard to the effect of the proposed action on the price of lumber involved the exact fallacy which runs all along the line of these tariff reductions. He says if it will cheapen the cost to the consumer it will do no harm.

Mr. Chairman, everybody understands that the immediate effect of the removal of this duty is to temporarily reduce the cost. It is a question, as my colleague has said, of the period of time you consider. You pass this bill putting lumber on the free-list, opening wide the door to the entry of Canadian and other foreign lumber, and undoubtedly it will temporarily reduce the price for the purpose of breaking down the industries in this country, of closing up the mills in the United States, and getting rid of competition here. But when the competition in this country is destroyed or greatly lessened, I ask my friend from Minnesota where he thinks then the price would go?

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Let me answer that by asking a ques-

tion: Which is the richest, the manufacturer of lumber in the United States or in Canada?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not know what bearing that has on this subject.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. The richest men will not be overrun by the poorest.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LIND. This question of lumber, Mr. Chairman, is one in which my constituents are largely interested, and I desire to say a word or two at this time. My views differ in some degree from those which I have heard expressed here in this discussion. I do not think that the removal of the tariff on lumber would have the effect to cheapen the price of lumber to any appreciable extent; but if it does, so much the better. It might in California, where there is Chinese labor to compete with, but it would not in my State. It would not make a particle of difference.

And so far as the trusts which are alleged to exist are concerned it would not make any difference. If the capital invested in the lumber interest of the country is placed under a trust and is controlled by a combination, why can it not also be extended to and control the Canadian lumber regions, which are smaller than our own?

Conceding that it makes no difference in price, and conceding that it makes no difference in wages, the result of placing lumber on the free-list will have one good effect, namely, diminishing the cutting down of the forests in this country and decreasing the consumption of our own timber. So far in that respect as it would furnish protection to the forests of our country, it is in my judgment a wise and desirable thing. [Applause on the Democratic side.] For the protection of the timber interests of this country we passed a timber-culture law. It has been denounced by every epithet known to the vocabulary, and, notwithstanding its defects and the frauds which have been perpetrated under it, it has proved to be one of the wisest and most beneficent laws ever passed.

Mr. BOUTELLE rose.

Mr. LIND. I will answer the question of the gentleman when I get through with my statement. We have given away thousands and millions of acres of the public land for the purpose of promoting the planting of trees and the cultivation and growth of our timber interests, the object being to provide a national supply of this useful and necessary commodity, not only for the present but for future generations. Now, the direct tendency of prohibiting the importation of timber is to hasten the destruction of our own forests, and for that reason I am in favor of this feature of the bill opening our country to the importation of lumber, which, indirectly, will have the effect of protecting our own forests and our own timber.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Let me make a suggestion to the gentleman from Minnesota. It has been proved, I think, to the satisfaction of those who have examined the subject that the lumber business, when carried on systematically, economically, and judiciously, as it is at the present day in the older States, is one of the greatest conservators of the timber of the country. In other words, that the trimming up of the forests of New England has done more to keep the timber growth standing than could possibly have been accomplished by abandoning them, leaving the forests to the ravages of insects and to decay, and the natural evils which follow from neglect.

Mr. DINGLEY. Let me suggest to my colleague this inquiry: Is it not true, also, that there is more lumber standing to-day in Maine than there was twenty-five years ago?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Yes; and let me suggest further——

Mr. LIND. A statement has been made and submitted to me for an answer; now let me answer it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Let me supplement that first.

Mr. LIND. I will answer the question first and then the supplement. How much white pine have you in your State?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Not a very great deal.

Mr. LIND. Well, in my State there is a great deal.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Ours has never been a great pine State.

Mr. LIND. And I can tell the gentleman that wherever white pine has once grown and been cut down it never grows again.

Mr. BOUTELLE. This bill is not going to protect pine lumber in Maine. Our principal lumber is the spruce and hemlock; and it is a fact that to-day, as my colleague has suggested, there is more lumber standing than there was twenty-five years ago. That is due in large measure, perhaps almost solely, to the fact that the timber has been better cared for. It has become more valuable, and hence there is more attention paid to it. The owners are watching it, protecting it from fires, and giving permits for cutting, taking only the ripened trees, and using that discretion in regard to cutting out the lumber that a farmer would use in rotating his various crops.

Mr. LIND. Is not the entire argument of the gentleman based on the assumption that if lumber were admitted duty-free the manufacture of American lumber would cease?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Partly.

Mr. LIND. And if that is the gentleman's argument, as I assume it is, I take it for granted that on an examination of the facts of the case when he gets down and considers the question impartially, he will not deliberately say that the removal of a $2-a-thousand-feet duty will drive every American manufacturer out of the business. Such a position is absurd. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. What does the gentleman think the effect of this bill will be, then?

Mr. LIND. I think perhaps that——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAWLER. I think unanimous consent should be given to allow these gentlemen to go on and bring out the whole of this question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. What is the pending question?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment to the amendment will be now reported, that the committee may understand the question.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out "1889" and insert "1890."

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Is another amendment in order?

The CHAIRMAN. No other amendment is in order until this is disposed of.

Mr. ENLOE. I want to offer a substitute for the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. That would not be in order.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I rise to a question of order. How is it that debate has expired?

The CHAIRMAN. By reason of the fact that the gentleman's proposition to amend was presented and debated for five minutes. The gentleman from Minnesota then took the floor and occupied five minutes in opposition.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Do I understand that to be the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. That is the rule. The Chair has caused it to be read, and the question now is on the amendment to the amendment, which has just been read.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I move to strike out the last word, and I send to the Clerk's desk a speech delivered on June 10, 1868, by Mr. Blaine, of Maine, which I will ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BLAINE. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the last word. I desire to discuss briefly the amendment which the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means so vigorously opposes. And in the first place let me say that during the entire war, when we were seeking everything on the earth and in the skies and in the waters under the earth out of which taxation could be wrung, it never entered into the conception of Congress to tax breadstuffs—never. During the most pressing exigencies of the terrible contest in which we were engaged neither breadstuffs nor lumber became the subject of one penny of taxation.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

What was the reason of this? Let me tell my friend from Ohio that it was not because of the influence of the rich grain dealers at Chicago, or Toledo, or Milwaukee. It was because if anything be universal breadstuffs are universal, for they constitute literally "the staff of life." If you impose on them a tax ever so small in amount it will be made a pretext by the very speculators of whom gentlemen talk for adding an appreciable amount to the cost of a barrel of flour. I do beseech this House not to sanction the principle of subjecting such an article to taxation for the sake of the paltry amount that is to be gained from this source.

Mr. WELKER. Does the gentleman expect to secure an exemption for lumber by advocating an exemption for breadstuffs? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLAINE. I am referring to breadstuffs because it illustrates a principle. I beseech this House not to sanction a tax on breadstuffs which will simply build up a mountain of prejudice for the sake of a mole-hill of revenue.

But, sir, I have said enough on that point. Now, as to the article of lumber, I again remind this House that there has never been a tax upon this article. The gentleman from Ohio may talk of this question as he pleases, but I say that wherever the Western frontiersman undertakes to make for himself a home to till the soil, to carry on the business of life, he needs lumber for his cabin; he needs lumber for his fence; he needs lumber for his wagon or cart; he needs lumber for his plow; he needs lumber for almost every purpose in his daily life.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. That was said in the House in 1868. I have but one word to add. We present the curious anomaly of having a law to encourage the destruction of our forests and at the same time a law to give away land for the purpose of planting forests. In the last twenty years we have given more acres of land away for the planting of trees than we have received dollars for duties on imported lumber in all its forms. We are, therefore, apparently burning the candle at both ends, depleting the forests where we have them and giving away our territory under the policy of creating new forests.

Mr. McKINLEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. McKINLEY. I wish to make a single inquiry. The gentleman had some remarks read which were made by Mr. Blaine. I desire to know whether as a matter of fact these remarks were not directed to internal taxation and not to customs, a subject he was not discussing. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. If the gentleman desires it, I will let the whole debate be published.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman from Kentucky answer the question of the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. BOUTELLE. What is the fact?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I do not know. If the gentleman will wait a minute I have no objection to answering the question. I do not know whether the remarks were made on that part of the bill reported by Mr. Schenck which related to internal revenue or on the part relating to external revenue. But it was a tax on lumber and breadstuffs that he spoke of, and the argument is precisely the same.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Is it not the fact that the argument was against a tax on domestic lumber, but not against the tax on foreign lumber?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. It was an argument against a tax on the necessaries of life, to be paid by the consumer. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.] The argument is precisely the same now as it was then.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted on the pending amendment.

Mr. ADAMS. I rise to oppose the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN].

Mr. MILLIKEN. I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] and those acting with him seem to be afraid that if we use our own resources the lumber of the country will be exhausted. I will say to the gentleman that he can stand in a forest in the State of Maine, where, if he uses the best ingenuity he has—and he has a great deal of it—he will find it very difficult for him to get out of the woods in the course of a week.

It is true, as far as the State of Maine is concerned, her pine has been cut off; and a gentleman has said that when pine is once cut it never grows again. The inference to be drawn from the gentleman's argument is that we should never cut pine, because if we do we will never get it again. But however that may be, I beg to say that in the State of Maine spruce and other lumber increases as fast as the existing supply is exhausted.

My friend from Texas [Mr. MILLS] argues that if a duty on lumber makes the price greater to the consumer the duty ought to be taken off or decreased. That remark would apply to everything that is on the dutiable list. It is very strange to me that the gentleman forgot to say that if there be 78 per cent. duty on sugar it costs the consumer very much more than he would have otherwise to pay for it, and it should therefore be put on the free-list.

Sugar, the duty on which gentlemen on the other side see no reason for reducing, is one of the prime necessaries of life. It goes into every home. It touches not merely every farmer, but it touches the poor man that labors in the city. It touches the interest of every man, woman, and child in the nation. And yet my friend has not had it occur to him that this is a tax on industry to the amount of 78 per cent. and causes an increase of the price to that extent to the consumer.

There is no conceivable reason for putting lumber on the free-list upon the theory laid down by gentlemen on the other side. They say they want duties imposed for revenue alone. The revenue duty on lumber would amount to about 40 per cent., but the duty on lumber to-day is not half that amount. Take your own theory that you lay a duty for revenue alone and I say you have not got half a revenue duty on lumber, while you are placing a double revenue duty on sugar and three times a revenue duty on rice. Yet you do not propose to cut down the duty on either of those articles to a revenue standard. Why is it you are so anxious to put lumber, which does not now pay 20 per cent., on the free-list, while at the same time you leave sugar with a duty of 78 per cent., and charge that 78 per cent. upon every man, woman, and child in the country?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DIBBLE. Will the gentleman from Maine yield to me for a question?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I would if I had time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired.

Mr. ENLOE. I notice this morning the very interesting fact that there is a difference of opinion among our friends on the other side as to what is to be the effect of the section of the bill that is now under discussion. I understood the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] to say that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] was mistaken as to the benefits which it would confer upon the farmers of his State in the way of giving them cheap lumber.

When the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means read the petition, representing, as he stated, the interests of sixty millions of people in this country, asking for the removal of this duty on lumber, I heard another gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] state that there was nobody else presenting such a petition, and that it was the only petition on that subject that had come to the House.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I did not make that statement. I should have made it if it had been necessary, but the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] made it much more clearly and forcibly than I could have done it.

Mr. ENLOE. Well, the gentleman from Maine resembles the gentleman from Michigan so much that I made a mistake, and I beg the pardon of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. Chairman, it makes no difference who made the statement. I find that in the Forty-ninth Congress there was a gentleman here who thought that taking off the duty on lumber would cheapen the product to the consumer. I find that the gentleman from Maine who has just corrected me [Mr. BOUTELLE] introduced a bill in that Congress to allow a rebate of the duty on lumber for the benefit of the citizens of Eastport, Me., in order that they might be enabled to rebuild their town more cheaply. The gentleman from Maine then wanted the duty taken off lumber, so as to give the citizens of Eastport, in his State, the benefit of cheap lumber, and now we on this side of the House want to claim for the benefit of sixty millions of people the same advantages which the gentleman from Maine then asked for his constituents.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Let me suggest to the gentleman that it would be a physical impossibility for his constituents to get that advantage. The sole reason for that bill was the geographical location of Eastport with reference to the British provinces.

Mr. ENLOE. Mr. Chairman, I imagine that if a duty does any thing it protects, that to the extent of the duty imposed there is protection, and that when we take off the duty we cheapen the product to that extent to the consumers, whether they reside in Tennessee or in Maine or on the prairies of the great West.

The duty is universal in its application to citizens of the different States, and if it was good for citizens of Maine to suspend it in 1885, it will relieve consumers of lumber in all the States to remove it entirely in 1888.

Mr. BOUTELLE. As to the case of Eastport, the idea was that the people across a little water-line of demarkation are paid so much less than our laborers that they are enabled to make the brick and lumber cheaper than our people can; but that does not apply to the gentleman's State.

Mr. ENLOE. Very well; that is conceding the point I make, namely, that we make the lumber cheaper by taking off the duty. We now insist on extending that benefit to all the people of all the States. This legislation is proposed not in the interest of a lumber trust, but for the benefit of the consumers of this country. It is gratifying to see that the gentleman from Minnesota on the other side [Mr. LIND] understands this question just as we do on this side of the House.

Where doctors disagree there is a chance for the patient. The doctrine that protection makes cheaper goods, and the higher the protection the cheaper the goods does not seem to hold good on lumber, even in the stronghold of protection. It seems that it all depends at last on where the shoe pinches.

Mr. MILLIKEN, by unanimous consent, withdrew his formal amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I happen to be a member of the Committee on Manufactures, which has been engaged during the past winter in an investigation of the subject of trusts, and I am astonished that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] should have had so great an amount of accurate information as to the existence of a lumber trust, and yet should not have appeared before that committee to impart that information and aid them in the investigation of that general subject. [Laughter on the Republican side.] No information of that sort has come to us, and, as a member of that committee, I say to the gentleman now, in view of the information that he has given us here, that if he will come to that committee and give us persons, places, and dates, I shall vote at once to commence the investigation.

Mr. WEAVER. I will give them to you.

Mr. BUCHANAN. And I am only sorry that the gentleman has left it until the hot weather has set in before giving us a chance to go to work upon that subject.

Mr. WEAVER. You have been all winter and spring at work on two trusts, and have not finished them yet. I will give you names, and plenty of them.

Mr. BUCHANAN. We have been at work, as the gentleman states, at intervals, but we could have examined this timber trust and have had the facts before the House now instead of loose assertion. But, Mr. Chairman, I rose primarily for another purpose.

Mr. WEAVER rose.

Mr. BUCHANAN. You have had your say; now give me my time, undiluted by any remarks from you. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, some remarks have been read here as having been uttered by a distinguished gentleman, formerly a Representative on this floor from the State of Maine, and the question has been asked whether those remarks referred to the imposition of an internal tax or to a customs duty, and the gentleman who produced them and had them read here, and who should have had knowledge on the subject, told us that he was unable to answer the question.

Now, Mr. Blaine is above all things accurate in matters of public concern, and I propose to throw some light upon the question which the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] was unable to answer. I find that by the act of July, 1846, wood, boards, plank, staves, laths, scantling, spars, etc., had a customs duty imposed upon them of 20 per cent.; I find that by the act of March 3, 1857, that was reduced to 15 per cent., and that by the act of March, 1861, it was increased to 20 per cent., and that through the subsequent tariff acts that

amount has been continued; and therefore it goes without saying that when Mr. Blaine said that no one had dreamed of imposing a tax upon lumber, he was speaking of the internal-revenue tax, not of customs duties.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, considerable has been said here in behalf of the labor employed in this lumber industry, and as that is supposed to be the sole reason why the gentlemen from Maine are anxious that this duty be retained, the query has suggested itself to my mind, What is there to prevent the capitalists engaged in this industry from going across that little river and employing Canadian cheap labor to come over and compete with American labor?

A MEMBER. The tariff.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The tariff does not prevent laborers from coming over. I have seen it stated in the papers that your capitalists do go across the line and employ Canadian cheap labor to come over and work in your lumber regions.

Mr. BOUTELLE. At what wages?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I suppose at cheap rates.

Mr. BOUTELLE rose.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I want to call the attention of the House to some statistics on this subject. I have before me the Compendium of the Tenth Census.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Let me ask——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I prefer to go on. During the time this discussion has been running to-day I have made a slight examination and computation from the figures embraced in this volume; and I want to show the great amount of wages that the poor lumberer gets in Maine and Michigan as compared with the percentage of the capitalist upon the amount he has invested. Take the State of Maine; total value of sawed lumber, $7,933,868; total value of materials, $4,951,957; and this estimate of material is, of course, at the high price that the manufacturers adopt as their estimate. Take the one sum from the other and you have remaining $2,981,911. From this subtract the amount of wages paid and divide the remainder by the capital, and it gives you 28¼ per cent. on the capital invested.

Mr. REED. Now, one single question.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Wait till I get through. Take the number of employés engaged in that business, and divide that into the total wages paid, and you get as the wages paid to a lumberman during one year $170. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. REED. A single question.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. In other words, Mr. Chairman, a man working during the year in this business in the State of Maine gets for his subsistence $170, while the capitalist upon every $1,000 invested gets a return of $285. Is not that a spectacle to show how protection benefits the laborer?

From the same page let us read the figures of the State of Michigan. The amount of wages paid there, as shown by a similar calculation, is in the lumber business $305 per year; the percentage upon capital invested is 33.7. In other words, the laborer during the year gets $305, while the capitalists upon each $1,000 invested gets $337, or $32 more than the laborer receives.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Now I will hear your question.

Mr. REED. I do not want to ask you a question; I want to say something.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I think you ought to say something in reply to these figures, which are taken from the Compendium of the Tenth Census, and which I suppose are authentic, because I have no doubt that in those two States they were taken by Republicans. I have tabulated these statistics, because they teach a striking lesson:

Sawed lumber in Michigan.

[Items taken from page 1162, Compendium of the Tenth Census.]

Total value of all products	$52,449,928
Total value of all material used	32,251,372
Total profit and wages	20,198,556
Total wages paid	6,967,905
Profit to capital	13,230,651
Total capital employed	$39,290,428
Rate per cent. received by capital	33.7
Total wages paid during the year	$6,967,905
Average number of hands employed (males above sixteen years)	22,732
A man's wages during the year	$305
Every $1,000 of the capitalist earning during the same time	$337

Sawed lumber in Maine.

Total value of all products	$7,933,868
Total value of all materials	4,951,957
Total profit and wages	2,981,911
Total wages paid	1,161,142
Profit to capitalists	1,820,769
Total capital employed	$6,339,396
Rate per cent. received by capital	28¼
Total wages paid	$1,161,142
Average number of hands employed (males above sixteen years)	6,480
A man's wages during the year	$170
Every $1,000 of the capitalist earning during the same time	$285

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, fortunately there are touchstones of fact——

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the Chair will regard the *pro forma* amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] as withdrawn.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I withdraw it.

Mr. REED. I wish the Chair would not interrupt the course of debate too much. A little leniency toward our unfortunate disregard of forms would make us very happy.

Mr. BLAND. I hope the Chair will enforce the rules. We have some rights as well as gentlemen on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to respect the rules.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] will rise in his seat when he addresses the Chair.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, as I was about to remark, when kindly interrupted by the Chair, whose devotion to the rules of the House has touched us all, it is fortunate that there are touchstones of fact and that we are not left to the absurdity of figures which gentlemen produce from the United States census. There are certain things so absurd that a man never can believe in them or ask anybody else to believe in them if he will allow his mind to be focused on the subject.

Now, nobody knows better than the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] that it is utterly impossible for a profit of 285 per cent. or 337 per cent. to be made in a single year on $1,000 in a manufacturing business long established, which covers a great belt of this country. He knows that it is impossible, or else he is unfortunate in his mental make-up. I know him well enough to know that the trouble is inadvertence. He has found these figures and he was struck with what a sensation he might make on the Democratic side if he produced them; and he forgot to apply to them the logic of his good sense. Every man knows that such profits are preposterous; he can not help understanding it the moment his attention is directed to the matter. I do not care where the gentleman got his figures; I do not care what they are; the result is enough to show to a man of sense who will attend to the question that the gentleman from Ohio must be in error.

And the gentleman parades the wages of the lumberman as so much a year, apparently not knowing that those men work only from a quarter to half the time.

Now, just think of these things being produced here amid applause on the Democratic side of the House. [Laughter.] Gentlemen on the other side actually applauded; they do not understand the absurdity of the result any more than the man who makes the figures. They undertook in caucus assembled to settle the questions of the industries of the country, and yet they applaud figures like those.

Upon my word there can not be any better commentary on the business condition of the country than that is now. The other part of the year these men engaged in lumbering are engaged in other business.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is so.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Does the gentleman answer my argument?

Mr. REED. Your what? [Laughter.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Do you answer my argument?

Mr. REED. Do you call it an argument? [Laughter.] That is not dictionary language. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and the formal amendments are withdrawn.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I think the necessities of our people in reference to the supply of lumber have been much changed in the last twenty or thirty years. There has long been a tax on lumber. In time our population covered the prairies of Illinois, and that vast treeless region of what we call the far West was reached on the latitude of Iowa and Minnesota, thence West to the woody slopes of the Pacific Ocean. South of this Arkansas and Missouri project a forest-covered region. Then Kansas and Texas and the country West are like the regions I just described. At present the great supply of lumber is in Arkansas and Southern Missouri.

One of the great difficulties the people had to encounter before they reached this treeless region was to get rid of the forest growth before they could make a crop. Now we find our population stretching out over Iowa, Minnesota, and Kansas, and they are cut off from the Canadian supply of lumber, which is mainly in the east of Canada, and is also taxed, and they are dependent for these supplies upon the country east and south of them.

And the gentleman from Maine, when reaching for a touchstone of fact, it seems to me did not get down to the bottom facts.

In the last five or six years there has been an enormous development of the lumber industry in my own State. It has perhaps as extensive and varied a supply of lumber as any other Territory of equal extent in the United States. I believe there is not less than $700,000,000 or $1,000,000,000 worth of lumber in the forests of Arkansas.

In the last five or six years, along the new lines of railroad crossing that State in various directions, we have great mills upon every hand. We see by our exports of lumber from Southern ports that they receive for their rough lumber from $12 to $13 a thousand, and we are selling it in my State in large quantities at from $9 to $10 a thousand. The coast mills now compete with Canadian lumber in every country on

the globe. In the unorganized state of the trade at this time we sell for less to Kansas, Omaha, and Chicago, and we make money handsomely.

The Canadian can not hurt us. If we organize we can meet his prices, plus the tariff, and rob the farmers of the West, and even the East must soon look to us. Why, then, should we maintain this high tariff on the people? We are making money now, and will never sell for less. Do you want us to go into a trust, to strike hands with other corrupt monopolies, to oppress these people?

We do not need the protection; it would be dishonest and unpatriotic to ask it, and here we are fighting against the gentlemen from Kansas and other States who are seeking to subsidize us and to burden their own people. There is neither need nor welcome for class legislation in Arkansas. Freedom and fair play are better.

[Here the hammer fell.]

By unanimous consent, formal amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, the principal excuse which has been offered for placing imported manufactured lumber on the free-list while most other manufactured products are retained on the dutiable list is the plea that it is a raw material. This is the plea of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS].

I would like to have the gentlemen who framed this bill explain why sawed lumber, shingles, staves, laths, clapboards, and pickets are to be regarded as "raw materials" to be admitted free of duty, while coal, iron ore, lead and zinc ores, tobacco in leaf, and sawed marble, for example, are held to be manufactured products to be placed on the dutiable list.

Logs may in one sense be regarded as raw material, although even they, when delivered in market, have as much labor in them as coal and ores. But logs are on the free-list already, and there is no objection to having them remain there. When logs are taken to the mill and manufactured into boards, shingles, laths, clapboards, and other forms, they become as much a completed product so far as the lumber manufacturing industry is concerned as sugar is a completed product of the sugar industry, leather of the leather industry, glass of the glass industry, or pig-iron of the iron industry. There are very few manufactured industries whose completed products are not also the materials of some other industry.

If even sawed lumber is tested by the percentage of labor required in its production from the round log in the forest it will be found that as large a proportion of human effort is demanded in its manufacture as in many of the articles left on the dutiable list by this bill.

In 1880 the value of the sawed lumber manufactured in this country in nearly every State was $233,268,729; the number of men employed, 147,956; wages paid, $31,845,974; value of materials used, $146,155,385. In other words, nearly 15 per cent. of the value of the product represented the labor directly used in converting the logs into sawed lumber, making no account of the labor used in getting the logs to the mill, transporting the sawed lumber to the market, and building the mill-dams and machinery, which probably amounted to nearly as much more. It is not too much to say that one-fourth of the cost of sawed lumber is in the labor, in the cost of transportation and manufacture from the log.

The percentage of labor required in the manufacture of logs into sawed lumber is greater than that used to convert hides into leather, on which this bill leaves an average duty of 20 per cent., and six times as much as that required to convert raw sugar into refined sugar, for which refining industry the pending bill imposes a protective duty as high as the present average duty on imported lumber.

Mr. Chairman, why should not the labor employed in our lumber manufacturing industries receive protection proportionate to the labor employed in other industries? The average duty on manufactured lumber under the existing tariff is only 16 per cent. Logs, firewood, railroad ties, shingle bolts, ship timber and planking, hop-poles, hemlock bark, and cabinet woods not grown in this country, are now on the free-list. Over three and a half millions of such unmanufactured lumber was imported last year free of duty, and now the pending bill proposes to also place on the free-list imported Canadian lumber which has been manufactured by labor that cost at least 50 per cent. less than our labor.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] says that the lumbermen use Canadian labor. To whatever extent they do this, they pay American and not Canadian prices.

I ask gentlemen if that is just? I ask gentlemen from the coal-producing districts if it is fair to place so crude an article as coal on the dutiable list at 26 per cent., and at the same time to deprive manufactured lumber of its low duty of 16 per cent. and transfer it to the free-list?

I ask gentlemen who propose to vote to retain a duty of 68 per cent. on raw sugar how they can justify a vote to place manufactured lumber on the free-list?

Mr. Chairman, it is evident that gentlemen who are seeking for an excuse to place manufactured lumber on the free-list begin to see that there can be no justification for such a course on the ground that it is a raw material, for it clearly stands on the same basis as other manufactured products.

They have therefore brought forward an argument of a benevolent character, in which they appear as public benefactors seeking to preserve our forests. They tell us that any duty imposed on Canadian lumber seeking to enter our markets and drive out American lumber only encourages the destruction of our forests, which we ought to seek to preserve.

Such public benefactors who seek to obtain a selfish advantage by placing Canadian lumber on the free-list, and who defend their unjust discrimination against our farmers that grow lumber and our mills which manufacture it, by claiming that they are protecting our forests, remind me of Artemus Ward who said that he loved his country so devotedly that in her defense he was willing to shed all the blood which runs in the veins of his wife's relations.

These gentlemen are so anxious to protect our forests that they propose to require the farmers and others who own them and the men who carry on our lumber mills to surrender our own timber markets to Canadian operators.

But, so far as this benevolent argument is sincerely presented, it is based on a misapprehension of the facts. Where the country is being denuded of forests at the present time it is the direct and indirect outcome of the advent of settlers who want the land for farms, or whose presence leads to accidental fires. Lumbermen who are holding lands for timber do not strip them unless they are compelled to in order to save them from destruction by fire. On the contrary, where the trees are of the kind that reproduce themselves on the same ground, they now carefully cut out the large trees and leave the smaller ones to grow and to be cut in the future. In my own State of Maine, for example, where large tracts of land are held for timber culture, there is more standing timber to day than there was twenty-five years ago.

It is argued, however, that, aside from the considerations already discussed, it is the duty of Congress to place manufactured lumber on the free-list in order to give our people cheaper building and manufacturing materials.

If it be true that the removal of duties on manufactured lumber and other imported articles which may be produced here to the extent of our wants permanently reduces prices to the extent of the duties, then I ask gentlemen who hold to this view what justice there can be in selecting one class of manufactured products for the sacrifice and leaving all other kinds of manufactured products on the dutiable lists with higher prices? Certainly cheaper lumber is not so much of a boon as cheaper iron, cheaper coal, cheaper cotton and woolen goods, cheaper boots and shoes, cheaper sugar, cheaper rice. If you really believe that free lumber would be a blessing, why would not free iron, free coal, free clothing, free sugar, free rice be a still greater blessing?

Mr. Chairman, it is possible that the placing of manufactured lumber on the free-list might temporarily give lower prices, but not permanently. While the Canadians were seizing upon our markets and taking away from our lumber industries a part of their opportunities, there would be that temporary reduction of prices which always results from a gorged market, but as soon as our lumber industries realized that they must surrender a part of their business to Canadians and contracted their operations to meet the changed situation, prices would soon go back to the old standard, partly because a permanent reduction would stop the whole American production of lumber, because with our wages of labor it could not be manufactured here, and partly because the Canadian lumber fields are mainly held by the Canadian Government, which would take occasion to at once advance the prices of permits for cutting lumber correspondingly with the reduction of the duty.

To show the House that this view of the effect of the abolition of the duty on Canadian lumber is well founded, I ask the Clerk to read the following statements of the United States consul at Ottawa—a free-trader, by the way—who, in an interview published in the Boston Herald, a staunch "tariff-reform" paper, says:

The opinion which I shall give you as my own personal view is shared by nearly every Canadian lumberman with whom I have conversed. I unhesitatingly say that the American consumer will not reap one iota of benefit from the taking of the duty off of lumber. The first party to be benefited would be the Canadian lumberman. His benefit, however, would be of brief duration, as the necessities and inclinations of the provincial governments, which control all standing timber, are such that by renewed legislation and the imposition of increased taxes they would soon absorb the increased percentage of profit that they found the manufacturer was getting out of the timber.

* * * * * * *

It should be more generally known in the United States that the timber tracts of Canada are owned and controlled by the provincial governments, and are only leased by the great lumbermen, not bought in fee simple, as in the United States. All government timber tracts—called limits—are leased by the square mile (640 acres). As there is always a competitive demand for these leases, they are put up at auction, and the right to lease for one year is sold to the highest bidder. At the recent sale of limits by the Ontario government, which took place at Toronto in December last, $5,500 per square mile was paid for a portion of the limits put up, while the average price paid is estimated at $3 per thousand feet for the stumpage.

These buyers did not purchase this land and the trees thereon, but paid these prices as a bonus for the exclusive right and privilege of cutting timber on the land for one year, with the government as lessor, under certain terms and conditions agreed upon, namely: That the lessee shall, on May 1, pay into the Crown land office the annual dues, or rental, of $3 per square mile, and $1 per 1,000 feet, board measure, on every 1,000 feet of logs (including culls) cut on said limits, with a tariff for square timber, namely, timber, poles, masts, ties, and every product of the forest thereon; and if any minerals are discovered on leased limits, the discovery must be reported and a mineral lease obtained. If the annual dues and all timber dues have been paid promptly, the lessee has the right

to a renewal for one year, and so on from year to year, subject, however, to any legislation the provincial government may see fit to enact for each coming year.

"You will see from this," said Mr. Hotchkiss "that the Canadian lumbermen are largely at the mercy of the provincial governments. The question naturally arises: How long would the provincial government look on and allow the manufacturers to enjoy the inflow of the $2 per thousand feet which the American Government remitted for the purpose of benefiting its own people by giving them cheaper lumber? You may safely say that not an iota of benefit will free lumber be to the American consumer."

That the Canadians regard the proposed abolition of all duties on manufactured lumber as a special boon to the Dominion is shown by the recent remarks of Sir Charles Tupper, the Dominion minister of finance in the Canadian Parliament on the fisheries treaty. Speaking of the introduction of the Mills bill into Congress, the Canadian minister says:

Already we have action by the financial exponent of the Administration of the United States—I mean Mr. MILLS—the gentleman who in the United States Congress represents the Government of the day, and stands in the position most analogous in the United States to the finance minister in this House, the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, who propounds the policy of the Administration in the House. How is he selected? The Democratic party, sustaining the Government, selects a man as Speaker of the House of Representatives who is in accord with the policy of the Administration for the time being, and Mr. CARLISLE, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, nominates the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means and all the members of the committee; and therefore the chairman of that committee occupies the position of representing the Government in bringing forward such bills as will represent the views and sentiments of the Democratic party in the United States supporting the Administration. What have we seen? The ink is barely dry upon this treaty before he, as the representative of the Government and chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, brings forward a measure to do what? Why, to make free articles that Canada sends into the United States, and upon which last year $1,800,000 of duty was paid.

* * * * * * *

I say that under this bill, which has been introduced, and which, I believe, will pass, for it does not require two-thirds of the Senate, where the Republican majority is only one in the whole House, to pass this bill; it requires a majority of one only, and I am very sanguine that this bill will pass during the present session. Modified it may be, but I am inclined to think the amendments will be still more in the interests of Canada than as the bill stands to-day. If this is the case, I think we may congratulate ourselves upon securing the free admission of our lumber, upon which was paid during the last year no less than $1,315,450. On copper ore, made free by the Mills bill, we paid, or there was paid to make it meet the views of the honorable gentleman opposite more correctly—$66,945. On salt $21,992 duty was paid. This is rendered free by the Mills bill. I am sorry to find, as I hoped would be the case from the first copy of the bill that came to me, that potatoes were not included amongst vegetables. I am sorry to find there is a doubt as to whether the term "vegetables not specially enumerated" will not exclude potatoes.

I call special attention, Mr. Chairman, to the "congratulations" of the Canadian minister over the anticipated advantage which Canada and not the United States is to gain by the passage of this bill. Evidently he and his associates are confident that Canada is to save the duty and the American people are not, in the end, to get their lumber any cheaper.

Mr. Chairman, I direct attention to the fact that the present duty on imported lumber is only 16 per cent., on the average, the same as it was made by the low tariff of 1846, which our Democratic friends have been commending us all through this debate. It is one of the lowest duties on the dutiable list, and now it is proposed to strike down that small duty and place manufactured lumber on the free-list.

The pending bill places wood and chemical pulp on the free-list. A manufactured product, produced in twenty-one States, valued at $12,375,000 last year, and giving employment to twenty-two thousand persons in the United States, is placed by this bill on the free-list. To show the injustice done in this particular, I print the following statement of this industry in the United States:

WOOD-PULP FIBER.

The Mills bill, so called, reported by the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives of Congress, transfers pulp fiber from the dutiable to the free list. The manufacturers of wood fiber in this country, believing it due to them, and for the advantage of users and makers of paper of all kinds, for the welfare of the labor employed by them, and essential to the profitable continuance and development of their business, ask that the duty, which is among the lowest on dutiable articles, be not removed; and in support of this request they respectfully submit a statement of the beginning, growth, and present condition of the industry in the United States, also a comparison with that in foreign countries with which they are brought in competition.

The term "wood pulp dried for paper-makers' use," as used in the existing tariff law, embraces two qualities of wood-pulp fiber, one known as mechanical and the other as chemical wood-pulp fiber.

Mechanical wood-pulp fiber is produced by grinding, where heavy and expensive machinery and large water-power is employed.

Chemical fiber is produced by the use of chemicals and steam, and also involves an expensive and still more costly plant, in either product an outlay for mill and machinery of from $15,000 to $25,000 for each ton of the daily product of a mill, according to the permanency of the machinery and structures.

The production and use of mechanical wood pulp began about 1868. The manufacture and use of chemical wood-pulp fiber began at an earlier date, but was confined to one or two mills in Pennsylvania until its manufacture and use became more general, between the years 1870 and 1883.

Both of these processes were subject to patents, all of which have now expired, except patents of recent date on a new process known as sulphite wood-pulp fiber.

The introduction and use of these fibers was slow and difficult, there being a great prejudice among paper manufacturers against adopting them and among paper consumers against using paper made from these fibers.

After a trial had been made and prejudice removed, the manufacture and consumption increased rapidly, until it reached the enormous daily production and consumption of about 1,100 tons.

The mills are located in twenty-one different States and employ capital to the amount of at least $20,000,000, as shown by the tables following:

THE YEARLY PRODUCTION OF WOOD-PULP FIBER.

	Tons.
Ground-wood fiber	225,000
Chemical wood fiber	112,500
Total	337,500

VALUE.

Ground-wood fiber	$5,625,000
Chemical wood fiber	6,750,000
Total	12,375,000
The cost of labor to produce the same	10,000,000
Chemicals (dutiable), lime, interest on plant, insurance, taxes, wood on the stump	2,375,000
Total value of yearly product	12,375,000

The number of men employed and the cost for labor embraces the cutting, hauling, and the preparation of the wood, as well as the men employed in the various establishments. In the United States no women or boys are employed. The wood-pulp fiber industry employs fully 22,000 in this country, affording support to 110,000 persons.

List of ground wood-pulp mills in the United States.

Location.	Name.	Daily capacity.
		Pounds.
California: Alta	Pioneer Pulp Company	3,000
Connecticut:		
Chaplin	Case Brothers	7,500
East Hampton	Brown Brothers	2,000
Georgia: Marietta	Marietta Paper Manufacturing Company.	
Indiana:		
Evansville	Ferdinande Funke, Evansville Paper Mill.	1,000
Mishawaka	The A. Gaylor Pulp Company	6,000
Do	M. W. Stokes	8,000
Monticello	Norway Pulp Company	6,000
Do	Tippecanoe Paper Company	6,000
South Bend	E. S. Reynolds	7,000
Do	South Bend Pulp Company	20,000
Kentucky: Louisville	Dupoint & Co	
Maine:		
Brunswick	Androskoggin Pulp Company	10,000
Livermore Falls	Alvin Record & Sons	16,000
North Gorham	Indurated Fiber Company	
Paris	J. S. Clapp (post-office, Snow Falls, Paris).	
Skowhegan	W. K. Shurtleff & Co	4,000
South Windham	Sebago Wood Board Company	18,000
Waterville	Kennebec Fiber Company	20,000
Maryland: Conowingo	Susquehanna Water-Power and Paper Company of Harford County.	
Massachusetts:		
Fitchburg	Charles Roesnell, Fitchburg Wood-Pulp Mill.	40,000
Hoosac Tunnel	Glen Pulp and Paper Company (post-office, Hartford, Conn.).	10,000
Stockbridge	C. H. Willis (post-office, Hartford)	3,000
Turner's Falls	Montague Paper Company	21,000
Wendell Depot	Farley Paper Company	4,000
Do	Goddard Wood Paper Company	6,000
Do	Wendell Paper Company	2,000
Michigan:		
Ann Arbor	Cornwell Manufacturing Company	6,000
Birkett	Birkett Manufacturing Company	4,000
Niles	Michigan Wood-Pulp Company	40,000
Do	Ohio Paper Company	4,000
Petoskey	Birkett & Spokes	4,000
Michigan:		
Utica	S. L. Dekay	1,000
Ypsilanti	Ypsilanti Paper Company	4,000
New Hampshire:		
Bath	Conant & Clark Pulp Company	12,000
Berlin Falls	Glen Manufacturing Company	60,000
Do	White Mountain Pulp and Paper Company.	10,000
Bristol	Train, Smith & Co	3,000
Concord	Moore, Brown & Co	10,000
East Tilton	P. C. Cheney Company	
Franklin	Franklin Falls Pulp Company	24,000
Do	Winnipiseogee Paper Company	14,000
Goffstown Centre	P. C. Cheney Company	
Lisbon	O. D. Moore	5,000
Manchester	P. C. Cheney Company	
Petersborough	Amoskeag Indurated Fiber Wire Company.	
New York:		
Ausable Chasm	Ausable Pulp Company (post-office, Troy).	10,000
Beaver Falls	J. P. Lewis, Beaver Falls Pulp Mills.	5,000
Binghamton	Bayless & Co	18,000
Balnard	Balnard Paper Company, Limited	
Brown's Station	Hudson River Manufacturing Company.	6,000
Brownville	Black River Paper Company	4,000
Crown Point	Scott, Wyman & De Poutes	4,000
Fullerville Iron Works	Oswegatchie Pulp Company	24,000
Fulton	Victoria Paper Mills Company	5,000
Glen's Falls	Glen's Falls Paper Mills Company	50,000
Hadley	New York Pulp Company	14,000
Lockport	Cascade Wood Pulp Company	20,000
Rochester	Rochester Paper Company	20,000
Luzerne	Manufacturers' Paper Company	6,000
Lyonsdale	Lyonsdale Pulp Company	10,000
Lyons' Falls	G. H. P. Gould	8,000
Do	Herkimer Paper Company, Limited	20,000
Do	Moose River Pulp and Paper Mills	7,400
Malone	Salmon River Paper Company	4,000

List of ground wood-pulp mills in the United States—Continued.

Location.	Name.	Daily capacity.
		Pounds.
New York—Continued:		
Middle Falls	Bennington Falls Pulp Company	30,000
Do	W. N. Sprague, Battenkill Mills	3,000
Niagara Falls	Cataract Manufacturing Company	16,000
Do	Niagara Wood Paper Company	25,000
Do	John F. Quigley	16,000
Oswego	Oswego Indurated Fiber Company	
Palmer's Falls	Hudson River Pulp and Paper Company.	70,000
Plattsburgh	Allen & Sherman (post-office, Port Henry).	10,000
Do	Martin & Smith, Saranac Wood Pulp Mill.	6,000
Rochester	Rochester Paper Company	30,000
Ticonderoga	Glens Falls Pulp Company	20,000
Do	Lake George Pulp and Paper Company.	4,000
Valley Falls	Thomas Lape (Valley Falls Pulp Mills).	10,000
Waterford	Gilbert & Bell	12,000
Do	C. R. Remington & Sons	18,000
Do	Taggart Bros. Company	3,000
Do	Watertown Paper Company	16,000
Westport	Westport Pulp Company (Limited)	4,000
North Carolina	W. & R. Tiddy (Long Shoal Pulp Mill).	2,000
New Berne	The S. H. Gray Manufacturing Company.	4,000
Ohio:		
Cleveland	Cleveland Paper Company	4,000
Grand Rapids	Ohio Pulp Company	6,500
Oregon: Portland	Columbia River Paper Company	
Pennsylvania:		
Ohiopyle	Stewart Bros. (Falls City Pulp Mills).	7,500
Philadelphia	York Haven Paper Company	
South Carolina: Bath	Hill & Johnson Manufacturing Company.	6,000
Tennessee: Manchester	Stone Fort Paper Company	
Vermont:		
Barnet	Cascade Pulp Company	3,000
Bellows Falls	Fall Mountain Paper Company	50,000
Do	Willard, Russell & Co	5,000
East Barnett	Wilder & Co. (post-office, Boston)	6,000
Lyndon	Wilder & Co	8,000
Middlebury	Beldens Falls Pulp Company	16,000
Do	Green Mountain Pulp Company	80,000
Morrisville	Lamoyle Valley Pulp Company (post-office, Lowell).	16,000
North Bennington	Bennington Valley Pulp Company	10,000
Olcott	Olcott Falls Company (post-office, Devonshire street, Boston).	24,000
Passumpsic	Passumpsic Pulp Company (post-office, Lowell).	16,000
Reedsborough	Deerfield River Company	12,000
Salisbury	Dunmore Pulp Company	5,000
Do	Kingsley Brothers	2,000
West Derby	Conant & Co. (post-office, Newport)	30,000
Wisconsin:		
Appleton	Atlas Paper Company	24,000
Do	Patten Paper Company, Limited	7,000
Centralia	Wisconsin Wood Pulp Company	8,000
Eau Claire	Eau Claire Pulp and Paper Company	
Grand Rapids	Pioneer Wood-Pulp Company, Limited.	10,000
Kaukauna	American Pulp Company (post-office Appleton).	8,000
Do	Badger Paper Company	
Do	Brokaw Pulp Company	7,000
Do	Fox River Pulp and Paper Company	12,000
Do	William Hood	6,000
Do	Kaukauna Paper Company	
Do	Union Pulp Company	36,000
Marinette	Marinette and Menominee Paper Company.	16,000
Oconto Falls	The Falls Manufacturing Company	9,000
Total amount		1,418,900

List of chemical fiber mills in the United States.

Location.	Name.	Daily capacity.
		Pounds.
Connecticut: Birmingham	Wilkinson Bros. & Co., sulphite	4,000
Delaware: Wilmington	Jessup & Moore (post-office, New York City).	42,000
Maine:		
Canton	Poland Pulp and Paper Company	20,000
Fairfield	Somerset Fiber Company	20,000
West Great Works	Penobscot Chemical Fiber Company	40,000
Lincoln	Lincoln Pulp and Paper Company	14,000
Cumberland	S. D. Warren & Co. (post-office, Boston, Mass.).	40,000
Yarmouthville	do	40,000
Mechanics Falls	Poland Pulp and Paper Company	14,000
Maryland: Elkton	William M. Singerly (post-office, Philadelphia, Pa.).	16,000
Massachusetts: Lawrence	Russell Paper Company	20,000
Michigan:		
Alpena	Fletcher, Pack & Co., sulphite	20,000
Jackson	R. H. Emerson & Co	8,000
Detroit	Detroit Pulp Company, sulphite	20,000

List of chemical fiber mills in the United States—Continued.

Location.	Name.	Daily capacity.
		Pounds.
New Hampshire:		
Berlin Falls	Forest Fiber Company	70,000
Wentworth	Mount Cube Fiber Company	15,000
New Jersey: Weymouth	Weymouth Paper Mills, sulphite	15,000
New York:		
Ballston Spa	George West	12,000
Mechanicsville	Hudson River Water Power and Paper Company.	11,000
Saugerties	Barclay Fiber Company, sulphite	10,000
Ticonderoga	Ticonderoga Pulp and Paper Company.	24,000
Willsborough	Champlain Fiber Company	21,000
Pennsylvania:		
Catawissa	Catawissa Pulp Company	8,000
Experiment Mills	Delaware Gap Pulp and Paper Company.	6,000
Lock Haven	Pennsylvania Pulp and Paper Company.	20,000
Philadelphia	American Wood Paper Company (post-office, New York City).	68,000
Manayunk	S. A. Rudolph (post-office, Philadelphia, Pa.).	8,000
Manayunk	M. & W. H. Nixon	20,000
Tyrone	Morrison & Cass	18,000
Rhode Island: Providence	Richmond Paper Company, sulphite	20,000
Wisconsin:		
Appleton	Atlas Paper Company, sulphite	4,000
Appleton and Neenah	Kimberly & Clark	18,000
Monico	Wisconsin Sulphite Paper Company, sulphite.	4,000
Kentucky: Louisville	Bremaker-Moore Paper Company	6,000
Ohio	Clutch & Co	12,000
		756,000

RECAPITULATION BY STATES.

States.	Ground wood.	Chemical fiber.
California	3,000	
Connecticut	9,500	4,000
Indiana	54,000	
Kentucky		6,000
Maine	84,000	188,000
Maryland		16,000
Massachusetts	89,500	20,000
Michigan	63,000	48,000
New Hampshire	118,000	86,000
New York	542,400	144,000
North Carolina	6,000	
Ohio	10,500	12,000
Oregon		
Pennsylvania	7,500	158,000
South Carolina	6,000	
Tennessee		
Vermont	283,000	
Wisconsin	143,000	26,000
Delaware		42,000
New Jersey		16,000
Rhode Island		20,000
Total ground-wood fiber	1,419,400	
Total chemical fiber	756,000	756,000
Amount of daily capacity	2,175,400	

A large majority of these mills were built between 1870 and 1883. The reduction of the tariff in 1883 from 20 to 10 per cent. ad valorem, the consequent increased importations, together with the sharp competition among domestic manufacturers, checked the increase in the development of the industry and compelled many mills to go out of existence. Among them we enumerate the following:

	Pounds.
C. H. Dexter & Sons, Connecticut, estimated daily product	4,000
Hulbert Chemical Fiber Company, Parkersburgh, W. Va	14,000
Chemical Paper Company, Massachusetts	20,000
Connecticut River Pulp Company, Massachusetts	26,000
Crocker, Burbank & Co., Massachusetts	12,000
Wilkinson Brothers & Co., Connecticut	12,000
Haverhill Fiber Company, New Hampshire	4,000
West Newton Mill, Pennsylvania; P. Markle & Sons	14,000
Philadelphia Enquirer Pulp and Paper Mill	4,000
Case Brothers, Connecticut	4,000
Middletown Company, Ohio	12,000
Hollingsworth & Whitlay Co., Maine	12,000
Total daily product	138,000
Value of plants abandoned	$2,070,000

Home competition has reduced the price of chemical wood fiber from 7 cents per pound in 1870 to 3½ cents, and ground wood-fiber from 4½ cents in 1870 to 1½ cents, now the selling prices at the mills.

The introduction of this fiber has wrought a wonderful change in the price of the paper. The lowest current price at which newspaper was ever sold, before the war, was 9 cents a pound. During the war, without wood-pulp fiber, and with a scarcity of stock, newspaper ran up to the enormous cost of 25 to 28 cents per pound. It has gradually fallen, until now the ordinary newspaper, such as is used by the metropolitan press, is furnished at about 4½ to 4¾ cents. Book papers in the same proportion. This has almost wholly been brought about by the introduction of wood-pulp fiber.

Norway and Sweden have also special advantages. Labor is very cheap, about one-third our own; inexhaustible water-powers and forests; easy and cheap communication with the shipping ports, such as Christiana and Gothenberg, whence low freights are obtained to American ports.

Finland has hitherto found its best market in Russia, but by reason of the high import duty recently imposed by Russia will, under the stimulus of this protection, produce their own wood-pulp fiber.

Then, Finland with its numerous lakes, its extensive forest, its labor—cheaper far than in Sweden and Norway—and its low water freights to this country, either direct or by way of London or Hull, will become another formidable competitor.

Wood delivered at the mill in Finland costs from $1.90 to $2 per cord; in Sweden and Norway from $2.90 to $3; in the United States from $5 to $9.

The chemicals used in the manufacture of chemical fiber are cheaper in these countries, having free admission into Norway and Sweden.

In Finland the labor employed in pulp mills costs from 25 to 30 cents per day. In the pulp mills of Norway and Sweden the men are paid from 30 to 50 cents per day. A large number of women are also employed at from about 12 to 20 cents per day. In the United States no women are employed, and the average wages paid are $1.50 to $1.65 per day.

The extent of the foreign competition even under the present tariff is shown by the constantly increasing importations.

There were reported in 1886, over 18,000 tons; in 1887, over 32,000 tons; in 1888, January and February, 9,000 tons, which, at the same volume through the year, will amount to 53,000 tons, or more than the two years 1886 and 1887.

Statements of the quantities and values of wood pulp (including paper pulp) imported into the United States during the years ending December 31, 1886 to 1887, and the two months ending February 29, 1888.

Customs districts into which imported.	Year ending December 31, 1886.		Year ending December 31, 1887.		Two months ending February 29, 1888.	
	Pounds.	Dollars.	Pounds.	Dollars.	Pounds.	Dollars.
Baltimore, Md....	.....	.....	.....	.....	110,230	1,868
Bath, Me.....	.....	.....	383,041	4,788	.....	.....
Boston and Charlestown, Mass	2,317,033	33,743	3,650,135	72,974	611,522	10,162
Champlain, N. Y.....	258,500	3,693	48,440	667	.....	.....
Detroit, Mich.....	60,000	614	175,600	1,671	20,000	200
Fairfield, Conn	.....	.....	432,400	5,079	.....	.....
Huron, Mich.....	226,426	6,687	572,415	16,871	136,838	3,870
New Orleans, La	221,770	2,331	.....	.....	.....	.....
New York, N. Y	28,988,235	250,969	53,518,805	682,569	14,934,714	185,610
Niagara, N. Y	345,000	3,450	891,614	8,968	151,875	1,898
Oswegatchie, N. Y..	105,145	1,898	25,580	289	.....	.....
Philadelphia, Pa	.....	.....	144,080	3,378	.....	.....
Portland and Falmouth, Me.....	241,209	3,015	230,000	1,089	.....	.....
San Francisco, Cal ..	19,200	220	1,004,330	11,449	1,577,900	19,342
Vermont, Vt.....	3,306,776	67,826	2,251,232	46,734	206,230	5,279
Total	36,089,292	374,446	65,328,581	856,526	17,749,310	228,229

WM. F. SWITZLER, *Chief of Bureau.*

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF STATISTICS, *March* 30, 1888.

Total importations for two years and two months, 119,167,185 pounds; 9,111,671 pounds came from Canada, or about 7½ per cent.

AN IMPORTANT INTEREST TO FARMERS AND FOREST-OWNERS.

The principal raw material used in the production of this fiber is wood, and its value in the forest, or on the stump, so called, is small—estimated from 75 cents to $1 per cord.

There are few, if any, products in this country the cost of which is so largely made up of labor as wood-pulp fiber.

The cutting and transportation of the wood to the mill, its preparation at the mill, and the skilled labor employed in its manufacture constitute fully 80 per cent. of its value; the balance representing imported chemicals, lime (a native product), the interest of the money invested in the plant, insurance, taxes, repairs, etc.

We wish here to call your attention to a very important fact connected with the manufacture of wood-pulp fiber in this country, which is that some of the principal woods (poplar and cottonwoods) used in the manufacture are of very little value for other purposes, being of too inferior a growth to be considered even of value for fuel. They grow profusely in every State in the Union and have a rapid growth, reaching their maturity in a few years, then going to decay unless used.

Therefore, to transfer this large and growing industry to Norway, Sweden, and Canada, where they have cheap labor, cheap wood, and water-power, not only deprives our people of a large capital investment, a large number of laborers of employment, but our farmers and land-owners of a ready market for their inferior woods.

An important factor in the manufacture of chemical wood fiber is soda-ash, on which there is a duty of 25 cents per 100 pounds. Other dutiable articles are also used, such as woolen felts and wire-cloths.

Wood pulp is manufactured extensively in Norway, Sweden, Finland, Germany, and Austria-Hungary—countries having cheap wood and water-power, cheap chemicals, and cheaper labor. At present the industry of the United States is most affected by competition with these countries, as they have extensive forests and wood well adapted for wood-pulp fiber.

Canada has extensive forests, abundant water-power, and cheaper labor than our own lying along our border, and will absorb this industry if the product be put upon the free-list.

These importations are chiefly from Norway and Sweden. In this connection it should be noticed that the great paper-consuming countries, with the exception of Great Britain, are closed to the manufacturers of this country by the tariff they impose, namely, France, Germany, and Russia.

In view of the fact that the manufacture of wood-pulp fiber has become so important an industry in so many States of the Union, engaging such a large capital, employing such a large number of adult male laborers at such remunerative wages, and consuming so much wood of so little value for other purposes, we are at a loss to know on what grounds the Ways and Means Committee place this American product on the free-list.

The manufacture of wood-pulp fiber is a distinctive manufacture, with as large an investment in plant and nearly as much labor per ton as paper itself, and the duty should be fixed and remain the same as on paper.

Tariff reformers can not justly assail this industry on the ground of being protected by an excessive duty while the duty is but 10 per cent. and the average duty on all manufactures is 40 per cent.

And those who believe in free trade can not consistently crowd us on the free-list while a duty still remains upon soda-ash, wire-cloth, felts, and machinery.

We claim for this product of American labor a specific duty of $10 per ton on chemical fiber and $5 per ton on ground wood fiber, equal to the duty on paper.

MAY 5, 1888.

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks, the time having expired, by unanimous consent it was extended.

Mr. WEAVER. I wish to submit a few remarks in reply to the three gentlemen from Maine. I have before me report No. 4173, second session Forty-ninth Congress, made by the Committee on Ways and Means, upon a bill introduced by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] to allow a drawback upon imports of lumber and building material used by persons in the city of Eastport, Me., who had suffered from fire. I will read the bill; it is very short:

Be it enacted, etc., That there shall be allowed and paid, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe, all materials actually used in buildings erected on the ground burned over by the fire which occurred at Eastport, Me., October 14, 1886, a drawback on the import duties paid on the same: *Provided*, That such materials shall have been imported and used during the term of two years from and after the said 14th day of October, 1886.

This bill was introduced by the gentleman from Maine, and its passage was urged by him, both before the committee and in the House. It establishes this fact, that there was a conviction in his mind at that time that the duty upon lumber enhanced the price to the consumer.

Mr. HATCH. There can be no doubt about that.

Mr. WEAVER. It establishes, secondly, that he considered it was a good thing for poor people who were in trouble financially to have lumber on the free-list. [Applause.]

Now there are a great many people all over my State who would like to have cheap lumber as well as the people of Eastport, Me.

Mr. BOUTELLE rose.

Mr. WEAVER. I have no time to yield to the gentleman from Maine.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] assures the House that logs and round timber are on the free-list. That is true—and who gets the benefit of it?

The American mill-owner imports his logs from Canada free, converts them into lumber, and then sells it at the tariff price to my constituents. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROGERS. "Log-rolling."

Mr. WEAVER. Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is log-rolling, as suggested by the gentleman from Arkansas, and log-rolling against the interests of my constituents.

Now, I wish to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the law of 1883 also puts railroad ties of wood on the free-list. The railroads buy them ready hewn in Canada, made by cheap Canadian labor, ship them over here by the million, and thus they obtain cheap ties for their roads. But they are unwilling to treat the people with equal fairness. The same law puts the lumber which my constituents must use in constructing their houses, their granaries, and their barns on the dutiable list at a rate of from $2 to $3 per thousand feet. This is an unmitigated shame. [Applause.]

It is a plain discrimination in favor of the railroads and against the farmers and builders. This bill, sir, in a broad and catholic spirit, treats the monopolies and the people exactly alike. It puts the lumber of the poor man upon the free-list and at the same time it leaves the railroad tie on that list also. [Applause.]

I am astonished at the strength of the opposition to free lumber. It injures nobody, but treats the people decently and fairly. [Applause.] It treats them with a fairness that has been denied for a quarter of a century.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Will my friend permit a suggestion? The gentleman from Maine made a point which seemed difficult to answer, but if any one can answer it the gentleman from Iowa can. He said that if this duty were taken off, the lumbermen of Canada, who are not one-fifth as wealthy as ours, would overwhelm us and run us out of the market. How can you answer that?

Mr. WEAVER. That overwhelms me. [Laughter.] Ask me an easy one. I tremble for my feeble country and her infant industries. Why try to answer such an argument? It is a mere chimera of the brain and wholly absurd. It answers itself. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out four or five words. [Laughter.] We have had to-day, sir, three or four very striking illustrations of the character of the so-called arguments upon which the Democratic party of the nation, as represented in this House, depends in its advocacy of legislation which threatens destruction to extensive and important industries of our country. One of the arguments is that adopted by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE]. It is one of the favorite expedients of gentlemen who seem to have a lack of familiarity with the subject they are trying to handle. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.]

It is a resort to the old trick of attempting to show that somebody, somewhere, at some time, said something which could be tortured or twisted into inconsistency with the attitude or the utterance of somebody else at some other time and in some other place; and so eager are these gentlemen to raise a cloud of dust to conceal their inability to deal with these important industrial questions, that they are not at

all careful or accurate as to the manner in which they make use of this kind of attempted argument.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] comes in here and undertakes to make a point in the guise of an arraignment of Mr. Blaine, by representing him as declaring against a tariff on foreign lumber—for that was the impression sought to be conveyed by the introduction of that extract from a speech of Mr. Blaine's—when, upon inquiry, the fact proves to be that the gentleman from Kentucky, if not purposely misusing that quotation from Mr. Blaine, was using it with an ignorance of its true application quite in keeping with the general treatment of this tariff question by gentlemen on the other side. The record demonstrates that Mr. Blaine stood at the time of that debate just where the Republican party stands to-day—in favor of raising the revenues of this Government by taxing the foreign manufacturer who desires to come into our market to compete with the American producer, and by removing as fast and as far as practicable the taxation placed by the internal-revenue laws, during a period of civil war, upon the industries of our own people. [Applause on the Republican side.]

That is one kind of "tariff-reform" argument.

Another is the very much worn and very threadbare, and, if it is parliamentary, I will say the very cheap and very small attempt to make a bill which I introduced here in behalf of a community that had been stricken by a calamity of fire a means of casting discredit upon the sincerity of my views and upon the strength of the position maintained upon this side of the House on the tariff question. There is not a gentleman on that side of the House of average intelligence—and I think there are some of them that would come within that category—who does not know that that bill was introduced as a request to the Government of this country to exercise an act of customary beneficence and kindliness to the people of a community who had seen their homes, their churches, their stores, their wharves, the entire business of their community swept away by a devouring conflagration.

There is not a gentleman in the valley of the Mississippi, or the Arkansas, or the Missouri, or the Ohio who does not know that the bill was simply a very modest request that this Government would extend to an afflicted community on the coast of Maine a slight measure of the same kindness and generosity that had been extended time and time again, partly by my vote in this House, to the people in those sections of the country who had been afflicted with disaster by floods and otherwise; and it is pretty small business for ambitious statesmen of the region that has so frequently been the recipient of national bounty to focus their intellects in assault upon a bill to allow the people of the town of Eastport, in the State of Maine, to bring across from the adjacent shores of New Brunswick, without the payment of duty, some of the brick and other materials required for the rebuilding of their stricken town—it is pretty small business, I say, to parade that bill as the peg upon which to hang speeches and reports from five or six different members on that side of the House who count themselves among the great exponents of tariff reform.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I ask to have my time extended.

A MEMBER. I object.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa, obtained the floor.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, at the time when that bill was introduced by me——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Maine has expired. The Chair recognized the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. ANDERSON], in front of the Chair, and understood he desired to yield a portion of his time to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I will yield if it does not interfere with my time.

Several MEMBERS (to Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa). You will get time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman from Iowa will yield his time to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I desire to state as a matter of justice to some gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House, some of whom are not present now—some who I believe have more than a faint and glimmering comprehension of the great principles underlying this discussion—that when that bill was introduced by me I conferred in regard to it with a number of the leaders of the Democratic side of the House—the giants of the Democracy in this tariff discussion—and said to them that if it was thought there would be a man on that side of the House who would attempt to make that bill the excuse or vehicle for a tariff discussion I would not introduce it, and I had the assurance of every one of those gentlemen that in their belief no one would think of attempting to do such a thing.

That bill asked that the same spirit of kindness be manifested toward Eastport that had been extended to Chicago, to Portland, and to other communities that had suffered from similar calamities. It followed almost immediately after the direct donations that had been made in this body to build houses over the heads of the houseless sufferers by the floods of the Arkansas, Missouri, and Mississippi Rivers. It followed directly in the line of the appropriations which had my vote and my voice to send food to the foodless of the Mississippi Valley, who had suffered from a similar dispensation of Providence. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] who ran before he was sent to make a report upon the bill for the relief of Eastport, Me., as one of his intellectual efforts on the tariff question, is on record upon the files of this House in the preceding Congress as introducing and having referred to the Committee on Appropriations a request from the governor of his own State for a donation of the public funds from the public Treasury in behalf of the people who were suffering from disaster by a flood in Arkansas. I will include in my remarks the letter, with the governor's indorsement, introduced by the gentleman from Arkansas, as follows:

SWAN LAKE, ARKANSAS COUNTY, ARKANSAS, *March* 3, 1884.

DEAR SIR: We have had one of the most destructive overflows here that has ever occurred in this county. Miles of fences, houses, gin-houses, store-houses washed away, and caused general ruin to this part of the county. Great many left homeless. The people do not ask any aid to repair their buildings or fences. But their levees are broken badly and must be repaired immediately or we can not make a crop this year. We are not in the habit of asking aid, but this is a case of extreme necessity. The people here in this district are perfectly willing to be taxed to pay for any aid extended. We are not able to repair the levees in time to make a crop.

* * * * * * *

If you have no power to help us and you think we could get any aid from the General Government, then please send this to Messrs. ROGERS, BRECKINRIDGE, and Garland. We are aware that there is a great deal of money expended on the Arkansas River, but the producing populace never reap any of its benefits. The most or a greater portion of the money expended at Pine Bluff, which was a failure, etc.

To His Excellency JAMES BERRY,
Governor of Arkansas.

This was signed by W. R. Groceo, J. S. Anderson, J. W. Rosey, T. J. Stokes, and G. E. Crutchfield, and bore the following indorsement by the governor of Arkansas:

DEAR SIR: The statements above made are true. There is great distress as the levee at Arkansas City is broken; I fear much more. If it is possible to obtain relief, I know that all our members will do so.

Very truly,

JAMES H. BERRY.

Maj. C. R. BRECKINRIDGE.

The request was for pecuniary aid from the Government. Mr. Chairman, that aid was given. Similar aid had been voted—not by thousands or tens of thousands, but by hundreds of thousands of dollars at a clip, repeated again and again for the sufferers in that part of the country from those disasters. Only a few days previous the House voted, on February 12, 1884, $300,000 for the sufferers by the floods on the Ohio and Mississippi and their tributaries; on February 15 another appropriation carrying $200,000 additional was passed. On March 27, 1884, a resolution reappropriating $125,000 for the sufferers on these rivers was approved, and May 27, 1884, the House passed a further appropriation of $100,000 for the same purpose.

I say, Mr. Chairman, with all seriousness, that it comes with a poor grace from gentlemen belonging to that part of our common country, thus generously treated, to undertake to cast reflection upon me or my people as mendicants, when Maine, by her representatives here, on every occasion when there has been a demand for this Government to manifest its sympathy and generosity toward their people in affliction, have voted freely and liberally for their relief. In the face of such a record it is a small business for you to undertake to fling back at me the bill to remit a few thousand dollars of duties on materials for rebuilding Eastport, Me. We have asked no alms at your hands. One per cent. of Maine's share of the sums voted as gifts to your people in distress would more than have covered all the redundant revenue that could have been remitted under that bill. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a good deal of interest, as I always do, to my friend who has just taken his seat, but it seems to me that he falls into an entire misapprehension as to the purpose and uses for which the measure he introduced was brought here. It seems to me that he has but elaborated the transaction to which he alludes a good deal more forcefully than the original suggester of the transaction. It seems to me that his constituents, be they whom they may, and situated where they may be, were to receive a direct and substantial benefit by being relieved from the duty imposed on lumber. They being adjacent to the line—nearer to where cheap lumber was than we upon the prairies, I will concede that by reason of such proximity the relief is greater in degree than it would be if they were 1,500 miles away. But it is a difference in degree only, not in kind; and whatever difference there may be, even though in a lesser degree, I want it for the benefit of the people in the Congressional district I have the honor to represent. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have listened to the arguments that my friends here have made; but, with the utmost respect for all they utter, I must say it does not obscure the fact of the dilemma in which they continually find themselves. During the many weeks in which this question has been discussed I have found scarcely a man on this floor opposing the pending measure, be his argument ever so forceful, who has not at one time or another produced arguments to answer himself. In this remark I include my distinguished friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY]. These gentlemen, to use a homely Western phrase, are out of the frying-pan into the fire, and back again.

He says there is no danger, there is no harm in the duty on lumber, because it does not enhance the price, and that if there is a duty on lumber and it does enhance the price it will make no difference to the poor people out in the country who want to buy shingles for their roofs because the cheaper lumber can not cross the line for the reason that the Canadian Government will in that event increase the price of export permits.

From my standpoint this is the simple question. I see men who are anxious to get in and sell cheap lumber. That proves one thing. I see men on this side of the Chamber with lumber to sell who are anxious to keep them out. That proves another thing. Putting the two together it satisfies my mind that the duty, whether it be great or small, has something to do with the value of the lumber.

I do not propose to indulge in any figures, because I have seen from the figures used in this debate they are most serviceable as in turn the same statistics seem to serve the purpose of members whether they are addressing the House upon this or the other side. [Laughter.] But the substantial fact, Mr. Chairman, remains that the men engaged in this business and who are directly interested in it do not want the tariff taken off. They must regard it, of course, as a good thing for them. Those who want cheap lumber of course want the duty taken off, and of course they must regard it as a good thing for them when it is taken off. The passage of this bill, therefore, in my mind, will enable the consumers of lumber, not only in my district, but throughout the country, to purchase lumber at a much cheaper rate than they now do. The removal of the duty to them will be a positive advantage, and for that reason I favor it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

By unanimous consent the formal amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. PETERS. I move to strike out the last word.

The first question I ask myself, Mr. Chairman, is whether free lumber will be of any benefit to the constituents I represent. We all look at these questions from the hearthstones we represent here upon this floor. We all endeavor to look at these questions from the standpoint of our homes and what is for their welfare. I for one, as representing a constituency of farmers, and farmers who are prairie farmers, without natural lumber enough to make a fire sufficient upon which to boil a cup of coffee, look at this question from the standpoint as to whether it will benefit the men who have gone out on the prairies on the great American desert to establish homes for themselves and their families. They need lumber to build their houses, they need lumber to fence their farms, and if there is anything in this bill that will compensate them for a threatened loss of customers they want to know it.

Now, what are the facts? Take a car-load of lumber in Chicago. My home is 700 miles from that city. What is the original cost of that car-load of lumber in Chicago? One hundred and forty dollars for a car-load of 10,000 feet, taking it as lumber runs. The cost is $12 a thousand feet at the mill. Then it costs $20 a thousand to transport it from the mill to Chicago, and $40 for a car containing 10,000 feet to transport it from Chicago to my home, 700 miles away. What is the tariff? Conceding that this $2 a thousand is added to the original cost of the lumber, what is the tariff on the car-load of lumber to my people? It equals the sum of $20 on every car-load of lumber laid down in the city of Newton, Kans., 700 miles from Chicago.

What do you ask? Why, here you ask the farmers of my section of the country to do away with these $2 a thousand or $20 on a car-load, and what do you promise for it? You promise them that the lumber they purchase there shall be reduced $20 a car-load. In other words, you promise that the consumer can get his lumber for $20 less. Can you prove it?

Let me show the dilemma in which you propose to put the farmer. What becomes of this $20 a car or $2 on each thousand feet of lumber? Let me tell you. The manufacturer comes in and says you have done away with the tariff and claims his portion of it, and he gets 50 cents on the thousand feet or $5 on the car-load. Then comes in the wholesale dealer and he gets his 50 cents on the thousand feet or $5 on the car-load. Then come in the men engaged in transportation, and they get their share; and if, as my friend from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] says, these men are combined in a trust, they will have their share, and they will come in and take the balance. What, then, is left to the consumer? How is the farmer to get his share when it is all taken before the car-load of lumber reaches him? Where does his share of the $20 on each car-load come in?

Mr. STRUBLE. Let me ask this question of my friend: If it is not about time that the farmers should be putting in their claims for a little of this saving?

Mr. PETERS. I was just coming to that. Here you ask the farmer to give up, as it has been asserted and threatened in this debate, to give up the market for his products which is afforded to him now by the hundreds of thousands of men engaged in the lumber interests in this country—persons who are his customers.

Mr. McMILLIN. And a good many of them Canadians.

Mr. PETERS. I do not care where they come from; whether they are Canadians or from any other country. So long as they are customers of the American farmer it makes no difference. [Applause on the Republican side.] I repeat, you are asking the American farmer to take his chances of doing away with the hundred thousand lumber customers he has in the United States markets, and as a necessity to come in and tussle with the railroads and lumber kings and manufacturers of lumber for his small pittance of the $2 reduction of duty on a thousand feet of lumber. You ask him to give up a certainty for an uncertainty. Do you suppose the farmer will stand any chance in such a tussle? The farmers of this country do not want to jump out of the frying-pan into the fire. [Applause on the Republican side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will consider the *pro forma* amendment as withdrawn.

Mr. BAYNE. I renew it.

Mr. Chairman, if there be one distinguishing feature of this bill under consideration more marked than anything else in it, it is its strictly sectional character; and the particular branch of the subject under discussion affords an illustration as clear as could be pointed out of that fact.

When appropriations are asked for charitable purposes in this House all sectional lines seem to be obliterated, and kindly feeling and considerate regard, and clasping of hands over the bloody chasm that has hitherto divided us, permeates and pervades everything and everybody. But when it comes to the preparation of a bill like this one, which vitally affects the business, the commerce, and all of the industries of the country, sectional lines are drawn, and, as I have said, in a marked degree. The very proposition under discussion shows that feature to be dominant in the minds of the committee.

Mr. McMILLIN. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. BAYNE. I will if you will extend my time; otherwise I can not yield.

There are great lumber regions in Georgia, in Mississippi, in Alabama, in Arkansas, and in other States of that section; but it must be borne in mind that the cost of transportation is a guaranty against competition of a material character against them, and feeling thus secure because of this cost of transportation, which is large, as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] has just now stated, free lumber is made a provision of the bill.

But the States on the northern border, like Maine, Wisconsin, Michigan, and others which are equally largely interested in lumber, and which compete with Canada, need protection. The cost of transportation is not a barrier against competition. Where an industry in the South, however, is subject to competition, the duties are made high. Take sugar, for instance; that duty is kept up to 78 per cent. and rice at 100 per cent. There is a chance for competition. Rice and sugar are necessaries of life. Rice and sugar, however, are the products of the southern section. They are protected, and it must be because competition will interfere with the amount of money which the producers of these articles are enabled to make. If the lumber of the South needed protection, I imagine lumber would not be on the free-list in this bill.

A MEMBER. What about cotton-ties?

Mr. BAYNE. Yes; and cotton-ties also. They are produced North and consumed South, and cotton-ties are admitted free. Whatever they want down there and do not produce themselves they put on the free-list. Whatever they produce down there and wish to continue to produce they put a high duty on, if it is necessary to protect it. That is the sectional line which runs through the bill, and its distinction in that respect is more apparent than in any other bill that ever has been reported to the House. Why even the bill introduced by Mr. Morrison in the last Congress did not exhibit anything so one-sided as this.

Mr. BLAND. I understood the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] to claim that he was advocating protection to lumber for the benefit of the South, who were chiefly to get the benefit of it, while you say they are not in need of it. How do you happen to disagree on so important a question?

Mr. BAYNE. I am not responsible for what the gentleman from Pennsylvania says. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] I am responsible only for the logic of the facts which I myself cite; and I state this fact, without fear of contradiction, that the cost of the transportation of lumber is a protection to the lumber producers of Arkansas, Mississippi, Georgia, and the other States South.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi. Does not the gentleman know that Mississippi lumber is being shipped to Chicago?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. And from Arkansas in large quantities? It does not want protection.

Mr. BAYNE. Well, there is not very much of it goes there.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. And it is nothing on earth but a robbing monopoly to keep protection upon it.

Mr. BAYNE. There is but little of your lumber that goes North; and you have not the enterprise to use it yourselves.

Mr. HOOKER. We send millions of it every year to the Northwest.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] has expired.

Mr. McMILLIN. I desire to say something in reply to the very peculiar speech of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE]. He says lumber is sacrificed because competition will not injure the

Southern lumber trade. His colleague [Mr. KELLEY] of very superior experience, and possessing how much ability in comparison I will spare the gentleman's modesty by saying, has said that if the bill is passed it does injure the Southern lumber trade. Now, which shall we believe, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY]?

Some gentlemen on that side seem to be so little that they can not look at anything except through sectional spectacles. I do not envy such a person his measure or his characteristics.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. McMILLIN. I can not. This bill framed on sectional lines! I might truthfully answer the charge of sectionalism made against this bill as the faithful Emilia answered the charge of infidelity made by Iago against her mistress. It will be remembered that she said, "I will be hanged if some eternal villain, some busy and insinuating rogue, some cogging and cozening slave, to get some office, have not devised this slander. I will be hanged else."

Sectional lines! In this matter I know no section. This committee has known no section in drawing this bill. It has known alone the good of the people of the United States. Sectional! To prove it the gentleman says there has been a small cut on sugar and on rice. Now, the cut on sugar is infinitely greater than the cut on the gentleman's own product, iron. The cut on rice is infinitely greater than the cut on iron. And he who uses this argument to prove the sectional nature of this bill simply writes his own ignorance of it.

Now I want to comment on the hollow pretense that this lumber tax is proposed to be kept for the benefit of the laboring men. When every other argument is exhausted, when every other resource has failed, when every other expedient has proved ineffective, then they come and say, "Oh, touch not the laboring man; he is my friend; I live for him; I am ready to die for him—till election."

What is the fact concerning the lumber trade of the region the gentleman speaks of which he desires to be protected? I speak on the authority of men who have been in that region and seen the laboring men there at work; and they have announced it as the truth that the bulk of the men who do the work and whom these gentlemen are so anxious to protect are Canadians with Canadian teams brought over for this work, and taking themselves back, bag and baggage, as soon as it is done.

Let us away with this hollow pretense. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] undertook to prove that the reduction proposed by the bill would not benefit the people of Kansas. That is a matter I leave him to settle at the election. He will find, I think, that his people have greater intelligence than he gives them credit for. He says it will reduce the wages of labor. But how on earth is it going to reduce the wages of labor if it is not going to reduce the price of lumber?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Does the gentleman want an answer now to his question?

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman from Maine has been on the floor to-day for the greater part of the time.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The gentleman asked a question, and I propose to answer it.

Mr. McMILLIN. I will ask the gentleman another question. Is it a fact that the lumbermen of Maine bring over Canadians to do their work? Is that a fact?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I say no; it is not a fact.

Mr McMILLIN. Then you say what is not correct, or I am misinformed.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

Mr. BOUTELLE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraw the *pro forma* amendment?

Mr. BAYNE. I do.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I renew it for the purpose of answering the gentleman from Tennessee in the good old Yankee fashion, by asking him another question. Does the gentleman from Tennessee assert that the Maine lumbermen do employ Canadian laborers?

Mr. McMILLIN. I do; I have been so informed on credible authority.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I want the gentleman from Tennessee to tell me why the Canadian laborers can be induced by the lumber manufacturers to come over to work for them.

Mr. McMILLIN. There are climatic influences. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE Let us hear about the climatic influences.

Mr. McMILLIN. This is the explanation of it. During the severe rigors of their more northern climate there is a period of time when these Canadians can go down to the State of Maine and work more successfully in the United States than in their own country, and then when that period is over they can go back and resume their regular avocations. I understand that as a matter of fact they do go back at a certain season.

Mr. BOUTELLE. They do! Now let me give the gentleman a little lesson in geography. People in Canada do not go down to the State of Maine. [Laughter.]

Mr. McMILLIN. There is a part of Canada from which they go and a part of the State of Maine to which they go.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Maine and Canada run pretty nearly upon the same parallel of latitude.

Mr. McMILLIN. They do in part.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And if the gentleman from Tennessee will come down to my district——

Mr. McMILLIN. "Down" from here? "Down?" [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Down or up, whichever way the gentleman likes.

Mr. McMILLIN. The gentleman himself needs a lesson in geography.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Well, if the gentleman will come to my district——

Mr. McMILLIN. Up, you mean.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Either up or down, as you prefer. We are not discussing the climatic or geographical relations of Washington and Maine, but those of Canada and Maine. If the gentleman will come to my district in the month of January I shall be glad to furnish him with a thermometer and let him make observations, and then I shall be glad to have him come here and tell us all about the climatic differences between Canada and Maine, all about the climatic advantages and disadvantages of men who live on one side of the St. John River, in the State of Maine, as compared with those who live on the other side of the river. Of course there is nothing in that.

Mr. McMILLIN. If the gentleman restricts his statement to that part of Canada and that part of Maine, of course he is correct; but I have been informed that those who follow lumbering along the Canadian border—not confining the statement to Maine, but extending away out West—do go back and forth across the line in the manner I have stated.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, the difference in climate all along the Canadian border between the localities from which Canadians are said to come and those on this side in which they are employed in lumbering would not be obvious to the ordinary observer, but of course it furnishes a convenient refuge for the gentleman from Tennessee. I believe that in the privacy of his closet and in the seclusion of his chamber, when he is alone by himself and is not obliged to grapple with the exigencies of the Mills tariff bill, the gentleman from Tennessee really believes that the Canadians come over to Maine to work because they get better wages.

Mr. McMILLIN. And the Maine employers turn out their Maine laborers and employ the cheaper Canadian labor.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And if the gentleman does not believe it, then I want to inform him now that the man who comes from Canada to Maine gets from 20 to 45 per cent. more wages than he can get at home. It is simply a question of supply and demand.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Hereafter I shall take time to show that all this talk about the employment of Canadian cheap labor does not affect the gist of this question. It is only the cheapest class of labor that comes from across the line. The skilled labor in the business is that of American workingmen.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. If there is the difference in wages between Canada and Maine which the gentleman states, will he tell us why it is that Maine has not depopulated Canada?

Mr. BOUTELLE. She is doing it as fast as the law allows.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Statistics do not show it.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Yes, they do show it. They show that Maine is not only drawing population from Canada year by year, but that she has also furnished population to build up Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, and those other magnificent commonwealths of the West, some of which are most ably represented to-day in this and the other branch of Congress by men who went out from Maine.

Mr. DUNN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to say a word about the competition of Northern lumber with Southern lumber, a question I happen to know something about. A large amount of lumber is sent from Arkansas and Texas not only to other parts of the South and to foreign countries, but to the West over the railroads. The great difficulty which the producers of Arkansas and Texas lumber have encountered is the excessive weight of the pitch-pine lumber as compared with the white-pine lumber of the more northern regions. It is a fact that a car-load of ten thousand feet of Northern pine is but little more than half as heavy as a similar car-load of pitch-pine lumber of the South. Therefore the lumber of Chicago is worth $12 per thousand, while the pitch-pine lumber at the Southern mills is worth only $9. These two classes of lumber meet in the markets of the West—in Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, and in the Territories—and our millers must suffer loss by the difference which the transportation costs them by reason of the excessive weight. Carloads are measured by tons, but lumber is sold per 1,000 feet. One thousand feet of pitch pine weighs twice as much as 1,000 feet of Northern white pine, and hence transportation doubles. All lumber-dealers and railroad men understand this matter. The Northern lumber can float into our country down stream on all the rivers tributary to the Mississippi, this being the cheapest transpor-

tation known to the commerce of the world. Requiring neither sail nor steam to propel it, the lumber floats from the mills and competes successfully with the lumber manufactured right upon the ground in the South. Therefore the argument of the gentleman from Maine and the gentleman from Pennsylvania is absolutely without foundation; there is no earthly authority for any such statement.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Is it not a fact that the lumber produced in your country is used for different purposes from the lumber of Canada?

Mr. DUNN. Not at all; the pitch pine and cypress come into competition with all other lumber.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Take Georgia pine.

Mr. DUNN. I am talking about Arkansas and Texas pine. Those are the lumbers that meet the Wisconsin lumber in the West.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Your lumber does not suffer from competition with the Canada lumber.

Mr. DUNN. We are not afraid of competition with Canada lumber or any other.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. Yours is a different class of lumber from the Canadian lumber.

Mr. DUNN. Yes, and we are at a disadvantage on account of the difference in cost of transportation.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. My point is that much of the lumber raised in the South—in Arkansas, Georgia, and Texas—is used for flooring, for decorating the interior of houses, and for other purposes for which Canada lumber is not used; and for this reason the question of free lumber or protected lumber makes no difference with the producers of Southern lumber.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. On this point let me refer the gentleman to a letter written by a New York lumber-dealer who is right upon the Canada line, and who speaks of the probable early exhaustion of the supply of lumber in the North and the unlimited supply of lumber in the South. The latter, he says, can be used where white pine is now used, is suited for exactly the same purposes. We know that it is used for every purpose for which your lumber is used, and is good for many other purposes besides.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. But you can not use the Canada lumber for all the purposes for which Georgia pine and other lumber of the South can be used.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. But we can use the Southern lumber for all the purposes for which Northern lumber can be used, and more, too.

Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois. That does not meet the question at all. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the *pro forma* amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. KERR. I move to amend by striking out the last five words. Mr. Chairman, the objection to this bill is that it proposes to change a line of policy in regard to the protection of our American manufactures. It is proposed to put lumber on the free-list after it represents the element of labor. Crude lumber—that is, in the log—is now and has been for years on the free-list. Where the element of labor is not involved, or is involved in only a small degree, lumber is already free. One gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] has taken the ground that there is a very great demand in his district for free lumber. So far as lumber represents merely the crude, raw material, his people now have such lumber free.

Any manufacturer in the gentleman's district has the right to-day to import from Canada all the logs that he thinks proper, and may establish a manufactory for which this lumber is to be the raw material. But the manufacturer in any district on the Mississippi River, after he has manufactured his logs into lumber, is as much entitled to protection on his product as the lumberman at Chicago or in any other part of the United States. So that the policy sought to be adopted by the men who favor putting manufactured lumber on the free-list is not to give cheaper lumber, but to destroy the advantage which men engaged in the manufacture of lumber now have by virtue of the tariff upon the manufactured material.

One other thing, Mr. Chairman. I deny as a proposition of fact that if this duty were removed lumber would be any cheaper than it is to-day. I am a farmer. I have bought lumber for the last thirty years, and I know that under the old system the case was not different from what it is to-day. When the duty went down to 15 per cent. the cost of lumber was not reduced.

Gentlemen have said that in changing this duty they propose a new line of policy. I hold that it is unwise to change our policy in this respect. We ought to be fair in our tariff; we ought to protect every American interest. Gentlemen on the other side should not insist that 68 per cent. of duty be allowed for the protection of the man who raises sugar, 100 per cent. for the man who raises rice, but that no duty be allowed to the man who manufactures lumber or the man who manufactures flax.

Mr. HEMPHILL. What about the man who raises cotton? Why not bring him in?

Mr. KERR. The man who raises cotton ships a large part of it abroad; it goes into the markets of the world.

Mr. HEMPHILL. His "home market" is over in England.

Mr. KERR. We have a home market in the United States for one-third of the cotton product; and the advantage you have received from that home market has raised the price of cotton above what it was before the war.

Mr. HEMPHILL. On the contrary, it is lower.

Mr. KERR. I think not. I understand that cotton is higher to-day than it was before the war; and it has been made higher by the fact that those who wish to buy it in Europe are obliged to compete to a certain extent with those who want to buy it in the United States.

Mr. HEMPHILL. If you are going to protect all home industries, we want protection for cotton.

Mr. KERR. A gentleman near me informs me that cotton is 3 cents a pound higher than it was before the war. There is no duty of any kind upon raw cotton——

Mr. STRUBLE. We are willing that there should be.

Mr. KERR. And none is imported.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose that part of this bill which reduces the duty on lumber, and I oppose it just as I intend to oppose the reduction of other duties interfering with the labor of our people. So far as it touches the industrial classes and puts a check upon their progress and the success of their labors, the committee and the House will hear much more of it, if it should become a law, in the future than they have heard in the past. It is a question which we can not avoid and it must be met. That is the labor question. And every sensible man in this country knows that labor is one of the most important subjects of legislation and at the same time one of the most difficult to settle. And, sir, it will not be settled unless this Congress pays some attention to the wants of the laborers.

If it can be proved to be true that the laboring interests of the country will be bettered by the reduction of these duties, or that in any respect it will better the condition of our laboring men throughout the country by passing such a bill as we have here; if it can be shown that the reduction of the duty on lumber or on any other article will help the laboring class and the working class; if gentlemen on the other side of the House will do that, I am then, Mr. Chairman, one of those who will support it. But I do not believe they can do any such thing. They have not done so, at least, up to the present time. I am one who will support any measure that will benefit the people of the land; and when I use the word "people," I mean the working class, the laborers, the farmers. I do not mean the well-to-do, wealthy class, those who are perfectly able to protect themselves. I speak of the great body of the people, and I say to gentlemen on the other side of the House that if they can show that by reducing the duty on lumber or the duty on any other article it will have the effect of helping the working class, I will support it. Otherwise I propose to vote solidly against them, unless where the article does not compete with the labor of our own people at home.

Gentlemen on the other side have formulated this bill in accordance with the message of the President of the United States. Now, with all respect to the President I will say that he is clearly mistaken, in my judgment, in the view which he has taken of this tariff question. He advocates the reduction of the tariff upon the ground that it has been forced upon the people by a condition of affairs unprecedented in the history of this country; that it is owing to the surplus in the Treasury. Now, let me say that there would not have been left a dollar of surplus in the Treasury if the President had done his duty in carrying out the legislation of the Forty-ninth Congress. There would not have been a dollar in the Treasury to-day in the way of surplus revenue if he had done his duty by approving the liberal measures which were passed by the Forty-ninth Congress for the pensioning of our soldiers, and for the improvement of the rivers and harbors of the country. If he had approved those measures the money would have been distributed throughout the country. They would have emptied the Treasury, and by the distribution of this money done good to the people everywhere. Instead of paralyzing business by being hoarded up by the Government, it would have enabled our people to tide over their difficulties by having it in their pockets.

As I have said, Mr. Chairman, this bill has been formulated by the Committee on Ways and Means for the purpose of sustaining the position taken by the President in his message. In my judgment, he has not only mistaken the interests of the country but the wishes of the country when he took that view of the subject. If the real object be to reduce the surplus and not to interfere with the labor of the industrial classes of our people, there is an easy way to accomplish it. But the President by his action at the last Congress has shown that he is not in favor of taking any such course, because when the liberal measures were passed at that Congress he vetoed them. He vetoed the bill pensioning our soldiers, as well as others of a liberal character passed at the last Congress, and if this Congress should pass the same measures, so far as we know they would be met by precisely the same veto.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The formal amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. COBB. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I make this *pro forma* amendment for the purpose of stating one fact.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] asserted that the pending bill is sectional in its provisions, and to sustain the assertion he alleged that the South, because of the cost of transportation of lumber to market, did not need and did not care to have protection on this article. He evidently intended to convey the idea—indeed, his statement in this regard was the assertion of a fact—that the lumber dealers in the South disposed of their lumber at home and in home markets. If I have not properly apprehended the gentleman he can correct me.

Speaking with reference to the lumber business in Alabama, I have to say that the manufacturers in my State—and the gentleman mentioned these—do not find at home the market for the products of their mills. On the contrary, much the larger quantity of the lumber manufactured by the mills in Alabama is shipped to the North and the Northwest. It is there the markets are found. And it not unfrequently happens that the manufacturers of lumber in Alabama are compelled to refuse small orders for lumber made by those living at the very doors of the mills, because of the unfilled orders from these Northern markets. So that the point attempted to be made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania has no support from the condition of the lumber business in my State.

I yield what remains of my time to the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has two minutes remaining.

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not care to occupy that time now, but will wait until I can get the floor in my own right.

Mr. STRUBLE was recognized.

Mr. MILLS. I want to ask that, by consent, the time of this debate be now limited. I ask the committee to let us come to a vote on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa has been recognized.

Mr. STRUBLE. Mr. Chairman, my constituents are largely, and, I may say, exclusively purchasers and consumers of lumber. They are, also—or a majority of them are—believers in the doctrine of protection to all the industries of the country. To a reasonable extent they believe in the application of this doctrine. At the same time I am persuaded there is quite a feeling among them that the duty on the wood schedule might be considerably reduced, if not entirely abated, without serious detriment to any class. I confess, sir, that this lumber question and my exact duty in connection with it have occasioned me serious thought.

It is not clear to me if we take off $2 on clapboards, for instance, that the farmers of my district will receive a very large percentage of that reduction. But I can not reason myself into the position as my friend from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] seems to have done, as well as my colleague [Mr. KERR], who seems practically to have the same opinion, that in this great struggle with the Canadian lumbermen and the Canadian manufacturers and the American manufacturers and wholesale dealers for a division of this $2, in the event lumber is placed on the free-list, the farmer is not going to receive any of it. I believe that in the scramble for division he will realize some benefit in the cheapening of his lumber; but I do not pretend to claim that it will be very much.

Now, it seems to me that inasmuch as we are engaged in an attempt to revise the tariff, and are considering the question of lumber, and that, too, in advance of a single line that touches the lumber schedule, we had better revise it on lumber by reducing it a little instead of making it free, and at the proper time I propose to submit an amendment proposing to strike out that part of this bill relating to lumber, and on reaching section 2, and the dutiable list, move to insert the provisions of existing law on the subject of lumber, but with the further proposition to reduce the rate of duty on each classification 50 per cent., thus making what I consider a fair reduction on this schedule.

As I have already said, I should not, if this amendment were made to the present law and duties were reduced 50 per cent., anticipate that the cost of lumber to the people of my district would be greatly cheapened. But I certainly think its cost would be somewhat reduced, and that without working any serious hardships to lumbermen, millers, and wholesale dealers. Let us try such a reduction for a reasonable time, until, if you please, the next general revision of the tariff laws, and if it clearly appears injustice to a serious extent is resulting to the lumber interests of the country a change can be made.

I confess, sir, I can not bring myself to believe that the whole business of lumber production in this country is to be irretrievably swamped if lumber is placed on the free-list. It does not seem to me at all probable. Our American dealers are not going to lie down in the face of Canadian competition and opposition. They are not of such metal. At the same time and while so believing, my desire, in so far as I can see my way clear, is to adhere to the protective principle in dealing with all these various productions of American capital and labor. And in this particular class I shall offer what I think a fair compromise; that being declined and none other proposed than the question of free lumber or the present rate of duty, I shall make choice of what I believe to be for the best interests of my constituents.

Mr. MILLS. I now ask unanimous consent that the debate close, and that we may take a vote on the pending amendments. Otherwise, I shall have to ask that the committee rise to limit debate.

Mr. ADAMS. I hope we will proceed for a while longer.

Mr. MILLS. We have had already four hours' debate.

Mr. ADAMS. I hope the gentleman will allow me to bring the attention of the committee back to the amendment I introduced.

Mr. MILLS. I will say to my friend that after we get into the House, if it is necessary to move that the committee rise, I will ask that debate be continued for ten minutes, five minutes on each side, and he may have the five minutes then, which, I suppose, will be satisfactory to him.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to say that I want five minutes on this amendment myself.

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending first which was submitted by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. COBB].

Mr. COBB. I yielded the time to the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. That time has expired; and if there be no objection, the Chair will regard the *pro forma* amendment as withdrawn.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 3, strike out the "1st day of July, 1888," and insert the "2d day of January, 1889."

The CHAIRMAN. This is the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS].

The gentleman from Texas now asks unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be limited to ten minutes.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I object.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to submit a *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. MILLS. I ask unanimous consent to close the debate now.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair submitted that request, and objection was made.

Mr. MILLS. Who objected? I will suggest that we have twenty minutes' debate then, ten on each side. Will gentlemen agree to that?

Several members objected.

Mr. MILLS. Then I move that the committee rise for the purpose of limiting debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that the gentleman from New Hampshire, having been recognized, should be permitted first to occupy his time, as he only yielded for a request for unanimous consent.

Mr. MILLS. I do not understand who objected to the proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New Hampshire now to move his *pro forma* amendment, as he had the floor and was recognized for that purpose.

[Mr. GALLINGER withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I have no purpose to protract at any considerable length the discussion of this question. It seems to me, however, Mr. Chairman, that neither the theory of "protection" nor the theory of "free trade," so called, should be invoked in the consideration of this item of the pending measure.

Protection of the lumber interest to the absolute exclusion of foreign lumber means the ultimate destruction of the American forests. That is the logic of the proposition, and I quite agree with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND], who properly characterizes the unwisdom of such a policy and also calls attention to the fact that it is in contravention of the spirit of the timber-culture act which was passed, I believe, by a Republican Congress.

Mr. GUENTHER. What are the forests good for if you do not utilize them?

Mr. DOCKERY. Of course we all understand what they are good for, but they will not be good for anything after they are destroyed. Mr. Chairman, the statement has been made that there is a larger area of timber at this time in the various sections of our country than there was a quarter of a century ago, and in this connection the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] has referred to the fact that the Walker tariff of 1846 imposed the same duty on lumber that the present tariff does. I concede that; but forty years ago there was not the same necessity for the protection of American lumber forests that there is to-day. I can not speak from personal knowledge as to other portions of the country, but I know that in the section of Missouri from where I come the forests have been largely denuded and the timber supply sensibly decreased.

Mr. GUENTHER. Not by the lumbermen; by the agriculturists.

Mr. DOCKERY. By the agriculturists; and in your State the forests have been cut down by the lumbermen.

Mr. GUENTHER. Yes; but the lands of which you speak now are farms, and the timber would have been gone in any case. The only difference is that on your plan it would not have been utilized.

Mr. DOCKERY. Possibly so; but as I have but five minutes I must beg to be allowed to proceed without further interruption.

Mr. Chairman, in the brief time allotted me under the rules I can only state that the theory of protection is largely responsible for the rapid destruction of our lumber forests, and I believe that the time has fully come when we should protect this great interest by supplementing our own resources with foreign lumber, thus enabling our people in Kan-

sas, Minnesota, Iowa, and other prairie States to build cheaper houses by giving them lumber freed from the burdens of taxation.

Sir, in my opinion the effect of this provision of the bill will be to decrease the price of lumber to the consumer. If I did not entertain this belief I would not support the measure, but I am fully persuaded that this result will follow.

Now, Mr. Chairman, permit me a word in reply to the statements of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS]. I am obliged to the gentleman for the calculation he presents, by which it appears that there will be a reduction of $20 per car on each car-load of lumber shipped to his home at Newton, Kans., in the event that this bill as the result should become a law; but the gentleman says that the reduction will not inure to the benefit of the farmers of his district. Substantially the same argument the gentleman offers was made a few years since when it was proposed to put quinine on the free-list. Gentlemen on the other side then said that such action would not reduce the price of quinine to the consumer, but that its effects would be to destroy that industry in this country, and that American competition, having been thus overthrown, the price to the American consumer would be increased.

The reduced price of quinine since it was put on the free-list conclusively refutes the assertions made by our Republican friends at that time. I am advised that there are more men employed to-day in the manufacture of quinine, and there are more American quinine industries than there were before quinine was put on the free-list, although we were told that the industry would certainly be destroyed and utterly overthrown by foreign competition.

Mr. KELLEY. The gentleman is entirely mistaken in that.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. DOCKERY. As my time is exhausted, I will close with the observation that the price of quinine, since it was stricken from the dutiable list, has fallen from $3.75 per ounce to 75 cents per ounce. In this instance the consumer is the beneficiary, as he will be when lumber is relieved from the burdens of unnecessary taxation.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that I desire to offer at the end of the fifth line.

The CHAIRMAN. If it is an amendment to the pending amendment it is in order.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I desire to have it come in at the end of the fifth line.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can only recognize at this time an amendment to the pending amendment of the gentleman from Illinois. The gentleman from New York can send his amendment up and have it read, and then the Chair will determine whether it is germane to the pending amendment or not.

The amendment was read, as follows:

After line 5 add:

"*Provided*, That in all cases a duty shall be imposed upon all goods and products now on the free-list whenever similar goods and products are subject to duty under the laws of the Dominion of Canada at a rate greater than or equal to that imposed thereunder."

Mr. MILLS. I make the point of order that we have not yet reached that part of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that this amendment is not now in order, as it is not an amendment to the pending amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. BAKER, of New York. When it is in order I shall ask leave to offer it and to be heard upon it. I move now to strike out the last word, for the purpose of saying a few words with regard to the question raised in the amendment which I have just submitted. Mr. Chairman, it is a fact which is well known and which ought to be appreciated by every gentleman upon this floor that in the United States, and especially in New York and the other States bordering on the Canada frontier, there are large nursery industries which are much affected by their proximity to the Canadian border. We have there many other industries that are materially affected by the proposed changes in this bill.

In 1883, under the tariff law adopted by Congress and approved by the President, nursery stock, seeds, plants, and bulbs, and many other products were put upon the free-list; and under the reciprocity act of Canada, passed in 1879, those things were permitted, upon the proclamation of the governor-general in council, to be put upon the Canadian free-list. But they were not. From 1883 down to the present year the Canadian authorities have exacted duties upon nursery stock, seeds, plants, bulbs, etc., while availing themselves of the free-list provision upon similar articles coming into this country. By a proclamation which was only made after the introduction and under pressure of a resolution introduced by myself in this House on the 2d of April last, the Canadian authorities put these things upon the free-list; but, Mr. Chairman, they have already taken steps to restore the duty upon them. These acts looking to a restoration of the duty upon nursery stock, etc., constitute a gross breach of faith on the part of the Canadian authorities. Hence I have offered the amendment which has been read by the Clerk; and I hope it will be adopted.

This amendment is due to the large interests involved. Its purpose is to afford some degree of protection to the nursery and other industries of the United States, particularly in those sections where, like my own district, the industries referred to are more largely concerned and affected to a greater degree; where, because of their proximity to the Dominion of Canada, they have much larger dealings with the Canadian people. Our people feel that this bill, if passed, will affect their agricultural and manufacturing interests very seriously and detrimentally. If it is to pass, these interests should be guarded by an amendment, such as I propose, against a renewal of the "tactics" heretofore practiced by the Canadian Government towards the interests concerned. It is in the interest of "fair play." We can not afford to inaugurate "free trade" for the benefit of Canadian agriculturists and manufacturing industries and leave our own to the tender mercies of a people by whom our nursery, our seed, and other industries have been uniformly imposed upon and compelled to endure until such time as the Canadian Government may be compelled by fear of retaliation, or through the influence of the Department of State they come, though reluctantly, to a realizing sense of their sins of omission and commission, and are constrained to do in April, 1888, what by every consideration of honor and good faith they should have done in 1883, five years ago.

This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is intended to guard against only one of the many wrongs our business interests have borne for a long time. Our people in the border districts of my State are beginning to feel that between the Dominion Parliament at Ottawa and the Congress of the United States now assembled everything is promised if not assured for Canada at their expense, while even Sir Charles Tupper boasts that "free lumber" alone will enrich Canada to the tune of a million and a half a year from the start, because he knows that their lumber will go in our markets, not at a reduced rate, but for American prices, thereby enriching the Canadian capitalist at the expense of American labor.

My friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] discourses upon the "climatic differences" between Maine and Canada and asserts that he is "so informed." I fear his informant is the same "unreliable fellow" that led the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] to assert over at Providence that seamless socks are made only in the old country by secret process, etc., but we all live and learn, and my friend from Texas will hereafter, I am sure, send to my city for his seamless socks.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose the amendment. I desire to reply to the remarks made a moment since by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY]. He claimed that the object of this bill is to protect the American forests. That is a very commendable object; and the question is one in which I feel a very great interest. It is a matter of great moment to this country that our forests shall be protected as far as possible. It has been demonstrated by our most learned men that the forests of this country have a great influence upon the quantity and uniformity of the rainfall, upon the temperature of any latitude, and upon the health of the people.

Therefore, if this bill would accomplish the protection of the American forests; if it would encourage the growth of timber; if it would preserve to the people this great source of moisture and temperature and health, I should certainly favor it. But I think, Mr. Chairman, that the gentleman is mistaken. Those who have given some attention to this question have discovered that the omission to cut down our mature forests will not preserve them. If you will go to the forests of Michigan or Maine you will find that they are wasting away by decay and by fire as fast as by the woodman's ax. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] made the statement that white pine will not grow a second time on the same soil, or on the same land.

In some regions of the country this may be true, but I want to say that in other regions it is not true. In the southern part of Maine I have seen pine forests growing where pine had previously grown, and also where hardwood had previously grown, as I was informed. I have seen in Mr. REED'S Congressional district beautiful pine forests which were a second growth.

Hon. John Hall, of York County, Maine, a gentleman well known to all of the Representatives from that State, pointed out to me a field in which he had hoed corn when a boy, from which he had recently cut a fine crop of pine timber. I saw the logs. They were large and made fine lumber—as fine logs as you would see in any log-yard in the country. The first growth on this land had been hardwood, and the second growth was white pine, and the trees had grown as thick as trees could grow anywhere.

In Maine and in New Hampshire you will see a great deal of pine timber that has been growing only thirty or forty years which you would suppose was the original growth. They sometimes cut off the growth at the end of twenty or twenty-five years, and find it profitable to do so; but a large growth of very fine timber can be cut at the end of forty years.

I have watched the cutting of timber in the State of Maine for more than twenty years, and I wish to confirm the statement made by the gentleman from that State [Mr. DINGLEY] that there is more timber there now than there was twenty years ago.

I have been told by scores of individuals with whom I have conversed on this subject that the growth of timber in that State, or in the part of the State of which I speak, is greater than the consumption

of it. The growth of pine in that country is simply marvelous, and what at first seemed to me destructive proved to be but a proper care of the growth.

The way to protect the American forests is by cutting down the old trees, taking care of the remaining ones, and by planting young trees. The only way to keep up the American forests is by continually planting trees. I would like to see alongside of every township and county road and along every railroad in this country lines of trees. All the poor, rough, stony, hilly land ought to be planted in trees. If this bill looked in that direction I would give it a very warm welcome, and I want to say that it is a mistake, a very grave error, to suppose that you can save our great forests by simply letting them alone.

The older trees decay rapidly and the value of trees after maturity greatly deteriorates. In my own State the farmers have been making this mistake. Our Ohio farmers have been preserving their timber with the greatest care for the last twenty or thirty years for future use, but when the time comes to use this timber it will be so decayed with the dry rot that it will be almost worthless. Instead of saving it they have lost it.

Nothing is gained by letting timber stand after it has reached its maturity. It decays and dies after it has reached a certain age, and should then be cut and used. There are times when the touching appeal to the axman to spare the tree is not founded in wisdom. We should use our timber at the proper time and grow more all the while. Again I repeat that the only way to protect the forests and retain the blessings which flow from them is to keep planting trees. We should study and practice tree-culture if we wish to preserve our American forests.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will assume that the *pro forma* amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I do not desire to withdraw the amendment I have offered.

Mr. OWEN. I move to strike out the last word, and yield the time to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I have offered, and which has been read from the desk, I deem of very great importance, and I would like very much to have the House give it careful consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs to interrupt the gentleman to state that he will find in a subsequent line on the first page a place where this amendment is properly applicable, and the Chair will then recognize the gentleman to offer it.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Very well; I will offer the amendment at the time suggested.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I move a *pro forma* amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. There is a *pro forma* amendment pending, on which the gentleman can take the floor.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise to state the exact relation of the speech made by the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Blaine, and which was quoted in debate this morning by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] as bearing upon, or having some application to, the subject now under consideration in this committee. I felt at the time the remarks were read from the Clerk's desk that that distinguished Republican and pronounced protectionist had never uttered such language in connection with the duties upon foreign imports, and therefore I made the inquiry of the gentleman from Kentucky which is now of record.

I have since looked up the debate, and have also procured a copy of the bill then under consideration, and to which Mr. Blaine was addressing himself on the floor of the House at the time he made the remarks referred to. I find that the Committee of the Whole had under consideration at the time House bill No. 1060, a bill to reduce into one act and to amend the laws relating to internal taxes; and, Mr. Chairman, of the sixty or seventy pages of this bill there is not one line of it having any relation whatever to duties upon imports. The remarks of the gentleman from Maine were uttered in protest of a proposed tax upon the domestic products of lumber and breadstuffs, and had no application at all to any proposed tax or duty upon foreign lumber or foreign breadstuffs. [Applause on the Republican side.] I merely state this in order that the record may be complete.

Mr. HEARD. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Certainly.

Mr. HEARD. I wish to ask this. Is not the figure chosen by Mr. Blaine, in the remarks to which reference is made, for the purpose of illustration, and as a plea for cheap lumber for the frontiersman who wants to build his cabin or construct his fence, just as forcible and as applicable to domestic lumber as to foreign lumber?

Mr. MCKINLEY. Oh, no; quite the opposite.

Mr. HEARD. What is the difference to the consumer of the lumber?

Mr. MCKINLEY. The difference is simply this: That under a tax upon domestic products, the consumer always pays the tax; whereas under a tax or duty imposed upon a foreign product the consumer does not always pay the tax, indeed, he very rarely pays it. And it is particularly true that he scarcely ever pays it if the tax be put upon a competing foreign product. That is the exact difference; and if the gentleman from Missouri studies political economy he will discover that such is the difference between a tax upon a domestic and a foreign competing product, the one being paid by the consumer always and the other being paid largely by the diminished profit of the foreign producer.

Now, the gentleman from Maine, Mr. Blaine, in making this speech to which reference was made, addressed himself to a motion made by Mr. Ferry, then a member of the House, and subsequently a Senator from Michigan, to exempt from the operations of this law any unmanufactured lumber and breadstuffs. It was simply an effort to wipe out as speedily as possible internal taxation. In the line of the suggestion of Mr. Blaine, the Republican party has from 1868 on down through its control of the Government wiped out every one of these taxes upon domestic production save and except alone the tax upon whisky and tobacco [applause on the Republican side], making an annual reduction of over $360,000,000 imposed upon domestic production in the United States.

I repeat, Mr. Chairman, I have only made this statement in order to have the record exactly correct.

Mr. HEARD. Let me say to my friend, who has suggested that if I would study political economy I would receive certain lights and information, that I have no doubt I would receive just the kind he suggests if I studied it in the same school in which he was taught.

Mr. MCKINLEY. And that is just the school I want the gentleman to enter.

Mr. HEARD. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. MCKINLEY. For it is the very best school not only for the study of political economy but for practical business purposes.

Mr. HEARD. It is the school in which the American consumer is paying the tuition of those who are getting the benefit of its teachings.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the language of Mr. Blaine, which I have put into the RECORD, like everything that comes from that distinguished gentleman, was worthy of his ability, and was an effective argument against putting a tax upon lumber, and seemed, therefore, to be not an inappropriate contribution to the discussion we have been pursuing to-day, as to whether the lumber used in America should be free from taxation or not. All forms of obtaining money by the sovereign power must necessarily be, in the ultimate analysis, taxation of some kind; and the gentleman is wholly mistaken when he says that the teachings of political economy point to the conclusion that the consumer does not pay the added cost of production, whatever may be the particular element of that cost which is under discussion. Whatever it is, in all the various elements thereof, which makes up the unit of cost of production. it is paid, as a rule, by the purchaser of the article which costs that amount to produce. Whether it be the cost of the material, the cost of the labor put into it, the cost of transportation, the insurance premium, the commission of the commission merchant, the profit of the intermediary, the ultimate unit of the cost of production is, as a rule, the amount that the consumer pays for the article plus the profit of the last person who sells it to him.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman permit——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. In a moment. The amount of duty imposed upon an article enters into the cost of the article and becomes a part of it, and, as a rule, is paid by the consumer. It is not always true in this country that the article on which a protective duty is imposed can be sold in America; and therefore it is not always true that the competing article sells for a price that is equal to its foreign cost of production plus the nominal duty that is by law put upon the competing article.

That is so with all the cheap cotton goods and upon the various other goods upon which duties are imposed as to their foreign competing goods where there is no real foreign competition, because there is no importation; but in every case where there is a foreign competition and there is a duty imposed upon the article, that duty enters into the cost of production. There can be no escape from it. That is the teaching of common sense. And that is the reason why the persons who manufacture the competing articles in America fight with such intense animosity against any bill which reduces those duties, for their profit is in the preservation of the duty which increases the cost of the competing article and enables them to undersell the foreign article at a price which will give to them a profit.

Mr. REED. I have no desire to follow the gentleman from Kentucky into the mazes of the argument by which he has withdrawn the House or the committee from the consideration of his presentation of Mr. Blaine's argument on one point precisely as if it had been made upon another, thereby inducing the Democratic party to give to Mr. Blaine what they have always most grudged him, the meed of generous applause. [Laughter.] I think the gentleman's losing himself in this argument to which we have just listened is plain proof to the House that his production of Mr. Blaine's statement on one point in order to uphold another was clearly an inadvertence; that it was done by accident; and it only remains for us to express our very sincere regret that he had not, prior to producing it to the House, given it the careful examination which it really merited. [Applause.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. If the gentleman from Maine is satisfied with the answer he has made to the remarks which I have sub-

mitted, I suppose I have no reason to complain. It was not an inadvertence that I produced the remarks of Mr. Blaine. I commend them to the gentlemen on the other side, and especially to my good friends from the Northwest, so that when they come to read them in the RECORD to-morrow they may mark, learn, and inwardly digest them.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman from Kentucky yield to me now for a question?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. With pleasure.

Mr. KELLEY. Did the gentleman know that Mr. Blaine was speaking of an internal tax and yet represent him as having referred to a customs duty? That is the point at issue.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The gentleman from Pennsylvania assumes what is untrue. I did not represent that Mr. Blaine had made these remarks about a customs duty, and the gentleman is wholly gratuitous and inaccurate in the assumption. I sent the RECORD to the desk to be read as the speech of Mr. Blaine, and when my friend from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY] asked the question I could not answer it at once because other gentlemen on the same side interposed inquiries. As soon as I could I said I did not know. There was no attempt of any sort in any way to do anything except to have the remarks of Mr. Blaine read and inserted in the RECORD.

As to the remark of my friend from Ohio [Mr. MCKINLEY], that the Republican party have reduced since then the internal taxes, I will say they have been decreased in the present bill and in the present tariff. But while it is true that all the taxes which were imposed on the various internal and domestic manufactures, except beer, and whisky, and tobacco, have been removed, the compensatory duties which the gentlemen on the other side put on foreign competing articles have not been reduced, and they do not propose to reduce them.

Mr. MILLS. I now ask unanimous consent that we may have a vote on the amendments that have been offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] asks unanimous consent that all debate upon the pending paragraph be now closed. Is there objection?

Mr. BAYNE. I object.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I object for the purpose of asking a question. I desire to know whether the paragraph includes the amendment offered by me a while ago and read from the Clerk's desk?

The CHAIRMAN. It does not embrace that amendment.

Mr. MILLS. Can we have unanimous consent to close the debate in ten minutes from this time?

Mr. BAYNE. I object, because there are a number of gentlemen here who had no opportunity to discuss this question in the general debate, and who now wish to speak upon it.

Mr. MILLS. We have been four or five hours talking simply about the date when this law shall go into effect.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that if debate is closed upon the pending paragraph the Clerk will then read, beginning with line 6 and ending with line 25. That is the paragraph in regard to lumber.

Mr. MILLS. This whole debate has been on the first paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. This whole debate has been on the first five lines.

Mr. MCKINLEY. What is before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS].

Mr. MCKINLEY. I demand the regular order.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 125, noes 107.

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

The CHAIRMAN. Tellers are demanded, and the Chair will appoint to act as tellers the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS].

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 122, noes 83.

So the motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration a bill (H. R. 9061) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue, and had come to no resolution thereon.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am instructed by the Committee on Appropriations to report back the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill with certain amendments for the farther action of the House, and unless gentlemen desire to be heard upon it I ask that the bill be now disposed of.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reports back from the Committee on Appropriations the bill (H. R. 9377) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

Mr. PETERS. I reserve all points of order on that bill.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman had better state his point of order now.

Mr. PETERS. I reserve all points of order.

Mr. RANDALL. I have no disposition to deprive anybody of any rights that he has under the rule. I ask for the reading of the amendments which I have been instructed to submit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 59, after "salary of governor," in line 6, insert "$2,000."

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that this bill must be first considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RANDALL. In reply I desire to state that not only this bill generally but these particular amendments now reported have already been considered in Committee of the Whole; so that the purpose of the rule has been carried into effect.

Mr. PETERS. I desire to be heard on that point. According to the Manual, page 142, after a bill has been committed and reported, it ought not in an ordinary course to be recommitted; but in cases of importance, and for special reasons, it is sometimes recommitted, and usually to the same committee. If a report be recommitted before agreed to in the House (which is the status of this bill) what has passed in the committee is of no validity; the whole question is again before the committee and a new resolution must be again moved as if nothing had passed.

Now, I take it for granted that this bill comes before this House virtually *de novo*, and that the usual point of order can be made against it, namely, that, as it provides for an appropriation, it must, under the rule, be first considered in Committee of the Whole. It is immaterial whether or not these amendments have once been considered in committee, and agreed to or disagreed to prior to the recommitment. That, I say, is immaterial, for otherwise a committee of this House would have the power within themselves to do away with any recommendation that the Committee of the Whole might make to the House. When this bill was passed an attempt was made to recommit it with instructions. The point of order was made against that, and then the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] made the motion to recommit virtually without instructions.

It was recommitted, and now it comes back as a new bill. As stated in Jefferson's Manual, without respect to what action may heretofore have been taken upon the bill in Committee of the Whole, it is now before the House for consideration just as though it were reported for the first time from the Appropriations Committee. I therefore make the point of order that this being virtually a new bill, it must be again considered in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, I always desire to speak with great caution when I rely on my memory, but I wish to refer the Chair to a decision made, I think, in the last Congress in a case exactly similar to this. When the deficiency appropriation bill, after consideration in Committee of the Whole, came before the House, Mr. REAGAN, then a Representative from Texas, moved to recommit the bill with instructions. When it afterward came back a point of order similar to that now pending was raised; and the decision was then made that the bill, having been once fully considered in Committee of the Whole, the requirement of the rule had been satisfied.

Mr. REED. That was a recommittal with instructions.

Mr. RANDALL. I so stated the fact a moment ago.

Mr. REED. This bill was recommitted without instructions.

Mr. RANDALL. There is no distinction so far as the present question is concerned. This bill comes back in the same relation as when it was recommitted.

Mr. PETERS. What was the status of this bill when it came back from the Committee of the Whole and when it was recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations? If I remember correctly, it contained about twenty-two blanks, perhaps more. Points of order had been made upon certain amounts in the bill, some of which were increases of salaries above the legal compensation and some of which were reductions of the legal salary. Those points of order had been sustained, and the amounts reported by the Committee on Appropriations were stricken out. Motions were made to fill those blanks with the several amounts provided by law. Those motions were voted down. Then a motion was made that the blanks be filled with the amounts named in the appropriation bill now in force for the current year. Upon that proposition a point of order was made and sustained.

If the present point of order be not well taken, then this House has no power to enforce its own action after having expressed itself in Committee of the Whole as against filling those blanks with the amounts provided by the statute law of the land. In other words, if this bill can now be taken up and passed without any opportunity to amend, without any opportunity to fill those blanks, then we place the entire House in the hands of the Committee on Appropriations. This now comes back as a new bill. We do not know what is in it; we do not know how those blanks have been filled. We do not know but that they have been filled in direct opposition to the will of the House as expressed when it voted down the proposition to fill the blanks with the amounts required by the statute law. And there is no opportunity to find out how these blanks have been filled or what is the present condition of the bill until we go into Committee of the Whole and again consider the bill by paragraphs.

We cannot go into the room of the Committee on Appropriations and ascertain the proceedings they may have taken in connection with each

item of this bill. The members of that committee are not permitted under the rules of the House to divulge the proceedings of the committee. We are powerless to obtain any such information if we desired to do so. Furthermore, no rule of this House can be so construed as to place the entire membership on this floor—325 members—under the power and dictation of the Committee on Appropriations.

There are certain blanks in this bill which appeared there after it had been considered and passed in Committee of the Whole. Certain statements were made in Committee of the Whole which were afterward found to be incorrect. Amendments were adopted in Committee of the Whole and afterward reported to the House with the understanding that certain statements were true; but those statements having been found incorrect, the bill with those incorrect figures in it was recommitted. How do we now know but that the Committee on Appropriations, in now reporting the bill back, have gone entirely contrary to the wishes of a majority of the members of this House? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in consonance with common sense, in consonance with justice, in consonance with the rights of each individual member on this floor, the bill should be again considered in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Speaker, in the proceedings of this House in the last Congress there is a precedent which, in my judgment, exactly covers the present case. I refer to the action of the House upon the river and harbor bill at the second session of the Forty-ninth Congress. That bill had been considered in Committee of the Whole, and at a certain time a proposition was submitted by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] to recommit the bill to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors with instructions to report a bill of a single section, being an appropriation in gross for the whole amount carried in the previous bill. That proposition was adopted. When the Committee on Rivers and Harbors re-reported the bill to the House Mr. Hepburn, then a Representative from Iowa, began a discussion of the report. Thereupon, later on the point of order was made to the Speaker [Mr. CARLISLE]. That, in my judgment, was a question exactly on all fours with the present one. There was a recommital of the bill substantially without instructions, and a new bill was formulated so far as the particular item then under consideration was concerned. The ruling of the Chair on that occasion was, wi hout doubt the bill was subject to the point of order only for the factit had been waived by entering on the discussion of the merits of the amendments.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. T he Chair hopes the gentleman will give the reference to that decision.

Mr. NELSON. I wish to say, being the party referred to, the gentleman is mistaken in his statement of that case.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It may be something else, but the question was precisely what I have said. The motion was to strike out the entire bill and insert, as I remember, and the present occupant of the chair on that occasion made the decision.

The question is whether by reference to the committee reporting a bill it can report back a new bill, because if you can do it in reference to one matter you can do it in reference to all. Now, can you evade the effect of the rule requiring a bill to be considered in the Committee of the Whole House by simply reporting back an amendment wiping out the entire bill and bringing in a new bill from the Committee on Appropriations or any other committee of the House?

Mr. RANDALL. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that there is not in the bill itself or any amendment of the bill anything whatever that has not been considered already in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NELSON. Reference has been made to the point of order on the river and harbor bill of last year. It was made by myself, and the gentleman has not stated it truly; we had been considering the river and harbor bill for several days, and progressed only a page or two.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Just as we have done here in the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. NELSON. I moved a substitute for the entire bill, which was adopted in the Committee of the Whole, and the committee rose and reported that substitute to the House. Then the House as a House struck it out and adopted the original bill. The point of order was made that my substitute for the entire bill was not in order until the whole bill was read. The point was made to the Chair. That was the precise question. It has no relevancy to this point, and I have merely stated it to get the facts correctly before the House.

Mr. BUCHANAN. When the point of order was raised by the gentleman in charge of this bill against the amendment offered by my colleague [Mr. LEHLBACH] proposing a slight increase and a proper one to two engineers named in the bill, and certain points of order were also made by the Committee on Appropriations against amendments submitted by myself raising the pay of, in one case one, in another case two, laborers employed in the Departments from $360 per year to $180, it seemed to me only proper, if the Committee on Appropriations were so anxious to have the rules observed, they should be compelled to observe those rules themselves.

These points of order in reference to the salaries named by the gentleman from Pennsylvania have been so ruled on that I think it has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of this House that the rules as construed and expounded by the occupant of the chair, if insisted upon, provide the only way we can complete this bill is, by filling the blanks with the amounts named in the statute law, and not the amounts named by the committee. But I am satisfied the committee do not mean to so fill those blanks, for, as I understand, the amendments which the chairman is instructed to report and ask concurrence in are of the same character as the parts which were originally struck out on the points of order in the Committee of the Whole, and are just as obnoxious to a point of order. But suppose the point is raised and they are ruled out of order, the bill will be then recommitted, and again the Committee on Appropriations will come serenely in with proposals just as obnoxious, and no progress in legislation is made.

These appropriation bills are already farther in arrears than ever known before in the history of Congress. During the whole month of December this House was in actual session just ten hours and two minutes. This bill should have been properly prepared, passed in accordance with the rules, and in the hands of the Senate long ago.

I am satisfied that I have performed my duty in endeavoring to have the committee observe the rules and the law, and I am just as well satisfied the committee mean to observe neither; and I hope now that all points of order against the bill will be withdrawn, and that the bill will be allowed to go to the Senate without delay, in order that that body may act upon it in time for these laborers named in the bill to be paid promptly for the first month of the coming fiscal year.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair understands the point of order to be withdrawn.

Mr. HERMANN. I renew it.

Mr. GIFFORD. And I wish to renew it also.

Mr. RANDALL. I ask unanimous consent to extend the time of this day's session until this matter is disposed of, and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SPINOLA] may have an opportunity of introducing a bill conferring upon General Sheridan the rank of full general.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Let that be done now.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to extend the time until the consideration of the legislative bill can be completed, and the proposition of the gentleman from New York [Mr. SPINOLA] acted upon, in relation to creating the office of General of the Army?

Mr. REED. I hardly think these two propositions should be coupled in that way.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Will the Chair state the proposition again?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It is to extend the hour beyond 5 o'clock, fixed for adjournment, in order to complete the consideration of the bill under consideration, and also to enable the gentleman from New York to call up for consideration the bill to create the office of General of the Army.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania fix any time?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. No time has been fixed.

Mr. RANDALL. In my judgment it will not take over a quarter of an hour.

Mr. MCKINLEY. The gentleman suggests that it will take but fifteen minutes. In order to avoid any difficulty I suggest a half hour.

Mr. BLAND. I think we had better have the time without limit, or I shall otherwise object.

Mr. SOWDEN. Say until both of these measures are through.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania object?

Mr. SOWDEN. No; but I want the time extended until these two measures are finally disposed of.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will again ask: Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to continue the session until the legislative bill is finally disposed of, and also the bill creating the office of general?

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

Mr. BLAND. Regular order.

Mr. RANDALL. I am willing, then, to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SPINOLA] to call up that bill now.

Mr. ROGERS. I rise to make a privileged report. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is the further consideration of the legislative appropriation bill.

Mr. PETERS. I rise to a question of order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PETERS. I am informed that some one withdrew the point of order I made. I desire to state that I did not withdraw it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair stated that the impression of the Chair was that the point of order had been withdrawn; but thereupon it was renewed by several gentlemen, and was so recognized by the Chair.

Mr. PETERS. I did not withdraw it.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I desire to ask unanimous consent to submit a suggestion to the House. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The demand for the regular order cuts off all requests.

Mr. McKINLEY. I desired simply to ask unanimous consent that the Sheridan bill be taken up and disposed of before 5 o'clock.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order has been demanded, and the legislative appropriation bill is now before the House.

Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania state that there is no new provision or clause in the bill as it came from the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. RANDALL. I state that there is no matter in the bill that has not been considered and acted upon in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, nor is there in the amendments.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That being so, the Chair is of opinion——

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I wish to ask a question for information, whether the amendment reported——

Mr. SPINOLA. I ask unanimous consent to present this bill for present consideration. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that the regular order has been demanded by several gentlemen, and this appropriation bill is the regular order.

Mr. SPINOLA. But will the Speaker hear a proposition?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order having been demanded, the Chair is unable to do anything but recognize the demand.

Mr. GOFF. But the gentleman wishes to submit an additional request, to which objection may not be made.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is the demand for the regular order withdrawn?

Mr. RANDALL. I demand the regular order for the purpose of getting a decision on the point of order before 5 o'clock, which is now near at hand.

Mr. SOWDEN. I would like to know who the gentleman was that demanded the regular order. We have a right to know.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It has been demanded by several gentlemen.

Mr. SOWDEN. But who was it that objected?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair has stated that a number of gentlemen demanded it.

Mr. SOWDEN. I would like to know the name of any one of them.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE] objected for one, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] demanded the regular order, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] demands the regular order to obtain a ruling upon the point of order.

Mr. SPINOLA. Will the Chair permit me to make a statement of a half a minute? [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair does not remember any decision bearing upon this point of order except one case where there had been a recommittal of a bill with instructions, after it had been considered in Committee of the Whole, which bill on being reported back with a statement from the committee that there was no new matter in the bill which had not been considered in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, was admitted for consideration in the House and the report was sustained.

Clause 3, of Rule XXIII, provides:

> All motions or propositions involving a tax or charge upon the people; all proceedings touching appropriations of money or bills making appropriations of money or property, etc., shall be first considered in a Committee of the Whole.

This bill was considered in Committee of the Whole, as required by the rule, and was reported back to the House. A controversy arising about some blanks existing in the bill, it was recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations. The gentleman from Pennsylvania, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, now reports it back with the statement that no clause or appropriation has been added which was not considered in the Committee of the Whole. The rule does not provide that it shall have more than one consideration in Committee of the Whole.

To hold now that the rule required this bill to be again considered in Committee of the Whole, would make it necessary to go through with the entire bill, section by section, in Committee of the Whole, if demanded; for it would be impossible to have a part of the bill pending in the House and other portions in the committee. The Chair is not of opinion that such a proceeding was contemplated by the rule, when provision was made that the bill "shall be first considered in a Committee of the Whole," and thinks that there has been a compliance with the rule.

The Chair thinks the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania brings this bill within the decision cited, and overrules the point of order, the gentleman having stated that there is no clause or provision reported by the committee that has not received consideration in Committee of the Whole. The Clerk will report the bill.

Mr. PETERS. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia to lay the appeal of the gentleman from Kansas on the table.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Upon that motion I call for the yeas and nays.

The question being put on ordering the yeas and nays, the Speaker *pro tempore* stated that evidently a sufficient number had arisen.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I withdraw the call for the yeas and nays and demand a division of the House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to declare that the House stands adjourned until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. C. H. ALLEN: A bill (H. R. 10269) granting a pension to John J. Gorham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARUTH: A bill (H. R. 10270) for the relief of Patrick Henry Sohan—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CULBERSON: A bill (H. R. 10271) for the relief of John M. Aycock—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GOFF: A bill (H. R. 10272) for the relief of James M. Weekley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRANGER: A bill (H. R. 10273) authorizing the President of the United States to appoint William Barrymore, of Connecticut, to be a junior lieutenant, not in the line of promotion, in the Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANE: A bill (H. R. 10274) granting a pension to Joseph W. Filler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10275) granting a pension to Joseph Hunter, M. D.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McADOO: A bill (H. R. 10276) amending an act entitled "An act granting a pension to Joseph M. Potter," approved March 3, 1887—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 10277) to place the name of G. W. Cook, of Jackson County, Kentucky, on the muster-roll of Company A, Forty-seventh Kentucky Volunteers—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MATSON: A bill (H. R. 10278) for the relief of Francis M. McDonald—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10279) granting a pension to William A. Moore—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WICKHAM: A bill (H. R. 10280) granting a pension to Lana Loder—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRIMES: A bill (H. R. 10281) for the relief of J. S. Miller—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10282) for the relief of William Amis—to the Committee on War Claims.

Change in the reference of the following bill, improperly referred, was made, namely:

A bill (H. R. 9832) granting a pension to Mrs. Mary T. Barnes—from the Committee on Invalid Pensions to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. C. H. ALLEN: Petition of John J. Gorham, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. M. ALLEN: Petition of Catherine Condra, widow of Louis Condra, of Tishomingo County, Mississippi, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. C. S. BAKER: Petition of Mrs. J. N. Hinolf, heir of S. W. Roys, of Savannah, Nebr., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BELDEN: Petition of J. C. Miller and others, of Baldwinville, N. Y., in favor of adhering to our past policy of protection for all American productions—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. T. H. B. BROWNE: Memorial of the mayor and other citizens of San Francisco, Cal., for the passage of a bill for quarantine at that place—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CARUTH: Paper relating to the claim of Patrick Henry Sohan, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CLARDY: Petition of 71 citizens of Madison County, Missouri, for the amendment of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. R. H. M. DAVIDSON: Petition of J. W. V. P. Plummer, mayor, and 163 citizens, of Key West, and of L. P. Thompson and 28 others, citizens of Florida, to increase the duty on stripped tobacco, on leaf-tobacco without stems, to 75 cents per pound—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DAVIS: Petition of J. D. Hathaway and 21 others, citizens of Bristol County, Massachusetts, in favor of an amendment to the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. ENLOE: Petition of executor of William P. Tharp, of Rutherford County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAYES: Petition for a pension for George R. Wells, of Buffalo, Iowa—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. S. I. HOPKINS: Petition of manufacturers and bankers of Lynchburgh, Va., for the immediate repeal of the tobacco tax—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. JONES: Petition of Charles H. McKee and others, citizens of Selma, Ala., favoring the Cullom-Breckinridge bill—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. LEE: Petition of citizens of Fairfax County, Virginia, for pure food—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of Webster & Co., of Boston, Mass., for better postal facilities—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MCCLAMMY: Petition of Hiram Grantham, heir of Needham Grantham, of Sampson County, North Carolina, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MAISH: Petition of Henry Alexander, late a private Company I, Maryland Volunteer Infantry, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEAL: Petition of administrator of Ann Latspeich, of Monroe County, Tennessee, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHARLES O'NEILL: Petition of C. P. B. Jeffreys, of Philadelphia, Pa., for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. H. O'NEALL: Petition of T. J. Downs and others, for a branch of the Soldiers' Home in Indiana—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PETERS: Petition of C. A. Haulenbeck and 52 others, of McPherson County, Kansas, for an amendment to the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, affidavit of Dr. W. W. Speirs, in the case of J. A. Underwood—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition of Hudson Harris, and of James B. and Joseph B. Abington, of Fayette County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of James F. Brooks, and of B. F. Reid, guardian heirs of Mary S. Sims, of Rutherford County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of administrator of John B. Hawkins, of Franklin County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: Petition of Joel S. Mansur, heir of Hiram Mansur; of Josephine Roberts, heir of Stephen Roberts; and of Susan Lee Mansur, heir of George Snizer, of Louisiana, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SENEY: Petition of Findlay (Ohio) Assembly, No. 656, and of Tiffin (Ohio) Assembly, No. 2698, Knights of Labor, against civil pensions—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TILLMAN: Petition of John H. Ruddell, executor of Reuben R. Turner, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TOWNSHEND: Petitions and affidavits to accompany House bill 9947, for the relief of John Morrison—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of administrator of Joseph A. Aldrich, and of Robert T. Sweeney, of Davidson County, Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITTHORNE: Petition of N. R. Wilkes, administrator of Richard L. Porter, of Maury County, Tennessee, for payment of his war claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

The following petitions in favor of House bill 9716, for the better protection of free labor from convict labor, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Labor:

By Mr. FUNSTON: Of Knights of Labor of Pleasanton, Kans.

By Mr. HERBERT: Of Knights of Labor of Montgomery, Ala.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Of Michael Bush and others, of Florence, Wis.

By Mr. CHARLES STEWART: Of citizens of Orange County, Texas.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. GRIMES: Of R. G. T. Halley, G. W. Newsom, and other citizens of Taylor County, Georgia.

By Mr. MAISH: Of A. Steward, M. D., and others, of Delta, Pa.

The following petition for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, was received and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. HERMANN: Of sundry citizens of Oregon.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. FINLEY: Of ex-soldiers of Greensburgh, Ky.

By Mr. MATSON: Of 36 citizens of Staunton, Nebr.

The following petition for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. HUNTER: Of M. C. Gittings and 63 others, of Gittings, Ky.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. T. J. HENDERSON: Of 131 citizens of Putnam and Lee Counties, Illinois.

By Mr. PAYSON: Of 165 citizens of Iroquois County, Illinois.

By Mr. PERKINS: Of 52 citizens of Elk County, Kansas.

By Mr. CHARLES STEWART: Of 25 citizens of Harris County, Texas.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *June* 1, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented the petition of Charles E. French, a citizen of Massachusetts, praying for the passage of an amendment to the bill for refunding the public debt that would eliminate the fifty-year provision thereof; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Allen County, Kansas, praying for the passage of an amendment to the interstate-commerce law which will give all fines and penalties collected in prosecutions under that law to the complainants; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Ashland, Wis., praying for such amendment of the interstate-commerce law as will prevent its gross violations as at present by the railroad companies of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of John Pope Hodnett, "president and founder of the United Labor League of America," praying to be allowed "permission to carry a deadly weapon on his person both day and night in the District of Columbia;" which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PADDOCK presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Stromsburgh, Nebr., praying for the passage of the refunding measure for the Pacific railroads known as the Outhwaite bill; which was referred to the Select Committee on the President's Message transmitting the Report of the Pacific Railway Commission.

Mr. PALMER presented the petition of H. C. Coburn and 36 other citizens of Montcalm County, Michigan, praying for an amendment of the interstate-commerce law to give the complainants all fines and penalties which may be collected in prosecutions under that law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Thompson Kirby and 58 other ex-Union soldiers and sailors, citizens of Ashley, Mich., praying for the passage of the per diem rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HAMPTON presented the petition of J. A. Whitman, M. D., and 28 other citizens of Beaufort, S. C., praying for the passage of the Platt prohibition bill for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. GRAY presented the petition of John W. B. Killgore and 22 other citizens of Newport, Del., praying for the passage of the Platt bill providing for prohibition in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. CULLOM presented a petition of Dunlap Grange, No. 919, Patrons of Husbandry, located at Dunlap, Ill., praying for the passage of the bill to create a department of agriculture with a Cabinet officer at its head; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. MANDERSON presented a petition of George B. Durkee and 26 other citizens of Hansen, Nebr., praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented the petition of John Barsby and about 300 other citizens of Nebraska, praying for the passage of the rated service-pension bill; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Stromsburgh, Nebr., praying for the passage of the Outhwaite Pacific Railroad funding bill; which was referred to the Select Committee on the President's Message transmitting the Report of the Pacific Railway Commission.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a resolution adopted at the annual meet-

ing of the Missouri State Medical Association, held at Kansas City, Mo., in April, 1888, in regard to epidemic diseases, recommending that external quarantine measures should be under the control and direction of Federal authority, so as to afford the highest degree of protection to the people of this country, and favoring Congressional action looking to that end. I move that the resolution be referred to the Committee on Epidemic Diseases.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR presented the petition of John J. Gorman, of Billerica, Middlesex County, Massachusetts, praying to be allowed a pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

ORRIS A. BROWNE.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I am instructed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 5859) to remove the political disabilities of Orris A. Browne, of Virginia, to report the same adversely, with a written report, the ground of the report being that this gentleman at the time he left any connection with the authorities of the United States was simply a naval cadet at Annapolis, and the committee are clearly of opinion—there can be no doubt about it on examining the statutes—that he is not under disabilities now. They were removed by the general act of 1871 as to everybody except an enumerated class of officers of the United States, and this gentleman was not an officer either in the Army or the Navy. The committee therefore recommend that the bill be indefinitely postponed for the reason that the gentleman is not under any disability whatever.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be indefinitely postponed, if there be no objection; and the report will be printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 3066) for the relief of Mrs. Mary T. Duncan; which was read twice by its title, and, with the papers on file in the case, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. HARRIS (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3067) for the improvement of Rock Creek, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3068) providing for the distribution of public documents to depositories and other public libraries; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

Mr. PALMER (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3069) granting pay and allowances of a second lieutenant of infantry to Charles L. Jenny; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3070) for the relief of John Anthony Orleman and Mary Albina Wilhelmina Orleman; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 3071) granting a pension to William H. Cummings; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3072) granting a pension to John J. Gorham; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 3073) granting a pension to Silas G. Brown; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. VOORHEES introduced a bill (S. 3074) for the relief of Nicholas J. Bigley; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CALL introduced a bill (S. 3075) to require preference to be given to citizens of the States and localities where the mails are to be carried in all mail lettings; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. COCKRELL (by request) introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 88) providing for printing public documents for sale; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. CULLOM submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. COCKRELL. I submit an amendment intended to be proposed to the bill (H. R. 2952) for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies taken and used by the United States Army, as reported by the Court of Claims, under the provisions of the act of March 3, 1883, known as the Bowman act. The amendment provides for an appropriation to Sarah E. B. Smith, of Scotland County, Missouri, for $837.50, and I accompany it with the findings of fact made by the Court of Claims. I move that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Claims and printed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. PALMER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ELIZA DOUGLASS.

Mr. DAVIS. I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate indefinitely postponed the bill (S. 2812) for the relief of Eliza Douglass, and that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to; and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Pensions.

ANASTASIA ISLAND.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business, the Chair lays before the Senate a resolution introduced by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL], coming over from a former day, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. CALL, as follows:

Resolved, That the Attorney-General of the United States is hereby directed to report to the Senate whether Anastasia Island, near St. Augustine, Fla., is the property of the United States, and whether the whole or any part is covered by any grant from Spain which has been confirmed and is recognized as valid by the United States under the treaty between Spain and the United States for the cession of the provinces of the East and West Floridas made in 1819.

Mr. CALL. I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. DAWES. If there is no further morning business, I move to take up the Indian appropriation bill.

Mr. BROWN. I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to allow me only a few minutes to call up the bill which I gave notice I should ask the Senate to consider this morning.

Mr. DAWES. Let me get up the appropriation bill, and then I will yield.

Mr. BROWN. Very well.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8565) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

AGRICULTURAL EXPERIMENTAL STATIONS.

Mr. BROWN. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1358, House bill 7222.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Georgia asks unanimous consent that the pending business be informally laid aside for the purpose of considering a bill the title of which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7222) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish agricultural stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto."

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BROWN. I have conferred with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB], who objected to the bill last evening, and we have agreed on certain amendments which I will now propose to the Senate.

At the end of line 9 I move to strike out the word "and" and insert the word "but;" so as to read:

But that such installments of the appropriations as may be now due or may hereafter become due, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. In line 10 I move to strike out the word "that," before the word "such," and insert the words "as to;" so as to read:

But as to such installments of the appropriations, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. In line 11, after the word "due," where it occurs the second time, I move to strike out the word "and" and insert the word "when;" so as to read:

Or may hereafter become due when the Legislature may not be in session.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. In line 14, after the word "he," I move to strike out the word "will" and insert the word "shall;" so as to read:

And upon a duly certified copy thereof to the Secretary of the Treasury he shall cause the same to be paid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Georgia desire a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments?

Mr. BROWN. I ask that a committee of conference be requested,

though I think the House of Representatives will concur in the amendments. I move that the Senate request a conference with the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. PADDOCK, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BLAIR were appointed.

DISTRICT BELT LINE RAILWAY.

Mr. HARRIS. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that it consider at this time Order of Business 1233, Senate bill 1580. I shall be absent from the sessions of the Senate for a few days after to-day, and would be glad to have this bill considered at this time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the pending business may be informally laid aside for the purpose of considering the bill (S. 1580) to amend an act entitled "An act incorporating the Capitol, North O Street and South Washington Railway Company." Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 11, after the words "Louisiana avenue," to strike out "east on Louisiana avenue to Pennsylvania avenue, diagonally crossing Pennsylvania avenue to Market Space, east along Market Space to," and insert "north on Ninth street to D street northwest, east on D street northwest to;" and in line 21, before the word "street," to strike out "Fifth" and insert "Fifteenth," so as to read:

Second. Beginning at Ninth street northwest and Louisiana avenue, north on Ninth street to D street northwest, east on D street northwest to Louisiana avenue, northeast along Louisiana avenue to Indiana avenue, southeast along Indiana avenue to C street northwest to its intersection with C street northeast, east along C street northeast, passing around Stanton square to Eleventh street northeast, with the privilege of extending the same on C street to Tennessee avenue, northeast on said avenue to Fifteenth street northeast, north along said Fifteenth street to its intersection with Benning Bridge road, after said streets and avenue shall have been graded.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, after the words "direction of the," at the end of line 3, to strike out "engineer commissioner of said Board of Commissioners," and insert "commissioners of the District;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That the rails for the said extension shall be approved by the commissioners of the District of Columbia, and shall be laid under the supervision and direction of the commissioners of the District of Columbia. Unless said extensions are constructed and the cars run thereon within two years from and after the passage and approval of this act, the authority herein granted shall be void.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, line 3, after the words "thereon the," to strike out "said" and insert "stock of the said;" in line 5, after the words "authorized to," to strike out "increase its capital stock in the" and insert "be increased to an amount equal to the cost of construction and equipment of said extension and the cost of real estate and buildings necessary to the same, not to exceed in the aggregate the;" and in line 9, after the words "sum of," to strike out "not more than" and insert "$250,000;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That for the purpose of the construction and equipment of said extensions, the purchase of land and the construction of necessary buildings thereon the stock of the said Capitol, North O Street and South Washington Railway Company is hereby authorized to be increased to an amount equal to the cost of construction and equipment of said extension and the cost of real estate and buildings necessary to the same, not to exceed in the aggregate the sum of $250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add as a new section:

SEC. 4. That section 3 of the act entitled "An act to amend the charter of the Capitol, North O Street and South Washington Railway Company," approved March 3, 1881, be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

Mr. EDMUNDS. What is the third section of the act referred to?

Mr. HARRIS. It is in respect of the little detached line from Pennsylvania avenue to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing. By this arrangement that detached part becomes a link in the general line of the road. The third section of the act of 1881 simply required that upon that little short line a higher rate of fare than 2 cents should not be charged, but now it becomes a link in the entire line of road, and if that section remains a passenger could get on at that point and travel all around the city for 2 cents.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add as a new section:

SEC. 5. That all the provisions of the charter of said railway company as they exist at this time shall apply to the extensions herein granted.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. EDMUNDS. Is there any provision in the bill reserving the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act?

Mr. HARRIS. That is in the original charter, but if it is not in this—I do not know whether it is in or not—I have no objection to putting it in.

Mr. EDMUNDS. I move to add the following as a new section:

SEC. 6. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 1948) to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River, in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark.; and

A bill (S. 2210) to revive the grade of General in the United States Army.

BENJAMIN T. BAKER.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from New Hampshire rise to morning business?

Mr. BLAIR. I do not. I wish to have a pension bill passed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. DAWES. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] took advantage of my not attending to my own business and got a bill through. I do not know that I can yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BLAIR. I could have made my peace with the Senator from Massachusetts and would not trouble the Senate but for the bill I wish to call up being one that seems to appeal with unusually strong reasons for immediate action. It is the pension case of a very old man who is entirely disabled and poor, and who has for a long time been taken care of by his wife. She has lately met with an accident and both are now entirely helpless. I desire to have the bill make progress if possible. I have received a letter in regard to it. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2825) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin T. Baker.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill indicated by the Senator from New Hampshire?

By unanimous consent the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out the words "a seaman," and insert "a quartermaster on the United States steamer Spuyten Duyvil;" so as to make the bill read:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Benjamin T. Baker, late a quartermaster on the United States steamer Spuyten Duyvil in the United States Navy, and pay him at the rate of $72 per month in lieu of that which he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is there any report in that case?

Mr. BLAIR. Yes, there is a printed report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Missouri desire to have the report read?

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to have some reason given why this pension should be increased to $72 a month. What is the rate he is now receiving?

Mr. BLAIR. He is receiving $24 now, and is entirely helpless.

Mr. COCKRELL. He will be entitled under the law now to have the pension increased to $72 a month in the Pension Office if he is entirely helpless.

Mr. BLAIR. He is so entitled upon the facts. I can not say in regard to what the Pension Office would do. I do not know whether he would be considered entitled there or not; but it is a case where I know something of the great necessity, of the great disability, and the great need. The bill has proceeded thus far, and it is important that there should be immediate action. It is like a great many other cases where we have made increases.

Mr. COCKRELL. Here is the question I want to get at: Has not the Pension Office ample authority, upon competent evidence showing the kind of disability referred to—total disability—to increase this pension and allow him $72 per month without any special act of Congress?

Mr. BLAIR. I do not know whether it has or not.

Mr. COCKRELL. Is not that the amount allowed for total disability?

Mr. BLAIR. In some cases they get it and in some cases they do not.

Mr. COCKRELL. The question is, what is the amount allowed by law for total disability when it is proved and established in the Pension Office? I ask the Senator for information. I am under the impression that the law explicitly allows $72 a month for total disability.

Mr. BLAIR. This is a case which has been examined once or twice in the Pension Office, and where the Pension Office has made a rating at $24 a month. The evidence has been filed with the Committee of

Pensions and carefully examined, and it is the opinion of the committee, from the evidence, that the rating should be $72 a month. I do not know whether the Pension Office has power, if it sees fit, to allow a pension at the rate of $72 a month, where there is an equal opportunity——

Mr. COCKRELL. I think I know what the law is. I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Missouri calls for the regular order.

Mr. VOORHEES. Before the regular order is called, I think I can relieve this point of embarrassment.

There are a class of cases which were pensionable at $72 a month by the Pension Office under the general law, such as total blindness and perhaps one or two other kinds of disability. An attempt was made to increase the pension of every person laboring under total disability to $72 a month, and that was successful as to the cases that had been adjusted. I had occasion during this session to examine into the case of an officer from New York who was laboring under total disability, and I found that that act simply fixed the amount of pension to be received by those already on the pension-rolls, and did not operate *in futuro*. The consequence is that the kind of case the Senator from New Hampshire is representing calls for $50 a month, and that is the highest they can go in the office. I had occasion to go over the ground, and in a case of total disability under the law (I need not go into an explanation of its intricacies, you may rely upon what I say) the best that can be done in such a case is $50 a month.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the further consideration of this bill?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes, Mr. President, I must see the law on that question. It will only take a short time for me to hunt up the law.

Mr. SHERMAN. With the consent of the Senator from Massachusetts I wish to call attention——

Mr. BLAIR. Unanimous consent was given to the consideration of this case. I do not know whether it is now subject to a call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. An objection can be interposed at any time.

JAMES B. MITCHELL.

Mr. SHERMAN. If House bill 615, which I wish to bring to the attention of the Senate, is read, and a short report is read, I have no doubt it will pass by unanimous consent, and I am willing to have it taken up subject to a call for the regular order. I make the request now because the man is in extremity. I am assured that he is now in great need of the small sum of money appropriated by the bill. He is very poor.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Massachusetts yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. DAWES. Yes, I will yield for fifteen or twenty minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. If there is any objection to the bill, I will let it go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 615) for the relief of James B. Mitchell.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It proposes to pay to James B. Mitchell $438 for services as surveyor of customs at the port of Yorktown, Va., from September 7, 1882, to January 31, 1883.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AARON FRIEDHEIM.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. BERRY] has a bill which he desires to call up.

Mr. BERRY. If the Senator will consent, as it will take but a moment, I ask unanimous consent to call up the bill (S. 2882) to pay Aaron Friedheim the rebate due him under the act of March 3, A. D. 1883.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It provides that the sum of $22.07 shall be paid to Aaron Friedheim, of Camden, Ouachita County, Arkansas, for the rebate due him under the act of March 3, 1883, of taxes paid on tobacco, snuff, cigars, and cigarettes, the claim for which having been lost in the transmission thereof.

Mr. BERRY. This is a bill in which my colleague [Mr. JONES, of Arkansas], is specially interested and I have called it up in his behalf.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Shall the bill pass?

Mr. BLAIR. I object, and call for the regular order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire objects.

Mr. BERRY. I ask if an objection can be interposed when the bill has been before the Senate by unanimous consent and the question is upon its passage?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. An objection can be interposed at any time.

Mr. BERRY. I hope the Senator from New Hampshire will withdraw his objection. I surely had nothing to do with stopping his pension bill.

Mr. BLAIR. I tried to get a bill through this morning, and an objection which went just like a hot iron through the heart of a man's mother was made here, and I feel a little as though when that bill could not be considered no other private bill should, because the bill I had called up was an act of humanity of the most pressing nature.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair must remind the Senator that debate is not in order.

Mr. COCKRELL. Does the Senator suppose that that kind of talk will make me withdraw my objection to his bill?

Mr. BLAIR. What does the Senator say?

Mr. COCKRELL. I say——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Debate is not in order. Does the Senator from New Hampshire insist on his objection?

Mr. BLAIR. No; I suppose I had better withdraw the objection.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is, shall the bill pass?

The bill was passed.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (S. 2210) to revive the grade of General in the United States Army; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Indian appropriation bill will be proceeded with.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 8565) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. DAWES. I ask that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, and that the committee amendments be considered as the reading of the bill proceeds.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

The Secretary proceeded to read the bill.

The first amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations was, in section 1, line 9, before the word "agents," to strike out "fifty-nine" and insert "fifty-eight;" so as to make the clause read:

For pay of fifty-eight agents of Indian affairs at the following-named agencies, at the rates respectively indicated, namely.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, to strike out lines 24 and 25, as follows:

At the Nisqually and S'Kokomish agency, at $1,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, to strike out line 26, as follows:

At the Quinaielt agency, at $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 26, to insert:

At the Puyallup (consolidated) agency, embracing Nisqually and S'Kokomish and Quinaielt agencies, at $1,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 96, to reduce the appropriation for pay of agent "at the Osage agency" from $2,200 to $1,800.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 118, to reduce the total amount of the appropriation for pay of Indian agents from $89,200 to $88,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 132, after the word "one," to strike out "superintend" and insert "superintendent;" and in line 133, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three" and insert "four;" so as to make the clause read:

Pay of one superintendent of Indian schools, $4,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was in the appropriations for "fulfilling treaty stipulations with and support of Indian tribes," in section 1, after line 339, to insert:

For payment of the balance of principal and interest of Kaw or Kansas Indian scrip, pursuant to the provisions of the Indian appropriation act for the year ending June 30, 1886, approved March 3, 1885, $65,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be paid out of the sum of $200,000 accruing to said Indians for cession of lands under article 2 of treaty entered into by said tribe with the United States, dated January 14, 1846, and to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the proceeds of sales of Kansas Indian lands realized hereafter shall be applied to the reimbursement of the said fund of $200,000 of the amount paid out under this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 399, to insert as a head-line "Miamies of Eel River;" and at the beginning of line 401

to strike out "Fulfilling treaties with Miamies of Eel River;" so as to read:

Miamies of Eel River:
This amount to be paid per capita to the Miamies of Eel River, being in full of all demands under their treaties with the United States dated August 3, 1795, August 23, 1805, and September 30, 1809, $22,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 438, to strike out the following clause:

Omahas:
For sixth of twelve installments, being last series, in moneys or otherwise, per fourth article of treaty of March 16, 1854, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 529, to insert as a head-line "Pottawatomies of Huron;" and at the beginning of line 536 to strike out "Fulfilling treaties with Pottawatomies of Huron;" so as to make the clause read:

Pottawatomies of Huron:
This amount to be paid per capita to the Pottawatomies of Huron, being in full for the permanent annuity, in money or otherwise, guarantied to them under the second article of treaty dated November 17, 1807, $8,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for fulfilling treaty stipulations with and support of "Quapaws," in section 1, line 538, after the word "education," to insert "during the pleasure of the President;" so as to make the clause read:

Quapaws:
For education, during the pleasure of the President, per third article of treaty of May 13, 1833, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for fulfilling treaty stipulations with and support of "Shoshones and Bannocks," in section 1, line 665, before the word "article," to insert "eighth;" so as to make the clause read:

For pay of second blacksmith, and such iron and steel and other materials as may be required, per eighth article of the same treaty, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for fulfilling treaty stipulations with and support of "Sioux of different tribes, including Santee Sioux of Nebraska," in section 1, line 694, after the words "per head for," to strike out "eight thousand persons roaming" and insert "such persons as roam and hunt, as per tenth article of same treaty;" in line 696, before the word "thousand," to strike out "eighty" and insert "fifty;" and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "or so much thereof as may be necessary;" so as to make the clause read:

For nineteenth of thirty installments, to purchase such articles as may be considered proper by the Secretary of the Interior, at $10 per head, for such persons as roam and hunt, as per tenth article of same treaty, $50,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, before the word "persons," in line 701, to strike out "three thousand five hundred;" in the same line, after the word "agriculture," to insert "as per tenth article of same treaty;" in line 702, before the word "thousand," to strike out "seventy" and insert "one hundred;" and in the same line, after the word "dollars," to insert "or so much thereof as may be necessary;" so as to make the clause read:

For nineteenth of thirty installments, to purchase such articles as may be considered proper by the Secretary of the Interior, at $20 per head, for persons engaged in agriculture, as per tenth article of same treaty, $100,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 716, after the word "dollars," to strike out the semicolon and insert a colon, and after the colon to insert:

Provided, That this sum shall include transportation of supplies from the termination of railroad or steam-boat transportation; and in this service Indians shall be employed wherever practicable.

So as to make the clause read:

For subsistence of the Sioux, and for purposes of their civilization, as per agreement ratified by act of Congress approved February 28, 1877, $1,000,000: *Provided*, That this sum shall include transportation of supplies from the termination of railroad or steam-boat transportation; and in this service Indians shall be employed wherever practicable.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 734, to insert as a head-line, "Sioux, Medawakanton band;" in line 737, before the word "band," to strike out "Medwakanton" and insert "Medawakanton;" in line 743, after the word "lands," to strike out "and in making improvements thereon;" and in line 748, before the word "thousand," to strike out "two" and insert "one;" so as to make the clause read:

For the support of the full-blood Indians in Minnesota, belonging to the Medawakanton band of Sioux Indians, who have resided in said State since the 24th day of May, A. D. 1886, and severed their tribal relations, $20,000, to be expended by the Secretary of the Interior in the purchase, in such manner as in his judgment he may deem best, of agricultural implements, cattle, horses, and lands: *Provided*, That of this amount the Secretary, if he may deem it for the best interests of said Indians, may cause to be erected for the use of the said Indians at the most suitable location, a school-house, at a cost not exceeding $1,000: *And provided also*, That he may appoint a suitable person to make the above-mentioned expenditures under his direction, the expense of the same to be paid out of this appropriation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "miscellaneous supports," in section 1, to strike out lines 817 and 818, as follows:

For subsistence and civilization of the Assinaboines in Montana, including pay of employés, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, to strike out the clause from line 819 to line 821, inclusive, as follows:

For support, education, and civilization of Blackfeet, Bloods, and Piegans including pay of employés, $70,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, to strike out the clause from line 854 to line 856, inclusive, as follows:

For support and civilization of the Gros Ventres in Montana, and for pay of employés, $30,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, to strike out the clause from line 866 to line 875, inclusive, as follows:

Support of Indians of Fort Peck agency: For this amount, to be expended in such goods, provisions, and other useful articles as the President may, from time to time, determine, in instructing in agricultural and mechanical pursuits, providing employés, educating children, procuring medicine and medical attendance, care for and support of the aged, sick, and infirm, for the helpless orphans of said Indians, and in any respect to promote their civilization, comfort, and improvement, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 901, after the word "employés," to strike out "and material for houses, fifteen thousand," and insert "seven thousand five hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

For support and civilization of the Navajo Indians, including pay of employés, $7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 902, to insert:

For continuing the work of constructing ditches and reservoirs for the Navajo Indians, and for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of a portable sawmill for the use of said Indians, and for the purchase of nails and such other necessary materials as can not be obtained by the Indians for houses to be constructed by them, $15,000, to be taken from the funds now in the Treasury belonging to said Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 921, to insert:

For support and education of the Seminole and Creek Indians in Florida, for the erection and furnishing of a school-house, for the employment of teachers, and for the purchase of seeds and agricultural implements and other necessary articles, $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 45, after the word "dollars," to strike out:

The various amounts appropriated in this act for the support, maintenance, civilization, pay of employés, etc., of the Indians in Montana receiving rations at Fort Peck, Fort Belknap, and Blackfeet agencies, respectively, shall not be expended, provided the several agreements made with them by the agents of the United States in December, 1885, and January and February, 1887, be ratified by Congress. The first installment stipulated in said agreements to take the place of said appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "general incidental expenses of the Indian service," in section 1, at the beginning of line 957, to strike out "general" and insert "incidental expenses of Indian service in Arizona: For general;" so as to make the clause read:

Incidental expenses of Indian service in Arizona: For general incidental expenses of Indian service, including traveling expenses of agents, in Arizona, $4,000; for the support and civilization of Indians at the Colorado River, Pima, and Maricopa and Moquis Pueblo agencies, $8,000; and pay of employés at same agencies, $8,000; in all, $20,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 970, after the word "carpenter," to insert "(for Hoopa Valley Agency);" so as to make the clause read:

Incidental expenses of Indian service in California: For general incidental expenses of the Indian service, including traveling expenses of agents, in California, and support and civilization of Indians at the Round Valley, Hoopa Valley, Tule River, and Mission agencies, $18,000; and pay of employés, including one carpenter (for Hoopa Valley Agency), at same agencies, $9,000; in all, $27,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary resumed and continued the reading of the bill to the end of the following paragraph, under the head of "Miscellaneous:"

To enable the Secretary of the Interior to employ practical farmers, in addition to the agency farmers now employed, at wages not exceeding $75 each per month, to superintend and direct farming among such Indians as are making effort for self-support, $50,000; and no person shall be employed as such farmer who has not been for at least five years previous to such employment practically engaged in the occupation of farming.

Mr. JONES, of Arkansas. I move to amend that paragraph by adding words which I offer with the approval of the committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It has been customary to go through with committee amendments first. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill. The next amend-

ment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in section 1, under the head of "Miscellaneous," to strike out lines 1041 and 1042, as follows:

For the payment of salaries of judges of Indian courts, $5,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

For compensation of judges of Indian courts, at such rate as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary of the Interior, $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 1063, after the word "severalty," to insert "in accordance with treaty stipulation;" and in line 1065, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "ten;" so as to make the clause read:

For survey and subdivision of Indian reservations and of lands to be alloted to Indians, and to make allotments in severalty, in accordance with treaty stipulation, to be expended by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, $10,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 1068, after the words "surveying and allotting Indian reservations (reimbursable)," to strike out the words:

For pay of special agents, and necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 3 of the act approved February 8, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes," $35,000; $10,000 of which sum shall be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 1076, to strike out:

For surveys and resurveys under the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 8, 1887, to be repaid proportionately out of the proceeds of the sales of such lands as may be acquired from the Indians under the provisions of said act, $75,000; in all, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 1082, to insert:

To enable the President to complete the work already undertaken and commenced under the third section of the act of February 8, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes," including the delivery to the Indians entitled thereunder of the trust patents authorized under said act, $10,000, to be immediately available.

Mr. DAWES. I move to amend that amendment by inserting, after the word "including," in line 1090, the words:

Necessary clerical work incident thereto in the field and in the office of Indian Affairs, etc.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in section 1, after line 1092, to insert:

To enable the President to cause, under the provisions of the act of February 8, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes," such Indian reservations as in his judgment are advantageous for agricultural and grazing purposes to be surveyed or resurveyed for the purposes of said act, and to complete the allotment of the same and delivery of trust patents under said act, $20,000. And no survey or resurvey shall be ordered or commenced upon any reservation unless the entire allotment upon such reservation and the delivery of trust patents therein can be completed under this appropriation.

Mr. DAWES. I offer from the committee an amendment to come in immediately after the word "same," in line 1102, as follows:

Including the necessary clerical work incident thereto in the field and in the office of Indian Affairs.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAWES. Also after the word "patents," in the same line, I move to insert:

So far as allotments shall have been selected.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAWES. In line 1105 I move to strike out the word "entire" and add the letter "s" to the word "allotment," so as to read "allotments;" so as to make the clause read:

And no survey or resurvey shall be ordered or commenced upon any reservation unless the allotments upon such reservation and the delivery of trust patents therein can be completed under this appropriation.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAWES. After the word "reservation," in line 1105, I move to insert the words "so selected."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in section 1, after line 1107, to insert:

For this amount, to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior in aiding Indians who have taken land in severalty under the act of February 8, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes," to establish themselves in homes thereon, to procure seed, farming implements, and other things necessary, in addition to means already provided by law or treaty, for the commencement of farming, $30,000. The amounts provided for in the three preceding paragraphs shall be repaid to the Treasury proportionately out of the proceeds of the sales of such lands, if any, as may be acquired from the Indians under the provisions of the aforesaid act. And a report in detail of the expenditures made to December 1 next, under the appropriations provided by said paragraphs, shall be made to Congress at the commencement of the next session.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 1141, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Interior to pay Charles F. Larrabee for services rendered as disbursing officer of the commission appointed May 15, 1886, to negotiate with certain tribes and bands of Indians in Minnesota, by reason of which service he was required to give a bond and to incur extra responsibility, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 1148, to insert:

To pay Shirley C. Ward, of Los Angeles, Cal., for his services to date as special attorney for the Mission Indians of Southern California, under appointment by the Attorney-General, made at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 1153, to insert:

For payment to Anna Adamson the equivalent of five months' salary as a teacher at the Indian school at the Mission Indian agency, California, $300.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 1158, to insert:

For this amount, to be paid to Wallace W. Rollins and Otis F. Presbrey, it being in full payment of the amount of their claim against the Eastern band of Cherokee Indians in North Carolina, found by the Court of Claims, in Departmental case No. 18, Senate Executive Document No. 158, Fiftieth Congress, first session, to be due them for services rendered under their contract of May 15, 1874, with same Indians, $10,176.77.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 1167, to insert:

For the construction of a bridge across the Big Wind River, on the Wind River Indian reservation, in the Territory of Wyoming, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, upon plans and specifications to be approved by him, $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 1173, to insert:

To enable the Secretary of the Interior to purchase, upon such terms and conditions as he may deem just and proper, a tract of land at or in the vicinity of the Dalles of the Columbia River, in Oregon, of sufficient area and in such locality as to afford suitable facilities for the Indians of the Warm Springs reservation to take fish in said river, and to properly cure the same, said land to be held by the United States in trust for the use and benefit of said Indians, $3,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be immediately available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 1183, to insert:

For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the Cœur d'Alene tribe of Indians for the purchase and release by said tribe of such portions of its reservation as such tribe shall consent to sell, on such terms and conditions as shall be considered just and equitable between the United States and said tribe of Indians, which purchase shall not be complete until ratified by Congress, $2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations "For support of schools," in section 1, to strike out the clause from line 1194 to line 1198, inclusive, as follows:

Support of Indian day and industrial schools, and for other educational purposes not hereinafter provided for, for construction and repair of school buildings, and for purchase of horses, cattle, sheep, goats, swine, and so forth, for schools, $725,000.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

For support of Indian day and industrial schools, and for other educational purposes not hereinafter provided for, $595,000; for the construction and repair of school buildings, $55,000; and for purchase of horses, cattle, sheep, and swine for schools, $10,000; in all, $750,000: *Provided*, That the entire cost of any boarding-school building to be built from the moneys appropriated hereby, including furniture, shall not exceed $10,000, and the entire cost of any day-school building to be so built shall not exceed $600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 1216, after the word "Pennsylvania," to strike out "and for transportation of pupils to and from said school" and to insert "at not exceeding $167 for each pupil;" so as to make the clause read:

For support of Indian industrial school at Carlisle, Pa., at not exceeding $167 for each pupil, $80,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 1222, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifteen" and insert "eighteen;" so as to make the clause read:

For the purpose of erecting, constructing, and completing additional schoolrooms, according to plans and specifications to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior, $18,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 1221, after the word "all," at the close of the appropriations for the Indian industrial school at Carlisle, Pa., to strike out "ninety-six" and insert "ninety-nine;" so as to make the clause read:

In all, $99,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 1227, after the word "each," to strike out the semicolon and insert a comma; and, in line

1229, after the word "school," to insert "at $1,500;" so as to make the clause read:

For support of Indian pupils, at $175 per annum each, at Indian school at Chilocco, Indian Territory (formerly near Arkansas City), and for pay of superintendent of said school, at $1,500, $52,125.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 1234, after the word "school," to insert "at $1,500;" and in line 1236, after the word "Nebraska," to insert "not exceeding $5,000 in all;" so as to make the clause read:

For support of Indian pupils, at $175 per annum each, and for pay of superintendent of school, at $1,500, at Genoa, Nebr.; heating apparatus, repairs, and erection of buildings at Indian school, Genoa, Nebr., not exceeding $5,000; in all, $36,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 1238, to insert:

For support of Indian pupils, at $175 per annum each, and for necessary repairs to building and fencing, and for pay of superintendent, at $1,500, at the Indian school at Grand Junction, Colo., in addition to the sum authorized to be expended under the Ute agreement, approved June 15, 1880, from Ute interest money, $10,000; and Indian pupils, other than children of Ute Indians, may be allowed in said school, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 1252, to insert:

To defray the expenses of transporting to and from the school at Hampton, Va., Indian pupils to be educated and supported thereat, without charge to the Government, $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 1261, after the word "school," to insert "at $2,000;" so as to make the clause read:

For support and education of four hundred and fifty Indian pupils, at $175 per annum each, necessary outbuildings, repairs, and fencing, at the Indian school at Lawrence, Kans., and for pay of superintendent of said school, at $2,000, $85,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 1266, after the word "necessary," to strike out:

And to secure additional and better water accommodations for the use of such school and the farm connected therewith, the further sum of $4,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary; in all, $97,000.

So as to make the clause read:

For the repair and improvement of the wagon-road leading from the city of Lawrence to such school, $7,500, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 1270, to insert—

For the purpose of securing additional and better water supply for the use of such school, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to contract with the Lawrence Water Works Company for such supply for a period not exceeding five years, and for the payment on account thereof for the fiscal year 1889 the sum of $1,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated; in all, $94,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 1290, after the word "sixty," to strike out "Indians, pupils," and insert "Indian pupils;" so as to make the clause read:

For support of sixty Indian pupils at White's Manual Labor Institute of Wabash, Ind., including transportation, $10,020.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 1297, after the word "school," to insert "at $1,500;" so as to make the clause read:

For support of two hundred Indian pupils at $175 per annum each: necessary outbuildings, repairs, and fencing at the Indian school at Salem, Oregon (formerly Forest Grove School), and for pay of the superintendent of said school, at $1,500, $36,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, to strike out the clause from line 1318 to line 1321, inclusive, as follows:

For the support and education of Indian pupils of both sexes at day and industrial schools in Alaska, $20,000; this to be expended under the supervision and control of the Bureau of Education.

Mr. HOAR. I think it will be interesting to the public, and especially to the persons engaged in the humane cause of Indian education, in which my friend and colleague has been so eminently a leader in this country for a good while, if he will make publicly the statement he has made to me in private, in regard to the purposes and the policy of his committee in reference to dealing with education in Alaska.

Mr. DAWES. The proposition to strike out this appropriation for Alaska did not arise in the committee from any disposition to limit the expenditures for the cause of education within that Territory; but it is very difficult to distinguish in Alaska those who go by the name of Indians, and those Aleuts and others who need education, and there has been from year to year an appropriation of $20,000 or $25,000 in the sundry civil bill for the purposes of education generally in Alaska, to be expended under the direction of the Bureau of Education.

In this bill there came from the other branch an appropriation of $20,000 for Indian pupils in Alaska, to be expended under the supervision and control of the Bureau of Education, and not under the Bureau of Indian Affairs. It was thought best to put both the appropriations together under the control of the Bureau of Education and have them in the sundry civil bill. If the Senate should be willing to increase not only this amount, but the aggregate of the two when that bill comes up, I do not think that the Committee on Appropriations would be misrepresented by a statement on my part that they would desire to see all the expenditure of money toward education in Alaska that can be usefully and profitably used in that line.

Mr. HOAR. Can my colleague state at this moment about the number of persons in Alaska of school age who require the aid and support of the Government for their education?

Mr. DAWES. I am unable to give the precise number of pupils, but there are several private schools supported by the Presbyterian church, and Mr. Sheldon Jackson is superintendent of those schools as well as superintendent of the expenditure of the Government money. They have, I should think, six or seven schools at different points in Alaska, but the precise number of pupils and the progress that has been made I am unable to state at this time.

Mr. HOAR. It seems rather out of place in this presence to say anything about Indian education upon a bill which is under the charge of my colleague; but I suppose it is well known to the Senate—it certainly is very well known to him—that the attention of humane and charitable persons throughout the country is now being especially called to the condition of things in the Territory of Alaska.

It has been growing in public interest for many years. It is undoubtedly true that the condition of things in that Territory is still a great reproach to the American nation. There are persons who are growing up and will grow up in barbarism, in one of the lowest and worst forms of barbarism, among the nations of those Northwestern regions. A tribe was brought over to our territory from British Columbia very recently who had been rescued from a very gross and horrible form of cannibalism to the glory of the missionary whose name, Duncan, is fresh in the memory of the public.

Now I believe, as I had the honor to say five or six years ago in regard to the general question of Indian education, that the expenditure for education in Alaska ought only to be limited by the amount that could be profitably employed. Of course the establishment of schools, the instruction and preparation of teachers, and the sentiment among the persons to be instructed must all be a matter of somewhat slow growth; and to hurry a vast expenditure of money before the time has come to make it would be a wasteful use of the purpose that persons who have Indian education at heart have in view.

But making allowance for that, it would be better for us to expend $10,000,000 a year for the next ten years in taking every Indian child in this country of school age and giving him instruction in certainly the ordinary employments of civilization. Then you have had every Indian youth who has grown up under the influence of this education, and let them take care of themselves like others, and in the end we should save by an expenditure of this kind, to say nothing of Indian wars, in Indian support, more than it would cost. But of course an expenditure of that kind would be utterly wasteful if undertaken now, and I suppose the same principle applies to Alaska.

I hope the committee and the Senate will be prepared to adopt the advice which my colleague has suggested would be given by him; that is, to go as far in that direction as the limits of profitable expenditure for the present year.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MANDERSON in the chair). The question is on the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations to strike out the clause.

Mr. BLAIR. The subject commented on by the Senators from Massachusetts is an important one. I am unaware that there is any accurate information as to the number of pupils in Alaska, but there must be not far from ten or eleven thousand there who are in need of the means of education, and who are without the opportunity of obtaining it except as it is furnished by the Government of the United States, not only with regard to money, but with regard to teachers themselves.

I have not observed the amount of the appropriation proposed in this bill, but always hitherto the amount has been too meager for the necessities, and I do not apprehend there is special danger that there will be any error in the direction of excess.

The number of Indians in the country, I believe, is not far from a quarter of a million, and the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] that an annual expenditure of $10,000,000 of money for their industrial and other education, in fact for the purpose of subjecting them to the processes of civilization efficiently and for a comparatively brief period of time, would be true economy, is of course a proposition which can not be controverted, and it seems not startling to us when we contemplate the application of that amount of money to the rescue of the Indians from their present condition. We know we shall save money by doing it. We know the cost of Indian wars, and we know that the support we give the Indians in the future, even if the future should be only a time of peace, would cost us more than this proposed investment of the Senator from Massachusetts, and yet while we are thus reasonable and thus inclined to be conservatively benevolent and economically generous for our own sake and for their sakes in regard to a suggestion like this, we hesitate and we fail utterly as a Congress to meet the glaring and certainly a thousand-fold more pressing necessity arising from the fact that some six or seven millions

of our own race and of another race that is closer to us than the Indian are under equal necessity of national assistance.

I think that some of the benevolent feeling which we properly expend upon the Indian might properly be concentrated, or at least if not that feeling a like feeling be concentrated upon our own flesh and blood.

I have a communication sent me by a prominent Indian woman who was a delegate to the recent convention of women held in this city, in which she writes from her standpoint. She is a descendant of a Mohawk chief. She writes me from her standpoint upon the Indian problem. I think there is so much of what she says that it would be worth while for Congress to consider, that I shall ask the Secretary to read her letter which I send to the desk.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

KALAMAZOO, MICH., *April* 16, 1888.

I was requested, while in Washington attending the International Council of Women, to write in regard to the education of my people, what I thought of their past treatment, etc. First treat the Indians honorably, and truthfully do as you promise, and you will never have need to do more than that. The Indian problem will be forever solved. The Indians are not paupers. They have enough money in the Government to educate themselves. Why, then, this neglect to the rightful owners of the country? The Indian knows the white man to be untruthful. He has had nothing in return for all he has given but broken treaties from time immemorial. Roger Williams and Penn treated the Indians honorably, and in turn the Indians honored and loved them. What we want for our people is an education by vesting them with individual rights of property and have them live by their own labor. Individual rights are required to develop individual citizenship. It is nonsense to attempt Indian civilization by providing for the red men in tribal life. They must be located as individuals and families and made to feel the responsibility of distinctive efforts.

The presiding defects in your Indian policy are that you have merely established almshouses, where you have graduated helpless paupers. You changed the mode of the red man's existence, but you gave him nothing in place of what he had lost. He had hunted and fished for a living before you took him in hand. When game was exhausted in one section or the fishing gave out he sought another. You gave him a portion of land and told him he might traverse it at will, but over its boundaries he must not set his foot. You provided for his wants in a measure as compensation for prescribing his territory. Constant hunting, the encroachments of civilization, and a variety of causes soon left him no work. As one illustration, the water was so much raised at different lakes and rivers by the building of dams that the Indians could not catch any fish, their chief sustenance. Hundreds and thousands of Indians were wronged, deprived of their rights by the construction of those dams, since these dams, for reservoir purposes, were built at the headwaters of the Mississippi.

The Red Lake, Leach Lake, and Winnebagoshish Indians have suffered every year by the loss of their fish, wild rice, and other crops. Indian history has been of similar character. It has been one of broken treaties. You have perpetually taken away privileges granted to the original people of this continent. You have condemned them because they could not grasp at once the idea of your civilization, and because they did not understand your condition to be more desirable than their own mode of life. You have regarded it a hopeless undertaking to make the Indian anything but a wild man of the forest. You have considered that his extermination was inevitable. Now, in Canada ever since 1857 or 1858 Parliament has been trying by various acts and amendments to enfranchise our Indians and gradually confer on them full rights of citizenship, but with such indifferent success that the efforts heretofore made may be said to have been entire failures. Why have these efforts failed? Simply because Parliament has, in every instance, begun at the wrong end. Every enfranchisement act in the past has made it a condition precedent for an Indian to obtain the right to vote that he should practically abandon his people, alienate them from himself, and destroy any influence he might have among them.

A change necessary: It is urged that only those Indians who thus become enfranchised should be given a vote and none other.

Surely nearly thirty years' experience of such a policy would in the future continue to be as barren of any good to the Indians as in the past. Our Indians in Canada, I respectfully submit, are as capable of exercising the right of franchise intelligently as are the majority of the farmers in that or any other country.

Qualifications of Indians: Let me briefly put before you the qualifications of some of these people with a right of franchise: Take first the Mohawks, of the Bay of Quinte reservation; Chief Samson Green has a farm near Deseronto, on which he resides, consisting of about 80 acres of land under cultivation. Chief Cornelius Maricle and the Lofts and others own a hundred acres apiece under good cultivation. These Indians are fairly educated and are intelligent, sober, industrious men. They are but types of scores of other Indians upon that reserve. If you go to the Grand River reservation you will find scores of Indians, such as the Garlows, Martins, Styers, Hills, Johnstons, and Smiths, that are equally intelligent, equally capable, and who are living each upon his farm in comfortable frame and brick houses, raising thousands of bushels of grain and farm produce each year, and thus adding to the wealth of the country.

Indians as rate-payers: These are the Indians that have been denied so long the right of franchise. Let it be clearly understood that both these reservations are surveyed and divided into farms of 100 acres each; that these farms are not held in common, but are regarded by the Indians as the individual property of the occupants thereof, just as much as if held in fee-simple, and that in this country some own over 50 acres, others 100, and still others 200 acres or more; that the Indians themselves maintain the roads and bridges; that at the Bay of Quinte reserve the Mohawks maintain three common schools on the reserve; that they themselves pay the stipend of their clergyman; that at the Grand River reserve there are some twelve or fourteen public schools, all taught by native teachers, and one industrial school, which are maintained in part by the Indians and in part by the New England Company. The six nations gave out of their own funds over a hundred thousand dollars to the Grand River Navigation Company; that they subscribed liberally to bridges built near their reservation, and in other ways have assisted to develop the country, and above all the Government does not contribute one cent for their support and maintenance. More than that, I believe some of the officers of the Indian Department at Ottawa are paid not out of the funds of the Government, but of the funds of the Indians themselves. In other words, these Indians are taxed to pay not only local and municipal charges, but also pay a part of the expenses in connection with the Government machinery at Ottawa. The Indians in Canada were given a vote for the first time in 1886. As far as I know at present all are prosperous.

The Indians of the United States are really in a deplorable condition. Why is this neglect to the rightful owners of the country? You as a nation have looked after the negro and in a measure redeemed some of the wrongs they have suffered. But the first people of the country have been driven from pillar to post, neglected. I ask you as a nation to at least give the Indians their rights to an education. I believe that Congress as a body wishes us no wrong, but nevertheless great wrongs are done. Some of them never can be righted. One of the greatest wrongs is the introduction of the fire-water among my people. I appeal to you as a nation to see the Indians are educated. Send less theology among them and more true Christianity. If you understand the Indians right you would have no trouble with them. Send honest people if you have any among you. An Indian loves honor and truth, but despises deceit. Native teachers should be furnished their schools. There are a great many Indian teachers in Canada as well as the United States that ought to be employed. The Indians are perfectly capable to fill any position in life when educated. I believe all were satisfied in Washington whom I talked with, that I at least, as an Indian, was capable of conversing with all whom I met there, and when I tell you when I was eight years of age I could not understand one word of English. My education was all received in Canada, but my travels and observation has been worth more to me. In a measure I have educated myself. Give the Indians a chance of an education and you will have reason to feel proud of them. You would have no more use for the United States troops that are held at the different agencies and of less expense to the Government. We have great reasons to be proud. We are Indians. We have never been known to manufacture alcoholic drinks to destroy body and soul; neither have we language to take God's name in vain.

Respectfully,

PRINCESS VIROGNA.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Secretary resumed the reading of the bill. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in section 1, after line 1329, to insert:

For the purpose of constructing and completing suitable school buildings for an Indian industrial school, to be located at some point in Ormsby County, in the State of Nevada, upon lands previously donated to the Government of not less than 200 acres in extent, and of such character and location as shall be deemed most suitable for the purpose by the Secretary of the Interior, upon plans and specifications to be approved by him, $25,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, after line 1347, to insert:

That in the expenditure of any money appropriated in this act for any of the purposes of education of Indian children, those children of Indians who have taken lands in severalty under any existing law shall not, by reason thereof, be excluded from the benefits of such appropriations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriation for "interest on trust-fund stocks," in section 2, line 5, before the word "namely," to strike out "eighty-nine" and insert "eighty-eight;" so as to read:

SEC. 2. That for payment of interest on certain abstracted and non-paying State stocks belonging to the various Indian tribes, and held in trust by the Secretary of the Interior, for the year ending June 30, 1888, namely.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued to line 5 of section 8.

Mr. DAWES. In line 4 of section 8, before the word "education," I move to insert the word "practical" and to strike out the word "Indian" before the word "children;" so as to read:

That there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a person of knowledge and experience in the management, training, and practical education of children, to be the superintendent of Indian schools.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in section 8, line 5, after the word "schools," to insert:

Who shall, from time to time, and as often as the nature of his duties will permit, visit the schools where Indians are taught, in whole or in part, by appropriations from the United States Treasury, and shall, from time to time, report to the Secretary of the Interior, what, in his judgment, are the defects, if any, in any of them in system, in administration, or in means for the most effective advancement of the children in them toward civilization and self-support; and what changes are needed to remedy such defects as may exist; and shall, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, employ and discharge superintendents, teachers, and any other person connected with such schools, and with such approval make such rules and regulations for the conduct of the schools as in his judgment the good of such schools may require. The Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be detailed from the employés of his Department such assistants and shall furnish such facilities as shall be necessary to carry out the foregoing provisions respecting said Indian schools.

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 8. That there shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a person of knowledge and experience in the management, training, and practical education of children, to be superintendent of Indian schools, who shall, from time to time, and as often as the nature of his duties will permit, visit the schools where Indians are taught, in whole or in part, by appropriations from the United States Treasury, and shall, from time to time, report to the Secretary of the Interior what, in his judgment, are the defects, if any, in any of them in system, in administration, or in means for the most effective advancement of the children in them toward civilization and self-support; and what changes are needed to remedy such defects as may exist; and shall, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, employ and discharge superintendents, teachers, and any other person connected with such schools, and with such approval make such rules and regulations for the conduct of the schools as in his judgment the good of such schools may require. The Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be detailed from the employés of his Department such assistants, and shall furnish such facilities as shall be necessary to carry out the foregoing provisions respecting said Indian schools.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President, it will be observed that this amendment takes the entire control of Indian schools away from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, and vests it in a bureau officer having equal salary and dignity with the Commissioner, and of equal rank with all the other bureau officers of the Interior Department. The determination to do this has been manifested by a unanimous vote in both the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Senate having passed a bill for this special purpose, and the House committee having put it on this appropriation bill exactly as it passed the Senate, the remarkable feature

of it being that it was done, as it was required to be done, under the rules of the House by unanimous consent.

This provision in its general effect reflects the judgment not only of both Houses of Congress, but of those who have observed the management of the Indian Bureau under the present Administration as to what is absolutely necessary to be done. It is deemed absolutely necessary to take the control of the Indian schools from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs under whose administration the schools have not been kept up to the proper standard, and by whom the general and proper management of Indian affairs has been largely subordinated to a scuffle about patronage. The Indian Bureau is under the control as to essentials of subordinates than of the head of it, and therefore it seems to both Houses of Congress necessary to the public interest to take away as much as possible of its jurisdiction.

It is exceedingly important that the system to be employed in the education of Indian children is one of sufficient importance to call for its control by a thoroughly competent man, vigorous, intelligent, effective one, totally unlike the present Commissioner of Indian Affairs, who, although well meaning, amiable, and honest, by reason of his age and inexperience and general lack of vigor, has been unable to cope with even the responsible and widely extended duties of this position. This may be said without special discredit, for better men have failed in the same position.

It is proper to say in connection with this subject that many of the vices of the system of Indian education are inherent. They grow out of misunderstanding the requirements of the Indian. They grow, to some extent, out of the misguided efforts of philanthropic people. They grow out of the fact, too, that neither the people of the United States nor Congress representing the people have heretofore addressed themselves as thoroughly to the situation as they ought to have done.

I am entirely persuaded myself, and I am satisfied that the country will ultimately come to the same conclusion, that what is needed is not the segregation of the Indians from the whites, it is not gathering them on Indian reservations, but it is their dispersal at the earliest possible moment among and absorption in the great body of the people of the United States. The Indian can not, as a rule, maintain himself and keep up a condition of necessary progress upon a reservation even with the protection of the laws. The civilization by which he will be surrounded is aggressive, forceful, and to some extent rapacious. He can not maintain himself in contact with the whites while under the tribal relation, nor can he do so in a condition of severalty, as a rule, except with the result of a descent in the scale.

He is so situated and constituted that he will take, by that kind of contact, the vices and not the virtues of the whites. He needs the sustaining power of civilization, and he needs it applied to him as an individual and not in his tribal capacity, and he needs it, too, applied to him in such a way that he is not the subject of cupidity. Just as long as an Indian holds a considerable body of land there will be men around him who will seek to take advantage of him, and who in one way and another will accomplish that, who will get the control of his estate, who will get the control of his operations, and they will do that by pandering to his vices; and no amount of protection which the Government can throw around him will prevent it from being done.

The remedy is to take the Indians as far as possible away from their reservations; it is to scatter them among the people of the United States; it is to put them in positions where their qualifications, whatever they may be, will be not only recognized but they will be protected from the effect of their weaknesses.

I have insisted for many years, vainly however, that the proper plan for the education of the Indian youth was to give them the smallest portion of what might be called book learning, and the largest amount of that education which comes by contact—to put them out among good people in families, in places where whatever aptitude they had could be developed, for work upon farms and in shops, and by the helpful aid of those who would take an interest in them to strengthen and to aid them in learning self-support, realizing always that they have got to begin at a rather low plane; that it is not possible to take an Indian and by the mere process of school education put him upon the plane of the white people who have been generations in doing that which he is now expected to do in the course of a few years.

Mr. BLAIR. May I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. PLUMB. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIR. I should like to ask the Senator if, in this method of distributing the Indian children throughout the country, he contemplates the breaking up of the family relation for the time being, or would he not do this with children nearing maturity, when the child naturally leaves the parent and is made to mix with civilized people and a totally different life from that to which he was accustomed? If he would pursue the first course, what would he do with the common feelings of human nature, which are as powerful in the savage as in civilized man?

Mr. PLUMB. No education of this kind could be secured at once, nor can it be done according to any rule which will be equally practicable for all Indian youth. Some may be taken earlier and some later, but I would take the Indian children for the purpose of education as far as possible from their original surroundings. I would not do unnecessary violence to the feeling of which the Senator has spoken, but taking the orphans, taking those whom their parents are willing to have go, taking them at an earlier age or later, as the case might be, and adapting what was done to the circumstances in each case, but acting upon the idea of getting them as far as practicable away from their reservations, away from savagery, and with the intention that they should not go back, if that could be reasonably prevented. One reason is because they find little or nothing to do in the time of their school acquirements. Take Sioux Indians, for example. Suppose you should take even five hundred children from thence and educate them at Carlisle or elsewhere in the mechanic arts, and when they have learned all they can learn there is nothing on the Sioux reservation for them to do——

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator will allow me to ask, for he has had observation, do the children thus educated at Carlisle, at Hampton, and other schools in the East, cease to be possessed of a longing for home and a desire to return as they become civilized? Do they form an inclination to desert their ancestors and to settle down among the white inhabitants of the country, or is there a tendency among them to return to their old associations, and perhaps to their old style of life? How is that?

Mr. PLUMB. I have no doubt there is a longing on the part of many of them to go back to the wild state from which they came, and when they go back to the reservation (and that is the unfortunate part of it) they go back to savage habits; they go back to idleness, which is the accompanyment of savagery; they go back not to labor with their hands as a rule, not to set examples in farming and mechanical labor and so on, but they go back to be judges at horse races, to be jockeys, to exhibit themselves as smart enough to get along without labor, and they almost inevitably deteriorate from the apparent standard which their education had brought them to.

I am not speaking of that as reflecting upon the Indians. It is the result of the forcing process we are putting them through. We are asking of the Indian that he shall come from a system of savagery into the daylight of civilization which the white race has been centuries in accomplishing. The fiber which has come by hard labor, by generations of toil, is not theirs to exercise. I am thoroughly convinced myself that a large portion of the money we are now spending upon Indian education is not only idly spent, it is worse than that, it is viciously spent.

Mr. BLAIR. Would it improve the matter if these schools, instead of being located on the Atlantic, were located right upon the reservations and sustained there, and civilization introduced among the Indians so largely and so symmetrically as to be able to effect a lodgment there, to set an example there, so that industrial as well as ordinary instruction could be laid there on the spot among the Indians and held in mind by observing and by witnessing as well as by actual instruction in the schools? Would such a system benefit the matter?

Mr. PLUMB. Any system which educates them on the reservation, in my judgment, is a mistake; that is to say, which seeks to educate them as to anything else except for the performance of what might be called the duties and avocations of a pastoral existence.

Mr. BLAIR. What will holding in severalty do?

Mr. PLUMB. The Senator asks what will severalty do. Severalty will do this: If you can put them under conditions in which they will not be subjected to the opportunity of acquiring the vices of the whites—give them time, generation after generation following, to build up in an increasing scale to a better condition of things, no doubt; but the trouble is that we are not willing that they shall do that. We pay our money, and we want results at once. We want to take these Indians from their reservations and put them in a condition where the white boys and girls of the United States are. We are trying to do too much at once. We are not giving them instruction in that which is primary to them.

We educate at Carlisle, and no doubt well, so far as the mere education goes, the Indian children in the various trades. They learn to be blacksmiths, they learn to be harness-makers, they learn to be carpenters and wagon-makers, and so on; but there is no employment for them when they go back to the reservation, or a very limited employment on the reservations from which they came. The Indians are not the greatest consumers of wagons and harness, of the blacksmiths' work, and things of that kind. So the mechanics we educate at such great expense find little or nothing to do.

Mr. BLAIR. They do go back?

Mr. PLUMB. They go too much, following naturally the instinct which the Senator has spoken of, which I have no doubt is as strong in them as in anybody else, and they ought as far as possible to be weaned away from it.

The following provision is found in the bill on page 55:

For collecting and transportation of pupils to and from Indian schools, and also for the transportation of Indian pupils from all the Indian schools and placing of them with the consent of their parents under the care and control of such suitable white families as may in all respects be qualified to give such pupils moral, industrial, and educational training under arrangements in which their proper care, support, and education shall be in exchange for their labor, etc.

That was first inserted in the Indian appropriation bill many years ago upon my suggestion, but with the full and active concurrence of

the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES]. He and I agreed in substance upon it, and if something of that kind had been carried out in a large way, if the people who are indulging in so much talk about the Indians, if the Indian Rights Association, which meets annually at Newport—if some of the philanthropy, which finds vent in high-sounding speeches about the injustice that has been done to the Indian, could be turned in the way of carrying into effect the idea embodied in this section—taking the Indian children from the reservations and placing them in good white families, surrounding them by influences which are not only wholesome, but which would lead them in the direction of self-support, they would find their place, not in the higher ranks of society, not perhaps in the politics of the country, but in avenues, modest enough, to be sure, but in which they could be useful and in which they would gradually build up, grow, develop, and become useful members of society. It is only by contact of that kind, by the supporting influence of a civilization which must not only surround them, but become interested in them, that the advance desired can be made—not that contact which they necessarily incur on the reservation.

Mr. BLAIR. The question whether we carry civilization to them or they come here and get it, and the relative expense and the results of the two systems, I think, is a matter of some consequence, and as the Senator knows about it, I wish to call his attention to the case of the civilized Indians in the Indian Territory. As far as I know the history of the process which brought them from savagery to very near our own civilization perhaps, it was one in which the missionary and the industrial and the civilized arts and civilization itself all went to the Indian, and they found him on the spot. They transformed him by long and persistent and systematic pressure and effort, finally, perhaps after generations of work, from what he was to what he is.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire will suspend. The Chair will receive a message from the President of the United States.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the act (S. 2210) to revive the grade of General in the United States Army; and communicated a message in writing.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. BLAIR. I suppose there may be a motion made to go into executive session.

Mr. HAWLEY. Probably the Senate is tolerably well aware of the nature of the communication just received from the President. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business for a few moments.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Connecticut moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After two minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. T. O. TOWLES, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9788) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes, numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11; that it had agreed to the twelfth amendment of the Senate to the bill with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; and that it also requested the concurrence of the Senate in an amendment to the title of the bill.

The message also announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4920) for the protection of the officials of the United States in the Indian Territory, and agreed to the same.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (S. 1772) for the relief of John H. Marion;

A bill (S. 2123) to authorize the removal of an obstruction to the navigation of Broad Creek, in the State of Delaware;

A bill (S. 6946) for the relief of Thomas Jordan; and

A bill (S. 8560) to establish a department of labor.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. CALL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the fortification appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8565) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with the various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BLAIR] is entitled to the floor on the pending amendment.

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] has the floor. I was asking him a question.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understood the Senator from New Hampshire to be on the floor when the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. BLAIR. At the time of the interruption I was asking the Senator from Kansas with reference to his theory that the Indian youth should be scattered among the civilized people, trained in the arts of civilization, and discouraged at least in their tendency to return to their own people; that gradually the Indians should be scattered and diffused among the civilized portion of the inhabitants of the country. I ask him whether the illustration that we have of an opposite theory in the case of the civilization and transformation of the Choctaws, Cherokees, and others in the Indian Territory would not seem to perhaps suggest a different treatment of the Indian question from that which he has advocated? There the Indians were concentrated practically upon the reservations. Civilization, Christianity, schools, the arts and sciences were carried to them, planted there, and by direct, constant, and persistent pressure of these influences and the effect of these examples constantly before their eyes for a few generations, we find them transformed from what they were to what they now are. Does not the Senator think it would be perhaps better for us, if need be, to discontinue our present experiment as we have carried it on and locate the Hampton school and the Carlisle school, and all the civilizing influences which we are maintaining at so great expense for a comparatively few, who finally return and find just the same condition as that from which they were first taken, and very soon, submitting to the pressure of barbarism, return to it; would it not be better, I say, to carry these influences there, to build a permanent fire, a constantly shining light, in the hope that the same which has happened to the Choctaws and Cherokees would ultimately happen to the Sioux and other equally great and persistent races or tribes of men?

Mr. PLUMB. I think the picture which the Senator from New Hampshire has drawn of the Cherokees is far removed from the fact. It is true they were set off by themselves, and so with the Creeks, Chickasaws, and Seminoles; but the most of the whites who came in contact with them were religious men, inspired by the motive to build up, develop, and christianize them. They did not want the Indian lands, nor even to trade with them. The Indians were beyond the tide of emigration and settlement for a long time after their removal, and so beyond that ordinary and demoralizing contact which has been spoken of. In the next place they commenced their career in the Indian Territory upon a higher plane than that upon which almost any of the Indians, certainly any of the great tribes of Indians, now are. Those tribes were in a better condition to receive instructions, and to benefit by the Christian contact by which alone they were accompanied and surrounded.

Again, the example of the Cherokees and of the other tribes in the Indian Territory is not, on the whole, an encouraging one. There are some very talented men in all those tribes, but the mass of them are not in an encouraging condition. Certainly the Senator has read enough in the public prints to know that a condition of lawlessness, which is without parallel in any civilized country in the world, obtains in the Indian Territory.

Mr. BLAIR. I was not aware of it, except in No Man's Land. I think many of those civilized tribes, as we call them, have really efficient schools. I have heard them spoken of certainly as being excellent, and many of the graduates as comparing in intellectual accomplishments very well with some of their educated white brothers. It may be ignorance on my part, but it certainly was my impression that among the civilized tribes, as they are called, in the Indian Territory, there were a very large proportion of intelligent people, and civilized people owning property, administering the laws and preserving order. I certainly thought that to be so.

If the Senator will pardon me, I certainly have seen during the session every week newspapers coming from that country which administered to the Indian Committee of the House and of the Senate that sort of civilized blackguardism and castigation which is hardly surpassed by the most able performances in the metropolitan press of this country. I thought they were entitled to perhaps rank pretty well up with the educated press of the country.

Mr. PLUMB. As I have before said, the Indian gets the vices of the white men perfectly, and I have no doubt that would be equally true of the vices of intemperate and immoral speech, and so on.

Mr. DAWES. Since the Senator from New Hampshire was standing here putting these inquiries, there has come from the other House notice of the passage by the House of an act which went through here, the purpose of which was to meet a terrible condition of things down in the Indian Territory which existed nowhere else, where officers of

the law were shot at their doors, and the murderers have been going about the Territory in the face of what are called the law officers of the Territory and the courts of the Territory with perfect impunity, and it was found necessary to make a special enactment for the protection of the officers of the law in the performance of their duties.

Mr. BLAIR. Does the Senator think that is anything exceptional on this continent? Has he not read of what has occurred within a very short time—a few years ago—in the great city of Chicago? Does he not know of instances where not only officers of the law were assailed, but where officers of the law themselves assailed others?

Mr. DAWES. I speak of the excess of this great lawlessness down there, of the fact that there was no law of the Territory, that the Territory has utterly neglected not only to protect the officers of the law but to make it an offense or to enforce such laws as it had until Congress, against the general policy of leaving the Five Nations to govern themselves, has interfered with legislation to do in the Indian Territory what the five civilized tribes as they are called have wholly neglected to do.

Now, if the Senator will allow me a little further——

Mr. BLAIR. I was going to ask the Senator, while he is explaining this, if he would go a little further and let us understand what that condition of lawlessness is there. What officers are assailed? Whose fault is it? Who is being protected?

Mr. DAWES. Nothing is more interesting than the study of the history of those five tribes for the last fifty years. The fact that after having made some progress, and comparatively great progress, they have come not only to a standstill, but in many respects to retrograde, presents a study for the political philosopher of great interest.

According to the general judgment of those familiar with the condition of things in that Territory, it is not only discouraging, but it is a very unfortunate condition of things. They have made progress up to a certain limit. Left to themselves in the beginning, as the Senator from Kansas has said, with their lands secured to them, and out of the influences and the way of the white man, with Christian missionaries among them, they made great progress towards civilization; but in the mean time they have become surrounded with the white people pressing in upon them. White people have gone in. They hold their land by a tenure which renders enterprise, industry, energy, and forethought impossible. They go along in a quiet way, content to be let alone in the condition in which they are. They do not want any better condition of life, and, content with that, there come in upon them all the malign influences of their surroundings without any power within themselves to repel it.

My idea is that the heroic treatment with the Indian Territory is coming faster to be a necessity to save the good that has sprung up there under other good influences of the past, and to break up that crust which rests upon them and which they seem unable to break up themselves. There has got to be put over them a new government, a new holding of their lands. There are men in that Territory who realize that fact, and who would be glad, if they could, to divide up their common heritage into small holdings, the fee-simple in individuals, without which in my opinion a higher state of civilization than they have is impossible.

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator's remarks and those of the Senator from Kansas would seem to indicate that the Indian is to be inevitably exterminated by war or by peace if he is to remain in contact with the white man at all.

Mr. DAWES. No, Mr. President——

Mr. BLAIR. I will just show the Senator why I think so, and I should be very glad to be controverted in my opinion then.

We certainly do know that our contact with the Indian from the beginning, so long as the relation between the two races was, and whenever it has been, one of force or of hostility between the two, has resulted in his extermination; at all events it has resulted in his expulsion from the territory which he had previously occupied so far as the white man has come to occupy any of the territory of the continent. The two races do not live intermixed; they do not live upon adjoining pieces of land. The Indian inevitably disappears so far and so fast as the pioneer and the white man's civilization take possession of the country. War destroys him. That is certainly so.

On the other hand, we have tried the method of civilizing him, seeking to live with him in peace; and in order that we may live with him in peace, either he must transform us or we must transform him. We have undertaken by the influences of what we call civilization and religion to transform him and make his condition homogeneous with our own.

We placed the Choctaws, the Cherokees, and some other tribes in the Indian Territory; we gave them geographical boundaries which we promised not to trespass upon; we sent there the missionary; we sent there the school; we sent there the printing-press; we placed in their possession the implements of industry; we taught them how to use them; and created among them civilized communities. I supposed that they were doing on the whole very well, but it seems that when this condition of isolation in civilization among the Indians ceases, whenever the white man surrounds them, by reason of his badness their goodness disappears; and thus it comes to pass that as we inclose them with a belt of civilization along this invisible geographical boundary which by our laws we respect or assume to respect, and the influences of what we call actual civilization find their way over that boundary and among the Indians, the Indians commence to retrograde. In other words, when the average white man, the higher orders of whom have improved him, goes there, unless our pioneers are below the average of white men (and I do not think they are, but rather above it than otherwise), when the average white man or the white man's civilization gets there, the Indian becomes a barbarian again, or worse, if the illustrations which the Senator is making are at all pertinent to the real problem that we are trying to consider.

So far as anything has been accomplished, however, it seems to have been done with the Indian by carrying to him where he is in a given community dominant in population and in general influence and not the white man—by carrying to him and locating in the spot where he is these civilizing influences and tendencies, the Christian teacher, the teacher of the arts and utilities of civilized life, and by his being instructed in those arts until he acquires a certain degree of civilization and gradually comes to improve; and so long as that state of things continues he proceeds to gradually find his way upward. We do not resort, we never have resorted to the method of disintegrating the human race and scattering the children away from home influences, from the natural instincts and the concentrating force of humanity, which is the theory of the Senator from Kansas, and which, when carried out by returning that civilized child to the home from which he emanated, still remaining under its barbarous influences, substantially the same as when he left home, very soon carries him back to the condition of degradation from which he started. So that amounts to nothing; that is a total failure; and the only good we have done we have accomplished by pursuing the other course, segregating these weaker specimens of humanity, these organized communities barbarous or savage in their condition, separating them from the influences, from the domination of the average white man's civilization, and in that isolated condition bringing to bear upon them the influences of civilization and the directly fructifying and transforming influences of what we call Christianity. That is the way we have done it, and so far as any good has been done it has been done that way, and thus the Indian is improving until the average civilization of the white man reaches him and then he commences to retrograde and be ruined again.

I think it is historically true that the improvement of these tribes continued until about the time of the war of the rebellion, and then the sudden destruction of all existing relations led perhaps to that demoralized condition in which these tribes appear to some extent to be now existing. But if we had left them as they were, if we had never approached them, if we had allowed them to be improving, strengthening, and elevating under the influences which were operating upon them and gradually transforming them, if we had allowed them thus to remain and to have improved, perhaps in a few generations more they would have become able to meet with and resist this rapacious Christian civilization which the Senator from Kansas has described to us. If that is not so, if the progress which has been demonstrated to produce some good effects is continued a sufficient length of time, it is not found to elevate to the point where they are capable of self-advance, then peace and Christianity are to exterminate them as well as war; and if that be so I ask what is the use of spending any more money on them? Why not abandon all these appropriations and this perplexity of legislation that we have every session of Congress for the benefit of the Indians? If the Indian is not worth saving and can not be saved, if nothing can be made out of him by either process, that suggested by the Senator from Kansas or that now being pursued under the policy which is being advocated by the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs, if both these policies ultimately are to fail, it seems to me the sooner we stop, the sooner we allow the savage either to destroy himself or to exist as a savage the better it is. There is no use whatever in any of these systems of education or improvement of the Indian if what we hear to-day be true.

Mr. PLUMB. The Senator will allow me to use an illustration for a moment. It seems to me that the plan which I suggest is one designed for the preservation, not the destruction, of the Indian. There is to-day a large preponderance of blacks in the State of Mississippi. They are a very large majority in some counties, forming almost the entire population of some counties. Some years ago an exodus took 40,000 of them to Kansas. That did not destroy those who went to Kansas because they were taken out of associations in which they had lived and been brought up. It took them out of those associations into others where they were not in a majority; where they were not the sole occupants of certain counties and subdivisions; but they were better off than they were before; they have advanced in civilization; they have increased in wealth and power, and to some extent in numbers by their deportation. The Indian himself might lose his tribal identity among the whites, but he would not thereby be lost as an individual; the Indian himself would be there; his blood would be there; he would intermarry; he would take his proper position in society; we should have whatever benefit would come of that contact, and he would have the benefit that grows out of the social contact and the support of civilization all around him, relieved, as I said before, of

the operation to some extent of the conflict going on now between him and the white people by whom he is surrounded.

Mr. BLAIR. That would be all very well if a like method should be pursued with the Indian that has been taken with the colored man where he had the opportunity, but the two methods of emigration are entirely different. The colored man goes to such place as he chooses; he has no tribal relation; he has been the subject of civilizing influences for lo, now, these two hundred and fifty years; and he is a very different being from the one who originally came from Africa. The illustration can hardly be held to be a pertinent one until the Indian has lived in civilized communities, until he has been first taken into civilized communities man by man by the destruction of those affinities of human nature to which I have alluded, taken as the colored man was, brought from Africa, when "men from England bought and sold him, paid his price in paltry gold," bought him as an individual and enslaved him, held him subject to the influences of civilization, it may be for purposes of gain or what not, yet in a manner that was overruled by Divine Providence so that at the end of two hundred and fifty years the colored man in the South as compared with the colored man of Africa or the savage of America is himself a civilized being; but they went as families, so at the present time it is a civilized man, it is a civilized family which is leaving one part of the country and finding a home somewhere else. The colored man in Kansas, who went there during the exodus, is a civilized man and is not a savage, and the cases are entirely lacking in parallelism.

But, Mr. President, I return to the point: If the savage is to be reclaimed by a process similar to that through which the negro passed and became what he is in this country, is it worth while for us to engage in what we are now doing? Is it of sufficient importance that we break up the tribal relation, not by giving them land to live on in severalty and teaching them the arts of civilization where they are and where their land is, but giving them title according to the rules of civilized life and civilized society to that land and to other property in the same way—is it, I say, worth while that we break up this human relation by scattering the individuals of which the family is composed, the human unit of which these races are composed, and taking them hundreds and thousands of miles from their existing location and affiliations? Is it a mercy to the Indian to do that when on the other hand we have seen the excellent results following from the original system which was introduced by the missionary and which worked well as long as we left the missionary and the Indian alone, and the good results of which omitted to appear when an unchristianized white civilization came in contact with them and introduced the elements of disorder and violence, to meet and overcome which we have just been passing the act to which the Senator from Massachusetts alludes? If, I say, we have an illustration of the good that another system can do, why not presevere in that policy and correct the evil results which have followed from our abandonment of it?

Give the Indian land; give him his inclosure; keep the white man away from him, as we have the power to do; give the Indian his land in severalty, if you please. The opportunity to maintain himself by hunting has disappeared with the buffalo and with the occupation of the greater portion of the territory where his hunting grounds were located. I say give him his territory; give him his land in severalty; give him that structure or organization of law which is necessary in civilized life; give him Christianity; give him schools and locate them where he is. Why not continue the process which we have seen so illustrated in other tribes among those which are working to us; and why not remove the pressure of the bad influences which we have cast among the Choctaws and Cherokees? Doing this there would be some sense in spending our money. If in order to do this it is necessary to withdraw the appropriations of the Government and to allow the missionaries private benevolence and those private influences which distribute and disseminate Christianity among the heathen and the lower orders—I mean if in order to do it successfully it is necessary that the Government shall stay its hand only so far as it gives them protection within the borders where they live, let it be done. But to introduce a system of disintegration, of destruction, and to undertake to justify this by saying that the opposite system which succeeded for two generations has proved a failure in the present day, I think must be an error.

I am very doubtful whether we do much for the Indian in the way we are now pursuing. We are certainly supporting him when he ought to support himself, and when, if the necessity were upon him, he would support himself, for the Indian will never starve rather than work. Nothing but the actual necessity of providing for his own wants makes the white man, or the colored man, or any man, exert himself. Make him work, and thus gradually civilize and elevate him. When we place upon the Indian and fasten upon him, and keep there, the necessity of individual exertion to avoid the pangs of hunger and to secure the prolongation of his life, when we compel him to submit to the same necessity that the white man submits to, then he will learn the art of labor and of civilization and get that best primary form of education which should precede and must precede that which is to be found even in the primary school.

I had not expected to say anything about this matter and have talked more to get information than to impart it, and having obtained a good deal from the mouths of the organ of the committee and the Senator from Kansas, I shall sit down instructed by what I have heard.

Mr. DAWES. Mr. President, I do not want to protract this debate, and will not undertake to intrude upon the Senate any new solution of the Indian problem. I have found in the few years I have been here, about once a week all the time there comes out some new solution of the Indian problem. There is some good in every one of these solutions and there is a great deal that is impracticable in most of them. It has been my observation that those who have the most to do with the Indian have the least to say about the solution of the problem, and they say the least about it the more they have considered the question.

I do not quite understand the Senator from New Hampshire. For part of the time the Senator seems to be advocating the idea of going back to the old method of gathering the Indians together away from the white man and letting them alone, keeping them away from the white man, and he closed up by urging upon us the necessity of——

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator will allow me to say——

Mr. DAWES. Wait until I tell you what the last idea was.

One idea was to keep things as they have been and as they have been going on so gloriously down in the Indian Territory, without free contact with the white man—nothing to do with him; and the other, the last one, was to take the Indian and force him to work, teach him the necessity of work, and show him how to support himself and how he had got to support himself. Those two things can not go together. You have got to take him away from his isolation; you have got to take him and put him among white men to show him how they work and live. Now the Senator says that one thing is certain, that the Indian is to be exterminated either by Christian influences or by some other.

Mr. BLAIR. I say that is so upon the theory of some gentlemen, but I do not agree to it.

Mr. DAWES. Upon any theory it is absolutely certain that the Indian as an Indian is to disappear from this country, for this reason: The Indian as an Indian can not live here any more. The climatic changes have not wrought more effectually upon the character of animal and vegetable life the necessity of an absolute change than the conditions of life in this country since we came here have made it absolutely impossible for the Indian of the past, the Indian as an Indian, to live here in this country. The Indian of our fathers with this vast continent to roam over, dominant, powerful, the rulers of the continent, can not live here because there is no condition in which they can longer exist.

The Indian who lived by the chase, who lived by what he could find of live game in the country, and in no other way, can not live here now because the game has disappeared. The Indian of the reservation can not live here, he can not be here in this crowded country of ours, with the white civilization gathering in around him on all sides and pressing in upon him. The Indian of the reservation can live here no longer. The Indian as an Indian can find no place on this continent. The race will continue here. Statistics show that the race instead of diminishing in the last twenty-five or thirty years is increasing and multiplying in numbers on our hands; and when all the conditions of the past have disappeared a new condition comes, and he must live here under one of two conditions—in his old character or in a new character. If in his passed character, it is that of a savage tramp, with no knowledge of work, with no disposition to work, with no means of self-support, with no heritage upon which to live, no habitation in which to dwell, and he becomes of necessity and the conditions of the life he lives are those of a thriftless wanderer, gathering his food and sustenance as best he may, with the same character he had when he had the whole country to roam over. Or he must live under a changed character; he must be made a self-supporting citizen of the United States, or he will certainly be a vagabond with the instincts of a savage.

That is the alternative as an absolute necessity. You can not continue the old condition of things in the Indian Territory, I will say to my friend from New Hampshire; that is impossible. Those who have solutions for the Indian question almost as "thick as autumnal leaves in Vallombrosa," forget that conditions make character; conditions determine what is to be done with the Indian, the white man, the negro, and all civilized and uncivilized life around us. All these forces combine to make this country what it is and what it is to be, involve in their sweep the two hundred and fifty or three hundred thousand Indians here along with sixty million white people, and we are going on in one common destiny to one common end of good or ill. They go together.

Now I will say a few words about what my friend from Kansas has said. There was a poor, unfortunate Indian at the school at Hampton so disappointed with the life there that he could not stay there, and after having been there a couple of years he ran away from school and went off back to his tribe. The next thing heard of him he was a jockey at a horse-race; and he has done more service since then; he has turned up in every discussion of the Indian problem since then that I have heard of everywhere as the result of education at Hampton and Carlisle. Now the Carlisle school is not responsible for that. The

Carlisle school is not constructed on the principle of educating Indians and sending them back. The theory of Captain Pratt to do just what the Senator from Kansas thinks ought to be done——

Mr. PLUMB. Captain Pratt is somewhat enamored of that idea. He got that, perhaps, from the Senator from Massachusetts and myself very largely. Certainly the practice at Carlisle in that respect has changed very much in the last two years. Prior to that time the other theory was carried out there.

Mr. DAWES. Captain Pratt has between five and seven hundred pupils under him, two hundred of whom he has scattered among the farmers of Pennsylvania at work at day labor, respectable employés of the farmers of Pennsylvania, and he is distributing his scholars as fast as he can. He does not believe in sending them back. He believes just as the Senator from Kansas does, that the best way is to absorb them in the civilization of this country. General Armstrong believes that he can do with his pupils a great deal by sending them back onto the reservations, and they go back to the reservations and the history of every one that has gone from that school back to the reservations is kept. The record is kept as faithfully and clearly as the record and history of the family of the Senator from New Hampshire or my own. There can be shown that out of the whole of them scarcely 10 per cent. who have gone back among their people have failed to come up to the anticipations and hopes and promises with which they went out among their people, and that under the very treatment alluded to by the Senator from Kansas.

They are made harness-makers, they are made blacksmiths, and they have been taught all manner of trades, and then they are sent off among their people to seek employment themselves. But while the treaties and while the statutes of the United States require every Indian agent to employ Indians in all the service upon the reservations, yet right in the face of it Indian agents have employed white people, and these young Indians who come from the schools have to find employment as best they can. They go out among their people and white men are doing what they are taught to do and they can not get employment, and so they have a hard time of it. They have not only the discouragement of young men and young women seeking employment, but they have to withstand all the adverse influences of their tribe, and they go about like young white men who get through with their education, seeking employment.

Many a poor white boy, I know, has sought in vain for employment and has gone to the bad in consequence of all these influences against him. There are not 10 per cent. of these Indian youth that have gone to the bad.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] and the Senator from Minnesota in front of me [Mr. DAVIS] and myself were upon a reservation last fall where we made a stipulation in our treaty that all the work done upon that reservation should be done by Indians, and yet all the employés almost without exception were white men, and there were educated Indians of the Chippewa race and others educated at the schools, the training-school in the very State of Minnesota, within 80 or 90 miles of there, and yet the lack—and that is all I desire to call it—the lack of intuition on the part of those who manage the Indian there, the lack of that knowledge of the necessity to take by the hand these young Indians and lead them along, help them, has led to the employment of white men to do that which Indians could do. But all I desire to say is that nothing is left for us, nothing confronts us in this Indian question but the alternative between making the Indian a self-supporting citizen of the United States and a vagabond savage tramp, and we can take our choice.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, I hardly know how to regard the Senator from Massachusetts in his effort at frequent and, as I thought, trifling personal allusion to those who have solutions for the Indian question. I do not know whether he deems that we are to go on year after year appropriating money by the million and no man ever ask a question or intimate a question, or whether the Indian problem is one for which we are continually to furnish money without asking those under whose direction we make these contributions occasionally to give us even an opinion on the subject. I do not think he could have had that idea, and therefore I presume I trespass not at all on any propriety of this Chamber in trying to find out something about the theory upon which we are spending our millions and either killing or curing the savage, one of the two.

So much for that part of the subject. Now, I am still forced to the conclusion by what the Senator says and fails to say, and by what the Senator from Kansas says and does not say, that the civilized tribes in their existence are a demonstration of the fact that the only way in which we can expect to accomplish good for this Indian population is to carry the good to the Indian population, is to oblige the Indian to acquire the knowledge that is wanted, and that it is not necessary that we expend our millions to break up the ties of humanity, to take the young boys and girls from their fathers and their mothers and distribute them among another, an alien, a hostile race, a race where, if they live at all, they live by ignoring and destroying the affiliations of childhood and youth.

I think the case of the civilized tribes is a demonstration that the true road to success is by carrying the principles of Christianity and the influence of the gospel and of civilization that the white man has attained after the two thousand years he has lived under the golden rule and the doctrine of the atonement and of Christianity, by carrying to them where they are, just as they were brought to our fathers who were savages but very little better than the Indians—by carrying to them the same influences as have made the difference between us and them, and applying them where the difficulty is, just as they were applied to us by the early missionaries, just as St. Patrick went to Ireland and just as St. Augustine and others carried the Christian religion to the pagans and the savages who surrounded them.

The fact that in these later years these five partially civilized tribes have retrograded, if you please, that violence has broken out among them, that it has been necessary to enact the law to which allusion has been made, the fact that this present condition has supervened upon the progress which they were making is not a fact from which the conclusion can logically be drawn which has been drawn that it is impossible to civilize the Indian where he is by carrying the medicine where the disease itself exists and locating its action where its action is needed. But it seems that, ignoring and in hostility to these influences and this good which was gradually being wrought out, we have surrounded them by the adverse influences of our own civilization; we have obstructed the gradual improvement that was going on, and we have presented to them Christianity intermixed with the remnants of savagery still lingering in our civilization. That is the difficulty. We have only to remove that difficulty and give the other theory which was formerly acted on by the missionaries full force and scope in order to produce to its full extent the result of elevation and advancement which is desired.

The Senator says that the percentage as shown is that at least 90 out of every 100 of the Indians educated at Hampton and who have been sent back to the tribes from which they came have maintained themselves in the condition of elevation and improvement which they acquired here in the Eastern schools. I doubt not that that is so and that it is true all over, and that if the white man was not allowed to go in among the Indians and compete for labor and practically exclude this Indian child after we have educated him from the opportunity of improving those who are around him by the exercise of the improved powers we have given him—if, I say, the white man did not go there and strike down the good which had been accomplished by these schools, we should find the tribes of Indians in other parts of the country improving and following after the model of what we call the civilized tribes up to the time when these adverse influences fell upon them by the rapacity of our civilization.

Now, I ask the Senator this question, why, if educating an Indian boy on the coast of the Atlantic in the arts of civilization and sending him back to the tribe from which he came is a good thing, and if the theory is carried out will result in the improvement of his tribe, why precisely the same effect would not be accomplished by locating the school where the tribe already is? If Hampton was in the middle of the Sioux reservation, if Carlisle was in the middle of the Sioux reservation, does anybody believe that the excellence of its influences would be lost upon the Indian tribes surrounding it? On the contrary, it seems to me it must be in comparison to what is now accomplished like the light of the sun in heaven burning and illuminating right where the darkness itself is. Carry light where the darkness is, and in my opinion the uplifting of the Indian tribes would be a matter of comparatively little expense.

I do not believe that there is so much difference in the different races of men. As to the Anglo-Saxon race, of which we are so proud and consider the highest form of civilization, I believe if when our ancestors were pirates they had been subjected to the influences which the Indian now suffers under, they would have been extirpated and destroyed. But Christianity took possession of the pirate—took him where it found him—improved the pirate's character, his whole character—elevated the whole character, and the Anglo-Saxon race of the present is the result. Those conditions came by carrying the elements of Christianity to those who were to be improved and changed by them.

The proposition of the Senator is simply saying that the savage can not be a savage after he is civilized; that under civilizing influences his condition must change. He can not live permanently a savage under the influences of civilization. Of course he can not. All that we are doing is undertaking to carry to him these new conditions, and it is a mere question whether we are to bring here the Indian's child and educate him and have him carry back civilization by the spoonful or by the peck measure, or whether we are to locate the school where the Indian is, in that fruitful soil, and develop and illuminate and civilize him by the wholesale. That is all there is in this.

For my own part I am willing to vote these appropriations, and I am anxious to see them applied in both ways. I believe that the Carlisle school is a great blessing, that the Hampton school is a great blessing, and that they are doing great things for the Indians to-day. But we are doing them in a small way, and while they accomplish what they can it will be well for us to locate like institutions devoted especially on the spot to the accomplishment of the great work in which they are engaged under great disadvantages.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, some question has been raised as to the conduct of the Indian Bureau under this Administration. I do not

know of any administration of which it can be said that the conduct of Indian affairs has been less subject to unfavorable criticism. It has been more successful than under any previous administrations, as I read the report of the Commissioner.

A more conscientious administration, in reference to its duties, and a more successful one in obtaining the results looked for has not recently obtained. No doubt the head of the bureau has had the usual difficulties which attend this subject, but on the whole his administration has been eminently successful—honest and clean-handed. The proofs of this will be found in the official reports. The school at Carlisle, under Captain Pratt, continues to be an eminent success. The schools on the reservations and elsewhere are doing as well as, if not better than, at any former period. I am a friend of the education of the Indian, as I am of all the people; and I have confidence that, under a proper system, the Indian and every other people may be civilized and made submissive to and conversant with all the humanizing arts and influences of our civilization; and I believe the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has been sincerely desirous of bringing this result into practical and successful effect.

Having said this much, which I think is due in vindication of the Commissioner and his administration of Indian affairs, I wish to say that I am opposed to the change which the bill makes in removing the charge of Indian education from the Commissioner. I have heard of no ground upon which reasonably it can be assumed that an independent superintendent of education to be subject alone to the Secretary of the Interior, and that in a somewhat doubtful manner to be entirely exempt from the control or supervision of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is a proper arrangement.

It will cause a divided authority over the same subject-matter and over the same people. An Indian agent and the Commissioner of Indian Affairs have comparatively little to do except in the matter of education of one kind or another. The education of the Indian is practical education. His subsistence and their protection in the rights given by the Government compose the agent's whole duty, and the larger part is the educational part. If there is any force in the idea that the education of the Indian should be regarded as of supreme importance and that a special jurisdiction should supervise the conduct of inferior agents and teachers, that may be very well, but that does not import that it should be independent of the agent, or the agent independent of the Commissioner, or the superintendent of education independent of the Commissioner.

Either the superintendent should be the Commissioner or the Commissioner the superintendent, and if you wish to have a general superintendent he should be inferior to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. He should be so placed and subordinated directly to the control of one chief, one head. If there be at any time some administrator of Indian affairs who is inefficient, who is incapable, that does not prove that the system is wrong. It simply means that you have the wrong incumbent of the office, and that he should be removed. But the idea is a correct one of responsibility in one head and with one person charged with a single discretion to carry out the law and execute the policy declared by the laws.

I venture the opinion here, and withhold my vote from this amendment to this bill, that there can be no good effect resulting from a divided jurisdiction over the same subject-matter and the same people, and for that reason I am opposed to this provision of the bill. The education of the Indian in the practical business of life, in the arts and handicrafts which will make him self-supporting, is all-important. Much has been done and is now being done in this direction, but I think the change made by this bill will not have a beneficial effect, and I shall vote against it.

Mr. PLUMB. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the word "such," in line 16 of section 8, before the word "schools," and inserting after the word "schools" the words "wholly supported by the Government."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment to the amendment will be stated.

Mr. BATE. Before that is read I wish to say that I was out of the Senate Chamber when the Senator from Kansas began his remarks, and I understood from the Senator from Florida, who has just spoken, that the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] made, during my absence, some comments on the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, General Atkins. He is my constituent, and I have known him during our lives. I have known him personally, officially, and comparatively; I know the reputation which he bears among the people whom I represent. I think that any reflections sought to be made upon him, or his administration, in the Senate, are without foundation.

I do not know whether my impression is correct; but if I understand correctly the statement of the Senator from Kansas, it was that the Indian schools were not kept up to that high standard under his administration that they ought to be. I have read the official reports from that bureau; I have had somewhat to do with this Department as its friend and as a Senator.

I have not, however, been a member of the committee to which such matters are referred, and therefore am not so familiar with the details of its management as otherwise I should have been; but from what I have been enabled to learn from the reports of that bureau and other sources I am persuaded that the administration of the educational feature is up to the highest standard of such schools, and has been so kept during his administration, and his will compare favorably with any previous administration of Indian affairs.

No one knows better than the Senator from Kansas that there is much to embarrass and criticise in the conduct of the Indian Bureau, and has been for half a century; and yet I repeat that during no administration has it attained a higher degree of excellence than it has under that which now has charge of it, and every dollar which has been appropriated to it has gone through the proper channels and has been put to the best and most efficient purposes and uses that possibly could have been under the circumstances.

I understand further that the Senator said that the management of Indian affairs has been subordinated to patronage, carrying the implication that the Commissioner has used it perhaps for either a party or a personal purpose. That I deny, and I say that in the dispensation of that patronage the Commissioner has not only shown a liberality towards his opponents, but he has shown a justice and a discrimination that is praiseworthy. You may take the State of Kansas, if you please, that the gentleman well represents on this floor, and take the State that the Commissioner himself is from, the State of Tennessee, and compare the numbers and the character of those who have been the recipients of his patronage, and you will find that there can be no cause of complaint whatever. If I understand it, there have been two to one, or more, who have been appointed from Kansas to these school positions than from the State of Tennessee.

Furthermore, if the Senator means that Commissioner Atkins has exercised a partiality for Democrats in making appointments, I say amen. I am one of those who believe that when a party is in power it has a right to gather around it its friends and those who sympathize with it politically. If the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has done this, if that is what the Senator means by the exercise of patronage, I approve it. I say that when a vacancy occurs in the bureau he has charge of, and he is the appointing power, it is then for him to exercise the discretion and say whether he will appoint a man who reflects his own political sentiments, or go elsewhere and select an antagonist as his subaltern officer. I think prudence would dictate that the Commissioner should, in a bureau where money is to be handled, bonds given, and the delicacy of official relationship has to be observed, the intercourse must needs be confidential, he should call around him men of his own political convictions. If that be the intimation, then I, for one, approve it, and say to my constituent, well done. I have no cause of criticism for that; neither have I fear for the consequences of such.

The other point made, as I understand, is that his subordinates seem to be running the bureau. That has been so successfully answered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] who has just taken his seat, that I feel that I am not called upon to say anything in regard to it. But who does not know when there is an office with machinery like the Indian Bureau, perhaps more embarrassing than in any other bureau in this Government, that the Commissioner is forced to rely on those who are his subordinates?

They are away, many of them, a great distance; there are but few of them in his office, where he can give personal supervision; but he has to rely on the character of the men and must appoint them on their reputations and characters as shown to him. That he may have made some bad appointments I do not deny; I know, however, instances where he has certainly removed agents, although they were appointed on the recommendation of his own political party, and members of that party, because they did not work the machinery as he desired and in the most efficient manner for the interest of the Government. Knowing that, I conclude, and I have a right to do so, I think, legitimately, that this Commissioner has exercised discretion and good faith in his appointments and in the conduct of his office.

He is a man who has held himself without criticism for thirty years, honored and trusted by his people. No judgment should be passed upon him unless the facts are given to sustain it before the country. Therefore I am here to defend in this way Commissioner Atkins. He may have committed errors in some respects. But who does not? He has done well, and no antecedents in that bureau have done better than Commissioner Atkins, and I doubt whether any one who will follow him, with the same embarrassments, will do better.

I felt, Mr. President, that this much was due to my constituent and the honorable reputation that he bears as to the conduct of his office so far as I have been able to learn it. I trust that if there are any things the Senator from Kansas knows that ought to be exposed, it will be done. I will not shrink from meeting them, and I believe that there is a full answer to any charge that can be make against him. If there is anything that ought to be known, let it come. He does not want to screen himself; he is open as day, and he is willing and ready to meet anything that may be said against him or his administration, and I court any investigation that may be desired.

As for comparison, whether the bureau is better managed now than it was formerly, that is a question of opinion which may be biased by the political sentiment of critics. For him, however, I have to say that he is honest, honorable, pure, and his reputation always has been of

that character, and I think he has conducted the bureau in a manner that will be approved by the people of this country in a way honorable to himself, and just and economical, and to the interests of the country.

Mr. PLUMB. The statement made by the Senator from Tennessee, to the effect that whoever succeeded the present Commissioner of Pensions would not do any better than the present incumbent himself, brings up a question that I do not now care to go into very deeply. With the material the President has at his disposal for such appointments, it may be he can do no better. The Senator knows better than I whether the Democratic party contains any one more fitted for the performance of the duties of Commissioner of Indian Affairs than the person now occupying that office. I will not go into that phase of the question.

Mr. BATE. It is certain that the Republican party did not furnish a better man.

Mr. PLUMB. I indorse all the Senator has said about the propriety of Democrats being appointed to office under a Democratic administration of the Indian Office as well as in all the other Departments of the Government. I am even willing that that which has never before occurred in the history of the Government, that politics be made the test of the appointment of Indian traders, still shall be continued so long as this administration lasts. I do not object to that. I do not know how many appointments there may be in the Indian Bureau from the State of Kansas. I am entirely free from knowledge on that subject. I can only recall one, but there may be a thousand for aught I know, and it may be, as the Senator says, that they are not up to the standard of those who have been appointed from the State of Tennessee. If that is one way of casting mud at the Democracy of Kansas, I do not know that I feel called on to defend them. I only regret that if they are not equal to the small remnant of unappointed Democrats to be found in Tennessee that the Commissioner did not ignore Kansas entirely and appoint all the employés from Tennessee. That certainly would seem to be the proper thing for the civil service, to take the best men who can be found, whether found in Kansas, Tennessee, or elsewhere. And if, as the Senator seems to intimate, the appointments from Kansas have not been up to the standard of those made from Tennessee, all, of course, being Democrats, I think there has been a very great mistake made and the quantum from Kansas ought to be displaced by appointments from Tennessee.

Mr. BATE. The Senator knows that I have said nothing in disparagement of those appointed from Kansas. Of course, I do not personally know the character or even the politics of the appointees, but I only stated the fact that if the Senator will look over the record he will find that more than twice as many have been appointed from his State, whether Democrats or Republicans I do not know, as from mine; and Mr. Atkins being a Democrat, he certainly should have appointed Democrats. If he did not, I say he should have done so. I have no reflection to make on the character of the men appointed who are constituents of the Senator from Kansas. I know nothing about them, but I do believe if General Atkins appointed men from that State he certainly appointed Democrats who were qualified and just as good as any who belong to the opposite party.

Mr. PLUMB. The Senator is shifting the issue a little. I supposed it was a question of quality, and now it seems to be a question of quantity.

Mr. BATE. I do not think it has always heretofore been regarded as a question of quality. As nothing has been heard of Indian traderships during his administration must be an improvement.

Mr. PLUMB. If the Senator from Tennessee means to intimate now, as it seems he does, that the President or the Commissioner of Indian Affairs has been able to find more qualified persons in the Democratic party in Kansas for office than he has been able to find in the State of Tennessee and other Democratic States, then he ministers to my State pride. But the Senator entirely mistakes my opinion upon this question if he supposes I complain about the character or locality of appointments under this Administration. I am like the Senator in wishing the Administration to have its own. I can illustrate my position more perfectly by relating an actual occurrence. A Democrat was appointed to a post-office in Kansas. A fellow-Democrat living in his town wrote to me to say that the appointee was not only a gambler, but had been convicted of gambling in the police court of the town; that he was not only a drunkard, but had been convicted of drunkenness in public, and he wanted to know if I, a Republican Senator, was going to vote to confirm such a man. My answer was that I did not know anything about the material the President had to work with in that section of the State. He was better qualified, certainly, to determine the qualifications, relative and actual, of the Democracy of the town in which this man had been appointed postmaster than I was, and I was bound to presume he had done the very best he could under the circumstances, and that I was so willing that the Democrats should have all the offices that I would give to even such an appointment as was under consideration the benefit of a belief that the President could do no better and vote for the confirmation.

So the Senator can get up no issue with me on this point. When I spoke of patronage I alluded to the necessary absorption by the Commissioner in the removal of Republican office-holders and Indian traders and their substitution by active Democrats. This duty was so much the most important that the Commissioner has not had time to attend to the ordinary duties of administration in his office. The brokerage in traderships, with headquarters in a Southern State, has been a very absorbing subject for the Commissioner.

Mr. President, I alluded to the schools because I found that the House of Representatives, Democratic in composition, unanimously agreed that they ought to be taken out from under the supervision of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, where they have been from the beginning, and that in that they agreed with the Senate, and in neither body has there been a single dissent from the proposition to take away from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs this most important function. The Senator can put whatever construction he pleases on this unanimous legislative action. I know that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is an honest man. He confesses that himself publicly three or four times every day that he lives, and that constitutes the best evidence. I believe he is just as honest as he confesses himself to be. I have never disputed it. I raise no question on that.

The substance of my complaint is that the Commissioner is unequal to the situation. He is a man of advanced years and of failing powers. He has had no experience in administration. He has fallen into the hands—unwisely, I think—of the experienced men whom he found running the financial department of his bureau. He has done what he thought, under all the circumstances, was the best by accepting the machinery which we furnished him and to do what these experienced people told him to do. I do not think he has misappropriated any money. The very nature of the machinery which he found ready to his hand when he came into office and which he has used would prevent it, if nothing else, and I know that there is no such desire on his part to do aught that is wrong. But he has been comparatively helpless. He has not the comprehensive intellect or the mental or physical vigor to control and direct the affairs of his great office, one of the greatest offices of the Government. There is more room for the exercise of quiet, judicious, wholesome power in the office of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs than probably in any bureau of the Government. It requires a man of great grasp, of mental, intellectual vigor, of determination; not a narrow man, not a man who quibbles about little things. He deals with a situation which presses him at every point, which can not be solved by general rules, which produces a multitude of cases that have got to be decided each upon its own merits. Perhaps it is not any reflection on the present incumbent to say that he has not been equal to this great situation.

It takes a wise man, a good man, and a strong one for it; one who is in the prime of life, in the enjoyment of his full intellectual faculties and capacity. Such a man I hope we shall get some of these days to deal with this problem that so concerns us in regard to the welfare of a dependent race of people to whom we are bound by the ties of humanity, of obligation, and of duty.

I have no doubt that many of the schools have been going on with a certain degree of excellence. Some of them may not have deteriorated; but there is lack of organization of system, and it is confessed that a change in control is necessary. And if I had time I should like to go into the administration of the affairs of the office in the Indian Territory. I should like to produce proof, which I can produce, that there is more drunkenness among Indians in the Indian Territory than ever before. I could show that never has there been a time when the despotism of the trader has been so manifest as now; that the Indians have never been so swindled by the men sent there under the auspices of the Government to sell them goods as is the case to-day.

Mr. BATE. I know nothing of that; but it is open to the Senator to make his charges, and I challenge him to make the facts known, and the man guilty of such offenses will be removed. A great many things may occur out there, 3,000 miles away, not known here at the center; but as soon as it is known to a man of the character of this Commissioner the guilty party will be removed. I think it is due him, when the Senator states that fact, to make it known through some proper channel, so that the service may be corrected if there is anything wrong in it.

As to the capacity of the Commissioner, a man who has held a high position in the other wing of the Capitol as representative of an intelligent constituency for fifteen or twenty years, and made a national reputation at the head of some of the chief committees there, and the American people are satisfied as to his character and pronounced a favorable verdict upon his capacity, he need have no fears of public judgment on that score.

As to age, he is but little older than my friend, and I think he is certainly in the full vigor of manhood. I say, therefore, he is up to the occasion—competent for the office he holds, and he exercises it with a discretion and urbanity becoming to any man who holds the position he does.

Mr. PLUMB. The Senator introduced the last part of this subject to the Senate. I did not bring it in. He replies to something I have not charged.

Mr. BATE. Let us understand each other. I only speak for this gentleman against the charge made. If no charges are made, very

well. I did not want it to go out in the daily papers or in the RECORD to last for all time that such charges were made against Commissioner Atkins without a proper defense. I have done that simply not only as a duty but to vindicate justice and the right.

Mr. PLUMB. The Senator perhaps does well to defend his constituent. I make no complaint about that. I repeat, however, that it is amply susceptible of proof that the condition of affairs in the Indian country is worse than it has been for the last fifteen years at least. The control of the traders is greater than ever; the Indians are worse cheated than when they were more in debt, and there never was a time when drunkenness was so common. The demoralization existing is very great, and this grows out of the lax management of the Indian Office in the main.

I did not expect, of course, that this matter would come up in connection with this bill, or I should have come armed with the proof which I shall make at a later period. It is not for me to tell the Commissioner of Indian Affairs that which comes within the purview of his jurisdiction and possibly under his knowledge and not specially or officially under mine. It is not for me to tell him that maladministration is going on in his department. It is not for me to tell him where the very purpose of the organization of his bureau is being defeated. He ought to know that himself if he is competent for his place.

Mr. BATE. But the Senator makes the statement on the floor of the Senate. Then he ought to be armed with the proof, so as to give him a chance to explain it if it becomes necessary to explain it, to refute it if it should be necessary, and see if he has not some facts which can be brought forward to set the matter right.

Mr. PLUMB. I make the statement now, on my responsibility as a Senator, that all the things which I have stated are true in regard to the condition of affairs among the Indians of the Indian Territory.

Mr. BATE. Do I understand the Senator to say that he knows these things personally?

Mr. PLUMB. I know them by contact with persons who are familiar with affairs in the Indian Territory.

Mr. BATE. Ah!

Mr. PLUMB. And for whom I vouch.

Mr. BATE. Then I know by contact with persons on the other side that they are not true.

Mr. PLUMB. You assume to know a negative, which no man can really know.

Mr. BATE. I see that, of course; but I get it from those men who are at the headquarters, and know these things.

Mr. PLUMB. It is the headquarters I am arraigning.

Mr. BATE. A man can certainly know a negative to be a negative.

Mr. PLUMB. It is the headquarters I am arraigning. I am not taking the word of those who are responsible for this, but I am taking the word of agents in the Indian Territory, persons who have had dealings with the Indians and with agents in the Territory. I am taking the common knowledge and judgment of men all along the entire border. I am taking the statement of officials who have had to do with the trial of causes arising in the Indian Territory, the statements made in newspapers and not gainsaid or questioned, although they are not matters within my personal knowledge. I know there is such a place as London. I never saw it. I know of the existence of a great many other things I have never seen, and yet my knowledge is no less perfect, no less definite because it is to a certain extent the result of hearsay.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, so now at last we are at the bottom of it. The trouble in the Indian Territory and among the civilized tribes is owing to rum, and not to religion and civilization. There is the trouble, and the bill which has come over from the other House providing for measures by which we can keep the officers of the law from being murdered in the discharge of their duties, which seem to multiply greatly of late, is not to be attributed to the operations of the missionaries or the civilizing influences that were going on among the Indians as the result of the method which I have alluded to earlier in this debate. That bill, I say, is to be attributed to the vices of the white man and not to any fault in that system of civilizing the red man. So I hold that still my illustration of what has been done by the civilized tribes is a demonstration of the true method of trying to make something of the Indian, and nobody has met that historical example as yet.

There are a good many things about this bill that I should like to know, and some that I want to know and mean to know about before I get through. I should like to know, in the first place, what the full amount of the appropriation is. The Senator from Massachusetts, of course, can state the aggregate. Bills of this kind frequently show the aggregate. I find nothing here but a multiplicity of items, with nothing to show the total. Perhaps the Senator can tell me.

Mr. DAWES. If the Senator would read the report, No. 1375——

Mr. BLAIR. I have not seen it, but I have read the bill. Will the Senator give me the aggregate? I do not ask the Senator to read the report, which is a day long.

Mr. DAWES. As I reported to the Senate, the amount appropriated by the bill, given on the first page of the report, is $8,172,129.13.

Mr. BLAIR. Can the Senator give me the amount which is expended for what is called education, for support of schools?

Mr. DAWES. If the Senator will turn to the fifth page of the report he will see that the amount for the support of schools appropriated by the bill, as passed by the other House, is $1,307,015. In the bill as reported to the Senate the amount is $1,348,015.

Mr. BLAIR. Can the Senator state to us the amount that is appropriated for schools outside of the Indian reservations or Territory; that is, for the Indian schools in Kansas and the Eastern States?

Mr. DAWES. If the Senator will turn to the fourth page of the report he will find at the bottom of the page a table giving the amount appropriated for the support of Indian schools, for day and industrial schools, construction and repair of school buildings at Albuquerque so much, Alaska industrial school so much, etc.

Mr. BLAIR. The items are in the bill itself.

Mr. DAWES. The items are in the bill itself, and the amount is carried out in a table on the fourth page of the report.

Mr. BLAIR. What is the amount? Will the Senator state it?

Mr. DAWES. Those schools separately are not added up by themselves, but I can give the Senator each item.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not care for that, because the items are in the bill itself.

Mr. DAWES. I can not give the Senator the aggregate of the amount appropriated for schools outside of the reservations and the amount for schools inside the reservations, the amount for the training-schools, the amount for the day schools, and the amount for the boarding-schools. They are all in this table, but they are not added up separately.

Mr. BLAIR. I wish to call the Senator's attention to the fact which appears on the fiftieth page of the bill, that there is "for support of Indian day and industrial schools, and for other educational purposes not hereinafter provided for," an appropriation of $685,000; "for the construction and repair of school buildings, $55,000; and for purchase of horses, cattle, sheep, and swine for schools, $10,000; in all, $750,000;" and then a proviso is added. I ask the Senator if it be the fact that the entire appropriation for the support of schools, save only the $750,000, is included in the appropriation for the support of children at the various independent schools outside of the reservations?

Mr. DAWES. There are treaty schools maintained by a fund, and there are treaty schools maintained in other ways.

Mr. BLAIR. Those are not appropriated for in this bill?

Mr. DAWES. This $750,000 is to be a sum of money in the hands of the Indian Bureau to maintain all maintained schools not enumerated in the bill. There are schools enumerated in the bill and appropriations made for those schools. Then there is the sum of one hundred and odd thousand dollars for purposes of Indian education, to be put into the hands of the Commissioner of Indian Affairs to be expended by him.

Mr. BLAIR. The point that I want to reach, if I can, is the amount that is appropriated by the bill for schools like the school at Albuquerque, in New Mexico, the rate per pupil being $167 per annum, making $35,000; and for support of Indian industrial school at Carlisle, not exceeding $167 for each pupil, $80,000. From that point on through the bill there seem to be perhaps twenty or more schools, to each of which is made a large appropriation for the support of a mentioned number of Indian pupils, all of them receiving $167 apiece. I should like to know the amount, or about the amount, that is appropriated for the maintenance of pupils at these various schools among the white folks at $167 per pupil.

Mr. DAWES. Take $750,000, in the first paragraph, from $1,348,015, and the remainder will be what is expended otherwise here. Five hundred and ninety-eight thousand and fifteen dollars is expended in support of the schools mentioned in this bill.

Mr. BLAIR. That is what I supposed, making about $600,000 that is distributed among these various schools for the support, culture, and discipline of the Indian pupils, at $167 each.

Mr. DAWES. The schools are not all in the East.

Mr. BLAIR. Schools among the white people, then?

Mr. DAWES. Those that are separate from the reservations.

Mr. BLAIR. Separate from the body of the Indian population?

Mr. DAWES. There are some on the border, like the school at Chilocco, which are not properly among the Indians, but are very near them.

Mr. BLAIR. I think I understand the Senator. On the fifty-second page of the bill I find the following item:

> For support and education of one hundred and twenty Indian pupils at the school at Hampton, Va., $20,040.

That is to support one hundred and twenty Indian pupils. Then there is a second appropriation provided—an appropriation of $1,000 for transporting Indian children to and from that school. I should like to ask the Senator if he thinks that is a prudent, economical, and judicious use of public money in the education of these one hundred and twenty Indian pupils?

Mr. DAWES. I am sorry that the Senator has picked up his old quarrel with General Armstrong on his educational bill.

Mr. BLAIR. I have not, but I shall do so if the Senator desires.

Mr. DAWES. I do not desire it. I want to get this bill through

and that is what made me regret that the Senator had brought up the question.

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator does not want to have the bill passed until it has been discussed and understood and appreciated upon its merits?

Mr. DAWES. The Hampton Institute is established and has been maintained by the Presbyterian body of Christians.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not ask the Senator to make a speech. If he is not inclined to answer my question definitely I will just keep the floor, and he can reply to me when I get through.

Mr. DAWES. Does the Senator wish to have the floor?

Mr. BLAIR. No; I should like to have the Senator's opinion as to whether he thinks that these appropriations at this rate are judiciously made.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator must take my opinion as I give it. I am not going to have the Senator prescribe the way I give it.

Mr. BLAIR. Let me ask the Senator the question, then——

Mr. DAWES. I thought the Senator had asked it already.

Mr. BLAIR. I ask the Senator whether in his opinion it is an economical and judicious method of expending public money in the matter of education to appropriate at the rate of $167 per pupil for the support of these children at Hampton, Lawrence, Carlisle, and these various other schools, where, it seems, some $600,000 of the public money is thus appropriated?

Before the Senator answers the question, as he seems to think, with a prescience that I commend him for, because his imagination outruns the fact, that I am picking up some old quarrel, I wish to say that I am not doing that at all. I have no old quarrel with anybody about this matter. But the discussion this afternoon has set me thinking about some of these things, and as the Senator from Massachusetts has studied these subjects a great while, and I presume for quite a number of Congresses has not been called upon to explain much about these appropriations, he will pardon me for asking him a few questions, and I do not know that I am likely to be deterred from doing it by the intimation that I have some old quarrel with somebody, when I have no old quarrel with anybody, and no new one either, for that matter.

These children are being educated at $167 apiece. There is great doubt or at least a question between the two eminent members of the Appropriations Committee who bring us this bill whether the child, after being thus educated, is made the better or made the worse, whether he is made a good Indian, whether he is fitted for civilized life, or simply is unfitted for savage life and thus practically ruined by his education.

The Senator from Massachusetts says that the institutions which educate these boys and get these enormous amounts of money for so doing follow them to their wilderness retreats again, and that according to the record which they make up for them 90 per cent. of them amount to something. The Senator from Kansas says that they become the worst kind of barbarians again, destroyed by the process of educated uselessness, neither fit for the savage nor the civilized life, and that their education is a dead loss. I do not know how that may be. The Senator from Kansas is very likely to know something about it, for he lives in that vicinity. But I assume, for my instincts and feelings are in that direction, that the Senator from Massachusetts is right, and that the Indian educated at Hampton and at Carlisle is improved by the process, and that he carries some good influence back to the people from whom he came.

However, the Senate will observe that here is annually expended, aside from transportation, $167 for each one of these pupils. At Hampton, for instance, which strikes my eye, the appropriation for this purpose to educate 120 Indian pupils is $20,040. The pupil is brought here; he is taken into this institution; he is boarded; he is clothed; and he is educated, and that is the amount of the cost. If there was a school among the Indians the same sort of instruction could be given, I venture to say, by a not larger number than two teachers. The plant once existing, that is to say, the school once established among the Indians, two teachers could very well take care of these 120 pupils. Vast numbers of the common schools of the country are filled with more than that number to each teacher.

I am asking for information; but it seemed to me that $1,000 or $1,500 given to a teacher on the spot would enable two teachers to impart as much instruction as is given by the process which is here pursued, the figure of which I do not wonder at when I see twenty or thirty institutions thriving under it, sure of their support and maintenance from the funds of the Government, when they would bankrupt themselves as private institutions, depending upon the ordinary sources that such private institutions have to depend upon for their support.

I say that in this way it has seemed to me that the money of the Government has been expended in the most uneconomical manner that could be imagined, and I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to answer the question I have propounded. I do not know but that there may be views of it by which it may be made to appear that what two teachers could do for $3,000, or $5,000 at the most, is economically performed under this system at $21,000 or $22,000, but I do not see how it can be so, and I ask the Senator to explain it.

Before he does that, since he has alluded to the supposed quarrel, to which I should not have alluded, I will ask him upon what basis it is that an institution like the one at Hampton, the head of which says that the imparting of education from any extraneous source demoralizes the people—that they must educate themselves—I ask him upon what principle it is that that is a rule which should apply to the negro or any individual or family or community which is found in our own immediate civilization and should not apply to the Indian himself? Why should he not be called upon to educate himself and to starve and remain a barbarian until he does it?

But, Mr. President, that is an argument the absurdity of which hardly needs a question to expose it. If I had a quarrel it would be that an eminent educator, himself a preacher of charity, coming here in this very bill asking charity in order that his institution may exist and may do good, should ever have propounded a theory of the description to which allusion has been made. That is no quarrel of mine. It is for the man who advances the absurdity to get along with it, and account for it theoretically as well as to account for his own contrary conduct.

Now I will ask the Senator if he considers this system of educating these Indian children a judicious and economical one, and if so, why?

Mr. DAWES. Mr. President, I do not consider that the system under which Indian education is carried on is the best possible. It is a very imperfect system. It is improving, I think, every day. It is enlarging its scope; it is increasing its efficiency; it is producing better results every day, and is growing, more and more answering the great end for which it was inaugurated. The system is but ten years old. It was begun with an appropriation of $20,000; it now covers an appropriation in this bill of $1,300,000. It has various phases. It has the day school upon the reservation, where simply a teacher is hired for $500 or $600 and attends to the school as well as he may. That is the teacher whom the Senator declared, with the aid of another one, could do what General Armstrong is doing with $20,000. He thinks he could accomplish all that with $2,000. General Armstrong takes the scholar and supports him; he keeps him day and night, and clothes him.

Mr. BLAIR. Will not the Senator answer me whether it would not be more judicious to support this Indian child at home, where we are already supporting his whole tribe?

Mr. DAWES. Will the Senator not let me answer him in my hobbling way as well as I can? I can not do it any better, and the moment when I am getting along as well as I can with these interrogatories of my learned friend, he gets up and complains, and asks, "Will you not answer better?"

Mr. BLAIR. Oh, no, Mr. President——

Mr. DAWES. I am doing as well as I know how. I want to say to the Senator that there are a great many kinds of these schools. It is necessary that there should be a great many kinds of them, because there are a great many things to be taught a savage who does not know anything, and there are a great many ways that you have got to go to work to teach him, and some of them cost a good deal more than others. A day-school is a good thing in some places and it is not good for anything in another place. Take a day-school among the Comanches and it would not be better than having a school of blue-jays. Then there is the boarding-school on the reservation. That is an excellent thing in some places and does wonderfully good work. Then there is the training-school, the purpose of which is to teach a savage Indian from the bottom clear up, to teach him how to walk, to teach him how to do everything in the world, just as my friend was taught when he was a little boy. Now, that costs a good deal more. You must have machine-shops, you must have tools, and you must have a great many things that you do not have in any of the schools to which the Senator alludes, what he calls a common school, with a school-marm. You can not teach Indian children how to make shoes with a school-marm in a log school-house, or how to make tin ware, or how to make harness, or how to make clothes, merely with a school-marm at $600 a year in a little school-house, such as he and I went to school in when we were boys. That costs a good deal more.

Now, Mr. President, the Senator wants to know whether I think it is economical. It is pretty expensive, there is no doubt about that, and the results are not all that we could desire; but they are something. They are more every year than they were the year before; and the number of Indians who are learning to take care of themselves is increasing wonderfully on all the reservations. Indian wars have ceased; they have become impossible. Indian reservations, I have already said, are going by the board; something else is taking their place. This is pretty expensive; it requires a good deal of patience, not only with the Indians, but with some white men too. It is quite as difficult to get along with the outside adverse influences as it is to get along with the Indians themselves.

I can not tell exactly in dollars and cents whether it would be as cheap to let the Indian go by the board as to educate him and expend this money in trying to make something of him. I undertake to say, however, that it would not only be a reproach to this nation that would sooner or later exact a penalty from it, after having robbed the Indian for two centuries, stripped him, hunted him, cheated him, murdered him, burned him in his wigwam, to have turned him out and let him become a vagabond and a beggar in the country, it would not only be

a disgrace and a dishonor that would ultimately be paid for dearly, but it would be a most dangerous thing in those communities in which it would be the misfortune for such a body of people to undertake to roam, for they would roam and plunder.

I am not stopping, sir, to try to figure out whether it would cost six cents and a quarter more to teach one of these Indians at Hampton than to teach him somewhere else. I am for the best results, and the results at Hampton, at Carlisle, at Chilocco, and at Lawrence are results that are not to be measured by dollars and cents. One hundred and twenty pupils at Hampton, developed into self-supporting citizens of the United States for $20,000, are worth more to this Union than so many vagabonds, and they are worth more than they cost.

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator evades the question by implication. I asked him whether as compared with the appropriation of this money for like schools in the like way on the spot, the appropriation was a judicious and an economical one.

Mr. DAWES. Did I not answer the Senator? I tried to do so. I will just say there are two or three plans, two or three ways of doing this. One is the theory and the plan upon which General Armstrong goes, to educate these Indians and send them back among their people to work out on the reservations the renovation and regeneration of their people. The other is the plan that Captain Pratt goes on, to educate and develop them into men and turn them out into the community to be absorbed. Another plan is the day-school, and another is the boarding-school. As to which is the best, there is a variety of opinion. Some think one is best and some another.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] gets up here, and from his observation and his information tells you that the very day-school you are pleading for is utterly worthless and ought to be abolished entirely. Now, I do not think so. I think every one of these schools, with different degrees of merit and different results, is useful. Everything that a white man does that is commendable brought in among these Indians, and in all the ways you can contrive, bringing them in contact with the right side of civilization at as many points as you can, is useful. Put railroads through everywhere; put white men's homes among them; let them be object-lessons. Everything of that kind has its influence for good. You can not tell whether a day-school is better than a family of white people living among them. In some places it would be better; in other places it would not be so good. It depends very much on the susceptibility of the Indian community in which they are to this kind of influence or that kind of influence.

For me to get up here and say that I can demonstrate that one kind of school is better than another kind of school among these savages of sixty or seventy different tribes, every one of them having a different and distinct characteristic of life, of habit, and of personality, to attempt to measure them all by one particular rule, is an absurdity.

Mr. BLAIR. Mr. President, it seems that after all it is a question that the Senator can not answer, and in his inability to do it I must concur, because he has demonstrated it by a somewhat prolonged effort to answer. If the confession had been made in the beginning it would have saved something of time. The Senator pursues throughout his effort to answer what he admits in the end to be unanswerable, a somewhat sneering style of comment which I observe at the same time that I will not, I think, mention it.

I did not suppose that it was necessary to bring an Indian to Carlisle or to Hampton to teach him how to walk and to run. I had the impression that the Indian race had developed a tolerable degree of agility without the assistance of civilized training under General Armstrong or Captain Pratt.

My inquiry was directed to a principle which when properly carried out would bring every Indian child across the continent and educate him along the shores of the Atlantic, and bring the Alaskan child to the same points and give him his education, and then send him back to that doubtful future status, whether of improvement or of the destruction of his good qualities even as a savage, which the Senator from Kansas has depicted. I say that a policy which at such an extraordinary expense leads to such absurdities in conduct and doubtful results, it seems to me, is properly one in regard to which question should be raised on this floor.

I can see myself how in order to give these Indians industrial training, as it is called, it may be well to bring some of them here to the Atlantic Slope, where they can come in contact with and learn to handle machinery, giving them industrial training and at the same time giving them education in the way of reading and writing, and I expect that they do not want much if anything more. These are processes to which the Indian child must be subjected like the white child, and the question whether it shall be done here, 3,000 miles from the place where his future is to be spent, or whether it shall be done on the spot, in the community where he was born, and to the improvement of which his education is to be dedicated, and whether it can be done there at a less expense than is now being incurred in the method that is being pursued, is one that those who have the guardianship of the public money might, it seems to me, well inquire into.

If the Indian children who are being educated in these Eastern schools are to go back and to act as instructors themselves, as teachers themselves, the limited number who are brought here may well be educated, it seems to me, even at a much higher expense, if it can be done with greater rapidity; and in the absence of the other system, the system of local development, undoubtedly it is better at any degree of expense to make the effort to do the work in the way it is being done in these Eastern schools. But I insist upon it that it is worthy of consideration on the part of the committee that every year comes in here and takes $8,000,000 and lays it out upon the Indians, when the most of it is laid out upon them in a way which is infinitely less creditable to our good sense and to our civilization than this pittance of it which is expended upon the schools, that is, in their support in a condition of idleness.

I say that when we lay out upon the 250,000 Indian men, women, and children (not more than 50,000 children in the whole of them) the amount of money which we have undertaken here in several Congresses to appropriate by the year for the period of only eight years' time to educate our own flesh and blood, as I expressed it a little while ago, I think it is time to inquire somewhat into this system of economy and this system of sentimentalism, when Senators get up here and say themselves, as was done in the earlier part of the debate, that it is questionable whether the Indian is to be saved at all, when it is admitted that war has destroyed him and peace has done just about the same, and after being educated to a certain extent, as in the case of the civilized tribes, as I call them, they are now retrograding and being gradually destroyed by ourselves and by our rum and the bad influences we bring to bear upon them. I say, Mr. President, when this is the ultimate result of the system of expenditure which has been going on from the beginning down to the present time and we are neglecting our own people, it is time to stop and inquire whether we are human ourselves exactly, to inquire something about charity beginning at home, something about justice beginning at home.

I think the committee may well consider, and the Senate may well consider, and the country may well consider whether it is judicious in the condition of the public funds when we can not educate our own children, that we should peddle our money out down here at Hampton and these other schools at $167 a head to Indian children, when they can get along at home and be educated at an expenditure of $1 where we now pay ten.

There is another point to which I should like to call the attention of the Senate, and I do it with deference. I should like to know how these various schools are supported. Who manages them? I see it stated in the papers, and great complaint made, that the Catholic Church has an undue influence in the administration of the money that is appropriated to the Indian schools. I should like to know about that. The Protestant denominations are raising this inquiry. I do not care so much about it myself, if it only educates the children and educates them economically and judiciously, but I should like to know about these different schools, what religious influences there are that get this money, and how it is that these appropriations are obtained from year to year, whether they are obtained, as is charged, by ingenuity and misdirection, or indirection, and for the support and for the benefit of particular ecclesiastical institutions, or whether it is otherwise; because it is a libel if it be otherwise. I think the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs ought to vindicate the Catholic Church if it is unjustly accused.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] to the amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB. In line 17 of the amendment I move to strike out the word "such" where it first occurs and insert the word "like;" in line 18 to strike out the word "the," after the word "of," and insert the word "such;" and to strike out the word "the" where it last occurs in the line and insert "then," and then to strike out the words "of such schools;" so as to read:

And any other person connected with schools wholly supported by the Government, and with like approval make such rules and regulations for the conduct of such schools as in his judgment their good may require.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Kansas to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in section 8, to strike out all after the word "schools," in line 5, as follows:

That it shall be the duty of the superintendent of Indian schools to visit, from time to time, and as often as the nature of his duties will permit, the schools where Indians are taught, in whole or in part, by appropriations from the United States Treasury, and, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, to report annually to Congress the condition and progress of said schools: what, in his judgment are the defects, if any, in any of them in system, in administration, or in means for the most effective advancement of the children in them toward civilization and self-support; and what changes are needed to remedy such defects as may exist. It shall be the duty of said superintendent, subject to the approval of the Secretary of the Interior, to employ and discharge superintendents, teachers, and any other person connected with such schools, and to make such rules and regulations for the conduct of the schools as in his judgment the good of such schools may require. He shall embody in detail his doings under

this section, with the reasons for his action in each case, in his annual report to Congress. The said superintendent shall be allowed and paid a salary of $4,000 per annum, and, in addition thereto, his actual and necessary traveling expenses incurred while in the discharge of the duties prescribed by this act, such expenses to be allowed and paid on vouchers approved by the Secretary of the Interior. The Secretary of the Interior shall cause to be detailed from the employés of his Department such assistants, and shall furnish such facilities, as shall be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 9, line 18, after the word "requisition," to insert "or requisitions;" after the word "made," at the end of the same line, to insert "by the proper authorities of the Choctaw Nation;" in line 20, before the word "Nation," to strike out "the Choctaw" and insert "said;" in the same line, after the word "such," to strike out "agent or other person" and insert "other person or persons;" in line 22, before the word "requisitions," to strike out "the requisition or" and insert "said;" in the same line, after the word "therefore," to strike out "made by the proper authorities of the said Choctaw Nation, as required by," and insert "in accordance with;" and in line 29, after the word "available," to insert "and to be in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States arising under article 12 of said treaty;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 9. That for payment to the Choctaw Nation, $2,858,798.62, the said sum being the amount of the judgment rendered in favor of said nation, by the Court of Claims, on the 15th day of December, A. D. 1886, on a mandate issued by the Supreme Court, at the October term of said court, together with such further sum as may be necessary to pay the interest on said judgment, at 5 per cent. per annum, from the date of the presentation of the transcript of said judgment to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment, as provided in section 1090 of the Revised Statutes, to the date of this act. The appropriation hereby made shall be a permanent and continuing appropriation, not subject to lapse, or to be covered into the Treasury; and said sum, together with the interest thereon, shall be paid from time to time, and in such sums as requisition, or requisitions, therefor shall be made, by the proper authorities of the Choctaw Nation, to the national treasurer of said nation, or to such other person of persons as shall be named in said requisitions therefor, in accordance with article 12 of the treaty between the United States and the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations, concluded June 22, 1855: *Provided*, That no interest shall be paid on this appropriation after the passage of this act, but the amount herein appropriated to be immediately available, and to be in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States arising under article 12 of said treaty.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was concluded.

Mr. DAWES. I ask unanimous consent to add a section in the nature of legislation, which is subject to a point of order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is it reported by the Committee on Appropriations?

Mr. DAWES. No, it is not.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add as a new section:

Until otherwise provided by law all that portion of what is known as the Blackfeet Indian reservation in Montana Territory, lying west of the one hundred and eighth meridian, ceded to the United States under an agreement with the several bands of Indians occupying the same, which said agreement was ratified by act of Congress approved May 1, 1888, is hereby attached to and made a part of the county of Choteau, in said Territory, and, until otherwise provided by law, all that portion of said reservation ceded under said grant and lying east of the one hundred and eighth meridian, Montana, is hereby attached to and made part of the county of Dawson, in said Territory. The laws of the Territory of Montana now in force in the counties of Dawson and Choteau shall extend over and be in force in the portions of territory added to said counties respectively.

Mr. DAWES. The need of this legislation is this: By a recent act of Congress ratifying the agreement made with the Indians of that large reservation, the Piegans, Blackfeet, and Bloods, a very large tract of country in Montana, about 20,000 square miles, has been opened to settlement and people are rushing in there in great crowds; but there was no provision in that bill by which the laws of Montana were extended over that territory, so that the processes of the county government which prevail in that Territory do not apply to that large tract of country. The taxes to be assessed for the ensuing year must be assessed by county officers, but there is nobody to assess taxes upon the property in this large area of country. The Legislature does not meet till next January, and it happens that all the cattlemen in all the region round about have gathered all their cattle on this territory to escape taxation. There is no method of enforcing law, and unless a bill should be got through in some such way as this it will be a whole year before there can be any government of that kind there. I hope, therefore, that the Senate will permit the amendment to be attached to this bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment proposing general legislation—is there objection to its reception? [A pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BLAIR. I do not desire to make objection, but I desire the Senator to answer my last question.

Mr. DAWES. Let this go on.

Mr. BLAIR. Very well.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAWES. The Senator desires me to answer his question. I will take occasion to do so before the bill passes.

Mr. TELLER. I desire to offer an amendment to come in on page 38, section 1, after the provision for the Navajo Indians, after line 910:

The sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to enable the Secretary of the Interior to pay the settlers who, in good faith, made settlement in township 29 north, ranges 14, 15, and 16 west, New Mexico principal meridian, in the Territory of New Mexico, prior to May 1, 1885, for their improvements and for damages sustained by reason of the inclusion of said townships within the Navajo reservation (executive order of April 24, 1886), and such settlers may make their homestead, pre-emption, and timber-culture entries as if they had never made settlement within said townships.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. In order that this may be understood by the committee of conference, I desire to submit some letters which recite the facts of the case and show why these people ought to be paid.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The papers will be received and printed in the RECORD.

Mr. TELLER. As well as a petition from one of the settlers.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That will also be printed.

The papers are as follows:

FARMINGTON, N. MEX., *October* 31, 1887.

DEAR SIR: Yours of September 24 is before me, and I herewith proceed to make as "calm and temperate" statement of "facts" as possible. As I have not the dates before me, I shall be obliged to relate the incidents without them. I shall go no further back than to the time that President Arthur, by Executive order, threw open for settlement all that portion south of the San Juan River in township 29, north of ranges 14, 15, and 16 west of principal meridian of New Mexico, being all in the Territory of New Mexico. This being a desirable portion of country, possessing a most charming climate and adjacent to thriving settlements of Americans, it was speedily settled upon by the home seekers. These lands having been surveyed were located under the several land laws, homesteads, pre-emptions, etc. The settlers, being possessed of the usual Western enterprise, taking hold and going to work with a vim, gave flattering promise of thrift.

It soon became apparent that the Navajo Indians were inclined to remain among the settlers with their numerous herds and flocks, which kept the country bare of grass. This, of course, the settlers could not tolerate, as they had stock of their own that must be fed. Consequently they petitioned General Bradley, Commanding the District of New Mexico, to send troops to remove the Indians, which he previously promised would be done when necessary. After a long and annoying delay one William Parsons, from Fort Defiance, N. Mex., arrived in our midst and announced himself as an agent of the United States Government to "investigate" our "troubles with the Indians," appointing a time and place that the settlers and Indians should meet him to make known their grievances. Accordingly the settlers went to the place designated, to find a large tent apparently full of Indians.

We were informed that the agent was inside, but there "was no room for white men." We lingered on the outside until his honor emerged. He said that he was glad to meet us, but was awful hungry, therefore he must request us to meet him at the Ohio school-house at 7 o'clock p. m., some 2½ miles away, on the opposite side of the river. Promptly we were on hand to find himself and his friends (the Navajos) in waiting. He installed himself chairman and proceeded to announce the object of the meeting, requesting us to make our statements. But every word and act of the man told us but too plainly that his verdict was rendered; that it was useless for us to speak; nevertheless we proceeded to state our case. This meeting was on April 5, 1886, just in the midst of planting time. The settlers were busily engaged in plowing and planting, and the Indians wished to do so likewise, as they had been accustomed to do in years past upon the same lands, some of them that the settler was occupying.

There was a conflict of interest, the Indian thinking he had a right, and the settler knowing that he had acquired rights of the United States Government. Neither party wished to yield. Mr. Parsons advised the settlers to suspend operations for a time, as he considered dangerous, as the Indian was greatly opposed to the white man making any further improvements, especially wire fences, as they were liable to injure Indian horses. Nevertheless the white man went on with his improvements, plowing, planting, building irrigating ditches, setting out fruit trees, etc., the Indian frequently encroaching with his stock, cutting down fences, etc. It seems a wonder that there was no blood shed. Mr. Parsons told the Indians and us that the Government would adjust matters.

On April 24 the President issued an order returning all the disputed country to the Navajo Indian reservation, which reached us some days latar. The news came to the writer while he was engaged setting out fruit trees. I had several hundred trees, grape-vines, etc., which have since proven a total loss on account of the Government interference. The next day after the President's order came every Indian seemed to know of it, and they gave us orders to vacate at once, they supposing that the land all belonged to them, which indeed, the President's order seemed to indicate, for that document totally ignored the presence of settlers on those lands. The settlers knew that they had rights there which they did not propose to relinquish without a struggle. Accordingly they sent a deputation to call on Mr. S. A. Marshall (an assistant agent residing at Farmington, N. M.,) and request his immediate presence among the Indians to explain matters to them, to inform them that the lands were not all theirs. This he attended to promptly, but the Indians insisted on being allowed to plant on the lands owned by the whites. Mr. Marshall seemed on the point of yielding to their entreaties, but the settlers stoutly protested that if they were to have tenants they would have them of their own choosing.

The Indians were finally ordered to desist from planting, with the assurance that they would soon get the lands and probably the crops also. In the meantime the soldiers were ordered to come to the rescue (but we were never fully satisfied of whom, the Indians or settlers), but they were of no consequence either way, for they were stationed several miles away and on the opposite side of the river.

Time dragged wearily on, the Indians frequently trespassing with their stock, committing numerous acts to annoy the settlers. At times it would seem that a conflict was inevitable, yet wonderful to relate there was no one hurt.

On June 17 Mr. Edwin S. Bruce arrived among us, announcing himself as an agent of the Government, sent for the purpose of "ascertaining the value of our improvements, in order that the Government might be able to know what to pay us." Against this we felt to revolt as we had not hired to work for the Government. However, we submitted to the listing of our improvements in many instances far below what we knew them to have actually cost us, for be it remembered that some of us had moved long distances to get here, and had labored under great disadvantages, which, of course, Mr. Bruce could not take into account. It was evident that the settlers could realize little or nothing from their labors by remaining here on account of the presence of the Indians, therefore Mr. Bruce advised them to leave and go where they could make something, telling them that the Government would recognize their claims the same as though they had remained.

On this assurance several left. Mr. Bruce called a meeting for the Indians at which he told them to remain "quiet and orderly," that the lands would soon be theirs, crops and all. I should have stated that Mr. Bruce assessed the valuation of the growing crops with the anticipation that the Indians would get them. It was Mr. Bruce's opinion that "the Government would make a final and liberal settlement with the settlers, one they would be satisfied with, within three months from that date, June 19, 1886. Matters moved on a little more quietly for a while, yet there was more or less annoyance to be endured all the

while, for it is impossible for Indians and whites to dwell together in unity. Time passed on, but we kept our pen busy trying to learn what was our legal rights. I wrote to the honorable Secretary of the Interior, to the honorable Commissioner of Indian Affairs, but could get no reply. I also wrote to a Western Senator with regard to the Government acts in this affair, which elicited a reply in this wise:

* * * "If you have paid for your lands there is no power in the Government of the United States to deprive you of your lands to give to the Indians.

"If you have not made payments for your lands, but have made settlement according to law under the homestead law, the Government can not disturb you any more than if you had paid for the lands.

* * * "In this country neither the President nor Congress can take away any one's property to give to some one else.

"No special agent can dictate what you are to have for your property."

This letter seemed evident to us all the while, hence our reluctance to list our improvements to Mr. Bruce. The above letter as quoted served to make us feel much more secure, as from it it was evident that the Government must respect the rights of its citizens under the law.

The three months elapsed and no word from the Government. The Indians and settlers were alike impatient. All were anxious for a speedy settlement of this vexatious problem. No official would deign to reply to anything that might be written, till we became tired and disgusted. Finally, I concluded to write to the register of the United States land office at Santa Fé, as I knew he must answer me one way or the other. I informed him that I had complied with all the requirements of the law with regard to pre-emption filing number 1884, and wished to make final proof on the same. To my surprise he instructed me to send $7 to pay for advertising, and he would set the time for final proof. This I did, and he set November 26, but as the advertisement did not appear in the paper at an early enough date, the day for final proof was postponed till December 11, at which date I made final proof on north half southwest fourth, southeast fourth southwest fourth, section 17, township 29, range 14 west, containing 120 acres. At this I was somewhat puzzled, as a neighbor whose lands were adjoining my own was refused the privilege of making final proof.

No further developments until some time in April, I think it was, the Government, through the local land office, gave us each notice that our filings and entries were all held for cancellation by the Interior Department; but we were informed that we had sixty days for appeal to the honorable Secretary of the Interior, to show cause why our filings and entries should not be canceled.

These appeals were promptly made in a legal form before a notary public and forwarded to the honorable Secretary through the local land office. This is the last we have heard from them; the honorable Secretary seems to have entirely ignored them.

Some of the settlers still stuck to their homes, hoping that sooner or later the Government might be induced to relieve its citizens. They ventured to plant crops and fight the Indians off as best they could. This they succeeded in pretty well, till a new lot of soldiers came; also the Navajo agent, Mr. Patterson, made us a visit, since which time the Indians seem to think themselves licensed to commit all kinds of petty annoyances. They have since broken into houses while the owners were absent and rifled them of all they desired, a thing never indulged in until Mr. Patterson's visit. The people clung to their rights against all odds, trying to raise crops, etc., notwithstanding it seemed a very pandemonium.

Finally, on August 25, the Government sent Lieutenant Scott, Company I, Thirteenth United States Infantry, with the boys in blue, to remove the settlers from their homes, which he promptly did. In one instance he came to a house where the husband was absent, informed the lady of his business, hurriedly tumbled a few of the most necessary household effects into the big Government wagon, nailed up the doors and windows of the house, turned their crops over to custody of a "responsible Navajo!"—so he (the lieutenant) wrote to the commandant of this military district; ordered the women and children to get into the wagon and take a ride off the reservation. Said responsible Navajo appears to have invited all his friends to come and harvest said crops, which consisted, in part, of about an acre of melons, very fine and just beginning to ripen. In three days you could not have found a melon as large as your fist.

They harvested everything they could use and turned their stock upon the rest. Since the eviction there has nothing of importance occurred. The Indians and soldiers have full possession. The soldiers daily patrol the river front, we suppose to keep the settlers from returning, which some of them are liable to do as soon as the soldiers leave, unless the Government settles with them. The soldiers are depredating upon the improvements worse than the Indians ever did. They tore down cabins, and pole fences, cut up fence posts, etc., and used them for fuel.

These are the main facts as they come vividly to my memory, stated as dispassionately as possible under my present feelings. I hope you will be able to use them to advantage in behalf of justice and American liberty.

We shall impatiently await the action of Congress; if it fails to give relief, I suppose our only resource will then be the court.

The above narrative is divested of its thunder, which of course you will supply when necessary; but I trust, Senator, you will excuse a few comments by myself.

First. The President's order making our country an Indian reservation is *ex post facto* in its nature, seriously affecting former agreements between the Government and its citizens—in fact, totally annulling them; an act illy becoming the Chief Executive of a free nation.

Second. In sending a man here to assess the value of our improvements, the Government is guilty of a gross usurpation, assuming to dictate what we "shall have for" our "property," a violation of law, as per the Senator's letter.

Third. In sending the soldiery to remove the settlers the Government is guilty of a military despotism; of evicting its citizens from their own homes. An act more unjust, more unwarrantable than was ever perpetrated against the Irish tenant. The Irish tenant is evicted for non-payment of rents and by the English landlord. The American evictions are by the Government itself, of its own citizens, who are accused of violating no law, guilty of no offense. Evicted while attending to their own business; their homes given to other parties who possess many hundreds of acres of lands besides.

It is claimed by some that the executive order opening that country for settlement, taking it from the Indians, was an illegal act; let us grant it. But is not the Government responsible for the acts of its officials? "Principals are responsible for the acts of their agents." Should the unoffending settler suffer for the illegal acts of the Government?

It is claimed that it was a military necessity to move the settlers to prevent bloodshed. Which is the easier to remove, the settlers or the Indians?

I trust that you may have had the time and patience to read this rather lengthy letter, and that it may be of service in the cause of justice.

Believe me, I am most gratefully yours,

W. P. HENDRICKSON.

Hon. H. M. TELLER,
Washington, D. C.

OHIO, N. MEX., *December* 21, 1887.

DEAR SIR: I herewith inclose a letter from honorable Commissioner of Indian Affairs for your examination, with a few comments by myself. I will underscore with pencil the points I would most particularly notice.

First, the Commissioner says "it is deemed absolutely indispensable to the well-being of the Navajo," etc.

This as an error, whether intentional or otherwise. As was suggested at your office in Denver, the Government might do a far better thing for the Indians, and no injustice to its citizens, than to give them those lands, by *sinking wells* and erecting *wind-mills* to hoist water, as they have vast acres of the finest of grazing lands now practically worthless. We are told that it is "practically impossible" to "reach water *outside* of the narrow strip" mentioned. It is known that the Navajo herds and flocks aggregate many hundreds of thousands, hence the absurdity of the above assertion; besides it can be easily proven that they *have on their reservation* no less than "18,000 head of cattle wintering for other *parties*." Not one of the above-mentioned stock water at the river on said "narrow strip." As above stated, the Indians have much fine grazing lands practically useless from the absence of water; they also have much that is available outside the "narrow strip," else how could they winter all those cattle for other parties?

"Long occupied and cultivated those lands," etc. Prior to the settlement of those lands, under President Grant's administration, by the whites not a foot of land was *cultivated* by the Navajos on said "narrow strip;" not until it had been occupied by the white man, who dug *irrigating ditches*, built houses, etc., did the Indian want it. Indeed, he could *not* have *cultivated* it *prior* to that time, for he has *not* the *engineering* skill to construct irrigating ditches. So that the "long occupation" spoken of only reaches back to the time that President Hayes robbed the first white settlers of those same lands and gave them to the Navajos.

The Honorable Commissioner does not think that the "white settler acquired any rights to the soil!" Oh, for shame, that a man holding his high position should thus unblushingly assert! He well knows that the Government has received $1.25 per acre for no less than two entries (my own and Mr. Mat Ebert's), besides numerous filing fees, and yet we are told that we have "acquired no rights to the soil."

It is held by "high judicial authority" that no one has a right to intrude upon lands held or "possessed by others;" in short, that no man should be robbed that another might profit. Had this just policy been carried out from the beginning, President Hayes would never have dispossessed the first white settlers of their lands and improvements on said "narrow strip." As before stated, the *only* improvements ever made in the way of ditches, etc., were made by *white men*.

"Only three settlers removed," these the "only actual bona fide" possessors of claims, etc. Why was this? As I have stated in a former letter, Mr. Bruce, the then mouth-piece of Government, told the settlers that they had "better leave and go where they could make something;" that "when it come to a settlement their rights would be recognized by the Government the same as though they had remained on their claims." Mr. Bruce could see that the settler could do himself but little good by remaining, hampered as he was by the Indians; hence the advice. But the Commissioner would seem to insinuate that all save these three were "speculators," and consequently entitled to nothing.

"No improvements except *here* and *there traces of old fences*."

Simply because the improvements of the settlers have been destroyed in their absence. I had several hundred fruit trees and vines on my place that had been destroyed by the Indian herds; besides, I had cleared the heavy sage brush from about 20 acres at an expense of about $12 per acre. Not myself alone but many others have been at great expense making improvements that are scarcely discernible at this time.

The people that settled those lands were not "speculators," as insinuated, and if they have made small improvements, and those almost all destroyed, it is because of the unwise and unjust policy of the Government towards them. Had their rights been respected to-day there would have been many pleasant homes on the "narrow strip" instead of a few worthless Navajos, who are a menace to civilization and will always be a hinderance to their white neighbors just across the river.

We are told that "they are now in peaceable possession" of those lands, etc. Yes, peaceable, as long as they are allowed to have their own way. But a very few days after the settlers were removed from the reservation, the Navajos were over on the north side of the river with their stock, but I guess the soldiers ordered them back; but the soldiers are withdrawn now and the Navajo is liable to repeat the experiment. If he does, he is liable to get hurt, for the people are thoroughly incensed at what has already happened and are not inclined to submit to much more foolishness. As we are the under dog and not able to fight Uncle Sam, we would ask that we be not wholly robbed. This Government is amply able to remunerate us for our *loss of time* and *opportunity to get other lands*, also for all the improvements we have ever made on those lands even if nothing remains but "here and there a few traces of old fences." We think our rights to locate *other lands* under the several land laws ought to be *restored* also. Several of these dispossessed people are quite destitute, and they ought to be relieved as soon as possible. If Congress is to do anything I hope it will hurry up.

After examination please return the inclosed letter; it might be of service if we were obliged to enter suit against the Government for our rights.

Please, Senator, if you can find time to spare, drop us a line that we may know what to expect from the Government.

Very respectfully and fraternally yours,

W. P. HENDRICKSON.

Hon. H. M. TELLER,
Washington, D. C.

AN OPEN LETTER.

FARMINGTON, N. MEX., *June* 25.

MY DEAR SIR: Your order adding to the Navajo Indian reservation those lands embraced in township 29 north, of ranges 14, 15, and 16 west of principal meridian of New Mexico, on the south side of the San Jan River, is, and has been from the reception of said order, working a grievous hardship to the American settlers upon those lands.

The order itself was a great surprise. First, because it apparently ignored the presence of any settlers upon those lands; and secondly, that the Government, through its Chief Magistrate, would essay to annul its contracts. The Government has virtually sold those lands to its citizens, has taken all the money demanded of them, and given its receipt for the same: how, then, it may be reasonably asked, can the Government deprive those parties of their homes without their consent, they having complied with the law by "continued occupation and improvement?" Can the Government justly violate faith with its loyal citizen tax-payers in favor of alien non-tax-payers?

The answer is self-evident to the mind of every lover of fairness. But it is argued that the Government has a right to condemn titles to property belonging to individuals and appropriate it to other uses when the public good demands it. It is difficult to see how the safety, honor, or prosperity of our great nation depends upon the robbing of a few of our hard-working citizens of their only homes—a small patch of 160 acres—and giving them to parties owning thousands of acres each, which is literally true of the Navajo Indians.

But it is said that the Government does not intend robbing those citizens. Let us see. It assumes the right to deprive these people of their homes without their consent, to say that they may have something or nothing as it wills. What is this but robbery? Is not the highwayman equally just? He takes what suits him and restores what he chooses, if anything. The Government sends out its land commissioner to assess the valuation of the improvements that those people have been able to make during the few short months that they have occupied, and to say that the Government would soon pay them for the same.

This is a gross absurdity. The value of those improvements in many instances is not a tithe of the expense incurred. To illustrate, a settler has been at the expense of moving hundreds, perhaps thousands, of miles to get to his home; he has purchased team and wagon, plows, harrows, hoes, etc., provisions for a year, seeds, in fact everything necessary for the first year's use on his new home. He has expended all his available means, but hopes by close economy and constant industry to be able to pull through.

Weary and dusty, Saturday night he pitches his tent upon the south bank of the beautiful San Juan River. With delight he "views the landscape o'er." 'Tis here he expects to reap a reward for his toilsome journey, to rear his young family, to beautify, to enrich the home of his choice. He spends the Sabbath in thanksgiving. Monday morning he meets one of his new neighbors, who tells him that the Government has given his home to its dusky pets, the Navajo Indians, but adds sarcastically that he will be allowed pay for his improvements!

Improvements! How absurd! How cruelly unjust! Not a dollar's worth can he show, though he has spent his all toward procuring and moving to what he fondly hoped to call home as long as he lived. Much that he has brought with him is now comparatively valueless to him. Can anything be more unjust than to turn him away empty? He has lost a settler's right. He has lost opportunities of locating in some other place; he has lost a year's time and a prospective crop. He has on hand that which cost his last dollar, now rendered worthless. Do you say that that man is not robbed? Shame on such a heartless, unprincipled Government!

If the Government has found that it made a mistake by offering inducements for its citizens to settle on those lands by taking their money for the same, as an honest individual it ought to have sought to have made amicable terms with them, and not to have robbed them upon the principle that might makes right, for there can be no other right.

Mr. President, I am informed upon reliable authority that you claim to have been ignorant of the presence of settlers upon those lands at the time you issued your order giving them to the Navajo Indians. It is hard for me to conceive how it is possible that our Chief Executive could be so illy posted, but through charity I prefer believing that, instead of believing that you would willingly, willfully rob the toiling few who have sought a place of repose, a home in the wilderness West. But, Mr. President, since the fiat has gone forth, I would ask you in behalf of those people, as an honorable guardian of the people's rights, to use your utmost influence that they be justly reimbursed, that they be enabled to move from here and procure as good places otherwheres, and that they be remunerated for at least a year's loss of time, for the year is lost to them. Thus you may be instrumental in wiping the foul blot from the brow of our fair country.

Very respectfully, yours,

W. P. HENDRICKSON.

To Hon. GROVER CLEVELAND,
President of the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS,
Washington, D. C., June 28, 1886.

SIR: Your communication of May 10, 1886, requesting instruction with regard to the right of one A. C. Damon to open and conduct a trading establishment without license upon the Navajo reservation, is received.

In reply I have to say that Mr. Damon has no valid claim to the land in question, which he can maintain against the United States, and therefore no right to trade with the Indians.

By the fact of prior settlement he has rights which he can maintain against an outsider or subsequent settler, but not against the United States. You will advise Mr. Damon, according to the above instructions, that he will not be allowed to engage in the Indian trade upon the reservation under your jurisdiction.

J. D. C. ATKINS, *Commissioner.*

S. S. PATTERSON,
U. S. Indian Agent, Navajo Agency, New Mexico.

NAVAJO AGENCY, NEW MEXICO, *May* 10, 1886.

SIR: I have the honor to state and make known that one A. C. Damon, residing on a tract of land within the reservation, about three-quarters of a mile south of this place, is about to open a traders' store upon his land for the purpose of selling goods to the Navajo Indians, and that he claims the right to establish such store and to sell goods there without a license, by reason of ownership and long-continued occupancy of this land before and after the extension of the reservation in which his land is situated.

I get the following statement from him respecting his occupancy and use of this land, which, as near as I can learn, is about correct, to wit:

Took possession and marked out 160 acres by monuments in May, 1874. A house 30 by 30, four rooms and a hall, built by Thomas V. Keams in 1870 and used as a trader's store up to the time Damon went upon the land, was then on it. He immediately fenced 20 acres and planted 10 acres. The remainder he used as pasture land, and erected another house 40 by 20, with an L 25 by 35, besides a stable, hen-house, and corral. Never took out any papers concerning title; the land is unsurveyed. Never homesteaded or pre-empted any other land. A continuous and unbroken residence and use since he first entered upon it, in May, 1874, as before mentioned. Not fully knowing what the practice of your office is in such cases, or whether such persons come within the law concerning license, I submit the foregoing statement of facts in the matter for your consideration and advice and ask for instructions.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

S. S. PATTERSON,
United States Indian Agent.

Hon. J. D. C. ATKINS,
Commissioner of Indian Affairs, Washington, D. C.

NAVAJO AGENCY, NEW MEXICO, *July* 5, 1886.

DEAR SIR: In the matter of the question of your right to trade on this reservation at your place without license, I have now to inform you that in response to my communication to the honorable Commissioner of May 10, 1886, I have received a letter of instructions saying that you will not be allowed to engage in such trade on the reservation, a copy of which letter is hereto annexed for your information. In pursuance of said letter of instructions, you are hereby notified that from the date of service of this notice on you, you will therefore desist from any further trading with the Indians within this reservation.

Very respectfully,

S. S. PATTERSON.
United States Indian Agent.

MR. A. C. DAMON.

Mr. TELLER. I submit, in connection with the letters that have gone in the RECORD, the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior in his last annual report in reference to the matter.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The Chair understands the Senator has a right to include whatever he thinks proper in the papers to be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. TELLER. I want the committee of conference to understand the case.

The following extract is from the report of Secretary Lamar for the year ending June 30, 1887:

NAVAJO TROUBLES ON THE SAN JUAN RIVER.

The presence of a few settlers, who had located immediately south of the San Juan River, in New Mexico, remaining there after the land had been again made a part of the Navajo reservation by Executive order of April 24, 1886, continued to cause some disquiet among the Indians in that locality. Their removal was suggested by the Indian Bureau, and repeatedly urged by the local military commander as a measure necessary for the preservation of good order. As inchoate rights of settlers had attached to the lands upon which they had located, the Department declined to sanction any proceedings for their removal until it was again strongly urged by Colonel Grierson as the only safe, proper, and effective measure by which peace could be permanently maintained and security given to life and property in that locality.

That officer recently reported that the settlers had been peaceably removed and the Navajoes quietly placed in possession of the lands occupied by them.

The settlers who in good faith located and made valuable improvements upon the lands, and who have been compelled for the public good to abandon them, should be fully indemnified for the losses thus sustained. To do this, however, it will be necessary for Congress to grant the authority and make a sufficient appropriation for the purpose.

Mr. BERRY. I wish to offer an amendment on page 43. In line 1031 of section 1, after the word "farming," I move to add:

Also, to pay clerk of Otoe agency, Indian Territory, $1,200.

This amendment was submitted to the chairman of the committee by my colleague [Mr. JONES, of Arkansas].

Mr. PLUMB. I shall have to make the point of order on that for the reason that there is no place in this bill where clerks at reservations are provided for. There is no provision anywhere in the statutes for clerks, except a general provision authorizing the appointment of clerks by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs or the Secretary of the Interior, and their payment out of such general fund as may be provided, and the Secretary of the Interior, or the Commissioner of Indian Affairs under his direction, fixes the rate of payment of every single clerk in the Indian service. Now, if one is to be taken out and provided for specially, of course all the others will be treated in the same way, and thus we shall enter on a course of legislation which is entirely unusual, and which, according to the experience of the Department, I think is wholly unnecessary.

Mr. BERRY. I suppose the point of order is well taken, and I shall not insist on the amendment. I am so anxious to get an executive session that I shall not contest the point.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TELLER. I offer an amendment, on page 51, section 1, line 1242, to strike out the word "five," and insert the word "eight." That will give the superintendent of the Grand Junction school $1,800 a year instead of $1,500. I beg to say here that it is impossible for a man to live in that expensive country on $1,500. I understand the committee do not object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The Chair hears no objection to the proposed amendment. It will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 1, line 1242, page 51, it is proposed to strike out "five" and insert "eight;" so as to read:

For support of Indian pupils, at $175 per annum each, and for necessary repairs to buildings and fencing, and for pay of superintendent, at $1,800, at the Indian school at Grand Junction, Colo., etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. I have a further amendment that I now offer to the same clause, to come in after the word "Interior," on line 1249:

That out of the appropriation hereby made there may be expended for the construction of a blacksmith shop, carpenter shop, sheds, stables, or outhouses, at such school, a sum not exceeding $1,500.

This does not increase the total.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. I offer an amendment which is in one sense legislation, and I appeal to the committee to make no objection on a point of order. It is simply changing the place of sale of the lands in the Umatilla reservation from the land-office to the reservation. A bill for that purpose has already passed the Senate, but is not likely to be acted on in the other House.

The Chief Clerk read the proposed amendment, as follows:

That section 2 of an act entitled "An act providing for allotment of lands in severalty to the Indians residing upon the Umatilla reservation, in the State of Oregon, and granting patents therefor, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1885, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to provide that the lands described in said section shall be sold at the agency on said reservation, in Umatilla County, State of Oregon, instead of at the proper land-office of the United States, as provided in and by said section, such sales in all other respects to be made in the manner as prescribed in said act.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The amendment is general legislation, and not in order under the rule. Is there objection to its being received? The Chair hears none. At what point in the bill shall it be inserted?

Mr. DAWES. As an additional section.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* It will be treated as an additional section, to be numbered by the Secretary.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time.

Mr. BLAIR. Before the passage of the bill I ask the Senator from Massachusetts to answer the question which I propounded in reference to the denominational management of the schools.

Mr. DAWES. As I stated before, there is a great variety of schools. One large branch of Indian education is what is called "the contract schools," schools which are established out of this gross sum of $700,000 by private individuals or associations or organizations, religious or other, and the Interior Department makes contracts with those people to educate a certain number of scholars as they agree upon at a fixed price, which is $108 in some instances and $158 in others. There has been a good deal of solicitation to obtain these scholars, and of course among the different denominations those the most active and vigilant get the most of these contracts.

There has been a good deal of complaint among the denominations, and it has been charged upon the Indian Bureau that some religious denominations have got a predominant share of these schools. There are religious denominations who are very active in looking out for every opportunity. There is one religious denomination that has a bureau here in Washington, whose duty it is to look out for opportunities to make contracts for the education of Indian children, and it is very natural that under such circumstances such activity and such earnestness should result in that religious denomination getting a large share of these contract schools.

Out of that has grown a complaint that the Catholic organization has got a larger share of the contract schools for the education of Indians than any other denomination, and I think that is true, that they have a larger share. I attribute it in some degree to the reasons which I have assigned here; but, whatever may be the reasons, the truth is undeniable that the Catholic religious organization has a very large share of the contract schools for the education of the Indians on the reservations.

The bill was passed.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. CULLOM. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it be to meet on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to.

CUSTOMS AND OTHER DEFICIENCIES.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives; which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, *June* 1, 1888.

Resolved, That the House concur in the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9788) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes, numbered as follows: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11. And concur in the twelfth amendment of the Senate to said bill with an amendment as follows:

After the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"EXPENSES OF UNITED STATES COURTS.

"Fees of jurors: To supply a deficiency in the appropriation for the fees of jurors, United States courts, on account of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, $50,000.

"Fees of witnesses: To supply a deficiency in the appropriation for fees of witnesses, United States courts, on account of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, $60,000.

"GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE.

"For current expenses of the Government Hospital for the Insane: For support, clothing, and treatment in the Government Hospital for the Insane of the insane from the Army and Navy, Marine Corps, and revenue-cutter service, persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States, inmates of the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and of all persons who have become insane since their entry into the military or naval service of the United States and who are indigent, $11,713.07, being a deficiency on account o the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888."

"And in the first line of the title of the bill, strike out the words "an appropriation," and insert the word "appropriations."

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House of Representatives. These amendments are three in number, one being for the fees of jurors for the current year, one for the fees of witnesses for the current year, and the other a small deficiency for the Insane Asylum in this District.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. Before that motion is put I desire to present a table which I promised the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] to present when this bill was pending before, and I ask that it be inserted in the RECORD, showing the amount of receipts from fines, penalties, and forfeitures under the customs laws for the years beginning in 1871 and ending in 1887. I will say that this table verifies in a specific way the general statement that I made on the floor when the bill was heretofore under consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be printed in the RECORD.

The paper is as follows:

Receipts and expenditures, customs service, and percentage of cost for the fiscal years 1871 to 1887, inclusive.

Fiscal year—	Total collections.	Cost of collection.	Percentage.
1871	$206,270,408.05	$6,560,672.61	.6318+
1872	216,370,286.77	6,960,189.81	.6321+
1873	188,089,522.70	7,079,743.42	.6376+
1874	163,103,833.69	7,319,487.88	.0448+
1875	157,162,722.35	7,028,796.77	.0447+
1876	148,071,984.61	6,702,230.34	.0452+
1877	130,956,493.07	6,501,037.57	.0496+
1878	130,170,680.20	5,887,443.69	.0452+
1879	137,250,047.70	5,485,343.87	.0414+
1880	186,522,054.60	6,023,253.53	.0322+
1881	198,159,676.02	6,383,288.10	.0323+
1882	220,410,730.25	6,506,359.26	.0295+
1883	214,706,496.93	6,591,224.51	.0306+
1884	195,067,489.76	6,709,485.76	.0344+
1885	181,471,949.34	6,494,847.29	.0357+
1886	192,905,023.44	6,427,612.67	.0333+
1887	217,286,893.13	6,870,804.29	.0316+

Receipts from miscellaneous sources, customs service, 1871 to 1887.

Fiscal year.	Fines, penalties, and forfeitures.	Fees of customs officers.	Storage, cartage, etc.	Total.
1871	$952,579.86	$575,887.69	$414,310.61	$1,952,778.16
1872	674,232.77	411,157.99	461,409.12	1,546,799.88
1873	1,169,515.38	321,212.61	475,741.37	1,966,469.36
1874	651,271.76	276,017.50	465,417.73	1,392,706.99
1875	228,870.23	677,617.68	434,882.85	1,341,370.76
1876	183,797.86	570,812.55	455,533.53	1,210,143.94
1877	146,413.21	511,780.15	386,519.48	1,044,712.84
1878	130,997.15	551,338.81	364,528.40	1,046,864.36
1879	163,513.06	566,414.44	370,944.16	1,100,871.66
1880	123,786.28	645,047.47	379,966.41	1,148,800.16
1881	150,433.99	668,914.44	406,166.43	1,225,514.86
1882	105,644.80	849,551.43	388,151.77	1,343,348.00
1883	134,590.74	896,027.08	405,618.52	1,436,236.34
1884	78,496.90	572,328.79	423,839.77	1,074,665.46
1885	142,759.52	578,345.11	459,663.54	1,180,768.17
1886	128,843.58	462,457.48	423,482.52	1,014,783.58
1887	160,205.41	446,121.29	446,711.16	1,053,037.86
Total	5,325,952.50	9,591,032.51	7,162,887.37	22,079,872.38

Mr. ALLISON. Prior to the passage of the act of August 5, 1882 (22 Statutes, 256), which requires that the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause all unexpended balances of the permanent and indefinite appropriations for collecting the revenue from customs which shall have remained upon the books of the Treasury for two fiscal years to be carried to the surplus fund and covered into the Treasury, the appropriation for "Expenses of collecting the revenue from customs" was a continuous one, and any balance thereof remaining at the end of a fiscal year could be used to meet the expenses incurred in the year following.

Since the fiscal year 1882 only the permanent annual sum of $5,500,000 and such miscellaneous customs receipts as are received within each fiscal year can be used to meet the expenses of such year.

The balances carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of the act of 1882 were:

Fiscal year—	
1883	$723,340.24
1884	293,752.93
1885	362,467.08
1887	89,893.60
Total	1,469,453.85

In addition to these balances, $2,000,000 were carried to the surplus fund by Secretary Sherman in the fiscal year 1880.

I believe this covers all the points suggested.

I will also say that while the amendments now presented by the House for deficiencies for fees of jurors and witnesses in the United States courts seem large, and are large compared with the expenses of other years, I am satisfied that they are necessary and should be agreed to.

The amendments of the House of Representatives were concurred in.

CONFINEMENT OF INEBRIATES IN GOVERNMENT INSANE HOSPITAL.

Mr. HOAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill No. 537, Calendar No. 1409. I propose simply to ask a recommitment of the bill with instructions.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the bill (S. 537) to provide for the confinement of inebriates in the Government Hospital for the Insane is before the Senate.

Mr. HOAR. I offer the following resolution:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 537) to provide for the confinement of inebriates in the Government Hospital for the Insane be recommitted to the Committee on the District of Columbia with instructions to inquire and report whether the

same, if enacted, will or not be injurious to the said hospital, and further as to the expediency of confining and treating inebriates in hospitals for the insane.

The resolution was agreed to.

PROTECTION OF OFFICERS IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. DAWES presented the following report; which was read:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4920) for the protection of the officials of the United States in the Indian Territory, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

H. L. DAWES,
F. B. STOCKBRIDGE,
JAMES K. JONES,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JNO. H. ROGERS,
JOHN S. HENDERSON,
WM. E. FULLER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The House having receded, no action of the Senate is necessary.

PURCHASE OF PROPERTY AT WEST POINT.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations, that a letter of the Secretary of War and certain documents be printed for the use of the Senate. These documents relate to the purchase of a certain tract of land immediately adjoining the Government property at West Point. There are some maps accompanying this communication which it is not necessary to print, and I hope the Secretary will inform the Printer that the maps need not be published.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator can give the necessary instructions to the printing clerk. The order to print will be entered.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 4, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATION.

Executive nomination received by the Senate June 1, 1888.

GENERAL OF THE ARMY.

Lieut. Gen. Philip H. Sheridan, to be General of the Army, under the provisions of an act of Congress approved June 1, 1888.

CONFIRMATION.

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate June 1, 1888.

GENERAL OF THE ARMY.

Lieut. Gen. Philip H. Sheridan, to be General of the Army.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *June 1, 1888.*

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by Mr. MCMILLIN as Speaker *pro tempore*, who directed the reading of the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 1, 1888.*

SIR: Hon. BENTON MCMILLIN is designated to preside as Speaker *pro tempore* at the session of the House to-day.

JOHN G. CARLISLE, *Speaker.*

To Hon. JOHN B. CLARK,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

Mr. RANDALL. I call for the regular order.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution of appropriation for expenses of international exchanges for the fiscal year of 1889; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

TREASURY DIVISION OF LOANS AND CURRENCY.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an amended estimate of an appropriation for the clerical force of the division of loans and currency for the fiscal year 1889; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of the Interior of appropriation to supply deficiency for expenses of the Government Hospital for the Insane for the current fiscal year; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

STATE, WAR, AND NAVY BUILDING.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the final report upon the construction of the State, War, and Navy Department building; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House letters from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting copies of the findings of fact in the following cases, and they were severally referred to the Committee on War Claims:

H. A. Bell, executor, etc., against the United States.
William R. Kearney against the United States.
Sarah E. A. Smith against the United States.
Milton J. Durham, administrator, etc., against the United States.

CLAIMS DISMISSED BY COURT OF CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the opinion of the court dismissing the case of Lucy E. Dowdy, executrix, against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the order dismissing the case of W. A. Galloway against the United States; which was referred to the Committee on War Claims.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CANDLER, for one week, on account of sickness in his family.

To Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. BARNES, for eight days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BACON, indefinitely, on account of going to West Point as member of the Board of Visitors.

BRIDGE ACROSS POTEAU RIVER, NEAR FORT SMITH, ARK.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House a bill (S. 1948) to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River, in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a House bill similar to that Senate bill, and I ask unanimous consent that the House take up the Senate bill and consider it this morning. I suggest that the reading of the bill be dispensed with, as it conforms to the established precedents for the construction of bridges.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I think any bill that is going to be passed by this House ought at least to be read. I do not object at all to the bill, but I ask that it be read.

The bill was read in part.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Speaker, I understand from the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] that substantially this bill has been read to the House in the form of a House bill, and I therefore withdraw my request for the reading.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not mean to say that the bill has been read twice in the House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read.

The Clerk completed the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ROGERS] that this Senate bill be considered at this time?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. I move the previous question on ordering the bill to a third reading.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROGERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The House bill for the same purpose (H. R. 7031) was laid on the table.

GENERAL OF THE ARMY.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a bill (S. 2210) to revive the grade of General in the United States Army.

Mr. SPINOLA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that that bill be now taken up. I have been instructed by the Committee on Military Affairs to make this request.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection is made. The bill will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. RANDALL. The gentleman from New York can attain his object on Monday next by a motion to suspend the rules, under an individual recognition by the Speaker. The only danger in that course is that, unfortunately, General Sheridan may not live until that time.

Mr. STEELE. I ask that the bill lie on the Speaker's table for the present.

Mr. SPINOLA. I make the same request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection, it will be so ordered.

LAURA E. MADDOX.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a bill (S. 2201) for the relief of Laura E. Maddox, widow and executrix, and Robert Morrison, executor of Joseph H. Maddox, deceased; which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BUILDING, DENVER, COLO.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House joint resolution (S. R. 79) permitting the public building authorized by act of Congress approved May 8, 1882, at Denver, Colo., to be located not less than 16 feet from any other building, instead of 40 feet, as provided in said act; which was read twice, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. WEAVER. I move to discharge the Committee of the Whole from the further consideration of the bill which I send to the desk, and ask that it be now considered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That motion is not in order at this time.

Mr. WEAVER. What is the reason of that? I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole from the further consideration of the bill and consider it at this time.

Mr. RANDALL. What bill is it?

Mr. WEAVER. A public-building bill appropriating only $40,000.

Mr. RANDALL. Oh, if we enter upon public-building bills we shall never get through.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Objection is made.

Mr. WEAVER. Debate is not in order, but I want to say a word in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania. We have entered upon this kind of business for other gentlemen in this House.

Mr. RANDALL. Well, I have not—not in the presence of an appropriation bill.

Mr. WEAVER. Oh, the appropriation bill will not suffer. That will pass anyhow.

Mr. BOWDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole from the further consideration of the bill which I send to the desk.

Mr. RANDALL. Let us have the regular order.

Mr. BOWDEN. I am sure the gentleman does not object to this bill.

Mr. RANDALL. I am quite sure that I do. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOWDEN. I do not think you will object if you examine it.

Mr. WEAVER. Oh, he would not have objected to my bill if he had examined it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

ESTIMATES FOR CERTAIN NEW LIGHT-HOUSES AND FOG-SIGNALS.

On motion of Mr. RANDALL the Committee on Appropriations was discharged from the further consideration of House Executive Documents Nos. 328, 329, 330, and 332, submitting estimate of lights and fog-signals at Stuart Island, Washington Territory, Point Buchon, California, Patos Island, Washington Territory, and Point Arguello, California; and they were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

DANIEL W. PERKINS.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8846) for the relief of Daniel W. Perkins; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JURIES IN UNITED STATES COURTS.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR also, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back favorably the bill (S. 64) to authorize the juries of the United States circuit and district courts to be used interchangeably and to provide for drawing talesmen; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF HENRY H. SIBLEY.

Mr. TAULBEE, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (S. 518) for the relief of the legal personal representatives of Henry H. Sibley, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

Mr. TAULBEE. I ask unanimous consent that a House bill now on the Calendar, precisely similar to the Senate bill just reported, be laid on the table and that this bill be substituted for it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That request can not be made during this call.

Mr. McCULLOGH. I wish to ask the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. TAULBEE] in regard to the nature of the report just made.

Mr. TAULBEE. We have adopted and filed with this bill the report already made on the House bill, accompanied with the views of the minority of the committee on that bill.

Mr. McCULLOGH. That is satisfactory.

CAROLINE T. COCKLE.

Mr. MASON, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 736) for the relief of Caroline T. Cockle; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

OWNERS, ETC., OF BRITISH BARK CHANCE.

Mr. BOWDEN, from the Committee on Claims, reported back with amendment the bill (S. 1026) for the relief of the owners, officers, and crew of the British bark Chance; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

AMERICAN TRUST COMPANY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. HEMPHILL, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported back with amendment the bill (S. 116) to incorporate the American Trust Company of the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

GRADE OF GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY.

Mr. SPINOLA. I ask consent that Senate bill No. 2210 be taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That request can not be made during this call.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT BURLINGTON, IOWA.

Mr. NEWTON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2121) authorizing the construction of a public building at Burlington, Iowa; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT PEORIA, ILL.

Mr. NEWTON also, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2546) to appropriate $12,000 for the completion of the public building at Peoria, Ill., and increasing the limit of the cost of said building; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT WINONA, MINN.

Mr. NEWTON also, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2475) to increase the appropriation for the erection of a public building at Winona, Minn.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

FRANCIS K. HOUSE.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 9865) granting a pension to Francis K. House; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

FRANK W. TUBBESING.

Mr. GALLINGER also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back adversely the bill (H. R. 9885) granting a pension to Frank W. Tubbesing; which was laid on the table, and the accompanying report ordered to be printed.

GRADE OF GENERAL, UNITED STATES ARMY.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Confederate soldiers, living and dead, I ask unanimous consent to put on its passage the bill which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table for consideration at this time the bill which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2210) to revive the grade of General in the United States Army.

Be it enacted, etc., That the grade of Lieutenant-General of the Army is hereby discontinued and is merged in the grade of General of the Army of the United States, which grade shall continue during the lifetime of the present Lieutenant-General of the Army, after which such grade shall also cease; and the President of the United States is hereby authorized to appoint, with the advice and consent of the Senate, a General of the Army of the United States.

SEC. 2. That the pay and allowances of the General be the same as heretofore allowed for that grade.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill which has just been read?

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

Mr. STEELE. Let it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Without objection that order will be made.

There being no objection, the bill was read a first and second time, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. WHITE, of New York, rising to a question of privilege, said: Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read the following telegraphic dispatch, which was sent from Washington on May 22, and which appeared in the New York Times on the following day.

The Clerk read as follows:

"Deacon" S. V. WHITE, of New York, has not had very much to say in the House of Representatives since he found it advisable to explain certain statements about his mixing of stock speculation and statesmanship, but he evidently is willing to be talked about again. Some of his colleagues are talking about him now. Their special theme is a little joint resolution introduced by the Deacon yesterday, which is regarded as proof that he possesses the necessary "cheek" to be a successful broker. Mr. WHITE's resolution in effect authorizes the President to declare war against the Venezuelan Government, if necessary, to collect indemnity for certain damages suffered by the Venezuelan Steam Transportation Company when some of their vessels were seized by Venezuelan belligerents in 1871.

Mr. WHITE is quite familiar with the history and standing of the various claims against Venezuela, for Mr. WHITE has a part interest in some of those claims. Secretary of State Bayard regards some of these claims as of such character as to warrant him in declining to pay on them the money deposited for that purpose by Venezuela until further investigation. Mr. WHITE is so anxious to see the claims paid that he has appeared as his own counsel in the United States Supreme Court in an effort to obtain a mandamus to compel the Secretary to distribute the funds in his possession. The Deacon is also credited with some knowledge of an attempt recently made to establish a precedent for the payment of 6 per cent. interest on claims against the Government. The authority of Congress to declare war upon Venezuela would probably be regarded by Deacon WHITE as an excellent whip with which to drive that government into consenting to pay all claims presented by Americans without a too critical examination into their merits.

Mr. WHITE, of New York. Mr. Speaker, I certainly should deprecate consuming the time of this House in the mere refutation of false, scurrilous, personal attacks in the public press.

It is unfortunately true that every man of affairs in this country, if he attempts to achieve success in his undertakings, will arouse somewhere a cur to bark at his heels; and experience has shown that it is generally the part of wisdom to let such curs bark till they become weary rather than waste time and muscle in clubbing them to their kennels, and such has been my course in the main for many years in a somewhat busy life.

But when a Representative in the American Congress is accused in a daily newspaper, printed in the city which has been his business home for well-nigh a quarter of a century, of attempting to involve the country which he represents in a war with a sister Republic, and of pressing a suit in respect to the diplomatic relations of his Government with such Republic in the highest tribunal in the land for the purposes of private pecuniary profit, the honor of the American Congress as well as the personal honor of the Representative assailed demands that he should turn aside from the contemptuous silence, which is ordinarily the most dignified rebuke, and expose the malignant mendacity of the author of the falsehood. [Applause.] Let this be my apology for consuming a very few moments of your time.

The article read by the Clerk starts out with the assertion that I "found it advisable" at one time "to explain certain statements about my mixing of stock speculation with statesmanship." You, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, are my witnesses of the falsity of that statement. I made no explanation of that charge whatever. I found a ridiculous lie afloat, and I stamped on it in your presence with the contempt which its absurdity demanded, and from the time that I took my heel off it upon this floor,

Imperial Cæsar, dead and turned to clay,

was not more dead than was this senseless canard. [Laughter and applause.]

But to the New York Times a dead lie, under the relations which that paper bore to me, was much better than no lie at all, and the mangled fragments of this wreck were carefully laid aside for future use.

There was without doubt much sadness in the office of the New York Times about that first lie. It was of the particular style of merchandise which they wanted on their shelves. It had been a secret pride in that office that, though they might be slow in news, they were smart in lying. [Laughter.]

And here was this juicy and toothsome falsehood, which, with better luck, they might have rolled under their tongue as a sweet morsel for days before it was contradicted, and in an evil hour they had mistaken it for news, and "got on to it," as usual, twenty-four hours after their more enterprising neighbors. [Laughter.] Evidently they were chastened and saddened, but determined upon more vigilance in the future; and so this "funeral baked meat" is used as a relish to whet the appetite for a more malevolent lie. [Renewed laughter.]

And now I address myself to the subject-matter of the communication which the Clerk has just read. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, you know it is not true that you are or have been talking about me and the joint resolution in regard to Venezuela. You and each of you have heard nothing about it, and have said nothing about it. It is also not true that I have a dollar's interest, direct or collateral, as principal or an attorney, in any claim of any nature against Venezuela, and, so far as I am aware, no constituent of mine has any such claim. The statement that I ever brought an action of mandamus or any other action against Mr. Bayard or any other human being, in respect to any claim against Venezuela, or that had respect to any contention about Venezuela, in any form whatever, is a lie; it is an unmistakable, palpable lie telegraphed from yonder press gallery, referring to an imaginary cause in the Supreme Court of the United States, whose archives are within a hundred paces of where the slander was penned; and those archives will prove, upon the most casual inquiry, the falsity of the fabrication. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, possibly I have said all that I am called on to say in regard to this matter, but I shall crave your indulgence a minute longer.

The Times in this article lays great and contemptuous stress upon my business as a stock-broker.

Mr. Speaker, there is not a man on this floor who will accuse me of ever "talking shop," either here or elsewhere. There was never a time when I so far lacked discrimination as not to know that it made no difference whether a man in public life had been a farmer or mechanic, a preacher or lawyer; that he did not stand in this hall upon any certificate of past achievement, but was rated here according to his ability and his fidelity in the discharge of his public trusts.

And so if any man on this floor knows anything of my past business life he knows it from outside information, and not from any remark of mine made here or elsewhere.

But before dismissing the New York Times I propose to embalm one of the editors of that sheet, who has for over four years inspired the course of the paper towards me, and to do this it is made necessary to recall a single personal incident in my past life.

This article which the Clerk has just read gives me my usual soubriquet of "deacon." The most genial and kindly friends I have on this floor often address me as "deacon." Some of you may think, when you behold my "orderly walk and conversation," that the title was given me from my official church relation, or because I behave like a "deacon." But candor compels me to admit, modestly, that these things are not true, and that however illogical it may seem I was brevetted deacon for success in battle upon the floor of the New York Stock Exchange, which battle was waged to settle a dispute over the appropriate market price of Lackawanna. [Laughter.]

The engagement took place on March 1, 1884. As is always the case in a contest of that kind, there were more camp followers than there were soldiers; and prominent among the camp followers was one of the editors of the New York Times.

He was one of those serviceable fellows whom you each met within twenty-four hours after your nominatian for Congress, who could do you so much good in the doubtful precincts, and whose services were at your command, if you would send out 10,000 papers at 10 cents a piece.

I did not need him and he was arrayed, through his broker, on the other side. It was a day of very marked activity among bears, and a day when those who asked for terms earliest, fared best. The Times editor was dilatory that morning, and before 3 o'clock I convinced him, through his broker, that my property which he had squandered by selling short the day before at 127 "regular" was cheap that afternoon at 137 cash. [Great laughter.] To use the language of the irreverent, the Times editor "got left" that day, and he has been trying to "get even" ever since, and the weakling in the press gallery who sent that dispatch was acting under general instructions from headquarters when he telegraphed the lie.

Let me give you proof of the personal malice which poisons this dispatch.

This Venezuela joint resolution, in the identical words which I used, was introduced into the Senate on May 16 (page 4366 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD) by the distinguished Senator from New York, Mr. EVARTS, formerly Secretary of State. This was five days before I introduced the same resolution in this House. Now, which horn of the dilemma will the Times take—that it had not enterprise enough to find that Mr. EVARTS had introduced the same resolution or that it did not gratify any personal malice to state the fact in respect to that distinguished Senator?

Again, in the matter of the amendment offered by me to the urgent deficiency bill to pay 6 per cent. interest from March 4, 1887, to the date of the passage of that bill, because the creditors had lost that interest through the neglect of the Forty-ninth Congress; the same amendment, in the exact words, was afterwards introduced in the Senate by the distinguished Senator from Ohio, Mr. SHERMAN. Was the suppression of that fact the result of ignorance as to public affairs, or had the Times no personal venom to inject in its relations with that Senator?

One word on the cowardice of these malignant misrepresentations, and I am done. This is no question of a manly statement of fact and fair criticism of a public servant; such statement and criticism I invite and commend; but this fabrication is a sample merely, with perhaps a higher percentage of truth than the average statements of the Times, with which they have commented upon my private affairs and my public acts for the last four years.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the world unites in its execration of a coward, but in the roll-call of cowardice the most execrable devil that answers to his name is the newspaper man who, armed with a printing press, uses it to gratify a personal spite, by scattering world-wide, false statements

against a citizen who has no equal means either of contradiction or of retaliation. And such a case is the case at bar. [Prolonged applause.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RANDALL. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. When the House adjourned on yesterday evening it was divided on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia to lay on the table the appeal made by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. RANDALL. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SPINOLA] to make a report from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SPINOLA. I wish to report back the bill from the Committee on Military Affairs, referred to that committee this morning, in regard to the rank of General of the United States Army.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will send the bill to the desk.

Mr. SPINOLA. I have sent to the committee-room for the bill; it will be here in a moment.

Mr. RANDALL. Pending that, I move to dispense with private business for the entire day.

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 140, noes 8.

Mr. BUTLER. No quorum has voted.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The point of order being made that no quorum has voted, the Chair will appoint tellers.

Mr. BUTLER and Mr. RANDALL were appointed tellers.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. This motion requires a vote of two-thirds.

Mr. BUTLER (one of the tellers). I withdraw the demand for a quorum.

So (no further count being demanded) the motion was agreed to, two-thirds voting in favor thereof.

GRADE OF GENERAL IN THE ARMY.

Mr. SPINOLA. Mr. Speaker, I now ask unanimous consent to report back from the Committee on Military Affairs the bill which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2210) to revive the grade of General in the United States Army.

Mr. SPINOLA. I am instructed by the committee to report the bill back with the recommendation that it pass.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the report being now made?

Mr. KILGORE. I object.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentlemen from Texas objects to making the report.

Mr. KILGORE. No; I do not object to making the report from the committee. I object to present consideration.

Mr. BLAND. I hope the gentleman will withdraw objection to the bill. Let it be considered now. General Sheridan ought to be given that rank, and I hope the bill will pass.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will again submit the request of the gentleman from New York for unanimous consent to make the report from the committee at this time.

Mr. OATES. I renew the objection.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The report can only be made by unanimous consent at this time.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. RANDALL. Let us have the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will again state that on yesterday evening, at the time of adjournment, the House was dividing on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] to lay on the table the appeal from the decision of the Chair taken by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS]. The yeas and nays had been demanded, which demand was subsequently withdrawn. Thereupon the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] demanded a division, and the House was dividing at the time.

The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia to lay the appeal on the table.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 112, noes 47.

Mr. MASON, Mr. PETERS, and others. No quorum.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The point of order being made that a quorum has not voted, the Chair will appoint tellers.

Mr. BLOUNT and Mr. PETERS were appointed tellers.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 111, noes 6.

Mr. MASON. No quorum.

Mr. RANDALL. To save time I ask the yeas and nays.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, I think we can save time upon this matter if the gentlemen on the other side of the House will consent to take up the bill for the relief of General Sheridan.

Mr. MILLS. Let us have the yeas and nays.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask unanimous consent to take up that bill for consideration at this time.

Mr. MORSE. You have already placed yourselves on the record.

Mr. RANDALL. And this side of the House has shown its disposition to take up and pass the bill.

Mr. BURROWS. Is there objection to the request I have made?

Mr. MILLS. The yeas and nays have been demanded.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on ordering the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the Chair please state the question?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] to lay on the table the appeal taken from the decision of the Chair by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS].

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 130, nays 9, not voting 185; as follows:

YEAS—130.

Abbott,	Dibble,	Landes,	Rogers,
Allen, Miss.	Dockery,	Lane,	Rowland,
Anderson, Ill.	Dunn,	Lanham,	Sayers,
Bankhead,	Elliott,	Lawler,	Seney,
Barry,	Enloe,	Lee,	Shaw,
Biggs,	Ermentrout,	Long,	Shively,
Blanchard,	Fisher,	Lynch,	Smith,
Bland,	Foran,	Macdonald,	Sowden,
Bliss,	Ford,	Mahoney,	Spinola,
Blount,	Forney,	Maish,	Springer,
Breckinridge, Ark.	French,	Mansur,	Stahlnecker,
Breckinridge, Ky.	Gay,	Martin,	Stewart, Tex.
Bryce,	Glass,	McAdoo,	Stewart, Ga.
Buckalew,	Grimes,	McClammy,	Stockdale,
Burnes,	Hall,	McCreary,	Stone, Ky.
Burnett,	Hare,	McShane,	Stone, Mo.
Bynum,	Hatch,	Mills,	Taulbee,
Campbell, P., N. Y.	Hayes,	Moore,	Thompson, Cal.
Cannon,	Heard,	Morgan,	Tillman,
Carlton,	Hemphill,	Morse,	Tracey,
Caruth,	Henderson, N. C.	Neal,	Turner, Ga.
Catchings,	Herbert,	Newton,	Vance,
Chipman,	Holman,	Oates,	Walker,
Clardy,	Hopkins, Va.	O'Neall, Ind.	Washington,
Clements,	Howard,	Outhwaite,	Weaver,
Cobb,	Hudd,	Peel,	Wheeler,
Cothran,	Hutton,	Penington,	Whitthorne,
Cowles,	Johnston, N. C.	Perry,	Wilkins,
Cox,	Jones,	Randall,	Wilkinson,
Culberson,	Kerr,	Rayner,	Wilson, Minn.
Dargan,	Kilgore,	Rice,	Wilson, W. Va.
Davidson, Ala.	Laffoon,	Richardson,	
Davidson, Fla.	Lagan,	Robertson,	

NAYS—9.

Anderson, Iowa	Hermann,	Lehlbach,	McKenna,
Baker, Ill.	Hiestand,	Lind,	Romeis.
Brewer,			

NOT VOTING—185.

Adams,	Dalzell,	Kennedy,	Rowell,
Allen, Mass.	Darlington,	Ketcham,	Russell, Conn.
Allen, Mich.	Davenport,	La Follette,	Russell, Mass.
Anderson, Miss.	Davis,	Laidlaw,	Rusk,
Anderson, Kans.	De Lano,	Laird,	Ryan,
Arnold,	Dingley,	Latham,	Sawyer,
Atkinson,	Dorsey,	Lodge,	Scott,
Bacon,	Dougherty,	Lyman,	Scull,
Baker, N. Y.	Dunham,	Maffett,	Seymour,
Barnes,	Farquhar,	Mason,	Sherman,
Bayne,	Felton,	Matson,	Simmons,
Belden,	Finley,	McComas,	Snyder,
Belmont,	Fitch,	McCormick,	Spooner,
Bingham,	Flood,	McCullogh,	Steele,
Boothman,	Fuller,	McKinley,	Stephenson,
Bound,	Funston,	McKinney,	Stewart, Vt.
Boutelle,	Gaines,	McMillin,	Struble,
Bowden,	Gallinger,	McRae,	Symes,
Bowen,	Gear,	Merriman,	Tarsney,
Brower,	Gest,	Milliken,	Taylor, E. B., Ohio
Browne, T. H. B., Va.	Gibson,	Moffitt,	Taylor, J. D., Ohio
Browne, Ind.	Glover,	Montgomery,	Thomas, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Goff,	Morrill,	Thomas, Ill.
Brown, J. R., Va.	Granger,	Morrow,	Thomas, Wis.
Brumm,	Greenman,	Nelson,	Thompson, Ohio
Buchanan,	Grosvenor,	Nichols,	Townshend,
Bunnell,	Grout,	Norwood,	Turner, Kans.
Burrows,	Guenther,	Nutting,	Vandever,
Butler,	Harmer,	O'Donnell,	Wade,
Butterworth,	Haugen,	O'Ferrall,	Warner,
Campbell, Ohio	Hayden,	O'Neill, Pa.	Weber,
Campbell, T. J., N. Y.	Henderson, Iowa	O'Neill, Mo.	West,
Candler,	Henderson, Ill.	Osborne,	White, Ind.
Caswell,	Hires,	Owen,	White, N. Y.
Cheadle,	Hitt,	Parker,	Whiting, Mich.
Clark.	Hogg,	Patton,	Whiting, Mass.
Cockran,	Holmes,	Payson,	Wickham,
Cogswell,	Hooker,	Perkins,	Wilber,
Collins,	Hopkins, Ill.	Peters,	Williams,
Compton,	Hopkins, N. Y.	Phelan,	Wise,
Conger,	Houk,	Phelps,	Woodburn,
Cooper,	Hovey,	Pidcock,	Yardley,
Crain,	Hunter,	Plumb,	Yoder,
Crisp,	Jackson,	Post,	Yost.
Crouse,	Johnston, Ind.	Pugsley,	
Cummings,	Kean,	Reed,	
Cutcheon,	Kelley,	Rockwell,	

When the name of Mr. MASON was called,

Mr. MASON said: I rise for information. I desire to know the question before the House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That has been stated more than once.

But, with the consent of the House, the Chair will again state, the question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia to lay on the table the appeal of the gentleman from Kansas from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. MASON. I desire, Mr. Speaker—— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. MASON. Can I not ask to be excused from voting? I will state that I do not propose to vote on this or any other measure while General Sheridan is alive until this bill giving him the rank and title of General of the Army has passed. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The Clerk continued and completed calling the roll.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask that the reading of the names be dispensed with.

Mr. MASON and others objected.

The following members were announced as paired on all political questions until further notice:

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, with Mr. SAWYER.
Mr. BELMONT with Mr. CLARK.
Mr. LATHAM with Mr. LAIRD.
Mr. BACON with Mr. HAYDEN.
Mr. GIBSON with Mr. PUGSLEY.
Mr. RUSK with Mr. SEYMOUR.
Mr. MERRIMAN with Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut.
Mr. SNYDER with Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa.
Mr. SIMMONS with Mr. DUNHAM.
Mr. TIMOTHY J. CAMPBELL with Mr. LAIDLAW.
Mr. WHITING, of Michigan, with Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan.
Mr. DOUGHERTY with Mr. PETERS.
Mr. TOWNSHEND with Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois.
Mr. GRANGER with Mr. ROCKWELL.
Mr. GLOVER with Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin.
Mr. NORWOOD with Mr. COOPER.
Mr. GREENMAN with Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois.
Mr. WHITE, of New York, with Mr. COCKRAN.

Mr. CANDLER was announced as paired with Mr. CUTCHEON until June 8.

The following pairs were also announced:

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. T. H. B. BROWNE, of Virginia, on all questions in the House and in Committee of the Whole until further notice.

Mr. CUMMINGS with Mr. MCCORMICK, on all questions in the House and in Committee of the Whole until further notice.

Mr. MATSON with Mr. OWEN, until further notice, not to vote in the House or in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. BARNES with Mr. BAKER, of New York, on all questions in the House and in Committee of the Whole until June 9.

Mr. COMPTON with Mr. WEBER, on all questions in Committee of the Whole and in the House until further notice.

Mr. YODER with Mr. BOOTHMAN, on all questions in the House and in Committee of the Whole until further notice.

Mr. CRAIN with Mr. ARNOLD, on this vote.
Mr. MONTGOMERY with Mr. BINGHAM, on this vote.
Mr. MCRAE with Mr. HOUK, on this vote.

The vote was then announced as above stated.

Mr. MASON. No quorum. I move there be a call of the House.

GENERAL OF THE ARMY.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up for immediate consideration the bill of the Senate entitled "An act to revive the grade of General in the United States Army."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The last vote having disclosed the fact that there is no quorum, no business is in order until the presence of a quorum is ascertained.

Mr. RANDALL. The request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] is for unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that a distinction is drawn in the rule between an aye-and-no vote and a vote taken *viva voce*, and the Chair is of opinion that the absence of a quorum having been disclosed by an aye-and-no vote, no other business is now in order.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I now move a call of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. That is right.

The question was taken on ordering a call of the House, and there were—ayes 177, noes 6.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will have to attain his object, the Chair thinks, by moving to reconsider the vote by which the call of the House was ordered.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Then I make that motion.

The motion to reconsider was agreed to.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I now ask unanimous consent to take up for immediate consideration the act to revive the grade of General in the United States Army. I do not know that it has been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, but if so, I move to discharge that committee from the further consideration of the bill, and to put it upon its passage.

Mr. SPINOLA. It was referred to the committee this morning, and I have just tried to report it back again, with the recommendation that it do pass.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] that his request can not be entertained at this time. The House has just reconsidered the vote by which the call of the House was ordered, and the question now recurs on the motion for a call of the House.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Which motion, with the consent of the House, I now withdraw.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The motion for a call of the House is withdrawn. The gentleman from New York [Mr. SPINOLA] asks unanimous consent to report back at this time from the Committee on Military Affairs the bill (S. 2210), being an act to revive the grade of General in the United States Army, and the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] moves that the bill be now considered. The Clerk will read the title of the bill.

Mr. FORD. Before that is done, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, I ask unanimous consent to make a statement, which will not occupy more than five seconds, to correct a misapprehension. [Cries on the Republican side of "No, no! Let us pass the bill."]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the bill; after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The Clerk again read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York that he may report this bill from the Committee on Military Affairs at this time? The Chair hears none. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] that the bill be considered at this time?

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the House that I am opposed to legislation of this character—— [Interruptions on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLOUNT. I hope gentlemen will allow the gentleman from Texas to make a statement.

Several MEMBERS (on the Republican side). Certainly.

Mr. KILGORE. I do not care whether they allow it or not. [Cries of "Go on!"]

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this character of legislation—this hasty legislation on an important matter like this, piling up precedents which may in the future be quoted and may prove to be dangerous; but I say to the House that if they will concede to us a yea-and-nay vote upon the bill and will allow me to put upon record a brief statement from a Republican paper in relation to this question, I will withdraw my objection.

Mr. MASON. All right.

Several MEMBERS (on the Republican side). There is no objection to that.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] for the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. KILGORE. On the condition I have stated I will withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was again read.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, was recognized.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE], who desires to make a statement.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, I have no statement to make further than to send to the desk to be read an extract from the Indianapolis News of May 30, an independent Republican paper, which expresses my views upon this question. I ask that this article be read and printed in the RECORD.

The article was read, as follows:

The Senate did a silly thing in reviving the office of General for General Sheridan. The office was dead, and it ought to be allowed to remain so. It is to be hoped the House will refuse to concur. In Grant's case there was a difference. The office had been created for him. He left it when he became President. In his last days it was an anomaly that the great soldier of our war should be without any right to a military title at all, and so his old office was conferred upon him. He was retired at the same time, and thus by a national act his title was conferred upon him. Sheridan never has held the office. It is not in existence for him to be promoted to, but must be recreated specially for the occasion, and it is a performance sadly out of place—waiting all these years without ever thinking of doing it, and now rushing into his sick-chamber, perhaps to the side of his death-bed. It is poor manners, diseased sentiment, and title-worship, and decent Republicanism and common sense ought to put an end to it.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. Speaker, in sending up this item to be read I have given full expression to my views on this question; and as I am now on record in opposition to this bill, and shall vote against it, I withdraw the other condition upon which I abandoned my objection, and will not insist on a vote by yeas and nays.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I now yield to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE], who I understand desires to occupy two or three minutes.

Mr. STEELE. I wish to state that the paper from which the extract has just been read by the Clerk is not a Republican paper. It is an ably-edited independent evening paper.

In justice to the Committee on Military Affairs, I will say that it has taken no hasty action in this matter. A bill similar to this has been before us for several weeks, and we have been considering it. The only reason it has not been reported back favorably before this was the hope that we might have a unanimous report. There have been only two or three objections up to yesterday evening, when there was but one. That is all I desire to say. [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM].

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise for the purpose of opposing this bill; I intend to support it. I simply wish to state the character and standing of the Indianapolis News, from which the Clerk has just read. True, it is an independent paper, but it is of Republican antecedents, and seldom supports a Democrat or a Democratic measure. It is an ardent supporter of General Harrison for the Presidency. It has at all times supported the national Republican ticket. At the same time it is thoroughly independent. No more independent, no more reliable, no more conscientious men edit any newspaper in the United States than those who edit the Indianapolis News. [Renewed cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I yield for a few minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORD].

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I did intend to say a word or two in justification of the action of the Committee on Military Affairs, but as my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE], has explained that matter, I do not care to take up further time of the House.

Many MEMBERS. Now let us vote.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Will the House allow me a word? [Cries of "Yes!" "Yes!"]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, there were reasons why I might not have been willing for this bill to pass if General Sheridan had remained in the prime of a vigorous and robust manhood. I can appreciate, however, the feeling of gentlemen on all sides of the House who desire to do honor to a gallant soldier who won deserved glory during four years of such terrific warfare; but whatever feeling I might have had under other circumstances gave way when I understood the other day that General Sheridan stood in the presence of that enemy whom he had so dauntlessly faced through so many years; and if it can add anything to the comfort of the dying hours of that great soldier or take something from the sorrow of the wife whom he leaves, for the nation to tender this new crown to him, I am glad to have the opportunity to mingle my sympathy with that of all sides of this Chamber. [Loud applause.]

I now desire to give the opportunity for a more handsome tribute than anything I can say by yielding to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] whatever time he may desire.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am very proud to be here to-day to give my suffrage for this bill. Although indisposed, and although my place would be perhaps in my own room, I came here to-day to do honor to a man whom I have known, lo! these many years, in all the vicissitudes of his wonderful life. He was born in Central Ohio, near where I was born. He drove a cart for watering the streets in the town of Zanesville about the time I came back from school. I can recall with distinctness the Congressman who sent him to West Point, and all the various anecdotes connected with that remarkable county of Perry and the town of Somerset come back to me now.

This man was not merely a soldier, as my friend from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] has said, in our civil conflict of four years, but he was a born soldier from the beginning of his career at West Point—not merely in the Indian country, but everywhere. Whilst criticising the strategy of the great generals of Europe in the great battles that have occurred within our own time, he was conspicuous as a critic, observant as a general, and brought to the examination of the contests in other lands the experience acquired in the great struggle of our own.

Mr. Speaker, in the agony of his present great struggle, when, almost in *articulo mortis*, he is reaching out to the unseen world, I am proud to forego all other associations to give my heart and my best hope for the success of this vote, which, I trust, the members of this House may give as an entirety for the bill, so that there may appear no objection from any member on this floor representing any part of the American people to thus placing upon the roster as a general the first soldier of the Republic, the kind and genial gentleman, Philip H. Sheridan. [Loud applause.]

[Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I desire to yield now to the venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] whatever time he may desire.

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Speaker, the unmeaning title of "father of the House" has never received appreciation from me, though I believe I have borne it longer than any of my predecessors, till now, when it justifies me in rising to say, as I do most fervently, that I am proud of the family which this title regards me as looking upon as in some sense my own. [Applause.] And to convey the heartfelt gratitude of the Republican minority to the Democratic majority of the House for overcoming the obstructions which seemed to be impassable in the pathway of legislation which proposes to cheer the greatest soldier of the age, General Philip H. Sheridan, in the closing days of his illustrious life. [Great applause.]

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The terms of the agreement made with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILGORE]——

Several MEMBERS. He does not insist upon it.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Texas withdrew his demand. [Cries of "Vote!"]

The bill was passed.

[Renewed and long continued applause.]

Mr. OATES. I demand a division. [Cries of "Don't do that, Oates," on the Democratic side.] Very well, I do not wish to embarrass any gentleman by demanding a division, but I wish it to be known that I voted in the negative.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

LEGISLATIVE, EXECUTIVE, AND JUDICIAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT] to lay upon the table the appeal taken from the decision of the Chair by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS], on which the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. RANDALL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the previous question was ordered on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BLOUNT].

The motion was agreed to.

The question recurred on Mr. BLOUNT's motion to lay the appeal of Mr. PETERS upon the table, and it was agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL moved to reconsider the vote just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL. I now move the previous question on the adoption of the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations on the bill (H. R. 9377) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the amendments will be voted on in gross.

The amendments of the Committee on Appropriations were agreed to.

Mr. RANDALL moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time.

Mr. RANDALL demanded the previous question on the passage of the bill.

The previous question was ordered, and under the operation thereof the bill was passed.

Mr. RANDALL moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

COLLECTING REVENUES FROM CUSTOMS.

Mr. SAYERS. I ask, by unanimous consent, to call up the report of the Committee on Appropriations on the bill (H. R. 9788) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes, and to now consider the same.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. SAYERS. I call for the reading of the report.

The report was read, as follows:

Mr. BURNES, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following report to accompany the bill H. R. 9788:

The Committee on Appropriations, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9788) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes, with the amendments of the Senate thereto, having considered the same, beg leave to report, as follows:

They recommend concurrence in the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, and 11.

They recommend concurrence in the amendment numbered 12 with an amendment as follows: After the matter proposed to be inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Expenses of United States courts:

"Fees of jurors: To supply a deficiency in the appropriation for the fees of jurors of United States courts on account of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, $50,000.

"Fees of witnesses: To supply a deficiency in the appropriation for fees of witnesses, United States courts, on account of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, $60,000.

"Government Hospital for Insane:

"For current expenses of the Government Hospital for the Insane: For sup-

port, clothing, and treatment in the Government Hospital for the Insane of the insane from the Army and Navy, Marine Corps, and revenue-cutter service, of persons charged with or convicted of crimes against the United States, inmates of the National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers, and of all persons who have become insane since their entry into the military or naval service of the United States and who are indigent, $11,713.07, being a deficiency on account of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888."

And in the first line of the title of the bill strike out the words "an appropriation" and insert in lieu thereof the word "appropriations."

Mr. ADAMS. I would like to have the gentleman from Texas explain to the House just exactly what action has been taken by the Committee on Appropriations in reference to the changes made by the Senate amendments, especially as to witness fees.

Mr. SAYERS. The Senate struck out the provision in the bill which related to a change in the method of supporting the customs service, and also amended the bill by adding certain items of appropriation covering the expenditures of that body. It also amended the bill with one item relating to the House expenditures. The Committee on Appropriations recommended concurrence in the Senate amendments with the adoption of other items, which provide for the Department of Justice in the matter of jury and witness fees, and also for the support of the Hospital for the Insane during the remainder of the present fiscal year.

Mr. ADAMS. Allow me to have an extract read from a newspaper in reference to the point to which I would like to direct his attention.

The Clerk read as follows:

NO MONEY TO PAY WITNESSES.

CHICAGO, *May* 22.

A dispatch from Fort Smith, Ark., says: Owing to the absence of appropriations for the pay of witnesses the Federal court of this city has been obliged to close, and over four hundred witnesses were discharged yesterday without pay. Many of these came from points several hundred miles distant on the Indian Territory, and are in absolute poverty. Among the cases continued until the next term of the court are thirty-five murders, twenty-six larceny, forty illicit-whisky selling, and twenty-eight assault, besides over thirty other cases. The district judge and United States marshal have sent a telegram to the Attorney-General asking that authority be granted for the transfer of witnesses' vouchers, Comptroller Durham having recently decided that they are not transferable—*Washington Post*, May 23, 1888.

Mr. ADAMS. I will ask the gentleman from Texas, first, whether the Committee on Appropriations has had in view that deficiency in the recommendations they made, and, secondly, whether they have inserted or can insert any provision in the bill to meet the difficulty last mentioned in that extract, to wit, the lack of transferability of witness' certificates.

Mr. SAYERS. I will say to the gentleman from Illinois, that one of the amendments proposed by the Committee on Appropriations meets that very difficulty. In response to the second question, I will say to him that it would be a matter of new legislation, and, as such, incompetent under the rules of the House to be reported by the committee.

Mr. ADAMS. Would it not be possible for the committee to ask unanimous consent, and in the opinion of the gentleman would not that consent be granted if asked by the committee?

Mr. SAYERS. I can only state that it would involve a change of existing law; and as it is absolutely necessary that this appropriation shall go through immediately in order to be available during the coming week, I do not think it would be wise to incorporate such a provision on the bill.

Mr. CANNON. I will say in answer to my colleague that I think there would be objection, even if unanimous consent was asked and given, to the incorporation of the legislation to which he refers.

Mr. RANDALL. Permit me to say a few words in this connection. The Committee on Appropriations have recommended appropriations, which were made, of $600,000, against the Department's annual estimate of $500,000 for 1888, for the fees of jurors; and in regard to payment of witnesses, the committee recommended the full amount of the annual estimate, $550,000, which was appropriated, and has since given a supplemental sum of $300,000. That is to say, the appropriations have exceeded the estimates, and Congress has given, as far as I know, every dollar that has been asked by the Department.

Mr. SAYERS. Yes, every dollar that has been estimated.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the recommendations of the committee.

The amendments of the committee were adopted.

Mr. SAYERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

WITHDRAWAL OF A VOTE.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a privileged question.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STEELE. I desire to withdraw my vote from the roll recently taken on the appeal from the ruling of the Chair. I make this request because I am not quite clear in my conviction as to whether the ruling was accurate or not. I prefer, therefore, to withdraw the vote altogether.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to withdraw his vote, and if there be no objection that will be allowed.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

PROTECTION OF UNITED STATES OFFICIALS, INDIAN TERRITORY.

Mr. ROGERS. I desire to submit a privileged report.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will send it up.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4920) for the protection of the officials of the United States in the Indian Territory, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

JOHN H. ROGERS,
JOHN S. HENDERSON,
WILLIAM E. FULLER,
Managers on the part of the House.

H. L. DAWES,
JAMES K. JONES,
F. B. STOCKBRIDGE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Under the rule the managers on the part of the House submitted the following statement to accompany the report:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to bill (H. R. 4920) for the protection of the officials of the United States in the Indian Territory submit the following written statement:

The effect of the action recommended in the accompanying conference report, if ratified by the two Houses, will pass the bill as amended by the Senate.

JNO. H. ROGERS,
JOHN S. HENDERSON,
WM. E. FULLER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, at this point it would be proper for me, I presume, to place on the record a statement exhibiting the lawlessness prevailing in that Territory, and the number of murders which have been committed in the last two years on the marshal's force of that district, which shows the necessity of this legislation. I will not ask to have it read, but simply print it in the RECORD.

It is as follows:

[Arkansas Gazette correspondence.]

FORT SMITH, SEBASTIAN COUNTY.

FORT SMITH, *December* 18, 1887.

It is the prevailing opinion out here on the border that the increase in lawlessness in the Indian Territory will induce Congress at its present session to open that county to settlement, or at least make an effort to do so. As it now is the Government is at an enormous expense in its endeavors to enforce the laws of that benighted county, and yet eight criminals out of ten are never brought to justice.

The present United States marshal for the western district of Arkansas has held the office since October 30, 1885, and during that time has had nine deputy marshals, two posses, and three guards murdered while in the discharge of their official duties, as follows:

Jack E. Richardson, murdered by Bill Pigeon, a Cherokee, who is still at large.

William Erwin, waylaid and murdered in the Choctaw Nation by Jake Spanlard and Frank Palmer for the purpose of rescuing a prisoner he had in charge. Both at large.

F. M. Sweeden, murdered in Choctaw Nation by unknown parties, who will probably never be known.

Sam Sickiller, murdered at Muskogee, Creek Nation, by Dick Vann and Alf Cunningham. The Government paid $500 for the arrest of the latter, but he broke down the jurisdiction of the court here and was turned over to the Creek Nation authorities, who allowed him to escape before trial, and he is still at large. Vann was killed a short time since by Deputy Marshal Jackson Ellis.

Capt. William Fields was murdered in the Creek Nation by Bill Cunius, who was captured and died in jail here before his trial.

Deputy Dan Maples was murdered at Tahlequah, the capital of the Cherokee Nation. Ned Christie, Charlie Bobtail, Bud Trainer, and John Parish are charged with this diabolical deed, and the three latter are in jail here, while Christie is at large.

Deputy John Carlton was murdered at Denison, Tex., by a lawless negro from the Territory, who is now in jail at Sherman.

Deputy Frank Dalton was murdered in the Cherokee Nation by Dave Smith, Will Towerly, and Lee Dixon. Dave Smith was killed by Deputy Cole at the same time he killed Dalton. Dixon was wounded by Cole and is now in jail here recovering. Towerly escaped and one week later killed Deputy Ed. Stokery, and was himself killed by his victim and the posse he had with him. The wife of Dixon was killed in the mêlée with Dalton, and Deputy Cole was wounded. Towerly acknowledged before he died that he and Smith had for some time been engaged in horse stealing. He was killed in his father's yard in the presence of his mother and sister. He was but nineteen years old.

Ben. Lupson, posse of Deputy Lawrence, was murdered by a citizen of the Territory, and being himself a citizen this court had no jurisdiction in the case, hence he has never been molested.

William Smith, posse, John Kelly and Mark Kuykendall, guards, were murdered in the Creek country by Seaborn Green, a young Indian, who was arrested, convicted, and hung for the crime.

Henry Miller, a guard, was murdered by Big Chewee, a Cherokee; but, as Miller was a citizen of the Cherokee Nation also, Chewee was turned over to that government, and a jury acquitted him.

Thus far, it will be seen that only one of the murderers of United States officers in the Indian Territory has been punished under the law, and that was Seaborn Green.

There is a standing reward by the Government of $500 each for the arrest of all murderers of deputy marshals, posse, or guards, who are still alive and at large, over whom this court has jurisdiction.

All the deputies murdered were good, honest, upright citizens.

This state of affairs will never cease so long as Congress allows the Indian country to remain as it is, and the killing of United States officers will continue with unabated vigor, while murder, rapine, and crimes of lesser magnitude will increase with the influx of outlaws of the States, who find a safe abiding-place among the Indians, where no one but United States officers can molest them.

A change must come, and the sooner Congress takes hold of it the better.

In this connection I desire also to correct what seems to have been, and I am sure was, a total misapprehension on the part of my friend from Maryland [Mr. MCCOMAS], who is not here at present, as shown by the RECORD of May 3, with reference to the places where these of-

fenses occurred, such as are embodied in the paper to which I have just referred. In the RECORD, in response to a remark, and a side remark from me, not intended for him, then occupying the floor, he said in substance that I had boasted on the floor of representing a district where this class of crimes, among others, had been committed more frequently than in any other district in the country. Upon calling his attention to it he kindly struck his remarks from the RECORD. It is right for me to say that only a small proportion of the territory spoken of as the "western district of Arkansas is in the State of Arkansas, and only a small proportion, perhaps one-third or less, of that which is in Arkansas is in my district; and finally, the Federal court has no jurisdiction whatever over crimes of this character committed in the State. I think I should be within the limits of the truth if I said that probably not 3 per cent. in number of the crimes tried at Fort Smith are committed in Arkansas, and that 3 per cent. are such as occur in all the States. They are committed in the Indian Territory, west of Arkansas, which was attached to that district by act of Congress, and are all tried at that point, where the United States court sits which has the jurisdiction, a general jurisdiction, because not within the limits of a State.

Of course my friend from Maryland was under a misapprehension, and as soon as he was so advised he struck the matter from the RECORD. But it is due to myself to say I never boasted of anything of that kind; on the contrary, I deplore the existence of crime anywhere, and if the gentleman had thought for a moment what the jurisdiction of the Federal courts was he would not have inadvertently fallen into the error. The effect of the Senate amendment to the House bill is to extend greater protection to the officials of that country, in this, that it confers jurisdiction on Federal courts to try parties for murder, assault with intent to kill, or assault and battery, or who shall resist process issued under authority of the United States courts. I concur entirely in the action of the Senate and now ask the adoption of the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. ROGERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the report was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

TARIFF.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering revenue measures. But pending that motion I wish to make a proposition to the gentlemen on the other side about limiting the time on the paragraph under consideration. When the committee rose the debate on that paragraph had lasted over four hours. I propose that debate on it shall close in twenty minutes, ten minutes being allowed to each side. I refer to the first paragraph, which has reference to the day on which the law shall come into operation.

Mr. ADAMS. Do you mean the first five lines of the bill?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I desire to make an inquiry, whether the limit proposed by the gentleman from Texas is to be applied to any amendments which may hereafter be offered to those five lines?

Mr. MILLS. My proposition is that as to those five lines debate after twenty minutes shall close upon all amendments.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Amendments now pending and those which may be offered?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I do not think we can accede to that.

Mr. MILLS. This does not exclude amendments, but only debate.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I understand that.

Mr. MILLS. Then I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union; and pending that I move that all debate on the paragraph and the amendments thereto be limited to twenty minutes.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I suggest that this paragraph is much more important, perhaps, than any other in the bill.

Mr. MILLS. It refers only to the date.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The gentleman refers to the paragraph of five lines which cover the proposition now pending to change the time when the law shall go into effect. It covers every schedule, and is of vastly greater importance than any other single paragraph in the bill.

Mr. MILLS. Gentlemen can have the same latitude in talking about the date when we get down to the consideration of lumber as they have had in talking about lumber when this amendment of date was under consideration yesterday.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I suggest, if this debate is to have any effect or is to be regarded as at all serious, or having any object, the debating of a proposition fixing the time when the law should go into effect after the paragraph had been passed and the time fixed would be a waste of time.

Mr. REED. I suggest to the gentleman from Texas to make the time an hour.

Mr. MILLS. I will agree to half an hour.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I move to amend by striking out twenty minutes and inserting forty minutes.

Mr. REED. I will consent to that.

Mr. MILLS. I accept the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio, and demand the previous question on my motion.

The previous question was ordered; and under the operation thereof the motion of Mr. MILLS, as modified, to limit debate to forty minutes, was agreed to.

The motion of Mr. MILLS, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of bills raising revenue, was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union (Mr. SPRINGER in the chair), and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenues.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 3 strike out "1st day of July, 1888," and insert "2d day of January, 1889."

The CHAIRMAN. By order of the House, all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto has been limited to forty minutes. The Chair will divide the time between those favorable to the proposition and those opposed to it.

[Mr. HOLMAN withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. MCCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time for the purpose of replying to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] and not for the purpose of offering any formal amendment to this bill, which I hope to do at the proper time. It was charged upon this floor yesterday by the distinguished gentleman from Iowa that there is a "lumber trust" in this country. That I may give his exact language, I read from the RECORD of this day's issue, page 5096. Replying to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED], the gentleman from Iowa says:

And, sir, by reason of their further combination with the transportation monopolies, no man can engage in the lumber business without the consent of the lumber trust and the transportation companies, which together constitute one of the most unconscionable trusts ever organized in this or any other country.

Mr. Chairman, coming as I do from a district whose chief industry is lumber, an industry that amounts to an annual product of more than $10,000,000, I feel it incumbent upon me to defend my constituents against this grave and criminal charge of the distinguished gentleman from Iowa. I deny in general and in particular that there exists in this country a "lumber trust" at all. I deny that it has ever existed anywhere in this country so far as the great lumbering industries are concerned; and the gentleman from Iowa, when interrogated by the gentleman from California [Mr. MORROW], finally limited his charge to the redwood lumber of California. That was denied by the two members on this side of the House representing California. What is now left of the charge?

The gentleman tells us that an article was published in the North American Review in 1884, and that some lawyer in New York by the name of Cook had charged that there is a "lumber trust" in this country. Why, Mr. Chairman, this trust is a phantom. There are real trusts in this country to which the gentleman's eyes appear to be blinded; but this phantom trust appears to satisfy his purposes better, because he is not hampered by the facts of the case. [Laughter and applause.] In regard to this his imagination can have full scope, and he can picture this non-existing "lumber trust" in all its hideous deformity.

Mr. Chairman, I do not charge the gentleman from Iowa with willfully misstating facts. His credulity has been imposed upon by some designing free-trader. [Laughter.] Somebody has suspected that he was the same gentleman who some years ago believed that money could be made by the use of the printing press and plenty of paper. [Laughter.]

Why, Mr. Chairman, a trust in lumber in the United States is simply out of the question. More than 350,000,000 feet of pine lumber grow in the States represented by the party associates of the gentleman on the other side of this House; and I know there is far too much virtue in the States represented by them to ever permit any such iniquitous thing as a "lumber trust." Besides that, Mr. Chairman, the duty upon lumber is so low that it is not prohibitory; and this is proven by the fact that during the years 1886 and 1887 one-half of the entire lumber product of Canada found its market within the limits of the United States. Talk about a "trust" or a "combine," it would have to be made with Canada; it would have to extend to every part of these United States, including the great lumbering districts of the South and of the Pacific coast. The mere statement of the proposition carries its own refutation. [Applause.]

Mr. WEAVER obtained the floor.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee of the Whole will rise informally that a report may be received from the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. COX having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*,

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that the Committee had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the following titles; which were signed by the Speaker:

A bill (S. 2210) to revive the grade of General in the United States Army;

A bill (S. 1772) for the relief of John H. Marion;
A bill (S. 2123) to authorize the removal of an obstruction to the navigation of Broad Creek, in the State of Delaware;
A bill (H. R. 8560) to establish a department of labor; and
A bill (H. R. 6946) for the relief of Thomas Jordan.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced the passage of bills and joint resolution of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 287) to quiet title of settlers on the Des Moines River lands in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 2986) to incorporate the American Historical Association; and

Joint resolution (S. R. 8) providing for the appointment of a commission to select a site for a naval station on the Pacific coast.

The message further announced the passage of the following House bills without amendment:

A bill (H. R. 4735) for the relief of Douglass Chapman; and
A bill (H. R. 615) for the relief of James B. Mitchell.

The message further announced the passage of the bill (H. R. 5919) to extend the time for the completion of the bridge across Staten Island Sound, with amendments; and that the Senate had requested a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed as such conferees on its part Mr. COKE, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. DOLPH.

The message further announced the passage of the bill (H. R. 7564) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Chattanooga, Tenn., with amendments; and that the Senate had requested a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed as conferees on its part Mr. VEST, Mr. SAWYER, and Mr. KENNA.

The message further announced the passage of the bill (H. R. 8623) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at or near Guntersville, Ala., and for other purposes, with amendment; and that the Senate had requested a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed as such conferees on its part Mr. COKE, Mr. CULLOM, and Mr. DOLPH.

The message further announced the passage of the bill (H. R. 7222) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish agricultural stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto;" and had requested a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed as such conferees on its part Mr. PADDOCK, Mr. BROWN, and Mr. BLAIR.

TARIFF.

The Committee of the Whole resumed its session, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I am very much astonished to hear the gentleman deny the existence of a lumber trust in this country. That such a trust exists is known to the entire trade and by the whole reading public. It is a part of the current history of the present period. Its headquarters are in Chicago, and I send to the Clerk's desk to have read an extract from an article by Henry D. Lloyd, in the North American Review for June, 1884.

The Clerk read as follows:

Four years ago the Chicago Lumberman's Exchange adopted a resolution declaring it to be "dishonorable" for any dealer to make lower prices than those published by it for the control of prices in one of the greatest lumber markets of the world. Monthly reports are required by this exchange from dealers, so that accurate accounts may be kept of stock on hand in order to regulate prices. The price-lists of the exchange are revised and made "honest" at monthly banquets. In February, 1883, it was found that members who ostensibly adhered to the price-lists dipped into the dishonorable practice of competition on the sly by giving buyers greater than the usual discounts. This was then forbidden, and another pathway of competition closed.

The effect of this price-legislation was attested by the address of a dealer of Minneapolis at one of the price-list banquets of the exchange, who said that his firm, which made sales as far as Manitoba and Dakota, had never sold a foot for less than the published lists. A delegation of dealers from the Mississippi River district spoke feelingly of their labors "for harmony," and their willingness that Chicago should make prices. A secret meeting of lumbermen from all parts of the West was held in Chicago March 8, 1883, to discuss means for advancing prices, restricting production at least 35 per cent., and in general, in the language of one of them, putting themselves into a position like that of the coal producers of Pennsylvania, who by combination dictated the prices of coal throughout the whole country. In May, last year, the national association of lumber dealers met in Chicago. It represents over five hundred and fifty retail dealers in the West, and its principal purpose was to prevent wholesale dealers at Chicago, St. Louis, and other centers from retailing lumber to carpenters, farmers, and scalpers in the territory of the retailers.

There are too many sellers, and so any wholesaler who persists in competing in this way with local dealers is, when found guilty, named to all the retailers and punished by losing their trade. The mills of Puget Sound, which supply a large proportion of the lumber consumed in the Pacific States, formed a combination last year to regulate the production and sustain prices. It is said by the local newspapers that the mills which do not belong to the association are hired to stand idle, as there are too many mills, and the association finds it profitable to sustain prices at the cost of thousands of dollars paid out in this way. The lumber market of the Pacific coast is ruled by the California Lumber Exchange, and that is controlled by a few powerful firms. The prices of redwood are fixed by the Redwood Manufacturers' Association, and those of pine by the Pine Manufacturers' Association.

During the past year the retail dealers of San Francisco have had to sign contracts with these associations, binding themselves to buy only from members of the associations, to buy and sell only at prices fixed by them, to give time and discount only according to rule, and to keep accounts so that every item will be clear to the inspectors hired by the associations to look after the retailers. Finally the retailer binds himself, if he is "found guilty" of committing any of the forbidden sins, to pay a fine, which may amount to $1,000, to be divided among the faithful. The literature of business can show no more remarkable productions than the printed forms of these contracts. This system is in imitation of the "special contracts" with shippers which have been put in force by the Central Pacific Railroad.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. MILLS. I will take the floor and yield my time to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, the article, an extract from which has just been read, is the famous article of Henry D. Lloyd on "The Lords of Industry," published in the North American Review in June, 1884, an article which has never yet been successfully assailed——

A MEMBER. Who is Mr. Lloyd?

Mr. WEAVER. He is an acknowledged authority on such subjects, of unquestioned information and veracity, and is one of the members of the eminent staff of that foremost of all periodicals, the North American Review.

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEAVER. No; I have not the time.

Now, I personally know members of that organization living in Chicago, extensive lumber-dealers there, and can give the names if it be necessary. I can say further that a gentleman in my State, a gentleman of prominence as a man of wealth, a lumber dealer, who has also been prominent in the politics of the State, told me all about how the combinations were carried on and how he and his relative had made an enormous fortune, $150,000, if I remember correctly, in seven years of business. He stood in with two pools, the lumber pool and the railroad pool. Before the farmer could get the lumber to construct his humble home he was and is to-day compelled to pay tribute to both of these pools.

The gentleman's lack of knowledge concerning the lumber trust is only equaled by his lack of knowledge concerning finance. I am somewhat older than he perhaps. I saw this great Government, by an exercise of its sovereign power, create money and with it preserve the life of this nation. The gentleman twits me of believing that the Government can make money out of paper. It is not a matter of faith. I know it. The whole country knows it, and the Supreme Court have declared it lawful in war and constitutional in peace; and I am not only opposed to the lumber trust but to the national-bank trust, and to all other trusts as well.

Mr. SOWDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question—just a short question?

Mr. WEAVER. Not now.

The gentleman says my charge, that there is a lumber trust, was denied by the gentleman from California [Mr. MORROW]. Let us see the denial. I turn to the RECORD, page 5097, and read from the remarks of the gentleman from California; he says:

I do not know of any redwood-lumber trust.

That is a mere declaration of the absence of knowledge and proves nothing.

And he goes on to say:

But suppose there is.

That is what the gentleman said.

Mr. MORROW. Permit me a moment. I asked the question:

Suppose there is?

Mr. WEAVER. There is no interrogation point.

Mr. MORROW. At all events it was intended as a question.

Mr. WEAVER. Well, now, let us suppose there is, then. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, the pending amendment, which is to extend the time within which this bill, if it becomes a law, shall take effect, has been under discussion for some time and the debate has been on everything else under the sun than on that amendment. Not wishing to appear singular, I desire to say something upon a subject other than upon the question of the extension of the time; and I will offer at the appropriate moment an amendment to the bill which I desire to explain now, because it must be offered to the paragraph under consideration, and I must explain it, if at all, before the expiration of the forty minutes.

I shall move to amend the bill by inserting, after the words "eighteen eighty-eight," in line 4, the following:

No goods manufactured or produced wholly or in part by prison labor or which have been made within or in connection with any prison, jail, penitentiary, or other penal or reformatory institution, shall be imported into the United States of America under a penalty of $200 for each invoice so imported, and the forfeiture and destruction of the said goods and of the packages in which they are contained; and it is further enacted that—

So that this provision of the bill will go on to read:

The following articles mentioned in this section, and imported, shall be exempt from duty.

The operation, Mr. Chairman, of that provision, if enacted into law, is obvious; and I know from the arguments and the appeals in the interest of labor in this country, which have been coming up all winter from the other side of the House, that my amendment will be adopted

by a unanimous vote; and the effect of the amendment when adopted will be to prevent the importation into this country of the goods made in the prisons of Canada and Europe. It is in effect and purpose precisely the same statute which the Dominion of Canada has had upon her statute-books ever since the year 1873; and if it is good for Canada it is good for the United States, under and in consonance with the reasoning of gentlemen on the other side. Further than that, to-day important industries in my own State have been driven to the wall. They have suspended their operations, and the men and women engaged in the prosecution of those industries are without employment, because of the importation from Austrian prisons of goods produced by convict labor and sent here to sell.

Now, whatever we may think about tariff duties, whether they should be high or whether they should be low, and whatever we may think of the abstract principles of protection or free trade, it seems to me every representative of American citizens will agree with me that the labor of this country should be protected at least against foreign prison labor.

I offer this amendment and send it to the desk that it may be considered as pending; and when it is in order I will move its adoption, and I will be gratified by seeing a unanimous vote in its favor.

The Clerk read the proposed amendment as already read.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I reserve the point of order on the amendment. I do not understand that the gentleman offers it now.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I gave notice that I would offer it at the proper time. How much time have I remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has one minute of his time remaining.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I yield that to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FARQUHAR], who will have it in addition to his own five minutes.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Contrary to what has been the practice of those who have preceded me in this debate, I desire to address the House in a few words about the pending amendment. In the bill presented to us, in the first section, it is provided that the act shall take effect as regards the articles mentioned in that section on the 1st day of July, 1888.

Now turning to page 9, section 2, I find there the same clause—

That on and after the 1st day of July, 1888, in lieu of the duties heretofore imposed on the articles hereinafter mentioned there shall be levied, collected, and paid the following rates of duties on said articles severally.

Turning to the third section we find this clause—

On and after October 1, 1888, in lieu of the duties heretofore imposed on the articles hereinafter mentioned in this section, there shall be levied, collected, and paid the following rates of duties.

That section covers woolen and worsted goods, flannels, clothing, cloaks, and other articles in the woolen schedule. And I find section 4 returning again to the provision that the articles controlled by that section shall be subject to the rates of duty it imposes on and after the 1st day of July, 1888. This section includes paper, printing-paper, paper-hangings, bonnets, carriages, hats, gloves, gutta-percha, feathers, and other miscellaneous articles.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why should there be this discrimination between the woolen schedule and the schedules which cover all other business interests in this country? Why should the one take effect on the 1st of October and the others on the 1st of July?

Then again I find a general provision that "this act shall be in force from and after July 1, 1888, and all laws and parts of laws inconsistent with this act are hereby repealed." So that the bill itself is contradictory.

Now, as to the pending amendment, in respect to lumber, I want to submit one or two propositions to the chairman of the committee especially. It is very well known that in the winter time in the North contracts are made that last a whole summer. Between the 1st day of January and the opening of navigation our lumbermen also go into contracts for transportation. This bill going into effect on the 1st of July hazards that trade at the very first step. Whatever the result of our legislation may be, whether lumber becomes free or not, whether shingles become free or not, it certainly hazards three hundred millions of property in this country, and also the wages of nearly a million of men engaged in this business. There is no part of the bill that really takes as unbusiness-like a shape as this does.

There is no other industry affected by the Mills bill that carries with it as long contracts as the lumber business does. And more than that, it is a business that inside of its season can not make any change in its contracts so as to make a recovery either of lost ground, lost prices, or lost contracts. Therefore whether you vote lumber free or not, I say it is unfair to the men engaged in the lumber business and the transportation companies, whether on water or by rail, to hazard at once an industry so large as this, and that is bound up by contracts as solemn and as exacting as a note in the bank.

Now, sir, I desire simply to confine my remarks to the pending amendment. At a proper time in the consideration of this bill I shall present other matters that are of paramount importance, but I want to say now, distinctly and unequivocally, that if this Congress should pass—I do not think it will, but if it should pass—such a nonsensical provision as this, it ought to be laughed out of existence as a legislative body.

Mr. NUTTING. Mr. Chairman, I desire to address myself briefly to the question whether lumber should be made free or not. I understand that the two reasons given by the majority of the Committee on Ways and Means why it should be made free are, first, that it will make lumber cheaper to the consumer, and, secondly, that it will open the markets of the world to our products. Now, in answer to the first proposition, I will say for myself that if any gentleman upon the floor of this House will prove to me that this change will make lumber cheaper to the consumer I will vote for it; but I think it is perfectly susceptible of proof that it will be impossible for this change to produce that effect. Precedent in this case is as good as it is in any other, and we all know that from 1854 to 1866 we had lumber free from Canada.

The reciprocity treaty permitted lumber to be imported free from Canada into the United States and what was the result? During all those years, at a time, too, which was particularly favorable to the administration of the proposition that is maintained by the majority here, because we had a war on our hands during nearly half the time—during all that period the result was that there was no change in the price of lumber except that it continually advanced. During all the time we had reciprocity with Canada, when lumber was coming in free, the price advanced steadily until 1866, when the treaty was done away with. Now, if this was true during a period which was so favorable for the demonstration of the theory which is advocated here by gentlemen on the other side, I say it is very likely to be true in the future if this bill should pass. I desire to treat this bill fairly as a business proposition, and I now proceed to consider the question whether we shall find a market for our lumber products in Canada.

We need not expect that if we give Canada the free *entrée* to our markets we shall necessarily have the *entrée* to her markets in regard to every particular article; still in a sense we may expect that. Now, the population of Canada does not exceed 5,000,000 of people to-day, not as many people as are in the State of New York, which I have the honor to represent in part. During the period of the reciprocity treaty the exportation of lumber from the United States to Canada was simply nothing, and it is nothing now. Last year we collected in duties on imported Canadian lumber $1,500,000. Now, if we are not to get lumber cheaper, and if we are not to secure a market in Canada for our products—and I do not believe there is a man on this floor who will contend that we shall find a market there—if, I say, we are not to get either of these things, what are we going to do by the passage of this bill? I will tell you, Mr. Chairman, what will be the result if this bill shall pass. The result will be that you will give to the Canadians $1,500,000 in duties which we now collect of them and which they will put into their pockets, while they will sell their lumber in our markets for precisely the same prices that it is bringing now. Wherever there is a trade of that kind between two countries the one that has the largest amount of product controls the price. Now, the United States manufacture 97 per cent. more lumber than the Canadians do, and from Canada we get the greatest amount of lumber that is imported into this country from any foreign country. So our market has controlled, and for all time in the future as long as any member of this House is likely to live, our market will control the price of lumber. Therefore, when by this bill you take off a duty of $2 per thousand from lumber imported from Canada into the United States you simply put $2 more into the pocket of the Canadian lumberman, and to the extent of that $2 per thousand you assess a tax upon our own people to make up the amount which our Treasury suffers by the operation.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire whether the amendment offered by me yesterday is to be regarded as pending to be voted upon?

The CHAIRMAN. Not at this time; not upon this paragraph.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I desire to have it considered as pending at the end of the fifth line.

The CHAIRMAN. It is not in order at this time. The Chair will entertain it at the proper time.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to know whether the forty minutes allowed for debate have not expired.

The CHAIRMAN. There are five minutes remaining to be occupied by a gentleman who favors the bill. As the time was to be equally divided between the friends and the opponents of the bill, unless some gentleman on the right of the Chair desires to occupy the time in favor of the bill, the debate will be considered as closed.

Mr. CROUSE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask a question for information. I understood that the proposition limiting the debate to forty minutes was confined to the first five lines of the bill. Reading those lines, I see that they qualify or relate to all that follows in section 1. I wish to ask whether the object of the motion limiting debate was to preclude any amendments that might be offered to any of the items that follow the five lines.

The CHAIRMAN. It was not; it applied only to the five lines.

The Clerk will report the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS].

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 3 strike out "1st day of July, 1888," and insert "2d day of January, 1889."

The question being taken, there were—ayes 87, noes 116.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. MILLS were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 81, noes 118.

So the amendment of Mr. ADAMS was rejected. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any further amendments to be proposed?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After "88," in line 4, insert—

"No goods manufactured or produced wholly or in part by prison labor, or which have been made within, or in connection with, any prison, jail, penitentiary, or other penal or reformatory institution shall be imported into the United States of America under a penalty of $200 for each invoice so imported, and the forfeiture and destruction of said goods and of the packages in which they are contained; and it is further enacted that."

Mr. MILLS. I make a point of order on this amendment that it is not germane to the pending provision of the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I understand the point of order is made that this amendment is not germane to the paragraph now pending.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I make the further point of order that the amendment is the substance of a pending bill.

Mr. MILLS. The pending paragraph simply fixes the date at which this bill shall go into effect. The amendment may be germane to some other provision of the bill, but it is not to this paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I do desire to be heard, for the reason that I do not believe the point of order can be seriously made by the gentleman from Texas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state to the gentleman from New Jersey that debate upon this portion of the bill having been closed by the House, discussion upon any points arising incidentally upon it can only be entertained by unanimous consent.

Mr. DINGLEY. The closing of debate on the paragraph does not cut off debate on the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The question pending now is upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Still it arises in connection with this paragraph of the bill; and the rulings of Speakers heretofore have been that all points of order arising after the previous question has been moved must be decided without debate.

Mr. REED and others. There is no previous question here.

The CHAIRMAN. The closing of debate in Committee of the Whole is equivalent to the previous question.

Mr. REED. Oh, no. If the Chair will permit me, the closing of debate is a mere incident to the question, "Shall the main question be now put?" The closing of debate is only one of the things which are the result.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read clause 3 of Rule XVII.

The Clerk read as follows:

All incidental questions of order arising after a motion is made for the previous question, and pending such motion, shall be decided, whether on appeal or otherwise, without debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that an order of the House closing debate in Committee of the Whole is equivalent to a motion for the previous question in the House, and as there can be no previous question in Committee of the Whole——

Mr. REED. Does the Chair mean to say that the closing of debate on the paragraph and amendments closes debate on a point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that debate on the paragraph and on all incidental questions connected with it was closed by order of the House.

Mr. REED. Debate on the point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. This is an incidental question.

Mr. REED. Well, that is a most amazing decision. I have no doubt the Chair has some precedent for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk has read the rule, which is clear enough.

Mr. REED. That has nothing to do with it, if the Chair pleases.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it has, with all due respect to the gentleman.

Mr. REED. There is no previous question here.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Maine inform the Chair what in his opinion is the effect of an order closing debate in the committee?

Mr. REED. The debate now proposed is not debate upon the paragraph, but upon a question of order. Debate was closed on the paragraph and pending amendments. This is not debate on either the paragraph or pending amendments, but upon a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. But this is an incidental question.

Mr. REED. It seems to me nothing can be said to make the question plainer. All that the House authorizes or intends to authorize by the order is the closing of debate on the paragraph and pending amendments. The House has no occasion to close debate on points of order. Debate on such points is primarily for the information of the Chair. Of course in some cases it would not be needed; but it is primarily for the information of the Chair and secondarily for the information of the House if an appeal should be taken. This is a most surprising decision of the present occupant of the chair. I presume he must have some precedent for it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has cited the rule.

Mr. REED. It seems singular that in all previous Congresses nobody has ever stumbled on such a decision before.

The CHAIRMAN. It has frequently been held that all incidental questions, after the previous question is moved, must be decided without debate.

Mr. LONG. I understand that debate on a point of order is very much within the discretion of the Chair, and that the Chair in its discretion never refuses to allow debate upon such a point.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is perfectly willing to hear gentlemen upon the point of order, and was about to ask whether the debate should proceed by unanimous consent. The Chair was very desirous to hear the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. LONG. This is not a question for unanimous consent. It is a matter within the discretion of the Chair—a discretion which the Chair has always exercised.

The CHAIRMAN. There is nothing in the rules providing for any debate upon points of order. The Chair always indulges such debate unless objection is made. In this case, as the previous question is operating upon this portion of the bill, so far as the previous question can operate in Committee of the Whole, the Chair was of the opinion that no debate could be allowed upon any incidental question after debate had been closed upon the main proposition. That is still the opinion of the Chair; but he will ask that the gentleman from New Jersey be permitted to address the Chair upon this point of order. If there be no objection——

Mr. CANNON. Let me make a suggestion to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. I wish to understand the Chair's decision. Does the Chair say the previous question is operating in the Committee of the Whole? I suppose the Chair means it is operating by analogy. The previous question in the House not only cuts off debate, but it also cuts off all amendments. If the previous question should operate therefore there would be not only no further debate on this paragraph, but it would not be in order to move an amendment or an amendment to an amendment. The Chair has therefore as much right to cut off amendments as he has to cut off debate under his construction that the previous question is operating in the committee. It is a construction of the rules never before given in this committee.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be true if it were not for the latter clause of the sixth paragraph of Rule XXIII, which says:

But this—

Which is the closing of debate—

shall not preclude further amendments to be decided without debate.

There is the limitation providing for other amendments, and without that clause not only would the debate be cut off but no further amendment would be in order to this paragraph.

Mr. BURROWS. Let me understand the position taken by the Chair. If an amendment is offered and a point of order is raised against that amendment, the Chair holds that is not debatable except by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair did not say so.

Mr. BURROWS. Then the Chair holds that the point of order is debatable?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair said that all debate on this paragraph of the bill having been closed by order of the House, that that was in the nature of a previous question in the committee and prevented the committee from further debate, and that that was provided for in the clause of the rule which was read.

Mr. BURROWS. Then the Chair thinks that a point of order is not debatable except by unanimous consent?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair so holds under the order of the House.

Mr. BURROWS. The Chair holds a point of order is not debatable even if the Chair desires to be informed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was asking unanimous consent for the gentleman from New Jersey to be heard.

Mr. BURROWS. Even if the Chair desires to be informed he could not get that information unless by unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. BURROWS. The Chair would be powerless even if he did not know anything about it.

Mr. REED. You can see how convenient this is going to be.

The CHAIRMAN. It may be convenient for gentlemen to make remarks of that kind, but the Chair intends to enforce the rules as he understands them. When the responsibility is imposed upon other

gentlemen they will exercise it as they think best, and the Chair, so long as he occupies his present position, will enforce the rules of the House as he understands them.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Suppose there be an appeal from that decision, will the Chair undertake to decide that all debate is cut off on that appeal? Does the Chair hold that we can not have any discussion on that point of order?

Mr. BLAND. I call for the regular order.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Does not this committee have the right to appeal from this decision of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. McMILLIN. I wish to know the length of time which the gentleman from New Jersey desires.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Not longer than five minutes. If permitted to proceed I would have been through long ago; but five minutes are enough to show the absurdity of this point of order.

Mr. McMILLIN. I have no objection.

Mr. REED. We intend to appeal from that decision of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will entertain it.

Mr. REED. And we wish to discuss that appeal. We wish to discuss the entire question. Does the Chair hold we shall have to get unanimous consent for such discussion? [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair asked for permission for the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. REED. Does the Chair hold we must have unanimous consent for each individual to be heard?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would so hold.

Mr. REED. I desire to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. HOOKER. I demand the regular order. The gentleman from New Jersey has the floor; let him speak if he wants to.

Mr. WHITE, of New York. I object to the speech being made. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. It is too late now to interpose this objection, as the gentleman has already received consent.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I desire to submit some observations touching this point of order by leave of the Chair, not by leave of the committee. The Chair desires to be informed as to the grounds upon which the point of order is made, whether it be tenable or not.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I object to the gentleman's proceeding under the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it is now too late.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I understand the gentleman declines to proceed by leave of the committee, but only by leave of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Leave has been given the gentleman to proceed, and he can proceed in his own way, which of course does not change the order of the committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The provision of this bill to which my amendment is applicable, and to which it is offered, is in the following language:

That on and after the 1st day of July, 1888, the following articles mentioned in this section, when imported, shall be exempt from duty.

And then follows a long list enumerating articles to which that language applies.

That list constitutes the entire remainder of the section. Let me state again: The remainder of that section, after the words I have quoted, is devoted exclusively to a list enumerating articles to which these active words apply. Take those words away from that section and the section is just as dead as a man with his head cut clean off. It cuts the head of the section off, and the whole section goes into a state of innocuous desuetude. [Laughter.] I do not wish to exercise any pernicious activity in a partisan line in using that expression, but it occurred to me as the best definition I could employ at the moment, and I had high authority for using it. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the first question here presented is, what does this section propose to do? This section proposes that a certain line of goods, when imported into the United States, shall be imported free of duty, and then proceeds to give a list of articles which come under that category. Now, what does my amendment propose? It simply limits that list, and that is all. The very words which make that list operative I propose to limit; and is there a brain belonging to any man who knew enough to find his way on the 4th day of December last to this Capitol to be sworn in that can not see the force of that point? [Laughter.] I say my amendment proposes to limit that list by prescribing that whereas these goods in this list may be imported into the United States free of duty, yet nevertheless goods of the character therein mentioned, when made in a certain way, should not be thus entitled.

A MEMBER. Let us have some authorities on that point.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No; I wish to keep my argument clear and undiluted, and so plain that a wayfaring man, even if a little below the average in intellect, need not err therein. [Laughter.]

I repeat it, that these three lines are the active words in this section; and that we have a right to limit the operation, the field, and the scope of that activity. That is exactly what my amendment seeks to accomplish, nothing more and nothing less.

I have authorities produced here by gentlemen near me, but I never want to go to a law-book to prove the proposition that two and two make four. In fact, sir, it seems to me that this question is so clear that the mere statement of the effect and the purport of the amendment is of itself enough to show that the point of order is utterly without foundation in parliamentary law. If the amendment be not germane to this list, will the Chairman tell me where in this section it is germane? Where will it be applicable if not here?

Some of my good brethren sitting near me request me to read this:

An amendment need not necessarily be germane to the pending paragraph, but must be to the general provisions of the bill.

That goes further than I have gone. It is not necessary for me to go as far as that. I say the amendment is not only germane to the section, but it is germane and proper to be inserted at the precise place I have asked to have it inserted. But if germane to any provision of the bill it would certainly be germane to the point where it is now offered for insertion.

I do not know that I desire to say anything more. It seems to me that I have stated the proposition so plainly that there can be no mistake.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that this provision would be germane to some subsequent paragraph of this bill, but is not germane at the present stage of the bill This is an amendment providing some criminal statutes in reference to the importation of goods manufactured by prison labor in foreign countries. If inserted in this place, it would be inserted in a provision which says "that the following articles mentioned in this section when imported shall be exempt from duty." The section, if amended as proposed, then proceeds with a clause prohibiting the importation of certain goods entirely, which would be absurd if inserted in this place; and the Chair presumes that we should look to the sense of the measure as it would stand if amended. Therefore the clause here would not be germane. It would be at a subsequent place in the bill, and the Chair will indicate to the gentleman where it would be proper to offer it, and where the Chair could entertain the amendment. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that he has misunderstood the connection in which those words occur. I say, "*Be it further enacted*, That the following articles mentioned in this section," etc. It makes good grammar, law, and justice.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has already stated that he will entertain the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey at the proper time; but it is certainly not germane at this point.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I dislike to appeal from the decision of the Chair; but it seems to me to be a very important ruling, and the sense of the committee should be taken on it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the committee?

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 123, noes 89.

So the decision of the Chair stood as the judgment of the committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I desire to offer another amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had recognized the gentleman from New York [Mr. BAKER].

Mr. BUCHANAN. The amendment I desire to offer comes in prior to his.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment proposed by the gentleman from New Jersey.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert between lines 4 and 5 the following:

"When not manufactured or produced, wholly or in part, by prison labor, or made within or in connection with, any prison, jail, penitentiary, or other penal or reformatory institution."

Mr. MILLS. I make the point of order on that amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I should like to be heard for two minutes on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks this proposition is germane and will entertain it. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 97, noes 105.

So the amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

After line 5 insert the following:

"*Provided*, That in all cases a duty shall be imposed upon all goods and products now on the free-list whenever similar goods and products are subject to duty under the laws of the Dominion of Canada, at a rate greater than or equal to that imposed thereunder."

Mr. MILLS. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment would properly come in at line 25. It is unusual to place a proviso at the beginning of a section.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I want it to apply to all articles on the free-list.

The CHAIRMAN. Then it should be reserved until the end of the free-list.

Mr. TAULBEE. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TAULBEE. I want to know if in the reading of this bill where the articles to be placed on the free-list are enumerated, as, for instance,

when lines 6 and 7 of the bill have been read and passed over, after the reading of line 8, would amendments to lines 6 and 7 be in order?

The CHAIRMAN. They would not be. After a paragraph has been passed it is not in order to return to it for amendment except by unanimous consent.

Mr. TAULBEE. My object was to understand what the Chair would construe as a paragraph of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that at the proper time, if no other amendment is to be offered, the Chair will direct the Clerk to read the next paragraph.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to line 5 the following:
"*Provided*, That articles, the manufacture of which or the sale whereof is controlled by trusts or other combination of capital to depress the price of labor, or increase the cost of the article to the consumer, shall not be imported into the United States."

Mr. MILLS. I make the point that that is not germane to that part of the bill.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I hope the point of order will not be sustained until the amendment has been carefully examined by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks it would be more in accordance with the fitness of things that provisos should come at the close of the sections than that they should precede them. But the Chair will entertain the proposition.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Does the Chair mean that if the only thing involved is the supposed fitness of things the Chair should refuse to entertain a proposition instead of submitting it to the committee?

Mr. REED. Suppose the committee chooses to put on a proviso early in a section, has not the committee that right?

Mr. BUCHANAN. In the twenty-second line the committee have placed a proviso in the middle of a section.

The CHAIRMAN. But that relates only to articles which precede it. This is a matter of taste; but the Chair will entertain the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio. The gentleman seems to have peculiar notions about taste, but the Chair will indulge him.

Mr. BURROWS. Let the amendment be again read.

The amendment was again read.

The question being taken on Mr. GROSVENOR'S amendment, there were—ayes 70, noes 105.

So the amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Perhaps the Chair will entertain my amendment now as a matter of taste.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will entertain the gentleman's amendment.

The amendment heretofore offered by Mr. BAKER, of New York, was again read, as follows:

On page 1, line 5, insert the following:
"*Provided*, That in all cases a duty shall be imposed upon all goods and products now on the free-list whenever similar goods and products are subject to duty under the laws of the Dominion of Canada, at a rate greater than or equal to that imposed thereunder."

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 83, noes 106.

So the amendment was not agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless some other amendment is to be offered the Clerk will report lines 6 and 7.

The Clerk read as follows:

Timber hewn and sawed, and timber used for spars and in building wharves.

Mr. STRUBLE. Mr. Chairman, is it in order at this time to move to strike out lines 6 and 7, and also the following lines down to and including line 25, or should the motion be confined to lines 6 and 7?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will entertain motions to perfect the text as taking precedence to the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. STRUBLE. Then I move at this time to strike out lines 6 and 7. Upon that I expressed myself yesterday as fully as I desired. All that I wish to do now is briefly to remind the House of my position, which is this, that all of these lines in relation to lumber schedules should be striken out of this bill, and that the existing law should be ingrafted upon it as section 2, with a reduction of the duties upon lumber.

Mr. TAULBEE. Mr. Chairman, I had purposed entering the motion which has been entered by the gentleman who has preceded me, to strike out these lines. I wish now to announce that if that motion should carry I will offer an amendment to a subsequent section of the bill, providing an import duty on the articles enumerated in this section at the rate of 10 per cent. ad valorem.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STRUBLE].

The CHAIRMAN. Let it be read.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, and insert in lieu thereof the following:
"Timber not further manufactured than hewn, squared, or sided."

Mr. STRUBLE. I make a point of order on that.

Mr. MILLS. That is not germane to these two lines.

Mr. DINGLEY. Line 8 has not been reached yet and an amendment to it is not in order.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. I move to amend the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STRUBLE] by striking out the last word of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCORMICK] is recognized as having the floor.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania made a motion, which has been ruled out on a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has not ruled upon it. The Chair called the gentleman's attention to the fact that he proposed to strike out a line which had not been reached.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. And there was a point of order made upon the amendment. If the gentleman's amendment was not in order, I am; if it was, then, of course, I am not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had recognized the gentleman from Pennsylvania, who was putting his amendment in proper shape.

Mr. McCORMICK. I understand that the Chair has ruled out my amendment as not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. No; the Chair only called the gentleman's attention to the fact that he had moved to strike out a line which had not yet been reached.

Mr. McCORMICK. Well, I desire to make a few observations——

Mr. LONG. Then, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR] is in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania may modify his amendment if he desires.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in line 7.

The CHAIRMAN. That is in order as an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, is not that a different motion, and does not mine precede it? It is not the motion we were acting upon, and the gentleman has not been recognized for another motion.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has modified his motion, and the Chair thinks he ought to be heard on his proposition. The Chair will entertain the motion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EZRA. B. TAYLOR] later.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, the amendment which I offered a few moments ago, and which I understood the Chair to rule out on a point of order as not being proper at this time, included lines 6, 7, and 8, and its object was to strike out those three lines.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, are lines 6, 7, and 8 under consideration?

The CHAIRMAN. Lines 6 and 7 are.

Mr. RANDALL. The amendment to strike out and insert applies to lines 6, 7, and 8, and I suggest that we have those three lines read and considered together, as the amendment relates to all three.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. McCORMICK] had withdrawn that amendment, and had submitted an overwhelming amendment upon which he was proceeding to address the Chair in explanation of the object he has in view. If there be no objection, however, the Chair will regard the eighth line as pending so that the gentleman may move to amend it also.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I object.

Mr. McCORMICK. I have offered this *pro forma* amendment for the purpose of showing the committee that the motion to strike out lines 6, 7, and 8, and insert in lieu thereof the amendment which I have proposed, is entirely proper at this time. Lines 6, 7, and 8 have reference entirely to timber hewn and sawed, and timber squared or sided. The amendment which I proposed and which I shall renew unless prevented by the ruling of the Chair has reference to all these classes of lumber embraced in these three lines. My proposition is to insert upon the free-list in lieu of the classes of lumber named in these three lines, "timber not farther advanced in manufacture than hewn, squared, or sided."

Such an amendment, while admitting free of duty timber not farther advanced in manufacture than simply hewn, squared, or sided, would not admit free of duty what is commonly known as bill timber, or timber which is farther advanced in manufacture than hewn, squared, or sided. Such an amendment as that proposed would preserve to our own people the right to manufacture the timber into the smaller sizes, and would have the effect of giving the labor to our own people instead of to foreigners. Logs are now on the free-list, and this amendment would enlarge the free-list by allowing the logs to be squared or sided in Canada before transportation to this country.

This is all I wish to say on this point at present. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

[Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, the pending motion is to strike from the free-list sawed lumber, and I suppose the motion is made in order that the men engaged in that industry as wage-earners shall be protected, and not for the benefit of the capitalists engaged in that industry. It is considered on all hands that they have been receiving as much tribute from the American people who use lumber as they ought to receive.

Yesterday in discussing a kindred question I uttered some remarks and I was taken to task for quoting figures from the United States census. We are about preparing to take other United States census reports, and if they are of no value we waste the time of the House in legislation to do so and the money of the people in getting together and publishing those facts.

How were they obtained? Slips were sent out and men were sent out to the people engaged in this industry, with the request they should make their returns; that they should state the number of establishments; that they should state the amount of capital invested; that they should state also the number of employés; that they should state the total amount of production; that they should state the total cost of material, and that they should state the total amount of wages. They made all those statements, and from those statements, drawn from the Compendium of the Census, I made the remarks I did yesterday.

The gentleman who took me to task for using the figures of the United States census uses this language:

That we are not left to the absurdity of figures which gentlemen produce from the United States census.

* * * * * * *

Now, nobody knows better than the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] that it is utterly impossible for a profit of 285 per cent. or 337 per cent. to be made in a single year on $1,000 in a manufacturing business long established, which covers a great belt of this country. He knows that it is impossible, or else he is unfortunate in his mental make-up. I know him well enough to know that the trouble is inadvertence.

I wish to call attention of the House to the fact that the inadvertence was not on my part, as can be seen by referring to the RECORD of yesterday, but on the part of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED]. I made no statement that lumber capitalists were receiving there in Maine or Michigan the enormous amount of 285 or 337 per cent. I stated that the capitalists in Maine receive as a return on their capital invested 28½ per cent. and in Michigan 33.7 per cent., and I have yet to see or hear any contradiction of that statement. Those are the facts, and they can not be contradicted.

To impress it upon the minds of members of the House, I took the position that a wage-earner in the State of Maine engaged in the sawed-lumber business during the year received as compensation $170, while the capitalist on every $1,000 he had invested received as wages on that capital $285. I was attempting to show, and I think I did, that the division was largely in favor of the capitalist. I wish to present it in another form; but before doing so, and right here, Mr. Chairman, allow me to suggest that the criticism that my figures related to the lumbermen is inaccurate. The statistics I have invoked in support of the argument that I have presented are statistics concerning sawed lumber. Now that industry, the industry of sawed lumber, is one that I presume goes on in some form all the year round.

Mr. GUENTHER. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I think it does.

Mr. GUENTHER. No, sir; you are mistaken.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. But whether it goes on all the year or not, taking the time while the wage-earner is engaged in earning $170, the thousand dollars of capital that is invested in that business is engaged in earning $285. To present this matter in another form, I want to make this statement: Taking $2.98 of the total profit and wages combined, what is the division of that sum? How is it divided between capital and labor? Why, Mr. Chairman, the capital gets $1.82 of the amount, while the laborer gets only $1.16 of that which is made by the combination of the two in the sawed-lumber industry of Maine.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HERBERT rose.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I shall only want a few moments longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's proceeding by unanimous consent for five minutes longer?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I ask that he have that privilege.

There was no objection.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I thank my colleague and the House for this courtesy.

As the House has now given me consent, I will hear the question of the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. DINGLEY. I wanted to call the gentleman's attention to certain errors he makes in using the census figures for the purpose of ascertaining the profits of the lumber industry, or any other——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I can only yield for a question.

Mr. DINGLEY. I want to show the gentleman that the census figures, while they are correct as far as they go——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not want any correction now in my five minutes, but if the gentleman asks a question I will answer, or try to do so.

Mr. DINGLEY. Very well; I will take my own time. The gentleman is doing himself a great deal of injustice.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I am perfectly willing to stand upon the figures of my own, computing from the census and the argument deduced from them.

Mr. REED. All baggage at the owner's risk here. [Laughter.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. If you consider in the same manner a case in Michigan, in which you use the same data as I used in my remarks heretofore, and take $20 of the profit of labor and capital combined, what is the division of that amount between the two—$20, I mean of that surplus over and above the cost of production, including raw material and supplies? That is, to be a little more explicit, let us take a product amounting to $52 out of which you deduct $32 for the material and mill supplies, leaving $20 as the result, the combined profit; and then let us see how this is divided between the capitalist and the wage-earner.

Of this sum the capitalist gets $13 out of the $20, and how much is left for the wage-earner? Why, $7; less than one-half of the amount, and but little more than one-half as much as the capitalist gets. We have heard here, and it has been customary to say in the course of this debate, that almost all of these protected products consist of 95 per cent. of labor. I certainly must be permitted to claim in this instance, at least in regard to Michigan lumber, that a large percentage of the value of the product—the finished product of the sawed lumber—is the result of labor. If that be true, instead of 95 per cent. of it going to the labor, there has been a very substantially different division in this instance; because capital gets $13 and labor but $7 out of the total of the $20 left to be divided between capital and labor, after deducting the $32 that had been paid for material and mill supplies from the whole product, valued at $52.

But to make the illustration a little clearer, a little more distinct, for the benefit of these men who are struggling in these protected industries to persuade the wage-earners that their industries will be destroyed, I take a dollar's worth of product. Now, what is the division in a dollar's worth of product in Michigan? How is it divided? By the term "product," as I now use it in this illustration I wish it to be understood that I do not mean simply the product, but I mean the surplus; I mean that portion over and above and after taking out all of the cost of material and expense of every kind, as shown by the census reports.

Mr. DINGLEY. But the census report——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I can not yield. One dollar of that combined profit is divided as follows: 65 cents of it to the capital and 35 cents to the labor.

Mr. BOUTELLE. What does that 65 cents include?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Nothing in the world but profit upon capital. It does not include a single penny of expense or material. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. REED. Sixty-five cents on the dollar profit?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No, sir; but 65 cents of that dollar.

Mr. REED. What percentage is that?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Thirty-three and seven-tenths per cent. upon the capital.

Mr. REED. And you believe that?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not know that it is a question of my belief. The figures show it.

Mr. REED. But do you believe it?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Certainly I do.

Mr. REED. I am very glad to hear it. I am glad to find one man who is willing to admit it. [Laughter.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I repeat that the wage-earner gets but 35 cents, while the capitalist gets 65 cents out of the dollar of surplus.

Mr. HERMANN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. HERMANN. Is the gentleman not aware of the fact that in a great many, if not in all of the States, where the lumber interest figures conspicuously, the manufacturers are, as a general thing, the owners of the lands from which the lumber is taken?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. In each instance I have given them the credit of the value of the raw lumber. I allow them interest on everything they say is capital engaged in the industry, and I do not think they were likely to omit putting in anything. I believe they put in their timber, not at prices they paid for land, but at the price they now deem it to be worth.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I wish to ask the gentleman this: Will you not kindly take a tree standing, cut it down, bring it to the mill, manufacture it, and then show how you arrive at your conclusion?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. It would take too long to do so.

Mr. BOUTELLE. It would not take me very long.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The gentleman will have an opportunity to do so. I take the figures from the census of the value of the product and the cost of the raw material in the State of Maine. The value of the product was $7,933,868. How much was there for material and expenses? Four million nine hundred and fifty-one thousand nine hundred and fifty-seven dollars. That is their own statement; their own presentation of their case. I have first deducted that before I began to divide between capital and labor. I have then deducted the amount paid in wages; I have taken out all of that; and I have no doubt there is clearly presented the amount of profit to the capitalists in the remainder.

Mr. BOUTELLE. You arrive at these results in the same way as yesterday, from the annual amount paid to laborers.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Exactly so; I speak of the amount of wages

during the year. I am dealing with the facts in the Compendium of the Census with regard to sawed lumber.

Mr BOUTELLE. But you do not see the difference between the amount of money paid a man for two or three months' work in a year and the money paid to a man who works a whole year.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I have no proof of what you suggest. You have produced none. I am taking the statistics as I find them.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Do you not know enough about the lumber business to know that without proof?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I know the saw-mills run nearly all the year round.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ATKINSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I presume that one of the reasons for putting timber on the free-list is that it will be cheapened in price to the consumer.

The free-traders claim that this always follows the removal of duties, and the decline in the price of quinine since it was put on the free-list has often been cited as an example.

Let us see if this is true? The duty on quinine prior to 1873 was 45 per cent. In that year it was reduced to 20 per cent., and it was placed on the free-list in 1879. When the duty of 20 per cent. was removed it sold for $2.96 per ounce in London; in 1887 its price in the London market was 50 cents an ounce, a decline of 83 per cent.

If this decline of 83 per cent. in the price of quinine in London is due to the removal of 20 per cent. of duty in the United States, then our tariff legislation must have a wonderful effect on prices outside of this country. Nobody believes any such thing. It is absurd.

But I will tell you what reduced the price of quinine. It is a product of cinchona bark, and the cinchona tree was found only in South America. This tree grows in remote mountain regions and the demand for its bark was so great that it was feared that the supply might soon be exhausted. In 1877 quinine sold as high as $4 per ounce in London because the exportation of cinchona bark from South America was interrupted by civil war in New Granada and by low water in the Magdalena River.

Owing to the fears entertained that the supply of bark might fail, and because it was furnished in uncertain quantities, attempts were made to cultivate the cinchona tree, and these experiments have met with complete success. The Dutch introduced it into Java and the British into the East Indies, and last year more than 15,000,000 pounds of bark were sold from their plantations. A remarkable fact connected with this enterprise is that the bark of the cultivated cinchona tree yields from 8 to 12 per cent. of quinine, while the bark of the native tree produces no more than 2 per cent. The decline in the price of quinine is said to be entirely attributable to this new supply of cultivated cinchona and the increased proportion of quinine it bears.

But besides this, new methods of extracting quinine from the bark have been adopted. Under the old process it took from ten to fifteen days to exhaust the bark; now it is done in ten hours. The British cinchona plantations have become profitable, and private individuals have begun the cultivation of the tree. The United States deserves no credit for the reduction in the price of this important drug, and anybody that claims that putting quinine on the free-list made the great reduction in price falls into a grave error. The duty should never have been removed. It does the consumer no good. If the price in London is now 50 cents an ounce and the duty of 20 per cent., to wit, 10 cents an ounce, were added, the increased cost would be lost in the course of trade. Few sick men take 100 grains of quinine, but the duty on that amount would be only 2½ cents, a trifle too insignificant to consider.

But the removal of the duty has made us dependent upon foreigners for our supply of quinine. In 1878, before the removal of the duty, we imported but 17,549 ounces; in 1879, the duty being off, we imported 228,348 ounces, and our importations in 1887 were 2,180,157 ounces. Only three firms now make quinine in the United States, and its manufacture is unprofitable. When the American supply was made in our own country it came from manufacturers who had a reputation to maintain and who put a pure article on the market. Now no man can tell whether what he buys is adulterated or not. Experiments must be made upon a sick man to determine how much foreign quinine will produce a given result. With the pure article made in America no such experiments were necessary. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that when a man is sick, good medicine, and not cheap medicine, is what he wants. [Applause.]

I append a statement of the facts, made by a firm of unquestioned character, which shows the truth of the whole matter.

PHILADELPHIA, *December* 20, 1887.

DEAR SIR: * * * In regard to the assertions respecting the manufacture of sulphate of quinine, we can only say that it is seldom so many misrepresentations are made in regard to any commodity as to this.

At the time of the removal of the duty sulphate of quinine ruled high the world over.

It need hardly be told to intelligent and fair-minded persons that prices were adjusted in Europe without reference to the United States tariff.

The duty was removed in 1879. We will submit quotations for the years 1877 and 1879.

AVERAGE PRICES IN THE LONDON MARKET, 1877.

English, in 1-ounce vials, 13*s.* 2*d.* per ounce = $3.16 in London.
French, in 1-ounce vials, 12*s.* 3*d.* per ounce = $2.94 in London.
Italian and German, in tins, 11*s.* 8*d.* per ounce = $2.80 in London.

AVERAGE PRICES IN THE LONDON MARKET, 1879.

English, in 1-ounce vials, 12*s.* 4*d.* per ounce = $2.96 in London.
French, in 1-ounce vials, 12*s.* 4*d.* per ounce = $2.96 in London.
Italian and German, in tins, 11*s.* 2*d.* per ounce = $2.68 in London.

MAXIMUM PRICES IN THE LONDON MARKET, 1877.

In the year 1877 the sales of sulphate of quinine were made in London at figures as high as the following, say May, 1877, in large lots:
English, in 1-ounce vials, 16*s.* 6*d.* per ounce = $3.96 in London.
French, in 1-ounce vials, 15*s.* 9*d.* per ounce = $3.78 in London.
Italian and German, in tins, 15*s.* per ounce = $3.60 in London.
Taking the shilling at 24 cents, we have as high as $3.96 per ounce paid for English quinine in London.

To say that the duty of 20 per cent. then imposed on foreign quinine by the tariff of the United States had any bearing on these quotations would subject the assertion to ridicule. It is simply an absurdity.

In like manner to venture the statement that recent low prices the world over have been brought about by the removal of the duty in this country would only expose the ignorance or the malicious falsehood of the utterance.

MINIMUM PRICES IN THE LONDON MARKET, 1887.

Now we submit the following as quotations named in the London market for sulphate of quinine, November, 1887.
English, in 1-ounce vials, 2*s.* 1*d.* = 50 cents in London.
French, in 1-ounce vials, 2*s.* = 48 cents in London.
German and Italian, in tins, 1*s.* 3*d.* = 30 cents in London.
Here we have London prices for foreign makes of quinine:
Fifty cents in 1887, against $3.96 for English, in vials, in 1877.
Forty-eight cents in 1887, against $3.78 for French, in vials, in 1877.
Thirty cents in 1887, against $3.60 for German and Italian, in tins, in 1877.

As quinine dropped in price the world over (from 80 to 90 per cent. between the years 1877 and 1887), and as English, French, German, Italian, and all manufacturers, irrespective of locality, lowered their figures gradually and synchronously—*pari passu*—step by step, and with equal pace, it follows logically that the controlling influence must have been one and the same.

If, then, that power was the Congress of the United States (and it is to be distinctly and prominently kept in view that to Congressional action alone is attributed the low price of quinine in the Star article), then to our legislators, and to them alone, is the whole world indebted.

Although the Americans never planted a tree in Ceylon and Java, and the work was all done by the English and Dutch, does it not seem ungenerous to say that our own Congress had nothing to do with it? Why not say they had all to do with it?

And why so modestly ask to be credited with only the insignificant amount of $50,000,000 saved to the American people, when the pounds sterling of the English (who paid $3.96 before the duty was removed and 50 cents since), and the francs of the French (who paid $3.78 before the 20 per cent. burden was lifted and 48 cents since), and the marks of the Germans and the liras of the Italians (who paid $3.60 before the rules were suspended and quinine made free and 30 cents since) might be added with just as much propriety and just about as little mendacity and effrontery, and make such a snug sum to represent the saving to the whole world by striking out a little 20 per cent. duty in the legislative halls of the United States?

Absurdity could no further go than to claim this reduction in prices in Europe to have been caused by any action whatever of the Congress of the United States.

But in order to impose upon the credulity of the American people, constant reference is made to the fall in prices in this country (while not a word is said about the drop from $3.96 to 50 cents for English quinine, from $3.78 to 48 cents for French, from $3.60 to 30 cents for German and Italian in London), and the cause assigned is the removal of the duty, and this is the only explanation given.

It is indeed to be hoped, not so much for ourselves as manufacturers of quinine, as for the sake of the good name of the American people, and for the cause of justice and truth, that so disreputable a course of misrepresentation and vilification may cease.

The duty, which was a moderate one (20 per cent.), was removed. The act was hurried through, under suspension of the rules, at the very close of the session, with undue haste, without debate, and it went into immediate operation. Special legislation, unlike that applied to all other industries in this country, was directed against one single manufacture. Surely that should satisfy the most violent opponent, and further injustice might reasonably be expected to stop.

The drug trade of the United States can not be ignorant of the real cause of the decline in price of quinine in this country and in Europe, but for the information of others not so well advised we will state that the cause of the decline was the reduced cost of cinchona bark, *i. e.*, the crude material employed.

The reduction in the price of bark was caused by the largely increased supplies. This in turn, was brought about by the action of the British and Dutch Governments in cultivating the cinchona trees in India and Java.

The United States is conspicuous by its absence in the whole business of bringing down the price of bark and quinine the world over. The American people and the American Government were as innocent of influence as were the Chinese or the Japanese, the Turks or the Egyptians.

Formerly all cinchona bark came from South America, and the trees were not under any system of cultivation. Fearing an eventual failure of supplies of bark, the European governments named commenced the cultivation of the cinchona trees in India, Java, etc.

After a lapse of years, necessary to the growth of the plants, exports commenced, from India first and then from Java.

In February, 1861, the first installment of seeds arrived in Ceylon from South America.

In 1869 the export was but 23 ounces of bark.
Season 1882–'83, Ceylon, etc., exported 6,925,595 pounds of bark.
Season 1883–'84, Ceylon, etc., exported 11,500,000 pounds of bark.
Season 1885–'86, Ceylon, etc., exported 15,225,000 pounds of bark.
Season 1886–'87, Ceylon, etc., exported 14,007,500 pounds of bark.
The above statistics apply to one of the sources of supply only, namely, East Indies (Ceylon, etc.).

To this is to be added the Java exportation, say—
July 1 to June 30, 883–'84, 1,104,534 pounds of bark.
July 1 to June 30, 1884–'85, 1,105,970 pounds of bark.
July 1 to June 30, 1885–'86, 1,531,156 pounds of bark.
July 1 to June 30, 1886–'87, 2,230,275 pounds of bark.
These sources of supply were unheard-of factors until comparatively late years, as South America alone supplied the world prior to the cultivation of the cinchona trees in the East.

It may also be properly stated here that the East India barks are uniformly richer than those heretofore and at present received from South America.

The solution of the question as to why the price of quinine has fallen is a very simple matter to those who desire to be enlightened. The wish must be father to the thought in the minds of such tariff reformers as draw the conclusion that the great reduction in the price of quinine all over the world was a natural sequence of the removal of the duty in this country.

The syllogism is very illogical when the high prices that ruled in England, France, Germany, and Italy enter as one of the premises, and without this premise it is not the happy illustration of tariff iniquity perpetrated in this country, so boastfully proclaimed, but is argumsnt degraded to the level of the lowest methods of reasoning—the *argumentum ad populum* and the *argumentum ad ignoran iam*.

It is an appeal to the prejudices of the multitude and an argument based on an adversary's ignorance of facts.

As to the prosperous condition of the quinine industry in the United States, and as to the increased production, we have only to say that the statements are so erroneous that it would be idle to attempt to answer them in detail. They are simply untrue throughout.

The industry has been unprofitable everywhere for a long time past, and this is due to excessive competition.

This country is flooded with foreign quinine, *e. g.*, 2,180,157 ounces received from Europe in one year (fiscal year ended June 30, 1887). On the other hand, American manufacturers can not hold their home market nor export an ounce.

The reason of this is that we can not compete with Europeans, who have great advantages over us.

Were the contest an equal one it would be different. To illustrate: The Italian manufacturers pay very low wages, their general expenses of doing business, cost of plant, apparatus, machinery, etc., are far below those in this country, and the Italian Government pays a bounty on all Italian quinine exported.

In every respect we are fighting a very unequal battle.

The Star says that the business is so prosperous that the quinine manufacturers have had numerous accessions to their ranks. So rapid is the increase in the mind of the writer that twelve becomes fourteen in making up the itemized list.

The list itself fairly represents the nature of the entire Star article.

Of the fourteen concerns named we find—

Three only are now manufacturing quinine.

Two have relinquished the business.

Nine never made any.

Respectfully,

POWERS & WEIGHTMAN.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I desire to call the attention of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] who, taking the census figures a few moments ago, undertook to show the profit of lumber-manufacturing in Maine, and also the attention of other gentlemen who have used the census statistics to show the alleged profits of other manufacturing industries, to a serious error they have fallen into in drawing the inferences they have drawn.

The gentleman from Ohio has assumed the census statistics, correct in every particular, have covered points which they did not undertake to include. There are only four elements relating to manufacturing in the census figures: First, capital; secondly, the value of the product, thirdly, the value of the material; and, fourthly, the wages paid. Now the gentleman from Ohio and others who have used the statistics have assumed that the census statement of the cost of material gives the whole expense of manufacturing in any particular industry.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Walker so states.

Mr. DINGLEY. My friend is mistaken. Mr. Walker's tables and comments suggest nothing of the kind. Indeed, his tables show for themselves that he does not undertake to cover all the expenses of manufacturing. I have conversed with the census officials on the matter, and they are surprised that any one should so infer. The materials for the manufacture of lumber are mainly the round logs, and the value of those is estimated, with a certain sum for tools, chains, etc., requiring frequent renewal. For woolen manufactures the material is the raw wool and other fiber, with dye-stuffs, coal, etc. Now, given the cost of the round logs, tools, chains, etc., is there not something more required in producing the manufactured lumber from those round logs than simply the labor that is used?

There must be money hired for the time being in addition to the capital to carry on the business for the year which elapses before the lumber reaches the mill and is converted into boards and finds a market. Interest—a considerable item—therefore is not included in the census cost of manufacturing. Then there are taxes; and do not taxes go for something in a manufacturing establishment? They are not included. There is the cost of insurance.

Mr. GEAR. Four or five per cent.

Mr. DINGLEY. Does not insurance cost something—a large item, as gentlemen understand who know anything of the lumber-manufacturing industry, because of the combustible character of the mills. Then there are repairs, another element which is very large. And after the lumber is manufactured it must be freighted to the markets and commissions paid for its sale.

Now, as a matter of fact, ascertained after investigation into this matter, I want to state to the gentleman that there are extensive expenses of manufacturing industries, such as those to which I have referred, of which the census takes no account, varying from 15 to 30 per cent. And when my friend takes the lumber-manufacturing industry in Maine, and figures a profit of 27½ per cent., because 27½ per cent. is the difference between the materials and the labor combined, and the value of the products, he leaves out of the computation expenses aggregating not far from 20 per cent.

It should be borne in mind that the value of the product as given in the census is the value in the market. Freight is not deducted, commissions are not deducted, repairs are not deducted, taxes are not deducted, insurance is not deducted, interest on money borrowed is not deducted, many other items of expense are not deducted. Instead of the lumberman's profits being 27½ per cent., I want to say to my friend from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] that last year the lumber-manufacturing mills in my State did not make a profit of 6 per cent., and on the average for ten years they have made no more than other industries.

Gentlemen will see that when they use the census figures in this careless way—and those figures have been used in such a way in other manufacturing industries all through this debate—they reach results which were never intended by those who presented those statistics. Those figures do not include the whole cost of manufacturing; only two elements in the cost—materials and labor—are included; and, while the figures are correct in themselves, when the gentleman adds the labor to the cost of materials and says that that is the cost of manufacturing, the cost of carrying on the industry, and this deducted from the value of product in the market gives the manufacturers' profits, he does himself and the manufacturers a great injustice. No such inference can be legitimately drawn from the figures of the census.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman two questions. First, I want to ask him whether these statistics were not furnished by the men themselves who are engaged in these industries?

Mr. DINGLEY. Yes, sir; and they correctly give the facts which they undertake to cover.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. And you say now that the figures do not include the cost of supplies at the mills?

Mr. DINGLEY. Certainly not. They include nothing but the round logs.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. This book says "value of logs, value of mill supplies," and there are given here thousands upon thousands of dollars for which they claim credit——

Mr. DINGLEY. But no such items as those which I have enumerated are included. "Mill supplies," as used in the census, means chains and other tools. They do not include insurance, nor taxes, nor freight, nor interest, nor repairs, nor commissions.

Mr. GUENTHER. I move to strike out several words, and I wish to ask the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] whether he calls insurance and taxes "mill supplies?"

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No.

Mr. GUENTHER. Then what do you mean?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I simply asked the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] if these figures did not include mill supplies, and he said they did not, and I showed him that they did.

Mr. GUENTHER. Mr. Chairman, he who takes the statements made on the free-trade side of this House yesterday and to-day, including that of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] a few minutes ago, seriously must come to the conclusion that the American lumberman is the greatest rascal unhung, a veritable pirate, who for the last twenty-seven years has unmercifully robbed the people of the United States in a most outrageous manner.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. If you choose to put it in that way, put it that way; I have no objection.

Mr. GUENTHER. You want to make the people believe that his profits have been excessive, outrageously excessive.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No; I only show what the census shows were his profits.

Mr. GUENTHER. But you want to create the impression upon the minds of the members of this House and of the people that the profits of the lumber manufacturers have been outrageously excessive, while the figures do not bear you out. Now I happen to know better. I live among the lumbermen, and I know something about saw-milling, and I say that this cry for free lumber, when not accompanied by some offer of just compensation to the people engaged in this industry, is an act of gross injustice, a virtual confiscation, at least a partial one, of their property and an unjust diminution of their earnings.

Logs and round unmanufactured timber and ship timber and ship planking are now on the free-list. I will accept the definition of the revenue reformers or free-traders and call these articles raw material for the manufacturer of sawed boards, planks, deals, hubs, posts, last-blocks, wagon-blocks, oar-blocks, heading-blocks, staves of all kinds, pickets and palings, laths, shingles, clapboards, etc. These articles, although certainly not raw material, are all placed on the free-list by this Mills bill, while heretofore and now protected by a duty of from 10 to 20 per cent. It certainly can not have been done under the plea of free raw materials. Why, then, I ask, is it done? Why do you take away all protection from the manufacturer of lumber and leave other industries protected on an average of about 38 per cent.?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Because I want the consumers of Ohio to buy it without paying tribute to those people.

Mr. GUENTHER. Oh, yes, you want the consumers of Ohio to buy lumber cheap because you do not produce it in Ohio, and you want to have all the articles that you produce protected, as is done in the Mills bill.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Not at all. What about free wool?

Mr. GUENTHER. You probably do not represent much of a free-wool district, and you think you are safe.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I live in the district of the greatest wool protectionists in this country.

Mr. GUENTHER. Then they ought to send somebody else here to take care of their interests. [Laughter.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. They had the opportunity, but they did not see fit to do it.

Mr. GUENTHER. You place a tariff on almost everything the lumberman and the millman uses—on their axes, saws, machinery, clothing, sugar, rice, medicines, etc.—but you exempt the products of his labor.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Why, it is the laborer that uses all those things that you enumerate, and not the manufacturer.

Mr. GUENTHER. They are both using them. I want to tell you that the wages paid to-day in the woods of Michigan and Wisconsin are 22 per cent. higher than they were in 1872, while the price of lumber is about 22 per cent. less than it was in 1872.

Why should the lumberman and the millman be singled out? Where is your jewel-like consistency? [Laughter.] Placing manufactured timber on the free-list means free trade in all these many manufactured articles, for the Canadians with us, while we under this bill receive nothing whatever in return.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Now, I want to ask the gentleman a question in good faith.

Mr. GUENTHER. Well, if it is not too long, you may.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. You take your ten dollars of product and divide it; you know all about that——

Mr. GUENTHER. I do not understand your kind of division.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Divide it between labor and capital and all the other elements——

Mr. GUENTHER. I do not understand your kind of division nor your addition, but I would like now to have some of your silence for a few minutes. [Laughter.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. GUENTHER. I am very much obliged to the gentleman for his courtesy, and I hope some of my other friends on the Democratic side will follow his example. [Laughter.] Mr. Chairman, the lumber industry of the United States, which is the largest of any, as I will show later on, when I will obtain the floor again, can not flourish if you place it in unrestricted competition with Canada, with her lower stumpage, her cheaper labor, and her lower taxation.

When I first saw this now so notorious Mills bill, and read the first twenty lines, I said to myself (and the person whom I addressed fully agreed with me [laughter]; yes, I usually agree with myself when I am right [laughter]), "This is a great scheme; a masterpiece of untutored political economy; the veriest raw material of enlightened statesmanship; a delightfully cool proposition for the annexation to Canada of at least four great States of this Union; in fact the greatest, never before precedented somersault of any disciple in either ancient or modern political stupidity. As a practical illustration of 'heads I win, tails you lose,' it takes the cake." [Laughter.]

Were it not for the serious drawback that we are the fellows who do the losing, we could join in the general merriment. Every million feet of lumber imported deprives fifty American workingmen of employment every year, and thereby directly injures two hundred and fifty people in our own country.

If you are bound to do something for the benefit of Canada, do it at least in such a way that we will derive some corresponding benefits. Negotiate a just and equitable reciprocity treaty with Canada, something like what my genial friend before me [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] advocates, so that those of our citizens living near the Canadian border can exchange the products of their labor on equal terms with Canadian citizens; but do not give all the advantage to them and nothing to us, as you do by this bill.

The average duty collected on Canadian lumber is less than 16 per cent. This percentage is less than the difference of the price of labor in the two countries. Wages are at least one-third lower in Canada than in the United States. Canadians come over every year to work in our mills and lumber camps, while nobody goes to Canada from here to get work.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I would like to ask the gentleman, as Canada has a protective tariff, why it does not bring up the rate of wages in Canada.

Mr. GUENTHER. Canada has a protective tariff on her exports, but I am now speaking of the question of our imports.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I thought these gentlemen were in favor of home industry; yet they allow foreigners to come over and carry away our high wage-money,

Mr. KELLEY. Most of those who come over become citizens of this country.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. No; the gentleman from Wisconsin states that they come over to work and then return.

Mr. GUENTHER. I did not state that, although it is so in some cases; but that makes no difference with my argument.

But it is said that many lumbermen in Michigan and Wisconsin are advocating to place manufactured lumber on the free-list. Mr. Chairman, I know there are some, but I am glad to say there are not many of that class of patriots. I also know that whenever you scratch off the thin "free-trade coating" of such an individual you at once discover the peculiar metal from which he derives his magnetic, free-lumber attractions. [Laughter.] As a general rule, he used to be a pine-land operator in the United States or a saw-mill owner. He has made money—sometimes a good deal. His pine lands in the United States are gone. For a number of years he has bought standing pine in sleepy Canada at a very low figure. "Give me free trade in lumber," he says to his patriotic soul, "and I can double and treble the value of my Canadian investment."

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOUTELLE obtained the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the *pro forma* amendment will be considered as withdrawn. The Chair hears no objection.

[Mr. BOUTELLE withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Inasmuch as I propose to make a few remarks in answer to the gentleman from Wisconsin, if he is allowed to be recognized again, I would prefer to have him go on now. I am willing he should go on and complete his remarks before I take the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I do not give up my time if he is not to proceed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can recognize the gentleman later in the day if he desires it; but the Chair has now recognized the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND].

Mr. BLAND. Inasmuch as we had a speech from one gentleman from Kansas yesterday [Mr. PETERS] on this lumber question I desire to have a few remarks read from what was said by another gentleman from Kansas in the Forty-seventh Congress.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. ANDERSON. The Legislature of Kansas has passed the following resolution:

"That our Senators and Representatives in Congress are hereby requested and instructed to use their best effort to have the duty upon lumber of every description removed so that the same may be placed on the free-list."

I shall obey these instructions, and I suppose it is not necessary to make any defense of the Republicanism of the State of Kansas, the State of John Brown, a State casting from 50,000 to 70,000 Republican majority in Presidential elections.

I wish to say in this connection that in the votes which I have cast upon this bill I have been influenced by a sincere adherence to the principles and practice of the Republican party. I have been in favor of lower rates than those presented in it. I have been and am in favor of a competitive tariff as a guard against monopolies. I am in favor of reducing the burden of taxation when the tariff is a tax. I am in favor of reducing the surplus. And now upon this question I stand upon the national platform of the Republican party of 1880, reaffirming that of 1876, which said:

"The revenue necessary for current expenditures and the obligations of the public debt must be largely derived from duties upon importations, which, so far as possible, should be adjusted to promote the interest of American labor and advance the prosperity of the whole country."

You will find the same thing affirmed in the platform of 1872:

"And that revenue, except so much as may be derived from the tax upon tobacco and liquor, should be raised by duties upon importations, the details of which should be so adjusted as to aid in securing remunerative wages to labor, and to promote industry, prosperity, and the growth of the whole country."

I stand there to-day, Mr. Chairman. I exercise the right of judging for myself and for those I represent as to what is requisite for the prosperity of the whole country.

Take now this case: You have the lumber region of Maine contiguous to a somewhat densely settled country in Canada. You then go West to Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota, contiguous to a portion of Canada which is not settled at all. I admit all that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HORR] has said in regard to the development of the lumber industry up to this time. I accept his statistics in full. Yet the question remains in my mind whether in order to preserve the present development of the lumber industry of Michigan we would be really promoting the prosperity either of the whole country or even of the larger part of the country.

This is a case in which you are not creating an original material. Whatever you do in the manufacture of lumber is based not upon a creative process, but upon a destructive process. It is not, as in the case of making cotton fabrics, or pen-knives, or steel rails, where you have the original material abounding inexhaustibly, so that your product will go to the development of the prosperity of your country. In this case you are stripping off the forests that God planted on this continent.

The question comes up whether it is really for the prosperity of the whole country, or even of the larger part of the country, that year after year you shall put a premium upon the starting of fires to destroy your forests——

Mr. HOAR. What is that?

Mr. ANDERSON. That you should put a premium on the cutting down of your forests in order to manufacture lumber. Then in the coming years what will be the result? You will have removed the original supply of lumber from your continent and placed yourselves inexorably in the hands of Canada.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. Robinson, of Massachusetts). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ANDERSON. I would like to have five minute's more time.

Mr. SPRINGER. I think that should be allowed him. He has to speak for a whole State on this subject. His State has instructed her Representatives on this question and should be heard.

Mr. BRENTS. He is not representing any timber State.

The CHAIRMAN. If there is no objection, the gentleman will be allowed to proceed.

Mr. BLAND. Now, I want to know from the gentlemen from Kansas on this floor whether they propose to obey the instructions of their

State Legislature, or whether they come here for the purpose of standing in not only with the lumber trust but with all the trusts and combines trying to defeat this bill?

There is another question in regard to which the farmers not only of Kansas but throughout the country feel a deep interest, and that is the effect our forests have upon the seasons, upon the rains which descend upon the earth, and which are so necessary to the success of agriculture. It is contended that the destruction of the forests is the occasion of the dry seasons year after year throughout the Northwest and West, and especially in Kansas, where they have been affected by drought which has cut down their crops one-half. I have read in the presence of the gentlemen from Kansas the views of their constituents, their voters on this question, to ascertain whether they are in harmony and sympathy with their people on this subject. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BURROWS. I ask by unanimous consent that the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER] be allowed five minutes in addition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. HEARD. I have never yet objected to anybody being allowed to proceed and complete his remarks. [Cries of "Then do not do it now."]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. GUENTHER. Mr. Chairman, whenever an American citizen invests his money, the money he has made in this country, in a foreign one, he ceases to be a reliable counselor where American interests are concerned. [Applause.] He becomes an unsafe guide to show us the road to American prosperity. [Applause.]

He becomes an ally of foreign interests. In this case he joins in the cry of free access to our lumber markets, that was started in Montreal and by other fellows of his ilk. He bargains away the interests of his people, among whom and through whom he became wealthy.

He becomes another Benedict Arnold, an American Judas Iscariot. I have no sympathy whatever with that kind of American citizens who expect to make their investments in foreign countries profitable at the risk of injuring, aye, even destroying that industry at home, which, if left with the present moderate protection, will prevent them from realizing large profits abroad.

While I radically differ with the theories of the "out and out" free-trader, I can respect him for his convictions and for his consistency. But, taking an inventory of my different kinds of respect, I fail to find any for that person who is in favor of the Mills bill, protecting almost every home industry, although under vigorous protest, but places lumber and wool on the free-list.

If you insist upon such an unjust course, give us at least something to compensate us for this great injury and injustice. Give us at least free sugar, free rice, free woolens, and free medicines.

A MEMBER. And free molasses.

Mr. GUENTHER. Yes, and free molasses. [Laughter.]

Mr. MACDONALD. And taffy. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. GUENTHER. Mr. Chairman, there may be lumbermen who, by reason of their Democratic tendencies, indorse everything dictated by their party leaders (and you know what portion of our beloved country they hail from), men who would rather be Democrats than men of unbiased judgment and ideas of their own; men who from sheer force of habitual prejudice oppose everything Republicans advocate; men who dare not say that their souls are their own if so decreed by modern Democracy; men who delegate their thinking to the professional Democratic whipper-in; men who think more of a little Federal office than of the well-being of their community. I have no harsh words for them; it is not anger, but pity I have for them. I even do not hold them in contempt, although they seem to be justly entitled to it.

And I have no harsh words to utter. [Great laughter.] But in a Christian spirit I commend them and I say, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." [Laughter.] At the same time, however, for their own good I want to have a guardian appointed to prevent them from squandering that which the Republican protective policy gave to them. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. They are men who made their wealth under a protective tariff. [Applause.]

Mr. GUENTHER. Yes, and I trust you did too.

I want to prevent them from treating the Canadians to our good things, filling Canadian stomachs with substantial food and choice dainties on top of it, while our people have to regale themselves on Democratic free-trade fizz. [Laughter.] And when we complain that this kind of windy diet is neither palatable nor nourishing, you free-traders say, "But it is good old Democratic doctrine, and, besides, it does not overload your stomach, and thereby may save you a doctor's bill. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] And then you think that this old worn-out chestnut, this stale "Democratic doctrine phrase," will fill the vacuum in our digestive organs. [Renewed laughter.] You who advocate this lumber schedule, you poor deluded innocents, are made to pull the chestnuts from the coals for these unselfish patriots with large investments in Canadian pine.

But pass this bill, and you will soon learn that by placing manufactured lumber on the free-list, the consumer in the United States will not be benefited, but the owner of that Canadian pine will rake in the persimmons, while you, unsophisticated, verdant free-traders will scratch your poor little aching heads in pitiable astonishment and wonder with mouths wide open, eyes dilated, and ears turned down, why this is so. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. GUENTHER. Then I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota, was recognized.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman had permission by unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes, which time has expired; and the gentleman from Minnesota is entitled to the floor.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, this is not a question of levity.

Mr. REED. Oh, no. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. It is a matter which touches the interests of somebody——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will interrupt the gentleman to state that debate upon the pending amendment is exhausted; and if there be no objection it will be considered as withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Then I move to strike out the last word.

I say, Mr. Chairman, that this is not a matter of levity. Somebody is suffering from the state of things that now exists, or will suffer from the change proposed by this bill should it become a law. Let us see, then, what the question before the House really is.

On yesterday I asserted when I had the floor in debate in the presence of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER], who has just surrendered the floor, a gentleman who is well informed on this question, that within my own personal knowledge there had been in the last twenty-five years more millionaires who made their fortunes in the lumber business than he could point out in all the United States prior to that time.

I said further, Mr. Chairman, that within my own knowledge the pine lands of that region of country that he and I have the honor in part to represent on this floor had within the last fifteen years risen in value from 300 per cent. to 500 per cent., or even, in some instances, 1,000 per cent.

Mr. GUENTHER. How much is real estate property in St. Paul worth now, and what was it worth twenty years ago? How much has it risen in value?

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. That illustrates the argument that gentlemen deem it fit to submit in support of a grave question. But let us examine this question for a few moments without being distracted by suggestions that are hardly relevant.

As I have said, I stated that as a rule it would not be questioned that the pine-land property—the property of the lumbermen—had risen in value within the last fifteen years 300 to 500 per cent., and even in some cases as high as 1,000 per cent., and I stated in the same connection, and before the same gentlemen——

Mr. GUENTHER. Well, give me time to reply as you go on.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I stated that the property of the agriculturist in a district whose soil is as rich and good as there is to be found anywhere (and this statement applies not alone to my State but to the Northwestern States generally) during the same time had not risen in value 1 per cent.

The answer of the gentleman to the suggestion was this: That the increase of the wealth of the lumber-men has grown out of the rise of stumpage, out of the rise in value of the pine lands themselves, and not in the manufacture of lumber. Do I quote the gentleman correctly?

Mr. GUENTHER. Yes, sir, and that is a correct statement of fact.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. These premises being conceded, let us for a few moments consider them and the lessons which they teach.

If pine lands have risen so much in value for that period as is conceded here, why is it? And if agricultural lands have not risen in something like the same ratio, or at all, why is that so? The answer to these questions is not far to seek. When an industry is prosperous its plant and property rise in value, and the rise is a fair index of the degree of prosperity. When crops are bountiful and prices high, agricultural lands go up. When crops are poor or prices low, such lands go down.

When mining is profitable, mineral lands go up; when unprofitable, they go down. When the products of the dairy go up grazing lands go up. This is just as true in all such branches of industry as it is that when a bank or a railroad company is earning money rapidly the stock goes up, and goes up in proportion to the earnings. This is the surest touchstone that can be applied in such case to test the prosperity of any business. And by this sign it is seen that the lumber industry has been exceptionally prosperous for a long time, and that for the last fifteen years or more agriculture has been unprofitable.

To the people of that part of the Northwest in which I am acquainted it needs no evidence to establish these facts. It will be there conceded, as I understand my friend from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER] here to

concede, that the lumberman and the pine-land owner have been exceptionally prosperous, while the agriculturists have been merely able to hold their own by industry and economy.

Now, I want some man to answer this question: Why should these men who are making not one farthing, but are merely holding their own, be forced to contribute $2 a thousand feet on any lumber consumed to an industry which is making millionaires of the men engaged in it? [Applause on the Democratic side.] Let somebody answer this question, and then he will have "touched the nub" of this issue. This deserves a serious answer. It will not do to go off and joke about this thing. I can well understand why a gentleman who represents a constituency who are making fortunes out of that industry can joke about it and how his constituents can laugh, but that the constituents of my friend from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] before me, the constituents of my friend from Illinois, and of my friends from Kansas and Missouri can laugh and joke about it is something I can not understand or believe.

It was shown here but a moment since that a few years ago the Republicans did not assent to the high-protection theories of to-day. But things have changed. The protectionists of this country have got the Republican party by the throat. They have the purse and the party organization, and no man is in good standing who does not subscribe to their creed.

When they can not meet the argument against that protection which compels the weak to protect the strong, the poor to protect the rich, they try to distract attention from the real issue. But the issue stands out so clear that it can not be obscured or misunderstood. It is whether the agriculturists and the masses of the people generally shall be compelled to contribute, not for the support of the Government, but for the enrichment of these prosperous protected industries.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MILLS. If I am recognized I yield my time to the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota be allowed to continue his remarks for five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Now, after this, I hope the gentlemen from these great Northwestern States will answer the question why poverty should "protect" wealth. That is the question that touches the masses of the people and which they would like to have answered. Says the gentleman, our laborers are benefited. The man that stands up to-day and says labor in the lumber industry receives higher wages than in other like industries, protected or not protected, makes a statement that can not be sustained.

Several MEMBERS on the Republican side. No one said that.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I am glad that you disclaim such a position. To say that laborers in the lumber protected industries receive higher compensation than in other industries is an absurdity.

Mr. FUNSTON. No one made that assertion.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. The gentleman from Wisconsin made substantially that assertion, whatever may have been his particular words. He said protected labor now received so much per month, while years ago it received much less, and he attributed that to the protective tariff on the lumber industry.

Mr. DOCKERY. If the labor does not get it, who does?

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. The millionaires get it. [Applause.]

Mr. REED. If it were true that profits of a thousand per cent. were made by the imposition of a tariff of 18½ per cent., there might be some reason for the observations of the gentleman from Minnesota. But it simply needs the statement of it to pierce the absurdity of what the gentleman has just said.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit me——

Mr. REED. I will if the House will give me ten minutes.

Many MEMBERS. Yes.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Did I say——

Mr. REED. Your statement was that the lumber lands had increased in value a thousand per cent.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. In fifteen years.

Mr. REED. I do not care in what time it was; but the inference which the gentleman would have the House draw from his statement was that owing to a tariff of 18½ per cent. the value of the forests of the United States had been increased a thousand per cent.

Now, what a preposterous statement that is. Why have values increased in the United States? It is on account of the prosperity of this country. A Kansas friend of mine said to me the other day, "I bought my land for $1.25 an acre only ten years ago." I said, "You will sell it to me at the rate at which you got it from the Government?" He said, "No, I want $10 an acre."

How did that land rise in price a thousand per cent? It rose on account of the prosperity of this country. Why is it that everything in this country has risen in value? It is because the system which has been adopted here has made the country prosperous beyond the utmost dream of any other land in the past history of the world.

Mr. BLAND. I wish to ask the gentleman a question. The increased value of the land that he speaks of has come from improvements; but I affirm that naked, unimproved lands are not worth as much per acre as they were years ago.

Mr. REED. That is what the gentleman from Missouri calls a question. [Laughter.] That is his idea of a question. I have had occasion time and again to point out the twisted ideas and the twisted uses of words which present themselves on the other side, and this is a very good illustration.

Mr. FUNSTON. What the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] says may be true of Missouri, but it is not true of Kansas.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, it does not need any argument to show that all this talk of gentlemen about "lumber kings" and about people who have made money has no relation to this question. This question is whether we shall continue to preserve the American market for the American people, and the reason we say that it ought to be preserved is because the whole history of the country shows such a state of prosperity under that system that bright, smart men have succeeded in making money, not only in the lumber trade or by the purchase of lands, but also by the upspringing of great cities, the value of the land of which has in some instances increased more that 10,000 per cent. The great population which has flowed into this country has come here because this country is prosperous. What makes land valuable? Did gentlemen even consider what is the foundation of the value of land? I have said it here before, and I beg leave to repeat it. What is the reason why land in the center of London is worth such incalculable sums of money? It is because that land is surrounded by five millions of people. Why is it that land is so very valuable in the city of New York? It is because it is surrounded by two millions of people. Why is land so cheap in Texas and in the very far West? Because there are fewer people there. As more people come to occupy this country the land of the individuals and the land of the nation increases in value, and the people come here because the country is prosperous, and we want to keep it prosperous.

We want to keep it prosperous by preserving all its industries, by keeping them all going. We want to preserve the wealth of this country and keep it here to be distributed among our own people. The gentleman knows, if he knows anything about this matter, that the introduction of lumber free into this country means an increase in the value of timber lands in Canada. My friend from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER] put it very well. Many of our lumber men have gone over to Canada and bought timber lands, and you gentlemen, with your outcries against "monopoly," are endeavoring to increase the fortunes of the very men whom you undertake to denounce by giving them greater opportunities in the rise in value of their timber lands in Canada. Is land any less valuable now in Iowa at $35 or $40 an acre because it has risen from $1.25 an acre?

Mr. GEAR. From 80 cents an acre.

Mr. REED. Now that thing has happened; that thing has taken place; and the question is, land being of that value, what shall we as legislators do with regard to it? The gentleman, I suppose, would not venture to say that the United States ought to charge for new lands from $30 to $40 an acre because in the progress of ten years similar land in the State of Nebraska has increased to $30 or $40 or $50 an acre. That increase is the result of our prosperity.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MILLS was recognized and yielded to Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to state that the request for leave to extend the time of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] was not submitted to the committee. The Chair endeavored to interrupt the gentleman in order to submit the question, but did not succeed.

Mr. REED. I will take my other five minutes later, after the gentleman from Minnesota gets through.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I do not wish to interrupt the gentleman. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the formal amendment has been exhausted.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I wish to ask the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] if he is through with his remarks.

Mr. REED. Oh, go right on.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I understand that the gentleman is through?

Mr. REED. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I move to strike out the last two words. I beg pardon of the committee for occupying further time, and I do not intend to take but a moment. This matter, however, should not be permitted to pass without an answer. If I know how to state a proposition clearly, I stated that within the last fifteen years the property of the lumber-men has risen in value from 300 to 500 per cent. and some as high as 1,000 per cent.; that within the same period in the section of country to which I referred the property of the farmer had not risen 1 per cent.

Having made those two statements, I asked somebody to tell me why the man who was barely making a living should be compelled to pay a tax or tribute for the enrichment of the man whose property had risen in this exceptional manner.

In reply to that question we have had the speech to which we have just listened. Has the question been answered? I submit to the Committee of the Whole whether it has or has not.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman [Mr. REED] has not said that my premises were false, but he has placed himself upon assumption. I have spoken here in the presence of gentlemen who know; and they have not only tacitly but verbally admitted that the facts are as I stated them. I see sitting near the gentleman from Maine the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], one of the most prominent men in this House. He lives in one of the finest countries on earth. I would not be afraid to ask him whether agricultural property in his district is worth more now than it was fifteen years ago. He will not say it is. I am not afraid to ask my friend from Iowa whether agricultural property in his district would sell for more to-day than it did fifteen years ago.

Mr. WEAVER. It would not.

Mr. STRUBLE. In my part of the State there has been a rise.

Mr. FUNSTON (to Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota). Ask me?

Mr. REED. Yes, ask a Kansas man.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. The gentleman from Maine undertakes to put on the stand his own witness, and to put into his mouth just what he would have him say. Does the gentleman from Maine mean to imply that the testimony of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], who does not undertake to contradict my statement, is not worthy of acceptance.

Mr. REED (to Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota). Ask a Kansas man.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I do not know about Kansas. I am different from the gentleman from Maine. I do not deal in poetry, but in prose. I deal in facts of which I have some knowledge. The agricultural property of that great country to which I have referred, one of the richest to-day under the shining sun, has not risen. Now, let me state the exceptions, and I will state them fairly. The gentleman from Wisconsin, to answer me, says, "See how property in St. Paul and Minneapolis has risen." Yes, but who has gotten the advantage of that rise? The land-speculator and the rich man. The masses of the people who buy lumber to build their houses and their fences have not enjoyed any of the benefits of that rise.

Again, go out upon the frontier where the Government gives away land for nothing. A man goes there and makes a farm. That is enhanced in value of course. Would you therefore say that property generally has risen? Is that a fair argument? Is that meeting a plain proposition in fairness? It is as well as gentlemen can meet it. The necessity of their case requires such an answer. That is the reason for such prevarication. But I stated that where improved property in this country is now in the same condition in which it was fifteen years ago it is not worth any more than it was then, as a rule, unless you go to the suburbs of a city, or to the frontiers, as I have suggested.

Several MEMBERS. That is true.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Now, under these circumstances the question is, Why this industry which is growing wealthy beyond precedent should require that these men, who are merely making a living, shall contribute to the support of their wealthier fellow-citizens by paying $2 a thousand on lumber?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MILLS. We have now spent nearly all day on these two lines that bring to the Government revenue to the amount of $198.80. I think we might go on now to the next clause of the bill.

Mr. REED. I would like to make a few remarks before we leave this question.

Mr. MILLS. Let us go to the next paragraph, and we can continue the discussion. I would like to have a vote on these two lines. We ought to make a little progress.

Mr. REED. I would like to say a few words upon these two lines.

Mr. MILLS. I will yield for the present; but when the gentleman from Maine gets through, I must ask that we go into the House to close debate on these two lines.

Mr. TAULBEE. I desire to be recognized when the gentleman from Maine has concluded.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota thinks I have evaded his question, but as that question as been answered during the general debate more than fifty times I did not suppose it necessary to go into general discussion, nor do I intend to do so now. I have risen for the purpose of pointing out to him what is the fundamental error in his remarks. He says there has been a rise of 1,000 per cent. in the value of timber land, and he undertakes to insinuate to the House that this was on account of a tariff of 18½ per cent. He then says that he made a comparison between the rise of timber lands and the rise of agricultural lands.

Well, now, does he not know the agricultural lands which have already had their rise had it before the fifteen years commenced? If he would go back far enough he would find the rise of agricultural lands had as large a percentage as the rise of timber lands. I venture to say that in the State of Maine the timber lands have actually not risen in value at all in the last ten years. They had their rise before that. The lands when the country gets developed, when railroads are run through them, then reach their full value.

Now the gentleman asks about land in Iowa. He confines himself to the last fifteen years. Why there are lands in Iowa to-day that are selling and will sell for $50 an acre which were purchased for 80 cents.

A MEMBER. Under land warrants.

Mr. REED. A rise greater than the most productive of timber lands, allowing him his own figures. And he attempts to compare the timber lands and farm lands by taking the timber lands during that period of rise and taking the farm lands after they had their value raised. In other words, he insists the farming lands must not only rise when it is their turn, but they must keep on rising when it is the turn of the other class of lands. It seems to me that is an absurdity that needs no more demonstration. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee do now rise.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 105, noes 89.

Mr. KELLEY demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. MILLS and Mr. BAYNE were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 104, noes 57.

So the motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER, from the Committee of the Whole, reported that they had had under consideration a bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. MILLS. I would like when we go into committee the debate on lines 6 and 7 shall be closed in twenty minutes. Do the other side object to that?

Mr. MCKINLEY. I think the gentleman should not undertake to limit debate in committee this evening.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union; and pending that motion I move that all debate be closed on the pending paragraph and all amendments thereto in one minute.

Mr. RANDALL. I desire to say a few words, and hope the gentleman will make it five minutes.

Mr. MILLS. I will move, then, that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in ten minutes.

Mr. TAULBEE. I would like to ascertain how that time is to be divided.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair supposes it will be divided equally between the friends and opponents of the measure.

Mr. MILLS. I demand the previous question on the motion to close debate. [Cries of "Division!" on the Republican side.]

The House divided; and there were—ayes 107, noes 69.

Mr. BAYNE demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. MILLS and Mr. BAYNE were appointed.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 107, noes 43.

Mr. BAYNE. No quorum.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 111, noes 52.

So the previous question was ordered.

The question then recurred on Mr. MILLS's motion to close the debate in ten minutes.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 101, noes 44.

Mr. REED demanded tellers.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the House takes a recess, under the order, until 8 o'clock p. m.

EVENING SESSION.

The recess having expired, the House (at 8 o'clock p. m.) was called to order by Mr. MCMILLIN, the Speaker *pro tempore*.

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of bills under the special order.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole (Mr. DOCKERY in the chair.)

Mr. MORRILL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we may take up bills upon the Calendar in the order in which they appear, their titles being read, and if the consideration is not asked for, that each bill as it is reached be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar, commencing where we left off on last Friday.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

L. J. M'GOFFIN.

The first pension business on the Private Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. MORRILL) was the bill (S. 1146) granting a pension to L. J. McGoffin.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of L. J. McGoffin, late a private in Company C, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

Your committee adopt the report of the Committee on Pensions of the Senate, and recommend the passage of the bill.

SENATE REPORT.

Lemuel J. McGoffin enlisted as a private in Company C, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, December 26, 1861, and was discharged with company, December 19, 1864.

On July 8, 1880, he made application for pension, alleging in his declaration that on or about June 20, 1862, he received a rupture of the left side of the abdomen, caused from lifting while building a block-house.

The Commissioner of Pensions rejected the claim June 28, 1885, on the ground of there being on record and of the claimant's declared inability to furnish evidence showing incurrence of the alleged hernia in the service.

The Adjutant-General United States Army furnishes the following military history: On muster-rolls from enrollment to April 30, 1863, present; roll to June 30, 1863, absent building a block-house; same to August 31, 1863; roll to October 31, 1863, present; same to October 31, 1864; mustered out with company December 19, 1864.

The claimant gives as a reason for his inability to furnish the testimony of his captain or lieutenants that they were not present at the time of the incurrence of the rupture; that he was detailed with others under charge of Corporal Trimbly to build a block-house at Bridgeport, W. Va., in June, 1863, under supervision of Lieutenant Carnico; that Corporal Trimbly, who had knowledge of the fact, is dead; that the addresses of the privates who were in the detail are unknown to him; that the surgeon who examined him for re-enlistment is dead; he refused to accept me; have had no medical treatment since discharge, except liniments and other patent medicines.

Capt. J. M. Godwin, in an affidavit, swears—

"The claimant enlisted as a veteran on or about the 20th day of March, 1864, and was examined by Surgeon John T. Wharton, and was by him rejected, and I understood he was rejected on account of hernia or rupture."

John C. Gartils and wife state that—

"They have known the claimant over forty years; that he worked for them prior to enlistment for about three yea s; that he worked on the farm, doing general work, and in the timber; that during all that time claimant was never sick a day or complained of any trouble, but that upon his return from the Army on furlough, in 1864, in the summer, he complained of a rupture that he claimed to have received while building a block-house in the summer of 1863."

The board of examining surgeons at Junction City, Kans., November 12, 1884, make the following report of their examination to the Commissioner of Pensions:

"We find left oblique inguinal hernia; opening large enough to admit index finger; varicose veins of both legs from knee down; skin in poor condition; muscles soft and atrophied. In the opinion of the board entitled to a one-half rating for disability caused by hernia."

Since his discharge his neighbors testify to his sufferings and its continuance, and agree that for more than seventeen years past he has been unable to perform one-fourth of a day's manual labor.

A numerously-signed petition of his fellow-citizens testify to his good character and habits, and straitened circumstances, financially.

Your committee therefore recommend that the bill pass.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

INFANT CHILDREN OF MICHAEL A. MORAN.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. PERKINS) was the bill (S. 1037) granting a pension to the infant children of Michael A. Moran.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the names of the infant children of Michael A. Moran, late of Company K, Seventeenth United States Infantry.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Pensions in the Senate, in their report, submitted March 6, 1888, make a very full and complete statement of this case. It shows that this soldier enlisted March 28, 1861, and for over seventeen years served his country faithfully. His death was not directly the result of his service, though it is probable that had he not incurred the disability for which he was pensioned his death would not have occurred at the time and in the manner it did.

Your committee can not believe that there will be any hesitation in placing upon the pension-roll the helpless children of this soldier, and, adopting the report of the Senate committee, recommend the passage of the bill.

SENATE REPORT.

The soldier enlisted March 28, 1861, in Company A, United States Infantry, and was discharged January 22, 1864; re-enlisted January 22, 1864, in Company H, Fourth United States Infantry, and was discharged January 22, 1867; re-enlisted February 7, 1868, and was discharged February 7, 1871, by expiration of term of service as sergeant in Company K, Seventeenth Regiment United States Infantry; re-enlisted in the same organization February 7, 1871, and was discharged February 7, 1876; re-enlisted February 7, 1876, and was discharged April 2, 1878, as a sergeant, on surgeon's certificate of disability on account of varicose veins of left leg and general debility.

At the date of his death the soldier was drawing a pension at the rate of $18 per month.

Application for pension for John Francis, Mary Ann, and Louisa Moran, minor children of the late soldier, was rejected February 1, 1886, on the ground that the cause of the soldier's death originated since his discharge from the service, and is not shown to have been the result of the disease for which he was pensioned or the service.

The petition praying for the granting of pension recites that on the morning of July 23, 1882, soldier was proceeding with his family to church, and owing to the crippled condition of his limbs from varicose veins, he had a chair placed in his wagon in order to rest his limbs, and as the wagon proceeded the chair was upset, throwing soldier out, causing his death the next day, namely, July 24, 1882. Owing to the crippled condition of his limbs from varicose veins aforesaid, having to wear bandages and elastic stockings, it was necessary to have the chair in the wagon. Thus situated he was unable to prevent the fall, which was the approximate cause of his death.

A claim for pension for the minor children, namely, John Francis, born June 16, 1870; Mary Ann, born July 22, 1874, and Louisa Moran, born October 20, 1878, was filed December 28, 1885, and rejected February 1, 1886, on the ground that soldier's death was not due to varicose veins, for which he was pensioned, but to a fall from his wagon.

Dr. D. Frank Etter, of Yankton, Dak., testifies that he was the late soldier's family physician; that said soldier received an injury July 23, 1882, which resulted in his death; that said soldier, prior to his death, was greatly disabled by reason of varicose veins, and that the accident which resulted in soldier's death was due to his crippled and helpless condition.

Hon. Alexander Huges states that owing to the helpless condition of soldier, on account of varicose veins of legs, he was unable to prevent a fall from his wagon, which resulted in his death July 24, 1882; that he was a gallant soldier, and the claim of his minor children for pension ought to be favorably considered by the Government in whose cause soldier served long and faithfully.

Your committee believe this to be a meritorious case, and therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MARY E. WOODWARD.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. MORRILL) was the bill (S. 2167) granting a pension to Mary E. Woodward.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mary E. Woodward, widow of Dr. James B. Woodward, late surgeon of the Tenth Regiment Kansas Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The report of the Pension Committee in the Senate sets forth fully the facts in this case. Just what the connection was between the disability of the soldier and the cause of his death no human power can ever know. The conclusion is irresistible that had it not been for his weakened and debilitated condition his death would not have resulted from the slight accident.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

SENATE REPORT.

Dr. James B. Woodward, husband of petitioner, was surgeon of the Tenth Regiment of Kansas Volunteers, and while in service contracted disease which compelled him to apply for discharge. This was granted on the certificate of the medical director of the St. Louis district, of May 20, 1864, which stated that the applicant was suffering from dyspepsia and general debility of several months' standing; that on account thereof he was unfit for duty, and that discharge from the service was indispensable to his recovery. Dr. Woodward continued an invalid from his discharge to his death; and for three years after leaving the service he was unable to practice his profession or attend to business. Gradually he became strong enough to engage in a limited practice, in course of which, while performing an amputation, he received a slight cut, which produced blood poisoning, and which, in his weakened condition, ended his life.

On application for pension by his widow it was rejected on the ground that the fatal disease was not contracted in the service. That the weak and diseased condition of the system, however, enabled the poison to take deathly hold upon him, is shown by the fact that the two assisting surgeons in the amputation, receiving abrasions also, being healthy men, suffered only with slight sores. It is presumed that if the decedent had died of the simple wasting away of the vital forces, such death might logically have been referred to the "general debility" in which he left the service; but such "debility" having been continuous in a greater or less degree to his death, it is difficult to see that the intervention of a specific disease, which he was too weak to resist, should deprive his widow of the benefit of this original disability.

The committee report by bill granting a pension to petitioner, and recommend its passage.

The bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

THEODORE F. CASAMER.

The next business on the Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. PETERS) was the bill (S. 2157) granting an increase of pension to Theodore F. Casamer.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Theodore F. Casamer, late of Company C, Tenth Michigan Volunteers, and pay him at the rate of $36 per month, in lieu of that which he is now receiving.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2157) granting increase of pension to Theodore F. Casamer, submit the following report:

Your committee, after a careful consideration of the case, adopt the report of the Senate committee, and recommend the passage of the bill.

SENATE REPORT.

Theodore F. Casamer enlisted in Company C, Tenth Regiment Michigan Infantry, in September, 1861; was discharged February 5, 1864, to re-enlist as a veteran, which he did the following day; was shot through the right shoulder joint, shattering the scapula, at Jonesborough, Ga., September 1, 1864; lay in hospitals until June 30, 1865; was pensioned, first at $8 per month, and afterwards by successive increase at $15 and $18, until, under the act of March 3, 1883, it was raised to $24 per month.

The act of August 4, 1886, provides—

"That from and after the passage of this act all persons on the pension-rolls and all persons hereafter granted a pension who, while in the military or naval service of the United States and in the line of duty, * * * shall have lost an arm at or above the elbow or a leg at or above the knee, or been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension of $36 per month."

Under this act the pensioner applied for the increase to $36 per month, and at his request was examined on the 27th April, 1887, by a board of medical examiners, who, after giving a technical description of the nature of the wound, state its results to be—

"Complete anchylosis of shoulder-joint, the arm being close to the side, and bound and held there by adhesion and contraction of tendons inserted into upper part of humerus; complete atrophy of muscles of the shoulder and of the upper third of arm; arm can not be moved out-from side, but can be moved a little backward and forward by the sliding of the scapula; the right elbow is not anchylosed, but he can not completely flex or extend it on account of atrophy of muscles of arm; the muscles of forearm are also largely atrophied; wrist-joint not anchylosed, but flexor tendons on front of wrist and tissues there are contracted on account of a burn on lower part of forearm on its anterior aspect; the little and ring fingers are semi-flexed from the same cause, and the remaining fingers slightly flexed; the muscles of right hand are also atrophied, and movements of fingers are much restricted from above causes; none of finger or thumb joints are anchylosed; there appears to be no loss of sensation in hand or arm; there is almost complete loss of power and great loss of motion in the hand and the entire limb, to the extent that he can make no practical use of either, and in the opinion of the board, as it understands the term, there is total disability of the right hand and of the entire limb."

This testimony, which is official and ample, is supplemented by the evidence of near neighbors and intimate acquaintances, who testify that what the doctors say he is not and ought not to be able to perform as a matter of professional opinion, he does not and can not perform as a matter of fact. It is difficult to conceive a case coming more completely within the plain provisions of the act of August 4, 1886, which grants a pension of $36 a month to the soldier who, within its limitations, "shall have lost an arm at or above the elbow," "or been totally disabled in the same;" and it is still more difficult to conceive the indifference or the audacity of the official who, when the pensioner, having fruitlessly furnished the complete evidence above given, asks the privilege of further examination to substantiate his claims, is denied such privilege in the terms and for the reason following:

"DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, PENSION OFFICE,
"*Washington, D. C., February* 15, 1888.

"SIR: In your pension case above described you are advised that you are not entitled to an examination looking to an increase, as the evidence recently filed (lay) fails to show that you are so disabled by reason of gunshot wound of right shoulder that you can do no manual labor.

"It may be that you can do no manual labor with the wounded arm, but there is no reason given why you can do no work with the other hand and arm.

"Your rating is believed to be correct.

"Very respectfully,

"JOHN C. BLACK, *Commissioner.*

"THEO. F. CASAMER, *Detroit, Mich.*"

In this impertinent communication to this crippled soldier the Commissioner fails to give any reason why he presumes to restrict and render inoperative the plain provision of the law enacted for this soldier's benefit. No justifying reason can be given. The law provides the specific pension for the specific disability, which is fully proven to exist, and so proven by all the official and lay testimony in the case; the Commissioner assumes the prerogative of disregarding the law in its application to a point so clear that it can receive no elucidation by argument or statement of fact; and in thus refusing to give the pensioner the rating to which the law entitles him the Commissioner is guilty of an inexcusable violation of its requirements.

The pensioner is entitled, by virtue of his officially-proved disability, to the pension of $36 per month, as provided in the bill, which is hereby reported favorably and recommended for passage.

Pending the reading of the report,

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, this report, so far as read, indicates why the pension was granted to this soldier, for the loss of an arm, and I ask that its further reading be dispensed with.

Mr. McMILLIN. I think the report had better be read.

The report was read at length.

Mr. CARUTH. Mr. Chairman, I give notice to the gentleman who introduced this bill that I shall demand a quorum upon its passage, in view of the unwarranted attack that report makes upon the Commissioner of Pensions. There are reflections in the report upon a public officer, endeavoring to do his duty to the people and to the country, that I do not think ought to be sanctioned by this House.

Mr. MORRILL. I appreciate the criticism of the gentleman from Kentucky, but want to say this, that it is a Senate report, and that individually I should never have used such language in drawing the report myself.

Mr. CARUTH. But the committee adopted the Senate report, and unless it is withdrawn I shall demand a quorum. Unless the objectionable features of the report shall be stricken out, I do not propose to allow it to go upon the record if I can avoid it, certainly not without my protest.

Mr. NELSON. That report comes from the Senate. It is not a House report, and I am myself sorry for some of the statements embodied in it. This soldier now, although from a Michigan regiment, is a constituent of mine; and it is further a case where he is clearly entitled to the relief asked. Evidently there was a mistake here, but to hold the Commissioner of Pensions responsible for it we all know is unwarranted, because in consequence of the large mass of these letters from that Department, they are necessarily written by clerks, and he can not take time to read them all, although he must bear the responsibility. I would not think for a moment of charging it to him.

Mr. CARUTH. But that report does so.

Mr. NELSON. But I hope this soldier will not be made to suffer for that.

Mr. CARUTH. Let the report be withdrawn.

Mr. MORRILL. I move that the report be not printed in the RECORD.

Mr. CARUTH. But the House committee adopted the report, and as it is I shall object to it.

Mr. WHEELER. It seems to me that it should be recommitted to the committee for a different report.

Mr. MORRILL. I hope, Mr. Chairman, that will not be done. The report can be omitted from the RECORD.

Mr. CARUTH. I shall oppose, and if I can I shall prevent any such report being printed in the RECORD.

Mr. MORRILL. I desire to explain as to this, that the Committee on Invalid Pensions have had all the work that they could possibly do; and when we find a case meritorious and have before us a Senate bill we usually adopt, as in this case, the report of the Senate.

Mr. CARUTH. I regard this as a gratuitous insult to a faithful officer of the Government; and as long as I can help it I do not propose to allow any such charge to go uncontradicted.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that the bill be laid aside to be reported to the House with a favorable recommendation, and that the report be not printed in the RECORD.

Mr. FORD. I presume the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH] does not want to punish this man because the Senate committee have made this comment upon the letter from the Pension Office.

Mr. McMILLIN. It occurs to me the gentleman from Kentucky can obtain the relief he wants by agreeing that the bill shall be recommitted and shall not lose its place on the Calendar when reported back.

Mr. MORRILL. That postpones the bill for a week.

Mr. CARUTH. I do not care if it should be postponed for a week or forever.

Mr. McMILLIN. I made that suggestion with the view of compromising this matter. If you act favorably upon the report you concede that the report is correct. Although you keep it from being printed in the RECORD, yet you found your legislative action upon it. I make the suggestion I have submitted as a means by which the case can be prevented from losing its place on the Calendar, and will be sure to be considered this session.

Mr. NELSON. I think this is standing upon a technicality. I think this soldier should not suffer because some gentlemen have seen fit to criticise a Democratic office-holder. If the gentleman is to be so technical as that, we might as well be technical in other directions. We have submitted a fair proposition to let this bill pass and not have the report printed in the RECORD. If that is not sufficient, I want to know why. I do not want this soldier to be punished because some gentleman thinks there is something here that might possibly reflect upon the Commissioner of Pensions.

Mr. CARUTH. We are asked to pass an act pensioning this soldier. On what ground? On the ground that the Commissioner of Pensions of the United States was false and derelict in the discharge of his duty. That is the record we are asked to make in this Congress as against this officer, whose record would defy any such charge as that. While I do not want to punish any soldier, and while the House will bear me witness that I have voted as cheerfully for pensions as any man on either side, still I do not propose to reward this man at the expense of a faithful officer of the Government. I therefore move that this case be laid aside with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. LAFFOON. The case not losing its place on the Calendar.

Mr. CARUTH. Yes.

Mr. HUNTER. Without unanimous consent the case must lose its place on the Calendar if recommitted.

Mr. RYAN. If the gentleman from Kentucky insists on recommitting the bill it seems to me he does not accomplish anything about not having the report printed in the RECORD. The report has been read, and unless we agree by unanimous consent it must go into the RECORD and becomes a part of the record of the proceedings of this House. That can be avoided by gentlemen agreeing to let the bill pass. The course the gentleman from Kentucky is pursuing necessarily gets the matter into the RECORD, and it does an injury to an innocent person, the beneficiary of the bill.

Mr. CARUTH. I submit this proposition: The Committee on Invalid Pensions of this House have submitted this report, which has been read, and which comes before the House as the action of the entire committee. There is no minority report. Upon that report we are asked to found this legislation.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask leave by unanimous consent to withdraw that report. Then I will ask permission to make a statement of the case and will ask the Committee of the Whole to pass the bill on that statement.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I wish to say I never joined in a report censuring the Commissioner of Pensions. Still, I hope the beneficiary of this bill will have a favorable report, and I am glad the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] has proposed to withdraw the report.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the report and to be permitted to make a statement of the case.

Mr. TAULBEE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas——

Mr. CHIPMAN. He has withdrawn the report.

Mr. TAULBEE. That is still pending. I would like to ask the gentleman from Kansas a question. I see it stated in the report that the disability for which this soldier has been pensioned entitles him by the examination of the medical board of the office to $24 per month, and he seems to be now rated on the pension-roll at $24 per month. The bill proposes to give him $36 a month.

Now, the question I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas is whether or not, according to the report of this medical board, $24 a month is not all that this man is entitled to under the law.

Mr. MORRILL. Strictly speaking, that is all that the Pension Office can give him; but I explained once before to the gentleman from Kentucky that the act of August 4, 1886, fails to provide for an equivalent rating. No provision is made by that act for a rating for wounds that are equivalent to the amputation of an arm.

Mr. CARUTH. And yet you blame the Commissioner for doing what he was compelled by the law to do.

Mr. MORRILL. I do not blame him at all.

Mr. CARUTH. Well, it is in the report.

Mr. TAULBEE. Mr. Chairman, the facts stated by the gentleman

from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] are correct. He and I had to do with the passage of that law, or with the action of the Committee on Invalid Pensions with reference to it, and I think he will agree with me that its failure to provide for an equivalent disability to the loss of an arm was due more to an oversight on the part of the committee than to anything else.

Mr. MORRILL. I think you are right about that.

Mr. TAULBEE. The gentleman will agree with me also that the passage of special acts giving a rating for disabilities equivalent to the loss of an arm has been frequent in this House. Now there is one feature in this case to which I invite attention in connection with statements of the committee in the Senate report based upon the letter of the Commissioner of Pensions which that report presumes to criticise. The point to which I invite attention is that this letter of the Commissioner of Pensions is in perfect keeping with the law, because there was no law authorizing him to give a rating for a disability equivalent to the loss of an arm. Hence the criticism in this report is unfounded.

Mr. MORRILL. Entirely so. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. TAULBEE. And I think the statement of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] is correct in his statement as to the adoption of the Senate report, a practice which I know to have been common in the committee in the Forty-ninth Congress without a close and rigid scrutiny of its language. I think the committee inadvertently adopted that Senate report, which contained a reflection upon the Commissioner of Pensions, and so far as I am concerned I am perfectly willing that permission shall be given for the withdrawal of that part of the report, and that this bill shall be considered upon its merits; but I would not be willing to take action based upon a report like that criticising the Commissioner of Pensions discourteously and wrongfully, when he did all that he could under the law, especially as I feel that I am as responsible as anybody else for the failure of that law to provide for a proper rating of this pensioner.

I am willing to take my part of that responsibility, but I am unwilling to give any sort of sanction to such criticism as that contained in the Senate report (which has now become a House report) upon an officer who has discharged his whole duty. Therefore, sir, I hope the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] will be granted, that the committee will be allowed to withdraw the report, and that we shall act upon the facts as they appear in the case.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I hope the report in this case will be withdrawn, and the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH] adopted. I think that is the sense of the committee.

Mr. NELSON. To recommit the bill? I object to that.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think we do justice to this report in speaking of it as a criticism of the Commissioner. It is a direct insult to one of the highest officers of the Government. I do not know, nor do I care, what Senator prepared the report. I am as anxious to see this claimant receive what the committee seem to think is due him and what I believe this House feels is due him, and I do not see any necessity for any great delay in granting it. We can agree that when the committee rises to-night this bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back by them this evening, and acted upon by the House this evening. By adopting that course there will be no necessity for any postponement, or any risk as to the case losing its place upon the Calendar, and at the same time we shall avoid giving any countenance to this report.

Mr. MONTGOMERY. I have no feeling about this matter so far as this pension is concerned; but I think a more serious question is involved than the simple question of a few days' or a few weeks' delay in considering his case. That this report ought to go back to the committee seems to be conceded upon all hands. That the criticism contained in the report is discourteous, improper, not justified by the circumstances connected with the case is admitted on all sides, and, Mr. Chairman, it is due to other pensioners having claims pending that such a report as this be not permitted to come into this House to prejudice other pension claimants.

If this report stands—if the committee or any member insists on the report standing without being referred back to the committee and their judgment returned that they do not approve of this unjustifiable censure of the Commissioner of Pensions—it will certainly have a tendency to prejudice the cases of other pensioners whose claims ought not to be prejudiced in that way in this House. That this report has gotten in here through inadvertence is, I think, manifest. In justice to ourselves, to the Commissioner, to the pensioner, and all other pensioners who are seeking to get bills through here, I think it proper that the report be recommitted, and that the committee not only refuse to adopt the Senate report, but actually censure a report which is so utterly without justification in the facts of the case.

Mr. CARUTH. Mr. Chairman, I think there ought not to be any difficulty in this matter. Every member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions who has spoken here to-night agrees that the criticism passed upon the Commissioner of Pensions in this report of the Senate committee is unjust; that it inflicts a gratuitous insult and a great wrong upon a faithful public officer. The acting chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions [Mr. CHIPMAN] agrees with me that this case ought to go back to the committee and that a new report should be made.

I do not want to delay the granting of the pension to this applicant. I want to treat him fairly; I do not want him condemned for what is the fault of somebody else. But I do want all this obnoxious matter to be expunged from this record. I do want the Commissioner of Pensions set right before the American people. I do not want the House to adopt any legislation based upon a report which embraces an allegation that an officer whom we all know to be faithful in the discharge of his duty has neglected that duty.

I do not care how soon this matter may come up; but I shall certainly insist that the case be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, so that this report of the Senate committee may receive the disapproval which it deserves.

Mr. WHEELER. The Committee of the Whole might rise now; the House might at once recommit the bill; and it might be reported back in a few moments.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, to insist on recommitting this bill is, as I have already suggested, standing too much on ceremony. It is doing injustice to the claims of a soldier in order to gratify a bit of sentiment in respect to the Commissioner of Pensions. I think this soldier should not be made to suffer in that way. While the Commissioner was undoubtedly right in this matter as a matter of law, I ask gentlemen to read the letter and say whether there is not in it something that treats this applicant for a pension in a cavalier manner.

Mr. TAULBEE. The gentleman from Minnesota should bear in mind what he is doubtless well aware of—that it would be utterly impossible for the Commissioner of Pensions to read all the letters that issue from his office over his signature.

Mr. MORRILL. He can not even sign them all.

Mr. TAULBEE. As the gentleman suggests, the Commissioner can not even sign with his own hand all such letters, much less read them.

Mr. NELSON. I have already conceded that the Commissioner is not to be blamed personally in this matter.

Mr. TAULBEE. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the additional fact that in nine cases out of ten these letters are prepared and examined by persons who are not in sympathy politically with the Commissioner of Pensions. Is that true or is it not?

Mr. CHEADLE. I think it is not true. I believe the clerks immediately about him are men of his own party.

Mr. TAULBEE. But it should be remembered that the clerks immediately about him in the Pension Office are not the persons who prepare and examine these letters; possibly they never see them.

Mr. NELSON. Assuming that these letters are written by Republican or "hold-over clerks" who were connected with the last administration—assuming that to be true, why all this "fuss and feathers" about this matter?

Mr. TAULBEE. Because the Senate has brought this question up. I know of no person in sympathy politically with the Commissioner of Pensions who has been instrumental in the agitation of this question. We simply propose to stand by the proper administration of the Pension Office; and if blame is to be attached to anybody in consequence of the phrascology of that letter, let the blame rest where it ought to rest.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] insist on his right to the floor?

Mr. NELSON. I insist on my right to the floor; but I am perfectly willing to yield to any gentleman for any question or statement. I simply insist on behalf of this Union soldier that after the committee has agreed to withdraw this report, his case ought to go on.

Mr. CARUTH. What right has the committee or any member of the committee to withdraw this report without the unanimous consent of the House? Will it not go into the permanent record as the report of the House committee?

Mr. MORRILL. Oh, no; not if unanimously withdrawn.

Mr. CARUTH. No individual member has a right to withdraw it.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH] is so terribly anxious to make a fight upon a Union soldier, here is an old soldier who is ready for him. [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, I quote from the act of August 4, 1886, as cited in the report:

> That from and after the passage of this act all persons on the pension-rolls and all persons hereafter granted a pension, who, while in the military or naval service of the United States, and in the line of duty * * * shall have lost an arm at or above the elbow, or a leg at or above the knee, or been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension of $36 per month.

That is the law as quoted in this report. Now, here is this letter of the Commissioner; and I want to call attention to its phraseology. While as a matter of law perhaps the Commissioner may be technically right, I say that the tone of this letter addressed to an old soldier seeking an increase of pension is, to say the least, discourteous.

Mr. CARUTH. Does the gentleman say that the Commissioner himself wrote that letter?

Mr. NELSON. Well, if it was written by a clerk without his knowledge, why all this fuss? If, on the other hand, the letter was written by the Commissioner, I say that he in his high position, drawing a pension of $100 a month and a salary of $5,000 a year, has no right to address a wounded Union soldier in this manner.

I want to read from this letter what is an insult to this old soldier, and it can not be got rid of by raising this tempest in a teapot. [Laughter and applause.]

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, PENSION OFFICE,
Washington, D. C., February 15, 1888.

SIR: In your pension case above described you are advised that you are not entitled to an examination looking to an increase, as the evidence recently filed fails to show that you are so disabled by reason of gunshot wound of right shoulder that you can do no manual labor.

It may be that you can do no manual labor with the wounded arm, but there is no reason given why you can do no work with the other hand and arm.

If he can do no manual labor with the wounded arm, that is the language of the law and that is the spirit of the law. The spirit of the law was that if a man is disabled in one arm, or disabled to an extent equivalent to that, he is entitled to $36 a month. Yet this Commissioner writes to this old soldier that it may be he can not do any manual labor with the wounded arm, although he may be disabled from doing duty by using that arm, nevertheless it does not follow he is not able to do something with the other arm; and for that reason he would not grant him the humble privilege of going before an examining board. Is that your idea of courtesy? It is not mine. It is an insult on the part of the Commissioner to this old soldier which he had no right to indulge in.

Mr. CARUTH. Is that an insult for the Commissioner to say if you can not work with one arm you may be able to work with the other?

Mr. NELSON. It may not be from one equal to another, but for a man occupying the high position of Commissioner to use such language and to assign such reason for not granting the poor privilege to this old soldier of going before an examining board, it is an insult. It is not proper nor just for the Commissioner to indulge in any such tone.

Mr. CARUTH. Is it an insult to say he may be able to work with the other arm?

Mr. NELSON. If the gentleman wants to know it, I will say that if the Commissioner should address me as a private soldier in that way, if I were an applicant and had lost one arm, or was disabled in one arm in the late war, and he should tell me, "Mr. NELSON, you may be disabled in your left arm, but there is no evidence you can not do manual labor with your right arm, and therefore I will not allow you to go before the examining board," by heavens and the eternal God I should consider it an insult, and should answer it as it deserves. [Applause.] Are you satisfied? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. CONGER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. ADAMS. I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Which one?

Mr. NELSON. I will yield to one or both.

Mr. CONGER. I desire to call your attention to the last lines of the report of the examination made by the Commissioner's own board——

Mr. ADAMS. That was my object.

Mr. CONGER. In which they say—

There appears to be no loss of sensation in hand or arm; there is almost complete loss of power, and great loss of motion, in the hand and the entire limb, to the extent that he can make no practical use of either, and in the opinion of the board, as it understands the term, there is total disability of the right hand and of the entire limb.

As the report of the committee states:

It is difficult to conceive a case coming more completely within the plain provisions of the act of August 4, 1886, which grants a pension of $36 a month to the soldier who, within its limitations, "shall have lost an arm at or above the elbow," "or been totally disabled in the same."

Take the law which gives a pension for an arm totally disabled; take this report of the examining board, made to the Commissioner, and it will be seen that he has not followed the law. No man can read the law and take that statement of the examining board and say that the Commissioner has followed the law.

Mr. NELSON. The gentleman is correct and I am immensely obliged to him. I feel like a man at camp-meeting. We read in the Holy Writ of how pious men were carried away by their emotions, and can it be expected, then, that we poor mortals in the Fiftieth Congress should not occasionally get excited?

The gentleman from Kentucky standing in the face of this law, standing in the face of the facts in this case, merely because the Senate committee saw fit to criticise in their report the action of the Commissioner in view of his action in going contrary to the report of the examining board, and in this matter there is no doubt the conduct of the Commissioner was susceptible of criticism on this account, I say the gentleman from Kentucky opposed the request of the gentleman from Kansas to withdraw this report.

Mr. TAULBEE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. NELSON. Certainly.

Mr. TAULBEE. Do you not know the letter of the Commissioner of Pensions as to the rating which he asks in the Pension Office, that the Commissioner's decision as quoted in the letter read was not based on the report of the examining board of that office, but is in perfect consistency with the rules of that office, the testimony being "lay" in its nature, which word the gentleman from Minnesota did not read, but which he pretended to read to the House; that because it was "lay" in its nature the re-examination was unauthorized under the rules adopted and carried out for many years in the Pension Office? I wish the gentleman in answering that would state why he omitted to read that portion of the report and attempted to create the impression upon the committee that the letter of the Commissioner of Pensions was based on the certificate of the examining board in the Pension Office.

Mr. NELSON. I yield now so much time as he may want to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CHEADLE].

Mr. CHEADLE. I shall only want two or three minutes.

Mr. TAULBEE. I would like first to hear an explanation of the gentleman as to why he left out a portion of that report.

Mr. NELSON. I want to answer the gentleman from Kentucky this: In the first place, the whole report has been read, and I did not undertake to read the whole report myself, but only to call attention to the substance of it, to which I wished to address my remarks. The report is already public property and before the House. In the next place, the private pension bills are passed here upon the theory that because of some technicality, because of some lapse in the law, or some missing link in the chain of evidence necessary to complete the claim it can not come within the strict meaning of the law, and hence the applicant must apply before this forum for relief; and if there ever was a case where the applicant should come and fairly ask relief, with the belief that it would be granted, this is just such a case.

Mr. TAULBEE. Now will the gentleman indulge me for a moment?

Mr. NELSON. For a question; but if the gentleman wants to make a speech he must take his own time.

Mr. TAULBEE. Very well; I will take my own time.

Mr. NELSON. If the gentleman wants simply to ask a question I do not object.

Mr. TAULBEE. I wanted to ask a question which the gentleman might construe as a speech, for it is in part a reiteration of my former question slightly enlarged.

Mr. NELSON. Very well; I shall be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TAULBEE. I wish to say that it is not competent for the gentleman from Minnesota to answer my interrogatory by saying that he did not read all of the report. He left out in the reading a part of that report, and a very essential part—one word, and one word only; but which word singularly enough absolutely changes the entire meaning of the letter in which it is embodied, and hence affects the whole report. Now I ask the gentleman the reason for that omission; and he attempts to evade the question by saying that the report is public property.

Mr. CHEADLE. Will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. CHEADLE. Mr. Chairman, I think there is enough in this case for us not to lose our temper and get out of humor in regard to it; and I want to say in the spirit of the greatest charity to the gentleman from Kentucky that the answer to the question submitted by him to the gentleman from Minnesota is contained in the report itself.

This man was examined, as the report shows, for an increase of his pension by the board of medical examiners; and the report was made by the board of the Pension Department, which is embodied in the committee's report also; and notwithstanding the fact that this report of the medical board states that there is a total disability of the right hand and of the entire limb, no increase was granted to the pensioner, and then subsequently——

Mr. TAULBEE. I do not presume the gentleman wants to be misunderstood by the committee, or to misunderstand the facts of the case himself. If he will reread the report he will find that the Commissioner of Pensions denies the claim for an examination which the pensioner seeks because the lay evidence filed in support of it does not show the disabled condition claimed, and on that very letter denying the examination the Senate committee makes the criticism of which complaint is made.

How can it be that the criticism is just when the examination has been had, and the report of that board is final, and the Commissioner acts upon it? If, then, the gentleman will examine again he will find that the examination is one that was had prior to the writing of the letter and upon which the Commissioner acted; and the purpose of that letter is to deny the examination, which the rules of the Pension Office and the circumstances did not justify or warrant.

Mr. CHEADLE. Let me say this to the gentleman from Kentucky, that he will find on an examination of this report that the act under which this man is pensioned is set forth in the report, and provides that any person on the pension-rolls, or person hereafter granted a pension, who was in the military or naval service and in the line of duty, and who, in the language of the law—

shall have lost an arm at or above the elbow, or leg at or above the knee, or have been totally disabled in the same, shall receive a pension of $36 per month.

Now on the 27th day of April, 1887, a medical board of the Pension Department submitted a report, which it is not necessary to read in full, but the conclusion is in the following words:

There is almost complete loss of power, and great loss of motion, in the hand and the entire limb, to the extent that he can make no practical use of either, and in the opinion of the board, as it understands the term, there is total disability of the right hand and of the entire limb.

Subsequently thereto, when this increase was not granted, it is true the petitioner submitted lay evidence; but the point the committee of the Senate make is that under the finding and the report made by the medical board of the Pension Department there would be no question of fact that the pensioner is entitled to the rating of $36 a month, and because of the fact that on the 15th day of February, 1888, that is after the medical board of the Pension Department found he was totally disabled in the arm, and notwithstanding that there had been filed other lay evidence that he was totally disabled in the arm, and still the increase was refused, then this letter referred to here was written, and it was because of that fact that the report was couched in this language.

Mr. Chairman, I am very free to admit that there is not full and proper courtesy of expression in the report, such as there should be, and yet I want to state the fact that there is perfect heartlessness in the ratings of pensions under the law.

Mr. TAULBEE. I agree with you.

Mr. CHIPMAN. And I agree with you.

Mr. CHEADLE. And I say that it is only just that the attention of the country should be called to the fact that there is a perfect and utter disregard of the ratings under the law.

Mr. STRUBLE. Where do you locate the heartlessness?

Mr. CHEADLE. In the fact that when the medical board says a man is totally disabled, I say to this committee and the country that there ought to be but one thing for the Department to do, and that is to obey the law. When it does not, it is open to the criticism I have made.

Mr. STRUBLE. Where does the responsibility lie?

Mr. CHEADLE. It lies in the Pension Department. I want to say a word more.

Mr. CHIPMAN. Will the gentleman allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. CHEADLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I agree with the gentleman there is heartlessness; but in my judgment the heartlessness is in the law.

Mr. CHEADLE. It is not always in the law; it is in the utter disregard of the law. The Commissioner of Pensions himself draws a pension of $100 a month for physical disability, and in addition thereto this House accorded him a salary of $1,000 a year more than was authorized by law. The officers of a government by the people and for the people ought to be at least liberal in their construction of the laws of the land.

There are one hundred thousand pensioners of the number who are on the rolls to-day, as my colleague stated the other day, rated at from 3½ cents to 13 cents a day. This is a land flowing with milk and honey, and its Treasury is groaning beneath its weight of gold and silver, and the laws of the land, if liberally and faithfully construed, would have given this applicant $36 a month and kept this case out of the House.

Mr. TAULBEE. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. CHEADLE. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAULBEE. Of these one hundred thousand volunteers of whose rating the gentleman complains, I would be glad to have him state——

Mr. NELSON. I wish to interrupt this discussion.

Mr. TAULBEE. I desire to ask just one question.

Mr. NELSON. I understand the gentleman from Kentucky intends to make the point of no quorum on this bill.

Mr. TAULBEE. Not I.

Mr. NELSON. I mean the gentleman's colleague [Mr. CARUTH].

Mr. CARUTH. I say so long as we have this report, with these reflections upon a public officer, I do not propose to allow this bill to pass without my protest.

Mr. NELSON. Does the gentleman intend to insist upon a quorum?

Mr. CARUTH. I say that without a quorum it shall not pass.

Mr. NELSON. Do you mean to call a quorum?

Mr. CARUTH. I do.

Mr. NELSON. Under those circumstances, as there are other soldiers whose cases are on the Calendar and other gentlemen who have bills for soldiers which they desire to have passed upon, I am unwilling to stand in the way of those soldiers.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to me for a moment?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CANNON. I wish to say that I do not think the dignity of the Commissioner of Pensions if he were here present and could speak would demand the call of a quorum as against the sense of the House or the call of a quorum as against the sense of a majority of the members present. I do not think he would consider that necessary to vindicate his dignity.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Will the gentleman from Minnesota yield to me for a moment?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORD. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FORD. What s the regular order?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota has the floor and is entitled to yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I rise for the purpose of suggesting if the gentleman will agree to recommit this bill——

Mr. NELSON. That suggestion has been made before.

Mr. ADAMS. I ask the gentleman from Minnesota to yield to me.

Mr. NELSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois five minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. When I read in the report the letter of the Commissioner I was struck by the word "lay," which I did not entirely understand at the time. I turned to the report and was informed that that expression referred to the testimony of neighbors and friends. But I wish the gentleman from Kentucky would take notice that the board of medical examiners had given the decision that this case came within the law; and in this report it is stated that this testimony, which is sufficient and ample, is supplemented by the evidence of mere neighbors and friends. To my mind the case comes very clearly within the law.

I object to a withdrawal of the report or a withdrawal of the bill. I do think we ought to guard ourselves against admitting the principle that a committee of either House of Congress has not the right to criticise an executive officer for a plain mistake or neglect of duty.

There is no question that the board of examiners did bring the case within the law. There is no question, in my mind, that when the Commissioner used that word "lay," intimating that the evidence was not the evidence of the medical board, as I understand it, he did overlook what had taken place in his office. There is no question, in my mind, therefore, that he is in some form and in some phrase amenable to criticism by either House of Congress that first takes cognizance of his action.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Will the gentleman permit me——

Mr. ADAMS. Allow me to finish this point. The only question is, whether we shall, by our action, admit the theory that the House of Representatives or the other legislative body of Congress ought not to notice a clear dereliction of duty on the part of an executive officer. I am willing to admit there should be a certain decorum of language in all such criticisms, but that it should not be criticised and severely criticised, I shall never admit.

Mr. WASHINGTON. The gentleman says he thinks the House ought to reserve the right to criticise a public officer, and so do I; but does the gentleman think this fair criticism: "This impertinent communication?" Does the gentleman think that is fair and parliamentary criticism when applied to the chief of any division?

Mr. ADAMS. Let me call the gentleman's attention to the language which appears previous to that in the report, and I did not learn from the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH] which particular phrase he objected to.

The committee criticised the Commissioner in this way:

> It is difficult to conceive a case coming more completely within the pla'n provisions of the act of August 4, 1886, which grants a pension of $36 a month to the soldier who, within its limitations, "shall have lost an arm at or above the elbow," "or been totally disabled in the same;" and it is still more difficult to conceive the indifference or the audacity of the official who, when the pensioner, having fruitlessly furnished the complete evidence above given, asks the privilege of further examination to substantiate his claims, is denied such privilege in the terms and for the reason following.

Now, I will admit that there should be a certain degree of decorum in all such matters, but I have not been informed either by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH], or anybody else, exactly what rules should be used in a report of Congress criticising an executive officer.

Mr. TAULBEE. Is it not a fact that if, as you have stated, the medical board——

Mr. ADAMS. I have stated my impression. I have not pretended to perfect knowledge of the subject.

Mr. TAULBEE. If it is true that the medical board of the Pension Office has rated this claimant at $36 per month, is it not a fact that even though the Commissioner of Pensions should refuse to place him on the roll at that rate, it is perfectly competent for the claimant to appeal to the Secretary of the Interior, whose duty it then becomes to take such jurisdiction of the matter on appeal as the Commissioner of Pensions originally had? And is it not true that that remedy has never been sought by this claimant?

Mr. ADAMS. Will the gentleman answer a question in his turn?

Mr. TAULBEE. If I can; but ask me an easy one. [Laughter.]

Mr. ADAMS. Admitting that it is the right of the claimant to appeal, and even that in one sense it is his duty to appeal, yet if the medical board did bring his case clearly within the law, and the Commissioner of Pensions in his letter to the claimant clearly ignored that ruling, is not the Commissioner subject to criticism in some form? And does the fact that the soldier has the right to appeal take away from a committee of Congress the right to criticise the Commissioner?

Mr. TAULBEE. I will answer that question by stating——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS] has expired.

Mr. NELSON. I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. TAULBEE. I wish the gentleman would yield to me to answer the question of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. NELSON. I have not the time. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] to make a request, and then we will end this discussion.

Mr. TAULBEE. I would like to answer the question of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS], but, not having the time, I of course submit to the rule.

Mr. MORRILL. It is very evident, Mr. Chairman, that we are wasting valuable time in this discussion and that we are accomplishing no good either for the soldiers of the country or for the Commissioner of Pensions. The request I desire to make is for unanimous consent that this report shall not be printed in the RECORD, and that all of this discussion which has taken place in regard to it shall also be withheld, so as to leave the matter as if the report had not been made, and then that the bill shall be considered upon a brief statement of the case which I will make. I think that ought to be satisfactory to all parties. It will let us out of this dilemma and let us go on with the regular business of the evening.

Mr. NELSON. Does the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH] agree to that?

Mr. CARUTH. No, sir.

Mr. MORRILL. Why not? It is better for all concerned.

Mr. CARUTH. I will tell you why. This report is the report of a committee of this House. I will state what I want in this case and what I propose to stand by, not only now, but hereafter when the case comes up for consideration. That is that there shall be a report from the Committee on Invalid Pensions of this House withdrawing the language of this report, which I consider to be an insult to the Commissioner of Pensions. So long as that language remains unwithdrawn so long shall I fight this case.

Mr. MORRILL. Then I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the report.

Mr. CARUTH. The gentleman can take a vote of the Committee on Invalid Pensions and bring in a proper report here and I will not object to the passage of this soldier's claim.

Mr. MORRILL. That seems to be standing on a technicality.

Mr. CARUTH. It is not standing on a technicality. It is standing on right and on justice to a distinguished and faithful public officer.

Mr. NELSON. I yield one minute to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON. I want to see whether I understand this case. I gather the facts to be that it is admitted upon all hands that it is the case of a soldier of the late war, honorably discharged and under the law probably, and in God's chancery actually, entitled to the relief proposed to be given by this bill.

Mr. CARUTH. If the gentleman will excuse me, I do not admit that proposition. I would like to have the record examined.

Mr. CANNON. I understand that it has been examined.

I understood it to be admitted, and it is so claimed on this side. But the gentleman says that this case shall not pass until some language in a report which he thinks reflects upon the dignity of the Commissioner of Pensions is modified by the committee. In the mean time the merits of the case are thrown aside and the soldier, who is entitled to this relief and to whom but for this criticism the relief would be granted, goes without the relief. If the gentleman wants to insist on that position, well and good.

Mr. NELSON. I am unwilling, Mr. Chairman, to take up further the time of the committee, so I move——

The CHAIRMAN. There is a motion pending.

Mr. NELSON. What is it?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH] will please state his motion.

Mr. CARUTH. My motion is that this bill be laid aside, to be reported to the House with a recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, not to lose its place on the Calendar.

Mr. NELSON. I object. That report, for the gentleman's satisfaction, will be printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield the floor?

Mr. NELSON. I withdraw the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The bill is properly before the Committee of the Whole under the order.

Mr. CHIPMAN. The gentleman can not withdraw the bill; he is not on the committee.

Mr. NELSON. I then call the attention of the gentleman and the Chair to the fact that the motion to recommit is not debatable.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is in error. The motion is that the bill be laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. WHEELER addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Minnesota yield the floor?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, I yield the floor.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] does great injustice to the gentlemen on this side of the House when he intimates—I might say asserts—that we are unwilling to pass the bill which allows a pension to the soldier whose case is now being considered.

The gentleman will remember that when it became apparent that the dignity of the House demanded that the improper language should be eliminated before action was had upon the report I urged that the committee should immediately rise and report the bill to the House with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, coupled with the request that said committee should immediately report it back, and that the bill should not lose its place on the Calendar.

I also called attention to the fact that a quorum of that Committee on Invalid Pensions was present, and they could make the report almost instantly, so that scarcely a minute would be occupied in the entire proceedings, and the bill could have been passed in half the time which has been consumed by the speech which he has made, and in which he will admit he has indulged in reflections from which he might with great propriety have abstained. But as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] and other gentlemen have spoken on the bill—some insisting that the language in the report was entirely proper, some endeavoring to justify the objectionable wording of the report, and some having gone out of their way to criticise the distinguished soldier, General Black, who for three years has efficiently discharged the duties of Commissioner of Pensions—it has become necessary for us to examine the facts and circumstances which have brought about this unfortunate episode.

It seems to be admitted that the letter to the claimant was written by a clerk who is not in political sympathy with the Commissioner, General Black; that this letter, together with thousands of others, were placed before another clerk who with a stamp affixed General Black's name thereto, and that General Black never did, and in the nature of things, never could have seen the letter.

I presume every member of Congress knows that it is impossible for the Commissioner of Pensions to give his personal attention to this class of correspondence. To show the utter impossibility of the Commissioner signing these letters, I will state that I am informed that from 3,000 to 8,000 such communications leave the Pension Office every day.

Now, with these well-known and well-established facts before us, we are confronted with a report which sets out the letter to the claimant so as to convey the impression that the letter was written by and signed by the Commissioner in person, and that the verbiage was the language of his choice.

The report shows upon its face that the House committee adopted the Senate report, and the acting chairman, the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHIPMAN], states that the objectionable language escaped the attention of the members of his committee, and he asks that the report be recommitted, so that a proper report may be prepared and submitted to the House. This is all that any man on his side of the House demands, and they will lend all possible aid in hastening this action.

Could any one ask us to do more for the pensioner, and would it be proper for us to do less than that to preserve the dignity of this House? Ought the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CHIPMAN] do less than he proposes in preserving the dignity of his committee?

What is the language which some gentlemen call "mere criticism?" No one can deny but that the gentleman who is responsible for the report knew that, under all the circumstances of the case, General Black never could have seen the letter, and yet, immediately following the letter purporting to be signed by General Black, he proceeds to characterize it in these words:

> In this impertinent communication to this crippled soldier.

Will any gentleman say that such language is in keeping with the decorum which should govern Congress in referring to the action of prominent officials?

He then says:

> The Commissioner fails to give any reason why he presumes to restrict and render inoperative the plain provision of the law enacted for this soldier's benefit.

The report then proceeds to say that—

> No justifying reason can be given.

In other words, without any grounds or any evidence to justify it, he makes a grave charge against the official integrity of the Commissioner.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order. What is the question before the committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The question pending is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH] to lay the bill aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Does the Chair entertain debate on that proposition?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that debate is in order.

Mr. WHEELER. It is stated by the acting chairman of the Committee on Invalid Pensions [Mr. CHIPMAN] that that report was adopted inadvertently, and he asks permission to have the report recommitted, because it is due to the dignity of the Commissioner and the dignity of this House that it be done.

Some gentlemen say there is nothing impertinent in this report made by a Republican committee of the Senate.

Mr. LIND. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, sir.

Mr. LIND. Is it not a fact that the chiefs of division in the Pension Office are in harmony with the Administration?

Mr. TAULBEE. No, sir.

Mr. WHEELER. Some are and some are not. It is stated and admitted by many gentlemen who are better informed of the facts than I am—and I am pretty well informed—that the clerks in the Pension Office who prepare these letters are very few of them in harmony politically with the Commissioner of Pensions. This case comes from what is called the middle division. I am told that all the clerks and all the chiefs of sections in that division belong to a political party not in harmony with the administration.

Mr. LIND. Is it not a rule in all the Departments that every letter written by an inferior clerk is read and approved by the chief of the division, and his initials marked in the corner of the letter before it is allowed to be placed before the head of the Department for his signature?

Mr. WHEELER. That may be the fact with regard to other Departments, but the gentleman knows that Commissioner Black has done more business since his accession to this office than any Commissioner who ever preceded him, and, besides, I am informed that the chief of the middle division also belongs to a party not in harmony with the administration.

Mr. LIND. That does not answer my question.

Mr. WHEELER. He has granted more pensions and done more for the soldiers than any Commissioner who ever held the office. The reports show that he has allowed some 56,000 more pension claims since he has been in office than any of his predecessors allowed in the same length of time.

Would gentlemen have a Commissioner who has supervised and directed this phenomenal amount of work forced to read and sign his name to each one of the thousands of letters sent out from his office every day?

Now, I say placing such a letter as that in a report coming before this House as though written by himself, and then criticising it as it has been criticised, is neither right nor proper to this officer; nor is it in harmony with the dignity and decorum of the House of Representatives.

But to return to the objectionable language of the report. After stating what the maker of the report asserts the law to be, it proceeds in these words:

> The Commissioner assumes the prerogative of disregarding the law in its application to a point so clear that it can receive no elucidation by argument or statement of fact; and in thus refusing to give the pensioner the rating to which the law entitles him the Commissioner is guilty of an inexcusable violation of its requirements.

This is a direct and unequivocal allegation that "the Commissioner has been guilty of an inexcusable violation of the requirements of the law." That is a direct charge against one of the highest officers of the Government that he has been guilty of an offense which is characterized as an inexcusable violation of the law.

Some gentlemen say it will obviate all objections if it be stricken out; but this has gone on the records of the House, and it can not be stricken out. It is a report coming from the Committee on Invalid Pensions. All the House asks is that the reports which are submitted to it for its action shall be proper, dignified, and worthy of the House of Representatives. That is all this House asks. They will be glad to be able to give the crippled soldier his pension, but it must be done in a regular and proper way.

Mr. NELSON. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. Does the gentleman from Alabama propose to allow the dignity of this Democratic official at the head of the Pension Office to stand between the gratitude of the people of the United States and this crippled soldier?

Mr. WHEELER. No, sir; and no one here proposes to do so.

Mr. NELSON. Is he above criticism? Is he the sacred white elephant? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WHEELER. No, he is not above criticism. He is not above censure, nor does he desire to be so considered; but it is neither right nor proper nor just to him or to this House that such imputations as deface this report should be indulged in against him. To allow any such report to remain upon record would be a dereliction of duty on our part. For one I would not consent to it.

Mr. NELSON. But we will not consent to the old Union soldiers of the country being rebuked in the way they have been attempted to be in this matter.

Mr. WHEELER. The gentleman knows that in making the statement he does the gentlemen on this side of the House very great injustice. He is fully aware of the fact that those on this side of the House in sympathy with the Commissioner would be glad to pass this bill. All they ask is to have the matter presented in the regular and proper way. We do not want a report to be brought in this House containing charges which are equally uncalled for and unjust.

That is all we ask, that this officer shall not be insulted in this manner. If necessary I will move the committee rise so that the report may be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, so that the matter may be again reported to the House and we can pass the bill to-night. When the committee rises and we get into the House we can recommit this matter to the committee for immediate action, and if I can do so I will move to amend the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky. But as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN] desires it, I will now yield him two minutes of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman move that the committee rise?

Mr. WHEELER. I will withdraw that motion, and yield a minute to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I hope now, in the interest of peace and the saving of time, the report will be recommitted, as seems to be the desire on the other side.

I do not see that anybody is going to alter his position, or that anybody here is going to gain anything, by taking the other course.

If this committee has reflected upon the Commissioner of Pensions it is a Democratic committee, and a majority of his own party have sanctioned the reflection. I can not see, therefore, why there should be any division of party on this question. I do not see why the Republicans should interfere in this matter where a Democratic committee has sanctioned this report.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WHEELER. I will yield another minute to the gentleman if he desires it.

Mr. MILLIKEN. A few moments longer.

Mr. CHIPMAN. If I can be recognized I will yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maine.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama has the floor.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Now Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CARUTH. Will the gentleman allow a question?

Mr. MILLIKEN. Yes, if it is not a hard one. [Laughter.]

Mr. CARUTH. Was it not a Republican member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions who made the report to the committee in this case?

Mr. RYAN. It is the unanimous report of the committee.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I do not know whether it is made by a Republican or a Democrat; but I will agree, if the gentleman wants me to do so, that it was a Republican. As I understand it the reports that come from that committee have to be authorized by the committee as a whole; and I do not presume that any member of any committee of this House would make a report to the House that was not authorized by the committee.

I have been informed, although I do not know personally whether that is correct or not, that this is the unanimous report of the committee.

What I was about to say, however, is this: That I can not see the least reason in the world why there should be the slightest partisan feeling, which seems to have cropped out on this question.

If a Democratic committee of this House has made such reflections upon a Democratic official as are improper, I do not see why we should grieve over it.

I do not see, I repeat, why there should be any division here at all on such a question; and I hope that my friend from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON] will accept the proposition of the gentleman from Kentucky to let the bill be recommitted and a new report made to the House.

Mr. WHEELER. I now yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] who submitted this report to the House from the Committee on Invalid Pensions has stated his desire to withdraw it, and I think he should be permitted to do so.

Mr. CHIPMAN. He has no right to do so.

Mr. SPRINGER. The report is no part of this bill. It is the argument of the Committee on Invalid Pensions in support of its action in recommending the passage of the bill. If recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, it will be the duty of the committee to report it again; and they should give their reasons for the action they recommend, and in language that would not be objectionable, as the gentleman has indicated his desire to do.

I hope that will be done, but before that action is taken I desire to call the attention of gentlemen on the other side to the fact that this report is entirely inadmissible in a parliamentary sense, and ought not to have come into this House. I hope it was the result of inadvertence on the part of the gentleman who made the report, as I believe it was. It was certainly a manifest injustice to the Committee on Invalid Pensions. That committee can not be, and should not be, held responsible for the language of the report. The gentleman from Maine seems to assume that these reports are all authorized by the committee.

The fact is, as he well knows, that the committee authorizes the member to submit the report for a certain amount. That is agreed to by the committee, and the gentleman having charge of the case——

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman permit me——

Mr. SPRINGER. Not now; I will complete my statement. The gentleman having charge of the case prepares the argument on it and brings it in here. That is the course of all the committees of this House, and the Committee on Invalid Pensions can not be held responsible for the particular argument which the gentleman supporting this case has submitted. That is my observation in all cases.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes, sir; for information.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Does not the gentleman know, because he has been in Congress longer than I have and ought to know, that no member of a committee can make a report to this House without being authorized by his committee?

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has asked me a question which he can answer as well as I can. I had stated that before, and the gentleman if he had been paying attention to what I was saying would not have desired to ask this question. I stated the committee authorized the fact to be submitted and the amount to be allowed——

Mr. MILLIKEN. But the committee is responsible for every report submitted.

Mr. SPRINGER. And that the argument was supplied by the gentleman having charge of the case. The gentleman knows that is the practice in the House, and it was not necessary for him to interrupt me.

The report in which this objectionable language occurs is a Senate report; and as submitted to that body it was, I may say without being unparliamentary, in the language of the report itself, "impertinent." [Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"] Gentlemen will pardon me. I think this is the first time this session that I have addressed the committee in regard to pension cases. I desire to address myself to this case, and am serious about it.

Gentlemen know well enough, every one who has had any experience with the Pension Office, that the number of letters from that office in a day goes into the thousand frequently, and it is utterly impossible for the Commissioner of Pensions to know the contents of the various letters that go out of that office. Gentlemen know, also, that cases based on rulings of officers of the Department come up to the Commissioner in a perfunctory way, and his name is signed by a stamp.

It is well known that it is impossible for the Commissioner of Pensions to understand the rulings upon all these cases. They come up from those constituted to make these reports, and his signing of them is merely official and perfunctory.

Now, who are the gentlemen in this office who make these decisions under the civil-service policy which has been adopted by this Government, and which has been carried out faithfully by this Administration? [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. STRUBLE. Now, you break us up!

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman will please be seated. I hope to wake you up. Of the officers in the Pension Office, more than 75 per cent. are Republicans, and were there when Commissioner Black took possession of the office; and under the civil-service system the Secretary of the Interior could turn every one of them out.

A MEMBER. He could not get along without them.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is the old cry. There was a similar cry three years ago last fall, that we could not run this Government. We have proved we can. It is running well, and will continue in the same channel for the next four years. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Under this policy these gentlemen have been retained in the Pension Office when thousands of Democrats all over the country were fully competent and perfectly willing to take these places.

If there is any blame to be attributed to General Black it is that the subordinates in his office, who appear from this report to be incompetent, ought to have been removed long ago and competent Democrats put in their places.

Mr. ADAMS. Will my colleague yield to me——

Mr. SPRINGER. Not now, but later.

This letter, about which so much has been said, which seemed so impertinent to the Senate committee, was a ruling in rather forcible language to the effect that the claimant was receiving all the pension to which he was entitled. He was not denied an examination, but a re-examination. He had already had the examination provided by law. The report of that examination is set forth in this report. So it is not a case of denying him a hearing and examination. But he asked the re-examination of the case when no new evidence was brought forth to support it. That is all there is to it.

Now, if I had been writing the letter, or if the honorable gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] who brought in this report (a gentleman who is always amiable) had been writing it, either of us would perhaps have used several more polite phrases than are found in this letter; but we would have said substantially the same thing. There is really no ground of offense in the letter, and I hold that gentlemen are not justified, that this body is not justified, that the Senate is not justified in adopting such language toward a judicial officer as is found in this report.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, can not we have a vote without any more talk on this subject?

Mr. CHIPMAN was recognized, and yielded to Mr. DOCKERY.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, it does seem to me that the discussion of this question has proceeded to sufficient length. The interests of other soldiers are to be considered and ought to be considered by this committee. Speaking frankly and candidly, I think there is nothing here but that can be easily explained and harmonized with proper respect to the Commissioner, to the Senate, and to the House of Representatives. I do not agree with some gentlemen who appear to find language that they esteem discourteous in the letter of the Commissioner to this claimant.

As a matter of fact, however, I do not imagine that the Commissioner ever saw that letter. We all understand that such letters are prepared by the clerks in the Pension Bureau, and that it is impossible for the Commissioner to have personal knowledge of the contents of all of them. But assuming that this is the letter of some clerk, I do not believe it warrants the criticism that has been made upon it by the Senate committee. But, Mr. Chairman, what is the situation here?

This is now the report, not of the Senate committee, but of a committee of our own body, presented by one of our most estimable members, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL], who, in my opinion, is incapable of intentionally doing an injury or an injustice to any man, whether in public or in private life. I do not believe that the Committee on Invalid Pensions intended to reflect improperly upon anybody. In other words, I think there is an entire absence of intention to wound or to offend anybody, except as it may appear in the report of the Senate committee, and of that I shall not speak.

So far as we are concerned here, I do not think there has been any intention to injure or to offend anybody. I do not believe there has been any intention, so far as this body is concerned, to reflect harshly upon the Commissioner of Pensions or unduly or unnecessarily to criticise him, and yet I think that the language of this report is not quite courteous. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, in the interest of harmony, and in the interest of other pension bills that await consideration, I suggest that this case be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, the bill not to lose its place on the Calendar, and that the committee return it to the House with another report. I think this suggestion, if adopted, will settle this matter, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill take that course.

Mr. CHIPMAN. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say this, that in all this debate there is one party who has been lost sight of; that is the soldier who wants this pension. I was perfectly astounded when my friend from Minnesota [Mr. NELSON], a gentleman whom I consider without a peer intellectually in this Congress, stood up here and made the remark which he did.

The remark made by my legal friend from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS] did not astonish me. I have seen men and I have seen men. [Laughter.] But that my friend from Minnesota should forget the soldier and think only of making a political point did astound me. It paralyzed me. [Laughter.] He is a man from whom I expect great things; great things in the enfranchisement of our trade and commerce; great things in favor of our great West; and I must say that after what took place here to-day, when we set up the chaplet of fame, the tribute of a country's gratitude and love, as the last thing upon which the eyes of that great hero who now lies dying may look upon, it astounded me that to-night any discussion, any irritation, any difference, should arise here upon the rights of the soldier.

Remember that General Sheridan lies dying, and remember that the day will come when General Black will lie dying.

Mr. NELSON. What about Casamer, this soldier?

Mr. CHIPMAN. I say give this man his pension.

Mr. NELSON. Let us give it to him to-night.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I say give it to him to-night. I do not care about this matter. General Black is so high, so good, so noble, that this report, which was not made by the majority of the committee or by the Democrats of the committee, will do him no harm.

Mr. SHERMAN. That is right.

Mr. CHIPMAN. Give him his pension now. I will vote for it. But why stop to spit venom on General Black? The day will come when you will be ashamed of your course in this matter. The day will come when you will stand over this man's tomb and pronounce eulogies on him.

Gentlemen, let us put this bill through. Do not take this soldier, who deserves a pension, and throw him back and forth in your political machine to be ground and destroyed. Let us give him his pension to-night.

Mr. WHEELER. I now yield to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON].

Mr. GUENTHER. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I believe I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] has been recognized.

Mr. GUENTHER. I wish to know what has become of the request for unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The request has never been stated, because the gentleman from Michigan took the floor.

Mr. GUENTHER. I thought it had been stated. Can it not be stated now? Mr. Chairman [Mr. DOCKERY in the chair], I renew the request that you made when on the floor.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I believe I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. The request, which will be stated when the gentleman from Tennessee yields the floor, was that the bill with the report be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, not to lose its place on the Calendar, and that the committee submit another report in lieu of the one now before the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Before that question is put to a vote, I wish to state as a Democratic member of this House, and from what I have seen here, that there is no disposition among my brethren on this side to fail in doing justice to the soldier.

A MEMBER on the Republican side. We know all about that.

Mr. WASHINGTON. You may talk as much as you please; but the remark is true. I think we proved it pretty conclusively the other day when we passed one bill appropriating over $80,000,000 for pensions for the next fiscal year. But be that as it may, while the present bill is before us I want to enter my protest against its passage, even if the objectionable language which has been used in criticizing the Commissioner of Pensions be striken from the report. My reason for objecting to the passage of the bill is that this soldier has already had his pension under the law increased two or three times; and, as this report states, he is still entitled under the law, if he can prove a certain amount of disability, to a pension of $36 a month, which can be granted to him by the Commissioner of Pensions upon an examination by a proper medical board.

Now, if I understand anything about our special pension legislation, it is the intention that Congress should act specially on such cases only as are not provided for by general law. This case is provided for by law. This man has his opportunity under the law to have his pension increased to $36 per month. I say let him go to the Commissioner of Pensions and file his proof; let him go before a board of medical examiners; and let his case not be decided here on one-sided testimony or upon a sentimentality.

Mr. STRUBLE. Does not the gentleman understand that this man's case has already been presented in the Pension Office, and that the Commissioner has denied his application?

Mr. WASHINGTON. I do; but that does not put him outside of the law; that does not make this a special case. We had a similar case here one week ago—a case which came from this side of the House; and we did not find the members on the other side boiling over with enthusiasm to override the Commissioner and pass the bill.

Mr. STRUBLE. In view of a long line of precedents in this and prior Congresses, was not this claimant entitled to come here and ask for Congressional action?

Mr. WASHINGTON. While the general law upon the statute-book allows him an increase?

Mr. STRUBLE. But his application has been denied at the Pension Office.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Let him go and perfect his proof.

Mr. STRUBLE. A board of medical examiners has already declared him entitled to the increase.

Mr. WASHINGTON. But in the face of a letter of the Commissioner of Pensions which denies the application for an increase upon what seems to the Commissioner very good ground, you ask Congress upon this insulting report to override the action of the Commissioner——

Mr. STRUBLE. The point to which I am directing attention is that this man has the right to come here to Congress with his application for an increase, upon the denial by the Commissioner of the increase which he asks.

Mr. WASHINGTON. He has the right to come; but why should he not proceed in the regular way, and by making proof properly get the increase to which he may be entitled? Why should we in cases of this kind, where a man makes application for an increase, pass a special act in his behalf? In this case there is a law giving this man a pension of $36 a month, if he can prove a certain extent of disability; and upon this question the Commissioner of Pensions, with his able boards of examiners all over the country, is more competent to form a judgment than this committee and this House. I shall therefore protest against the passage of this bill in any shape.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on laying the bill aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

EMMA S. FREE.

The next business on the Private Calendar (which was called up for consideration by Mr. MORRILL) was the bill (S. 431) granting a pension to Emma S. Free, widow of Thomas S. Free, late major of the United States Army.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Emma S. Free, widow of Maj. Thomas S. Free, deceased, late a major of the Tenth Regiment of Volunteers of the United States Army, at the rate of $25 per month, the same as was allowed by law to her husband at the time of his death.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 431) granting a pension to Emma S. Free, widow of Thomas D. Free, late major of the United States Army, respectfully report:

The report of the Committee on Pensions of the Senate sets forth fully the facts in this case as follows:

"Your committee, January 31, 1888, made the following report in this case:

"'The claimant is the widow of Thomas D. Free, whose rank was first lieutenant, Eleventh Regiment Colored Infantry. During his life the Pension Office allowed him a pension at the rate of $50 a month. After his death the widow was pensioned at the rate of $17 a month and $2 a month for each of her three children, commencing February 8, 1887. This bill is to pension her at the rate of $50 a month. It is stated that this amount is needed for the comfortable support of herself and family. What she is now receiving is the rate fixed by law and paid to all widows of first lieutenants.

"'The committee is not aware of any reason for a liberal discrimination in this case, and believing that as a precedent it would stimulate appeals for legislation of this kind, the bill is reported adversely, with a recommendation that it be indefinitely postponed.'

"On the 9th of February, however, the bill was reconsidered and recommitted by reason of further information received by the committee.

"Major Free enlisted as a private in the Tenth Iowa Infantry July 31, 1861, and by exceptional and meritorious conduct won his way successively to the rank of major, which rank he held at the time of his discharge, March 22, 1866.

"The soldier served as first lieutenant from April 30, 1863, to July 30, 1865, when he was appointed major. The disability for which he was pensioned was incurred, in the language of the Pension Office, "about one month prior to his promotion to major, and while he was serving as first lieutenant and adjutant," so that, although he afterward served three years as major, his widow is only entitled under the present law to $17 a month, the pension allowed the widow of a first lieutenant.

"Major Free at the time of his death was drawing a pension of $50 a month on the ground of softening of the brain and insanity, consequent upon disease of the nervous system induced by wounds received at Milliken's Bend while in the line of duty. This loss of his mind occasioned heavy expense to his family for medical attendance, etc., and he was much of the time confined in the Dakota Asylum for the Insane.

"The widow is left without means of support with a family of three children, one of which is in an imbecile and helpless condition, the hereditary effect of its father's insanity.

"The Commissioner of Pensions in his last report makes the recommendation that 'rank subsequently acquired bona fide should be considered by the Commissioner in determining the amount of pension to be allowed.'

"Your committee, in consideration of the long and meritorious service of Major Free, who also was inspector-general of Mississippi, adjutant-general of the Vicksburg district, adjutant-general of Dakota, and who served in the Freedman's Bureau under General Howard, and in view of the terrible affliction that has been visited upon his child as a consequence of disabilities received in the service, and of the recommendation of the Commissioner of Pensions, recommends the passage of the bill as provided by its terms when originally introduced."

Your committee are unable to reach the same conclusions as the Committee of Pensions of the Senate and recommends that the bill be amended by striking out the word "fifty" and inserting the words "twenty-five," and as amended that it do pass.

The amendment of the committee was agreed to; and the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

MRS. HETTIE K. PAINTER.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar was the bill (S. 424) granting a pension to Mrs. Hettie K. Painter.

Mr. MORRILL. I move that the bill be laid aside to be reported back to the House with the recommendation that it be indefinitely postponed, as a similar bill has been already passed.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

GEORGE PARK.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. MORRILL) was the bill (S. 1299) granting a pension to George Park.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George Park, dependent father of William C. Park, Company H, Fifty-seventh Massachusetts Volunteers.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1299) granting a pension to George Park, submit the following report:

The report of the Senate Committee on Pensions is adopted and the passage of the bill recommended.

SENATE REPORT.

The petitioner, George Park, alleges that his two sons, H. L. Park and William C. Park, both minors, enlisted in Company H, Fifty-seventh Massachusetts Volunteers. H. L. Park, the eldest, was killed in the battle of North Anna River, June 24, 1864, aged nineteen years. William C. Park was wounded in the battle of the Wilderness; returned to his regiment from hospital; was taken prisoner at the springing of the mine at Petersburgh, and sent to the prison at Danville, N. C., where he died January 6, 1865, aged eighteen years.

The mother is drawing a pension on account of the death of the eldest son, and the petitioner is advised that he can not be allowed a pension under existing laws because the mother is receiving a pension on account of the death of one of their deceased sons.

Petitioner is seventy-three years old; is unable to support himself without outside help; is troubled with varicose veins in his limbs and rheumatism in his shoulder-joints. The Commissioner of Pensions writes to the chairman of this committee in regard to this case:

"The parents had two sons, who were killed or died in the service. Unless the parents are living apart or at variance, the father can not be pensioned under the laws as they now exist."

F. Wessen deposes, August 22, 1886, that William C. Park worked for him for the last two years previous to enlistment, and that deponent paid his wages to the petitioner, amounting to about $40 a month.

October 13, 1866, said Wessen and one F. F. Hopkins made a joint affidavit; Wessen deposing that he employed William C. Park from July, 1860, to December, 1863, at which time he enlisted, and that he, Wessen, paid the father the son's wages, at the rate of $25 to $30 a month, the father being in delicate health and nearly dependent on the earnings of his son for the support of his family of wife and four children.

Hopkins deposes that he has known the father and family four years, and that the above statement is true in all respects.

Both deponents also state that the soldier left surviving one sister (Theresa), whose age on January 3, 1866, was five years.

This claim was rejected by the following indorsement:

"May 13, 1867. Rejected. The mother alive."

In view of all the facts in this case, your committee recommend the passage of the bill which is herewith submitted.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

VIRTUE SMITH.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. MORRILL) was the bill (S. 1957) granting a pension to Virtue Smith.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension law, the name of Virtue Smith, widow of David W. Smith, late a private in Company A, of the First Regiment of Minnesota Volunteers, and to pay her a pension from and after the passage of this act.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1957) granting a pension to Virtue Smith, submitted the following report:

The claimant is the widow of David M. Smith, late of Company A, First Regiment Minnesota Volunteers. She filed an application for pension in 1880, which was rejected "on the ground that the soldier's death from disease of lungs was not a result of the alleged wound or of the service."

The soldier was pensioned in 1867 at $6 per month, for gunshot wound of right elbow-joint; increased from November 9, 1872, to $8; increased from August 4, 1875, to $10 per month; gunshot wound of right elbow, right thigh, and nervous debility, and prostration resulting from wounds.

His wounds were received in service in Minnesota, and he suffered greatly in consequence of a nervous shock, not only from his wounds, but from lying thirty-six hours in the grass under the fire of the Indians.

Mrs. Dr. Edson, a respectable physician of Washington, D. C., testifies to her acquaintance with him for many years prior to his death. His food did not assimilate, and he wasted away. There were several medical examinations, and the reports all refer to his nervousness, suffering, and physical depreciation in consequence of his wounds. There was a special examination had, at which Dr. St. Clair testifies that he died of softening of the brain, which was a result of his prostration and suffering, and there is a large amount of testimony corroborating this conclusion.

The conclusion of the special examiner is that the soldier was not suffering from phthisis pulmonalis, but that the death cause was white atrophic softening or degeneration of the brain, due primarily to defective innervation, as a result of the anchylosis of the elbow, and secondly to age and mental avocations of the soldier.

The report of the health department of Washington, where he died, is: "Cause of death, wounds in Army."

Dr. Reyburn says he died of consumption, and this is the basis of the Pension Office rejection.

The committee is at a loss to see how any one, reading a history of his case, could come to any other conclusion than that he died in consequence of his wounds, after years of suffering.

The bill is reported favorably, with a recommendation that it do pass.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

JOHN LINSLEY.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. MORRILL) was the bill (S. 2332) granting a pension to John Linsley.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of John Linsley, father of Robert Harrell, alias Harrid, deceased, late a private in Company E, Eighty-first Regiment of United States Colored Troops.

The report (by Mr. MORRILL) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2332) granting a pension to John Linsley, submit the following report:

The claimant is the father of Robert Harrell, late a private in Company C, Eighty-first Regiment United States Colored Troops, who died in service of diarrhea December 4, 1864. The father is nearly eighty years of age, almost blind, and utterly destitute. The Pension Office rejected the claim on the ground that it was not shown that the claimant was dependent on the soldier at the time of death. He is now dependent. It might be further stated that claimant gave three sons to the Union Army.

Your committee recommend the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

CHARLES H. ORDWAY.

The next pension business on the Private Calendar (the consideration of which was asked by Mr. GALLINGER) was the bill (H. R. 8762) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Ordway.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension of Charles H. Ordway, late a private in Company H, Seventh New Hampshire Volunteers, from $35 to $50 per month, from and after the passage of this act.

The report of the committee (by Mr. GALLINGER) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8762) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Ordway, having considered the same, report as follows:

Charles H. Ordway was a private in Company H, Seventh New Hampshire Volunteers, and was wounded at the charge on Fort Wagner, Charleston Harbor, July 18, 1863, receiving a flesh wound from a shell, and also by being struck by a ball which entered the chest and lodged in the right lung, where it still remains. That lung is but little used, and the right arm is partially paralyzed, the wound remaining open.

Soldier was pensioned at $24 per month, which rate was increased by special act in 1882 to $36 per month. To give a clear idea of the present condition of claimant the following affidavits from two distinguished surgeons are given:

"239 BOYLSTON STREET, BOSTON, MASS., *March* 15, 1888.

"I attended Charles H. Ordway in the Boston City Hospital in October, 1887, for two weeks and four days. I operated on him for necrosis of a rib and removed a sequestrum from the pleural cavity. A sinus of 6 or 8 inches in length extended up into the lung; air and pus came from it. I was obliged to resect a sound rib to reach and remove the sequestrum. He had exhibited great endurance to have lived through this condition for twenty years.

"Now he has a slight necrosis of the edge of the excised rib; much pus still flows from the sinus. He holds up well, but the prognosis for complete recovery is long and indefinite.

"DAVID W. CHEEVER, M. D.

"COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS,
"*Suffolk County, ss:*

"BOSTON, *March* 16, 1888.

"Then personally appeared the within-named David W. Cheever and made oath that the foregoing statement by him subscribed was true.

"Before me,
"[SEAL.] GEORGE A. SAWYER,
"*Notary Public.*"

I, Granville P. Conn, of Concord, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire, on oath depose and say: That I am a physician and surgeon, and have been in the active practice of the same in the city of Concord aforesaid since 1863; that I have known Charles H. Ordway, of this city, for more than fifteen years; that said Ordway has been under my care and supervision from time to time during this period; that said Ordway was wounded in the right side during his service in the United States Army, and now carries a ball in that side; that said bullet when it entered the side struck the edge of a rib, which became diseased, causing an open sore more than ten years since; that the abcess did not heal by reason of the diseased bone; that last October (1887), by my advice, said Ordway entered the City Hospital in Boston, Mass., and endured a severe and dangerous operation in having a portion of the diseased rib removed; that since his discharge from said hospital he has again come under my care; that the wound is still open, and, in my opinion, it will remain in substantially the same condition so long as he may live; that at present it discharges full 3 ounces of pus per diem; that the cavity is so situated that considerable portion of this pus must be removed by a tube and pump by his wife or some other attendant, and that he has and will require this aid and assistance from some one, not only to dress the wound, but also in many other ways in order to render him comfortable.

"I further depose and say that I have no interest whatever in said Ordway's claim for an increase of pension.

"GRANVILLE P. CONN, M. D."

"CONCORD, N. H.

"MERRIMACK, *ss:*

"Personally appeared before me, register of probate court, the same being a court of record within and for said county, Granville P. Conn, and subscribed and made oath that the foregoing affidavit by him so subscribed is true according to his best knowledge and belief, and I further certify that the said Granville P. Conn is a practicing physician in good professional standing, and that said affidavit is in his handwriting, and that I have no interest, direct or indirect, in the prosecution of said claim.

"Witness my hand and seal of said court this 19th day of March, A. D. 1888.

"[SEAL.] JOHN P. NUTTER,
"*Register of Probate Court for Merrimack County, N. H.*"

The Pension Office is unable to give relief in this case, as soldier does not require the constant attention of another person, which would entitle him to $50 per month, but he does require attention a portion of the time, for which no provision is made in the general laws. Besides this he is a great sufferer, with a painful disability, incurable in its nature, and which makes life a constant burden.

Your committee recommend that the bill be amended by striking out the word "fifty" in the sixth line and substituting therefor the words "forty-five," and that as amended the bill do pass.

The amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was laid aside to be reported to the House with the recommendation that it do pass.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MORRILL. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker *pro tempore* having taken the chair, Mr. DOCKERY reported that the Committee of the Whole House having had under consideration the Private Calendar under the special order, had directed him to report sundry bills with various recommendations.

BILLS PASSED.

The bill (H. R. 8762) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Ordway, reported from the Committee of the Whole with an amendment, was considered, the amendment adopted, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Senate bills of the following titles, reported from the Committee of the Whole without amendments, were severally considered, ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, were passed; namely:

A bill (S. 1146) granting a pension to L. J. McGoffin;

A bill (S. 1037) granting a pension to the infant children of Michael A. Moran;

A bill (S. 2167) granting a pension to Mary E. Woodward;

A bill (S. 1299) granting a pension to George Park;

A bill (S. 1957) granting a pension to Virtue Smith; and

A bill (S. 2332) granting a pension to John Linsley.

The bill (S. 431) granting a pension to Emma S. Free, widow of Thomas S. Free, late major of the United States Army, reported from the Committee of the Whole with an amendment, was considered, the amendment adopted, and the bill as amended read the third time, and passed.

The bill (S. 2157) granting an increase of pension to Theodore F. Casamer, reported from the Committee of the Whole with the recommendation that it be recommitted to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, was considered and the recommendation of the committee concurred in.

The recommendation of the Committee of the Whole that the bill (S. 434) granting a pension to Mrs. Hettie K. Painter be indefinitely postponed was agreed to.

Mr. CHIPMAN moved to reconsider the several votes taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. GALLINGER. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is a motion to go into Committee of the Whole, or else a motion to adjourn.

Mr. GALLINGER. I wish to make a brief statement before withdrawing the demand for the regular order.

I am, as gentlemen know, a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and have not asked for recognition during these sessions, while a great many gentlemen whose bills I have reported have been recognized to get them considered.

The next bill on the Calendar is in behalf of a woman who is eighty-four years of age, and in extreme destitution, and I hope the House will allow me to call it up to be considered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair has recognized the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RUSSELL], but will endeavor to recognize the gentleman during the course of the evening.

Mr. GALLINGER. I withdraw the demand for the regular order.

GRISWOLD ROGERS.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 8984) granting a pension to Griswold Rogers, and put it upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the limitations and restrictions of the pension laws, the name of Griswold Rogers, late a private in Fourth Company, Third Regiment Connecticut Militia, in the war of 1812.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut. I ask unanimous consent now to make a brief statement embodying the substance of the report in order to save the time of the House, and let the report be printed in the RECORD.

This claimant is ninety-two years of age, and served in the war of 1812. The records of the War Department do not show service of sufficient length of time to entitle him to secure his pension under the general law; but there are affidavits of those who served with him in his company and in engagements to show that he did serve the length of time required. The trouble is that there is some defect in the records.

Mr. WASHINGTON. How long did he serve?

Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut. He served seventeen days, and the law required only fourteen days' service.

Mr. DOCKERY. He can not live long to enjoy it, and I hope it will be granted.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut. He is now supported by charity.

The report (by Mr. BLISS), which was ordered to be printed, is as follows:

The records of the Departments show that the claimant served in Capt. J. Manwaring's Company, Connecticut Militia, war of 1812, and was paid by the United States Government for a period of eleven days, from August 15 to 25, 1814. He was granted a bounty-land warrant for 160 acres of land by the Pension Bureau, because of his military service. In addition to the above service he claims to have been in an engagement with the British at Rope Ferry Bridge, near New London, Conn., and to have assisted in the repulse of the enemy when an attempt was made to burn the shipping at Essex.

The Third Auditor, United States Treasury Department, reports that there is no record on file of either of these engagements, but an examination of the files of newspapers of that time shows that the engagements took place as alleged, and a full account of the repulse at Essex is given on pages 534 and 535 of Connecticut Historical Collections, by John Warner Barber (1836).

The fact that the claimant participated in the battle of Rope Ferry Bridge is testified to by Anson Smith, of Circleville, Ohio, who was present and took part in the engagement as a volunteer; he states that the claimant served with the members of Captain Manwaring's Company at the time.

The claimant is now ninety-two years of age, and is in need of assistance. He is represented to your committee as a man of credibility and truth, and in every way worthy of the assistance of the Government.

Your committee are of the opinion that the bill should pass, and return it to the House with such recommendation.

There being no objection, the bill was considered and ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, it was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Connecticut, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ROBERT M'CLEAN.

Mr. GLASS. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 1069) granting a pension to Robert McClean, and put it upon its passage.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Robert McClean, late a private in Company F, Second Illinois Cavalry Regiment.

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the report may be dispensed with, and that it be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

The report (by Mr. HUNTER) is as follows:

Robert McClean was enrolled July 30, 1861, in Company F, Second Regiment Illinois Cavalry Volunteers, and honorably discharged June 22, 1865.

On April 28, 1879, he filed application for pension, alleging that he contracted bronchitis at La Grange, Tenn., November 30, 1862, and was sent to College Hospital, La Grange, Tenn., where he remained under treatment of Dr. McNeal, surgeon in charge, until June 25, 1863; also was in general hospital, Vicksburg, Miss., June 1, 1865, until discharge. The claim was rejected by the Pension Department on the ground of inability of claimant to furnish medical evidence showing treatment therefor in service or soon after discharge, and for the further reason that the lay testimony as to origin is unsatisfactory. The medical records are very imperfect and many of them are not on file. However, they show that he was in general hospital, Memphis, Tenn., January 19, 1863, and at La Grange, Tenn., December 2, 1862, to June 30, 1863, and at Vicksburg, Miss., June 11, 1865, and was discharged from service June 23, 1865.

There is abundance of evidence to show that the soldier was sound at the time he enlisted, and that he was sick a considerable of the time during his term of service; that he was in bad health at the date of his discharge, and that he has been troubled with bronchitis and general debility almost continuously ever since. Jones Green testifies that he was in hospital with soldier at Vicksburg; that he had very bad health, constantly coughing as though his lungs were badly affected. The doctor called his malady bronchitis.

While the medical evidence as to the disease having been incurred as stated is quite meager, yet the committee believe that there is sufficient evidence to justify a favorable report, and we therefore recommend the passage of the bill.

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading; and being engrossed, was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GLASS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MRS. ANNA BUTTERFIELD.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 8761) granting a pension to Mrs. Anna Butterfield.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. Anna Butterfield, dependent mother of James A. B. Butterfield, late a lieutenant in the Second Illinois Cavalry.

The Committee on Invalid Pensions recommended the following amendment:

In line 7 strike out "lieutenant" and insert "sergeant."

Mr. GALLINGER. I have myself considered this case, and the entire committee have acted upon it. It is the case of a dependent mother, and I think there can be no objection to it.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I ask for the reading of the report.

The report (by Mr. GALLINGER) was read in part.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I withdraw the request for the reading of the report in full.

The report in full is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8761) granting a pension to Mrs. Anna Butterfield, have had the same under consideration, and beg leave to submit the following report:

The beneficiary named in the bill is the mother of James A. B. Butterfield, who enlisted August 8, 1861, in Company A, Second Regiment Illinois Cavalry, and was discharged August 13, 1864. He remained in Louisiana, as the mother is advised, in the service of the Government, until April, 1865, when he took passage on the steamer Sultana, and with about 1,700 other sick and discharged soldiers he lost his life in the explosion of said steamer near Memphis, Tenn., April 27, 1865, while under charter by the Government.

In 1870 or 1871 she placed in the hands of Hon. James G. Blaine, letters and other papers from the soldier showing her dependence upon him, to be used as evidence in a bill he introduced in the House for her relief. Unfortunately these papers were lost or misplaced, and although Mr. Blaine and others have made search for the same, they have not been found. She is thus deprived of the proof usually required by Congress in the consideration of private bills, but the existence as well as their loss is shown by letters of Mr. Blaine and others.

The mother, while a widow, raised and educated the soldier out of her small earnings as a mill operative, having no other income from any property or otherwise. He contributed to her support while in the Army, and until his untimely death. She is now eighty-eight years of age, unable to support herself by labor, and is compelled to subsist on $1.25 a week, her only income from a small amount on deposit, which she laid up from her hard labor in her younger days, and which is rapidly growing less year by year.

Your committee are of opinion that the long services of the son, and her extreme old age, coupled with poverty, entitle her to favorable consideration at the hands of Congress, and therefore unhesitatingly report favorably on the accompanying bill, and ask that it do pass, amended, however, by striking out the word "lieutenant" in line 7 and inserting therein instead the word "sergeant."

The amendment was adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GALLINGER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MRS. JUDITH DEIG.

Mr. CARUTH. I ask unanimous consent to consider at this time the bill (H. R. 9364) granting a pension to Mrs. Judith Deig.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place the name of Mrs. Judith Deig on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws.

The Clerk commenced to read the report (by Mr. HUNTER).

Mr. NELSON (interrupting the reading). I wish to ask whether that report is courteous to the Commissioner of Pensions?

Mr. CARUTH. It is.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Let us hear it read.

Mr. NELSON. I think there is no necessity for that. I do not want to punish the soldier in this case in order to punish the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the further reading of the report.

There was no objection.

The report in full is as follows:

The Committee on Invalid Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9364) granting a pension to Judith Deig, submitted the following report:

Andrew Deig was a resident of the town of Lebanon, Ky., and joined the home-guard company of Lebanon. The rebel general John H. Morgan having invaded Kentucky, and threatening Lebanon, the company of which Deig was a member was called into action, and while fighting the battles of his country, although not regularly mustered into the service, the said Deig was, on the 12th day of July, A. D. 1862, wounded by a gunshot, and from this wound he next day died.

The widow, Mrs. Judith Deig, applied for a pension, but her claim was rejected on the ground that, while her husband was killed fighting the battles of his country, he had never been mustered into the Army, consequently there was no law under which the claim could be allowed. Congress has been in the habit of providing for such cases by special acts.

This is a meritorious case. The widow is poor and needy, and your committee report the bill favorably and recommend its passage.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. CARUTH moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The hour of 10.30 p. m. having arrived, it is the duty of the Chair to declare the House adjourned until 11 o'clock to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. ABBOTT: A bill (H. R. 10283) for the relief of J. Q. St. Clair—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BELDEN: A bill (H. R. 10284) for the relief of Mary A. Kelley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BUTLER: A bill (H. R. 10285) granting a pension to Rebecca Stone—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CANNON: A bill (H. R. 10286) for the relief of Richard Guilliford—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DAVIS: A bill (H. R. 10287) granting a pension to Sylvia C. Dunham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10288) to remove charge of desertion against Rufus M. Kinser—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10289) granting a pension to Miss Emily Romine—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10290) directing the Secretary of War to correct his records in the case of Lieut. Joseph T. W. Barnitt—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HUNTER: A bill (H. R. 10291) granting a pension to Jane Jackson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEEL: A bill (H. R. 10292) for the relief of John N. Hays—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10293) for the relief of Standwix H. Mayfield—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10294) for the relief of Andrew Deans—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUNTER: A bill (H. R. 10295) granting a pension to George W. Prickett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEEL: A bill (H. R. 10296) for the relief of S. S. Stearns—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: A bill (H. R. 10297) for the relief of William B. Smith—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PERKINS: A bill (H. R. 10298) granting a pension to James Radley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10299) granting an increase of pension to Michael Shirkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 10300) for the relief of Simon T. Irvin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. D. TAYLOR: A bill (H. R. 10301) for the relief of Emily Cross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. E. J. TURNER: A bill (H. R. 10302) granting a pension to Lucy A. Nicholson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BURNETT: Petition of the Clinton-Turnverein, relative to foreign immigration—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. CLARDY: Resolutions of the Missouri State Medical Association, asking for Federal control of the quarantine stations—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, protest of the Merchants' Exchange of St. Louis, Mo., against House bill 4923, to create a national bureau of harbors and waterways—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. CLEMENTS: Petition of heirs of Fielding Kay, of Gordon County, Georgia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers relating to House bill 9817, granting a pension to William H. Reynolds—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CRAIN: Petition of M. J. Mulcahy and 69 others, citizens of Galveston, Tex., for the investigation of certain charges against officials of the United States district court for the eastern district of Texas, etc.—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, letter from M. J. Mulcahy, of Galveston, Tex., relative to the alleged murder of John P. Graham by W. R. McCullough on the high seas—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. A. C. DAVIDSON: Papers in the claims of William A. Kelley, of Robert Milling, of George M. Campbell, of Moody H. May, of John M. Leech, of Joseph H. Peples, of Joseph Blake, of John M. Hays, of S. H. Mayfield, of Andrew Deans, and of Philip S. Fulford, of Alabama—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. J. S. HENDERSON: Petition of J. R. Cline and others, citizens of Catawba County, North Carolina, for the passage of a bill to eradicate pleuro-pneumonia—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOOKER: Petition of Mattie S. Whitney, administratrix, for payment of war claim—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEE (by request): Petitions of Charles O. Embrey, for estate of Tabitha A. Waugh, and of W. A. Bickers and John Bickers, administrators of James Bickers, of Virginia, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition for the relief of Arthur Gunnell—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition in favor of House bill 8381—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LONG: Petition of Charles E. French, of Boston, Mass., concerning the public debt—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PEEL: Petition of Samuel Foster, of Rogers, Ark., for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of L. C. Moss, of Newton County, and of Mary A. Wisener, of Washington County, Ark., for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition of John Warren, administrator of James Pankey, of Hardeman County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of W. T. Beard and others, for the passage of the Chace copyright bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHERMAN: Petition of W. S. Armitage, of Verona; of Mrs. A. E. Baron, and of the representatives of M. Coyle, of Croghan; of M. S. Wood, of Clinton; of A. Bickford, and of M. Tipple, of Camden; of W. H. Nelson, and of O. S. Kenyon, of Taberg; of G. Weldon, of Prospect; of representatives of S. R. Howe, of Oriskany Falls; of J. H. Wilcox, of Port Leyden; and of Fred. J. Glendale, and of F. J. Crandall, of Glendale, N. Y., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. W. L. WILSON: Paper in the claim of H. C. Worthington—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The following petition in favor of House bill 9716, for the better protection of free labor from convict labor, was received and referred to the Committee on Labor:

By Mr. RYAN: Of Knights of Labor of Kansas.

The following petitions for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. JACKSON: Of druggists and physicians of Rochester, Pa.

By Mr. TOOLE: Of sundry citizens of Montana.

The following petition for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, was received and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. YARDLEY: Of farmers of Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were

in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. CONGER: Of L. Gill and 45 others, members of R. L. Clingan Post, No. 203, Grand Army of the Republic, of Minburn, Iowa.

By Mr. PEEL: Of citizens of Newton County, Arkansas.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. HALL: Of 180 citizens of Mercer and Crawford Counties, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Of 27 citizens of Price County, Wisconsin.

The following petition for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters was referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. ROBERTSON: Of J. M. Odom and other citizens of Louisiana.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, *June* 2, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CENSUS COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER appointed Mr. WASHINGTON on the Select Committee on the Eleventh Census to fill existing vacancy.

FURNITURE OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury in relation to the unexpended balance of appropriation for furniture and repairs of furniture in public buildings for 1888, and transmitting an estimate from the Supervising Architect of appropriation to be immediately available therefor; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

CREE INDIANS, MONTANA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, with inclosures, a letter from the Commissioner of Indian Affairs recommending legislation for the relief of the Cree Indians, Montana Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

AGRICULTURAL STATIONS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 7222) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish agricultural stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the act supplementary thereto," with amendments by the Senate.

Mr. BLOUNT. I ask the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture [Mr. HATCH]. The amendments which have been made to this bill by the Senate are merely verbal. The Senate requests a committee of conference. I think the gentleman from Missouri, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, will verify what I have said; and, if so, I ask that the amendments be concurred in.

Mr. HATCH. This bill is simply to correct an error or an omission in the original act in relation to the acceptance of the act known as the experimental-station act on the part of certain States whose Legislatures have been in session since the passage of the act. The original act allowed, under certain circumstances, the acceptance to be made by the governors of the State. Georgia and perhaps one or two States have had adjourned sessions of their Legislatures, and there has been some trouble about the construction of the act. This is simply to correct that; and the amendments placed upon the bill by the Senate, as the gentleman from Georgia has stated, are simply amendments. I hope the House will concur in the Senate amendments.

Mr. BLOUNT. I move concurrence.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to concur in the amendments of the Senate. Is the reading of the amendments requested?

The reading of the amendments was not requested; and the question being put, they were concurred in.

Mr. BLOUNT moved to reconsider the vote just taken; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TENNESSEE NEAR CHATTANOOGA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 7564) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Chattanooga, Tenn., with amendments of the Senate thereto.

Mr. CRISP. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments of the Senate be concurred in. The bill contains all the usual provisions of a bridge bill.

The SPEAKER. Is the reading of the amendments demanded?

Mr. BURROWS. How do the amendments affect the bill?

Mr. CRISP. There is no material change. The amendments are not long, and if the gentleman desires they can easily be read.

Mr. BURROWS. I do not care to detain the House.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

Mr. CRISP moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendments were concurred in; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TENNESSEE NEAR GUNTERSVILLE, ALA.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 8623) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at or near Guntersville, Ala., and for other purposes.

Mr. CRISP. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments of the Senate be concurred in.

Mr. FORNEY. Mr. Speaker, one end of that bridge will be in my district. I have examined the bill and it is all right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia that the amendments of the Senate be concurred in?

Mr. BURROWS. What bill is that?

The SPEAKER. It is a bridge bill.

Mr. BURROWS. The same one that was up a few minutes ago?

The SPEAKER. Another one.

There being no objection, the amendments of the Senate were concurred in.

Mr. CRISP moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendments of the Senate were concurred in; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS STATEN ISLAND SOUND.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 5929) to extend the time of the completion of a bridge across Staten Island Sound.

Mr. CRISP. I ask that the amendment of the Senate to that bill be read, and I ask unanimous consent that it be concurred in.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line —, after "eighty-six," insert "but this act shall have no other effect whatever than to operate as if the time herein mentioned had been embraced in the said act."

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. CRISP moved to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was concurred in; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House Senate bills of the following titles; which were severally read twice, and referred as indicated:

The bill (S. 287) to quiet the titles of settlers on the Des Moines River lands in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The bill (S. 2986) to incorporate the American Historical Association—to the Committee on the Library.

Joint resolution (S. R. 8) providing for the appointment of a commission to select a site for a naval station on the Pacific coast—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BOWDEN, for three days, commencing on Monday next, on account of important business.

To Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana, for three weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. SCULL, for five days, from June 4, on account of important business.

To Mr. GLASS, for two weeks, on account of business.

To Mr. MCCLAMMY, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. GALLINGER, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to extend his remarks of yesterday in the RECORD.

WITHDRAWAL OF PAPERS.

Mr. WADE, by unanimous consent, obtained leave to withdraw the evidence filed by E. R. Shipley, late postmaster in Springfield, Mo., in his claim for relief under special bill in the Forty-ninth Congress.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 615) for the relief of James B. Mitchell; and

A bill (H. R. 4735) for the relief of Douglas Chapman.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT JACKSON, MICH.

Mr. O'DONNELL. I ask unanimous consent to take from the files of the House for present consideration the bill (H. R. 8592) for the erection of a public building at Jackson, Mich.

Mr. HATCH. I must call for the regular order. I have had a few minutes yielded to me for the purpose of calling up the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. O'DONNELL. I ask only one minute.

Mr. HATCH. I would be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan and other gentlemen, but I have only a limited time under my control, and I am compelled to insist on the regular order.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

Mr. HATCH. I ask to dispense with the morning hour for the presentation of reports.

Mr. WILKINS. I hope the gentleman will also make a request for general leave to file reports with the Clerk.

Mr. HATCH. I ask also that members desiring to present reports may file them with the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] asks unanimous consent that the morning hour for the presentation of reports be dispensed with, and that gentlemen having reports may file them with the Clerk for reference to the appropriate Calendar. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

FILING OF REPORTS.

The following reports were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

ISSUE AND REGULATION OF A NATIONAL CURRENCY.

Mr. WILKINS, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 10303) to revise and consolidate the laws relating to the issue and regulation of a national currency secured by United States bonds; which was read a first and second time, referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER AT DECATUR, NEBR.

Mr. CRISP, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8841) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Decatur, Nebr.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS TOMBIGBEE RIVER, IN ALABAMA.

Mr. CRISP also, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9610) to authorize the Birmingham, Selma and New Orleans Railroad Company to build a bridge across the Tombigbee River, in Alabama; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER.

Mr. CRISP also, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9619) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at some accessible point within 1 mile north and 1 mile south and east of the mouth of the Kansas River; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RAILROAD BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER OF THE NORTH.

Mr. CRISP also, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back, with amendments of the Senate, recommending concurrence therein, a bill (H. R. 2528) authorizing the construction of a railroad bridge across the Red River of the North by the North Dakota and Pacific Railway Company; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSOURI RIVER, NEBRASKA CITY, NEBR.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2674) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the city of Nebraska City, Nebr., and for other purposes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS CUMBERLAND RIVER.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa, also, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1525) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River between Burnside, Ky., and Carthage, in Tennessee, or the South Fork of said river between Burnside and Tateville, Ky.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

COMPENSATION OF CHIEFS OF DIVISION, GENERAL LAND OFFICE.

Mr. HUDD, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9422) to regulate and increase the compensation of chiefs of division in the General Land Office; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH MOUNT VERNON ARSENAL RESERVATION, ALABAMA.

Mr. MAISH, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably with an amendment the bill (H. R. 8632) granting the right of way to the Mobile and Birmingham Railway Company across the Mount Vernon arsenal reservation, in Mobile County, Alabama; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RAILROAD BRIDGE, FORT SMITH, ARK.

Mr. CRISP, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 9816) to authorize the building of a railroad bridge at Fort Smith, Ark.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

LUCY M. SWINNEA AND MARY E. HANSERD.

Mr. STOCKDALE, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8127) for the relief of Lucy M. Swinnea and Mary E. Hanserd; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ADVERSE REPORT.

On motion of Mr. SOWDEN, the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6100) for the erection of a public building at New London, Conn., and the bill was laid on the table.

WILLIAM GAFFER AND OTHERS.

Mr. MACDONALD, from the Committee on the Public Lands, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9234) for the relief of William Gaffer and his legal representatives and assigns; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. HATCH. I now move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills.

Mr. STEELE. I demand the regular order, which I believe is the hour for consideration of bills called up by committees.

The SPEAKER. But the rule provides that immediately after the first morning hour it shall be in order to make a motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills or revenue bills. If that motion be not agreed to, then the consideration hour will begin.

Mr. STEELE. I hope the gentleman from Missouri will allow us to have this morning hour, which we have not had since February 8. There are two or three very important matters from the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HATCH. The gentleman ought to make the request at some time when it will not delay the agricultural appropriation bill, which ought to pass at once.

Mr. STEELE. There can only be a delay of one hour.

Mr. HATCH. I have not an hour at my disposal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of appropriation bills.

Mr. STEELE. If this motion be agreed to, will it dispense with the morning hour for the consideration of bills from committees?

The SPEAKER. It will not, unless the House should again go into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of some other matter.

Mr. STEELE. I hope, then, we may have the consideration hour after the agricultural bill is disposed of.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. HATCH, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of general appropriation bills, it was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. MCCREARY in the chair) and proceeded to the consideration of the first general appropriation bill in order, being the bill (H. R. 10233) making an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

Mr. HATCH. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with and that all general debate upon the bill may be considered as closed.

There being no objection, the order requested by Mr. HATCH was made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now read the bill by paragraphs for consideration under the five-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Laboratory—Chemical division: For chemical apparatus, chemicals, laboratory fixtures and supplies, purchase of samples, and necessary expenses in conducting special investigations, including necessary traveling expenses, labor, and expert work in such investigations, $6,000: *Provided*, That the accounting officers of the United States Treasury are hereby authorized and directed to allow credit to Norman J. Colman, Commissioner of Agriculture, in the sum of $1,809.16, on his account for "laboratory" for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1885, disallowed by the First Comptroller as per his report of adjustment of laboratory account numbered 247504, dated December 19, 1885.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I move *pro forma* to amend by striking out the last word. I do this for the purpose of asking the gentleman in charge of this bill [Mr. HATCH] the reason for the proviso just read.

Mr. HATCH. My attention was diverted for a moment. What is the proviso?

Mr. BUCHANAN. I refer to the proviso giving a credit to the Commissioner of Agriculture, as I understand, against the ruling of the First Comptroller. It seems to be in the nature of a claim; and I would like to know the reason for the provision.

Mr. HATCH. This is not a claim at all. A portion of a fund appropriated to one division was expended in another. This is simply a transfer of the sum stated from the laboratory fund to another fund indicated in the decision of the Comptroller. The question is merely one of book-keeping; this is not a claim at all. There is not a doubt that this money was expended in good faith, though expended in the wrong division. The effect of this proviso is to remedy the difficulty which has thus arisen in the matter of accounts.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. CANNON. I renew the amendment for the purpose of addressing an inquiry to the gentleman in charge of this bill. I find that on page 15 there is noted an increase of salaries to the amount of $9,230. I would be glad to know what salaries are increased and the necessity for such increase.

Mr. HATCH. There has been an adjustment and rearrangement of some of the salaries. If the gentleman will read the report he will find that the increase as to a part of these salaries is apparent, and as to another part actual.

Mr. CANNON. I have the report in my hand, and have consulted it. It states:

> There has been a readjustment and partial equalization of salaries in several of the divisions, which show an increase on account of salaries of $9,230, a part of which is, however, now paid out of the general fund, and is therefore only an apparent increase in the actual expenditures.

Mr. HATCH. I will give the gentleman one instance. The Commissioner found that he had an inadequate force in the disbursing division of the Department, and he was compelled to transfer a $1,400 clerk to that division for the purpose of keeping up the work there. And in this bill we provide an additional assistant clerk at $1,400, and add this to the salary list, which assistant has been paid heretofore out of the general fund.

But I will state to the gentleman, generally, that there were several salaries that in the opinion of the committee ought to be increased, as they were two or three hundred dollars lower than similar salaries paid to officers doing like service in other Departments of the Government, and the committee as far as it could do so, equalized them with the amounts paid for similar services in other Departments.

Mr. CANNON. But the gentleman knows that it has been the policy of the Government ever since the Forty-seventh Congress to absolutely prohibit—in fact the law prohibits—the payment of any salaries out of the contingent or other funds appropriated to the Departments in Washington, except where they are specially provided for and where the appropriation is made specifically; and it does occur to me that this committee is entitled to know and ought to know, either from the report or by some statement by the gentleman who makes the report and which is to go upon the record, what specific salaries have been increased and what it is that makes up this aggregate of $9,230 increase.

Mr. HATCH. If the gentleman had called my attention to this matter when that part of the bill which has been gone over was under consideration, I could probably have referred to these items in detail as we proceeded; but I will state generally as I recollect the matter now. The salary of the Commissioner of Agriculture has been increased $500, and the committee were unanimous in recommending that increase, because the Commissioner of Agriculture is the only head of a department or bureau of any consequence or importance in any Department of the Government whose salary is less than $5,000.

Mr. MORGAN. Permit me to say further that it was the opinion of the committee that it would not last more than three or four months.

Mr. HATCH. Probably not so long as that. We hope at all events that it will not go very far beyond.

Then the salary of the disbursing clerk has been fixed heretofore at $1,800. The present occupant of the position has been there for a number of years, and the amount of money that he now disburses has been increased almost tenfold, and his bond has been increased in a corresponding ratio. He has been paid this salary of $1,800 heretofore, which the committee think proper to increase to $2,000, which is still $500 less than salaries paid to officers performing similar duties in any other Department of the Government.

Then we increased by $250 per annum the salary of the superintendent of the grounds, Mr. Saunders, who has been in charge of that Department since its organization and done more to build up and increase the practical work of the Department of Agriculture, I think, than any ten men connected with the Department, and we thought he was entitled to this slight increase of $250 of salary.

That is, as I recollect it, the substantial increases in any salaries, except the statement which I have already made, where clerks have been simply detailed to perform this work and who are now upon the salaried list.

Mr. CANNON. That, Mr. Chairman, covers about one thousand out of the nine thousand and odd dollars of increase. Now I do not want to burden the gentleman, but I will ask him, when he comes to revise his remarks in this connection, to be kind enough to give us a detailed statement—a tabulated statement—showing the items which go to make up this increase.

Mr. HATCH. I will do that with pleasure. I will ask the clerk to make up a tabulated statement and incorporate it in my remarks. I will state as it now occurs to me, in the same connection, that the salary of the librarian is fixed by a provision in the Revised Statutes at $1,800; but for the last few years, for some reason, it has been reported in the appropriation bill at $1,400. The committee have restored it to the amount fixed by law, because of the importance of the position and the efficient and excellent work done by the present incumbent.

Mr. CANNON. I want to say now, Mr. Chairman, a word after what the gentleman from Missouri has stated. The other day in considering the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL], bringing that under-jaw of his up with the strength that he can exhibit on certain occasions [laughter], announced in the presence of the House that this was "a bad year to increase salaries," and I think the loudest applause that I have heard during this session came from gentlemen on that side of the House, and some of us applauded on this side, being glad to know that another year was to run around when the officers of the Government were to have substantially the same salary as former officials had. You may judge then of my surprise after hearing that statement on taking up this bill——

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HATCH. I will yield my time to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CANNON. Judge of my surprise, Mr. Chairman, on taking up this bill to discover that these increases mentioned here had been made, not set out in the report or in the bill; in fact, sir, I would have missed them altogether had it not been that I struck it on the last page of the bill.

Mr. BIGGS. It is all in the interest of agriculture, my friend.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I am glad——

Mr. BIGGS. And I hope you will not make any fight against the producing element.

Mr. CANNON. Then I suppose now that the crops will grow better——

Mr. BIGGS. They will.

Mr. CANNON. And the rains will descend, and the refreshing dews fall, and the markets will be increased, and we will have peace and plenty and prosperity covering the entire country, because we have increased these salaries which were provided in former years as not only sufficient but ample, and especially in view of the announcement the other day that it was a bad year to increase salaries.

I merely wanted to show that your side of the House had been consistent for two days, but now the line of consistency is broken. It may be in some of these instances the increase was warranted. Then if you wanted to do equal and exact justice you ought to wander back to the long years past, when you did not appropriate these salaries, for the Librarian for instance, and perhaps give him a deficiency. I do not know whether that would help agriculture or not. I merely want to call attention to the fact that so far as salaries are concerned, notwithstanding your former and present professions of economy, it does make some difference whose ox is gored.

Mr. HATCH. I am not responsible for anything which is stated by the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, nor for any position taken by the gentleman from Illinois or any member of the Committee on Appropriations. The Committee on Agriculture do not feel themselves bound by any precedent established by the Committee on Appropriations of this House; and when we think that it is for the best interest of the public service that certain salaries should be increased in the Department of Agriculture we are not afraid to do it in this year of our Lord 1888, or in any other year.

The Committee on Agriculture have reported this bill to the House after a careful investigation and examination of all these questions, believing that every single appropriation recommended is for the best interest of the public service; and we do not stand on two or three hundred dollars upon the salary of this man or that and try to reduce to a minimum the employés of the Government. The fact is that this is a great and growing Department, and most of the employés in it have been there for a great while. They have a reputation in the country as heads of their respective departments of being the very best men that can be employed for the salaries paid.

I want to state to the gentleman from Illinois that since the establishment of the experimental colleges throughout the United States it is difficult for the Commissioner to keep competent men in two or three of the divisions upon the salaries authorized. The States to-day are paying 20 or 30 per cent. more for chemists, entomologists, pomologists, etc., than the Government is paying for the same class of work in the Department of Agriculture. And I submit to my friend that the employés in the Department of Agriculture are entitled at any rate to

such salaries as the States and colleges are paying for the same work throughout the country.

The following will show the increase and additions of salaries for the Department of Agriculture as compared with the appropriation for the year ending June 30, 1888, which I submit in reply to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]:

Commissioner of Agriculture	$500	
Librarian	400	
Disbursing officer	200	
Superintendent of folding-room	200	
Fireman and steam-fitter	180	
Assistant microscopist	200	
Superintendent experimental garden and grounds	250	
Chief of seed division	200	
		$2,130
New offices created by reason of the growth of the several divisions in the Department of Agriculture:		
Assistant disbursing officer	1,400	
Assistant botanist	1,400	
Artist pomological division	1,200	
Assistant pomologist	1,000	
Assistant of forestry	1,200	
Clerk of division of forestry	900	
		7,100
Total increase		9,230

Mr. WASHINGTON. I dislike very much to disagree with my good friend, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, on any subject or any point connected with this bill. But I feel compelled, inasmuch as the increase of salaries in the Agricultural Department commences with the head of the department and not with the underpaid class of employés in the lower divisions, whose services are worth more than they are getting, who are perhaps, as the gentleman says, underpaid—and I have no objection to their being paid a sum equivalent to the services they perform, whether scientific or clerical—but I feel compelled to make the point of order on the salary of the Commissioner of Agriculture.

This bill raises his salary $500. When he went into the office his salary was fixed. He has performed the service for that salary, and we have not heard that he is complaining. I suppose he has been well paid. In conformity with rulings of the Chair on other occasions, I make the point of order.

Mr. HATCH. I make the point of order that the point of order of the gentleman from Tennessee comes too late. The paragraph in which the salary of the Commissioner of Agriculture is fixed has been passed, and no point of order was made when that was reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order. The point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH], that the point of order of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] is now too late, is sustained.

Mr. WASHINGTON. When the Clerk commenced reading the bill I supposed he was reading it the first time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair distinctly stated that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] had asked unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill; and there was no objection to that request.

Mr. WASHINGTON. If I can not make the point of order, I now move to amend the bill by reducing the salary of the Commissioner of Agriculture $500.

Mr. HATCH. I make the point of order that we have passed that paragraph, and that the amendment is not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BURROWS. I desire to ask, were not all points of order on the bill reserved?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not remember; but if they were, they should be made when the paragraphs to which they apply are reached.

Mr. HATCH. Points of order were reserved.

Mr. BURROWS. I understand the bill is all in one section.

Mr. HATCH. No, sir; not in one section nor in one paragraph.

Mr. BURROWS. It is all in one section, and the gentleman from Tennessee made the point of order against this provision. All points of order having been reserved, I do not see why the point of order should not be made now.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I am also loth to disagree with the Chair on this matter, but I call attention to the fact that this bill is composed of 344 lines, and if 344 consecutive lines without a break do not constitute one section, what in the name of common sense does? This whole bill is one section.

The CHAIRMAN. The decision of the Chair is not governed by the question of sections. This bill is being read by paragraphs, and the paragraphs relate to different subjects, and the Clerk has already read paragraphs relating to a number of subjects. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] made the point of order that the point of order of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] was too late, because the paragraph to which it related had been passed, and the Chair sustained the point of order of the gentleman from Missouri in accordance with the uniform rulings in such cases.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. Chairman, my time is quite limited, and I trust that the gentleman from Tennessee will not consume any more of it upon this point, but will let the Clerk proceed with the reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the *pro forma* amendment will be considered as withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For collecting and disseminating information relating to silk-culture; for purchasing and distributing silk-worm eggs, and for conducting at some point in the District of Columbia experiments with automatic machinery for reeling from the cocoon, and for expenses incurred in collecting, purchasing, preparing for transportation, and transporting the cocoons necessary therefor, and for necessary traveling expenses, $15,000. And the Commissioner of Agriculture is hereby authorized to sell in open market any and all reeled silk and silk waste produced in these experiments, and to apply the proceeds of such sales to the payment of the legitimate expenses incurred therein; and the Commissioner of Agriculture shall make full report to Congress of the experiments herein provided for, and also of all sales and purchases made under this paragraph, with the names and residences of all producers of cocoons of whom purchases are made.

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. My object is to get some information from the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, who has charge of this bill. I call his attention especially to the language in lines 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, and 169. Provision is there made for an appropriation of $15,000 for certain specific purposes. What are they? I read, commencing in line 164:

And for conducting at some point in the District of Columbia experiments with automatic machinery for reeling silk from the cocoon, and for expenses incurred in collecting, purchasing, preparing for transportation, and transporting the cocoons necessary therefor.

Now that all relates to the purchase, preparation for transportation, and transportation of the cocoons "necessary therefor." Necessary for what? For "conducting at some point in the District of Columbia experiments with automatic machinery for reeling silk from the cocoon."

Under that provision the Department of Agriculture would not have authority to purchase a cocoon for any other experimental station, and, as the gentleman well knows, there is in my State—perhaps in his State also, but certainly there is in mine—an experimental station which promises very satisfactory results. If this language will confine the purchase of cocoons for experimental purposes to a station in the District of Columbia, of course none can be purchased for the other experimental stations, and I therefore suggest to the gentleman that, in order to obviate that difficulty, he agree to strike out in line 168 the words "necessary therefor." That will remove the restriction.

Mr. HATCH. I have no objection. I will accept that amendment on behalf of the committee. I think the gentleman is somewhat particular about the point, but rather than take up time in discussing it I will move to strike out the words "necessary therefor," in line 168, so that the provision may have the broadest latitude.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. RYAN. Now I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture whether there will be sufficient funds to purchase all the cocoons necessary for experimental purposes before the commencement of the next fiscal year.

Mr. HATCH. I will state to the gentleman that a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture (of which the gentleman from California [Mr. BIGGS] was chairman) was appointed to investigate that subject. They had a conference with the Commissioner and with the superintendent of the sericulture division of the Agricultural Department, and they reported unanimously that no additional appropriation was necessary for this fiscal year, because there would be a sufficient amount to pay for all the cocoons that would be ready for market.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, I renew the formal amendment. There has been no general debate and this bill has not been read in full, and therefore I do not think I need to apologize for taking up a few minutes in getting some information from the committee. I am interested in the subject under discussion, but I am not thoroughly informed. I notice that the words in lines 162 and 163 indicating the object to which the appropriation is directed are "for collecting and disseminating information relating to silk culture," and I notice that in line 178 the language is "for the encouragement and development of the culture of raising raw silk."

Mr. HATCH. The gentleman will notice the difference. The first paragraph to which he calls attention makes an appropriation of $15,000 for the Department of Agriculture. The other one is "for the encouragement and development of the culture of raising raw silk, $5,000, to be expended under the direction of the Woman's Silk-Culture Association of the United States, located at Philadelphia," which is the exact language of the law of the present fiscal year, and, so far as I know, the character of the work which that association is doing is very satisfactory.

Mr. ADAMS. Is the language in line 162 exactly the language that is in the act making appropriations for the current year?

Mr. HATCH. It is.

Mr. ADAMS. And does it, as the more general term, include "the culture of raising raw silk?" I desire that it should be a more general term and should include the more specific term below.

Mr. HATCH. It is; and the Commissioner is buying all the cocoons

raised in the United States that he can get. That is exactly what he is doing.

Mr. ADAMS. All right.

Mr. RYAN. The amendment already made renders it necessary to strike out the word "the" in line 168.

Mr. HATCH. Yes; the word "the" in line 168 before the word "cocoons" should be struck out.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, that amendment will be made. The Chair hears no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the encouragement and development of the culture of raising raw silk, $5,000, to be expended under the direction of the Women's Silk Culture Association of the United States, located at Philadelphia, and to be paid directly to said association; and said association shall make a full and detailed report of the expenditures and results obtained under this appropriation, and also under the appropriation to said association made for the fiscal years 1887 and 1888, as provided by law, if not already made, to the Commissioner of Agriculture, who shall transmit the same to Congress, and $2,500 for the same purposes and under the same restrictions and conditions, to the California Ladies' Silk Culture Association of California, and for the continuation of the study and experiments, by Joseph Neuman and associates, of the wild native silk-worm of California, $2,500; and the said Joseph Neuman shall report the results of such work to Congress through the Commissioner of Agriculture on or before the 1st day of January, 1889.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Reserving a point of order on line 192 and the following lines to the end of the paragraph, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture something about this specific appropriation to Mr. Neuman—whether it is a new thing or an old one; if an old thing, what is he doing, and if a new thing, what he proposes to do. The only evidence that I have seen of his activity is a room down on Pennsylvania avenue which has a very nice sign in front, but which is evidently visited by nobody, cared for by nobody, and which interests nobody. I suppose there is more active, intelligent, and valuable work back of that; but I would like to know something about it.

Mr. HATCH. If the gentleman from New Jersey will step into that establishment which he has described, down on Pennsylvania avenue, he will get a great deal of information. The discovery of this native cocoon growing in its natural state in the open air in certain portions of California is regarded by the Representatives from that State as a very valuable discovery and well worthy of an appropriation of $2,500 for the purpose of further investigating and reporting to this House at the next session or at the end of the next fiscal year, the probabilities of making that a great industry of this country. The gentleman from California on this side [Mr. BIGGS] or either of the gentlemen from California on the other side can enlighten the gentleman from New Jersey on this subject to a greater extent than I can; they have more information about it. But I will state that the majority of the Representatives from the State of California were present in our committee-room, and it was upon their suggestion that the sum of $5,000 given to the State of California in connection with this subject was divided in this way. As it is entirely satisfactory to the Representatives of that State, I hope the gentleman from New Jersey will not make any objection.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I have not made any point of order and will not do so.

Mr. BIGGS. That is right.

The Clerk read as follows:

Seed division: For the purchase, propagation, and distribution, as required by law, of seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, and expenses of labor, transportation, paper, twine, gum, printing, postal-cards, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same, and to be distributed in localities adapted to their culture, $100,000.

Mr. LIND. For the purpose of asking a question, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture whether this appropriation of $100,000 includes a sufficient amount of money to enable the Commissioner of Agriculture in the future to make purchases of seed wheat for distribution.

Mr. HATCH. It unquestionably does.

Mr. LIND. I will state what my experience was last year—not for the purpose of criticising the Commissioner, but simply as a matter of fact. As the gentleman is aware, wheat is the great staple of our State, and I had probably a thousand inquiries for seed wheat, particularly for Russian wheat. I went to the Commissioner soon after coming to Washington and requested him to procure some Russian seed wheat. He complained that the appropriation was insufficient; that he had not the means. The commissioner of agriculture of Canada, however, imported a cargo of Russian wheat, and I wrote to him asking for some. He very courteously sent some to me for my own use, and sent some to my friends.

Now, it does seem to me that it is hardly proper or in good taste to compel an American citizen, if he wants to get a desirable quality of seed, to apply to a Canadian official in order to secure it. If the gentleman has any doubt about the sufficiency of the appropriation for this purpose, I ask to offer an amendment to increase the appropriation.

Mr. HATCH. I think the gentleman will not offer his amendment when he hears my explanation. I agree with everything he has said. It is simply a criticism upon the kind and character of seeds which have been purchased under the direction of our Commissioner of Agriculture.

Mr. LIND. I did not so intend it. I understood the appropriation was insufficient.

Mr. HATCH. If the gentleman calls again upon the Commissioner, and the Commissioner states that $100,000 is not a sufficient sum to enable him to carry out the provision of existing law which requires him to purchase for distribution rare and valuable seeds, I hope the gentleman will suggest to the Commissioner that Russian wheat is a rare and valuable seed for distribution throughout the Northwest, and will tell the Commissioner to buy less turnip and radish seed and more Russian wheat-seed.

We have simply in this bill to give to the Commissioner the authority to carry out the law, as that law on the statute-book requires him to buy only rare and valuable seed which will benefit the agriculturists and farmers of the United States, and $100,000 is every dollar that ought to be appropriated, and a large portion of it should be used in the purchase of seed such as the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] has indicated.

Mr. LIND. I withdraw the amendment.

Mr. ENLOE. I move to amend in line 233 by striking out "$100,000" and inserting "$50,000," and I do it for this reason: I understand the object of establishing the Agriculture Department, but I understand the object for which it was established has been perverted and that it has become a sort of political machine for the purpose of electioneering in a cheap way by members for their return to Congress.

A great deal of the time of members of Congress which ought to be devoted to public business is taken up in answering requests for garden seed such as can be bought in any store of the country. I say it is a perversion of the public funds to use them in buying common seed which can be purchased anywhere and distributing them all over the country for the purpose of securing the return of members of Congress to this House.

If the money should be used as the chairman of the committee suggests, to buy rare and valuable seed, and new varieties, such as will have the effect to promote the interests of agriculture, then I say the appropriation would be a proper one. I object to the administration of the law as it is administered, and I object to the present use of this fund because I believe that it can be applied to better purposes. I say, furthermore, if we are not going to reduce the appropriation or change the administration of this law, then we ought to increase the appropriation, so that every member on this floor can send to each one of his constituents a portion of the seed. As it is, a Democratic member finds nearly all the good farmers in his district belong to the Democratic party, and therefore distributes to them the packages of seed which have been sent to him from the Department, and the Republican farmers get very few, or none. [Laughter.] And when the Republican member of Congress comes to distribute his seed he does not find many good Democratic farmers in his district, and he distributes nearly all of his packages of seed to the Republican farmers, and the Democratic farmers get none. [Laughter and cries of dissent from various parts of the House.]

Mr. HATCH. I do not know how it is with the gentleman from Tennessee, but I wish to say that his remarks have no application to many members on this side of the House.

Mr. ENLOE. I am glad I have thrown a rock which has hit somewhere, and to judge from the effect it has produced it struck all around. [Laughter.]

I wish to say that so far as I am individually concerned I have distributed seeds to all who applied for them, as long as I had any to distribute, regardless of the politics of the applicant, and I am satisfied that my experience is the common experience. Most of those who applied were Democrats, and of those sent without application I have generally sent them to my friends, who I thought would make proper use of them. So it followed that in my district most of the seeds went to Democrats, and I have not a doubt that in Republican districts most of the seeds go to Republicans for the very same reasons. They are necessarily distributed to a greater or less extent on political lines; and often designedly so. I am firmly of the opinion that this appropriation should be restricted so as to provide only a sufficient fund for the purchase of such rare, new, and valuable varieties of seeds as are necessary to the proper tests in different sections of the country, as contemplated in the creation of this Department; or it should be increased as I have said, to a sufficient sum to give every citizen an equal showing in the distribution of such common varieties of seeds as are used by every farmer and gardener in this country. The present system is a palpable fraud on the agricultural interests of the country. If the method of administration can not be changed, the law providing for this distribution ought to be wiped from the statute-books.

Mr. BIGGS. I do not like to interrupt the remarks of my friend from Tennessee, but I can not permit them to go out without entering my protest against them. They do not apply to me in the distribution of packages of seed which I receive from the Agricultural Department. I send them to the postmasters of my district, and they are distributed by those postmasters amongst the farmers so as to do the most good in the promotion of agriculture. Therefore I hope the gen-

tleman from Tennessee will withdraw his sweeping charge about these seeds being distributed merely for electioneering purposes. [Applause.]

Mr. ENLOE. I am very sorry I did any injustice to my friend from California. It may be different in his State, but I think members generally will admit the distribution of these seeds is made throughout the country as I have stated.

Mr. BIGGS. You have no right to impugn the motives of any member upon this floor.

Mr. ENLOE. I certainly do not intend to impugn the motives of any gentleman here, and especially I do not intend to impugn the motives of my distinguished friend from California, for I do not know what they do in California; but I do know how the distribution of these seeds is generally made. I merely wish to add that, in my judgment, if the appropriation is made these seeds should be distributed through the commissioners of agriculture in the several States, and not through Senators and Members of Congress.

Mr. YOST. I agree to some extent with what was said by the gentleman who has moved the amendment to reduce the appropriation. Some six thousand packages of seed are distributed to each member of Congress. There are some fifty thousand families in each district. It is necessary for the purpose of accomplishing any good to send six packages to each family. These six thousand packages therefore would only supply a thousand families, while the other forty-nine thousand are left without seeds. Either the system of distribution ought to be abolished or the appropriation should be made sufficient to give to every member of Congress enough seed to distribute to every family in his district, and thereby avoid the discrimination he is now compelled to exercise.

I distribute the seeds allotted me, so far as I can, to the poor people in my district. That is the only rule I have, and I do it irrespective of politics. I know there are more than one thousand families in my district who want these seeds. I know there are more than ten thousand poor families in my district, as there are in the districts of other gentlemen on this floor, and my contention is that a member should be enabled to supply the reasonable demand made upon him, or else that the present system of distribution be abolished.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully submit to the members of the committee that the entire theory and purpose of this appropriation appear to be misunderstood. It is not for the purpose of furnishing every man who chooses to apply to the Department with a supply of seed for ordinary domestic purposes.

Mr. HATCH. That is right.

Mr. MORGAN. It is for the purpose of distributing seed of superior quality and of different varieties amongst the people in order that they may get a foundation or root; and after establishing the value of the class of seed that then thereafter they may be distributed generally amongst the people from the usual sources of supply—not that the Agricultural Department should supply everybody by any means.

Mr. WARNER. Then, of course, you want to put them in the hands of the most intelligent people; and in that way you would send the great bulk of them to my Republican constituents. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORGAN. The theory is to send these seed to such leading persons, agriculturists, and gardeners who may understand the best mode of using them, and demonstrate their adaptability to the soil or climate in which they are used, and not for the special benefit of the persons so using them, but as an experiment for the benefit of the whole people.

Now, we send to Russia for Russian wheat, for instance, and get the seed here. When that seed has been tested and found to be adapted to the climate or soil in which it is to be used, it can be generally distributed throughout the land; and so it is with rare and valuable seeds of all kinds.

It is a mistake, then, to come here and say that the purpose of this law was for the benefit of individual constituents of any member of this House. It is an entire misunderstanding of the purpose. These seeds should be distributed in the manner that will produce the best results for all the people and place the seed by actual reproduction in the reach of all.

Mr. HATCH. I hope now, Mr. Chairman, that the committee will come to a vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Tennessee. I do not want to make a motion to limit debate, but the time I am allowed to occupy with this bill is limited, and this question has been discussed so often that it is scarcely necessary to go over the ground again.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I hope the gentleman will not cut off amendments.

Mr. HATCH. I do not want to cut off amendments, but simply to cut off debate.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have an amendment I wish to offer.

Mr. HATCH. Then I ask unanimous consent that debate be closed now, and that we may vote upon such amendments as are offered.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I must object, because I want to offer an amendment, and will need a minute or two to explain it.

Mr. HATCH. Then I ask a vote on the pending amendment.

The question was taken on the amendment of Mr. ENLOE, and it was rejected.

Mr. BREWER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word; and I make this motion for the purpose of calling the attention of the Committee of the Whole, as well as the Committee on Agriculture, especially to the fact that we have appropriated already over $500,000 for the purpose of establishing agricultural-experimental stations in each of the States and Territories of the Union. It has been suggested by my friend from Minnesota [Mr. LIND] that the great desire of the Northwest is to experiment with Russian wheat, wheat growing being their great industry.

It does seem to me, after we have established these experiment stations in each of the States and Territories, that the experiments should all be made at the stations themselves. The advantage of such an arrangement is obvious. Suppose the Commissioner of Agriculture should purchase some of this Russian wheat for the purpose of experimenting with it in the Northwestern States. He can send this wheat to the experimental stations, instead of being distributed generally throughout the Northwest among the citizens, where the benefit, if any arises from the test, will not become generally known. But by sending it to these stations, in Minnesota, for instance, it can there be tested under the best conditions, and the results made known to the people generally, not for the benefit alone of the State of Minnesota, but for the whole Northwest. If it is desired to send a package of it to each of the experimental stations that can be done, and the experiment made in different climes, with different kinds of soil and different modes of treatment; and so on with every valuable class of seed which is purchased and distributed by the Department. This arrangement would save this sending out promiscuously of seed all over the country, from which the Agricultural Department gets no benefit or return from the experiments which have been made.

Mr. STEELE. Why would it not be better to allow the superintendents of these institutions to exercise their own judgment in buying the seeds adapted to their particular localities?

Mr. BREWER. This question, it seems to me, had better be under the guidance of one person, and should all be done from one place here in the city of Washington, and by the Commissioner of Agriculture. He can procure the seeds and send them where he thinks fit, or as may be requested by the experimental stations themselves.

These stations, after making experiments, publish their reports of all experiments, and, as I have said, the people of Minnesota and all of the other States will have the benefit of the experiments made there. In this manner we can obtain the advantage of all the tests of every new variety of seeds. This is why we have appropriated $500,000, the very purpose of which is to secure these experiments, made under the most favorable circumstances, in order that everybody may have the benefit. That was the plan in view in the adoption of the stations; but, as stated here on the floor, we now simply send the seeds out to poor people all through the country, and in the district from which a Representative comes to any one who asks for them—I know I do—and the result is that not one single report comes in from any one who has received seeds in my district; and I apprehend that the same occurs in all districts throughout the country as to the result of the experiments made in them. Why have we made these great appropriations except that the people of the whole country should have the results of the experiments? It seems to me that it was the intention and object of the appropriation of this large sum to enable the people to have the benefit of the experiments made at these stations.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HATCH. I desire to say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BREWER] that the Committee on Agriculture are satisfied that probably within the next year this amount of $100,000 can be very materially decreased because of the work which will be done by the different experimental stations; but he will remember they are just established. They have not raised any crop, and will not be able to raise any crop probably before the expiration of the next fiscal year so as to distribute valuable seeds.

The Commissioner has the distribution of one-third of all the seeds provided under this paragraph, and it is his duty, and he will do it, to distribute to each of these stations such rare and valuable seeds as may come into his possession for trial in different sections and latitudes of the country. I am satisfied that in time this appropriation can be largely reduced, if not entirely done away with.

Mr. BREWER. And the experiments made as I suggested?

Mr. HATCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. BREWER. Have the Committee on Agriculture considered this question in the line I have suggested?

Mr. HATCH. They have, in every shape of it. I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LAIRD].

Mr. LAIRD. I want to make this suggestion to my friend from Michigan and the House. It can not escape the attention of the House that the entire discussion so far which obstructs the passage of this bill is addressed to matters of administration alone, and not to matters of legislation. I am bound to say from my investigation of the Department, having been on that subcommittee—and I do so cheerfully—that

the present head of it has administered it so practically that he is a monument in certain respects and aspects of the administration of the office of merit.

Witness the conduct of the business of his Department concerning the suppression of diseases among domestic animals. These things can not escape Mr. Colman; they do not; they will not. And I submit the important thing for the House and the business of the country is to proceed to dispatch this business.

I am perfectly willing to trust my interest and the interests of my constituents to the matters exclusively of administration which belong to the Commissioner of Agriculture. If the country is not satisfied with that administration they know how to secure their remedy.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move to strike out the last two words for the purpose of making an inquiry and a suggestion. The object of this distribution of seeds throughout the country is to secure the introduction of new and valuable varieties.

Mr. HATCH. The words of the law are "rare and valuable varieties."

Mr. DINGLEY. That object I commend. I do not know any other plan can be adopted that will work on the whole more successfully than the present one. I wish there could be, because it brings to all of us a great deal of inconvenience.

But I want to call attention to one point in connection with the administration of this office. It is often the case that rare and valuable seeds and plants are purchased by the Commissioner and the fact goes into the newspapers. Members of Congress are immediately besieged by letters calling attention to the fact that the Agricultural Department has such and such seeds and plants and desire they should be sent to them, and when the inquiry is made it is found that they have all been distributed.

I call attention particularly to one article, Chapman's honey plant. Early in this session I received letters calling attention to the fact that the newspapers had announced that that valuable seed or plant was in the Agricultural Department for distribution. Having received several letters, I sent them to the Agricultural Department, asking that the seeds or plants might be distributed. After a time I received a notice that the Department had had such plants, but that they were all distributed; and, so far as I can learn, not a single package of that seed or plant has gone to the State of Maine, although they have been distributed in many other directions.

Now, my inquiry is, what is the use of those plants if we can not receive them? What I particularly object to is that public notice is not immediately given that such and such plants are ready for distribution. When I applied for those plants and received the answer that they were distributed, it appeared to me that when there are any seeds or plants of a rare character to be distributed they should be distributed in a way that will carry them into various parts of the country, in order that their value may be tested and the seeds sent to the various localities throughout the various States suitable for their cultivation.

Mr. MORGAN. I ask the gentleman from Maine, can we not effect that through agricultural colleges when they come into operation?

Mr. DINGLEY. Very likely. I am now speaking of the present administration.

Mr. HATCH. The gentleman from Maine is simply criticising the administration of the law; and I submit to him that has nothing in the world to do with the adoption of this paragraph.

Mr. DINGLEY. I admit that.

Mr. HATCH. If there has been any dereliction on the part of the Commissioner or any of the authorities there in regard to the fair and equal distribution of seeds under the existing law, the gentleman ought simply to make a statement of the facts to the House and send the matter to the Committee on Agriculture for investigation.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is just what I am doing.

Mr. MORGAN. And I hope that the committee will go the whole length with the gentleman.

Mr. DINGLEY withdrew his *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. GROSVENOR was recognized.

Mr. HATCH. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAIDLAW].

Mr. GROSVENOR. I have the floor to offer an amendment.

Mr. HATCH. I ask the gentleman to withhold that for a moment, in order that the gentleman from New York [Mr. LAIDLAW] may make a brief statement.

Mr. LAIDLAW. Mr. Chairman, so far as the honey-plant is concerned, I can give the committee all the light they require on that subject. All of that plant that the Department got was obtained from a constituent of mine at my suggestion. The Bee-Keepers' Association of the United States have been canvassing the question of this honey-plant, which, in the opinion of bee-keepers, is a plant of very great merit, and is indorsed by the Bee-Keepers' Association of the United States. The Department, as I have said, got only a very small quantity of the plant, and got it from a gentleman in my district, but of course the Bee-Keepers' Journal immediately announced that the Department had the plant for distribution, and the consequence was a great multitude of applications for it. I received a number of letters myself from my own district asking for the plant, but I knew the Commissioner did not have it to give, and I know that many, many applications were denied for that reason.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Add at end of line 233 the following:

"*Provided*, That it shall be unlawful for the Commissioner of Agriculture or any subordinate of the Department to buy for or furnish to any member of Congress or other person any seed beyond the regular quota of seed allotted to such person or to pack or put up or mail to or for any person any such extra seed; nor shall it be lawful for such Commissioner or any subordinate to act as agent for any seedman or other person either in buying or selling any seed beyond the amount allowed by this bill."

Mr. HATCH. I make the point of order upon that amendment that it changes existing law—that it is new legislation, and is not in order upon this bill. I do not want to take the gentleman from Ohio off of the floor or prevent him from making his statement, but I make the point of order.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I will speak to the point of order. Mr. Chairman, does the law of the United States authorize the Commissioner of Agriculture to be the agent of a seedsman to buy seeds for members of Congress? Is that the point of order? Where is the law which authorizes the abuse which this amendment seeks to correct?

Mr. HATCH. The provision of the bill which has just been read and is now under discussion is an exact copy of existing law.

Mr. GROSVENOR. But it is silent upon this subject. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. HATCH] makes the mistake of supposing that because this amendment proposes an enactment, it proposes to change existing law. I know of no law upon this particular subject, and it seems very strange to me that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture seeks to prevent putting into this bill so simple and salutary a provision as this.

Mr. HATCH. I do not want to discuss the merits of the matter, but if the gentleman will reflect for a moment, he will see that while the law as it stands to-day is as broad and comprehensive and as binding on the Commissioner as it is possible to make it, there are cases occurring between members of this House when an allotment of seeds which is made to one member is more valuable to some other member, and there are members from city districts, who, from time to time, have quantities of seeds allotted to them which they can not use in their districts and which are distributed among other members.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I wish the gentleman would listen to this amendment which I have offered, because it does not affect that matter at all.

Mr. HATCH. I listened to it very attentively, and I insist upon the point of order.

Mr. GROSVENOR. It does not affect that at all. The amendment I have offered is intended merely to interdict the matter described and nothing else. It does not affect the right of the Department to issue to my friend on the other side the quota of myself and as many other members as will assign their quotas to him.

Mr. HATCH. I think there is no necessity for a provision of this kind in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order. The third paragraph of Rule XXI contains this language:

Nor shall any provision changing existing law be in order in any general appropriation bill or any amendment thereto.

The Chair thinks that the amendment sent up by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] changes existing law.

Mr. GROSVENOR. What law?

The CHAIRMAN. It adds to the law as it now stands; it qualifies the existing law in such a way as to change it.

Mr. HATCH. In other words, it makes new law.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. ENLOE. I move to amend by inserting, after the word "culture," in line 233, the words "through the State experimental stations," so that these seeds shall be distributed through the State experimental stations instead of by members of Congress.

Mr. HATCH. I raise the point of order that the amendment changes existing law by taking it out of the power of members of Congress to distribute these seeds; it changes the whole system of distribution.

Mr. ENLOE. That is exactly what I have been wanting to do—to change the present method of distribution. For that reason I have offered this amendment, my first amendment being presented with a view of calling attention to the matter.

I will say that I had no intention of making any reflection upon the Commissioner of Agriculture in his administration of the law in the purchase of seeds, for he purchases what the constituents of members of Congress call for and what members want to distribute. I am satisfied, however, that a stricter adherence to the law would be better, and that a distribution through the agricultural commissioners of the different States or through these experimental stations would insure a much fairer distribution of the seeds, and would tend to promote the interests of agriculture. I withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

An equal proportion of two-thirds of all seeds, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants shall, upon their request, be supplied to Senators, Representatives,

and Delegates in Congress for distribution among their constituents; and the person receiving such seeds shall inform the Department of results of the experiments therewith: *Provided*, That all seeds, plants, and cuttings herein allotted to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates to Congress for distribution remaining uncalled for at the end of the fiscal year shall be distributed by the Commissioner of Agriculture: *And provided also*, That the Commissioner shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase. But nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Commissioner of Agriculture from sending flower, garden, and other seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, propagation, and distribution of improved and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants: *But provided, however*, That the Commissioner shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each member may have seeds of equal value, as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee whether that portion of this paragraph from line 246 to line 249 is not the authority by which the Commissioner of Agriculture is enabled to distribute seeds to those who directly apply for them; and is it not the authority which enables a member of Congress to have seeds sent directly from the Agricultural Department to persons whose names he may furnish to the Department?

Mr. HATCH. The language is just as broad as it can be made. It gives the Commissioner power to distribute one-third of all these seeds to parties who may apply for them in person or whose names may be furnished to the Department by members of Congress.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. While upon my feet I wish to remind members that most of the Representatives here from city districts have not a single acre of agricultural land in their districts. In the districts, for instance, represented by my colleague [Mr. RANDALL] and myself there is not one acre of such lands; but in each of those districts there are persons who have country seats, and persons living less expensively who have little gardens adjacent to their humble residences. These are the persons who apply not only for flower-seeds, but for garden and vegetable seeds; and I want to say that no one who has applied to me for any kind of seeds has been refused so long as there were seeds subject to my distribution. Those who first apply get them, just as in the distribution of documents. According to the plan of distribution which experience has suggested to me, whoever writes to me for a document gets that document, if I have it.

One word in justice to the Commissioner of Agriculture, upon whom there have been some reflections cast here to day. I want to say that in all my intercourse with him I have been treated as one gentleman should treat another; and I can say the same in regard to all the officers of that Department. I am glad to have had an opportunity to make this statement in justice to the administration of the Department.

Mr. KERR. When I received, as a farmer, packages of seed there was printed on each package a request from the Department to the party receiving those packages of seed to make report of his success in using those seeds. I notice that none of these packages contain any such request at the present time. I ask the gentleman, therefore, why that requirement of the law has been discontinued under the present administration of the Agricultural Department?

Mr. HATCH. I have not been advised it had been discontinued. I understand that with each package of seeds the Commissioner sends out a circular requesting report in reference to the use of the seeds, and that in hundreds and thousands of instances such reports had come to the Department, and that they have been exceedingly valuable in their results.

The Clerk read as follows:

Division of forestry: For investigations into the structural differences of important timbers and the factors that influence their quality, their biology; miscellaneous reports; expense of experimental grounds; collection, purchase, and distribution of forest-tree seeds and seedlings in aid of forest culture; and for ascertaining the area, amount, and condition of the remaining white-pine supplies in the Northwestern States; and for working collection and apparatus, traveling and other expenses, $10,000.

Mr. ADAMS. I move to strike out the words "and for ascertaining the area, amount, and condition of the remaining white-pine supplies in the Northwestern States."

The appropriation for forestry this year is $10,000. Last year it was $8,000. I am glad it is increased. I wish it were more. But I should be sorry to see a single dollar wasted in work, the result of which, as any one familiar with the country knows, will be utterly futile. You can not, by any Government official, with a sum of $2,000 or $10,000, ascertain the remaining white-pine supplies in the Northwestern States. The white-pine tree grows on the same ground with the hard pine, and even experienced lumbermen can not tell, until their agents are sent in to cover almost every acre of the ground, what their supplies are.

The lumber business for the last ten years has been carried on where the white pine grows with the hard pine. It is scattered pine. That is the most valuable part of the pine product of the Northwestern States. A person of great experience, of great aptitude for the work, can only tell after a very careful investigation of a forty-acre tract how many thousand feet white pines are standing on that land. And to suppose a Government official can do good to any portion of the people of this country by spending any part of that sum in that way is utterly futile. An official in that Department might, perhaps, by collating statements made by State authority, make a report, but it would not be reliable and would have no practical value whatever. And I would rather see this appropriation or a larger appropriation devoted to ends which are practical than to see a portion of it wasted for a purpose out of which there could be no valuable result.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HATCH. I would state to the gentleman from Illinois that the chief of the division of forestry and the Commissioner asked to have additional authority in the use of this appropriation. I am under the impression that it is for the collection and collation of local statistics on this subject. It is not a large expenditure of money, and is simply for information to be used in the forestry report.

The Treasury Department is so particular about expenditure of public money that unless it comes exactly under the description of the appropriation there is difficulty about it. When we go into conference on the bill, I will tell the gentleman that if I find there is no necessity for this appropriation I shall certainly be in favor of reducing it or strike it out altogether.

Mr. ADAMS. My object is to have the appropriation used for a legitimate purpose.

Now, I wish to make this further statement. The first part of this paragraph reads as follows: "Division of forestry: For investigation into the structural differences of important timbers and the factors that influence their quality, their biology," etc. In the latter part of the paragraph it is for the purpose of enabling the Commissioner of Agriculture to experiment and continue an investigation and report upon the subject of forestry.

An investigation into the structural differences of important timbers, is not a matter which applies to the Department of Agriculture, and I would rather see this appropriation, or, as I have said, a much larger appropriation for forestry proper, than to see any portion diverted for objects which belong to other departments hereafter to be formed.

Mr. HATCH. I agree with the gentleman from Illinois, and when the Book of Estimates came in with this provision in it I objected to its incorporation in the bill, and had a conference with the Commissioner of Agriculture, and received a statement from the superintendent or the chief of this forestry division bearing upon this question. The present chief of that division is, I am informed by gentlemen who know him and are competent to speak of the facts, a man of the very highest reputation throughout the United States, and eminent in this particular branch of science. He is regarded as a very practical man and perhaps one of the best that has ever presided at the head of such a bureau, and I yielded to his better knowledge after hearing his explanation.

If the gentleman from Illinois will read the report submitted by him, which is now in press, and I understand will soon be out, he will find that a large portion of it is devoted to information upon this very subject.

Mr. ADAMS. I will follow the example of the chairman of the committee, and yield to his better judgment. I withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. HATCH. I move that the committee now rise and report the bill as amended to the House.

Mr. LAWLER. Before that I wish to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill what provision is made for the pay of laborers in the bill?

Mr. HATCH. I would be very glad to gratify my friend from Illinois if I had the list before me, but I can only refer him now to the report of the Commissioner of Agriculture for the past fiscal year for a detailed statement of such payments. The law compels him to report to Congress once a year every single item of expenditure of his Department. The gentleman is probably as familiar with the labor-roll there as I am.

I know one thing, however, that the Government pays its laborers there well; indeed, so well in that Department, taken in connection with the number of hours they work and the pay, that they are not only entirely satisfied with their positions, but every member on this floor has from one hour to three hours of his time every day taken up by answering applications for positions in the Agricultural Department; and if the gentleman can find one person over there on that roll who is dissatisfied and wants to resign, and he will give me his name and photograph, I would be very much obliged to him, because I would like to have it hung up in the committee-room as a curiosity. [Laughter.]

Mr. LAWLER. I ask the gentleman, before we pass this bill, to permit me to offer this amendment, which is in conformity with the general provisions of the bill, and I am sure will not be objectionable.

Mr. HATCH. I will hear the amendment read, and reserve the right to object.

The amendment was read, as follows:

That the pay of laborers provided for in this act shall not be less than $2 a day.

Mr. HATCH. I make the point of order on the proposed amendment that it changes existing law.

Mr. LAWLER. I would like the chairman of the committee to point out to me any provision of law that this changes. I have asked the gentleman for information as to the amount paid there. The pay of laborers and charwomen in this bill is provided for in a lump; and I wanted to know before offering the amendment what amount is to be

appropriated specifically for this item. Failing to get the answer, I offer the amendment.

Mr. HATCH. I gave the gentleman all the information I had, and I hope he will withdraw the amendment and let this bill go through without further delay.

Mr. LAWLER. I hope the gentleman in charge of this bill will not object to the insertion of this amendment on the bill.

Mr. HATCH. I have very serious objection to the amendment, because it is not in harmony with the existing law; and the gentleman knows that the laborers in that Department are paid from time to time, at different seasons of the year, for different hours' work, and all that; and I do not propose, as far as I have anything to do with it, to incorporate any provision in this bill that is not strictly in harmony with existing law and for the very best interests of that Department. The gentleman knows that some of these laborers are already getting over $2 a day. Nobody is dissatisfied with the compensation, and there is a great clamor for places there. There is no necessity for such an amendment even if it was strictly within the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, that the committee rise and report the bill to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. COX having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. MCCREARY reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the agricultural appropriation bill, had directed him to report the same to the House with sundry amendments.

Mr. HATCH. I demand the previous question on the engrossment and third reading of the bill and amendments. I will state that there are but two amendments, and they were simply verbal amendments adopted in committee, and I presume the vote can be taken on both of them at once.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Pending that motion——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The motion is not debatable.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I do not want to debate it; but pending that I move to recommit the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That motion would not now be in order. The Chair will recognize the gentleman hereafter to submit it.

The previous question was ordered; under the operation of which the amendments were adopted, and the bill as amended ordered to be engrossed and read a third time.

Mr. HATCH. I demand the previous question upon the passage of the bill as amended.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I now move to recommit the bill to the Committee on Agriculture, with instructions to strike out in line 10 the words "five thousand" and insert "four thousand five hundred." I wish to state——

Mr. HATCH. Debate is not in order.

Mr. WASHINGTON. I am only going to make a statement, not debate it.

Mr. HATCH. But it is not debatable at all.

Mr. WASHINGTON. All right.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The bill was passed.

Mr. HATCH moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MCMILLIN and Mr. STEELE demanded the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (Mr. COX). The pending question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] to limit debate on the pending paragraph of the tariff bill and amendments thereto to ten minutes.

Mr. STEELE. I submit that the regular order is the call of committees for reports, followed by a consideration hour.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The previous question was ordered on the motion of the gentleman from Texas to limit debate.

Mr. STEELE. As soon as this vote is taken I will call for the regular order.

The question being put on the motion to limit debate to ten minutes, there were—ayes 107, noes 75.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. STEELE. I call for the regular order.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the consideration of revenue measures.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I desire to submit a couple of conference reports.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Conference reports are privileged.

ROCK CREEK RAILWAY COMPANY, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The Clerk read the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill of the House No. 2017, to incorporate the Rock Creek Railway Company of the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, and agree to the same.

That the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11; and the Senate recede from the same.

JOHN T. HEARD,
JONATHAN H. ROWELL,
BARNES COMPTON,
Conferees on the part of the House.
ISHAM G. HARRIS,
CHARLES B. FARWELL,
Conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. ADAMS. Is there no statement to be made in explanation of this report?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The rules require a written statement to accompany the report.

Mr. BURROWS. If there be no explanation no one knows what the report means. If there be a written statement I ask that it be read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is informed there is no written statement. The gentleman can withdraw the report and submit it at a future time.

Mr. ADAMS. I would be content with a verbal explanation.

Mr. HEMPHILL. My recollection is that the amendments were nearly all verbal.

Mr. ROWELL. All but one.

Mr. HEMPHILL. I withdraw the report for the present.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. STEELE. I call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering revenue measures.

Mr. STEELE. I hope the gentleman will give way for a morning hour.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I am sorry I can not yield to the gentleman. I regard this as being second to no other matter that can come before the House.

Mr. SOWDEN. I ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to make may file them with the Clerk.

Mr. MCMILLIN. I must insist on the regular order.

Mr. STEELE. My reason for calling for a consideration hour is this: I hold in my hand a bill that we would thereby be enabled to bring before the House, the bill (S. 671) which provides for the sale of the site of Fort Omaha and for the purchase of a new site. The property proposed to be sold, I am credibly informed, would bring $300,000 at least, and four times as much land could be bought in a more eligible location and buildings constructed thereon superior to those at Fort Omaha for $200,000.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee, that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 94, noes 87.

Mr. STEELE. I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, 33 members voting therefor.

The House again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 93, noes 70.

So the motion was agreed to.

TARIFF.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union (Mr. SPRINGER in the chair), and resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and to simplify the laws in relation to the collection of revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in lines 6 and 7, namely, these words:

"Timber, hewn and sawed, and timber used for spars and in building wharves."

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto is limited to ten minutes.

Mr. RANDALL. If I understood correctly the effect of the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STRUBLE], it is to continue logs on the free-list and to permit them to be sided and squared, and in that condition to come in free, remitting unmanufactured timber further advanced than that to be rated upon the dutiable list.

I am free to say all my early impressions favored the placing of timber on the free-list, both as it related to the destruction of our forests and as it related to the enormous consumption of timber in the United States. But a principle involved to cover the difference in labor cost abroad and the labor cost in the United States checked me in that connection. The only warrant, in fact, the only necessity, for any tax upon foreign lumber is to cover the cost of production in this country and Canada, including Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. The present duty is $2 per thousand feet. Let us try and reach, if we can correctly, what is the difference between the cost of lumber in the United States and its cost in the places to which I have referred.

I am, perhaps, not conversant with the wages paid in all sections of

the country, but I am apprised, I think correctly, of what has been the average rate of payment in Pennsylvania for a number of years. In the field or woods the pay is $30 per month and board; while at the mills it is about $2 per day. An examination establishes the fact, I think, that the wages in Canada for like work are about one-half. I think it may be safely assumed that the labor cost of a thousand feet of lumber in the United States is about $6, while the cost in Canada and the provinces named is about $3 per thousand. It is natural that the Canadian should come to this country; first, because he desires work, and secondly, because he receives better remuneration on this side of the line than on the other. But, after all, what we want to do is to cover the difference in labor cost between Canada and the United States. The present duty of $2 per thousand feet is not equal to the difference. The question whether we should remit this form of lumber to the dutiable list, as I propose, at 15 per cent. ad valorem, or, as I understood the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. TAULBEE] to propose on yesterday, at 10 per cent. ad valorem, should be determined by the difference in cost in the two countries.

I think 15 per cent. is a sufficient sum to cover that difference, which is at some point between $2 and $3. I shall, therefore, so far as my vote on this question is concerned, cast it in favor of this amendment, hoping to have an opportunity to put lumber farther advanced than logs squared and sided on the dutiable list at 15 per cent. ad valorem, which is a very decided reduction from the present rate of duty.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the reduction of the tariff on lumber; first, because it strikes a blow at an important industry in my district, and, secondly, because I believe that it strikes the same blow, only heavier, at the same industry throughout the United States. In the census of 1880—that much-abused, but also much-used document since this discussion began—I find that we had in my district in that year 307 lumbering establishments, having a capital employed of about $1,300,000, and that they furnished employment to 1,800 hands, or, in the aggregate, furnished a living to about six or seven thousand persons. The yearly payment of wages in that single industry in my district amounted to $348,561.

Now, it is admitted in this discussion so far that our competitors in this industry are Canada and British Columbia. It is further admitted that the wages paid in the United States in lumbering average from 25 to 40 per cent. greater than the wages paid to laborers in the same business in Canada and British Columbia. It is safe to assume—and here what I have to say is in line with the statement of the gentleman who has just preceded me [Mr. RANDALL]—it is safe to assume that we pay an average of 30 per cent. higher wages in the United States than they pay in those countries in the lumbering industry. In 1880 we paid out in wages in the lumber industry in my district $348,561. Reduce that 30 per cent., and you have stricken from the labor in this one industry, in that one district in a single year, the sum of $104,568. Now, what are you going to give these laborers in place of the employment of which you thus deprive them? You say to them, "Go out of the business if you can not stand it; go into something better." But, Mr. Chairman, where are they to go? They will be compelled to go into agriculture, and thus they will thenceforth labor to increase the already glutted cereal markets of the world. As it is now, they supply a home market for the farmers in my district; but drop them out of this business, or transfer the business to some other place, and to that extent you take away the farmers' home market.

Since 1880 the lumber industry has doubled in my district. And now just broaden the view a little and look at the same industry throughout the United States. By the same census report of 1880 I find that there were then in the United States 25,708 lumbering establishments, employing 147,956 men. They had a capital invested of $181,186,122. They paid in wages in that year $31,845,974. They made an annual product of $233,268,729. Knock off 30 per cent. of the wages paid and you knock off in one year from the laborers employed in that industry alone $9,553,792. It is to be presumed that the capital invested in this business is not going out of it; it is going to stay, because we have the timber from which to make the lumber. Therefore, if this cut is made, who is going to lose it? Where will it be first felt? In a manufacturing establishment you have four elements to consider, the plant, the raw material, the cost of labor, and the cost of repairs. Those constitute the elements of cost in any manufacturing establishment. Now, I ask again, where is the cut coming first if the duty is taken off lumber? It is coming upon labor. American wages must conform to the Canadian standard or else the American manufacturer must go out of the business. They will conform to the Canadian standard. Now, let us see whether the existing tariff is too high to make up the difference between the American and the Canadian standard of wages. In my own district the proportion of wages to the amount of the annual output is 16 per cent. Take it in the whole United States and the proportion of wages to the amount of annual output is 14 per cent.

Take the rate of duty at $2 per thousand, which includes the rough lumber which is most generally used by lumber consumers, and the ad valorem equivalent is 16.18 per cent., and considering all wood products but 15 per cent.; so that the duty is simply large enough to cover the increased cost in labor; and to remove it is to strike a blow which would destroy the home market of our farmers and cut down the wages of the laborers engaged in this business to a point that they can not stand.

The plea for free lumber is especially placed upon the ground that it would benefit the farmers, and the argument is urged and urged again that if we make lumber free it will benefit the farmer very greatly; and it is sought by this means to call to the aid of the free-trade view the agricultural interest of the nation. I deny the proposition that free lumber would greatly benefit the farmer. Let us see, by a close inspection of the question, the amount of benefit which the farmer could obtain under the most favorable condition of affairs.

No ordinary farmer will use in the course of a lifetime more than 30,000 feet of lumber. But say for argument sake he may use 60,000 feet. The duty on this—if he paid it all, which protectionists deny—would be $120, at $2 per thousand feet, or an average per year of $4, extending the computation over a series of thirty years. Now, to save this $4 per year, the farmer is asked to strike down the wages of one hundred and fifty thousand laborers—not $4 per year—but at the average rate of more than $66 per year. At the same time he is asked to kill his home market furnished by this one hundred and fifty thousand laborers, and the five hundred thousand or more persons dependent upon their labor. Gentlemen of free-trade proclivities are banking upon the inability of the farmer to see the point of this attack upon the protective system.

They say if we can get the farming element alienated from the protective idea, by holding up to them this immense cost—averaging $4 per year—which they are compelled to pay for lumber, because of protection, and at the same time conceal from their view the benefits they derive from protected wheat, corn, meats, oats, barley, other cereals, and wool, we can then induce them to believe that they are abused; and we will thus alienate from the ranks of the protectionists a large number of their most staunch supporters. But gentlemen thus reasoning make a mistake, in that the nine million farmers of America know more than they credit them with.

The farmer knows that to have a diversity of industries and a home market, and better wages and a more prosperous country, we must not have men all farmers or all anything else. That the system of protection makes the nation richer and more prosperous, because it balances the advantages and the disadvantages of a tariff in such way as to make the average amount to practically the same thing, and thus confines the trading of a great nation largely to exchanges between its own citizens, and keeps the money at home to enrich our citizens instead of scattering it in foreign lands to enrich those who neither care for nor in any way support our Government.

The farmer knows that if, by reason of the tariff, he pays $4 per year more for lumber, he for the same reason makes $30, $40, or $50 more per year on his wool, and more than that on his other farm produce.

And gentlemen who are deceiving themselves as to what the farmers of America think and feel upon this subject may rest assured that the man who buys the American farmer for a fool has "dropped his money." They are not fools. They are not ignorant upon the true bearings of this question. They know that this is a blow at their interests just as truly and certainly as "free wool" is such a blow. They realize that when the wage question is assaulted a reduction there is to that extent a destruction of their home market and a sure increase of the force of farmers and by just that much a decrease of their profits, by increasing the number of farmers and consequently the cereal products, and so depressing market prices for cereals.

Again, why should we not protect and foster this lumber industry? Gentlemen say because to do so is to destroy our timber, and we will soon have no timber and must then depend upon a foreign market for our lumber. Well, who should use our present amount of timber supply? Shall it be this generation or the next? Shall it be our people now living, or shall we save it for those who shall inhabit our country a hundred years hence? I take it that should we follow the sentimental cry of "Woodman, spare that tree," rather than the injunction "cut and use such timber as you now have and need," we would find that we have left to our posterity exceedingly high-priced lumber. For, suppose we take the "free-trade in lumber" theory, throw down our tariff and go to Canada for our lumber until that is exhausted, what have we done? Saved a supply of timber to satisfy an export demand of a hundred years hence? No! We have only preserved a timber supply of limited amount and of few years' duration for a few thousand Americans of that day, then owning it, to sell to other Americans of the same day and generation at a greatly advanced price. The true economy is to properly use the timber now while we have it, and have it cheap, and trust to new growth and new means of supply for the future American.

Gentlemen say that our protective system in lumber, and generally, encourages trusts, and they go into a perfect frenzy of righteous indignation against "trusts." Well, they are to be deplored; but the "trust" cry, as against the protective system, is a man of straw; and it has been set up and knocked down so often that it is like cruelty to animals to notice it. Will not gentlemen take counsel of their common sense? Will they not let go of their free-trade theory long enough

to consult the most common kind of commonly understood history? Do they not know that from the time of the adoption of the Twelve Tables of the Roman law down to the present, "trusts" have existed at all times and among all peoples in some form or other? They will not go out with a protective tariff, because they never came in with it or because of it. And if any man is so foolish as to think otherwise, let him ask himself why does the "oil trust" exist? There is no duty on petroleum, and yet we are told an "oil trust" exists, as deadly, as octopus-like, and as formidable as ever disgraced a people or plundered a populace.

The "trust" cry is no more a valid argument against a protective tariff than is that other silly argument that men get rich in the lumber business, and therefore the duty should be removed. The same, or greater, duties on lumber have existed since 1846 as now exist. Why has not their tendency to create "trusts" and "millionaires" been discovered before this? I suppose that when enacted by Democrats and under Democratic rule a tariff on lumber was as obnoxious in these regards as now; then, why should the majority of this House deny the paternity of the child of their own creation? Men get rich in any well-chosen and properly-followed avocation. We do not want it otherwise. It is the boast of our American life that the opportunity of acquiring a competency—and wealth, if you choose—is greater among us than with any other people on earth. Let us keep it so. Let us stand first for the American citizen and his welfare before all the rest of the world. Thus shall we preserve and send down to our children's children this goodly heritage, the founding of which cost so much of suffering and hardship, and the preservation of which has, since its founding, required such an infinite effort on the part of our people.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] has two minutes remaining.

Mr. RANDALL. I only wish to add that I do not believe the consumer will get the benefit if this duty is taken off. I believe the advantage will be divided between the lumber-dealer in the United States and the Canadian, and that in the end the effect will be to reduce to Canadian rates the wages of those in the United States engaged in this business. In other words, we can not compete against Canada lumber in our common markets except by a reduction of our wages to a price corresponding with those paid in Canada, or one-half now received by our field and mill wage-earners.

I yield the residue of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. TAULBEE].

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania a question.

Mr. TAULBEE. I have but a minute, and I must decline to yield. I am much obliged to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but of course I can not hope to say much in a minute.

I regret that the gentlemen having the management of this bill did not see fit to allow a fuller discussion on this question, which certainly involves the merits of paragraphs which we are subsequently to consider. As I announced yesterday, I shall vote for this amendment with the understanding that when we reach a subsequent paragraph I shall, if the present amendment be carried, move an amendment levying a duty of 10 per cent. upon the articles enumerated, which will be 50 per cent. of the present rate of duty.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this paragraph is now closed by order of the House. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STRUBLE] to strike out lines 6 and 7.

Mr. RANDALL. I did not understand that to be the amendment. I understood it was a proposition to strike out and insert.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no proposition to insert.

Mr. RANDALL. Then I submit as an amendment to the amendment the proposition which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 6 and 7, and in lieu thereof insert "timber not further manufactured than hewn, squared, or sided."

Mr. DINGLEY. Is not the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Iowa first in order—the amendment to strike out?

Mr. RANDALL. The object of my amendment is to put on the free-list timber which is hewn, squared, or sided, but not timber which is sawed.

Mr. DINGLEY. You propose to put on the free-list lumber which is not farther advanced than hewn, squared, or sided?

Mr. RANDALL. Yes, sir; my proposition is that lumber in the condition of logs hewn, squared, or sided be placed on the free-list.

Mr. STRUBLE. Is it not in order now to have a vote on my motion?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair, after consideration, is of opinion that the motion to strike out takes precedence; but if that motion should be carried, it will then be in order to insert the words proposed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. STRUBLE. My theory about this matter differs from that of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. I seek, as I have already stated, to strike out not only these lines, but all the following lines in this section relating to lumber.

Mr. RANDALL. We have not reached those.

Mr. STRUBLE. My purpose is later, when we reach the second section of the bill, to move to insert the present lumber schedule with the proposed reduction of 50 per cent. I call for the question on my motion to strike out.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa to strike out lines 6 and 7.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Before the question is taken on striking out, is it not in order to perfect the paragraph by way of amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. Any motion to perfect the paragraph would be in order.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I understood such to be the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is to strike out the whole clause and insert another. The Chair thinks the motion to strike out is first in order. If it be carried, it will then be in order to insert the words proposed, or if it should not be carried, the motion to strike out and insert the words suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania would be in order.

Mr. TAULBEE. Would it not be in order, whether the paragraph be stricken out or not, to insert the words suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania? I think, according to the gentleman's statement, the words he proposes to insert are as foreign to this paragraph as are the subsequent clauses of the bill enumerating different things to be put on the free-list. I do not know but his proposition would be obnoxious to a point of order if made. I presume the subsequent paragraph, which reads "timber squared or sawed," is to be regarded as an independent paragraph.

Mr. RANDALL. The object of my amendment is to specify the particular class of lumber named in the amendment as a part of the free-list. We are now considering the free-list clause. I do not want to embarrass those in charge of the bill or to confuse this paragraph relating to the free-list.

Mr. MCMILLIN. Let us have a vote.

The question recurred on Mr. STRUBLE'S amendment.

Mr. DINGLEY demanded a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 84, noes 108.

Mr. STRUBLE demanded tellers.

Tellers were ordered.

Mr. BURROWS. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BURROWS. I desire to know, where gentlemen are paired, whether they are entitled to vote. To illustrate: Suppose I am paired with the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD], am I permitted in Committee of the Whole to vote under my standing pair which reads that we are paired on all political questions until a certain date, and that date has not arrived? Now, while that pair is in existence can I be permitted to vote?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that that is not a parliamentary question.

Mr. BURROWS. But it is a very important question.

The CHAIRMAN. That is a matter which is left to each member to determine for himself. Each member is to settle it in his own way.

Mr. BURROWS. I wish to know for my own information, and I think every member of the committee ought to know, for gentlemen are paired pretty generally on the one side and the other, whether they are permitted to vote in committee or not?

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman from Michigan stated, I understand, that he was paired with my colleague [Mr. NORWOOD].

Mr. BURROWS. I used it merely as an illustration.

Mr. CRISP. I understand my colleague regarded his pair as extending to all questions on this bill whether in the committee or in the House.

Mr. BURROWS. I merely used it as an illustration. This is an important matter. I do not know whether it has ever been decided before or not. Are gentlemen who are paired for a certain time permitted to vote in committee?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks there ought to be no question about that where a pair has been entered into.

Mr. TAULBEE. I rise to a point of order. I demand the regular order of business. The gentleman from Michigan certainly knows this debate has nothing to do with the matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks that this is an important matter.

Mr. TAULBEE. Will the Chair indulge me?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has indulged the gentleman, but wishes to make a statement now himself.

Mr. TAULBEE. I wish to make my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has made his point of order.

Mr. TAULBEE. I was proceeding when interrupted by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Allow the Chair to make a statement.

Mr. TAULBEE. Certainly, with pleasure. I can not keep him from it.

The CHAIRMAN. This is an important matter, and if a determination can be reached which is satisfactory to both sides of the House,

the Chair desires to hear what can have the effect of reaching such a determination, and therefore is willing to entertain suggestions on the part of gentlemen.

Mr. KELLEY. I have heard this question raised many times, and always with the decision that pairing relates to record votes, unless when arranging the pair it shall be agreed to cover proceedings in committee where no record could be made. Therefore I have always, in accordance with that usage, felt myself as complying with my agreement to pair in the House as free to vote on any question of which a record shall not be taken.

Mr. TAULBEE. I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TAULBEE. My question of order is that there is nothing pending before the House which is debatable, and that this debate is out of order.

Mr. RANDALL. I would like to say a word just here, in view of what I have known to be the custom in this connection. In my judgment, and so far as I remember, there has been an unvarying rule——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks a question has arisen which is now to be settled. We are about to take a vote, and the gentleman from Michigan has asked whether certain gentlemen who are paired shall have the right to vote in committee or not. That is the regular order, and the Chair will hear gentlemen on it.

Mr. TAULBEE. I hope the Chair will not insist that the gentleman from Michigan has raised a point of order. If the gentleman made a point of order when he rose I certainly misunderstood him.

Mr. STEELE. I rise to a point of order, that the gentleman is out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman raised a question of order, which has not been disposed of.

Mr. TAULBEE. What is the regular order?

The CHAIRMAN. To determine the question whether certain gentlemen are entitled to vote or not in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TAULBEE. I believe I have the floor.

The CHAIRMAN. No, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. TAULBEE. How was I taken off the floor?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman rose to a question of order, and the Chair decided it. The gentleman from Pennsylvania then took the floor to speak to the subject-matter before the committee.

Mr. TAULBEE. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand how the Chair decided my point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Whenever the gentleman from Kentucky is ready to allow the business of the committee to proceed we will go on with the public business.

Mr. TAULBEE. I do not wish to obstruct the business here, nor do I wish to be taken off the floor *ad libitum*. I rose to address myself to the point of order which I had raised, and on which I have not yet heard a decision of the Chair. If the Chair has not understood the point of order I would be glad to be allowed to restate it, and would do so briefly. I want to be in order, but I want to be distinctly understood at the same time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to hear the point of order of the gentleman.

Mr. TAULBEE. Then I will restate it. It is this: that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] did not present a question of order, nor did he assert that he did; but he rose, as he said, to make a parliamentary inquiry, which consisted in asking the question as to whether or not members who were paired would be allowed to vote in committee. He then proceeded to discuss that question in connection with other gentlemen. I rose to a point of order, which was this: that under the order of the House closing debate, nothing which was debatable was then pending before the House except what I had presented, and I demanded the regular order. Thereupon the gentleman from Pennsylvania rose, as I understood, to address himself to the question raised by the gentleman from Michigan, and the Chair decided against my objection to his proceeding, that he was in order, and that I did not have the floor. Now, I repeat, my point of order is that I had the floor at that time on the only question which was debatable, being the point of order I had made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can entertain but one point of order at a time. The gentleman from Kentucky seeks to make the point of order that the point made by the gentleman from Michigan is not a question of order at all. The Chair begs leave to state that that is a question which should be submitted to the Chair; and for the purpose of having a correct understanding on the question, which the Chair regards as one of importance, the Chair will entertain it as a question of order.

Mr. TAULBEE. With all due deference to the opinion of the Chair, I must submit, because I can not, of course, hope to convince him against his preconceived opinion. Hence I yield the floor.

Mr. RANDALL. I only desire to say in this connection a word as to what has been the result of my own experience. The rules, as every member of the House well knows, and as I read them, make no provision for pairs. They do not regulate pairs; and hence it is a matter of personal convenience only to the members themselves, and in that manner have been allowed to be matter of record—the rules not further recognizing and do not regulate pairs in any way. It is a question that is remitted necessarily to the individual Representatives themselves, and there is, of course, where it should rest.

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. BLAND. I concur in the conclusion reached by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, except to the extent that the rules do not recognize pairs. It does recognize them by providing that they shall be announced from the desk after each roll-call.

Mr. REED. But the rule only recognizes the announcement of the pair.

Mr. RANDALL. And for the convenience of the House and the members themselves.

Mr. REED. It simply substitutes the announcement by the Clerk for the announcement by the individual members, which was heretofore the custom.

Mr. RANDALL. That is correct.

The whole matter, whether in committee or in the House, as to pairs must rest upon the understanding and honor of the members who have entered into such an agreement. It is a matter which the House has no authority to regulate, but must, in the very nature of things, be remitted to the individual.

Mr. DINGLEY. And presents no question of order.

Mr. RANDALL. And I may add that nobody else has any right to interfere.

Mr. BURROWS. Upon the question of order I quite agree with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] and others that the point I raise may not possibly be a point of order at this time for the decision of the House. We have a list of gentlemen who are paired——

Mr. TAULBEE. I hope the gentleman will not make that question.

Mr. BURROWS. If my friend from Kentucky will not interrupt me now I will be obliged to him.

We have a list of pairs, as I have said, and I might have deferred the inquiry until one of the gentlemen on that list had attempted to pass between the tellers and vote, at which time, of course, the question could be raised as to his right to vote. But I thought it better to call the attention of the committee to it at this time in order that there may be an understanding, or, at least, that attention might be drawn to the question, because I firmly believe that when two members are paired generally, neither member has a right, under that pair, to vote in committee, unless, of course, special exception be made.

Mr. DOCKERY. That is entirely correct, I should say.

Mr. BURROWS. I find that some of the pairs, as I have examined them, announce that the members are paired both in the House and in committee. Others read that the members are paired on all political questions, and several other forms are used. But I simply call attention to this because I believe that when a man is here present who is paired with another who is absent, he has not the right to vote in committee on any question that is manifestly involved in the pair.

Mr. KELLEY. I believe the uniform usage allows the vote of a member who is paired to be given in committee, unless the written pair stipulates, as some of these do, that it covers both the committee and business of the House.

Mr. HOOKER. I desire to say a word upon the subject-matter as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL]. The uniform custom has been to allow pairs, and it has been recognized, and pairs are read, for the purpose of indicating to the House that two gentlemen have agreed that neither one shall vote in the absence of the other. Now, in reference to the point made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania on my right, Judge KELLEY, it was very evident, sir, that when this tariff bill was a matter of discussion all the voting upon it would necessarily be in Committee of the Whole, because it would have to be considered by paragraphs in committee; and therefore gentlemen would not make a proposition to pair unless it extended to the vote in committee as well as in the House.

Mr. KELLEY. It would be very easy to express that.

Mr. HOOKER. It would be easy to express it, but if it is not expressed it must be assumed that both parties intended to consent and did consent there should be a pair, especially on this question, in committee as well as in the House itself. If it were restricted to the limit which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] suggests, then there would be a pair when the record would show there was a vote; whereas the intention and purpose of gentlemen making pairs is to pair on all questions.

Another point. It will be seen that the pair of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] and the gentleman with whom he is paired extends to all political questions. I think the doctrine is well settled that each gentleman must determine for himself when paired whether the question coming up is a political question or not. If he determines it is not he has a right to vote. But if he determines in his own conscience and judgment that it is a political question, I hold the proper rule is that he can not vote more in committee than he can in the House.

Mr. BLOUNT. I think it is generally received here that there is nothing in the Constitution, the laws of the land, or the rules of the

House regulating the subject of pairs. The object of pairing is that the gentleman's constituents may suffer no disadvantage or injury by his absence. That is the purpose of a pair. There are pairs at that desk now between gentlemen on the tariff bill for one week. It is well known to us all that this bill is not to be disposed of in that time. We can easily understand what was meant by such a pair.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as this matter of pairing has always rested on the good faith of honorable Representatives on this floor, I think we can safely rest it there, believing that no gentleman on this floor who is associated with another gentleman in a pair will permit him to suffer under it. I trust we shall do in this matter as we have always done.

Mr. FELTON. Treat it as a question of personal honor.

Mr. McCREARY. Pairs are announced in this House under Rule VIII, which declares that—

Pairs shall be announced by the Clerk after the completion of the second roll-call from a written list furnished him and signed by the member making his statement to the Clerk.

They are further recognized by a subsequent portion of the same rule, which requires them to be published in the RECORD as a part of the proceedings immediately following the names of those not voting.

There was a long time in this House when pairs were not recognized. It was not until the Forty-sixth Congress that the rule I have just referred to was adopted.

Now the question is raised as to how far a member is bound when he is paired. I hold that when a member is paired, if he expresses no condition about it, he is paired as regards every vote taken in the House or in Committee of the Whole; that if he desires any limitation or any condition as regards the pair he must state it at the time and in writing, and that when a member is paired generally, as expressed in Rule VIII, he is paired as regards every vote in the House and in Committee of the Whole, standing or passing between tellers.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR. If he is paired and votes in the committee, and anybody seeks to challenge his vote, how can he do it? It rests with him alone. It is not a question to be decided by anybody else. Particularly is it a matter which appeals to his honor and sense of right, and nowhere else.

As regards my own case, and I judge for myself alone, when I and another pair generally for a given period, I am paired everywhere. If I pair on those terms with anybody else he is paired everywhere in the committee and in the House. But it is a matter between him and me, and nobody else has any business with it. I can not challenge his vote nor can he challenge mine. But if he votes in the House or in the committee once I will never pair with him again, because he will have forfeited his honor.

Mr. MILLIKEN. While it is true, as my friend from Ohio states, that the question of faithfully keeping a pair is between the two parties and rests on their honor, still it is not improper that there should be some general understanding as to what rule should be observed. I think the question resolves itself into this, whether you desire to make an honest, genuine pair, one that shall take care of your constituents when they do not see you as well as when they do see you, or whether you shall simply pair that they may know you are here to vote or that you are paired with somebody. They are as much interested in a vote that does not go into the RECORD as when it does go in, and when a man wishes to make an honest pair that will take care of his constituents at all times why limit it to those votes that go into the RECORD and which they can read at home. If it be an honest and genuine pair it will affect a man's vote as well in committee as in the House, and as much where our constituents have no record of the vote to read as well as where they have.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that this is a matter resting entirely with the members who make the pair.

Upon this question tellers have been ordered. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. STRUBLE] and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. McMILLIN] will take their places and act as tellers.

Mr. MILLS. Will the Chair state the question?

The CHAIRMAN. The question is upon striking out lines 6 and 7 of the bill.

The House divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 66, noes 100.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL], which will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 6 and 7, and insert: "Timber not further manufactured than hewn, squared, or sided."

The question was taken by a rising vote; and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RANDALL. The last vote makes it unnecessary to insist upon a division.

The Clerk read as follows:

Timber, squared or sided.

[Mr. TAULBEE withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, the people I represent are not interested directly to any considerable extent in the manufacture of lumber. Here and there throughout the district there are mills for the manufacture of hard-wood lumber, but the great lumbering interest of Michigan is located in the north. I have been waiting for days to hear the gentlemen on the other side, my colleagues who are the representatives of that constituency which is more deeply interested in the lumbering industry, make some observations upon this part of the bill, but up to this time they have remained silent. I therefore feel constrained, sir, to read to the committee a communication which I hold in my hand, signed by five gentlemen residing in the Saginaw Valley, and of different political affiliations, which presents in a very succinct form, and very much better than I could present them, the reasons for not placing lumber on the free-list.

The names appended to this paper are those of Arthur Hill, W. C. McClure, P. A. O'Donnell, Max Heavenrich, A. T. Bliss, and F. C. Stone, gentlemen of high standing, well known to my colleagues who represent the Saginaw Valley and throughout the State.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. BURROWS. Not at this time. With the permission of the committee I will read this communication.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *March* 12, 1888.

Hon. J. C. BURROWS, *Washington, D. C.:*

DEAR SIR: The Saginaw Board of Trade recently presented to Congress a memorial setting forth in general terms the injustice of putting lumber and salt on the free-list.

We had desired, as representatives of that organization, to appear before the Ways and Means Committee to present for its consideration further information which might assist in guiding it to just and intelligent action relating to these industries.

But as we are not to be granted a hearing by that committee, we place in your hands, as the Michigan member thereof, this statement for such use as will, in your judgment, best serve these interests.

One defense of the proposition that lumber should be put on the free-list is that the lumbermen of this country are destroying the forests, and that this so-called destruction should be stopped in the interest of arboriculture. It is proposed by a repeal of the lumber tariff to invite Canadian competition to the end that the American lumbermen shall be driven out of the business and the forests thus remain uncut.

We do not believe that the magnitude of the industry that it is proposed to strike down is generally understood and appreciated.

The conditions of the lumber industry of Michigan are substantially the same as in 1882 as relates to the amount and cost of production.

I beg the careful attention of the committee to this statement.

The annual output of lumber is about 4,000,000,000 feet, valued at $52,000,000. Referring to the Tariff Commission Report of 1882, page 956, it will be found that in producing this lumber, besides the timber investment, there is invested in saw-mills and lumbering apparatus $40,000,000; that the average number of men employed is 28,000; that there is paid annually on account of labor $17,585,500; that there is paid annually for men engaged in transporting same $4,000,000; that there is paid farmers annually for produce $6,000,000.

In addition to these sums are the many millions paid annually to manufacturers and merchants, all of which, with the above, tend to give employment, within our borders, both to capital and labor, and swell the tide of State and national activity.

These are the details for lumbering in Michigan alone. In the entire country there are produced annually not less than 20,000,000,000 feet of lumber, involving an investment in mills and lumbering apparatus of at least $200,000,000.

The amount paid labor annually is not less than $90,000,000, and to farmers for produce $30,000,000.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. JOSEPH D. TAYLOR. If I can be recognized I will yield my time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS].

Mr. BURROWS. Possibly the Committee of the Whole, by unanimous consent, will grant me a few moments more to complete this statement.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I hope that will be done.

Mr. COX. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] asks that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] be allowed five minutes more.

Mr. DOCKERY. And I ask that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] be allowed a similar extension when he shall take the floor to reply to the gentleman from Michigan.

The CHAIRMAN. The request is that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] be allowed five minutes, and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] when he takes the floor shall be allowed a similar extension. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURROWS (reading):

According to the census report of 1880 but two industries lead lumber in the amount of capital employed in manufacturing.

Here are some of the important industries:

Industries.	Capital.	Duty per cent. ad valorem.
Iron and steel	$250,900,000	41
Cotton	219,500,000	40
Lumber	181,100,000	16
Flour and grist mills	177,300,000	20
Woolen	96,000,000	67

These tables further show that one man for each fifteen employed in the leading industries is now engaged directly in the manufacture of lumber.

If this plan for transferring the cutting of timber to Canada, by legislation, could be effected, it would involve then the destruction of the third largest industry in the country and throw out of work one man in fifteen of those employed in the trades.

In the words of our memorial, "Where would these losses be made good and in what new field would this labor be employed?"

But, as has many times been pointed out by the forestry experts, even if we

stop cutting our white pine and hemlock timber it will not be saved, but rather lost, from being consumed by forest fires.

The Forestry Report of the United States Census of 1880, pages 490 *et seq.*, presented maps and statistics illustrating the continual prevalence of and damage to timber by these forest fires.

Gentlemen may have forgotten that map prepared under the direction of my friend from New York [Mr. COX], showing the extent of forest fires in the United States, according to the census of 1880.

[Mr. BURROWS here exhibited the census map of 1880, showing the extent of the destruction of American forests by fires.]

They sweep through the forest and kill the timber. If cut at once and before bored by grubs this burned timber makes good lumber. If left standing for a year it is unfit for all but the most common uses, and at the end of, say, five years, is worthless. The testimony of Messrs. Rust, Van Schaik, and Hotchkiss before the Tariff Commission (see report, page 955 and seq.) sets forth very fully the manner and extent of these losses from forest fires.

With railroads traversing every portion of the State, and homestead settlers clearing land in the midst of pineries, the strictest statutes against the careless and criminal burning of our forests have been ineffectual to prevent it. Fires prevail every year, and during especially dry years, like 1871 and 1881, they not only damage millions of dollars worth of timber, but destroy the homes and even the lives of settlers, arresting the attention and evoking the charity of the whole nation.

It is sometimes claimed that the lumbermen of Michigan buy their lumber for $1.25 to $2.50 per acre, and that when they realize $4.50 per thousand for stumpage the return is exorbitant. If this statement were true the conclusion would be sound, but the statement is not founded on fact.

At least 80 per cent. of the pine timber held by the men engaged in manufacturing lumber in Michigan was originally included in a series of immense grants to canal companies and to aid in the construction of railroads and military roads. These grants were held by Eastern capitalists until the timber had been substantially cut from the cheap lands; and to provide in advance timber for their mills the lumbermen have been compelled to pay such prices therefor that they can not now profitably sell lumber at less that the prevailing prices.

There is no import duty on saw-logs, and the Michigan lumbermen have never asked for one, showing that they do not desire to protect the American timber owner, but rather the American manufacturer.

We have attempted to show that the way to save our forests from destruction was to utilize them, and that to compel lumbermen to cease cutting timber would bring great loss to the industrial community.

We will now present a few facts as to the extent of our forests and the sufficiency of the home supply of lumber, and the impolicy and injustice of removing the tariff from the Canadian product.

I desire to call the attention of Southern Representatives to the statement which now follows:

The forestry statistics of the census of 1880 show that in the States of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas there was claimed to be 237,000,000,000 feet of pine, and it is stated that these are in fact underestimates. The cut of the Northwest, as was developed at the January session of the forestry convention of Michigan, will exceed the census estimates by at least 50 per cent., so that we may safely call—

	Feet.
Pine in above States	300,000,000,000
Cypress (estimated)	50,000,000,000
Pine and allied woods in States north of the Southern States and east of the Rocky Mountains (estimated)	100,000,000,000
In States and Territories west of the Rocky Mountains (census)	350,000,000,000
Total	800,000,000,000

It appears, then, that we have in this country to-day 800,000,000,000 feet of timber belonging to the coniferous family, against only 50,000,000,000 feet according to the accepted estimates (see Tariff Commission Report, pages 1023 and 1024) in Canada.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURROWS. I would like to have five minutes longer, but I dislike to trespass so much on the patience of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to permitting the gentleman from Michigan to occupy the floor for five minutes longer? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BURROWS (reading):

A review of the forestry statistics shows that the pine timber supply of Canada, east of Manitoba, lies next our border; that the upper waters of the streams which supply this timber flow through treeless barrens and morasses with here and there a worthless and stunted growth of fir. They further show that the pine timber of Canada, like that in the Northwestern States, does not renew itself when cut; other timber taking its place, while the timber from Maine down the entire Atlantic coast, along the Gulf of Mexico, and the timber of our western slope is naturally reproduced after being cut, and will be unless prevented by fires.

Our great coast belt, then, suited in soil and favored by humidity, constitutes therefore our natural timber preserve, and it will continue to supply building material to our people long after the pine forests of Canada and the Northwest are swept away.

With this 350,000,000,000 feet of pine and cypress in the South, and with probably 150,000,000,000 feet of deciduous timber valuable for construction, such as poplar, gum, etc., why should we turn to Canada for our timber supply? Especially why should we do this when we can not find a market in our own country for the lumber which we now produce?

The revenue tables show that the export of lumber and timber during the last fiscal year was 643,000,000 feet, mainly from the Southern States; while the import was only 443,000,000 feet from Canada. And this Canadian lumber comes into direct competition with the Southern product.

At a large government sale of timber berths at Toronto, December 16 last, an effort was made by the Canadian lumbermen to have the stumpage dues in certain cases reduced. Mr. Charleton, member of the Canadian Parliament, publicly addressed the council which has these matters in charge, and urged as a reason for such action that the Southern pine and poplar were invading the Northern market so that they could not compete with it unless they had relief. He claimed that 150,000,000 feet of Southern pine came into New York City in direct competition with the Canadian product.

I have here a letter stating the amount of Southern pine brought into New York City, and also the statement of a Canadian official that he desired some latitude by which he could reduce certain charges for Canadian lumber, so that the Southern product might be driven out of this Northern market.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Was he asking for protection against Southern pine?

Mr. BURROWS. I can not yield because I do not want to trespass too far upon the patience of the committee.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I am asking for information, not to interrupt the gentleman. I wish to know whether that was a Canadian request for protection against Southern pine. Did the gentleman state that a Canadian official asked protection against Southern pine?

Mr. BURROWS. The paper to which I have just referred asks that the stumpage may be reduced in Canada so that the Canadians can furnish their lumber more cheaply; and the reason assigned is that the Southern pine is invading the Northern market, and unless some reduction of the stumpage be made so that the Canadians can produce their pine more cheaply, the Southern people will control this Northern market. The Canadian official to whom I referred desires latitude to reduce these charges.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. That establishes our superiority, about which I have had no doubt.

Mr. BURROWS. If the Canadians hope to drive you out of the Northern market when there is a duty of $2 a thousand, how easily might that hope be realized if the duty was removed?

[Reading:]

We have learned the exact amount of Southern pine arriving in the New York market during the year 1887, and we find it to be 220,599,294 feet, besides 50,000,000 feet of what is known as North Carolina pine.

This lumber, as well as the poplar, comes North on a very narrow margin of profit, not to exceed, say, $1 per thousand, and it is impossible to stand a reduction of $2 per thousand and meet this avowed Canadian competition.

It is impossible to understand on what principle of tariff legislation lumber can be placed on the free-list, unless the protective principle is to be entirely abandoned, which is not now proposed.

The lumbermen pay high taxes, employ protected labor, use protected manufactures, and are as much entitled to consideration as the iron or steel worker or the cotton and woolen manufacturer.

The lumberman is now protected against Canada lumber by a duty of only 16 per cent., while his labor costs him 30 per cent. more than in Canada.

The average duty on our dutiable goods which he uses is over 47 per cent. Even under the Walker tariff, from 1846 to 1857, which was called relatively a free-trade period, the tariff on lumber was 20 per cent. ad valorem.

But what is known as the Mills tariff bill provides in substance that Canada shall remit her export duty on logs in consideration of our letting her lumber come in free.

This is not a proper consideration. We have always admitted Canadian logs free of duty, and Canada recently placed an export duty thereon of $2 per thousand.

We hold that an export duty is an obsolete and indefensible means of raising revenue, and considering that it is prohibited by our Constitution, we certainly are not called upon to make concessions to Canada in order that she may abandon an improper practice.

If lumber were made duty-free, so that logs and lumber would be, as now, on the same footing, the logs would be, as now, manufactured in Canada, as they are nearer their natural market, which is in the Eastern States, than in Michigan, as a glance at the map will show. We should compel Canada to repeal this export duty.

As to export duties generally we would respectfully suggest that in all new treaties they should be prohibited, and that Congress should enact legislation providing that when an export duty is charged by any nation upon any article coming to this country an additional import duty shall be collected upon such article, its products, and all manufactures into which it enters, to the extent of, say, 30 per cent. ad valorem.

There is another view of this question of free lumber which can not be overlooked by any Representative from Michigan.

Hon. Perry Hannah said at the recent forestry convention that the hard woods of the State would bring more money to the people than the pine forests, and that this money would be distributed among those who most need it, the farmers and settlers. This distribution has only fairly begun, yet the comparatively recent demand for hard-wood lumber has already brought millions of dollars into the State. To surrender this trade to Ontario, lying, as this province does, between Michigan and our main market, the East, would compel the settler to burn his timber as he cleared his lands, as he has done in the past, instead of turning it into lumber at a profit.

To conclude. The facts here stated and the evidence referred to we think plainly shows—

First. That if the forests of the Northern States are not cut and utilized they will be burned and wasted.

Second. That on account of the magnitude of the lumber business, serious interference with it will give a shock to the entire industrial system.

Third. That the ultimate forest resources of this country relatively exceed those of Canada, and that we are now seeking a market abroad for timber which we should be able to use at home.

Fourth. That the principal timber supply of this country lies in the South comparatively untouched, yielding less than 4,000,000,000 feet in 1880, while it is capable, under proper conditions of forest growth, of producing 10,000,000,000 feet annually without impairment.

Fifth. That the present duty on lumber is much less than on any other article where labor is employed to a similar extent in its production.

Recognizing the necessity for the reduction of the current revenue, we point first to the burden of internal taxes, which bear directly upon our own people, as a proper subject for at least a partial removal.

To meet the balance of the reduction necessary we stand ready to accept such proportionate reduction in the duty on lumber as is made in the entire dutiable schedule, and we can not in justice or safety be compelled to go further.

And in any new adjustment of duties Canada and all other countries should be compelled, by some form of retaliatory legislation, to abolish export duties, so they shall be on the same footing as ourselves, who are not permitted to impose them.

Yours, respectfully,

ARTHUR HILL,
W. C. McCLURE,
P. A. O'DONNELL,
MAX HEAVENRICH,
A. T. BLISS,
F. C. STONE,
Committee.

Now, I will ask to have printed the balance of the statement, Mr.

Chairman, because I feel embarrassed by trespassing upon the attention of the committee so long.

I present this statement not from my district but from the Saginaw district, represented by my friend Mr. TARSNEY, and also from the district of my friend Mr. FISHER, neither of whom I now see in the House.

Mr. TARSNEY. Yes; I am here.

Mr. BURROWS. My friend from Michigan [Mr. TARSNEY] will be able to state whether these gentlemen are reliable and worthy of the fullest confidence, as I believe them to be.

Mr. TARSNEY. Who are the gentlemen?

Mr. BURROWS. I will read the names: Arthur Hill, W. C. McClure, P. A. O'Donnell, Max Heavenrich, A. T. Bliss, and F. C. Stone.

Mr. TARSNEY. Yes; these gentlemen are personally known to me, and they are respectable gentlemen.

Mr. GUENTHER. Are they Republicans or Democrats?

Mr. BURROWS. I ask to have the balance of the statement printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. GUENTHER. Are these men Democrats or Republicans?

Mr. TARSNEY. Both Republicans and Democrats.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COX. That statement is signed by gentlemen no doubt respectable, as they are indorsed by my friend from Michigan [Mr. TARNSEY]. [Laughter.] They are the names of millionaires. They are the names of men who have got rich by bringing these forests of Michigan to utmost desolation. They are men who made fine fortunes with the aid and hire of 90 per cent. of their labor from Canada, and thereby displacing American labor. Above all, sir, they are men who got rich at the expense of the consumers of this country, for whom I speak more than for any other class.

Why, to hear gentlemen on the other side talk and to see the gentlemen from Maine sneer one would suppose——

Mr. REED. Did the gentleman refer to me?

Mr. COX. I am speaking in my own time.

Mr. REED. Did the gentleman refer to me?

A MEMBER. There is another member from Maine.

Mr. REED. Oh, you referred to Governor DINGLEY. [Great laughter and applause.]

Mr. COX. I generally take a man of my own size. [Renewed laughter and applause.] The gentlemen make their arguments always in favor of the producers. They are for the producer—the producer—the producer—never for the consumer. The statement read by my friend from Michigan——

Mr. BURROWS. Pardon me, statements are made by others who are not producers.

Mr. COX. I did not interrupt you. We gave you time. I was gentle about it.

Where there is one producer of lumber in this country there are at least five hundred consumers; and are we to forget the consumers always and forever in legislating? Must we ignore always those who have to use every form and shape of wood, from a box to a barn, from a fence to a desk, from a clothes-pin to a house, everything required for their convenience, comfort, and shelter? Does it come with good grace or fair reason for any one, I do not care whether he comes from down East or from out West, to sneer at any argumentation on behalf of the great body of the people who are consumers, and against the few who do not even parcel out to their employés a fair share of their enormous gains?

Moreover, I may say on this subject that I favor the protective system. I want to protect our forests and underbrush in Maine, in Michigan, all along the Pacific coast, and in the Appalachians and Adirondacks. Let us "protect" them not merely from forest fires, from cattle, and the scourge of monopolies, who, by perjury and fraud, absorb our timber land, but from all other destructive agencies. Among these agencies the worst is the tariff, with its $2 a thousand feet, to which conspirators have added by their "trusts" twice as much more, to fleece the consumers of lumber.

Every one knows that petitions have been filed here from the forestry committees and societies and persons interested in the preservation of our rivers and lands by equable water distribution. These petitions show that our timber lands—70,000,000 of acres in extent—are, under such ruinous schemes, becoming absolutely waste places—moribund——

Mr. REED. Moribund!

Mr. COX. Yes, moribund, sick, dying, almost dead. History, geography, and sanitary science show such results. In all ages and in all countries where the forests have been denuded climatic disturbances affect the desolated lands, as if it were calcined by fire, and render it uninhabitable and uncultivable.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURROWS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to proceed for the same length of time that was allowed to me.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I hope that will be done.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman will be permitted to proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. I am glad, Mr. Chairman, that gentlemen upon the other side have emphasized this lumber question. I am glad that they have fought this measure of putting lumber on the free-list at the threshold of their contest for protection. Of all the objects next in importance to a reduction of the surplus is the reduction of the duty or freedom from taxation of lumber. Its tax should be dispensed with, as it is among the least dispensable articles of human need and comfort.

I may except clothing, which is its analogy, as they are closely related. This is a happy coincidence growing out of the arrangement of the tariff bill.

Gentlemen upon the other side, by their special pleas for delays in the consideration of this bill and by objections of all kinds urged in general debate against any revision of the tariff, have antagonized the great body of the people in an interest where the logic and facts are plain. It makes the demand for revision more imperious from the people who bear the burden. It may, sir, make it urgent for the majority here to so amend the rules as to pass this bill before the heats of August shall come, in despite of this dilatory action of the minority.

Mr. REED rose.

Mr. COX. I wait for the gentleman. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. I have been in the habit of having the gentleman from New York yield——

Mr. COX. I yield to you always. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED resumed his seat.

Mr. COX. Now I want to make a protection speech, and I suspect I will have to go over on the other side to do it.

[Mr. COX here walked across the aisle amidst laughter and applause.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. It is needed worse on that side.

Mr. COX. Oh, well; I will take care of myself. I come over here near my distinguished friend from Philadelphia [Mr. O'NEILL]. He comes from the home of the Friends—the Quakers. I speak near him, where I am not in danger of being assaulted [laughter] in order to say that I am in favor of the doctrine of "protection" as properly used in the order of good government. I do not mean the kind of protection referred to by Shakespeare when he puts in the mouth of one of his sovereign Tudors a protest against the practices of his time which took one-sixth of all values from the people?

> We must not rend our subjects from our laws,
> And stick them in our will. Sixth part of each?
> A trembling contribution! Why we take
> From every tree lop bark, and part of the timber;
> And though we leave it with a root, thus hacked
> The air will drink the sap!

I do not believe in the similar protection that you gentlemen have been so strenuously advocating here. I would protect our forests—every tree lop, bark, and part of the timber, all over the country—not only against the inroads made by the unscrupulous selfishness of speculators, but against a policy which promotes the insatiate greed of a class who, under the incentive of high tariffs and monopoly of timber-lands, cut down the forests, and after converting them into money, leave nothing but charred and hideous, hacked and sapless ruins.

Let us be warned, sir, against the inevitable. Eventually these splendid wooded mountain ranges of our country will be converted into arid wastes, unless we cease to give a legal premium and moneyed bounty for these ravages. They will become the lair of malaria and the abode of desolation. Such has been the fate of all other countries in past ages that have been reckless of the priceless blessings of their wooded treasures. We will only value our forest riches when we shall have lost them.

Therefore I favor the "protection" of the forests, but not the protection which you gentlemen would have, which raises the cost of lumber to the multitude for the enrichment of the few. I am for the genuine sovereign remedy—not the pretended and specious quackery. I am reminded of the difference between the real sovereign and the pretender. Who is the pretender in this matter of protection? The power which would take care of your forests and thereby promote those sanitary and climatic influences and arrangements which give rains to our soil and health to our people, or the power which pretends "protection" by spoliation? It reminds me of the old distich, for as I see my friend from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] listening eagerly, I am compelled to quote a little poetry to illustrate the genuine and the pretended sovereign over these matters of economy:

> God bless the king, who is the faith defender.

That is our side of the House. [Laughter and applause.]

> God bless—no harm in blessing the pretender,
> Who that pretender is, and who that king—
> God bless us all is quite another thing!

[Renewed applause and laughter.]

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Chairman, in the letter I read I was repeating the views of gentlemen familiar with this great branch of national industry. The gentleman from New York says in reply that it is simply a plea for the interest of the great moneyed kings and millionaires. I am very certain he must have lost sight of statements embodied in that paper. It discloses the fact that outside of the value of pine lands there is invested in mills and appliances for lumbering in the State of Michigan $40,000,000. He forgets that we are producing in these

mills in the State of Michigan more than 4,000,000,000 feet of lumber every year, and that this is not produced without the employment of a large amount of labor.

Mr. COX. Canadian labor.

Mr. BURROWS. Now do not, my friend, raise any side issue. The value of this product is $52,000,000 per annum. The gentleman from New York forgets the disclosure in this communication that we employ in these mills an average per year of 28,000 laboring men. He forgets that this paper discloses the fact that we pay not to millionaires, but to the laboring men in the State of Michigan engaged in the lumbering industry, every twelve months, $17,585,000. He forgets that during the year the farmers of Michigan sell of the products of their farms to the men engaged in the lumber camps and mills $6,000,000 worth.

In the country at large there is invested in saw-mills and appliances, as shown by this paper, $200,000,000. It is shown that we are producing in the United States 20,000,000,000 feet of lumber annually, for which we pay to labor engaged in its production the sum of $90,000,000 every twelve months.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Where do you get that statement?

Mr. BURROWS. I get these figures from the communication which I have just read to the committee, signed by five gentlemen, whose statements my colleague affirms are entitled to the fullest credence.

More than that, the farmers of the United States sell annually to the men working in the mills and lumber camps $30,000,000 worth of the products of their farms. It will not do to say that if you destroy this industry you affect no other interests. It will not do for the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] to say that the millionaire is the only one to be affected. Besides the destruction of the farmers' market for $30,000,000 worth annually of the products of the farm, it will rob labor of an annual princely sum of $90,000,000. Let me say, therefore, to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] that the statement to which he refers shows that when you sweep away this great industry by opening the flood-gates of Canadian importations you not only assail the millionaire, but the farmer and laborer go down in the common ruin. [Applause.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] submits figures of the amount of capital engaged in the lumber industry and of the number of men employed in that industry, and assumes without any demonstration that that capital and those men are benefited by and need the existing duty upon lumber.

The gentleman states, and doubtless correctly, that there are perhaps 800,000,000,000 feet of lumber left in this country, or timber suitable for making lumber. I will say to the gentleman that nearly one-tenth of that estimate is in the State which I have the honor in part to represent. We have exceeding 70,000,000,000 feet of lumber, or timber suitable for making lumber, in my State. Since 1880 there has been a remarkable development of this industry with my people. When you travel on the railroads the hum of the saw-mills is like the hum of the locusts. We sell our lumber under the very shadow of the forests of Michigan. We reach out to Chicago, to Omaha, to Iowa, and Kansas, and we cover the State of Texas. We sell to Boston and Cincinnati of selected kinds, and push our commerce from the Gulf to the British line.

Only on yesterday I saw a statement in regard to additional parties from the gentleman's own State who have come to the growing and enterprising little city where I live. They are said to have acquired some 200,000 acres of our pine lands and to be about to build 28 or 30 miles of railroad to add another to the gigantic lumber enterprises we have in our State. They are welcome to a condition of equal rights and fair play.

Now, sir, our people are making and selling lumber at eight and nine dollars a thousand, and they are making money very handsomely upon that basis. As yet, with great skill and energy, they are nevertheless but partially organized. Profitable as their business is they are still selling lumber at $5 a thousand less than its export price. They are almost rioting with joy in the midst of our virgin and splendid forests. This will not long continue. They will soon come together and organize. Our official reports show that at the Southern seaports we command $13 a thousand for rough plank and scantling. This is a free-trade price. The interior can command this and more by reason of natural advantages. These natural advantages we may neither begrudge nor deny capitalists. But shall we add to them?

Let us inquire into this. What will be the effect of putting up lumber from $8 and $9 a thousand to $13 a thousand? What will be the effect of putting it up from $13 to what the tariff, when by combination its benefits are reaped, will make it, which is $15 per thousand feet? Both changes make lumber that much dearer to the people of Chicago, to the people of Iowa and Kansas, and to millions of others of our people. That restricts the consumption of lumber, and that restricts the employment of labor.

The effect of each advance will be oppressive to the farmer, to the citizens in the cities, and to the laboring men engaged in the mills in my State.

I have met this question before the people in my State, and I have got without dissent the votes of our laboring people, because they see that the continuation of a tariff on lumber is class legislation, it is unjust to our toiling millions, and it means an ultimate curtailment of the consumption of the products of their labor by high prices of which they will receive not one dollar. Moderate profits require a large output to make material gains upon capital. Here comes a demand for many men to speed the mills. A demand for labor to do this makes good wages. Our people know this. Nature holds out to us large profits yet unreached, and that no country on earth can deprive us of. Our capitalists would be foolish indeed to invoke the resentment and wrath of a free and high-minded people by asking that their rich and lawful advantages be tainted by ill-gotten gains.

These, sir, are the truths about lumber. If a duty be desirable to some it is obnoxious to us. We have a fair and easy mastery of the situation, and you gentlemen have the same within all reasonable, considerate, and humane limits. Let us not seek to corrupt our capitalists or to corrupt or deceive our workingmen, or to oppress our good people seeking shelter and homes for purposes that make decay alike for society and the state.

Mr. BURROWS. I would like to ask the gentleman from Arkansas a question.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN] is recognized.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I yield time to the gentleman from Michigan to ask a question.

Mr. BURROWS. What explanation does the gentleman make of the statement of Mr. Charlton, of Canada, when he desires to have authority to lower the price of stumpage that the lumber may be produced more cheaply on the theory that Southern pine has invaded the Northern market; and what would be the effect in addition of taking the duty of $2 off when to-day Canada can put her lumber in Chicago cheaper than we in Michigan can put ours in Buffalo?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. The gentleman mistakes the necessity for an explanation. He is the one who needs to explain the statement which he has cited and which is so contradictory of his own position. It shows that we have the mastery. You say they need that to keep us out of the market. If they are weak and need help to keep us out, we, who are the stronger, certainly do not need help to keep them out.

Mr. BURROWS. That is under the existing tariff of $2 per thousand. Now, if you take that off, will they not drive you out of the New York market? They expect to do so and say they will do so.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Very well; let us look at that. We are now selling near by at $4 and $5 less than Canadian near-by prices. We can advance two and three dollars with the duty off. Do you insist that we shall charge the farmers $5 more than now? Look at the export tables. We have nothing to fear from them. Look at the exports from the Southern States exposed as we are, not along the seaboard. We are meeting the Canadians in England, France; we have driven them from Spain; and we ask them no odds in the North Sea, the Baltic, the Mediterranean, or in any part of the world. We are meeting them on a free-trade basis and have been for many years without any diminution of our exports. Can we not meet them also in Boston and New York? Of course we can oppress our people. We have cheaper access. We are the masters of the situation. All we ask for American nerve and American energy and American skill and our natural advantage is to get a fair chance at the half-breeds of Canada. We can run the year around; they can not. Neither can you, but you are better fixed than they are. We are the ones you need to fear in competition; but you can not have a tariff against us. If times get hard, come down and join in with us.

Mr. BAYNE. Do you refer to lumber?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I do.

Mr. BAYNE. We are exporting lumber to Europe largely.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Yes, sir.

Mr. BAYNE. Do you refer also to sugar?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. We are talking about lumber now, but I am perfectly ready to discuss sugar with you when the proper time comes.

Mr. BAYNE. The things we produce in abundance you do not want any protection on; but the thing which we produce in insignificant quantity you want protected.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Oh, we will take up the sugar question in due time, and I will help you to hurry on to that schedule.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Chairman, there have been a good many reasons given here why lumber should be put on the free-list; and I have certainly been surprised at some of them. My friend from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] desires it to be done because he says that if the tariff remains, the manufacturer, where he now gets $9 for his lumber, will then get $15, and that will crush the workingman who is engaged in producing the lumber.

By what logic the gentleman argues that the laborer who works for an employer who receives $15 per thousand for his product is not to get as large an advantage as when he works for an employer who receives but $9 per thousand, I can not understand. There is no doubt, sir,

that as between labor and capital the laboring man in this age of the world is going to get his fair share of the profits, and if the profit on the product be $5 instead of $2 a thousand, the laboring man is going to get more money out of the $5 than he would get out of the $2; while, on the other hand, if there is no profit at all, there will be none for either the employer or the workman.

My friend from New York [Mr. COX] desires to have lumber put on the free-list as a "protective" measure. In his great generosity of heart—for he is generous toward nature as well as toward man—he looks with sadness upon the slaughter of American forests. Well, sir, if the picture which he painted had any real foundation in truth, I certainly would shed tears with him; but I desire to ask the gentleman, of what utility are these forests of ours if we make no use of them? And if Canada has but fifty billions of lumber now, where are we going to get lumber for use in this country when, by putting lumber on the free-list, the Canadian forests shall have been exhausted? Are we to go houseless and barnless? Are we going without shelter rather than touch these great American forests that are being destroyed by fires and by maturity and decay as well as by the act of man? He says that there are fifty times as many consumers as there are producers to be regarded in dealing with this question. Let me remind the gentleman with reference to sugar, upon which this bill leaves a duty of more than 60 per cent., that there are sixty millions of consumers of that article while there are but two thousand producers in this country.

My friends on the other side who are so anxious to protect the consumers of this country seem to be entirely blind to the enormous duty of 78 per cent. now existing upon an article which goes into the consumption of every family in this land. My friend from New York wants to provide shelter and clothing for the consumer; but does not the consumer want food as well? We may live with very poor shelter, we can get along with ragged clothes, but we must fare very badly indeed when our food is interfered with. Yet here is an article of prime necessity, an article used by every person as food, and it pays a duty of 78 per cent. While our friends on the other side are so anxious to protect the consumer they forget this matter altogether.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MILLS. I now ask that debate on the pending clause be closed. I think we had better go on with the next paragraph. I ask unanimous consent for that purpose.

Mr. BAYNE. I object.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee rise to close debate.

The motion was agreed to—ayes 89, noes 70.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. COX having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue, and had come to no resolution thereon.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of House bill No. 9051; and pending that motion I move that all debate in Committee of the Whole on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be closed in ten minutes. On this motion I call the previous question.

The question being taken on ordering the previous question, there were—ayes 99, noes 1.

Mr. BAYNE. No quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will appoint tellers.

Mr. BAYNE. I wish to suggest to the gentlemen on the other side that it is very bad policy to undertake to apply a gag rule to the discussion of the propositions in this bill. Thus far we have been debating these propositions upon *pro forma* amendments. But gentlemen desire to offer substantial amendments and to support them in debate. It would be very unfair towards this side of the House to cut off debate in explanation of such amendments.

Mr. MILLS. We have now spent two days on this bill, and have made no progress whatever. Gentlemen have insisted on speaking and speaking and speaking all the time. We have been liberal with them. Here is this lumber schedule, embracing a number of lines. I think now, toward the close of the second day, we have reached about the eighth line. Some one submitted the other day in a newspaper a mathematical problem, which I think a very good one—if it takes one day not to pass two lines of this bill, how long will it take to pass one thousand lines? Our friends on the other side should treat us fairly in this matter. We want to be liberal in regard to debate, but we want to make a little progress. Since disposing of the agricultural bill this morning, we have spent the entire time on one or two lines; we have not even passed them.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Will the gentleman agree to allow forty minutes for the discussion upon the pending paragraph?

Mr. MILLS. I will accept the gentleman's proposition.

Mr. REED. The gentleman from Texas will allow me to say that he has been long enough a member of this House to understand that a bill of this character is very sure to elicit in the early stages of its consideration a great deal of discussion, discussion covering a great deal of general ground; but the time spent in discussing these earlier propositions is no indication whatever of the length of time it will take to pass the bill. Members have their ideas on the general subject fresh in their minds, and desire to discuss them. I think the gentleman will really make quite as much progress by allowing the House to go on its own way as he will in any other manner. In discussing the lumber question we are also disposing of the general question.

Mr. MILLS. I appreciate the suggestion of my friend from Maine. But I want to remind the House that we have spent this day in discussing a clause involving in revenue to the Government the sum of $3.

Mr. ADAMS. The discussion is worth a great deal more than $3.

Mr. MILLS. Yesterday was spent in discussing a clause involving revenue to the amount of $198.80. Let us continue the discussion on the next clause of the bill, which relates also to lumber. We have not yet reached the important part of the lumber question. I ask unanimous consent that debate in Committee of the Whole on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be limited to forty minutes.

Mr. MACDONALD. I object.

Mr. MILLS. I move, then, to limit debate in Committee of the Whole to forty minutes on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto; and on that motion I call for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered; and under the operation thereof the motion of Mr. MILLS to limit debate in Committee of the Whole was agreed to.

The question recurring on the motion of Mr. MILLS that the House again resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill No. 9051, it was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. SPRINGER in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the tariff bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and all debate on the pending paragraph by order of the House has been limited to forty minutes. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted, but if there be no objection the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. DOCKERY. I make the usual *pro forma* amendment in order to submit a few observations touching the proposition to admit lumber free of duty,

Mr. Chairman, the most distinguished of all the leaders of the Republican party (Mr. Blaine) in the course of debate in this Hall, June 10, 1868, used the following language in opposition to the policy of laying an internal tax on lumber. I quote from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

Mr. BLAINE. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the last word. I desire to discuss briefly the amendment which the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means so vigorously opposes. And in the first place let me say that during the entire war, when we were seeking everything on the earth and in the skies and in the waters under the earth out of which taxation could be wrung, it never entered into the conception of Congress to tax breadstuffs—never. During the most pressing exigencies of the terrible contest in which we were engaged neither breadstuffs nor lumber became the subject of one penny of taxation.

What was the reason of this? Let me tell my friend from Ohio that it was not because of the influence of the rich grain-dealers at Chicago, or Toledo, or Milwaukee. It was because if anything be universal breadstuffs are universal, for they constitute literally "the staff of life." If you impose on them a tax ever so small in amount it will be made a pretext by the very speculators of whom gentlemen talk for adding an appreciable amount to the cost of a barrel of flour. I do beseech this House not to sanction the principle of subjecting such an article to taxation for the sake of the paltry amount that is to be gained from this source.

Mr. WELKER. Does the gentleman expect to secure an exemption for lumber by advocating an exemption for breadstuffs? [Laughter.]

Mr. BLAINE. I am referring to breadstuffs, because it illustrates a principle. I beseech this House not to sanction a tax on breadstuffs which will simply build up a mountain of prejudice for the sake of a mole-hill of revenue.

But, sir, I have said enough on that point. Now, as to the article of lumber. I again remind this House that there has never been a tax upon this article. The gentleman from Ohio may talk of this question as he pleases, but I say that wherever the Western frontiersman undertakes to make for himself a home, to till the soil, to carry on the business of life, he needs lumber for his cabin; he needs lumber for his fence; he needs lumber for his wagon or cart; he needs lumber for his plow; he needs lumber for almost every purpose in his daily life.

Mr. KERR. Let me ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. DOCKERY. I have but five minutes and can not yield to the gentleman.

Sir, there is no point in the effective argument of Mr. Blaine in opposition to an internal-revenue tax on lumber that does not apply with equal force to a tax on imported lumber. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that when a great party throws itself like a lion in the path of a proposition to strike the tax from this article of almost universal consumption, there ought to be some substantial reason given for the faith that is in them. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] opposes the "free-lumber" clause of this bill although he admits that it will strike off $20 from the cost of every car-load of lumber, but justifies his opposition by the statement that his constituents will not get any part of the reduction. If the gentleman will get out of the way of the passage of this measure I will guaranty that the Kansas farmer will get his share of the $20 in the scramble. [Laughter.]

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], it seems, differs somewhat from the gentleman from Kansas, and rests his opposition upon the declaration that it will destroy the lumber industries. In this view of the case it is evident that he is of the opinion that the consumer will get a large share of the $20 and that the effect will be

to reduce the price to the men who need lumber for the construction of houses, fences, and barns.

But, Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to attempt to reconcile the conflicting views of the opponents of this just measure, but will proceed briefly to notice the labor question as it relates to the lumber industries; but before doing so will say that the people of the West and many States of the Northwest, without party distinction, have for many years favored free lumber. The great Republican State of Kansas prior to the revision, so called, of 1883, instructed her Representatives upon this floor in the following terms:

Resolved, That our Senators and Representatives in Congress are hereby requested and instructed to use their best effort to have the duty upon lumber of every description removed so that the same may be placed on the free-list.

Mr. Chairman, this is the voice of a great State whose Representatives, in part, refuse to obey the request, on the assumption that such action would imperil the interests of labor.

Sir, where lies the real interest of labor in this connection, and what policy will most certainly contribute to its prosperity? The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] asks that the duty on lumber be made sufficiently high to cover the increased cost of labor in this country as against foreign countries.

Mr. BURROWS. The argument used on your side of the House is that if lumber is put on the free-list we will save our forests. We would save our forests if we went out of business.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman from Michigan only states our position in part and not in its entirety; and I may also add favors a policy the effect of which is to bring Canadian labor in competition with American labor, and drive it from the field with lower wages.

Let me come to the labor question, because you insist that you are the special friends of the workingman. I desire to read your confession as it appears in the RECORD of yesterday's proceedings. Here it is, wrung from you in a colloquy with the very able gentleman from Minnesota:

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Now, after this, I hope the gentlemen from these great Northwestern States will answer the question why poverty should "protect" wealth. That is the question that touches the masses of the people and which they would like to have answered. Says the gentleman, our laborers are benefited. The man that stands up to-day and says labor in the lumber industry receives higher wages than in other like industries, protected or not protected, makes a statement that can not be sustained.

Several MEMBERS on the Republican side. No one said that.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I am glad that you disclaim such a position. To say that laborers in the lumber protected industries receive higher compensation than in other industries is an absurdity.

Mr. FUNSTON. No one made that assertion.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. The gentleman from Wisconsin made substantially that assertion, whatever may have been his particular words. He said protected labor now received so much per month, while years ago it received much less, and he attributes that to the protective tariff on the lumber industry.

Mr. DOCKERY. If labor does not get it, who does?

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. The millionaires get it. [Applause.]

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. And they did not answer that question.

Mr. DOCKERY. They did not.

Mr. Chairman, I was surprised for the moment at the admission, and was curious to hear an explanation from some of our Republican friends, who were willing to concede that those laborers received no higher wages than those employed in the non-protected industries. But when I heard the statement to-day by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX], made as it was on the authority of reputable gentlemen from the Northwest, that 90 per cent. of the laborers employed in the lumber industries were Canadians, I began to understand why it was that they did not receive any greater compensation. The same result that is manifest in the lumber industry appears along the whole line of protected avocations. American labor has been driven out by cheap foreign labor until to-day 33 per cent. of the employés of the manufacturing industries of the United States are foreigners, the larger per cent. of them imported to compete with the laborers of America. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURROWS. Can my friend state the rate of wages paid to lumbermen in Michigan?

Mr. DOCKERY. I can not; I made the statement that I did on the authority of a gentleman from your own State.

Mr. BURROWS. Do you know what amount is paid to a single laborer?

Mr. DOCKERY. No, sir, I do not; do you?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes, sir, I do.

Mr. DOCKERY. Well, then, you have the advantage in that respect. I have not assumed to have any personal knowledge of the wages paid, but have stated that 90 per cent. of the laborers employed in lumber industries are Canadians; and that in debate yesterday it was conceded that their wages were not in excess of the non-protected avocations.

Mr. BURROWS. I know that as high as $1 a day is paid there.

Mr. FULLER. Mr. Chairman, I regret that this bill, known as the "Mills bill," has not the same merit throughout as is shown by placing lumber on the free-list. If it had I should feel like congratulating the other side on the measure presented.

In my judgment, the true theory of protection is not involved when it comes to this question of lumber. Why do I say this? Because the supply is limited. I will admit that a tariff of from two to three dollars per thousand will temporarily stimulate the industry, but the more you stimulate the sooner you destroy your supply. If we had the timber, which is so desirable for building purposes, in unlimited quantities, I should feel very differently on this question. We know as a matter of fact that we have only a limited supply of white-pine timber—the timber so essential for building purposes.

In this country it is estimated that we destroy 2,500 square miles of timber each year. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] tells us that the output is 20,000,000,000 of feet annually. He tells us that they have $40,000,000 invested in lumber mills in the State of Michigan. I ask him how long it will be, if this condition of things exists, before they have succeeded in killing the goose that lays the golden egg in the State of Michigan? I want to call the attention of the gentlemen who represent the timber kings of Northern Wisconsin and Northern Michigan to the fact that there is the great State of Illinois, the State of Iowa, Southern Minnesota, Dakota, Nebraska, and Kansas, forming the very garden spot of this country, susceptible of a greater population than any other portion of the United States, that are now using this lumber millions upon millions each year in making permanent improvements; and this lumber must be paid for by the people through agriculture; and there is no question, and no well-informed man will dispute the proposition, that 75 per cent. of this protection on lumber goes to the lumber kings who own four-fifths of the white pine of our Northern region east of the Rocky Mountains. [Applause.]

The day is not far distant when we shall be obliged to seek other sources than our own for pine lumber. We should not forget the interests of the people who have to pay an increased price by reason of the tariff on lumber. It is a short-sighted policy to hasten the destruction of these forests. I have not the time to discuss the question from a climatic standpoint. I will simply say that our scientific men inform us that large areas of forest are necessary from an agricultural point of view as well as climatic. Our Government has recognized the importance of looking out for a timber supply in the passage of the timber-culture act. The fact is that the day is near at hand when we shall be obliged to take steps in the direction of systematically renewing our forests or be forced to use other material than lumber in the erection of buildings.

And then again the benefit derived from the tariff on lumber goes into the hands of comparatively a few men. A few hundred men own about all the valuable pine lands of the North. They have become immensely wealthy, and the fact is beyond dispute that the protection of $2 and $3 per thousand is largely the cause of their fortunes, the value of the stumpage being increased nearly to the amount of the tariff. There are some branches of industry which are not materially stimulated by a tariff; for instance, sugar. We have demonstrated that no amount of protection will develop the sugar industry from cane proper. Hence sugar should be free. Protection will stimulate the lumber industry temporarily, but in the end your supply is exhausted and industry destroyed. We have not enough white-pine timber in this country to last many years at the present rate of destruction; and it is admitted by statisticians that in Lower Canada, taking the entire white-pine lumber district of the entire province, it will afford a supply to last this country not more than ten years.

Gentlemen talk about markets. I admit if we had a permanent industry in this business as now carried on, there would be something in the argument. But at most it is temporary, and in a few years what will become of the laborers employed? You will have destroyed the industry, and they will be forced into other channels. We should look at this question in a business way and from a business standpoint. If we do it seems to me that the conclusion will be reached that the time has come to place lumber on the free-list. [Applause.]

[Mr. TAULBEE withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. GUENTHER. Mr. Chairman, my friend, Judge WILSON, of Minnesota, who followed me on yesterday, replied to my remarks by asking a number of questions that have already been answered fully and well by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED]. There is one point, however, to which I wish to call the attention of the gentleman from Minnesota.

With remarkable pertinacity he insists upon it that the rise in the value of pine lands in the last fifteen years is due to the tariff on lumber. Then it follows that had we had free trade no such advance in the value of pine lands would have occurred.

Now, I know that ever since the Mills bill was introduced speculators of the American species, whom I described yesterday, rushed to Canada to buy more pine lands in anticipation of the passage of the Mills bill; forests advanced by the President's message, and the price per acre has doubled, trebled, quadrupled, and I am credibly informed in some instances is now fivefold from what it was a year ago. Forties then selling for $400 now bring $2,000. Now I presume, if my good friend Judge WILSON happened to live in Canada, seeing that free trade in lumber with the United States, even only threatened, had the result of raising the value of pine lands 500 per cent. and make these speculators rich, fervently and eloquently (as he always does) he would

pray that lumber should be stricken from the American free-list. How much would they rise if free trade in lumber actually takes place? Now, I, for my part, advocate that kind of a tariff that will benefit Americans in America, rather than Canadians or Americans in Canada.

But, Mr. Chairman, I have the highest regard for the sincerity of the gentleman from Minnesota. I can not say less, especially as he has assured me of the same state of feeling on his part. It is a pleasant instance of mutuality of respect between two antipodes on the tariff.

I am firmly of the opinion that while you, my free-trade friends, are so sanguine that the result of this wonderful bill will be to strew our path with roses and compel prosperity to enter every hut, put a stop to all trusts (perhaps with the only exception of the Democratic public trust) the result will be the very contrary from what you anticipate.

It will be free trade and universal distress and lumber at the same old rate, but less money to buy it with. You will then have to solace yourselves with that last resort of people who are the opposite of wise men, that your intentions were good. That perhaps will then call to your troubled brain the picture of a certain place where we are sure to go if you do not mend your ways and defeat this bill, a place that is not renowned as a favorite summer resort, the road to which is paved with that kind of material you call good intentions. That is the place where we will land with swiftness and dispatch if you pass this bill. There you will behold large forests of pitch pine; but these trees are not felled for the purpose of converting them into free lumber. Every branch and every knot will be used for fuel, not for the purpose of raising revenue, but to raise the temperature to at least 600 degrees above zero, Fahrenheit. You will then consent not only to a revenue duty on wood, but you will even vote for a prohibitory tariff on that article of commerce.

Mr. Chairman, I yesterday paid my compliments to these unselfish American capitalists who have invested in Canadian pine and are now ready for free trade.

Mr. Chairman, there is another class of American capitalists, and these I commend to the favorable consideration and respect of the American people. They are the men who by their enterprise and energy have made the United States a beehive of industries; men who have utilized the bountiful resources with which kind Providence has blessed our beautiful country.

Northern capital has lately been largely invested in pine lands in Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Florida, and Texas, and on the Pacific coast. I have here a notice from the market reports of the Chicago Times, May 24, 1888. Under the heading "Lumber" appears the following:

I read:

Henry Hewett, jr., of Menasha, Wis., one of the pine-lumber barons of Wisconsin, has just returned from an exploring trip to the Pacific coast, the immediate result of which is the purchase by himself and a few others of 160,000 acres of Washington Territory fir and spruce timber, every acre of which Mr. Hewett, who is an experienced land-looker, says will cut 100,000 feet of timber. It is the intention of the buyers to begin developing this property at once.

Complaints of the inroads that yellow pine is making in the Southwest upon the trade of the jobbers in Northern wood, who, not long since, found good customers there in plenty, prove, says Lumber, that the ground it is gaining is such that it can permanently hold. The market there for dimension lumber and bill timber of all sorts is practically controlled by the Southern producers, and in flooring and ceiling, and largely in inside finish they have all the advantage. It seems likely now that a few years hence white pine will be almost entirely withdrawn from the trans-Missouri country, that important field being practically given up to the lumber from the South and that from the West. The competition seems likely to be rather between the Southern and Pacific coast manufacturers than between the former and their erstwhile only competitors.

Mr. Chairman, I rejoice over the flattering prospects of the people of the Southern States. Let them enter into a vigorous competition with their Northern fellow-citizens; let them utilize what nature gave them; let them devote their energies to build up their lumber as well as all other industries. They are part and parcel of this great country; their interests are ours; their prosperity benefits the whole country. They are not foreigners to us, like the Canadians. We in the North ask no protection against the South. We welcome your coming, my Southern friends, into a great industrial race, and we will cheerfully submit if an impartial jury awards you first prize.

The forest resources of the United States are ample for all times to come for our people.

There are two hundred and thirty-five thousand millions of pine standing in the Southern States. Develop this immense source of raw material by protecting those who engage in this industry against Canadian invasion of our markets. The Canadians, even now under protection, ship about one-half of their lumber product to the United States to compete with the home supply.

Do not allow your free-trade theories to elope with your practical sense. For every million feet of lumber imported to this country you will ultimately sell 1,000,000 feet less, and nobody but foreigners will reap any advantage whatever. I said some time ago that the lumber industry is the largest manufacturing industry in the United States. I will not weary your patience by long statistics and many figures. A very few will suffice to verify my statement.

According to the census of 1880 the value of the products of the lumber industry in 1879 was $542,788,657, employing 326,197 men; the value of sawed lumber was $233,268,729. Fully 70 per cent. of the value of sawed lumber is labor. At this low estimate you have an annual expenditure of $165,000,000 paid in wages for lumber alone.

A free-trader may consistently say, "Place lumber on the free-list along with everything else;" but he should at least impose a tariff on it for revenue. And if you are sincere in your declaration that you are tariff reformers with incidental revenue, then do not take the incident away from us.

Nobody can justly claim that an average of 16 per cent., as it is on lumber now, is excessive, especially when the Mills bill carries an average of 38 per cent. Do not proscribe this enormous industry, but in the name of equal justice, of political prudence, of enlightened political economy and true Americanstatesmanship, unterrified by the cry of foreign pine-owners and demagogues and deluded theorists and *doctrinaires* at home, give the lumber industry something of an equal chance with other American enterprises.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I certainly beg pardon of the committee for taking a moment's time, but I think there is one point that ought to be understood; and I supposed it was.

I did not say yesterday that the fortunes made by lumbermen in such a short time were on account of the tariff. I said nothing about that. I made a proposition that I thought could not be misunderstood, to wit, that lumbermen had within a few years made, and are now making, fortunes in their industry. The gentleman from Wisconsin, who has just taken his seat, and who is the especial champion of this lumber tariff, assents to this. He is familiar with the facts and knows this to be the truth. I stated at the same time that in the part of the country to which I referred, which is as good a country as there is under the sun, agriculturists had recently been barely able to hold their own. The gentleman does not question that. I believe no gentleman has questioned that. And I said, these two facts conceded, I wanted some man to tell me why we were compelling the poor to pay tribute to the rich.

Mr. REED. That is, you wanted them to tell you why a thing was happening which was not happening at all. Of course nobody could answer that question.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] himself tried yesterday to answer my proposition, but in just such a way as he does it to-day.

Has any man on this floor answered the question, why is poverty continuously compelled to pay tribute to wealth, as the present tariff compels it to do?

Mr. LONG. But we do deny that poverty pays tribute to it.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Do you deny that we are compelled to pay $2 extra per thousand upon lumber?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. LONG. Yes. That is the very point at issue.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen say they deny that proposition.

Mr. REED. Nobody here admits it.

Mr. LONG. You have not established your proposition. Establish your proposition first.

Mr. REED (to Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota). You do not seem to see that you beg the question and assume a fact which does not exist, and then want to know why it is so. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I supposed, Mr. Chairman, that our statute settled that question. On every thousand feet of lumber imported there is imposed a tariff tax of $2. This, of course, raises the price of the imported lumber by that amount. And as this lumber and that manufactured in the United States are sold in competition in the same market, the increased price of that imported enables the domestic manufacturer to raise the price of his lumber by the amount of the tariff. This is why the tariff is called a "protective" tariff. It gives the domestic lumberman "protection" to the amount of the tariff; that is, it enables him to raise the price of his lumber in the market by that amount, and yet to sell in competition with the imported lumber. It would be just as reasonable to deny that the price of the groceries or dry goods of the merchant is increased to the consumer by the amount of the freight as to deny that this enhanced cost of the lumber by reason of the tariff is borne by the consumer.

It is conceded that the lumbermen have made for a number of years exceptionally large profits, and the argument of the gentlemen on the other side amounts to this: "If you lessen our profits we will go out of business;" that is, if they are reduced to a reasonable remuneration they will abandon the industry.

Mr. Chairman, no man can show, nor do I believe that the removal of this tariff will make a reduction of 1,000 feet a year in the lumber products of the United States. The industry will still be a prosperous one.

Mr. LONG. Do you think that is a fair statement of the argument by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] this morning?

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I can not answer all these gentlemen at once. I am not answering the gentleman from Michigan now. I am answering the other gentleman. When it is argued that the farmer is benefited by the tariff because he is enabled to sell his products to the lumbermen, it is implied that if the tariff were removed the business of manufacturing lumber would cease. This is an unjustifiable assumption.

Mr. LONG. You are not answering the argument of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS].

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I do not pretend to answer the gentleman from Michigan. The gentleman from Michigan did not, I believe, pretend to make an argument. He read an *ex parte* statement made by a number of wealthy men in their own interest.

Mr. LONG. He made a very substantial argument, compressed into five minutes. That I did not hear.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LONG was recognized, and offered to yield to Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota.

On motion of Mr. REED, by unanimous consent, the time of Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota, was extended to five minutes.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope that no gentleman will hereafter misunderstand the proposition I made yesterday, and when any gentleman attempts to argue in opposition to it I hope he will answer the question which I propounded.

Mr. REED. Will the gentleman allow me to answer it right here?

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. You know I have not the time to spare. Mr. Chairman, they will not answer that question, but they will answer some other question which they propound themselves. I wish they would answer, too, whether the repeal of this tariff law will lessen the price of lumber. If it has not that effect it will not injure the lumbermen.

Mr. Chairman, since this discussion began the statements on the other side of the House have been in direct contradiction of each other. The gentleman from Pittsburgh [Mr. BAYNE] has argued that this is a sectional bill, that it is gotten up for the benefit of the South, and that the North will receive no benefit from it, whereas the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] rises this morning and states directly the opposite of that proposition, arguing that the South will be greatly injured by the repeal of this tariff.

One says that this tariff helps labor, and another that it does not. One that taking the tariff off lumber will lessen the price of lumber and injure the laborers employed in the business, while another says, on the contrary, that it will not lessen the price. No two seem apparently to agree except in prophesying disaster to the country if this bill passes.

Mr. REED. If the discourse of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WILSON] did not illustrate a great many more things, I should not feel it at all worth while to reply to his oft-repeated question. He wants to know why poverty is taxed to pay money to wealth; he wants to know why it is so; and he has been unable after two days of consideration to comprehend that the question implies a statement, namely, that poverty does so contribute. He assumes that it does, and then wants to know why. Can he not see the absurdity of asking me to tell him why a thing is so when I asseverate with all my voice that it is not so? If he believes it is so, he ought to give the reason for it—not I. I believe it is a lie; and therefore I am unable to give any reason for it.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota, rose.

Mr. REED. Now, I sincerely hope the gentleman from Minnesota can comprehend a proposition so plain as that, especially when it is dissected into its two parts. But there are some minds that seem to be incapable of comprehending that a question may involve an assertion; and he has paraded that proposition here, in season and out of season, until he actually believes it himself, which is astonishing, he being an intelligent man; and he has actually got some of the other people on that side to believe it, which is far less astonishing, judging by what I have heard from them. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. May I ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Do you affirm, or do you not, that the tariff increases the price of lumber?

Mr. REED. If the gentleman will do me the honor to read a discourse which I delivered in this House on the 19th day of May he will find a very plain and simple answer to that question; and if he will keep quiet I will repeat some of it so that he may be instructed, because I perceive that he is one of the class that require not only the statement of a proposition but iteration, and "damnable iteration" at that. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Can you not answer that question?

Mr. REED. Now, will the gentleman keep quiet and peaceful a moment? I do not wonder that he does not like this, but the dissection was absolutely necessary to the peace of the country; for he would have been still repeating that question day after day if he had not discovered the answer by the same surgical operation which seems to be necessary to get a joke into a Scotchman's head. [Laughter.]

Now, this famous free-trade dilemma——

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota, rose.

Mr. REED. Oh, there he is again!

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. The gentleman stated, as I understood, that he would answer my question—does or does not the tariff raise the price of lumber?

Mr. REED. The question which the gentleman asked me just before, which, now that I am about to answer, he seems anxious not to have answered, was whether the tariff does not necessarily raise prices, and, if it does not, what is the good of it? Now, that is a pet remark of gentlemen on the other side. I have heard it as many times as I have heard some of the witty remarks of the gentleman from New York. [Laughter.] It has the same sanction of universality and antiquity.

The proposition which we make is that by the encouragement of an industry engaged in the production of a necessary of life, the result in a long series of years will be good wages and low prices, and we prove it by facts and figures; we prove it by the general consensus of mankind; we prove it by the fact that every civilized nation on earth, except one, which is exceptionally situated, is in favor of the principle and practice of protection. Now, if we prove it by figures, if we prove it by theory, if we prove it by the common sense of mankind, as shown by the general adoption of the doctrine, it seems to me that even the gentleman from Minnesota might, by giving days and nights to the matter, get some glimmering of the idea connected with it. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this paragraph is now closed by order of the House. The Chair will assume that the *pro forma* amendment submitted by the gentleman from Minnesota is withdrawn. The question is therefore upon the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. TAULBEE], to strike out the lines which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Timber squared or sided.

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. TAULBEE, there were—ayes 73, noes 70.

Mr. TAULBEE. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. TAULBEE and Mr. MILLS were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 61, noes 101.

So the amendment of Mr. TAULBEE was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the next paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wood unmanufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for.

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out this clause. The gentleman from Missouri some time ago cited several questions which had been put by the gentleman from Minnesota to our side of the House, and remarked that no answers had been given to those questions. That statement is hardly fair in view of the fact that under the five-minute rule very few gentlemen will submit to interrogatories. But we were quite ready to answer the gentleman's questions if he insisted upon it.

The allegation has been made that unprotected industries pay as good wages as the protected industries. I deny the allegation, and say that the protected industries pay better wages as a rule. In connection with this, I say that if in Alabama, Georgia, Arkansas, and other States which are now shipping their lumber to the Western markets, as high wages were paid as are paid in Maine, Michigan, or Wisconsin, you gentlemen on the other side would take as good care of the lumber industry as you do of your sugar, your rice, and your pig-metal.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. The same lumber men who work in Michigan are brought down to our country, and they receive there the same wages that they do in Michigan.

Mr. BAYNE. That may be so as to men employed for certain purposes, where you require a superior order of skill. But the wages that are paid for the drudgery, the real hard work, and the wages that are paid——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Just the same wages are paid there.

Mr. BAYNE. Are lower than the wages of labor in corresponding branches of industry North.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. You have the same force employed, doing the same class of work, and the same wages are paid as would be paid in Michigan. The mills largely bring their crews down with them.

Mr. BAYNE. I would like my friend from Arkansas to produce a statement of the wages paid there in that section of Arkansas, which is intimately connected with the lumber industry.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I will say again that we pay as good wages as anywhere. Do you suppose that the same men you spoke of would come down there to work for less wages than they got at their old homes?

Mr. BAYNE. Can the gentleman produce a statement of the wages? I would like my friend to produce such a statement.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Of course I can not recite offhand a table of wages, but I can and do state enough to settle the question. I do know that these same men have been brought down there, and that they are satisfied with the wages that are paid them.

Mr. BAYNE. Well, I suppose climatic influence has had something to do with that.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Oh, you need not bring in the question of climatic influences. That is side play. You have run against a fact and you are trying to get around it.

Mr. BAYNE. That was brought up by your own side of the House

as one of the reasons and one of the advantages that that country possessed.

Mr. HOOKER. We beat you altogether on the subject of climate. Just come down there and we will take great pleasure in showing you what a delightful climate we have.

Mr. BAYNE. I know that it is a lovely climate, and I know that men might be tempted to go down there and work for less wages because of that delightful climate.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. That is not the question at all, and the gentleman should know that it has nothing to do with the subject before the committee.

Mr. BAYNE. But I do say that the line of wages paid in the States producing those things, for instance in mining coal, producing iron ore, hauling it, paying teamsters, and the pay of men engaged in these various occupations in these States, shows a difference of 25 to 33 per cent. higher than the rate of wages paid in Southern States.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. That is a mistake. Railroad men and others requiring the most vigorous laborers tell me they have to pay higher wages than in the North. Such labor is scarce with us.

Mr. HERBERT. Let me call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the fact that his colleague, Judge KELLEY, went to Alabama last year, and when he came back stated on this floor, if I am not mistaken, and if I am he will correct me, that the wages paid in Alabama in the iron works compared favorably with wages paid for the same character of work in Pennsylvania.

Mr. BAYNE. Undoubtedly that is skilled labor, you have to pay for that; but when it comes down to the men who have to do the drudgery, the real workers who do the ordinary labor, which any laboring man can do, there the rates are different.

Mr. HERBERT. That is a very different statement from that made by the gentleman's colleague.

Mr. BAYNE. I think you will find it is not.

Mr. HERBERT. The gentleman spoke of the industries generally in that section, taking all classes of labor engaged in the manufacture of iron; and if I am mistaken he will correct me. But my recollection is he made that statement, and made it very clearly and forcibly.

Mr. BAYNE. Can the gentleman from Alabama furnish me with a list or statement of the wages paid there? I challenge the gentleman to produce the statement of the wages paid to the workmen in these different branches of industry, and I will point out to him the difference. I say that the men who are engaged in digging coal, in working in the mines, driving teams, hauling ore, in all of these branches of industry where the cheaper grades of labor can be used, are not paid equivalent wages to those paid North. And at the same time this class of labor amounts to far more in the aggregate than the skilled labor, but which is necessary as an adjunct to the skilled labor. Without it the skilled labor would be valueless. All of those men are paid far lower wages than in the Northern States.

Mr. HOOKER. As a refutation of that, we have never had a strike in the whole history of the country from the beginning to this time.

Mr. LAIDLAW. They are too poor to strike.

Mr. BAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman——

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MACDONALD. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that we have a tariff against Alabama.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I just want to add one or two words in answer to what has been stated by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE]. Ever since this tariff debate commenced we have heard the same sneers from gentlemen on the other side about the wages paid in the South——

Mr. BAYNE. Oh, no; not sneers.

Mr. WASHINGTON. And in the different industries in the South. I want to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I live there and know from experience, for I have employed labor myself, and know of others who do, that we pay them all they can earn and in proportion to what they do. It is the amount of work that a man does that gauges the rate of his wages, without regard to locality, whether he lives South or North.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Permit me to ask the gentleman a question. Have we any different tariff system in the South from that prevailing in Pennsylvania?

Mr. WASHINGTON. None whatever. Exactly the same conditions apply.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. And yet one would infer from what the gentleman from Pennsylvania says that there is a very different system prevailing; that one section is living under free trade and the other under a tariff.

Mr. WASHINGTON. The amount that our labor produces in a given number of hours gauges the amount of the wages of labor, because we pay them every cent that they can earn and for everything that they produce; and if the amount of the day's wages in our Southern industries is the gauge of a man's salary, while it would not be so much in dollars and cents as the statistics show to be the case in other parts of the country, yet I will venture to assert that when other considerations are taken into account it is more, because, Mr. Chairman, a very different system prevails in that country from what prevails elsewhere. We furnish our laborers with their rations, with their houses, with garden spots, and all these things taken into consideration afford a higher rate of wages in the aggregate, I will venture to assert, than men receive in the same line of industries pursued in Northern localities.

Mr. BAYNE. Let me ask——

Mr. WASHINGTON. And we have no strikes, no riots.

Mr. BAYNE. Let me ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question. It was stated by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. O'NEALL] that in Alabama, Tennessee, and elsewhere in the South you could produce a ton of pig-iron for $8. We can not do that our way. We can not produce a ton of pig-iron for less than $12 or $14. Now, how does it come that you pay as good wages if the gentleman from Indiana has proved that you could produce a ton of pig-metal for $8?

Mr. WASHINGTON. In answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I will say that I do not know precisely what a ton of pig-iron is produced for at Birmingham, Ala.; I believe for $9. The reason why it can be produced cheaply there is that our coal, our ore, and our limestone are almost side by side; and God Almighty has given us a protection which your tariff can not give.

Mr. BAYNE. Therefore you do not want any protection for that industry.

Mr. WASHINGTON. Yes. We do not want to add to what God Almighty has given as an additional bonus. We can work on that on which you fellows would starve.

Mr. BAYNE. Why then do you keep a tariff of $6 a ton on pig-iron?

Mr. WASHINGTON. Simply to keep you gentlemen from starving.

Mr. BLAND. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] to explan to me one point. I understood him to say that labor in the protected industries was paid better wages than it was in the non-protected industries.

Mr. BAYNE. I said as a rule that was the case.

Mr. BLAND. Why is it so?

Mr. BAYNE. Because the manufacturers are able to sell their goods at a good price, and because they have the assurance that in a country like our great country, which can supply everything, and can make a supply equal to the demand, there is not that fear of overproduction which you see to exist when you look abroad.

Mr. BLAND. You do it because other people are taxed?

Mr. BAYNE. Not at all.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. KERR. I move to strike out the last word.

I wish to say in regard to the point that has just been made by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. WASHINGTON] that wages are as high in the South as they are in the North, that in my town there is published a Democratic paper conducted by a Democratic editor named Bly. That gentleman has just returned from a visit to Tennessee and has been in the iron works down there, and he says there they pay boys sixteen years of age 50 cents a day. And that has been published in the Democratic paper in my own town.

I am not prepared to dispute the gentleman's proposition, but if the statement of that Democratic editor is not true I would like to hear it answered from that side.

I believe there may be some truth in the proposition of the gentleman from Tennessee. I believe that intelligent labor demands a good price. In order that laboring men may secure good wages it is necessary that labor should be made intelligent; and the converse of that proposition is true, that by paying labor well you thereby increase its intelligence.

There has been a great deal said by gentlemen on that side of the House about low prices in the West. We heard something about that three or four years ago. We heard more about it from the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] than from any other man in this House. We have had a suggestion a short time ago from a gentleman on that side about silver certificates. It was said that the state of the currency was considered a sufficient reason why prices of farm produce and farms in the West were lower than they were before. The gentleman then argued that the prices of farm products, of farms, of everything in the United States had been decreased one-half by the demonetization of silver, and I think there is some little truth in that statement.

Mr. BLAND. And I still argue that farm products have decreased greatly in value on account of the lock-up of money in this tariff system.

Mr. KERR. Then let not the gentleman hereafter say that the lowering of the price of farm products and the lowering of the price of farms in the West is to be attributed to the protective tariff, as has been asserted here in this debate all the time.

I hold, Mr. Chairman, that the protective tariff—and it has been illustrated over and over again by the gentleman from Maine and other gentlemen in this House—that the protective tariff does not increase the value of a single article produced in America in the long run, but it secures to American labor all the time a steady, continuous market for its products. It secures them a protection against foreign labor, and in the end secures to us every article in this country cheaper than we would get it without this protection.

I would say, in reply to my colleague from Iowa [Mr. FULLER], that

we have to-day as cheap lumber as we ever had. The gentleman from Wisconsin says we have abundance of lumber, abundance of trees in this country to sustain this country for all time; and this tariff will not only benefit Northern lumber districts, but it will benefit the lumber districts of the South.

We want to secure to the American lumber men, North and South, the protecting influence of our American tariff, and then our farms and our lumber interests will take care of themselves; then the very fact that lumber is a valuable product will induce greater care and caution as to the destruction of our forests, and will make every American man a friend of the American tree. I have myself planted with my own hands 10 acres of American forest, and the trees that I planted ten years ago are now, some of them, a foot in diameter, and protection to American forests will develop American forestry.

Mr. WEAVER. If you let the people of your district know that you are opposed to free lumber you will not be "a foot in diameter" at the next election. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. KERR. I will take care of my constituents. I am not trimming on this subject. I am for protection because it is an American duty. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HERBERT. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] is not present in order that I might call him as a witness to testify in answer to his colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE]. My recollection is very distinct that after a visit to Alabama, in which he examined into the question for himself for several days, nay, even for weeks, Judge KELLEY came back and said in the city of Philadelphia, and I think printed in the Manufacturers' Record, published in Baltimore, his opinion that labor engaged in the manufacture of iron in Alabama and Tennessee was as well paid in all its departments as in Pennsylvania, and he said in addition to that—or if he did not say it the gentleman who was with him, and whom I saw at Anniston, did say in my presence, and he was an expert, that the highest skilled labor was a little better paid there than in Pennsylvania.

Gentlemen ask how it is that we can pay the same wages and yet produce iron so much cheaper than they make it in Pennsylvania. Let me state right here another fact, which, though it may be known to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE], will, I have no doubt, astonish other gentlemen in this House, and that is that in Birmingham, Anniston, and other places in Alabama, and also in Tennessee, iron is made and shipped and sold at a profit in Pittsburgh, the gentleman's own town. My recollection is that during last year over 100,000 tons of iron were shipped from Alabama and Tennessee to the North, some of it to Boston, some to Pittsburgh, some to Philadelphia, and much of it to the West.

The simple fact is that we have superior natural advantages for the manufacture of iron. We can make more cheaply than anywhere else on this continent. Business men are finding it out, and millions of dollars have gone from the North for investment in the South, especially in Alabama and Tennessee. Some gentleman a moment ago asked whether we wanted any tariff at all. That is not the issue. Nobody advocates free trade. What we are advocating here is the Mills bill. That is the proposition before us. We say that the $6 a ton given in that bill is protection enough for Alabama, and it is protection enough for Pennsylvania also, and as high as the people of this country ought to pay.

The gentleman from Iowa, who has just taken his seat [Mr. KERR], wants to know how it is that farm values in this country are continually shrinking, as they are in the West, and as they certainly are in the North. Only this morning, in the last report on the condition of the crops issued officially from the Agricultural Department, I saw it stated that farm lands in the State of New York are continually shrinking in value, that there are many more farms to rent than there are tenants, because agriculture does not pay. To some extent that is true of the South also. Why is it? The answer is that this boasted American market, which gentlemen iterate and reiterate is the best in the world, is not sufficient for the farmers. It never can be sufficient to take the grain and the provisions of the North and the West and the cotton of the South.

Year after year we are shipping more and more cotton to foreign markets; year after year more flour; year after year more wheat; year after year more cheese and other dairy products. Your high tariff has existed in this country practically unchanged since 1862; all that time you have been prating to us about relying upon the home market protection was to furnish us, and yet more and more every year have we been forced to rely upon the foreign market.

The farmers of the North and the farmers of the South are compelled to send their products abroad to compete with the products made by the pauper labor of the whole world, and all the while we are paying high prices on everything that we consume. It is this foreign market that regulates the prices of the wheat and the meats of the West, for the merchant who ships abroad is bidding against the merchant who buys to sell at home. It is the foreign market that regulates the price of the cotton in the South, and yet the farmers are to buy at home and pay prices fixed by high tariffs. That is the condition of the American consumer.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The formal amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. ROWELL. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the reasons given for and against the provisions of this bill are as varied and contradictory as the individuals on the two sides of the House. It was said by one gentleman on the other side that farm lands do not increase in value, while timber lands do; and therefore the conclusion would be that the tariff benefits the timber-owners and injures the farmers. Now, in the section of country where I live farm lands have increased in value, while timber lands have diminished; therefore, by the same method of reasoning, the conclusion follows that the tariff benefits the farmer, while it injures the owners of timber lands.

I remember when the prairie lands in my own district, the richest lands in all the world, went begging at $1.25 an acre while the timber lands adjacent sold for $50 an acre. To-day prairie lands which were then worth $1.25 an acre are worth $50 an acre; and the timber lands are worth $25 an acre. The reason is that we have ceased to have use for the timber as we used it some years ago. Then we split walnut trees into rails to make fences; now we make fences out of hedge or wire.

The gentleman from Iowa took it for granted that trees never grow but once; that when we once exhaust the trees which stood upon the lands when this country was discovered we exhaust the supply of timber. Yet, sir [Mr. SPRINGER in the chair], the State which you and I in part represent has more timber standing upon its soil to-day than it had forty years ago; and every year the quantity is increasing. So that my friend from New York [Mr. COX] need not be frightened about our lands being denuded of their timber. Everywhere in all the prairie country the farmers have been and are planting trees, not for timber purposes, but with reference to health and ornament; so that where once the eye could see nothing but extended prairies everywhere, there may now be seen trees and hedges growing upon every farm for the purposes of health and beauty.

Mr. Chairman, in my judgment, the passage of this bill, so far as it affects lumber, can have but two results: First, it will diminish the amount of revenue that we receive; secondly, it will increase the profits of Canadian timber-owners by the amount of revenue that we lose. Outside of that I do not believe it will affect anybody. There is just about a certain demand for lumber each year, there are just so many mills to cut it, and 5 or 6 per cent. of our supply will come in, as now, from Canada. You can not increase the supply immediately. Lumber will sell for about the same price. The wages of the lumberman must keep pace with the wages of other people. I do not believe they will be diminished. Canada will supply in our markets about the same amount of lumber that she now supplies, and as we shall produce the principal part of our supply we shall fix the price as we do now, so that you will succeed in taking off a little revenue and in enriching a few men who own timber lands in Canada. Is that your object?

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is stated that the retention of the tax of $2 per thousand feet on lumber should be retained in order to cover the difference in the labor cost of cutting the thousand feet and preparing it in some form for the market. It is said the tax should be retained for the protection of American labor against the competition of the cheaper labor of Canada. The question presents itself to me from several points of view.

I suppose there is some difference, but is it true that there is any such pronounced and marked difference in the price of labor in the United States and Canada as is claimed by the opponents of free lumber? Do the statements made on this floor as to the great difference in labor-wages in the two countries rest in fact or assumption? The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] says the labor-cost of a thousand feet of lumber in the United States is $6 and in Canada $3, a difference of 100 per cent. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BOOTHMAN] affirms that the wages of laborers employed in the lumber business are 30 per cent. higher in the United States than in Canada. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the difference 100 per cent. The gentleman from Ohio makes it 30 per cent.

Mr. BAYNE. What gentleman makes the difference 100 per cent.?

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL].

Mr. BAYNE. Oh, no.

Mr. RANDALL rose.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] said that the labor-cost of a thousand feet of lumber in the United States is $6.

Mr. RANDALL. As I am informed, that is about correct as applied to my own State.

Mr. STONE, of Missouri. The difference between these two distinguished gentlemen, both of whom speak with the assurance of perfect knowledge, I suspect is greater than the difference in wages between Canada and the United States. It is only a small matter of 70 per cent. Now, which of these two is wrong? Both? I suspect so. Where do these gentlemen get their figures, and why did they not get them from the same source? Is it not true that all this is largely a mere phantom of the mind conjured up for the occasion?

In one breath we are told this tax is to protect American labor against Canadian labor, and in the next we are told that every year the Canadian

cheap laborers pour into New England to supplant American workmen. Why do they come? Gentlemen on the other side say, because they can get better wages in the United States. But why do you employ cheap Canadian labor? Why do you gentlemen in Maine allow it to displace American labor? Is it not because you get it cheaper? You stand here and shed crocodile tears over the American laborer and denounce this bill with a flaming vocabulary as a menace to his prosperity, and then go chuckling from here to turn your back upon the American laborer in the forests of New England to welcome and embrace these so-called miserable lazzaroni from Canada. The laborers of the United States are displaced at their own home by adventurers from abroad, and whatever difference there is in the price is pocketed by the employer.

In the mean time the consumers of lumber are wholly ignored. There are several large prairie counties in the district I represent. The county I live in is a fair example of them all. When I went there, less than twenty years ago, the county was a wild waste of fertility and beauty. The entire population was only about 10,000. The city in which I live then had a population of 1,000. Now that city has a population of 10,000 and the county a population of over 40,000. The greater part of this growth has occurred within the last ten years. Homes for 25,000 people have been built in that time. Dwellings, barns, business houses, fences, improvements of all kinds have been built. Millions have been expended in these improvements, and $2 has been paid on each 1,000 feet to the lumber kings.

This fitly illustrates the situation everywhere throughout the West and Southwest. It is time this farce was ended. Millionaires are multiplying, while labor limps along with faltering step, bending under burdens that are ever accumulating. In the name of labor the seed is sown from which an ever increasing harvest of millionaires is reaped. It is abominable.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Formal amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I move to strike out the last word.

Now, Mr. Chairman, after considerable investigation and correspondence I can speak for the State of New York and for the State of Pennsylvania that it is exactly an average of $6 of labor that enters into a thousand feet of lumber. The wages paid in both States are $30 a month and board. The general average of mill wages is $2 a day. In both States the present tariff just about makes the difference between the American workingman's wages and the wages of the Canadian workman.

Mr. RANDALL. Not up to it.

Mr. FARQUHAR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says not up to it, but I think it is within a dollar or a dollar and a half if we take competing grades of lumber per thousand. That settles the wage question so far as my State is concerned, or the State of Pennsylvania. I have asked gentlemen engaged in the lumber business and they have informed me the average in the West is a little more. I have not been able to verify that statement.

Now, the wage question having been settled, one of the arguments this afternoon has been a remarkable one to me, and that is this: That these millionaires who have made their millions during the last fifteen years out of American stumpage are now satisfied after they have made their fortunes not to come in here and ask more protection, but Democrats of the House throw open to them the whole of the Canadian stumpage for those American millionaires to go in there with all their plants for another fifteen years to make still further fortunes. It is to me a most remarkable thing that after we get rid of those bloated millionaires the Democratic party must now by legislation open to them a new field to skin the Canadians as they have skinned the American farmer. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. DUNN rose.

Mr. FARQUHAR. If the House would only extend my time the gentleman from Arkansas can ask me fifty questions, and he knows I would pleasurably answer if he asked them.

Mr. Chairman, I am talking business. I have no politics in this matter. I represent a district that is wholly business in character. It is more interested in the lumber business than the whole State of Texas. It has more money in it—hard cash.

The average of stumpage in America is $4 at present. I think I am correct in the figure. You may go into Canada, where the average of stumpage is $2, but say it is $2.50 or $2.75; you get Canadian labor less 20 per cent., and you get the advantage of the difference of the American price of stumpage. I can see, under this condition of things, why American lumbermen would forsake their own forests and go there. It does not need American forestry laws to drive them out of this country.

Now, a good lumber plant costs two hundred or three hundred thousand dollars. Money placed in Canada does not come back. When you establish a lumber plant you establish your village, you establish your tramways or railroads, you put your money in there, and the American workingman will certainly have to follow the American capitalist.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee now rise.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Will the gentleman withhold that motion for a few minutes, as I should be glad to have consent to proceed for a little while longer?

Mr. MILLS. Very well.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman from New York will be permitted to proceed for five minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I wish now, Mr. Chairman, to supplement what I have said, and to supplement also the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], by submitting an argument, not my own, but I think one intensely practical on this free-lumber question. I hold in my hand a letter from one of the greatest lumber firms in America; and I want to say further that the members may be accounted as millionaires. That I do not care to discuss. I will say, however, that they are divided in politics, as the members of the firm are of both parties, and all stand very high as representative men. This letter, outside of politics, speaks for itself. I desire to ask the attention of the committee for a minute or two while I read it.

TONAWANDA, N. Y., *March* 7, 1888.

DEAR SIR: We notice the progress of the Mills tariff bill in Congress, and observe that lumber is therein placed upon the free-list. As business men, and in a position to know thoroughly whereof we speak, we beg to bring to your careful consideration several reasons why the bill in its present shape as regards lumber should not pass:

First. Everything necessary to procure lumber in Canada is at least 25 per cent. cheaper than in the United States.

Second. Three hundred million dollars and one million men are engaged in the business, and a tariff reduction, if made, would be a direct blow at both the labor and capital therein represented.

Third. The average value of lumber to the consumer may be placed at, say, $20 per thousand. The present duty of $2 per thousand is therefore only 10 per cent., and as probably nine-tenths of the people who use lumber are people above the laboring classes, the duty is not in any sense a burden upon the community.

Fourth. The Canadian lumber mills being situated nearer the Eastern States than the mills of the producing pine regions of the United States, they have an advantage in the item of freights of at least one-half of the present duty; and if such duty were removed it would give to the Canadians control of the markets of the Eastern States, whither their product is most largely imported; so that the present rate of duty is absolutely necessary in order that Western pine lumber may be shipped to Eastern markets.

Fifth. Careful estimates by practical lumbermen show that there is enough standing timber in the States of Michigan and Wisconsin to last twenty years, thus showing the Government's forestry bulletins to be entirely erroneous.

Sixth. There can not possibly be any scarcity of lumber for a century after every tree has been cut in Michigan and Wisconsin, for the reason that there are larger tracts of yellow pine and other timber suitable for building purposes in the Southern States than ever existed of white pine in the Northern States. This can all be used where white pine is now used; and the duty on lumber should be retained, so that the Southern States may have the benefit of Northern capital to develop this vast industry, which will not be done for years if Canadian lumber is admitted free.

Seventh. Consider the difference it will make to the States having these large tracts of yellow pine, Pennsylvania, Virginia, Mississippi, Georgia, Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, and North and South Carolina, whether they are developed or left comparatively untouched, as they certainly will be for years if Canadian lumber comes in free of duty.

We certainly hope you will use your influence and vote to prevent the consummation of such a glaring injustice to this large industry as would be involved in the removal of the present lumber tariff.

Very truly yours,

GRATWICK, SMITH & FRYER LUMBER COMPANY.

Hon. JOHN M. FARQUHAR.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. COX having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the tariff bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, informed the House that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 2882) to pay Aaron Friedheim the rebate due him under the act of March 3, A. D. 1883; and

A bill (S. 1580) to amend an act entitled "An act to incorporate the Capitol, North O Street and South Washington Railway Company."

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, to the bill (H. R. 9788) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, the bill (H. R. 8565) making an appropriation for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with the various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8565) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes; which, on motion of Mr. PEEL, were ordered to be printed with the bill, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT OTTUMWA, IOWA.

Mr. WEAVER. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9771) for the erection of a public building at Ottumwa, Iowa, and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I object.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT JACKSON, MICH.

Mr. O'DONNELL. I ask unanimous consent to take up for present consideration the bill (H. R. 8592) for the erection of a public building at Jackson, Mich.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole from the further consideration of the bill which he has indicated. The bill will be read subject to objection.

The bill was read at length.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I withdraw the objection I made to the other bill.

Mr. WEAVER. It is now too late; it is near 5 o'clock.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. I ask unanimous consent that the time be extended for ten minutes.

Mr. MILLS and Mr. McMILLIN objected.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill which has just been read.

Mr. McMILLIN. If there is a report let it be read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the report, but before completing it (the hour of 5 o'clock having arrived) the Speaker *pro tempore* declared the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BURNES: A bill (H. R. 10304) granting a pension to J. M. Berkey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10305) for the relief of Jacob Mettier—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10306) for the relief of James Nickels—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: A bill (H. R. 10307) for the relief of Antoine Campan—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX: A bill (H. R. 10308) for the relief of employés and late employés in the Post-Office Department—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. DUBOIS: A bill (H. R. 10309) granting to the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company the right of way through the Nez Percé Indian reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10310) authorizing the construction of railroad bridges across the Snake River and across the Clear Water River by the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HUNTER: A bill (H. R. 10311) granting a pension to Nancy E. Adams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 10312) granting a pension to Joseph Weidel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 10313) granting a pension to Sarah Brashears—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10314) for the relief of S. M. Grace—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YOST: A bill (H. R. 10315) for the relief of Henry Sniteman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10316) to remove the charge of desertion against Addison C. Stanton—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BUTTERWORTH (by request): A bill (H. R. 10317) for the relief of J. F. Richardson—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 10318) granting a pension to Mary C. Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. A. R. ANDERSON: Petition of Typographical Union No. 2, of Philadelphia, for the international copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BOUND: Petition of Typographical Union No. 2, of Philadelphia, favoring the passage of the Chace bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CARLTON: Petition of Alf. Davis, Frank Leverett, and others, citizens of Putnam County, Georgia, urging the passage of the international copyright law—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CHIPMAN: Petition of Typographical Union No. 2, of Philadelphia, for international copyright—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. COX: Petition of employés of the post-office for compensation for extra hours of work, etc.—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. A. C. DAVIDSON: Papers in the claims of Mrs. Martha A. Works, of William Wilson, of Martha A. Sherer, of John Sherer, of Thomas B. Pierce, of Reuben Price, of Robert M. Martin, of Sarah J. Harrison, of Aquilla M. Goodwin, of William B. Gill, of Sarah A. English, of James M. C. Ball, of Jasper N. Barnes, and of Benjamin Barnes, of Alabama—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DORSEY: Resolution of the Board of Trade of Stromsburgh, Nebr., favoring the Outhwaite bill for the extension of payment of debt of Union Pacific Railway Company—to the Committee on Pacific Railways.

By Mr. FARQUHAR: Resolutions of the Buffalo Merchants' Exchange, favoring the passage of the Nicaragua Canal bill—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GALLINGER: Petition of Typographical Union No. 2, of Philadelphia, in favor of the Chace international copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. D. B. HENDERSON: Petition of Myers, Tice & Co., of Dubuque, Iowa, in respect to internal-revenue tax on tobacco—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, paper from the "American party," in relation to immigration, etc.—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HOOKER: Papers in the claim of Elias Unger, of Mississippi—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McCORMICK: Petition of Typographial Union No. 2, of Philadelphia, for the passage of the international copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MERRIMAN: Petition of A. Hildebrand and others, asking that the duty on flax and hemp may not be reduced—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. POST: Petition of Gilbert Tompkins, of Avon, and of F. W. Latimer, heir of William W. Latimer, of Tennessee, Ill., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. RANDALL: Memorial of Typographical Union No. 2, of Philadelphia, in behalf of the passage of the Chace international copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. RICHARDSON: Petition of S. M. Hawkins, of Franklin County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROWLAND (by request): Petition of H. J. Booker, of Osgood, N. C., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. T. G. TURNER: Petition of Mrs. Sarah O. Wade, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WHITTHORNE: Petition of Thomas J. Whittaker, of Maury County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. YARDLEY: Petition of 41 citizens, of 55 citizens, of 25 citizens, of 56 citizens, and of 51 citizens of Bucks County, Pennsylvania, against the admission of Utah so long as Mormonism remains in the Territory—to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. YOST: Petition of Joseph Welch, for Typographical Union No. 2, of Philadelphia, for the passage of the international copyright bill—to the Committee on Patents.

The following petition in favor of House bill 9716, for the better protection of free labor from convict labor, was received and referred to the Committee on Labor:

By Mr. FORNEY: Of Knights of Labor Assembly No. 10206.

The following petition for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists was received and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. LEE (by request): Of physicians and druggists of Virginia.

The following petition for the proper protection of the Yellowstone National Park, as proposed in Senate bill 283, was received and referred to the Committee on the Public Lands:

By Mr. McKINLEY: Of citizens of Youngstown, Ohio.

The following petition for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, was received and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. WILBER: Of 32 citizens of Schoharie County, New York.

The following petition, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. McKINLEY: Of citizens and soldiers of Ohio.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. FLOOD: Of 21 citizens of Tompkins County, New York.

By Mr. POST: Of 47 citizens of Stark County, Illinois.

By Mr. ROBERTSON: Of Charles Morgan and 45 others, citizens of Louisiana.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *June* 4, 1888.

Prayer by Rev. E. GRAHAM, of Chico, Cal.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of April 11, 1888, a list of officers of the Army placed on the retired-list since the creation of that list by the act of Congress approved August 3, 1861, etc.; which, with the accompanying papers, was ordered to lie on the table, and be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Interior in relation to Cree Indians (British refugees), now in Montana Territory; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Indians Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a petition of citizens of Galveston, Tex., praying for an investigation into alleged misconduct of officials in the eastern judicial district of Texas; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MANDERSON presented a petition of citizens of McCook, Nebr., praying for the passage of Senate bill 283, for the better protection of the Yellowstone National Park; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Fairbury (Nebr.) Board of Trade, praying for the passage of what is known as the Outhwaite Pacific Railroad funding bill; which was referred to the Select Committee on the President's Message transmitting the Report of the Pacific Railway Commission.

Mr. DAWES. I present a resolution of the Boston (Mass.) City Council in favor of the passage over the President's veto of the joint resolution to grant the use of Castle Island to the city of Boston for park purposes. I should like to have the resolution accompany the veto message. Is it upon the table? I believe the veto message is in the other branch.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that as the bill originated in the House of Representatives, the veto message has probably been returned to that body.

Mr. DAWES. Then let the resolution lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That order will be made.

Mr. DAWES presented the petition of H. D. Robinson and 38 other citizens of New Bedford, Mass., praying for prohibition in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. COKE presented petitions of citizens of Williamson and Parker Counties, Texas, praying for certain amendments of the interstate-commerce law; which were referred to the Committee on Interstate-Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 8771) to place the name of Mrs. Flora C. Andrews on the pension-roll;

A bill (H. R. 6545) to increase the pension of Henry T. Bridges;

A bill (H. R. 7466) granting a pension to Hannah H. Grant;

A bill (H. R. 6996) to place the name of Rebecca E. Shoemaker on the pension-roll; and

A bill (H. R. 8496) to increase the pension of Albert E. Magoffin.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2412) granting a pension to Haskell A. Evarts;

A bill (S. 2850) granting a pension to Harriet M. Smith; and

A bill (H. R. 7719) granting an increase of pension to George Kincaid.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Mary M. Shattuck, praying to be allowed a pension, submitted a report, accompanied by a bill (S. 3076) granting a pension to Mary A. Shattuck; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MORRILL. I am authorized by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds to report as an amendment to the sundry civil appropriation bill the bill (S. 2752) for the establishment of a zoological park in the District of Columbia. I move that the amendment be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. QUAY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each without amendment:

A bill (H. R. 2174) granting a pension to Lewis Fichthorn; and

A bill (H. R. 5378) for the relief of Tillman Faux.

Mr. SPOONER, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2662) for the erection of a public building at Salt Lake City, Utah, reported it with amendments.

Mr. DOLPH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 14) to repeal all laws providing for the pre-emption of the public lands, the laws allowing entries for timber-culture, and for other purposes, reported it adversely, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom the subject was referred, reported a bill (S. 3077) to repeal all laws providing for the pre-emption of the public lands, the laws allowing entries for timber-culture, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title.

Mr. MITCHELL, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2680) releasing the estate of Asher R. Eddy, late lieutenant-colonel and quartermaster-general United States Army, deceased, and George W. Gibbs and R. L. Ogden, sureties on his official bond, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs; which was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. I report from the Committee on Appropriations, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 6833) making appropriations for the consular and diplomatic service of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes; and I give notice that I shall endeavor to call it up to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Meanwhile the bill will be placed on the Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 3078) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James S. Vaughn; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. DOLPH introduced a bill (S. 3079) for the relief of the citizens of the State of Oregon and the Territories of Idaho and Washington who served with the United States troops in the war against the Nez Perces and Bannock and Shoshone Indians, and for the relief of the heirs of those killed in such service, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FARWELL introduced a bill (S. 3080) granting arrears of pension to William Foot; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. PLATT introduced a bill (S. 3081) to remove the charge of desertion against Horace E. Ball; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. QUAY introduced a bill (S. 3082) for the relief of Thomas Purcell; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3083) restoring to the pension-roll the name of Florian Lischewsky; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3084) granting a pension to Joseph H. Mason; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3085) restoring to the pension-roll the name of James Monohan, minor child of Richard Monohan, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3086) granting a pension to Victor, Gertrude, Margaret, and Helen, minor children of Lieut. George R. McGuire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3087) granting a pension to Mary A. Pfeiffer; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3088) granting a pension to Mary S. Carr; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, introduced a bill (S. 3089) making May 30 a holiday in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. PLUMB introduced a bill (S. 3090) authorizing the Secretary of War to accept the resignation Maj. D. H. David, of the Fourteenth Regiment Kansas Cavalry Volunteers, and for other purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. HOAR introduced a bill (S. 3091) granting a pension to John Corr; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SAWYER introduced a bill (S. 3092) granting a pension to Mrs.

Augusta Kalb; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 3093) for the relief of A. N. Kimball and sureties on his official bond as receiver of public moneys; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CAMERON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 89) amending and re-enacting joint resolution approved June 14, 1879, directing the erection of a monument to mark the birthplace of George Washington, as amended and re-enacted February 26, 1881; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Library.

Mr. DAWES introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 90) granting leave of absence to certain persons employed in the service of the United States; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McPHERSON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 91) declaratory of the meaning of certain acts of Congress; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. MORGAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2992) to accept and ratify the agreement submitted by the Shoshones, Bannocks, and Sheep-eaters of the Fort Hall and Lemhi reservations in Idaho, May 14, 1880, and for other purposes; which was ordered to be printed.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted sundry amendments intended to be proposed by him to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPOONER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

STREET PAVING IN WASHINGTON.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the commissioners of the District of Columbia be directed to inform the Senate the cost of extending the concrete pavement on each of E, F, and G streets to Fifth street east.

Mr. MORRILL submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia be instructed to inquire into the propriety of inserting an amendment in the District of Columbia appropriation bill providing for making an appropriation for paving that portion of New Hampshire avenue between I and R streets northwest.

ACCOUNTS OF SUPERVISORS OF ELECTION.

Mr. SPOONER submitted the following resolution; which was read:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate copies of all correspondence, statements of accounts, and inclosures which, during the incumbency of the office of First Comptroller of the Treasury by the present occupant, such officer, or his deputy, has had with any United States commissioner or any chief supervisor of elections, and of all replies thereto received by said First Comptroller; and also to inform the Senate whether the several supervisors of elections appointed by the respective circuit courts at and for the election of 1886, at which Representatives in Congress were chosen, or for any registration held prior thereto and for said election, were paid for the respective number of days, not exceeding ten, for which their accounts were presented; and if such payments were not made, the reasons therefor, and for what number of days they were not allowed and paid; and also to transmit to the Senate copies of all correspondence upon such subject-matter had between the First Comptroller of the Treasury and the Attorney-General, or any United States marshal.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask for the present consideration of the resolution.

Mr. COCKRELL. The only question is as to calling for a copy of the accounts. I do not know how voluminous the accounts may be. That might cause a great deal of unnecessary labor when a mere statement of the amount would be sufficient. I suppose, though, these accounts are not very long in their form.

Mr. SPOONER. I think they are not; they are only for ten days in each case, I understand.

Mr. MORGAN. Let the resolution be printed and lie over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will go over under the rule, and be printed.

NAVAL STEAMER TENNESSEE.

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Navy be directed to furnish to the Senate copies of the following records of the Navy Department concerning the United States naval steamer Tennessee: All reports of the trial of the machinery made in the year 1866; the report of the trial of the machinery in 1867; the steam-log for the first quarter of 1867; all other reports of the performance of the ship or machinery in the year 1867; and all reports or other papers relating to the trial at which the maximum speed was made in the year 1875.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. CULLOM. I desire to say that on a former day I gave notice that I should address the Senate to-day upon the bill (S. 2851) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887. I find that nearly all the members of the Committee on Interstate Commerce are absent, and I now therefore announce that I shall not address the Senate to-day; but on my return from West Point I shall ask that the bill be taken up for consideration, at which time I shall have something to say.

BUSINESS OF THE WEEK.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there further morning business? If there is none, that order is closed and the Calendar under Rule VIII is in order. The Secretary will report the first bill on the Calendar.

The CHIEF CLERK. Order of Business 1101, a bill (S. 2762) to provide for the erection of public buildings for post-offices in towns and cities where the post-office receipts for three years preceding have exceeded $3,000.

Mr. COKE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Order of Business 1393, Senate bill 2929.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed now to the consideration of a bill the title of which will be reported.

Mr. SHERMAN. I thought the order of business to-day was the Calendar under Rule VIII.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair had announced the consideration of the Calendar under Rule VIII, but the Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent to have a bill considered.

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask for the reading of the title of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The title will be reported.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2929) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct and operate a railway, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

Mr. COKE. It will take but a moment.

Mr. SHERMAN. As the Senator has got the right of way, after his bill is taken up I shall insist, and I suppose gentlemen upon the other side will insist also, upon having the regular order of business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill asked for by the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill; which was read.

Mr. SHERMAN. Before action upon the pending bill, I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that during the remainder of this week, unless otherwise ordered, the Senate will proceed to the consideration only of bills favorably reported on the Calendar and appropriation bills, and that all special orders assigned shall be continued without prejudice until next Monday.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent that for the remainder of this week the Senate proceed to the consideration of appropriation bills and other bills favorably reported upon the Calendar, the special orders assigned to stand over until Monday, the 11th instant.

Mr. SHERMAN. Without prejudice.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. SHERMAN. Unless otherwise ordered.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Unless otherwise ordered.

Mr. SHERMAN. And that appropriation bills shall have the right of way whenever reported and their consideration is asked.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is proposed that we shall proceed with the unobjected cases on the Calendar, beginning where we left off?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, to commence where we left off.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

Mr. HALE. Under the five-minute rule?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes; under Rule VIII.

Mr. MANDERSON. I have no objection. I am certainly in favor of the order; but before we proceed with the Calendar I shall ask the Senate at the conclusion of the pending bill to take up a House bill that is on the Calendar, simply to make Inauguration Day a holiday in the District of Columbia. I shall ask the Senate to consider that bill, which may be regarded outside of the general rule, it not being on the Calendar.

RAILROAD IN INDIAN TERRITORY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2929) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct and operate a railway, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

Mr. COKE. In section 9, line 4, after the word "built," I move to insert:

And it shall not be necessary in such case for a forfeiture to be declared by judicial process or legislative enactment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. I move to amend the bill in section 3, by striking out after the word "for," in line 47, the words "a larger sum than the award of the referees," and inserting the words "the complainant;" so as to read:

If, upon the hearing of said appeal, the judgment of the court shall be for the complainant, the costs of said appeal shall be adjudged against the railroad company.

And also, after the word "company," in line 49, by striking out the words:

If the judgment of the court shall be for the same sum as the award of the referees, then the costs shall be adjudged against the appellant. If the judgment of the court shall be for a smaller sum than the award of the referees, then the costs shall be adjudged against the party claiming damages.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INAUGURATION DAY.

Mr. MANDERSON. I ask that the Senate now consider the bill (H. R. 8843) to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia, so as to make Inauguration Day a holiday within said District.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 1069) granting a pension to Robert McClean;

A bill (H. R. 8761) granting a pension to Mrs. Anna Butterfield;

A bill (H. R. 8762) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Ordway;

A bill (H. R. 8984) granting a pension to Griswold Rogers; and

A bill (H. R. 9314) granting a pension to Mrs. Judith Deig.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 1037) granting a pension to the infant children of Michael A. Moran;

A bill (S. 1136) granting a pension to L. J. McGoffin;

A bill (S. 1299) granting a pension to George Park;

A bill (S. 1957) granting a pension to Virtue Smith;

A bill (S. 2167) granting a pension to Mary E. Woodward; and

A bill (S. 2332) granting a pension to John Linsley.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 431) granting a pension to Emma S. Free, widow of Thomas S. Free, late a major of the United States Army, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had concurred in the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 5929) to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across Staten Island Sound;

A bill (H. R. 7222) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish agricultural stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto;"

A bill (H. R. 7564) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Chattanooga, Tenn.; and

A bill (H. R. 8623) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at or near Guntersville, Ala., and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (H. R. 615) for the relief of James B. Mitchell; and

A bill (H. R. 4735) for the relief of Douglas Chapman.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS FOR POST-OFFICE PURPOSES.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The Calendar under Rule VIII will now be proceeded with.

The bill (S. 2762) to provide for the erection of public buildings for post-offices in towns and cities where the post-office receipts for three years preceding have exceeded $3,000 annually was announced as first in order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The Secretary will report the pending amendment to the bill.

Mr. COCKRELL. My colleague [Mr. VEST], I believe, is in charge of the bill, and is necessarily absent. I think under the circumstances, as it will lead to considerable discussion, we had better let the bill retain its place on the Calendar and be passed over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The bill will be passed over without prejudice, if there be no objection.

THOMAS CONROY.

The bill (S. 506) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas Conroy, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Military Affairs reported an amendment to add to the bill "as of date November 14, 1862, for disabilities received in the service in the line of duty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War of the United States be, and he is hereby, directed to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas Conroy, late of Company I, Sixty-ninth New York Infantry Volunteers, and issue to his widow an honorable discharge from the Army of the United States as of date November 14, 1862, for disabilities received in the service in the line of duty.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMANDER GEORGE M. BACHE.

The bill (S. 1169) for the relief of Commander George M. Bache, United States Navy (retired), was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The preamble recites that the United States gunboat Cincinnati, under the command of Lieutenant George M. Bache, United States Navy, while engaged in bombarding the Confederate batteries at Vicksburg, on the Mississippi River, during the late war of the rebellion, was struck by a shot from the Confederate batteries on May 27, 1863, which caused her to immediately sink and become a total loss; that the bombardment was commenced at the instance and under the order of Admiral David D. Porter, then in command of the Mississippi squadron; that the conduct of Lieutenant Bache on that occasion was highly commended in a special letter from the Secretary of the Navy; and that by the sinking of the gunboat Lieutenant Bache (now commander) lost his entire personal outfit.

The bill therefore provides that to reimburse George M. Bache for the losses incurred by him in the sinking of the gunboat Cincinnati, while under his command, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to him or his legal representatives $1,500.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

ALLEGED NAVAL DESERTIONS.

The bill (H. R. 1508) to relieve certain appointed or enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps from the charge of desertion was announced as next in order.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is quite an important bill, and I have not had time to examine the language of it closely and the report; but my impression is that it would have the effect to relieve the regular sailors and appointees in the Navy and Marine Corps from the charge of desertion—that is, those in the regular service of the Navy. The legislation in regard to the soldiers to relieve them of the charge of desertion has only been made applicable to the volunteers, and not to the soldiers in the regular Army, who are sworn in for the period of five years. I am inclined to think it would be proper to let the bill pass over until we can have time to examine it, retaining its place on the Calendar.

Mr. HALE. The Senator in charge of the bill [Mr. STANFORD] is not present. The object of the committee was to secure a bill covering precisely the field contained in the Army provision, which everybody agrees to.

Mr. COCKRELL. I see that.

Mr. HALE. It was not intended to go any further than that.

Mr. COCKRELL. But I am satisfied the language here used would make it applicable to the regular sailor, whereas our bills from the Military Committee only apply to the volunteer soldier.

Mr. HALE. Let the bill stand in its place until the Senator can examine it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* The bill will be passed over without prejudice.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

The bill (S. 784) to enlarge the powers and duties of the Department of Agriculture was announced as next in order.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the attention of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] to this bill. There is, I believe, a House bill on the same subject.

Mr. PLUMB. I was about to move that the House bill be substituted on the Calendar for this bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* What is the Order of Business of the House bill?

Mr. PLUMB. Order of Business 1422.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore.* If there be no objection, Order of Business 1422, being House bill 8191, will be considered in lieu of this Order of Business. Is there objection?

Mr. COCKRELL. Let us hear the other one read.

The Chief Clerk read the bill (H. R. 8191) to enlarge the powers and duties of the Department of Agriculture, and to create an Executive Department to be known as the Department of Agriculture; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider it.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 2, line 3, after the word "Senate," to strike out the word "and;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That there shall be in said Department an assistant secretary of agriculture, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent

of the Senate, who shall perform such duties as may be required by law or prescribed by the secretary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, line 1, after the word "shall," to strike out "hereafter;" so as to read:

That the secretary of agriculture shall receive the same salary as is paid to the Secretary of each of the Executive Departments.

Mr. PLATT. I do not know whether there is a quorum in the Senate to-day or not, but I should like to record my vote on the yeas and nays upon this bill, and if there is not a quorum it had better go over.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let it be passed over, retaining its place on the Calendar.

Mr. PLATT. Certainly.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Shall Senate bill 784, on the same subject, take the same order, or shall that be indefinitely postponed?

Mr. PLUMB. I think it had better not be indefinitely postponed. But is there objection to the consideration of the House bill?

Mr. PLATT. I shall desire to have the yeas and nays called.

Mr. PLUMB. It might as well be done now as any other time.

Mr. PLATT. I have no objection if there is a quorum.

Mr. PLUMB. I think a quorum will be found.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment which has been read.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The reading of the bill will proceed.

The Chief Clerk resumed the reading of the bill. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, in section 3, line 3, before the word "Assistant," to strike out "First," and in line 5, before the word "Assistant," to insert "First;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of Agriculture shall receive the same salary as is paid to the Secretary of each of the Executive Departments, and the salary of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture shall be the same as that now paid to the First Assistant Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, line 1, before the word "relating," to strike out "law" and insert "laws;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That all laws and parts of laws relating to the Department of Agriculture now in existence, as far as the same are applicable and not in conflict with this act, and only so far, are continued in full force and effect.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 5, as follows:

SEC. 5. That the Weather Service of the United States Signal Service Bureau is hereby transferred to the Department of Agriculture, to take effect July 1, 1888, and shall consist of one chief and such subordinate officers and employés as may be necessary to efficiently manage said bureau. Until otherwise provided by law, the present organization of the subordinate force of said bureau, including the second lieutenants now in service, shall continue as at present: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall be construed as altering or affecting in any way the present status in the Army of the commissioned officers of the Signal Corps. The chief of said bureau shall receive an annual compensation of $4,500, and be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That the Chief Signal Officer of the Army, in addition to his strictly military duties, may be assigned to the charge of the Weather Bureau until a chief shall be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate; and the compensation now paid to the employés and enlisted men of said service shall continue as now; and the moneys appropriated for said service and hereafter appropriated shall be disbursed under the direction of the Secretary of the Department of Agriculture.

The Secretary of War is authorized and directed, within thirty days after the passage of this act, to appoint a board of three Army officers, of which the Chief Signal Officer shall be a member. The duty of said board shall be to make an inventory of all property now in the control and posesssion of the Signal Service Bureau, and shall separate and turn over to the Department of Agriculture such portions of the property as the said board may determine to be suitable for the work of the Signal Service Weather Bureau. The remainder of the property shall remain in the control of the Secretary of War.

The amendment was declared to be agreed to.

Mr. MORGAN. Is that amendment to strike out all that provision about the Weather Bureau?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry is to strike out section 5 of the bill, being what has just been read by the Secretary. The Chair will treat the question as not having been taken. Shall the amendment of the committee be agreed to?

Mr. MORGAN. It occurs to me that the amendment now proposed is denying to this measure one of its chief provisions. We have enough of bureaus which are practically independent and irresponsible growing up in this Government; and while we are creating a department of agriculture, I think it would be very wise, indeed, to congregate or assemble some of those outstanding bureaus under the control of that department.

A commission that was presided over by the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] had this subject in charge a few years ago. I had the honor of being a member of that commission, and it took a great deal of evidence and examined the subject very thoroughly indeed. That commission, as I remember now, reported in favor of taking the Signal Service and putting it under the civil department of the Government. To characterize that as a branch of the military service of the United States is simply a misnomer. The duties to be performed by the Signal Service are not in any sense military. They are no more military than the Life-Saving Service. They have no relation at all to the military service of the United States, except that part of it which General Sheridan and the Secretary of War have wisely organized out of the Army itself and have located at different camps of instruction where large bodies of troops are assembled for the purpose of training military men in military signals, and that has the slightest possible connection with the weather service.

I remember the report made by General Sheridan and his testimony on that subject before that commission. The weather-service part of this establishment has grown into very much the larger part of it, in fact has now become all that there is of it of any use. It has not been of any benefit to the Army or to the signaling service of the Army; it has come to be a mere incubus upon it, something that can not be very well controlled by the head of the Army, and that belongs in every essential particular to the civil side of the service of the United States.

Now we have an opportunity here, the House having passed this bill, to reform this legislation, and it needs reform. We shall never get a reform of this legislation as long as there is a question of military rank to come in between the Chief of the Signal Service and some civil officer to whom he may be made a subordinate. It is very true that the Secretary of War is only in name a military officer, and his office has more control of civil affairs concerning the Army of the United States than it has, I believe, of military affairs; nevertheless the head of the Signal Service has always been found opposed to a transfer of that service into the civil department of the Government.

This Signal Service ought really to be reformed from the bottom to the top. It ought to have no military feature in it at all. It has no military function to perform. It is connected only with the information of the agriculturists of the country and the men engaged in commerce on the seas, and it has no real reference to anything that is military, concerning the management of the Army in battle or in time of peace. It is not in any way connected with it, and, as I observed before, General Sheridan has made his military signaling service entirely independent of this, and does not rely on this for the training of the men that is necessary to qualify them for signaling in the Army and between different branches of the Army in time of war or in time of peace. It has no connection with it at all.

I was very much in hopes that inasmuch as the other House had taken the subject up, and, I believe, discussed it pretty fully and passed upon it with considerable unanimity, the Senate would agree to allow this feature of the bill to remain. It seems to me it is a matter worthy of very serious consideration; and while this is not as great a step as I would like to see taken in the reformation of this peculiar and new branch of the service here that has sprung up within the last few years, it is still one step in the right direction, and we ought instead of rejecting it to encourage it. Let this service go into the control of the Agricultural Department, with which it is most nearly allied. If there are a set of people in the United States who derive any advantage at all from this weather service, it is the agriculturists. Next to them, I believe it is advantageous to the men who go down upon the sea in ships.

I hope that the Senate will not reject this section. I hope that the matter will have further consideration, and with the view of gaining time for further consideration of it—I think the subject ought to be carefully inquired into—I ask that the bill shall go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Alabama objecting, the bill goes over without prejudice, retaining its place on the Calendar.

Mr. PLUMB. Before it goes over, I ask the Senator to withdraw his objection for a moment.

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly.

Mr. PLUMB. I was acting, in reporting the bill with this amendment to which the Senator from Alabama objects, as the organ of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I sympathize entirely with what the Senator from Alabama has said about the propriety of transferring the Weather Bureau to the Agricultural Department. I would be glad also to have transferred to it the Bureau of the Geological Survey. Both of these bureaus belong more properly in the Department of Agriculture than anywhere else. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER], who presided for several years over the Department of the Interior, knows very well that that Department already has superabundant and widely separated duties, more than any Secretary can properly and satisfactorily look over.

The Signal Service Bureau was made a part of the War Department because it was supposed to be connected with the military service. Gradually it has grown until it has come to assume public relations to agriculture, and it ought to assume very important relations to that great interest. I have no doubt myself that the present head of that bureau is entirely competent for the position, but he has not been long enough in it yet to have thoroughly organized it, and the bureau is not rendering the service it ought, and I think myself if it were put under the Department of Agriculture in the proper way, with the excrescences taken away, it would respond readily and usefully to the interests with which it is identified.

As a sample of what gets out of that bureau now in the way of in-

formation, or alleged information, I want to read a recent dispatch which was sent out to the district composed of Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska, in order that the people there might know what kind of weather to expect. This is the dispatch:

For Missouri, Kansas, and Nebraska: Warmer southerly, shifting to cooler, fresh to brisk northerly winds; light rain or snow, followed by fair weather.

That is about as deceptive as anything could be, and the farmers of that section of country who read that would be like the darkey who ran to the brush. It applies to a section of country embracing 200,000 square miles, in which as a matter of course every day there are various kinds of weather, and the information that it will rain somewhere or snow somewhere, and that a brisk northerly wind will blow somewhere else, and a brisk southerly wind somewhere else, is of no consequence in that area unless a particular kind of weather is located at some particular point. The department might be organized a great deal more comprehensively than it is now in order to maintain the service. I do not mean to say that it ought to take any more money; indeed, for some years I have been inclined to think that a great deal of money has been uselessly expended in that department.

Certainly, if it is to be the hand-maid of agriculture it ought to be a part of the Department of Agriculture. It is a misuse of terms to talk about its being a branch of the War Department. It undoubtedly renders some service; but more, it contains a suggestion of great service, and it can be made very useful, the people believe, and they ask at the hands of Congress, not that it shall be abolished, but that it shall be made more perfectly to answer the purpose of its creation. One of the first steps to this, in my judgment, would be to put it under the charge of the Commissioner of Agriculture, and for similar reasons the Geological Survey ought to be there. There are enough duties now being performed by what the Senator from Alabama describes as substantially independent bureaus, which, while acknowledging a nominal authority in the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of War, practically are not under the authority of those Secretaries, which ought to be brought under the Commissioner of Agriculture, and the addition of which would make that Department one equal in dignity and authority and power with any other Department of the Government.

I shall, I give notice now, at a very early day move that the Senate take up this bill, and when it is up shall, as far as I can, insist on its being disposed of before its consideration is dropped.

Mr. PLATT. If the Senator from Alabama will still further withdraw his objection, so that I may make a remark or two, I shall be obliged to him.

Mr. MORGAN. Certainly; I withdraw the objection temporarily.

Mr. PLATT. It is very probable that when this bill shall come up again for consideration I may not be present, and therefore I should like at this time to express the reason why I would vote against the bill in its present shape.

I think, Mr. President, that the Chief Executive officer has perhaps advisers enough in his Cabinet already, and I have very great doubt about the propriety of creating a new executive department with an officer at its head, whom we call a Cabinet officer, to be another adviser of the President. Perhaps in a multitude of counselors there is safety, but it seems to me that the chief executive office is one which a great many advisers will only hamper.

But though I might be willing to forego my objection to a new executive department and another Cabinet officer if the emergency required it, I do not think we ought to erect the Department of Agriculture alone into such an executive office. Agriculture constitutes, to be sure, a great portion of the business of the country, but it does not constitute the entire business of the country, and other branches of business are just as much entitled to be represented in the Cabinet and among the executive officers of the United States as is the business of agriculture. If a new department is to be created it ought to be a department which should not be limited, as this is if you create it, to being a Department of Agriculture, but it ought to be an executive department which should embrace within its purview all of the great business interests of the country.

There is no reason why those people interested in agriculture should be represented in the Cabinet, and those who are interested in manufactures, or mining, or transportation, or commerce, should not be; and while I do not wish in any way to disparage the agricultural interests of the country, while I would go perhaps a great way in fostering them, in protecting them, and in giving them representation in the public councils of the nation, I think that any bill which is passed should go further than that.

And when we go outside of what may be called the actual business interests of the country there is another greater interest which is as much entitled to be represented in an executive office as any of the great branches of business of which I have spoken, and that is the labor interest of the country. Why should agriculture be promoted to the dignity of having a Cabinet officer, and labor employed in other branches of business and in the diversified industries of our people be shut out from being represented in the Cabinet?

So, as it seems to me, if we are going to have a new executive office, it ought to embrace and represent not only agriculture, but all the other great branches of business of which I have spoken—manufactures, mining, commerce, transportation—and it also ought to embrace and represent the interests of labor in this country, of work pure and simple as distinguished from capital. It ought to be as well a statistical department. It ought to have charge of taking our census, which is taken every decade, and to understand that as the new decade approached it would be the business of such a department to make ready for the taking of the next census, so that when the next census should be taken it should be by a deliberate plan and largely from information which had been collected from time to time during the whole ten years; so that the census should be accurate, should be reliable, should be something which the people could rely upon, instead of being what it is when taken in a hurry and with the lack of preparation with which it is now taken.

It will thus be seen that my objection to this bill is not leveled against the agricultural interests of the country by any means. I would stand by them; I would do everything for those interests; but it is that this bill, if another executive office is to be created, does not embrace enough. The Department of the Interior is overloaded. Many of the things that are done there—some of them have been alluded to—would be naturally embraced within this new department.

Possibly it may be replied to this that if the Department of Agriculture is once established it will be easy to add to it these other matters of which I have spoken; but it is not easy to add matters to a department which has itself been created with special reference to a particular interest of the country, and if it is going to be done it seems to me it ought to be done at the start. I am sorry that the committee to which this bill was referred did not consider the project of embracing all these great industries and branches of business and the interest of labor, of the workingmen of this country, within the department which it was proposed to create.

Mr. TELLER. Would it be in order to move to recommit this bill to the committee?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks it would not. The bill having been passed over under objection it is on the Calendar under Rule IX, not subject to motion now.

Mr. TELLER. If the objection is withdrawn can that be done?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That can be done if the objection is withdrawn.

Mr. MORGAN. I withdraw the objection for that motion.

Mr. TELLER. It seems to me that if there is to be a new executive department, the name "Department of Agriculture" is indefinite. Some other name should be selected, like "the Department of Industry," which has been suggested, or "the Department of Labor," or some of the other names which have been suggested; and then we should transfer to this new department a great many things that are already in the existing Departments, more particularly in the Interior Department.

The Interior Department, as everybody knows, is overcrowded with various bureaus that do not properly belong to it, and which are not particularly appropriate to a mere agricultural department. So great is the labor there that it is utterly impossible for any head of that Department to examine the current business of the Department. It was stated here the other day and truly that the Secretary of the Interior, day by day, can not read, let alone digest or consider, all the papers that are presented for his signature. He relies almost entirely upon the subordinates. He must rely absolutely on the heads of bureaus. There could be a number of bureaus of the interior, without infringing on the usefulness or impairing the dignity of the Interior Department, transferred to this new department when it is created. Therefore I move that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. PLUMB. The chairman of the committee [Mr. PALMER] is not here, and I would not like to take responsibility in regard to the matter in his absence. I do not like to make objection, but I should be glad to have the motion also embrace the proposition that the bill when reported back should take the place on the Calendar of Senate bill 784, which is Order of Business 1151, so that it will not be put at the foot of a large Calendar and possibly not be reached for consideration.

Mr. TELLER. I have no objection to that, but I will say to the Senator that I do not think there will be any trouble in getting up the bill at any time. I think there is a general feeling that another Department can be created properly and ought to be created, and it ought to be made in law equal in importance and dignity with every other Department, and to do that we should transfer to it something besides what is proposed to be transferred by this bill.

Again, if we create a department it would not be fair to create a department with very little business and leave an overburdened Department like the Interior Department to-day. I do not care about what particular bureaus shall be put in this new department. The committee can see that many would be in harmony with the general idea and purpose of this new department.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Colorado [Mr. TELLER] moves that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Mr. MANDERSON. Does that mean the House bill?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair was about to state that if that course is pursued the order of substitution had better be reconsidered and both bills referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the understanding being that when reported back, as suggested by the Senator from Kansas, they shall resume their numerical places on the Calendar. Is there objection? If there is none, it is so ordered.

MRS. FRANCES MARSHALL.

The bill (H. R. 326) for the relief of Mrs. Frances Marshall was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill being adversely reported will be passed over.

STATUE OF EX-PRESIDENT TAYLOR.

The bill (S. 2787) for the erection of an equestrian statue of ex-President Zachary Taylor was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS FOR POST-OFFICE PURPOSES.

Mr. SPOONER. What disposition was made of Calendar No. 1101, being the bill to provide for the erection of public buildings for post-offices, etc.?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It went over under objection without prejudice, retaining its place on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. I stated that my colleague [Mr. VEST] was not present.

Mr. SPOONER. That is all right. I simply wanted to know whether the bill had lost its place.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 9377) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2551) to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia, so as to make inauguration day a holiday within said District.

The message further announced that the House had receded from its amendments to the following bills:

A bill (S. 300) granting a pension to Mrs. Juliet G. Howe; and

A bill (S. 393) for the relief of Frances Anne Pyne Ricketts.

JOURNALS OF CONGRESS.

The bill (S. 2802) to fix the number of unbound and bound Journals of the Senate and House of Representatives, and to provide for their distribution, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CALL. This subject has been before the Senate several times. The Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] has taken great interest in it, and I do not think that the bill ought to be considered in his absence.

Mr. MANDERSON. I do not think that it will be necessary to postpone it on that account. This matter has been very carefully investigated by the Committee on Printing, and after this bill was reported to the Senate I called the attention of the Senator from Missouri to the bill, and it met with his entire approval, and meets the difficulty of which he complained.

Mr. CALL. I would rather he were here when this subject is considered.

Mr. MANDERSON. I can assure the Senator from Florida that the Senator from Missouri is as anxious for the passage of this bill in this form as any member of the Printing Committee. If the Senator desires that it shall go over, of course I shall make no objection; but I can assure him that it meets the approval of the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CALL. Does it reach the difficulties to which he referred?

Mr. MANDERSON. It reaches those difficulties and reduces the number of Journals of both the Senate and House very materially.

Mr. CALL. I make no objection.

Mr. COCKRELL. Will the Senator explain exactly what changes this bill makes, and whether each Senator will still be furnished with a copy of the Journal?

Mr. MANDERSON. Each Senator will still be furnished with one copy of the Journal of both the Senate and the House, and this distribution is made after consultation with the officers of both the Senate and House. It reduces by nearly 1,600 the number of both the Senate and House Journals printed. I think perhaps it might be well to print in connection with the bill in the RECORD the report of the committee. It is quite short and it explains the matter very satisfactorily.

The report, submitted by Mr. MANDERSON April 26, is as follows:

The Committee on Printing, having made full investigation into the matter stated in the foregoing title, recommend the passage of the accompanying bill.

It was learned by your committee that there were more of the unbound Journals of both branches of Congress printed and distributed in signatures or parts, semi-monthly, than were needed, and hence the number has been reduced. Since the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been made so complete by its index, there seems to be little demand for the semi-monthly issue of the Journals, the former containing the same information in better form.

Your committee, by correspondence and personal interview, endeavored to ascertain the exact number of bound Journals required for the good of the public service and to meet every reasonable demand. The result of this investigation is presented in the bill. By a mistake in the revision of the United States Statutes of 1878, the number of bound Journals was increased 1,550 copies. There being no need of continuing this duplication of the usual number, it was deemed in the interest of economy to cut it off. Wherever the committee has found it possible to reduce the number of Journals printed under old law or custom by fitting the issue to the exact requirements, it has been done. The following tables will show in convenient form the distribution of the number of copies of the Journals proposed to be printed in the bill:

Unbound copies in signatures.

	Senate.	House.
Office of the Secretary of the Senate	6	6
Office of the Clerk of the House	5	25
Document-room of the House	5	5
Public Printer	4	4
Library of the House (file copies)	5	5
Library of the Senate (file copies)	5	5
Total	30	50

Bound copies of Journals.

	Senate.	House.
Office of the Secretary of the Senate (for Senators)	78	78
Senate library	36	36
Senate document-room	25	25
Senate folding-room	43	43
House document-room (for members)	337	348
Department of State	10	10
Department of the Interior (for States)	435	435
Clerk of the House (for governors of States)		123
Library of Congress (for foreign exchange)	52	52
Court of Claims	2	2
Library of the House of Representatives	7	15
Total	1,025	1,124

Mr. HOAR. I should like to ask the Senator from Nebraska if one copy of the Journals will be furnished hereafter to each of the depositories?

Mr. MANDERSON. The printed volumes pass in very large numbers—to the extent, perhaps, of 1,500 copies—to the Interior Department; and that is a surplusage beyond what is needed to supply all the depositories, the libraries, and the governors of all the States, and they seem to accumulate there without demand from any source for them. These 1,500 or 1,550 copies that have been printed for some years seem to have been printed as the result of a misunderstanding. By a change of the law made in 1878 this number in excess of the real demand of the country was ordered to be printed, and this bill reaches to the repeal of that law, and makes a new and better distribution, in the opinion of the Committee on Printing, of the Senate and House Journals.

Mr. HOAR. Will the librarian of the Interior Department still have charge of the distribution? Has he been consulted?

Mr. MANDERSON. That is not changed by any means. The clerk of the committee has been in consultation with that officer.

Mr. HOAR. I do not know particularly about the details of this bill; but I am satisfied that the number of public depositories of these documents ought to be very largely increased, and that every document of this kind which relates to the legislative or the administrative history of this country should be placed certainly in every considerable public library throughout the country. There are to be found in every neighborhood, certainly in those parts of the country with which I am familiar, and in those parts of the country with which you, sir, are familiar, jurists, persons connected with the press, persons in every department of public business and political life, who feel an interest in keeping up with current politics, and who ought to have access to the original sources of history.

There are, I suppose, ten or twelve—I do not remember the exact number—of these depositories of public documents in the State of Massachusetts. There ought certainly to be three hundred in that single State. There ought to be three hundred copies of the Journals of the House and Senate and three hundred sets of the debates placed in the public libraries for the reasonable wants of that State alone. The copies are almost valueless unless the collections are complete, as the Senator knows as well as I do.

Mr. MANDERSON. The important document, as it seems to me, for the purposes suggested by the Senator from Massachusetts, is the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD rather than the Journals of the Senate and House. Necessarily the Journals of both the Senate and House are mere skeletons of their proceedings. The debates referred to by the Senator from Massachusetts are to be found, of course, in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and these have a much more extended distribution than either House or Senate Journal. Under the old practice we had about as many unbound copies of the Senate and House Journals as we had bound copies, and they were simply wasted. They were not needed in that form. The only need for unbound copies of the

Journals of the two Houses is for use during the progress of the session, and therefore for that purpose, for the purpose of indexing, for the use of the clerks and committees, etc., we have reduced the number of unbound copies to 50, leaving of the bound copies 1,025 for the use of the Senate and 1,124 for the use of the House of Representatives; and by this method of distribution it will be ascertained that there go to the Department of the Interior, to be distributed by the superintendent of documents, 435, which number supplies all of the depositories allowed by law. In addition to that there go to the Clerk of the House for governors of States 125 copies, and to the Library of Congress for foreign exchange 62 copies.

This is in addition to the number that are retained in the House document and folding rooms, and the Senate document and folding rooms, and in the office of the Secretary of the Senate, and in the office of the Clerk of the House for distribution to Senators and to members of the House.

Mr. HOAR. What is the number for depositories?

Mr. MANDERSON. Four hundred and thirty-five, or very near that number.

Mr. HOAR. I believe I shall object to the consideration of the bill until I can have further opportunity to inquire into it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHACE in the chair). Objection being made, the bill goes over.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF MARY H. PIKE.

The bill (S. 1191) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mary H. Pike was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to the legal representatives of Mary H. Pike, deceased, late of Little Rock, Ark., $35, for rent of a building in Little Rock, occupied by the military authorities of the United States, under contract, from October 1 to October 30, 1864, and for which vouchers were given her by those authorities.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

UNITED PEORIAS AND MIAMIS.

Mr. DAWES. I move that the bill (H. R. 8074) to provide for allotment of land in severalty to United Peorias and Miamis in Indian Territory may be recommitted to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

The motion was agreed to.

ESTATE OF JOSEPH FENNO.

The bill (S. 1190) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Fenno was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to the legal representatives of Joseph Fenno, deceased, late of Little Rock, Ark., $580, for rent of buildings owned by him in Little Rock, which were occupied by the military authorities of the United States, under contract, from July 1, 1864, to January 30, 1865, and for which vouchers were given to Busby by those authorities.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SEDALIA, MO.

The bill (H. R. 1599) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Sedalia, in the State of Missouri, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALARIES OF DISTRICT JUDGES.

The bill (S. 407) fixing the salaries of the several judges of the United States district courts at $5,000 per annum, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. COKE. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, being objected to, will go over without prejudice.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT MONROE, LA.

The bill (H. R. 1483) for the erection of a public building at Monroe, La., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments. The first amendment was, in line 4, after the word "purchase," to insert "acquire by condemnation;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase, acquire by condemnation, or otherwise procure a suitable site, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 22, after the word "exceed," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" so as to read:

The plans and estimates for said building shall first be prepared, examined, and approved as required by section 3734 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, and the cost shall not exceed $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 31, after the words "sum of," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" so as to read:

And no purchase of site nor plan of said building shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the said sum of $75,000, which sum is hereby appropriated for the same out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair would call attention to the fact that there is a verbal amendment necessary in line 27, to strike out the word "same" and insert "sum."

Mr. COCKRELL. That correction ought to be made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This amendment will be made, if there be no objection.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY.

The bill (S. 194) to increase the endowment of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural College was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Lands with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 3, line 5, after the word "entries," to insert "or under any law of the United States;" and in line 7, after the word "selections," to insert "for the purposes of this act;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any legal subdivision of land to which the right of homestead entry or pre-emption shall have attached in favor of any person who is entitled to such homestead and pre-emption entries, or under any law of the United States, and who is occupying and claiming such subdivision of the public land in Louisiana at the time when such selections for the purposes of this act are approved by the Secretary of the Interior; and in cases where it is found that such claims are superior to the rights of the State of Louisiana herein granted, the said State may select other lands in lieu thereof, and in like quantity, elsewhere in the said State, from the public lands of the United States, so as to make up as nearly as may be the total number of acres of land granted in this act to said State.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHANDLER. Is there any report in that case?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is no report, the Chair is informed.

Mr. CHANDLER. Then I object, unless some statement can be made of the reasons for the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Hampshire makes an objection, and the bill goes over.

Mr. CHANDLER. Retaining its place on the Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Retaining its place on the Calendar.

INAUGURATION DAY.

Mr. MANDERSON. The Senate this morning on my motion passed the bill (H. R. 8843) to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia, so as to make inauguration day a holiday within said District. Since the passage of that bill by the Senate the House of Representatives have passed a Senate bill on the same subject and it has been received here. I therefore move that the vote by which House bill 8843 was passed be reconsidered, and that that bill be indefinitely postponed. I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that the vote by which House bill 8843 making inauguration day a legal holiday in the District of Columbia was passed may be reconsidered. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. MANDERSON. I also move that the bill be postponed indefinitely.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator move to take up the other bill now?

Mr. MANDERSON. No, sir; the bill formerly passed the Senate and has now passed the House of Representatives.

BRIDGE ACROSS OCONEE RIVER.

The bill (H. R. 8279) to authorize the county of Laurens, in the State of Georgia, to construct a bridge across the Oconee River at or near Dublin, in said county and State, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT WATERBURY, CONN.

The bill (S. 2319) for the erection of a public building at Waterbury, Conn., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 12, after the words "one hundred," to strike out "and fifty;" so as to read:

The site and building thereon, when completed upon plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall not exceed in cost the sum of $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 21, after the words "one hundred," to strike out "and fifty;" so as to read:

And no purchase of site, nor plan for said building, shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the said sum of $100,000 for site and building.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add as a new section:

SEC. 2. That the sum of $100,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be used and expended for the purpose provided in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIENS OF JUDGMENTS.

The bill (H. R. 8180) to regulate the liens of judgments and decrees of the courts of the United States was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 4, after the word "court," to insert "of the United States;" in line 5, after the word "property," to insert "throughout such State;" in line 6, after the word "conditions," to insert "only;" in the same line, after the word "as," to insert "if such;" and in line 7, after the word "decrees," to strike out "of the courts of such State" and insert "had been rendered by a court of general jurisdiction of such State;" so as to read:

That judgments and decrees rendered in a circuit or district court of the United States within any State shall be liens on property throughout such State in the same manner and to the same extent and under the same conditions only as if such judgments and decrees had been rendered by a court of general jurisdiction of such State.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 12, after the word "attach," to strike out "such regulations shall apply to the judgments or decrees of the courts of the United States" and insert "this act shall be applicable therein;" so as to read:

Provided, That whenever the laws of any State require a judgment or decree of a State court to be registered, recorded, docketed, indexed, or any other thing to be done, in a particular manner, or in a certain office or county, before a lien shall attach, this act shall be applicable therein whenever and only whenever the laws of such State shall authorize the judgments and decrees of the United States courts to be registered, recorded, docketed, indexed, or otherwise conformed to the rules and requirements relating to the judgments and decrees of the courts of the State.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TELLER. I ask that the bill may go over. It seems to me that it establishes quite a new rule.

Mr. MANDERSON. I hope the Senator from Colorado will not object to the consideration or the passage of this bill While it may establish a new rule, it is certainly a rule that is very greatly needed, particularly throughout the Western States.

This is simply the establishing of a principle for which many of us have contended for many years, and it seems to reach the remedy that is sought very completely. It is that the judgments of the United States courts shall not only be of record in the office of the clerks of the United States courts, but that there shall also be a record of the judgments that are liens upon real estate in the counties where the land is situated, thus rendering it unnecessary where one seeks to obtain information as to incumbrances by way of judgment-lien, that, being in an interior or outside county, he shall be compelled to communicate, within the Senator's own State, for instance, at Denver, but that he can simply go to the records of his own county and ascertain the fact whether there is a judgment of the United States court.

I know that this bill has received the very careful consideration of the Committee on the Judiciary, and that it applies a remedy which certainly is desirable in most of the States in the Union, if not all of them.

Mr. TELLER. I suggest that the bill go over so that it may be looked into. It is a new idea to me. While I have great confidence in the committee that reported the bill, I know they worked some very disastrous results in a bill which we allowed to pass here in the last Congress. I shall take an opportunity to look at it, and the Senator can call it up again. It will not lose its place.

Mr. MANDERSON. All right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado objects, and the bill goes over without losing its place on the Calendar.

USE AND SALE OF OPIUM.

The bill (S. 375) to restrict the use and sale of opium in the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides that every person who, within the District of Columbia or any of the Territories of the United States, or other place within the exclusive jurisdiction of the United States, shall sell, lend, or give away, or offer to sell, lend, or give away, any apparatus or device or instrument whereby opium may be smoked or used in any manner whatsoever, or who shall permit or allow persons to assemble upon any premises in his or her control for the purpose of smoking opium, or shall lease, hire, or rent any buildings or premises, or any part thereof, to be used, occupied, or employed for the purpose of smoking opium or of using opium in any manner, shall be guilty of misdemeanor, and, upon conviction, shall be sentenced to pay a fine of not less than one nor more than five hundred dollars, or be imprisoned not exceeding one year.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASSISTANT ASTRONOMERS.

The bill (S. 653) defining the positions and salaries of assistant astronomers at the United States Naval Observatory, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was to add to section 1 the following words:

And such officers to be removable by said Secretary whenever the public interests may require such removal upon the recommendation of the Superintendent of the Observatory and a majority of the professors of mathematics on duty at such Observatory.

So as to make the section read:

That there be, and hereby are, permanently authorized the positions of five assistant astronomers at the United States Naval Observatory, who shall receive a compensation per annum of $1,800 during their first three years of service, of $2,100 during their second three years of service, of $2,400 during their third three years of service, of $2,700 during their fourth three years of service, and of $3,000 after twelve years of service, the appointments to these positions to be made by the Secretary of the Navy; and such officers to be removable by said Secretary whenever the public interests may require such removal upon the recommendation of the Superintendent of the Observatory and a majority of the professors of mathematics on duty at such Observatory.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 1, after the word "that," to strike out "this act shall take effect upon its passage, and that;" in line 2, after the word "compensation," to strike out "thereafter" and insert "after the passage of this act;" in line 5, before the word "section," to insert "the preceding," and after "section" to strike out the word "one;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That the compensation after the passage of this act of the three assistant astronomers now attached to the said Observatory shall be reckoned according to the terms of the preceding section by adding to their terms of service under this act their previous terms of service at the said Observatory as assistant astronomers, assistant observers, or aids.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, line 1, after the word "two," to strike out "remaining" and insert "additional;" in line 2, before the word "section," to insert "the preceding," and after "section" to strike out the word "one;" in line 5, after the words "consist of," to strike out "two professors" and insert "one professor;" in line 6, after the word "Navy," to strike out "who shall at the time be on duty at the Naval Observatory, and of;" in line 8, after the word "astronomer," to insert "and one other competent examiner, who may be either naval or civilian;" in line 22, after the word "least," to strike out "one month" and insert "two months;" and in line 25, after the word "date," to strike out "or dates;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. That to fill the two additional positions authorized in the preceding section, and to fill any vacancies that may hereafter occur in the positions of assistant astronomers, the Secretary of the Navy shall appoint an examining board, which shall consist of one professor of mathematics in the Navy, one assistant astronomer, and one other competent examiner, who may be either naval or civilian, and this board shall examine all candidates who request permission to appear before it, in astronomy, mathematics, astronomical physics, and knowledge of and experience in practical astronomy, and the said board shall report to the Secretary of the Navy the names of such persons as they shall find qualified for the position of assistant astronomer in the order of their standing as developed by the examination, and from this number the Secretary of the Navy shall fill the vacancies that may exist; and no person shall be appointed to fill such vacancy without such favorable report from such examining board; and the Secretary of the Navy shall cause to be circulated to the principal observatories, universities, colleges, and schools of technology and engineering throughout the United States, at least two months before such examination, a circular announcing the number of vacancies existing, the compensation attached to the position, and the place and date of the examination to be held.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, line 2, after the word "appropriated," to strike out "out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000, or as much," and insert "such sums;" and after the word "for," at the end of line 5, to strike out "such part of the two fiscal years ending June 30, 1889, as is unexpired at the time of the passage of this act," and insert "the current fiscal year and for the fiscal year next succeeding."

So as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That, to carry out the provisions of this act, there is hereby appropriated such sums as may be necessary to pay the salaries of the assistant astronomers authorized in section 1 for the current fiscal year and for the fiscal year next succeeding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT LYNCHBURGH.

The bill (S. 2277) to provide for the extension of the public building at Lynchburgh, Va., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, in line 3, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the sum of $30,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any funds in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the

extension of the public building at Lynchburgh, Va., upon such plans and specifications as may be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury. Any amount not necessary for the purpose aforesaid shall be covered into the Treasury.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENSIONS TO JUDGES.

The bill (S. 2470) to repeal section 714 of the Revised Statutes, allowing pensions to judges in certain cases, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill, having been reported adversely, will go over under Rule IX.

ESTATE OF ISAAC P. TICE.

The bill (S. 987) for the relief of the administrators of the estate of Isaac P. Tice, deceased, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let that bill go over. I should like to make some inquiry in regard to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Rhode Island objecting, the bill will go over.

PEARSON C. MONTGOMERY.

The bill (S. 750) for the relief of Pearson C. Montgomery, of Memphis, Tenn., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. TELLER. I do not see why that bill should come from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is evidently a mistake in the printed Calendar. The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims.

Mr. COCKRELL. It was referred to the Committee on Claims, and reported by that committee.

Mr. TELLER. Then it is a mistake in the Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a mistake in the Calendar.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know anything about the bill; only I knew that it did not belong to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill was reported by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PASCO] from the Committee on Claims with an amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Claims was, in line 6, before the word "thousand," to strike out "fourteen" and insert "three;" and in line 7, before the word "hundred," to strike out "eight" and insert "two;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Pearson C. Montgomery, of Memphis, State of Tennessee, the sum of $3,200, in full compensation for property taken from him for the use of and used by the Army of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

The bill (S. 2851) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. HALE. That, I suppose, should go over, as the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] is not here.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine objecting, the bill will go over without losing its place on the Calendar.

Mr. HALE. I do not object to that at all. I suppose it is the bill the Senator from Illinois referred to this morning, stating that he would call it up when he returned from West Point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will not lose its place on the Calendar.

CLARA B. DAVIDSON.

The bill (S. 2852) granting an increase of pension to Clara B. Davidson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Clara B. Davidson, widow of John W. Davidson, late colonel of the Second Cavalry, at the rate of $70 per month, in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL ARMY RETIRED-LIST.

The bill (S. 1100) to retire certain disabled officers of the Army was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The preamble recites that there are about eighty officers now borne on the active-list of the Army who, in consequence of wounds received in action or exposure in the line of duty, are incapacitated for active service; and that the present limitation upon the number of officers on the retired-list will not permit their retirement, although the efficiency of the Army would be greatly increased by such a measure.

The bill authorizes the President of the United States to retire those officers of the Army who, by retiring boards as now constituted by law, have already been recommended for retirement, or may be so recommended prior to January 1, 1889, and provides that the names of all officers retired in accordance with this proposed act shall be placed upon an additional retired-list in which vacancies occurring by reason of death, resignation, or dismissal shall not be filled. But this additional retired-list shall cease to exist and the act shall have no further effect when those officers of the Army retired under its provisions shall all have died, resigned, or been dismissed from the Army of the United States.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

ALFRED PLEASONTON.

The bill (H. R. 2972) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Alfred Pleasonton with the rank and grade of colonel was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 8, after "United States," to strike out "a brevet major-general in the Army of the United States;" so as to read:

That the laws regulating appointments in the Army be, and they are hereby, suspended, and suspended only for the purpose of this act, and the President is hereby authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint Alfred Pleasonton, late a major-general of volunteers in the Army of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 11, after the words "grade of," to strike out "colonel" and insert "major;" so as to read:

And thereupon to place him, the said Alfred Pleasonton, upon the retired list of the Army with the rank and grade of major, without regard and in addition to the number now authorized by law of said retired-list.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. PLATT. How does the bill stand? With what rank does it retire General Pleasonton?

Mr. CAMERON. With the rank of major.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that it makes him a major.

Mr. COCKRELL. I was going to state that there was an oversight in reporting the bill. The word "major" should be inserted after the words "United States" in line 8 to make it correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no objection, that amendment will be made.

Mr. COCKRELL. It would then read:

And the President is hereby authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoint Alfred Pleasonton, late a major-general of volunteers in the Army of the United States, a major, and thereupon, etc.

Mr. CAMERON. That is right.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be made.

Mr. TELLER. I understand that the House of Representatives gave by the bill the rank of colonel, and I regret very much that our Committee on Military Affairs did not see fit to report it as the House passed it. I understand the Senate Committee on Military Affairs have adopted a rule that they will confine these retirements to the rank that the officer held in the regular Army when he retired from the Army, and that I understand in this case was major. I should insist, if I believed it would do any good, upon passing the bill as it came from the other House, but I am pretty well satisfied that it can not be passed in that shape from some examination I have made, and believing that a little is better than nothing, and that this is an act of justice in part towards a gallant officer, which has long been deferred, I shall not make any objection to the bill being passed as amended by the committee.

The amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the President to appoint and retire Alfred Pleasanton, with the rank and grade of major."

Mr. CAMERON. I move that a conference with the House of Representatives be requested on the bill and amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the Presiding Officer was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. CAMERON, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. COCKRELL were appointed.

POTTAWATOMIES OF MICHIGAN AND INDIANA.

The bill (S. 2176) for the ascertainment of the amount due the Pottawatomie Indians of Michigan and Indiana was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs with an amendment, in line 12, after the word "Indians," to insert the words "nor by the receipt in full given by said Pottawatomies under the provisions of said resolution;" so as to read:

That the Court of Claims is hereby authorized to take jurisdiction of and try all questions of difference arising out of treaty stipulations with the said Pottawatomie Indians, of Michigan and Indiana, and to render judgment thereon;

power is hereby granted the said court to review the entire question of difference *de novo*, and it shall not be estopped by the joint resolution of Congress, approved July 28, 1866, entitled "Joint resolution for the relief of certain Chippewa, Ottawa, and Pottawatomie Indians," nor by the receipt in full given by said Pottawatomies under the provisions of said resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COCKRELL. This seems to be, from what I can hastily see of it, a repeal of the final action had under a former law of Congress, and I think probably we had better let the bill pass over.

Mr. PLATT. Why not let the report be read and then perhaps the Senator will be satisfied?

Mr. COCKRELL. The report contains 42 pages.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut ask to have the report read?

Mr. PLATT. No, I do not. The Senator who reported the bill is not present. However, the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs is present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the bill will go over, without losing its place on the Calendar.

MICHIGAN CITY BRIDGE.

The bill (S. 2097) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Trail Creek, in the city of Michigan City, Indiana, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was to add to section 1 the following additional proviso:

Provided also, That if tolls shall be collected for passage or transportation across said bridge, the rates thereof shall be subject to the approval of the Secretary of War, who shall have power to fix said rates at reasonable amounts.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add as section 2:

SEC. 2. That if the construction of the bridge hereby authorized shall not be commenced within one year from the time this act takes effect, and be completed within three years after its commencement, then this act shall be void, and all rights hereby conferred shall cease and determine.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, and was read the third time, and passed.

LONGEVITY PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

The bill (H. R. 8809) to provide for the promotion of officers of the Army after twenty years' continuous service in one grade was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. Let that be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri objects, and the bill goes over without losing its place on the Calendar.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT HICKMAN.

The bill (H. R. 7340) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Hickman, Ky., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, in section 3, line 2, after the word "spans," to strike out:

Having at least one channel span of the width to be prescribed by a board of engineer officers constituted to examine and determine the same with the approval of the Secretary of War, and all other spans over the water way shall have a clear channel way of not less than 650 feet, and a clear head room of not less than 85 feet, above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, and the bridge shall be at right angles to, and its piers parallel with, the current of the river.

And to insert:

Before approving the plans for said bridge the Secretary of War shall order three engineer officers from the Engineer Bureau to be detailed to the duty of examining, by actual inspection, the locality where said bridge is to be built, and to report what shall be the length of the main channel span and of the other spans: *Provided*, That the main channel span shall in no event be less than 700 feet in length, or the other spans less than 650 feet each in length; and if the report of said officers shall be approved by the Secretary of War, the spans of said bridge shall be of the length so required. The lowest part of the superstructure of said bridge shall be at least 85 feet above extreme high-water mark, as understood at the point of location, and the bridge shall be at right-angles to and its piers parallel with the current of the river.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

FRANCES ANNE PYNE RICKETTS.

Mr. DAVIS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 393) for the relief of Frances Anne Pyne Ricketts having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment to said bill.

C. K. DAVIS,
ALGERNON S. PADDOCK,
RUFUS BLODGETT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. LOGAN CHIPMAN,
JOHN LYNCH,
J. G. SAWYER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The other House having receded from its disagreement, the report requires no action on the part of the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1241) to prevent obstructive and injurious deposits within the harbor and adjacent waters of New York City, by dumping or otherwise, and to punish and prevent such offenses, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker *pro tempore* of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 9788) making appropriations to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes; and it was thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore*.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills, received from the House of Representatives, were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 1069) granting a pension to Robert McClean;

A bill (H. R. 8761) granting a pension to Mrs. Anna Butterfield;

A bill (H. R. 8762) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Ordway;

A bill (H. R. 8984) granting a pension to Griswold Rogers; and

A bill (H. R. 9314) granting a pension to Mrs. Judith Deig.

The bill (H. R. 9377) making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

EMMA S. FREE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 431) granting a pension to Emma S. Free, widow of Thomas S. Free, late major of the United States Army.

The amendment of the House was, in line 6, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty-five."

Mr. BLAIR. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House of Representatives, and ask for a conference thereon.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. BLAIR, Mr. PADDOCK, and Mr. FAULKNER were appointed.

RIGHT OF WAY ACROSS FORT M'CLARY RESERVATION.

The bill (H. R. 7509) granting to the York Harbor and Beach Railroad Company a right of way was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to grant the right of way, four rods in width, across the military reservation at Fort McClary, in the town of Kittery, Me., to the York Harbor and Beach Railroad Company, a corporation created by the laws of Maine, and the company is authorized to construct, maintain, and operate its railroad on the right of way, according to the location thereof, as recorded in the office of the commissioners of the county of York, Maine, and described in the temporary revocable license issued by the War Department to the company June 10, 1887.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RIGHT OF WAY ACROSS MOUNT VERNON ARSENAL RESERVATION.

The bill (S. 2477) granting the right of way to the Mobile and Birmingham Railway Company, the successor to the Mobile and Alabama Grand Trunk Railroad Company, across the Mount Vernon Arsenal Reservation, in Mobile County, Alabama, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 3, after the word "hundred," to strike out "and fifty," and in line 4, before the word "feet," to strike out "seventy-five" and insert "fifty;" so as to read:

That a right of way of 100 feet in width, being 50 feet on either side of the center line of the said railroad as the same was constructed by the Mobile and Alabama Grand Trunk Railroad Company, and now maintained and operated by the said Mobile and Birmingham Railway Company across the arsenal reservation at Mount Vernon, Ala., be granted to the said Mobile and Birmingham Railway Company across the reservation aforesaid.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 2, in the following words:

SEC. 2. That the said company, in addition to the right of way for its tracks and sidings as above granted, shall also have the right to construct and maintain a freight and passenger depot and platform for their freight and passengers, and also a turntable and "Y," at some suitable point on said reservation: *Provided*, That the location of such depot, platform, turntable, and "Y," shall be approved by the Secretary of War.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING IN NASHUA, N. H.

The bill (S. 385) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Nashua, in the State of New Hampshire, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 4, after the word "purchase," to insert "or acquire by condemnation;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to purchase, or acquire by condemnation, a site for, and cause to be erected thereon, a suitable building, with commodious fire-proof vaults, for the accommodation of the post-office, internal-revenue office, and other Government offices, at the city of Nashua, in the State of New Hampshire.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 1, line 12, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" so as to read:

The site, and the building thereon, when completed upon plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall not exceed the cost of $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 1, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 2. That the sum of $75,000 be, and the same is hereby, appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to be used and expended for the purpose provided in this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF JAMES L. DAY.

The bill (S. 1245) for the relief of Nancy E. Day, administratrix of the estate of James L. Day, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay Nancy E. Day, administratrix of the estate of James L. Day, deceased, late of Norwich, Conn., $3,041.66 in payment and satisfaction of the amount found due from the United States to Nancy E. Day by the Court of Claims upon a reference of her claim to that court by the Postmaster-General.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN E. FENIMORE.

The bill (S. 355) for the relief of John E. Fenimore was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. COCKRELL. That is an adverse report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill was adversely reported and will go to the Calendar under Rule IX.

WILLIAM SCHAUS.

The bill (S. 1632) to refund moneys collected from William Schaus at the port of New York on an oil painting not subject to duty was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY IN VIRGINIA.

The bill (S. 515) for the relief of the Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary and High School in Virginia was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

Mr. FAULKNER. That claim has been passed by the House of Representatives in another bill, which has been brought over and presented to the Senate and referred to the Committee on Claims, with a number of other claims included in the same bill. The House bill was ordered to be reported favorably by the Senate committee, and it has been suggested by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL], who is specially interested in this Senate bill, that it be passed over, so that the claim may be passed in the House bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over without prejudice, retaining its place on the Calendar.

WEST VIRGINIA MILITIA.

The bill (S. 1807) to refund to the State of West Virginia the money paid to officers of the One hundred and thirty-third Regiment West Virginia Militia for services rendered during the rebellion was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to the State of West Virginia $2,019.57, the amount paid by the State to certain officers of the One hundred and thirty-third Regiment West Virginia Militia for services rendered by them in the war of the rebellion, being the difference between $13 per month received by them and the amount they should have received as such officers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

B. M. PARISH.

The bill (H. R. 322) for the relief of B. M. Parish was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay B. M. Parish, of Barren County, Kentucky, $635, for property taken and used during the late war.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COLLIN ADAMS.

The bill (S. 2849) for the relief of Collin Adams was announced as next in order on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. This bill was adversely reported, and will go over to the Calendar under Rule IX.

DAVID MERIWETHER.

The bill (H. R. 331) for the relief of David Meriwether was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, in line 6, after the word "appropriated," to strike out:

One thousand nine hundred and twenty-nine dollars and forty cents, being arrears of his salary as governor of the Territory of New Mexico; also, $3,602.55, being the amount due him as disbursing agent of public moneys; also,

And in line 12, after the word "part," to strike out the words:

Amounting in all to the sum of $6,086.60, all.

So as to make the bill read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to David Meriwether, of Louisville, Ky., out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, $525 for loss of public moneys sustained without fault on his part, as found and set forth by the Court of Claims in its findings of fact dated the 14th day of December, 1885.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

LAND OFFICE AT FOLSOM, N. MEX.

The bill (S. 2040) to establish a land office at Folsom, in the Territory of New Mexico, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES V. MESLER.

The bill (H. R. 2695) for the relief of Charles V. Mesler was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Postmaster-General, in adjusting the accounts of Charles V. Mesler, postmaster at Gasport, N. Y., to allow him a credit of $39.88 for postal-cards, stamps, and envelopes stolen from him at the post-office on the night of the 25th or 26th of April, 1880, without any negligence or default on the part of the postmaster.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAIL ROUTE IN LOUISIANA.

The bill (H. R. 8965) to authorize the Postmaster-General to cancel mail contract on route No. 30100, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ALTOONA, PA.

The bill (S. 1318) for the erection of a public building at Altoona, Pa., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 4, after the word "purchase," to insert "or acquire by condemnation proceedings;" so as to read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase, or acquire by condemnation proceedings, a site for, and cause to be erected thereon, a suitable building, with fire-proof vaults therein, for the accommodation of the post-office and other Government offices, at the city of Altoona, State of Pennsylvania.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 12, before the word "thousand," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five," and after the word "dollars," in the same line, to insert "which sum is hereby appropriated;" so as to read:

The plans, specifications, and full estimates for said building shall be previously made and approved according to law, and shall not exceed for the site and building complete the sum of $75,000, which sum is hereby appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY.

Mr. GIBSON. I ask the Senate to take up the bill (S. 194) to increase the endowment of the Louisiana State University and Agri-

cultural College. When the bill was reached on the Calendar the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. CHANDLER] objected to its consideration, but he is now, I understand, disposed to withdraw his objection.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am willing to withdraw the objection if the Senator will explain the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill has been read at length, and the amendments of the Committee on Public Lands were agreed to. If there be no objection, the bill is again before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. GIBSON. Mr. President, this is a college which was founded mainly upon the act of July 2, 1862, donating public lands to the several States and Territories which may provide colleges for the benefit of agricultural and mechanic arts. Its buildings and its apparatus were destroyed by fire, and it is to-day supported mainly by the State of Louisiana and partially out of the proceeds of the scrip of the public lands which were granted by the Government of the United States. It now occupies the United States barracks and property at Baton Rouge. But the sum derived from the public lands was greatly diminished on account of the large indebtedness of the State of Louisiana, which was scaled in 1874–'75 40 cents in the dollar, so that this institution lost its main source of revenue.

It is a very good college as conducted to-day. The first president of it was General Sherman, and he has always taken very great interest in it. It is a meritorious college.

It has always been the policy of the Government to assist education by grants of public land. I had the pleasure a few days ago to visit this institution, and I can say to the Senate that it is well conducted. The young men are regular in their attendance. The course of study is appropriate to such an institution, and it is doing good work.

This bill has already passed the Senate, I think, once or twice. Several other bills of a similar character have passed the Senate, and I trust there will be no objection to it.

Mr. PLATT. Let the bill be read once more.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read as amended by the Senate as in Committee of the Whole.

The Chief Clerk read the bill as amended, as follows:

That 25,000 acres of the public lands in Louisiana are hereby granted to the State of Louisiana, to be applied, as far as may be necessary, to the erection of suitable buildings for said university, and to the restoration of the library and scientific apparatus heretofore destroyed by fire, such application to be made in such manner as the Legislature of said State may direct, or may empower the trustees of said university to direct: *Provided*, That the State of Louisiana shall pay the expenses of agents appointed by the governor thereof to select such lands, to be reimbursed out of the proceeds of the sales thereof.

SEC. 2. That the governor of Louisiana may appoint one or more agents to select the lands granted in this act, from any public lands within said State not included in some subsisting grant made by the United States; and such agent shall make report of such selection to the Commissioner of the General Land Office, to be approved by the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 3. That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any legal subdivision of land to which the right of homestead entry or pre-emption shall have attached in favor of any person who is entitled to such homestead pre-emption entries, or under any law of the United States, and who is occupying and claiming such subdivision of the public land in Louisiana at the time when such selections for the purposes of this act are approved by the Secretary of the Interior; and in cases where it is found that such claims are superior to the rights of the State of Louisiana herein granted, the said State may select other lands in lieu thereof, and in like quantity, elsewhere in the said State, from the public lands of the United States, so as to make up as nearly as may be the total number of acres of land granted in this act to said State.

SEC. 4. That when the selections of said lands are so made and are approved by the Secretary of the Interior, the title to the same shall vest in the State of Louisiana, to and for the use and benefit of said Louisiana State University and Agricultural College, to be applied to the uses and purposes declared in the first section of this act, and then to the endowment of said university, and to no other purpose whatever; and patents shall issue to said State for the land so selected and approved. And the State of Louisiana shall by law direct the sale of such lands, and the money arising from such sales shall be paid into the treasury of the State of Louisiana; but no expenses that may be incurred in making such sale after the selection of lands made under this act are confirmed by the Secretary of the Interior and entered on the township maps of the proper land offices shall be paid by the United States.

SEC. 5. That the Secretary of the Interior is empowered to make all needful and proper regulations and rules for carrying this act into effect, and for the decision of all questions that may arise as to the right of the State of Louisiana to any lands that may be claimed under the provisions of this act.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION OF INDIAN LANDS.

Mr. DAWES. I ask the Senate to go back to a bill which has been passed, Order of Business 930, being the bill (H. R. 8393) to protect lands belonging to Indians from unlawful grazing, and for other purposes. This bill was passed in the absence of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. PLUMB] and myself in the Committee on Appropriations. The Senator from Kansas had prepared certain amendments to it. I entered the motion to reconsider on my return to the Senate Chamber so as to enable the Senator from Kansas to offer his amendments. I now ask that the motion to reconsider be acted on so as to give him the opportunity.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The vote by which the bill was passed will be reconsidered by unanimous consent, if there be no objection, and also the vote by which the bill was ordered to a third reading, and the bill is now open to amendment.

Mr. PLUMB. I move to amend by inserting in line 5, after the word "conveys," the words:

For pasturage, transit, or other purposes.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB. I move now, in line 6, to strike out the words "to range and feed;" so as to read:

Every person who drives, or otherwise conveys for pasturage, transit, or other purposes, any stock of horses, mules, or cattle on any land belonging to any Indian or Indian tribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLUMB. I move to strike out section 2 and insert what I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the words proposed to be inserted, as follows:

That the Secretary of the Interior may make and enforce such rules and regulations concerning the transit of cattle across Indian reservations as he may deem necessary to prevent the spread of disease among cattle lawfully on such reservations.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DAWES. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments and ask for a conference with the House of Representatives on the bill and amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent the President *pro tempore* was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. DAWES, Mr. MORGAN, and Mr. PLUMB were appointed.

JAMES L. ALSIP.

The bill (H. R. 6575) for the relief of James L. Alsip was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension-roll the name of James L. Alsip, late of Company A, Third Regiment Kentucky Cavalry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID STRUNK.

The bill (H. R. 417) granting a pension to David Strunk was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension-roll the name of David Strunk, late private in the Eighteenth Battery of New York Light Artillery.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NELLIE PALFREY GOODWIN.

The bill (H. R. 7913) granting a pension to Nellie Palfrey Goodwin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Nellie Palfrey Goodwin, the invalid, dependent, and pauper daughter of William H. Goodwin, late of Company K, Second New Hampshire Volunteers, at the rate of $18 per month, payable to her legally constituted guardian.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES F. WARD.

The bill (H. R. 6520) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Ward was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay to Charles F. Ward, formerly of the ship Vermont, United States Navy, a pension of $30 a month, in lieu of the pension now received by him.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DANVILLE A. RICKER.

The bill (S. 2646) granting a pension to Danville A. Ricker was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Danville A. Ricker, father of Henry G. Ricker, late private in Company K, Seventh Regiment Maine Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY S. MAYNARD.

The bill (S. 2459) granting a pension to Mary S. Maynard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mary S. Maynard, mother of George S. Maynard, late a member of Company K, Twenty-first Massachusetts Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GERTRUDE K. LYFORD.

The bill (S. 2500) granting a pension to Gertrude K. Lyford was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Gertrude K. Lyford, widow of the late Maj. and Bvt. Lieut. Col. Stephen C. Lyford, United States Army, at the rate of $40 per month, in lieu of the pension which she now receives.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY E. HOPKINS.

Mr. CAMERON. I understand that Senate bill 1914, Order of Business 927, was passed over some time since. I should like to have the Senate take it up for consideration now.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1914) for the relief of Mary E. Hopkins. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to Mary E. Hopkins, widow of Alfred Hopkins, late a captain in the Navy, $5,156.64, being for the salary of Alfred Hopkins, on leave pay, from the 21st of November, 1882, to the 24th of September, 1884.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH DOMM.

The bill (S. 2454) placing the name of Elizabeth Domm on the pension-rolls was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension-rolls the name of Elizabeth Domm, widow of John L. Domm, deceased, late member of the Eleventh Ohio Battery.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLOTTE T. ALDERMAN.

The bill (S. 2439) granting a pension to Charlotte T. Alderman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Charlotte T. Alderman, widow of James Alderman, who was a private in Company E, Forty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLEN SMITH.

The bill (S. 2705) granting a pension to Ellen Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Ellen Smith, widow of James Smith, late a private in Company C, Eighty-eighth Regiment of New York Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INDIANA J. NICHOLS.

The bill (S. 2728) to grant a pension to Indiana J. Nichols was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension-roll the name of Indiana J. Nichols, widow of Henry H. Nichols, late private of Company K, One hundred and thirty-third New York Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIJAH MARTIN.

The bill (H. R. 5522) for the relief of Elijah Martin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Elijah Martin, late a private in Lieut. James Whelpley's company of the Twenty-sixth Regiment United States Infantry in the war of 1812, at the rate of $20 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY M. SWEET.

The bill (H. R. 955) granting a pension to Mary M. Sweet was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mary M. Sweet, widow of George W. Sweet, late a private in Company A, Seventy-third Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE E. OLIPHANT.

The bill (H. R. 2167) for the relief of George E. Oliphant was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of George E. Oliphant, late a private in Company I, Seventeenth Regiment of Indiana Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MAJ. GEN. W. W. AVERELL.

Mr. CAMERON. I ask the Senate to consider Order of Business 683, which was passed over without prejudice a few days ago.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 1650) for the relief of Maj. Gen. W. W. Averell.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments. The first amendment was, in line 10, after the words "positions of," to strike out "colonel" and insert "captain;" so to read:

That in view of the long and faithful services of Bvt. Maj. Gen. William W. Averell, United States Army, before and during the late war, and of severe wounds received by him in battle, the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to nominate and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint William W. Averell, brevet major-general United States Army and late brigadier-general United States Volunteers, to the position of captain in the Army of the United States, and to place him on the retired-list of the Army as of that grade, the retired-list being thereby increased in number to that extent; and all laws and parts of laws in conflict herewith are suspended for this purpose only.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to add at the end of the bill the following proviso:

Provided, That from and after the passage of this act no pension shall be paid to the said William W. Averell, nor shall any compensation be paid to him for any period prior to his appointment under this act; but this proviso shall be no bar to any claims for pension that the widow or children or other heirs of the said William W. Averell may have after his decease.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SIDNEY W. WHITELOCK.

The bill (H. R. 7490) for the relief of Sidney W. Whitelock was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Sidney W. Whitelock, late a private in Company K, Eleventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACKSON CHAPMAN.

The bill (S. 2721) granting a pension to Jackson Chapman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Jackson Chapman, late a member of Company E, Forty-fifth Regiment of Iowa Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSAN E. ALGER.

The bill (S. 1162) for the relief of Susan E. Alger was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It directs the Commissioner of Pensions to examine the claim of Susan E. Alger, of Worcester, Mass., for a pension on account of the death of her son, Warren A. Alger, late of Company D, Fifteenth Regiment of Massachusetts Volunteers, and to allow or reject the claim as if Warren A. Alger had left no widow; and if he shall allow the claim, to cause the amount to be paid Susan E. Alger which would have been due her if the pension had been granted at the time when the widow ceased to receive a pension.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM S. GROW.

The bill (S. 2884) granting a pension to William S. Grow was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of William S. Grow, late of Company I, Second Minnesota Volunteers, and deputy provost-marshal of second district of Minnesota, at the rate of $20 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY A. HAWLEY.

The bill (S. 2885) granting a pension to Henry A. Hawley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Henry A. Hawley, late hospital steward, United States Army.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH BURR.

The bill (H. R. 488) granting a pension to Elizabeth Burr was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Elizabeth Burr, widow of William Burr, late of Company F, One hundred and seventy-second Regiment of Ohio National Guards.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CASPER SEIBEL.

The bill (H. R. 3922) to place the name of Casper Seibel on the pension-roll was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of Casper Seibel, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment of Kentucky Calvary, on the pension-rolls.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DOLLY BLAZER.

The bill (H. R. 3959) granting a pension to Dolly Blazer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Dolly Blazer, widow of Richard Blazer, deceased, late captain of Company A of the Ninety-first Regiment of Ohio Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN WITHAM.

The bill (H. R. 6845) granting a pension to John Witham was con-

sidered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension-rolls the name of John Witham, late a member of Company C, Thirteenth Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. CLARISSA G. GREEN.

The bill (H. R. 8266) for the relief of Mrs. Clarissa G. Green was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Clarissa G. Green, dependent mother of James F. Green, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-ninth New York Volunteer Infantry, afterward the Eighth New York Heavy Artillery.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM CLARK.

The bill (H. R. 5844) to increase the pension of William Clark was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension of William Clark, a veteran of the war of 1812, from $16 per month, the amount now allowed him, to $30 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LOANDA SHERMAN.

The bill (S. 2604) granting a pension to Mrs. Loanda Sherman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Loanda Sherman, widow of Urial Sherman, who was a private in Company A, of the One hundred and eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CANCELLATION OF MAIL CONTRACTS.

The bill (S. 2647) regulating the practice in certain cases in the Post-Office Department was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads reported an amendment, to add to the bill, "and in any case where the contractor is willing to perform the increased service at pro rata pay;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for the Postmaster-General to cancel any valid and subsisting contract between the United States and any of its contractors for the performance of mail service over any given route for no other reason or upon no other ground save and except the fact that it is for the purpose of increasing the frequency of the service on such route, and where no change in the means of transportation is intended, and in any case where the contractor is willing to perform the increased service at pro rata pay.

Mr. COCKRELL. I should like to have some explanation of that bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think it had better go over as the Senator who reported it is absent.

Mr. COCKRELL. It is a peculiar bill. It prohibits the Postmaster-General from rescinding a contract when the service is expedited although he might get it for a great deal less than the increased rate of pay pro rata would be.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill goes over under objection and takes its place on the Calendar under Rule IX.

Mr. PLATT. The bill does not seem to be very clearly expressed.

EMILY J. STANNARD.

The bill (S. 2657) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Stannard was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Emily J. Stannard, widow of the late George J. Stannard, brevet major-general of volunteers, at the rate of $100 per month, instead of the pension she is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WIDOW OF JOHN SCHAFER.

The bill (S. 2710) granting a pension to the widow of John Schafer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-rolls the name of the widow of John Schafer, late private in Company H, Ninth Regiment of Ohio Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SETH F. MYERS.

The bill (S. 2595) to increase the pension of Seth F. Myers was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension of Seth F. Myers, late surgeon of the Seventy-third Regiment of Indiana Volunteers, from $30 to $50 a month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH B. SELLERS.

The bill (S. 2886) granting increase of pension to Joseph B. Sellers was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Joseph B. Sellers, late of Company I, Twenty-seventh Indiana Volunteers, at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of that which he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT JACKSON, MISS.

The bill (S. 785) to provide for an addition to the United States building at Jackson, Miss., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT HOBOKEN, N. J.

The bill (H. R. 7265) for the erection of a public building at Hoboken, N. J., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT VIRGINIA CITY, NEV.

The bill (S. 2788) for the erection of a public building at Virginia City, State of Nevada, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, in line 11, after the words "sum of," to strike out "one hundred and fifty" and insert "twenty-five;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase, or acquire by condemnation, a site for, and cause to be erected thereon, a suitable building, with fire-proof vaults therein, for the accommodation of the post-office and other Government offices, at Virginia City, State of Nevada. The plans, specifications, and full estimates for said building shall be previously made and approved according to law, and shall not exceed for the site and building complete the sum of $25,000, which sum is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treaury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That the site shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of not less than 40 feet, including streets and alleys; and no money appropriated for the purpose shall be available until a valid title to the site for said building shall be vested in the United States.

Mr. BLAIR. Is the amount reduced from $150,000 to $25,000? I have no knowledge of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill is reported as the amendment appears on its face.

Mr. BLAIR. It strikes me as remarkable that an appropriation of $150,000 should be so much reduced. It must have been designed to strike out the "fifty" and insert "twenty-five," so as to make it $125,000. I have no knowledge of the matter, however.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Perhaps the bill had better stand over informally until one of the Senators from Nevada appears. The Chair will order that dispositsn of the bill if there be no objection. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART] is now here. The amendment will be again read.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 11, after the word "of," it is proposed to strike out the words "one hundred and fifty" and to insert the words "twenty-five."

Mr. STEWART. Let it go.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT RENO, NEV.

The bill (S. 2789) for the erection of a public building at Reno, State of Nevada, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with an amendment, which was, in line 11, after the word "of," to strike out the words "one hundred" and insert "sixty;" so as to make the bill read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase, or acquire by condemnation, a site for, and cause to be erected thereon, a suitable building, with fire-proof vaults therein, for the accommodation of the post-office and other Government offices, at the city of Reno, State of Nevada. The plans, specifications, and full estimates for said building shall be previously made and approved according to law, and shall not exceed for the site and building compete the sum of $60,000, which sum is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated: *Provided*, That the site shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire in adjacent buildings by an open space of not less than 40 feet, including streets and alleys; and no money appropriated for this purpose shall be available until a valid title to the site for said building shall be vested in the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER OF COAST SURVEY.

The bill (S. 2487) to transfer the survey of the coasts of the United States to the Navy Department, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HALE. I object to the consideration of that bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over to the Calendar under Rule IX.

STATE NATIONAL BANK OF LOUISIANA.

The bill (S. 205) for the relief of the State National Bank of Louisiana was announced as next in order.

Mr. SHERMAN. I think that had better go over.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be placed on the Calendar under Rule IX.

CARL M. SCHWANTES.

The bill (S. 2716) granting a pension to Carl M. Schwantes was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Carl M. Schwantes, late private Company K, Fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL MILLER.

The bill (S. 2707) granting a pension to Samuel Miller was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Samuel Miller, late a private in Company C, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Reserves.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN K. EVANS.

The bill (S. 2717) granting a pension to John K. Evans was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of John K. Evans, late lieutenant Company C, Second Eastern Shore Maryland Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN B. ROSS.

The bill (S. 2720) granting a pension to John B. Ross was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of John B. Ross, late of Company F, Thirteenth Regiment Kansas Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTRIX OF WILLIAM WARD, DECEASED.

The bill (H. R. 611) for the relief of Mrs. P. L. Ward, widow and executrix of William Ward, deceased, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides for the payment to P. L. Ward, executrix of William Ward, deceased, of Norfolk, Va., $2,075.13 in full satisfaction of all claim for beef and vegetables furnished by Ward to the United States Navy, and in full satisfaction for hay sold to the quartermaster of the United States Army.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FORMAN MATHEWS AND DAVID STOUT PARKER.

The bill (S. 2013) for the relief of Forman Mathews and David Stout Parker was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides that the Court of Claims shall retain jurisdiction of the claim of Forman Mathews and David Stout Parker, of Ocean County, New Jersey, for recovery of the value of their schooner, the Twilight, sunk by collision with a public vessel of the United States, and, upon full hearing of said cause, shall enter such judgment therein as right and justice may require.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABEL G. RANKIN.

The bill (S. 2866) granting a pension to Abel G. Rankin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Abel G. Rankin, late of Company F, Tenth Maine Volunteers, at the rate of $72 per month in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAILROAD PROPERTY IN HANDS OF COURTS.

The bill (S. 231) to provide that where any railroad property is taken into the possession of any United States court, and such railroad shall not have been completed, the net earnings of said railroad be applied to the completion of the same, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. This bill, being adversely reported, goes over to the Calendar under Rule IX.

WILHEMINA HOSBAND.

The bill (S. 2260) restoring the name of Wilhemina Hosband to the pension-roll was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to restore to the pension-roll the name of Wilhemina Hosband, widow of the late Sandy Hosband, deceased, private in Company K, Eighty-second Regiment United States Colored Volunteers, of the city of New Orleans, La., and to pay her on pension certificate numbered 177761 the original amount allowed her from the date her name was dropped from the roll.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH B. BURTON.

The bill (H. R. 2151) for the relief of Joseph B. Burton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides for the payment to Joseph B. Burton of the pay and allowances of a private soldier from July 21, 1862, to June 26, 1865, he having served as a private in Company A, Seventy-second Indiana Regiment, deducting therefrom any sum of money heretofore paid him on account of his service.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AGRICULTURAL AND HORTICULTURAL INFORMATION.

The bill (H. R. 1844) to promote agriculture, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to amend sections 1712 and 1713, in chapter 2, under Title XVIII of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to consuls and commercial agents, so as to read:

SEC. 1712. Consuls and commercial agents of the United States in foreign countries shall procure and transmit to the Department of State authentic commercial information respecting such countries, of such character and in such manner and form and at such times as the Department may from time to time prescribe; and they shall also procure and transmit to the Department of State, for the use of the Agricultural Department, monthly reports relative to the character, condition, and prospective yields of the agricultural and horticultural industries and other fruiteries of the country in which they are respectively stationed; and the Commissioner of Agriculture is hereby required and directed to embody the information thus obtained, or so much thereof as he may deem material and important, in his monthly bulletin of crop reports.

SEC. 1713. Every consular officer shall furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury, as often as shall be required, the prices current of all articles of merchandise usually exported to the United States from the port or place in which he is situated; and he shall also furnish to the Secretary of the Treasury, at least once in twelve months, the prices current of all articles of merchandise, including those of the farm, the garden, and the orchard, that are imported through the port or place in which he is stationed; and he shall also report as to the character of agricultural implements in use, and whether they are imported to or manufactured in that country, as to the character and extent of agricultural and horticultural pursuits there. That part of the information thus obtained which pertains to agriculture shall be transmitted by the Secretary of the Treasury, as soon as the same shall have been received by him, to the Commissioner of Agriculture, who shall include the same, or so much thereof as he may deem material and important, in his annual reports, stating the said prices in dollars and cents, and rendering tables of foreign weights and measures into their American equivalents.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALIEN LABOR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

The bill (H. R. 8724) to prevent the employment of alien labor upon public buildings or other public works and in the various Departments of the Government, etc., was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. PLATT. I should like to have the first section read again.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The first section of the bill will be again read.

The Chief Clerk read the first section of the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in all advertisements for the erection or construction or completion of public buildings or other public works, and in all contracts made under or in pursuance of such advertisements, there shall be inserted a condition that no person who is not a bona fide resident within the limits of the United States, and who is not a citizen, or who has not declared his intention to become a citizen thereof, in the manner provided by law, shall be employed in the erection, construction, or completion of any public building or other public work.

Mr. PLATT. There ought to be an amendment inserting the word "or" there.

Mr. COCKRELL. The word "or" is in.

Mr. PLATT. It has not been read so. I mean between "citizen" and "who has not declared his intention."

Mr. COCKRELL. The word "or" is there. I will show it to the Senator.

Mr. PLATT. I see now that it is in the printed bill, which I have examined, but it was twice read and not so read.

Mr. TELLER. I have not read the bill. I only judge from the reading at the desk, and as I gather from what I heard, it is to prevent aliens from taking contracts to erect public buildings or doing any work thereon.

Mr. PLATT. It does not prevent them taking contracts, but prevents them from working.

Mr. TELLER. I want to inquire if an alien may make a contract and be prohibited from doing the work? I suppose if he may make a contract, he may contract to have all the stone cut in Canada, all the iron made in Belgium, and the wood-work made in some other country, and every particle of the labor may be done in foreign lands, and all the profits that may arise from the construction of the building, except what the contractor himself gets, who may be a Canadian, or an Englishman, or a Belgian, or some other foreigner, goes abroad.

I heard to-day of a public building being erected in the State of Kansas, the iron beams for which are being purchased from a Belgian firm, transported across the ocean, sent out to Kansas and put into the building, because, I suppose, they could be got somewhat cheaper than if they had bought the beams from some American manufacturer.

The House of Representatives is wrestling with the question whether American labor is entitled to protection or not. This bill, I suppose, is intended to be a sort of tub thrown to the whale. I presume it is intended to say to the laborers, "See what we have done for the American laborer. We do not intend to let you come in contact with a man who is not a citizen of the United States; we are looking out for your interests, and when a public building is to be built you shall have the privilege of working on it."

That will not be true if this bill passes in this form. There will be,

of course, some labor about a public building in putting together the parts and pieces that may be done by American laborers, but it will be quite possible in any of the great seacoast cities, or anywhere in the United States, to put up buildings upon which there has been no American labor, save and except what there may be in handling the pieces as they come from the wharf or in putting them together.

I do not know but that there may be some propriety in this bill; but it does not seem to me that there is very much. It does not seem to me that a House, a majority of which or the political party that controls it insists that it is not a wise policy to look after the interests of the American laborer, as we should do by giving a preference to American manufactured goods and giving them an opportunity to make a fair profit, cares very much for American labor. It seems to me that they are not going to answer the public interest on this subject by passing a bill of this kind.

While I do not know that I object to the bill, I simply want to put in my suggestion that this kind of legislation will not answer. The American laborers will not be fooled by it. They can not be deceived by the House saying, "We sent over to the Senate a bill of this kind." I think it would have been a good thing for the Senate to have legislated on this subject, if they desired to protect American laborers; it they had said when a public building is to be erected in the United States it shall be constructed out of material manufactured by American laborers. If there was opportunity now, I should like to offer that amendment, and I ask that the bill be passed over until I can prepare such an amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over on the suggestion of the Senator.

Mr. BLAIR. While the Senator is preparing his amendment I wish to say, having charge of the bill, that this is a measure which was pending in the last Congress. It originated in the Senate the Congress before, as I recollect. It has been the habit of the Senate to pass this bill and send it to the House, and the House has heretofore ignored it entirely.

I have found, as a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, that the true way to pass a bill that does anything whatever for the laboring people of this country is to let the House send it here, and then we can pass it. A Senate bill goes there to death and destruction, just like a pension bill. So for some time I have quietly taken what has come from the House and done my best to get it through the Senate, and then, with the concurrence of the President, it could become a law.

This bill in substance went through the Senate at the last session of Congress, and went to the House. It failed to become a law because it was received by the Executive too late for consideration, as was said. It went to the Executive, I think, on the 1st of March, and here it is again.

There is some little need of this bill. All along the line of Canada, wherever it is convenient for aliens or foreigners to cross the line, get employment, and go back home at nights, living in Canada, working here for American wages and going back there and living on the Canadian scale of expenditure, they do so, and thus take the money of the United States. That is done to a considerable extent. Of course, so far as the interior of the country is concerned, it is much better that there the money derived by taxes from the people of the United States should be paid out in the form of wages to citizens, or to those who have declared their intention to become citizens. I believe in going that far, and the bill does go that far; and that is about all there is in it; but that is a good deal, it seems to me. I have thought we had better take the bill and pass it and get what we can. Perhaps at the next Congress we can get more.

I wish to say, in regard to the matter of compelling the use of American materials in the construction of our public buildings and public works, that it does not seem to me at least to be so important in reality as it at first might appear to be, for all foreign material that gets in here comes under the protection of the tariff. There is nothing so far as I now recall or know that is used in the construction of public buildings or any form of public work which is not subject to tariff duties. All stone work certainly is. Lumber is subject to duty, being manufactured generally. If it comes here as a mere log it is raw material, which requires labor before it can be used in a public building or any other public work.

So we have the protection of the tariff upon the materials coming from foreign countries and used in and about the work of the public precisely the same as though they were employed and applied to some private use, and whether on the whole it be not better for the American laborer that is an American or one who has declared his intention to become a citizen, that the foreign materials employed in the public works should simply be protected like other material employed in private uses, is a question which, it seems to me, may be open to discussion, and perhaps there is no real point in the amendment proposed by the Senator from Colorado. I should say myself that it would be better policy to let this bill pass and let it go to the President and get it through, if we can, and then by a separate bill attempt to accomplish the end the Senator has in view.

The amendment, of course, will raise other questions and send the bill back to the House of Representatives, and under the circumstances it may prevent any legislation. I should dislike very much to take the responsibility, on the idea of a tub-throwing business, to defeat the bill; but I am not aware that we are engaged in any such business.

Mr. TELLER. I offer the following amendment, to come in immediately after the enacting clause:

That all public buildings or public works, for which an appropriation shall have been made by Congress, shall be constructed wholly of material made and prepared within the limits of the United States. No bid shall be received or accepted for the construction of any such public building or public work from any person who is not a resident and citizen of the United States, or who has not declared his intention to become such.

Mr. CALL. I hope that amendment will not prevail. There is such a thing as carrying any proposition to an extreme point, and while I suppose every one will concur in the policy of the Government acting for the benefit of our own people and to encourage them in every pursuit that it is practicable for them to follow, we may carry that idea to an unjustifiable extent. We may go so far as to declare by law that we shall use no discovery, no idea, no invention but such as is produced on our own soil and amongst our people, and that is the character of this proposition. Every people has sought to make their public buildings the expression and monument of the highest art.

We regard them as an evidence of civilization, refinement, power, and progress, and especially of the architectural progress of the people of this generation. Now, to say that nothing that may come from abroad, however important it may be as a matter of art, shall be in a public building of this country upon the pretext that it is going to benefit American labor, when it will not benefit them, when it will not increase the compensation of our laborers, but, on the very contrary, will diminish their employment and their wages, for as you diversify the productions of art by the importation of foreign material you may give great additional employment and impetus to American labor and greater compensation. It does not follow that by excluding the ideas and the productions of foreign countries universally and without discrimination or difference we are going to add to the employment of the laborers of our own country.

But however that may be, upon a public building we should use every method of decoration, everything that can increase its architectural excellence, and while it may be very proper that the policy of encouraging our own labor should be pursued, certainly it is not right to say that we shall exclude all the material and all the productions of a foreign country, because we may thereby prevent the excellence and beauty of the structure either in its exterior or interior decoration.

Mr. PLATT. Mr. President, this is not a new idea at all. It has been adopted with regard to the building of our naval vessels after somewhat deliberate discussion here in the Senate, with a single modifying clause, which I think there is no need of, in the matter of the construction of public buildings; and it will be remembered that in that discussion the modifying clause was put in because it was supposed there might be some machinery needed which could not at that time be produced in the United States. But so far as I am aware the United States is capable of producing every species of material and property that is required for the erection of our public buildings. In the Forty-ninth Congress, in the act for the increase of the Navy, on page 593 of volume 24 of the Statutes, Congress enacted this:

That the material used in all naval structures provided for in this act, and the armament for the same shall be, so far as practicable, of American production and furnished and manufactured in the United States.

It is the same idea which is now proposed to be carried into the matter of erecting public buildings.

Mr. CALL. I say to the Senator from Connecticut that there is an edifice in my own State, built by a broad-minded and liberal man, not as a matter of private or personal emolument, but that it may be transmitted to the future as a specimen of the architectural skill and genius of this age in which he has been eminently successful. The ancient structures of Greece and Rome exceed it but little if at all in beauty. The structure to which I refer, the Ponce de Leon Hotel in St. Augustine, Fla., was built by an eminent Northern gentleman of great wealth and enterprise and of great intelligence.

That building contains largely, I am informed, the productions of foreign artists, and gave employment, to a great amount, to American labor. Probably more than a million dollars have been expended in compensation to American laborers in that building.

Mr. TELLER. Will the Senator tell us what foreign production has gone into it?

Mr. CALL. I was just going to state that there are in that building specimens of architectural skill in various kinds of material, one of them a mantel made of Mexican onyx, a most costly and beautiful species of stone, obtained at immense cost, and it adds greatly to the beauty and perfection of the building. I remember that especially.

Mr. BLAIR. I wish to say to the Senator that I referred to the tariff.

Mr. CALL. Of course that is a consideration which largely enters into the matter and prevents the importation of foreign material except where the artist wishes to produce some special architectural effect

in the structure which requires a foreign material. Art is free, and, like thought, traverses the universe to find new and original forms of expression and material, and can not be bound to one country nor made subordinate to the personal wants and necessities of labor. It gives employment and compensation to labor, but can not be made subservient or inferior to it. To make it so would be to kill it.

Mr. TELLER. We are not likely to indulge in those fancies in constructing public buildings. There is not anything but what we can manufacture on the American soil that needs to go into a public building, and I think it would be quite as well to confine the public buildings to the use of the material we can furnish at home. If there is any necessity for this bill it should go to its logical result, as we did with the shipping. I have no objection if any Senator desires the words "as far as practicable" to be inserted, but it is certainly not necessary with reference to constructing public buildings to go abroad for anything. They are built of stone, brick, and iron, and wood, and plenty can be had in this country, and of workmanship equal to that of any in the world. It is not necessary to go abroad for anything of that kind.

Mr. MANDERSON. As this bill is one of very great importance, and the amendment that is proposed is one that involves perhaps some issues, and deliberation is probably necessary over both amendment and bill, I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

Mr. TELLER. Let the amendment be printed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be printed. The Senator from Nebraska moves that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 5, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *June* 4, 1888.

The House was called to order at 11 o'clock a. m., by Mr. MCMILLIN, who directed the reading of the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 4, 1888.

SIR: Hon. BENTON MCMILLIN is hereby designated to preside as Speaker *pro tempore* at the session of the House to-day.

J. G. CARLISLE, *Speaker.*

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK, Jr.,
Clerk House of Representatives.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

PRINTING OF CERTAIN TESTIMONY.

On motion of Mr. FORD, by unanimous consent, leave was granted to the Committee on Military Affairs to have printed the testimony taken in the Fort Brown investigation.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PENINGTON, until the 6th instant, on account of sickness.

To Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, for ten days, on account of important business.

To Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR, indefinitely, on account of sickness in his family.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. Regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. This being Monday, the first business in order is the call of States and Territories for the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, etc.

BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER, LA.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (H. R. 10319) to authorize the Natchitoches Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Red River, in Louisiana; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

H. B. KEFFER.

Mr. WILKINS submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Accounts:

Resolved, That H. B. Keffer be paid from the date of his appointment and during the remainder of the Fiftieth Congress the difference between his present compensation as folder at the rate of $720 per year and that of messenger at the rate of $1,200, and that the said difference in compensation be paid out of the contingent fund.

COFFEE.

Mr. BOUND submitted the following resolution; which was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

Whereas it is well known that nearly all the coffee used in the United States is imported from Brazil, and that in order to cheapen the cost of this product to our people coffee was placed upon the free-list under our existing tariff; and

Whereas it is equally well known that the price of coffee to the consumers in this country has been very little reduced, if at all, by placing coffee on the free-list, for the reason that an export duty on coffee was imposed by Brazil as soon as coffee was admitted into this country free of duty, nearly equal, if not altogether, to the duty imposed upon Brazilian coffee by our tariff laws; and

Whereas it is in like manner well known that an import duty of 75 cents per barrel is imposed upon all flour exported from the United States to Brazil by the latter Government, in consequence of which the farmers and millers of this country are greatly injured; and

Whereas it is currently reported that English capitalists have been, and are now, engaged in the erection of extensive mills at Rio Janeiro for the manufacture of flour by and with, as it is believed, the aid and encouragement of the Brazilian Government; and

Whereas it is also well known that a very small duty, if any, as compared with that upon flour, is imposed upon wheat and other grain imported into Brazil by said Government; and

Whereas it is well known that the soil and climate of Brazil are not adapted to the cultivation of wheat—a product in which the farmers of this country are so largely interested—and that when the extensive flouring mills heretofore alluded to are completed they will be mainly supplied with wheat and other cereals from the Argentine Confederation, a country whose soil and climate are well adapted to wheat-raising, to be manufactured into flour to the great disadvantage of American millers and American farmers, and to the serious detriment of our trade and commerce with Brazil: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs be instructed to inquire into these things, and if found to be true to report the same to the House in order that the injustice complained of may be speedily remedied.

ADULTERATION OF FOOD, ETC.

Mr. LEE introduced a bill (H. R. 10320) to prevent the sale, manufacture, or transportation of adulterated articles of food, drink, or drugs, manufactured or made in one State and intended to be sold in another or intended for export or sale in the District of Columbia or any Territory or reservation of the United States, and to prevent the exportation or importation of adulterated food, drink, or drugs, and for creating a pure-food division; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. This completes the call of States and Territories for the introduction of bills and resolutions. In the absence of objection the Chair will recognize gentlemen who were not in their seats when their States were called.

PAGE FOR ENROLLING-ROOM.

Mr. BURNES (by Mr. DOCKERY) submitted a resolution authorizing the Clerk of the House to appoint a page for the enrolling-room; which was referred to the Committee on Accounts.

COMMERCE.

Mr. BLANCHARD introduced a bill (H. R. 10321) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce;" which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

IMMIGRATION OF FOREIGNERS.

Mr. OATES introduced a bill (H. R. 10322) to restrict the immigration of foreigners into the United States; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

RELATIONS WITH CANADA.

Mr. DINGLEY submitted the following resolution; which was read, and referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

Whereas the treaty of Washington, between the United States and Great Britain, provides that "citizens of the United States shall have the use of the Welland, St. Lawrence, and other canals in the Dominion of Canada on terms of equality with the inhabitants of the Dominion," in return for which citizens of the Dominion of Canada were given the use of the Sault Ste. Marie Canal at the foot of Lake Superior on the same terms of equality: Therefore,

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury inform the House (if compatible with the public interest) whether any order has been issued by the authorities of the Dominion of Canada and is now in force, by which vessels from ports of the United States laden with wheat or other merchandise for export, or otherwise, are required to pay a less toll in passing through the Welland Canal when they pursue their voyage by the way of the St. Lawrence and Montreal than when they pursue their voyage by way of Lake Ontario and American ports; and if so, what steps have been taken to secure the removal of such discrimination against American ports in violation of the spirit of the treaty of Washington; and whether any further legislation is required to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to impose tolls upon vessels passing through the Sault Ste. Marie Canal and bound for Canadian ports, in case the Dominion authorities should continue to discriminate against vessels passing through the Welland Canal and bound to ports of the United States.

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

Mr. PHELAN introduced a bill (H. R. 10323) to incorporate the American Historical Association; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Library, and ordered to be printed.

INAUGURATION DAY.

Mr. LEE. I ask unanimous consent to call up for consideration at this time the bill S. 2551. It is in identically the same language with the bill which passed the House some days ago. It proposes to make inauguration day a legal holiday in the District of Columbia.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (S. 2251) to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia so as to make inauguration day a holiday within said District.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, be, and the same hereby is, amended, by adding to the days therein declared to be holidays within the said District that day upon which the President of the United States is inaugurated, otherwise called inauguration day, and that such day shall be a holiday for all the purposes mentioned in said section.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia to bring this bill before the House for present consideration?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. LEE moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

JENNIE D. RICE.

Mr. DINGLEY. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Private Calendar for present consideration the bill which I send to the desk.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 3722) for the relief of Jennie D. Rice.

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to pay to Jennie D. Rice, sole surviving daughter of Richard T. Lurvey, late a private in Company K, Thirteenth Regiment of Maine Volunteer Infantry, the amount of pension which had accrued to the said Richard T. Lurvey, deceased, at the time of his death, December 30, 1882, by virtue of certificate numbered 34553, restoration and reissue, dated July 5, 1887, subject to deduction for any amount that may have been paid for reimbursement of the expenses of the last sickness and burial of the deceased, the said Jennie M. Rice having had the care and contributed to the support of her father, the said Richard T. Lurvey, who was totally blind, from July 1, 1877, to the time of his death, December 30, 1882.

Mr. OATES. I ask for the reading of the report.

The report was read, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3722) for the relief of Jennie D. Rice, having considered the same, report:

The claimant is the surviving daughter of Richard T. Lurvey, late a private in Company K, Thirteenth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, deceased, and she claims arrears of pension due her father at the time of his death, by reason of having devoted her time and means to his care and support for more than five years prior to his death, during which time said soldier was totally blind, in consequence of a sun-stroke received in the service.

From the evidence presented to the committee it appears that Lurvey was pensioned in 1864 for disability contracted in the service, and that subsequently he was dropped from the pension-rolls—improperly, as it was afterwards decided by the Pension Office. Lurvey applied for restoration and increase of pension, and this application was pending when he died, December 30, 1882, from a fall occasioned by a misstep on account of the fact that he was then and had been totally blind from the sun-stroke received in the service since July 1, 1877.

During these five years and a half the daughter had the entire charge of her father, gave her whole time to his care, and spent what little means she had, leaving her in penury.

After the decease of her father, measures were taken to satisfy the Pension Office that a great wrong had been done the soldier in dropping him from the rolls and rejecting his application for increase, and on investigation that department recognized this by issuing to said Lurvey on the 5th day of July, 1887, four years and a half after his death, certificate numbered 34553, restoration and reissue, granting a pension at the rate of $2.66⅔ per month from April 10, 1862, and $10.66⅔ per month from September 16, 1881, to the time of death, for disease of eyes as the result of sun-stroke and chronic bronchitis, former payments during any portion of the time before he was dropped from the rolls to be deducted. Justice was done to the poor soldier at last, but not until he had died.

There being no widow, or child under sixteen years of age, living to receive the arrears of pension allowed the soldier, the daughter, who had cared for him during five long years and spent her little all, applied for reimbursement for her expenses and services in supporting the soldier during these years, supposing that she would be entitled to the few hundred dollars of pension arrears due her father, but was informed by the proper officers that the law allows the person who cared for a deceased soldier to whom arrears of pension were due only the expenses of the last sickness and burial out of such arrears; and it must be held that, inasmuch as the soldier died from a fall, the expenses of taking care of him during his five years of total blindness up to the time of his fall could not be allowed, notwithstanding the fall was the result of his blindness. An offer was made to pay the expenses of the soldier's burial, but it is stated that kind neighbors came forward and contributed the burial expenses, so that this has not been drawn.

While the decision of the proper officers is technically correct under the law, yet it seems so clear to your committee that justice and patriotism demand that Congress, as an ultimate tribunal not bound by merely technical rules, should make the only restitution possible in this case by paying to the daughter who so heroically and self-sacrificingly gave all of her little means and five years of her life to the care of the blind soldier who lost his eye-sight from injuries received in the service of his country, the few hundred dollars of arrears of pensions which it is confessed ought to have been paid while the soldier was living.

Your committee therefore report back the bill with a favorable recommendation.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine to discharge the Committee of the Whole House from the consideration of this bill, and that it be considered in the House.

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. DINGLEY moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman to withhold that motion for a moment to give me a chance to ask unanimous consent to take up a bill.

Mr. MILLS. I will yield to the gentleman.

DEPOSITS IN NEW YORK HARBOR.

Mr. COX. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of Senate bill 1241, to prevent obstructive and injurious deposits in the harbor and adjacent waters of New York. A similar bill has been reported from the Committee on Commerce of this House, and I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill be substituted for the House bill and be put upon its passage.

The Senate bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the placing, discharging, or depositing, by any process or in any manner, of refuse, dirt, ashes, cinders, mud, sand, dredgings, sludge, acid, or any other matter of any kind, other than that flowing from streets, sewers, and passing therefrom in a liquid state, in the tidal waters of the harbor, of New York, or its adjacent or tributary waters within the limits which shall be prescribed by the supervisor of the harbor, is hereby strictly forbidden, and every such act is made a misdemeanor, and every person engaged in or who shall aid, abet, authorize, or instigate a violation of this section, shall, upon conviction, be punishable by fine or imprisonment, or both, such fine to be not less than $250 nor more than $2,500, and the imprisonment to be not less than thirty days nor more than one year, either or both united, as the judge before whom conviction is obtained shall decide.

SEC. 2. That any and every master and engineer, or person or persons acting in such capacity, respectively, on board of any boat or vessel, who shall knowingly engage in towing any scow, boat, or vessel loaded with any such prohibited matter to any point or place of deposit, or discharge in the waters of the harbor of New York, or to any point or place elsewhere than within the limits defined and permitted by the supervisor of the harbor hereinafter mentioned, shall be deemed guilty of a violation of this act, and shall, upon conviction, be punishable as hereinbefore provided for offenses in violation of section 1 of this act, and shall also have his license revoked or suspended for a term to be fixed by the judge before whom tried and convicted.

SEC. 3. That in all cases of receiving on board of any scows or boats such forbidden matter or substance as herein provided, it shall be the duty of the owner or master, or person acting in such capacity, on board of such scows or boats, before proceeding to take or tow the same to the place of deposit, to apply for and obtain from the supervisor of the harbor appointed hereunder a permit defining the precise limits within which the discharge of such scows or boats may be made; and any deviation from such dumping or discharging place specified in such permit shall be a misdemeanor within the meaning of this act; and the master and engineer, or person or persons acting in such capacity, on board of any tow-boat towing such scows or boats, shall be equally guilty of such offense with the master or person acting in the capacity of master of the scow, and be liable to equal punishment.

SEC. 4. That all mud, dirt, sand, dredgings, and material of every kind and description whatever taken, dredged, or excavated from any slip, basin, or shoal in the harbor of New York, or the waters adjacent or tributary thereto, and placed on any boat, scow, or vessel for the purpose of being taken or towed upon the waters of the harbor of New York to a place of deposit, shall be deposited and discharged at such place or within such limits as shall be defined and specified by the supervisor of the harbor, as in the third section of this act prescribed, and not otherwise. Every person, firm, or corporation being the owner of any slip, basin, or shoal, from which such mud, dirt, sand, dredgings, and material shall be taken, dredged, or excavated, and every person, firm, or corporation in any manner engaged in the work of dredging or excavating any such slip, basin, or shoal, or of removing such mud, dirt, sand, or dredgings therefrom, shall severally be responsible for the deposit and discharge of all such mud, dirt, sand, or dredgings at such place or within such limits so defined and prescribed by said supervisor of the harbor; and for every violation of the provisions of this section the person offending shall be guilty of an offense against this act, and shall be punished by a fine equal to the sum of $5 for every cubic yard of mud, dirt, sand, dredgings, or material not deposited or discharged as required by this section.

SEC. 5. That a suitable office for the meetings of the board shall be provided in some building of the General Government in New York City or its vicinity.

SEC. 6. That a line officer of the Navy shall be designated by the President of the United States as supervisor of the harbor, to act under the direction of the Secretary of War in enforcing the provisions of this act, and in detecting offenders against the same. This officer shall receive the sea-pay of his grade, and shall have the personal charge and supervision under the Secretary of War, and shall direct the patrol boats and other means to detect and bring to punishment offenders against the provisions of this act.

SEC. 7. That the sum of $30,000 is hereby appropriated to carry out the provisions of this act; and the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to pay that sum from moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the point of order, for the purpose of trying to learn something about this bill. I do not want to object at this time, but I would like to know what committee reported this bill.

Mr. COX. A bill for this purpose has been reported by my colleague [Mr. BRYCE] from the Committee on Commerce. Several times in several Congresses this measure substantially has been reported. The Senate bill which I ask to have substituted is almost identical with the House bill reported by my colleague. A bill almost similar with this—introduced by myself—passed this House in the Forty-seventh Congress. It was upon a river and harbor bill, and was eliminated from it in the Senate as being rather incongruous upon that bill.

Mr. ROGERS. Has it passed the Senate?

Mr. COX. It has.

Mr. ROGERS. What committee reported it there?

Mr. COX. The Committee on Commerce.

Mr. ROGERS. Let me make another inquiry: What court has jurisdiction of the offenses described in the bill?

Mr. SPINOLA. Any district court of the United States.

Mr. COX. I will state for the information of the House that a Federal bill, like this, is rendered necessary, because these waters come within the jurisdiction of two States—New Jersey and New York; and unless we have Federal jurisdiction over them we can never protect the harbor from the continual dumping that is shoaling it to its ruin. The Committees on Commerce of the House and of the Senate have approved and reported this bill.

Mr. BLANCHARD. In what respect does the Senate bill, which the gentleman proposes to substitute, differ from the House bill?

Mr. COX. It does not differ except in the situation—the Senate has passed the bill and we have not.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Does it not differ also in respect to the commission? The original bill proposed a commission. The Senate bill puts the matter under the control of the supervisor of the harbor.

Mr. COX. The House bill introduced by myself struck out the commission, and left the matter under the control of the supervisor of the harbor. He is to be under the control of the War Department, because the engineers have control of harbor improvements, and harmony of action is a *desideratum*.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, the object of this bill is undoubtedly very laudable, and I am in favor of it so far as I understand the measure; but I think this is a most important matter and that we ought to hear the Senate bill read. I make that suggestion because of the great confusion that was in the Hall while the bill was being read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. It was the Senate bill that was read.

Mr. ROGERS. Then I have got the wrong bill. I still reserve the point of order until I can hear further from the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED. What is the meaning of section 5?

Mr. SPINOLA. Section 5 is wrong in the Senate bill.

Mr. REED. Section 5 can not mean anything.

Mr. COX. I desire to have the Senate bill pass.

Mr. REED. But the Senate bill has a section, section 5, providing for the meetings of a board, and there is no board provided for in the bill.

Mr. COX. That has been stricken out in the Senate. It has no place in the bill before us. It is a mistake.

Mr. BLAND called for the regular order, but subsequently withdrew the call.

Mr. SPINOLA. I ask that section 5 of the Senate bill be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

That a suitable office for the meetings of the board shall be provided in some building of the General Government in New York City or its vicinity.

Mr. COX. That has been stricken out.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Let the amendment relating to that section be read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk informs the Chair that there is no amendment relating to that section.

Mr. COX. What we want is the Senate bill in its entirety.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Does section 5 provide for a commission?

Mr. COX. It does not.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Then what is the meaning of the language which has been read?

Several MEMBERS. It ought to be struck out.

Mr. COX. I desire to move to strike out section 5 if it is in the bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill is not before the House.

Mr. COX. I am aware of that. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill and this amendment be considered as pending.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, what I am most interested in with reference to this bill is a point which has recently come before the Judiciary Committee of the House and has had a most careful consideration by it. It is the question whether or not Congress has constitutional power to confer upon the courts of the United States criminal jurisdiction over the inland waters of the country. If we have complete jurisdiction it must extend, I take it, to every navigable river of the United States upon which there is any interstate commerce. It certainly goes this far, if it does not extend to all the navigable waters. Now, I regard this as an exceedingly doubtful power. Our Government has now been in existence a hundred years, and we have never until the present Congress undertaken to exercise criminal jurisdiction over the Great Lakes.

Mr. COX. This bill has reference to maritime cases—to Federal waters.

Mr. ROGERS. I am referring to criminal jurisdiction. The maritime jurisdiction of the United States extends over the Great Lakes, of course.

Several MEMBERS. No doubt of that.

Mr. COX. This bill only proposes to extend jurisdiction over tidewater.

Mr. ROGERS. But you say "the harbor of New York or its adjacent or tributary waters or those of Long Island Sound."

Mr. COX. Those are tide-waters. The tide runs nearly a hundred miles up the Hudson, certainly as far as Poughkeepsie.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not profess to be very familiar with the geography of that part of the country, and upon the assurance of the gentleman from New York I withdraw my objection to the consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. COX. I move to amend by striking out section 5.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Several amendments to this bill have been reported by the Committee on Commerce.

The amendments reported by the Committee on Commerce were read, as follows:

After the word "waters," in line 8, section 1, insert "or in those of Long Island Sound."

At the end of section 1, add "one-half of said fine to be paid to the person or persons giving information which shall lead to conviction of this misdemeanor."

After the words "harbor of New York," in line 6, section 2, insert "or in its adjacent or tributary waters or in those of Long Island Sound."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the question on these amendments will be taken in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SPINOLA. I move to amend the fourth section by adding the provision which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Any boat or vessel used or employed in violating any provision of this act shall be liable to the pecuniary penalties imposed thereby, and may be proceeded against summarily by way of libel in any district court of the United States having jurisdiction thereof.

Mr. COX. I have no objection to that amendment. It strengthens the bill. It gives it a vigorous penalty which will assist its enforcement.

Mr. FARQUHAR. And makes it more clear.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SOWDEN. I move to amend by inserting after the word "dollars," in line 1, section 7, the words "or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Mr. COX. There is no objection to that amendment.

Mr. FARQUHAR. That is correct.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BUCHANAN. My observation has been that the prescribing of minimum terms of imprisonment very often prevents conviction. I therefore move to amend section 1 by striking out, in line 17, the words "less than thirty days nor;" so that the clause will read "and the imprisonment not to be more than one year," etc.

Mr. ROGERS and others. That is right.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COX. I now call the previous question.

The previous question was ordered; and under the operation thereof the bill as amended was ordered to a third reading, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. COX moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, House bill No. 8947, now on the Calendar, and similar in substance to the Senate bill just passed, will be laid on the table.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

POST-OFFICE, ETC., FOR WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. HEMPHILL, by unanimous consent, introduced (by request) a bill (H. R. 10324) authorizing the purchase of square 489 in the city of Washington, for the purpose of erecting thereon a building for the accommodation of a city post-office and offices of the District of Columbia; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE.

Mr. HALL, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 10325) amending the interstate-commerce act, approved February 4, 1887; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

LAND OFFICE AT FOLSOM, N. MEX.

Mr. CONGER, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 10326) to establish a land office at Folsom, in the Territory of New Mexico; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER.

Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Private Calendar and have passed at this time the bill (H. R. 7776) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River in the county of Monona, in the State of Iowa, and in the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, and to make the same a post-route.

The bill was read.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill.

The following amendments reported by the Committee on Commerce were read and agreed to:

Insert after the word "river," in line 25 of section 2, the words "and the bridge itself at right angles thereto."

At the end of section 5 add "and equal privileges in the use of said bridge shall be granted to all telegraph companies."

The following amendment, reported by the Committee on Commerce, was also read:

Add to the bill the following as a new section:

"SEC. 8. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date thereof."

Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin. I move to amend the amendment just read by striking out the word "one" and inserting "two," and by striking out "three" and inserting "four."

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I hope the gentleman will explain the effect of this amendment.

Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin. It simply extends the time in which to commence the bridge from one year to two years, and the time in which to complete it from three years to four years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin, moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

PROPOSED EVENING SESSIONS.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the resolution I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House will, on the days mentioned below, take a recess at 5 o'clock p. m. until 8 o'clock p. m., and that the evening sessions shall be devoted exclusively to bills and measures reported from the committee indicated in the order to be designated by such committees, namely:

On Saturday evening, June 9, to the Committee on Public Lands.
On Monday evening, June 11, to the Committee on Military Affairs.
On Tuesday evening, June 12, to the Committee on Pacific Railroads.
On Wednesday evening, June 13, to the Committee on the Territories.
On Thursday and Saturday evenings, June 14 and 16, to the Committee on Commerce.
On Tuesday evening, July 10, to the Committee on the Territories.

And that, if at the adjournment of the House on either of the evenings indicated any bill called up should remain undisposed of, such bill shall be considered in the House on the succeeding legislative day, immediately after the reading of the Journal, and, after one hour's debate thereon—except on Wednesday, June 13, when three hours' debate shall be allowed—to be equally divided between those in favor of and those opposed to the bill. The House shall proceed to vote upon all pending amendments and on the final passage of the bill without any intervening motion or business.

Mr. CANNON. Before demanding a second, I ask the gentleman from Texas to withhold the resolution a moment, in order to permit an amendment giving two days to the Committee on Invalid Pensions for the consideration of general pension bills.

Mr. MILLS. Regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CANNON. I demand a second.

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker——

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The pending question is on ordering a second on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURROWS. But I want to ask a question——

Mr. TOWNSHEND. Let a second be considered as ordered by unanimous consent.

[Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BURROWS. I wish to know if this resolution proposes to fix any days for the consideration of general pension legislation. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. HATCH. It is not the fault of Representatives present that the gentleman was not in his seat. If he had been he would have heard the resolution read.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The resolution having been read once it can only be read a second time by unanimous consent, and the demand for the regular order cuts that off.

Mr. BURROWS. I want to ascertain, if possible, if the resolution fixes any day for general pension legislation. [Continued calls of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BUCHANAN. The resolution does not provide any time for pension legislation, and they seem determined that we shall not make that fact known.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Debate is not in order. The Chair will appoint as tellers the gentleman from Texas, Mr. MILLS, and the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. CANNON.

The House divided, and the tellers reported—ayes 95, noes 2.

Mr. CANNON. No quorum.

Mr. MILLS. I withdraw the resolution.

JULIET G. HOWE.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I desire to submit a privileged report from a committee of conference.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 300) granting a pension to Mrs. Juliet G. Howe, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment to the said bill.

J. LOGAN CHIPMAN,
CARLOS FRENCH,
E. N. MORRILL,
Managers on the part of the House.
A. S. PADDOCK,
C. K. DAVIS,
DAVID TURPIE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. HOLMAN. Has the statement accompanying the report been filed?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The only report submitted by the conference committee has been read.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I demand the previous question on the adoption of the report.

The previous question was ordered, under the operation of which the report was adopted.

Mr. CHIPMAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MRS. FRANCES ANNE PYNE RICKETTS.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I desire to submit a further conference report.

The Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill of the Senate No. 393 for the relief of Mrs. Frances Anne Pyne Ricketts, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment to said bill.

J. LOGAN CHIPMAN,
JOHN LYNCH,
JOHN G. SAWYER,
Managers on the part of the House.
C. K. DAVIS,
A. S. PADDOCK,
RUFUS BLODGETT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

Mr. CHIPMAN. I demand the previous question on the adoption of the report.

Mr. ROGERS. I think there should be in all of these cases a written statement accompanying the report, as required by the rule. I make no point on it in this case, but hope the statement will be made to go into the RECORD.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that the rules require such a statement to be submitted.

The report of the conference committee was adopted.

Mr. CHIPMAN moved to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House now resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House bill No. 9051; and pending that I move that all debate on the paragraph under consideration and amendments thereto be closed in ten minutes, on which I demand the previous question.

Mr. McKINLEY. I desire to make an inquiry before proceeding with the consideration of this question. When the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas a few moments ago——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That has been withdrawn. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. McKINLEY. I wish to submit a question in reference to that matter before proceeding——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state that it is not in order pending this motion, on which the gentleman has demanded the previous question. That cuts off all debate, and the resolution mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio is not before the House.

Mr. McKINLEY. I do not rise to debate the question, Mr. Speaker. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is the demand for the previous question.

Mr. McKINLEY. I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McKINLEY. And it is in the interest of the orderly business of this body. If, when the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas is disposed of——

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That has been disposed of. [Loud calls of "Regular order!"]

Mr. McKINLEY. I desire to inquire of the Speaker if, when that is disposed of, he will recognize some gentleman to offer a resolution fixing a day for the consideration of general pension legislation?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. That is not a parliamentary inquiry. The Chair will decide questions of recognitions as they arise.

Mr. McKINLEY. I wish to get a statement from the Chair.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair does not think the gentleman presents a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McKINLEY. The Chair, then, declines to say that he will recognize any gentleman for the purpose of moving to fix a day for the legislation I have suggested?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will decline to answer what is not a parliamentary inquiry when propounded as a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. McKINLEY. I move to amend the motion by making it forty minutes.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. REED. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REED. If this proposition of the gentleman from Texas to go into Committee of the Whole is voted down, will it then be in order for the Chair to recognize some gentleman for a motion to suspend the rules and fix days for the consideration of pension legislation?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The recognitions of this day are within the discretion of the Chair, the subjects upon which the recognition will be given and the time of the recognition, and the Chair states that on this day it is in order under the rules to move to go into Committee of the Whole, which motion is now pending.

Mr. REED. Will it be in order for the Chair, if the Chair is so disposed, to recognize a motion to suspend the rules and fix a day for pension legislation?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair has already answered the gentleman.

Mr. REED. Will the Chair answer that parliamentary inquiry squarely and fairly?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair has answered the gentleman's inquiry. The question is on ordering the previous question on the motion of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. REED. Will the Chair answer a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question being put, the Speaker *pro tempore* stated that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Kansas. I call for a division.

Mr. REED. I desire to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The House is dividing.

Mr. REED. The House is dividing because the Chair is overriding parliamentary law.

Mr. DUNN. But the gentleman from Maine can not override the Speaker.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 97, noes none.

Mr. MCKINLEY. No quorum.

Mr. MILLS. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 115, nay 1, not voting 208; as follows:

YEAS—115.

Abbott,	Dibble,	Lawler,	Russell, Mass.
Anderson, Miss.	Dockery,	Lee,	Sayers,
Bankhead,	Dunn,	Lynch,	Seney,
Barry,	Enloe,	Macdonald,	Shaw,
Biggs,	Fisher,	Maish,	Smith,
Blanchard,	Foran,	Martin,	Sowden,
Bland,	Ford,	McCreary,	Spinola,
Bliss,	Forney,	McMillin,	Springer,
Blount,	French,	McRae,	Stahlnecker,
Breckinridge, Ark.	Grimes,	McShane,	Stewart, Tex.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Hall,	Mills,	Stewart, Ga.
Burnett,	Hare,	Montgomery,	Stockdale,
Bynum,	Hatch,	Moore,	Stone, Ky.
Carlton,	Heard,	Morgan,	Stone, Mo.
Caruth,	Hemphill,	Morse,	Tarsney,
Catchings,	Henderson, N. C.	Neal,	Taulbee,
Chipman,	Herbert,	Newton,	Thompson, Cal.
Clardy,	Holman,	Oates,	Tillman,
Clements,	Hooker,	Outhwaite,	Tracey,
Cobb,	Hopkins, Va.	Peel,	Townshend,
Cothran,	Howard,	Perry,	Turner, Ga.
Cowles,	Hutton,	Phelan,	Walker,
Cox,	Jones,	Randall,	Weaver,
Crain,	Kilgore,	Rayner,	Wheeler,
Crisp,	Laffoon,	Rice,	Wilkins,
Culberson,	Lagan,	Richardson,	Wilkinson,
Dargan,	Landes,	Robertson,	Wilson, Minn.
Davidson, Ala.	Lane,	Rogers,	Wilson, W. Va.
Davidson, Fla.	Lanham,	Rowland,	

NAY—1.

Goff.

NOT VOTING—208.

Adams,	Brumm,	Davenport,	Guenther,
Allen, Mass.	Bryce,	Davis,	Harmer,
Allen, Mich.	Buchanan,	De Lano,	Haugen,
Allen, Miss.	Buckalew,	Dingley,	Hayden,
Anderson, Iowa	Bunnell,	Dorsey,	Hayes,
Anderson, Ill.	Burnes,	Dougherty,	Henderson, Iowa
Anderson, Kans.	Burrows,	Dunham,	Henderson, Ill.
Arnold,	Butler,	Elliott,	Hermann,
Atkinson,	Butterworth,	Ermentrout,	Hiestand,
Bacon,	Campbell, F., N. Y.	Farquhar,	Hires,
Baker, N. Y.	Campbell, Ohio	Felton,	Hitt,
Baker, Ill.	Campbell, T. J., N. Y.	Finley,	Hogg,
Barnes,	Candler,	Fitch,	Holmes,
Bayne,	Cannon,	Flood,	Hopkins, Ill.
Belden,	Caswell,	Fuller,	Hopkins, N. Y.
Belmont,	Cheadle,	Funston,	Houk,
Bingham,	Clark,	Gaines,	Hovey,
Boothman,	Cockran,	Gallinger,	Hudd,
Bound,	Cogswell,	Gay,	Hunter,
Boutelle,	Collins,	Gear,	Jackson,
Bowden,	Compton,	Gest,	Johnston, Ind.
Bowen,	Conger,	Gibson,	Johnston, N. C.
Brewer,	Cooper,	Glass,	Kean,
Brower,	Crouse,	Glover,	Kelley,
Browne, T. H. B., Va.	Cummings,	Granger,	Kennedy,
Browne, Ind.	Cutcheon,	Greenman,	Kerr,
Brown, Ohio	Dalzell,	Grosvenor,	Ketcham,
Brown, J. R., Va.	Darlington,	Grout,	La Follette,
Laidlaw,	Morrill,	Reed,	Thomas, Ill.
Laird,	Morrow,	Rockwell,	Thomas, Wis.
Latham,	Nelson,	Romeis,	Thompson, Ohio
Lehlbach,	Nichols,	Rowell,	Turner, Kans.
Lind,	Norwood,	Russell, Conn.	Vance,
Lodge,	Nutting,	Rusk,	Vandever,
Long,	O'Donnell,	Ryan,	Wade,
Lyman,	O'Ferrall,	Sawyer,	Warner,
Maffett,	O'Neall, Ind.	Scott,	Washington,
Mahoney,	O'Neill, Pa.	Scull,	Weber,
Mansur,	O'Neill, Mo.	Seymour,	West,
Mason,	Osborne,	Sherman,	White, Ind.
Matson,	Owen,	Shively,	White, N. Y.
McAdoo,	Parker,	Simmons,	Whiting, Mich.
McClammy,	Patton,	Snyder,	Whiting, Mass.
McComas,	Payson,	Spooner,	Whitthorne,
McCormick,	Penington,	Steele,	Wickham,
McCullogh,	Perkins,	Stephenson,	Wilber,
McKenna,	Peters,	Stewart, Vt.	Williams,
McKinley,	Phelps,	Struble,	Wise,
McKinney,	Pidcock,	Symes,	Woodburn,
Merriman,	Plumb,	Taylor, E. B., Ohio	Yardley,
Milliken,	Post,	Taylor, J. D., Ohio	Yoder,
Moffitt,	Pugsley,	Thomas, Ky.	Yost.

The following-named members were announced as paired on all political questions until further notice:

Mr. COLLINS with Mr. MCCOMAS.

Mr. GLOVER with Mr. ATKINSON.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio, with Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. BACON with Mr. HAYDEN.

Mr. GIBSON with Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. SIMMONS with Mr. DUNHAM.

Mr. TIMOTHY J. CAMPBELL with Mr. LAIDLAW.

Mr. DOUGHERTY with Mr. PETERS.

Mr. TOWNSHEND with Mr. HENDERSON, of Illinois.

Mr. GRANGER with Mr. ROCKWELL.

Mr. NORWOOD with Mr. COOPER.

Mr. GREENMAN with Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois.

Mr. WHITE, of New York, with Mr. COCKRAN.

Mr. WISE with Mr. BOUTELLE.

Mr. HUDD with Mr. CLARK.

Mr. CANDLER with Mr. CUTCHEON (until June 8).

Mr. MERRIMAN with Mr ARNOLD.

Mr. SNYDER with Mr. BOWDEN.

The following-named members were announced as paired on all questions until further notice in the House and in Committee of the Whole:

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri, with Mr. KEAN.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi, with Mr. WILBER.

Mr. SCOTT with Mr. THOMAS H. B. BROWNE.

Mr. CUMMINGS with Mr. MCCORMICK.

Mr. MATSON with Mr. OWEN.

Mr. BARNES with Mr. BAKER, of New York

Mr. MAHONEY with Mr. SPOONER.

Mr. MCCLAMMY with Mr. BROWER.

Mr. SHIVELY with Mr. STEELE.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana, with Mr. LYMAN (until June 25).

Mr. COMPTON with Mr. WEBER.

Mr. YODER with Mr. BOOTHMAN.

Mr. VANCE with Mr. WEST.

Mr. HOGG with Mr. POST.

Mr. ELLIOTT with Mr. JACKSON.

Mr. BURNES with Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa.

Mr. MCKINNEY with Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan.

Mr. HAYES with Mr. GEAR.

Mr. MANSUR with Mr. WARNER (except Oklahoma and Union Pacific funding bills).

Mr. SCULL with Mr. ERMENTROUT (until June 9).

Mr. GLASS with Mr. HOUK.

Mr. PENINGTON with Mr. YARDLEY (until June 6).

The following-named members were announced as paired on all political questions for this day:

Mr. FELIX CAMPBELL with Mr. HOPKINS, of New York.

Mr. RUSK with Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. BELMONT with Mr. DE LANO.

Mr. LATHAM with Mr. NICHOLS.

Mr. MCADOO with Mr. HOPKINS, of Illinois.

Mr. WHITTHORNE was announced as paired with Mr. HARMER on this vote.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. I desire to vote.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Was the gentleman in the Hall when his name was called?

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. I was not.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Then the gentleman is not permitted by the rule to vote.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of North Carolina. I desire to state that if present I would have voted "ay."

Mr. TOWNSHEND. I understood that another gentleman had been substituted for myself in the pair with my colleague General HENDERSON. But in any case it would be proper for me to vote, in order to make a quorum; and I have voted.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The yeas are 115, nay 1. A quorum has not voted.

CALL OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. MILLS. I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk proceeded to call the roll, when the following-named members failed to answer:

Allen, Mich.	Cockran,	Hogg,	Patton,
Allen, Miss.	Collins,	Holman,	Penington,
Arnold,	Compton,	Hopkins, N. Y.	Pidcock,
Atkinson,	Cooper,	Houk,	Post,
Bacon,	Crouse,	Hudd,	Rockwell,
Barnes,	Cummings,	Jackson,	Rusk,
Belden,	Cutcheon,	La Follette,	Sawyer,
Belmont,	Davenport,	Lagan,	Scott,
Bingham,	Davis,	Latham,	Scull,
Boutelle,	De Lano,	Maffett,	Shively,
Bowden,	Dunham,	Mahoney,	Snyder,
Bowen,	Elliott,	Mansur,	Spooner,
Browne, Ind.	Ermentrout,	Mason,	Taylor, E. B., Ohio
Brown, J. R., Va.	Fitch,	Matson,	Thomas, Ill.
Brumm,	Gaines,	McAdoo,	Vance,
Bryce,	Gay,	McClammy,	West,
Burnes,	Gibson,	McComas,	White, Ind.
Butterworth,	Glass,	McKinney,	White, N. Y.
Campbell, F., N. Y.	Glover,	Morse,	Whiting, Mich.
Campbell, Ohio	Greenman,	Norwood,	Whitthorne,
Campbell, T. J., N. Y.	Hayes,	O'Ferrall,	Yardley,
Candler,	Henderson, Iowa	O'Neall, Ind.	Yoder.
Clark,	Hires,	O'Neill, Mo.	

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will now call the roll a second time, when gentlemen desiring to present excuses for themselves or for other members will have an opportunity to do so.

The Clerk proceeded to call the absentees, as follows:

Mr. ALLEN, of Michigan: No excuse offered.

Mr. ALLEN, of Mississippi: No excuse offered.

Mr. ARNOLD: No excuse offered.

Mr. ATKINSON: No excuse offered.

Mr. BACON: No excuse offered.

Mr. BARNES: No excuse offered.

Mr. BELDEN: No excuse offered.

Mr. BELMONT: No excuse offered.

Mr. BINGHAM.

Mr. FELTON. Mr. Speaker, General BINGHAM has been called away by the death of a very near relative, and I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. BOUTELLE: No excuse offered.

Mr. BOWDEN: No excuse offered.

Mr. BOWEN: No excuse offered.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana: No excuse offered.

Mr. J. R. BROWN: No excuse offered

Mr. BRUMM: No excuse offered.

Mr. BRYCE: No excuse offered.

Mr. BURNES: No excuse offered.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH: No excuse offered.

Mr. FELIX CAMPBELL: No excuse offered.

Mr. CAMPBELL, of Ohio: No excuse offered.

Mr. TIMOTHY J. CAMPBELL: No excuse offered.

Mr. CANDLER: No excuse offered.

Mr. CLARK: No excuse offered.

Mr. COCKRAN: No excuse offered.

Mr. COLLINS: No excuse offered.

Mr. COMPTON: No excuse offered.

Mr. COOPER: No excuse offered.

Mr. CROUSE: No excuse offered.

Mr. CUMMINGS: No excuse offered.

Mr. CUTCHEON: No excuse offered.

Mr. DAVENPORT: No excuse offered.

Mr. DAVIS: No excuse offered.

Mr. DE LANO: No excuse offered.

Mr. DUNHAM.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. DUNHAM, has been called away by the death of his wife, and I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. ELLIOTT.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. ELLIOTT, is absent from the city, and I ask that he be excused from further attendance on the session of the House to-day.

Mr. ERMENTROUT: No excuse offered.

Mr. FITCH: No excuse offered.

Mr. GAINES: No excuse offered.

Mr. GAY: No excuse offered.

Mr. GIBSON: No excuse offered.

Mr. GLASS: No excuse offered.

Mr. GLOVER: No excuse offered.

Mr. GREENMAN: No excuse offered.

Mr. HAYES.

Mr. GEAR. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. HAYES, is absent from the city on business, and I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HENDERSON, of Iowa.

Mr. LYMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. HENDERSON, is unable to be here on account of sickness. I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HIRES.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. HIRES, has been called home by sickness in his family, and I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HOGG: No excuse offered.

Mr. HOLMAN: No excuse offered.

Mr. HOPKINS, of New York.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. HOPKINS, has been called home by the very serious illness of his children, and I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HOUK.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague, Mr. HOUK, who is unwell, be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HUDD: No excuse offered.

Mr. JACKSON: No excuse offered.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE: No excuse offered.

Mr. LAGAN: No excuse offered.

Mr. LATHAM.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague, Mr. LATHAM, be excused on account of sickness.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. MAFFETT.

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague, Mr. MAFFETT, who has been called home on account of sickness, be excused and be given indefinite leave of absence.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the gentleman will be excused. The indefinite leave of absence can he obtained at another time.

There was no objection, and Mr. MAFFETT was excused.

Mr. MAHONEY: No excuse offered.

Mr. MANSUR.

Mr. WARNER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. MANSUR, has been called home on business, and, if his leave of absence has expired, I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. MASON: No excuse offered.

Mr. MATSON: No excuse offered.

Mr. MCADOO: No excuse offered.

Mr. MCCLAMMY: No excuse offered.

Mr. MCCOMAS: No excuse offered.

Mr. MCKINNEY: No excuse offered.

Mr. MORSE: No excuse offered.

Mr. NORWOOD: No excuse offered.

Mr. O'FERRALL.

Mr. LEE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. O'FERRALL, is confined to his bed with an acute attack of rheumatism, and I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Speaker, I ask that my colleague, Mr. O'NEALL, of Indiana, be excused.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is informed that the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. O'NEALL, has leave of absence.

Mr. SHIVELY.

Mr. STEELE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. SHIVELY, is absent on account of sickness, and I ask that he be excused until Saturday next.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. O'NEILL, of Missouri: No excuse offered.

Mr. PATTON: No excuse offered.

Mr. PENINGTON: No excuse offered.

Mr. PIDCOCK: No excuse offered.

Mr. POST: No excuse offered.

Mr. ROCKWELL: No excuse offered.

Mr. RUSK: No excuse offered.

Mr. SAWYER.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Mr. Speaker, my colleague, Mr. SAWYER, is absent on account of illness. I ask that he be excused.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT: No excuse offered.

Mr. SCULL: No excuse offered.

Mr. SNYDER: No excuse offered.

Mr. SPOONER: No excuse offered.

Mr. EZRA B. TAYLOR: No excuse offered.

Mr. THOMAS, of Illinois: No excuse offered.

Mr. VANCE: No excuse offered.

Mr. WEST: No excuse offered.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana: No excuse offered.

Mr. WHITE, of New York: No excuse offered.

Mr. WHITING, of Michigan: No excuse offered.

Mr. WHITTHORNE: No excuse offered.

Mr. YARDLEY: No excuse offered.

Mr. YODER.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. YODER has been called from

the city on extremely important business. I ask that he be excused until Saturday.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. MOFFITT. I ask that my colleague, Mr. FITCH, have leave of absence until Saturday next.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection, and leave is granted.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, does the roll-call show a quorum present?

The SPEAKER *pro temproe*. The roll-call shows the presence of 233 members.

Mr. MILLS. I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question now recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS].

Mr. MILLS. I withdraw the motion I made to limit debate and for the previous question on that motion; and I now demand a vote on the motion to go into Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* (having put the question) said: The ayes seem to have it.

Mr. REED and others called for a division.

The question being again taken, there were—ayes 101, noes none.

Mr. MORRILL. No quorum.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MORRILL] makes the point that no quorum has voted.

Mr. MILLS. I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 112, nays none, not voting 212, as follows:

YEAS—112.

Abbott,	Davidson, Ala.	Lee,	Russell, Mass.
Anderson, Miss.	Davidson, Fla.	Lynch,	Sayers,
Anderson, Ill.	Dibble,	Macdonald,	Seney,
Bankhead,	Dockery,	Maish,	Shaw,
Barry,	Dougherty,	Martin,	Simmons,
Biggs,	Dunn,	McCreary,	Smith,
Blanchard,	Enloe,	McMillin,	Sowden,
Bland,	Fisher,	McRae,	Spinola,
Bliss,	Ford,	McShane,	Springer,
Blount,	Forney,	Merriman,	Stahlnecker,
Breckinridge, Ark.	French,	Mills,	Stewart, Tex.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Grimes,	Montgomery,	Stewart, Ga.
Buckalew,	Hall,	Moore,	Stockdale,
Burnett,	Hare,	Morgan,	Stone, Ky.
Bynum,	Heard,	Morse,	Stone, Mo.
Carlton,	Hemphill,	Neal,	Tarsney,
Caruth,	Henderson, N. C.	Newton,	Taulbee,
Chipman,	Herbert,	Oates,	Tillman,
Clardy,	Hooker,	Peel,	Tracey,
Clements,	Hopkins, Va.	Perry,	Turner, Ga.
Cobb,	Howard,	Phelan,	Walker,
Cothran,	Johnston, N. C.	Randall,	Weaver,
Cowles,	Jones,	Rayner,	Wheeler,
Cox,	Kilgore,	Rice,	Whitthorne,
Crain,	Landes,	Richardson,	Wilkins,
Crisp,	Lane,	Robertson,	Wilkinson,
Culberson,	Lanham,	Rogers,	Wilson, Minn.
Dargan,	Lawler,	Rowland,	Wilson, W. Va.

NAYS—

None.

NOT VOTING—212.

Adams,	Caswell,	Granger,	Lind,
Allen, Mass.	Catchings,	Greenman,	Lodge,
Allen, Mich.	Cheadle,	Grosvenor,	Long,
Allen, Miss.	Clark,	Grout,	Lyman,
Anderson, Iowa	Cockran,	Guenther,	Maffett,
Anderson, Kans.	Cogswell,	Harmer,	Mahoney,
Arnold,	Collins,	Hatch,	Mansur,
Atkinson,	Compton,	Haugen,	Mason,
Bacon,	Conger,	Hayden,	Matson,
Baker, N. Y.	Cooper,	Hayes,	McAdoo,
Baker, Ill.	Crouse,	Henderson, Iowa	McClammy,
Barnes,	Cummings,	Henderson, Ill.	McComas,
Bayne,	Cutcheon,	Hermann,	McCormick,
Belden,	Dalzell,	Hiestand,	McCullogh,
Belmont,	Darlington,	Hires,	McKenna,
Bingham,	Davenport,	Hitt,	McKinley,
Boothman,	Davis,	Hogg,	McKinney,
Bound,	De Lano,	Holman,	Milliken,
Boutelle,	Dingley,	Holmes,	Moffitt,
Bowden,	Dorsey,	Hopkins, Ill.	Morrill,
Bowen,	Dunham,	Hopkins, N. Y.	Morrow,
Brewer,	Elliott,	Houk,	Nelson,
Brower,	Ermentrout,	Hovey,	Nichols,
Browne, T. H. B., Va.	Farquhar,	Hudd,	Norwood,
Browne, Ind.	Felton,	Hunter,	Nutting,
Brown, Ohio	Finley,	Hutton,	O'Donnell,
Brown, J. R., Va.	Fitch,	Jackson,	O'Ferrall,
Brumm,	Flood,	Johnston, Ind.	O'Neall, Ind.
Bryce,	Foran,	Kean,	O'Neill, Pa.
Buchanan,	Fuller,	Kelley,	O'Neill, Mo.
Bunnell,	Funston,	Kennedy,	Osborne,
Burnes,	Gaines,	Kerr,	Outhwaite,
Burrows,	Gallinger,	Ketcham,	Owen,
Butler,	Gay,	Laffoon,	Parker,
Butterworth,	Gear,	La Follette,	Patton,
Campbell, F., N. Y.	Gest,	Lagan,	Payson,
Campbell, Ohio	Gibson,	Laidlaw,	Penington,
Campbell, T. J., N. Y.	Glass,	Laird,	Perkins,
Candler,	Glover,	Latham,	Peters,
Cannon,	Goff,	Lehlbach,	Phelps,
Pidcock,	Scull,	Thomas, Ky.	West,
Plumb,	Seymour,	Thomas, Ill.	White, Ind.
Post,	Sherman,	Thomas, Wis.	White, N. Y.
Pugsley,	Shively,	Thompson, Ohio	Whiting, Mich.
Reed,	Snyder,	Thompson, Cal.	Whiting, Mass.
Rockwell,	Spooner,	Townshend,	Wickham,
Romeis,	Steele,	Turner, Kans.	Wilber,
Rowell,	Stephenson,	Vance,	Williams,
Russell, Conn.	Stewart, Vt.	Vandever,	Wise,
Rusk,	Struble,	Wade,	Woodburn,
Ryan,	Symes,	Warner,	Yardley,
Sawyer,	Taylor, E. B., Ohio	Washington,	Yoder,
Scott,	Taylor, J. D., Ohio	Weber,	Yost.

The following additional pairs were announced:

Mr. WHITING, of Michigan, with Mr. DUNHAM, on all political questions, until further notice.

Mr. O'FERRALL with Mr. LA FOLLETTE, for the rest of the day.

Mr. THOMPSON, of California, with Mr. MCKENNA, for the rest of the day.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. On this question the yeas are 111, the nays none. A quorum has not voted.

Mr. MILLS. Is that point raised?

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the opinion of the Chair it is his duty to recognize the fact that no quorum has voted.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question being taken, there were—ayes 88, noes 60.

Mr. REED and others called for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 114, nays 93, not voting 117; as follows:

YEAS—114.

Abbott,	Dargan,	Lawler,	Sayers,
Anderson, Miss.	Davidson, Ala.	Lee,	Seney,
Anderson, Ill.	Davidson, Fla.	Lynch,	Shaw,
Bankhead,	Dibble,	Macdonald,	Simmons,
Barry,	Dockery,	Maish,	Sowden,
Bayne,	Dougherty,	Martin,	Springer,
Biggs,	Dunn,	McCreary,	Stahlnecker,
Blanchard,	Enloe,	McMillin,	Stewart, Tex.
Bland,	Foran,	McRae,	Stewart, Ga.
Bliss,	Forney,	McShane,	Stockdale,
Blount,	French,	Mills,	Stone, Ky.
Breckinridge, Ark.	Grimes,	Montgomery,	Stone, Mo.
Breckinridge, Ky.	Hall,	Moore,	Tarsney,
Buckalew,	Hare,	Morgan,	Taulbee,
Burnett,	Hatch,	Morse,	Tillman,
Bynum,	Hemphill,	Neal,	Tracey,
Carlton,	Henderson, N. C.	Newton,	Townshend,
Caruth,	Herbert,	Oates,	Turner, Ga.
Catchings,	Hooker,	Outhwaite,	Walker,
Chipman,	Hopkins, Va.	Peel,	Washington,
Clardy,	Howard,	Perry,	Weaver,
Clements,	Hutton,	Phelan,	Wheeler,
Cobb,	Johnston, N. C.	Randall,	Whitthorne,
Cothran,	Jones,	Rayner,	Wilkins,
Cowles,	Kilgore,	Rice,	Wilkinson,
Cox,	Lagan,	Robertson,	Wilson, Minn.
Crain,	Landes,	Rogers,	Wilson, W. Va.
Crisp,	Lane,	Rowland.	
Culberson,	Lanham,	Russell, Mass.	

NAYS—93.

Adams,	Ford,	Laird,	Plumb,
Allen, Mass.	Fuller,	Lehlbach,	Reed,
Anderson, Iowa	Funston,	Lind,	Rowell,
Anderson, Kans.	Gallinger,	Lodge,	Ryan,
Baker, Ill.	Gest,	Long,	Seymour,
Bound,	Goff,	Lyman,	Sherman,
Browne, Ind.	Grout,	Mason,	Stephenson,
Brown, Ohio.	Guenther,	McCullogh,	Stewart, Vt.
Bunnell,	Harmer,	McKinley,	Struble,
Burrows,	Haugen,	Milliken,	Taylor, J. D., Ohio
Butler,	Hermann,	Moffitt,	Thomas, Ky.
Cannon,	Hiestand,	Morrill,	Thomas, Wis.
Cheadle,	Hitt,	Morrow,	Thompson, Ohio
Cogswell,	Holman,	Nichols,	Vandever,
Conger,	Holmes,	Nutting,	Wade,
Dalzell,	Hovey,	O'Donnell,	White, Ind.
Darlington,	Hunter,	O'Neill, Pa.	Whiting, Mass.
Dingley,	Johnston, Ind.	Osborne,	Wickham,
Dorsey,	Kelley,	Parker,	Williams,
Farquhar,	Kennedy,	Patton,	Woodburn,
Felton,	Kerr,	Payson,	Yost.
Finley,	Ketcham,	Perkins,	
Fisher,	La Follette,	Peters,	
Flood,	Laidlaw,	Phelps,	

NOT VOTING—117.

Allen, Mich.	Brumm,	Davenport,	Heard,
Allen, Miss.	Bryce,	Davis,	Henderson, Iowa
Arnold,	Buchanan,	De Lano,	Henderson, Ill.
Atkinson,	Burnes,	Dunham,	Hires,
Bacon,	Butterworth,	Elliott,	Hogg,
Baker, N. Y.	Campbell, F., N. Y.	Ermentrout,	Hopkins, Ill.
Barnes,	Campbell, Ohio	Fitch,	Hopkins, N. Y.
Belden,	Campbell, T. J., N. Y.	Gaines,	Houk,
Belmont,	Candler,	Gay,	Hudd,
Bingham,	Caswell,	Gear,	Jackson,
Boothman,	Clark,	Gibson,	Kean,
Boutelle,	Cockran,	Glass,	Laffoon,
Bowden,	Collins,	Glover,	Latham,
Bowen,	Compton,	Granger,	Maffett,
Brewer,	Cooper,	Greenman,	Mahoney,
Brower,	Crouse.	Grosvenor,	Mansur,
Browne, T. H. B., Va.	Cummings,	Hayden,	Matson,
Brown, J. R., Va.	Cutcheon,	Hayes,	McAdoo,

McClammy,	Penington,	Shively,	Warner,
McComas,	Pidcock,	Smith,	Weber,
McCormick,	Post,	Snyder,	West,
McKenna,	Pugsley,	Spinola,	White, N. Y.
McKinney,	Richardson,	Spooner,	Whiting, Mich.
Merriman,	Rockwell,	Steele,	Wilber,
Nelson,	Romeis,	Symes,	Wise,
Norwood,	Russell, Conn.	Taylor, E. B., Ohio	Yardley.
O'Ferrall,	Rusk,	Thomas, Ill.	Yoder.
O'Neall, Ind.	Sawyer,	Thompson, Cal.	
O'Neill, Mo.	Scott,	Turner, Kans.	
Owen,	Scull,	Vance,	

So the motion was agreed to.

During the roll-call,

On motion of Mr. WHEELER, by unanimous consent, the reading of the names was dispensed with.

The following additional pair was announced:

Mr. MASON with Mr. O'FERRALL, for the rest of the day.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted in the following cases:

To Mr. LATHAM, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. SYMES, for one week, on account of illness.

To Mr. MANSUR, indefinitely, on account of important business.

The vote was then announced as above recorded.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

A bill (H. R. 4920) for the protection of the officials of the United States in the Indian Territory;

A bill (H. R. 5929) to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across Staten Island Sound;

A bill (H. R. 7222) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish agricultural stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto;"

A bill (H. R. 7564) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River, at or near Chattanooga, Tenn.;

A bill (H. R. 8623) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River, at or near Guntersville, Ala., and for other purposes; and

A bill (H. R. 9788) making an appropriation to supply a deficiency in the appropriation for expenses of collecting the revenue from customs for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, and for other purposes.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. BURROWS: A bill (H. R. 10327) to amend an act entitled "An act granting a pension to Alonzo Higley"—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHEADLE: A bill (H. R. 10328) granting a pension to Nancy E. Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10329) granting a pension to Maria Youngs—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARUTH (by request): A bill (H. R. 10330) for the relief of Jane Green, alias Cheatham—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GRANGER (by request): A bill (H. R. 10331) to remove the charge of desertion against Horace E. Ball—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOVEY: A bill (H. R. 10332) for the relief of George A. Linton—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LYMAN: A bill (H. R. 10333) for the relief of William H. Howell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MACDONALD: A bill (H. R. 10334) to grant a pension to Elizabeth O'Laughlin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCREARY: A bill (H. R. 10335) for the relief of James D. Bastin—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 10336) granting a pension to Almooreen Eidenire—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OUTHWAITE: A bill (H. R. 10337) granting a pension to John Ebert—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 10338) for the relief of James B. Sparks—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAULBEE: A bill (H. R. 10339) for the relief of Eliz. J. Richardson—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10340) for the relief of Mary A. McGinnis—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10341) for the relief of John Spurlock—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. A. C. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 10342) granting a pension to John Dauper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10343) granting a pension to Sarah Perkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10344) granting a pension to Simon W. Ratcliff—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10345) granting a pension to Catherine Ward—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BLANCHARD: Petition of James E. Keegan and 110 others, citizens of Robeline, Louisiana, for an amendment to the interstate commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. BROWER: Petition of Elizabeth Brockwell and William C. Mason, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committe on War Claims.

By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of Alexander McClanahan, of Joseph C. Sloan, and of William McNish, of Tennessee, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CARUTH: Petition of Paul Denver, of Michael Denver, and of Valentine Ault, of Franklin County, Ohio, and of Mary Leissing, of Jefferson County, Kentucky, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CROUSE: Petition of wire-drawers and manufacturers, in favor of a reduction of duty on wire rods—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FORNEY: Petition of citizens of Cullman County, Alabama, for amendment of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Petition of citizens of Allen County, Kansas, for amendment of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. HAYDEN: Petition of the mayor and council of Boston, Mass., to pass the bill granting the use of Castle Island for park purposes notwithstanding the President's veto—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of J. Q. A. Brackett and others, citizens of the United States, for the passage of the bill for the relief of Nathaniel McKay and the executors of Donald McKay, that their claim may be referred to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LANHAM: Petition of citizens of Weatherford, Tex., asking an amendment of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. LODGE: Petition of the city government of Boston, Mass., in favor of passing Castle Island resolve, notwithstanding the President's veto—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MACDONALD: Petition of citizens of Goodhue County, Minnesota, in favor of amendment of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NEAL: Petition of Robert Pearce, for pension, to be considered in connection with House bill 9193—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STONE, of Missouri: Petition of Hugh G. Glenn, of administrator of John Hammontree, and of E. N. Peyton, of Cass County, Missouri—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAULBEE: Petition for the relief of George S. Steele—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Letcher County, Kentucky, for the improvement of North Fork of Kentucky River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. WHEELER: Papers in the claim of Joseph Commons, of Huntsville, Ala.—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition for the relief of Isaac N. Hollingsworth—to the Committee on War Claims.

The following petition for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists was received and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. HAYDEN: Of the Massachusetts Pharmaceutical Association.

The following petition, indorsing the per diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, was referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. McCULLOGH: Of C. G. Koechlin and others, ex-soldiers and sailors, of Westmoreland County, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. G. A. ANDERSON: Of 127 citizens of Adams County, Illinois.

By Mr. DINGLEY: Of 93 citizens of Sagadahoc County, Maine.

By Mr. FUNSTON: Of 139 citizens of Douglas County, Kansas.

By Mr. GALLINGER: Of Alonzo W. Smith and 14 others, citizens of Grafton County, New Hampshire.

By Mr. LANE: Of 55 citizens of Shelby and Moultrie Counties, Illinois.

By Mr. MACDONALD: Of 67 citizens of Renville County, Minnesota.
By Mr. ROMEIS: Of 119 citizens of Sandusky County, Ohio.

The following petitions for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters were severally referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:
By Mr. BLANCHARD: Of A. S. Taylor and 55 others, citizens of Louisiana.
By Mr. COBB: Of N. C. Ellis and others, of Good Hope, Alabama.
By Mr. TAULBEE: Of citizens of Bloomington, Kentucky.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *June 5*, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.
The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending that an additional appropriation be made for clerk-hire for that Department; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the Attorney-General, transmitting, in response to a resolution of March 16, 1888, certain information as to the amount due commissioners for examining damage from erecting dams in the Fox and Wisconsin Rivers; which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

COURT OF CLAIMS REPORT.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a communication from the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of law and fact in certain spoliation claims; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* presented a memorial of Lone Star Grange, at Cedar Ford, Butler County, Kansas, remonstrating against the passage of the bill to create a new Bureau of Animal Industry; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Jamestown, Kans., praying that a pension be granted to Robert W. Compton, late quartermaster Thirty-third Regiment Kentucky Volunteers; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented the petition of James M. Miller, a citizen of Kansas, late of Company H, Third Regiment Missouri Mounted Volunteers, praying for an equalization of pension from June 4, 1862, to June 4, 1881; which was referred to the committee on Pensions.

Mr. FAULKNER presented the petition of William B. Jackson and 250 other citizens of Washington, D. C., praying for the construction of a bridge across the Eastern Branch of the Potomac, from the foot of South Capitol street to Giesborough, Maryland; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia,

Mr. CALL presented a petition of citizens of Florida, praying that an appropriation be made to deepen and straighten the channel of Indian River from Grant's Farm to Jupiter, in that State; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. QUAY presented a petition of the Lake Carriers' Association of Buffalo, N. Y., and a petition of the Commercial Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the purchase by the United States of the Portage Lake and Lake Superior Ship Canal; which were referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. ALLISON presented the petition of Silas G. Goss and 26 other citizens of Lehigh, Iowa, praying for the passage of the bill for prohibition in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANDERSON presented a petition of the Board of Trade of Omaha, Nebr., praying for an extension of the time of the Union Pacific Railroad to pay its indebtedness to the Government; which was referred to the Select Committee on the President's Message transmitting the Report of the Pacific Railway Commission.

He also presented petitions of posts of the Grand Army of the Republic located at Logansport, Albany, Ossian, and Greentown, in the State of Indiana, praying for the establishment of a branch of the National Home for disabled soldiers and sailors at Marion, in Grant County, Indiana; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, submitted adverse reports thereon; which were agreed to, and the bills were postponed indefinitely:

A bill (S. 2943) granting a pension to Henry Chamberlain;
A bill (S. 2926) for the relief of Madison V. Boeitnight; and
A bill (S. 2676) granting an increase of pension to Capt. Francis M. Work.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the petition of Miss Emily Luttrell, praying to be allowed a pension, reported adversely thereon, and the committee were discharged from the further consideration of the petition.

Mr. DAVIS, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 3021) granting a pension to Carrie V. Miller;
A bill (S. 2945) granting a pension to J. S. May;
A bill (S. 2938) granting a pension to James McDonald;
A bill (S. 2995) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Stewart;
A bill (H. R. 6840) for the relief of Hiram M. Goss;
A bill (H. R. 6245) for the relief of William Burk;
A bill (H. R. 3706) granting a pension to Henry C. Richardson; and
A bill (S. 2979) granting a pension to Laura J. Ives.

Mr. CHACE, from the Committee on Patents, to whom was referred the bill (S. 463) for the relief of Jacob D. Felthousen and the heirs of William H. Akins, deceased, reported it without recommendation.

Mr. QUAY, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2726) granting an increase of pension to Margaret S. Heintzelman, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2747) for the relief of John W. Keating, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2711) restoring Phebe McLaughlin to the pension-roll; and
A bill (S. 2724) for the relief of H. H. Helper.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2861) granting a pension to David A. Hall;
A bill (H. R. 9682) increasing the pension of Jesse Dickey;
A bill (H. R. 3690) granting a pension to Penelope Morton, widow of Lieutenant Morton;
A bill (H. R. 780) granting a pension to James H. Darling; and
A bill (H. R. 5177) granting a pension to Pleman Cook.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2665) granting a pension to Charles J. Esty;
A bill (H. R. 4103) granting a pension to Edna M. Hildreth;
A bill (H. R. 7829) granting a pension to Thomas McGuire;
A bill (H. R. 2413) granting a pension to Mrs. Mercy Knight; and
A bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Moses L. Chase.

Mr. COKE, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2930) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct a bridge across Red River at or near Hook's Ferry, Red River County, Texas, reported it with amendments.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 5903) for the relief of Lewis Davis, a soldier of the war of 1812, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2890) granting a pension to Fannie A. Kimball;
A bill (H. R. 8798) granting a pension to Nettie Ellicott;
A bill (H. R. 432) granting a pension to Columbus Bosteder;
A bill (H. R. 3016) granting a pension to Mary F. Harkins;
A bill (H. R. 5756) granting a pension to David Gibbons; and
A bill (H. R. 2215) granting a pension to Charles Glamann.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 3722) for the relief of Jennie D. Rice;
A bill (H. R. 7776) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River in the county of Monona, in the State of Iowa, and in the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, and to make the same a post-route; and
A bill (H. R. 10233) making an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker *pro tempore* of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (H. R. 4920) for the protection of the officials of the United States in the Indian Territory;

A bill (H. R. 5929) to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across Staten Island Sound;

A bill (H. R. 7222) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish agricultural stations in connection with the colleges established in the several States under the provisions of an act approved July 2, 1862, and of the acts supplementary thereto;"

A bill (H. R. 7564) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Tennessee River at or near Chattanooga, Tenn.; and

A bill (H. R. 8623) authorizing the construction of a bridge over the Tennessee River at or near Guntersville, Ala., and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. MCPHERSON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3094) for the relief of Morton C. Warren and Elizabeth C. Torrey; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Patents.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3095) granting a pension to Hubert Hendrickson; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. COLQUITT introduced a bill (S. 3096) to amend section 907 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 3097) to place Henry Zell on the retired-list of the Army; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PLATT. I introduce a bill for an act concerning the settlement of the boundary line between Connecticut and Rhode Island, and with the bill I present a certified copy of the action of the commissioners of the two States appointed to settle the boundary line, and also the action of the Legislatures of the States of Connecticut and Rhode Island. I ask that the bill, with the accompanying papers, be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 3098) concerning the settlement of the boundary lines between Connecticut and Rhode Island was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CHACE (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3099) to regulate and license pawnbrokers in the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3100) to correct the military record of David C. Spears; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3101) for the relief of William Mackey; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3102) granting a pension to James Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3103) granting a pension to Clara B. Hoyt; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3104) granting an increase of pension to Albert H. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CHANDLER introduced a bill (S. 3105) for the suitable and adequate protection of American fishing interests; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a joint resolution (S. R. 92) authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to loan tents to the Northwest Soldiers and Sailors' Association of Iowa, for reunion purposes; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PATENT OFFICE CLERICAL FORCE.

Mr. HALE submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to send to the Senate at as early date as is practicable a copy of Order No. 339 of the Commissioner of Patents, dated June 26, 1886, and the report made in pursuance of said order; also a copy of a report made to the Commissioner of Patents in June, 1887, in regard to the clerical force of the Patent Office, signed by the chief clerk and chiefs of divisions of that office.

ACCOUNTS OF SUPERVISORS OF ELECTION.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a former day that was objected to yesterday by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN]. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted yesterday by Mr. SPOONER, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate copies of all correspondence, statements of accounts, and inclosures which, during the incumbency of the office of First Comptroller of the Treasury by the present occupant, such officer, or his deputy, has had with any United States commissioner or any chief supervisor of elections, and of all replies thereto received by said First Comptroller; and also to inform the Senate whether the several supervisors of elections appointed by the respective circuit courts at and for the election of 1886, at which Representatives in Congress were chosen, or for any registration held prior thereto and for said election, were paid for the respective number of days, not exceeding ten, for which their accounts were presented; and if such payments were not made, the reasons therefor, and for what number of days they were not allowed and paid; and also to transmit to the Senate copies of all correspondence upon such subject-matter had between the First Comptroller of the Treasury and the Attorney-General, or any United States marshal.

Mr. MORGAN. I desire to offer an amendment to the resolution, but it appears not to have been printed as yet. I move to amend the resolution by inserting after the word "incumbency"——

Mr. PLUMB. I understood that the resolution was offered by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. SPOONER] who is not now in his seat, and I would suggest, if agreeable to the Senator from Alabama, that the resolution go over, retaining its place, until the Senator from Wisconsin appears.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. That order will be made, if there be no objection.

Mr. MORGAN. I have no objection to that course.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will lie over subject to be called up, and will not be placed upon the Calendar.

ASSISTANT ASTRONOMERS.

Mr. CHANDLER. I move to reconsider the vote by which the Senate yesterday passed the bill (S. 653) defining the positions and salaries of assistant astronomers at the United States Naval Observatory, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection the vote by which the bill was passed and also the vote by which it was ordered to a third reading will be reconsidered, and the bill is open to amendment.

Mr. CHANDLER. I offer the amendments which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendments will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 3, line 2, after the word "preceding," it is proposed to strike out the word "section" and insert "sections."

Mr. ALLISON. How will the section read as proposed to be amended?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The section will be read as proposed to be amended.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

That to fill the two additional positions authorized in the preceding sections and to fill any vacancies that may hereafter occur in the positions of assistant astronomers, the Secretary of the Navy shall appoint an examining board, which shall consist of one professor of mathematics in the Navy, one assistant astronomer, and one other competent examiner, who may be either naval or civilian, etc.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The next amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 4, line 4, it is proposed to strike out the word "sums" and insert the word "sum," and in line 5 to strike out the words "section one" and insert "this act;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 4. That, to carry out the provisions of this act, there is hereby appropriated such sum as may be necessary to pay the salaries of the assistant astronomers authorized in this act for the current fiscal year and for the fiscal year next succeeding.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business, the Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. HALE. I move to take up the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6833) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year 1889.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the amendments reported by the Committee on Appropriations will be acted on as they are reached in the reading of the bill. It is so ordered, there being no objection.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in "Schedule A," in the appropriations for "salaries of ministers," in line 25, after the name "Colombia," to strike out "and;" in line 26, after "Turkey," to insert "Belgium, Netherlands, Sweden and Norway, and Venezuela;" and in line 28, before the word "thousand," to strike out "twenty-two" and insert "fifty-two;" so as to make the clause read:

Envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to the Argentine Republic, the United States of Colombia, Turkey, Belgium, Netherlands, Sweden and Norway, and Venezuela, at $7,500 each, $52,500.

Mr. MCPHERSON. I would be pleased to inquire of the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], who has charge of the bill, why Portugal was not included in that list of envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary at $7,500 each. It seems to have been transferred to the heading "ministers resident and consuls-general."

Mr. HALE. The only change that the amendment in line 26 covers is in transferring the ministers at Belgium, Netherlands, Sweden and Norway, and Venezuela, which are now ministers resident at $7,500 each salary, to the same class as the Argentine Republic, the United States of Colombia, and Turkey, which are termed envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary; but it makes no change in the salary. It only does the same by them that has been done by the Senate and House of Representatives before with the Argentine Republic, United States of Colombia, and Turkey. It does not take Portugal, because that is in another class with a smaller salary, and therefore it has not been changed. The amendment recommended by the committee changes no salary.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was continued.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, to strike out the clause from line 29 to line 32, inclusive, as follows:

Ministers resident in Belgium, Hawaiian Islands, Netherlands, Sweden and Norway, and Venezuela, at $7,500 each, $37,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 32, to insert:

Minister resident in Hawaiian Islands, $7,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 34, to insert:

Minister resident and consul-general in Corea, $7,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 39, after the name "Bolivia," to strike out "Corea" and insert "Paraguay and Uruguay;" so as to make the clause read:

Ministers resident and consuls-general in Bolivia, Paraguay and Uruguay, Denmark, Hayti, Persia, Portugal, Siam, and Switzerland, at $5,000 each, $40,000 (and the minister resident and consul-general in Hayti shall also be accredited as chargé d'affaires to San Domingo).

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, to strike out lines 48 and 49, as follows:

Chargé d'affaires to Paraguay and Uruguay, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "salaries secretaries of legations," in line 73, after the name "Chili," to strike out "and;" in the same line, after "Peru," to insert "Argentine Republic and Venezuela;" and in line 75, before the word "thousand," to strike out "three" and insert "six;" so as to make the clause read:

Secretaries of the legations in Chili, Peru, Argentine Republic, and Venezuela, at $1,500 each, $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 76, after the word "legation," to strike out "and consul-general;" so as to make the clause read:

Secretary of legation at Corea, $1,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The reading of the bill was resumed and continued to line 84.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will call the attention of the Senator from Maine to the apparent defect or omission in line 84, on page 4.

Mr. HALE. The blank should be filled by inserting "thousand dollars;" so as to read "one thousand dollars." It is an error of the type.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The correction will be made.

The reading of the bill was resumed.

The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the head of "Schedule B," in the appropriations for "salaries, consular service," after line 184, to insert:

Consul-general at Nuevo Laredo, $2,500.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 186, to insert:

For salaries of consuls, vice-consuls, and commercial agents, $375,000, as follows, namely.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. I ask the Senator in charge of the bill to yield to me for a moment to have a change made in a conference committee.

Mr. HALE. Very well.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT BAY CITY, MICH.

Mr. SPOONER. The Senate appointed as the conferees on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate bill 965 for the erection of a public building at Bay City, Mich., among others the Senator from California [Mr. STANFORD] who has gone abroad. The conference committee is ready to meet, and I ask that the Senator from California be excused from further service on the conference, and that another Senator who is present be appointed in his place.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Who does the Senator from Wisconsin desire to have substituted?

Mr. SPOONER. I ask that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL] be substituted in place of the Senator from California.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6833) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year 1889.

The reading of the bill was resumed. The next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, in the appropriations for "Salaries consular service," "Class V," in line 276, after the name "Acapulco," to strike out "and Matamoras" and insert "Paso del Norte, and Piedras Negras;" so as to make the clause read:

Mexico:
Consuls at Acapulco, Paso del Norte, and Piedras Negras.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "Salaries consular service," "Class VI," in line 327, after the words "consuls at," to strike out "Paso del Norte" and insert "Matamoras, Nogales;" so as to read:

Mexico:
Consuls at Matamoras, Nogales, and Tampico.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the head of "Schedule C, Class VII," at the beginning of line 370, to strike out the word "consuls" and insert "consul;" and in the same line, after the name "Guaymas," to strike out "Nuevo Laredo, and Piedras Negras;" so as to read:

Mexico:
Consul at Guaymas.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, after line 383, to insert:

And in the estimates for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1890, there shall be estimated for specifically, under classified consulates, all consulates and commercial agencies where the fees collected or compensation allowed for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1888, exceed $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the appropriations for "Allowance for clerks at consular offices," in line 401, after the word "consulates," to strike out "fifty thousand three" and insert "fifty-one thousand nine;" so as to make the clause read:

For allowance for clerks at consulates-general and consulates, $51,920, the sum to be allowed at each not to exceed the rate herein specified, as follows.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 418, before the name "Tunstall," to strike out the word "and;" after "Tunstall," to insert "Toronto and Brussels;" and in line 419, after the word "each," to strike out "twelve thousand" and insert "thirteen thousand six hundred;" so as to make the clause read:

Antwerp, Bordeaux, Calcutta, Colon, Dresden, Glasgow, Leipsic, Melbourne, Nuremberg, Panama, Port au Prince, Sheffield, Singapore, Sonneberg, Tunstall, Toronto, and Brussels, at $800 each, $13,600.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 421, after the name "Leith," to strike out "Matamoras" and insert "Nuevo Laredo;" so as to make the clause read:

Barmen, Belfast, Dundee, Halifax, Leith, Nuevo Laredo, and Victoria, at $640 each, $4,480.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Chief Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Have the committee further amendments to offer?

Mr. HALE. From the Committee on Appropriations there are no further amendments.

Mr. SHERMAN. I offer an amendment to come in on page 8. I have the assent of so many members of the Committee on Foreign Relations as are present to the amendment. It is now pending in that committee, and rather than postpone the bill by asking the Senate to let it go over until to-morrow I will submit the amendment now. I have no doubt it will meet with general approval.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. After line 165, on page 8, it is proposed to insert:

For salaries and expenses of a scientific commission of three persons, to consist of one officer of the Army or Navy competent for such service, a geologist and mineralogist, and a naturalist, to visit and report upon the commercial resources of the Upper Congo Basin, its products, its minerals, its vegetable wealth, the openings for American trade, and to collect such information on the subject of that country as shall be thought of interest to the United States, $25,000; and the President may fix the salaries and compensation of the members of this commission at such sum, not exceeding $6,000, as he may deem proper; and said commission shall expire on the 30th day of June, 1889.

Mr. HALE. Will the Secretary read again that portion of the amendment which defines the qualifications of the commissioners? I did not catch it as it was read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chief Clerk will read as requested.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

For salaries and expenses of a scientific commission of three persons, to consist of one officer of the Army or Navy competent for such service, a geologist and mineralogist, and a naturalist, to visit and report upon the commercial resources of the Upper Congo Basin,

Mr. HALE. The geologist and mineralogist are one, making three commissioners in all?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, three.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALL. On page 3, line 46, I move to strike out the words "Paraguay and Uruguay," and to insert after the word "San Domingo" in the forty-fourth line, the words:

For minister-resident and consul-general at Uruguay and Paraguay, $7,500.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL].

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the importance of the countries of Paraguay and Uruguay to the United States in the extension of its commerce requires, I think, that a minister resident should be there with an adequate salary. The incumbent of the office, Mr. John E. Bacon, is a man of very remarkable ability and adaptation to the performance of the duties of the office. It is within my knowledge that American interests there to a large amount and of great importance have received his attention and have been largely benefited by him; but I am informed by those who represent these interests that owing to the fact of his inadequate compensation and of the official character he has borne of a chargé d'affaires only, he has not been able to have that access to the different offices and departments of that government which would enable him efficiently to represent American interests there.

The committee have remedied this difficulty in part by making him a minister resident and consul-general, but they have left him with the small and inadequate salary of $5,000, which although he has a small family is not sufficient, within my knowledge, to pay the most economical expenses of living in a person required to maintain some degree of respectability of appearance and style of living in order not to be contrasted unfavorably with the representatives of other governments. A consul of France, or England, or Germany, is provided by his government with the means of making a better impression on the people and Government of Uruguay and Paraguay than the minister of the people of the United States.

If we will consider what those countries are and what their future relations to this country may be under a wise and intelligent policy in the consumption of American products, both of manufacture and agriculture, we will see the importance of the United States being represented there by a person of suitable position in the sense in which rank and position are regarded by that people, and with means sufficient to live in a style at least equal to that of the representatives of other governments.

I find the returns of Montevideo made to the Department of State by the consul at that place in 1881:

In a report made to the Department of State, dated February 23, 1881, I gave the exports to the United States from the River Plate, *i. e.*, all that part of South America, including Paraguay, Uruguay, and the Argentine Republic, drained by the Rio de la Plata, for the year 1880. In a subsequent report, dated February 28, 1882, I gave a similar statement for the year 1881. I now give a table of the shipments from the River Plate for the year ending December 31, 1882. As heretofore, it has been compiled from the official returns of exports declared at the consulates of Montevideo, Paysandu, Rosario, and Buenos Ayres, for the first three of which I am indebted to the courtesy of the United States consular officers at those places, respectively.

The table exhibits a shipment of $4,753,925.56 for the year 1882 to the United States from the River Plate through Montevideo, the consular residence of this minister. The productions of Paraguay are only estimated as a portion of this gross amount.

I find by further reference to these reports that it is one of the richest countries in the world. The exports of British cottons to Uruguay during the year 1880 were as follows: The total exports, value $3,081,000, an increase of over 16,600,000 yards of piece goods and of $1,392,000 on the exports of 1879. The exports of cotton goods from France to Uruguay amount to $225,000 per annum, the French goods therein amounting to $170,000. The exports of American cottons to Uruguay during the fiscal year 1880 were only $52,524. Our representative there writes as follows:

It can not be questioned that steam communication between New York and the River Plate, established and conducted by steamers judiciously constructed for the trade, with due regard to cost, carrying capacity, and passenger accommodation, would prove a success. Americans coming to this country from New York would certainly prefer to travel under the folds of an American flag, as would also citizens of the United States homeward bound. A "through line," it is believed, would also invite European travelers in this country to make their return voyage via the United States; but on inquiry they learn—Americans with mortification, Europeans with surprise—that no steamer carrying the American flag clears from any port of the River Plate. It would also greatly relieve the postal service of present intermediate hindrances and delays, and thus greatly promote not only commercial interests, but the social comfort for the people of both countries. There is, too, an outspoken preference here for the markets of the States. Farming implements and manufactured articles generally are highly appreciated, coming, as they say, from the mother Republic.

We find there a country with an area in one of these states of 45,000,000 acres of land, and with a production already very large and capable of being made twenty or thirty times (according to the reports of our officers there) its present capacity, with an inclination to favor American productions, and we have not made use of the advantages which we have in the favorable dispositions of those people. While other nations are represented there by men of capacity and with adequate salaries and with adequate rank, which, whatever we may say about it, carries its weight and influence with it and gives efficiency and power to our representatives, we have neglected our opportunity of improving our advantages, and our export trade to those countries has been steadily decreasing to the present time, while the import trade to the United States has been growing.

Mr. President, there came within my observation, as I stated, a very large American interest that had been created in those states, and which had been in the time of their troubles confiscated by the authority which was in power for some years. The American Government made a demand for compensation to the citizens of the United States who had lost their property by the proceedings of the arbitrary government of these states. That demand is still pending.

The present diplomatic representative of the United States, Mr. John Bacon, now a chargé d'affaires with a salary of only $5,000, in his dispatches to the State Department gave great satisfaction to all those who were connected with the American interests that had grown up under the commercial relations between the two countries; and the statement has been made to me by them that while they complimented him for his great ability and efficiency, and the services that he had rendered, he had been embarrassed all the time in the representation of these American interests and the protection of American citizens by the niggardly salary which he received, disabling him from extending the courtesies, and living in the style, not of extravagance, but of ordinary respectability and comfort of well-to-do persons in that country.

I was requested to ask of Congress the adoption of this amendment in behalf of this trade growing up between these states of Paraguay and Uruguay, which are to be very soon rich and populous states, having a delightful climate, one of the most fertile soils in the world, and a capacity for the most diversified agricultural productions, with a commerce now of between $3,000,000 and $4,000,000 with the United States, and differing from the Argentine Republic less than a million dollars in the total amount of their exports to this country in 1880.

While we give to the Argentine Republic a full minister with a large salary, and give to Corea a salary of $7,500 and a minister, and to various other countries which are absolutely insignificant as compared with the future of these two immensely rich states of South America, disposed to create a commerce between their people and ours, we give to them nothing but a chargé d'affaires, now a minister resident by the favorable provision of this bill, with a salary entirely inadequate to defray even his moderate expenses of living.

I therefore hope, Mr. President, that there will be no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL].

Mr. HALE. I feel constrained to make a point of order on this amendment.

Mr. CALL. I do not see how the Senator can make a point of order. The amendment was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and no objection was made on a point of order heretofore. There was no objection made in committee on that ground.

Mr. HALE. I was going to give my reasons for making the point of order.

The Committee on Appropriations considered this subject and rejected this proposition. The general statements that the Senator has made as to the extent of the trade with the La Plata region do not apply to Paraguay and Uruguay. Years ago, after Paraguay was obliterated in the sanguinary contest with Brazil, this mission was abolished entirely. Again it was thought desirable to have some diplomatic relation there, and Paraguay and Uruguay were joined and a chargé d'affaires at $5,000 was placed there. There has been no complaint from the State Department that this officer had not such magnitude of designation as was necessary to attend to what nominal duties come under his eye and charge there. They are very light, as I have occasion to know, because the place was at one time filled by an acquaintance and townsman of mine.

The commerce of the La Plata that in any way comes either in the charge of our minister or our consul there is such that the last year the fees collected at the consular office at Montevideo, which is the central point in Uruguay, were but $1,119.50. The truth is that our representative there has little or nothing to do. He may search ever so closely and he may go forth to stir up business for himself and he can find little or nothing to do, and there is no reason why he should be placed upon an equality with the minister at the Argentine Republic, who lives at Buenos Ayres, where there is a large trade, which is increasing, and where there is communication that needs the interposition of a minister.

We have a consul at Montevideo, and probably, strictly speaking, that is all that is needed there, but we give a minister at that point with $5,000 salary, and the committee did not deem it advisable to raise this salary.

As the amendment is subject to the point of order that it raises an appropriation in the bill, under these circumstances, it not being a new question, but having been submitted to the committee and voted down, I feel constrained to make the point of order.

Mr. CALL. I hope the Senator from Maine will withdraw the point of order when he considers how entirely wrong his statements are, and how entirely without any foundation in fact. I am very much surprised that the chairman of the subcommittee who reported this bill should have made such statements. He says that we collect only $1,100 in consular fees at Montevideo. What has that to do with it? Are our foreign affairs to be conducted upon propositions of that character?

Mr. HALE. The Senator has made a pretty broad statement that I do not think is customarily made on the floor of the Senate. Does he deny my statement that the consular fees are $1,119?

Mr. CALL. I do not, but I deny the inference drawn that that signifies that no great American interest is there.

Mr. HALE. What statement did I make which justifies the Senator in declaring that it is without ground?

Mr. CALL. The statement that there are no great American interests and no large commercial interests there.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Maine insist on his point of order?

Mr. HALE. I am willing that the point of order——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The point of order is not debatable.

Mr. HALE. I am willing that the Senator from Florida should go on and discuss it if he wants to do so. I do not withdraw the point of order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Debate may proceed by unanimous consent.

Mr. CALL. The committee has refused to consider it, and therefore the argument is that the Senate must refuse to consider it. I do not propose to discuss the point of order; it has been so often discussed. It seems when the Senate is disposed to consider a thing it is in order, and when it is not, following the lead of the committee, it is not in order; but, as I have said, the whole proposition of the Senator from Maine on this point is a mistake. I understand him to state that there are no American interests, either present or prospective, of sufficient importance in Uruguay and Paraguay or the river La Plata which require a representative—from the United States.

Mr. HALE. The Senator is entirely mistaken. I said nothing whatever about there being no interests of importance on the river La Plata. I say that when you come to Uruguay and Paraguay the business that in any way comes there under our minister or consul is so small that it does not justify the increase of the salary of the minister.

Mr. CALL. And you read the receipt of $1,100 fees by the consul.

Mr. HALE. That applies to the consulate at Montevideo. I do not go into the question. I, in fact, stated that the case of the Argentine Republic is entirely different. There we have a minister who is made an envoy extraordinary. We have a consul, and we have other Government officers there, because there is something there to foster. I was confining my remarks to this particular region.

Mr. CALL. You have said that at Uruguay and Paraguay American interests needed no representation. You contrasted these with the Argentine Republic. Now I propose to show that the interest at Uruguay and Paraguay is very nearly equal to that at the Argentine Republic, and that there is exactly the same necessity for a minister and a representative in those countries that there is at the Argentine Republic. That is the point I make. This arrangement by the Committee on Appropriations for the development of American interests and their representative abroad has nothing whatever in point of fact to justify it. Now let us see.

In the consular report, made on the 23d of February, 1881, we find the following:

Shipments from the River Plate to the United States during the year 1880.

Montevideo.	Paysandor.	Buenos Ayres.	Rosario.

We find from Montevideo $5,456,891.62 of total value. We find from Buenos Ayres $5,994,169.07, being a difference between Montevideo and Buenos Ayres of $500,000 in round numbers.

What justification is there, when the commerce of this country in productions imported from Uruguay and Paraguay to the United States is very nearly equal to that of the Argentine Republic, for giving an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to that country and sending to Uruguay and Paraguay, as the Senator says, no representative whatever? It is true it is one of the regions recently opened to American immigration, enterprise, manufacture, and investment; and they exhibit the most favorable disposition towards our people and our productions under the influence of our present able and accomplished diplomatic representative there. It was at one time made a desolation by arbitrary, cruel usurpation and tyranny, but they are recovering from it under institutions like our own. There are Americans resident there, and with its fertile soil and ingenious people it promises a commerce for which we pay annually five million four hundred-odd thousand dollars, nearly the same amount that we pay the Argentine Republic in money and exports, while we export to Uruguay and Paraguay in return little or nothing.

United States interests require protection by a representative of our Government there. Our people have so requested, and the Department of State has recommended $10,000 for two ministers—one to Paraguay and one to Uruguay—but I think the evidence shows that it will be much better to give this one able and accomplished minister, who has done so much and made so favorable an impression, $7,500, instead of $10,000 for two representatives asked for by the Department of State.

Then, again, why should we send representatives anywhere? Of what use are they? Because Americans are going there and commerce always seeks extension and they want protection. They want this Government visibly and ably represented there. They want some person armed with the authority, the dignity, and the power of the Government, and with the right of access to the foreign government to protect them and their business interests, or how can they trade? Enterprising people in my own State from the ports of the Gulf are seeking trade towards and in Central American and South American ports.

We have lines of steamers established by Northern gentlemen, Mr. H. B. Plant and his associates, and we have brave and hardy Southern sailors from Pensacola to Key West—brave and enterprising as any in the world—trading in their small vessels, who are increasing our trade between the Gulf ports and these countries, and they desire that we should have a representative there; and are we to sit still here with bills like this affording no adequate support for our foreign representatives, with niggardly salaries, forbidding men of character and enterprise to continue to represent and forward this promise of a great commerce, and really disgracing and discouraging the American business men who seek to carry their money and their enterprise into these ports. This is a case in point which has come within my observation from people in my own part of the country, men with money, and brave and hardy sailors without money, who are building up trade and commerce with that country. I know the facts. They are certified by the statements in consular reports here, the last that we have. These show that as between these two fertile states, with so large an area of unoccupied soil, having gone through the throes of revolution, American and European intercourse is developing their great resources and is making their trade valuable and of great promise. They desire increased trade and commercial relations with our people. Every year they increase their business largely and they are nearly equal in every respect to the Argentine Republic, to which we give an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary at a salary of $10,000 a year.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Florida I will not say, as he did, was making a false statement, but he was mistaken in the fact.

Mr. CALL. I never used such language as saying that a Senator made a false statement.

Mr. HALE. We do not give the minister at the Argentine Republic $10,000; we only give him $7,500. This is not a question which ought to detain the Senate at all, whether the United States should have any representative with a fitting and proper rank applied to him in Uruguay and Paraguay. He already stands with the same rank as a minister resident under this bill with the ministers to Denmark, Hayti, Portugal, Bolivia, Siam, and Switzerland, $5,000. The only question is whether that shall be raised, as reported in the bill, to $7,500. I do not think that is justified. I do not think the situation justifies it. I do not go back to 1881 to read reports of that year. The last report given out for the year 1887 shows all the business that came under the control of our consul there to have been such that the fees only amounted to $1,119 and some odd cents. That is the whole question, whether this position shall be raised in salary above what is reported in the bill. Under the facts, I feel constrained to make the point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. I ask unanimous consent to make a statement in connection with the point of order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BUTLER. There are many incongruities in the diplomatic service, it seems to me, and many irregularities in the pay of the diplomatic agents of this Government abroad. It comes within my knowledge that this official at Montevideo is very inadequately paid. It is getting to be an extremely important diplomatic office. The tendency is to enlarge the trade and commerce with the country, and the present diplomatic officer of the United States has been instrumental in creating a favorable impression on the people, and I trust that his pay will be something like equal to the responsibilities of the position he occupies. His position has been changed in this bill from chargé d'affaires to minister resident and consul-general, with a salary of $5,000. I find in the same bill an amendment offered by the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate:

Minister resident in Hawaiian Islands, $7,500.
Minister resident and consul-general in Corea, $7,500.

Then I find in the bill:

Envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary to the Argentine Republic, the United States of Colombia, Turkey, Belgium, Netherlands, Sweden and Norway, and Venezuela, at $7,500 each.

It seems to me that the countries of Paraguay and Uruguay are co-

tainly as important in any aspect of the question, whether commercial or otherwise, to the United States as some of those I have just mentioned, and I can not understand, I confess, why it is that the minister resident at the Hawaiian Islands should be given $7,500 salary, and the minister resident and consul-general at Corea $7,500, and the minister resident to Uruguay and Paraguay only $5,000. Corea is almost *terra incognita*. It is of very recent date that the outside world has had any transaction whatever with the Corean Islands. I can not for the life of me see the consistency or the wisdom or the propriety of giving the resident minister and consul-general to Paraguay and Uruguay $5,000, and giving those others $7,500. The city of Montevideo is one of the most expensive cities for residence certainly in South America, and the salary is entirely inadequate for the support of the minister there in anything like a respectable position in the position he occupies. I trust, therefore, that the Senator from Maine will withdraw the point of order and permit the minister at Uruguay and Paraguay to be paid as similar officers to the Hawaiian Islands and to Corea and the Netherlands, and Sweden and Norway, and Venezuela.

I see that these officials are graded from the four first-class missions at $17,500 each to the missions to Austria, Brazil, China, Italy, Japan, Spain, and Mexico at $12,000 each; and then come Chili and Peru at $10,000; Costa Rica, Honduras, Nicaragua, and San Salvador at $10,000. And yet it is proposed to pay the minister resident at Uruguay and Paraguay but $5,000.

I take it for granted, of course, if the point of order is insisted upon it is fatal to this amendment. It will be remembered that at the last session of Congress, when it was proposed to make this salary $7,500, the point of order was raised then; but I trust my friend from Maine will not insist on the point of order.

Mr. HALE. If I had my way, if this was left in accordance with the real needs of a minister there, I would strike it out entirely. There is no reason in the world why this minister should receive any more than the minister to Bolivia, Denmark, Hayti, Portugal, Siam, or Switzerland. It is not to be compared with the mission to the Hawaiian Islands. Our relations with that people are delicate, liable at any time to involve the whole question of annexation, a people that is sensitive about the representatives that are sent there. Everybody for years has understood that at the Sandwich Islands it was proper that we should keep an important minister, an able man, in view of what may arise at any time involving questions there. There are no such questions in relation to Paraguay and Uruguay.

Perhaps it is because I have not the same personal interest in this man who is there that the Senator from South Carolina and the Senator from Florida have that it follows that I do not believe his place is of such extravagant importance. There is not, in my judgment, any need of a minister there at all; but I am willing that he should remain at $5,000. I am not willing for one that he should remain there with any more.

Mr. BUTLER. It is not a question about personal interest in regard to the incumbent of the place; but I am conscientious and clear in my belief that he is inadequately paid. I think the Senator from Maine belittles the importance of the post. I think he is entirely misinformed geographically and commercially.

Mr. HALE. It is a curious thing that until the change was made and the present minister went down there nobody ever heard of the importance of this place and the necessity of increasing his salary. Just as soon as a new man gets in he can not wait until the old man is put out; he not only wants to have the place with the old salary, but he wants the salary increased, wants more money, wants to get more out of the Treasury. We have had a minister there for years who was content with $5,000, and nobody was hurt when the place was abolished. But now there is a new man in who has gone down there in hot haste, turning the old man out, and his salary must be raised. I am opposed to it not only on the point of order, but as a matter of principle.

Mr. BUTLER. The old man was not turned out, and I do not think the present minister ought to be responsible for the sins of somebody else. The new man has been there now for two years, and I take it that, like everybody else, he wants to do the best he can. But apart from that I really and sincerely think he is inadequately paid. He has been there as chargé d'affaires up to this time, and the salary has been $5,000. Now the committee have raised him to a minister resident. They have thought the position of sufficient importance to make him minister resident and consul-general, and yet the Senator says the post might be abolished.

Mr. HALE. That was done on the request of his friends, because it would give him a better chance to get audience with whatever government there is there. It was done as a matter of favor to him, that he might have the title of minister resident, so that he should not have to get a special dispensation for an audience with a minister of foreign affairs, if there is any such officer in this place. But now, because that has been done as a matter of favor to increase his accommodation, not in any way adding a penny to his expenses, it is argued from that that he ought to have the increased salary.

The committee would have done better to have left him where he was, but it was willing to make him minister resident as is our representative to Portugal, to Siam, and to Bolivia, and other countries in order to give him a chance to see "the powers that be" and not have to get a dispensation in order to have a personal interview; but it does not add a cent to his expenses.

Mr. BUTLER. I take it for granted that this very additional opportunity he has to receive this special dispensation from somebody—I do not know who; I did not know these things had to be disbursed by special dispensation, if I may use the expression, but if that be true and he now has access within a circle to the presence of royalty, as he has to wear royal robes, etc., I take it for granted his expenses are increased.

Mr. HALE. He could get there before, but he had to go a roundabout way. This carries him straight.

Mr. BUTLER. Then it would require, as a matter of course, some additional expense to buy these royal robes and so on.

Mr. HALE. No. The Senator must know that our ministers abroad, unlike those of other countries, do not wear royal robes. That was settled years ago. They appear in a very plain, modest, and nonpicturesque garb; and whether they are chargés d'affaires, ministers resident, or of the higher grade of envoys extraordinary and ministers plenipotentiary, they wear the same clothes exactly and are not allowed to wear royal robes. That is a matter fixed by regulation, and, for aught I know, by statute.

Mr. BUTLER. I am aware of that, but I had supposed that by reason of what the Senator from Maine said some additional paraphernalia was necessary in order to get into the presence of royalty.

Mr. HALE. No.

Mr. BUTLER. I did not know but that that might be true, and hence I made the suggestion of additional expenses. It is very true that our ministers abroad find it very difficult to distinguish themselves from the head-waiter of a hotel or of a royal house. I have no doubt about that. They go in very simple garb; they are republicans. I have no quarrel to make with them on that account; but there are certain expenses which it seems have to be incurred by this gentleman, and which ought to be allowed by the Government.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Maine withdraw the point of order?

Mr. HALE. I have no objection to the Senator proceeding.

Mr. MORGAN. I had hoped that opportunity would be furnished to the Committee on Foreign Relations to examine this bill before it was brought before the Senate for action. The bill was brought in here from the House of Representatives on the 22d of May, which was on a Tuesday, when it was ordered to be printed and referred to the Committee on Appropriations. That was two weeks ago to-day. Since that time, owing to the absence of Senators, we have not been able to have a quorum of the Committee on Foreign Relations; in fact there has been no meeting of the committee since that time and no quorum attending.

I desired to bring up before that committee the subject of our diplomatic relations with the South American states. We have had the matter before the committee during the present session of Congress, and reported a bill, which has become a law, providing for a conference with the South American and Central American states, I believe next spring, for the purpose of looking over the general field of our relations, monetary and commercial, and political as well, and arriving or attempting to arrive at some general line of policy by which the intercourse and trade between the United States and the Central and South American states may be increased. The proposition which is made here to increase the salary of the minister resident to Uruguay and Paraguay is in that direction, and it is really a proper part of that movement.

I understand—I am perhaps not very accurately informed about it—that the estimates sent in by the Secretary of State were for two missions, one to Uruguay and the other to Paraguay, at $5,000 each. I ask the Senator from Maine if I am correct about that.

Mr. HALE. There have been several estimates of that kind.

Mr. MORGAN. Sent in at the present session?

Mr. HALE. There are several estimates for increasing missions and salaries. None of them were incorporated in the House bill.

Mr. MORGAN. That does not affect the question of order. The House bill combines the two missions into one, and I take it that, equitably at least, the estimate of $10,000 for the two missions would cover $7,500 when they are consolidated and put into one mission, and the point of order probably would not be well taken if that be true.

Mr. HALE. There has been no consolidation of these missions in this bill. The law at present gives a joint mission to Uruguay and Paraguay, and the House committee have not consolidated them in this bill. That has been the law for some time. I stated that the law at one time abolished entirely and then restored the joint mission to this place, with a chargé d'affaires at $5,000.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. On what proposition does the Senator make the point of order?

Mr. HALE. The proposition of increasing the salary.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. On what provision of the rule?

Mr. HALE. It increases the appropriation as reported in the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator insist on the point of order because it has not been reported by the committee?

Mr. HALE. I make the point of order that it does increase an appropriation.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It still might be in order.

Mr. HALE. It is a fact that it has not been reported by the committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It still might be in order although it increases an appropriation.

Mr. HALE. Not unless the committee reported it.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If estimated for by the head of a Department.

Mr. HALE. But there is no estimate for increasing this salary.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair desires to be informed in order that he may know what division of the rule the Senator from Maine relies upon in making his point of order.

Mr. HALE. There is no recommendation either of the Department or of the committee that the salary of this minister be raised.

Mr. MORGAN. I was under a misapprehension about the form in which this estimate came here. The Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] informs me that there is an estimate here for a salary of $10,000 for a minister to Uruguay and Paraguay sent in by the State Department.

Mr. HALE. There is an estimate for two ministers at $5,000 each, but there is no estimate for raising the joint mission. That would involve another question, as of course the Chair sees.

Mr. MORGAN. There seems to be a great deal of confusion about that. I do not understand now that there are two ministers estimated for by the Secretary of State, one to Uruguay and the other to Paraguay.

Mr. HALE. That is precisely what the Department estimate for.

Mr. MORGAN. If that is the state of the case, and the House and the Senate conclude that it is better to hold to the old arrangement, and have the Government of the United States represented by one minister to both these governments, then I say again, equitably, if not technically, the estimate for $10,000 would cover the $7,500 provided for in the amendment, the House and Senate disagreeing with the Secretary of State as to the form of the mission merely, a saving of $2,500 by cutting down his estimate.

It seems to me that the point of order comes in rather a peculiar shape. I have never seen it before in the Senate in a shape like this.

I have not any authority to speak for the Committee on Foreign Relations, but knowing the views of that committee, as I think I do, on questions of this kind, particularly in reference to the South American missions, I feel very confident that we should have their recommendation, their very earnest recommendation, for the raising of this minister resident to that sort of dignity and that sort of position which is common to all ministers representing the United States in South American States, none of whom gets less than $7,500, except the minister to Paraguay and Uruguay. It would be a very great mistake if we should fail to recognize the growing prosperity of the countries along La Plata River, that pour their tribute of wealth now with such wonderful rapidity into the Bay of Montevideo. That is a port receiving the chief products of both these republics, lying one, I believe, on one side and one on the other of this great river.

There is not any part of the civilized world that now excels the countries occupied by the Argentine Republic and Urnguay and Paraguay in progress and development of every kind and character. There is no country where the German and English Governments seek commerce with greater avidity than they do in that portion of South America. The capacity of that region for growing stock of every description—horses, cattle, and sheep—is really unparalleled. It is becoming also a very fertile country in the cereals. They are exporting wheat now from that region to Buenos Ayres and from Buenos Ayres to Rio de Janeiro and to various other ports of South America, of which we have had heretofore almost exclusive control as to flour.

The truth is that the resources of that country are unparalleled. It is said to be a country with elevated table-land, very much resembling that portion of the United States which covers the area between the lakes and the northern boundary of our country, extending from the Atlantic Ocean toward the Mississippi River, a region of unexampled fertility, into which they are introducing a very large amount of agricultural machinery from the United States. We happen to excel in that branch of manufactures, and the people throughout that whole region of the world are taking our products in the way of agricultural machinery very rapidly, and exchanging for them hides, tallows, and other productions of that part of the earth.

The latest statistics I have been able to obtain in regard to Uruguay and Paraguay are found in the "Statesman's Year Book" for 1887. I have seen a later and very much better account written by some gentleman in Harper's Magazine, which is a very excellent article. I forget his name, but he is a gentleman well known to many persons. I extract from this Statesman's Year Book some data in regard to the value of that country. Speaking of Paraguay, it is said—

An enumeration made by the government in 1857 showed the population to number 1,337,439 souls.

It must be twice or perhaps three times that number now, for the influx of population by immigration has been very great in all that section of country.

The chief article of foreign commerce of Paraguay is the *yerba maté*, or Paraguayan tea, made of the leaves of the *Ilex Paraguayensis* tree, dried and reduced to powder, which are extensively consumed in all the States of South America. The value of this export in 1881 was 910,925 pesos; in 1882, 964,800 pesos, and in 1884, 729,351 pesos; the other chief export being tobacco, in 1881, 658,650 pesos; in 1882, 410,380, and in 1884, 248,900 pesos. The total exports in 1881 amounted to 1,928,545 pesos, in 1882 to 1,650,676 pesos, in 1883 to 1,766,457 pesos, and in 1884 to 1,572,297 pesos. In 1881 the imports were valued at 1,294,465 pesos, in 1882 at 1,320,125 pesos, in 1883 at 953,076 pesos, and in 1884 at 1,148,120 pesos. The chief imports are textiles, valued at 596,564 pesos in 1884, 35 per cent., from Great Britain; foods and drinks, 384,524 pesos. About 48 per cent. of the total imports come from Britain.

That is one of these two countries to which we are sending this minister. I will refer now to some statistics of the other country, Uruguay. The imports in 1885 of Uruguay were $25,275,476 and the exports $25,253,000. Of the total Great Britain exported to Uruguay $7,381,860 in value, while the United States exported to that country $2,045,107. The imports of Great Britain from Uruguay during that year were $4,885,456, and of the United States $4,370,591.

The principal articles of export are animals, 762,000 pesos, in 1885; preserved meat and extract, 4,960,000 pesos; skins and hides, 7,760,000 pesos; tallow, 2,215,000 pesos; wool, 7,338,000 pesos. The total export of animal products (besides live animals) in 1885 is valued at 23,462,518 pesos, and of agricultural products 633,797 pesos. Nearly the whole of the exports and imports of the Republic pass through Montevideo, the capital, at the mouth of the Rio de la Plata.

I need not go any further to present statistics, although our own statistical tables are important to be considered in this connection; but enough appears from what I have already read to show that we have a very important traffic that we ought to be cultivating with Uruguay and Paraguay.

I understand one of the best ways of arriving at it is, first of all, to send an honorable representative in the diplomatic branch to those governments whose trade and commerce we desire to cultivate; and in order to have a man of proper character, and to have him properly respected and in proper position, he ought to have a salary sufficient, at least, to enable him to live with some degree of comfort.

Now, let me ask why it is that we should make a discrimination in the salary of our minister to Uruguay and Paraguay, as between those countries, two of which are combined in this mission, and the other republics of South America. Buenos Ayres lies just across the bay from Montevideo, perhaps 150 or 200 miles, and across a bay that is almost entirely landlocked. The two places have a large correspondence in commerce. The number of ships entering the port of Montevideo in 1885 is stated as follows:

There entered at the port of Montevideo in 1885 1,249 foreign vessels of 1,222,962 tons, and cleared 1,161 vessels of 1,221,223 tons; over 60 per cent. of the tonnage was British. In the river and coasting trade there entered 3,326 vessels of 1,163,283 tons, and cleared 3,419 vessels of 1,189,434 tons.

There were railways of a total length of 271 English miles open for traffic in 1885. The telegraphic lines in operation at the end of June, 1883, were of a total length of 1,405 English miles, including 295 miles of coast cables.

The post-office carried 3,147,370 letters, 28,811 post-cards, and 9,027,200 samples and printed papers in the year 1885. The receipts of the post-office in recent years were insufficient to cover the expenditure.

These statements show a very active state of business, and the facts are not given here fully because that country is outgrowing the records of the past with great rapidity. What would measure the prosperity of that country in 1885 would scarcely be accepted as a fair measure of its prosperity in 1888, and we ought to progress in the means through which we communicate with that country somewhat in a parallel movement with the progress of the country itself.

Mr. TELLER. If the Senator will allow me, I should like to suggest to him, speaking of the progress of this section, particularly of Uruguay, that the recent improvement there, as shown by the latest financial statements from Europe, is that the value of their lands, their banking capital, and all that, is three times what it was in 1885.

Mr. MORGAN. I have no doubt about that, and I was about to observe that the city of Montevideo, in which this minister resides, is a health resort. It is a place to which the people of Buenos Ayres, who are very rich and have an enormous commerce extending with wonderful progress and rapidity—the people of Buenos Ayres, where the location is not quite so healthy and pleasant as at Montevideo, go up there on a line of steamers which run between the two cities in a very few hours and spend their winter season (which is our summer season) at this place of refreshment and resort, bringing to Montevideo a very enlightened and splendid population. I doubt, sir, if you can find on the Atlantic coast of this country, outside of our great cities, a population that is superior to that which assembles in Buenos Ayres and Montevideo. If we have a minister there at all, that man ought to be able to live in something of a style becoming the fact of his being the minister resident and consul-general of the United States. This Government is not so poor that it can not afford to honor a man who is sent to a country like this with which we have such growing commercial connection, by giving to him a compensation the equal at least of that of our representatives to other South American republics. This is a narrow piece of legislation, it is not worthy of the condition of this country, and I am quite satisfied that if the Committee on Foreign Relations had had an opportunity to express themselves on this question, which they have not had, they would present very strong reasons to the Senate why this salary ought to be increased at least to $7,500 a year. The bill puts it at $5,000 a year, every other South American mission being $7,500.

Mr. HALE. The ministers resident at Bolivia, Denmark, and Hayti receive $5,000. Bolivia is in South America.

Mr. MORGAN. I ought to have excepted Bolivia; I remember now that mission is $5,000. I do not know the gentleman who is there. I know nothing about him. I hope he is a good representative. He ought to be if he is not, because he is representing us at a very interesting country. He is brought into contact with prospects that the merchants and agriculturists and manufacturers of this country must look to with considerable interest because of the market which is there afforded to our people for productions of every kind.

I may say here that if there is one view of American policy in which I feel more interest than I do in all the balance so far as it regards foreign intercourse, it is that we shall cultivate the most amicable and intimate commercial relations with the people of South America. That is the kitchen-garden of the United States. In almost the entire area of South America, except the particular country about which I am now speaking, the products are not those which are made in this part of the hemisphere. Our products are naturally interchangeable with their productions, and commerce with South America can be carried on with a less use of money for the purpose of paying balances than with any other countries that we trade with at all. It is very largely a barter trade, almost exclusively a barter trade, and we should have in that an advantage which is, I think, very great in all commercial transactions. I will illustrate with the case of Cuba. We take from Cuba, I believe, about $80,000,000 of sugar, and we send to Cuba, I will say, $15,000,000—I believe not exceeding that—of our own productions. The difference of course between what we take from them in sugar and send to them in our products must be settled in money. It is a very great drain upon the finances of any country to have money circulating back and forth to pay the balances between us and Cuba. If by some commercial arrangement we could interchange productions with Cuba, I should say that that would be very greatly to the advantage of the people of the United States, and that this money that goes abroad to that island for the purpose of paying balances would be employed here in the activities of industry, and it would be something of immense value to our people if this arrangement could be made, or some arrangement of the kind.

Well, we are tending in that direction. We are all anxious, I know, to get the trade of South America. More than that, these people in South America have with heroic purpose adhered to the system of government established by the United States, which overturned the traditional ideas and affections of every Spanish descendant in the world, for if there is a natural-born monarchist that man is a Spaniard. But these people accepted our example, commencing as far back as 1822 or 1824, have spread with their independence the republican system of confederated states, with a national union all over the whole continent of South America excepting Brazil and a few possessions that mainly belong to France, Germany, and Great Britain, a very small area indeed.

They have had very great difficulties, very great struggles to overcome their own prejudices against free constitutional government. They have also been loaded down there by constitutional provisions which fastened upon them a fixed church polity, while we in the South had a constitutional provision that fastened on this country a slave policy. They have been warring against it year after year, and their efforts to throw it off have been really heroic and entitled to the commendation certainly of all the people of the United States. They have held on to this little flickering light of constitutional liberty in the midst of storms and darkness, and when a people with less heroism and less determination would have given up their purpose and relinquished it and lapsed back under the rule of some great monarch or king, who would have made the hidalgos rich; but, as I said before, these people have held on to their ideas of American constitutional liberty.

My sympathies for these people are very much akin with that sort of sentiment which animated our people in the years 1820 to 1825, when we came forward and upheld the hands of Bolivar and other great South American patriots and statesmen and soldiers, and enabled these people to plant upon that hemisphere in the South two very important things—one, republican institutions organized under constitutional forms of government, and the other the Christian religion. So I feel all the time as if I were willing to spend some money, as if I were willing to take a step in advance, although it might not be strengthened perhaps by the most practical sort of economy in every instance, in order to encourage and meet these people in their efforts to build up the South American states. I shall welcome them to Washington City with perfect joy when they come here next year to participate with us in our centennial anniversary of the establishment of the Constitution of the United States, which is the foundation after all of their own governments, and I shall be delighted if that shall be the occasion when more liberal views shall pervade all these states and unite much more closely in commerce and every other way, in all the national affections if we may call them such, which ought to characterize the association of republics with each other.

I hope the Senator from Maine will not take the view that the question in this case is so narrow a one that it only relates to the advancement of some gentleman, whom I do not know, from a smaller to a higher salary. If I knew him he might not be a worthy man; but being the representative of my country in the states of Paraguay and Uruguay, and at the great capital of Montevideo, amongst that enlightened and splendid population, I should still insist that he should have out of the Government of the United States a somewhat decent living to maintain the state and dignity of his mission at that very important point.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I have no question as to the decision of the point of order by the Chair, but as the discussion has run largely into the general features of this amendment I want to make a brief reply to the Senator from Alabama.

There never is a time in the Senate when it is not pleasant to listen to that Senator. His general information on all subjects that he investigates—and he investigates almost every subject that comes up here—makes his remarks and his views on general subjects of importance and well worthy of consideration; and listening to him now as he brings up the question of encouraging South American trade and of the growth of our trade with those countries, if it were not for the question whether that argument applied to this particular case nobody would have any dispute with him. I am as much in favor of encouraging trade with the South American Republics where it is possible to increase it, as any member of this body. I have always voted and spoken in that direction and taken great interest in the subject-matter. But the question of increasing South American trade is not involved in the question which now arises on the point of order whether the Senate can increase the salary already fixed by law of the minister to Paraguay and Uruguay.

A few facts which I get from the last report of the Treasury Department on the commerce and navigation of the United States, make a complete answer to what has been said by the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Florida as to the increase of our trade with these countries, and they show a distinction that I have made all the while between the Argentine Republic, equally watered, fed, and dependent upon the La Plata River with Paraguay and Uruguay. The two are entirely distinct.

This report shows that the trade by importation from Uruguay with this country has decreased from 1882 to 1887 from $6,800,000 to $2,400,000, and it is running smaller and smaller all the time. These are the imports that we receive from that country; I am coming later to the exports. So that instead of the general view which has been urged here that it is increasing—the Senator from Alabama says you can not tell anything about what there was a few years ago, because it is very much more now—it is precisely the reverse in this case. Our imports from there have run down from almost $7,000,000 to less than two millions and a half. Now, turn to the exports. Our exports in the last six years to the Argentine Republic, represented largely by Buenos Ayres, below the bay, have increased from $2,258,000 to $5,600,000, while those to Uruguay have decreased from $1,536,000 to $1,300,000, and the trade with Paraguay, which is the other country that is represented by this mission, is so insignificant that it is included in "all other countries in South America," the aggregate of which embraces only $106,000, having run down from $700,000 in 1882 to $106,000 now.

Mr. MORGAN. Does the Senator refer to the productions of that country?

Mr. HALE. I refer to our exports and our imports.

Mr. MORGAN. I know that there has been a falling off unquestionably.

Mr. HALE. But it has not been falling off with the Argentine Republic. Our exports to that country have increased from two million and odd up to nearly $6,000,000. The truth is that the trade we have, or are likely to have, is not with these two countries. The general considerations that apply do not apply to Uruguay and Paraguay any more than do the considerations that the Senator last mentioned, that republican institutions have been planted in South America, and that it is our duty to nurse them. There never was a greater violation of the whole republican system, never a greater despotism existed on either continent than existed in Paraguay when she was almost struck from the face of the earth as a nation in the Brazilian contest. It was a dictatorship without limit and had been so for years. The planting of republican institutions, sowing the seed and encouraging it, watering it, increasing it, does not apply to these countries. Paraguay and Uruguay do not stand to-day with the United States on that mark, either by sympathy or by traffic, as compared with the other South American states.

I might go on and amplify upon this and show that the general considerations urged by the Senator do not apply here. I only give the figures as shown by the official reports submitted to us by the Secretary of the Treasury in the annual report on commerce and navigation for the very last year that has been reported to us.

Mr. MORGAN. I suppose the Senator, however, may know that Montevideo is situated on the shores of the mouth of the river La Plata, and we have very little intercourse by steamer.

Mr. HALE. There is a large distance between Buenos Ayres and Montevideo. Montevideo lies more directly at the mouth of the river, and Buenos Ayres lies across below on the bay. The two countries are entirely different. The Argentine Republic is the growing republic of the South.

Mr. MORGAN. They are about 150 miles apart, right across the

mouth of the river; as the two countries are on the opposite sides of the river, the Argentine Republic and Uruguay and Paraguay being on the opposite sides of the same river. I want to call the Senator's attention to this fact, that the apparent falling away in our commerce with Montevideo is due in a considerable degree, as I am informed, to the fact that our intercourse with that part of the world through the vessels that we have which go there is directly with Buenos Ayres, and the commerce that is really absorbed in Uruguay and Paraguay is credited to Buenos Ayres, so that there is shown a very large increase at Buenos Ayres, while at Montevideo there is a falling away. The truth is that our actual interchange of commodities with Paraguay and Uruguay has been increasing for the last three or four years; otherwise, gentlemen familiar with the country are very incorrect in their statements.

Mr. TELLER. I do not know the minister to either of these countries by name, and I never did know personally any minister that ever was there, and I do not expect to have any personal interest in any minister to South America. In fact, I never did have any personal acquaintance, I believe, with any man that went to South America as a minister of the United States; but I think it is a mistake to suppose that we can afford to let go a country like this, growing as it is more rapidly perhaps to-day than any other portion of South America, especially Uruguay I now speak of having made progress in the last two or three years that is phenomenal and astonishing to everybody, and treat it as a matter of no concern in its commerce and its interests and its welfare and its connection with us.

The Senator from Maine says we are losing some trade. I have not looked up the statements very carefully, but I find that in 1887 the exports were $1,393,000. I have before me the Statesman's Year Book, published in England, and from that it appears that our exports to that country were 1,246,000 pesos. A peso is nearly a dollar—96½ cents—which may be considered practically a dollar. Their exports to this country were something over twice that amount. They furnish, as stated by the Senator from Alabama, very many things that we desire. These South American regions are large producers of cattle, and we have purchased from them a very large amount of hides and a considerable amount of wool within the last few years. We have a great many things that they desire. To-day 48 per cent. of all they buy they buy from Great Britain. Sixty per cent. of all the tonnage that goes into their ports goes from Great Britain, and I find that of all that went into Montevideo 60 per cent. of the tonnage that enters the port is British tonnage, and 48 per cent. of all they buy is of British goods, and they buy of Great Britain much more than they sell to Great Britain. The balance of trade is the other way. There is no reason why we should not have trade with these South American countries, and why we should not have a considerable amount of trade, excepting the fact that we have neglected to secure it.

A few years ago we sent a commission to South America for the purpose of determining what we could do, what steps could be taken to bring us in closer commercial relations with those countries. That commission reported. The report is a very valuable one, and yet since that report was made there has been practically no effort at all made by the Government to take advantage of the information furnished. We have not increased our diplomatic relations with them in any shape that I know of, and without meaning to say anything about the men who have gone there, because, as I say, I do not know them and presume that they are all right, we have not sent the class of men we should have sent, because we have not paid the proper salaries that would induce the proper class of men to desire these places. Every consul that we send to South America ought to be the agent of the manufacturers and producers of this country. There ought to be a close relation with every South American and Central American nation. If there had been attention directed to this and an effort had been made, we might have made our silver dollar the silver dollar of every one of those South American republics without difficulty and without trouble. They are a silver-using people, producing but little themselves of that metal, and would have been glad to have this arrangement with us for trade and commerce and for the interchange of money in that way.

Mr. President, I find on the same page of this bill—

Minister resident and consul-general to Greece, Roumania, and Servia, $6,500.

Will the Senator who has the bill in charge, or anybody else, tell me what our trade with Greece is, or what our trade with Roumania or Servia is, or what our relations are or are likely to be with those countries, that we require $6,500 there to pay the agent of the Government, while $5,000 is sufficient at this place? I doubt whether any man in the Senate can give me a reason why the consul-general to Greece, Roumania, and Servia should get $6,500, while in these South American countries he gets $5,000. Nobody expects to create any traffic, and we have no such relations with those countries as requires so much. There is no reason why there should be this difference—why the one should be paid $5,000 and the other $6,500.

Mr. HALE. The Senator will allow me a word. I do not want to make a speech in the midst of his.

Mr. TELLER. That might help mine.

Mr. HALE. All that the Senator says about increasing trade is entirely true. It never has been said so well as he is saying it now; but it has been gone over repeatedly before. I have had the honor of making speeches going into this whole question; but trade is not going to be built up by increasing the salaries of ministers. They have very little to do with trade. The consuls have to deal with trade, and many Senators believe that the ministers should be abolished and the consular feature advanced. Ministers have nothing to do with trade. We shall never get any trade with these countries until we take hold of other subjects besides increasing the salaries of ministers. We have got to do what other nations have done; we have got to give subsidies and aids to commercial lines, mercantile ventures, so that we may build up a trade, as Great Britain and France and Germany build up their trade. It is not in any way, it is not even remotely, connected with the question of our diplomatic establishment. So the questions which the Senator asks are not pertinent to the consideration of the important subject he has in mind.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator from Colorado will yield to me a moment. The designation of this officer is "minister resident and consul-general."

Mr. HALE. That never has been so until the present time. There is no necessity of his being a consul-general. He has nothing to do with that. It is put on, and I shall move to strike it off if it be necessary.

Mr. BUTLER. It is there.

Mr. HALE. We have a consul there who attends to all the consular duties connected with trade.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator is mistaken. Governments like Uruguay and Paraguay of course have assigned to them a consul-general in addition to the local consul at Montevideo.

Mr. HALE. They never have had.

Mr. BUTLER. This gentleman as chargé d'affaires had charge of the diplomatic as well as the consular and business part of the mission, and so he has now.

Mr. HALE. He had charge of the diplomatic part, but not the consular part.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, yes, he has.

Mr. TELLER. I do not agree with the Senator from Maine that the ministers have nothing to do with trade. I do not understand, of course, that a minister is the agent of our manufacturers or is allowed to be; but in establishing good relations between the countries he is invaluable. Why do we keep ministers to these countries if they are of no advantage? We want to have ministers there who have skill and ability and who can live in such a way as will give them standing in the community to which they are accredited, in order to bring to us the good-will, the respect of these nations. It is their duty to oversee and to some extent direct the consuls, to bring about the direct results of missions of this kind in the way of trade.

The trade of this South American country is not very valuable; it is worth to us somewhere in the neighborhood of $2,750,000, nearly $3,000,000. We buy of them; they sell to us. They have an army. This little country has an army of 20,000 men, a national guard armed with rifles made in the State of New York. They are not Indians. They have at the capital of the country an institution of learning upon which they spend a half million dollars a year; they have all the civilization that belongs to the age; and I repeat again what I said in reply to a remark made by the Senator from Alabama, I do not think there is any country in the world that has made more progress than it has in the last three years if published European reports are to be accredited. They have increased their banking system; they have increased their commercial relations with the interior of the country and with other countries.

Mr. HALE. The Argentine Republic?

Mr. TELLER. No; I do not mean the Argentine Republic. I mean this little people, less than 600,000 population. They have made a progress and development that are astonishing and almost without parallel. I know it is said by some of the European financiers that they are going too fast and will break down. Possibly they may, but it shows that they have arrived at a stage where they propose to get their part of the world's progress and the world's goods; and it is for us to see whether these people are to be allied to us, as they ought to be, as our neighbors in sympathy with us in form of government and in every other way; and to stand and haggle about $2,500 a year seems to me to be absurd.

We ought to make a determined effort to bring every South American and Central American state in close alliance with us, commercially and politically. Their interest ought to be our interest, and our interest ought to be theirs, and when any nation, whether it be Great Britain or any other, moves upon their territory without their consent it ought to be the duty, and I believe it to be the duty, of this great Government at least to enter a very earnest protest. That would bring these people to us in commercial relations, would make a market for us that can be had in no other place in the world.

We talk about a market for our surplus goods. All Europe is closed against us to-day either by their tariffs or by their cheap labor. If we can send our goods anywhere to find a reasonable market to-day it is to the South American and Central American countries, and nowhere else; and to haggle over whether we shall give $7,500 or $5,000 a year

to a minister is, in my judgment, unworthy of a great nation like ours. I would not waste any money on anybody or for any purpose, but I would send men to these countries who are capable of representing this Government in such a way as to command the respect of all the people there, and whose business it should be to bring them to us in close alliance, and when the Government of the United States shall enter upon that career it will provide markets for the surplus that we are producing of our manufactures, and in a thousand other ways that will contribute to the prosperity of the whole country.

Mr. PLUMB. Mr. President, if this were a proposition to really strengthen or increase the trade of the United States, I would very cheerfully vote for it. But it is not such a proposition. In all this matter of ministers plenipotentiaries and envoys extraordinary, and so on, we simply copy from the pattern set by Great Britain and other European countries, and have sent men to foreign posts representing the United States, not to promote the trade of the country, but for the purpose of keeping up a certain show. We think at home that the United States is a good deal of a government; and yet it is a fact that those who represent Hayti, San Domingo, and other countries of the pumpernickel kind outrank the minister from the United States. When the minister of the United States to London is invited to a dinner he goes, if he goes at all, knowing that he is to sit at the foot of the table, while sitting above him are the persons who represent the inferior states, and that is because they are dubbed with a greater title; that is to say, they have greater rank by denomination or designation than is given to the person who goes with the authority of the United States. This only shows that all this is simply playing with what may be called the interests of the country.

We send a minister to London to do what? Simply to dine with the other dignitaries that he meets there, to perform a mere social office around the august court of Queen Victoria. He does no other thing whatever save now and then introduce a person like my friend from South Carolina to the Queen or to some of the lords in waiting. But when it comes to matters concerning the substantial and material interests of the United States he is without consequence. We are simply keeping up in the framework of our diplomatic service the pattern which we copied from Great Britain. We have done nothing more and done nothing less, and all this talk about the minister to Paraguay and Uruguay being of consequence to the commerce of this country is, in my judgment, entirely without foundation.

If instead of a minister to Paraguay, if instead of a minister to London, if instead of a minister to Berlin and to other countries to which we now send representatives of this Government, we were to send strong, wise, intelligent American business men, with ample salaries, we should do something that would return to the people of the United States a benefit by increasing their foreign trade. As it is we send men to perform the social service of which I have spoken, and to revolve as satellites around the central orb of a monarchy to the effect of casting discredit upon republican institutions.

Whoever will look at our treaties, of which we ratify a half dozen at every session of the Senate, will find that they deal not with trade relations, but with an entirely different class of subjects, in which the people of the United States have practically no interest whatever. There has not been any treaty of trade or commerce with Great Britain in thirty years; there has not been a treaty ratified by the Senate for the past twenty-five years which has enlarged the trade horizon of the people of the United States one single iota. The only treaty I can recall which related to that subject even remotely during my term in the Senate is the treaty negotiated with Mexico, which has never been carried into effect. It is because we have based our entire system of intercourse with foreign peoples upon a false basis that we have had such meager results.

I do not object to high salaries. I would be glad to pay a consul to Liverpool $10,000 a year, and similar salaries to consuls at all principal points reached by the trade of the people of the United States or which might possibly be reached by it. It is not a question of money. But as it is we send to these places decayed, broken-down politicians.

There is not a man connected with the State Department to-day who knows anything about the trade or manufacturing interests of the United States. I do not speak of that as a ground of offense at all, but as simply an illustration of the fact that in the matter of our intercourse with foreign people we have got up into what Mr. Conkling so felicitously called the "upper air and solar walk" away from the every-day affairs of life and away from the business concerns of our people, into a domain of society and politics the chief characteristic of which is lying and insincerity. The politics of the outside world is of little consequence to us, consequently we have no need of sending anybody to deal with political relations with those people; but, on the contrary, we ought to send men there to deal with relation to our trade interests, our manufacturing supplies, the products of our soil which are to be exchanged for the products of their soil and the products of the loom and the shop.

This whole bill is based upon a false idea. We give $1,500 for a consul to an important point, and if we have occasion for a minister to that place we give him, as we have given him here, from $5,000 to $7,500, perhaps $10,000 a year. The consul is supposed to do the work. By reason of the limited salary we pay him, we can not get the right kind of a man. The work, therefore, is imperfectly done. But nobody expects the minister to do anything. No one ever did and no one ever will do anything. We never have had a treaty of any consequence negotiated with a great foreign power that was not negotiated in Washington. Our minister to England undertook a few years ago some negotiations about the fisheries business. The moment he got to the essential point everything was taken away from him and the negotiation was carried on by a special commission on the part of both powers sitting here in Washington.

Mr. TELLER. I should like to ask the Senator if he does not think it would have been better to have left the minister to negotiate the treaty? Does he not think he would have got along better?

Mr. PLUMB. Perhaps he might. I think on the whole the steps he took indicated that he had a more patriotic comprehension of the issues involved than those by whom the treaty was subsequently negotiated. But the fact is that he can not be anything more than a mere pawn upon the chess-board. When it comes to close quarters, when it comes to that which is important, he will undoubtedly be superseded by the agency of the Secretary of State himself, or the President of the United States, or some one appointed for the particular purpose in view. So when it came to the adjustment of our relations with Great Britain after the close of the civil war it was the Joint High Commission which made the treaty that resulted in the Geneva arbitration which made what is known as the Alabama award.

What we want is a thorough reconstruction of the entire business of our intercourse with foreign peoples. I believe it is wise that we should abolish the office of minister to England and minister to all these foreign powers. We should substitute men to be called consuls, or what not, but who should have special charge of the material interests of the people of the United States among the people to whom they are accredited. They ought to be men of the highest ability.

In order to get them, of course we must pay higher salaries. We may get a good consul at London who can do all our business there for $10,000—for less than we pay to the minister whom we send there, because the man whom we send as consul, or as trade agent, or as commercial agent, or by whatever name he might be known, would not be obliged to spend $10,000 or $15,000 a year in entertaining people who are of no more consequence to us than the summer fly. It is the merchants who distribute for the common people, the middle-men generally, and all the agencies that relate to the distribution and exchange of the productions of one country with those of another whom we want to reach. Those people are never reached, they are never seen by the men whom we send as ministers to London, Paris, Berlin, Vienna, and St. Petersburg.

We rely upon the underpaid men, the men who are willing to take a foreign position at $1,500 or $2,000 a year to do this business for us. Of course they are inferior people, and these positions have come to be regarded as the rewards of political service. They are filled naturally with a class of inferior persons, with those who are worn out and belated, of no account at home, because no self-respecting American would go abroad for a salary of $1,200 or $1,500 a year; that is to say, the salary would be no inducement when he could make more than that at home. Consequently we take the valetudinarians, the played-out people, and send them abroad at insufficient salaries to perform these great and important functions for the people of the United States.

Mr. President, if we are to have better trade relations with Paraguay and Uruguay, and with South America generally, we do not need to send down there men bearing the commission of the United States as ministers plenipotentiary with a large salary or with any salary at all. We want to abolish that office, and to put in place of it an office having a plain, straightforward duty connected with it, in which the people of the United States have some interest, and which can be filled, as it will be, by some man who is keenly alive to the interest of the people of the United States, thoroughly conversant with them, and not some one who is concerned in the mere tinsel, in the frills and furbelows of the kind of intercourse which those indulge in whom we send abroad as ministers plenipotentiary.

Mr. TELLER. The Senator from Kansas can not be serious when he means to say that we shall dismiss our ministers to foreign countries and rely upon commercial agents and consuls for all communications with those governments.

Mr. PLUMB. And the telegraph.

Mr. TELLER. If we have trouble with a foreign power we must approach that foreign power according to a regular system which has grown up among civilized people. We can get at them in no other way; and while it is probably true that some of our ministers are of very little consequence (probably the minister to Persia has very little to do, and the minister to Greece has very little to do, and so in some other regions in the world), yet nobody can say but that the minister to Great Britain, ever since we have had a minister there, has not occasionally had the most delicate and important duties to perform, duties that nobody, not even the Senator from Kansas, would think of intrusting to a commercial agent or a business man, duties which are only to be handled and treated by either born or trained diplomats—questions with which the brightest and best business man would be as little qualified to deal as an infant.

I agree with the Senator from Kansas that trade must be largely

sought, if at all, through the commercial agents and through the consuls; but the very minister whose salary it is proposed to raise is a consul-general. He has to act in the double capacity, performing the delicate functions of a minister, if occasion requires, and he has to perform the more important sometimes, and sometimes less important, functions of a commercial agent or consul-general.

The only question is whether the best men in the country can be obtained and can afford to go away from this country, leaving their business, and stay for the limited period unfortunately that our ministers and commercial agents have been allowed to stay abroad at the salary proposed to be given.

I wish to say one other thing with reference to what the Senator from Kansas said about the class of men we have sent abroad. As a general rule the ministers we have sent abroad from this country have been men who have been no discredit to us. That has been proved. It has not been the policy of preceding administrations, whatever it may be now, to remove commercial agents and consuls who are business officers upon a change of administration. So there had grown up in all the great European cities a system of commercial agencies and consulships that was creditable to the Government. A change in the administration may have made some difference. Undoubtedly it has; that is to say, some of them were removed when the terms expired for which they had been appointed, and others filled their places with less experience and with less knowledge of the subjects with which they were called to deal. The Senator is a member of the subcommittee which considered this bill perhaps.

Mr. PLUMB. Not of the subcommittee.

Mr. TELLER. He is a member of the general committee at least which passed upon this bill; and I think the committee ought to have inquired why we should give to the minister at Corea $7,500 when the total exports of that country last year were less than the trade between the United States and Uruguay. All that they bought and all that they sold was less than the trade both ways between Uruguay and the United States. I know of course that it is important to have a man of sense and of ability there, for he may have delicate missions to perform in looking after the welfare of American citizens in that foreign land, and that is a part of every minister's business. A ship manned with American sailors gets into trouble with some foreign ship, and to whom do they apply? First to the consul. If it is a matter which ought to be brought to the attention of the Government the consul applies at once to the minister, and the minister to the foreign power. There is no waiting to send over to this country. It is worth something that an American citizen abroad shall know to whom he may apply—not a mere commercial agent, not a mere seller of goods or buyer of wares, but a man who understands the law that should govern the treatment of the subjects or citizens of another nation. It is worth something to them that they can appeal to a man who knows what the law is and what the usages and customs have been among civilized nations, and what is demanded and what will be demanded not only by his Government but by the civilized world of the nation whose citizen it is supposed has committed some infraction of international law.

Mr. PLATT. Have we that kind of representatives abroad?

Mr. TELLER. A Senator inquires whether we have that kind of representatives abroad. I do not know. I am not now speaking of what we have, but of the system. I do not know whether the foreign offices are filled with the men they ought to be filled with. Upon that point I am not qualified to speak, because I have given no attention to it. I only speak of what ought to be the rule; of what ought to be the character of the men who represent this great nation.

But I can speak with some degree of pride as to the character of the men who have heretofore filled the high offices at least, like ministers to these great powers. The Senator from Kansas says that our minister sits at the foot of the table. Very well; he sits there because we will that he shall sit there, because simply three or four words put into an appropriation bill creating him an embassador instead of a minister would give him rank equal to that of the copper-colored Asiatic who goes to the English court as an embassador.

I have propounded the question for ten years to the men who are charged with this branch of the public service, and the only reason that I have ever heard given was given the other day in another body, when it was said that the republican simplicity of this country would be embarrassed by receiving a man of so high rank who was in international law and theory the immediate representative of the throne. If there was ever anything that deserves to be called "bosh" in a public place like this, that kind of reasoning deserves it. Why should we not have an embassador, if the Emperor of Germany should send an embassador here? If we had embassadors there, it is said we should have to receive embassadors. Why should we not receive embassadors? Who are more fit and who have a better right to receive embassadors than the 60,000,000 people in this country? Why should we not receive them, and why should we not receive them with the American simplicity with which we receive the ministers? Could we be expected to put on any extra service or to do anything that we had not done when we received the ministers? That is all nonsensical. It is barely possible if we gave them this high rank that we might be required to spend a little more money in order to be equal with the other embassadors. But suppose we did. Can we not afford it? If it is worth while to keep a minister to England, what difference does it make to us whether we pay him $17,500, or $25,000, or $35,000, or $40,000? If it is worth while to keep him there at all, it is worth while to keep him there in dignity, so that he will command the respect of the people.

I know it was said by the Senator from Kansas that negotiations are usually concluded here. I am free to say that I believe it would have been better if the recent negotiations between our country and Great Britain had been left to the American minister in London. I have looked carefully over every line and every word that he has said on that subject, and I have not yet found a single line that any American citizen need find fault with. It is commendable that he at least, whatever others may have done, understood the rights of the American people, and proposed, so far as he was concerned, to maintain them. I believe that has been the history of our foreign ministers through all time, and I think it is as indispensable that we should have foreign ministers as it is that we should have consuls.

There are very many other things that we ought to have which we do not have in reference to the creation of trade, with regard to which I do not propose to speak upon this bill, but I may upon some other at some future time.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, there are two questions involved in the amendment which I have presented. One is the comparative, direct importance of Paraguay and Uruguay to the business and commerce of this country. I read from the commercial reports of our consuls for the year 1881–'82. I understood the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] to say that as compared with the Argentine Republic, where it is admitted that it is advisable to have a diplomatic representative of the highest rank except one, and of adequate salary, the business of the two countries was largely in favor of the Argentine Republic; that that had increased, while that of Uruguay and Paraguay had decreased. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] has shown by an examination of the special facts of the case that that is an illusory statement; that the trade of Buenos Ayres has a large portion of the Paraguayan and Uruguayan production included in it.

But the statement is not correct that the trade with the Argentine Republic has increased. It has decreased a million dollars. From the statement which we have of foreign commerce made to the Treasury Department on the 30th of June, 1887, we find that the gross amount of trade with the United States of the Argentine Republic for 1882 was $5,234,000, and in 1887 it was $4,100,000, a decrease of a million dollars.

Mr. HALE. Will the Senator look at the export trade on page 37?

Mr. CALL. This is the aggregate value of the imports.

Mr. HALE. Now look at the export trade, which is our own trade, which is of much more importance than the import trade, on page 37 of the same report. Look at the trade of the Argentine Republic and also look at that of Uruguay.

Mr. CALL. I find there is an increase in our exports to the Argentine Republic from $2,258,000 in 1881, to $5,671,729 in 1887, and that in Uruguay there was an export trade in 1886 of $1,536,000, and in 1887 of $1,393,000, there being a difference of some $200,000.

Mr. HALE. Did the Senator give the export trade of the Argentine Republic? I did not hear.

Mr. CALL. Yes; I gave that of the Argentine Republic.

Mr. HALE. There is a very large increase?

Mr. CALL. Yes; there is a large increase in our export trade.

Mr. HALE. In our own products?

Mr. CALL. Yes; in our own products, and there is a decrease of $200,000 in Uruguay and Paragnay; but there is a total decrease in the amount of the importations from that country to this, which, of course, involves trade of an absolute amount of $1,000,000 since 1881 by this table.

Mr. HALE. Taking the aggregate together the increase more than balances the decrease.

Mr. CALL. No; that can not be.

Mr. HALE. The amount of decrease in imports from the Argentine Republic is about a million dollars. The amount of increase of our export trade of our own product, which, of course, is much more important, is between two and three million dollars, so that, taking the two together, there is an aggregate increase of nearly $2,000,000.

Mr. BLAIR. I should like to inquire if this debate is proceeding by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. By unanimous consent.

Mr. BLAIR. Then I give notice that upon the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Florida I shall ask for the regular order. I should like first to ask the Senator from Maine whether he proposes to withdraw the point of order?

Mr. HALE. No, sir.

Mr. BLAIR. Then I shall call for the regular order upon the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CALL. As I stated, there was a decrease of $1,000,000 in the amount exported from the Argentine Republic in that period of time, and there was a large decrease also in the importations from Uruguay and Paraguay. But what does that import? If it imports anything it is that we have neglected, by the absence of any diplomatic efforts, the trade of the states of Uruguay and Paraguay, just what we are seek-

ing to supply now; and that is vindicated by the fact that in the absence of any communication, direct and diplomatic, between this country and Uruguay and Paraguay this decrease in our trade and intercourse with them has occurred, while the total production of these two states, with their limited population, was nearly equal to that of the Argentine Republic, and therefore an object to be sought for.

Of what kind of value is the proposition that we shall make no efforts to acquire close relations with a country producing equally as much as another country, the importance of whose connections is urged upon us because we have some kind of trade with them? The proposition upon which this motion to amend the bill is made is that Paraguay and Uruguay are valuable producing states; that they have a population capable of consuming and paying for American productions; and that its capacity is equal to that of the Argentine Republic. That comprehends the whole question. If it is so it is an object worthy of seeking to acquire.

I have evidence here by the statements of our consular agents that the disposition of those people is favorable to it. What is it? Our trade in leather, which is a great American industry with the Argentine states and with Uruguay and Paraguay, is about the same. Hides are imported from Uruguay and Paraguay, and the leather interest of this country is largely connected, according to these statistics, with making close relations with Uruguay and Paraguay.

It is said that there is no function for a minister to perform. What foundation is there for that idea? Is it reasonable? Is it based upon a proper analysis of the necessities which have demanded between civilized states various grades of diplomatic representation and intercourse? Let us see. General statements are always delusive; they import nothing. There can be no reasoning upon a mere general affirmation, which is merely an assertion of opinion by some one. But what is the fact? What does a minister do? He has two functions. One is to establish definitively the principles of official intercourse, of alliance, or of enmity and hostility, the relations which belong to peace or war. These are questions which concern the international relations, the public law of the world. You can not have a business man who has never devoted himself to investigating these questions deal with diplomatists upon a code of international law which has recognition among the nations of the earth as the means of intercourse and of peace or war.

What is the other function? Is it possible that this relation between nations and this intercourse for these thousands of years has been based upon a fatuity, upon a mere visionary idea, upon a something that has no existence? We should revise our ideas upon that subject and see what it is that we have been dealing with in governments, in congresses, and in nations in all time.

A citizen of a foreign country finds himself in another country. He needs protection; he needs the just administration of the laws of that country; his property needs protection. What is the minister sent for but to be the representative of the government which accredits him, and to speak in their name, and for them to demand that the flag of his country shall give that citizen protection, and to inform officially and advisedly his own people that a citizen has a right to have the power of the government exercised for his protection, and the protection of his property? And he must be a man learned in the laws of intercourse between nations, that he may creditably and intelligently represent the interests of his people in respect to persons and property and demand recognition for them.

Mr. President, there can be nothing but barbarism to result from these ideas which seek to do away with the means of civil and amicable intercourse and relationship between nations. The Senator from Kansas says, and it is the effect of his argument and proposition, that we should have business men. That is a very good title, if other nations will recognize it, instead of embassador. He proposes to vest all the functions of a minister in a man called a business man, and to give him a good salary. I have no objection to that, nor is the argument against it, if foreign nations will consent to recognize that title as giving a man the right to represent his own nation. But the functions of a minister are one thing. He is to represent the country which accredits him in the protection of the persons and the property of his own nation under a foreign flag, to assert and demand their rights in the name of his Government, to speak for the people and the property interests which by treaty are allowed to go there.

Now, Mr. President, here are the facts. The states of Uruguay and Paraguay have a business of imports from this country of from a million and a half to two million dollars, the amount not being fixed with absolute certainty for the past year. They have an import trade which is paid for in American money to the United States of something like $3,000,000 or $4,000,000. They have a foreign trade of more than $7,000,000 or $8,000,000. Other countries are getting the advantage of this country.

Mr. BUTLER. It is twenty-odd million dollars, speaking of the imports in the aggregate.

Mr. CALL. They have a total foreign trade, as suggested by the Senator from South Carolina, of upwards of $20,000,000. That is what we ask to be encouraged, to be increased. I have spoken here in behalf of American merchants who are trading from the United States to Uruguay and Paraguay, who are building ships to sail from the ports of my own State of Florida to the Central American states, representing the difficulties under which they have labored for the want of proper compensation and a proper rank, which give credit and respectability even in a republic, and access, according to the laws to regulate the intercourse of nations, to the authorities of those countries. I have spoken in behalf of men actually engaged in the extension of this commerce, investing large sums in the construction of ships, and asking in the light of actual experience in that business that this method of relief should be afforded to American interests now establishing themselves in the states of Uruguay and Paraguay.

I agree with much that has been said in regard to this niggardly policy in reference to our foreign relations and our foreign ministers. I think this bill had better not be passed at all than to leave those who represent the majesty of the people and its power in rags, presenting a disreputable appearance by contrast with the representatives of a foreign and aristocratic power. My idea of the dignity of the American people is that those who represent them shall be equal in all respects to those who represent absolute power, and that they shall not be required to present themselves in such a manner as to be discreditable to the people and render them incapable of performing the functions with which they are intrusted, which require a certain degree of respect and a certain degree of decent appearance in the performance of their duties.

Mr. President, I shall not say anything further upon this subject except that it appears to me, while I do not propose to discuss the question of order, that the amendment is strictly within the rule upon the subject. The estimate of the Secretary of State is for an increase of $5,000 for this ministry. It is not in exact words for the minister to Uruguay and Paraguay. It differs in the one respect of making two ministers instead of one of this embassy, but it is to give to the representative of the United States at the states of Paraguay and Uruguay $10,000. It is made in pursuance of a resolution, an amendment, an act adopted at this session in this bill, which makes the representative or the embassy at Uruguay and Paraguay minister resident instead of chargé d'affaires. Therefore it seems to me to be within the rule.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Maine insist on his point of order?

Mr. HALE. I do.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks that the point of order is well taken.

Mr. CALL. I appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Florida appeals from the decision of the Chair. The question is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. PLATT. Let the rule be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The sixteenth rule will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

1. All general appropriations bills shall be referred to the Committee on Appropriations, except bills making appropriations for rivers and harbors, which shall be referred to the Committee on Commerce; and no amendments shall be received to any general appropriation bill the effect of which will be to increase an appropriation already contained in the bill, or to add a new item of appropriation, unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law or treaty stipulation, or act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session; or unless the same be moved by direction of a standing or select committee of the Senate, or proposed in pursuance of an estimate of the head of some one of the Departments.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, I wish to have a little attention to the language of this rule, which is, I think, very clear. No increase of an appropriation "already contained in the bill" is allowed "unless it be made to carry out the provisions of some existing law." That affirms that if there be an existing law establishing a diplomatic function at Uruguay and Paraguay an amendment increasing the appropriation to carry out that law may be made. If it does not mean that, what does it mean? The rule requires that there shall be an existing law. Is there an existing law for a diplomatic function at Uruguay or Paraguay? Unquestionably there is. In that event an amendment to increase the appropriation in the bill may be made. It seems to me language could be no plainer than that. But what further does the rule say: Or to carry out an "act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session."

What is in this bill? It is an act and a resolution of the Senate to establish a minister resident at Paraguay and Uruguay. That can not be denied; it is too plain for argument. That is the language of the rule, and here is an act or resolution of the Senate passed at this session to establish a minister resident at Uruguay and Paraguay, and here is an amendment to increase the appropriation to carry out that act and resolution of the Senate. Who shall say that that increase of appropriation to carry out an act or resolution of the Senate shall be of one kind or another kind? Who shall limit it? What course of reasoning are you to find which shall construe that language into some other meaning? What other meaning can be given to it? The action of the Senate already taken has made this a minister resident. That was done by agreeing to the amendment of the committee, and that action having been taken by the Senate, my amendment proposes to increase the salary by giving to the minister resident the usual and customary and necessary salary to carry out that act of the Senate.

Now, instead of assertion, let us have some argument and reasoning

on the subject. Is there an existing law for a diplomatic function at Uruguay and Paraguay? If there is, then the rule expressly affirms that an increase of the appropriation in the bill may be made to carry out its provisions. If you wish to answer or avoid this argument, you must prove either that there is no law for a diplomatic function at Uruguay and Paraguay or you must prove that the increase of appropriation will not carry it out.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is the Senate ready for the question?

Mr. HALE. I have no doubt that the amendment is subject to a point of order under section 3 of Rule XVI:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

All of these salaries are fixed by the general law, and aside from the question of raising an appropriation in the bill under the second clause of Rule XVI, if there is any difference between one point of order and another, it is subject to the more serious objection of being general legislation in changing the general law.

But I do not suppose that any Senator has any doubt that the ruling of the Chair in this case is correct. It is a question whether Senators, after the Chair has ruled upon a subject, choose to overrule it because they want to vote for the amendment. That is all there is of it.

Mr. CALL. Mr. President, the assertion that no Senator has any doubt about the correctness of the ruling is not an argument. That is more than any Senator can know. The Senator from Maine can not look into the hearts of Senators and know it to be true; and even if he did know it, it would not be an argument. If every Senator here had no doubt on the subject it would not answer the proposition. The question is not whether Senators have doubts or confident opinions about it, but what is the truth in reference to it?

I say there is no law, and the Senator from Maine can not find such a law, fixing the salary of the minister resident to Uruguay and Paraguay. In what sense is it true that this whole subject is regulated by general law? What is the subject? It is a proposition to give the minister resident created by this bill $7,500, and the Senator from Maine says that the salary is fixed by general law.

There is no such law, we know. We need not look at the law-books to find it, because this bill has created the minister resident, and it has given him a salary, and it is not yet a law; but it is "an act or resolution of the Senate." So there is not the slightest foundation for the proposition of the Senator from Maine. There is no law upon the subject; it can not be referred to. The very bill before you shows that there is no law, but there is "an act or a resolution of the Senate," which the rule requires, establishing the office of minister resident, so far as this bill is concerned, at Uruguay and Paraguay; and the question now is as to providing a salary for an office that is created by this bill, and which is of course not provided for by law. There can be no question about that. There is no law on the subject, and this amendment is to create a salary for an office created by this bill and not by any antecedent law—an office for which there is now no salary.

The salary provided by this bill is for a minister resident at Paraguay and Uruguay. This is an office, and this bill which has been adopted by the Senate—by an act or resolution of the Senate—is an act of the Senate, not a law, but an act of the Senate. If it is not, let the Senator define it and say what is the action of the Senate on agreeing to this amendment; and the rule expressly says that an appropriation to carry out an act orresolution of the Senate, not a law, may be increased—and this is an increase. Now let the Senator from Maine or others, instead of asserting one thing or another, take their several elements of the question and deny the mseparately and prove them to be untrue.

Mr. HALE. I think on the whole I had better make the point of order on changing this official from a chargé d'affaires to a minister resident. That is clearly new legislation. It is in the bill as reported from the committee, but I think I had better make that point of order, and send him back to the place where he is now by law as a chargé d'affaires.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Has not that amendment been agreed to?

Mr. HALE. The clause has not yet been completed.

Mr. CALL. The amendment has been agreed to.

Mr. HOAR. Is it in order to make one point of order when an appeal from the decision of the Chair on another point of order is pending?

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly it is not, but I can give notice. He was simply made minister resident to help him out and give him the additional rank which he wanted. When that is used as an argument why we should increase his salary, it shows that the committee were too good-natured. They ought to stick to it just as it was, and leave him where he has been for years, a chargé d'affaires.

Mr. COCKRELL. I suggest to the Senator from Maine that the point of order can be made when the bill reaches the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly.

Mr. COCKRELL. I hope it will be made then.

Mr. HALE. We will put him back where he belongs.

Mr. BUTLER. It is scarcely worth while, I take it, to argue a motion after the judge has decided against you, as has been done in this case. I understand the Chair to have decided that the point of order is well taken.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. But an appeal has been taken. The question now is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. BUTLER. That is debatable?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It is debatable.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not know that I care to go into that. I must say, however, that I think there is a good deal of force in what was said by the Senator from Florida; and there is much force in the idea that this amendment is taken out of the rule which makes it liable to a point of order by reason of the fact that it has been estimated for by one of the Departments of the Government. Not in terms, perhaps, but for all practical purposes it has been estimated for, so that I really do not think that it is amenable to the point of order.

Mr. HALE. This item has not been estimated for.

Mr. BUTLER. I understand that it has been estimated for. If not, I have been misinformed by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. CALL. "Ministers to Uruguay and Paraguay" have been estimated for separately.

Mr. BUTLER. I say the estimate has been made for two places—Uruguay and Paraguay—$5,000 each.

Mr. HALE. On page 89 the Department estimate for minister resident in Paraguay, $5,000; minister resident in Uruguay, $5,000.

Mr. BUTLER. Precisely; that is what I said.

Mr. HALE. It does not follow, of course, that the Department is in favor of this increase.

Mr. BUTLER. That is a matter of argument. I say that for all practical, essential purposes this amount has been estimated for, not in terms, it is true, but the two missions have been estimated for at $5,000 each. To hear this omnipotent, infallible, and amiable committee, for which the Senator from Maine speaks, as embracing within its jurisdiction all of the wisdom and economy and judgment of the Senate, and that nobody outside of it shall have an opinion because the Committee on Appropriations have said so and so, is somewhat novel. I have great respect for the wisdom, judgment, patriotism, honesty, and integrity of that illustrious body of American citizens bearing the commission of United States Senators, but still I beg and trust that they will permit some of us who are not within the reach of that circle—that sacred circle, I was about to say—to have an opinion at least, and to express it upon this floor.

Mr. HALE. The Committee on Appropriations do not make the rules of the Senate.

Mr. BUTLER. No, they do not make them; but they seem to reserve the entire right to construe them to suit themselves.

Mr. HALE. It was rather the construction of the Chair than of the committee. The committee have a right to appeal to the Chair.

Mr. BUTLER. The committee have given us their version, at least, in a rather dictatorial manner, in the Sir Oracle style. "This is what the rule means; it does not mean anything else; it can not mean anything else. The court has decided against you; take your seat." That is about the style of the Committee on Appropriations, it seems to me, upon this and upon all other subjects.

Mr. HALE. It is a very novel thing to hear the Senator from South Carolina complain of dictatorial ways.

Mr. BUTLER. I do not understand the Senator.

Mr. ALLISON rose.

Mr. BUTLER. Now here comes my amiable friend from Iowa.

Mr. ALLISON. The Senator should not hammer the Presiding Officer of this body under the guise of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. BUTLER. I am not hammering it.

Mr. ALLISON. The Chair has made this decision.

Mr. BUTLER. I am bowing with the utmost respect to the decision of the Presiding Officer.

Mr. HALE. I thought you were going to vote against him.

Mr. BUTLER. I have not said that I was going to vote against him. I was going to appeal to the Senator from Maine to permit the Senate to settle this question for itself. That would be the fair manner of disposing of this matter, and not interpose a mere technical point of order. If a majority of the Senate think it is wise to give this gentleman, or this mission (I am not going to recognize any personalities) $7,500, why not let us have the opportunity to do it?

Mr. HALE. The Senate has a right to overrule the Chair if the Senate believe that the decision of the Chair is wrong and that he does not know what the rule means.

Mr. BUTLER. I am not prepared to say that the Chair is wrong, but I am prepared to say that the Senator from Maine is wrong in making the point of order. There is where I am trying to fasten the fault.

Mr. HALE. Then clearly the Chair is wrong in sustaining the point of order.

Mr. BUTLER. Not at all. I think the point of order well taken, but I do not think the Senator from Maine ought to make it. That is the point I make with him.

Mr. HALE. I am sorry to disagree with the Senator.

Mr. BUTLER. You see, Mr. President, it was upon that particular question that I was trying to appeal to the good nature and the amiability of my friend from Maine; but whilst I am doing that, up rises the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON], looking fiercely at me, as if I had said something unpleasant to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HALE. He always looks fierce. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUTLER. He always looks fierce. So I think the best solution of this question would be for the Senator from Maine to withdraw the point of order and let the Senate settle it. Notwithstanding the opinion of that august body, the Committee on Appropriations, I beg leave to differ with them.

Mr. CALL. I should be glad if the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] or the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] would inform me, as well as the Senate, whether this is not "an act or resolution of the Senate" by which this officer is made a minister resident to Uruguay and Paraguay, and if it is, whether this amendment is not to carry out that existing "act or resolution of the Senate" passed at this session. I should like to have those two statements answered for the enlightenment of the Senate.

Mr. HALE. Let us take the Senator's own reasoning on that point. He says that the Senate having made this man a minister resident already, and having put it in the bill, this increase naturally follows. If the Senate has done anything, it has made this man minister resident and consul-general to Paraguay and Uruguay at $5,000. If it has done anything, it has done that; and if it has made him a minister resident at $5,000 it clearly is not carrying out that by putting him up to $7,500. I do not think the point is good for anything; but adopting the Senator's basis with whatever logic there is in his point, that is a complete answer to it. If the Senate has done anything, it has fixed this man's salary at $5,000 as minister resident.

Mr. BUTLER. How does the Senator get around the estimate?

Mr. CALL. The Senator from South Carolina will pardon me for a minute. I agree to all that, but does it not still leave it to be an existing act of the Senate passed at this session which has done that, and does not the rule say expressly if the amendment be to carry out the provisions of "an act or resolution previously passed by the Senate during that session," it shall be in order?

Mr. HALE. What is that act?

Mr. CALL. Creating a minister resident.

Mr. HALE. At what?

Mr. CALL. At Uruguay and Paraguay.

Mr. HALE. At how much salary?

Mr. CALL. Giving him $5,000. If we gave him $10,000, would it not be carrying out that existing law?

Mr. HALE. No, sir.

Mr. CALL. If we gave him $2,000 would it not be still carrying out the existing law for the minister resident at Uruguay? The office is one thing, and the pay of the officer another.

Mr. HOAR. I move to lay the appeal on the table.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the appeal of the Senator from Florida from the decision of the Chair lie on the table.

Mr. CALL. I ask for the yeas and nays on that motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HALE. The question is upon laying the appeal on the table?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on laying the appeal upon the table. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER (when his name was called). I am paired generally with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. CAMERON]. I do not know how he would vote on this proposition if here, and I shall withhold my vote, for the present at least.

Mr. CHACE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. RANSOM].

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. TURPIE].

Mr. FAULKNER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. QUAY].

Mr. SPOONER (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WALTHALL].

Mr. VANCE (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. PALMER]. If his colleague [Mr. STOCKBRIDGE], who, however, I believe is absent, thinks I may be permitted to do so, I will vote to make a quorum, as there is probably not a quorum present. This does not seem to be a political question.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from North Carolina desire to have his vote recorded?

Mr. VANCE. Yes, sir; if it be necessary to make a quorum, I will take that liberty.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The want of a quorum is not yet developed.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON].

The roll-call was concluded.

Mr. SHERMAN. I hope that by unanimous consent the appeal may be withdrawn, and let the bill be laid aside, so that we may take up the Calendar. I do not choose to state the reasons.

Mr. CALL. I am entirely willing for that. I do not want to embarrass the business of the Senate. I am entirely willing to let the bill go over until to-morrow.

Mr. BUTLER. It seems to me the best way to relieve the Senate of any embarrassment is to adjourn; and therefore I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair can not entertain the motion while the Senate is dividing.

Mr. BUTLER. I give notice that after the announcement of the vote I shall make that motion.

Mr. BATE. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. HARRIS] is paired with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. MORRILL].

Mr. SHERMAN. I again ask unanimous consent that the bill may be laid aside so that we may take up the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio asks unanimous consent that the pending proceedings on the bill, and the bill, may be informally laid aside.

Mr. HALE. No, I understand the Senator's proposition is that the appeal shall be withdrawn.

Mr. CALL. I will withdraw the appeal and let the bill go over.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let the bill go over until to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Then the appeal from the decision of the Chair is withdrawn.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let the bill go over until to-morrow, and let us take up the Calendar.

Mr. BUTLER. If that is done, I submit a motion to adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair will state the attitude of the bill.

Mr. SHERMAN. I am informed that there are on the Calendar a number of pension bills.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question, then, will stand on the decision of the Chair.

Mr. CALL. I suppose that would not prevent me from renewing the motion.

Mr. SHERMAN. You can renew it to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair, then, would ask leave, if these proceedings are to be submitted to the Senate, to withdraw his decision upon the point of order, and submit it to the Senate to be voted upon, which will determine the whole question. If there be no objection the Chair will withdraw his decision upon the point of order and will submit it to the Senate, and upon that the question will be taken to-morrow.

Mr. HALE. I do not wish to consent to the withdrawal of the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The result will be the same in either event.

Mr. HALE. I do not wish to consent to it upon so plain a question.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, I submit that the Senator from Maine is making an issue with the Chair and is hammering the Chair somewhat over the shoulders of Senators. The Chair has withdrawn the decision.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair asks unanimous consent to withdraw his decision upon the point of order, and that the same may be submitted to the Senate for its decision.

Mr. HALE. I object.

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from South Carolina moves that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. SHERMAN. A motion to adjourn can not legally and properly be entertained until the result of the vote is announced. I hope that by unanimous consent we may go on with the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. These proceedings have all been by unanimous consent, no motion being in order while the Senate is dividing, or while the question is being taken by yeas and nays.

Mr. HOAR. What has happened by unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Nothing has happened.

Mr. HALE. Nothing is likely to happen.

Mr. CALL. I withdraw the appeal, Mr. President.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further suggestions for unanimous consent, the Secretary will announce the result of the vote.

Mr. CALL. I withdraw the appeal.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair submitted the request for unanimous consent to withdraw the appeal, and it was refused.

Mr. SHERMAN. I again ask the unanimous consent of the Senate that without the announcement of the vote the bill be laid over until to-morrow, and that the Calendar be proceeded with.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. What, then, shall occur to-morrow, the resumption of the roll-call?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, the resumption of the roll-call.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resumption of the roll-call on the appeal?

Mr. SHERMAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUTLER. I object to that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from South Carolina objects. The Secretary will announce the state of the vote.

Mr. MITCHELL (after having voted in the negative). I inadvertently voted. I now remember that I am paired for the week with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES]. I ask leave to withdraw my vote.

Mr. VANCE. I vote "nay."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon withdraws his vote. The result of the vote will be announced upon the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to lay the appeal of the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] upon the table.

BILLS BECOME LAWS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 29th of May approved and signed the joint resolution (S. R. 87) authorizing and directing the payment of the salaries of the officers and employés of Congress for the month of May, 1888.

The message also announced that the following acts were presented to the President May 18, 1888, and not having been returned by him to the House of Congress in which they originated within the ten days prescribed by the Constitution, they have become laws without his approval, namely:

An act (S. 38) granting to the Washington and Idaho Railroad Company the right of way through the Cœur d'Alene Indian reservation; and

An act (S. 269) to grant to the Fort Smith and El Paso Railway Company a right of way through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the President had yesterday approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 2901) granting to the Milwaukee, Lake Shore and Western Railway Company the right of way through the Lac de Flambeau Indian reservation, in the State of Wisconsin;

An act (S. 325) granting to the Billings, Clark's Fork and Cooke City Railroad Company the right of way through the Crow Indian reservation;

An act (S. 339) granting a pension to Eliza Douglass;

An act (S. 737) granting a pension to Berry Day;

An act (S. 1298) granting a pension to Mary Gammell;

An act (S. 1300) granting a pension to Cordelia R. Jones;

An act (S. 1477) granting a pension to Harlow B. Hyde;

An act (S. 1478) granting a pension to George W. Peavey; and

An act (S. 626) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Franklin, alias McKee.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 3722) for the relief of Jennie D. Rice was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The bill (H. R. 7776) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River, in the county of Monona, in the State of Iowa, and in the county of Burt, State of Nebraska, and to make the same a post-route, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (H. R. 10233) making an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

The result of the vote on Mr. HOAR'S motion to lay on the table the appeal taken by Mr. CALL from the decision of the Chair was announced—yeas 13, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—13.

Aldrich,	Dawes,	Platt,	Sherman.
Allison,	Dolph,	Plumb,	
Blair,	Hale,	Riddleberger,	
Cockrell,	Hoar,	Sawyer,	

NAYS—13.

Bate,	Chandler,	George,	Vance.
Blodgett,	Coke,	Hampton,	
Brown,	Colquitt,	Stewart,	
Call,	Eustis,	Teller,	

ABSENT—50.

Beck,	Faulkner,	McPherson,	Sabin,
Berry,	Frye,	Manderson,	Saulsbury,
Blackburn,	Gibson,	Mitchell,	Spooner,
Bowen,	Gorman,	Morgan,	Stanford,
Butler,	Gray,	Morrill,	Stockbridge,
Cameron,	Harris,	Paddock,	Turpie,
Chace,	Hawley,	Palmer,	Vest,
Cullom,	Hearst,	Pasco,	Voorhees,
Daniel,	Hiscock,	Payne,	Walthall,
Davis,	Ingalls,	Pugh,	Wilson of Iowa.
Edmunds,	Jones of Arkansas,	Quay,	Wilson of Md.
Evarts,	Jones of Nevada,	Ransom,	
Farwell,	Kenna,	Reagan,	

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There is not a quorum voting.

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 49 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, June 6, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, *June* 5, 1888.

The House was called to order at 11 o'clock a. m. by Mr. MCMILLIN, who directed the reading of the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1888.

SIR: Hon. BENTON MCMILLIN is hereby designated to preside as Speaker *pro tempore* at the session of the House to-day.

JOHN G. CARLISLE, *Speaker.*

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK, Jr.,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

On motion of Mr. LANHAM, the Committee on Claims was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1935) for the relief of Andrew T. McReynolds; and the same was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

BARRACKS AT FORT SNELLING, MINN.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a modified estimate from the Secretary of War of an appropriation for the erection of barracks at Fort Snelling, Minn.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT PEORIA, ILL.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Supervising Architect of an additional appropriation for finishing the public building at Peoria, Ill.; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

NEW YORK AND ROCK ISLAND ARSENALS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting an estimate for the erection of a set of officers' quarters at the New York arsenal, and for a hospital building at the Rock Island arsenal; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SANDY HOOK SHIP CHANNEL.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report upon the work of deepening the Sandy Hook ship channel; which was referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, indefinite leave of absence was granted to Mr. MCKINNEY, on account of important business.

STATE NATIONAL BANK, NEW ORLEANS.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3713) for the relief of the State National Bank of New Orleans, formerly the New Orleans State Bank, and put it upon its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read at length.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BUCHANAN. This is a very important bill, and should be fully discussed when there is a full opportunity.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I ask the gentleman to withhold his objection for a moment, to hear a brief explanation.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am familiar with the facts of the case, as it was before a committee of which I was a member. I have no objection to its consideration when there is opportunity for full discussion.

Mr. SPRINGER. Regular order.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

ADDITIONAL MODE OF TAKING DEPOSITIONS.

Mr. OATES, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back favorably the bill (S. 832) to provide an additional mode of taking depositions of witnesses in causes pending in the courts of the United States; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

FORT HALL RESERVATION, IDAHO.

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8662) to accept and ratify an agreement made with the Shoshone and Bannock Indians for the surrender and relinquishment to the United States of a portion of the Fort Hall reservation, in the Territory of Idaho, for the purposes of a town site, and for

the grant of a right of way through said reservation to the Utah and Northern Railway Company, and for other purposes; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

REBECCA RHODES.

Mr. CHIPMAN, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back with amendments the bill (H. R. 9541) for the relief of Rebecca Rhodes; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. SUSAN BATES.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9370) granting a pension to Mrs. Susan Bates, widow of Thomas Bates, late private Company A, Twenty-sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteers; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES M'INTYRE.

Mr. CHIPMAN also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7713) granting a pension to James McIntyre; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

EUGENE SULLIVAN.

Mr. HUNTER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6254) granting a pension to Eugene Sullivan; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY P. MULLIN.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 10223) for the relief of Mary P. Mullin; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CENTENARY REFORMED CHURCH, WINCHESTER, VA.

Mr. LAWLER, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 609) for the relief of the trustees of the Centenary Reformed Church of Winchester, Va.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ESTATE OF ALFRED ROBINSON.

Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 114) for the relief of the heirs and legal representatives of Alfred Robinson, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

CARL F. KOLBE.

Mr. CROUSE, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back with a favorable recommendation the bill (H. R. 7458) for the relief of Carl F. Kolbe; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

FIRE-ESCAPES IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. ROMEIS, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, reported as a substitute for the bill H. R. 8860 a bill (H. R. 10346) providing for fire-escapes in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

The bill H. R. 8860 was laid on the table.

INAUGURATION OF GEORGE WASHINGTON.

Mr. OATES. I desire to make a report from the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Clerk read the resolution referred to the committee April 23, as follows:

Whereas the committee on the centennial celebration of the inauguration of George Washington as President of the United States, by a memorial this day presented by the Speaker, requests the House of Representatives of the United States to participate in the celebration to be held in New York City on April 30, 1889: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That this House hereby accepts the invitation tendered, and that the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, directed to inform the committee of the said centennial celebration of the action of the House in the premises.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will read the report submitted by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the resolution, submitted April 23, 1888, proposing that the House of Representatives accept the invitation of the committee on the centennial celebration of the inauguration of George Washington as President of the United States to participate in said celebration, having had the same under consideration, report as follows:

The resolution proposes the acceptance by "this House" of the invitation extended by the committee on the centennial celebration of the inauguration of George Washington as President of the United States, to be held in New York April 30, 1889. Your committee and doubtless every member of this House most heartily indorses and applauds the patriotic purpose of the promoters of the celebration on the spot where one hundred years ago occurred one of the most notable events in the history of our country, the inauguration of the first President of the United States. It is an occasion which elicits the profoundest sympathy and respect of every citizen of our common country.

But "this House" of Representatives ceases to exist by the expiration of the term for which its members were chosen, on the 4th day of March preceding the date of the proposed celebration, which alone prevents the acceptance of the invitation so generously extended. As we have no right to accept the invitation for the House of Representatives of the Fifty-first Congress, we are constrained reluctantly to report against the adoption of the resolution and the acceptance of the invitation.

This House of Representatives, as such, will at that time be *functus officio*, and can not participate in said celebration, though its members may as individuals.

The Clerk of the House is hereby requested to transmit to each member of the committee whose names are signed to the memorial a printed copy of the resolution and this report thereon.

Mr. OATES. The report is adverse. I ask that it be printed, and that the resolution be laid upon the table.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

MARTHA F. WOODRUM.

Mr. THOMPSON, of California, reported back the bill (H. R. 2805) granting a pension to Martha F. Woodrum, widow of James Woodrum, deceased, with amendments by the Senate and a request for a committee of conference.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection the amendments of the Senate will be non-concurred in and the request for a committee of conference will be agreed to. The Chair will appoint the committee later.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT ALLENTOWN, PA.

Mr. DIBBLE. I desire to make a privileged report from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. The committee recommend that the bill (H. R. 4357) to erect a public building at Allentown, Pa., be passed notwithstanding the objections of the President.

The bill and report were ordered to lie on the Speaker's table.

JESSE M. STILLWELL.

Mr. CHEADLE. A bill (H. R. 3671) granting a pension to Jesse M. Stillwell has been reported by the Committee on Invalid Pensions with an adverse recommendation. I ask that the bill and report be placed upon the Calendar.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

An act (H. R. 2068) authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay certain citizens of Chicago, employés of the custom-house, for extra-time service;

An act (H. R. 8006) to amend section 5388 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, in relation to timber depredations;

An act (H. R. 4909) for the relief of the estate of C. M. Briggs, deceased;

An act (H. R. 108) for the relief of John C. Weaver;

An act (H. R. 4908) for the relief of the heirs of A. Gates Lee and heirs of B. P. Lee, deceased;

An act (H. R. 1540) to establish a port of delivery at Grand Rapids, Mich.;

An act (H. R. 6098) authorizing the construction and repair of the roads from the entrance to the reservation of the Presidio at San Francisco, Cal., to the national cemetery on the same, and the fencing and protection of the said reservation and the cemetery thereon;

An act (H. R. 8394) to authorize United States marshals to arrest offenders and fugitives from justice in Indian Territory;

An act (H. R. 314) authorizing the Secretary of War to place the name of James L. Henderson on the roll of Company B, Sixteenth Kentucky Volunteers;

An act (H. R. 2161) for the relief of Thomas J. Taylor;

An act (H. R. 92) for the relief of Morgan Rawls;

An act (H. R. 335) granting a pension to General W. E. Woodruff; and

An act (H. R. 8489) granting a pension to Abial G. Chamberlain.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSOURI RIVER.

Mr. McSHANE, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 10347) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River, at or near the city of Plattsmouth, Nebr., and for other purposes; which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LIND, by unanimous consent, introduced a bill (H. R. 10348) for a public building at Mankato, Minn., which was read a first and second time, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and ordered to be printed.

TARIFF.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, for the purpose of considering revenue measures; and pending that I move that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments be limited to ten minutes; and upon that motion I demand the previous question.

Mr. McKINLEY. I move to amend by making the time thirty minutes.

Mr. MILLS. I accept that as a modification of my motion.

The previous question was ordered; and under the operation thereof the motion to limit debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto to thirty minutes was agreed to.

The motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair, and resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the pending paragraph.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wood unmanufactured not specially enumerated or provided for.

The CHAIRMAN. When this paragraph was under consideration the last time the House was in Committee of the Whole a formal amendment was pending. In the absence of objection that will be considered as withdrawn. By order of the House all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto is limited to thirty minutes.

Mr. PARKER. I move to strike out the last three words. Mr. Chairman, it would seem proper in the consideration of a bill of this kind——

[At this point the waving of a red pocket handkerchief in the Press Gallery attracted the attention of members and excited repeated manifestations of applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The Chairman can not see the waving of an object in the Reporters' Gallery which has been mistaken by gentlemen upon the other side for the red bandana handkerchief of Ohio, when, in fact, it is a telegram from the State of Oregon. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect, in introducing the remarks which I have to make this morning, that I should encounter the first flutter of that flag which I suppose is to wave in the coming campaign. It seems to be perfectly well understood that the man who is not yet nominated and who is to be placed at the rear of the ticket shall be the man who will carry the flag and lead in the campaign. [Laughter.] If that is a matter of solace and consolation to the gentlemen who are cheering the bandana they are welcome to it. I suggest, however, to the gentleman in the gallery who flaunts it, that it would be in better taste and have a better effect if he would use it for the purpose for which it was originally intended. [Great laughter.]

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that a committee of three be appointed to remove the red flag which the Reporters' Gallery is flaunting in the faces of our irritable friends.

Mr. BLAND. You will have to stand it for the next four years. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair reminds gentlemen that this is not a political convention. The Committee of the Whole is proceeding to consider an important bill, and the Chair requests that gentlemen will come to order and cease conversation or else retire to the cloak-room.

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, it is proper that I should say, before proceeding with my remarks, that my venerable friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY], in his remark made just now, did not refer to any one upon this side of the House, but did refer to many upon the other side.

Mr. KELLEY. Certainly; red is not gray.

Mr. PARKER. Now, Mr. Chairman, to come back to the business of the occasion, I wish to ask attention to some of the arguments presented by my excellent friend from New York [Mr. COX] the other day upon the pending bill. He referred to the complaint which is sometimes made that the lumbermen are working in opposition to the friends of forestry preservation and forestry culture, and, elaborating that idea, he said, among other things, this:

I want to protect our forests and underbrush in Maine, in Michigan, all along the Pacific coast, in the Appalachians, and the Adirondacks.

And then he says:

Every one knows that petitions have been filed here from the forestries committees and societies and persons interested in the preservation of our rivers and lands by equable water distribution. These petitions show that our timber lands, 70,000,000 acres in extent, are, under such ruinous schemes, becoming absolutely waste places.

Then he passes on to other points. Now, in response to that, I wish to say that it is well known in our lumber regions that timber lands can be recut every fifteen or twenty years; that, as a rule, when the cut is originally made—certainly that is the rule in the regions to which he refers—only from fifteen to twenty trees per acre are cut. The underbrush which the gentleman so feelingly alludes to, and the small trees, and all of the hard-wood timber, the great mass that constitutes the forest, is left untouched, so that a few years after the cutting over of any of those forests a forester from a city going there would be unable to tell that the ground had been lumbered upon at all. It would require an expert to ascertain that the country had been cut over. Therefore merely lumbering over a region does not have the effect which the gentleman supposes. Nature takes care of that. Where a tree is cut down nature replaces it with another, and in a very short time the growth of the small trees and the continued growth of the larger ones more than supply what has been taken away and leave scarcely a scar to show that the lumberman has struck a blow there. I know of a marked case illustrating this where not many years ago a cyclone passed over a region in the northern Adirondacks, sweeping in its path absolutely every tree, cutting a swath as though it had been cut by a scythe. The trees were all taken by the great whirl of the air and laid in one direct line, leaving the edges upon both sides as straight as though they had been cut by the chopper.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCKINLEY was recognized, and yielded to Mr. PARKER.

Mr. PARKER. I am obliged to the gentleman. Now, Mr. Chairman, a man passing through that region and crossing the whirlwind's path to which I have just referred, unless he were one familiar with the signs and features of the woods, would not know that that forest had ever been destroyed there.

I refer to the cyclone track extending across Jefferson, St. Lawrence, and Franklin Counties, and known by all the hunters and sportsmen there under the name of the "great windfall."

But the gentleman from New York contends that in this matter of lumber and forestry protection we are "pretenders," and he quotes to us a bit of poetry which he gave in his own fine style. He says:

I am compelled to quote a little poetry to illustrate the genuine and the pretended sovereign over these matters of economy:

"God bless the king, who is the faith defender."

That is our side of the House. [Laughter and applause.]

"God bless—no harm in blessing the pretender;
Who that pretender is, and who that king—
God bless us all—is quite another thing."

[Renewed applause and laughter.]

We are not the pretenders in this case, nor in any other. We represent the interests of the people in this matter, and not those of the king. The gentleman from New York, it is well known, represents a city made up very largely of men born upon other soils and within other jurisdictions, and he may, if he sees fit, say, "God bless the king!" and have it responded to in his locality in many different languages. But as for us who guard American interests, we will personify and treat as sovereign our industries; and we will join with Robert Burns, where he contrasts the king and the people, saying:

Who will not sing "God save the king"
Shall hang high as the steeple;
But while we sing "God save the king"
We'll not forget the people.

[Applause.]

We protect our industries and thus remember the people.

Mr. Chairman, any bill drawn with even assumed fairness would not leave the tariff duty off one item and put it on others which go to make up the expense of the very item declared to be free. I call attention now to some of the items which enter into the cost of lumber. These items embrace the cost of supplies, the expenses of the men employed, and which go to create the lumber cost. If, as our opponents claim, the duty is added to the cost of a thing in making up its price, why should not all industries be borne upon alike?

By this Mills bill, which assumes to make lumber free, I find that flannels are dutiable at 40 per cent. ad valorem; blankets, 40 per cent. ad valorem; wool hats, the same; and woolen cloths, the same, while, upon some theory of free trade, shoddy is admitted free. But shoddy does not last long in the forests. Chains, which have to be used of course, are dutiable under this bill at from 1¼ to 1½ cents per pound. Axes for the lumbermen are dutiable at 40 per cent. ad valorem. Crosscut saws are dutiable at 8 cents per linear foot. Mill-pit and drag-saws are dutiable at 15 cents per linear foot; circular saws, 30 per cent. ad valorem; files to file the saws, 35 per cent. ad valorem. Iron and steel rails, over which the lumber is conveyed, are dutiable at the rate of $15 per ton under this bill. Leather belting and Spanish sole-leather are dutiable at 15 per cent. ad valorem; manufactured leather, 30 per cent. ad valorem. Cleaned rice, such as is raised in South Carolina, is dutiable, if brought in from abroad, at 2¼ cents a pound, or 100 per cent. Sugar I find dutiable at the rate of about 2 cents per pound, or about 78 per cent. Imported salt fish is dutiable at 50 cents per hundred pounds; and so on through the list. Almost every item that makes up the expenses of the more than 90 per cent. of labor of which lumber is composed is taxed under this very Mills bill. And yet the product, when turned out at last, the lumber itself, which may be said to be mostly labor in a new form, is declared to be free of duty and is made subject to the competition of our Canadian competitors. Hence the plain injustice done to the makers of sawed boards and lumber by the provisions and discriminations of this Mills tariff bill.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I will occupy one minute in reply to my honored friend and colleague. He says a forest will be renewed within fifteen years after the besom of destruction has swept through it. Nature is so prodigal, it so constantly helps civilization——

Mr. PARKER. The gentleman does not cite my statement quite correctly. I say that where a lumber forest is gone over, taking out the trees proper to be cut, the pine and the spruce, that timber can be cut again in from fifteen to twenty years.

Mr. COX. Then why do you want a duty of $2 a thousand feet when nature is so kind to you?

Mr. PARKER. Because in Canada they can get their land and their labor so much cheaper that we can not cut off this little percentage that we take away every ten or fifteen years and make it pay to do it.

Mr. BLAND. Does not Canada protect everything? How does it happen that prices are so much cheaper there?

Mr. COX. Yes, Canada is a protective country. I am in favor of reciprocity, like some of my friends on the other side.

But I desire simply to print in connection with these remarks the basis of my former statement. I referred to the memorial of the American Forestry Congress and other citizens to the Fiftieth Congress.

Memorial of American Forestry Congress and other citizens to the Fiftieth Congress, United States of America.

To the Senate and House of Representatives in Congress assembled:

Your memorialists, the American Forestry Congress and citizens of the United States, respectfully represent:

Whereas the present laws in regard to the public lands, so far as they relate to the disposal of timber lands, or of the timber from the same, are entirely inadequate to the requirements of the present state of our civilization, are unreasonable, pernicious, and prejudicial to the best interests of this country, and have a tendency to induce fraud, theft, and perjury;

Whereas, especially in the Rocky Mountain and Pacific Slope region, the mining interests, in regard to material supplies, and the agricultural interest, in regard to a favorable distribution of water supply, are threatened with danger, or have already been endangered, by the thoughtless and unnecessary destruction of the forests and brushlands on the mountain slopes and hillsides;

Whereas by ax, by the teeth of cattle, and by fire, many millions of dollars' worth of public property have been destroyed without benefit to any one, owing to the neglect on the part of the Government to protect the property of the people;

Whereas favorable agricultural and climatic conditions of a country are largely dependent upon a proper amount of well-distributed forest areas, and especially upon the preservation of the forest cover on the mountains;

Whereas such preservation can not be had under the existing laws, nor can be expected at the hands of private individuals;

Whereas by the disposal of the timbered areas now in the hands of the United States, and by their devastation under present conditions, the power to insure proper forest legislation passes from the people:

Therefore, the undersigned memorialists, imbued solely by a desire to further the best interests of the country at large, most respectfully and urgently pray that you will, without delay, give consideration to and enact as a law the subjoined bill, which provides for the withdrawal from entry or sale, classification, and proper disposal or administration of public forestry lands, or that you provide such other legislation in the same direction as may appear best to your honorable body.

On behalf of the American Forestry Congress:
B. E. FERNOW, *Secretary.*

On behalf of the Southern Forestry Congress:
A. O. LANE, *President.*
Hon. MOSES HALLETT,
Professor J. S. NEWBERRY,
And many others.

This memorial shows that in the regions where the forests have been so large and luxuriant they are being destroyed; and I would not add to their destruction by giving an encouragement and premium to it in our tariff. At the same time I would cut down items which enter into the cost of the lumbermen's living and which the gentleman enumerated. So far as I am concerned I would reduce the tariff on sugar and on the other articles which the gentleman mentioned, so far as it can be done justly, in view of the reduction which we propose, some $78,000,000.

I would also like to have printed in this connection, from the office of the corresponding secretary, American Forestry Congress, 1882, Washington, D. C., a letter as to what becomes of our timber lands.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. COX. It is as follows:

AMERICAN FORESTRY CONGRESS, 1882,
OFFICE OF CORRESPONDING SECRETARY, *Washington, D. C.*

WHAT BECOMES OF OUR TIMBER LANDS?

You are part owners of about 70,000,000 acres of land, more or less stocked with timber and not considered agriculturally valuable, held by the General Government and lying mostly on the Western mountains.

There are five ways in which a citizen may acquire either the land or the timber on it:

1. In California and on the Pacific Slope generally we allow him to get as much as 160 acres "for his own use," at $2.50 per acre, a price from ten to thirty times less than the true value. The use to which most owners put their purchase is to relinquish it to some large lumbering corporation, which in fact has paid men to perjure themselves in taking up such lands.

2. In the Southern States you can buy at $1.25 per acre, in any quantity, as much Government timber land as you may still be able to find, the most having gone at that price to speculators and lumbermen.

3. Every land-grant railroad, in addition to its share of the land grant of 75,000,000 acres and the right of way, is permitted to cut timber "for first construction," "adjacent to the line of its road." But the railroads do not construe "construction" and "adjacent" exactly in the sense in which the lawgivers did, and they have cut wherever, whenever, and for whatever purpose they chose.

4. Those who take up a homestead or pre-emption claim upon timber land are also given the right to clear as much timber as is necessary for the development of their claim and improvements before they have acquired title. We are told that most settlers on such lands do not exert themselves to procure the title after they have got the timber off.

5. Lastly, any resident citizen may cut all the timber he needs for mining and domestic purposes upon lands which are designated as "mineral lands." Oh, for the power to know what "mineral lands" are!

Shall we pride ourselves on our liberality? Or shall we rather feel ashamed of our niggardliness? Not only have we allowed the most valuable part of this class of our property to be fooled away to a few speculators, largely upon fraudulent entries, but we have criminally permitted the depreciation of the remainder, and, besides, have compelled the population of two States and seven Territories to become trespassers and criminals on account of taking the timber they needed because we would not sell it to them. In the years 1881 to 1887 there was reported timber stolen from the public domain to the value of $36,719,852, probably a small fraction of the actual depredations; there was recovered, mostly by compromise, $478,073, and expended for protection, $455,000. To this add an annual loss from fires valued at $8,000,000.

The charity which we have extended to the pioneer settlers in allowing free use of our property under certain conditions, has worked more harm than good; the settled community would gladly exchange the privilege for a fair bargain in which the consumer pays for what he uses.

The present settlement and disposition laws are the cancers that destroy the public timber lands, leaving a sick, dying, dead mountain desert, and impairing the agricultural and industrial interests adjoining.

If you feel an interest in having this property administered in a more reasonable manner, for the benefit of the settlers, as well as for the rest of the nation, write to E. B. Fernow, secretary of the American Forestry Congress, at Washington, D. C., for memorial and bill to be presented and urged in the Fiftieth Congress.

To these frauds, perjuries, and spoliations is it not monstrous to add the incentive of a tariff for protection.

Books have been written—they are in the Library—written during the last two years by scientific men, about our climatic influences looking to the safety of our forests. The conclusion of these books, drawn from history—drawn from data irrefragable—is this: That unless we protect our forests now, as some of the States are doing, by statute and police; unless we protect them against the insidious influences by monopoly and tariff, which uproot them; unless we give them additional longevity, we will become what other nations have become which have lost their forests.

From my observations in other countries, such as Turkey or Asia Minor, or such as Spain—in fact all the countries along the Mediterranean, who in time have lost their forests, and who sank precisely as they have lost them in the scale of nations, I would be derelict if I did not warn legislators here to avert the inevitable catastrophe of a treeless land.

My friend and colleague in front of me [Mr. SPINOLA] says that the people of Northern New York, represented by my colleague [Mr. PARKER], have stolen nearly all of the Adirondacks. Our best men believe that the Hudson River, which has its source in those forests and mountains, is in process of failure as a stream and as a sanitary element. Destroy the underbrush which holds the snows and you fail in your water supply! Those forests in Northern New York are indispensable to the commerce and agriculture, as well as to the health of New York. All that these gentlemen care for at present is to kill the goose that produces the golden egg.

Is it not short-sighted to seek present benefit out of these forests in the hurry of getting out their lumber and making it dear at home to the consumers because they are aggrandized by the enhanced price?

Nevertheless, the time will come, sir, when the American people will find out when they have lost their forests that they have lost that which will take ages to replace. We will never know the value of our forests until we shall have lost them. We are fast exhausting these timber lands, because of the greediness of a few and against the interest of the many. If we continue to do it we will suffer in the long run.

I do not favor the proposition to cut down our forests simply because of the economies of our future, nor of the peril to our land as a health resort for the outworn people of the world; but are we not entitled in our big cities and little towns, for houses, and fences, and every wooden thing, and in whatever form lumber is used—whether for a boat in Maine or a toothpick in New York—to lumber as free as the air we breathe?

God Almighty has planted the forests. He gave the sun to shine and the early and latter rain to fall upon them; He has arrayed the earth in its garniture of greenery, and He intended it all for the well-being of His creatures. It is a beautiful utility as well for their shelter as for their health. I will never vote in this House to restrict or limit His benefactions; I will not vote to add a burden to our people by keeping up a selfish tariff on a commodity like lumber, which the great body of our people demand should be within the reach of the humblest cottager. [Applause]

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, I suppose this is the last expiring note on the subject of the preservation of our forests. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. No; it is just begun.

Mr. REED. There was a time when a great many people actually believed what the gentleman from New York said, and actually thought that as we presented the case it was an argument against the preservation of the American markets for American lumber. Now, that forestry excitement has served its purpose. Its object was to increase the number of acres of land which could be obtained in the West. It certainly has had a good effect in settling the country. I am glad the gentleman from New York has had an opportunity to say the last morsel of oratory that probably will be dedicated to that subject. [Laughter and applause.]

Why, what an idea! Think of it for a moment—the forests are to be preserved simply on account of the rivers, and they are to be preserved, not at the expense of the community at large, but at the expense of the individual owners thereof, who are to be treated differently from the rest of the people of this country on that account.

The great value of our forests is to furnish lumber for the people. The gentleman from New York demands cheap lumber for the benefit of all the people, and then, in one and the same breath, he advocates not cutting down the trees of the forest on account of the alleged injurious effect upon the flow of the rivers!

If the gentleman knew anything about the effect of the forests, the effect of the breaking up and settling of the country, he would not join

in this jeremiad about the rivers drying up and the country becoming an arid waste in consequence of cutting down the trees.

The settlement by human beings of all the new countries of the earth, the necessity for their subsistence, their effect upon the soil, their turning up the soil, devoting it to the purposes of civilization—to human purposes—in themselves by the laws of God promote a rain-fall steady and permanent, which gives the rivers their natural flow; and there is no more reason to refuse to cut the increase of the forests than to refuse to cut the increase of the farms. And I say to the gentleman from New York that he is taking up the eloquence of a by-gone time and devoting it to the consideration of a present subject. It has no applicability here. Further facts and further history have shown the absurdity of this argument, which had its largest currency in order to add another section of land to the amount that could be purchased or taken up in the growing Western States and Territories.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman allow me a moment?

Mr. REED. Yes, sir.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman state what his experience is in Maine? Is it only the increase of the forest that has been taken?

Mr. REED. Precisely.

Mr. COX. Only the increase?

Mr. REED. I say to the gentleman that the timber lands of Maine are to-day used in precisely the same fashion as the farming lands; that is to say, that the timber lands proper are cut for their increase, and the size of the logs cut being limited, it is just as legitimate, just as reasonable and proper a business as any on earth; and to refuse to pursue such an occupation on the idea suggested by the gentlemen here, that some day or other these lands will be denuded, the rain-fall checked, and our rivers dried up, would be just as appropriate as an argument which would refuse to catch whales because we would have to live in darkness after we got through with them. [Laughter.] The truth of the matter is that the most of the things of this world have been provided by God for the happiness of human beings, and for human beings to exploit—to increase the riches, the comfort, and the happiness of the people of the world. And when people proclaim that it is injurious to the world for human beings to reap the riches thereof, as nature provided they should, they are doing something for a special purpose, of which, when they become better informed, they will be duly ashamed. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will assume that the *pro forma* amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, I doubt if there is a change proposed by this bill which is more universally approved by the people than by this schedule, which places timber, lumber, etc., upon the free-list. I confess that I have been considerably surprised at the opposition to this change by Representatives upon the other side, especially those from Illinois, Nebraska, Kansas, and Iowa who oppose this provision. It occurs to me that, representing constituencies wholly at the mercy of the lumber trust, which unquestionably is in copartnership with the transportation companies, they would be the last to rise here and defend a law which enables these monopolies to fleece their constituents out of millions of dollars. What are the facts? In Michigan, Wisconsin, and Minnesota there are large quantities of white pine. It makes a valuable lumber. We have but little elsewhere. The pine lumber of the Southern States is valuable, but does not come into competition with the white-pine lumber of the North. The yellow pine is filled with turpentine and resin. The white pine is adapted to all finishing purposes. It can be used where you desire to paint. Large quantities of yellow pine are shipped all over the world, but is not used for the same purposes as the white pine. Consequently there is but little competition between the pine lumber of the South and that of the North, whether they meet in the markets in the North or in the South.

Much has been said about the wages paid by the lumber manufacturers of Michigan and other States. It is claimed that if lumber is placed upon the free-list wages in this industry will be reduced. It will require more than mere assertions; it will require more than the testimony of interested parties to convince me that wages are higher in the lumber regions of Michigan than they are in close proximity in Canada. Such a statement the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] would say "everybody knows is absurd." The laborers of Canada are not going to work for 30 per cent. less if by crossing an imaginary line they can get 30 per cent. more wages. They will come over and keep coming until wages have so fallen in the United States and so risen in Canada as to be upon an equality. What has the tariff done? That it has put one penny into the pockets of the wage-workers no one has dared to claim. Every member upon the other side when pressed has admitted that the wages paid by the lumbermen are no greater than those paid in other avocations in the same locality. Who, then, has received any benefit?

The price of white-pine lumber has advanced several dollars per thousand in the last two years. The price in Saginaw, Mich., in 1876 was $9.67 per thousand; in 1877 it was $9.73; in 1878 it was $9.66; in 1879 it was $9.50; in 1880 the stumpage, that is the timber, had been so reduced that the same had come under the control of a few men, who, organizing a combination, advanced the price to $11.63. In 1881 it was further advanced to $13.92, and in 1882 it was sold as high as $14 per thousand, and still sells for about that price; that is, good common white-pine lumber. This advance was brought about by a combination of the owners of the stumpage, who were principally the lumbermen. The lumber barons having gotten hold of all the timber, advanced the price of stumpage from an average of $1 to an average of $4.50 per thousand. This was the cause of the advance in the price of timber lands of from 300 to 1,000 per cent., as stated by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WILSON]. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] attempted to answer this in his usual style, declaring that the increase in value was solely on account of the wonderful growth and progress that had taken place throughout the country. The truth is that the best farming lands in Ohio, Indiana, and the Western States, which had been improved, have during this period fallen instead of risen in value.

This argument is upon a par with all the sophistry that has been made use of by gentlemen upon the other side during this debate. Why should white-pine stumpage have advanced so marvelously, while the stumpage of all other kinds of timber remained stationary? Why should this class of stumpage be worth $4.50 per thousand in the United States and only $1.25 per thousand in Canada? The reason is perfectly apparent: a few men own the timber in the United States; they have combined to realize every dollar they possibly can out of it. They have an advantage over their Canadian competitor of about $1 per thousand in the cost of transportation, and $2 per thousand in the duty, and these they have added to the value of their timber and estimate it as a part of the cost of lumber. Every dollar goes to the owners of the stumpage. Let us see what their profits amount to. The Government sold the lands upon which the timber stands at from $1.25 to $2.50 per acre—a section, at the highest price, costing $1,600. These lands according to the lowest estimate contain, upon an average, a stumpage of 5,000 feet per acre. A section, therefore, contains a stumpage of 3,200,000, which, at $4.50 per thousand, brings $14,400.

The land, after the timber has been removed, sells for from $2.50 to $10 per acre. Upon an average it brings more than the original cost. The lumbermen therefore realize a clean profit off of each section of land purchased by them of over $15,000.

Here is where the $2 per thousand duty has gone. Here is where your protection protects. It has not gone into the calloused hands of the wage-worker, but into the price of the timber, before labor has touched it, and afterwards into the bank accounts of the timber or lumber barons. Shall we uphold and sustain this monopoly, or shall we release the people from its grasp?

The manufacturers of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin produce about 8,000,000,000 feet per annum. The $2 duty per thousand, which they have placed upon the value of their lumber in the tree, amounts to $16,000,000 annually. Who pays this bonus? The farmers of the West; the wage-workers in our cities who are struggling by the aid of building and loan associations to get a little home of their own, from which their families can not be driven when they are out of employment.

Mr. O. R. Bishop, of Chicago, an iron worker representing the Knights of Labor before the Tariff Commission upon the subject of lumber, said:

It was stated yesterday by the lumber interests that they had paid in wages to 56,000 workers $17,000,000. Truly a large sum, but if divided by 56,000 it gives to each worker the insignificant sum, for a year's hard toil, amid snow and ice in winter, and malarial fever in summer, $304 with which to clothe, feed, and educate himself and family, while the few employers cleared, by their own figures, nearly $4,000,000 net, and still have $40,000,000 worth of mills and tools on hand. Why should they not wish a continuance of the monopoly when it pays so well? And your attention is called to the action of the Lumbermen's Exchange (a trade union). The other day they met and raised the price of all grades of lumber $1.50 per thousand, which, if made general on the 3,919,500,000, will increase the profits to $8,000,000—a very mild species of robbery.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] talks about the number of establishments in this industry, the amount of capital invested, and the number of laborers employed as if these were all to be extinguished by the passage of this bill. The number of establishments will not be decreased, the wages of the laborers will not be reduced, nor the capital invested be diminished by placing lumber upon the free-list, but the power of the trust to extort from the people $16,000,000 annually, over and above a fair and legitimate profit, let us hope will be forever destroyed.

The CHAIRMAN. All debate on the pending amendment is exhausted. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] to strike out lines 9 and 10, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Wood unmanufactured, not specially enumerated or provided for.

The question being taken, the Chairman stated that the "noes" seemed to have it.

Mr. GUENTHER. I call for a division.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 74, noes 100.

Mr. GUENTHER. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and Mr. GUENTHER and Mr. MILLS were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 77, noes 96.

So the motion to strike out the paragraph was not agreed to.

The Clerk read the next paragraph, as follows:

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and all other articles of sawed lumber.

Mr. MOFFITT. I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the paragraph just read.

Mr. MOFFITT. Mr. Chairman, representing as I do constituents who annually manufacture 150,000,000 feet of lumber I offer this amendment in good faith and solely in the interests of those engaged in this industry in my district without regard to party.

On the 18th day of March last I presented to the House a memorial from certain lumbermen in Northern New York protesting against any reduction in the duties on lumber, which by unanimous consent was printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. As the majority of that committee have failed to favorably consider the memorial thus presented, I now send it to the Clerk's desk and ask that it be read in my time for the information of the Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America:

The undersigned, manufacturers of lumber in the county of Franklin and State of New York, respectfully present for your consideration the following statement in regard to this important industry, with an earnest protest against any change in the existing tariff on lumber.

We are situated so near to the Canadian frontier that a reduction of the small duty now exacted would take away all the profit now enjoyed, unless it could be saved by a reduction of the wages paid the laborers engaged in the work. Fully four-fifths of the cost of lumber is in the wages paid, and these wages are based upon giving a fair return for the labor expended, and are from 50 to 75 per cent. in excess of those paid by the Canadian lumbermen with whom we compete, and in the aggregate amount to at least $3 per 1,000 feet more than paid to the Canadians for the same work. Should the duty be removed and the rates of wages in this country be maintained as at present, we, in common with others, would be compelled to shut up our mills. This would throw out of employment a vast army of workmen, and drive them into other occupations, thereby creating a fresh competition in the labor market, and tending to diminish the income of all wage earners. This in turn would take away their purchasing ability and curtail the market for other producers, thus throwing still other laborers out of employment, and yet further deranging the entire business of the communities, and so of the nation. In time the pangs of hunger would compel a resumption of labor in some field, but at the starvation wages paid in other lands, and in the distant future, on the basis of lower wages, the lumber industry might be resumed, but after a complete demoralization and the ruin of hundreds of men engaged in it to-day.

If the reduction in price claimed by the advocates of the removal of the duty should be made, who would get the benefit of it? The Canadians have millions of feet of lumber awaiting a favorable time for shipment, and would get the opportunity of supplying the immediate demand. That accomplished and the home manufacturers being driven from the market, the citizens of our neighboring Dominion would hold absolute control, and our builders would be at their mercy. Then, with a wasted trade, demolished mills, and lack of properly trained laborers, our manufacturers could again seek to supply the demand which a careless act of legislation had taken from them.

The supply of timber in our Adirondack forests is in no danger of being exhausted by those who operate according to the plan pursued by your petitioners, for they cut only the large timber, leaving the smaller trees for further growth. In this way the preservation of the forests as regulators of moisture is not injured, and the sources of water supply are maintained. The hemlock timber on most of the tracts is cut for the use of tanners, and the logs are saved for the lumbermen. The spruce supply is in some sections dying rapidly, and to prevent great loss to the owners this must soon be cut. The supply of pine is not large, and the hard word can not be manufactured to any considerable extent at a profit with present railroad facilities and at present prices.

The discontinuance of the lumber business in our county would entail serious consequences on a host of other industries dependent on the consuming power of the fifteen thousand people supported by this industry. The store-keepers, produce dealers, millers, machinists, farmers, railroads, all depend largely upon the prosperity of the lumbermen. Such discontinuance would entail upon the manufacturers who have been for years engaged in establishing their business and locating and preserving their vast forest possessions an almost irretrievable ruin. The cost of the mills in this country is upwards of a quarter of a million of dollars, and the value of the timber lands, if the tariff is maintained, is reckoned by millions.

The conditions existing here are not very different from those in other States, and when the great aggregate of laborers employed is taken into account, the disastrous effects of a repeal of the present small tariff duty, which is felt by no consumer of lumber and yields a comparatively insignificant revenue to the Government, are so appalling that we are constrained to enter our vigorous protest against so ruinous a measure.

Respectfully submitted, February, 1888.

Name.	Residence.	Annual capacity of mills.
		Feet.
A. B. Parmelee & Son	Malone, N. Y	4,000,000
A. A. Wood	St. Regis Falls	4,000,000
McFarlane & Ross	do	9,000,000
R. P. Lindsay	do	1,000,000
J. W. Shanley	Shanley's Station	5,000,000
The Deecey & Backus Lumber Company	Brandon	15,000,000
St. Regis River Lumber Company	Santa Clara	30,000,000
F. A. Cutting, per D. M.	St. Regis Falls	1,000,000
David Mitchell		
C. J. Adams	Bangor	2,000,000
Ladd & Smallmann	Malone	4,000,000

Mr. MOFFITT. I am satisfied, Mr. Chairman, that if the majority of the committee who presented this bill will use their honest judgment in the matter, and throw aside their set method of figuring the profits upon lumber by theory, and examine more carefully this business from a fair and unprejudiced standpoint that the amendment will be agreed to. [Applause.]

[While Mr. MOFFITT was delivering the foregoing remarks his five minutes expired. By unanimous consent, his time was extended for five minutes.]

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, the communication prepared by the lumber men of Michigan, and read on the floor of the House the other day by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], states that the annual output of lumber in that State is 4,000,000,000 feet, which is of the value of $52,000,000; that $17,585,500 is paid to labor in its production; that $4,000,000 is paid to labor in its transportation, and about $6,000,000 is paid for farm productions. This statement shows that the cost of producing is about $4.25 per thousand feet, and that the value of the lumber at the mill is $13 per thousand. Hence, after deducting the cost of production from the value of the product, the remainder will show the value of the lumber in the tree to be $8.75 per thousand feet. This calculation is based upon the statements made in the communication read by Mr. BURROWS. For, if $17,585,500 of labor will produce $52,000,000 in value of lumber from the stump, then $4.25 of labor will produce $13 in value of lumber from the stump, which is 1,000 feet.

Therefore, for every 1,000 feet of lumber the Michigan lumberman manufactures and sells at the mill at $13 per thousand he receives $8.75 per thousand feet for his lumber in the tree. It costs to cut down and saw the tree into logs 16 feet long on an average 50 cents per thousand feet; the average cost of hauling the logs from the stump to the water course is 75 cents per thousand feet; for rafting them to the mill 10 cents per thousand feet; and for sawing the logs and piling the lumber on the dock at the mill the cost will not exceed $1.90 per thousand feet, making the total cost of production in Michigan of $3.25 per thousand feet. This gives the manufacturer a profit of $1 per thousand for sawing at the mill, and he has the further profit of 20 cents per thousand feet on his teams that haul his logs; total profit in manufacturing the lumber of $1.20 per thousand feet. Add this sum to the enormous price of $8.75 the Michigan lumberman gets per thousand feet for his lumber in the tree, it will make $9.95 per thousand feet which is left in the pockets of the lumberman for every foot he manufactures and sells at $13 per thousand. The Michigan lumbermen can not go back on these figures, because they state in their memorial read by Mr. BURROWS that the 4,000,000,000 feet annually produced in Michigan is of the value of $52,000,000, which is just $13 per thousand. They further state that the amount paid to labor in producing the 4,000,000,000 feet is $17,585,500. This will make each thousand feet cost $4.25. But in this labor account of $17,585,500 are included the team account and the mill account, with the profits thereon, and not more than one-third of that sum goes to the actual laborer; the balance is retained by the lumberman himself for the use of his teams, mill, and machinery used in the production of the lumber.

The memorial of the lumbermen of Michigan has served one good purpose; it has given the amount of feet of lumber annually produced in that State, its value, and cost of production, which has enabled us to arrive at the foregoing conclusions by mathematical calculations. It is also made apparent that in the production and sale of 4,000,000,000 feet of lumber in the State of Michigan the lumberman receives for the timber in the tree and the profits on its production $39,800,000, leaving $12,200,000 for the cost of production, less the value of the timber in the tree; but out of that $12,200,000 the teams are fed, the horses are shod, wagons, harness, and sleds kept in repair; fuel and oil for the mills are purchased, and the necessary repairs upon all the machinery and appliances at the mills are kept up; so that not to exceed one-third of the $12,200,000 is paid to the laborer. Yet this is the industry our Republican friends tell us will be broken down and trampled under foot in the State of Michigan if the tariff of $2 per thousand feet upon foreign lumber is repealed. Is there a man upon the floor of this House that honestly believes it?

The repeal of the tariff could possibly do no more than to reduce the value of the lumberman's timber in the tree from the enormous sum of $8.75 to $6.75 per thousand feet; his profits on the production would still remain the same, and he would still have to pay the market value for the labor, and the question whether the lumberman is to get $8.75 or $6.75 per thousand feet for his timber in the tree over the cost of production will neither stop its production nor decrease the price of labor. It has been said during this debate that the average yield of lumber per acre in the tree is 5,000 feet. This statement is calculated to mislead those not familiar with the method used in arriving at such conclusion. In making these estimates the timber belt, comprising half of the State (more or less), is taken and the quantity of standing timber upon the whole area estimated, and the average per acre is made by taking all the land included in that section of the State, when perhaps four-fifths of the land embraced in the calculation is not timber land at all nor entitled to such appellation.

The fact is that in the wild timber portions of Michigan the unculled forests will average 30,000 feet of lumber per acre if you will count out the lakes, swamps, and prairies, if any. This will give to the lumberman for his 30,000 feet of timber on an acre of his ground, after the proposed reduction of the tariff, $6.75 per thousand feet. Thus we see

the lumberman whose land is thus rich with timber—and no one dare deny that many thousand acres are—realizes for his timber per acre $202.50 besides all the profits he makes upon the manufacturing of the lumber. But as the tariff now stands the lumberman will get $60 more per acre for the timber in the tree, making $262.50. This extra $60 per acre the consumer has to pay in the name of protection. This is the business (which is making more millionaires than any other business in the United States) we are called upon, in the name of labor, to protect.

The Michigan memorial further states that the annual production of lumber in the United States is 20,000,000,000 feet; that the whole amount of timber in the tree in the dominion of Canada is 50,000,000,000 feet. Now, if the United States consumes 20,000,000,000 feet of lumber annually, as is stated in the Michigan memorial, Canada, with her 50,000,000,000 feet, could not supply the United States to exceed two and one-half years. The estimated quantity of coniferous timber in the United States is 800,000,000,000 feet, of which 350,000,000,000 is west of the Rocky Mountains, leaving east of the Rocky Mountains 450,000,000,000 feet. Now, if the United States should in the future only produce annually, as she now does, 20,000,000,000 feet of lumber, all the timber in the United States east of the Rocky Mountains would be consumed in twenty-two and one-half years, and the whole quantity in the United States would be consumed in forty years.

Of the 450,000,000,000 feet east of the Rocky Mountains, 350,000,000,000 is in the following-named States: North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, Florida, Mississippi, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Texas, leaving but 100,000,000,000 feet, or one-eighth of the whole, in the twenty-six other States of this Union, to wit: Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Kentucky, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Michigan, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, and Nevada, with a population of over 45,000,000. This statement shows at a glance the interest these great barren Northwesten States have in this timber question, and the folly of insisting that there is a necessity for protection to our lumber industries by continuing a duty on foreign lumber, when, at the rate the United States are now manufacturing lumber, every stick of timber now standing in the twenty-six great States last named would be consumed in five years.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I renew the amendment, and send to the desk the Public Ledger, of Philadelphia, of this date, that the Clerk may read the dispatch I have marked, and show the Democratic members of the House what wickedness they have aided me in perpetrating.

The Clerk read as follows:

MR. SHEARMAN ON THE TARIFF.

[Special to the Public Ledger.]

NEW YORK, *June* 4.

Thomas G. Shearman delivered an address on the tariff question in Brooklyn to-night. In beginning his address he said he had received a dispatch from Washington, in which it was stated that President Cleveland had just signed the bill of Mr. KELLEY, of Pennsylvania, putting a duty of $12 a ton on all pig-iron imported from England.

"Now," said the speaker, "as we import 2,000,000 tons of pig-iron from England every year, and as this duty is absolutely prohibitory, let us see how it will benefit or injure the workingmen of the United States. It takes 700 large steamers to bring this amount of pig-iron to the United States, and their stoppage will throw the men who handle the pig-iron on board out of employment for the time being, or say, 10,000 men. It would take 3,000 longshoremen a year without a holiday to take the iron from the 700 ships that would bring it across. It would take 6,000 men with horses and carts to remove it to the depot to be transferred to the different railroads, and, taking into account the sailors, longshoremen, railroad men, molders, stove-makers, and other men engaged in the manufacture of iron, 150,000 men would be thrown out of employment altogether."

Mr. KELLEY. Mr. Chairman, I have had that dispatch read for the purpose of illustrating to the innocent gentlemen on the other side of the House, who believe all the statements they hear made on this subject of the tariff by their leaders and party friends, and to show them how dangerous it is to trust the statements of gentlemen like Mr. Shearman or my friend from New York [Mr. COX], who has just delighted us by showing in his cheerful way how the lumber trade is denuding our country of its forests and subjecting its people to the dreadful perils he depicted with so much hilarity, or like Augustus Mongredien, who some years ago prepared for the Cobden Club a pamphlet addressed to the American farmer, of which the club sent 50,000 copies for distribution among our farmers.

The distribution was begun, but Mr. Mongredien's statements were found to be so wonderfully exaggerated and so much like the imitations of Munchausen contained in Mr. Shearman's address of Saturday evening, that it was soon discovered that it would not do to bring them to the attention of practical farmers. The pamphlet was therefore withdrawn from the agricultural portions of the country for which it had been intended, and is now from time to time sent into our manufacturing towns where the people do not know very much about farming. These gentlemen, Mr. Shearman and my friend from New York, are gentlemen, as was Mr. Mongredien. It has been my privilege to know all of them. Mongredien is dead; but with the survivors of the trio he had read Bastiat long ago, and, knowing as they all thought they did, that Bastiat uttered nothing but pure philosophic truth, none of them ever thought it important to investigate facts. To their minds anything that harmonizes with Bastiat's theories is true and anything that does not is not worth knowing, because, being out of harmony with Bastiat's aphorisms, it can not be true. [Laughter.]

Mr. Shearman is a gentleman of intelligence. He is the eminent lawyer who was said to have shed tears when testimony bearing against his client was brought out during the protracted trial of the late Henry Ward Beecher. He is eminently pious, too, and he is a most agreeable man, as is my friend from New York [Mr. COX], on all subjects except his lunacy that the facts of history, to be accepted, must square with the theories of Bastiat. [Laughter.] Mr. Shearman is a gentleman in all respects. His home, of the hospitalities of which it has been my privilege to partake, is one of the most delightful homes in all the City of Churches. He is, as I have said, a very agreeable gentleman, almost as agreeable, if it were possible, as my distinguished friend from New York. [Laughter.] He is, however, more pious than my friend from New York. [Renewed laughter.] This is probably because he has not been in Congress. I mention his piety to show that the misstatements the dispatch discloses, that you gentlemen had helped me to put a duty of $12 a ton upon pig-iron, and had gone up with me, with a brass band before us, to get President Cleveland to sign the bill, are not deliberate attempts to injure us or to mislead his hearers. Mr. Shearman did not think he was stating what was not true a bit more than Mongredien did when he represented our farmers as suffering so terribly that they ought to send over written pledges to the Cobden Club that at the next Congressional election they would not vote for any candidate who would not promise to favor the repeal of the duties that were destroying them and their farms. Let us look a little at this statement. The gentleman who made it is really a sensible man, an educated man, a leader of prayer meetings, a gentleman who is delegated every few years to represent the New York and Brooklyn free-traders at the Cobden Club dinners. Yet listen to what stuff he utters:

First. Here is a statement that the President has signed, you gentlemen having at my instigation passed, a bill to impose a duty of $12 a ton—on what? Why, on the 2,000,000 tons of pig-iron which he says we import annually. Just think of it! Two million tons annually! The duty $12 a ton.

Now, what have you and the President done by being thus seduced and deluded by me? You have thrown out of work "6,000 men with horses," each of whom—that is if there are 6,000 men with horses employed in distributing those 2,000,000 tons, each of whom with his horse lived by handling thirteen tons and a half of pig-iron a year.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. KELLEY. I trust I may have my time extended a little.

Mr. BURROWS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have further time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] may be permitted to continue his remarks for five minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. KELLEY. First, we import 2,000,000 tons of pig-iron, and this importation requires "seven hundred large steamers" to bring it to this country, and the awful consequence of stopping those seven hundred steamers would be to—

Throw the men who handle the pig-iron on board out of employment for the time being, or, say 10,000 men; it would take 3,000 longshoremen a year without a holiday to take the iron from the seven hundred ships that would bring it across. It would take 6,000 men with horses and carts to remove it to the depot to be transferred to the different railroads, and, taking into account the sailors, longshoremen, railroad men, molders, stove-makers—

You see how intimately Mr. Shearman is informed on all branches of business connected with these imports of 2,000,000 tons of pig-iron annually—

and other men engaged in the manufacture of iron, 150,000 men would be thrown out of employment altogether.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask, what would be the effect on our labor market of admitting 2,000,000 tons of pig-iron? How many men are employed in digging the ore, quarrying the fluxes, digging the coal, coking it and handling it? Forty miles is the average that material has to be hauled in England. Four hundred miles, upon the highest British authority, that of Sir Isaac Lothian Bell, is the average that American ore, flux, and fuel have to be hauled. Look, too, at the effect upon our railroads of drawing our lumber from a British province or our iron from Britain herself. Look at the thousands of American men employed on the ships on our lakes, and on our railroads, whose lines are now longer on land than Britain's lines have been on sea since the opening of the Suez Canal. But, happily for our wage-earning countrymen, Mr. Shearman's sketch is but a figment of the brain, a pure work of imagination. During the four fiscal years closing June 30, 1887, we imported 1,299,530 tons or an average not of 2,000,000 but of 324,883 tons, or less than one-sixth of the amount on which Mr. Shearman based his appeal for free trade.

In submitting this extraordinary statement of Mr. Shearman's, I call attention to these vagaries to show gentlemen that they can not rely upon the statements of fact which are made by theoretical free-traders

who draw their facts from their "inner consciousness" or from practical jokers, who probably deceived him and perverted my friend Shearman's Saturday night address.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] has quoted something in reference to our friend, Brother Shearman, and associates me quite pleasantly with him. I find a little quotation about Judge KECLEY——

Mr. KELLEY. Oh, I could furnish the gentleman a volume of them.

Mr. COX. I find a quotation about Judge KELLEY which is very good——

Mr. KELLEY. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. COX (reading):

Judge KELLEY's talk to the people about the benefit of protection to them reminds one of the conduct of the hunter who cut off his dog's tail, roasted the tail, picked off the meat from the tail, and gave the bone of the tail to the dog for his share.

[Laughter.]

Mr. KELLEY. Is that from Mr. Shearman?

Mr. COX. That is perhaps a theoretical exaggeration——

Mr. KELLEY. Is it from Mr. Shearman, or is it original?

Mr. COX. It is original with a San Francisco paper.

Now, I want to make one remark, so as to emulate the good temper of my friend from Pennsylvania, who is always so kind toward me, as he has been, lo! these thirty years. The gentlemen on the other side who find fault with this bill, which is brought here really for the purpose of reducing the surplus——

Mr. KELLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. COX. As the principal idea, with me, it is the surplus; the tariff being the incident. Gentlemen find fault with the committee's bill without yet giving us any remedy. They say, if they say anything at all, "Keep to the old tariff." This is no remedy. It is a continuance of the mischief; and yet the body of the political followers of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] say in their platforms, "Revise the tariff." How revise it? If you can not revise it on lumber, on what can you revise it?

A MEMBER. On sugar.

Mr. COX. On sugar? We propose to do that to some extent.

A MEMBER. On rice.

Mr. COX. Well, wait till the vote comes.

Mr. MILLIKEN. How much do you propose to leave on sugar after you reduce it?

Mr. COX. I want to say a word in reply to the gentleman's colleague from Maine, whom I always delight to hear speak on account of the music of his voice—I will not mention which one of the gentleman's colleagues. [Laughter.] He gave us a fable the other day—a very good fable, which brought down the House. It had some appositeness. And now I will give a fable to illustrate as well the "antiquity and universality" of Æsop's humor, as the terrible results of fault-finding. While you gentlemen on the other side clamor for a revision of the tariff, you find fault with every proposition looking that way. You find fault with placing lumber on the free-list as you find fault with every other item in this bill. I send up the fable to the Clerk's desk to be read. It is full of meaning. Besides, it is an answer to the gentleman from Maine who gave us another fable in the general debate.

The Clerk read as follows:

Jupiter, Neptune, and Minerva (as the story goes) once contended which of them should make the most perfect thing. Jupiter made a man; Pallas made a house; and Neptune made a bull; and Momus—for he had not yet been turned out of Olympus—was chosen judge to decide which production had the greatest merit. He began by finding fault with the bull, because his horns were not below his eyes, so that he might see when he butted with them. Next he found fault with the man, because there was no window in his breast that all might see his inward thoughts and feelings. And lastly he found fault with the house, because it had no wheels to enable its inhabitants to remove from bad neighbors. But Jupiter forthwith drove the critic out of heaven, telling him that a fault-finder could never be pleased, and that it was time to criticise the works of others when he had done some good thing himself.

[Applause and laughter.]

Mr. COX. Jupiter drove the critic out of heaven; and I do not know where he went, but I suspect where he must have gone. I have never heard of him since. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. He went below.

Mr. COX. I do not know. I give it up. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. ADAMS. If the amendment is withdrawn I renew it.

Mr. KELLEY. I will withdraw it if the gentleman will renew it.

Mr. ADAMS. I renew the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, so far as we have now gone, it does not appear that the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] is correct in saying that the particular purpose of this bill is to reduce the revenue. I do not know exactly what the total receipts from the lumber duty were last year, but I remember very well the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] pointed out the other day that the items we have discussed produced only an insignificant amount. Therefore, so far as those items are concerned, or the items we have had the opportunity to discuss in this five-minute debate, the main object of the bill is not to reduce the revenue, but to revise the tariff according to certain principles entertained by gentlemen on the other side. They believe it will permanently furnish cheaper lumber to the American consumer. We believe, or at any rate I believe, that although for six months after this law takes effect it will produce cheaper lumber, that saving to the consumer will not be permanent.

But my purpose was not to discuss that question; I wished to point out what I regard to be an exaggeration in the argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX]. Whatever good argument may be made for the abolition of the lumber duty it can not be found in the proposition that the abolition of the duty is necessary to the protection of our forests. Yet that argument has been made time and again on the floor of the House—once or twice by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY], and several times by the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX]. I am inclined to think the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] on this question does not show his usual accuracy. He draws his facts confessedly, or almost confessedly, from his reminiscences of the Orient.

Mr. COX. I drew them from the report of the forestry congress.

Mr. ADAMS. He referred to his experiences of oriental countries.

Mr. COX. Yes, I did. I am not a theoretical person; I made practical observations.

Mr. ADAMS. He seems to be of the opinion the lumber business is so carried on that when the lumberman gets through with a certain piece of land he leaves it naked land; that the sun strikes down upon it and dries up the soil; evaporation increases and the climate changes. Now, I do not believe that that is true of the lumbering business in any part of the United States. It is certainly not true of New England.

Mr. COX. Northern Pennsylvania is almost destitute now because the timber was cut off. I remember gangs of sixteen saws running.

Mr. ADAMS. Where?

Mr. COX. At Williamsport.

Mr. ADAMS. When?

Mr. COX. Thirty years ago.

Mr. ADAMS. That brings me to what I was about to state.

Mr. COX. All that lumber went west, west to Chicago, to be used on the prairie, but now it all comes from Chicago east. We are destroying the forests of the Northwest as they were destroyed in Pennsylvania.

Mr. ADAMS. We are destroying them in the Northwest. There has been a change in the method of carrying on the lumber business since the gentleman from New York, who is not a theoretical but a practical observer, made his observations in Pennsylvania thirty years ago, on which he bases his references of to-day.

So far as New England is concerned we have the information from Representatives of that section on this floor that it is not so. They say that they cut only the increase of the forests, and it is further stated that there is more timber standing to-day in New England as a result of this system than there was forty years ago.

So far as the South and Southwest is concerned I am inclined to think from information received that the same is true to a certain extent.

So far as the Northwestern States are concerned, a great change has been made in the method of lumbering within the last twenty years. Twenty years ago lumbering was carried on upon the lower portions of the logging streams exclusively. It was necessarily the case and could not then be changed. There were no appliances in use at that day to get to the upper waters of the streams and get the logs out; and hence the lumber upon the lower streams which was accessible was taken. These forests, which were pine, were exclusively consumed by the business. The argument of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] might fairly apply to lumbering as it was then carried on.

There has since that time been a great change, and his argument does not so fairly apply. By the use of dams the lumbermen are now enabled to reach the upper courses of the streams and take the finest pine timber, selecting the best and largest where it grows amongst the hard timber, leaving the latter standing.

The gentleman from New York, therefore, who is a practical and not a theoretical observer, will see the difference at once. You may take a single pine from a 40-acre tract; it will increase to a certain extent the evaporation of the soil, and in a limited way dry up the land; but as a practical question it does not have any material effect. It makes a great difference whether you take every tree from a 40-acre tract or take only the scattered pine standing in such a tract and leave the rest of the growth standing; and I think I am in a position to state as a matter of fact that a very large part of the lumbering in the Northwest is carried on in that way. I have, of course, no practical familiarity with the business except in so far as excursions for recreation have made me familiar with the country where it is carried on. But I know that that is the way it is carried on to a great extent.

I am sure that when an argument is made by a gentleman so intelligent as the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX], which is based on an erroneous impression, he will willingly accept the correction of the exaggeration into which he has been betrayed.

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, in 1854 we entered into a treaty with

Canada by which the Canadian lumber was brought into the United States free of duty. The Commissioner of Revenue, in 1869, tells us that at the expiration of that treaty in 1866, when lumber became dutiable, the price of lumber in Chicago, where my friend [Mr. ADAMS] lives, was $14.80 per thousand feet; but as soon as the treaty expired and the tariff took effect upon Canadian lumber the price jumped instantly up to $17.30 per thousand feet.

That was an increase of just about the amount of the duty—cent per cent. of the average rate of duty that was placed by the lumber dealers in the United States upon all lumber. Now that, Mr. Chairman, is a very singular fact.

Mr. WEBER. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. MILLS. Certainly.

Mr. WEBER. Of course the gentleman wishes to be entirely correct, and I would like to ask if this was manufactured lumber within the terms of the reciprocity treaty?

Mr. MILLS. I will read from the article itself.

Timber and lumber of all kinds, round, hewed, sawed, and unmanufactured in whole or in part——

Mr. WEBER. I thought so, "unmanufactured."

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir. That is the class of lumber the Commissioner spoke of.

Mr. WEBER. Then, of course, the gentleman's argument does not apply.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman's argument applies exactly. The Commissioner was recommending Congress to take the duty off of lumber, and he said take the tariff off of the Canadian lumber, and it will be money in the pockets of the consumers of lumber in this country.

Now, then, if the tariff has been added to lumber, and it has in a great measure—in some localities it has not—because every gentleman who is posted upon the subject knows that a tariff is inoperative in a locality where the product is exported, for the simple reason that an article never comes from one point to another except it goes from the point where it is produced at a less cost of production to the point where it is produced at the highest, and therefore when it goes from the point where it is produced at the least cost of production to another point where it is consumed it has no advantage from a tariff at the place of production.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Will the gentleman permit an interruption, to ask him how he can reconcile his statement with the statement of Sir Charles Tupper, who says that if you take the duty off of lumber it will be worth one and one-half millions a year to Canada?

Mr. MILLS. Oh, I do not pretend to reconcile all the statements of these high-tariff people. Sir Charles Tupper is a high-tariff man, and I do not undertake to make his statement fit with those of other high-tariff people. Why, you can not reconcile the statements of your high-tariff friends on that side of the House on this very question. The venerable gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] stated at the opening of this debate that the preservation of the Southern forests should be one of the great aims of this Congress, and said that this bill, instead of preserving these forests, aimed at the destruction of Southern interests. That remained until his colleague came along and took the other view of the question—that the whole theory of the bill was sectional, and it was aimed at the destruction of Northern industries. Now I cannot reconcile these; I do not undertake to do it. I give the question up.

Mr. KELLEY. I can reconcile it.

Mr. MILLS. Oh, yes; you can reconcile impossibilities. [Laughter.]

Mr. KERR. The gentleman from Texas says it was an internal-revenue officer——

Mr. MILLS. No, I said the commissioner of revenue.

Mr. KERR. Well, the Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Now, I ask——

Mr. MILLS. It was not the Commissioner of Internal Revenue.

Mr. KERR. I ask if the opposition to the abolition of the internal-revenue system does not come almost unanimously from the people who hold offices under that system?

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman can determine that question for himself. It is only necessary to say that it was not the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, but the revenue commissioner of whom I spoke.

Mr. KELLEY. David A. Wells, the Commissioner of Revenue, the counsel for the Cobden Club in the United States of America.

Mr. MILLS. Now, I want to give you a little of what Sir Charles Tupper said. Sir Charles Tupper made a speech in the Canadian Parliament a few days ago. As he has been quoted on the other side of the Chamber several times in this debate, and his wise sayings have been specially recommended to me, I also may quote him. He reminds the free-trade people in Canada that they are complaining against the measures reported in the Canadian Parliament, and that their friends on the south side of the line, the Democrats, are doing something for free trade. He speaks of the iron interest. He takes this very bill and finds that with an existing duty on iron and steel of 43½ per cent. the bill proposes to reduce it to 41½ per cent. And he asks, "Do you call that free trade?" Yet gentlemen on the other side do so, and say we are trying to ruin the industries of the country. He says Canada does not impose half the duty that we propose in this bill for the United States. Yet his policy in Canada is called a protective policy, because it imposes a 23 per cent. duty on iron and steel, when you charge us with being free-traders when we propose making it 41 per cent.

But let us go back to lumber. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], who is well posted on this matter, read an article from some friend of his in which he stated there were $250,000,000 worth of domestic product of lumber in this country per annum. He stated that there was a product of 4,000,000,000 feet of lumber in Michigan. He stated in the whole country it was 20,000,000,000 feet and worth $250,000,000.

Now the average rate of duty on the lumber we import into this country, $8,000,000 worth, is something about 18 per cent. Mr. Wells, Commissioner of Revenue, said in 1869 it took $16,000,000 out of the pockets of the people of the United States. If that was true in 1869 it is true to-day. If the tariff takes 18 per cent. out of the pockets of the people, that is $35,000,000 taken out of the pockets of the people that go into the pockets not of the laborers, but of the timber-owners. The laborer works for whatever he can get for the market price of his labor.

[By unanimous consent the time of Mr. MILLS was extended for five minutes.]

Mr. MILLS. Among the strange things which I find impossible to reconcile is to see gentlemen standing up all the time, and when presented with arguments by gentlemen on the other side, telling us labor is 30, 40, or 50 per cent. higher than it is on the other side. They have a tariff in Canada on sawed lumber of 20 per cent., while ours on an average is 18 per cent. If the tariff makes high wages, why does it not make high wages in Canada as well as here? I want to know if there is something in the atmosphere of Canada, if there is something exceptional in her laws, notional or economic, that paralyzes their system and prevents it from protecting their laboring people?

Mr. WEBER. Does the gentleman want an answer now?

Mr. MILLS. Yes, sir.

Mr. WEBER. It is because the current of trade is this way instead of going the other way.

Mr. MILLS. The gentleman should get a patent for that expression. He might claim a monopoly of it.

Mr. WEBER. If the gentleman will allow me I will demonstrate it. From my own personal experience I know there is a less demand for the employment of labor in that country. If there was a greater demand the labor would be higher.

Mr. MILLS. But my friend from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] a few moments ago punctured the whole of this bubble with the statement that if labor across the line is 30 per cent. less than in Maine a man would have nothing to do but go across the border in order to get additional pay. But suppose you say the labor is away up in Canada in the pine forests; then your transportation charges protect you, and I believe you could put your lumber in the market at a lower price than that man can put his lumber, paying transportation charges.

It is not for the benefit of the workmen. It is not for the benefit of the man who puts his arm to the log and rolls it on the wagon. It is for the benefit of the man who wears the leather wallet. The profit which comes to him he divides with no one. Such is the truth. You may cover it with sophistry as much as you please, but the fact still stands that the man who gets the benefit is the man who holds the lumber.

What means has the laborer of exacting this additional price from his employer? What power has he over it? The property has increased in price, but it is not the property of the laborer. It belongs to the owner of the timber. Then why do you say that a man, because he has the capacity to pay more, will, out of mere charity, do it, when you know that that is not human nature?

Mr. DOCKERY. Men do not go around looking for high-priced labor.

Mr. MILLS. No, sir. Mr. Chairman, before the tariff can take the benefit of this tax out of the pocket of the man who owns the property and put it into the pocket of the laborer who performs the work, it has got to change the constitution of the human heart, and no legislation can do that. Man is to-day what he was when he was created. He is governed by the instinct of self-preservation. The moving impulse, the controlling power that causes him to accomplish anything in this world is the motive of self-interest; and in order to take an advantage from the employer and give it to the workingman, you must have some compulsory power of law to take it out of the pocket of the employer and transfer it to the pocket of the employés; just as the law now puts its hand into the pocket of the consumer and transfers this money from his pocket to the pocket of the protected monopolist. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, with becoming modesty I hope, I beg to extend to the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means, as well as to the assembled St. Louis convention, the compliments of the people of Oregon, and to accompany this expression with this message from her people: "Oregon has voted for protection by 3,000 majority." The lumber interests and the wool interests have spoken. The producer as well as the consumer in one common voice send forth this defiant protest. The wage-earner has spoken. The pending bill has been in issue and carefully and intelligently considered. The people

are willing for those to have free trade who desire it, but denounce the attempt of those who impose free trade on others while retaining protection for themselves.

Sir, this is the first signal gun from that great moving column of the people, who, realizing the threatened danger to American industries, are rising up all over the land to testify their indignation at this mischievous interference with our onward progress to national as well as individual prosperity. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I say—and I say it with regret—that if the Committee on Ways and Means or the majority of them had designed with malicious intent to injure the best interests of the people of the Pacific coast, they could not have done it more effectually than by the provision in this bill which is now under consideration. The three great industries of that wonderful section of the Union which has made such marvelous strides in greatness and prosperity may be said to be wool, lumber, and grain, together with fruit. Lumber it is proposed to slaughter; wool receives a common fate with lumber. Fruit is also placed under the common guillotine, with other industries which affect every man, woman, and child upon the shores of the great Pacific.

Mr. Chairman, coming directly to the paragraph at issue, and speaking not merely from a general study of the subject, but from some personal experience in the business, I desire to say to the gentlemen who advocate this provision that, so far as the Pacific coast is concerned, there is no industry which is so precarious as the lumber industry. More failures have occurred among the lumber manufacturers of the Pacific coast than among gentlemen engaged in any other business.

Let me say further to those who have taken up the idea of the immense profits which go to the millionaire lumbermen, that at least 75 per cent. of the proceeds of lumber manufacture, so far as the business has come under my knowledge, goes directly to the laborer, the wage-earner. Look for a moment, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, at the extent of that great industry and the corresponding injury which must be inflicted upon us by anything which disturbs it, and then you will appreciate the indignation which has spread over that land like an immense cyclone, and brought forth the result which was announced at the polls in the State of Oregon on yesterday evening. The lumber product of the Pacific coast for the year 1880 amounted to 692,000,000 feet. So rapid has been the increase of the business, that last year, 1887, our lumber product amounted to 1,370,000,000 feet.

[Here the hammer fell.]

On motion of Mr. MILLS, unanimous consent was given to Mr. HERMANN to continue his remarks for five minutes longer.

Mr. HERMANN. I thank the gentleman from Texas for his courtesy. Speaking for my own State, which has over 300 miles of coast-line bordered by forests for the whole distance, and extending inland from 50 to 100 miles, along the western slope of the Cascades, as well as the Coast Range, are found the mightiest forests, the most magnificent timber that ever grew upon American or any other soil. In 1880 the product was 177,171,000 feet, whereas last year it had risen to 300,000,000 feet. Twenty-five thousand people upon the shores of the Pacific are supported directly by the lumber industries. Gentlemen speak of the effect upon the consumers of combinations among the lumber manufacturers. I desire to say that so far as the commodities which make up the ordinary course of the lumber trade on the Pacific coast, the Oregon pine, the ash, the sugar-pine, etc., our resources are too immense ever to be affected for more than a very brief period by any combination of manufacturers that can possibly be formed. Look at the situation; from Monterey, in the State of California, up to the boundary line of British Columbia, over 1,000 miles, not including the wonderful timber resources of Alaska, the forests extend, and through all that vast forest region you will find the lumbermen engaged in their busy traffic. I differ with the gentleman from New York [Mr. COX], who always entertains the House with so much information upon every subject of which he treats—I differ with that gentleman when he speaks of the great danger to the forests of this country from the lumber trade. I do not agree with him that they will be entirely denuded so that those who succeed us will have to resort to foreign lands for lumber.

I can not speak with any definite knowledge as to the character of the forests on the Atlantic coast or in the States east of the Rocky Mountains; but as for the Pacific coast our forests are reproductive. They are very similar to those of Norway, and under our humid atmosphere are constantly being reproduced. Cut off the forests there this year, and in a quarter of a century or in thirty years you will find there trees of almost the diameter of those which preceded them. So that I apprehend that the time will not come in centuries when those forests will cease to afford lucrative employment to all the people who may be engaged in them. Such is the character of those great forests. As to their immensity, I might suggest to gentlemen that the acreage of the timber forests of the Pacific coast equals almost one-half of the aggregate forestry resources of the entire Union.

That recently high prices have prevailed upon the Pacific coast I must admit. But let me say that these are more to be attributed to the great "boom" in the building industries in Lower California, in San Diego, Los Angeles, Pasadena, and other cities which have grown up like mushrooms in the night time, than to any combination. That is the history of our experience so far as the Pacific coast is concerned.

Let me ask gentlemen what shall we do with these immense forests? If we are to invite the industry into the Canadian borders and transfer our busy traffic from the American shores to the communities of British Columbia and Canada, what are we to do with these great resources? Allow them to lie there unused for generations? Or does not the case rather appeal to us in a business point of view that we shall utilize those great natural resources, give employment to our wage-earners, give markets to our producers and farmers, and offer resources for the investment of idle American capital?

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HERMANN. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. I renew the amendment. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with attention to the remarks of the gentleman who has just taken his seat [Mr. HERMANN] because I know he is well informed about the lumber question of the Pacific Slope. That is his business. He is a large lumber dealer and producer there. I have had the pleasure of some very interesting conversations with the gentleman on the lumber question, and I have found him well informed.

Now, in numerous petitions which have reached us from that coast, certain reasons have been stated why competition would be feared with British Columbia. None of those gentlemen have stated that they feared that the lumber of Wisconsin or Michigan or Eastern Canada could be transported to the Pacific coast by railroad or by water to successfully compete with them. None of them complain that they fear cheap lumber from any part of Asia. They say they do, however, fear cheap lumber from British Columbia, where there is Chinese labor. But, sir, in the very papers which they have sent to us they have laid particular stress upon the fact that "vigorous manly labor is required for and stimulated by the prosecution of the lumber industry." Every gentleman on this floor knows that this work requires the most muscular service. I ask the gentleman who has just taken his seat whether there is not a redundancy of Chinese labor on the American side of the line, and whether he and other lumbermen can not employ that labor when they desire it, and whether they do not refuse to employ it because it is not profitable, being too feeble for this heavy work? I have myself been somewhat in the lumber business; I have worked a solid crew of Chinamen, and discharged them as being utterly worthless around a saw-mill. Will the gentleman from Oregon reply to my inquiry?

Mr. HERMANN. With great pleasure. The facts of the case, I think, are such as should entirely destroy the erroneous impression which seems to prevail in the gentleman's mind in reference to this matter. In the first place, the people in our part of the country are opposed, constitutionally, socially, morally, and otherwise, to the employment of Chinese labor. While it is true that such labor can be employed at from 25 to 50 per cent. less than American labor, and in many departments will perform as much service to-day as the white labor, still we have reached the conclusion, in the interest of the white laborer, that "the Chinese must go." That is the verdict of the people; that is the verdict of this Congress; and will forever prevent that class of Chinese labor from again obtaining a foothold on American soil.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. The gentleman with his comments is taking up a good deal of my five minutes. I only asked a statement of facts. He knows that those Chinamen are there. There are many thousands of them on that coast; and they are employed. I do not believe the gentleman can successfully say that there is any more heart, or humanity, or patriotism in the people who are in the lumber business than there is in any of the other classes of our citizens on that coast who to-day are employing the resident Chinese wherever they can be profitably employed. If they could be profitably employed in the lumber business, I am sure the gentleman would employ them just as quickly as those who now employ them in other branches of business.

Mr. HERMANN. Pardon me a moment. I take especial pleasure in replying to the gentleman's last remark. I can say, Mr. Chairman, and it is of record in connection with my brief operations in the milling business, that I have positively refused at any and all times to employ a single one of the Mongolian race, although they offered to perform the same service for 50 per cent. less than white laborers.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Precisely.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. ROGERS took the floor, and yielded his time, by unanimous consent, to his colleague.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. The gentleman from Oregon, in the remarks which he has submitted to the House, occupied some very curious industrial positions, but it must be remembered that he is also in politics, and we all know that the Chinaman is not a favorite feature in politics on the Pacific coast. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. HERMANN. Has the gentleman from Arkansas also discovered that?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Yes, and I have discovered another thing.

Mr. HERMANN. I suppose that was before the gentleman went into politics.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Yes, and I have discovered another point, that your people who are in the lumber business do not employ Chinamen because that kind of labor does not pay. It is not

every mill owner who is in politics, and yet none of them employ Chinese crews. The Chinamen who are found in my State are occupied in light employment, but when it comes to heavy work on plantations or clearing up ground, to plowing, to work in the forests, they are utterly unprofitable at almost any price.

Mr. HERMANN. I presume those who have had experience in reference to Chinese labor are the best judges of it. The gentleman from Arkansas will not pretend to say he is as well acquainted in Arkansas with that class of labor as the people upon the Pacific coast.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. That is not what we have in hand. But you admit my statement, and my own experience and observation further prove it. I am answering the argument put forward by gentlemen on the Pacific coast that what they have to fear from British Columbia is the cheap Chinese labor which is employed there in the lumber business. I am trying to show that Chinese labor in this industry is unprofitable labor, and that this is no just ground of fear on the part of those engaged in the lumber business on the Pacific coast.

Now, sir, there is one other feature about the lumber trade in the gentleman's own section of the country. From that lumber region from which he comes there were exported last year over 92,000,000 feet of lumber, such as plank and boards alone. It went into the markets of the world in competition with the lumber of British Columbia, and if it had not gone through profitably it would not have gone at all. And yet gentlemen have the effrontery to stand here in the face of this immense export trade of lumber from the Pacific coast and of the other evidence and say they can not compete with worthless Chinese labor in British Columbia. It is a gratuitous putting of high prices on our own people for purposes of subsidy and nothing else.

There is one thing it might affect, however, and that is the profits on stumpage. Those gentlemen who have bought up the vast areas of lumber land and got large profits on stumpage would possibly in some cases have to reduce stumpage charges, and that is the feature uniformly left out by you gentlemen in the discussion on this floor.

Mr. HERMANN. So far as Chinese labor is concerned, is not the gentleman aware of the fact that the building of the Union Pacific Railroad and of the Northern Pacific Railroad would have been postponed for years if it had not been for the employment of Chinese labor in the construction of those roads? Is he not aware that they would not have been completed within two or three years of the time they were but for the fact of the employment of Chinese labor?

And now as to the employment of Chinese labor around saw-mills, the gentleman certainly must admit there are portions of work in the lumbering business where Chinese labor is employed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Yes; I suppose they are good for picking up chips. [Laughter.]

Mr. HERMANN. They make good teamsters, and they make excellent cooks.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Oh, yes; that may be so.

Mr. HERMANN. They are preferred to white cooks in the lumber camps. They are employed to haul sawdust.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. Oh, yes; they do very well to haul sawdust, pick up chips, and boil soup. [Laughter.] Experience has shown that where you do employ them for heavy work it is unprofitable in competition with vigorous, manly labor." You admit now that you do employ them for light work wherever it will pay. I admit their service on the two railroads you cite. It was Chinamen or nothing at that time and under the then existing circumstances. Are they so employed now? No; better and hence cheaper labor can be got now. Where else with our 150,000 miles of railroad has this been done? You know it was an exception and of dire and expensive stress. The world over, railroad men say and show by their acts that the vigorous labor they can employ at almost any price is the cheapest labor they can get. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. Chairman, I understand the pending amendment to be to strike out lines 11 and 12 of the bill under consideration, and that it is not a *pro forma* amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending amendment is a *pro forma* amendment, but in the absence of objection it will be withdrawn. Debate upon the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. McCORMICK. Then I renew the *pro forma* amendment.

I do this, Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of discussing briefly the two lines constituting the paragraph under consideration. All that has gone before in this bill is of minor consideration, and all that follows these two lines is likewise of minor importance, as compared with the paragraph now before us. This paragraph strikes at the entire lumber industries of the United States. It includes sawed boards, planks, deals, and all other kinds of sawed lumber and puts them all on the free-list.

Under existing law hemlock, white-wood, basswood, sycamore, and the cheaper grades of lumber are admitted upon the payment of a duty of $1 per thousand feet, while all other sawed lumber, which includes pine and hard wood of all kinds, pays a duty of $2 per thousand feet.

Much has been said, sir, in this debate upon the subject of pine lumber; but as I recollect it neither in the general debate nor in the discussion now taking place upon the several paragraphs of the bill as they have been reached and considered has any attention been paid to the great hemlock-lumber industry.

I have the honor to represent a district which comprises a distinct hemlock belt representing an area of country averaging in length 250 miles and in width about 50 miles. There was manufactured in that district during the last year some 500,000,000 feet of hemlock lumber and more than 300,000,000 of white-pine lumber; and when I heard the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. COX] inform the House a few minutes ago that the lumber of Pennsylvania had been destroyed by the gang-saws that he saw there in operation more than thirty years ago, I inferred, and very naturally, that he intended the committee to understand that the lumber regions of Pennsylvania are in that condition that he described the other day as the scene of "calcined desolation."

And yet, Mr. Chairman, that region of country produced—and I refer to the district which I represent—nearly one thousand millions of feet of lumber last year, and five hundred millions, or about one-half of it, was hemlock. Why, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me there is no proper appreciation, if we may judge from the expression of opinion we hear from the other side of the House, of the extent of the lumber industry of this country.

It stands third in magnitude of the great industries of the country, and I am surprised that the gentlemen constituting the Ways and Means Committee, whose business it is to understand the question, should come upon the floor of this House and gravely tell us that the lumbering industries of the country are confined solely and exclusively to the Pacific coast and the Southern States. A business which pays $5,000,000 annually in wages in the State of Pennsylvania alone, it strikes me, is a very considerable industry, and one which deserves at least a passing consideration at the hands of this committee.

But it is said, sir, that the wage-earner is not to have and does not receive the benefit of the duty which is imposed upon imported lumber. I want to say, and I speak within my own knowledge when I assert it to be true here, that in the locality which I represent, and in the industry of which I speak the difference of wages between Canada and in that region is greater than the amount of the duty. It costs the manufacturer for every thousand feet of lumber that he manufactures, in labor alone, $5.50 to $6. This varies, to a certain extent, according to locality, the proximity of the timber to the streams, and other existing difficulties in the way of carrying on the business.

That lumber is worth at the mills about $7 per thousand feet. The labor-cost of a thousand feet of lumber in Pennsylvania, as already indicated, is from $5.50 to $6, and the labor cost in Canada is about one-half of that sum. The statement of my colleague [Mr. RANDALL] as to the difference in the wages paid in Canada and Pennsylvania are in exact accord with the facts. The Ways and Means Committee were furnished with the proofs that such were the facts not only by the petition of the West Branch Lumbermen's Exchange, of Williamsport, Pa., but the difference between the wages paid in Northern New York and Canada, right on the Canadian border, were proven by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MOFFITT] by a like petition to be just as great.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. McKINLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania may be permitted to proceed for five minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMICK. The lumber product piled up in the rough at the mill is only worth, as I have said, about $7 per thousand feet on the average, leaving only $1.50 to represent the stumpage, the investment in plant, etc., and the profit of the manufacturer. The stumpage is worth from 50 cents to $1 per thousand feet in the tree, leaving to the manufacturer for all of his outlay and investment, after he pays his employés and the price of stumpage, but from 50 cents to $1 per thousand feet as the margin out of which he is to get his profit. When we take into consideration the depreciation of the plant by use, the constantly recurring expenses, and the necessary losses in the course of trade by reason of bad accounts, I think all will agree that this is indeed a very narrow margin.

Yet we are told that the lumbermen are getting rich, that their profits are simply enormous. I undertake to say here, and without fear of successful contradiction, that of every thousand feet of hemlock lumber, when it gets to market, not less than 90 per cent. is labor. The profits realized by the manufacturer are therefore very inconsiderable.

Now a word as to the destruction of the forests, which it is said the present tariff tends to encourage. Why, Mr. Chairman, so far as the hemlock industry is concerned, the matter of tariff or no tariff can have no appreciable effect, and for this reason: that not a single hemlock tree in Pennsylvania is ever cut by the lumbermen.

They are cut by the tanners for the bark, and lumbering in hemlock is incidental to the tanning business. If you take the duty off lumber the cutting of the timber will go right on, but you cripple or destroy the business of lumbering because the hemlock of Pennsylvania comes into competition with the hemlock and spruce of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick in the Eastern markets of this country. The great bulk of

the hemlock will be cut down for the bark, and allowed to lie in the woods and decay as it did ten years ago, because there was not sufficient margin of profit to warrant the manufacture of it into lumber.

Not a single tree has been cut in ten years in the State of Pennsylvania, so far as I know, for lumbering purposes alone. If you take this duty off you wipe out the narrow margin that now exists in favor of the American lumberman, unless he maintains the margin by taking that much from wages of the labor employed. You certainly cripple and may destroy the whole lumber interest of Pennsylvania. With a margin of but 50 cents a thousand feet, and with hemlock in great quantities in Nova Scotia and elsewhere reaching New York by cheaper transportation than we can reach it from Pennsylvania, there will not be much to encourage the manufacture of hemlock lumber in my State. There is not a member of this House from the State which I in part represent—and I see some of them listening to my remarks—but will agree with me; and I challenge contradiction when I say that the margin of profit on hemlock does not exceed the figures I have stated.

One thing more. I desire to call the special attention of the Committee on Ways and Means to the legal effect of enacting into law this provision—putting sawed lumber on the free-list. It goes further, perhaps, than the committee intended. The present law provides that—

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and other lumber of hemlock, whitewood, sycamore, and basswood, etc.,

Shall pay a duty of $1 per 1,000 feet.

And the existing law provides further that—

When lumber of any sort is planed and finished, in addition to the rates herein provided, there shall be levied and paid for each side so planed or finished 50 cents per 1,000 feet, board measure.

Now, the paragraph of this bill at present under consideration uses this language:

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and all other articles of sawed lumber.

These are put upon the free-list.

[Here the hammer fell.]

By unanimous consent, the time of Mr. MCCORMICK was extended.

Mr. MCCORMICK. The point I make is this, that if this paragraph is enacted into law it covers not only boards in the rough, but boards planed on one side or on two sides as well; the effect of enacting this paragraph being not only to admit lumber sawed, but lumber planed as well. Will not the language "sawed boards" and "all other articles of sawed lumber" cover lumber planed on one side or both sides? It is certainly still "sawed" lumber even though it be planed in part or in whole. But, in truth, there is no greater reason for protecting the labor engaged in planing lumber than that engaged in sawing, and hence I assume that it may have been intended to admit it all free of duty.

Mr. MILLS. I ask for a vote.

The question was on the motion to strike out lines 11 and 12, namely, these words:

Sawed boards, planks, deals, and all other articles of sawed lumber.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 60, noes 76.

Mr. GUENTHER. No quorum.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I hope my friend from Wisconsin will not insist upon the point of no quorum; but I call for tellers.

The CHAIRMAN appointed as tellers Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. MILLS.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 60, noes 85.

So (further count not being called for) the amendment was not agreed to.

The Clerk read the following paragraph:

Hubs for wheels, posts, last-blocks, wagon-blocks, oar-blocks, gun-blocks, heading-blocks, and all like blocks or sticks, rough, hewn, or sawed only.

Mr. BAYNE. I move to strike out the paragraph which has just been read. We have heard some very peculiar arguments with relation to the tariff bill. One gentleman from the State of Minnesota, and a very learned gentleman he certainly is, argued that the tariff had resulted in depreciating the value of farm lands, while land producing timber had risen to a very high figure. I recall the period of time when the depreciation of the farms in the country was attributed to the contraction of the currency by the withdrawal of the greenback notes, and at a later period of our history I recall the fact that that depreciation was attributed wholly to the demonetization of silver.

And now we have the spectacle presented of that depreciation in the value of farm lands being attributed to the tariff. The depreciation of the value of farm lands is thus made to serve so many purposes that one becomes rather skeptical whether sufficient reason is presented or not.

But the people, I believe, can not be so easily misled as many gentlemen seem to suppose. I do not know whether our Democratic friends have heard the news from Oregon or not.

A MEMBER. What is it?

Mr. BAYNE. The Representative in Congress is elected by over 3,000 majority. The Legislature is overwhelmingly Republican. It had been said there were dissensions there in the Republican party which would probably result in the election of a Democratic Legislature and that the present Republican Senator might be superseded. There may have been dissensions in the Republican party there, but they have not been manifested thus far, because the Legislature is overwhelmingly Republican.

But let me tell you one fact, that although there may be local dissensions in the Republican party at different points, when it comes to the question of protection there is no dissension. The Republicans of this country stand as a unit for the protection of American industry. Can the Democratic party say so much for their side of the House? No; there are dissensions there that will tell in the fall election. I have heard that my friend from Georgia [Mr. CLEMENTS], who had been misrepresented to his constituents as being opposed to the Mills bill, received letters of congratulation from his constituents because he had taken that attitude.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Will the gentleman allow me to interrupt him?

Mr. BAYNE. You will have five minutes of your own. If I can have my time extended five minutes I will yield.

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, let the correction go in now. [Laughter].

Mr. BAYNE. Very well, I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLEMENTS. I wish to say that that is like other rumors which have been quoted by gentlemen on the other side of the House. I think I have received one letter from a protectionist gentleman, which has been magnified in the way illustrated by the remarks of my friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BAYNE. One letter; well, that showed dissent to some extent, and it came, too, from one of the gentleman's constituents who is able to write. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. Which was a large proportion.

Mr. CLEMENTS. And as against that one letter I have received dozens taking the opposite view.

Mr. BAYNE. I know myself of such communications coming from Virginia. I met a very intelligent Democratic lawyer the other day who had looked into the Mills bill and found great fault with it. He thought that it put iron ore on the free-list. Some of the gentlemen who prepared the bill have denied that, but he took that view and he adheres to it.

[Here the hammer fell.]

By unanimous consent Mr. BAYNE was allowed to proceed for five minutes longer.

Mr. BAYNE. In addition to that, the Democrats of New York, in their State convention, do not seem to be able to swallow the Mills bill. They do not seem to be willing to indorse the President's message, and I understand that reports are coming from St. Louis that a straddling plank is to be prepared for the platform of that convention——

Mr. MACDONALD. Will the gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. BAYNE. Not just now—not until I have finished my sentence. That plank is to be prepared so as to straddle the issue in such form that Democratic speakers may go, as they have gone heretofore, into New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and other States, and represent to the people thereof that the Democrats are just as good protectionists as the Republicans are.

Mr. MORSE. That is right.

Mr. BAYNE. Now, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion the President has made the issue squarely and fairly. He has done it in a manly way, for which he is to be commended; and I do not think that even the resolutions of the St. Louis convention will prevent the issue from going before the country in that form. I understand that our distinguished friend, Judge Thurman, is forging ahead as the nominee for Vice-President, and is likely to receive that honor.

Mr. MORSE. That is good.

Mr. BAYNE. And that the shibboleth of the Democratic party is likely to be "Cleveland and the Red Bandana." [Enthusiastic applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad that my suggestion meets the approval of gentlemen. I am glad to see that it causes the hearts of my Democratic brethren to rejoice to-day, for I do assure them that within a day or two after the election takes place in November they will not clap their hands so heartily as they do now. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Because, with the issue of protection squarely before the people, the Republican ticket will carry the day. There are already straws which show how the wind blows, and no stronger manifestation of that character has been seen of late than the result of the election in Oregon yesterday. [Renewed applause on the Republican side.] In Oregon the issue was plainly made and the battle was fought upon the issue of protection to American industries, and Oregon responded with no uncertain voice and said, "We want the Republican party to win and the doctrine of protection to American industry to survive," and it is going to do it and "don't you forget it." [Renewed laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MILLS. What has all that to do with hubs, the subject we are discussing?

Mr. BAYNE. I will tell you. I have insisted all along that this Congress should not revise the tariff, because in 1884 my colleague, Mr. RANDALL, and other Democrats, went into New Jersey and Pennsylvania and Connecticut and other States, and insisted before the people that the Democratic party was as good a friend of protection as the Republican party, while you gentlemen down South and in some of the

Western States took ground substantially like that which you take here in this bill. Now, I say fair play requires that this issue shall go to the people next November, and if the people then elect a Democratic President and a Democratic House of Representatives, and they come in here and choose to revise the tariff, I will offer no objection or obstruction to their managing that matter in their own way.

Mr. COX. I would like to have read a dispatch just received from St. Louis.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be read as a part of the gentleman's remarks.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. LOUIS, *June* 15, 12.54 *p. m.*

Cleveland's name, when mentioned by the temporary chairman, took the convention by storm, and the applause was deafening. He got another round of applause when he referred to tariff reform.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MILLS. I call attention to the fact that the question now before the Committee of the Whole is in relation to hubs.

Mr. MILLIKEN obtained the floor and said: I yield for a moment to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WEBER], who desires, I believe, to read a dispatch.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, as campaign enthusiasm seems to be the order of business, I wish to read the following newspaper paragraph in that connection:

A STRIKING DIFFERENCE.

The Buffalo Sunday News, which was an earnest and enthusiastic supporter of Grover Cleveland in 1884, in fact, one of his most persistent and untiring newspaper advocates, in great display type, makes this comparison:

88!

This is the number of Grover Cleveland men "Who Marched Behind the Band" yesterday afternoon to take the train for St. Louis.

In 1884 there were

2000!

Who went to Chicago, clamorous for his nomination.

Quite a difference, isn't it?

Why?

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MILLIKEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not rise for the purpose of discussing the St. Louis convention. If by "applause" or otherwise the Democratic party assembled in that convention will make the issue sharply and clearly between protection on the one side and free trade on the other, I shall be glad to have the issue thus presented. We welcome that issue. We will go into the campaign and honestly fight it out on that line, and as good citizens of the Republic will accept the result.

But what I desired to say was this: My friend from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] the other day—endeavoring, I suppose, to show that the duty on lumber does not go to the benefit of the workman but to the manufacturer—asked the question whether Canadians were not imported into Maine to be employed in the manufacture of lumber, and I answered him in the negative. So far as concerned the proposition he was then making, that answer was correct. It is true, Mr. Chairman, that there are some Canadians who come across the border and work as axmen in our woods.

Mr. MCMILLIN. That is what I had heard.

Mr. MILLIKEN. They fell the trees and perhaps help to haul them, and there the matter ends, so far as they are concerned.

Mr. MCMILLIN. They bring their teams also, I believe.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Now, my friend undoubtedly knows and will not fail to recognize the fact here to-day, that there is no import duty imposed by the United States on round logs. There is a Canadian duty. Canada places an export duty of $2 a thousand feet, if I recollect aright, on round logs, in order to keep the manufacture of lumber within her own dominions and to give the labor to Canadians, recognizing in that way the principle of protection.

But so far as the Canadian labor goes in producing the log, that labor is not protected at all by the duty upon lumber, for the duty does not commence to operate until the manufacture of the log into finished lumber has been commenced. And here, Mr. Chairman, is where the American begins to work. You may go through the mills of Maine, from one end of the State to the other, and you will find that the manufacture of lumber from the round log into the plank, the deal, the joist, the finished stock, up to the form in which it goes into the structures for which it is designed, is done by Americans; and this duty upon lumber protects the American manufacture of lumber, and protects American labor—no other.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MCKINLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Maine be allowed five minutes more.

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, with whom does the American laborer have to contend? Our friends here have very well said that on the Pacific coast he has to contend in the lumber business with the cheap Chinese labor. In Maine he has to contend with the cheap Canadian labor. I know the fact (for I have had the opportunities of observation) that the Canadian laborer works more cheaply, works more hours a day, and is satisfied with fewer of the comforts of life than the American laborer.

You may ride on the railroad across the State line into New Brunswick. There is no guide-board set up to tell you when you cross from your own country into Canada; the State boundary is an imaginary line. Yet the least observant traveler sitting at the car window will not pass the second station after crossing the State line without noticing by the character and dress of the people that he sees and by the houses along the line that he has gone out of this country of protection and into a land whose prosperity is not so great.

You may ride up the line of separation between the two countries and see upon one side the American, on the other the Canadian homes. On one side you will see white houses with green blinds, neat, clean door-yards, everything tidy, with all the evidence of thrift and comfort about them. On the other side unpainted houses, broken windows, shabby surroundings, without any evidence of the thrift and comfort on this side.

And Canada, at last recognizing this condition of things, has begun to imitate her great neighbor, the American Republic, and protect her people by duties on imports.

It was well said by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANDALL] yesterday, in his remarks on this subject, that the duty should be equal to the difference at least of the cost of labor which enters into the production of lumber on this side of the Canadian line and the cost of labor on the other side, and that while this difference is $3 per thousand, the highest duty on manufactured lumber is but $2, so that the present law hardly protects the American workman in his present rate of wages. Do gentlemen on the other side of the House wish to deny him this meager protection? Do they desire to reduce the $6 per thousand which he receives for his work in the manufacture of lumber to the pittance of $3 per thousand which the Canadian workmen in New Brunswick receive?

This would be the direct effect of the provision of this bill now under discussion. If the Democracy shall succeed, as it here proposes to do, in placing lumber on the free-list, never hereafter let that party pretend that it does not favor the reduction of the wages of American workingmen to the low standard of poorly-paid foreign laborers.

Then it should be remembered that the manufacturers of lumber in Maine and the other Northern States find their competitors at their own doors. The Canadian possesses forests and mills contiguous to our own, and has not the disadvantage of long transportation in reaching American markets. The sugar producer of Louisiana has no competitor except across the water and in the islands of the sea. The rice growers of South Carolina and Georgia contend in the American market against those who bring their product from far away Japan, and the coal and iron miners, the duty upon whose product is not reduced in this bill, have little cause to fear competition on this side of the Atlantic.

And yet with these advantages which amount to some degree of protection at least, these industries are touched either tenderly or not at all by the Mills bill, which strips the Northern lumbermen entirely of protection.

Mr. TARSNEY. Can the gentleman state the amount of wages paid in Maine and the amount of wages paid in Canada?

Mr. MILLIKEN. It was stated the other day by my colleague [Mr. BOUTELLE]. I believe it amounts to a little less than 100 per cent. of difference against American manufacturers of lumber.

Mr. TARSNEY. How much is that a day? How much is the difference a month?

Mr. MILLIKEN. If the gentleman will refer to the debates he will see it fully stated by my colleague in his remarks made a few days ago. It averages $2.40 to the American workman in Maine and $1.38 to the Canadian in New Brunswick, or about $6 per thousand feet of lumber manufactured on this side of our boundary line, while it is a little more than $3 on the other side, while the highest duty is but $3. It will be seen, therefore, that the duty does not cover the difference between labor on this side and the other.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chairman, I have patiently listened to the discussions which have taken place upon this important subject, just as others have been doing. When the President's message on the tariff question was delivered to Congress our Republican friends on the other side said they were willing to go to the country on that issue. After carefully considering the President's message and investigating the matter, the Committee on Ways and Means reported to the House what is known as the Mills bill, and again our Republican friends responded that they were willing to go to the country upon that issue. Now, there must have been something radically wrong in this country in 1884, when this grand old Republican party, in possession of the offices of the country and still in possession of the Presidency, induced the people to rise up and drive them out of office by the election of Grover Cleveland as President of the United States.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I will tell you what was wrong. That was the failure to count the votes in the South. That is where the wrong was.

Mr. LAWLER. Now, I have not interrupted any gentlemen who have addressed the committee. Let me go along; I do not interrupt anybody.

It occurred to me, Mr. Chairman, there must be something radically wrong with the country when it became necessary to enter into the

formation of Knights of Labor organizations to prevent combines and trusts against the interests of labor.

I am a little surprised sitting here to find that a plain proposition to business men, such as this presented here, is not taken up and acted upon as a business proposition ought to be. I can not sit here quietly as a member of this House and allow political matters to come in on a question of a bill affecting, as this does, the interests of all classes and so important to the people of this entire country. I say it does not become us as business men, in the face of the stagnation which is known to exist all over the United States, to delay further action upon this matter.

Mr. MASON. Stagnation caused by the pendency of this bill, do you say?

Mr. LAWLER. No, sir. We have a large number of Congressmen who are professional men in this House on both sides; we have got them in all classes of professional life, and this mode of retarding legislation and avoiding to put it before the people for a vote on the bill as a fair, stand-up, open question, is not the way to deal with a great public measure. These gentlemen are very apt to app'y the word "demagogue" at times when any person rises here and champions the cause of the laboring masses, though you well know that there has been hardly a speech made on either side on this question but we hear that our hearts are outpouring for the hardships of the toiling masses of the country. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see some of the good works that these men claim to champion. The people of this country will be very apt to judge of the truthfulness of their statements by the measure of the performance. Do you not understand, gentlemen, that the trusts have within the past six months, during the pendency of this question—the settlement of the tariff question here—suspended in part the operations of their industries, throwing laboring men out of employment, and the only answer when complaint is made is that they were waiting until they see what Congress will do? And yet we hear it said by gentlemen here that they are the friends of the masses of the people of this country.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I say let us stop this delay and let this bill go to the people. Our Republican friends believed that they could beat the men who are nominated on the platform of this bill. They believed, as they asserted, that Cleveland's message was just what they looked for, a great political issue. They are willing to go to the country on that. As business men let us drop this thing [cries of "All right!" on the Republican side] and continue the work that is before us in this session. We have many important matters to bring up here, and this question ought to be settled in a business way and in a business view.

We have on both sides members who would like to be heard on this question. They have not taken the time of the House or occupied its attention in the debate. But we all know it to be a fact that those who took up a great portion of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with their remarks continue to come in here day by day and present speeches on every line of this bill. I say, gentlemen, that that is not a fair way to treat the people. It is not a fair way to treat the members of Congress and those gentlemen who did not intend and have not taken up any time in the debate. I speak for the city of Chicago, representing it as I do in part, when I make an appeal to you to press this matter to a conclusion; and the leading Republican newspaper there is in favor of the position taken by this side of the House.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROUT was recognized.

Mr. BAYNE. I ask unanimous consent to extend the time of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAWLER. I do not ask anything further. I am very much obliged to the gentleman. I merely appeal to this House that we may go along and consider this bill as business men and take a vote on it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GROUT. Mr. Chairman, a word on the subject of lumber before passing from this part of the bill——

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield to me for a moment to respond now to what has been said by my colleague from Illinois?

Mr. GROUT. Very well.

Mr. MASON. My friend and colleague, and my immediate neighbor at home, says that there is a stagnation of business throughout the country which we all know about. No one knows it better than he, and if he will stop and think for a moment he will remember that every man who is about to enter into a new enterprise of any kind, and who is about to invest any of his money in new plans, and even has his hand at the plow, whether in the field or manufacturing or otherwise, is standing waiting to see what this Congress will do in reference to this bill.

Mr. LAWLER. Then let us do it and do not keep them waiting. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MASON. That is just what we propose to do. The only difference between us is that we want to do it in the proper way.

Mr. LAWLER. And do not let us be filibustering about it either.

Mr. MASON. Then the gentleman admits he has been filibustering?

Mr. LAWLER. No, sir; that side is filibustering.

Mr. MASON. I do not admit anything of the kind. The gentleman may be filibustering: I am not. I have not been engaged in filibustering on this bill at all.

Mr. LAWLER. Well, you are under the lash. It amounts to the same thing.

Mr. MASON. Nor am I under the lash. I smart under the lash of no man or party. If the gentleman feels that he is under the lash, he knows how it is; but he can not apply it to this side.

Mr. LAWLER. No, I do not know how it is.

Mr. MASON. Now, I represent the city of Chicago, or a part of it. I sit here responsible to my constituents, and will submit the matter to them—to the people of my district, as my colleague will submit to the people of his district in the future; and the people there will deal with this question, when it is submitted to them, in such a way as to demonstrate the accuracy of the position assumed by either of us.

The gentleman speaks of "professional men" sitting here. Now, there may be and are professional men sitting here as members of Congress. I am myself a member of a profession. I make my living in that way. I am a professional lawyer. I do not know what the gentleman's profession is, nor do I care. I simply say this: that we are not measured here by the standard of what we may promise or pretend to be. We will be measured by our constituents by what we do; and when he says that a leading Republican newspaper of Chicago is in accord with the sentiments of this bill, and in favor of its passage, then I state that the editorials of that paper do not warrant the gentleman's assertion. The Chicago Tribune has time and time again been standing, just as the Republican party stands, in favor of a tariff reform; and still it stands to-day striking at the Mills bill as a direct and living monument to the incapacity of the members of the committee that produced it, and a standing menace to the best business interests of the people of this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LAWLER. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir.

Mr. LAWLER. Has that been the case with the Tribune right along since this bill came into the House?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir; since the first day the bill came into the House it has not had the approval of the Chicago Tribune. While in favor of putting on the free-list certain raw materials it is opposed to the Mills bill and to free trade, as you will find out.

Mr. LAWLER. The four leading Democratic papers are opposed to the gentleman's position on this question. Is not that a fact?

Mr. MASON. I will say this, that while I am a Republican and *prima facie* can read, I do read the papers, but I do not know what the gentleman considers the leading papers in that city. Nor do I go to the editorial columns of any paper for my position on this or any other bill. I say that certain men editing papers if they could be in Congress could settle up the great questions that agitate the American people in fifty minutes, at least to their own satisfaction.

Mr. LAWLER. It would be well to send one of them here to settle this question before the summer is over.

Mr. MASON. I have a suspicion that they will do so from your district, my friend. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. I move to amend the motion to strike out. I suppose that is in order. I move to amend, in line 15, by striking out the word "hewn."

Mr. Chairman, although it may be a novelty on the morning's discussion, I propose to confine my remarks to the subject immediately in hand. The paragraph under consideration provides for placing upon the free-list hubs for wheels, as well as gun-blocks, etc., rough, hewn, or sawn; and when it is proposed to strike out hubs I favor it for this reason, that especially in the matter of hubs for wheels, these blocks are sawed, and then they are hewn, and under the provisions of this act they will be admitted into the United States free of duty ready for the turning-lathe, ready to be at once made into hubs. Now, so far we have provided simply for the importation into this country of manufactures of wood, sawn, but this paragraph goes one step further and provides not only that they may be sawn, but also that they may be hewn into shape. That involves an additional amount of labor expended upon them, and it seems to me that it is one step further than, upon any argument which can be adduced, we ought to go. For these reasons I ask that this provision be stricken out.

Mr. GROUT. I thank the Chair for recognizing me again so soon after yielding my time to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], who was desirous of replying at once to his colleague [Mr. LAWLER], who it seems is now an ardent champion of this bill, but who before the recent Democratic caucus was understood to have been opposed to it. It seems the Democratic caucus fixed Mr. LAWLER by agreeing not to put glue on the free-list, as proposed by the bill, but to leave the duty on it undisturbed; and now he sticks by the bill closer than a brother. Glue did it. [Laughter.]

When I yielded I was about reminding the other side of the House, who cheered so lustily over what some have spoken of as the red bandana, which was hung out from the press gallery a little while ago, that really that bandana was more yellow than red, and that in the late unpleasantness the yellow flag was always the sign of a hospital.

[Laughter.] That flag always said, "Here somebody is sick or hurt," and sometimes badly hurt. [Laughter.]

Now, I suppose this yellow flag signifies that the Democratic party is sick and in hospital [laughter], and that the leaders are looking to the noble old Roman from Ohio as the physician who is to help them out, and so cheer hopefully the bandana as the sign of their deliverance. The Democratic party may survive its present predicament—it has survived many other very sick spells—but it is certain to be marked by the American people next fall as unfit for duty for a very long time. [Laughter.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, a word with reference to the merits of the bill. The fact that we have been now four days, I believe, upon these first few lines, which put lumber in its various forms upon the free-list, would indicate that this is an important question, as it really is; and very good reasons, I think, have been given here why this provision of the bill should not be retained. But ever since the first vote in this committee upon the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS] to extend the time when this first section of the bill should take effect, it has been very apparent that argument and reason were to have but little to do with the disposition of this bill.

Now, Mr. Chairman, every fair-minded man will admit that in justice to those business men in this country who have put their money into stocks of lumber and wool and the other commodities which by this first section will be put upon the free-list, and have done so upon the faith of the present duty upon it, that Congress ought not to do anything to affect the value of their investment. We have no moral right to, without giving the investors reasonable time in which to turn themselves and dispose of those stocks so purchased. That is what this amendment proposed to do. But the other side coolly voted it down, and thereby demonstrated not only their willingness to strike down these industries, but at the same time to ruin those who may now be engaged in them.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] spoke approvingly this morning of the attitude of certain gentlemen from Kansas and Iowa and other Western States towards this bill. For one, sir, I want to say that I like the position of the gentleman from Kansas, Judge PETERS. I like it because of its intelligence, its fairness, and its consistency, as the position of a protectionist.

It must be admitted that in Kansas, Iowa, and, I presume, in some parts of Minnesota where lumber is scarce, this argument of "free lumber" is a very plausible and captivating one when addressed to the consumer of that article. But the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS], who is well acquainted with all the circumstances of the case, tells us that he can not understand how the Kansas farmer will be in any certain degree benefited by free lumber. But suppose that he would be benefited to a slight extent, he certainly could not expect to get the full advantage of the duty removed, because gentlemen on both sides have told us of a transportation trust which has its greedy grip on lumber; and it seems to me that they would do better to direct their batteries against that trust than against the tariff.

But suppose, for the sake of argument, that making lumber free would help the Kansas consumer a little, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. PETERS] sees, and sees clearly, too, that if the lumber camps and the saw-mills of this country were broken up and the thousands, nay, the tens of thousands, of woodsmen and millmen who are now eating the bacon and the beef and the wheat and the corn which the Kansas farmer produces, were to go over into Canada, then, to the extent of the consumption of these products by this very considerable army of men, the Kansas farmer and every other American farmer would lose the benefit of his good American market, and their surplus of farm products, already forced abroad for a market, would be increased, and would have to go to England or some other free-trade country for sale, for they can not follow these lumbermen into Canada without first paying a high duty for the privilege; and so to the extent of the transfer of this business to Canada, where timber-lands are cheap and where labor is cheap, as is recognized by all, to that extent the Kansas farmer is a sufferer.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. GROUT. I would like a few minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there unanimous consent that the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. GROUT] continue his remarks for five minutes? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. GROUT. I say that not only would the Kansas farmer and every other farmer in the country be injured, but the Canadian farmer would be benefited. A home market would be established near by him for the sale of his agricultural products, and there would be a greater demand for them; they would bring a better price. But every American farmer would suffer.

More than that, Mr. Chairman, every other industry and interest, both commercial and manufacturing, which in any way attends upon the lumber interest, would also be injured, because this army of lumbermen have not only to be fed, but they must be clothed, and if in the United States clothed with American fabrics. They must have axes which American manufacturers can furnish; they must be furnished with crosscut saws and cant-hooks and calipers or caliper-compasses, and chains and sleds and expensive mill machinery for cutting out the lumber when once delivered to the mill. Now, to the extent that this business would go over into Canada, to that extent all these attendant industries would also go there, and thus our people would be prevented from supplying them. There would be less employment for labor, which would also be unfavorably affected.

This is the way the gentleman from Kansas looks at the question, and though his constituents might be benefited just a little perhaps in the price of lumber, he is unwilling to surrender his consistency as a protectionist and join hands with gentlemen on the other side of the Hall whose philosophy is fashioned according to that Democratic discovery that the tariff is a local issue, that each man must take care of the interests in his own section, and let others take care of themselves.

But, Mr. Chairman, would this lumber business go to Canada? Beyond all question it would, and to a large extent, too. In the Ottawa valley timber lands are worth about one-third what they are in the United States. Back from both sides of that great river, the Ottawa, which has its rise away in the far North, there extend forests which are simply interminable. We were told the other day, and it has been reaffirmed several times to-day, and not denied, that the labor cost per thousand of lumber in Canada is just about one-half what it is here—$3 per thousand.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. That is not conceded or believed on this side of the House.

Mr. GROUT. It has not been contradicted before. The gentleman from Texas said that with this lumber two or three hundred miles in the interior, the cost of transportation would prevent Canada from absorbing the business. Let me say that lumber from those vast forests of the upper Ottawa, as any one in that country knows, could be brought down that river and across the St. Lawrence, through a canal system into Lake Champlain, through the Champlain Canal into the Hudson, and so to the Atlantic Ocean, coming every single inch of the way by cheap water transportation. And I tell you the lumberman, if frozen out in the United States, would go to Canada. He would not go down into Arkansas, as he now does—a fact upon which the gentleman from Arkansas was congratulating himself the other day; but he offered no congratulations upon the fact that there is now a duty of $2 a thousand on lumber to protect the Arkansas manufacturer, which is all that now takes him to Arkansas instead of Canada.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. We do not need it, and do not want it.

Mr. GROUT. But you are sending your lumber into our country for sale there, and it is protected by this $2 duty. The very fact that you send it North shows that it yields a better price there than you get "in the markets of the world," else, liking them so well, you would certainly go there. I remember the gentleman said the other day that they were competing on a free-trade basis with all the world and had conquered several countries on this lumber business. Why, then, do they send their lumber up into our country for sale? Because, Mr. Chairman, it is the best market for it, and they send their surplus abroad.

There is hardly a town in the little State from which I come, which is back from the seaboard, in which pine from the South is not used every year for building purposes, and it is protected there by the present duty against this influx from the North. I say to the gentleman from Arkansas, and to every other citizen interested in the manufacture of lumber, that the removal of the duty would affect the value of his product in our markets, and affect it materially. It would let a flood of lumber in from Canada with which Southern lumber could not successfully compete, as it now does aided by this $2 duty.

The removal of this duty would of course affect more unfavorably the lumber interests in the whole tier of States bordering on Canada when timber lands on this side the line abut upon timber lands on the other side. The product in my own State would be surely overwhelmed by cheap Canadian lumber. The injury to the industry in the Northern States would be greatest, but Southern lumbermen would also very soon learn the difference in the value of their yellow pine throughout all the Middle and Northern States when met by Canadian lumber admitted free of duty.

One word in reference to the argument advanced by my friend from New York [Mr. COX] in regard to the destruction of our forests. I do not know that there is any need of replying to him after the remarks of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED]. But I want to say that this talk about the destruction of our forests is simply a bugaboo, at least in all our northern section of country. The people there have learned to husband their forests. They go in and take out the larger trees, thus letting in the air and the sunlight, so that there follows a more rapid growth of the trees which are left, and within a few years there is another crop. There are thousands of acres along the Connecticut valley—good lands, too—that stand thick with the growth of sapling pine, high and thick, not very large yet, nor can it ever be because of the density of the growth, but still valuable as a timber product.

Another consideration: As our country grows older we are constructing our buildings more and more of brick and stone and iron, so that we do not need lumber for such purposes to the same extent as formerly. Brick is now almost as cheap as lumber; so that there is constantly less demand for lumber. I say, then, the cry which is raised

that this wooden country of ours, having millions upon millions of acres of forests extending from the Lakes to the Gulf, is in danger of being denuded of timber-lands, thus making timber high, and the country uninhabitable, is simply preposterous.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there is on the other side of the House a member who is willing to see himself so completely written down as an unabridged ass, and I think I am using "dictionary language" now [laughter], as to say he believes that taking off this slight percentage of the profits of the manufacturers of lumber is going to destroy that great and magnificent industry in this country. I do not think any one believes it will have any other effect than to slightly reduce the profits of the manufacturer and possibly reduce somewhat the pay of the laborer.

It has been said here frequently during the discussions, this is a sectional bill, sectional as emanating from the South. I hold in my hand a petition, the original of which has been sent to the Pacific coast Congressional delegation, which closes with a paragraph in which I find the following language:

> Finally, from a sectional standpoint, etc., we therefore most respectfully beg of you that your every effort will be used to the end that no change shall be made in the existing duty on manufactured lumber.

[Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The sectional feature of this discussion comes from the few States which are locally interested in this industry, although the discussion has spread abroad through the other States. It is this industry, sectionally distributed, which is chiefly forward in opposing this revision.

I want it understood that I desire not to injure any industry, and I do not believe this reduction of taxes will have the effect of injuring this industry. I do believe it would materially injure the percentage of its profits. I stated the other day that the statistics, those drawn from the Compendium of the Census, showed that the profit which went to the manufacturer of lumber in Maine was 28.5 per cent.; in Michigan, 33.07 per cent. I have since examined and find my own State of Ohio in this lumber interest fares a little better than Maine.

At that time my attention was called to the fact I had given no consideration to certain other elements which ought to be considered. I am frank to say, having taken up the subject while the discussion was going on, and made a re-examination of it, having studied further the statistics, I have come to the conclusion that a portion of my argument is too unfavorable to the State of Maine in this: I discovered the mills there which manufacture sawed lumber are in a larger degree water power than those in my own State or Michigan. For instance, in the State of Maine one-sixth of the power is steam, while five-sixths is water power. In the State of Ohio one-twelfth is water, while eleven-twelfths is steam power. In the State of Michigan the proportion is about one-tenth water and nine tenths steam power.

But I want to say something as to those other elements which it is claimed should be considered in any estimate of the division of net profits between the laborer and the capitalist.

Mr. DINGLEY, in his remarks, said mill supplies, as used in the census, means chains and other tools; that they did not include insurance, or taxes, or interest, or repairs, or commission, or freight. I think I make a fair statement when I allow 1 per cent. on the entire capital; not 1 per cent. on that invested in water saw-mills or in lumber, but 1 per cent. on the entire capital for taxes. I defy any man to show these interests pay for taxes yearly as high as 1 per cent. upon all of their capital. Then, there is 1 per cent. disposed of. Take away 2.5 per cent. for insurance; 2.5, not upon the total capital in mill investments, but the total capital, the whole six millions invested in the business, and I think that is a liberal proposition—2.5 per cent. off there, and thus you have 3.5 per cent. to be deducted from the 28.5 per cent. in Maine, so far.

But the gentleman says we ought to deduct commissions. Commissions for what? The value of this product is generally estimated at the mill, and if you will examine the statistics you will find it is given as the mill price. Then there is no commission to be deducted.

Then he says we should make some deduction for interest. Very well, I am going to give the benefit of a deduction for interest. I will take one-sixth of the capital, $1,000,000 of the $6,000,000 invested in this business, I will take $1,000,000 during the year and pay 6 per cent. on it; that is 1 per cent. on the whole capital. Will any one claim that those manufacturers of sawed lumber in Maine borrow annually and for the whole year more than one-sixth of their entire capital, or pay interest upon more than that portion of it?

Now, we have 4½ per cent. to take off; nothing for commissions and nothing for freight, because there should be no commissions to pay yet and there is no freight. The value is taken in the product at the mill, hence there is no freight. But some gentlemen may say, as Mr. DINGLEY does, you must take off something for repairs. Very well; then, give the capitalists an amount equal to 3 per cent. on their whole capital for repairs, which is nearly as much as they use for mill supplies, and still you have a net result of 20 per cent. to capital, or $200 annually upon each $1,000, and $170 to the man who makes the whole of this profit by his labor. That is the position exactly, and figured out, as I think, upon the facts and figures given in the census, and a fair estimate of the others.

Let me now call attention to something in this connection in regard to the farmers.

Mr. REED. Do you mean to have us understand that you believe now in your revised figures?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Certainly: for they justify me in the belief.

Mr. REED. Well, there has been an improvement; you come in originally with the belief of 28½ per cent.; now you have reduced that to 20 per cent., and we may be permitted to hope that to-morrow or the next day on further consideration you will be induced to come in with something else that is a little less unfair and unreasonable than your last figures. [Laughter.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Your speech is much more unfair than any figures that I may have now presented, because the first figures that I submitted were hastily collected and presented in the heat of debate.

Mr. REED. But you are giving these figures now in the heat of debate; and I do not know how we can trust you in the heat of debate to-day, when we could not trust you in the heat of debate at another time.

Mr. GROUT. But this is deliberate.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. These figure are reliable, I am convinced, and as such they are deliberately submitted here and you can not refute them.

Mr. REED. Oh, you think so.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I am satisfied that they are correct. Gentlemen have been requested time and again to come here and present figures to show how much is labor, how much is capital, how much is protection, and how much is the general result; and you do not present anything in support of your argument but general estimates of figures. Now, I have given you in detail the figures that make up these items, not estimates.

I now call attention to some remarks of my friend from Ohio [Mr. BOOTHMAN], and I will take his own figures as an illustration and for the argument. He has presented us with a statement showing the earnings of the wage-workers connected with the lumber industry of his district, and he figures up that this industry furnished employment to 1,800 hands in 1879, as shown by the census. He shows that the yearly payments to be divided among that body of workers is $348,561; so that taking his own statement, which any school-boy can figure out, we find the average earnings of each worker so employed during that year is $194 per annum.

But, says the gentleman—

> No ordinary farmer will use in the course of a lifetime more than 30,000 feet of lumber. But say, for argument sake, he may use 60,000 feet. The duty on this—if he paid it all, which protectionists deny—would be $120, at $2 per thousand feet, or an average per year of $4, extending the computation over a series of thirty years. Now, to save this $4 per year the farmer is asked to strike down the wages of one hundred and fifty thousand laborers.

Four dollars per year for each farmer in this country, taking his own figures as the standard, giving the total at seven millions of farmers in the country in 1879, would amount to $28,000,000, which is the tribute that this industry extorts from the farmers, according to his calculations. The farmers, according to this statement, pay the whole of this tribute, while the whole wages paid in the sawed-lumber industry itself amounts to only about $3,000,000 more than the $28,000,000.

But I am going to deal fairly with the gentleman from Ohio. I intend to do so. Perhaps the word "farmers" was not what he intended, but that he intended to use the word farms. Let us see what the result will be on that basis. We will say that there are 4,000,000 farms in the United States, as the census shows, and 4,000,000 farms, each one paying this annual tribute of $4 to this protected industry, makes a total of $16,000,000 so paid, or over one-half the whole amount of wages paid in the sawed-lumber industry is paid by this tax upon the farms of the country.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question for information?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLIKEN. How much per day of the wages in your computation are you allowing to the American lumbermen?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. In the State of Maine an average of $170 for the whole time that he works during the year.

Mr. MILLIKEN. But how many days?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not know, but I assume it to be at least six months of the year.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Where do you get your figures from?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. From the Compendium of the Census just before me.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Do you not know that the lumberman gets more than $2 a day on the average?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not. I know that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] said that he knew of men who got $4 a day. I know also that the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BOUTELLE] said that he knew some men who got one and a half, two and a half, or three dollars——

Mr. BOUTELLE. And $4 a day.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Yes, and here is given a report of a manufacturer who states how much he pays to the men in the aggregate and how many men he has employed, and it is a mere question of calculation to show that for every one of them who gets $4 a day out of that total there must be a number who do not get anything like it.

Mr. REED. That is it exactly. That is just like the rest of the argument. [Laughter].

Mr. OUTHWAITE. If every man gets $4 a day, and so many men are employed, any person can calculate what the total expense of that labor would be. But if the average wages are but $1 a day, and one man gets $4 a day, then of course some men must get less than $1 a day.

Mr. REED. That is it, exactly. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Do you know that to be so, or do you suppose it to be so?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That is a statement that is not susceptible of dispute.

Mr. BYNUM. A mill-owner in East Saginaw gives a list of the wages there, showing an average of only $2 a day.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. If two thousand men get an average of $2 a day the year round, whether you compute their wages by the day or the month or any other period, and one thousand of these men get the whole amount paid in wages, does it not follow that the other one thousand could get nothing?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Then you believe that, do you?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Believe it! Do you ask me whether I believe that twice two are four?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Then you believe that half those men work for nothing?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I have not said so.

Mr. BOUTELLE. That is what you are telling the House.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I have said that, if your claim that one-half of them get $2 a day is correct, and the average is only $1, then the other half get nothing.

Mr. BOUTELLE. And if the facts do not square with your percentage, I suppose you think it is so much the worse for the facts.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I have not undertaken to state the facts; but I do say that if your claim is correct, that the average is $1 a day, then for every man who gets more than $1 a day there must be some other one who gets less than $1 per day.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The trouble with the gentleman from Ohio is that he is dealing with generalizations and percentages without regard to the actual facts of the case.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I am dealing with figures that you can not answer.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I told you the other day what the actual rates of wages were, and the statement which I then made can be substantiated.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That was the actual wages of some individuals. [Here the hammer fell].

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the committee to indulge me for five minutes longer, because other gentlemen have occupied so much of my time.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to a portion of the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER] the other day.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I hope that in this second five minutes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] will proceed to demonstrate that the other half of those men work for nothing. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I have not said that. I have only said that if your claim be true that the average wages is $1 per day, and if a certain proportion of those men get $2 per day, their excess over $1 must be taken off the others, and I say that if you gave $2 a day to half the men who are doing this work, the other half would have to work for nothing. Now, is that plain?

Mr. BOUTELLE. It seems to be to you.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, I have here in the RECORD a statement which was made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER], and I want to show the committee just how figures can be juggled with. [Jeers and laughter on the Republican side.]

A MEMBER. You have shown that already.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. You people who boast of your greater intelligence, you people who boast of having the better schoolmasters, had better go home, some of you, and take a few lessons in arithmetic.

Mr. REED. If we are to get them at all we must go home. We do not get any here. [Laughter.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER] says:

According to the census of 1880 the value of the products of the lumber industry in 1879 was $542,7<8,657—

That is not in the census—

employing 326,197 men.

That is not in the census.

The value of sawed lumber was $233,268,729.

That is in the census, page 1163 of the Compendium.

Fully 70 per cent. of the value of sawed lumber is labor. At this low estimate you have an annual expenditure of $165,000,000 paid in wages for lumber alone,

That is not in the census; but I will tell you what is in the census in the same line from which the gentleman from Wisconsin got his figures. In the Compendium of the Census you find under the head of sawed lumber "total value of product" so much, and then across the page "wages paid during the year." Instead of being 70 per cent. of $233,268,729, as the gentleman said; instead of being $165,000,000, as he said, they are just one-fifth of that amount, namely, $31,845,974. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. What payments do those figures cover?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. They come from this book.

Mr. BOUTELLE. What part of the cost of producing lumber do they cover?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Please take the book and look at it for yourself.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Ah! But I would rather you would look at it a little more carefully before you give us your deductions.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. These figures are from the page giving the statistics of sawed lumber, and they show the wages paid.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But those are the wages for doing what?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. This shows the number of hands employed, males above sixteen years of age, females above fifteen years of age, children and youths.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Employed in doing what?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. In the industry of sawed lumber.

Mr. BOUTELLE. In sawing lumber?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. In the industry of sawed lumber; the industry which the gentleman from Wisconsin said yielded an annual product of $233,000,000.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Does not the gentleman understand that that statement does not cover the whole cost of producing the lumber? Sawing is only one item of the cost.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. This does not say "sawing;" it deals with the whole industry.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Oh, you are mistaken about that.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I am not mistaken; but you gentlemen will try to make it appear that I am; and the book also.

Mr. MILLIKEN. You do not count cutting the logs, hauling them to the streams, running them down the streams, and thence to the mill.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That may be another industry entirely. Now do you please keep quiet. [Laughter on the Republican side.] If that is another industry, where are the statistics showing that the items you mention are to be considered as affecting this question differently from the way I have presented it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] has expired. The Clerk will report the pending amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 15, strike out the word "hewn."

The CHAIRMAN. Debate upon this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. MILLS. I desire to submit a proposition to close the debate on this paragraph.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] has made some statements which require a reply.

Mr. REED. Yes; he has started some new points that ought to be answered.

Mr. MILLS. You can go on with that discussion on the next paragraph.

Mr. REED. We might as well do it on this.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not think it would be so lucid on the next paragraph as on this one.

Mr. REED and Mr. BAYNE. Let us have twenty minutes on each side.

Mr. MILLS. Very well; twenty minutes on each side, and it will be understood that then we are to have a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Unanimous consent is asked that the debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto be limited to twenty minutes on each side. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I sought the floor some time ago to discuss some of the remarks of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] in regard to the amount of money paid to labor in this country. The gentleman quoted the other day from a Chicago paper a statement in which a man, who was represented to be a large owner of timber lands, said that he put all the profits into his own pocket. Now, I ask the gentleman from Texas whether it is not true that every man on the other side who has discussed this question has admitted that the laboring men in this country are paid more than they are in other countries? If that be true—assuming that there is an increase of price arising from the tariff—is it not tacitly admitted that a part of this increased price has gone to labor?

But I rose particularly to call attention to some of the gentleman's philosophy. He says that it is a rule of human nature as old as the world that men always get their labor as cheaply as they possibly can. That is his proposition. I will admit that, so far as the individual is concerned, the proposition is true. But in society the theory of our

age, the theory of our Government, the theory of our institutions, is that the common sense of the many, the general conscience of society, is better than the selfish instincts of the individual, and that it is the duty of society to concrete and crystallize into the form of law the general sentiment of the masses in order that the selfishness of the individual may be restrained. That is the whole theory of protection. It is the duty of society to take care of all the members of the community and to protect them against the selfishness of individuals.

A number of years ago there existed in this country the institution of human slavery. The average man who owned a slave would not free him. He insisted that he had the right to get all he could out of the slave's labor. But the great heart of the country revolted against that theory. The mass of the people said "We believe that slavery is wrong;" and that sentiment became finally crystallized into the form of law, and the selfishness of the individual was restrained in the interest of society. I ask the gentleman from Texas to take that thought into consideration when he is discussing this bill.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the merits of this bill both sides of the House, it seems to me, lose sight of the main question involved. Gentlemen on both sides plead for the laborer, the workingman; but neither of them has presented any method whereby the evils existing may be redressed.

It is true that under a policy of protection the working classes in this country suffer a great many evils; but the next question that comes home to us is this: Will a change of policy help us out of this dilemma? Will free trade redress the grievances from which the working classes now suffer? That is the main question before the people of this country; it is the question which confronts this Congress; and this Congress, or some other in the near future, will have to solve it in the interest of the working people, or the working people will take the matter in hand and solve it for themselves.

I am sure there is a method by which the existing evils can be redressed. I think that if the President had studied the labor problem, had studied the interests of the masses of this country as much as he has studied the free-trade theories which he has embodied in the message sent to this House, that message would have been more opportune and more in keeping with the wants of the people. Of all the measures which the President has proposed to Congress in his message, there is not one that does not tend to favor the wealthy. I take the ground that the prices paid by the working classes of this country, the farmers, the laborers, and the mechanics, for the commodities required for their subsistence and comfort, are not affected one iota by the tariff.

I do not care what the commodity may be, whether lumber, wool, cotton, or any other article, the competition among the manufacturing interests is such that prices are reduced to so low a point that even in the face of the tariff our working people get the articles that they require for their subsistence and comfort just as cheaply as they would if the tariff were removed. If, then, the tariff be removed, what follows? Simply that there is no revenue collected from those commodities, and the people of Canada, of Europe, and of Asia pour their products into this country. There is simply that much less produced by our working people here. They do not purchase the commodities they require a particle cheaper, because the competition existing among manufacturers, merchants, and dealers reduces the price of any commodity to a minimum, so that even the foreign importation does not lessen the price.

Now, a word as to the solution of this labor problem. Why is it that the other side, in presenting this bill, has not introduced any feature which would remedy the trouble in this respect? I say they should have done it, and it lies with this side to do it if the other side does not.

I had hoped in this bill that efforts would be made in favor of the working classes; that gentlemen would seek to correct some of the methods for the protection of labor as well as for the protection of the products of labor. I mean, sir, I was in hopes that something would be done in favor of the protection of the wages of the laborer.

Now, it may be asked how can this be done? I say it can be brought about by legislation just as other results have been brought about; that the same means which have been used for the purpose of protecting the capitalists can be adopted with the view of the protection of the interests of labor.

I wish to show why the bill is not exactly formulated to correct that evil in reference to labor and the wages of labor. I think myself of presenting a measure with a view of accomplishing that purpose, and I intend to bring it forward for consideration, and as both sides of the House are in favor of the protection of labor, of course I shall expect the assistance of both sides of the House in carrying that measure through.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. I hope there will be no objection to the extension of my time so that I may add to my remarks a few extracts which I have cut from the journals of the country. They are as follows:

A HUNDRED THOUSAND UNEMPLOYED IN NEW YORK.

NEW YORK, *December 5.*

The Daily News, which claims to be the organ of the laboring classes, says:

"It is estimated that there are 50,000 skilled workers of both sexes out of employment in this city, and with the army of common laborers and men who do all sorts of odd jobs it is believed that the total number of persons who are willing to work, but can not obtain employment, is 100,000.—*Washington Post*, December 6, 1887.

A PROBLEM FOR LEGISLATORS.

An exhaustive inquiry into the condition of some 40,000 female workers in New York has been made, and this is the melancholy conclusion which it reaches: "The sewing women of this city do skilled labor for fifteen hours a day for so little pay they must accept charity or starve." We hear so much glib talk about the pauper labor of Europe, and are treated to so many comparative tables showing the great superiority of American wages that such a decision as this will probably come with the force of a revelation to the majority of readers. But any one at all familiar with those who obtain aid from any one of the numerous charitable organizations of this city will recognize its truth.

Nor does the dangers to society end with the pauperization of so large a body of working women. The tenement houses in which they are herded are nests of contagion, and no proper precautions are taken to prevent the work which they do there from carrying with it the seeds of pestilence. The problem is a grave one—perhaps the gravest that the foremost manufacturing city in the Union has to face—and it is a service of no small value to have its character thus clearly and truthfully set forth.—*New York Epoch*, March, 1888.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I rise for the purpose, Mr. Chairman, of making a correction. In my remarks I attributed to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] the use of the following language:

According to the census of 1880 the value of the products of the lumber industry in 1879 was $542,788,657, employing 326,197 men; the value of sawed lumber was $233,268,729. Fully 70 per cent. of the value of sawed lumber is labor. At this low estimate you have an annual expenditure of $165,000,000 paid in wages for lumber alone.

This language was not used by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], but by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER].

Mr. BURROWS. The remarks the gentleman from Ohio attributed to me were made in fact by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER].

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That is the correction I have made.

Mr. KERR. I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask gentlemen on that side of the House, why should lumber come in free? The lumber manufacturers in the country they say own millions of dollars. They pay taxes at the rate of 1½ and 2 per cent. on all they own. Those taxes are used by the State and national authorities for carrying on the Government. They support our schools, our institutions of learning, and our charitable institutions. Every American interest is supported in part by taxes on our lumber interests in the Northern and Southern States. I ask, then, why should these men be taxed and men who do not contribute one cent to support these institutions of the Government which do so much to build up the character of our people, that American character of which we are so proud, why should these men particularly, who do not contribute a cent, why should they take possession of the American market without contributing one dollar to the support of our American institutions? Why do they call it revenue reform? If they are revenue reformers why should they give the advantage to the foreign producer to the disadvantage of the American producer? [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Chairman, I was entertained this morning by a statement of the value of the pine stumpage in the northern lumber regions of Wisconsin by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM]. That gentleman estimates the value of stumpage to be $4.50 a thousand feet, and seems to wish to have it inferred that this value is largely the result of the duty on lumber. I wish to compare the value of stumpage in Wisconsin as given by the gentleman with its value as considered by the Interior Department of the present Democratic Administration.

There are some Indian reservations in the northern part of my State, and the pine upon those reservations is certainly as valuable on the average as is the stumpage in the same vicinity outside the reservations. The pine upon them is as accessible to driving streams and has been better preserved than the average of pine outside. There is an investigation going on at present at the other end of the Capitol to ascertain whether or not the present administration has treated the Indians fairly and properly guarded their interests in the sale of the stumpage on those reservations. We find by the testimony given before the committee investigating that matter that the present Secretary of the Interior and his predecessor do not and have not considered that stumpage to be as valuable as the estimate given by the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BYNUM. Is that accessible?

Mr. HAUGEN. It is considered very desirable by our lumbermen, and is undoubtedly as accessible as is pine on the average outside the reservations. Lumbermen all understand that the value of stumpage varies according to its proximity to driving streams.

Now, when the gentleman puts the value of stumpage at $4.50 a thousand feet I suppose he means the average value. This pine has been considered very desirable to the lumbermen up there, as would appear from their anxiety to enter into contracts with the Indians. The present administration has indorsed contracts made by the lumbermen with the Indians whereby the timber has been sold for from $1.25 up to $2.50 per thousand feet, the latter price being exceptional. I think the gentleman from Indiana ought to go to the Secretary of

the Interior to ascertain whether the Indians under his guardianship have been receiving a fair price for their stumpage under this administration.

The Democratic Secretary of the Interior and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BYNUM] do not seem to fully agree as to the value of stumpage in Wisconsin. The lumber has been fully as well preserved on these reservations, I repeat, as a rule as it has on the average in the lumber regions adjacent, and it is equally as accessible to the streams. The present Secretary is somewhat of a lumberman himself, and some of this lumber, the testimony of the Senate investigating committee shows, has found its way into the mills of a corporation of which he is a large stockholder; and it looks a little suspicious on the face of it, if the gentleman from Indiana is correct in his statement that the value of this stumpage averages $4.50, to find this lumber going to the mill-yards of the Ashland Lumber Company, of which I believe Mr. Vilas is a large stockholder, the Indians receiving nothing like that price, but only from $1.25 to $2 per thousand feet.

The other gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOWARD] goes into this question of profit to the lumbermen somewhat, and claims that the cost of cutting and hauling the timber to the streams is only $1.50 a thousand feet. Now, if that be so, the Secretary of the Interior must be permitting frauds to be perpetrated upon these Indians, for the testimony shows that these lumbermen are permitted to charge them $3 to $3.50 per thousand feet for this cutting and hauling, and I think it would be well for this reform administration to look into the matter if the testimony of these Indiana gentlemen is correct. I think it would be proper for them to go and see the Secretary of the Interior and get an explanation as to why these things are permitted.

Mr. Chairman, we have been told repeatedly during this discussion that the endeavor of the Committee on Ways and Means has been to place raw material on the free-list as far as possible, so that manufacturers could have free raw material, and thereby lessen the cost of their product. Logs seem to have been made an exception to the rule that no obstacle should be placed in the way of the free admission of raw material into this country. Logs and shingle-bolts are at present admitted into this country free of duty, and are the only lumber product so admitted; but Canada has an export duty on logs and shingle-bolts. This bill would leave that export duty just as it is at present, and it would be as much hinderance to free importation of logs as at present. We learn also from reliable sources that many of our own citizens own timber lands on the Canadian side of the line. If the bill passes in this form it is a direct bid to border lumbermen owning pine lands in Canada to transfer their manufacturing plants from the soil of the United States to the soil of Canada.

On page 2, after enumerating the different forms of lumber which this bill places upon the free-list, it continues as follows:

Provided, That if any export duty is laid upon the above-mentioned articles, or either of them, by any country whence imported, all said articles imported from said country shall be subject to duty as now provided by law.

Now, as there is no duty "provided by law" on logs imported into this country, the result of this proviso would be that the unmanufactured lumber would be imported here free; but the Canadian export duty on the logs—the unmanufactured article—would still continue and would not be affected by the passage of the bill, because it is a duty imposed by Canada. It would be an inducement to Canada to retain her export duty, for that would necessitate the manufacture of Canadian pine on Canadian soil in order to avoid the duty which the logs would have to pay if shipped in an unmanufactured state.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The twenty minutes allowed on this side have expired.

Mr. WEBER. I ask the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means if I may be allowed to proceed, not perhaps exceeding five minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman on the next paragraph. Debate on the pending paragraph under the order of the House is exhausted.

Mr. BYNUM. Mr. Chairman, I shall occupy the attention of the committee but a moment. In giving the value of stumpage I only stated the prices fixed by the lumber manufacturers in their statements before the Tariff Commission in 1882. Mr. J. A. Whittier, of East Saginaw, Mich., president of the Saginaw Board of Trade, and other gentlemen representing the lumber interests of Michigan, in their statement as to the cost of making lumber, gave the stumpage at $4.50 per thousand. Commissioner Kenner propounded to Mr. Whittier the following interrogatory: "Are your trees worth $4.50 in the stump?" to which he responded, "Yes, taking that as the average quality that we have adopted."

Whether the lumbermen have succeeded in getting the timber belonging to the Indians at a less rate I do not know; but if that is a fact it is only another reason for placing lumber upon the free-list.

Mr. BURROWS. Will my friend advise the committee of the time when the transaction took place to which reference has been made in this debate, when the lands were bought at $2.50 per acre?

Mr. BYNUM. For stumpage?

Mr. BURROWS. Yes; this occurred some years ago.

Mr. BYNUM. The stumpage sold for less than $1 per thousand in 1870.

Mr. BURROWS. That was eighteen years ago.

Mr. RYNUM. True; but why should the stumpage be worth $4.50 per thousand now as against $1 per thousand eighteen years ago? Either timber is getting scarce or the whole industry is in the hands of a trust. If timber is getting so scarce as to run up the price from $1 to $4.50 per thousand, we should certainly avail ourselves of timber of Canada; if our timber lands are under the control of a few men, and they have combined and put the price up to this enormous rate, then we should break up the trust, and not to do so would simply be to stand idly by and see the people robbed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. BUCHANAN] to strike out the word "hewn," in line 15.

The question being put, there were—ayes 49, noes 96.

So (further count not being called for) the amendment was disagreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question recurs on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] to strike out the three lines which have been read.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 58, noes 98.

Mr. CHEADLE. No quorum.

The Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CHEADLE and Mr. MILLS.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 53, noes 89.

Mr. CHEADLE. I withdraw the point of no quorum.

So (further count not being called for) the amendment was disagreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the next paragraph.

The Clerk read line 16, as follows:

Staves of wood.

Mr. WEBER. I move to strike out that line, my purpose being chiefly to answer the query put by the distinguished gentleman from Texas a few moments ago. He asked why the tariff levied by Canada does not raise the wages of labor?

So far as their tariff on lumber is concerned it is not a difficult matter to answer that from a practical business standpoint. It is about as useless as the fifth wheel to a wagon.

The tariff, as I understand, is for the purpose of preventing an inundation of articles from foreign countries. Inasmuch as there is no importation of lumber into Canada, they do not need a tariff for the purpose of preventing its entering into that country.

Our friends on the other side have persistently attempted to pose as not being free-traders. I ask them whether, so far as this item of lumber is concerned, it is not absolutely free trade in that particular article. I do not intend to make any statement in respect of this matter simply as an assertion, but I desire to prove my observations by analogy and practical business experience.

We have had absolute free trade so far as wheat, so far as cattle, and so far as flour are concerned. We had that for nearly twelve years during the existence of the treaty of reciprocity between this Government and Canada. That treaty was abrogated in 1866 by the action of the Republicans, it having been inaugurated by the Democrats, I believe; the Republicans taking the earliest opportunity in abrogating that treaty, which worked so injuriously to our interests.

At that time I was in business in the city of Buffalo, just before the abrogation of the treaty and just after. My correspondence westerly was almost entirely with Canadians. The business was selling flour and wheat. I heard before the abrogation of the treaty some of the same arguments I have been listening to here for weeks and the same that are laid down by the President in his message. It was said by the Canadians that the duty would be added to the article and would be paid by the consumer, which proposition, plainly enunciated by the President in his message, has since been amended by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] so as to apply only to articles on which there is foreign competition. I heard those same arguments day in and day out from my Canadian friends who insisted that when the treaty expired we would pay the 20 per cent. duty levied on flour and wheat. And I want to say to the gentleman from Texas, who is honoring me by not giving attention to a practical statement, that I bought the same flour just after the treaty for precisely the same amount as before, less the amount of duty. In other words, I bought it laid down on our side of the water——

[Here the hammer fell.]

On motion of Mr. BAKER, of New York, by unanimous consent, the time of Mr. WEBER was extended.

Mr. WEBER. My friend from Massachusetts [Mr. LONG] suggests that the statement I have just made was not quite clear to him. I desire to repeat the flour I had been in the habit of buying at $5 a barrel I bought after the termination of the treaty at $5, less the duty. I bought it for $5 laid down on our side.

A MEMBER. Who paid the duty?

Mr. WEBER. The Canadians paid the duty. The reason I submit is that the quantity coming from Canada is so insignificant that it does not appreciably affect our prices. A little rivulet trickling down

the mountain side makes no appreciable increase in the volume of the great stream into which it empties, but if by any process of art or nature the larger stream could be turned back into the other it would regulate and control the smaller. And so the great volume of trade flowing regularly and irresistibly from West to East is not affected in prices by the little stream which in accordance with the natural laws of trade flow into it from Canada.

The same thing is even more true in regard to lumber, because it is heavy and bulky compared to its price, and because the cost of transportation is great in proportion to its value; and our Canadian friends must come over to our market with their lumber whether the duty be off or on.

The same logic conversely applied relates to the article of sugar, because the amount produced in this country is relatively so small that it does not affect the price to the consumers; and yet our free-trade friends have taken the one article which, so far as the duty is concerned, is purely a tariff for revenue only, and removed the duty off that article, while in the case of the other they allow it to remain on. As my genial friend from New York, the poet laureate of the New York delegation, stated it a few moments ago, the bill reduces it on sugar "*pro hac.*"

The trouble is we want a bigger "hac" than the committee gives us.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the tariff is to be revised for the purpose of reducing the revenue that reason should not apply to this article of lumber, because I hold that making lumber free will simply reduce the revenue and put the difference in the pockets of the Canadian manufacturers or their laboring men. If the "robber barons" over there are as piratical as ours have been pictured to us by gentlemen on the other side, the only possible effect of it will be to transfer millionairism to the other side of the line, and, as between a home millionaire and a foreign millionaire, I believe in the home product. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The amendment was read, as follows:

Page 2, line 16, add to the line the words "in the rough, as split and not shaved."

The CHAIRMAN. This being an amendment designed to perfect the text, it takes precedence of an amendment, to strike out.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I desire to say a word in support of this amendment, which, as will be seen by the committee, is a substantial one. It will also be observed that it makes a material change in the paragraph. The paragraph as it stands proposes to admit to the free-list staves of wood. My amendment provides that that shall only be done when those staves are "in the rough, as split and not shaved." I offer this amendment for these reasons: As soon as you begin to shape these staves that moment you put additional labor into their production; and if it be said that this paragraph is designed to save our home wood supply, this amendment does not interfere with that object. These billets, as I may call them, would be admitted free, but if this amendment were adopted the moment they were shaped into staves they would become dutiable; and in that stage of production, I say, they ought to carry some rate of duty, because whatever may be said about raw material, whilst we may claim that wooden blocks are raw material, no one will claim that the finished stave is raw material. To the maker of staves it is his finished product, and it ought to be eliminated from the free-list and put upon the dutiable list at a low rate of duty, but at some rate of duty, in order to make things equal.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not suppose this amendment will be adopted. I suppose it will meet with the fate of the amendment which I offered to the preceding paragraph, against which not one word was uttered, against which not one word could be uttered, but which the other side, rallying their forces to a man, voted down. They defeated it not by reason but by the brute force of numbers; and I want to say to those gentlemen and to this House that although ay-and-no votes will do very well here, the matter does not end here, and if we can not have a dispassionate and calm discussion and vote upon the merits of these propositions, there is a forum outside of these walls to which we will appeal.

I now ask that this amendment be considered upon its merits, and if any gentleman on the other side has a word to say against its merits, I want to hear him.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair must first recognize any gentleman who desires to oppose the pending amendment.

[Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] very felicitously suggested to the House a while ago that he proposed to show how figures could be juggled with. I have no idea that the gentleman intended to deceive the House or to misrepresent facts. I know that he has great zeal in this matter, and that he probably searches the census reports with a very earnest desire to find there things that will make arguments for the side which he advocates, but he ought to know, and I think he does know, that there is nothing more unsafe than to take figures relating in a general way to any technical occupation and make deductions from them, without some familiarity with the business itself. I do not know how I could illustrate this more forcibly than by calling attention to the figures which the gentleman gave us of the aggregate amounts in the business of sawed lumber as divided between the manufacturers and the workingmen.

The gentleman from Ohio takes the proceeds of the product of the mill and subtracts from that the amount he finds set forth in this book as paid for labor, and then, making what he calls a liberal allowance for interest and insurance, he deduces therefrom the inference that a very small percentage of that product is paid to the laboring man. I want to say to the gentleman and to the House that these census tables, except as to certain lines of statistics in which there is little opportunity for error, are liable to be very misleading, and if the gentleman had examined this statement with a little more care I think he would have escaped some of the errors into which he has fallen.

But even these figures here do not purport to be what I understand the gentleman takes them for. They purport to be reports of statistics upon the sawed-lumber interest. The heading is, "Lumber sawed;" and the different columns embrace a list of the establishments, the amount of capital, the number of males, females, and children employed, and the wages paid during the year. I undertook to fasten my friend down at that point to find out for what the wages to which these statistics refer were paid. I find upon examination that the statistics refer entirely to just what the caption shows—to the sawed-lumber interest. The amount of wages paid is the amount paid for sawing lumber in the saw-mills.

Now, how do I know that? I know it in the first place in a general way, and I have the absolute proof of it on this printed page, which proof would have made itself obvious to the gentleman from Ohio if he had been familiar with the lumber business; because immediately after the column showing amount of wages paid during the year I find a column devoted to the value of logs. What does that mean? Why, sir, it means the greater part of this entire problem. It means that in the figures given by the gentleman from Ohio he made no allowance for the great item of cost in producing lumber.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. My friend will excuse me. In my figures I deducted the cost of the logs, in order to get the wages of the men engaged in the sawed lumber industry.

Mr. BOUTELLE. How could you get the rate of wages?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. After taking from the value of the whole product, first, the cost of the logs, some $133,000,000; second, the mill supplies, and, third, the interest, insurance, and taxes——

Mr. BOUTELLE. How did you arrive at the cost of the logs?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That is a separate thing. I am getting at the sawed lumber industry. Those are the wages paid in that industry. The item of wages must have been included in the value of the logs.

Mr. BOUTELLE. How much do you allow for the wages paid?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not allow anything, because in my calculation I have included the value of the logs.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a few minutes longer, as other gentlemen have been granted the same indulgence.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. As I have interrupted the gentleman, I hope the consent will be granted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to allowing the gentleman from Maine to continue for five minutes longer? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Mr. Chairman, the best way——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. My friend will allow me to say that perhaps the wages earned by the laborers in the logging industry go into the value of the logs.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Certainly; but do you allow in your statistics the whole value of the logs?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Yes, I allowed the whole value of the logs.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I think not.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. My figures show that I did.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The gentleman must certainly have made a mistake in his figures, because the first item in the cost of the lumber is the value of the tree as it stands in the forest. That varies according to locality. In my part of the country stumpage for spruce would be, I should say, from $2 to $2.25 per thousand; that is what the operator pays for the standing tree. When that has been paid men are sent into the woods; they cut the tree down; they trim it; they haul it to the water. I am not going into the minutiæ, but simply state the principal operations. They put it in the stream; they make rafts, which they drive down the river to the mill. The logs, when they reach the mill in my country, will average a value of $9 per thousand. Subtract the cost of stumpage and you have something like $7 or $7.50, every penny of which has been paid to labor—the labor put upon the log up to the time it reaches the mill.

Mr. McSHANE. Does the gentleman know how many men are employed in logging in this country?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Enough to supply all the mills with logs.

Mr. McSHANE. Does the gentleman know how many?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Forty to fifty thousand, I should say. I do not know what bearing that question has upon the matter I am discussing. I am trying to find out who gets the money that comes from the sale of lumber in the market.

We have now carried the log to the mill, where it has assumed a value of about $9 per thousand. To-day spruce sawed boards are worth at the mills in my State, I should say, from $10 to $11. Of course the value varies somewhat with the fluctuations of the market. The difference between the cost of the log at the mill and the value of the lumber per thousand as it lies at the mill ready for shipping represents the cost of milling, which is a very small part of the aggregate cost of taking the tree from the forest, carrying it to the mill, and making it into lumber. A thousand feet of lumber, valued at $10 to $11 or $11.50, represents to the extent of eight-tenths or nine-tenths what has been paid to labor to produce it.

As to this fabulous amount of profit which gentlemen here have figured up as being realized in the lumber business, it is a very easy thing, as has been said here, to juggle with figures; but I suppose among practical lumbermen in this country, especially those in the Eastern States, and more particularly those in my own State, where we are subjected to close and sharp competition with Canadian labor—paid, as I said the other day, from 25 to 50 per cent. less than we pay our laborers—nothing is better known than that the lumber business has been carried on upon the closest possible margin for years, and that men engaged in this business are only able to get out of it without loss by reason of the advantage which they get in the manufacture of what is known as short lumber, working up the refuse with a care and economy unknown in former years—working slabs into pickets, palings, laths, and every conceivable form in which this class of lumber can be fitted for the market.

I have been told by an old lumberman, within the last six months, that within the past five years he has been simply saved from absolute loss by working up all the refuse into this class of what is known as short lumber.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I will ask two or three minutes more.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do not object, but I wish to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Certainly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. You give the price now of the labor in the logging industry at from $7 to $7.25 per thousand feet.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have never figured it in that way.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. What did you give as the cost?

Mr. BOUTELLE. The entire cost?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. No, the cost of labor in logging. Did you not put it at from $7 to $7.25 per thousand feet.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have not figured it in that way.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The question I was going to ask is this: Do you know as a matter of fact that the cost of the logging multiplied by production, the number of thousand feet produced in this country at the rate you give would be as much as the whole cost of the logs as shown by the statistics, not allowing anything for stumpage?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not know that, and I do not agree to what you undertake to prove from a few selected statistics or carelessly gathered figures in regard to this industry. I wished to say this to the gentleman when up, that I do not believe he knows, and I am very well satisfied I do not know, the statistics of the lumber interest of this country, and he is a bold man who assumes to know it. I know in my State we have established a bureau of statistics recently, and we do not know the aggregate statistics of our lumber business. They have not been able to ascertain them. They are not given in the census.

But I do know what is paid in the lumber market. I know what is paid men in the camps. There is no doubt about it. I know what is paid to the men in the mills. I know it from the men; I know it from the pay-rolls of the men who pay it. I know that, and knowing the cost of stumpage, and knowing what lumber brings in the market, I do not need your census statistics. You go into indefinite nothingness when you attempt to generalize about a business like this of lumber.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Do you know that Mr. Ralph Beaumont, the chairman of the executive committee of the Knights of Labor, has stated that he visited your district and found men working there in the lumber business from 5 o'clock in the morning to 7 o'clock in the evening at 95 cents a day?

Mr. BOUTELLE. If Mr. Ralph Beaumont said that I should regard it as without authority.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That he found men in the lumber business working at from 75 cents to 95 cents per day.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I do not wish to be led into specific contradictions of statements made by anybody else. I do not wish to be drawn into controversy with anybody. I do not propose to hold a controversy with Mr. Ralph Beaumont or anybody else. I stand here as the representative of a great constituency, and in respect to their business interest on my responsibility I undertake to give and have given the figures as to the average wages paid in my district to-day to men employed in the lumber business. There may be some persons connected with some portion of the work around the mills who get their board, but I have given the regular scale of schedule wages, and these wages speak for themselves.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The question recurred on Mr. BUCHANAN'S amendment.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 55, noes 85.

So the amendment was disagreed to.

Mr. BURROWS. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the present duty on staves is 10 per cent. We import something over $300,000 worth in value, upon which duty to the amount of $30,000 is collected, and I want to say that I think it extremely unfortunate that the Committee on Ways and Means did not before reporting this bill permit gentlemen who are familiar with the various industries embraced in the bill to be heard before the committee. This debate demonstrates the fact that we know nothing whatever about this industry with any certainty, certainly not with that degree of accuracy with which to formulate legislation. No gentleman of the House of Representatives asserts that wages are higher in the United States than in Canada in the lumber regions but what it is denied, and nobody has been able to furnish the proof that the wages are higher in the United States than in Canada. And so upon every single proposition we are all afloat as to the facts, whereas if we could agree upon the facts probably we could arrive at unanimity of opinion upon the result.

Upon this question of staves I know nothing about it personally, and I venture to say that other gentlemen are in the same condition; and yet I hold in my hand a communication from nine firms engaged in the manufacture of staves taken from the National Press of yesterday that I would like to have read. It will take but a moment to read it. If these gentlemen had been heard before the Committee on Ways and Means we would have had some information upon the subject, but as it is we have to rely upon this evidence in Committee of the Whole.

Before that is read allow me to state that Michigan manufactures annually 199,000,000 staves, valued at $50,000,000; and I hold in my hand a table embracing thirty-five States and Territories engaged in this industry, showing the amount and value of this production upon which there is a duty of 10 per cent. I shall be glad if the committee will listen to what these gentlemen say who are largely engaged in this industry. I ask the Clerk now to read the extract I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

If the duty were to be taken from hoops, staves, and heading, we fail to see where (in the end) it would benefit the American people. We think it would be a temporary advantage to the American consumers, resulting in the duty received by this country being placed upon the timber in Canada, and thus an injustice to the American manufacturer, and tending to drive them from the country.

D. B. & D. C. SWEET, *Buffalo, N. Y.*

If staves are placed on the free-list we will all be obliged to shut down, as the percentage now on staves is all we make. Millions of dollars' worth of property would be rendered worthless, and thousands of families would be thrown out of work. The percentage now on staves is just enough to keep us alive. I hope Congress will see this; if it does not, disaster will follow.

HENRY C. SCHUNOR,
Superintendent Fair Haven (Mich.) Stave Co.

We think the price of staves is as low as they can be manufactured for. Putting them on the free-list will, in our opinion, have the effect of driving the border manufacturers into Canada, thereby benefiting Canadian labor at the expense of labor in the States, and would enable the Canadian manufacturer to advance his prices with consequent greater profits. It is certainly very poor policy to drive capital and labor from the country, and by so doing greatly benefit some foreign country.

DETROIT STAVE AND HEADING WORKS.

Our opinion is, with the small profit on staves here, by putting them on the free-list three-quarters of the manufacturers will have to stop, and many of the largest plants along the Detroit River would go to Canada, where labor and timber are cheaper.

ST. LOUIS (MICH.) HOOP AND STAVE COMPANY.

We believe the effect would be to put down the price of cooperage stock in the States. It would be a boom for Canada, but disastrous to the timber-owners and wood-working interest of the United States.

E. C. BRADFORD & BRO.,
Detroit, Mich.

To admit lumber and staves free would lead to the closing up of our mills and factories. Canada is now, under the present tariff, flooding our country with all kinds of lumber and staves. We are now selling our stock as low as it can be made and leave a profit.

SKIDMORE & THACHER,
Toledo, Ohio.

We believe that putting lumber, staves, and salt on the free-list will be a great damage to this State, as they are a large product of our State, and we think it would have a tendency to prostrate those industries and work injustice to those having money invested in machinery and timber.

BUTTERS & PETERS SALT AND LUMBER COMPANY.
Ludington, Mich.

In our opinion it would be ruinous to the manufacturers of cooperage stock in the United States, and plants that are now valuable and paying a fair percentage on cost would not be worth 50 cents on the dollar.

THE DEWEY STAVE COMPANY,
Toledo, Ohio.

Mr. BURROWS. I stated that the value of this industry in Michigan was $50,000,000 annually. That includes, however, the manufacture of shingles and laths as well as staves, these three items combined aggregating the $50,000,000. I desired to have these letters read in order that the majority of the committee might know something of the industry they are about to destroy, in addition also to the fact that upon this question of lumber, as I intimated in the beginning, but one peti-

tion was filed before the Ways and Means Committee asking that the duty on lumber be disturbed. That petition was read by the chairman of the committee, but he did not read all of those which were against the bill, sixty in number, which were exclusively on the other side in the shape of a firm protest against disturbing this industry. I call attention to this merely because these gentlemen whose communication I have had read are thoroughly familiar with the industry.

Mr. MILLS. I want to say that the number of petitions the gentleman speaks of as being opposed to disturbing this duty were by those people who are interested in receiving the tax; and the one I read was by gentlemen who were interested in paying the tax. There is just the difference between them.

Mr. BURROWS. I did not discuss the character of the men who signed that petition.

Mr. MILLS. Well, I am discussing it.

Mr. BURROWS. I said that but one petition was filed in this Congress asking that the duty on lumber should be disturbed.

Mr. MILLS. And it is well known that all of these others were from gentlemen interested in receiving the tax.

Mr. BURROWS. But in the line of this cry for free lumber I repeat there has been but one petition, one demand, while sixty petitions are filed against it, and the members of the Committee on Ways and Means closed their doors against men having knowledge of this industry, who were told they should not be heard. Now, the course of this debate shows conclusively that the committee have not heard men who knew something about it.

Mr. MILLS. The gentlemen on the other side contend, it seems to me, that nobody has any right to be consulted about taxation except the parties who are putting their hands into the pockets of other people and taking the money out. No one has any right to be consulted here or spoken of on the floor when a law is to be made, except the man who is to determine how much of that money he will take from the people. The Committee on Ways and Means could not agree to the doctrine that the only question to be considered when you are taking their money is, how much will the people bear?

We are here, sir, to represent the consuming people, to represent the people who are paying the taxes. We are here under the solemn pledge that we will reduce this taxation. We are here with a surplus and an excess of $80,000,000 a year coming into the Treasury, and when we present a bill to reduce the taxation we are confronted with the determined opposition of the gentlemen on the other side of the House at every stage of its progress. They are constantly refusing to reduce the taxation on a single article. Not an item of the bill has yet been read on which there has not been a motion to strike it out from the free-list and restore the taxation.

We are told nobody is asking for this. I know that one hundred and sixty-eight members of this House have pledged themselves to the country and to their constituents that they will reduce taxation. And the gentlemen on the other side come here with the provision in the platform of their party at the last national convention pledging themselves also to revise the taxation and reduce the surplus. But there are two ways of revising taxation. The Democratic way is to revise the tariff by reducing taxation; the Republican way is to revise it by raising the taxation.

Mr. MILLIKEN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] has never debated this question in this House without begging the question. His whole talk has been for the reduction of taxation with the assertion that this side of the House is engaged in an effort to keep taxation up while he desires to reduce it. Now the gentleman knows, because he is a man of intelligence, that this is an absolutely unfair, unjust, and incorrect statement of the case. He knows that this side of the House is quite as eager as he is to reduce taxation, only they are not ready to reduce it in his particular way.

The gentleman has formulated his bill, has brought it into the House, and says he desires to reduce taxation by cutting down the duties on imports, which would affect the interests of certain sections of the country and destroy the industries in those sections.

Mr. BLAND rose.

Mr. MILLIKEN. If I had time I should be glad to give it to the gentleman from Missouri to repeat that same old speech he has made in this House any time for the last five years. I always did like that speech.

But what I have to say is that the gentleman from Texas formulated a bill to take the duty off lumber, thereby affecting the Northern industries; and while the duty on lumber to-day is only 16 per cent. he leaves more than 60 per cent. on sugar and more than 100 per cent. on rice. Because we will not agree to the injustice to the Northern section of the country, and because we do not agree to take off a duty on lumber, which is less than half the revenue duty, he stands up with the air of a Sir Oracle, and says that we are opposed to reducing taxation.

When I rose I intended to speak on another point brought before the committee by the very line under consideration. There is nothing in this bill which shows its injustice in a clearer light than the attempt to reduce the duty upon staves. What will be the effect of reducing that duty? To-day there are more than twenty vessels carrying staves from the Penobscot and adjacent waters of Maine to ports on the Hudson. While we had the late reciprocity treaty with Canada that industry did not exist, although it had existed prior to that reciprocity treaty. That treaty took away from us the benefit we had hitherto enjoyed. That industry under the reciprocity treaty went to New Brunswick. The staves were manufactured there, and carried from there to our ports, and carried by Canadian vessels. Now to take the duty off staves would place us right where we were during the reciprocity treaty. It would not only destroy the production of staves in the State of Maine, but a large portion of the carrying trade. In New Brunswick they build their vessels cheaply, their sailors live cheaper, and, as I have said, if this duty is taken off it will not only take this industry from us, but will take the carrying trade from us, too.

Gentlemen on the other side have shown their willingness to attack our domestic carrying trade, and they do it insidiously in this bill when they attack those industries which require our vessels to carry their products to the places where they are disposed of. For when this industry is transferred to New Brunswick by the unpatriotic provisions of this bill the American vessels which it employs will be supplanted by cheaply built, cheaply manned, and cheaply provisioned Canadian craft.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. MILLIKEN] divides his complaint into two parts—one as to the articles that we do strike, and the other as to the articles that we do not strike. His complaint as to the articles upon which we reduce taxes, viewing the matter, as he does, from a sectional standpoint, includes two items. One is the wood products, which we put on the free-list. Why, sir, have we not heard the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KELLEY] plead here for the Southern forests, and say that this measure would be destructive of the Southern timber interests? I trust the gentleman will take some occasion to answer his protectionist friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I did not hear that statement, and therefore I do not discuss it.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. It was made just as I have stated it. You have discussed it in conflict with Judge KELLEY when you charged that we thus favored our section. The gentleman from Pennsylvania said this measure would paralyze the Southern timber trade. I trust the gentleman from Maine will pay attention to the tears shed by the gentleman from Pennsylvania on behalf of the Southern forests, and will get his bowl ready to catch those tears, and will endeavor to reconcile his views and those of the gentleman from Pennsylvania on that point before he repeats his reckless charges.

Then as to wool, does not the gentleman know that since 1875 New England and Pennsylvania and New York and Ohio have fallen off 10 per cent. in the number of their sheep, while the South has increased nearly 100 per cent.? Where is the production of wool a growing industry? Where is the limit of Southern development? We have more territory for wool-growing, sir, in the single State of Texas alone than you have in all the States I have enumerated. There is the growing industry, there is the infant industry; and yet when we put wool on the free-list you fly in the face and teeth of all the facts and say we do it to favor ourselves and to hurt you. You would call that a sacrifice, only that for partisan purposes you choose to go contrary to the official facts. We furnish the wool and your people wear the woolen clothing; and yet if we seek to reduce our protection on wool, to give your mills cheap wool, as you put it, and your working people cheap, warm clothing for winter, you say we are sectional and selfish. Why do you not measure your words?

Then gentlemen talk of staves, and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] talks about a lot of data which he brings in here from gentlemen who speak of industries that exist and express the opinion that they will be stricken down, but not one line of argument is even attempted in all that miserable rot, either in this House or in the Committee on Ways and Means, and when we ask them to give the bottom facts, to measure the taxes we should lay on the people, to prove their needs, they gather around them the insolent garb of a subsidized industry and say that it is their private business. Now, what is the fact about staves?

We have the broad, bottom fact that we are competing successfully in foreign markets. From Baltimore we shipped last year $114,600 worth of staves; from Boston and Charlestown, we shipped $138,000 worth; from New Orleans, $637,000 worth; from New York, $532,000 worth, and from Philadelphia, $142,000 worth. We sent abroad from this country over $2,000,000 worth of staves to foreign ports, and we are successfully competing with foreigners in the markets of the world. If we can do that abroad with difficulties to overcome, we can certainly command the market at our own thresholds. It is subsidy you want—needless subsidy, at the cost of our own people. These, sir, are the facts about these things. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. BAYNE. I move a *pro forma* amendment. It will not do, Mr. Chairman, to take the position taken by the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and charge that we on this side of the House are not in favor of a reduction of taxation. We are. [Derisive cheers on the Democratic side and cries of "Name!" "Name!"]

Mr. BAYNE. I will name what I would do and what I believe the majority of this side of the House would do. I would take off entirely

the tax on domestic tobacco, amounting to $30,000,000 a year, and I would take off three-quarters of the duty on sugar, amounting to $45,000,000. That would make a reduction of $75,000,000; which is as much as the revenue of this country ought to be reduced.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas. You are always ready to take the duty off articles that do not yield a subsidy. What article that yields a subsidy are you willing to take the duties off?

A MEMBER. How about rice?

Mr. BAYNE. I have named what I will do and what I hope the House will do and what I hope will be done, if any tariff legislation is to be enacted in this Congress.

Mr. DUNN. That is not sectional at all.

Mr. BAYNE. No, it is not sectional, because the sugar industry does not come within the legitimate range of protection at all. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side.]

You may laugh at that, but it is a fact; and for this reason: The idea of protection means that we shall supply or be almost able to supply the wants of our country by the home production. Anything the home production of which falls ten-elevenths short of the wants of the country can not be said to fall within the theory of protection.

Now, gentlemen on the other side of the House have been looking a great deal to-day at dispatches; and I am a little surprised that no more enthusiasm is manifested over those dispatches.

Mr. MACDONALD. May I ask——

Mr. BAYNE. I can not be interrupted further. I glanced at some of those dispatches and discovered that they come from St. Louis, and related to the nomination of President and Vice-President. As those dispatches have reference to nominations, I want to read a few dispatches with regard to an election. [Cries of "Go on."] Here is a dispatch from the State of Oregon—from a wheat-growing county in that State which has been Democratic since the war. The dispatch is addressed to the honored Representative from Oregon [Mr. HERMANN]:

I congratulate you on your election. We probably elected nearly the entire Republican ticket in Lane.

A Democratic MEMBER (derisively). "Probably!"

Mr. BAYNE. That is from a wheat-growing county, built up by farmers whom you gentlemen on the other side are so anxious to relieve from the "intolerable burdens of taxation."

Here is another dispatch. It comes from Baker County, in Eastern Oregon, largely engaged in wool-growing and mining. Two years ago it gave 250 Democratic majority.

A Democratic MEMBER. How much four years ago?

Mr. BAYNE. They have heard there of the Mills bill and of the free-wool clause in that bill, and they send this dispatch to Mr. HERMANN:

Your majority in this county will reach 150.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

A Democratic MEMBER. Is that all?

Mr. BAYNE. It is not all. Here is a dispatch from Columbia County, a lumber county on the Columbia River, with only 400 voters, and which gave 50 Republican majority two years ago. What majority does it give now?

Columbia County gives you 200 majority.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

The people out in Oregon are against the Mills bill, against free lumber, free wool, and everything of that kind. They have just voted on that question out in Oregon.

Here is a dispatch from another county——

Mr. BIGGS. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. BAYNE. Wait a moment. These are facts. I am not dealing now with problematical questions. Here is another dispatch from another county out there—Douglas County.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BAYNE. I would like a minute or two more.

[Cries of "Go on!"]

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to allowing the gentleman from Pennsylvania to continue his remarks for five minutes? The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BAYNE. Douglas County is a large wool-growing and lumbering county in Southern Oregon—the home county of the Representative from that State [Mr. HERMANN]. That county gave 186 majority two years ago. What does it do now?

Your majority in the county 300; over 3,000 in the State. Victory everywhere in the State.

[Applause on the Republican side.]

Now, Mr. Chairman, what I have asked for and insisted upon all along has been that the people of the United States should have a chance to vote upon this issue, squarely presented to them in the Mills bill and the President's message. They will have that fair, square opportunity this fall; and I have commended the President over and over again for his manly, outspoken position on the tariff question.

Mr. WASHINGTON. And the people are going to sustain him, too.

Mr. BAYNE. If they do so, all right.

Mr. WASHINGTON. They will.

Mr. BAYNE. But until the people shall have had an opportunity of voting on this square issue, I insist that the free-traders in this House of Representatives ought not to have an opportunity of revising this tariff in the interest of free trade and for the destruction of the industries of the country.

I regret very much, Mr. Chairman, that I have made my friends on the other side so happy, for they seem to be enjoying themselves; but there was a controversy a short time ago on that side of the House, and they were discussing the subject without eliciting facts. I thought I would simply present a few facts which were recorded by the sovereign voters of the State of Oregon as bearing upon this question.

Mr. LAWLER. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have read a short extract from a paper published at Albany, Oregon, bearing upon this very subject.

A MEMBER. What is the date?

Mr. LAWLER. It is of recent date. I ask the Clerk to read it.

The Clerk read as follows:

The high tariff cry of protection to American labor—a cry which is the inspiration of this delusive bill—is the most offensive piece of humbuggery advocated by demagogues in the United States to-day. The purpose of the high tariff is not to maintain the high wages of labor, but to maintain the high profits of protected manufacturers. The cry about labor is a mere stalking-horse under whose shelter protected interests trust to be able to keep up a fiscal system which is for their exclusive benefit, and which robs everybody outside their pale.

Mr. LAWLER. I would ask my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] to take that, and put it in his pipe and smoke it.

Mr. GUENTHER. But have not the people of Oregon been heard from since then? It seems to me that they had a vote the other day.

Mr. MILLS. I hope now that we will have a vote on this line, as I want to move that the committee rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will regard the *pro forma* amendment as withdrawn, if there be no objection, and the question is on striking out the line, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out line 16: "Staves of wood."

The question was taken; and on a division there were—ayes 59, noes 87.

Mr. GUENTHER. No quorum.

Mr. MILLS. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon that, as I want to move that the committee rise.

Mr. GUENTHER. With that understanding I will withdraw the point of order.

So (no further count being demanded) the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 17: "Pickets and palings."

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union having had under consideration the tariff bill had come to no resolution thereon.

VETO MESSAGE—PUBLIC BUILDING, BAR HARBOR.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith without approval House bill 4467, entitled "An act for the erection of a public building at Bar Harbor, in Maine.

The entire town within which Bar Harbor is situated contained in 1880, 1,639 inhabitants, as appears by the census of that year. There is no pretense that there is any need of a public building there, except to accommodate the post-office.

This is a third-class office, and the Government does not pay rent for offices of that class. The gross receipts of the office for the year ended June 30, 1887, are reported by the Postmaster-General at $5,337. The postmaster reports that he employs five clerks in the summer and three in the winter. The fact that Bar Harbor is a place of very extensive summer resort makes its population exceedingly variable, and during a part of the year it is quite likely that the influx of pleasure seekers may make a more commodious post-office desirable, though there does not seem to be much complaint of present inconvenience. The postmaster pays a rent of $500 per annum for his present quarters.

The amount appropriated by the bill is quite moderate, being only $25,000, but the postmaster expresses the opinion that a proper site alone would cost from twenty thousand to thirty thousand dollars.

I am decidedly of the opinion that if a public building is to be erected at this place, of which at present there appears to be no necessity, it should be done under a system which will not give the post-office and the postmaster there an advantage over others of their class.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *June 5, 1888.*

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. What action will the House take with the message?

Mr. MILLS. I move its reference to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The motion was agreed to.

The message was accordingly referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and, with the bill, ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, informed the House that the Senate had excused Mr. STANFORD from service as a manager on the part of the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7263) for the erection of a public building at Bay City, Mich., and that Mr. MORRILL had been appointed in his place.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 385) for the erection of a public building in the city of Nashua, in the State of New Hampshire;

A bill (S. 785) to provide for an addition to the United States building at Jackson, Miss.;

A bill (S. 1318) for the erection of a public building at Altoona, Pa.;

A bill (S. 2277) to provide for the extension of the public building at Lynchburgh, Va.;

A bill (S. 2319) for the erection of a public building at Waterbury, Conn.;

A bill (S. 2788) for the erection of a public building at Virginia City, State of Nebraska;

A bill (S. 2789) for the erection of a public building at Reno, State of Nevada;

A bill (S. 194) to increase the endowment of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural College;

A bill (S. 375) to restrict the use and sale of opium in the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States;

A bill (S. 506) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas Conroy, deceased;

A bill (S. 653) defining the positions and salaries of assistant astronomers at the United States Naval Observatory, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 750) for the relief of Pearson C. Montgomery, of Memphis, Tenn.;

A bill (S. 1100) to retire certain disabled officers of the Army;

A bill (S. 1169) for the relief of Commander George M. Bache, United States Navy (retired);

A bill (S. 1190) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Fenno, deceased;

A bill (S. 1191) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mary H. Pike, deceased;

A bill (S. 1245) for the relief of Nancy E. Day, administratrix of the estate of James L. Day, deceased;

A bill (S. 1632) to refund moneys collected from William Schaus at the port of New York on an oil painting not subject to duty;

A bill (S. 1650) for the relief of Maj. Gen. W. W. Averell;

A bill (1807) to refund to the State of West Virginia the money paid to officers of the One hundred and thirty-third Regiment West Virginia Militia for services rendered during the rebellion;

A bill (S. 1914) for the relief of Mary E. Hopkins;

A bill (S. 2013) for the relief of Forman Mathews and David Stout Parker;

A bill (S. 2040) to establish a land office at Folsom, in the Territory of New Mexico;

A bill (S. 2477) granting the right of way to the Mobile and Birmingham Railway Company, the successor to the Mobile and Alabama Grand Trunk Railroad Company, across the Mount Vernon arsenal reservation, in Mobile County, Alabama;

A bill (S. 2787) for the erection of an equestrian statue of ex-President Zachary Taylor;

A bill (S. 2929) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct and operate a railway, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 1162) for the relief of Susan E. Alger;

A bill (S. 2260) restoring the name of Wilhemina Hosband to the pension-roll;

A bill (S. 2439) granting a pension to Charlotte T. Alderman;

A bill (S. 2451) placing the name of Elizabeth Domm on the pension-rolls;

A bill (S. 2459) granting a pension to Mary S. Maynard;

A bill (S. 2500) granting a pension to Gertrude K. Lyford;

A bill (S. 2595) to increase the pension of Seth F. Myers;

A bill (S. 2604) granting a pension to Mrs. Loanda Sherman;

A bill (S. 2646) granting a pension to Danville A. Ricker;

A bill (S. 2657) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Stannard;

A bill (S. 2705) granting a pension to Ellen Smith;

A bill (S. 2707) granting a pension to Samuel Miller;

A bill (S. 2710) granting a pension to the widow of John Schafer;

A bill (S. 2716) granting a pension to Carl M. Schwantes;

A bill (S. 2717) granting a pension to John K. Evans;

A bill (S. 2720) granting a pension to John B. Ross;

A bill (S. 2721) granting a pension to Jackson Chapman;

A bill (S. 2728) to grant a pension to Indiana J. Nichols;

A bill (S. 2852) granting an increase of pension to Clara B. Davidson;

A bill (S. 2866) granting a pension to Abel G. Rankin;

A bill (S. 2884) granting a pension to William S. Grow;

A bill (S. 2885) granting a pension to Henry A. Hawley; and

A bill (S. 2886) granting increase of pension to Joseph B. Sellers.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the House of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 322) for the relief of B. M. Parish;

A bill (H. R. 417) granting a pension to David Strunk;

A bill (H. R. 488) granting a pension to Elizabeth Burr;

A bill (H. R. 611) for the relief of Mrs. P. L. Ward, widow and executrix of William Ward, deceased;

A bill (H. R. 955) granting a pension to Mary M. Sweet;

A bill (H. R. 1599) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Sedalia, in the State of Missouri;

A bill (H. R. 1844) to promote agriculture, and for other purposes;

A bill (H. R. 2151) for the relief of Joseph B. Burton;

A bill (H. R. 2167) for the relief of George E. Oliphant;

A bill (H. R. 2695) for the relief of Charles V. Mesler;

A bill (H. R. 3922) to place the name of Casper Seibel on the pension-roll;

A bill (H. R. 3959) granting a pension to Dolly Blazer;

A bill (H. R. 5522) for the relief of Elijah Martin;

A bill (H. R. 5844) to increase the pension of William Clark;

A bill (H. R. 6520) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Ward;

A bill (H. R. 6575) for the relief of James L. Alsip;

A bill (H. R. 6845) granting a pension to John Witham;

A bill (H. R. 7265) for the erection of a public building at Hoboken, N. J.;

A bill (H. R. 7490) for the relief of Sidney W. Whitelock;

A bill (H. R. 7509) granting to the New York Harbor and Beach Railroad Company a right of way;

A bill (H. R. 7913) granting a pension to Nellie Palfrey Goodwin;

A bill (H. R. 8266) for the relief of Mrs. Clarissa G. Green;

A bill (H. R. 8279) to authorize the county of Laurens, in the State of Georgia, to construct a bridge across the Oconee River, at or near Dublin, in said county and State; and

A bill (H. R. 8965) to authorize the Postmaster-General to cancel mail contract on route No. 30160, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 8393) to protect lands belonging to Indians from unlawful grazing, and for other purposes, requested a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, and had appointed Mr. DAWES, Mr. MORGAN, and Mr. PLUMB as conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 1483) for the erection of a public building at Monroe, La.;

A bill (H. R. 331) for the relief of David Meriwether;

A bill (H. R. 2097) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Trail Creek, in the city of Michigan City, State of Indiana; and

A bill (H. R. 7340) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Hickman, Ky.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 2972) authorizing the President to appoint and retire Alfred Pleasonton with the rank and grade of colonel, requested a conference, and had appointed Mr. CAMERON, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. COCKRELL as conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message further announced that the Senate disagreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 431) granting a pension to Emma S. Free, widow of Thomas S. Free, late major in the United States Army, asked a conference with the House of Representatives, and had appointed Mr. BLAIR, Mr. PADDOCK, and Mr. FAULKNER as conferees on the part of the Senate.

CONFERENCE COMMITTEE APPOINTED.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the House on the bill S. 2805, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CHIPMAN, and Mr. HUNTER.

VETO MESSAGE—PUBLIC BUILDING AT COUNCIL BLUFFS.

The SPEAKER also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, and, with the accompanying bill, ordered to be printed:

To the House of Representatives:

I return without approval House bill No. 1334, entitled "An act authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase additional ground for the accommodation of Government offices in Council Bluffs, Iowa."

A new public building at Council Bluffs will be completed in a short time. The ground upon which it is located has a frontage of 192 feet and a depth of 106 feet and 10 inches. The proposition is to add 30 feet to its depth. The act under which this building has been thus far constructed provides that the ground purchased therefor shall be of such dimensions as to leave the building unexposed to fire by an open space of at least 40 feet, including streets and alleys. The building is located on land now belonging to the Government, sufficient in size to comply with this provision, and in point of fact more than the open space required is left on all sides of the same. There is no pretense that any enlargement of the building is necessary or contemplated.

The report of the committee to which the bill was referred in the House simply states that "the grounds on which said building is situated are inadequate for its proper accommodation and safety."

If this is so I can see no reason why additional ground should not be purchased for "the proper accommodation and safety" of a large proportion of the public buildings completed and in process of erection, since the provision that there shall exist 40 feet of open space on all sides is, I think, contained in all the bills authorizing their construction. In this view the proposed legislation would establish a very bad precedent.

It is provided in the bill that the additional 30 feet mentioned shall be purchased for a sum not to exceed $10,000. The adjoining 106 feet and 10 inches, located on the corner of two streets, were purchased in the year 1882 by the Government for $15,000. The permission to purchase this addition at a price per foot greatly in excess of that already owned by the Government seems so unnecessary, except to benefit the owner, that I am of the opinion that it should not be granted.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *June* 5, 1888.

JOHN T. HIGGINS.

Mr. McCREARY. I ask unanimous consent to take from the Calendar for present consideration the bill (H. R. 8307) for the relief of John T. Higgins. It is a little bill, and carries only $130.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay John T. Higgins, of Lincoln County, Kentucky, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $130 for necessary expenses as general storekeeper in the revenue service of the eighth district of Kentucky.

The bill was reported by the Committee on Claims with the following amendment:

And a gauger for two months and six days.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Arkansas, called for the reading of the report.

The report (by Mr. LANHAM) was read, as follows:

The Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8307) for the relief of John T. Higgins, have had the same under consideration, and make the following report:

On the 1st day of December, 1885, John T. Higgins was designated by Hon. Thomas S. Bronston, collector of the eighth district of Kentucky, to act as general storekeeper and gauger during the necessary absence of B. M. Burdett, a general storekeeper and gauger.

John T. Higgins performed the duties of said position for the period of two months and six days, during which time his necessary traveling expenses amounted to $130, which amount he has never been paid.

The written statement of Collector Bronston shows that he appointed John T. Higgins temporary general storekeeper and gauger during the necessary absence of General Storekeeper and Gauger B. M. Burdett, and that said John T. Higgins faithfully performed the duties required of him for the said period of two months and six days, and that his necessary traveling expenses while thus engaged amounted to $130, and Collector Bronston recommends the payment of said amount.

B. M. Burdett was not allowed anything for necessary traveling expenses during the said period, but if he had discharged the duties performed by John T. Higgins he would have been allowed, under the law, his necessary traveling expenses. At the time that John T. Higgins was designated as temporary general storekeeper and gauger he was not in the revenue service.

He was paid his per diem during the time that he acted as temporary general storekeeper and gauger, and the Department ruled that there was no fund out of which his necessary expenses could be paid.

It is believed that as he lawfully performed the duties of the absent general storekeeper and gauger he should receive the pay and expenses that the absent storekeeper and gauger was entitled to when performing the same service.

Therefore the committee recommend that the bill do pass, with the following amendment: Amend the bill in line 7, after the word "storekeeper," by inserting the words "and gauger for two months and six days."

The amendment was adopted.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and being engrossed, it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McCREARY moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

BRIDGE ACROSS ROCK CREEK, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. ROWELL. I ask unanimous consent to concur in the Senate amendment to the bill H. R. 1184. It is merely a formal amendment.

The title of the bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1184) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Rock Creek, at Woodley Lane road, in the District of Columbia.

The amendment of the Senate was read, as follows:

In line 18, page 1, strike out "six" and insert "eight."

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I object.

Mr. ROWELL. It is merely a verbal amendment changing a date and inserting "1878" instead of "1876."

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. If it is merely a correction of date I shall not object, the bill having already passed the House. I am utterly opposed, however, to the bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROWELL moved to reconsider the vote by which the amendment was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

POSTAL CRIMES.

Mr. DOCKERY. I rise to present a report of a conference committee.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7052) relating to postal crimes and amendatory of the statutes therein mentioned, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

A. M. DOCKERY,
S. R. PETERS,
Managers on the part of the House.
ELI SAULSBURY,
PHILETUS SAWYER,
E. K. WILSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The explanatory statement by the managers on the part of the House was read, as follows:

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on H. R. 7052, beg leave to make the following statement: The amendment of the Senate makes non-mailable all envelopes or postal-cards, on the outside of which appears "libelous, scurrilous, or threatening delineations," or envelopes or postal-cards on which appears language "reflecting injuriously upon the character or conduct of another."

S. R. PETERS,
A. M. DOCKERY,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SPRINGER. What is the amendment of the Senate?

The amendment of the Senate was read.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is all right.

The report was adopted.

Mr. DOCKERY moved to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

SUPREME COURT OF UTAH.

Mr. CAINE. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Territories be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1507) providing for an additional associate justice for the supreme court of the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes; and that it be brought before the House for consideration.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. HOLMAN. Let the bill be read.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill, when, the hour of 5 o'clock having arrived, the Speaker *pro tempore* declared that, pursuant to order, the House stood adjourned until 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. G. A. ANDERSON: A bill (H. R. 10349) granting a pension to John Ackles—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. J. E. CAMPBELL: A bill (H. R. 10350) granting an increase of Pension to Eliza J. Alexander—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DARLINGTON: A bill (H. R. 10351) granting a pension to John W. Armstrong—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FORD: A bill (H. R. 10352) granting a pension to Sarah J. Clayburg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GEST: A bill (H. R. 10353) granting a pension to Eliza Richardson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUNTER: A bill (H. R. 10354) for the relief of Daniel F. Gann—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10355) granting a pension to Ruth Jones—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10356) granting a pension to J. T. Vincent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCULLOGH: A bill (H. R. 10357) for the relief of James B. Grooms—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. McSHANE: A bill (H. R. 10358) granting a pension to Webber S. Seavey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 10359) for the relief of Sarah Ann Vaught—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SIMMONS (by request): A bill (H. R. 10360) to place Henry Zell on the retired-list of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STONE, of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 10361) for the relief of Charles Wilkenson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10362) for the relief of Isaac Spurr—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10363) for the relief of Stephen Williams—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAULBEE: A bill (H. R. 10364) for the relief of Richard Wilson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10365) for the relief of John Samuels—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10366) for the relief of Matilda Cody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 10367) granting a pension to Joshua Caldwell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: A bill (H. R. 10368) for the relief of Sophia Fowler—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 10369) to place the name of Anthony Grady on the pension-roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10370) for the relief of Edward Heffner—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 10371) for the relief of James S. Sayler—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: A bill (H. R. 10372) for the relief of John Kalbfleisch—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. J. A. ANDERSON: Petition of Samuel Morehead, of Rob-

inson, Kans., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. BLOUNT: Petition of Andrew H. Turner, of Alapaha, Ga., for relief—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. C. R. BRECKINRIDGE: Petition of John Lacotts, of Mary Lowe, of William A. Kimbrough, of Nancy F. Jones, and of B. M. Crabtree, of Arkansas County, Arkansas, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FELIX CAMPBELL: Memorial of Eliza J. Alexander, widow of Lieut. Francis Alexander, United States Navy, for an increase of pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FARQUHAR: Resolutions of the Merchants' Exchange, of Buffalo, N. Y., favoring the passage of the Nicaragua Canal bill—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. FORNEY: Petition of citizens of Cullman County, Alabama, for amendment of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. GAINES: Petition of N. A. Tucker, of Deatonsville, Va., for relief—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Abraham Miller, of David L. Wood, of Joseph Sharp, of Rosa B. Hill, heir of John H. Batte, of A. R. Shands, jr., for heirs of Ann C. Wood, of William B. Shands, trustee for M. C. Shands' children, and of Peter W. Anderson, heir of Francis B. Anderson, of Virginia, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of citizens of Farmville and of Petersburgh, Va., for repeal of the internal-revenue tax on tobacco, and setting forth the suffering of the trade on account of delay by the Fiftieth Congress—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, resolution of the Military Board of Virginia, for the pending bill making appropriations for the maintenance of the militia of the States of the Union—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERBERT. Petition of Sophia Stacey and Alice Stacey, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HUNTER: Petition of H. E. Jenkins, of T. T. Roup, of Joseph Woorley, of James Oller, of J. M. Oller, of G. W. Woorley, and of George H. Galloway, administrator of Logan M. Dishman, of Kentucky, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition of Daniel F. Gann, for removal of charge of desertion—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LAIDLAW: Petition of citizens of Chautauqua County, New York, relating to protection to American industries—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LODGE: Petition of William F. Sears and 32 others, of South Harwich; of Addie E. Lake and 107 others, of South Brewster; of George W. Breed and 35 others, of Lynn; and of S. R. Keith, and 48 others, of Malden, Mass., for the repeal of duties on sugar and molasses—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCREARY: Petition in favor of bill for relief of Alexander Curd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCULLOGH: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of New Alexandria, Pa., for the immediate repeal of the internal-revenue tax on liquor—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MILLS: Petition of Jones Corgrove, of Navarro County, Texas, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of Mrs. M. A. McCracken, widow of David J. McCracken, of Tate County, Mississippi, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. NEAL: Papers in the case of S. H. Fox, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PETERS: Papers in the case of George Prescott, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, petition and papers in the case of Milton Fuson, for relief—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHELAN: Petition of William L. McLean, administrator of Charles D. McLean, of Shelby County, Tennessee, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RANDALL: Petition of A. F. Owens and others, asking aid for the colored people's exposition to be held at Atlanta, Ga., in 1889—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ROGERS: Petition of numerous citizens of Lonoke, Ark., for an amendment of the interstate-commerce law—to the Committee on Commerce.

Also, petition of Mrs. Sarah Ann Vaught, for reference of her claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers in the claim of Sarah Ann Vaught, of Crawford County, Arkansas—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENSON: Petition of A. J. Packard and 206 others, citizens of Manitowoc, Wis., that that city be made a harbor of refuge, and to appropriate $100,000 to construct and maintain said harbor of refuge—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. J. D. STEWART (by request): Petition of C. C. Davis for heirs of Larkin H. Davis, Fulton County, and of heir of William G. C. Jones, of Fulton County, Georgia, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. TAULBEE: Proof to accompany bill for the relief of Arch Huffman—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of Brice Shepherd—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of Miles M. Ward—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, papers to accompany bill for the relief of Susan Burnett, of Prestonburgh, Ky.—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WASHINGTON: Petition of Sophia Fowler, for relief—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. W. L. WILSON (by request): Petition of Barbara Kropp, for relief—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The following petition for the repeal or modification of the internal-revenue tax of $25 levied on druggists was received and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. DARLINGTON: Of citizens of Spring City, Chester County, Pennsylvania.

The following petitions for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. REED: Of citizens of East Jefferson and of South Livermore, Me.

By Mr. E. J. TURNER: Of W. T. Davis and others of Ellsworth, Kans.

The following petitions, indorsing the per-diem rated service-pension bill, based on the principle of paying all soldiers, sailors, and marines of the late war a monthly pension of 1 cent a day for each day they were in the service, were severally referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

By Mr. PETERS: Of Nelson Warren Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Danville, Kans.

By Mr. WADE: Of citizens of Fordland, Nebraska County, Missouri.

By Mr. THOMAS WILSON: Of John A. Myers Post, Grand Army of Republic, of Minnesota.

The following petitions, praying for the enactment of a law providing temporary aid for common schools, to be disbursed on the basis of illiteracy, were severally referred to the Committee on Education:

By Mr. McCORMICK: Of 126 citizens of Sullivan and Potter Counties, Pennsylvania.

By Mr. O'DONNELL: Of 48 citizens of Calhoun County Michigan.

The following petitions for an increase of compensation of fourth-class postmasters were severally referred to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads:

By Mr. BLOUNT: Of H. F. Barnes and others, of Butts County, Georgia.

By Mr. TAULBEE: Of citizens of Canada, Ky.

Also, of citizens of West Liberty, Ky.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, *June* 6, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

THE JOURNAL.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read.

Mr. HOAR. I thought the point of order on the amendment submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] to the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill was withdrawn. I had some understanding that the point of order was withdrawn by unanimous consent yesterday.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The recollection of the Chair is that the condition of business appears fully stated in the RECORD. Does the Senator from Massachusetts submit a motion to amend the Journal?

Mr. HOAR. I have no interest as having any charge of this matter, but the RECORD reads in this way:

Mr. SHERMAN. I hope that by unanimous consent the appeal may be withdrawn, and let the bill be laid aside, so that we may take up the Calendar.

* * * * * * *

Mr. CALL. I am entirely willing for that.

* * * * * * *

Mr. BUTLER. It seems to me the best way to relieve the Senate of any embarrassment is to adjourn,

and so on. The Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] then says:

I will withdraw the appeal and let the bill go over.

Mr. SHERMAN. Let the bill go over until to-morrow morning.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Then the appeal from the decision of the Chair is withdrawn.

* * * * * * *

Mr. SHERMAN. I am informed that there are on the Calendar a number of pension bills.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question, then, will stand on the decision of the Chair.

Mr. CALL. I suppose that would not prevent me from renewing the motion.

So the point of order was withdrawn, and the suggestion was that the Senator from Florida might renew his motion this morning.

The Chair then said:

The question will stand on the decision of the Chair.

The Chair then asked leave, if these proceedings were to be submitted to the Senate, to withdraw his decision upon the point of order, and submit it to the Senate to be voted upon. That is what was objected to by the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. I do not wish to consent to the withdrawal of the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The result will be the same in either event.

Mr. HALE. I do not wish to consent to it upon so plain a question.

Mr. BUTLER. Now, I submit that the Senator from Maine is making an issue with the Chair and is hammering the Chair.

* * * * * * *

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair asks unanimous consent to withdraw his decision upon the point of order.

* * * * * * *

Mr. HALE. I object.

Mr. BUTLER. I move that the Senate adjourn.

As I understand it, the decision of the Chair stands as the decision of the Senate, the appeal having been withdrawn.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The only obstacle to that conclusion is that subsequently the state of the vote on the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to lay the appeal on the table was announced and no quorum was disclosed, whereupon the Senate adjourned.

Mr. HALE. The condition under which the Senate adjourned comes up now, does it not?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It does not.

Mr. HALE. Whenever that comes up I have a proposition to make which I think will meet with approval. After the morning business is completed that will come up.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The only question before the Senate now is whether the Journal shall be approved.

Mr. HOAR. I make no objection.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If no objection be made, the Journal will stand approved as read.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. SHERMAN. Before the regular morning business it is necessary to have a brief executive session. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened.

JOHANNA LOEWINGER—VETO MESSAGE.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read:

To the Senate:

I return without approval Senate bill No. 739, entitled "An act granting a pension to Johanna Loewinger."

The husband of the beneficiary named in this bill enlisted June 28, 1861, and was discharged May 8, 1862, upon a surgeon's certificate of disability. He was pensioned for chronic diarrhea. He died July 17, 1876. A coroner's inquest was held, who found by their verdict that the deceased came to his death "from suicide by cutting his throat with a razor, caused by long-continued illness."

This inquest was held immediately after the soldier's death, and it appears that the case was fully investigated, with full opportunities to discover the truth. Upon the verdict found, in the absence of insanity caused by any disability, it can hardly be claimed that his death was caused by his military service. The attempts afterwards to impeach this verdict and introduce another cause of death do not seem to be successful.

GROVER CLEVELAND.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, *June 5, 1888.*

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Shall the bill pass, the objections of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding?

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the message and bill be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. STEWART. Let the bill be passed now.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Minnesota moves that the message and bill be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLAIR. Why not take the question on the passage of the bill? Is there objection?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Minnesota moves that the bill with the message of the President of the United States be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLAIR. As it is suggested that there may be a question as to a quorum being present, I do not wish to press the matter; but these veto messages, as far as I have ever examined any of them, are universally unjust. They nevertheless result in the defeat of the bill. It occurred to me that it might be well enough to discuss some of these cases in open session and take action upon them.

Mr. COCKRELL. I desire simply to say that I do not believe one solitary statement of the Senator from New Hampshire in regard to these vetoes being unjust. If the Senator desires to discuss them the legitimate way is for the Committee on Pensions to report them back to the Senate and propose to pass them, notwithstanding the veto. Then we shall have a fair chance to discuss them upon their merits.

Mr. BLAIR. It is a matter of indifference to me whether the Senator believes my opinion to be my opinion or not. I express it as my opinion. In regard to the propriety of referring the bill and message to the committee, I know that is the regular way, but I suggested another way which might result in some discussion and the knowledge on the part of the country as to whether these cases thus vetoed are properly vetoed upon their merits or otherwise. It is of no use to send them to a committee; they do not come back here; and they might as well be disposed of when they are first received.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] that the bill with the accompanying message be referred to the Committee on Pensions.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Petitions and memorials are now in order.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PADDOCK presented a petition of the Board of Trade of South Omaha, Nebr., praying for the passage of the Pacific Railroad funding measure, known as the Outhwaite bill; which was referred to the Select Committee on the President's Message transmitting the Report of the Pacific Railway Commission.

Mr. CAMERON presented the petition of J. H. Husted, M. D., and 25 other citizens of the Sixteenth Congressional district of Pennsylvania, praying for the passage of the Platt prohibition bill for the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. MITCHELL presented a petition of citizens of Lane and Benton Counties, Oregon, praying for the passage of amendments to the act of May 6, 1886, entitled "An act to protect homestead settlers within railroad limits, and for other purposes;" which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the State Grange of Oregon, praying for an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of United States Senators by a direct vote of the people; which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. MORGAN presented the petition of G. W. Stidham, delegate of the Creek Indians, praying that 500 Creeks be paid for the expenses of their emigration to the Indian country west of the Mississippi River; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2764) granting an increase of pension to James McGowan, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SAWYER, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred an amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. MITCHELL to the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill for the purpose of reimbursing B. F. Bonham, United States consul-general at Calcutta, India, for transit pay for twenty days' unavoidable detention at San Francisco by sickness on his way from his home in Oregon to his post of duty, etc., reported it favorably, and moved that it lie on the table; which was agreed to.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3008) for the relief of P. A. Leatherbury, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1077) for the relief of Mrs. Clara Morris, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. WILSON, of Maryland, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 610) for the relief of William Lavery, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HOAR, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1257) for the relief of Mrs. Sarah H. Wood, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

PENSIONS TO PRISONERS OF WAR.

Mr. QUAY. I am instructed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1770) granting pensions to soldiers and sailors confined in Confederate prisons, to report it favorably. Majority and minority reports will be prepared and filed in this case. I make the formal report now in order that the bill may take its place on the Calendar. As it involves the expenditure of a large amount of money, I move that it be printed in the RECORD. It is a brief bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be placed on the Calendar, and the majority and minority reports when received will be printed together. The bill will be printed at length in the RECORD, if there be no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the names of such officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines who, while in the service of the United States and while in the line of their duty, were taken prisoners of war, and as such confined in so-called Confederate prisons, between the 1st of May, 1861, and the 1st of May, 1865, as follows: All who were prisoners of war two months and less than six months, one-half pension; those who were prisoners of war six months and less than twelve months, a three-fourths pension; and all such as were prisoners of war twelve months and more than twelve months, a total pension; and, furthermore, such surviving prisoners of war shall receive $2 per day for each and every day's confinement in said Confederate prisons: *Provided*, That such pension shall in each case begin from the date of the passage of this act, and shall be paid at the same time and in the same manner as other pensions are now paid:

Provided further, That this act shall not entitle any person to draw more than one pension, but that such survivors of the so-called Confederate military prisons as are entitled to and are receiving a pension at the time of the passage of this act shall be entitled to the increase of their pension which this act may grant them.

MINISTER TO PARAGUAY AND URUGUAY.

Mr. MORGAN. I am instructed by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report a resolution, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

The resolution was read and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Relations recommend that the annual salary of the minister resident and consul-general to Paraguay and Uruguay be increased to the sum of $7,500.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. SHERMAN introduced a bill (S. 3106) for the relief of W. H. Davis; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3107) for the relief of John Kalbfleisch; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO BILLS.

Mr. SHERMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3859) for the relief of the Sone and Fleming Manufacturing Company (Limited), of the city of New York; which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FAULKNER submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the agricultural appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER and Mr. TELLER submitted amendments intended to be proposed by them respectively to the District of Columbia appropriation bill; which were referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

ARTHUR KILL BRIDGE.

Mr. McPHERSON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Committee on Commerce be, and it is hereby, directed to place before the Senate the recent report and recommendation of the Secretary of War, together with a report of the Board of Engineers, in respect to change of plan of the bridge now under construction over Arthur Kill or Kill von Kull between Staten Island and the State of New Jersey, and that the reports and accompanying papers be printed for the use of the Senate.

CREEK INDIAN CLAIM.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior send to the Senate a copy of a report made by R. L. Owen, United States Indian agent for the Union agency, relating to the claims of the Indians of the Creek tribe for reimbursement of expenses of travel and for a year's support when said Indians were emigrated to the Indian country west of the Mississippi River, and any other facts shown on the records or files of the Indian Bureau bearing upon the justice of such claim.

JULIET G. HOWE.

Mr. PADDOCK. I desire to present the report of a conference committee.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business that order is closed, and the Chair will receive the conference report.

Mr. PADDOCK. I present this report simply to perfect the record. It will not be necessary to take action upon it as the House has receded from its amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 300) granting a pension to Juliet G. Howe, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its amendment to said bill.

ALGERNON S. PADDOCK,
C. K. DAVIS,
D. TURPIE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

J. LOGAN CHIPMAN,
CARLOS FRENCH,
E. N. MORRILL,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report requires no action on the part of the Senate.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. HALE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6833) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1889.

Mr. HALE. In order to relieve the Senate from the condition that it found itself in last night, without a quorum, I ask that all proceedings touching the appeal, the decision of the Chair, and the vote which was begun upon the same be vacated by unanimous consent. That will bring the Senate back to the consideration of the amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine asks unanimous consent that the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to lay the appeal made by the Senator from Florida [Mr. CALL] upon the table, the decision of the Chair, and the interposition of the point of order by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] may be withdrawn. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HALE. The Committee on Foreign Relations at its meeting this morning considered the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida and reported it to the Senate, which makes it in order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question, therefore, recurs upon the amendment proposed by the Senator from Florida to amend the bill. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 3, line 40, it is proposed to strike out the words "Paraguay and Urugnay," and to insert after the words "San Domingo," in the forty-fourth line, the words:

For minister resident and consul-general at Uruguay and Paraguay, $7,500.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. The Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE] desires to obtain the floor for a few minutes to call up a bill. I have no objection myself to that being done.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Texas asks unanimous consent that the pending order be informally laid aside. The Chair hears no objection.

RED RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. COKE. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2930) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct a bridge across Red River at or near Hooks' Ferry, Red River County, Texas.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 2, line 25, to strike out "Congress" and insert "Secretary of War;" and in line 29 to strike out "Congress" and insert "Secretary of War;" so as to read:

And the said structure shall be at all times so kept and managed as to offer reasonable and proper means for the passage of vessels through or under said structure; and the said structure shall be changed, at the cost and expense of the owners thereof, from time to time, as the Secretary of War may direct, so as to preserve the free and convenient navigation of said river; and the authority to erect and continue said bridge shall be subject to the revocation or modification by law whenever the public good shall, in the judgment of the Secretary of War, so require, without any expense or charge to the United States; and in case of any litigation arising from any obstruction or alleged obstruction to the free navigation of said river, caused or alleged to be caused by said bridge, suit may be brought in the circuit courts of the United States of Texas or Arkansas, in whose jurisdiction any portion of said bridge may be located.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, line 13, to strike out "Congress" and insert "Secretary of War;" so as to read:

And if, upon such reasonable notice to said railway company to make such change or improvements, the said company fails to do so, the Secretary of War shall have the authority to make the same, and all the rights conferred by this act shall be forfeited; and the Secretary of War shall have power to do any and all things necessary to secure the free navigation of the river.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 4. That this act shall be null and void if actual construction of the bridge herein authorized be not commenced within one year and completed within three years from the date thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR APPROPRIATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6833) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year 1889.

Mr. HALE. Because of the amendment just adopted, I move, in line 41, on page 3, before the word "thousand," to strike out "40" and insert "35;" so as to read:

At $5,000 each, $35,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPOONER. On page 9, after line 200, I move to insert in consulates of class 3 "Austria-Hungary, consul at Prague;" so as to read:

CLASS III.

At $3,000 per annum.
Austria-Hungary:
Consul at Prague.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MITCHELL. Some time since I submitted an amendment which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and reported back with a recommendation that it be inserted in this bill. I now offer it. I ask to have a very brief letter from the Secretary of State read in

support of it and then I will appeal to the Senator in charge to permit the amendment to go on this bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 19, after line 438, it is proposed to insert:

For the purpose of reimbursing B. F. Bonham, United States consul-general at Calcutta, India, for transit pay for twenty days' unavoidable detention at San Francisco by sickness, on his way from his home at Salem, Oregon, to his post of duty at Calcutta, in December, 1885, $271.74.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The letter of the Secretary of State will be read, if there be no objection.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, *Washington, April 5*, 1888.

SIR: In reply to your letter of the 31st ultimo, inclosing a proposed amendment to the bill making appropriations for deficiencies in the diplomatic and consular service, etc., "for the purpose of reimbursing B. F. Bonham, United States consul general at Calcutta, India, for transit pay for twenty days' unavoidable detention at San Francisco by sickness, on his way from his home at Salem, Oregon, to his post of duty at Calcutta, in December, 1885, $271.74," I have the honor to inform you that on the 21st day of February, 1887, this Department addressed a communication to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, the terms of which it now repeats, to the effect that Mr. Bonham's statement concerning the delay in reaching his post was satisfactory, and that inasmuch as his claim had been disallowed by the Comptroller, it unhesitatingly recommended the proposed Congressional action for his relief.

Returning herewith, as requested, the inclosure in your letter, I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant,

T. F. BAYARD.

Hon. JOHN H. MITCHELL,
United States Senate.

[Inclosure.]

Bill for relief of B. F. Bonham.

Mr. HALE. That is a just and proper claim against the Government. I will say to the Senator from Oregon that none of those matters ever go on the consular and diplomatic bill, which simply provides for the running force of the Department, but it is proper for the deficiency bill which will be at no distant day reported. It may be referred to the Committee on Appropriations as an amendment to that bill.

Mr. MITCHELL. Upon that statement I will consent to that arrangement. I sent it at the last Congress to the Committee on Appropriations, but it was not put in the deficiency bill, and that is why I offered it now. However, under the statement made by the Senator in charge of the bill, I will consent to withdraw the amendment for the present, and will offer it as an amendment to the deficiency bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon withdraws the proposed amendment.

Mr. SPOONER. I move to make a verbal amendment in order to adapt the bill to the amendment adopted a few moments ago. In line 247 I move to strike out the letter "s" in the word "consuls," so that it will be in the singular number instead of the plural, and in the same line to strike out the words "and Prague," after "Trieste;" so as to read:

Consul at Trieste.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALE. In line 188, before the word "thousand," I move to strike out "three hundred and seventy-nine" and insert "three hundred and eighty;" so as to read:

For salaries of consuls, vice-consuls, and commercial agents, $380,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business, the Calendar, under Rule VIII, is in order. The first bill on the Calendar will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Order of Business 1295, being the bill (H. R. 8724) to prevent the employment of alien labor upon public buildings or other public works and in the various Departments of the Government, etc.

Mr. CAMERON. I ask that the Senate take up in advance of the Calendar a bill reported from the Naval Committee in reference to the cadets at Annapolis. I do that because the graduation will take place in a few days, and if the bill is to pass at all it ought to pass now.

Mr. SPOONER. I am obliged to leave the Chamber, and I ask the Senator from Pennsylvania to yield to me to present a conference report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The conference report is in order and will be received.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Mr. SPOONER submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7264) for the erection of a public building at Bridgeport, Conn., having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN C. SPOONER,
JUSTIN S. MORRILL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
SAMUEL DIBBLE,
WM. H. SOWDEN,
HERMAN LEHLBACH,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report requires no action on the part of the Senate.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT BAY CITY, MICH.

Mr. SPOONER also submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7263) for the erection of a public building at Bay City, Mich., having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

And the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN C. SPOONER,
JUSTIN S. MORRILL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.
SAMUEL DIBBLE,
C. NEWTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report requires no action by the Senate.

NAVAL ACADEMY CADETS.

Mr. CAMERON. I now ask for the consideration of Order of Business 1386, being Senate bill 2925.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the regular order be laid aside and that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2925) in relation to cadets at the Naval Academy. Is there objection?

Mr. ALLISON. I should like to hear that read.

Mr. BLAIR. I wish to inquire what effect the motion will have on the consideration of the pending bill. I do not desire to yield it preference for any length of time certainly.

Mr. CAMERON. I do not think this will take more than fifteen minutes. The reading of the report will be called for I suppose.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. BLAIR. If there is to be debate upon it I must object. I have no desire to obstruct the convenience of the Senator from Pennsylvania. If it can be passed without debate and without obstructing the bill which is regularly in order, I shall not object; but there is no reason why one bill should be preferred to the other, and the bill now pending has been partly discussed, and it would be certainly very convenient to me to have it disposed of now.

Mr. CAMERON. I stated the reason why I asked for its present consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. HALE. It is a very important bill and I think it had better go over. I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine objects.

JOHN A. DOYLE.

Mr. QUAY. Before proceeding with the Calendar I ask permission of the Senate to move to recommit a bill. It is the bill (S. 2596) to increase the pension of John A. Doyle. It was reported adversely by the Committee on Pensions, and indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks that the vote by which the bill was indefinitely postponed may be reconsidered and the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Pensions. It is so ordered, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

SUSAN E. ALGER.

Mr. HOAR. I ask leave to enter a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the Senate passed the bill (S. 1162) for the relief of Susan E. Alger, and that a message be sent to the House of Representatives requesting the return of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be so ordered, if there be no objection.

ALIEN LABOR ON PUBLIC WORKS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8724) to prevent the employment of alien labor upon public buildings or other public works and in the various Departments of the Government, etc., the pending question being on the amendment proposed by Mr. TELLER to come in immediately after the enacting clause:

That all public buildings or public works for which an appropriation shall have been made by Congress shall be constructed wholly of materials made and prepared within the limits of the United States, and no bid shall be received or accepted for the construction of any such public building or public works from any person who is not a resident and citizen of the United States or who has not declared his intention to become a citizen, and——

Mr. BLAIR. I hope the Senator from Colorado will not insist upon pressing the amendment at this time. It seems to be legitimate matter for a new bill, and requires consideration independently of the provisions of this bill. This bill comes from the House of Representatives, and as far as it goes I have heard no fault found with it. An amendment will be considered hostile to the purpose of the bill itself and may endanger its passage. I hope the Senator will not insist upon his amendment being voted on at this time.

Mr. TELLER. This is the only bill that has come from the House of Representatives for the protection of American laborers from the competition of alien labor on this continent on public buildings. It is equally important that they should be protected against alien labor on the other continent. If, on any principle, the bill as it came from the House can be defended, the amendment must be sustained. It has nothing to do with anything except public buildings and public works. That is all the bill deals with as it comes from the House, and it is all the amendment deals with. If the one presents a question of policy for the protection of American labor, so does the other. If it is worth while to protect American labor against foreign labor at all, it is more important that we should protect the American laborer against the foreign labor performed abroad than it is against foreign labor performed on this continent.

In order that the Senate may know what the amendment is, I ask that it may be read in connection with the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be again read.

The Chief Clerk read Mr. TELLER'S amendment and the bill.

Mr. HAWLEY. I can not imagine that there can be any serious objection to the amendment if the bill is to pass, and I hope the Senate will make itself aware of the nature of the bill under consideration.

That in all advertisements for the erection or construction or completion of public buildings or other public works, and in all contracts made under or in pursuance of such advertisements, there shall be inserted—

In the advertisement and in the contract—

a condition that no person who is not a bona fide resident within the limits of the United States, and who is not a citizen, or who has not declared his intention to become a citizen thereof, in the manner provided by law, shall be employed in the erection, construction, or completion of any public building or other public work.

If gentlemen desire to pass that I will submit, but I think it belongs to a narrow and illiberal class of legislation unworthy of the great American Republic. This bill is intended to command that the vigilant eye of the great Republic shall be directed to every public work to the end that out of the tens of thousands employed, and the thousands and you may say millions of money expended, there shall be no dollar given and no day's work offered to any man from any foreign country who happens to be on this shore, just landed, and desiring honestly to earn his bread to keep out of the poor-house—not a day's work and not a dollar to be given to such a man!

He may be at a very considerable distance from some court before which to declare his intention to become a citizen. It is no matter; he shall not be permitted to earn his daily bread.

That is not all. The second section proceeds to say that if any contractor should happen to employ any such man—"willfully" to be sure it says—he is to be fined $10 or $50 or $100. No, that does not satisfy those who have drawn this bill. The employment of a clerk by the contractor to perform sculpture or the apprentice of a sculptor or a mason's apprentice who has not declared his intention—the employment of any such one out of twenty thousand employed and $10,000,000 expended—

shall constitute a complete defense in bar against any claim or action against the United States for the recovery of any sum or sums under said contract; and it shall be the duty of the officer letting any such contract, upon being advised that any contractor has knowingly violated the terms of such contract, to declare the same forfeited.

The officer in charge of one of these works, of his own sovereign will, at five minutes' notice, shall declare a $500,000 contract forfeited. Is that proceeding with any due regard, any reasonable regard, to the proportions of offenses? Is it possible to imagine the Czar of Russia (who is often held up as about the wickedest man) adopting any more severe measures against an American who might find himself stranded on Russian soil and desire to earn something before becoming or without becoming a Russian citizen?

There is no gradation in the character of the employés. As I said, it may be a man who carries a hod for a week or rolls a wheelbarrow for a week to get something for his family, or it may be a sculptor; it may be a man of art and taste; it may be a man like Brumidi, who decorated this Capitol. No matter; if he has not declared his intention to become a citizen his employment is to be guarded against, and if by any carelessness or oversight the employer does take him, knowing him to be such, then the whole contract is by that one single act forfeited.

I submit that the bill is out of proportion; I submit that it is a cruel and unusual measure. If the Senator from New Hampshire desires to punish that class of heinous crimes, let him do it by some fine, or, if he chooses, imprisonment. I should think some pecuniary penalty of a moderate kind would answer the purpose if the crime is one worth taking notice of.

We are all foreigners. We have none of us been in this country a very great while anyhow; and I used to think that measures of this kind were narrow and bitter, and I took up arms against the Know-Nothing party when I was a young politician. I thought it a party unworthy to represent any American. I would keep out any foreign element, I would keep out any large body of men whose sympathies were not in accord with our Constitution, or who did not come here to be citizens, who came to stay a little while and then go away, who were to any extent a dangerous element. We have a right to protect ourselves against the fraud, if we may call it so, on our liberal laws by sending paupers and criminals here. We are trying to do that by our legislation.

I think this is an unnecessary, an extreme, an unusual step. I am afraid the Committee on Education and Labor did not give it the consideration they should have done; otherwise I am sure they would at least have moderated the penalty and would have put in, if necessary, some of the old-fashioned words about necessity, charity, and mercy in employing men.

Mr. BLAIR. The Senator from Connecticut finds a little fault with the bill because it provides that a contractor willfully violating the law shall forfeit his contract; and the Senator supposes that for some lesser penalty he should be permitted to violate the law, and proposes to have the committee consider the matter and decide after careful examination, first, what shall be paid by a contractor for the privilege of violating the law of the country. Why should that be? After prosecution for a criminal offense it is a very usual, a universal condition, that attaches to any willful violation of law in the performance of a contract with the Government that the contract shall be forfeited. That is all there is about that. And whether it is good theory or is not good theory is of course for the Senate to consider. I am not able to see precisely how it is that the Senator from Connecticut can expect the country in enacting laws to make some definite provision or fix some definite sum or fix some definite consideration for which it will permit this contractor to violate the provision of an existing law with reference to which his contract was specially made. We have put the provision in this bill, which is a general law, if it becomes a law at all, and every contractor will have notice of it beforehand; and if he refers to it, he will make his contract with a view to it, knowing that if he willfully employs a foreigner or person being a foreigner who has not declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States, or who does not actually become one, his contract shall be forfeited. Of course that being the law, he would make his contract with reference to it, and it seems to me that it is no hardship whatever if with a full knowledge beforehand he makes such contract and then deliberately violates it, the contract at least should be forfeited.

Of course it is not to be supposed that if he inadvertently or carelessly employed any one prohibited by law, though he should perhaps have exercised greater caution, he is to be deprived of his contract, and the bill does not provide that he shall be deprived then of his rights under his contract; but if he willfully does it, if he designedly violates this law, then the contract with the Government will be forfeited, and he will be obliged to appeal to Congress for such equitable adjustment of the amount that may be due him, if he had really conferred great benefit on the country by the substantial discharge of his contract, in order to get what might be equitably allowed him in the judgment of Congress.

Now, upon the main question which the Senator raises, whether this sort of legislation is desirable, that of course we shall decide according to our general views. We have indulged in some legislation touching foreigners from the Asiatic shores, and I think the general sentiment of this country is that they should not only be excluded from employment by the public, but also from employment by private individuals, and excluded from the country itself absolutely and totally. And yet I do not know any reason that can be in principle applied to the Mongolian, so far as employment after he is in the country is concerned, which we may not properly apply to any other foreigner whatsoever.

The principle of legislation by which we exclude foreigners from the occupation of our country, carried to its full extent, it seems to me, is certainly all-comprehensive of everything that is contained in the provisions of this bill. I do not say that persons of our own race should not be permitted to come here and become citizens of the United States; but that they should come here for temporary purposes with no design other than for a time to occupy our land and eat up our substance, and then go away and give to foreign countries the advantages which they may have derived from a temporary residence here, is strictly within the argument which has been made from time to time by our friends on the Pacific coast with regard to the Mongolian immigration. It is an argument which if it is good for anything is good for any foreigner, so far as that part of the subject is concerned.

Those men who come to this country with the design of becoming residents of the United States can have no difficulty whatever in making their application early and at once, and they will do so, and it is fair to presume that if they come here in good faith they will do so immediately upon their arrival. So there can be no hardship whatever in the principle of the bill so far as it is applicable to any foreigner who is here in good faith desiring to become a citizen of the United States.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator has spoken five minutes.

Mr. BLAIR. Is this proceeding under the five-minute rule?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Under Rule VIII.

Mr. BLAIR. We did not so regard it when the bill was up before.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the Senator's time be extended.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the Senator from New Hampshire proceeding? The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLAIR. I will not abuse the privilege.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to ask a question about the third section of the bill.

Mr. BLAIR. I will speak of that later. To refer to it now is not exactly in the line of the remarks I was making, and I do not wish to be diverted.

The bill itself is not a new bill. We passed it in the last Congress through both Houses. I do not remember whether the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. HAWLEY] opposed it at that time or not; but it recommended itself to the judgment of Congress. It reached the Executive very late, and failed to become a law, as I am informed, because the Executive did not have time for action; at any rate for some reason he did not act upon it.

I do not care to argue the provision. These men have plenty of avenues left open to them. The simple question is whether the public money derived by taxation on everybody and expended on public buildings and public works shall in being paid out for labor be paid only to those who are or who design to be citizens of the United States?

As I was saying when the bill was up before, this may be of comparatively little consequence so far as public buildings in the interior of the country are concerned. Foreigners going there may be supposed to intend to become citizens, though some may be imported in violation of law; but all along the Canadian border there has been complaint that in the erection of public buildings and the construction of public works foreigners across the line have been invited over to take work away from those who are really residents of the United States, to a very large degree, and that contractors encourage this sort of thing; and thus it comes to be the case that the public money is really made use of to encourage competition with American labor. It ought not to be so. I submit that it ought not to be so; and this bill is designed to reach primarily that practical evil.

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. MITCHELL] calls attention to the third section, which provides that—

> No person shall be employed in any Department of the Government of the United States (except persons employed in the consular or diplomatic service abroad) who is not a citizen and resident of the United States or who has not previously declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States.

I do not know the point of the Senator's inquiry.

Mr. MITCHELL. The declaration that it shall not be lawful. Suppose it is done; how is the prohibition to be enforced?

Mr. BLAIR. If done at all, it should be done by some authority of the Government itself, by the Secretary of the Interior, or by some subordinate, or by some other Cabinet officer, or by the President.

Mr. MITCHELL. But suppose the bill becomes a law with the third section, and suppose a subordinate officer retains a person who is not a citizen and who does not propose to become a citizen, in one of the bureaus in one of the Departments, what are you going to do about it? What is your remedy? What is your process?

Mr. BLAIR. Impeachment and removal from office. Sir, this will be a law of the United States, and if in violation of it the head of a Department wantonly employs a person who is prohibited by law from being employed, in such a case, if it could be shown to be a willful violation of the law it would be the business of the House of Representatives to impeach that officer and of the Senate to try him, and, if the proof was complete, convict him, for it would be a violation of his oath.

Mr. MITCHELL. Would it be a high crime and misdemeanor?

Mr. BLAIR. It would be a misdemeanor unquestionably, and a high crime, because it would be the commission of official perjury.

Mr. VANCE. Mr. President, will one objection postpone the consideration of this bill?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The rule provides that the objection may be interposed at any stage of the proceeding.

Mr. VANCE. I think it is a very important bill, and I am afraid it is a departure from the principles of both the great parties which prevail in this country and will be attended with very serious consequences. Inasmuch as there is evidently a very thin Senate, and probably the calling of the roll would disclose the absence of a quorum, I object to the further consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill will be passed over under Rule IX.

Mr. BLAIR. I give notice that I will call it up as soon as possible, for it is desirable that the bill should be disposed of.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 2017) to incorporate the Rock Creek Railway Company of the District of Columbia; and

A bill (H. R. 6899) to incorporate the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills:

A bill (H. R. 1184) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Rock Creek at the Woodley Lane Road, in the District of Columbia;

A bill (H. R. 1483) for the erection of a public building at Monroe, La.; and

A bill (H. R. 7340) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Hickman, Ky.

The message further announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7052) relating to postal crimes, and amendatory of the statutes therein mentioned, and agreed to the same.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2805) granting a pension to Martha F. Woodrum, widow of James Woodrum, deceased; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the bill and amendment, and had appointed Mr. THOMPSON, of California, Mr. CHIPMAN, and Mr. HUNTER managers at the conference on its part.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1191) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mary H. Pike, deceased.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1507) providing for an additional associate justice of the supreme court of the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes, with amendments; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (H. R. 8307) for the relief of John T. Higgins; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

AMENDMENT TO A BILL.

Mr. MITCHELL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SUPREME COURT BUILDING.

Mr. MORRILL. I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a bill at this time, as I must leave the Chamber directly.

Mr. HOAR. I have morning business to present, but I will wait until the Senator gets through.

Mr. MORRILL. I ask for the consideration of a bill among the first on the Calendar that will be reached in regular order, Order of Business 1303, Senate bill 2727.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Vermont asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed now to consider the bill (S. 2727) authorizing the purchase of a site for a building for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. MORRILL. I supposed it was generally understood when the site for the library was acquired that in due time an effort would be made to acquire the squares upon the opposite side of East Capitol street. It is obvious that if we delay this the greater will be the cost of the acquisition, and there is an immediate necessity for different accommodations for the Supreme Court. Its members, as well as Congress, fully understand that they must soon be crowded out of the Capitol. The Supreme Court is a co-ordinate branch of the Government, and therefore ought to have accommodations of some dignity and propriety.

This bill only proposes at the present time the acquisition of the three squares directly on the east of the present grounds and north of East Capitol street. It will be necessary for us to have them in order to complete the grounds around the Capitol, but we want them for this purpose, and some members of the other House think they want them for some other purposes. At all events, I think there is a general agreement in favor of the acquisition of these squares at the present time.

The Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds reported this bill unanimously. It is in the same terms as were used for the acquisition of the ground where the Library is now being constructed. I ask, therefore, for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2727) authorizing the purchase of a site for a building for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. STEWART. I move to amend in section 3, line 5, by striking out the words "nor the prices at which the respective owners shall have heretofore consented in writing to sell the same to the United States."

Mr. MORRILL. I hope the Senator from Nevada will not press that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be first reported from the desk.

The CHIEF CLERK. In section 3, line 5, after the word "thereof," it is proposed to strike out:

> Nor the prices at which the respective owners shall have heretofore consented in writing to sell the same to the United States.

So as to read:

> SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Interior shall be authorized to purchase said land, or any part thereof, as soon as practicable, at such prices as may be fixed by agreement between the said Secretary and the respective owners, not exceeding the actual cash value thereof, and payment therefor shall be made to the respective owners, on the requisitions of the Secretary of the Interior, upon

the release and conveyance of said lands to the United States by good and sufficient deeds executed in due form of law.

Mr. MORRILL. I hope the Senator from Nevada will not insist upon the amendment. There are some parties who have offered their property at reasonable prices on the valuation as estimated some years ago. Other parties are asking more, and theirs will probably not be taken without condemnation proceedings. That is precisely the condition. Therefore I hope the Senator from Nevada will not insist on the amendment.

Mr. STEWART. It occurred to me that these prices having been offered several years ago, values may have advanced, and while persons would be willing to negotiate on fair terms, they would not take the prices fixed years ago. They may have made improvements since. It seems to me we might trust the Secretary of the Interior to make the contracts where people are willing to sell at the present cash value, which is easily ascertained. This provision might force the whole proceeding to be at law and require condemnation in all cases. It really takes away the ordinary power we have given to the Secretary of the Interior to contract with persons at the present cash value. It seems to me that that is an unusual limitation; and as I understand the offer was made several years ago, probably it would not be a fair price now. It seems to me we should be more likely to get through with the business speedily by leaving this to the Secretary of the Interior. I think it would be safe to allow him to contract with these owners according to the present cash value.

Mr. MORRILL. I am very sure that any proposition of the kind giving unlimited power to purchase will meet with objection in the other House, and therefore I hope the Senator will not insist on his amendment.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART].

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BENJAMIN HALE'S ESTATE.

Mr. HOAR. I am directed by the Committee on Claims to report a resolution which I ask to have put on its passage.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the petition of Apollos Hale, administrator of the estate of Benjamin Hale, and Senate bill 877, referring the claim of Apollos Hale, administrator, to the Court of Claims, be referred to the Court of Claims to find and report the facts relating thereto and the facts concerning any laches of petitioner or his intestate in presenting said claim or prosecuting the same, or applying for relief against the final action of the Court of Claims therein.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection to the present consideration of the resolution, the Chair will put the question on its adoption. The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

NAVAL ACADEMY CADETS.

Mr. CAMERON. I ask now that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1386, Senate bill 2925. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] withdraws his objection, as I understand, to its consideration.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that the bill (S. 2925) in relation to cadets at the Naval Academy be now considered. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 1, line 8, after the word "than," to strike out "nineteen" and insert "twenty;" in line 9, after the word "follows," to strike out "fourteen" and insert "fifteen;" so as to make the section read:

That the act of August 5, 1882, making appropriations for the naval service be, and is hereby, so amended that the number of appointments from graduates of the Naval Academy to positions in the lower grades of the line and Engineer Corps of the Navy and the Marine Corps shall not be less than twenty in each year, to be apportioned as follows: Fifteen to the line, four to the Engineer Corps, and one to the Marine Corps.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 6, after the words "ages of," to strike out "seventeen" and insert "sixteen," and before the word "years" to strike out "twenty-two" and insert "twenty-one;" so as to read:

SEC. 2. That cadets shall be appointed one year in advance of the time of their admission to the Academy, except in cases where by reason of death or other cause a vacancy occurs which can not be provided for by such appointment in advance. Appointees shall be admitted to the Academy only between the ages of sixteen and twenty-one years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 7, after the word "years," to strike out:

No cadet who is reported as deficient in either conduct or studies, and recommended to be discharged from the Academy, shall, unless upon recommendation of the academic board, be returned or reappointed or appointed to any place in the Navy before his class shall have left the Academy and received their commissions.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STEWART & CO.

Mr. MITCHELL. There was a resolution passed over on the Calendar the other day in my absence referring a matter to the Court of Claims. I ask that it be now considered.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Was it passed over without prejudice?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir; it is Order of Business 789.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution reported by Mr. MITCHELL from the Committee on Claims March 21, 1888, to refer the bill (S. 800) for the relief of Stewart & Co. to the Court of Claims.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the bill (S. 800) entitled "A bill for the relief of Stewart & Co.," now pending in the Senate, together with all the accompanying papers, be, and the same is hereby, referred to the Court of Claims, in pursuance of the provisions of the fourteenth section of an act entitled "An act to provide for the bringing of suits against the Government of the United States," approved March 3, 1887. And the said court shall proceed with the same in accordance with the provisions of said section of such act and report to the Senate in accordance therewith.

The resolution was agreed to.

GEORGETOWN BARGE, DOCK, AND ELEVATOR COMPANY.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. I ask leave to call up Order of Business 529, being the bill (S. 2252) to incorporate the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator, and Railway Company.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOLPH in the chair). The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Virginia to a verbal mistake in the printing in line 41 of section 1. The word "on" should be "or;" so as to read:

Duly authorized route or routes, etc.

The amendment will be made, if there be no objection.

Mr. RIDDLEBERGER. Let it be made.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Calendar, Mr. President.

POSTAL CRIMES.

Mr. SAWYER. I present a conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7052) relating to postal crimes and amendatory of the statutes therein mentioned, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, and agree to the same.

ELI SAULSBURY,
PHILETUS SAWYER,
E. K. WILSON,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

ALEX. M. DOCKERY,
S. R. PETERS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report requires no action on the part of the Senate.

COURTS AT DULUTH, MINN.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Calendar will be proceeded with and the next bill in order will be stated.

The bill (H. R. 5932) providing for the holding of the terms of the United States courts in the district of Minnesota was announced as next in order, and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider it.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That hereafter, and until otherwise provided by law, there shall be held annually, on the second Monday in September, a term of the district court of the United States for the district of Minnesota at the city of Duluth, in said district, said term to be in addition to the terms now required by law to be held at the cities of St. Paul and Winona, in said district; and a grand and petit jury may be summoned to serve at said term of court hereby established.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read:

An act providing for the holding a term of the United States district court at Duluth, in the district of Minnesota.

SUBURBAN RAILWAY COMPANY.

The bill (S. 905) to incorporate the District of Columbia Suburban Railway Company was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with amendments. The first amendment was, in section 1, line 5, before the name "Page," to strike out "Frank" and insert "Horace;" in lines 7 and 8, to strike out the words "and created into;" in line 21, after the word "along," to strike out "or" and insert "a line;" in line 22, after the word "by," to strike out "the most eligible" and insert "such;" in line 23, after the word "company," to strike out "under" and insert "with;" in line 26, after the word "by," to strike out "the most eligible" and insert "such;" in line 27, after the word "thence," to insert "bordering the proposed park;" in line 28, after the word "to," to strike out "P street bridge" and insert "Woodley road;" and after the word "Potomac," in line 31, to insert:

Thence eastward with and in the vicinity of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal to the head of M street extended in Georgetown. Also beginning with the intersection of said roadway on Maryland avenue, at Twelfth street northeast, and running thence northward on Twelfth street east to Boundary street, and thence northward across Boundary street, passing in the vicinity of the National Fair Grounds; thence northward—bearing westward to a point northeast from the Soldiers' Home—where it will intersect the east and west line of said road: *Provided*, That all of the routes herein mentioned shall be subject of the approval of the commissioners of the District of Columbia.

So as to make the section read:

That L. G. Hine, Joseph G. Waters, Charles E. Creecy, W. W. Curtis, John T. Mitchell, J. W. Denver, Green B. Raum, Horace Page, Gilbert Moyers, Thomas J. Myers, Michael Shaughnessy, John W. Childress, D. W. Glassie, and their associates, successors, and assigns, are hereby created a body corporate by the name, style, and title of "The District of Columbia Suburban Railway Company," and by that name shall have perpetual succession, and shall be able to sue and be sued, plead and be impleaded, defend and be defended in all courts of law and equity within the United States, and may make and have a common seal. And said corporation is hereby authorized to lay out, locate, construct, furnish, maintain, and enjoy a continuous railroad with single or double track wholly or in part in the District of Columbia, with the necessary switches, turnouts, depots, stations, and other appurtenances, beginning at or near the intersection of Maryland avenue and First street east, in the city of Washington; thence along said avenue northeast to Boundary street; thence along a line near to the Columbia or old Bladensburg road to or near the District line; thence by such route as may be determined by the company (with the approval of the commissioners of the District of Columbia), and passing east and north of the Soldiers' Home to or in the vicinity of Brightwood; thence by such route to Rock Creek; and thence bordering the proposed park along the valley of Rock Creek to Woodley road, with a branch railroad from some point along Rock Creek to a point near Tennallytown; thence to the Potomac River, in the vicinity of Little Falls of the Potomac; thence eastward with and in the vicinity of the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal to the head of M street extended in Georgetown. Also beginning with the intersection of said roadway on Maryland avenue, at Twelfth street northeast, and running thence northward on Twelfth street east to Boundary street, and thence northward across Boundary street, passing in the vicinity of the National Fair Grounds; thence northward—bearing westward to a point northeast from the Soldiers' Home—where it will intersect the east and west line of said road: *Provided*, That all of the routes herein mentioned shall be subject of the approval of the commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 2, line 2, after the word "limits," to insert the words "and along Rock Creek valley;" in line 3, after the word "power," to insert "which may be approved by the commissioners of the District of Columbia;" beginning in line 12, after the word "railroad," to strike out the words "said company shall always maintain along its line of route a suitable fence on each side thereof at such places as may be designated by the proper authorities of the District of Columbia. The company shall maintain a suitable protection along their line outside the city limits," and insert "at such place or places as may be approved by the commissioners of the District of Columbia, and from such place make connection with other street railways;" so as to make the section road:

SEC. 2. Said company may run and operate their trains and cars within the city limits and along Rock Creek valley by means of any motive power which may be approved by the commissioners of the District of Columbia other than that created by steam in locomotive engines; and they are hereby empowered to construct and make all necessary bridges and culverts, and also necessary trenches and excavations for cables, and to place and work therein motive apparatus, tubing, cables, and machinery, and erect the necessary buildings and operating engines and other machinery and other apparatus required in the construction and operation of their railroad at such place or places as may be approved by the commissioners of the District of Columbia, and from such place make connection with other street railways.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, to strike out in lines 1, 2, and 3, the following words, "the capital stock of said company shall not exceed $1,000,000 and be not less than $250,000," and insert "said company is hereby authorized to issue its capital stock to an amount not to exceed the actual cost, more than 10 per cent. of the right of way, construction and equipment, motive power, and such land and buildings as may be necessary to said road;" in line 23, to strike out the words "and the highest bidder shall be taken to be the person who offers" and insert the words "and the person who offers;" in line 26, after the word "due," to insert "shall be taken to be the highest bidder, and such shall be conducted;" and in line 30, after the word "said," to strike out "body" and insert "corporation;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. Said company is hereby authorized to issue its capital stock to an amount not to exceed the actual cost more than 10 per cent. of the right of way, construction and equipment, motive power, and such land and buildings as may be necessary to said road, in shares of $50 each. Said company shall require the subscribers to the capital stock to pay in cash to the treasurer appointed by the corporators the amounts severally subscribed by them as follows, namely: Ten per cent. at the time of subscribing and 5 per cent. each thirty days thereafter until 50 per cent. thereof shall have been paid, the balance of such subscription to be paid at such times and such amounts as the board of directors may require; and no subscription shall be deemed valid unless the 10 per cent. thereof shall be paid at the time of subscribing, as hereinbefore provided; and if any stockholder shall refuse or neglect to pay any installment as aforesaid, or as required by resolution of the board of directors after reasonable notice of the same, the said board of directors may sell at public auction, to the highest bidder, so many shares of his stock as shall pay said installments, and the person who offers to purchase the least number of shares for the assessment due shall be taken to be the highest bidder, and such shall be conducted under such general regulations as may be adopted in the by-laws of said company; but no stock shall be sold for less than the total assessments due and payable, or said corporation may sue and collect the same from any delinquent subscriber in any court of competent jurisdiction.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, line 14, after the word "national," to strike out "banking house" and insert "bank;" so as to read:

Provided further, That nothing shall be received in payment of the 10 per cent. at the time of subscribing except lawful money or certified checks from any established national bank.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, line 22, before the word "newspapers," to strike out "public" and insert "daily;" so as to read:

And when the books of subscription to the capital stock of said company shall be closed, the corporators named in the first section, their associates, successors, or assigns, or a majority of them, and in case any of them refuse or neglect to act, then a majority of the remainder shall, within twenty days thereafter, call the first meeting of the stockholders of said company, to meet within ten days thereafter, for the choice of directors, of which public notice shall be given for five days in two daily newspapers published in the city of Washington, and by written personal notice to be mailed to the address of each stockholder by the clerk of the corporation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 4, line 31, after the words "forfeiture of," to strike out "all chartered rights and privileges granted to said company. That the iron or steel used in the construction of said road shall be of American manufacture," and insert "this charter;" so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That it shall be unlawful for the company hereby incorporated to consolidate with any other railroad company now in existence or which may be hereafter chartered, and any such consolidation shall of itself operate as a forfeiture of this charter.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the end of section 5, to add the following proviso:

Provided, That within the city limits six tickets shall be sold for 25 cents.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 6, as follows:

SEC. 6. That the said road and its branches shall be deemed real estate, and they, together with other real property and personal property of said body corporate, shall be liable to taxation as other real estate and personal property in the city or District of Columbia as aforesaid, except as hereinafter provided.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section [7] 6, line 10, after the word "tracks," to insert "and rails;" in line 11, after the word "order," to insert "with such kind and character of pavement as shall be designated by the commissioners of the District of Columbia;" in line 15, before "District of Columbia," to insert "authorities of the;" and in line 17, after the word "avenues," to strike out "and the average thereof, as may be under their authority and control;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 6. That within the city limits the said railway shall be laid in the center of the avenues and streets, as near as may be, in the most approved manner adapted for street railways, with rails of the most approved pattern, laid upon an even surface with the pavement of the street, and the space between the two tracks shall not be more than 4 feet, and the gauge to correspond with that of other city railroads, and the said corporation shall be bound to keep said tracks, and for the space of 2 feet beyond the outer rail thereof, and also the space between the tracks and rails, at all times well paved and in good order, with such kind and character of pavement as shall be designated by the commissioners of the District of Columbia, without expense to the United States or the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall prevent the authorities of the District of Columbia, at any time, at their option, from altering the grade or otherwise improving such streets and avenues; and in such event it shall be the duty of said company to change their said railroad so as to conform to such grade as may have been established.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section [8] 7, line 2, before the word "convenient," to insert the word "such;" in line 3, after the word "points," to insert "as the commissioners of the District may approve;" and in line 10, after the word "said," to strike out "grantees" and insert "company;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 7. That it shall be lawful for said company and its successors or assigns to erect and maintain, at such convenient and suitable points as the commissioners of the District may approve, along the line of the streets or avenues under which wires or cables are placed, steam-engines and boilers of sufficient power, and to connect the same with said wires or cables, and it shall not be lawful to propel their cars over said railroad, or any part thereof, at a rate of speed exceeding 8 miles per hour within the city limits; and for each violation of this provision said company, their successors or assigns, as the case may be, shall be subject to a penalty of $50, to be recovered in any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the commissioners of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section [9] 8, line 8, after the word "re-

quire," to insert "subject to the approval of the commissioners of the District;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 8. That the said company shall place first-class cars on said railways, with all the modern improvements for the safety, convenience, and comfort of passengers, and shall run cars thereon as often as the public convenience may require. And said company shall also provide such passenger rooms, ticket offices, workshops, stables, depots, and necessary buildings at such points as the business of the railroad and the convenience of the public may require, subject to the approval of the commissioners of the District; and they are hereby authorized to lay such rails through transverse or other streets as may be necessary for the exclusive purpose of connecting said workshops, stables, and depots with the main tracks. The said company is hereby authorized to purchase or lease such lands or buildings as may be necessary for said passenger rooms, ticket offices, workshops, stables, and depots.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section [11] 10, line 2, before the words "board of," to strike out "the" and insert "a;" in the same line, after the words "board of," to insert "nine;" in line 3, after the word "directors" to strike out "nine in number;" in line 5, before the word "duly," to insert "until their successors are;" in line 6, after the word "qualified," to strike out "to take their places as directors;" in line 15, before the word "vacancy," to strike out "the" and insert "such;" and after "vacancy" to strike out "thus occasioned thereby;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 10. That the government and direction of the affairs of the company shall be vested in a board of nine directors, who shall be members of the company, and who shall hold their office for one year, and until their successors are duly elected and qualified; and the said directors (a majority of whom shall be a quorum) shall elect one of their number to be president of the board, who shall also be president of the company, and they shall also choose a vice-president, a secretary, and a treasurer, who shall each give bonds with surety to said company in such sum as the said directors may require for the faithful discharge of his trust. In the case of a vacancy in the board of directors by the death, resignation, or otherwise, of any director, such vacancy shall be filled by the remaining directors.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section [12] 11, line 9, after the word "condemnation," to strike out "and also to issue bonds, secured by mortgage of its franchises and property, real and personal, but the amount of such bonds shall not exceed $20,000 per mile;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 11. That the directors shall have power to make and prescribe such by-laws, rules, and regulations as they shall deem needful and proper touching the disposition and management of the stock, property, estate, and effects of the company, not contrary to the charter or to the laws of the United States and the ordinances of the District of Columbia, and the said corporation shall have the right to obtain the right of way for their said railway either by purchase, lease, gift, or condemnation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section [13] 12, line 6, after the word "prescribe," to strike out "and the said directors shall annually make a report in writing of their doings to the corporation;" so as to read:

SEC. 12. That the principal office of the company shall be in Washington City, and there shall be an annual meeting of the stockholders for choice of directors, to be holden there at such time and place, under such conditions, and upon such notice as the said company in their by-laws may prescribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the end of section [13] 12, to insert:

That said railway company shall, on or before the 15th of January of each year, make a report to Congress of the names of all the stockholders therein and the amount of stock held by each, together with a detailed statement of the receipts and expenditures, from whatever source and on whatever account, for the preceding year ending December the 31st, which report shall be verified by affidavit of the president and secretary of said company; and if said report is not made at the time specified, or within ten days thereafter, it shall be the duty of the commissioners to cause to be instituted judicial proceedings to forfeit this charter; and said company shall pay to the District of Columbia, in lieu of taxes upon personal property, including cars and motive power, each year, 4 per cent. of its gross earnings, which amount shall be payable to the collector of taxes at the times and in the manner that other taxes are now due and payable, and subject to the same penalties on arrears; and the franchise and property of said company, both real and personal, to a sufficient amount, may be seized and sold in satisfaction thereof, as now provided by law for the sale of other property for taxes; and said per cent. of its gross earnings shall be in lieu of all other assessments of personal taxes upon its property, used solely and exclusively in the operation and management of said railway. Its real estate shall be taxed as other real estate in the District: *Provided*, That its tracks and right of way shall not be taxed as real estate.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section [14] 13, after the word "dollars" at the end of line 10, to strike out "to said company;" in line 12, before the word "liable," to strike out "remain," and insert "be;" after "liable" to insert "to said company;" and in line 16, after the word "committed," to strike out "unless the offender is beyond the jurisdiction of the courts of the District of Columbia;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 13. That said company shall have at all times the free and uninterrupted use of the roadway, and if any person or persons shall willfully, mischievously, and unnecessarily obstruct or impede the passage of the cars of said railway with a vehicle or vehicles, or otherwise, or in any manner molest or interfere with passengers or operatives while in transit, or destroy or injure the cars of said railway, or depots, stations, or other property belonging to said company, the person or persons so offending shall forfeit and pay for each such offense not less than twenty-five nor more than one hundred dollars, to be recovered as other fines and penalties in said District, and shall be liable to said company, in addition to said penalty, for any loss or damage occasioned by his or her or their act as aforesaid; but no suit shall be brought unless commenced within sixty days after such offense shall have been committed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section [15] 14, in line 6, after the word "lawful," to strike out "general;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 14. That no person shall be prohibited the right to travel on any part of said road, or ejected from the cars by the company's employés, for any other cause than that of being drunk, disorderly, unclean, or contagiously diseased, or refusing to pay the legal fare exacted, or to comply with the lawful regulations of the company.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section [16] 15, line 7, after the word "Columbia," to insert "and use said tracks in common with such company," and in line 10, after the word "District," to insert "and upon such terms as may be agreed upon by the companies or fixed by the supreme court of the District;" so as to make the section read:

SEC. 15. That the corporation hereby created shall not have power to construct any part of their road, or its extensions or branches, in or upon any of the squares or other reserved lands in the city of Washington, nor in or upon the lands of the Soldiers' Home, or of any cemetery in the District; but they may cross, connect with, and coincide with the lines of any other railway company within the District of Columbia, and use said tracks in common with such company, under such regulations as may be made by the proper authority of the District, and upon such terms as may be agreed upon by the companies or fixed by the supreme court of the District.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to strike out section 17, as follows:

SEC. 17. That this act may at any time be altered, amended, or repealed by the Congress of the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 16. That if the work of construction is not commenced in one year and completed within three years from the passage of this act, such failure shall operate as a forfeiture of this charter.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert as a new section the following:

SEC. 17. That Congress reserves the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act at any time.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PLATT. When the bill comes into the Senate I shall reserve one amendment for a separate vote.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Will the Senator from Connecticut indicate the amendment upon which he desires a separate vote?

Mr. PLATT. It is the amendment on page 6, from lines 31 to 34.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendments will be concurred in, if there be no objection, except the one indicated by the Senator from Connecticut, upon which the question is, Shall the amendments made as in Committee of the Whole be concurred in by the Senate? The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. After the words "forfeiture of," the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, struck out the words:

All chartered rights and privileges granted to said company. That the iron or steel used in the construction of said road shall be of American manufacture.

And inserted:

This charter.

Mr. PLATT. I should like to have the amendment agreed to inserting the words "this charter" in place of the first words stricken out, namely, "all chartered rights and privileges granted to said company." Then that will leave the remainder of the proposed amendment to be acted upon, which is to strike out the words:

That the iron or steel used in the construction of said road shall be of American manufacture.

It is upon this question that I wish to take the sense of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. Strike out the words "all chartered rights and privileges granted to said company" and insert "this charter;" so as to make the proviso read:

Provided, That it shall be unlawful for the company hereby incorporated to consolidate with any other railroad company now in existence or which may be hereafter chartered, and any such consolidation shall of itself operate as a forfeiture of this charter.

Mr. PLATT. Now, the question being divided, I move that the Senate non-concur in so much of the amendment as proposes to strike out the words:

That the iron or steel used in the construction of said road shall be of American manufacture.

It is not fifteen minutes since we passed a bill relating to a dock and barge company in the District of Columbia in which that clause was contained. It seems to me that the Senate ought to be consistent, and inasmuch as the parties to this proposed charter have been perfectly willing that that clause should remain in the charter, I think it ought not to be stricken out.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair understands the first part of the amendment to be agreed to.

Mr. PLATT. Yes, inserting the words "this charter" in place of the words "all chartered rights and privileges granted to said company."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The first part of the amendment will be concurred in if there be no objection. The question is on concurring in the second part of the amendment.

The second part of the amendment was non-concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSIDERATION OF PENSION BILLS.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent to go to the Calendar of pension cases.

Mr. PLATT. We are almost to them.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the Senate proceed now to the consideration of private pension bills upon the Calendar reported favorably and to which there is no objection. Is there objection to that course.

Mr. VANCE. Why can we not take all the bills as they come? We are almost upon the pension bills.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Iowa?

Mr. VANCE. No, I do not object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection. The first private pension bill on the Calendar will be announced.

Mr. TELLER. That is simply for to-day, I suppose.

Mr. ALLISON. Yes, for to-day.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. For the remainder of this day, or until the private pension cases are disposed of. Order of Business 1315, Senate bill 849, is the first pension bill to be considered.

MORGAN GORDON.

The bill (S. 849) granting a pension to Morgan Gordon was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Morgan Gordon, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JANE REILLY.

The bill (S. 2677) granting a pension to Jane Reilly was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Pensions reported an amendment, after the word "Cavalry," at the end of line 6, to strike out "to date from December 25, 1861, and otherwise;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll the name of Jane Reilly, widow of Alexander M. Reilly, late sergeant of Company M, First New York (Lincoln's) Volunteer Cavalry, subject to the limitations and provisions of the pension laws.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MINERVA TILLEY.

Mr. COCKRELL. What was done with Order of Business 1312, Senate bill 2921?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. It was inadvertently omitted in the call of the Calendar. It will now be read.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2921) granting a pension to Minerva Tilley.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair is compelled to withdraw the admission made by him in response to the Senator from Missouri. This bill has never been reported favorably from the committee, but it was introduced by the Senator from North Carolinia [Mr. VANCE], read twice, and placed on the Calendar without any action by a committee.

Mr. COCKRELL. Then how did the report come to be made?

Mr. VANCE. The report was made in connection with the petition. The petition was adversely reported and the report placed on the Calendar.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill does not come within the agreement of the Senate.

Mr. COCKRELL. The Calendar does not show that it was an adverse report. The Calendar states that that bill was introduced by the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] and "read twice. Report No. 1263 on petition of Minerva Tilley." The Calendar ought to show that it was an adverse report.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill does not come within the agreement, and will be passed over.

HARRISON WAGNER.

The bill (S. 332) granting a pension to Harrison Wagner was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Pensions reported an amendment, after the word "Maryland," in line 7, to insert "and pay him at the rate of $25 per month;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Harrison Wagner, late a nurse in general hospital No. 1, Frederick, Md., and pay him at the rate of $25 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOPHIA SCHIMMELFENNIG.

The bill (S. 2879) increasing the pension of Sophia Schimmelfennig, widow of Alexander Schimmelfennig, late brigadier-general and major-general by brevet, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension of Sophia Schimmelfennig, widow of Alexander Schimmelfennig, deceased, late brigadier-general and major-general by brevet, to $50 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES R. PORTER.

The bill (H. R. 6552) to increase the pension of James R. Porter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of James R. Porter, late colonel of the One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CAROLINE R. HAZELTINE.

The bill (S. 2385) granting a pension to Caroline R. Hazeltine was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Caroline R. Hazeltine, mother of Edward C. Hazeltine, late ensign in the United States Navy from New Hampshire at the rate of $15 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLEN ST. CYR.

The bill (H. R. 2535) granting a pension to Ellen St. Cyr was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Ellen St. Cyr, widow of Abner St. Cyr, late a first lieutenant in Company G, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL A. TATE.

The bill (S. 2750) to increase the pension of Samuel A. Tate was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Samuel A. Tate, late of Company I, Fortieth Regiment Illinois Volunteers, at the rate of $24 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARITY J. TOWNS AND MINOR CHILDREN.

The bill (S. 2782) granting a petition to Charity J. Towns and minor children was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Charity J. Towns, the widow of Arthur D. Towns, late private of Company B, Seventy-second Regiment of New York Volunteer Infantry, and the names of Jessie Mabel Towns, born January 20, 1873; Edwin M. Towns, born November 15, 1875; Nellie B. Towns, born January 20, 1881, and Pearl L. Towns, born January 27, 1886, sons and daughters of Arthur D. Towns, late a private of Company B, Seventy-second Regiment of New York Volunteers.

Mr. PLATT. Let the report be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The report of the committee will be read.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. DAVIS May 15, 1888:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2782) granting a pension to Charity J. Towns and minor children, have examined the same, and report:

The claim covered by the bill is for the widow of a pensioned soldier and four minor children. The husband drew a pension for disabilities created by gunshot wounds in the right shoulder and thigh received at the battle of Williamsburgh, Va., in May, 1862. He died August 18, 1887, of Bright's disease of the kidneys, leaving his wife and children destitute. The widow's application for pension was disallowed on the ground of pathological disconnection between the wound for which the soldier was pensioned and the disease with which he died. This is probably technically true; but it is also probably true that the draining effects of gunshot wounds in the shoulder and thigh, severe enough to entitle the soldier to a pension, and suffered during a term of twenty-five years, were also severe enough to render his system less able to resist the fatal kidney disease, and to hasten his death, if it did not cause it; and in such a case, on a question between sustaining a pathological theory, on the one hand, and a pensioner's destitute widow and orphans, on the other, the committee, in the spirit of the pension laws, vote for the latter.

The committee recommend the passage of the bill.

Mr. PLATT. I do not understand this bill. It proposes to put on the pension-rolls, according to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of the widow and five children. It does not state the amount which is to be paid to any of them. I should like to inquire what the operation of the act would be, whether it would be to pension the widow and each of the children at $8 or $12 a month, as the case may be, or whether it would be one pension to be divided between them. From a hasty examination of the bill I am uncertain about it.

Mr. COCKRELL. The same point suggested itself to me, and not seeing in the Chamber the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] who

reported the bill, I will suggest an amendment which will settle the question.

Mr. PLATT. I think perhaps it had better be passed over for the present.

Mr. COCKRELL. I presume the intention of the bill is to give them the rate of pension they would have received if the Pension Office had decided that they were entitled to a pension under existing law.

Mr. PLATT. That would give each of the children $2 a month until arrival at the age of sixteen?

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes, and the widow $12. I suggest that the amendment be made.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The proposed amendment of the Senator from Missouri will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add to the bill:

And to pay them respectively such pension as they would have received if the pension had been allowed by the Pension Office.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY M. STRONG.

The bill (S. 2162) for the relief of Mary M. Strong was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mary M. Strong, widow of Thomas J. Strong, late lieutenant-colonel of the Sixteenth Regiment New York Heavy Artillery.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEMUEL S. SKINNER.

The bill (S. 2666) granting a pension to L. B. Skinner was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Pensions reported an amendment, in line 6, before the name "Skinner," to strike out the initials "L. B." and insert "Lemuel S.;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Lemuel S. Skinner, late of Company I, One hundred and twenty-third New York Volunteer Infantry.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Lemuel S. Skinner."

ISSUE OF COIN CERTIFICATES.

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to offer a resolution at this time to lie on the table and be printed. Let it be read.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the resolution submitted by the Senator from Nevada will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That subdivision 3 of Rule XVI be suspended so that the amendment hereinafter set out shall be in order to House bill 9377, making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending with June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, the amendment to be inserted in the bill immediately following the several appropriations therein contained for the United States mints and assay offices.

The following is the proposed amendment:

That any person may deposit at any mint or assay office of the United States either gold or silver bullion, or both, in quantities of not less than 5 ounces of gold or 80 ounces of silver and demand and receive coin certificates therefor at the rate of $1 in certificates for 25.8 grains troy weight of standard gold nine-tenths fine; and at the rate of $1 in certificates for 412½ grains troy weight of standard silver nine-tenths fine.

The coin certificates issued under the provisions of this section shall be of such denominations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That they shall not be of less denomination than $1 or more than $1,000, and that one-half of the amount issued shall be in denominations less than $50, and shall be redeemable in gold or silver coin at the option of the United States. And the Secretary of the Treasury shall cause to be carried from time to time such portions of the bullion deposited under the provisions of this section as may be necessary to enable him to furnish coin for the redemption of such certificates.

The coin certificates issued under the provisions of this section shall be a legal tender at their nominal value for all dues, public and private, except where otherwise expressly stipulated in contracts heretofore made, and when such certificates shall be received for public dues they shall be reissued. And a sufficient sum to carry out the foregoing provisions of this section is hereby appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated. And the provision in section 1 of the act of February 28, 1878, entitled "An act to authorize the coinage of the standard dollar and to restore its legal-tender character," which requires the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase at the market price thereof not less than $2,000,000 worth of silver bullion per month, nor more than $4,000,000 worth per month of such bullion, is hereby repealed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will lie on the table, and be printed.

Mr. STEWART. I give notice that I shall call the resolution up tomorrow for consideration.

Mr. HOAR. For the purpose of addressing the Senate?

Mr. STEWART. No, for its passage.

WASHINGTON T. OTEY.

The bill (S. 1307) to increase the pension of Washington T. Otey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Washington T. Otey, late a lieutenant of Company F, of the Sixty-second Regiment Illinois Infantry Volunteers, at the rate of $12 a month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LOUISA WARD.

The bill (S. 2639) granting a pension to Mrs. Louisa Ward was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension-roll the name of Louisa Ward, mother of Edgar A. Ward, who served as a private in Company H, Twelfth Iowa Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EPHRAIM REYNOLDS.

The bill (H. R. 809) granting a pension to Ephraim Reynolds was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Ephraim Reynolds, of Monroe, Me., late a private in Company F, Twenty-sixth Regiment of Maine Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SMITH V. CAMPBELL.

The bill (H. R. 5429) to place the name of Smith V. Campbell on the pension-roll was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of Smith V. Campbell, late assistant surgeon of Twenty-third Iowa Volunteer Infantry, on the pension-roll.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALPHEUS DYER.

The bill (H. R. 4891) granting a pension to Alpheus Dyer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Alpheus Dyer, of Belfast, Me., late a private in the One hundredth Regiment of Illinois Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LINNAEUS W. RISLEY.

The bill (H. R. 1074) granting a pension to Linnaeus W. Risley was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Linnaeus W. Risley, late of Company D, Eighteenth Indiana Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALLY B. WILSON.

The bill (H. R. 6583) granting a pension to Sally B. Wilson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Sally B. Wilson, wife of Franklin Wilson, late a private in Company B, Seventy-second Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW J. FOUST.

The bill (S. 2683) granting a pension to Andrew J. Foust was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension-roll the name of Andrew J. Foust, Company B, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM H. H. WELSH.

The bill (S. 2842) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Welsh was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of William H. H. Welsh, late of Company F, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, at the rate of $18 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES M. FROST.

The bill (S. 2759) granting a pension to James M. Frost was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of James M. Frost, late a member of Company A, First Regiment of Tennessee Cavalry Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EZRA E. ANNIS.

The bill (S. 2746) granting a pension to Ezra E. Annis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Ezra E. Annis, dependent father of John B. Annis, late hospital steward Seventy-second Illinois Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRIET WELCH.

The bill (S. 2899) granting a pension to Harriet Welch was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pen-

sion-roll the name of Harriet Welch, widow of Cyraneous Welch, late a private in Company C, Thirty-eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WARREN OHAVER.

The bill (H. R. 2156) granting a pension to Warren Ohaver was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Warren Ohaver, late of Company A, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES W. POAG.

The bill (H. R. 9170) granting a pension to James W. Poag was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of James W. Poag, late private Company M, Seventeenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAMUEL M'CLURE.

The bill (H. R. 354) granting a pension to Samuel McClure was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Samuel McClure, late a private in Company B, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, at $8 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. THERESE GUELICH.

The bill (H. R. 152) granting a pension to Mrs. Therese Guelich was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Therese Guelich, a volunteer nurse in the late war, at $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE W. WILBURN.

The bill (S. 1750) granting a pension to George W. Wilburn was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of George W. Wilburn, late of Company K, Second District of Columbia Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATHARINE SIMMONDS.

The bill (S. 876) granting a pension to Catharine Simmonds was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Catharine Simmonds, widow of William E. Simmonds, late first sergeant of Battery L, First Regiment United States Artillery, enlisted under the name of William E. Scott.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DANIEL K. SMITH.

The bill (S. 2101) granting a pension to Daniel K. Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Daniel K. Smith, dependent father of J. B. Smith, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment New Hampshire Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADRIAN C. DODGE.

The bill (S. 885) to increase the pension of Adrian C. Dodge was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Adrian C. Dodge, late a private in Company I, Nineteenth Maine Volunteers, at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of the pension which he now receives.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY O'NEIL.

The bill (H. R. 3745) granting a pension to Mary O'Neil was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mary O'Neil, sister of Thomas C. O'Neil, late captain of Company E, Twenty-fifth Massachusetts Volunteers, and to pay to her legally constituted guardian $18 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LYDIA A. HICKS.

The bill (H. R. 8260) granting a pension to Lydia A. Hicks was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension-roll the name of Lydia A. Hicks, the widow of John Hicks, late a private in Company I, Sixty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MILTON JUDD.

The bill (H. R. 3712) increasing the pension of Milton Judd was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides that Milton Judd, a pensioner of the United States, a soldier in the late civil war, in Company B, Thirteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, shall be allowed a pension at the rate of $45 per month, in lieu of $36 per month, as now allowed.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SHADRACH BROWN.

The bill (S. 2733) granting an increase of pension to Shadrach Brown was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Shadrach Brown, late a private in Company F, Seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteers, at the rate of $50 per month, in lieu of the $37.50 per month heretofore allowed him.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM C. SHIMONECK.

The bill (S. 2947) granting increase of pension to William C. Shimoneck was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of William C. Shimoneck, late principal musician in the Third United States Infantry, at the rate of $24 per month, in lieu of that which he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BENJAMIN T. BAKER.

The bill (S. 2825) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin T. Baker was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Pensions reported an amendment, in line 6, after the word "late," to strike out "a seaman" and insert "a quartermaster on the United States steamer Spuyten Duyvil;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Benjamin T. Baker, late a quartermaster on the United States steamer Spuyten Duyvil in the United States Navy, and pay him at the rate of $72 per month, in lieu of that which he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOHN GLENNING.

The bill (H. R. 7688) granting a pension to John Glenning was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of John Glenning, late private Company B, Tenth Regiment Tennessee Volunteers, on the pension-roll.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM SCOTT.

The bill (H. R. 7115) granting a pension to William Scott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of William Scott, of Kokomo, Howard County, Indiana, a special surgeon at Hospital No. 14, Nashville, Tenn., and then surgeon of the Eighty-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, upon the pension-roll.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM COMPTON.

The bill (H. R. 6574) for the relief of William Compton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to pay William Compton, a soldier in the Regular Army in the Thirty-ninth Tennessee Infantry and other regiments, from 1814 to 1819, $25 a month, instead of $8 per month as at present allowed and paid him.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JESSIE M. BARTHAUER.

The bill (H. R. 8722) granting a pension to Jessie M. Barthauer was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-rolls the name of Jessie M. Barthauer, widow of William C. Barthauer, late private of Company A, One hundredth Regiment New York Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY L. POTTER.

The bill (H. R. 7857) to increase the pension of Henry L. Potter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension of Henry L. Potter, late colonel of the Seventy-first Regiment of New York State Volunteers, to $50 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LYDIA BURRIDGE.

The bill (H. R. 8400) for the relief of Lydia Burridge was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-

roll the name of Lydia Burridge, mother of Edwin Burridge, late of Company E, Third New York Light Artillery.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELLEN SEXTON.

The bill (H. R. 8174) granting a pension to Ellen Sexton, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Ellen Sexton, widow of Daniel Sexton, late a private in Company K, Tenth Regiment of Minnesota Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMILY M'CLURE.

The bill (H. R. 8884) granting a pension to Emily McClure was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Emily McClure, mother of Thomas J. McClure, late first lieutenant Company L, Seventh Regiment New York Artillery.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY MINOR HOXEY.

The bill (H. R. 600) increasing the pension of Mary Minor Hoxey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mary Minor Hoxey, widow of Bvt. Maj. Benjamin W. Hoxey, late of the United States Volunteers, at $30 per month, in lieu of the pension which she is now drawing as such widow.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ENOCH WEATHERS.

The bill (H. R. 6973) for the relief of Enoch Weathers was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Enoch Weathers, late captain of a company of Indiana militia during the Morgan raid.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABIGAIL SULLIVAN.

The bill (H. R. 6577) granting a pension to Abigail Sullivan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Abigail Sullivan, widow of the late William Sullivan, late of Company G, Twelfth Kentucky Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANN V. FERGUSON.

The bill (H. R. 7944) granting a pension to Ann V. Ferguson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of Ann V. Ferguson, of Indianapolis, Ind., a nurse in the United States Army during the late war of the rebellion at Hospital No. 1, Murfreesborough, Tenn., and other places, upon the pension-rolls, at the rate of $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JANE BROWN DUNN.

The bill (H. R. 8159) granting a pension to Jane Brown Dunn was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Jane Brown Dunn, daughter of William H. H. Dunn, late a private in Company A, Sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteers, and Company L, Fourth Indiana Cavalry, at $18 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RAPHAEL FOWLER.

The bill (H. R. 8217) granting a pension to Raphael Fowler was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes that the name of Raphael Fowler be placed upon the pension-roll of the United States as the dependent father of Raphael S. Fowler, late a private in the Fifty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEAH ROARK.

The bill (H. R. 6531) to pension Leah Roark was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Leah Roark, widow of Yancy Roark, late a member of T. J. Babcock's company of Missouri independent militia.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEVI B. SMITH.

The bill (S. 1719) granting a pension to Levi B. Smith was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Levi B. Smith, late sergeant of Company B, of the One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM M. DEAN.

The bill (S. 2862) granting a pension to William M. Dean was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of William M. Dean, late a member of Company G, Fifteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers, at $72 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH E. BOULTER.

The bill (S. 2898) granting a pension to Sarah E. Boulter was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Sarah E. Boulter, widow of Joseph B. Boulter, late a sergeant of Company D, Fifth New Hampshire Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELNATHAN MEADE.

The bill (S. 1427) granting an increase of pension to Elnathan Meade was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Elnathan Meade, late of Company C, Forty-fourth Regiment of New York Volunteers, at the rate of $45 a a month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CASPAR BLANKE.

The bill (S. 2833) granting a pension to Caspar Blanke, of Portland, Oregon, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Caspar Blanke, of Portland, Oregon, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry, at the rate of $50 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MITCHELL subsequently said: I wish to inquire if the bill (S. 2833) granting a pension to Caspar Blanke, of Portland, Oregon, was passed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The bill has been passed.

Mr. MITCHELL. I move to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. For what purpose; to recommit?

Mr. MITCHELL. For the purpose of offering an amendment. I was trying to watch it, but it slipped through before I noticed it. I wish to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to it, if the motion to reconsider prevails.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon moves to reconsider the vote by which the bill (S. 2833) granting a pension to Caspar Blanke, of Portland, Oregon, was passed, and also the vote by which it was ordered to a third reading. The Chair hears no objection, and the vote is reconsidered.

Mr. MITCHELL. I wish to say to the chairman of the committee that in introducing this bill for this person I made a mistake in providing that the pension should be $50 per month where it ought really to be $72. This person is to all intents totally blind. I know him personally. He was brought to my room last summer; he was led; and while he can distinguish light slightly with one eye, he is as far as practical purposes are concerned totally blind. I move to strike out "$50" and insert "$72."

Mr. COCKRELL. I did not understand what the motion of the Senator from Oregon was.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Oregon moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed, and also the vote by which it was ordered to a third reading——

Mr. COCKRELL. I understand that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. For the purpose of enabling him to move to increase the pension from $50 to $72 per month.

Mr. MITCHELL. On the ground, I will state to the Senator from Missouri, that this person is known to me personally, and he is totally blind. I made a mistake in introducing the bill at $50. The committee simply reported the bill back as introduced, giving him $50 when he ought to have $72.

Mr. DAVIS. I think it is perfectly proper to make the amendment. The mistake into which the Senator from Oregon fell was on account of consulting the previous statute, by which only $50 a month was allowed——

Mr. MITCHELL. That is it.

Mr. DAVIS. Overlooking the fact that by a later statute on the subject the pension for total blindness is $72 a month. The amendment is a perfectly proper one, I think.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In line 8, before the word "dollars," strike out "fifty" and insert "seventy-two;" so as to read: "at the rate of $72 per month."

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. BATE. What does the report say about the case?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Secretary will read the report.

The Secretary read the following report, submitted by Mr. TURPIE May 29, 1888:

The Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2833) granting a pension to Caspar Blanke, have examined the same, and report:

This claimant was a private in Company E, Fourteenth Regiment United States regular Infantry. He served a term of enlistment from 1876 to 1881, and again re-enlisted in 1881, serving until 1885, when he was discharged for disability under a surgeon's certificate. The disabilities were described as rheumatism, partial paralysis, and loss of sight, or double sight.

There is no doubt of the serious nature of these disabilities; that they were incurred by the claimant during the time of his service. They are called technically "locomotor ataxia" and ophthalmia. The patient at present and for a long time has been wholly blind in one eye, almost blind in the other—discerning light but not objects, and being unable to walk, except with assistance; wholly unable to perform manual labor, and most of the time requiring the attendance of a third person.

The claim has been rejected by the Pension Bureau upon the ground that these disabilities are the results of vice in the claimant, not incurred or incurrable in line of duty.

The medical referee of the Pension Office, after an examination of the papers (not the patient), says:

"I could not, therefore, say that syphilis could with safety be eliminated."

We think this rejection a mild one—a conclusion not very well or firmly assured. On the other side, it is shown that four physicians—Wells, Wheeler, Taylor, and Easton—of Portland, Oregon, where the claimant resides, testify upon a personal examination of the claimant that "he is not a syphilitic subject; that locomotor ataxia and blindness are the diseases to which he is subject, and that his disability therefrom is total."

These are shown to be persons of credit and character, specialists in eye diseases, eminent in their practice and profession, totally disinterested.

Your committee think the disabilities mentioned were incurred by the claimant in the line of duty by reason of his military service, and therefore recommend passage of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIEUT. JAMES G. W. HARDY.

The bill (H. R. 8281) for the relief of Lieut. James G. W. Hardy was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-rolls the name of James G. W. Hardy, late second lieutenant Company K, Eleventh Regiment of Indiana Cavalry Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS TODD.

The bill (S. 1002) granting a pension to Thomas Todd was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Thomas Todd, late a member of Company K, Third Regiment Ohio Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADAM DENNIS.

The bill (S. 2880) granting an increase of pension to Adam Dennis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension allowed Adam Dennis, late private Company G, Seventy-ninth Regiment of Pennsylvania Volunteers, to $45 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ELIZABETH B. SMITH.

The bill (S. 2910) to increase the pension now paid to Elizabeth B. Smith, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Thomas Kilby Smith, United States Volunteers, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension now paid to Elizabeth B. Smith, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Thomas Kilby Smith, late United States Volunteers, to $75 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LIEUT. JAMES R. DURHAM.

The bill (S. 2675) granting an increase of pension to Lieut. James R. Durham, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll, at the rate of $30 per month, the name of James R. Durham, late first lieutenant Company E, Twelfth Regiment West Virginia Infantry Volunteers, in lieu of that which he is now receiving.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY CALVERT TRUXTUN.

The bill (S. 2275) granting a pension to Mary Calvert Truxtun was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mary Calvert Truxtun, widow of the late Commodore William T. Truxtun, of the United States Navy, at $50 per month in lieu of her present pension.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDMUND RYAN.

The bill (H. R. 7097) granting a pension to Edmund Ryan was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Edmund Ryan, dependent father of Michael Ryan, late of Company K, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SARAH E. M'NAMARA.

The bill (S. 2593) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah McNamara was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Pensions reported an amendment, in line 6, after the name "Sarah," to insert the initial "E;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to place upon the pension-roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Mrs. Sarah E. McNamara, widow of the late John McNamara, D. D., late a chaplain of the Wisconsin Volunteers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting a pension to Sarah E. McNamara."

MARY ISABELLA R. CLEMENTS.

The bill (S. 2549) for the relief of Belle R. Clements was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 4, after the words "pension of," to strike out "Belle" and insert "Mary Isabella;" and in line 8, after the word "act," to insert "in lieu of the pension she is now receiving;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension of Mary Isabella R. Clements, widow of the late Bennett A. Clements, surgeon United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of $30 per month from and after the passage of this act in lieu of the pension she is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Mary Isabella R. Clements."

GEORGE W. PADGETT.

The bill (S. 2874) granting a pension to George W. Padgett was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of George W. Padgett, late a private in Company B, Fifteenth Regiment of Illinois Cavalry, on the pension-roll.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ABBIE R. BROWN.

The bill (H. R. 7642) granting a pension to Abbie R. Brown was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Abbie R. Brown, widow of John A. Brown, late a sergeant in the Fifth Battery Maine Light Artillery.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JACOB BEHR.

The bill (H. R. 4864) to place the name of Jacob Behr on the pension-roll was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Jacob Behr, late of Company B, Second United States Reserve Corps, Missouri.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MINNIE A. BAILEY.

The bill (S. 2344) granting a pension to Minnie A. Bailey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Minnie A. Bailey, daughter of Oscar M. Bailey, who was a private in Company F, Fifteenth Regiment of Connecticut Volunteers, at $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BETSEY A. MOWER.

The bill (S. 2838) granting an increase of pension to Betsey A. Mower was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Pensions reported an amendment, in line 7, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to increase the pension of Betsey A. Mower, widow of the late Joseph A. Mower, a major-general of the United States Volunteers in the late war for the Union, to the rate of $75 per month.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATHERINE TATE.

The bill (S. 2483) granting a pension to Catherine Tate was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Catherine Tate, widow of John Tate, late of Company C, First Vermont Heavy Artillery.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ABBA E. JACKSON.

The bill (H. R. 8629) granting a pension to Mrs. Abba E. Jackson was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Abba E. Jackson, late a nurse in the Army, at $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY O. HALL.

The bill (S. 889) granting a pension to Mary O. Hall was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of Mary O. Hall, widow of Augustus J. Hall, late of Company D, Twelfth Maine Volunteers, on the pension-roll.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTHA LINTON.

The bill (H. R. 7721) granting a pension to Martha Linton was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Martha Linton, widow of Benjamin Linton, late private in Company I, Eighteenth Regiment Connecticut Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HEMAN RANKINS.

The bill (H. R. 7974) granting a pension to Heman Rankins was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Heman Rankins, late a private in Company B, First Maine Coast Guards Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANK LEWIS.

The bill (H. R. 7574) granting a pension to Frank Lewis was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Frank Lewis, *non compos* son of Franklin Lewis, Company B, First Battalion Infantry Maine Volunteers, and to pay to his legal guardian a pension of $18 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISS CARRIE A. LUEY.

The bill (H. R. 6770) granting a pension to Miss Carrie A. Luey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Miss Carrie A. Luey, dependent sister of William B. Luey, late of Company H, Thirteenth New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, at $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATHARINE TIERNEY.

The bill (H. R. 5812) granting a pension to Catharine Tierney was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of Catharine Tierney, widow of Mark Tierney, late of Company I, First Regiment of United States Infantry, on the pension-roll.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. FLORA C. ANDREWS.

The bill (H. R. 8771) to place the name of Mrs. Flora C. Andrews on the pension-roll was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Flora C. Andrews, widow of Samuel D. Andrews, deceased, late a private in Company C, Forty-fourth Regiment of Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY T. BRIDGES.

The bill (H. R. 6545) to increase the pension of Henry T. Bridges was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to grant an increase of pension to Henry T. Bridges, late a soldier in the war with Mexico, and to pay him $30 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALBERT E. MAGOFFIN.

The bill (H. R. 8496) to increase the pension of Albert E. Magoffin was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension of Albert E. Magoffin, late a member of the Eighty-ninth Ohio Volunteer Infantry, so as to include injury to leg, as set forth in original application.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REBECCA E. SHOEMAKER.

The bill (H. R. 6990) to place the name of Rebecca E. Shoemaker on the pension-roll was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place the name of Rebecca E. Shoemaker, widow of David R. P. Shoemaker, deceased, late a private of Company E, Eleventh Ohio Volunteers, on the pension-roll.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HANNAH H. GRANT.

The bill (H. R. 7466) granting a pension to Hannah H. Grant was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension-roll the name of Hannah H. Grant, mother of John Jordan, late of Company D, Second Regiment United States Sharpshooters.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY M. SHATTUCK.

The bill (S. 3076) granting a pension to Mary M. Shattuck was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mary M. Shattuck, widow of Merritt Shattuck, late a private in Company H, Thirty-fifth Regiment Iowa Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TILLMAN FAUX.

The bill (H. R. 5378) for the relief of Tillman Faux was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Tillman Faux, late a private in Company E, Two hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEWIS FICHTHORN.

The bill (H. R. 2174) granting a pension to Lewis Fichthorn was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Lewis Fichthorn, late a private in Company K, One hundred and thirty-first Pennsylvania Infantry Volunteers, and in Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Pennsylvania Cavalry Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARRIE V. MILLER.

The bill (S. 3021) granting a pension to Carrie V. Miller was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Carrie V. Miller, a volunteer nurse in the late war, at $25 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. S. MAY.

The bill (S. 2945) granting a pension to J. S. May was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of J. S. May, private First Minnesota Infantry, at $25 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES M'DONALD.

The bill (S. 2938) granting a pension to James McDonald was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of James McDonald, assistant wagon-master, Quartermaster's Department, whose invalid-pension claim, numbered 163621, was rejected in the Pension Office on the ground that applicant was a civilian employé when he received the injury which caused the amputation of his leg, and to pay him a pension at the same rate as if he had been a regularly enlisted soldier.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. ELIZABETH STEWART.

The bill (S. 2995) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Stewart was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Elizabeth Stewart, mother of Charles Stewart, late a private in Company G, Twelfth Regiment Pennsylvania Reserves.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HIRAM M. GOSS.

The bill (H. R. 6840) for the relief of Hiram M. Goss was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Hiram M. Goss, late of Company A, Ninety-fourth Regiment New York Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

WILLIAM BURK.

The bill (H. R. 6245) for the relief of William Burk was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of William Burk, late lieutenant of Company D, Thirtieth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, at $17 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OREGON STATE CLAIM.

Mr. DOLPH. I move to discharge the Committee on Claims from the further consideration of the bill (S. 2440) for the relief of the State of Oregon, and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Has the bill been referred to the Committee on Claims?

Mr. DOLPH. It has been referred to the Committee on Claims.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Committee on Claims will be discharged, and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, if there be no objection. The Chair hears none.

HENRY C. RICHARDSON.

The bill (H. R. 3706) granting a pension to Henry C. Richardson, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Henry C. Richardson, late of Company K, Fifth Kentucky Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LAURA J. IVES.

The bill (S. 2979) granting a pension to Laura J. Ives was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Laura J. Ives, step-mother of George E. Ives, late second lieutenant of Company E, First Regiment of Iowa Cavalry Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARGARET S. HEINTZELMAN.

The bill (S. 2726) granting an increase of pension to Margaret S. Heintzelman was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the penson-roll the name of Margaret S. Heintzelman, widow of Maj. Gen. Samuel P. Heintzelman, deceased, at $100 per month, in lieu of $50 per month provided for in the act of Congress approved December 23, 1880.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PHEBE M'LAUGHLIN.

The bill (S. 2711) restoring Phebe McLaughlin to the pension-roll was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Pensions reported an amendment, in line 7, after the word "Volunteers," to strike out "to take effect from date of suspension of claimant from the roll;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to restore to the pension-roll the name of Phebe McLaughlin, widow of James McLaughlin, late soldier in Company D, Seventy-eighth Regiment of Ohio Volunteers.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID A. HALL.

The bill (S. 2861) granting a pension to David A. Hall was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of David A. Hall, late a member of Company C, Fifty-fifth Massachusetts Regiment.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JESSE DICKEY.

The bill (H. R. 9682) increasing the pension of Jesse Dickey was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to increase the pension of Jesse Dickey, late of Captain Johnson's company Illinois Mounted Volunteers, Black Hawk war, to $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PENELOPE MORTON.

The bill (H. R. 3690) granting a pension to Penelope Morton, widow of Lieutenant Morton, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Penelope Morton, widow of James Morton, late lieutenant Company F, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES H. DARLING.

The bill (H. R. 780) granting a pension to James H. Darling was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of James H. Darling, late of Company G, Seventy-third Regiment Ohio Infantry Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PLEMAN COOK.

The bill (H. R. 5177) granting a pension to Pleman Cook was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Pleman Cook, late of Company D, Sixth Ohio Cavalry Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES J. ESTY.

The bill (S. 2665) granting a pension to Charles J. Esty was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Charles J. Esty, late a private in Company H, Tenth New Hampshire Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDNA M. HILDRETH.

The bill (H. R. 4103) granting a pension to Edna M. Hildreth was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to put on the pension-roll, at $18 per month, the name of Edna M. Hildreth, of Jay, Vt., the helpless invalid daughter of William H. Hildreth, a private in Company D, Fourth Regiment Vermont Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THOMAS M'GUIRE.

The bill (H. R. 7829) granting a pension to Thomas McGuire was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Thomas McGuire, late of Company I, Ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. MERCY KNIGHT.

The bill (H. R. 2413) granting a pension to Mrs. Mercy Knight was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mrs. Mercy Knight, dependent step-mother of Lendall Wright, deceased, late a private in Company D, Fifteenth Regiment of Maine Infantry Volunteers at $12 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MOSES L. CHASE.

The bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Moses L. Chase was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-rolls the name of Moses L. Chase, a private in Company M, First Vermont Cavalry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEWIS DAVIS.

The bill (H. R. 5903) for the relief of Lewis Davis, a soldier of the war of 1812, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Pensions reported an amendment, in line 7, after the word "month," to insert "in lieu of the pension he is now receiving;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and required to place the name of Lewis Davis, of Laclede County, Missouri, a soldier of the war of 1812, on the pension-roll, at the rate of $20 per month, in lieu of the pension he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

FANNIE A. KIMBALL.

The bill (S. 2890) granting a pension to Fannie A. Kimball was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Fannie A. Kimball, the blind daughter of Charles A. Kimball, deceased, late sergeant Battery D, First Rhode Island Light Artillery, at $18 per month.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NETTIE ELLICOTT.

The bill (H. R. 8798) granting a pension to Nettie Ellicott was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the

pension-roll the name of Nettie Ellicott, widow of George G. Ellicott, late a private in the Seventeenth New York Independent Battery.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COLUMBUS BOSTEDER.

The bill (H. R. 432) granting a pension to Columbus Bosteder was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-rolls the name of Columbus Bosteder, late a private in Company B, First Regiment of Missouri Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARY F. HARKINS.

The bill (H. R. 3016) granting a pension to Mary F. Harkins was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of Mary F. Harkins, widow of John Harkins, late of Company E, First Regiment of Wisconsin Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID GIBBONS.

The bill (H. R. 5756) granting a pension to David Gibbons was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place on the pension-roll the name of David Gibbons, late a private in Company D, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteers.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES GLAMANN.

The bill (H. R. 2215) granting a pension to Charles Glamann was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It proposes to place upon the pension-roll the name of Charles Glamann, late of Company C, Ninety-second Illinois Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. COCKRELL. I believe that is all of the pension bills.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There is one that was passed over, Order of Business 1497, Senate bill 2724.

H. H. HELPER.

The bill (S. 2724) for the relief of H. H. Helper was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Committee on Pensions reported an amendment, before the word "dollars," in line 12, to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to place on the pension-roll the name of Hardie Hogan Helper, who was a private soldier in Company H, and sergeant-major of the Eighth Illinois Cavalry, also a private soldier of Company H, Second New York Cavalry, and who in the *interim* of that service was totally and permanently disabled whilst under military orders of General A. E. Burnside, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, and that he be granted a pension of $24 per month instead of $10 per month, his present rating.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Senate to proceed to the consideration of the bill (S. 2305) to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the Executive Departments. The bill was passed over without objection recently. It was reported by the select committee of which I was chairman, and of which the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM] were members. I think it is a very important measure, and there can be no objection to the provisions of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. MANDERSON. I desire to ask the Senator from Missouri whether within the scope of this bill it would be in the power of any of the Departments to destroy the original papers that pertain to the conduct of the war?

Mr. COCKRELL. Not at all. The bill does not give any power to the Departments until both the Senate and House have passed upon the matter. Under the existing law the Postmaster-General has authority to destroy all such papers as are described in the bill, which have no permanent value or historical interest. He is the sole judge of it, and every year he sells whatever papers he chooses of his Department. The Sixth Auditor has the same authority. The other Departments have no authority at all to dispose of waste papers, and they must accumulate there, valueless as they may be.

In order that there may be no criticism, the bill provides that whenever the Secretaries, not only the Secretary of the Treasury, but the Postmaster-General and all the heads of Departments, have an accumulation of papers which are deemed not valuable for reference or for historical purposes, they shall report that fact to Congress and give an inventory of the papers. Then the Senate is to appoint two Senators and the House of Representatives two members, and they examine the papers and the inventory, and if they say that the papers are no longer of any value for reference or for historical purposes, the Department is then authorized to dispose of them. So there can never be any disposition of any kind of a document by the Departments until first the character of the document has been passed upon by the Senate and the House through their committees. In the event that the administration is one way, the Senate or House the other way, no advantage can be taken. All branches of the Government will participate in the disposition of the documents.

Mr. MANDERSON. Is the committee, composed of two members of the Senate and two members of the other House, required to report to their respective bodies?

Mr. COCKRELL. Oh, yes; the bill authorizes them to report to their respective bodies that fact.

Mr. MANDERSON. The bill seems very well guarded.

Mr. COCKRELL. Yes, so that there is no possibility of evasion. I drew the bill after considering all the laws and all the possibilities of conflict between the Senate and the House and the Departments, so that I do not think anybody can object to it on any ground.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH.

Mr. PADDOCK. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1483.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 2662) for the erection of a public building at Salt Lake City, Utah, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds with amendments, which were, in line 14, after the word "of," to strike out the words "five hundred" and insert "one hundred and twenty-five," and in line 23, after the word "of," to strike out "five hundred" and insert "one hundred and twenty-five;" so as to make the bill read:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to purchase, acquire by condemnation, or otherwise provide a site, and cause to be erected thereon a substantial and commodious building, with fire-proof vaults, for the use and accommodation of the Legislature, the governor and secretary, United States courts, land offices, internal-revenue offices, post-office, United States marshal's office, surveyor-general's office, and for other Government uses at Salt Lake City, Utah Territory. The site and building thereon, when completed upon plans and specifications to be previously made and approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall not exceed in cost the sum of $125,000; nor shall any site be purchased until estimates for the erection of a building which will furnish sufficient accommodations for the transaction of the public business, and which shall not exceed in cost the balance of the sum herein limited after the site shall have been purchased and paid for, shall have been approved by the Secretary of the Treasury, and no purchase of site nor plan for said building shall be approved by the Secretary of the Treasury involving an expenditure exceeding the said sum of $125,000 for site and building; and the site purchased shall leave the building unexposed to danger from fire by an open space of at least 40 feet, including streets and alleys: *Provided*, That no part of said sum shall be expended until a valid title to the said site shall be vested in the United States.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAKOTA TERRITORIAL JUDGES.

Mr. DAVIS. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 1497, Order of Business 1353.

The motion was agreed to; and the bill (S. 1497) to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of Dakota, and for other purposes, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

The first amendment was, in section 11, line 6, to strike out the word "subdivision" and to insert "county;" so as to read:

SEC. 11. That the associate justice of the eighth district shall hold two terms of the United States district court in each year, in the city of Grand Forks, and grand and petit juries shall be summoned thereto as now provided by law, and said associate justice shall hold at least two terms of court in each county of his district in each year.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 12, line 3, after the word "proceeding," to strike out the words "upon which he has acted judicially" and to insert the words "decided by him;" so as to read:

SEC. 12. That no justice of the supreme court of said Territory shall sit as a member of said court in any matter, action, or proceeding decided by him in his district or wherein he has any interest directly or indirectly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was to insert the following as an additional section:

SEC. 14. That all offenses committed before the passage of this act shall be prosecuted, tried, and determined in the same manner and with the same effect (except as to the number of judges) as if this act had not been passed.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 8307) for the relief of John T. Higgins was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

MISSOURI RIVER BRIDGE AT OMAHA.

Mr. MANDERSON. I move that the Senate take up Order of Business 1308, House bill 6440, granting permission to build a bridge at Omaha.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6440) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River at or near the city of Omaha, Nebr.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment, to add as a new section:

SEC. 7. This act shall be null and void unless the construction of the bridge hereby authorized shall be commenced within one year and be completed within three years from the date of the approval of this act.

Mr. MANDERSON. I move to amend the amendment by inserting the words "two" and "four," in the third line of section 7, where the words "one" and "three" occur respectively; so as to read:

Shall be commenced within two years and be completed within four years from the date of the approval of this act.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

FREEDMAN'S SAVINGS AND TRUST COMPANY.

Mr. SHERMAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1450, Senate bill 1138.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1138) to reimburse the depositors of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company for losses incurred by the failure of said company.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Finance with amendments.

The first amendment was, in line 11, after the word "representatives," to insert "as hereinafter provided;" so as to read:

That the commissioner of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company, and his successors in office, be, and the same are hereby, authorized and directed to pay, or cause to be paid, under such regulations as said commissioner, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, shall prescribe, to all depositors of the Freedman's Savings and Trust Company whose accounts have been properly verified and balanced under existing laws, or to their legal representatives, as hereinafter provided, a sum of money equal to the verified balances due said depositors from said company at the time of its failure, less the amount of dividends which have been or may be declared from the assets of said company.

Mr. VANCE. I object to the consideration of the bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Objection being made, the bill goes over.

Mr. ALLISON. I move that the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Thursday, June 7, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 6, 1888.

FOR PROMOTION IN THE ARMY.

First Lieut. Francis Michler, regimental adjutant, to be captain, May 23, 1888, *vice* Price, deceased.

JUDGE-ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY.

Capt. William B. Remey, of the Marine Corps, to be Judge-Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of colonel in the Marine Corps, for the term of four years.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 6, 1888.

JUDGE-ADVOCATE GENERAL OF THE NAVY.

Capt. William B. Remey, of the Marine Corps, to be Judge-Advocate General of the Navy with the rank of colonel in the Marine Corps for the term of four years.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 31, 1888.

CONSUL.

Laws V. Moore, of Iowa, to be consul of the United States at Lyons.

POSTMASTER.

Joseph D. Lopez, to be postmaster at St. Augustine, St. Johns County, Florida.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, *June 6*, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The House was called to order by Mr. MCMILLIN as Speaker *pro tempore*, who directed the reading of the following communication:

SPEAKER'S ROOM, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 6, 1888.

SIR: Hon. BENTON MCMILLIN is designated to preside as Speaker *pro tempore* during the sitting of the House to-day.

JOHN G. CARLISLE, *Speaker.*

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK, Jr.,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

Prayer by Rev. Dr. PRICE, of Washington, D. C.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

JOHN B. REED VS. THE UNITED STATES.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report of the proceedings of a board of officers appointed to examine upon the claim of John B. Reed against the United States for use of projectiles, rifled ordnance, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

EMMA S. FREE.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the bill (S. 431) granting a pension to Emma S. Free, widow of Thomas S. Free, late a major of the United States Army, the House amendments to which were disagreed to by the Senate, with a request for a committee of conference.

On motion of Mr. MORRILL, by unanimous consent, the committee of conference was agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will announce the conferees on the part of the House during the day.

UNLAWFUL GRAZING ON INDIAN LANDS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 8393) to protect lands belonging to Indians from unlawful grazing, and for other purposes, with amendments of the Senate thereto.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, that is a bill reported by the Committee on the Judiciary, and I ask unanimous consent that it lie on the Speaker's table until I can have an opportunity to examine it.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

PUBLIC BUILDING, MONROE, LA.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 1483) for the erection of a public building at Monroe, La., with amendments of the Senate thereto.

Mr. NEWTON. Mr. Speaker, that bill as it passed the House appropriated $100,000. The Senate has amended the bill by reducing the amount to $75,000. There is also a Senate amendment authorizing the acquirement of a site by condemnation. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments of the Senate be concurred in.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments, after which the Chair will ask for objections.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 2, after the word "purchase," insert "acquire by condemnation."
Page 1, line 17, strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five."
Page 1, line 21, strike out the word "same" and insert the word "sum."
Page 2, line 3, strike out "one hundred" and insert "seventy-five."

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

Mr. BURROWS. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the only material amendment is a reduction of the amount from one hundred thousand to seventy-five thousand dollars.

Mr. NEWTON. Yes, sir.

There being no objection, the amendments of the Senate were concurred in.

DAVID MERIWETHER.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 331) for the relief of David Meriwether, with amendments of the Senate thereto.

Mr. CARUTH. I ask unanimous consent that the House non-concur in the Senate amendments and agree to a committee of conference.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair is informed by the Clerk that the Senate do not ask for a conference. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 3, strike out all after the word "appropriated" down to and including the word "also," in line 7.
Page 1, line 9, strike out all after the word "part" down to and including the word "all," in line 10.

Mr. CARUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House non-concur in the amendments of the Senate, and ask for a committee of conference.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let the bill be read.

The bill was read.

Mr. SPRINGER. What is the effect of the amendments?

Mr. CARUTH. It strikes out all but the $500.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CARUTH]?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

BRIDGE ACROSS TRAIL CREEK, MICHIGAN CITY, IND.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 2097) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Trail Creek, in the city of Michigan City, Ind.; which, with the amendments of the Senate, was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE MISSISSIPPI RIVER AT HICKMAN, KY.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 7340) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Hickman, Ky.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. This bill has been passed by the Senate with an amendment.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent that the House concur in the amendment of the Senate. It relates simply to the length of the span of the bridge.

Mr. BLANCHARD. I wish to ask whether this is a high bridge.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. It is a bridge 85 feet high.

Mr. BLANCHARD. Then I have no objection.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. As I have said, the amendment of the Senate relates simply to the length of the span.

Mr. CLARDY. What is the effect of the amendment proposed by the Senate?

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. The House bill provides that the length of the middle span shall be determined at the discretion of the Secretary of War. The Senate amendment provides that three engineers shall go there and fix the length of the span.

Mr. CLARDY. Does the bill contain the same provision that was in the Memphis bridge bill?

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLARDY. Then I have no objection.

The amendment of the Senate was concurred in.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House Senate bills of the following titles; which were respectively read a first and second time, and referred as indicated:

The bill (S. 385) for the erection of a public building in the city of Nashua, in the State of New Hampshire—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 785) to provide for an addition to the United States building at Jackson, Miss.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 1318) for the erection of a public building at Altoona, Pa.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 2277) to provide for the extension of the public building at Lynchburgh, Va.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 2319) for the erection of a public building at Waterbury, Conn.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 2788) for the erection of a public building at Virginia City, State of Nebraska—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 2789) for the erection of a public building at Reno, State of Nevada—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

The bill (S. 194) to increase the endowment of the Louisiana State University and Agricultural College—to the Committee on Education.

The bill (S. 375) to restrict the use and sale of opium in the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The bill (S. 506) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas Conroy, deceased—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 653) defining the positions and salaries of assistant astronomers at the United States Naval Observatory, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Expenditures in the Navy Department.

The bill (S. 750) for the relief of Pearson C. Montgomery, of Memphis, Tenn.—to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (S. 1100) to retire certain disabled officers of the Army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 1169) for the relief of Commander George M. Bache, United States Navy (retired)—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (S. 1190) for the relief of the estate of Joseph Fenno, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

LEGAL REPRESENTATIVES OF MARY H. PIKE, DECEASED.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the bill (S. 1191) for the relief of the legal representatives of Mary H. Pike; which was read a first and second time.

Mr. ROGERS. I ask unanimous consent that this bill be now taken up and passed. It is a little claim for only $35.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the legal representatives of Mary H. Pike, deceased, late of Little Rock, Ark., out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $35, for rent of a building in Little Rock, Ark., occupied by the military authorities of the United States, under contract, from October 1 to October 30, 1864, and for which vouchers were given her by said authorities.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill?

Mr. WILLIAMS. What is the amount involved?

Mr. ROGERS. Thirty-five dollars.

Mr. WILLIAMS. All right.

There being no objection, the House proceeded to the consideration of the bill; which was ordered to a third reading, was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. ROGERS moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

REFERENCE OF BILLS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House bills of the Senate; which were severally read a first and second time, and referred as follows, namely:

The bill (S. 1245) for the relief of Nancy E. Day, administratrix of the estate of James L. Day, deceased—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 1632) to refund moneys collected from William Schaus at the port of New York on an oil painting not subject to duty—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 1450) for the relief of Maj. Gen. W. W. Averell—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 1807) to refund to the State of West Virginia the money paid to officers of the One hundred and thirty-third Regiment West Virginia Militia for services rendered during the rebellion—to the Committee on War Claims.

The bill (S. 1914) for the relief of Mary E. Hopkins—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 2013) for the relief of Forman Mathews and David Stout Parker—to the Committee on Claims.

The bill (S. 2040) to establish a land office at Folsom, in the Territory of New Mexico—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

The bill (S. 2477) granting the right of way to the Mobile and Birmingham Railway Company, the successor to the Mobile and Alabama Grand Trunk Railroad Company, across the Mount Vernon arsenal reservation, in Mobile County, Alabama—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 2787) for the erection of an equestrian statue of ex-President Zachary Taylor—to the Committee on the Library.

The bill (S. 1162) for the relief of Susan E. Alger—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2269) restoring the name of Wilhemina Hosband to the pension-roll—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2439) granting a pension to Charlotte T. Alderman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2451) placing the name of Elizabeth Domm on the pension-rolls—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2459) granting a pension to Mary S. Maynard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2500) granting a pension to Gertrude K. Lyford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2595) to increase the pension of Seth F. Myers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2604) granting a pension to Mrs. Loanda Sherman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2646) granting a pension to Danville A. Ricker—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2657) granting an increase of pension to Emily J. Stannard—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2705) granting a pension to Ellen Smith—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2707) granting a pension to Samuel Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2710) granting a pension to the widow of John Schafer—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2716) granting a pension to Carl M. Schwantes—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2717) granting a pension to John K. Evans—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2720) granting a pension to John B. Ross—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2721) granting a pension to Jackson Chapman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2728) to grant a pension to Indiana J. Nichols—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2852) granting an increase of pension to Clara B. Davidson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2866) granting a pension to Abel G. Rankin—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2884) granting a pension to William S. Grow—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2885) granting a pension to Henry A. Hawley—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

The bill (S. 2886) granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Sellers—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

WITHDRAWAL OF APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair wishes to state that on yesterday conferees were appointed on the bill H. R. 2972, the Chair being under the impression that there had been a disagreement in reference to the Senate amendments. It appears upon an examination of the record that this appointment was premature, there not being the necessary action taken on the part of the House, and the appointment will be withdrawn. The Chair makes this statement in order that the proper correction of the Journal may be made.

ADDITIONAL ASSOCIATE JUSTICE, UTAH.

Mr. CAINE. I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on the Territories from the further consideration of the bill (S. 1507) providing an additional associate justice for the supreme court of the Territory of Utah, and for other purposes, and pass the same.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill will be read, subject to objection.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the supreme court of the Territory of Utah shall consist of a chief justice and three associate justices, any three of whom shall constitute a quorum; but no justice shall act as a member of the supreme court in any action or proceeding brought to such court by writ of error, bill of exceptions, or appeal from a decision, judgment, or decree rendered by him as a judge of a district court.

SEC. 2. That it shall be the duty of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to appoint one additional associate justice of said supreme court, who shall hold his office for the term of four years, and until his successor is appointed and qualified.

SEC. 3. That temporarily, and until otherwise ordered by law, the additional associate justice to be appointed under this act is hereby assigned to the third judicial district in said Territory of Utah, as an associate of the judge already assigned to said district, and each of said judges may hold separate hearings and trials, or sit and act together for the expedition of the business of said district, as they may deem expedient, and the times and places as now fixed by the statutes of said Territory for holding court therein shall remain until changed by law.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAINE. I offer the following amendment:

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out in the third section all after the word "act," in the third line, down to and including the word "Utah," in the fourth line; and insert: "Shall, from time to time, as the business of the courts may require, be assigned by the governor of said Territory of Utah to either of the judicial districts thereof."

Also strike out the word "said," before "district," in the fifth line, and also in the seventh line, and insert the word "such" in each place.

Mr. REED. How does this bill now differ from the Senate bill?

Mr. CAINE. In this, that the Senate bill assigns the judge to the third district, while this provides that the governor may assign the judge from time to time, as the business of the court may determine, to either district.

Mr. FORD. The Senate bill provides for one district, and this provides that the judge may be assigned to any district.

Mr. SPRINGER. A bill for this purpose has already been recommended by the Committee on the Territories at this session, and is now pending, providing for associate justices in several of the Territories, Dakota, Arizona, Wyoming, etc., and I hope that bill for the other Territories will receive consideration at an early date. I shall seek an opportunity to ask unanimous consent, if practicable during this week, to call it up for consideration.

Mr. WARNER. Why not ask unanimous consent now?

Mr. HOLMAN. I wish to say to my friend from Illinois that I think this bill to which he refers ought to be referred to the Department of Justice for a report. While I do not make objection to the present bill on account of not having been so referred, I shall insist upon that action before unanimous consent is hereafter granted for the passage of any of these bills.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Utah.

The amendment was adopted.

The Senate bill as amended was ordered to a third reading; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SPRINGER moved to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take up House bill 988 and put it upon its passage.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I call for the regular order.

ECKINGTON AND SOLDIERS' HOME RAILWAY.

Mr. HEMPHILL. As the regular order is demanded, I desire to submit a conference report.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6899) to incorporate the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Strike out the word "personal" before "taxes," in line 18, page 2; so as to read:

"And said company shall pay to the District of Columbia in lieu of taxes upon personal property, including cars and motive-power, each year 4 per cent. of its gross earnings," etc.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Amend section 8 so that it will read:

"That the main line of said railway shall be commenced within three months and completed within twelve months from the passage of this act, and the branches of the same shall be completed within two years from the time First and Fourth streets and New York avenue shall be, respectively, graded; and if the said work on the main line shall not be so commenced and completed, then the privileges and powers herein granted shall be void."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 15, 16, 17, and 18, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: After the words "sell the same" in the Senate amendment insert "after five days' notice;" so that it will read:

"SEC. 12. That all articles of value that may be inadvertently left in any of the cars or other vehicles of the said company shall be taken to its principal depot and entered in a book of record of unclaimed goods, which book shall be open to the inspection of the public, and if said property remain unclaimed for one year the company shall sell the same after five days' notice."

That the House recede from its disagreement of the Senate numbered 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 28, and agree to the same.

That the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 29 and 30, and the Senate recede from the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same.

JNO. J. HEMPHILL,
W. H. F. LEE,
M. S. BREWER,
Conferees on the part of the House.

ISHAM G. HARRIS,
C. B. FARWELL,
Conferees on the part of the Senate.

The following statement was submitted under the rule:

The managers on the part of the House of the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6899) to incorporate the Eckington and Soldiers' Home Railway Company of the District of Columbia, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and submitted in the accompanying report.

The first amendment gives the company the privilege of extending its line from one of its termini on Fourth street, northward along said street to the Bunker Hill road, within one year after Fourth street shall have been opened and graded, which will carry the road to the proposed Catholic University.

The second amendment requires the company to sell six tickets for 25 cents.

The third amendment strikes out the words "Eckington and Soldiers' Home" as surplusage so that the section reads "That said railway company, etc.," a mere improvement on the phraseology.

The fourth amendment provides that if the said company does not make the required report to Congress each year, giving a full and detailed statement of the business of the company during the preceding year, within ten days after the time specified, the commissioners shall cause to be instituted judicial proceedings to forfeit this charter.

The fifth and sixth amendments of the Senate are merged in one in the conference report, and the section is amended by the conference committee by striking out the word "personal," in line 18, page 2, and inserting after the word "taxes" in same line the words "upon personal property, including cars and motive power." The word "each" [year] is substituted for the words "the next ensuing" in same line; so as to read: "And said company shall pay to the District of Columbia in lieu of taxes upon personal property, including cars and motive power each year 4 per cent. of its gross earnings," etc.

The effect of these amendments leaves the bill substantially as it passed the House, the change in phraseology making the meaning clearer.

The seventh amendment strikes out the words "upon traffic for the preceding year, as shown by said verified statement," as being unnecessary after the above amendments.

The eighth amendment strikes out provision requiring the company to reduce its fare whenever the net receipts of the company shall for any year exceed 10 per cent. of the cost of the road, and provides that the real estate of the company shall be taxed as other real estate, except that its tracks shall not be treated as real estate.

The ninth and tenth amendments substitute for the word "order" the word "repair," a mere verbal amendment.

The eleventh amendment requires the company in the event of change of grade of the streets occupied by it to change the grade of its road at its own expense so as to conform to the established grade.

The twelfth amendment makes a mere verbal change by striking out the words "engineer commissioner" and inserting the words "commissioners of the District."

The thirteenth amendment merely perfects the sentence by inserting, after the words "boiler house," the words "or houses."

The fourteenth amendment, as amended by the conference committee, strikes out section 8 of the bill and inserts the section set out in the conference report. Its effect is to fix the time within which the branches of the said road shall be built within two years from the time First and Fourth streets and New York avenue shall be respectively graded. (See conference report for amendment agreed to.)

The fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth amendments, limiting the increase of the capital stock on the branches of the road, above provided for, were rendered proper and necessary by the fourteenth amendment, changing section 8 of the bill, giving such increase for new branches provided for as was thought necessary.

The eighteenth amendment merely improves the wording of the section, in reference to sale of articles left in the cars of the company.

The nineteenth amendment provides for the sale of articles of value left in the cars of the company, and which are not claimed within one year; the company is required to give five days' notice of such sale.

The twentieth amendment requires the corporators to keep their books of subscription to the capital stock of the company open not less than five days, instead of two days, as provided in the bill.

The twenty-first amendment requires notice of the time and place of the opening of the books of subscription to be given in at least two daily papers.

The twenty-second amendment provides that nothing but money or certified checks from any national bank shall be received in payment of the 10 per cent. required to be paid at the time of subscribing.

The twenty-third amendment is a mere verbal change of a pronoun to correct the phraseology.

The twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth, and twenty-sixth amendments change the section so as to give the fine for obstructing the passage of cars over the tracks to the public Treasury, and provide that the company may maintain a civil action in addition to the penalty imposed, provided suit is brought within sixty days from commission of the act.

The twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth amendments are merely verbal amendments striking out unnecessary words; using the word "said" in lieu of repeating the words "Eckington and Soldiers' Home."

The twenty-ninth amendment proposed to strike out the provision that no person should be ejected from the cars of the company for any cause than that of being drunk, disorderly, unclean, or contagiously diseased, or refusing to pay the legal fare, or failing to comply with the lawful regulations of the company. The amendment was not agreed to by the conference committee, and it was agreed that the Senate recede from the same, leaving the provision as it passed the House.

The thirtieth amendment was a verbal one suggested by the Senate, but was not agreed to by the conference committee, and in this particular the bill stands as it passed the House.

The thirty-first amendment strikes out section 20, the repeal clause, as being unnecessary.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee of conference.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, before that vote is taken I simply desire to say that the report of the conferees upon this bill, explanatory of their agreement, is what every such report ought to be. It is almost the first time for a great while that I have seen conferees perform their full duty in that particular. If every conference report were accompanied by such an explanation as this, we should find it easier to agree to them, and in the end the time of the House would be saved, although it would take a little longer to read them.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, after that compliment I call for the previous question upon the adoption of the report.

Mr. STEELE. I notice that there is no penalty provided in case the branch lines are not completed, while there is a penalty for the non-completion of the main line. Is that intentional?

Mr. HEMPHILL. That was provided for by the Senate. Unless the company go to work and build the main line within a year, they can not do anything at all. If they do build that line and fail to build the others, Congress can easily charter another company. Of course we reserve the right to repeal the charter. The reason we did not put in any penalty in regard to the branch lines is that those branches can not be built until the streets are graded, and that depends somewhat upon the action of the commissioners. I call for the previous question on the adoption of the report.

The previous question was ordered.

The report of the committee of conference was agreed to.

Mr. HEMPHILL moved to reconsider the vote by which the report was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

ROCK CREEK RAILWAY.

Mr. HEMPHILL. Mr. Speaker, I also desire to submit another conference report.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2017) to incorporate the Rock Creek Railway Company of the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10, and agree to the same.

That the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and that the Senate recede from the same.

JNO. T. HEARD,
J. H. ROWELL,
BARNES COMPTON,
Conferees on the part of the House.
ISHAM G. HARRIS,
C. B. FARWELL,
Conferees on the part of the Senate.

The statement of the House conferees, accompanying the conference report, was read, as follows:

The conferees on the part of the House of Representatives on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on H. R. 2017, to incorporate the Rock Creek Railway Company of the District of Columbia, submit the following explanation of their report:

The first amendment requires the road to be built in the middle of the street, instead of the west side.

The second amendment strikes out the provision that whenever the net receipts of the company from its business shall for any year exceed 8 per cent. of the cost of said road the fare shall be so reduced as to bring the net receipts down to the said per centum.

The third amendment strikes out the words "engineer commissioner," and inserts the word "commissioners."

The fourth amendment inserts the words, "the line of," to improve the phraseology.

The fifth amendment strikes out the provision prohibiting the company from charging or collecting fare from parties not accommodated with seats.

The sixth amendment strikes out the penalty for the violation of the above regulation.

The seventh amendment inserts, after the word "associates," the words "successors and assigns," giving them authority to open books of subscription to the capital stock of said company.

The eighth amendment inserts, after the word "first," the word "section," a clerical omission.

The ninth amendment inserts, after the word "maliciously," the words "and unnecessarily" in the clause providing a penalty for the malicious and unnecessary obstruction of the tracks of the said company.

The tenth amendment inserts the word "motive," omitted by mistake.

The eleventh amendment proposed was not agreed to, and the conference committee agreed to retain the provision that no person shall be ejected from the cars for any other cause than that of being drunk, disorderly, contagiously diseased, for the use of profane and obscene language, refusing to pay the fare, or failing to comply with the lawful regulations of the company.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I wish to ask the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia what motive governed the conferees in agreeing to strike from this bill the provision that the company, when their profits shall exceed 8 per cent., shall reduce their rate of fare.

Mr. HEMPHILL. The Senate struck that out for two reasons. In the first place, the fare as fixed in the bill, with a requirement that the company shall furnish six tickets for 25 cents, is the same that governs all the railroad companies in this District; and under the law requiring interchange of tickets among the several railroad companies it would be difficult to arrange so that a company selling tickets at a less rate could exchange with those charging more.

In addition to that, one of the Senators on the District Committee of the Senate [Mr. SPOONER] is preparing a general tax bill by which it is proposed that all railroads making more than a specified rate of profit on their business shall be compelled to pay the excess into the public Treasury. The Senate thought it better that this excess should go into the public Treasury for the benefit of the whole community, rather than that the benefit should be confined to the people who may ride on the railroad. It would be unfair to make this railroad company sell tickets at a lower price than that charged by other railroad companies, while it would be perfectly fair to make all these companies pay the amount of their profits over a reasonable sum into the Treasury for the benefit of the whole community.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman state briefly why the conferees struck out the provision of the bill which prohibited the company from charging fare after the seats were full. That is a system of restraint upon railroad companies which has been tried in some of the large cities and seems to work reasonably well.

Mr. HEMPHILL. The suggestion was made by some of the Senators (and it struck the members on the part of the House with considerable force) that it may be very doubtful whether such a provision would not do more harm than good, so far as concerns the convenience of the public. For instance, when a man is waiting at a street corner in rainy or snowy or very hot weather, or when he is in a hurry, he may prefer to take the first car that comes, although it is crowded, rather than wait for another car, because by standing in the crowded car a few minutes he may be able to get a seat for the remainder of his ride after the car has gone only a few blocks, as people are constantly getting out. As a gentleman suggests to me, a man, in order to catch a train or meet some important engagement, would much prefer to stand in a crowded car rather than wait.

The report of the committee of conference was agreed to.

Mr. HEMPHILL moved to reconsider the vote by which the report of the committee of conference was agreed to; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PEEL. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs to report back with the amendments of the Senate the bill (H. R. 8565) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes; and to ask that the House non-concur in the amendments of the Senate and ask a conference.

Mr. BUCHANAN. It seems to me that these amendments are important enough to be considered in committee.

Mr. PEEL. I hope the gentleman will not object to this proposition.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. As the Chair understands, objection is made.

Mr. PERKINS. Perhaps the gentleman from New Jersey does not understand that the Senate amendments have already been considered by the Committee on Indian Affairs; and the gentleman from Arkansas now reports them back.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The objection, then, would carry the bill to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I understand the status of the case.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill, with the amendments, will be referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I call for the regular order.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to make a statement.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the gentleman will proceed.

There was no objection.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, in 1864 four men who resided in the district in which I live enlisted in the Federal Army. They served about six months, and were not mustered into service until the

end of that time. Before they were mustered, however, the company to which they belonged was consolidated with another regiment. From the time of the consolidation these men served as private soldiers until the close of the war. They had served as officers of that company up to that time. They were not mustered as officers at the time of the consolidation, from the fact that they were absent on detached service. Now, these men from that time to this have never been paid for their service during those six months. I ask unanimous consent that the House will now pass a bill which will pay those men for that service. A bill providing for this has been favorably reported by the Committee on War Claims. Two of these men I know to be in suffering circumstances.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill indicated by the gentleman can only be taken up by unanimous consent. The call for the regular order, unless it is withdrawn, cuts off that.

Mr. STONE, of Kentucky. I ask the gentleman from Texas to withdraw the call for this purpose.

Mr. MILLS. I am afraid if I do it in this case, I shall have to do it for gentlemen all around. But I withdraw the call for the present.

Mr. BYNUM. I object, and call for the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is called for.

Mr. MILLS. I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the morning hour for the call of committees.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. MILLS. I now ask unanimous consent that gentlemen having reports to make may file them with the Clerk for reference to the appropriate Calendars.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection, that order will be made.

There was no objection.

FILING OF REPORTS.

The following reports were filed by being handed in at the Clerk's desk:

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH MILITARY RESERVATION.

Mr. LAIRD, from the Committee on Military Affairs, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 8639) granting the Leavenworth Rapid Transit Railway Company the right to construct and operate its railroad through a portion of the military reservation at Fort Leavenworth, Kans.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

IRWIN M'ADAMS.

Mr. WILKINSON, from the Committee on War Claims, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 9989) for the relief of Irwin McAdams; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER, MUSCATINE, IOWA.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1883) to authorize the construction of a railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Muscatine, Iowa; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS MISSISSIPPI RIVER, CLINTON, IOWA.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa, also, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1882) to authorize the construction of a railroad, wagon, and foot-passenger bridge across the Mississippi River at or near Clinton, Iowa; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. MATILDA WILKINS EMORY.

Mr. LYNCH, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2547) to increase the pension of Mrs. Matilda Wilkins Emory; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

KATE A. DALZELL.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably with amendment the bill (S. 1338) granting an increase of pension to Kate A. Dalzell; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY VON KUSSEROW.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 655) granting an increase of pension to Mary Von Kusserow; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PHILLIPE RAY.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1614) granting a pension to Phillipe Ray; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. VIRGINIA GRIER.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 123) granting a pension to Mrs. Virginia Grier; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MANHATTAN PICKETT.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2301) to increase the pension of Manhattan Pickett; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

TOBIAS BANEY.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 121) granting a pension to Tobias Baney; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN F. BALLIER.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (S. 1613) granting an increase of pension to John F. Ballier; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MRS. SARAH R. BLEECKER.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6339) for increase of pension to Mrs. Sarah R. Bleecker; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

SARAH E. ROBERTS.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5253) to restore the name of Sarah E. Roberts to the pension-roll; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ELNATHAN MEADE.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4069) granting an increase of pension to Elnathan Meade; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES MILLER.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 528) granting a pension to James Miller; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

FLORIAN LISCHEWSKY.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5918) restoring to the pension-roll the name of Florian Lischewsky; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARY KARSTETTER.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 7877) to place Mary Karstetter on the pension-roll; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MINOR CHILDREN OF GEORGE R. M'GUIRE.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 4038) granting a pension to Victor, Gertrude, Margaret, and Helen, minor children of Lieut. George R. McGuire; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JOHN A. GRIFFEY.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 6783) to place the name of John A. Griffey on the pension-roll; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

JAMES MONOHAN.

Mr. LYNCH also, from Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported back favorably the bill (H. R. 5919) restoring to the pension-roll the name of James Monohan, minor child of Richard Monohan, deceased; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calander, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

MARGARET STEWART.

Mr. LYNCH also, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, reported

back favorably with amendments the bill (H. R. 4716) granting a pension to Margaret Stewart; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calander, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

EMMA BIDDLE.

On motion of Mr. LYNCH, the Committee on Invalid Pensions was discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 4074) granting an increase of pension to Emma Biddle, and it was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

C. A. WILLIAMS AND OTHERS.

Mr. McCULLOGH, from the Committee on Claims, reported back favorably the bill (S. 2411) for the relief of C. A. Williams and others; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

TARIFF.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of bills raising revenue.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union (Mr. SPRINGER in the chair) and resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

The pending paragraph was read as follows:

Pickets and palings.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I move to amend by striking out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, on yesterday during my temporary absence from the House my colleague [Mr. OUTHWAITE] paid some attention to some figures which I had submitted upon a former day in the course of this discussion, and he made the statement that he desired to be entirely fair in the consideration of those figures. In the line of that statement, and believing the gentleman meant what he said, I wish to take the inflation out of some of the figures which, as I had stated, I had used only for the sake of argument, in order that we may arrive at something near a proper and correct conclusion.

The gentleman selected that statement of mine in which I said that we would call the amount of lumber used on the farm 60,000 feet. He is aware, as I am, that the statement is too high, and he will agree with me that the average amount of lumber used is not more than 30,000 feet for an average farm in the average period of thirty years, that being the basis of calculation; that not more than one-half of the lumber used in this country is used on the farms, the balance being used in cities and villages. It will reduce the amount of the tax paid on account of lumber used on the farm which the farmer pays, as we are told, to not more than $1 a year. But what does he get for that? There are employed 147,000 laborers. It is fair to presume those laborers have three persons in each family besides the laborer. Therefore laborers' families, including three persons besides the laborer, would give us 441,000. To this we must add the laborers, 147,000. The estimated number of manufacturers is 50,000. Their families will average three persons each, or 150,000, to be added to the 50,000 manufacturers. The total number of persons to be supplied and supported, then, is 788,000. The estimated cost of food for each of these persons at 25 cents per day would be $197,000. This estimate I believe to be entirely too low. Per month of 30 days it would amount to $5,910,000, or for a year of 360 days to $70,920,000.

Now, these 788,000 persons who are engaged in the lumber business must draw their subsistence from some source, and from what source do they draw it? They raise no cereals themselves. They are dependent upon the farmers for the means of their subsistence. They provide this home market to our own farmers to the extent of $5,910,000 a month of 30 days, or $70,920,000 a year of 360 days. That being true the farmer pays one dollar a year for the advantage of this home market, even supposing the free-trade view that the consumer always pays the tax—a proposition I utterly deny and repudiate.

The amount of lumber used, as stated in my former remarks, was estimated too light, and was not seriously stated as a fact, but simply to illustrate an argument. More than one-half of the lumber is used in villages and towns, as I have already stated. This cuts the statement down to $8,000,000 paid by the farmers, supposing my colleague's argument to be correct, and the estimate being twice too high cuts it down another half, or to $4,000,000, or to $1 each per year. It will thus be seen that each farmer, therefore, gets a home market of $17.50 worth of produce per year by the payment of $1, and no more. Whoever else may have reason to complain, this calculation will demonstrate to every reasonable person that certainly the farmer has no good ground to complain, but on the contrary has reason to rejoice in the establishment of such a system as will bring him such a reliable and remunerative home market for the sale of his agricultural products.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is one other question which ought to be considered and acted upon by this Congress. That question seems so far to have been lost sight of in this discussion of economic principles and tariff details. It is a question which ought to be carefully weighed, and, for the honor of American history and American patriotism, justly decided. I should not speak of it in this discussion were it not for the fact that the application of the rules of this body and the exercise of the power given under them bid fair to prevent a majority of the House from having any opportunity whatever to otherwise discuss or act upon it.

And that majority is forced, too, into that attitude of inaction notwithstanding the fact that both dominant parties for more than twenty years now have declared in their national platforms in favor of an opposite policy.

I call attention to some of those declarations in order that I may "stir up" your pure minds "by way of remembrance."

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN PLATFORMS.

1864.—That the thanks of the American people are due to the soldiers and sailors of the Army and Navy, who have periled their lives in defense of the country and in vindication of the honor of its flag; that the nation owes to them some permanent recognition of their patriotism and their valor, and ample and permanent provision for those of their survivors who have received disabling and honorable wounds in the service of the country; and that the memories of those who have fallen in its defense shall be held in grateful and everlasting remembrance.

1868.—Of all who were faithful in the trials of the late war there were none entitled to more especial honor than the brave soldiers and seamen who endured the hardships of campaign and cruise and imperiled their lives in the service of their country; the bounties and pensions provided by the laws for these brave defenders of the nation are obligations never to be forgotten; and the widows and orphans of the gallant dead are the wards of the people—a sacred legacy bequeathed to the nation's care.

1872.—We hold in undying honor the soldiers and sailors whose valor saved the Union. Their pensions are a sacred debt of the nation, and the widows and orphans of those who died for their country are entitled to the care of a generous and grateful people. We favor such additional legislation as will extend the bounty of the Government to all our soldiers and sailors who were honorably discharged, and who in the line of duty became disabled, without regard to the length of service or the cause of such discharge.

1876.—The pledges which the nation has given to her soldiers and sailors must be fulfilled, and a grateful people will always hold those who imperiled their lives for the country's preservation in the kindest remembrance.

1880.—That the obligations of the Republic to the men who preserved its integrity in the day of battle are undiminished by the lapse of fifteen years since their final victory. To do them honor is and shall forever be the grateful privilege and sacred duty of the American people.

NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PLATFORMS.

1864.—* * * That the sympathy of the Democratic party is heartily and earnestly extended to the soldiery of our Army and sailors of our Navy, who are and have been in the field and on the sea under the flag of our country, and in the event of its attaining power they will receive all the care, protection, and regard that the brave soldiers and sailors of the Republic so nobly earned.

1868.—* * * That our soldiers and sailors who carried the flag of our country to victory against a most gallant and determined foe must ever be gratefully remembered, and all the guaranties given in their favor must be faithfully carried into execution.

1872.—* * * We remember with gratitude the heroism and sacrifices of the soldiers and sailors of the Republic, and no act of ours shall ever detract from their justly-earned fame for the full reward of their patriotism.

1876.—* * * The soldiers and sailors of the Republic, and the widows and orphans of those who have fallen in battle, have a just claim upon the care, protection, and gratitude of their fellow-citizens.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I shall ask consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Now, the gentleman shows by his estimates and the figures submitted that a man working in the lumber district to which he refers pays the agriculturist $456 each year. How does he do it out of the $194 that he is able to earn in the lumber business? I ask the gentleman to explain that.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. The calculation made by the gentleman is as wild and extravagant as the profits he assigns in his former remarks to the manufacturers.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. But I am taking your own figures. You gave one set of figures here which proves conclusively that the lumberman gets $194 for his earnings in a year. You show by another set of figures to-day that he pays $456 each year to the farmer. How does he do it?

Mr. BOOTHMAN. If you will allow me time I will give the gentleman a satisfactory explanation. A large portion of this home market comes from the manufacturers, and not from the laborers alone.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague be permitted to proceed without interruption for five minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. BOOTHMAN. I thank my colleague for his kindness.

These, Mr. Chairman, are some of the pledges of the people of this Republic to the men who passed through the fiery furnace of untold suffering in order to preserve the nation's existence.

The consideration of any proposition to reduce taxation that might prevent the fulfillment of these pledges without first considering the righteous demands of the Union soldiers is to that extent a repudiation of an obligation so sacred that it can only result in lasting dishonor to the whole American people.

It is proposed by this bill to reduce our yearly revenues to the extent of $78,000,000, and yet no one appears to be asking the question, how will this affect needed and just pension legislation?

Can this be done and still leave us sufficient revenue to pay off the $230,000,000 or more of bonds falling due in 1891, and the interest on the rest of our bonded debt, and the current expenses of the Government, and at the same time enable us to keep with honor these pledges of the nation to these soldiers?

Gentlemen say, do we not now pay them $80,000,000 per year, and

is not that enough? I say no, it is not enough. For, in the first place, the Union soldiers themselves only get about $60,000,000 of it. The balance goes to dependent relatives, soldiers of other wars, Department expenses, etc. But of this I am not complaining. Concede that, in some sense, the whole amount is paid largely for the soldiers of the war of 1861–'65, and then let us ask what are some of the reasonable demands they may yet make which the nation should pay?

I answer, they are these:

1. A service pension.

2. A pension to their minor children, in case of their decease.

3. A pension to the physically or mentally afflicted children as long as such disability continues.

4. A pension to their widows during widowhood.

5. In cases where there are dependent parents, but no widow or minor children, a pension to such parents.

6. That these various pensions shall be large enough to preserve the respective classes from want in old age and affliction.

I believe in the principle of what is known as the "per diem rated service-pension," so modified in cases of "total incapacity" and half "total incapacity" as that when the pension so calculated would in those cases be less than $12 and $6 per month respectively, it shall be increased to those amounts. I think also that the amounts paid in the cases of minor children should be at least $5 per month, and that sum should be continued to imbecile or otherwise helpless children as long as the disability continues.

These are features, Mr. Chairman, which I know the Union soldiers feel ought to be incorporated into our pension system, and they feel that it ought to be done now.

I therefore ask attention to a statement of the reasons upon which and because of which such relief should be granted, and to a discussion of the objections which are or may be urged against granting it.

The nation never can, in money, fully discharge the debt it owes to these men for a preserved and perpetuated existence. But I recognize the principle that their just and reasonable demands upon the bounty of the people must be measured by the ability of the people to pay. I shall therefore try to demonstrate in this argument that this claim of theirs is based upon a correct principle; that it is within the ability of the nation; that the bill S. 181, now standing upon the Calendar of this House, favorably reported by the Committee on Invalid Pensions of the House, ought not, as proposed by that committee to be amended, to be enacted into law, because it is impolitic and unjust. And if we are ever permitted to consider or discuss that measure I shall propose and hope to have incorporated into it the following amendments in place of those proposed by the House committee:

AMENDMENTS.

1. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to place on the pension-roll of the United States the name of all persons specified in this section, upon satisfactory proof that they respectively performed the service referred to below, namely: All officers and enlisted men who served in the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps of the United States, including regulars, volunteers, and all other enlisted men in any war. The rate of pension to be paid shall be the aggregate sum per month of 1 cent for each day of service so rendered. The date of muster-in and of final discharge from the service shall determine the period of service, but no discharge given by reason of re-enlistment as a veteran volunteer, or on account of promotion shall be taken into account, and no pension under this section shall be given to any person who deserted after April 1, 1861, and prior to May 1, 1865, until such charge shall be removed by lawful authority. The pension herein provided shall be paid to the persons entitled for the remainder of their natural lives respectively, and is a service pension, and to be paid in addition to all other pensions heretofore or which may be hereafter granted for disability proven to have originated in the said service: *Provided*, That in all cases where any person entitled to pension by the terms of this section is so disabled by physical or mental disease, or injury, not the result of his own vicious acts, as to be entitled to be rated as "totally incapacitated," according to the meaning of that term as now used and understood by the Pension Department, which disability such person may be unable to prove originated in the said service, then in such case such person shall be entitled to receive a pension as long as such degree of disability continues at the rate of $12 per month; and in cases where the disability is equal in degree to one-half "total incapacity," as above defined, of not less than $6 per month; and upon the disappearance of such degree, or degrees, of disability such pension shall then be rated as first hereinbefore stated, provided that in cases where the pension computed as first hereinbefore stated would amount to more than $12 per month, or $6 per month as the case may be, the $12 rate or $6 rate shall not apply.

2. That if any pensioner has died, or shall hereafter die, leaving a widow, minor child or children under eighteen years of age, or in case there be no widow or minor child or children, a dependent mother or father, such widow, minor child or children, or mother or father shall be placed upon the pension-roll at the rates established by law for widows, minor children, and dependent parents without regard to the cause of death of such pensioner: *Provided*, That in the case of a widow, where the service has been rendered prior to the passage of this act, she must have been married to the deceased soldier, sailor, or marine prior to the passage of this act. But in cases of service rendered after the passage hereof the marriage, to entitle the widow to the pension herein provided, must have been solemnized prior to the expiration of the five years next following the close of such service: *And provided further*, That no pension granted by this section shall date from a period prior to the passage hereof, but in cases of the death of the soldier thereafter such pension shall date from the day of such death, and in all other cases from the date of the passage of this act; and such minor child or children shall hereafter be paid a pension of $5 per month instead of $2 per month, as heretofore paid, and in cases of physical or mental helplessness of such minor or minors which amounts to "total incapacity" as in this act defined, such pension to a minor child or children so incapacitated shall continue during the existence of such disability; and a widow's pension shall be paid only so long as she remains the widow of the soldier, sailor, or marine on account of the death of whom such pension is originally granted.

Now, in this discussion, I assume to speak from the standpoint of the rank and file—for the lowly home and poverty-stricken abode of the private soldier—because it is a fact, as undeniable as it is deplorable, that a large number of the private soldiers who served the nation faithfully in the hour of its direst necessity are men in moderate, if not in necessitous, circumstances. And there are substantial and sufficient reasons for this, as I will endeavor to show presently.

WHY GOVERNMENTS ARE INSTITUTED AMONG MEN.

It is an elemental as well as fundamental proposition that a government owes, by reason of its very existence, certain duties to its people; certain general obligations which it will gladly discharge in order that it may be called a good government. These obligations are twofold:

1. The duty of the government to secure for its people, as far as it is able, better social and moral conditions.

2. As a means to reach this end, its duty to secure for them the best possible material condition.

Acting within the scope of the limitations of its power, that government fails of its duty which does not, at all times, keep these ends in view.

It is to the second of these general obligations that the subject under discussion is to be referred—the bettering of the material condition of a most deserving class of our people.

Do you claim that this is class legislation? If so, I concede at once that it is the duty of the nation, as far as it can, to give all classes of its citizens an equal chance in the race of life. But I hold that where the nation has for its own purposes deprived any class of our people or that equal chance it then becomes its duty, just as soon as it is able, to reinstate that class in the position it would have occupied but for such deprivation. That gives the equal chance. The citizen is called upon to make sacrifices to preserve his government. Is not the obligation reciprocal? Should not the government, saved by the sacrifices of certain of her citizens, in all honor, make sacrifices to preserve those citizens from hardship and want in their hour of need?

Recognizing the justice of this proposition, every civilized nation on the face of the earth has a service-pension policy of some kind, differing in details it may be, but agreeing in the main upon the principle of paying an amount reasonably sufficient to preserve from want those who have served in their armies. And if this nation shall not pay to the Union soldiers of our great war a service pension it will be the first considerable body of men ever serving in its armies during a war which it will have failed to so reward.

HOW THE SOLDIERS OF 1861 REGARD THIS QUESTION.

The war closed twenty-three years ago. The average age of the Union soldiers is calculated, by those best able to determine the question, to be fifty-two years. The number now alive closely approximates 900,000 persons. There rests undeniably in the minds of these men the conviction that our Government should grant them a service pension. Let us ask why this is so. The answer will develop this state of facts:

1. That a service pension has been at some time granted by the Republic to her soldiers of all prior wars.

2. That the soldiers of prior wars also received bounty lands, while the Union soldiers did not.

3. That the Union soldiers were paid in a currency on an average worth less than 39 per cent. of its face value.

4. That those who volunteered last received by far the larger compensation, so that the men who really bore the heat and burden of the day received the least for it.

5. That those who loaned money to the Government, by legislation adopted since the contract of loaning was made, but of course declaratory of that contract, have been or will be paid in coin, or its equivalent, while these men who loaned their lives to save the nation have met with no such generous and honorable treatment.

6. That when they returned from the Army, in very many cases, instead of finding themselves better off they found themselves in debt for the support of their families; lands gone up to a price far beyond their reach; employment gone; business scattered to the four ends of the earth, and they were practically compelled to begin life over again.

7. Many of them who served long and faithfully and in spite of diseased conditions which would have sent less resolute men to their beds in the hospitals, refused to go there time and again, and now they have no "hospital record," and for their very faithfulness can not, though justly entitled, obtain a disability pension.

That this last statement is true, I need only cite the fact of the large number of disability claims which are now daily rejected by the Pension Bureau, although present disability is proven, because origin of the disability in the service can not be proven. The soldier now finds that, although comrades are dead and memories are defective, and forgetfulness of the value of his work in the day of our great trouble is engulfing him and his labors with its Lethean waters, yet there is one thing which fails not to assert its power—the seeds of disease sown in his system by the swamps and malaria-breeding regions of the South, when he served in the armies of the Union, now in his age assert their power and remind him continually that if his Government does not remember him, they do.

8. Another and weighty reason they urge for granting this relief, is, that the Union soldiers are now very generally broken down in health.

The truth of this statement is apparent even to a casual observer who will take the trouble to examine the matter. And the reasons why it is so require but little consideration in order to convince the most skeptical. The men were, as a rule, taken from their Northern homes at any and all seasons of the year, and being hurried from a temperate zone to a semi-torrid climate were plunged at once, from regular habits of living and employment, into the hard life of a soldier engaged in carrying on an aggressive campaign. Coming from the comfort of their homes, the men were, before they could be acclimated, compelled to undertake the hardships of the camp, the bivouac, the march, the skirmish line, and the battle-field, while hard fare, irregularly supplied, scanty medical attendance, insufficient shelter, exposure to winter's cold and summer's heat in a strange climate, marchings by day and watchings by night, overshadowed always and ever by the nervous apprehension of a violent death, all contributed to tear down and destroy their constitutional vigor, and to plant within their systems the seeds of disease that should in after years rob life of its pleasure. No wonder that at fifty-two years of age they find themselves physically bankrupt when they should be in the full enjoyment of health and strength.

These reasons the Union soldiers consider substantial and sufficient to warrant them in asking this relief, this partial reinstatement in the position in life in which but for their service they would now be placed. And I submit that no man can dispassionately consider their request in the light of our history without subscribing to the opinion.

And, sir, I submit another observation; it is this, that the men who were intelligent enough to comprehend the questions involved in that great war, and brave and resolute enough to fight it through to the end, are not now unpatriotic nor willing to make or persist in making an unjust and unconscionable demand upon the nation they suffered to save. That if this demand is wrong and unjust, there ought to be and will be no serious difficulty in convincing these men that it is so.

If, however, as they believe, it is based upon a right principle; if it is intrenched by precedent, and rests within the ability of the nation, then, sir, it will require something more than the demands of a penurious economy to convince them that they ought not to make the demand. Now, the summary statement of the reasons they urge why this legislation should be had is that by their service in the armies of this Union they lost time, health, opportunity, education, and wealth. They were left behind in the race of life. And they feel that the nation ought now, in the fulfillment of its pledges then made, and since quadrennially repeated by all parties, and out of its present abundant prosperity, secured by their efforts, preserve them from want in their age and necessity.

OTHER REASONS WHY A SERVICE PENSION SHOULD BE GRANTED.

Suppose one desired to find reasons why this demand should be granted, instead of searching for an argument to overthrow it. He would find but little trouble in seeing that these results would be reached, namely:

1. The pay of the soldiers would be equalized. That he who has served longest and got least heretofore would now get most.

2. That the deserving man and faithful soldier would, in a measure, be placed upon an equality with those who remained at home and became well to do or wealthy by reason of the high prices the war created.

3. That a demand of the soldiers, by them believed to be just and established by precedent, would be satisfied.

4. That it would preserve the nation against any reasonable charge of ingratitude or bad faith towards its preservers.

5. That, being inherently right, it would commend itself to the people of the nation.

6. That it would be a law presuming in favor of the claim of the faithful soldier instead of against him.

7. That it would largely reduce the cost of the present cumbrous pension machinery and greatly relieve from special-act legislation.

8. That in the cases of great disability and poverty it would preserve the nation from the humiliating and disgraceful charge that by its neglect it permits the men who gave up everything to preserve its existence to die in its poor-houses.

THE NATION IS ABLE TO GRANT THIS RELIEF.

Upon the question as to our ability to grant this relief I call the attention of the House to the following computation of its probable cost.

A very accurate statistician and distinguished public man, Mr. Blaine, states that the whole number of enlisted men upon the side of the North in that war was 2,063,000; the number killed in battle or who died during the war was 285,545. There were then living at the close of the war of these enlisted men 1,777,455. Of this latter number the best estimate we can obtain from the pension officials is that 50 per cent. have died since the close of the war, so there are now surviving in all 888,728.

And this estimate of the number of survivors is corroborated by the opinion of Adjutant-General Drum, who states the number to be 884,000.

Now, estimating the average service to be twenty-four months, which I think is over rather than under the mark, and the total additional annual cost per man, except in cases of "total incapacity," is $87.60, or, in all, an additional annual charge in round numbers of $77,000,000.

Now, this increased cost the nation is amply able to bear. And assume that it will continue for twenty years yet, which is not at all probable, we will then have paid for pensions, all told, a sum less by one-half than the amount paid and to be paid on account of the principal and interest of our bonded war debt. It may be claimed that this is too great a charge upon our people and that it will bankrupt our Treasury. Let us examine that objection, for if it be well taken then the soldiers ought not to insist upon the demand; if not well taken, then the opponents of their claim ought not to raise the objection.

The probable annual Treasury surplus now accumulating is variously estimated at from $120,000,000 to $150,000,000. From this surplus this just expenditure can be most properly and easily made, and, if those estimates be true, still leave a large margin for the reduction of taxes. And when we consider that our population is increasing by more than 1,300,000 persons yearly, we may reasonably expect that even with a large reduction of taxes our revenue will increase with the population and still exceed the estimates. Also, when we consider that the pension-roll, even though thus increased, would be diminishing yearly by reason of death, remarriages, and children getting beyond pensionable age, it will be seen how easily the nation can do this act of justice. Now, the money paid out on account of pensions does not go out of the nation. It is expended here, and remains here with our people. It is collected from the whole population, including the soldiers themselves, paid into the Treasury, from thence paid out to our own people—the soldiers—and remains with the people until again collected and again disbursed to the pensioners.

It is the money which goes out of the nation that makes it poorer; not so if it remains with its people.

So that the payment of pensions, briefly stated, consists in taxing our whole people in order to pay a portion of them in part for that which years ago that portion gave to the nation to preserve its life.

If we, as I believe we should, pay the bondholder the last cent due him, should we not be equally honest with those other creditors of the Government, the men of the rank and file who loaned the nation their lives to save it from destruction? When that bonded debt is canceled this nation will have paid on that account, in principal and interest, nearly $6,000,000,000, or more than twice the amount necessary to liquidate this demand of the soldiers.

We have been swift to preserve our honor in this regard; shall we not with greater alacrity hasten still further to save it by the discharge of this higher and holier obligation which we owe to the men who loaned us, not money, but lives? The Republic can not with honor permit itself to be placed in the position of being generous only to its bondholders. It must so act that the American citizen of any number of years hence will say we of this day and generation treated the men who saved the nation, the soldier and the bondholder alike, justly and generously.

THE ADOPTION OF THE SERVICE-PENSION PRINCIPLE AS NECESSARY FOR THE SOUTH AS FOR THE NORTH.

The adoption of the principle I advocate is, I maintain, as necessary and valuable to the Southern citizen of the future as it is just to the Northern citizen of the present. We do not know what wars the future may develop. We hope none. But three great wars in the first century of our national existence teach that we can not say when our citizens may be called upon to risk their lives and brave the storm of shot and shell in defense of the nation. If the call shall come, we confidently expect to see the American citizen from the South coming up shoulder to shoulder with the man from the North, to the common sacrifice of a common defense for our common flag—the stars and stripes of the United States. And when he shall do this, then for him, as well as for the man from the North, I want the history of this nation to say, that neither of them shall ever be sent to the almshouses of the country because of the laches of the Government in failing to grant service-pension.

And, furthermore, I want that history also to say that in all cases of the wars of the Republic a service-pension shall be granted to her soldiers just as soon after a war closes as the nation is able to pay it. I want the laws of this commonwealth so constructed in that regard as that the Government may not wait until the men to be benefited are dead in order that we may be economically generous.

OBJECTIONS URGED AGAINST A SERVICE-PENSION POLICY.

Objections to the principle of the measure I am advocating, or similar measures, come usually from two sources:

1. From those who oppose such legislation for these particular soldiers.

2. From those who oppose a service pension in any form.

This last class find themselves arraigned against all of the precedents in our history, as well as against the universal practice of the other civilized nations of the world.

When cited to the policy of other nations on this question as a dernier resort they urge that it requires a much longer term of service in the armies of civilized Europe to enable a soldier there to secure such a pension than would be required by this measure, and that we are proposing to pay too much for a short period of service. They forget, how-

ever, that in the European systems nearly every able-bodied man is a soldier by virtue of their military codes all his active life; that when not drawing pay as a soldier he is usually drawing a service pension; that in computing the time when this shall commence the years of peace as well as of war are taken into the account, while here we have no standing army, or next to none, and base our demand for a service pension and our precedents upon actual service in time of war. We can pay the amount proposed by this measure, and still pay in the twenty-seven years which have gone by since the war began, very much less than any one of the first-class powers of Europe has expended in the same time upon her armies.

The Republic can not afford to be less mindful of its soldiers who have faithfully served it in war than is France, Great Britain, Austria, Germany, and other nations of theirs who have served mainly in time of peace.

I beg of gentlemen to remember that the annals of the world record no other instance of a war approaching our civil war in the arduous and fatally dangerous service required of the soldier. Consider the line of battle, a thousand miles long, which the Union soldier was required to man; the fact that he was almost always the attacking party; the two thousand or more battles and skirmishes he was required to fight—being more than one for each day of the continuance of the war; the great army of those who perished in these engagements; that other great army, the maimed and crippled, left at the close of the conflict to drag out their days in pain and anguish. Search the history of the world and find, if you can, another example of such heroic sacrifice and fatal service required of the soldiery of a nation. It does not exist.

Then we may properly say that the judgment of the civilized world has declared in favor of the principle of a service pension. That it comes to us as the result of the ripened experience of mankind. And certainly our civil war, bloody and costly and dangerous and great as it was, should not form an exception to the rule. For if it is admitted that my position is right, but argued that this war does not fall within the principle, I would ask gentlemen to state one good reason why it does not. Certainly it lasted long enough, was cruel enough, and costly enough, and bloody enough to rank it as the greatest war of modern times. Do gentlemen expect that we will ever again be engaged in another comparable with it? But in any event, why ought the Union soldiers to be excluded from the benefit of this time-honored, righteous, and generous custom of the Republic, and the 1812, Revolutionary, and Mexican war soldiers be permitted to profit by it?

Sir, the true principle which, in my judgment, we must preserve is that in all the wars of the nation those who faithfully serve in its armies shall, just as soon as the nation is able to pay it after a war closes, receive a service pension commensurate with the service rendered, and that the disabled shall have a disability pension in addition thereto.

Let this principle be enforced, that he who risks most and suffers most in the service of our country shall, when the battle is fought and won, receive most from the people whose cause he upheld. By so doing we shall show that republics are not ungrateful, and that the debt of gratitude we owe to the defenders of our flag is not one which we intend shall be paid in words merely. Do you say this detracts from the glory the Union soldier earned by his service, and that it is mercenary? I answer: Praise is poor food for a hungry, unclothed, and poverty-stricken man to live upon, or to feed and clothe and educate his family with.

Why, sir, the mercenary part of this matter is upon the other side of this question. The nation that will not and does not provide against letting her defenders be sent to the poor-houses, or preserve them from want, when she is amply able to do so, is, in my opinion, a stingy nation, a penurious nation, and a mercenary nation, and can not expect either to obtain or retain the respect of her people.

Now, regarding the objections coming from those who would not grant a service pension to these particular soldiers, I have only this to say: That the man who can not rise above the clouds and passions of that great conflict and see that by this policy the best interests of our whole people, both present and future, are subserved—I say the man who can not do that would not be convinced by anything that might be said upon the subject. The man who will not see can not see, and I shall spend no time discussing the subject with him. But I would say to him, Go, learn to love your country, its people, its institutions, and its flag, and then you will be broad enough in your sympathies and liberal enough in your views to appreciate this great boon and blessing to humanity of American citizenship, preserved against your murderous acts by the sacrifices and sufferings of these soldiers.

There are, however, some objections that may be urged, which I propose to discuss. It may be claimed that if this proposition should become the law, it will prevent a reduction of taxation, and the people demand such reduction. I recognize in such an objector a face that has become familiar to the friends of a service pension. It is the face of the man who is against all such legislation. He is a pretended friend, and a real enemy to the measure. It makes no difference to him that his objection has no foundation in fact; that taxes can be largely reduced and the revenues still be amply sufficient to meet the expenditure required. But he will still insist that we can not reduce taxes if we pass this measure; and then after taxes are reduced we will find him vehemently arguing that we can not pass the measure without increasing the taxes, and we must not think of doing that. He is of those who look upon the function of a legislator as arising no higher than to the plane and level of a trick; and belongs to that class of men who are eternally engaged in doing mean little acts in a mean little way, and are afterwards in a chronic state of apology to an alleged conscience therefor.

Depend upon it, sir, the men who were able to discriminate between real and pretended friends when that great struggle was in progress have not lost their power of discrimination. They will not punish their friends believing them to be enemies, nor will they reward their enemies believing them to be friends.

Another objection that may be urged is that cases of disability among the soldiers are already taken care of by existing laws; and we should not grant a service pension until the men are older, and consequently in greater need. The answer to the first part of the objection is that it is not true. The disabled are not taken care of by existing laws. Many, very many, of the men who know they are suffering from their army service are unable to procure a disability pension because comrades are dead or a "hospital record" is wanting. And they are going down in years and want to their graves; suffering for the common necessaries of life, while they see others who did perhaps not one-half the amount of service, but who have fortunately secured a record in some hospital, for some fancied disease, placed on the invalid pension-roll. It is that state of affairs, sir, that is driving the dagger home to the hearts of the men who had most to do in putting down the rebellion. And the only remedy that can relieve this, in whole or in part, is a service pension based upon the principle of these amendments.

Now, as regards the claim that we must wait until the men are older before we pass this measure, I undertake to say in answer to that that there is no case on record, and one can not be found, where a service or any other kind of a pension has ever really benefited a dead man.

Fifty per cent. of the soldiers are now dead; and to delay this matter longer, until the men are older and in greater want, is to court the shameful charge that ingratitude marks the action of our nation in dealing with her preservers.

What stronger evidence is necessary that this action is needed now than the fact that the States are by taxation moving to the relief of these men.

We have in the State of Ohio for two years or more raised money by taxation, now amounting to three-tenths of a mill upon all the taxable property in the State, for the relief of the "indigent Union soldiers, sailors, and marines, and their widows and orphans," thus taxing a State for a necessity which the General Government should meet, because the service was rendered not for the State, but for the United States. But, sir, the State of Ohio believes that it is shameful and disgraceful to permit these men to suffer, and she does not intend that it shall be truthfully said of her she stood by consenting to it. And yet no State ought to be permitted or required to do this when the General Government is amply able to prevent it, and I sincerely hope, for the honor of our people, it will soon be unnecessary.

Another objection urged in this case, as in all similar cases, is that the measure will only benefit the claim agents. This claim-agent objection is what country merchants name an unsalable article of dress-goods—a shop-keeper. It is known throughout the Union as the cloak which covers up a secret opposition to all such legislation.

No soldier to be benefited by the law makes such a complaint. He does not for that reason regard this or similar legislation with disfavor, or ask its repeal when passed, or petition for the staying of the legislative hand. The objection in question deceives no one and convinces no one, because it is not true. And if it were true it can not apply to the principle of these amendments, because the allowance of the pension and the amount would depend upon the Army records and muster-rolls and medical examinations, and the services of an attorney would be as useless and unnecessary as the argument is illogical and untrue.

Another objection is that this antagonizes the wishes of the Grand Army of the Republic, which desires other and different legislation.

My answer to that is, that when that grand body of men formulated a demand of what they at the time thought the country ought to do for the soldiers they had in mind, not so much the ultimate relief which should be asked, but what they hoped to obtain now for the most neccessitous. They saw men who had fought valiantly for this Union in the county poor-houses. They saw the orphans and widows of others begging bread. They asked that the most needy be first cared for. But now the situation is changed. The per diem rated bill had not then been thought of, or at most was under discussion for the first time by the committee on pensions of the organization known as the Union Veterans' Union, then in session at Cleveland, Ohio, which, acting upon the suggestion of its commander-in-chief, first formulated the idea.

The soldiers who have favored a service pension have all the time felt the injustice of giving as much to the man who served least as to him who served longest. But until the principle I am discussing was placed before them they had found no measure which adequately set forth their

feeling upon the subject. The large and increasing Treasury surplus had not then received so much public attention as it has since, and the members of the Grand Army did not know then, as they do now, that the Government was able to do more than care for the classes they then designated.

One of the most strongly urged and often repeated arguments against the first "dependent bill" was, that the revenues were not sufficient to meet its requirements. But since the meeting of the last national encampment of the Grand Army, which indorsed the bill as passed by the Senate of this Congress, that organization, as well as all other soldier organizations, has seen that the plea of insufficient revenues is not good as against this demand. And the soldiers everywhere, without regard to organizations, have overwhelmed the Committee on Invalid Pensions of this House with petitions for the passage of a law embodying this principle. And the Grand Army itself, acting by State departments and post organizations, has been foremost in circulating, signing, and forwarding such petitions, until I am certain more Grand Army men have in that way signified their desire for the passage of these amendments than voted for the bill which the Senate passed.

The soldiers now feel that they may well ask themselves the question: If the Government will not grant this just claim when it is abundantly able, when may we expect it to take such action? They feel now when the objection of a want of means is urged that it is only opposition under a false pretense of economy coming from men who intend finally to prevent the legislation. And they demand that the issue shall now be made, and that public men shall declare for or against the measure. They desire to know who the men are that are willing to violate every precedent in our history, and to steel their hearts against a just demand in order to prevent giving a service pension to the Union soldier. They believe in the justice and honesty of the claim they make, and they will submit the issue upon that claim to the people, and abide by the result. But they now demand acts, not words.

Now to the objection that it is proposed to make this service pension additional to disability pensions already granted, or that may be granted, I would reply, the reason upon which such proposed action is based is that of two men serving the same length of time, one of whom is disabled, and for which disability he receives a disability pension; that man has suffered more from the service to the extent indicated by his disability rating than the other, and so should receive more.

At first view this would seem to work a hardship in the cases of those who are really disabled by their service, but can not make proof of that fact, in that they would only be receiving a service pension when their condition ought to entitle them to a greater rating. But upon reflection it will be seen that it is no reason why a man who is disabled by his service, and can prove it, should not receive this treatment because some other man who is likewise disabled can not prove it. Withholding from the one will not benefit the other; nor will giving to the one withhold from the other; and it is difficult to see how justice would be done to the man whom we know, beyond question, has been disabled by the service, if we refuse to give him the benefit of the consideration due to his number of days' service, plus that due to the fact that he was disabled in the service. Absolute justice can not be done in all cases; but we can approximate it. And certainly length of service and disability combined ought to receive more consideration than length of service only.

OBJECTIONS TO THE MEASURE AS PROPOSED BY THE HOUSE COMMITTEE.

In the discussion of these objections I do not wish to be understood as reflecting improperly upon the committee or upon the individual members of the committee. Men honestly differ in their views upon this pension question, but it does seem to me that if the recommendation of the majority report upon that Senate bill 181 shall be carried into law it will be an injustice and a mockery to the men whom it is supposed to benefit. I do not mean to say that the committee intended to attain that result, but the effect is the same as if it had been intended.

Let us judge of it by a comparison with the treatment given to the soldiers of other wars.

In 1818 the Revolutionary soldier who had served nine months or more and was in necessitous circumstances was pensioned at $8 per month.

In 1828 there was added to this roll, at the same rate, all who had served through that war.

In 1832 the Revolutionary roll was further increased by placing upon it, at $8 per month, those who had served two years, and all others who had served six months and less than two years at a proportionate rate.

In 1871 a service pension of $8 per month was granted to the 1812 soldiers who had served sixty days or more. In 1878 this roll was increased so as to include at the same rate all who had served fourteen days or more.

In 1887 a like pension of $8 per month, to begin at age sixty-two or sooner if any disability ordinarily pensionable existed, was granted to the Mexican war soldiers, and this law required only sixty days' service, or in lieu thereof participation in a battle or battles of that war.

Now, judging of the action of our nation in these prior years, does not the patriotic American, who is honest with himself, earnestly wish that the payment of those service pensions had commenced at an earlier period in the lives of the men, so that it would have benefited more of them? Do we now feel that the amount paid was or is too much? Do we not excuse the tardiness of the nation in those cases by the reflection that it was unable to act sooner? Does not the lapse of time between the rendition of the service and the granting of those pensions at once excite the inquiry, "Why did the nation wait so long before granting those pensions?" I believe, sir, that if we respond truly to the promptings of our better natures we will say these payments did not begin soon enough. The amount paid is not too much, and we wish it could have been made more. If I am correct in this, then the argument that a service pension should be paid as soon as the nation is able after the close of a war, and should be sufficient in amount to preserve its beneficiaries from want, becomes irresistible.

Judged by this standard and by the amounts heretofore paid by the nation, how does the bill reported by the committee commend itself to the thinking mind? Why, sir, the number proposed to be benefited is entirely too small. It only includes, prior to age sixty-two, the soldiers who are "totally incapacitated" for the performance of manual labor; in other words, those only whose incapacity is equal to the loss of an arm below the elbow, or a leg below the knee, for that is what "total incapacity" means. This would leave a large number of partially disabled men to drag along for ten or twelve years more, without receiving any assistance from the Government, in whose service they know they were disabled, and that, too, when the Government all the time is abundantly able to grant the needed and well-earned aid.

Again, the amount proposed to be paid by the bill is entirely inadequate. The man who faithfully served two full years, and is "totally incapacitated," receives only $7.30 per month. Another, in like physical condition, who served one full year, gets only $3.65 per month; and those who served less than a year would receive a pittance per month so small as to cause a feeling of shame when it is mentioned. And yet each and all of these classes of soldiers can not get any more although they are in exactly the same physical condition, namely, "totally incapacitated" for the performance of manual labor.

Contrast this with the 14 and 60 day limit as to length of service in the prior wars, and the $8 per month service pension granted in them, and the absolute injustice and wrong of the measure is apparent. It violates all precedent. It violates our sense of justice. It makes an invidious and harmful distinction between the Union soldier and the other soldiers of the Republic who precede him. It arises out of a too close adherence to the idea that length of service alone should determine the amount to be paid and disregards the present condition of the men, the debt the nation owes to them, the nation's ability to care for them, and the demands of fair play and just treatment.

Again, the same injustice that marks its provisions in regard to the men themselves enters into its terms touching their widows, and it makes no provision for the imbecile and helpless minor children.

Now, amend the bill as I propose and these objections, which seem to me to violate every sentiment of patriotic feeling and all sense of justice and equality, will disappear, and the perfected measure will stand forth a fit monument marking the generosity and gratitude of a great nation and a liberal people toward those whose heroism and suffering gave a new lease of life to the Republic. It will give meaning to the term "debt of gratitude" which the nation owes to its defenders.

It will constitute a just, liberal, and wise precedent for the future. It will promote a sense of justice and fairness among our people upon the pension question, and, above all, it will remove the gaunt specter of want, now daily stalking about in the homes of many of these old veterans.

Sir, I have so far considered and argued this subject upon the facts and cold logic of the situation. But I wish to remind the House and the country that, rendering homage to a divinely noble sentiment and truth combined, it becomes us, when we are called upon to consider such topics, to feel that we should come to their consideration, not with hearts steeled against them, not with feelings as hard and unyielding as the stone steps of this Capitol. But, before acting we should ask ourselves this question: If the men whose statues adorn yonder hall, which aforetime was wont to ring with their patriotic eloquence, and those others, whose splendid and costly images of bronze, erected by an admiring and grateful people, command attention in the public grounds and parks of this city, could arise from their now inanimate dust and again counsel us as of old, what would they say is the duty of the United States Congress upon this question?

Nay! If the great army of the dead, who fell from our ranks during the progress of that terrible war, and now repose in sacred but unforgotten graves, could again be marshaled in the blue-coated columns as of yore, and pass in voiceless review here before us; and if, after that long column of speechless heroes had passed by, some Almighty voice should make known to us the wish of the soldier dead for his comrade living, what think you would that voice declare that wish to be upon this question? I ask the members of this House to measure their action upon this matter by a patriotism no less exalted than that which required the sacrifice of 285,000 lives offered upon battle, on skirmish line, in prison pens, and in the fevered and plague-stricken hospitals in order to preserve our nation and our flag.

For once I ask you to let justice and generous sympathy speak with united voice and command the nation to crown the "uncrowned heroes" who passed through the red sea of trial, and hardship, and suffering a quarter of a century ago to preserve that nation's existence.

Defer action upon this tariff bill until the measure I am advocating can be passed. Then bring forward your measure for reducing taxes based upon the idea of saving the American market for Americans, of protecting our nation's industries and our labor, and you will have done that for which generations of Americans yet unborn shall rise up and bless you, and that which will preserve and establish us as a wise and patriotic people among the nations of the earth.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

"A bill that is in the main so moderate." Thus is the Mills bill described in the leading editorial of a Democratic newspaper. "A bill in the main so moderate"—a bill that, in its initial lines, strikes down one of the greatest industries of the United States; a bill that changes the policy of nearly half a century in reference to lumber, that would crush an industry that amounted last year to over one hundred millions of dollars, that would drive our "hewers of wood" into direct, unprotected, disastrous competition with the lower wages of Canada—is such a bill, so far as lumber is concerned, moderate? If it is, then action by Congress that would enter and devastate the workman's cabin is moderate; for my friend from Pennsylvania [MR. MCCORMICK], during the general discussion of this bill, demonstrated that the duty on lumber was a direct benefit to its amount to the lumber workmen, that the amount of duty precisely measured the difference between the wages of American and Canadian workmen, and demonstrated it so ably and conclusively that no gentleman on this floor has attempted to answer him.

Moderate to make lumber free from and after the 1st day of July, 1888? Moderate to take such radical action in such haste as to amount almost to a stampede? But why should we take this very moderate step? What reasons have our friends on the other side of the Chamber given us during the discussion of the lumber paragraphs to suppose the bill in this particular is not extreme? What arguments have they advanced to prove not alone the moderation of this section, but that it will benefit the American people? All through the general debate upon the Mills bill they told us they wanted duties removed, a reduction of revenue, and now and then one braver than his fellows spoke of "free trade" so as to open "the markets of the world" to all American products.

Pass this bill, they said to us, and the "markets of the world" are yours. Pass it, and you will have a ready foreign sale for everything you produce. Surely if that argument applies to one article it applies to all. And yet hardly is the bill taken up for consideration by sections when they tell us they want lumber free. Why? So that the markets of the world will be open to American lumber? Oh, no. Free trade in lumber, they say, will not open other markets for our lumber, but our markets for others, and thus save our beautiful forests. That now seems to be the one idea—excepting "trusts," of course—paramount in the Democratic Congressional mind. Our forests must be saved. They are being wasted so rapidly, the beauty of the country, the health of the people demand that the lumber we need should come from other countries. American lumbermen must suffer that our forests may be saved.

Let me say, sir, it is not waste to cut trees into lumber. What is used for the benefit of mankind is no waste. It is the forest fires, the rot, the decay of years that is waste, and this waste is saved where the lumberman is at work. Our forests will never disappear. Certain uses for timber grow less as others increase. Coal for fuel, wire for fencing, stone and brick for building have largely displaced certain uses for timber. I suspect, sir, the Democrats in Congress are not sincere on this question. They want lumber free as a part of their free-trade crusade work.

That is the long and the short, the height and depth of their proposed moderate action. [Applause.]

During the delivery of the foregoing remarks the hammer fell.

Mr. KELLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York be permitted to occupy the floor for five minutes longer without interruption.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERMAN resumed and concluded his remarks as above.

Mr. MILLS. I hope we will now have a vote on this line.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will regard the *pro forma* amendment as withdrawn; and the question is on striking out line 17.

The motion was not agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 18: "Laths."
Line 19: "Shingles."

Mr. BUCHANAN. I offer the amendment I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 19 strike out the final "s" in the word "shingles," and add the word "bolts;" so that it will read "shingle-bolts."

Mr. BUCHANAN. The effect of the amendment, if adopted, will be to take shingles off the free-list, where they are placed by this bill, and leave upon the free-list the rough material out of which the shingles are made. The word that I have suggested is a word that is known in many sections of the country, and it means the rough blocks from which the shingles are cut. We hear a great deal about the advisability of importing free of duty raw material for the benefit of our people. My amendment does not affect that question in the least.

It is hurled back to us with derision, almost with disdain, by the other side of the House when we say to them that they are free-traders. They say, "No; we deny it." We are "revenue reformers," and we want "free raw material." The effect of my amendment is, as I have said, to give them free raw material in this regard; but it goes further, it protects the labor which places the raw material in manufactured form.

These bolts or blocks are either sawed or riven into shingles. The shingles themselves after they are riven are shaved and jointed, and this is all done by the expenditure of labor. Now if you are not free-traders, do not vote against this amendment. If you are free-traders, show your faith by voting against the amendment. Come out of your camps and place yourselves fairly and squarely on one side or the other of this question.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Did the gentleman observe that the article of lumber to which he refers is included in lines 9 and 10?

Mr. MORSE. Oh, he does not care about that. Let us have a vote. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. I believe if this bill is the perfect thing it is pretended to be, and, as I understand, in a caucus held in this Hall, it was held to be, then there was a purpose in placing this paragraph, "shingles," there where we find it. I purpose to meet that question now, and say, All right, gentlemen, you want raw material to come in free; let it come free. But if you want to protect the labor which puts that raw material into manufactured form, then adopt this amendment. Now, let us see your faith.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. The gentleman will see that this comes in free already, under line 9 of the bill.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I am not responsible for line 9. It did not emanate from my brain or heart.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. It is already a portion of the bill, so far as it can be at this time.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If the gentleman finds redundancy of expression in the bill, it is for the framers of the bill to explain, not for me.

And I am glad to say to the gentleman——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Then the point you make is that you must put in a provision yourself.

Mr. BUCHANAN. No, sir; my point is that you must come out from behind your cry of free raw material, but really no duty on manufactured products, and place yourselves fairly and squarely on one side or the other. [Derisive laughter on the Democratic side, and cries of "Vote!" "Vote!"]

Mr. MORSE. We will not do that. [Laughter.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. No, of course you will not. You say one thing and vote the other way. [Jeers on the Democratic side.]

That is all right, gentlemen. Keep up your howling on the other side. I have a right as a Representative of the people to express my opinion of these paragraphs, and I mean to do it; and in view of the evident preparations for the coming influenza upon the other side [laughter], I will recite a verse which I happen to find lying upon my desk:

From Oregon, the Pioneer State,
To the mouth of the Susquehanna,
The good people will settle the fate
Of Cleveland and his red bandana.

[Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from New Jersey.

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Clapboards, pine or spruce.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Some remarks which I made here yesterday in regard to the duty upon staves were answered by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], who said that they were not a Northern product, because staves in great quantities were shipped from the South as well as from the North; and, among other things which he said, was that staves to the value of $138,000 were shipped abroad from my own port of Belfast, Me.

That statement, I think, must have been a *lapsus linguæ* upon the part of the gentleman, for on looking over the statistics he will find it to be entirely incorrect.

Now, what are the facts about staves? It is true that large quantities of staves are shipped from the South, but that does not prove that this provision in the Mills bill is not sectional, because those are hardwood staves which are shipped, many of them to the West Indies for the purpose of making molasses hogsheads, and there are no staves manufactured in Canada that compete with them. They do not need any duty to protect them, because they have no competition. But the staves that are made in Maine are made of soft wood, and are used in large measure for cement casks, and are marketed in this country. The same kinds of staves are made in Canada, and come in direct com-

petition with ours. The statement I made yesterday is correct, that during the existence of the reciprocity treaty, when we had no duty upon staves, we lost the industry; it went over to New Brunswick; and, as I said, the staves were carried from New Brunswick up the Hudson and to ports in different parts of this country by vessels built and owned in the province of New Brunswick and other parts of Canada.

Mr. KERR. What was the final effect of the reciprocity treaty upon the price?

Mr. MILLIKEN. Our product was driven out of the market by the reciprocity treaty, but our industry in staves revived after that treaty was abolished; and it exists now in my State in a healthy condition.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Then, as a matter of fact, the putting of a tariff on staves raised the price of the staves in the market, while the removal of the former tariff put the price down?

Mr. MILLIKEN. The putting of a duty upon staves unquestionably protected the industry upon this side of the line against the competition of cheaper staves manufactured by cheap labor in Canada.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. And raised the price here?

Mr. MILLIKEN. It had the same effect that the duty has everywhere. The gentleman knows what that is.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I do.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I have but five minutes, and I do not believe we could go into such an extended discussion of that subject as the gentleman's question would lead to in so short a time.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire to answer a question which was raised on the other side yesterday. When I claimed that the Mills bill was sectional, gentlemen asked what we had to offer in place of it. To that I reply that at the beginning of this session I introduced a bill which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and was undoubtedly buried there deeper than if it had been at the bottom of the tomb of the Capulets; at any rate, it never has been heard of since. I now send that bill to the desk, and ask the Clerk to read it as a part of my remarks, to show what means I would propose of reducing the revenue.

The Clerk proceeded to read the bill. During the reading the time of Mr. MILLIKEN expired, when, on motion of Mr. MAFFETT, by unanimous consent, he was permitted to proceed for five minutes more.

The bill was read in full, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all the laws providing for the assessment and collection of internal-revenue taxes upon tobacco and the manufactures thereof be, and the same are hereby, repealed.

SEC. 2. That sugar of all standards, when imported, shall be exempt from duty on and after the 1st day of January, A. D., 1889: *Provided*, That this section of this act shall not apply to the sugar product of any country which shall lay an export duty upon such sugar; nor to sugar imported in vessels other than those of the exporting country and the United States of America; nor to sugar from countries refusing to vessels of the United States of America the same treatment in their ports as to light-house and other charges that are granted to the vessels of such countries in American ports; nor to the sugar of any country which shall not make as favorable terms for the entry of the products of the United States in its ports as for the entry of the products of other countries the most favored by it in this respect.

SEC. 3. There shall be paid out of the Treasury, from any moneys not otherwise appropriated, to the producers of sugar in the United States of America, in lieu of the duties hereby repealed, within thirty days after the 1st day of January each year, a sum equal to the present rate of duty upon their product, having regard to standard and quality, the sum to be paid each producer to be ascertained and awarded through the internal-revenue or customs officers under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Now will the gentleman explain why there should be a bounty paid to sugar-raisers any more than to the raisers of any other agricultural product in this country?

Mr. MILLIKEN. I will. It is because the sugar-producers of Louisiana have already got thousands upon thousands of dollars invested in that industry, and I do not believe that the Government of the United States ought to pass any law that would ruin those investments. I do not believe that the Government has a right to legislate away the accumulations of years out of the hands of its citizens in that way.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in regard to this bill of mine, I want to say in the first place that it would be certain to reduce the revenue and the surplus in the Treasury, while on the other hand the bill now before the House is by no means certain to do that. This Mills bill comes in here with flying colors as a measure to reduce the revenue; it comes in with the recommendation of the President of the United States, who looks with alarm upon the great surplus that is in the Treasury, and warns Congress of the necessity of reducing it. And yet, sir, it is a matter of great doubt whether, if this Mills bill becomes a law, it will not rather increase than reduce the revenue, whether the greater importation of goods from abroad, which will result from the lowering of the duties, will not increase the revenues to an amount at least equal to the reduction made by putting certain articles on the free-list and the proposed reduction of the tobacco tax.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to say another thing about the bill which I introduced. It attacks no industry in this country. It protects the sugar-grower at the same time that it reduces the duty. It harms no man in the land. It threatens no interest in this country. Again, it would reduce the duty upon one of the prime necessaries of life, an article that goes into the consumption of every family in the country. Men use sugar in Texas as well as in Maine, in California as well as in New York; therefore there is nothing sectional about this proposed reduction, and I do not believe there is any way in which you can reduce the revenue of this Government and do no harm to any industry in the country and at the same time carry comfort to so many homes in the United States as by passing this bill.

Mr. MILLIKEN. I withdraw the *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment to perfect the paragraph.

The amendment was read, as follows:

At the end of line 20 add, "not planed nor worked."

Mr. BUCHANAN. I offer that amendment for this reason: I do not know whether it was the purpose of the Committee on Ways and Means to allow the importation free of clapboards planed and wrought or not, but I do know that the provision as it stands in the bill would be susceptible of that interpretation. Clapboards are sawed, then planed, and then some kinds are tongued and rabeted, the planing and tonguing and rabeting being of late years performed in one operation by the same machine.

Now, I wish a distinct and authoritative expression by the Committee of the Whole, either by accepting or rejecting this amendment, as to whether this provision in the bill is intended to include these products or not. If it is so intended, then it does not merely permit the admission free into this country of raw material, but it permits the free entry of a manufactured product of the planing-mill. It seems to me that this amendment ought, on principle as well as from considerations of justice, to be adopted.

Mr. THOMAS, of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to let this subject of putting lumber and its products on the free-list pass without saying a word. In the State which I have the honor in part to represent there are thousands of men engaged in the lumbering business whose interests will be affected by this bill. Sir, those men are to-day receiving wages ample and sufficient to satisfy them, wages that are bringing men from Maine, from New York, from the old country, to the pineries of Wisconsin; and to strike down their interests, as I believe this bill proposes to do, and place them on a level with the pauper labor of Canada is something that is unnecessary, cruel, and vicious, something that requires of me a protest, and as long as I have a vote in this House it shall be given against such legislation. It is claimed here that unless we pass this bill our forests will be denuded, although gentlemen on both sides have admitted that it will probably not make a difference of 1,000 feet in the cut. But, sir, the practical effect will be to strike down the laborer in this industry and make his wages less in consequence of the competition of the Canadian laborer.

Another thing, Mr. Chairman. This bill will strike down the interests of the farmers of my State, who now have a large local market, a market nearly equal to the supply. They sell to the lumbermen the oats, the hay, the corn, the pork, everything that the farm produces. It will strike down the merchants; it will strike down every interest. And I believe that at the next election you will hear a louder protest from the people of Wisconsin against this legislation than you have heard recently from Oregon. [Applause on the Republican side].

The question being taken on the amendment of Mr. BUCHANAN, it was rejected—there being ayes 73, noes 84.

Mr. BURROWS. I move to amend by striking out line 19.

The CHAIRMAN. Line 19 has been passed; the Committee of the Whole is considering line 20.

Mr. BURROWS. I move, then, to amend by striking out line 20.

The amendment of Mr. BURROWS was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Logs.

Provided, That if any export duty is laid upon the above-mentioned articles, or either of them, by any country whence imported, all said articles imported from said country shall be subject to duty as now provided by law.

Mr. DINGLEY. I move to amend by adding to the paragraph just read the proviso which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

And provided further, That all said articles shall be subject to the same duty as now provided by law when imported from any country which denies in its ports, to fishing or other vessels of the United States authorized to touch and trade at foreign ports, the same commercial privileges, including the right to buy provisions, bait, and supplies, and to transship any portion of cargo, as are granted to similar vessels of such country in the ports of the United States.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, does a point of order lie against this amendment that it is not germane to this portion of the bill?

Mr. DINGLEY. There is no doubt about its being germane.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I hardly think it is. We are now discussing the lumber schedule. This is a provision in regard to fish.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] make a point of order?

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I do.

Mr. DINGLEY. I want to be heard on the point of order, if it is made seriously. This is simply a further limitation in addition to the proviso in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN (after examining the amendment). The Chair is of opinion that the amendment is in order. The point of order is overruled.

[Mr. DINGLEY withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. WILSON of Minnesota. The question before the committee, Mr. Chairman, is one solely whether the proposed amendment is germane to the bill or not.

Mr. LODGE. That question has already been decided.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. But I understand there is an amendment proposed, and the question is whether that is germane or not.

Mr. LODGE. The Chair has ruled the amendment in order.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. What was the decision of the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair decided that the amendment was germane.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. As that has been disposed of, then I will not occupy the floor longer, as I do not wish to discuss the merits.

Mr. TARSNEY. Mr. Chairman, I have sat here for the last week listening with patient attention to the discussion of the different paragraphs of this section of the bill and I have so far remained silent. On yesterday, when the paragraph in lines 11 and 12 was under discussion in this House and voted on, myself and the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. SOWDEN] were the only two gentlemen on this side of the House who voted to strike those lines from the bill. In justice to myself and in justice to my constituency I desire to explain the reason why I so voted. I did it for the purpose of moving at the proper time, if I could, an amendment to this bill providing that the lumber schedule should be reduced annually 33⅓ per cent. until it came upon the free-list; but the House voted down the motion to strike out those lines.

I stand here as the representative of one of the largest lumber constituencies in the United States. The produce of the Saginaw River during the last year was 779,000,000 feet of lumber. That section in which the principal portion of the entire lumber product of Michigan is produced is represented on this floor by my colleague [Mr. FISHER] and by myself. I could point to you from the bridges at Saginaw to-day a continuous line up and down that river as far as the eye can reach of smoke-stacks, of mill chimneys, and docks on either side loaded with lumber the product of those mills.

I have been somewhat amused to find prairie chickens from the prairie fields of the Northwest, from Iowa and Kansas, standing up upon the floor of this House to protect Saginaw lumber. [Applause.] And I have been accused of neglecting the interest I represent. Why, sir, as I have said, I have listened to all this conversation (I call it conversation) upon this floor, and I have heard of the great benefits that labor has received by reason of your protective tariff. But when did you ever hear under that system of protection of its ever protecting the laboring man one dollar's worth in the world? [Applause on the Democratic side of the House.] We employ thousands of men in our lumber industry, but how are they protected? Within a few miles of the Canadian line we have found year after year that our lumbermen, instead of protecting the American laborer, would go into the province of Ontario and bring over cheap Canadian labor, bring them across the river and through the lines, and greet them with a good morning as they passed out of the custom-house and came into competition with American labor whom you pretend to protect. That is the way you protect American labor. [Applause on the Democratic side of the House.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. You say that has been permitted in your district?

Mr. TARSNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Where is the United States district attorney up there that he does not enforce the statute?

Mr. WEBER. Why did you not apply to the Secretary of the Treasury, as I did, to enforce the law and protect your labor?

Mr. TARSNEY. Now, sir, while my desire was, and it is my earnest desire yet, to see this bill so amended that those who have invested their money upon the basis of this existing but false theory and false law should have time in which to adjust their business to meet the change proposed, yet, sir, when I come to contemplate the fact that all over this country to-day, with an overflowing Treasury, we have a pauperized people—— [Cries of "Oh," and derisive laughter on the Republican side.] Go on, gentlemen, I repeat the assertion. With a tax-list that is bringing into the Treasury of the United States over $1,000,000 every day, more than we need by one-half, and when I realize the fact that this money, so needed in the business, in the commercial interests of the country, is drained like draining the very life-blood that flows through the veins, under this vicious system of taxation, and is daily being absorbed in this manner, I look forward, I must confess, with very fearful forebodings to that condition of things which must eventually bring about universal ruin and bankruptcy to the people of this land.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BURROWS. If I can be recognized I will yield the floor to my colleague.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from Michigan will be permitted to proceed for five minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARSNEY. Now, Mr. Chairman——

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BURROWS. I wish to ask a question for information.

Mr. TARSNEY. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BURROWS. Permit me to ask the question if it is true that the lumbermen of your locality go into Canada and hire cheap labor and bring it into your district?

Mr. TARSNEY. They advertise over there and bring laborers in. They send agents from Michigan into Canada, and they are continually bringing them in.

Mr. WEBER. I asked the question of the gentleman a few moments ago, why he did not invoke the aid of the Secretary of the Treasury to stop that, as I did in my district, and succeeded?

Mr. TARSNEY. I will come to that. I yield now to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. The gentleman from Michigan says protection affords no relief to the laboring men. I ask if in making that statement he includes the laboring men who own the mills and timber lands? [Laughter.]

Mr. TARSNEY. Oh, no; that is quite a different question.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have heard various opinions expressed about the results of this protective law upon the people of this country. According to my recollection, the last census shows that there were 44,019 industries in this country protected under the protective tariff laws. Sixty million of people have been paying tribute to them. If it be true, as stated by some of our Republican brethren over there, that the removal of the duty on lumber will not decrease its price, then for God's sake what do you want of this protection?

You are not hurting the manufacturer if you place it upon the free-list. If upon the other hand it does increase the price of lumber $2 per thousand feet by thus fixing it upon the tariff laws, who is the person who pays that tribute? Let us take into consideration the tens of thousands of people who consume that lumber. We are not to legislate for the benefit of the few at the expense of the great multitude.

Mr. BREWER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TARSNEY. Oh, yes.

Mr. BREWER. If that is your opinion, why did you pass through the tellers and vote with us upon the proposition to strike out these lines in reference to manufactured lumber?

Mr. TARSNEY. I did not.

Mr. BREWER. I understood you to say that you and Mr. SOWDEN on that side were the only gentlemen who did pass between the tellers from that side of the House.

Mr. TARSNEY. Oh, I did not understand the gentleman's question. I have already explained that I did it for the purpose of presenting at the proper time such an amendment to the bill as I believe ought to be made to enable those who have put their money in the business to prepare to meet the change and conform to the changed conditions.

Mr. BREWER. But why did you vote to restore the tariff on lumber, when, according to your own view, it is prejudicial to the ten thousand consumers that you pretend to be speaking for?

Mr. TARSNEY. Do not ask any questions. [Laughter on the Republican side.] I say do not ask because I have but a very few minutes.

Now, I desire to send to the Clerk's desk, to be read for the information of the committee, a table of wages, compiled by the Board of Trade of Saginaw in 1886, showing the wages that are paid in the mills upon the Saginaw River upon the protective system.

The Clerk read as follows:

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WEBER was recognized.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan, representing an important lumber district, be allowed five minutes longer.

There was no objection.

Mr. TARSNEY. I wish now to suggest a few comments upon that table.

Mr. COX. With the permission of my friend from Michigan, I would like to have a little matter read from the desk.

Mr. TARSNEY. Certainly.

Mr. COX. I ask the Clerk to read this dispatch.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. LOUIS, *June* 6—12.12 p. m.

Cleveland nominated by acclamation.

[Loud applause on the Democratic side, followed by counter applause and cheers on the Republican side.]

Mr. TARSNEY. Now, if this interruption will not be taken out of my time, let me explain that table a little. This table shows the rate of wages paid, the highest and the lowest, and I presume no gentleman will question its accuracy, for it is prepared by the board of trade of my city. We find the rate of wages running from $1.25, in some instances, to $3.25, $3.50, and $4.

Mr. KEAN. And $5.

Mr. TARSNEY. I do not think there are any at five. Yes, there are one or two, I believe. And these men are skilled sawyers, the gang-men and the scientific engineers who manage the machinery. They are the men who receive the higher wages. Now how many of these are in one mill? There is one engineer, or two at most; and if two, the assistant engineer receives but one-half as much as his superior. The sawyer receives a high rate of wages; the foreman receives a high rate; but the great masses are working at from $1.25 to $1.50 per day. There is your protection to American labor.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TARSNEY. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana. Is that not more than a man gets on the railroads and the farms in the Northwest?

Mr. TARSNEY. No.

Mr. JOHNSTON, of Indiana. I say it is, and that is all there is of it. [Laughter.]

Mr. TARSNEY. Well, you can settle that to suit yourself. I say no.

Mr. BLAND. The lumbermen, I suppose, are more charitable than the farmers.

Mr. TARSNEY. I never knew in all my experience any one of your manufacturers that ever paid a workingman a dollar more than he was compelled to pay, and you never will find one. Wages of men are regulated by the law of supply and demand.

Mr. FUNSTON. Answer this question: Is there a farmer in your State that pays a dollar a day to the men he employs?

Mr. TARSNEY. But he boards the men.

Mr. WEAVER (to Mr. FUNSTON). Are you opposed to taking the duty off lumber?

Mr. FUNSTON. I say there is not a farmer in the State of Michigan who pays his farm hands a dollar a day. [Laughter.]

Mr. WEAVER. Are you opposed to taking the duty off lumber?

Mr. FUNSTON. I am for every man being paid what he is worth.

Mr. ROGERS. Will you answer the question? [Laughter].

Mr. FUNSTON (to Mr. ROGERS). Have you got a man in your State that pays his men 75 cents a day? You do not pay your men 50 cents per day.

Mr. WEAVER. I want you to answer my question. Are you opposed to taking the duty off lumber?

Mr. OWEN (to Mr. WEAVER). Take your seat until the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TARSNEY] answers the other question.

Mr. FUNSTON. Yes, gentlemen; one at a time.

Mr. WEAVER (to Mr. FUNSTON). Are you opposed to taking the duty off lumber.

Mr. FUNSTON. Go back to Iowa and have your question answered next fall by the people of your district. You will have all you can do to manage them.

Mr. WEAVER. I dare you to answer it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FUNSTON. I will answer it in my own way and in my own time. There is one thing——

Mr. WEAVER. Are you opposed to taking the duty off lumber?

Mr. FUNSTON. I want to answer you this way—— [Jeers on the Democratic side.] We can always tell—your side refuse to let me answer.

Mr. WEAVER. Are you opposed to taking the duty off lumber? Yes or no?

Mr. FUNSTON. We can always tell—— [Jeers and loud interruptions on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WEAVER. Are you opposed to taking the duty off lumber?

Mr. FUNSTON. I will answer that question at the proper time and in my own way. I say you do not pay your farm hands a dollar a day in your State. Either admit my charge or refute it, and I will then answer.

Mr. WEAVER. I challenge you to answer my question.

Mr. FUNSTON. Stick to the text. You will not find a farmer in your State that pays his farm hands a dollar a day. [Great confusion in the Hall.]

The CHAIRMAN. The House will come to order. No business will be transacted until order is restored. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TARSNEY] has expired.

Mr. TARSNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am not responsible for these interruptions.

Mr. BREWER. I hope the time occupied by these interruptions will not be taken out of my colleague's time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman had expired before the interruption occurred. [Laughter.] Debate upon the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. WEBER. I move to amend the amendment by striking out the last word.

Mr. BREWER. I want to ask my colleague a question.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WEBER] is recognized.

Mr. BUCKALEW. Mr. Chairman——

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Pennsylvania rise?

Mr. BUCKALEW. I do not rise for the purpose of taking part in the debate, but simply to ask the indulgence of the House to make a single observation. I think it would be well to get one of Mr. Edison's phonographs in order to record such a scene as this for the contemplation of posterity. [Laughter.]

Mr. WEBER. I would be glad to have a phonograph put in operation here while the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TARSNEY] answers the question I asked him a few moments ago. He very kindly yielded to me for a question and then stopped short. Now, under the rule, I have five minutes, and I desire to yield to him so much of that time as he requires to give me a straightforward answer to the question I put to him, namely, "Why do you not apply to the Secretary of the Treasury and invoke his aid to enforce the law relating to contract labor?"

Mr. TARSNEY. I am not the district attorney for the district of Michigan.

Mr. FORD. Will my colleague allow me to answer that question?

Several MEMBERS. Oh, no!

Mr. TARSNEY. We have law officers whose duty it is to do that. We have also citizens there who have done it and who are doing it to-day, citizens who are interested in this matter, and I thank God that the time has gone by when even in the State of Michigan the contract-labor law can be violated.

Mr. PERKINS. I thought you said it was violated all the time.

Mr. WEBER. Mr. Chairman, of the two minutes which I yielded to the gentleman to answer my question, about one minute remains, and he is still at liberty to proceed to answer the question.

Mr. TARSNEY. I have answered your question, sir.

Mr. WEBER. To the best of your ability?

Mr. TARSNEY. I am here attending to my public duties as a Representative upon this floor——

Mr. REED. We had not noticed that. [Laughter.]

Mr. TARSNEY. I have been here for months; I have not been in Michigan for six months.

Mr. WEBER. But when my constituents living upon the border called upon me and directed my attention to violations of the law, I did not answer them that I was here attending to my duties as a Representative, but I notified the Treasury Department and had the abuse stopped. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. TARSNEY. And in the United States court at Detroit cases have been prosecuted.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I asked you if these violations were still going on, and you said they were.

Mr. TARSNEY. They were, last winter.

Mr. WEBER. If the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TARSNEY] will devote his great abilities and some of his time to the practical solution of the difficulty in that way, instead of wasting the midnight oil in writing speeches and posing as a pretended friend of the laboring man, he will be of some practical benefit to the laboring man; which he is not now. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLAND. As I understood the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TARNSEY], he stated that advertisements for laborers were sent into Canada; now, where is there any law to prevent that?

Mr. WEBER. During this discussion——

Mr. BLAND. I want an answer to that question.

Mr. WEBER. I am going to answer it.

Mr. BLAND. Is there any law to prevent Canadians coming into Michigan?

Mr. WEBER. I am going to answer the gentleman. During all the debates it has been iterated and reiterated on this floor that our "robber barons," our "piratical lumber millionaires" have been going to Canada and bringing into this country this cheap labor under contract to compete with our American labor, and it has been affirmed by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TARSNEY] this morning more emphatically perhaps than upon any previous occasion. Now, I want to say to the gentleman from Michigan and to the House that there are no more Canadian dinner-pails coming across the Suspension Bridge since the Secretary of the Treasury has enforced the law, upon my calling his attention to it directly after being requested to do so by my constituents.

Mr. WHITING, of Michigan. The Canadian laborers do not come over in the morning and go back at night. They come over and spend the winter in our lumber woods, and there is no law to prevent it.

Mr. WEBER. If they come here they violate the law.

Mr. WHITING, of Michigan. They do not violate any law.

Mr. WEBER. If gentlemen will assist in the enforcement of the law where these grievances exist there will be no difficulty.

Mr. WHITING, of Michigan. There is no law to prevent their coming over. They come over all along the border, work on this side during the winter, and take away the wages which would otherwise be earned by American laborers.

Mr. WEBER. It is suggested to me here that the grievance of which gentlemen on the other side complain may be more useful to them than the remedy.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I arise for the purpose simply of answering the question which the gentleman from New York put to my colleague [Mr. TARSNEY].

Mr. REED. And which your colleague did not answer.

Mr. FORD. I did not suppose the gentleman from New York was so unsophisticated as to think the lumbermen undertook to violate our laws with reference to the importation of contract labor. They do not attempt that; but this is the way they operate: They put advertisements in the newspapers in Canada saying that a great demand is now existing in the State of Michigan for men to work in the lumber woods. Only last winter an advertisement appeared in the Toronto Mail, I think, which read something after this fashion: "Wante', ten thousand men to work in the lumber woods at Saginaw." One of the Saginaw papers, in copying this article from the Toronto paper, said: "We advise the men in Canada not to come here; no men are wanted here in the lumber woods at all; the market is already overstocked; within the last ten years wages have declined 25 to 40 per cent." These lumber operators never undertake, Mr. Chairman, to go to Canada and contract for the importation of Canadian laborers; but by means of these deceptive advertisements they get them into the country, and thus "flank" the law, which is designed to keep such laborers out.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the *pro forma* amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. BAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by striking out the last word. I rise merely to have the two gentlemen from Michigan, both on the same side of the House, reconcile their statements. One gentleman [Mr. TARSNEY] said in a very emphatic way that contract labor was imported by the lumbermen——

Mr. OWEN. By the car-load.

Mr. BAYNE. Imported by the car-load into Michigan under advertisements for contract labor inserted in the Canadian newspapers. His colleague [Mr. FORD] denies that there is any violation of the law by bringing in contract labor from a foreign country. The question of veracity does not arise between any gentleman on this side and a gentleman on the other side, but the question of veracity seems to lie between the two gentlemen from Michigan. Now, I would like very much—and I yield the remainder of my time for that purpose—that these two gentlemen would reconcile that question of veracity which they themselves have raised between themselves as to this matter.

Mr. MCMILLIN. You and your colleague, Judge KELLEY, should settle your differences first.

Mr. BAYNE. I have repeatedly said that I am not responsible for all the utterances of my friend, Judge KELLEY. [Laughter.] He is an optimist.

A MEMBER. What is that? [Laughter.]

Mr. BAYNE. He looks on the sunny side of everything, and especially on the sunny side of the future of the South. I do not look upon the future of the South with such an optimistic view, unless you gentlemen of the South will reconcile your views with better business ideas and better methods. When you come to do that I shall join with my colleague in his great expectations respecting your future development; but at present I can not take that view.

But I rose for the purpose of having the two Representatives from Michigan reconcile their statements, which are diametrically opposed to each other.

Mr. TARSNEY. Mr. Chairman, there is no contradiction between my colleague [Mr. FORD] and myself. My colleague's statements, which supplement what I said, simply demonstrate that there is a great deal more devilment going on up in that part of the country than I had informed the House about. And I say to my friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE] that I thank God Judge KELLEY is not responsible for the gentleman's utterances or his conduct. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Now, sir, the rate of wages which I have shown you—and those are the mill wages—continues how long? Our mills generally open about the 1st of May and close from the 15th of November to the 1st of December. That is the extent of the sawing season. Now, take the rate of wages—$1.25 a day—and consider that the work continues only six or seven months in the year; and how much, under this so-called protective system, does a laboring man receive for the support of himself, his wife and family? That is the point I want to get at.

Another question. If one of these laboring men is so prudent and thrifty as to be able to save money to buy himself a little lot and to build a house, then when he buys from his employer 10,000 feet of lumber, the cost to that workingman who produces the lumber is $20 more than it would be if your theory were correct.

Mr. BREWER. Will my colleague allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. TARSNEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. BREWER. Are you in favor of placing lumber on the free-list, or are you opposed to it?

Mr. TARSNEY. I am in favor of this, and I supposed you had comprehension enough to understand it——

Mr. BREWER. I did not understand my colleague's position.

Mr. TARSNEY. With a pertinacity which has been almost impertinent I have labored night and day with members of the Committee on Ways and Means and members of the House to have an amendment adopted to this bill which would place lumber upon a sliding scale. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Laugh, will you? You will be braying in a little while. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] Why, Mr. Chairman, as I look across the aisle of this House I observe some persons who are laughing now, but in my humble judgment their ears are too short for the animals they represent. [Derisive cries on the Republican side.]

I have explained my position on this question—the position on which I stand to-day. But I stand here to refute some of the assertions which have been made here which I know to be untrue. And I am willing to go before my constituents at home and repeat to them what I say on the floor of this House to-day.

Mr. BREWER. The gentleman has not answered my question. Will he answer it—yes or no?

Mr. TARSNEY. I have told you what I propose to do.

Mr. BREWER. What are you in favor of?

Mr. TARSNEY. If the time comes, and come it will, and I shall stand here to say whether I shall yield to the amendment or whether I shall not, whether I shall vote on this floor in the interest of lower taxation for the benefit of the entire people, although some of my own people may suffer slightly by it, then as a patriotic citizen, representing a patriotic constituency, I shall vote in favor of that lower taxation for the entire people. In that accomplishment of the general good I feel confident my constituency will approve of my course. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Let me ask the gentleman from Michigan a question before he takes his seat.

Mr. TARSNEY. Certainly.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. In that connection I should like to ask the gentleman this question. We have been told, but we may have been wrongly informed, that in the canvass between our late friend on this floor, Mr. Horr, and our brother, TARSNEY, the latter was successful because he was deemed the better protectionist.

Mr. TARSNEY. That is not true, sir.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I thought it was; and as the statement has been made more than once, I have asked the gentleman from Michigan whether it was true or not.

Mr. TARSNEY. No, sir; it is not true. In the campaigns in which I have been a candidate for Congress in that district the question of tariff was the leading one. I stood upon the rostrum in every town in my district and advocated the doctrine of the reduction of taxation. It is only fair to say that in the canvass between myself and Mr. Horr the tariff question was the one chiefly involved.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. The gentleman who was successful persuaded the people of that district that he was a better protectionist than his opponent, Mr. Horr.

Mr. TARSNEY. I wish to say here on this floor, and it can not have been forgotten, that I voted for the consideration of the so-called Morrison tariff bill in the Forty-ninth Congress. I went home to my people after I gave that vote and I was attacked by high protectionists. The gentleman whose name headed the memorial presented by my colleague [Mr. BURROWS] was at that time the Democratic mayor of the city of Saginaw. He is a protectionist. He opposed me. He wrote in the newspapers against me. He placed upon every door-step of every house in that city a flyer, "Do not vote for TIM TARSNEY; he is a free-trader." I spoke in that city the night before the election, and I said to them that I had been accused of being an enemy of my own surroundings. If that were true I was my own enemy, because everything I had was centered in Saginaw. I told them that I had voted for the consideration of the so-called Morrison bill and I told them I would do it again. I did do it again. Notwithstanding those statements, not leaving my position in the slightest doubt as to what I was for and what I was against, the next day after that speech I carried the city of Saginaw by a larger majority than the mayor of the city had ever received. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I carried the county of Saginaw on that platform by 1,650 majority.

Mr. BAKER, of New York. Did you tell your people during the campaign that if you were elected you would vote to put lumber on the free-list?

Mr. TARSNEY. I did not.

Mr. KERR. Were you charged with being a free-trader? Are you not in fact a free-trader in lumber?

Mr. TARSNEY. I am a fair trader. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. TARSNEY. I wish to ask, by unanimous consent, that I may have leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD. There are some tables which I wished to present in connection with my remarks which I did not get time to refer to.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection and it is ordered accordingly.

Mr. FARQUHAR rose.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment is now in order except the one moved by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], upon which debate is exhausted.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I will move a *pro forma* amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in the list or scale of wages presented by the gentleman from Michigan we find the lowest upon the unskilled scale is at the rate of $1.25 a day. The highest wages are those of foremen and head sawyers and engineers. That skilled labor receives from $3.50 to $4 a day.

Now, in this connection, Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from Michigan one or two questions. We will between us consume the five minutes in a friendly way, without interruption by others. Let me ask him whether the engineers and sawyers in his district belong to labor organizations?

Mr. TARSNEY. As distinct organizations?

Mr. FARQUHAR. Do they belong to organizations of skilled labor?

Mr. TARSNEY. If they do, I am not aware of it.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Do the unskilled laborers in your district belong to any labor organizations?

Mr. TARSNEY. I am unable to answer except in this way, that I understand there are organizations of labor known as Knights of Labor, and I have no doubt they do belong to that organization.

Mr. FARQUHAR. That is, generally speaking, then, you think both the skilled and the unskilled labor is organized?

Mr. TARSNEY. I am not certain of that.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Well, as to the mill men?

Mr. TARSNEY. I do not know that all of them are; I know some are.

Mr. FARQUHAR. I am not quite so well acquainted with that district during the last four or five years; prior to that time I was, and I would like to get this information. Let me ask if your district is subject to many strikes on the scales of wages?

Mr. TARSNEY. Not many; we had one strike in 1886.

Mr. FARQUHAR Was that a strike of a single assembly of the Knights, or several assemblies helping one out?

Mr. TARSNEY. I do not know as to that. I am not a Knight of Labor myself——

Mr. FARQUHAR. Certainly.

Mr. TARSNEY. I could not be if I would, nor would I be if I could.

Mr. FARQUHAR. But it would seem that you ought to know about these things, as you speak in the interests of labor in your own district. Now, as your district has been free from strikes, and as you come here as the champion of wages of your people. I want to know if you are paying less wages in your district than what others are paying in other parts of Michigan or in Wisconsin.

Mr. TARSNEY. I do not know the rate of wages in Wisconsin.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Well, is it your opinion that the average rate paid in your district is about the same in money value as it is in corresponding industries in Wisconsin?

Mr. TARSNEY. I repeat, I do not know the rates in Wisconsin.

Mr. FARQUHAR. The presentation of some figures made here by Mr. GUENTHER and Mr. BOUTELLE seemed to furnish food for considerable thought in that direction.

Mr. TARSNEY. I am only speaking from personal knowledge. I am not quoting figures of which I know nothing.

Mr. FARQUHAR. Your labor, unskilled and skilled, as I understand it, is organized. Now, I am free to say that all organized labor in America is protection labor, and the very fact that any man is a Knight of Labor or Trades Unionist indicates that he is a protectionist, and the reason that the Knights of Labor are so closely united is that it is an acknowledged protection to those who are in these organizations of labor.

Mr. TARSNEY. Protection against capital!

Mr. FARQUHAR. Ah! protection against a reduction of wages. Now, if you are taking care of your district as I take care of mine in these matters, and as every Representative on this floor ought to do, I hold that you should be able to speak from information upon these points which are essential in the consideration of the present subject; you ought to be able to give the rate of wages as compared with other districts, and also the fact of the existence of these various organizations.

I do not want men to come here and talk to us of pauperized labor, when an intelligent Congressman can go to his own district, where he is respected for his opinions, and elevate the unorganized labor to a better wage, and thus settle this clamor as to a tariff bill and reduction of duty.

Mr. TARSNEY. It has been settled twice already by a vote of my constituents.

Mr. FARQUHAR, You say, then, that your strikes are stopped, and you intimate from your argument that your men are satisfied; but I will tell you they never will be satisfied to take up their little holdings in the Saginaw Valley and tramp across the Canadian line and take 20 per cent. less wages for their labor than they can get in protective America. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLAND. Does a protective tariff prevent strikes?

Mr. FARQUHAR. Nobody pretends that it does. There are other conditions which prevail.

Mr. BLAND. I believe in labor striking against injustice and in protecting itself. But what I want to get at is what is the use of the tariff if it does not protect the labor as you claim?

Mr. FARQUHAR. Men have to strike in order to secure their rights at times. No tariff can prevent the necessity for that. When you had slavery you had no strikes; slaves never strike; but men who go South now may bring about strikes.

Mr. BLAND. Then protection does not prevent strikes?

Mr. FARQUHAR. No, sir; protection does not prevent them. Protection elevates the condition of the laboring classes and neutralizes strikes. As the workman rises in the scale of intelligence he has a keener sense of his rights and an increased courage to stand up for them, strike or no strike.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will regard the *pro forma* amendment as withdrawn.

Mr. MILLS. I renew it.

Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] admonished us to consider well before we conferred this great boon on Canada of removing the duty on lumber to be imported into this country. It has always been understood from the time that we first read of commercial transactions in history that it requires two parties at least to make a trade, and the reasons why trades are made is because each party to the trade is benefited thereby.

I do not doubt but that Canada will receive the benefit of the removal of the duties on lumber, nor do I doubt that the people of the United States will receive a greater benefit from it than Canada. The trade will be beneficial to both people. I am not at all astonished that the people of Canada and the great leader of the protection party in the Parliament of Canada is deeply impressed with the importance of the action we are taking on this part of the bill. I am not at all astonished at the expressions quoted from his speech by the gentleman from Maine.

If my friend had been a careful and attentive reader of the speech he would have found that the speaker said that both countries would have been benefited by the removal of the barriers to commercial exchange. He said the reciprocity treaty was beneficial to both countries, and more to the United States than to Canada; and so of the measure we are now discussing. He did not say that we were helping Canada alone by our bill, but that we were helping ourselves as well. Let me read a paragraph from his recent speech in which he refers to this bill we are now considering. He says:

> When we take the proposal to put lumber on the free-list, as it is proposed in the Mills bill, a bill regarding which I still entertain a very sanguine hope that it will become law during the present session of Congress—I say when we find that to be the case, we know at once that it is not for the purpose of furthering Canadian interests. It is done simply because in carrying out the policy of the Democratic party of the United States, they desire to make that article free in the interests of their own country and in the interests of their own people.

He well represents the Democratic policy on this question.

Mr. MILLIKEN. Who are you reading from?

Mr. MILLS. I am reading from the budget speech of Sir Charles Tupper in the Canadian Parliament. They feel the same interest in exporting the surplus products of their labor that are injured by the prohibitory duties we impose upon them that we feel to-day in this country in getting cheaper lumber and getting prohibitory duties removed from our exports.

The injury from prohibitory duties on our pork and grain and other products by the action of some of the governments of Europe is one which has been severely felt in this country; and we would feel to-day that we would do almost anything in our power if we could remove the barriers that intervene between us and the European people so that we could export our wheat, which a few years ago was worth $1.19 a bushel, but which was worth last year only about 66 cents per bushel, if I remember right.

We feel deeply interested in removing the obstructions to the exportation of our pork and our beef, our lard and our cotton. Of course we feel on our side of that question that we would be benefited by the removal of the duty, but we also know that if the European Governments were wise, if they would seek the advantage of all their people instead of the benefit of class interests, they would remove those obstructions so that when our exports went to them we would receive in return the things that their labor makes, the surplus above their home consumption, and both parties would be benefited by the transaction. Commerce is not a one sided affair. Commerce benefits both him that gives and him that receives, and that is an inseparable part of the nature of the transaction.

No man is injured by commercial exchange. He only sends away from home that which is a surplus to him, which he can not consume, and he gets in exchange for it the other man's surplus which the producer can not consume. It goes away from the man that has not the want, it goes to the man that has the want, and both are benefited by it. So it is with us to-day. Canada, of course, will be benefited by our removing the duty on her lumber, but are not the people of the Northwestern prairies to be benefited also, some of whom are now living in the ground because they are unable to buy lumber on account of the high duty that is placed upon it—a duty that raises the price of the domestic product over $30,000,000 upon an annual output of about $250,000,000?

And is not that something worthy of consideration in this House as well as the question of the interests of the lumbermen and the syndi-

cates? Is it not something worthy of consideration in our councils here, and should we not think of the amount of taxes that we are extracting in this way from the laboring people and the farmers on the prairies of the West? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FUNSTON was recognized.

Mr. DINGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. FUNSTON] is recognized. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Maine later.

Mr. FUNSTON. Mr. Chairman, it was not my design to occupy the attention of this committee further upon the question of the duty upon lumber, but the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] kindly put a question to me a few moments ago that I think it proper to answer in my own way [laughter on the Democratic side], and I thank him for it. He did me a very great kindness in asking me the question, which I feel in duty bound to answer. True, I was not addressing the gentleman from Iowa at the time, but he was at perfect liberty to ask the question, and I am very much obliged to him. The gentleman put the question to me whether I am in favor of placing lumber upon the free-list. In asking that question I suppose he intended to follow my answer with a reference to the action of the Legislature of the State of Kansas in 1883 in passing a resolution instructing their Representatives in Congress to vote for free lumber, which had been done by the gentlemen from Missouri, Mr. DOCKERY and Mr. BLAND.

It is true, Mr. Chairman, that the Legislature of Kansas did pass such a resolution, but, mark you, sir, after 1883, in March, 1884, I went before the people of my district and took up the doctrine of protection which had been advocated upon this floor by the distinguished and lamented Haskell. I advocated protection, not merely to such things as we produce ourselves, but protection to everything that gives employment to American labor or in which American capital has invested a dollar, and I came here from the second district of Kansas with a majority of 6,000. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, I want to say to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] that my people, thank God, read newspapers and books; they are an intelligent people, and therefore I am not afraid of them, as he is afraid of his people in Iowa, and that, too, without any foundation, for I can assure him that their intelligence is far above his estimate of them.

Mr. GEAR. What gentleman from Iowa does the gentleman from Kansas refer to? [Laughter.]

Mr. FUNSTON. I beg pardon of the gentleman [Mr. GEAR]. I am referring to the district of his colleague, Mr. WEAVER. [Laughter.] Now, Mr. Chairman, in this talk about free lumber the farmer has been used by the other side as a stalking horse all the way through. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY] stated the other day, though he was very careful not to have it appear in the RECORD, that he wanted free lumber in order to give the farmers fencing boards [laughter], when in fact he knows, and everybody knows, that almost the only material the farmers of the West use for fences to-day is barbed wire, and upon that material this Democratic House has put a duty of 45 per cent. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] And not only have they put that duty upon barbed wire but they have placed a duty of 60 and odd per cent. upon the material from which barbed wire is manufactured. Some historical personage once exclaimed, "Oh, Liberty! what crimes are committed in thy name," and I say to this House, "The farmers! what crimes are committed in their name!" [Laughter.]

Mr. Chairman, the people of my district ask to have nothing free upon the list as it stands to-day, unless you give them all free. We do not ask that those articles which we want to purchase shall come in free, while we seek protection on everything else. The farmers of my district believe that under our system they are getting a good market for their products, which fully compensates them for every extra cent they may possibly have to pay for their lumber. What are the facts? Gentlemen have told us that this duty is keeping the benefits of cheap lumber from the farmers of the Western States, especially of Iowa and of Kansas.

What are the facts? I call upon the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] to tell whether there is not a lumber-yard association in his State, as there is in mine, which dictates the price of lumber to the consumer, without regard to what the dealers purchase it for?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. MILLS. I want to correct one statement which the gentleman from Kansas made awhile ago. He said that we had increased the duty on barbed wire to 45 per cent. We have not done anything of the kind. We have not touched it.

Mr. BAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Kansas be allowed to continue his remarks for five minutes.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. FUNSTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask how much benefit will the farmer get from the taking off of this duty of $2 a thousand? The Democratic party have been tinkering with the railroad question; they have appointed a railroad commission, the members of which I presume are all Democrats; if not, it is the fault of the Democratic party. You have undertaken, gentlemen, to regulate the railroads in regard to freight with reference to lumber and other things, and what is the result? The result is that lumber is higher to-day in Kansas than it was before you appointed your railroad commission. So much for that.

Mr. DOCKERY. Did not you vote for it?

Mr. FUNSTON. I did; and it is a good law if managed by men who understand their business.

Now you propose to take the duty off lumber, but who will get the benefit of that reduction?

Mr. MCMILLIN. The people of Kansas.

Mr. FUNSTON. The railroads will get the lion's share as they are getting to-day under your railroad commission.

And in my State there is a lumber-yard organization controlled by a gentleman named S. A. Brown. There is not an independent lumber-yard in my district to my knowledge unless it is owned by some very rich man whom this man Brown can not crush. Near me, a young man started a lumber-yard with a small capital, and this man S. A. Brown sat down by the side of him and undersold him, and continued to do it until he broke him up; and then, having accomplished that, he ran up the price of lumber sufficiently high to get back every dollar he had lost while engaged in the process of breaking up his young rival. Now I say that if you take off this duty, this same S. A. Brown and his associates will get the benefit of it, and the farmers will pay the same for lumber as before.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that I have made a canvass of my district, and I have heard Democrats testify (we have honest Democrats there) that they believe that the market for their hogs and their cattle and their farm products is so much better by reason of the protective system as to fully compensate them for what they have to pay extra, if anything, upon lumber and other articles which they buy. The people of my State believe in the protective principle. They want everything that we produce in this country protected, and they want everything that we can not produce to come in free. Now, I answer the gentleman's question by saying, Yes; I am opposed to anything coming in free that we produce in this country. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DOCKERY. Does the gentleman insist that the protective tariff on lumber is an advantage to the labor employed in that industry?

Mr. FUNSTON. Certainly I do. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TARSNEY] stated a while ago that the wages paid for labor by the farmers of Michigan were as great as those paid in the lumber manufactured, but in making that statement I think he will admit himself that he was incorrect. I understood the gentleman from New York to show by statistics a moment ago that the lumbermen pay from $1.30 to $1.62 a day to the workers in that branch of business. Now, I stand here to-day to defy the gentleman from Michigan to name a single farmer who pays his hands that much; and I will give him time to answer.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Then the farm laborer does not derive any benefit from this protective tariff?

Mr. FUNSTON. I stand here to-day to say that whenever you transfer the industries of this country to a point 3,000 miles away, and force the American farmer into a foreign market, where he will come into competition with the cheapest labor of the world, you might as well pitch the products of our farmers into the sea. It is the markets which are created in the West by the protective policy that the farmers greet as their best friend.

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the *pro forma* amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. DOCKERY. Mr. Chairman, I renew the *pro forma* amendment. It is not my purpose to attempt a reply to all the statements just made by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. FUNSTON]; but before I get through with my five minutes I think I can show that the utterance of the gentleman on a former occasion will be a sufficient answer to one of the statements he has just made. I regret that the gentleman is not now in his seat.

Prior to the so-called tariff revision of 1883 the State of Kansas, by her Legislature, passed a resolution, which will be found on page 5210 of the RECORD, instructing her Senators and requesting her Representatives in Congress to vote to put lumber on the free-list. In response to that expression of the people of Kansas four of the Representatives from that State have, during the consideration of the present bill, voted to put lumber on the free-list. The gentleman can reconcile his own course in this respect as best he may with the action of his colleagues and the Legislature of his State.

He stated a moment ago, in reply to a question, that the tariff on lumber did operate to the advantage of the laborer in this industry. I ask to read in response to that statement of the gentleman his own declaration made on this floor on the 2d of June, to be found on page 5210 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He there states in a colloquy with the very able gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WILSON] that the laborers employed in the lumber industry receive no greater wages than those employed in the non-protected industries, and yet in spite of this admission he records himself in opposition to the positive request of his own Legislature and insists that lumber shall still pay a tax of $2 a thousand. If labor gets no benefit from the tariff on lumber, why

should the farmers of Kansas and other States be compelled to pay tribute on this article of universal necessity? The gentleman can make answer to this interrogatory to his own constituents.

Mr. PETERS. Does the gentleman claim that the farming industry in this country is not protected?

Mr. DOCKERY. I was not talking about farming industries, but about lumber industries.

Mr. PETERS. You were referring to a comparison between labor in the lumber industry and labor in the farming industry.

Mr. DOCKERY. I was simply placing the testimony of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. FUNSTON], given in this Hall on the second day of the present month, against his statement made on the floor to-day. In order that I may not misrepresent the gentleman I will read from the RECORD, page 5210:

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Now, after this, I hope the gentlemen from these great Northwestern States will answer the question why poverty should "protect" wealth. That is the question that touches the masses of the people and which they would like to have answered. Says the gentleman, our laborers are benefited. The man that stands up to-day and says labor in the lumber industry receives higher wages than in other like industries, protected or not protected, makes a statement that can not be sustained.

Several MEMBERS on the Republican side. No one said that.

No one said what? That labor in the lumber industries receives higher wages than in the non-protected industries. Let me read further and the position of the gentleman is clearly manifest:

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I am glad that you disclaim such a position. To say that laborers in the lumber protected industries receive higher compensation than in other industries is an absurdity.

Mr. FUNSTON. No one made that assertion.

No one made what assertion? Why, clearly the meaning is that no one asserted that labor employed in the lumber industry receives higher wages than in the non-protected industries. This is the statement of the gentleman as it appears in the record of the proceedings of the 2d of the present month.

Mr. GROUT. He was simply stating what had taken place on the floor; that is all.

Mr. DOCKERY. I submit in all fairness, Mr. Chairman, that no other construction can be given the language than the one I have submitted. "No one made that assertion." If the "assertion" had not been made, and the "assertion" was true, it was proper then for the gentleman to rise in his place and state that laborers in the lumber industry do receive higher wages than in the non-protected industries. He did not so state.

A MEMBER. Mr. FUNSTON is not here.

Mr. DOCKERY. I regret that the gentleman is absent from the Hall, as I have no doubt but that he would have honored me with his presence had he known of my purpose to reply to his observations.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. McCREARY. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended.

There was no objection.

Mr. KERR. Was it not the fact that nobody had made the assertion up to that time?

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, that is begging the question. You can not afford to masquerade behind such a flimsy technical construction. The language of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WILSON] was too clear and explicit to admit of any misunderstanding. I have read the statement which the gentleman made; and I again submit that it fairly admits of no other construction than the one I have given it.

Mr. ADAMS. Will you please point out what the contradiction is between the statement which you are assuming the gentleman from Kansas to have made the other day and something which he said to-day?

Mr. DOCKERY. When the gentleman addressed the House a few moments since I rose in my place and asked him whether labor in the lumber industry was protected by reason of the tariff, and he said that it was.

Mr. ADAMS. That is, it was protected.

Mr. DOCKERY. I do not think there is any misunderstanding about that, and I am unable to reconcile it with the admission that appears in the colloquy with the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. WILSON]. Protection that brings no increase in wages is no protection at all. If those men employed in the protected industries get no more wages than men employed in the non-protected industries, where does the "protection" to labor come in? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. KERR. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. KERR. Is it not true that men go from one industry in the United States to another in accordance with the rise or fall of wages paid in those various industries?

Mr. DOCKERY. Oh, most certainly.

Mr. KERR. Is it not true that high wages paid in one industry maintain high wages in other industries?

Mr. ADAMS. Is that true or is it not?

Mr. DOCKERY. Is what true?

Mr. ADAMS. That high prices in one industry tend to raise wages in another?

Mr. DOCKERY. It depends on the character of labor, whether the labor is skilled or unskilled.

Mr. DINGLEY. That is it.

Mr. DOCKERY. The gentleman attempts to evade the force of the statement I made by "lugging" in a general proposition. The question at issue was the relation of the tariff on lumber to the wages paid in that industry and the seeming change in the views of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. FUNSTON]. I thought it but right that he should be permitted to explain to his people and to the Republican Legislature of Kansas why he is not in harmony with four of his colleagues who favor free lumber.

Mr. CHEADLE. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. DOCKERY. Not now. Mr. Chairman, I have no personal knowledge of the lumber industry in Michigan; but I do know that it is the most prosperous business in my section of the country. While it is not conducted under the auspices of a "trust," yet as a rule I think it may be safely stated that the schedule of prices is controlled by local "pools," and competition thus avoided.

Mr. CHEADLE. Will the gentleman pardon me for asking him a question?

Mr. DOCKERY. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. WARNER. What is the lumber interest in your country? Is it not the interest of the lumber yard?

Mr. DOCKERY. Yes, sir.

Mr. WARNER. The sale of lumber?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly. The scale of prices is fixed and maintained by agreement, so as to avoid competition, and the profits thus made staple, certain, and highly satisfactory.

Mr. WARNER. Let me ask the gentleman another question. If you could make more money in the lumber business, that is, if you could make larger profits than you could expect to make in the banking business, would you not leave the banking business and go into the lumber business; that is, if you understood it?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly; but that question has no relation whatever to the point at issue. It trenches in nowise upon the accuracy of the statement under discussion. I reassert that many of the dealers in lumber in my district, as indeed all over the country, avoid competition by "pooling their issues" and fixing a scale of prices that insures a profit in excess of that enjoyed by other industries not so favorably circumstanced.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. WARNER. I will take the floor and yield my time to my colleague; but before he proceeds I would like to ask him whether the lumber interest is the only one which has agreed upon a scale of prices? Is it not true that the medical profession and the legal profession also fix schedules of fees which are to be charged?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly.

Mr. WARNER. Do not lawyers and doctors agree to charge the same fees for the same services?

Mr. DOCKERY. Certainly; but that does not affect the proposition under consideration, for the reason that the medical and legal professions do not come to Congress and ask for "protection" as our friends of the lumber interest do. [Applause.] The analogy my colleague seeks to establish does not hold good at all. In one case the men engaged in the lumber business ask for legislative aid, while in the other case the sturdy, self-reliant doctors and lawyers depend on their own energies and rely upon the resources given to them by the Almighty. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. KERR. Is is not a sufficient answer to that proposition to say that the lawyers and the doctors are not importing goods?

Mr. DOCKERY. No; I do not think it is. I can not see that the observation of my friend is at all relevant.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, in discussing the tariff question and looking over the message of the President in relation to that question, I am clearly of the opinion that he misunderstands or has entirely misunderstood the whole subject. I do not know that he is to blame for that, and for the reason that I believe he has not had any considerable experience in that direction. Had a legal proposition been submitted to him for an opinion probably he would have been capable of advising as to the proper way to deal with it. But this is a business question, and as his business relations have not been very extensive it is not to be expected, of course, that he would be able to handle the question with that clearness its importance demands. If he had had that training and experience he would never have penned the message he sent here to this Congress, because in its conclusions he is clearly wrong in the deductions he makes, and I desire briefly to call attention to the facts.

For instance, if you look at page 7 of the message when he takes up and discusses this question of the tariff, where he refers to it as being "vicious, inequitable, and illogical," he goes on to argue that those who buy these imports pay the duty charged thereon, and which goes into the public Treasury. But let me ask my friends, the members of this House, who it is that buys these imported commodities. Is it your farmers, your artisans, your mechanics throughout the coun-

try? That I would like to know. Mr. Chairman, there is not a member on this floor who represents a constituency of the people who has been troubled with that question any time from the first moment he came here as a member of this Congress to the present hour. There is no complaint from his people as to the tariff on imports. Where, then, do these complaints arise? They come from the nabobs of the land, who complain about the tariff. They are complaining, for they are the ones who buy the foreign importations, the foreign goods, and they would be able if the reduction of the tariff was made to be benefited by the reduction. They are complaining; not the working classes or the farmers of the country. They do not say a word about it. They are perfectly satisfied. Nobody is suffering under the present condition of things. The country is prosperous; and besides, supposing you do reduce the tariff, how are you going to get any money out of these rich people? How will you raise money from them for the support of the Government? You will not collect any money from them, and why? Because they have their money in bonds and stocks. You collect no taxes on their bonds. Therefore if you do not collect it in the shape of duties from them you can not collect it at all. They are able to send to Europe and Asia and other countries for these things which are imported. The Government and the people generally reap the benefit from the duty which they pay. If that is true then why remove the duty? They can afford to spend their money for these fine goods on which the duty is levied, and what object would there be in repealing the tariff? The complaint which comes for a change or modification comes from these very people, the rich people of the country. They are the ones who want to escape paying the duty.

Mr. Chairman, I venture to assert that there are not a hundred men in any constituency in any district, in the western part of this country especially, that have been affected by this tariff in the way that has been suggested here, while the other two hundred thousand people, the average in a Congressional district, are satisfied with the goods that we have in this country. They are good enough for them, and they are satisfied with our home productions; therefore the tariff does not affect them.

But, furthermore, to justify his views on this position, the President goes on to argue what he is in favor of, and so has misled the committee, with all due deference to the committee, by telling them that in addition to this they pay the duty directly into the public Treasury. But he says there is another class of people who pay it indirectly, and that this goes into the pockets of the manufacturers. That is the grand mistake and delusion. If he had been a manufacturer, or if any member of the committee had been a manufacturer, this statement would not have gone abroad as a fact. It is a grand fallacy. It can be easily demonstrated that it is, and if you will wait a moment I will endeavor to show you why it is so. Take, for instance, the article of calico. There is 3 cents a yard duty; but you can go into the mills and factories in Massachusetts and buy it for 2½ cents a yard.

Before the war that calico sold for 12 cents per yard, and of a medium quality. To-day you can buy it in the retail stores in the West for 4 cents a yard. How does it come, then, that the duty would raise the price of calico? This goes clearly to show that it has reduced the price instead of increasing it. Why? In consequence of the great competition among the manufacturing establishments throughout the country. So it is, Mr. Chairman, the same principle runs through all these commodities. You can take woolen clothes, if you please, of which so much has been said here, and you will find the same principle prevails.

Some members of the House, and especially the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS], have advocated the theory that the tariff on wool increases the price of the domestic article. That is a clear mistake.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Will the gentleman explain how, if the value of calico has been reduced to 3 or 4 cents a yard by the tariff, it has enabled the manufacturer to pay his labor higher wages, as has been alleged?

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. My dear sir, I did not say it made higher wages. [Laughter.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. That is the claim over there.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. I told you yesterday that your side of the House had an opportunity to remedy that difficulty, and that is what I propose to do as one member of this side of the House, if I am permitted to remain and live long enough to do it. That is the future question that I propose to attend to.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BYNUM. I desire to ask the gentleman a question, as the lumber schedule is under discussion, whether he is in favor of free lumber?

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. No, sir; I am in favor of free nothing that our people can manufacture. I am in favor of having the benefit of all that we can manufacture.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the *pro forma* amendment to be withdrawn.

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. Let me ask the gentleman a question. Are you in favor of free coal?

Mr. BYNUM. Of free wool?

Mr. WHITE, of Indiana. I said free coal, but I will include free wool.

Mr. BYNUM. Certainly I am in favor of free wool. I have nothing to keep back; I am in favor of free wool and free coal, too.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the amendment of the gentleman from Maine is exhausted.

Mr. HOOKER. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I find in one of the daily papers of the great metropolis of our country a comment on the debate which has been taking place in this House upon the subject of the duty on lumber, which expresses very well the sentiment I entertain myself on that subject after having listened to this discussion. Before calling attention directly to this article, however, I will remark that one would suppose from the character of the debate here there was no lumber in this country save that in Maine and in Michigan. Some of us upon this side of the House who represent the States of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi come from a region of country which is as largely interested as any other, perhaps more largely interested in this lumber industry than even Maine or Michigan. On the coast of Mississippi, on the Pearl and the Pascagoula, and other streams which drain the interior of the country, there are mills as large in extent probably as any in Maine or Michigan.

Our vast area of pine timber remained in almost a virgin state until very recently, when these mills have been erected, and only a few days ago there passed through both Houses of this Congress a joint resolution to prevent large entries of lands in the South, and of timber lands, upon the ground that great monopolies and syndicates were being formed for the purpose of getting possession of those lands, which are now coming into market and are eagerly sought in consequence of the exhaustion of the timber lands of Maine and of Michigan by use, and their still more terrible exhaustion by fires.

It has been said here at times that this bill is sectional. Why, sir, there is no region of the country which will be more affected by the provisions of the bill than the timber region of Arkansas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. But I agree with the sentiment expressed by my distinguished friend from New York [Mr. COX] a few days ago (which excited ironical remarks upon the other side of the chamber), that among the prime reasons why the policy of this bill should be adopted is the desirableness of preserving our forests and protecting the agriculture of the country from the injury which would result from the too rapid drainage of our rivers. It was said by some gentleman on the other side, in reply to the honorable gentleman from New York [Mr. COX], that that was an exploded idea, something that had been entertained in the past, but which in this progressive age no man familiar with the subject would consider. In connection with that point I now ask attention to an extract from the New York Evening Post.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE TAX ON LUMBER.

The House has been engaged for three days in Committee of the Whole in considering the duty on lumber. The insensate obstinacy of the Republicans, their determination to defend every tax that goes to the creation of a monopoly, however oppressive it may be to the great mass of the people, and however deleterious to the physical well-being of the country, receives here its decisive illustration. During the past ten or twelve years the highest scientific testimony in the nation has been regularly and unremittingly presented to Congress to the effect that measures should be taken to preserve the remaining forest area from the ravages of reckless woodmen in the interest of fertility and public health, and in order to prevent the springs and life-giving water courses from drying up. The arguments which enforce this policy are only in part economic. They touch the higher ethical considerations which ought to move the public spirit of the nation. They appeal to our love for the beautiful, and bid us preserve, while there is yet time, the forest-clad slopes of our uplands, with their grateful shade, their charming color, their sublimity, their poetry, their religious inspiration. They teach at the same time a most impressive lesson of another sort, showing how countries that have allowed their timber to be swept off by private greed have become the prey of alternate droughts and freshets, their once fruitful lands being either torn from its bedding in the rocks and washed away, or dried up and rendered barren to such a degree that population can no longer be supported on it.

Mr. HOOKER. And in confirmation of the views thus expressed, I desire to refer to an investigation which was made some years ago in that country which has been so often alluded to in this debate, Canada, and to the testimony given before a commission appointed by the Canadian Parliament to make inquiry upon the subject of the value of the timber lands and the importance of their preservation. Mr. Thayne was being examined upon that subject, and he said:

In regard to the duration of timber supply in the North of Europe, a definite answer could not be given. Russia is credited with a large forest area that might be made available by railroads. Austria likewise possesses some magnificent forests in the center of Europe, which can only be reached by similar means. Whether so bulky an article of timber can bear the expense that such transportation in Europe would involve, can only be decided by experience. It is true that the European governments are beginning to show a great deal of interest in protecting the forests; but this newly-awakened feeling does not owe its existence entirely to any desire to promote the exportation of forest products, but rather to the fact that they are alarmed at the injuries sustained by the arable land consequent on stripping the hills and river banks of their wood.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman of Mississippi has expired.

On motion of Mr. ROGERS, by unanimous consent, Mr. HOOKER'S time was extended for five minutes longer.

Mr. HOOKER. The same gentleman, speaking on the same subject, says further on:

By a system very different to the one pursued in the older provinces of the

Dominion, the forest lands have been treated without due regard either for present purposes or for the future wants of the country. Here, however, the opinion was universal that the timber was inexhaustible, and that its destruction was advantageous to the country. It is only of late years that the fallacy of this belief has been brought home to the minds of those who have examined the matter. In the Northwest the case is very different; no competent authority affects to maintain that the timber supply is equal to the wants of such a population as the fertile lands might be expected to support. The obvious policy of the government would, therefore, be to have the timber-producing regions surveyed at the earliest date, before any vested interests are created, and set apart permanent reserves wherever the adjacent land requires shelter, or where a large population is likely to settle. These reserves should be under the direct control of the government, who might either lease them, subject to the condition that the lessees should maintain a regular supply, or better still, according to the system followed in the state forests of Northern Europe, a certain proportion of full-grown timber should be disposed of by public competition, the trees to be removed by the purchasers, the number being regulated by the requirements of the locality and the yield of the reserve.

I wish to refer also to a report made by the Secretary of the Interior of our own country in 1878–'79 upon this question of the importance of preserving our timber lands. I allude to that eminent and distinguished incumbent of the Interior Department under a Republican administration, Mr. Carl Schurz, who in his report to Congress upon this subject said:

The traditions of a time are still alive when the area covered with virgin forest in this country was so great that the settler might consider the trees on the land he occupied as a mere difficulty to be overcome and to be swept out of his way. But circumstances have very materially changed. We are now rapidly approaching the day when the forests of this country will no longer be sufficient to supply our home wants, and it is the highest time that the old notion that the timber on the public lands belongs to anybody and everybody, to be cut down and taken off at pleasure, should give way. A provident policy having our future wants in view can not be adopted too soon. Every year lost inflicts upon the economical interests of this country an injury which in every part of the country will be seriously felt, but in the mountainous regions threatens to become especially disastrous and absolutely irreparable. We ought to learn something from the calamitous experiences of other parts of the world. If the necessity for such a provident policy be not recognized while it is time the neglect of it will be painfully appreciated when it is too late. I am so deeply impressed with the importance of this subject that as long as I remain intrusted with my present duties I shall never cease to urge it upon the attention of Congress.

The Secretary also says:

As to the importance of this subject I shall add but little to what I said in my last annual report. The disastrous consequences which always follow the destruction of the forests of a country are known to every well-informed man. These consequences will inevitably come upon us in a comparatively short period of time, considering the rapidity with which the timber growth of this country is being swept away, unless legislation be adopted systematically to arrest this indiscriminate spoliation. In accordance with the suggestions which, in this respect, I offered in my last annual report, a bill was introduced in the Senate (Senate bill No. 609) which provides that all timber-bearing lands, chiefly valuable for the timber upon them, shall be withdrawn from sale or other disposition under existing laws, and be held by the Government with a view to preventing indiscriminate destruction and waste, and to the preservation of the young timber and the reproduction of the forests. The bill further provides ample means by which settlers on the public lands and miners can procure timber and fire-wood to supply their wants, with or without the soil, at minimum rates. It also provides for the sale of timber at reasonable prices for manufacturing purposes and for export period. It finally provides for the appointment of a number of officers to execute its provisions under the direction of this Department.

In another report, made in a subsequent year, Mr. Carl Schurz, the same Republican Secretary of the Interior, speaks further upon this subject, and says:

The rapidity with which this country is being stripped of its forests must alarm every thinking man. It has been estimated by good authority that, if we go on at the present rate, the supply of timber in the United States will, in less than twenty years, fall considerably short of our home necessities. How disastrously the destruction of the forests of a country affects the regularity of the water supply in its rivers necessary for navigation, increases the frequency of freshets and inundations, dries up springs, and transforms fertile agricultural districts into barren wastes, is a matter of universal experience the world over. It is the highest time that we should turn our earnest attention to this subject, which so seriously concerns our national prosperity.

The Government can not prevent the cutting of timber on land owned by private citizens. It is only to be hoped that private owners will grow more careful of their timber as it rises in value. But the Government can do two things: 1. It can take determined and, as I think, effectual measures to arrest the stealing of timber from public lands on a large scale, which is always attended with the most reckless waste; and, 2. It can preserve the forests still in its possession by keeping them under its control, and by so regulating the cutting and sale of timber on its lands as to secure the renewal of the forest by natural growth and the careful preservation of the young timber.

* * * * * * *

Moreover, nowhere is a wasteful destruction of the forests fraught with more dangerous results than in mountainous regions. The timber grows mostly on the mountain sides, and when these mountain sides are once stripped bare, the rain will soon wash all the earth necessary for the growth of trees from the slopes down into the valleys, and the renewal of the forests will be rendered impossible forever; the rivulets and water-courses, which flow with regularity while the forest stands, are dried up for the greater part of the year and transformed into raging torrents by heavy rains and by the melting of the snow, inundating the valleys below, covering them with gravel and loose rock swept down from the mountain sides and gradually rendering them unfit for agriculture, and, finally, for the habitation of men. Proper measures for the preservation of the forest in the mountainous regions of the country appear, therefore, of especially imperative necessity. The experience of parts of Asia, and of some of the most civilized countries in Europe, is so terribly instructive in these respects that we have no excuse if we do not take timely warning.

In consonance with the views which other gentlemen have expressed on this subject, I wish to say that wherever syndicates are formed, whether in Maine, Michigan, Mississippi, Arkansas, or Louisiana, for the purpose of raising the price of the product to the consumer, who has to shelter himself, his wife, and his little ones by means of this timber when manufactured and carried as it is by the billions of feet on our railroads and steam-boats to the untimbered lands of Kansas and Nebraska, where you offer a premium for the raising of timber by allowing land devoted to that purpose to go untaxed, we propose now to send you the lumber which is grown cheaper and cheaper every year; and I am astounded to hear gentlemen from those regions which produce no lumber oppose this proposition to take $2 a thousand feet off the cost of lumber.

But I favor this proposition for another reason. I am opposed to these syndicates and "combines" whatever form they take and whatever commodity they affect, whether lumber or anything else. That distinguished jurist who once adorned the office of Attorney-General of the United States, that man of splendid intellect and vast acquirements, whose memory is still treasured in the hearts of the American people—I allude to the illustrious Jeremiah S. Black, of Pennsylvania [applause on the Democratic side]—has well described these trusts and their effect upon the country when in a periodical published within the last few years he said of these trusts and "combines" that—

They are inventions to increase the plunderers' stealing powers, through which his felonious fingers are made long enough to reach into the pockets of posterity, lays his lien on property yet uncreated, anticipates the labor of coming ages, coins the industry of future generations into cash, and snatches the inheritance from children whose fathers are unborn.

[Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the *pro forma* amendment will be regarded as withdrawn.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, representing as I do a large lumber district in the South, and being familiar, I think, with the lumber business, I have been amused at the statements which have been made here during the last month—statements made, too, by gentlemen from the South who ought to be the representatives of an industry which has become within the last few years one of the most flourishing and most important to our people. I undertake to say to-day that not a man, woman, or child in any of those districts has asked any representative, directly or indirectly, to have the tariff taken off lumber—not one. What would be the result of removing this duty? Take my district; and we ship largely. Lumber is one of our most important industries, next to iron. We ship to London; and we ship also to Boston and New York. Most of our lumber goes to the two latter cities. When it lands there, with what does it come in competition? With Canadian lumber. We sell our lumber for $10 a thousand; the Canadians sell theirs for the same price. They pay $2 a thousand duty, giving them $38 on the thousand, while we receive $40. Now, the proposition is to take off the $2. Who will get the benefit of it? Why, Mr. Chairman, what is the use of talking to sensible people about a matter like this? If the duty be removed, the Canadians can either keep the price at what it is to-day and pocket that $2, or they can reduce the price $2 a thousand and we shall have to do the same; otherwise we could not sell our lumber.

What is the argument (and I have been amused at it) which is made by Representatives on the other side from the South? How eager they are to help these Yankees! They want to give the Yankees cheap homes, cheap barns; and they want to give the Northwestern men cheap fences. To use the phrase of a Baptist minister down in Arkansas, "how their bowels yearn for these Yankees!" They want to give them cheap lumber.

A statement was made by the gentleman from Arkansas that people in his section of the country were selling lumber at $9 a thousand, and that if this bill should not be passed, the price would go up to $15. How the people down there would murmur at that! How the workmen and the owners of the stumps, as we say down there, would bewail such a calamity! How everybody connected with the lumber trade in Arkansas would shed tears if lumber should go up from $9 a thousand to $15 a thousand! I can imagine I see some of these Arkansas men who cut the trees or haul the logs to the mill, getting together and saying, "What does this mean? Lumber has gone up from $9 to $15. Will not our wages go down?"

Mr. Chairman, that sort of claptrap will not do for sensible men, even those who cut the trees down in Arkansas. There is no man in any business who, when he gets good prices and fair profits, does not feel like giving better wages to his workmen. Let me give you a little bit of my own history. I have a furnace. When iron, charcoal iron of the very best character, went down from $30 a ton to $19 a ton (and I had been giving my hands good wages when the price was $30) I called my workmen into my office and said, "Gentlemen, here is a great difference in price. Look at my books. I do not want to deceive you. I shall have to cut down your wages or I must stop the furnace—must 'blow out.'" They said, "We do not want you to do that; we will submit to such reduction as you see proper." Notwithstanding that I said to them, "Take your houses; here is plenty of land; go to work and raise what you want to eat, but I must stop."

Do you tell me that if the price of lumber advances from $9 to $15 there is any employer in Arkansas who will not feel like giving to the poor men who work for him—his neighbors—better wages than when the price was $9 a thousand?

As I have said, the lumber business is a great Southern industry. Since we emerged from the rebellion it has become under the tariff one of our greatest industries. Our people are prosperous. The farmer

has a ready market for all he can supply. He feeds the people engaged in this industry. The community is contented. I can say that in my own State there is not a single individual connected with the lumber business, or a farmer, or a merchant, or a mechanic who has asked any Representative of our State to have the tariff taken off lumber.

Nobody wants it. It was the demagogues who brought about these strikes on the part of the workingmen. Gentlemen may talk about strikes and combines and trusts, and all that sort of thing. I will give you my own opinion of that matter.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I ask by unanimous consent that the gentleman from Tennessee be allowed five minutes longer.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. BUTLER. Now I will give you my opinion about these strikes. It is the demagogues of the country who have brought them about. In old times the workingmen got their wages, they got them promptly, and they were satisfied: but this cry of the rich getting richer and the poor getting poorer, and all the talk about railroad magnates have made the workingmen dissatisfied.

When I first came to Congress some years ago I was put on the Committee on Labor. Men came before that committee and talked about giving the workingmen their share of the profits earned by the capital invested in business; that is, that after the workingmen got their wages the profits should be divided up between them and the capitalists. In this way these demagogues of the country engendered a feeling of dissatisfaction on the part of the workingmen, who were made to believe they had a right to a part of the profits of capital invested in business all over the country.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BUTLER. Certainly.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Then your theory is for the Government to protect the rich, and they will take care of the poor? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BUTLER. I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. I understood that to be your argument.

Mr. BUTLER. I will take care of myself. The Southern country is prosperous and looking up. Our lumber is doing well; there is no doubt about it. The only thing that stands in the way is the demagogue who has caused strikes on the part of the workingmen as the result of the dissatisfaction which he has created on their part.

But some of our Southern Representatives seem to be anxious about furnishing cheap houses to the Yankees who are going down there. They seem to be wonderfully careful of them! [Laughter.] I remember the time when these same Yankees were nothing to them but hirelings, who went down there for no other purpose than to steal their negroes and everything else they had. [Great laughter and applause.] Now, it would seem they want to furnish them with good houses like we have in Tennessee and Arkansas. [Laughter and applause.] Those are about the facts in the case.

If the removal of this tax on lumber makes that article cheap, who is to get the benefit of it? Will it not be the Canadian manufacturer of lumber and the Canadian laborer engaged in the production of that lumber? If, on the contrary, the removal of the tax does not cheapen the cost of the article, then the Government loses the revenue which it now gets from that article. If it does not protect those engaged in the lumber interest so far as the cost of this article is concerned, and it does not give any revenue to the Government, I should like to know what good reason there is or why our people should be anxious to take off the duty on lumber? Is it for the purpose of helping these Yankees to whom they have referred? [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. Chairman, so far as my country is concerned I represent a large lumber district. Yesterday one of the most intelligent gentlemen from Abingdon, in Southwestern Virginia, came here to meet myself and Mr. GOFF on business. I asked him about the feeling in reference to the removal of the duty on lumber, and he said that the people in that section of the country were almost unanimously opposed to taking the duty off of lumber. He said that every one engaged in the lumber trade in Southwestern Virginia was against the proposition contained in this bill.

By unanimous consent, the *pro forma* amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. WEAVER. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, my question to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. FUNSTON] was propounded for the purpose of having it understood in the Northwest just what the issue is. I am opposed to all tax on lumber, and wish it put on the free-list. I wish the honorable gentleman from Kansas to state before the House whether he is opposed to putting lumber on the free-list. That was the only motive I had in propounding the question to him. I esteem him highly as a personal friend. He had the candor to say a few moments ago that he is opposed to free lumber and in favor of keeping the protective duty upon it.

To use his own language, he is in favor of "protecting everything that is produced in this country," and then, strange to say, he accuses the gentlemen in charge of this bill of putting a duty of over 40 per cent. on barbed wire, of which he says the fences of Kansas are constructed. I want to say to him that the committee did not put a duty on barbed wire at all. They left the duty where it is now under the law, fixed at an ad valorem rate of 23.91 per cent. or about 2 cents per pound, and just where it was placed by a Republican House of Representatives.

Mr. FUNSTON. I know the gentleman does not want to misrepresent my statement.

Mr. WEAVER. Certainly not; and if the Chair will extend my time the gentleman can have as much time as he wants to explain himself.

Mr. FUNSTON. I did not accuse the Democratic party of keeping up the duty on barbed wire; I only stated it as a fact.

Mr. WEAVER. But you stated they had increased the duty to 45 per cent.

Mr. FUNSTON. Well, you did; you increasad the duty on billets from 45 to 65; and you increased it $11 per ton, the equivalent of which is about 65 per cent.

Mr. WEAVER. But that is not barbed wire. The material out of which barbed wire is made is wire known as No. 10, and from that to No. 16; never below No. 10 nor above No. 16. That has not been disturbed.

Mr. FUNSTON. Did not the chairman——

Mr. WEAVER. Now, I can not yield any further in the short time that I have.

That duty was placed there, I repeat, by the Republican party, and the gentleman has confessed before the House that he is not only in favor of that duty of 2 cents per pound upon wire, but that he is also in favor of a duty upon lumber.

Mr. FUNSTON. Let me say that you are mistaken.

Mr. WEAVER. It is true, as the gentleman says, that very little fencing is made in Kansas of lumber; all or nearly all of it is made of barbed wire. But Kansas is interested in lumber because the granaries, the barns, and the houses are made of lumber; so we have the issue clearly made here between the gentleman and his constituents. He states squarely and openly that he is in favor of a duty on lumber and on barbed wire as well.

Mr. FUNSTON. I did not make any such statement, sir. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WEAVER. Did you not say that you were in favor of protecting everything?

Mr. FUNSTON. Yes; everything that America produces. [Laughter.]

Mr. WEAVER. Do we not manufacture wire—barbed wire? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FUNSTON. I made a statement——

Mr. WEAVER. No, no; do not take my time now to explain what you meant. Answer my question. Do we not manufacture barbed wire?

Mr. FUNSTON. Yes; but you put a duty on it. Do you favor that? [Laughter.]

Mr. WEAVER. Not at all. The Republican party put it on, and this committee left it just where it was. Now, I will ask the gentleman from Kansas, will you vote with me to put wire on the free-list? [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FUNSTON. Now, answer me a question. You say you represent the farmers. Why not take the duty off?

Mr. WEAVER. No; the gentleman must submit to my questions or sit down, one or the other.

Mr. FUNSTON. I am asking you a question. Answer my question first and then I will answer yours. [Renewed laughter.]

Mr. WEAVER. I have the floor, and I intend to hold it. Answer this question, yes or no. This matter goes into the RECORD for your constituents and my constituents to read, and let them decide the question between us. I ask if you will vote with me to put wire No. 10 and No. 16, out of which barbed wire is made, on the free-list. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FUNSTON. Answer my question and I will answer yours. [Renewed laughter.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DOCKERY. I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Iowa be extended.

Mr. GROUT. I will object unless he allows the gentleman from Kansas to ask his question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the request to the committee. Is there objection to the gentleman from Iowa proceeding for five minutes longer?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEAVER. Now, I wish the gentleman to take his seat and allow me to proceed.

Mr. FUNSTON. Will you not answer my question? [Laughter.]

Mr. WEAVER. Not until you have answered mine.

Mr. FUNSTON I was first.

Mr. WEAVER. I have the floor, and I will insist that either the gentleman shall take his seat or answer the question. [Laughter.]

Mr. FUNSTON. I want to know why you do not take the duty off of barbed wire and billets?

Mr. WEAVER. And I have asked you if you would vote with me to do it. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Why do not you answer? I challenge the gentleman to answer.

Mr. FUNSTON. Why not take the duty off barbed wire?

Mr. WEAVER. I am not on the committee. [Laughter and jeers on the Republican side.]

Mr. FUNSTON. If you represent farmers why not take it off, and why do not you take it off of blankets? [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.] You dare not answer it. Why do not you take it off of blankets and woolen goods? I repeat it.

Mr. WEAVER. I am in favor of that. But you want to shift the controversy from lumber to blankets. [Applause on Democratic side.] I repeat the question, and challenge an answer. Will you join me in voting to take the duty off of wire?

Mr. FUNSTON. Well, answer the other question first. [Laughter.]

Mr. WEAVER. Yes, when you come squarely up and answer mine. And I want the gentleman to understand that he has no right to interrupt me when I have the floor, and when I tell him plainly that I will not yield unless he answers my question. Now he declines to answer. He replies with counter-questions, shirking the real issue. I arraign the gentleman before this House and the district he represents as being opposed to putting barbed wire and lumber upon the free-list. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FUNSTON. And I arraign you, sir, before your district as being opposed to taking the duty off barbed wire. You are a coward and afraid to do it. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WEAVER. I say I will vote to put barbed wire on the free-list. Will you do it?

Mr. FUNSTON. I have said that I am in favor of protecting everything that American labor produces, whether it be little or great. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WEAVER. Do I understand you to answer that you are opposed to taking the duty off either barbed wire or lumber?

Mr. FUNSTON. Certainly; I am opposed to taking the duty off both or either, and I appeal to my party friends that they will stand by me as they did in 1886.

Mr. WEAVER. Now, then, I arraign the gentleman before his constituents and before the Republican party of Kansas, as opposing and trampling under his feet the resolution of his own Republican State Legislature.

Mr. FUNSTON. Why do you not take the duty off both?

Mr. WEAVER. I stand exactly where the Republican Legislature of Kansas has stood, and the gentleman is here in rebellion against it and in favor of the lumber trust and the barbed-wire trust of this country. [Applause on Democratic side.] I arraign him also as being in opposition to four of his own colleagues, who stood up here like men and voted with us on this side of the House for free lumber.

Mr. PETERS. Oregon has given an increased majority against free trade. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. WEAVER. There is another wounded duck. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HERMANN. Six thousand majority in Oregon, according to the latest reports. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER] has expired.

Mr. FUNSTON. I am glad to hear from the gentleman from Iowa, but first of all I want to reply to the observations of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. DOCKERY]. I was called out just as I had finished my remarks awhile ago by a gentleman from Kansas, but I would not have gone at that time if I had known that the gentleman from Missouri intended to reply to what I had said. The gentleman claimed that I had asserted that protected labor in the lumber business was better paid than any other industry. What I said was that no one on this floor had asserted that. The RECORD reads:

Mr. FUNSTON. No one made that assertion.

That is the only reference I made to the subject, and I repeat now that no one did make that assertion.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. WEAVER], I thanked him a few moments ago for putting a question to me, because I delight to answer these questions. I say to him now, as I have said before, that I am a protectionist, not merely for the things that we produce ourselves, not upon the ground that I want all things that we consume in my State to come in free and a duty to be laid upon all things that we produce. That is not the kind of protectionist I am. I place myself upon the broad principles of Henry Clay, who so ably advocated the doctrines of the protective system. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, sir, I stand here to say that the gentleman misrepresents even his own Iowa. He came down into my district last fall and made a canvass there. The people of Kansas have learned by experience that whenever there is a drought in the Rocky Mountains we get the grasshoppers, and whenever there is a failure of crops in Iowa we get the cranks. [Laughter.] So they came down and overran my district, but the gentleman with all his pals did not succeed in carrying a single county for his doctrine of free trade.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I will say further, so far as regards barb wire, that I am in favor of putting everything we produce in this country upon the protective-list. I am consistent; I am in accord with the protective system of the Republican party. But you [Mr. WEAVER] claim to be a free-trader; you claim to be a friend of the farmer; you claim to be a friend of the farmer of Iowa, Mr. WEAVER, of Iowa, and yet you stand by the Committee of Ways and Means who propose to put a duty of 45 per cent. on barb wire and increase the duty on the material of which it is manufactured, so as to make it amount to about 65 per cent. You also vote for a duty of about 80 per cent. on rice. And at the same time you do that you vote for free wool; you vote for free flax; you vote for free linseed oil; you vote for making every thing free that the farmers in your State produce, and the farmers of your district, if they vote for you this coming fall, will make the greatest mistake of their lives. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BYNUM. The gentleman states that he is in favor of protecting everything that we raise. Do I understand him, therefore, as intending to vote against the proposition which comes from his side of the House to put sugar on the free-list?

Mr. FUNSTON. I want to say to the gentleman that I differ with some of my friends on this side, and that I shall stand for protecting sugar just as I stand for protecting other things. I am not a little-souled man. I hope I do not represent a little-souled people who want everything free that they consume and everything that they produce protected. The gentleman from Indiana can not say as much. [Applause.]

Mr. BYNUM. That is all. I just wanted a square answer and I have got it.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on the pending amendment is exhausted. The amendment being formal, the Chair will presume that it is withdrawn.

[Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to renew the amendment for the purpose of saying a word on this barb-wire question. In regard to that there are two points to be taken into consideration: first, the effect of the duty upon the material, and, second, the effect of the patents upon the profits of the manufacturers. Now, what has the Committee on Ways and Means done as to the first? In line 161 of this bill I find, "slabs and billets of steel, $11 per ton." Wire is made of wire rods; wire rods are made of slabs and billets. The present duty on these billets is 45 per cent., which a large manufacturer as well as importer tells me is equivalent to $8 per ton. Therefore this bill raises that duty from $8 to $11 per ton. Looking farther along in the bill I find that "iron and steel wire and iron and steel wire galvanized, and all manufactures of iron and steel wire and of iron and steel wire galvanized shall pay the duties now provided by law; provided that no such duty shall be in excess of 60 per cent. ad valorem." That shows the sympathy of the committee for the barb-wire-using farmer.

Now, as to the other point, the effect of the patents. Almost all this barb wire is made under a set of patents granted by the Government of the United States, and I do not hesitate to say that our patent system needs a thorough revision. I do not hesitate to say that the price of barb wire has been raised beyond the normal point because of the existence of these patents; and in that connection I want to state that bills have been introduced in this House limiting the effect of the patent system, and have been referred to the Committee on Patents, of which the honorable gentleman from Iowa is chairman; but he has made no effort to have those bills considered in this House.

[Cries of "Vote!" "Vote!" on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will consider the formal amendment as withdrawn.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending amendment is that of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Maine.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment will be read.

The amendment was read, as follows:

And provided further, That whenever the said commercial privileges, including the right to buy provisions, bait, and supplies, and to transship any portion of cargo, are granted to the fishing and other vessels of the United States by the Dominion of Canada, then mackerel, herring, salmon, and other fish smoked, dried, salted, pickled, or preserved, except anchovies and sardines, or other fish preserved in oil, shall be free of duty.

And provided further, That whenever the Dominion of Canada admits products, wares, and merchandise grown, produced, or manufactured in the United States free of duty, then the products, wares, and merchandise grown, produced, or manufactured in said Dominion of Canada shall be admitted free of duty.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. It is admitted by almost everybody that there must be some reduction of the revenue. The entire amount of revenue now raised annually by means of the duty on the various items of lumber, wood, etc., which this bill places on the free-list, is a little over $1,000,000—not quite the amount of the revenue now received by the Government in a single day, and not quite 1½ per cent. of the surplus after the payment of all the annual expenditures. So that the entire amount of reduction by the schedule which we have been discussing for the last four or five days does not equal one day's revenue, and is not quite 1½ per cent. of the annual surplus.

As it is necessary to reduce revenue, the only way, of course, in

which it can be done is by an assorting of taxes, by an elimination from the tax schedule of some subjects of taxation or a reduction of the tax upon subjects which are left. The entire amount of these various articles annually imported has been a little less than seven million dollars, the amount exported between twelve million dollars and fifteen million dollars, The schedule reported by the Bureau of Statistics is not so classified as to render absolutely certain what is the amount of exportation under the classification given in the present tariff law and in the pending bill. It is probably about $15,000,000. Thus it appears that the schedule which we have been discussing embraces items of which the exportation is nearly twice as much as the importation. Therefore, it is perfectly clear, as it strikes me, that the contests we have witnessed on the part of gentlemen on the other side have not been for the purpose of preserving the revenue received from these various articles, but simply in defense of protection as protection. There is and can be no schedule as to which it can be more absolutely certain than in this case that the contest made to prevent the change proposed by the Committee on Ways and Means arises from a purpose to preserve the system of protection for the sake of protection, and not for the sake of the revenue arising from the existing duties.

The amendment which I propose to attach to the amendment of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], so that if his amendment be adopted and become law, it may have substantial and fruitful results, puts upon the free-list, not only the fish that we may import from the Dominion of Canada, but also those that we may import from other countries. A very large part of the fish that we import is not Canadian fish. I am informed that the larger part of the imported fish used by the foreign population in the Northwest is not Canadian fish, but is fish cured or preserved in Norway, Sweden, and other European countries.

The second branch of the amendment I offer looks to commercial reciprocity between the Dominion of Canada and the United States. Canada has a protective tariff. The cheap Canadian labor, of which we have heard so much, is protected by a protective tariff. Along the extended border between our country and Canada there are the two barriers—the protective tariff of Canada and the protective tariff of the United States. The effect of the second branch of my amendment is that when the Canadian Government shall see its way clear to give free admission to American goods into Canadian markets, when the oversupply of manufactured articles which could be produced if labor had full twelve-month's occupation given to it annually, when the oversupply of our farmers who now have to seek a market across the ocean can find admission into Canada by means of the removal of the protective duty which Canada imposes, then we shall give to the Canadians the advantage, whatever it may be, of our market.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DINGLEY. Does the gentleman from Kentucky desire further time?

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. No, I will not trespass further upon the attention of the Committee of the Whole. My main purpose was to submit my proposition rather than to make any extended remarks upon it.

Mr. DINGLEY. I desire to be recognized to oppose the amendment to the amendment.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee rose informally, when, Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*,

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, requested that the House return to the Senate the bill (S. 1162) for the relief of Susan E. Alger.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, the bill (H. R. 6833) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year 1889.

DAVID MERIWETHER.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* announced the appointment of Mr. SHAW, Mr. TAULBEE, and Mr. MASON as the conferees upon the part of the House on the bill (H. R. 331) for the relief of David Meriwether.

TARIFF.

The Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union resumed its session.

The amendment and the amendment to the amendment were read.

[Mr. DINGLEY withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. In view of the fact that the gentleman from Maine is discussing a question that goes beyond the mere rate of duty upon articles imported for use in this country, I trust that the gentleman will be permitted to proceed without the enforcement of the five-minute rule until he has concluded his remarks.

Mr. COX. I would like to hear from the gentleman from Ohio also.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Oh, well, the gentleman from Ohio knows when to speak.

Mr. COX. Certainly.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I do not wish to be ungracious, Mr. Chairman, and decline the request in favor of the gentleman from Maine, but in view of the fact that the gentleman has already occupied ten minutes in presenting the amendment and now ten minutes again on the amendment suggested, this is such a manifest change in the order of debate and course of proceedings in committee that it does not seem altogether just to other gentlemen. Would the gentleman consent to occupy but five minutes more?

Mr. DINGLEY. I have some other words I would like to say in the hearing of the House.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I hope ten minutes, at least, will be allowed to the gentleman.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I will compromise on five minutes. I repeat I do not wish to seem ungracious.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I trust ten minutes will be allowed in view of the importance of the question which is presented.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the request of the gentleman from Ohio to the committee.

Mr. MILLS. I want to move that the committee rise early this evening, because there are other matters, an appropriation bill, which should be considered. If the gentleman from Maine will consent to go on in the morning, I will move that the committee rise.

Mr. DINGLEY. That will suit me better. I would prefer to yield for the motion that the committee rise, with the privilege of continuing in the morning.

Mr. MILLS. I have no objection to the gentleman having his ten minutes in the morning.

I move that the committee now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. COX having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the tariff bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PEEL. Mr. Speaker, as is well known, the amendments of the Senate to the Indian appropriation bill have been reported back by the committee to the House, and my object now is to move that we go into Committee of the Whole for the purpose of considering those amendments. But inasmuch as the amendments, of which there are quite a number, are none of them of very great importance, I hope the House will consent, and therefore I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole from the further consideration of the bill, and that we non-concur in the amendments of the Senate, in accordance with the unanimous instructions of the Committee on Indian Affairs, which considered the Senate amendments this forenoon, and appoint a conference on the disagreeing votes thereon.

It is well known to gentlemen that when a conference report comes in the various amendments are set out in full. In addition to that the managers upon the part of the House have to make a separate report and a statement of the effects of the various amendments for submission to the House; and if there is any one point on which any gentleman desires to have a discussion or a separate vote he shall have the privilege when it comes before the House. I make this request, therefore, in order to save time, that we non-concur in the amendments and agree to the conference.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to non-concur in the Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 8565) known as the Indian appropriation bill, and agree to the conference asked thereon.

Mr. ADAMS. I shall object unless I hear some good reason for such action. I know of no reason why the House of Representatives should not consider Senate amendments. My position in this respect is well known. If the gentleman from Arkansas will state some reason for making this bill an exception to the general rule, which he must admit to be a good one, I may perhaps withdraw my objection.

Mr. PEEL. It is a well-known fact that the Commissioner of Indian Affairs is now in New York letting contracts which have to be met and paid for out of this appropriation. At the end of this month the current appropriation expires, and the prompt passage of this bill is necessary in order to close up these contracts. If we go into Committee of the Whole to consider these various amendments it will undoubtedly take a great deal of time. I assure the gentleman there is no principle of legislation involved that will provoke any discussion.

Mr. BLOUNT. Will the gentleman state how much has been added to the bill by the Senate?

Mr. PEEL. Very little. Really I can not say that they have added anything. They claim to have reduced it to some extent and perhaps made some increases in one or two places, so that when the two are balanced up there is little difference.

Mr. BLOUNT. There is no new legislation involved?

Mr. PEEL. No, sir.

Mr. ADAMS. I suggest to the gentleman that he can now move to go into Committee of the Whole to consider the various amendments.

Mr. PEEL. As a matter of course; and that is what I propose to do if objection is made to the request.

Mr. SPRINGER. Is not my colleague from Illinois willing to trust his political associates on this subject?

Mr. NELSON. Let me state to the gentleman that this has been thoroughly considered by the Committee on Indian Affairs, and they are unanimous in this conclusion.

Mr. ADAMS. Has it been considered by the Committee of the Whole of the House of Representatives?

Mr. NELSON. And we are simply following out what has been the custom here in making this motion.

Mr. ADAMS. Does the gentleman regard it as a good or a bad custom?

Mr. NELSON. I am not here to criticise the action of the House in that regard.

Mr. ADAMS. Then I will criticise it, and say it is a bad custom.

Mr. SPRINGER. The bill has already been considered in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection?

Mr. ADAMS. I object.

Mr. PEEL. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering general appropriation bills.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the Indian appropriation bill.

The amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7 were read, and, by unanimous consent, were concurred in.

Amendments numbered 8 and 9 were read, and non-concurred, in by unanimous consent.

Amendments numbered 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27 were concurred in, by unanimous consent.

Amendments 28 and 29 were non-concurred in.

Amendment 30 was read, as follows:

Strike out in lines 817 and 818 of the bill the words: "For subsistence and civilization of the Assinaboines in Montana, including pay of employés, $30,000."

Mr. PEEL. I ask unanimous consent that that amendment be concurred in.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I would like to know the reason for that.

Mr. NELSON. The reason is simply this: We have entered into a treaty with these Indians for the purchase of a large portion of their reservation, and in pursuance of that treaty they get a large annuity. The treaty has been ratified and confirmed by an act passed and approved since this appropriation bill passed the House, and the provisions of the treaty render this appropriation unnecessary.

The amendment was concurred in.

By unanimous consent, amendment 31 was concurred in.

Amendment 32 was read, as follows:

Strike out lines 854, 855, and 856 of the printed bill, as follows: "For support and civilization of the Gros Ventres in Montana, and for pay of employés, $30,000."

Mr. PEEL. I ask unanimous consent that that amendment be concurred in, for the same reason. The amount to be struck out by the Senate in these cases are simply the estimates that were made by the Department for these various bands of Indians in Montana. At the time this appropriation bill was made up by the committee there was a bill pending before the House to ratify an agreement made with the Indians last fall, by which, if it became a law, we should acquire from them some 17,000,000 acres of land, for which we were to pay them $4,300,000 in ten annual installments. Not knowing whether that bill would become a law or not, we inserted the usual estimates; but when the appropriation bill reached the Senate this other bill of which I have spoken had already become a law, so that there was no longer any necessity for these various appropriations. Having that contingency in view, we had inserted a provision in the appropriation bill which would have prevented the expenditure of these moneys in case the other bill became a law, and the Senate proposes now to strike out these items, and we ask the House to concur.

The thirty-fifth amendment was read, as follows:

Insert the following:

"For continuing the work of constructing ditches and reservoirs for the Navajo Indians, and for the purchase, maintenance, and operation of a portable sawmill for the use of said Indians, and for the purchase of nails and such other necessary materials as can not be obtained by the Indians for houses to be constructed by them, $15,000, to be taken from the funds now in the Treasury belonging to said Indians."

Mr. PEEL. The Committee on Indian Affairs recommend non-concurrence in this amendment.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

The thirty-sixth amendment was read, as follows:

Insert the following:

"The sum of $10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated to enable the Secretary of the Interior to pay the settlers who, in good faith, made settlement in township 29 north, ranges 14, 15, and 16 west of the New Mexico principal meridian, in the Territory of New Mexico, prior to May 1, 1886, for their improvements and for damages sustained by reason of the inclusion of said townships within the Navajo reservation by Executive order of April 24, 1886, and such settlers may make their homestead, pre-emption, and timber-culture entries as if they had never made settlement within said townships."

Mr. PEEL. I ask that this amendment be non-concurred in.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, while I shall not oppose the request of the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs that this amendment be non-concurred in, I wish to express the hope that the conferees on the part of the House will do whatever may be in their power to secure in the conference the adoption of both these items with reference to the Navajo Indians, the item embraced in the thirty-fifth amendment, appropriating $15,000, and the item in the thirty-sixth amendment, appropriating $10,000. I am satisfied that this sum of $25,000 ought to be appropriated for the purposes specified. My friend from Arkansas understands, of course, the condition of these Indians. The Navajoes are one of the very best and most progressive of our Indian tribes, and one of the most capable in the main of self-support. They have large herds of sheep, goats, and horses. As a tribe they are increasing rapidly in numbers and have been for years. I hope, therefore, that the encouragement proposed in this appropriation of $25,000 for the two purposes named will be readily yielded.

Allow me to say another word. It was at the instance of the committee of which the gentleman from Arkansas is now chairman and of which I had the honor to be at the time a member that this action by the Government extending the boundaries of the Navajo reservation was taken. We were not aware at the time of the number of settlers on the land which was added to the reservation, but it was very manifest that on account of the increasing numbers of the Navajoes their reservation ought to be enlarged.

While I will not now ask concurrence in this amendment, I trust the committee of conference on the part of the House will not hesitate a moment in concurring in the action of the Senate as to both these amendments.

Mr. PEEL. I fully agree in all that has been said by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN]. I have no authority, of course, to anticipate the action which may be taken by the conferees on the part of the House, though I feel myself strongly inclined to concur in the gentleman's suggestion; but not understanding this matter thoroughly we thought it the safe course to ask non-concurrence, so that we may ascertain the reasons which have actuated the Senate in inserting these two amendments.

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, in view of the remarks which have just fallen from the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] I move concurrence in this amendment, and I wish to say——

The CHAIRMAN. The thirty-fifth amendment has already been non-concurred in.

Mr. HOLMAN. The two amendments ought to go together; and after the intimation of the chairman of the committee [Mr. PEEL] I think we can safely allow them to do so.

Mr. ADAMS. I do not know that I shall insist on my motion; but I most respectfully protest against the reason just given by the chairman of the committee in favor of non-concurrence—that the committee want further information. My whole point in opposition to this proceeding and the only reason why I have objected to non-concurrence is that I deem it the duty of the Committee on Indian Affairs to inform the House in regard to questions of this kind. If they can send a messenger to the Senate to get information, all right; if they can not, let them get information in some other mode. But let us, at any rate, have information in order that we may legislate, and that we may not allow the Senate and the House conferees to legislate for us.

Mr. HOLMAN. Let me say a single word. I would very fully concur in the view expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADAMS] but for the fact that we have already non-concurred in one of these paragraphs, and of course we might as well put the other on the same footing.

Mr. ADAMS. I desire to ask the gentleman from Indiana whether on a second view he sees such a logical connection between these two amendments that we can not now concur in this because we have non-concurred in the preceding.

Mr. HOLMAN. Oh, no; they stand on a somewhat different footing, but they are for the benefit of the same tribe of Indians.

Mr. ADAMS. The pending amendment is for the benefit of the settlers, not for the benefit of the Indians at all.

Mr. HOLMAN. I connect the two measures together, though they are somewhat different as to their subject-matter.

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman connects them, permit me to say, without having any logical reason for doing so.

Mr. HOLMAN. There may be no very logical connection except that this provision is really for the benefit of both the Indians and the settlers, for the difficulties in regard to the lands added to the Indian reservation have been a source of trouble between the Indians and the settlers.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the thirty-sixth amendment will be non-concurred in.

There being no objection, it was ordered accordingly.

The thirty-seventh amendment was read, as follows:

Insert the following:

"For support and education of the Seminole and Creek Indians in Florida, for the erection and furnishing of a school-house, for the employment of teachers, and for the purchase of seeds and agricultural implements and other necessary articles, $6,000."

Mr. PEEL. I ask that this amendment be non-concurred in.

Mr. ADAMS. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee why he makes that request.

Mr. PEEL. Simply because there is no estimate from the Department in regard to this item, and we have had no opportunity to hear the reasons of the Senate committee and the Senate for putting the amendment upon the bill. The gentleman says that we ought to inform ourselves in regard to these matters. I do not know any rule of parliamentary law which would allow a committee of one House to be in conference as a body with a committee of the other to hear arguments in favor of action which may have been taken. Hence we have no legitimate means of ascertaining the reasons which have secured the adoption of these amendments in the Senate unless we personally interview members of that body. When we non-concur an issue is made up between the two Houses, and the House has the matter to that extent within its control until the question can be examined in conference. But if we concur at this stage, without understanding the reasons in favor of the amendment, there is no opportunity to remedy any mistake we may make.

Mr. ADAMS. Would not that reason require non-concurrence in any amendment which the Senate might choose to make?

Mr. PEEL. I did not understand the gentleman's remark.

Mr. ADAMS. Does not your argument require you to throw into conference any amendment which the Senate may choose to make?

Mr. PEEL. Not necessarily. Any amendment which we can understand, and which appears to us proper, we can readily concur in. We have already concurred in quite a number.

Mr. ADAMS. The gentleman is the chairman of a committee which it is supposed ought to be able to investigate these questions and give us information.

Mr. PEEL. It is a rash assumption to suppose that the chairman of the committee must know all about these matters.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

The thirty-eighth, thirty-ninth, fortieth, forty-first, forty-second, forty-third, and forty-fourth amendments of the Senate, which are as follows, were concurred in:

Thirty-eighth amendment: Strike out the following:

"The various amounts appropriated in this act for the support, maintenance, civilization, pay of employés, etc., of the Indians in Montana receiving rations at Fort Peck, Fort Belknap, and Blackfeet agencies, respectively, shall not be expended, provided the several agreements made with them by the agents of the United States in December, 1886, and January and February, 1887, be ratified by Congress. The first installment stipulated in said agreements to take the place of said appropriations."

Thirty-ninth amendment: Strike out in the paragraph under general incidental expenses of the Indian service the word "general" and insert the following words: "Incidental expenses of Indian service in Arizona: For general."

Fortieth amendment: Insert in the same paragraph the words "for Hoopa Valley agency."

Forty-first amendment: Strike out the following paragraph:

"For the payment of salaries of judges of the Indian courts, $5,000."

Forty-second amendment: Insert the following paragraph:

"For compensation of judges of Indian courts, at such rate as may be fixed from time to time by the Secretary of the Interior, $5,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary."

Forty-third amendment: Insert the following words: "In accordance with treaty stipulation."

Forty-fourth amendment: Strike out "twenty-five" and insert "ten;" so it will read:

"For survey and subdivision of Indian reservations and of lands to be allotted to Indians, and to make allotments in severalty, in accordance with treaty stipulation, to be expended by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, $10,000."

The forty-fifth and forty-sixth amendments of the Senate were non-curred in, as follows:

Forty-fifth amendment: Strike out the following:

"For pay of special agents, and necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of section 3 of the act approved February 8, 1887, entitled "An act to provide for the allotment of lands in severalty to Indians on the various reservations, and to extend the protection of the laws of the United States and the Territories over the Indians, and for other purposes," $35,000; $10,000 of which sum shall be immediately available."

Forty-sixth amendment: Strike out the following:

"For surveys and resurveys under the provisions of the act of Congress approved February 8, 1887, to be repaid proportionately out of the proceeds of the sales of such lands as may be acquired from the Indians under the provisions of said act, $75,000; in all, $100,000."

Mr. PERKINS. The forty-seventh, forty-eighth, and forty-ninth Senate amendments are more specific and are in lieu of the forty-fifth and forty-sixth amendments of the Senate in reference to what is known as the general allotment bill. As we have non-concurred in the forty-fifth and forty-sixth amendments striking out the House provisions we should also non-concur in the forty-seventh, forty-eighth, and forty-ninth amendments, and let the whole question go to the conference committee.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Will not the gentleman from Kansas admit that the Senate provisions are better and more specific?

Mr. PERKINS. They are.

Mr. ADAMS. Let me ask whether this is not an instance illustrating how unwise it is on our part to concur or non-concur by unanimous consent in reference to these amendments, as was proposed in the House, and to which I objected. If consent had been granted these amendments of the Senate would have been non-concurred in.

The amendments were non-concurred in.

The fiftieth amendment of the Senate was read, as follows:

Insert the following paragraph:

"To enable the Secretary of the Interior to pay Charles F. Larrabee for services rendered as disbursing officer of the commission appointed May 15, 1886, to negotiate with certain tribes and bands of Indians in Minnesota, by reason of which service he was required to give a bond and to incur extra responsibility, $1,000."

The amendment was non-concurred in.

The fifty-first amendment of the Senate was read, as follows:

Insert the following:

"To pay Shirley C. Ward, of Los Angeles, Cal., for his services to date as special attorney for the Mission Indians of Southern California, under appointment by the Attorney-General, made at the request of the Secretary of the Interior, $2,500."

Mr. PEEL. The committee recommend non-concurrence.

Mr. HOLMAN. What information has the chairman of the committee in reference to this claim for services as special attorney for the Mission Indians of Southern California?

Mr. DUNN. I happen to know about that case. Suit was brought to dispossess the Indians, and the decision of the lower court was against them, but the decision of the Supreme Court reversed that decision of the lower court and left the Indians in possession.

I say that fee provided for in this amendment of the Senate was earned in a righteous cause, every dollar of it. I have read the decision of the Supreme Court since I have been here.

Mr. PEEL. We do not know whether the amount provided is reasonable or not, and therefore we move to non-concur so as to look into it. We do not know whether it is too much.

Mr. DUNN. This attorney was employed by advice of the Attorney-General, and the fee is not one-quarter of what it would have been to private parties. This land sold for $130,000 while I was there to the parties who had brought the action of ejectment against the Indians. The fee is $2,500, but it ought to be $10,000. It was honestly earned and in a righteous cause.

Mr. PEEL. That may be all true, but I move to non-concur.

Mr. DUNN. I do not wish to antagonize the committee, but in my judgment that fee ought to be paid.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

The amendments of the Senate numbered 52 and 53, which are as follows, were non-concurred in:

Fifty-second amendment: Insert the following:

"For payment to Anna Adamson the equivalent of five months' salary as a teacher at the Indian school at the Mission Indian agency, California, $300."

Fifty-third amendment: Insert the following:

"For this amount, to be paid to Wallace W. Rollins and Otis F. Presbrey, it being in full payment of the amount of their claim against the Eastern band of Cherokee Indians in North Carolina, found by the Court of Claims, in Departmental Case No. 18, Senate Executive Document No. 158, Fiftieth Congress, first session, to be due them for services rendered under their contract of May 15, 1874, with same Indians, $10,176.75."

Amendments numbered 54 and 55 were non-concurred in.

Amendment numbered 56 was read, as follows:

For the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with the Cœur d'Alene tribe of Indians for the purchase and release by said tribe of such portions of its reservation as such tribe shall consent to sell, on such terms and conditions as shall be considered just and equitable between the United States and said tribe of Indians, which purchase shall not be complete until ratified by Congress, $2,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary.

Mr. ADAMS. I understand the committee recommend non-concurrence in this amendment. I would ask why this should be non-concurred in. I suggest that the transaction is not to be completed until it is ratified by Congress.

Mr. PEEL. That may be true; but it may be found on an investigation that it is not necessary to go to this expense at all. There may be an experimental expenditure there of this sum without producing any good results.

Mr. ADAMS. But it is subject to the approval of Congress.

Mr. PEEL. I move to non-concur in this amendment.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendments 57 and 58 were read, as follows:

Strike out the words "support of Indian day and industrial schools, and for other educational purposes not hereinafter provided for, for construction and repair of school buildings, and for purchase of horses, cattle, sheep, goats, swine, and so forth, for schools, $725,000," and insert:

"For support of Indian day and industrial schools, and for other educational purposes not hereinafter provided for, $685,000; for the construction and repair of school buildings, $55,000; and for purchase of horses, cattle, sheep, and swine for schools, $10 000; in all, $750,000: *Provided*, That the entire cost of any boarding-school building to be built from the moneys appropriated hereby, including furniture, shall not exceed $10,000, and the entire cost of any day-school building to be so built shall not exceed $600."

Mr. ADAMS. I rather infer that amendment No. 58 is intended as a substitute for what is proposed to be stricken out by the Senate. Before that is non-concurred in let us hear the judgment of the committee as to whether the substitute is not better than the provision contained in the original bill.

Mr. PEEL. That may be so. It should be remembered, however, that this bill only came over to the committee on Saturday last, and we have had little time to consider these matters, and therefore prefer to look further into it.

Mr. ADAMS. Has the gentleman any opinion of his own as to the superiority of the amendment numbered 58?

Mr. PEEL. There is a difference between them, and for the present I should prefer to non-concur in the amendments.

The amendments were non-concurred in.

Amendment 59 was read, as follows:

Strike out the words "and for transportation of pupils to and from said school" and insert "at not exceeding $167 for each pupil;" so that it will read: "For support of Indian industrial school at Carlisle, Pa., at not exceeding $167 for each pupil, $80,000."

Mr. O'NEILL, of Pennsylvania. Is that the Philadelphia school?

Mr. PEEL. No; that is the Carlisle school.

Mr. ADAMS. What change does this make?

Mr. PEEL. I believe it has been the rule, anyhow. I see no special objection to it as amended by the Senate.

The amendment was concurred in.

Amendment No. 60 was concurred in.

Amendment No. 61 was non-concurred in.

Amendment No. 62 was concurred in.

Amendment No. 63 was non-concurred in.

Amendment No. 64 was concurred in.

Amendments numbered 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, and 70 were non-concurred in.

Amendment No. 71 was concurred in.

Amendments numbered 72 and 73 were non-concurred in.

Mr. MILLS. I ask unanimous consent to non-concur in all the other amendments, as I want to move an adjournment.

Mr. ADAMS. I hope the gentleman will come at once to amendment No. 76 and let us hear an explanation of why the Senate have stricken out this paragraph.

Amendments numbered 74 and 75 were non-concurred in.

Amendment No. 76 was read, as follows:

Strike out the words:

"For the support and education of Indian pupils of both sexes at day and industrial schools in Alaska, $20,000; this to be expended under the supervision and control of the Bureau of Education."

Mr. NELSON. The gentleman from Illinois wants to know the object of the Senate in striking out this paragraph. We do not know. We propose to non-concur to find out.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendment No. 77 was read, as follows:

For the purpose of constructing and completing suitable school-buildings for an Indian industrial school, to be located at some point in Ormsby County, in the State of Nevada, upon lands previously donated to the Government of not less than 200 acres in extent, and of such character and location as shall be deemed most suitable for the purpose by the Secretary of the Interior, upon plans and specifications to be approved by him, $25,000.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent that we non-concur in this and all the rest of the amendments.

Mr. BUCHANAN. I want an explanation first of one of the following amendments, No. 78, before that is done.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this amendment, No. 77, will be concurred in. The appropriation of $25,000 here is for the construction of an Indian industrial school in Nevada. We have done nothing at all for these Indians in Nevada, and quite a large number of intelligent and benevolent people are interested in their education.

Mr. PERKINS. Permit me to suggest to the gentleman that the committee have already reported a bill, which is upon the Calendar, providing for an Indian school in Nevada. But there are some provisions in that bill which are not incorporated here; and while we are in favor of the school we thought it well to compare that bill with the Senate amendments.

Mr. HOLMAN. In the hope that the committee will yield to that amendment, I shall make no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. The committee have already reported a bill.

The amendment was non-concurred in.

Amendment No. 78 was read, as follows:

That in the expenditure of any money appropriated in this act for any of the purposes of education of Indian children, those children of Indians who have taken lands in severalty under any existing law shall not, by reason thereof, be excluded from the benefits of such appropriations.

Mr. NELSON. At the request of the gentleman from New Jersey, I will briefly explain the nature of this amendment.

At the instance of the gentleman from New York, who is not now in his seat, I was informed that there were certain Indians in New York and other places who had lands allotted to them in severalty whose children the Department thought were not entitled to the educational provisions in the appropriation bill; and this amendment, or the substance of it, was suggested to meet that difficulty.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Then you are in favor of it?

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to non-concur in that amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN. If the gentleman is in favor of this proposition why should we not concur?

Mr. NELSON. Has the chairman of the Committee on Indian Affairs any objection to amendment 78?

Mr. PEEL. I see no objection to it.

The amendment was concurred in.

Mr. NELSON. I ask unanimous consent to non-concur in all the remaining amendments.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. PEEL. I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill and amendments to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having resumed the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported from the Committee of the Whole that they had had under consideration a bill (H. R. 8565) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes for the year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, with the amendments of the Senate thereto, and had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that certain of the amendments be concurred in and that the others be non-concurred in.

Mr. PEEL. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments in which the Committee of the Whole have recommended concurrence be now adopted by the House.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Are separate votes demanded on the amendments?

Mr. PEEL. Let them be taken together.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is upon the adoption of the amendments reported favorably from the Committee of the Whole.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the other amendments will be considered as non-concurred in.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. PEEL. I now ask unanimous consent that a conference be requested on the disagreement of the two Houses on the bill and amendments.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* appointed as conferees on the part of the House, Mr. PEEL, Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi, and Mr. PERKINS.

BARRACKS AT FORT SNELLING.

On motion of Mr. TILLMAN, the Committee on Military Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate from the Secretary of War for an appropriation for the erection of barracks at Fort Snelling, and it was referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

GENERAL PLEASANTON.

Mr. HOOKER. Mr. Speaker, there is a bill upon the Speaker's table which came from the Senate yesterday with an amendment—a bill to retire General Pleasanton. I move that the Senate amendment be non-concurred in.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The bill is not on the Speaker's desk, but will be here in a few minutes.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and the House accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS INTRODUCED AND REFERRED.

Under the rule private bills of the following titles were introduced and referred as indicated below:

By Mr. GEST: A bill (H. R. 10373) granting a pension to Alex. Kelleman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. NEAL: A bill (H. R. 10374) for the relief of John T. Gates—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEEL: A bill (H. R. 10375) granting a pension to S. R. Watts—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PETERS: A bill (H. R. 10376) granting a pension to Eva L. Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHEELER: A bill (H. R. 10377) to refer the claim of Mahala H. Portlock to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. T. H. B. BROWNE: A bill (H. R. 10378) for the relief of William J. Lewis—to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

The following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk, under the rule, and referred as follows:

By Mr. R. H. M. DAVIDSON: Petition of citizens of Citrus County, Florida, for the improvement of Homosassa River, Florida—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ERMENTROUT: Memorial of the Boards of Trade of Philadelphia, Pa.; of Portland, Oregon; of Savannah, Ga.; of Mystic Valley, Conn.; and of the Chamber of Commerce of Duluth, in favor of the Nicaragua canal—to the Committee on Railways and Canals.

By Mr. GAINES: Petition of E. Oscar Pegram, of Dinwiddie County, Virginia, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. LEE (by request): Petition of Elias Cooper, of Loudoun County, and of J. F. and Charles E. Conrad, executors of J. M. Conrad, of Loudoun County, Virginia, for reference of their claims to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PETERS: Copy of discharge and papers in case of Eva L. Webb, for a pension—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. G. M. THOMAS: Petition of William Bell, of Fleming County, Kentucky, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WADE: Petition of citizens of McDonald County, Missouri, for the establishment of a system of Government telegraph—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WHEELER: Petition of Jesse Keys, of Madison County, Alabama, for reference of his claim to the Court of Claims—to the Committee on War Claims.

The following petitions in favor of House bill 9716, for the better protection of free labor from convict labor, were received and severally referred to the Committee on Labor:

By Mr. DUNHAM: Of Jerry Scofield and 7 others, members of Local Assembly No. 1597, Knights of Labor, of Lake, Cook County, Illinois.

By Mr. PERKINS: Of William J. Needham and others, citizens of Cherokee County, Kansas.

By Mr. WADE: Of citizens of McDonald County, Missouri.

The following petition for the more effectual protection of agriculture, by the means of certain import duties, was received and referred to the Committee on Ways and Means:

By Mr. GROUT: Of William Douglass and other citizens of North Concord, Vt.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *June 7*, 1888.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. J. G. BUTLER, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

BRIG GEORGE WASHINGTON.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate a communication from the clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting conclusions of that court in regard to the French spoliation claim in the case of the brig George Washington; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. FAULKNER presented the petition of Justin Rittenhouse and 37 other citizens of Harrison County, West Virginia, praying that the interstate-commerce law be amended; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. MORRILL presented the petition of George Peltier, late a private in Company F, Eighth Regiment Vermont Volunteers, praying that he be allowed arrears of pension; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CALL presented a petition of citizens of Jacksonville, Fla., praying for the passage of Senate bill No. 1448, to create a national bureau of harbors and water ways; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented a petition of citizens of Indian River, Fla., praying that an appropriation be made to deepen and straighten Indian River from Grant's Farm to Jupiter Inlet; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. DOLPH presented a petition of citizens of Washington Territory, praying that certain improvements be made on the Skagit River at Mount Vernon, in Washington Territory; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. GEORGE presented the memorial of the Board of Trade of Jackson, Miss., remonstrating against the passage of the bill (S. 1448) to create a national bureau of harbors and water ways; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. COCKRELL. I present a petition of citizens of Clay County, Missouri, who respectfully pray that, in view of recent public disclosures of gross violations under the interstate-commerce act by the railway companies of this country, in case of all prosecutions commenced and brought after the passage of the interstate-commerce act against any person or corporation for a violation of the act passed February 4, 1887, on the complaint of a citizen of the United States, whether the violation of said act complained of occurred prior or subsequent to the passage of this act, such citizen shall be entitled to have and receive for his own benefit all fines and penalties that may be imposed and collected for such violation of law.

I move that the petition be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FAULKNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 9487) granting a pension to Mrs. Aurelia P. Hall, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1963) for the relief of John A. Lynch, have carefully considered the same, and, in accordance with the resolution of the Senate of February 7, 1884, report as follows:

That they have referred the same to the Court of Claims under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to afford assistance and relief to Congress and the Executive Departments in the investigation of claims and demands against the Government," approved March 3, 1883.

Mr. BLAIR, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1960) granting a pension to Willard A. Jackson; and

A bill (S. 2756) granting a pension to Andrew J. Hadley.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2982) granting a pension to Ellen M. Thornton, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr WILSON, of Maryland, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 436) for the relief of James Barnes, Joab Williams, and William Titus, submitted an adverse report thereon; which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

JOHN TAYLOR.

Mr. SAWYER. I ask that the bill (S. 2058) granting a pension to John Taylor be recalled from the House of Representatives. The House of Representatives has passed a bill similar to it, and when the Senate bill is returned I shall ask its indefinite postponement and the passage of the House bill.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Wisconsin asks that the House of Representatives be requested to return the bill indicated by him to the Senate. That order will be made; if there be no objection.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. ALLISON introduced a bill (S. 3108) granting a pension to Daniel Hartsook; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3109) granting a pension to D. G. Rummel; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLACKBURN introduced a bill (S. 3110) to amend section 2 of an act entitled "An act to define more clearly the jurisdiction and powers of the supreme court of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 1, 1866; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAMERON (by request) introduced a bill (S. 3111) to incorporate the trustees of the National Industrial Institute in Washington, D. C.; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. STOCKBRIDGE introduced a bill (S. 3112) granting an increase of pension to William H. Marston; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. BLAIR introduced a bill (S. 3113) granting a pension to Clara H. McIntire; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 3114) granting a pension to Joseph H. Harwood; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills, and agreed to the same:

A bill (H. R. 7263) for the erection of a public building at Bay City, Mich.; and

A bill (H. R. 7264) for the erection of a public building at Bridgeport, Conn.

The message also announced that the House had non-concurred in the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 331) for the relief of David Meriwether, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHAW, Mr. TAULBEE, and Mr. MASON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to some and disagreed to other amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8565) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. PEEL, Mr. ALLEN of Mississippi, and Mr. PERKINS managers at the conference on the part of the House.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Mr. MORGAN submitted the following resolutions; which were read:

Whereas in the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations on the treaty now pending in the Senate between the United States and Great Britain, concerning the interpretation of the convention of October 20, 1818, signed at Washington February 15, 1888, the question is presented whether the President had authority to negotiate such a treaty without the previous consent of the Senate; and

Whereas in said report the question is also raised whether the persons appointed by the President without the advice and consent of the Senate as plenipotentiaries to negotiate and sign said treaty were lawfully appointed, and whether said document is a treaty duly negotiated for the consideration and action of the Senate; and

Whereas said committee declare in said report that the matters to which said treaty relates are not fit subjects for negotiation with the Government of Great Britain and that the time for negotiation with that Government on these subjects has passed; and

Whereas the Senate will consider said treaty on its merits, and declines to adopt the views of the committee as expressed in their report as to the constitutional powers of the President in negotiating treaties, and also declines to affirm that the time for negotiation with Great Britain on the subject of our fishing rights or the commercial rights of our fishermen has passed, or that the existing difficulties on these subjects are not subjects of negotiation:

1. *Resolved*, That, in the opinion of the Senate, the treaty signed by Thomas F. Bayard, William L. Putnam, and James B. Angell, as plenipotentiaries of the United States, in conjunction with the British plenipotentiaries, on the 15th day of February, 1888, and sent to the Senate by the President as a treaty duly negotiated for the consideration and action of the Senate, is properly authenticated as a treaty made by the President of the United States, acting within his constitutional powers, and is lawful and valid as a negotiation.

2. *Resolved*, That, in the opinion of the Senate, the time has not passed for negotiation with Great Britain as to the just interpretation of any part of Article I of said treaty of 1818 upon any point of sincere disagreement between the two Governments as to the true meaning of the same, and that no act of Congress has declared that such time for negotiation has passed; nor has the time for such negotiation passed in respect of any commercial rights that may be claimed or that may be needed for our fishermen in any of the harbors or ports of the British possessions of North America, and that the existing matters of difficulty, including the claims of our fishermen, for damages wrongfully sustained, are subjects for treaty negotiation.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Alabama ask for the present consideration of the resolutions?

Mr. VANCE. I move the reference of the resolutions to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN. The resolutions are subject to objection?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. They are, under the rule.

Mr. SHERMAN. As a matter of course, I should like to have them printed. I have not read them. I can only see that there is an endeavor to avoid and evade the real issue in regard to the British treaty.

Mr. MORGAN. I rise to make an inquiry of the Chair. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] has moved to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and I desire to know if I can not be heard now in opposition to the motion.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair would hold that, under the rules, if objection is made to their present consideration the resolutions will lie over one day and be printed.

Mr. SHERMAN. I rose to make the objection when the Senator from North Carolina rose, and I paused because I did not know but that he intended to make the objection.

Mr. MORGAN. The Senator from North Carolina made a motion to refer the resolutions.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair could not entertain that motion until unanimous consent had been asked for the consideration of the resolutions, under the rule.

Mr. MORGAN. I must say, Mr. President, that I am utterly surprised at that ruling, because it has never been before practiced in the Senate, so far as I am aware.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Will the Senator permit the rule to be read? The Secretary will read the rule.

Mr. SHERMAN. Am I at liberty to ask the Senator from Alabama what is his desire in regard to the resolutions?

Mr. MORGAN. My desire is to address the Senate on the resolutions this morning.

Mr. SHERMAN. This morning?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. SHERMAN. I must object to that, very decidedly.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not wish to have any action taken on the resolutions this morning, however.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is but proper that I should state that the Senator who was the author of the report which is commented upon and which is said to make certain allegations is not here. He is out of the city, and I therefore deem it my duty, as a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to object to the present consideration of the resolutions. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] wrote the report, and I am very glad to give him now the credit of it.

Mr. MORGAN. I propose this morning to make in the Senate the speech I made in executive session, every word of which the Senator from Vermont heard, or could have heard if he had listened to it. If the Senate will give me leave to furnish that speech in print I will print it without delivering it in the Senate. Otherwise I shall find an early opportunity to deliver it.

I desire to say also, Mr. President, if I am permitted to do so——

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair hears no objection to the Senator from Alabama proceeding.

Mr. SHERMAN. Reserving, however, the right to object to the consideration of the resolutions.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair has already ruled on that point. Will the Senator from Alabama pause one moment to allow the rule to be read? Clause 5 of Rule XIV will be read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

5. All resolutions shall lie over one day for consideration unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, the Senator from Alabama will be allowed to proceed.

Mr. SHERMAN. I have no objection to the Senator from Alabama proceeding to explain, but I do object to the consideration of the resolutions to-day. I will waive my objection for the purpose of allowing him to make a statement now.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not understand that the consideration of a resolution is the subject that is up when a motion to refer it to a committee is made. The consideration of a resolution implies——

Mr. SHERMAN. Consideration can not be had on the day of presentation until the consent of the Senate is given by unanimous consent. Without the leave of the Senate, the Senator can not discuss the resolutions at all to-day.

Mr. MORGAN. If that is so, then the Senate has been out of order for at least twelve years under my observation.

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of a resolution which relates to a mere matter of business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair can not receive any further resolutions except by unanimous consent while the question now pending is undetermined.

ALLOWANCE OF CLAIMS.

Mr. CALL. I ask unanimous consent to offer a resolution. This is my only opportunity, as the Senator from Alabama is going to make a speech.

Mr. MORGAN. No, I do not suppose I shall have the opportunity to make a speech.

Mr. CALL. The resolution I wish to offer relates to a mere matter of business.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution submitted by Mr. CALL, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Treasury be directed to transmit to the Senate a schedule of all claims allowed by the accounting officers of the Treasury under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act approved June 20, 1874, since the allowance of those which are embraced in Senate Executive Document No. 101, present session.

Mr. COCKRELL. I ask the Senator from Florida if there has not been already a resolution passed on that question.

Mr. CALL. Not that I am advised of.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SHERMAN. I object.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio objects, and the resolution lies over under the rule.

Mr. SHERMAN. I object simply because the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] is absent.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The resolution will be printed.

THE FISHERIES TREATY.

Mr. MORGAN. I thought that I had the unanimous consent of the Senate to take the floor. Other Senators on this side and on that have asked me the courtesy to yield it for a moment for formal business.

Mr. CAMERON. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Pennsylvania moves——

Mr. MORGAN. Have I the floor?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator had been recognized. The Chair understood him to yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. MORGAN. I had not yielded. He had not asked my consent to yield.

Mr. CAMERON. I beg pardon; I thought the Senator had yielded.

Mr. MORGAN. I do not propose to be taken off the floor at the will and pleasure of every gentleman who chooses to claim it. I am rather peacefully inclined in this body, but——

Mr. HOAR. I rise to a question of order. What is the pending matter?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. MORGAN] offered a series of resolutions, to the consideration of which the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] objected. The Chair held that the resolutions, being objected to, must lie over one day under the rule for consideration. The Senator from Alabama asked unanimous consent to be heard on the proposition, and the Chair submitted that to the Senate, and there was no objection.

Mr. HOAR. On what proposition?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Whether or not the resolutions, being objected to, went over until to-morrow.

Mr. MORGAN. To make a statement.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the Senator from Alabama proceeding?

Mr. SHERMAN. I have an objection to his proceeding to discuss the resolutions. If he wishes only to state his view of the point of order raised, I have no objection to that.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. There is no rule that the Chair can enforce restraining Senators from debate upon any aspect of the question if consent is given.

Mr. SHERMAN. I object to any debate on the resolutions until

the Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS] is present, and then at any time when the Senator from Alabama desires to address the Senate he can do so. I have no objection to the proposition that he made a while ago, but I think until the Senator from Vermont is here this debate ought not to proceed. This whole subject was postponed by unanimous consent till next Monday.

Mr. MORGAN. I have the floor, Mr. President, by the unanimous consent of the Senate, and I do not think the Senator from Ohio has the right to object to my proceeding under that consent to say what I have to say.

Mr. SHERMAN. I respectfully enter my objection. I did so from the beginning. The very moment the resolutions were read I sent for them to look at them, and rose to object; and the Senator from Alabama can not get the floor in this way. Of course he can hold the floor, because nobody would prevent him and pull him down, or anything of that kind. But the Presiding Officer having ruled that the resolutions are not now in order, except upon the point of order, I shall say nothing further about the matter, except to renew my objection.

Mr. MORGAN. The Chair, in stating the attitude of the question before the Senate, has omitted one very important fact, which is that the resolutions were read, and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. VANCE] got the floor and moved to refer them to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN. The resolutions were not before the Senate.

Mr. MORGAN. And it was after that, a considerable time, when the Senator from Ohio interposed his objection to the consideration of the resolutions.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If the Senator from Alabama will pause one moment the Chair will state that under the rules the motion to refer could not be made until the question of consideration was decided. No disposition could be made of the resolutions while the question of their consideration was undetermined, and before they can be considered to-day unanimous consent must be given, to which the Senator from Ohio objected. The resolutions therefore are not before the Senate, unless the Senator from Alabama sees fit to appeal from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. MORGAN. That is what I was about to do. I was about to appeal; and I now take an appeal from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The question then is, Shall the decision of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. MORGAN. The resolutions have been characterized by the Senator from Ohio as an attempt to evade an issue brought up by the treaty. On the contrary, Mr. President, this is an attempt to present the true issue before the country which the treaty presents, separated from an issue that the Committee on Foreign Relations have seen proper to make in their report, which is simply a political issue and nothing else.

I maintain that I am in order in the discussion of this question, in bringing forward now the attitude of that committee for the consideration of the Senate and of the country in respect of this very important matter, and in showing that they are making a mere political foot-ball of a great treaty and of treaty relations with foreign countries for the sake of advancing the interests of certain gentlemen in a convention which is about to assemble at Chicago.

Mr. HAWLEY. I am sorry to do it, but I should like permission to introduce some morning business. It will take but a moment.

Mr. MORGAN. If it can be done without taking me off the floor, I will yield.

Mr. HAWLEY. I would not ask it if it did.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. Does the Senator from Alabama yield for that purpose, retaining the floor?

Mr. MORGAN. Unless the Senator has some urgent reason for being absent from the Senate, I wish he would excuse me.

Mr. HAWLEY. I will wait. I did not notice that the call for morning business had been concluded.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. President, the minority of the Committee on Foreign Relations had no expectation that the majority would take the ground in their report that the time for remonstrance or negotiation with Great Britain had passed with reference to the fishing rights or the commercial rights of our fishermen. Nor did they have reason to suppose that a majority of the committee would hold that the President had no right to negotiate a treaty without having first obtained the consent of the Senate, or to appoint plenipotentiaries for that purpose without having first submitted their names to the Senate for confirmation. In this opinion I was confirmed after the resolution declaring his right to do both these things had been laid upon the table of the committee on the motion of a member of the majority.

The committee having decided without the aid of a single vote of the minority against a resolution to discuss this treaty in open session, the minority had the right to suppose that this attitude would be adhered to.

On May 14 the Senate, after full debate, voted 3 for and 41 against the discussion of the treaty in open session.

On May 22, after further debate, the Senate by a vote of 28 to 28 again refused to discuss this treaty in open executive session, Mr. HALE, of Maine, voting in the negative.

Mr. SHERMAN. I rise to a question of order.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Ohio will state his point of order.

Mr. SHERMAN. I desire to state it in all seriousness, because if this example set to-day is followed, that is the end of our rules. I raise the point of order that the Senator from Alabama is not discussing the question before the Senate, but is, in violation of the rules, discussing resolutions offered by him, which by the rules can not be discussed to-day except by unanimous consent.

Mr. HOAR. The Senate agreed, by unanimous consent, that the matter should go over until next Monday.

Mr. SHERMAN. And the subject-matter of which has been postponed until Monday next. I raise the point of order simply that the Senator from Alabama is not at all discussing the question before the Senate, but having the floor upon a point of order he is discussing a question which by the rules of the Senate is not now before the Senate.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Chair holds that under parliamentary practice the Senator from Alabama should confine himself to the discussion of the point of order. The Chair, however, has no means of enforcing the rule, and it is for the Senate to decide and not for the Chair.

Mr. MORGAN. The Republican party in the Senate held a party caucus on May 21 and reached two conclusions, first, that the treaty should be discussed in open Senate, thus reversing the action of the committee, as I have stated it, in which the opposite result was reached alone on the votes of Republicans; and second, that no amendments of the treaty should be permitted, at least on the motion of a Republican.

They were unable to execute the decree of the caucus of the Republican party on the 22d of May, because one Republican Senator voted with the Democrats against it.

That honorable Senator was absent from the Senate until after May 28, when the final vote was taken, and was not paired.

The Democratic side of the Chamber, rather than resort to the expedient of breaking a quorum of the Senate, concluded to permit the Republican side of the Chamber to execute the mandate of their caucus, even in the absence of the Senator from Maine, who was still absent without a pair.

It was under these circumstances that the debate proceeded on Friday 25th and Monday 28th of May. On stating his position on the question of an open discussion of this treaty, the Senator from Vermont announced that his convictions, often expressed in the Senate heretofore, and also in this debate, were not changed in the least, but that he would vote for the open session because he yielded his convictions to the superior wisdom of his party associates.

It will never be forgotten by the members present in the Senate how ably and eloquently the Senator from Vermont had presented his views against the discussion of this treaty in open session on the 14th May, 1888. Many of the Democrats in the Senate had made up their minds to vote in favor of open sessions on this treaty, until they heard the argument and impassioned appeal of the Senator from Vermont on that day. Many of them yielded their preference for an open session to the force of his argument, as they then and afterwards stated.

This fact accounts for the vote of 41 to 3 against the resolution for an open discussion of this treaty, including the vote of the honorable Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR], who offered the resolution, and the honorable Senator from Vermont [Mr. EDMUNDS], who had so powerfully opposed it. No pairs were announced, and neither of the Senators from Maine voted.

The following was the vote on that resolution:

Those who voted in the affirmative were Messrs.—

Dawes,	Sherman,	Teller.

Those who voted in the negative were Messrs.—

Aldrich,	Cullom,	Hiscock,	Saulsbury,
Allison,	Davis,	Hoar,	Sawyer,
Bate,	Dolph,	Jones of Arkansas,	Spooner,
Berry,	Edmunds,	Morgan,	Turpie,
Blair,	Evarts,	Palmer,	Vance,
Brown,	Faulkner,	Pasco,	Walthall,
Butler,	George,	Pugh,	Wilson of Iowa,
Call,	Gray,	Quay,	Wilson of Md.
Chandler,	Hampton,	Ransom,	
Cockrell,	Harris,	Reagan,	
Coke,	Hawley,	Sabin,	

The sudden revolution in the attitude of the Senate between the 14th and 22d of May, which produced a tie vote on the same proposition, was the result of caucus mandate. It reconciled the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR] to the support of his own resolution, which he had so recently assisted in killing, and swept the Senator from Vermont so far from his base that it placed his vote in the affirmative and left his convictions on the negative side with the Democrats, many of whom he had so recently converted to his views on this subject. When I was convinced that the unbroken usage of the Senate for a hundred years would be violated in the discussion of this treaty in open executive session I could not forego the last opportunity I would have to present to the Senate in confidential session my views of the situation in which we would place the United States by the adoption of the report of the majority of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

I was the more compelled to do this because the minority of the committee had not had any opportunity to answer what we think is a very dangerous and indefensible attitude in which the assertions and arguments of the majority of the committee in their report will place the country.

Announcing to the Senate that I had prepared a written statement of my views in reply to the report of the majority, which I had never seen until it had been reported to the Senate, I proceeded in executive session to read what I will presently again read to the Senate in open session.

I stated then that I had written out what I desired to say by way of reply to the majority report, and that I would repeat it in the open Senate if the vote of the body should open the doors, in order to present properly the issue between the reports of the majority and the minority. In consequence of interruptions by other Senators, I answered orally upon questions submitted while I held the floor, and those episodes in the discussion I have not attempted to recall. I could not do so without giving my version of remarks and statements made by other Senators, which might not be just to them.

When the argument was afterwards progressing in open executive sessions several allusions and statements were made by the Senator from Maine and others as to what I had said in the remarks I am now about to repeat.

I shall not now attempt, as I will do at a later period in this debate, to show that my remarks, made in executive session, were misunderstood by the Senators from Maine and Massachusetts [Mr. HOAR].

I wish first to put into the RECORD what I did say, and further to say that nothing was said by me in any oral remarks during that debate that was at all in conflict with or different in sentiment or statement from my written remarks, which I will now proceed to read:

It may be correct in practice, but in nearly twelve years' service in the Senate I have never known an instance in which the report of the majority of a committee has been withheld from the minority until it was laid before the Senate, in any matter of real controversy.

In this case the report was printed and laid before the Senate without the minority having been informed of a word that it contained.

This statement is made now, not as a complaint that the minority were not advised as to the facts relied upon by the majority, or of the general course of the argument they would follow, but as an explanation of the reasons why the minority did not essay to answer, as I now propose to do, the argument that has been presented in the report of the majority, but relied solely upon the strength of the treaty for the vindication of the views they entertained in favor of its ratification.

It was as well known to the committee then as it is now to the Senate that the majority did not agree in their opposition to the treaty upon at least two very important points:

First. As to the power of the President to negotiate this treaty, through the agents he selected, without the advice or consent of the Senate; and

Second. As to the importance of the delimitations in the treaty of the bays and harbors from parts of which the treaty excludes our fishermen.

These disagreements, which were known to the committee, disappear in the report.

It was also obvious that in the main the provisions of every article in the treaty except the fifteenth were acceptable to at least one member of the majority.

It was therefore a surprise to the minority that the attack upon the treaty made in this report of the majority should have been made upon these grounds, along with others.

It was a startling surprise to me, as it must have been to my colleagues on the committee, to find, as we did, on yesterday, by acknowledgments of no uncertain sort on this floor, that a caucus decree had preceded the discussion of the treaty, which forbade the allowance of any amendments by its friends or the friends of any sort of negotiation, by which it could be in any way improved or made more acceptable to the country. That caucus edict has crushed an amendment that was presented in committee by a very distinguished Senator of the majority, and has silenced other Senators on that side who said that they had amendments to offer.

I am glad to know that no political party ever before attempted thus to impose upon a question of foreign policy the embarrassments of domestic party politics. It rejoices me to find that the party that would attempt to do such a thing makes this broad confession that all its other policies have failed to engage the confidence of the people. In its wild distress it thus addresses itself to the task of doing what it hopes will enable it to regain power by a united appeal to a supposed restless desire of our people for strife and war and to old resentments towards Great Britain, recently intensified amongst our Irish population by the conduct of that Government towards their friends in Ireland. The party that made this decree in its caucus, that this treaty should neither be amended nor ratified, feels the sad need of a new issue for its campaign.

They need another issue where prejudice can set free the tongue of clamor until the voice of reason can not be heard.

If they get it they will need a new rider for this Pegasus. Mr. Blaine, Mr. EVARTS, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. Gresham were all members of cabinets, and two of them were Secretaries of State, while discussion, which always implies negotiation, was being conducted on these same questions. The wrongs went on; the people suffered; the diplomats quarreled, as lovers do, only to prove the depths of an inner love that no surface storm can reach, but they still mildly discussed a treaty and hid away all thoughts of war from their peaceful contemplations. Their repose, which argued an indifference to the wrongs then existing, is in strange contrast with their present wild and sudden fury, excited by those wrongs.

They were in power then and were not so mad as they are now with the Queen of Great Britain. They are very mad now, but their anger is so sudden and unexpected to the people concerned in promoting good feeling with the Canadians that no responsive growl has come back from the masses. The only answer yet made from a convention comes from the State of Maine.

It was confidently expected by this caucus of treaty-makers that the people of that State would follow the caucus pell-mell and that the treaty and its friends would be pushed into the sea. Instead of that we see the people on the Bay of Fundy courageously supporting a treaty that is honorable and just.

It was a cooling *douche* upon this hot expectation that the caucus could not compel a Senator from Maine to throw open the doors of the Senate and invite the galleries to assist us in treating with Great Britain or in forcing us to go to war with that power.

But the firm Democracy of Maine, who will also become at no distant day the Democracy triumphant, have utterly flattened out this brilliant hope of the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Virginia. In their State platform they expressly indorse this treaty, and they put at the head of their ticket for governor Hon. Mr. Putnam, one of the "plenipotentiaries" who negotiated it, and one of its ablest supporters, whom this committee try to disparage as the usurper of a high office. There will be open debate in Maine, and before we hasten to reject this treaty it would be wise for the Senate to hear the result. Their bold resolution in favor of this treaty must cause the people of the other States to give thoughtful consideration to its provisions.

None of the great names I have mentioned could be safely trusted on a war platform about a matter that so long encouraged their comfortable and peaceful slumbers. With the new issues the caucus has made they must find a new candidate. Who can so well play the austere rôle of the offended friend of the fisherman as the distinguished Senator from Vermont? No drowsy *dolce far niente* of a Cabinet couch has ever closed his vigilant eyes on the fishermen's wrongs. Alert, powerful, adroit, and modest, he fills the character that is needed for the occasion. He is no summer friend, and is willing to suffer the cold severity of own self-condemnation to let the world know how he loves the fishermen.

When the Senator from Virginia [Mr. RIDDLEBERGER] hauled his venerable form into the Senate, a captive draggled in the dust of his chariot wheels, I felt indignant that such a prisoner should grace such a triumph; but when I discovered that the venerable Senator from Vermont was happy in the recent discovery of his ability to change his vote without changing his convictions my grief was modified. The gentle composure of this lofty and irascible spirit in its new cage has led me to believe that he is content, and that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. RIDDLEBERGER], instead of capturing a prisoner of war, has captured a new candidate for the Presidency—and a big one at that.

The minority of the committee found no objection to this treaty or to the manner of its negotiation. They found not only an open field for negotiation, but one that could not be honorably retired from by the United States while Great Britain manifested a desire for an amicable arrangement of our disputes. This duty, we thought, was made imperative by the fact that our retaliatory legislation was directed against Canada, and the treaty we relied upon was a treaty with Great Britain. They were of one mind in support of the entire "document," as it is ironically styled in the report.

They believed that the President had served his country with wisdom and patriotic fidelity in resorting to negotiation, that he might find a just and honorable way by which to avoid the necessity of embarrassing the trade of our own people along the whole northern border and at our great seaports on both oceans, with retaliatory non-intercourse, in order to obtain a fair settlement of disputed questions with Great Britain. They looked over the wide field of disputation, filled for most of the time during seventy years with dangerous incidents and violent contentions, and they found that only two of our statesmen, Mr. Seward and Mr. Bayard, had ever attempted to settle these troubles by a conference and mutual agreement with Great Britain. They found that of more than four hundred cases of seizures of our ships not one had been made the occasion of a demand by our Government for redress for the violation of the treaty of 1818 until Mr. Bayard came into office as Secretary of State.

They looked over our statute-books and saw that Congress had never declared that any of these seizures of our ships were violations of any

treaty with Great Britain, or of any commercial rights or privileges that our fishermen were entitled to enjoy under any agreement with Great Britain, tacit or express.

They found that the Committee on Foreign Relations, in 1886, had declared that Great Britain had violated the treaty of 1818, but no measure was enacted, or even proposed, which followed up that declaration with the moral support of a legislative act, or a declaratory resolution, which asserted that such a violation of that treaty had ever, in fact, occurred. I will read an extract from that report, in which I participated, and to which I still adhere:

It will be seen, from the correspondence and papers submitted by the President in his message on the subject, of the 8th of December last (Ex. Doc. No. 19, Forty-ninth Congress, second session), and from the testimony taken by the committee, that some of these instances of seizure or detention, or of driving vessels away by threats, etc., were in clear violation of the treaty of 1818, and that others were on such slender and technical grounds, either as applied to fishing rights or commercial rights, as to make it impossible to believe that they were made with the large and just object of protecting substantial rights against real and substantial invasion, but must have been made either under the stimulus of the cupidity of the seizing officer, sharpened and made safe by the extraordinary legislation to which the committee has referred, whereby the seizing officer, no matter how unjust or illegal his procedure may have been, is made practically secure from the necessity of making substantial redress to the party wronged, or of punishment, or else they must have arisen from a systematic disposition on the part of the Dominion authorities to vex and harass American fishing and other vessels, so as to produce such a state of embarrassment and inconvenience with respect to intercourse with the provinces as to coerce the United States into arrangements of general reciprocity with the Dominion.

Our whole complaint was just to the extent that we stated it; but we were cautious to make it general, not specifying particular cases. We were using pressure to gain justice and future peace, and were not stating any case upon which to formulate a demand for redress, or to invite hostilities. We had a good case for redress, but we had no desire to make it capital.

That committee did not impute to Great Britain—the power responsible to us—any complicity in the violation of the treaty. It complained of wrongful acts of the Canadians, and the legislation that was recommended by the committee did not relate to British commerce or British ships, but to Canadian commerce and ships. The wrongs imputed to Great Britain were not those of aggression on our treaty rights, but of permission in allowing Canada to do so.

The act of Congress, passed in full view of all that had been said by committees in both Houses, mounted this high, and no higher than this, in the heroic work of predatory retaliation on the goods, wares, merchandise, and ships coming from the Dominions. I read the act, as follows:

An act to authorize the President of the United States to protect and defend the rights of American fishing vessels, American fishermen, American trading and other vessels, in certain cases, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that American fishing vessels or American fishermen, visiting or being in the waters or at any ports or places of the British dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied or abridged in the enjoyment of any rights secured to them by treaty or law, or are or then lately have [been] unjustly vexed or harassed in the enjoyment of such rights, or subjected to unreasonable restrictions, regulations, or requirements in respect of such rights; or otherwise unjustly vexed or harassed in said waters, ports, or places; or whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any such fishing vessels or fishermen, having a permit under the laws of the United States to touch and trade at any port or ports, place or places, in the British dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied the privilege of entering such port or ports, place or places, in the same manner and under the same regulations as may exist therein applicable to trading vessels of the most favored nation, or shall be unjustly vexed or harassed in respect thereof, or otherwise be unjustly vexed or harassed therein, or shall be prevented from purchasing such supplies as may there be lawfully sold to trading vessels of the most favored nation; or whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied that any other vessels of the United States, their masters or crews, so arriving at or being in such British waters or ports or places of the British dominions of North America, are or then lately have been denied any of the privileges therein accorded to the vessels, their masters or crews, of the most favored nation, or unjustly vexed or harassed in respect of the same, or unjustly vexed or harassed therein by the authorities thereof, then, and in either or all of such cases, it shall be lawful, and it shall be the duty of the President of the United States, in his discretion, by proclamation to that effect, to deny vessels, their masters and crews, of the British dominions of North America, any entrance into the waters, ports, or places of, or within the United States (with such exceptions in regard to vessels in distress, stress of weather, or needing supplies as to the President shall seem proper), whether such vessels shall have come directly from said dominions on such destined voyage or by way of some port or place in such destined voyage elsewhere; and, also, to deny entry into any port or place of the United States of fresh fish or salt fish or any other product of said dominions, or other goods coming from said dominions to the United States. The President may, in his discretion, apply such proclamation to any part or to all of the foregoing-named subjects, and may revoke, qualify, limit, and renew such proclamation from time to time as he may deem necessary to the full and just execution of the purposes of this act. Every violation of any such proclamation, or any part thereof, is hereby declared illegal, and all vessels and goods so coming or being within the waters, ports, or places of the United States contrary to such proclamation shall be forfeited to the United States; and such forfeiture shall be enforced and proceeded upon in the same manner and with the same effect as in the case of vessels or goods whose importation or coming to or being in the waters or ports of the United States contrary to law may now be enforced and proceeded upon. Every person who shall violate any of the provisions of this act, or such proclamation of the President made in pursuance hereof, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and, on conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000, or by imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years, or by both said punishments, in the discretion of the court.

Approved, March 3, 1887.

Why was the word "authorized" used in the title of the act, and why was not the word "required" put into the body of this act, if Congress intended to limit and not to enlarge the powers of the President?

Was this all that it was expected that the President would do, or was permitted by Congress to do, under this law, to choke the Dominion to its knees by choking down its commerce? Was he forbidden even to ask Great Britain, the treaty power whose treaty obligations were alleged to have been violated by the Dominion Government, whether it avowed or disavowed these wrongs, before he should declare a blockade of our ports against Dominion vessels? Such an attitude taken by Congress would have been unworthy the character of any nation.

There is no hint in this act of Congress that the time for negotiation had passed.

The President was bound, according to the plainest dictates of justice and propriety, to lay this matter before the British Government, and it was done, and that firmly.

If Alabama should do a wrong, under State authority, to a Cuban ship in the Bay of Mobile, what would we do if Spain should prohibit any ship from that State to enter a Spanish port, without having first informed the United States of the wrong which led to the act of retaliation? Congress never expected the President to do such an absurd act.

On the contrary, Congress, in the act of March 3, 1887, instead of declaring that any wrong had been done to our fishermen, enacted that "whenever the President of the United States shall be satisfied" that our fishermen and fishing vessels "are or then lately have been denied or abridged in the enjoyment of any rights secured to them by treaty or law," that he should have the power to retaliate as to certain privileges of commerce enjoyed by the Canadians in our country, and might cut them off by his proclamation.

The minority of the committee searched in vain to find any declaration made by any competent authority to the effect that the time had passed for "negotiation and unavailing remonstrances" in relation to our fishing and commercial rights or privileges or their denial or abuse by the British Government.

The emphatic and very remarkable statement made on pages 21 and 25 of the report of the majority of the committee that Congress, on March 3, 1887, had reached this conclusion, and had expressed it in the retaliation act of that date, has affected me, as I think it must have affected other Senators of the minority of the committee, with painful surprise. I will read it:

This condition of things became so intolerable that, at last, the remonstrances of the Executive became vigorous and urgent, and on the 8th of December, 1886, the President sent to Congress the following message on the subject:

"*To the Senate and House of Reprcsentatives of the United States:*

"I transmit herewith a letter from the Secretary of State, which is accompanied by the correspondence in relation to the rights of American fishermen in the British North American waters, and commend to your favorable consideration the suggestion that a commission be authorized by law to take perpetuating proofs of the losses sustained during the past year by American fishermen, owing to their unfriendly and unwarranted treatment by the local authorities of the maritime provinces of the Dominion of Canada.

"I may have occasion hereafter to make further recommendations during the present session for such remedial legislation as may become necessary for the protection of the rights of our citizens engaged in the open-sea fisheries of the North Atlantic waters.

"GROVER CLEVELAND.

"EXECUTIVE MANSION,
"*Washington, December* 8, 1886."

Justly influenced, doubtless, by this message and by the state of affairs shown in the documents accompanying it and by the evidence taken by, and the report of the Senate Committee of Foreign Relations on the same subject made on the 19th of January, 1887 (Report No. 1683, Forty-ninth Congress second session), Congress came to the conclusion that the period of negotiation and unavailing remonstrance had passed, and with almost absolute unanimity and without any party division enacted the act of March 3, 1887, hereinbefore mentioned, by which the duty was imposed upon the President of withdrawing from British North American vessels, etc., those liberties and advantages which by the pre-existing laws they were enjoying in the harbors and ports of the United States, whenever and as often as it should appear to him that similar rights and liberties were denied the United States fishing vessels, etc., in the ports, etc., of British North America, or whenever it should appear to him that American fishing vessels should have been subjected to outrageous or unjust treatment in the exercise of the rights secured to them by the treaty of 1818.

All that remained unprovided for according to the sense of self-respect and of just policy on the part of the United States was to obtain indemnity from the British Government for the injuries that had thus far been committed.

The utter want of any rational foundation for this statement, and the very serious attitude in which it places Congress and the United States towards Great Britain, demand of this body a careful consideration under circumstances of the least possible embarrassment to individual expression of opinion, before the Senate shall yield its assent to the situation in which it will place the country.

When the Senate has indorsed this statement, what must it be held to mean by so grave a declaration?

After so many disputes and conflicts of opinion between two great governments, many of them existing for more than half a century, and all of them attended with much bitterness of feeling, one of the governments declares that the Parliament, or the Congress, has reached the conclusion that "the time has passed for negotiations or unavailing remonstrances," and that the next step, the first and lightest step towards redress, shall be retaliation.

What does that mean but the opening of the door to a new plan of redress which it may be impossible to close until war has filled the land with slaughter? Congress refused to open that door, and the Senate now proposes to tear it open.

If Great Britain had followed up her many complaints as to the violation of the treaty of 1818 by our people with a declaration of her Parliament stating that it had reached the conclusion that "the time had passed for negotiation and unavailing remonstrance," our people would not have stopped to inquire whether she intended to fight us with non-intercourse or with arms. They would have instantly accepted such a declaration as one pregnant with war, and would have defied her to take the first step in a march towards redress, the last step of which would be halted upon the battle-field.

Does the committee mean that, in following up this alleged solemn conclusion of Congress, we should attack British commerce and our own with non-intercourse proclamations, and, these failing to secure our rights, that we will then abandon our rights; or that we will in that contingency advance to blows when words have failed? We would thus interpret such a declaration by Great Britain, and how shall we expect that Government to regard such a declaration on our part?

If the United States has really been put into this attitude by any "conclusion" that Congress has reached about our fishery or commercial rights, the rejection of this treaty will place the Senate in the position of being the first branch of the Government to declare the fact, the first to act upon that declaration, and the first to assume any responsibility that it may create.

If this is done for the purpose of forcing conclusions with Great Britain by commercial retaliation, wherever that may lead, we should be certain of support from the co-ordinate branches of our Government and from the people, at least, before we assume this heroic attitude, lest the solitude of our glory should become painful.

It is certain that the President has been entirely unconscious of the "conclusion" to which the Senate is now required to give recognition through the rejection of this treaty, that "the time for negotiation had passed." The Congress must have been equally unconscious of the fact, and equally ignorant of the situation when it was left to the President to first become "satisfied" as to the facts on which, alone, such a conclusion could rest, and then to make proclamation of non-intercourse, "in his discretion."

The Senate, in the effort to sit in supreme judgment upon the situation of the country, and to force it into an attitude that no other branch of the Government recognizes, should find some safe and undeniable ground for its lofty isolation and some more cogent reason than the political solicitudes and aversions that have marked all the proceedings thus far upon this treaty, and that are so obvious in the critiques, the irony, the disparagement, the bad temper, and the scarcely-concealed contempt which the report unjustly loads upon the President.

If we reject the treaty, we adopt the report of the majority of the committee as settling the ground upon which this part of our treaty-making power refuses either to amend or ratify it. The report, if it is not amended, will constitute the irreversible ground upon which the United States, represented by the Senate in these high and sovereign powers, will solemnly place these great contentions over the fisheries, with all their varied aspects of strife.

When the Senate has adopted this report by rejecting the treaty, as it will be held to have done, this résumé by the committee of this history of the questions in dispute, and the declaration founded on that statement, must be considered as the decision of the Senate, as it is found in the report, in the following language:

> In view of the plain history of these transactions and of the matters hereinbefore stated, it does not seem to the committee that the existing matters of difficulty are subjects for treaty negotiation; and such appears to have been the opinion of the Senate by its action and by the remarks of many of its members of both political parties and by the action of the House of Representatives upon and in the passage of the act of March 3, 1887, and its approval by the President.

This shuts the door upon all further negotiation. It removes the entire subject of our disputes from the category of unsettled questions; settles them by our sole decree, which cuts up further discussion of them by the roots and burns the bridges behind us. "No treaty, no negotiation, and no surrender" is written on our banners by the Senate, and, in its impotence to take a single step to carry its flag into action, it becomes the subject of universal amazement.

If this report is to be adopted as stating the grounds and reason of our action, I very much regret that it was ever written and laid before the Senate. It hedges in the country with arbitrary and unreasonable barriers by dismissing negotiation as a means of coming to a proper and satisfactory understanding with Great Britain, so that no branch of the Government can resort to anything but force for the settlement of these serious disputations.

The only door of escape from the dilemma was the fact stated by the Senator from Virginia that the issue presented on this treaty is only political; as he expressed it, "politics and only politics." He advised the Republicans to use the open discussion of this treaty as the means of getting the votes of foreign-born people.

Hereafter, when further steps are to be taken with reference to these troubles, the country will claim, as the Senator from Virginia claims, that the Senate turned aside from the proper consideration of this treaty on its merits and used the occasion for the purpose of gratifying its desire to obtain a political victory over a Democratic President.

The foreign vote that the Senator from Virginia avowed that it was the purpose of this opposition to the treaty to capture for the Republican party, that he has led with such distinguished success recently, may turn out to be a potent factor in the election now approaching. I doubt, however, if it will more than fill the gap that will be created by the desertions from his own party of those Americans whose honor and interests will be put at hazard by this political exploit.

How all this may turn out we do not know, but we do know that the Senator from Virginia has possibly relieved the Senate, whose organization he holds in his grasp, by attributing its action to the inconsiderate heat and passion of a political campaign instead of its being a solemn judgment upon matters of great and vital interest.

This Senate never saw a more dangerous day than this to its own influence and the welfare of the country, when the chairman of this committee, who is an avowed and very prominent candidate for the Presidency, resorts to a party caucus to force the Senate to violate all its wise and time-honored practice in order to promote the political ends that the Senator from Virginia has so boldly and honestly avowed.

This report of the majority, signed by the chairman of the committee and a very distinguished following of his party associates—all the Republicans on the committee—was published to the world on his motion, and must have received his hearty concurrence. Its doctrines are his doctrines, its conclusions are his conclusions, after most mature consideration. I can not but regret that he can not have the support of my vote in the public exhibition of the pride he must feel in launching this report and the treaty it is intended to crush into the great campaign about to open. Should he fail in this, however, no one can deprive him and the Senator from Virginia of the distinction of having compelled two at least of the great statesmen of the country to yield to him their votes and everything but their convictions in converting this treaty and the interest involved in it into a target for campaign practice.

If the President believed, as the report more than intimates, that this treaty, or any treaty on the topics to which it relates, was attempted to be forestalled and forbidden by Congress in the act of March 3, 1887, his assertion of his constitutional powers against such usurpation and attempted destruction will forever distinguish him as among the most intrepid defenders of the constitutional powers of his great office, and will mark him as being worthy of the gratitude of the people.

This report places Congress in a most humiliating attitude. Congress was not satisfied on March 3, 1887, that such wrongs had been inflicted on our fishermen as to demand any conclusive measures which the President would be compelled to execute. Committees of both Houses had declared the facts that would justify such measures, but Congress avoided the responsibility. Instead of making the final decision and acting upon it, Congress left it to the President to take action, by retaliation on Canadian commerce, when he should be satisfied that the occasion had arisen, and then to act according to his discretion—a most remarkable and peculiar duty in a matter of such momentous importance, and attended with the most serious difficulties and responsibilities.

If he should follow the opinions of the two committees and was "satisfied" with their finding of the facts, he would thereby advance far beyond the ground taken by Congress, which refused to declare that non-intercourse should be enforced upon those very facts. Such conduct would have been offensive to Congress, as well as extremely rash. Congress had made no provision of military or naval forces with which to capture ships or men that might attempt to break such a paper blockade. Forfeiture and confiscation of ships or fine or imprisonment of men, provided they were caught, was as far as Congress was willing to go in backing up this mock heroic policy which the President was required, in his discretion, to inaugurate and enforce.

This act undertook to compel the President to decide what Congress refused to decide, and thus to assume a responsibility that Congress refused to incur. If he could not agree with the committees, and acted in harmony with Congress, he would do precisely what Congress had done, which was nothing, as to the redress of wrongs "then lately" sustained by our fishermen.

As to future wrongs that might happen there was no need of this law, for the act of September 20, 1850 (Rev. Stat., section 3129) gave all the power of retaliation that was needed; but imposed the duty of retaliation on the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approbation of the President.

The minority of the committee saw that this law had never been enforced; that Congress had never complained that it had been a dead letter on the statute-books for more than thirty years; and that no one ever had supposed that this law compelled retaliation as the only means of expounding our fishing rights under the treaty of 1818, or of securing to our fishermen commercial rights or advantages.

The treaties of 1851 and 1871, relating both to fisheries and commerce, were made in the face of this retaliatory law; and no one ever supposed that the great publicists who made those treaties or the Presidents who

sent them to the Senate, were forbidden by that statute from negotiating with Great Britain for the liberalization of our fishing rights under the treaty of 1818 or for commercial privileges.

The minority of the committee did not believe that Congress had the power, or that it ever had the intention, to prescribe to the President and to limit him to the exercise of the power of retaliation under the act of March 3, 1887, as the only way in which he should employ his "discretion" in securing justice, immunity, or redress for our fishermen.

The minority of the committee did not suppose, until they saw the report of the majority in print, after it had reached the Senate, that this act was construed as conferring the power of retaliation on the President as the only means of removing the cause of our troubles about the fisheries, and that the resolution of the Senate, which I will read, was construed as destroying or interfering with his constitutional power to negotiate a treaty for the same purpose:

Resolved, That in the opinion of the Senate the appointment of a commission, in which the Governments of the United States and Great Britain shall be represented, charged with the consideration and settlement of the fishing rights of the two Governments on the coasts of the United States and British North America, ought not to be provided for by Congress.

That resolution is such an absurd basis for such a conclusion that we never supposed that it would be considered by the committee as placing any limit upon the President in his power to negotiate treaties, or even as an expression of opinion that "the existing matters of difficulty" are not "subjects for treaty negotiation," as the majority of the committee assert.

With all these and many other considerations in view, the minority of the committee saw that the majority, who were divided in opinion on the merits of the treaty, united in an adverse report, and that, when united, their lines coincided "with the lines of political parties." I use the language of the majority in stating this fact.

In the report of the minority of the committee no allusion is made to party lines. They had no place in our estimate of the treaty. But the majority, with an evident purpose of uniting as a political party against the treaty, point out the coincidence of the minority with party lines, and read a lecture to us that is utterly without justification in the history of these transactions. They say in their report:

The committee regrets that these conclusions do not meet the approval of all its members. It had hoped, as has been the case generally hitherto, that no influences or divisions of a nature coincident with the lines of political parties would enter into a matter of this character, and that, as was the case only a little more than a year ago, all Senators of all political parties would unite in standing firmly in the attitude taken in the winter of 1886-'87, and culminating in the act of March 3, 1887, and in declining, at whatever cost, to enter into any new engagements with the British Government that should leave any American citizen, engaged in whatever occupation or business, deprived of any right or privilege, other than fishing, in any British North American or other waters, that is or may be granted to citizens of the United States engaged in any other occupation, and that have been and are fully and freely granted by the United States to every British subject, whatever may be his occupation.

They also attempt to support this unjust statement by allusions to opinions expressed in debate by Senators in the discussions on the measures of retaliation.

I well understand this reference, and will answer it before I have closed my remarks on this treaty. I allude to it now for the purpose of denying that any member of the minority on that committee has ever taken the ground that the time for negotiation had passed, or that the President was ever informed by Congress or the Senate that such a conclusion had been reached by any branch of Congress.

Availing myself of this the first opportunity to discuss the attitude of the majority of the committee towards this treaty, and the great and serious questions, past and future, to which it relates, I will examine their report in some of its leading features.

The leading view they take of the situation is that negotiation is an unfit and even humiliating means of securing our rights from Great Britain; that such a resort is condemned in advance by the action of Congress; that "all that remains unprovided for (within the duty of the President) according to the sense of self-respect and just policy on the part of the United States, was to obtain indemnity from the British Government for the injuries that had thus far been committed;" and that on the 19th of January, 1887, "Congress came to the conclusion that the period of negotiation and unavailing remonstrance had passed, and enacted the act of March 3, 1887, for the purpose of retaliation."

This is a bold statement, and, if it were sustained by the facts, would be extremely derogatory to Congress. If Congress had sedately reached "the conclusion that the period of negotiation and unavailing remonstrance had passed," as to what subject do the committee mean to assert that this period had passed?

On page 23 of the report the committee say:

And the treaty of 1818, formed on that basis, was not intended to and did not in any way touch the question of any trade or commercial right whatever, and of course made no distinction in these respects between fishing and other American vessels.

It could not, therefore, be in reference to any trade or commercial rights under the treaty of 1818 that "the period of negotiation and unavailing remonstrance had passed." It must have been in relation to fishing rights, if at all.

All the commercial rights we have in any Canadian port exist only by the permission of the British Government, which it may rightfully withdraw at any moment. This is expressly conceded in the report of the majority. (Pages 5 and 6.)

The right (except in the cases before stated) of the British to exclude such vessels and all others of the United States from her ports in British North America, as the matter stood until 1830, is fully conceded, and it is also conceded that during that time the only right of any vessel of the United States to enter the waters of British North America depended upon the treaty of 1818 alone, and in order to obtain the benefit of that treaty for such purposes, the American vessel must have been a fishing vessel, and must have resorted to those particular waters for some one of the purposes mentioned in the treaty, and no others.

The matter, then, under the treaty of 1818 was a very simple one, and can be restated thus:

1. No American vessel had any right to resort to British North American ports for any commercial or other purpose, and no British North American vessel had any right to resort to any port of the United States for such purposes.

2. But American fishing vessels had a right to resort to certain of the coasts, bays, harbors, and creeks of that part of British North America described in the treaty of 1818 for all purposes of fishing which they had anciently enjoyed.

3. But American fishing vessels, and fishing vessels only, had also a right to resort to all other British North American waters for the special purposes named in the treaty.

4. The general result of this was as to American fishing vessels that they had, on all the British North American coasts and in all her bays and harbors, the right to shelter, to repair damages, and to obtain wood and water, but on certain named parts of the same coasts, etc., they had not the right to take or cure fish; and

5. As a consequence of the situation embraced in the British laws and in that treaty, the matter of resorting to British North American ports either by American fishing or other vessels was entirely outside of and unaffected either way by that treaty.

"The period of negotiation" as to commercial rights for our fishermen never commenced until this treaty was agreed upon, and therefore it had not passed in 1887.

"The period of remonstrance" for the denial of commercial rights to our fishermen passed in 1850, if the passage of a retaliatory law is held to conclude and forbid all such remonstrances.

But how could we remonstrate against the denial of a right that is one of mere permission and not of agreement?

So the period of remonstrance and negotiation that Congress concluded had passed in 1887 must have related only to the wrongs we had suffered under the treaty of 1818. And yet those wrongs were as flagrant in 1871 as they were in 1887.

Negotiation and remonstrance being thus ended, nothing remains to be done, in the view the majority of the committee take of the subject, but "to obtain indemnity from the British Government for the injuries that [have] thus far been committed," and by retaliation to secure commercial privileges to our fishermen.

The committee advise the country that "the sense of self-respect and just policy" forbid us to negotiate or remonstrate, and that Congress has thus concluded; and, therefore, all we can do is to retaliate.

The issue is thus made that we must have no further treaty, no further remonstrance, nothing further except retaliation and indemnity.

This is the conclusion that the committee assert that Congress had reached in 1887 and expressed in the act of March 3.

If that was the conclusion reached by Congress it unjustly threw upon the President the responsibility of deciding for the country that which Congress had already decided but had not the honesty to avow, and made him responsible for the exercise of a discretion that was so hedged in with conclusions already reached and determinations already fixed that it was not attended with any moral liberty of choice or action.

If this plan, attributed by the majority of the committee to Congress, is true, instead of its having been the purpose to relieve the country of troubles, by the act of March 3, 1887, it had only a design to entrap the President, or else to force the country into an attitude of hostility to Great Britain.

To the imputation, made in the report of the majority, that the minority of the committee, for party reasons, had abandoned the ground that retaliation is the only means that self-respect can now permit the United States to employ for the redress of our wrongs, we may justly reply, that the effort made to confine the country to this narrow ground for the settlement of a great dispute has developed into a mere design to throw a responsibility upon the President that Congress should have assumed, and to leave him after he had been forced to embroil the two countries, and after he had been forced to greatly damage our country by crippling its commerce, without any right to declare war, or any means with which to commence war.

If Congress had used the language so boldly stated by the committee, even as a "whereas" or recital of its conclusions as a *précis* to the act of March 3, 1887, no one could have doubted that the United States had reached the last ditch and that Congress had determined to try conclusions with Great Britain, first with a blockade and embargo on commerce, and, that failing, then with armies and navies.

The argument of the majority of the committee is all centered upon the propositions which I will now read:

Our Government remonstrated at first mildly, and later on with something of the vigor that should belong to those intrusted with the defense of clear American rights. But these remonstrances, unaccompanied or followed by any further steps, were unavailing.

The President, in his annual message of December, 1885, in view of these circumstances, recommended to Congress the making provision for a commission to adjust and settle the difficulties and disputes thus arisen, but Congress did not see fit to do it, and the Senate, on the 13th of April, 1886, adopted a resolu-

tion by a majority of 25 declaring that, in its judgment, no such commission ought to be established; and by a resolution of the 24th of July, 1886, proceeded to order an investigation by its Committee on Foreign Relations into the fishery question and into the unjust treatment of our fishermen and the circumstances connected therewith, with a view, as it may be presumed, to taking such measures on the report of its committee as the interests and honor of the United States should require.

So far as is known to the committee, no step whatever was taken by the President to put this law into execution, but negotiations were initiated and continued to the apparent end of accomplishing what Congress had thought it unfit to undertake in such way, an adjustment of these difficulties by the diplomatic course of securing a part of American rights at the expense of yielding other and the most fundamental and important of them.

On pages 24 and 25 of the report they say:

Justly influenced, doubtless, by this message and by the state of affairs shown in the documents accompanying it and by the evidence taken by and the report of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations on the same subject made on the 19th of January, 1887 (Report No. 1683, Forty-ninth Congress, second session), Congress came to the conclusion that the period of negotiation and unavailing remonstrance had passed, and with almost absolute unanimity and without any party division enacted the act of March 3, 1887, hereinbefore mentioned, by which the duty was imposed upon the President of withdrawing from British North American vessels, etc., those liberties and advantages which by the pre-existing laws they were enjoying in the harbors and ports of the United States, whenever and as often as it should appear to him that similar rights and liberties were denied the United States fishing vessels, etc., in the ports, etc., of British North America, or whenever it should appear to him that American fishing vessels should have been subjected to outrageous or unjust treatment in the exercise of the rights secured to them by the treaty of 1818.

All that remained unprovided for according to the sense of self-respect and of just policy on the part of the United States was to obtain indemnity from the British Government for the injuries that had thus far been committed.

Page 34:

In view of the plain history of these transactions and of the matters hereinbefore stated, it does not seem to the committee that the existing matters of difficulty are subjects for treaty negotiation; and such appears to have been the opinion of the Senate by its action and by the remarks of many of its members of both political parties, and by the action of the House of Representatives upon and in the passage of the act of March 3, 1887, and its approval by the President.

No new event or situation of affairs has arisen since that time, and the only real questions subsisting between the two countries in respect of the subject were those of reclamations by the United States for outrages upon its citizens, for which this treaty makes no provision, and the question of whether the mutual arrangements of 1830 and the mutual rights of transit under the treaty of 1871 shall continue.

After these distinct statements there can remain no doubt of the purpose of the committee to close forever the door of negotiation against all efforts to reach an amicable settlement of these vexed questions with Great Britain.

No other branch of this Government and not one of our diplomatists, amongst whom are numbered Adams, Monroe, Calhoun, Webster, Clay, Cass, Marcy, Everett, Seward, Fish, EVARTS, and Frelinghuysen, have ever intimated that the United States had even approached the point where this committee so broadly places our Government, in the attitude of open hostility to Great Britain, at least in a commercial warfare. Such contests between adjoining countries must soon result in more serious collisions.

The Senate can not declare war or make war or peace, but it can, by the use of its lofty powers as an obstruction to a peaceful solution of international disputes, make war necessary, as I am afraid we are doing on this day in this Chamber.

The declarations I have read from this report and the adoption of the report by the Senate close the door to amicable arrangement, and that in the end means war. Where nations refuse to negotiate in reference to great interests that are sincerely in dispute some sort of force is necessary to bring about a settlement.

What I have just read is what the committee declare that Congress meant in March, 1887, and no doubt is left in the majority report that this is the alternative they prefer to any negotiation or remonstrance.

If Congress meant to force the country to so sharp an alternative it shamefully devolved the responsibility of the choice of the horns of the dilemma, that it had created and had fled from, upon the President.

If this is what the committee mean to assert is our only self-respecting way to deal with these alleged wrongs, nothing can excuse the majority from a duty that their self-respect now plainly demands, to bring in a bill to declare our wrongs, to demand their redress, and to provide the means for enforcing that demand.

You have the power, at least in the Senate, to enforce your views and to vindicate your motives.

The legislative power of this country is supreme over the treaty-making power. It can override the treaty now under consideration, if it should be ratified by a two-thirds majority of the Senate, by the power of a bare majority in each House of Congress. It can force the President to execute any degree of retaliation upon British commerce that it may require. It can declare war and provide men and means for its prosecution.

With all this power in our hands, what must we do if this treaty is rejected? What do we mean to do in that event? What does the Committee on Foreign Relations advise that we should do?

It is declared in this majority report and the report of the Committee on Foreign Relations (page 15), made on the 13th of April, 1886, that the treaty of 1818 has been violated, that we must have redress and indemnity, and that retaliation is the only remedy that self-respect will allow us to demand.

It is also declared in this report that "our Government remonstrated, at first mildly, and later on with something of the vigor that should belong to those intrusted with the defense of clear American rights. But these remonstrances, unaccompanied by other steps, were unavailing."

The wrongs remain, but "the further steps" not having been taken, they remain to be taken.

Does this committee propose to take even the first of these further steps? No bill has been introduced in either House to promote this heroic purpose. There is no intimation of any such intent in the report, or in anything that Congress has done on this subject.

The committee, forgetting the blood of our own race, rely upon British pusillanimity. They expect Great Britain to wilt under the sham threats of their report.

This committee, and those who oppose the treaty, do not permit their indignation towards Great Britain or their contempt for that "ill-advised negotiation" (as they advise Her Majesty that it is, in their concluding address to the British crown) to materialize in a law that is adequate to their high conceptions of duty and their resolute purposes. They provide no substitute for the treaty; they suggest none. Nevertheless, it is but the demand of justice and truth that I should admit that they are making some preliminary preparation, so that "when the worst comes to the worst," they will have enlisted the sympathies of disaffected subjects of Her Majesty, and will be better prepared to protect American rights and American honor, with the assistance of foreign levies, against British wrongs.

Having once voted in favor of and once against the "Riddleberger resolution" for open sessions in committee, and having once voted for and once against that resolution in the Senate, they content themselves with making of this great question, and of the interests, honor, peace, and prosperity of the American people, a political foot-ball to be kicked about by politicians in the approaching Presidential election. They use these great questions to make war on the Democracy, and forget to make war on Great Britain in view of the greater prize of the Presidency.

I am not averse to open discussion of this treaty, because I know that the immense interests of the great populations contiguous to Canada and along the Great Lakes will considerately weigh every fact that bears on this controversy. Their vote will be that peace, cultivated under honorable agreement with a kindred people in the Dominion, is better than votes that politicians may win by vociferous abuse of the Government of Great Britain to help them to get or to retain offices through their party alliances.

Now, what is the actual situation?

Congress, in the act of March 3, 1887, asked the President to satisfy himself, first, whether any rights had been recently denied or were thereafter denied to our fishermen, and then, in his discretion, to proclaim total or partial non-intercourse with Canada and Newfoundland.

The President finding, as he believed, in his diplomatic powers a means of settling these troubles, resorted to that method of composing them. If the Senate rejects that settlement, the law of 1887 still operates. If the President is still not satisfied that the wrongs we have sustained should be redressed by the expensive, disturbing, and dangerous "further steps" that the committee demand that he should have taken and shall take, who will take these further steps?

The way will be open when this treaty is rejected to all the "further steps" that the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Senate, or Congress may wish to take. It is open now to them, and has been open for nearly seventy years. Fifty years ago, and every day since, the wrongs were as great in their nature as they are now; the demand upon Presidents and upon Congress for decisive "further steps" was as great then as now; it is as great now as it was in 1887. Yet no shadow of an approaching host of intrepid patriots, coming to occupy this open way and to sacrifice themselves in this just cause, has flitted across these legislative halls. Congress has been dead to its duty, if it has been anybody's duty, to retaliate on British commerce for their denial of rights to our fishermen. It is yet dead to that duty, and gives no sign of life.

This committee comes into the Senate sounding melancholy funeral notes for the President, who is supposed to have died in the pit which Congress dug for him, without being conscious that they furnish in their own wasted remains the corpse for the funeral.

Congress gave to the President the power, which all the Presidents had possessed since 1850, to wage a paper war on British commerce. It then stood by to see whether he would push this paper war into the category of real war. Had he done this the country would have cried out for his impeachment for a reckless abuse of power that was attended with a full and responsible discretion expressly given him in the act of March 3, 1887. Failing to do this, he is charged, in this report, with usurpation and abuse of constitutional powers, because he sought to find a peaceable and just way to get our rights and to suppress future troubles on the fishery question; and a threat is made by the committee of a future dealing with the President, held "in reserve for the time-being" on account of such abuses. See page 17 of the report, as follows:

But holding in reserve, for the time-being, these grave questions touching usurpations of unconstitutional powers, or the abuse of those that may be thought to exist on the part of the Executive, the committee thinks it sufficient for the present occasion to deal with the document itself.

Congress commands the President that he will satisfy himself, and in his discretion, and on his own responsibility for the exercise of that discretion, to make a paper war on Great Britain, which, it is prophesied in the Senate, would never lead to a conflict of arms. He prefers to exercise his constitutional powers to secure a wiser, safer, and better settlement. He brings the result to the Senate and asks that it be ratified, if two-thirds of this body concur; and what I have just read is the insulting, unjust, incriminative, and threatening answer they have to make to a President who is as honest, true, and patriotic as any of us in his devotion to the country.

The supposed offense that the President has given to the Senate in this "document," as it is derisively styled by the committee, is (1) that he presumed to negotiate when Congress had commanded him to "be satisfied" that wrongs had been done us, and then to make war, on paper, with British commerce, and that, therefore, he must not negotiate; (2) that he presumed to enter upon any negotiation without the consent of the Senate; and (3) that he chose agents to conduct and conclude the negotiation whose names were not first submitted to the Senate. The country will not fail to see the injustice and the spirit of usurpation which led the committee into the following criticisms upon the President and the plenipotentiaries:

> These plenipotentiaries, thus created, began their real work at Washington while both Houses of Congress were sitting, and without any communication by the President in his annual message on the meeting of Congress, or otherwise, of the fact that such important and extraordinary operations were in progress, or that very grave interests of the United States had been placed in the custody of gentlemen whose names had not even been communicated to it.
>
> These "plenipotentiaries" came to a conclusion of their labors on the 15th of February, 1888, and the offices of "plenipotentiaries" terminated, and the result was reached without the advice and consent of the Senate having been asked or taken concerning the selection of these public ministers, and without any communication to either House of Congress concerning this most important subject.
>
> It is not difficult to see that, in evil times, when the President of the United States may be under influence of foreign and adverse interests, such a course of procedure might result in great disaster to the interests and even the safety of our Government and people.
>
> It is no answer to this suggestion to say that an arrangement thus concluded can not be valid or effectual without the advice and consent of the Senate, for the rights and interests of the people of the United States might be so neglected, misunderstood, abandoned, or sold by President's "plenipotentiaries" as to greatly embarrass, if not defeat, their ultimate reassertion in better times and under better administrations, though it is hoped that such will not be the case in respect of these negotiations.
>
> The document submitted to the Senate by the President as the outcome of these negotiations may, it is thought, well illustrate the dangers of such methods.

These complaints, accusations, and threats are rested upon an assumption that has no other foundation than mere arrogance.

The history of the country, and the practice of Presidents and of the Senate, utterly overthrow this pretension, which is, that the Senate has the right to permit or to refuse to permit, any negotiation, on any subject, to take place, without the consent of two-thirds, or at least of a majority, of that body is given in advance.

In more than four hundred cases the President has appointed negotiators whose special powers were not first communicated to the Senate, to make and sign treaties. Washington, Jackson, and Grant, and other Presidents not so conspicuous in their services to the country, tore up by the roots this parasitic growth of presumption that has sometimes flourished in the atmosphere of party zeal, and oftener in the jealousies of political rivalry, that are sometimes found even inside the walls of this Chamber.

To illustrate how far this assumption of authority over negotiations is carried by the committee, and the want of consistency in their contention that no negotiation or remonstrance is now allowable because the time has passed for such weak remedies, I will read the concluding appeal—the doxology and final prayer—of the committee, made in their report. It is addressed to Her Majesty's Government, the Queen of Great Britain. It is not a prayer for the forgiveness of the sins of Congress, or of the Committee on Foreign Relations, for having neglected to exercise their powers in the interests of peace to be manifested by a sudden blow administered upon her crowned head in a fit of sudden anger at wrongs that are now more than half a century old. Neither Congress nor the committee were guilty of that sin, and had no forgiveness to ask. The burden of the petition is that President Cleveland, having the power, if he saw fit (as Congress had not seen fit) to do all these sudden things, with a sudden effect, missed his opportunity and entered into "these ill-advised negotiations." The humble prayer is that the Queen will not mistake the Senate as being in any way responsible for such follies, "which, as is known to all the world, can not properly commit the United States in any degree." Then the prayer concludes with a devout appeal for full commercial reciprocity for our fishermen.

The committee having notified Her Majesty that this treaty would be rejected, and that the President having made this "ill-advised negotiation," his protection would not be claimed, and that the committee were not willing longer to intrust the subject of retaliation in the hands of the President, who preferred negotiation to unfriendly controversy, they with one accord besought Her Majesty Queen Victoria in the following plaintive petition:

> The committee can not but hope * * * that if these ill-advised negotiations * * * shall fail [that] Her Majesty's Government will take measures to secure justice and fair treatment in her North American dominions to American vessels and American citizens in all respects and under all circumstances.

This may be claimed to be a covert threat to Great Britain that we will go to war if she fails to do us justice. If that is what is meant, who has empowered this committee to flaunt a threat and to declare the ultimatum of the United States to Great Britain on this or any other question? That is a diplomatic subject, in dealing with which the President has the constitutional power and responsibility. If a committee can do this, it can force the country into war.

But this is no threat. It is a petition, a prayer. It does not demand justice, but invokes justice, forbearance, and leniency for reciprocal considerations and for the sake of peace.

We have traditions that reach back to our first war for Independence that the poorest and weakest citizen who would claim "British protection" was disgraced before the American people.

Yet here is a committee of the Senate praying the British Government "to take measures to secure justice and fair treatment * * * to American vessels and American citizens."

This case had been hauled before the country in the period of an eager canvass for the Presidency, doubtless with a view to exciting the antagonism of Irish voters against the present Administration, because of its alleged subserviency to British influence, and it is asserted this treaty proves the fact. This is a charge that rankles with injustice. But how does the alleged subserviency to British influence, which this treaty is made to express, by a false construction, compare with this imploration of the committee for British protection? An Irish patriot in a British dungeon would grow to the walls of his prison before he would turn his back on the League and implore "Her Majesty's Government" to "take measures to secure justice and fair treatment in her prisons even to her wronged Irish subjects."

But the committee go still further. Having closed their prayer for British protection in lieu of these "ill-advised negotiations," they rise to their feet and begin to negotiate. They state, in a previous part of their report, already quoted, "that the period of negotiation and unavailing remonstrance had passed," and yet they proceed to remonstrate and negotiate in their report. The President's "time" is up, and the committee assume the function of negotiators. It is not very strange they should do this, when they had just closed a tirade against the President, which I have read from their report, for having presumed to enter upon this negotiation without the consent of the Senate, and for having appointed negotiators whose names had not been submitted to the Senate for their judgment upon their fitness for the place.

Contrary to the statutes and to all proper usages, and in a spirit of usurpation that the Senate by a vote has never sanctioned, the committee address their remarks directly to the British Government:

> The committee can not but hope that * * * Her Majesty's Government * * * will see the justice and propriety of according to American vessels engaged in the business of fishing all the commercial rights and facilities in her North American ports that are freely and cheerfully accorded to her own in the ports of the United States, and that thus the friendship and good feeling which ought to exist between neighboring nations may be finally established and secured.

The Senate has never empowered this committee to send out this diplomatic missive to the British Government. It is a purely gratuitous offer of a reciprocal agreement with Great Britain for equal commercial privileges to their fishermen and ours, which no Senator has a right to make.

In the fifteenth article of this treaty Great Britain proposes the largest commercial privileges to our fishermen whenever Congress shall repeal the duty on fish. This offer of the committee is the same reciprocal agreement without the proposed equivalent of free fish. If the committee flattered themselves that Her Majesty, Queen Victoria, would accord these blessings to their prayerful importunity, or that Her Majesty's Government would accept the fifteenth article of the treaty without the equivalent of free fish, it was their plain duty, as the advisers of the President, to propose through him an amendment of the treaty to that effect.

How can Senators excuse their deliberate refusal to offer to amend the fifteenth article of the treaty by striking out the condition as to free fish and then make imploration and give advice to Great Britain to the effect that these concessions should be granted, and that such concessions would establish and secure "the friendship and good feeling which ought to exist between neighboring nations?"

If there is any meaning or significance in the extraordinary address to Her Majesty's Government made by the committee, they must have believed that it would excite the sense of "justice and propriety" of that Government to the degree of "according to American vessels" the "commercial rights and facilities" claimed for them in the report.

Believing this, was it not as well worthy of the committee to amend the treaty as it was to soften British obstinacy by prayer, or to inform British judgment by suggestion as to a policy that would smooth out all our troubles?

Yet, in the face of these hopeful expressions in favor of "friendship and good feeling," this treaty comes from the committee as a "document" that is not worthy of amendment, and British forbearance and British fear are relied upon for the security of this friendship by the committee, who declare that the time for negotiation and remonstrance has passed.

In my opinion the President and the Senate and the Congress of the United States are still a better reliance than the implorations or the threats of the Committee on Foreign Relations to secure justice at the hands of the British Government.

As I am endeavoring to reply to the report of the majority of the committee, which was never laid before the minority for examination, and as the minority of the committee have presented in their report the facts upon which they are willing to rest their support of the treaty, I will not undertake to repeat what we have said in that report. My purpose on this occasion, I repeat, is to define the real issues that are involved in our differences of opinion as they appear in the two reports.

The broadest issue thus presented is this, that the President seeks to amend the treaty of 1818 so that it shall be understood as to all disputed points hitherto in controversy; and to add to it commercial rights and navigation privileges fixed by mutual agreement, so that we can live under it without the harassing controversies that have attended the whole period of its existence. The committee refuse to amend the treaty; insist upon the execution of its provisions in accordance with all our constructions of the instrument; and further demand full commercial privileges for our fishermen to be obtained by retaliation on Canadian commerce. To emphasize this policy they declare that Congress, on the 3d of March, 1887, "came to the conclusion that the period of negotiation and unavailing remonstrance had passed." This alleged "conclusion" was applied in that act of Congress to fishing rights and commercial privileges alike, so that, if Congress did come to that conclusion, it has shut the door finally and forever, until that act is repealed, against any negotiation with Great Britain about fisheries or commerce with their North Atlantic possessions.

If this position taken by the committee is not well founded on the facts, or if it is, the question of entering upon an effort at negotiation on either of these subjects before proceeding to exercise his discretionary power of retaliation was one of expediency and personal duty on the part of the President, of which he was the sole judge under the Constitution.

If the committee are correct in saying that Congress had come to such a conclusion, and that it operated as an instruction to the President, that he should not negotiate or remonstrate, but should proclaim non-intercourse with Canada, then Congress puts words and phrases into that act that have no meaning. The act says that the President shall, "in his discretion," make proclamation, and "it shall be lawful" for him to do so "whenever" he "shall be satisfied" that certain things have been done to our commercial and fishing rights that are referred to descriptively in the statute.

These words are vain and idle expletives if the President must be "satisfied" without further conference with Great Britain as to the redress or indemnity they are willing to give for such wrongs; or as to what provision that Government will make against their repetition; or what sincere constructions they may have placed upon the treaty of 1818; or the true meaning of the so-called reciprocity of 1830, as affecting our rights; or as to what humble apology and reparation they will make if our rights have been flagrantly abused.

To require the President to be "satisfied" on subjects of this character, without the privilege of remonstrance and the advantage of a reply, is a palpable absurdity. But it is not less absurd than the other "conclusion" which the committee impute to Congress, that the President, in the exercise of his "discretion" which this act gives him, should be required to abdicate his constitutional power to negotiate treaties.

It would be altogether unprofitable to consume further time in discussing a matter that is so entirely plain. "The absurdity" of such a construction of this act could not be "overlooked by any intelligent person," to use the language that the committee employ towards the President.

The minority of the committee are much surprised at the effort of the majority to commit the Senate and the country to the statement that the twenty-ninth article of the treaty of Washington is any way affected by the treaty now before the Senate. It is true this assertion is made with reserve and tentatively in the report, but in any form it is misleading and unjust.

The committee do not assert, and can not say, that the present treaty would in the slightest manner affect the twenty-ninth article of the treaty of Washington. If that article ever gave any commercial rights to our fishermen, as such, these rights remain, wholly unaffected by anything contained in this treaty. That question was settled by the Halifax commission. In that controversy, the United States' agents distinctly asserted, and it was so decided by the commission—

That the various incidental and reciprocal advantages of the treaty, such as the privileges of traffic, purchasing bait and other supplies, are not the subject of compensation, because the treaty of Washington confers no such rights on the inhabitants of the United States, who now enjoy them merely by sufferance, and who can at any time be deprived of them by the enforcement of existing laws or the re-enforcement of former oppressive statutes.

After this decision of the very question here raised against the British contention, before the Halifax commission, the committee reassert that claim, and in support of it make no other argument than this:

That the proceedings before that commission distinctly demonstrate that under article 29, the right to transship fish was understood by the British to be included, and without any conditions depending upon the force of any other articles of the treaty.

If that was true then, it will be equally true after this treaty is ratified. The committee find no difficulty in adopting this British contention, adverse to the United States, when it is supposed to help their argument.

Why should the committee state and rely upon the alleged British understanding of Article XXIX without giving any expression as to their own understanding of it? Why bring this subject into controversy in the face of the declaration of the committee "that the fisheries articles of that treaty (1871) contained no provision either in respect of any commercial rights in Canadian ports or in respect of transshipments, and that the reciprocal transshipment article of the treaty was entirely separate from any question of fisheries or fish as such?"

Throughout this report there is an evident seeking for occasion to condemn the President, and to place him in the light of a usurper of authority to enter upon negotiations with Great Britain without the consent of the Senate and against the "conclusion" of Congress, as is alleged, that the time had passed for negotiation.

This strained, indefinite, and obscure allusion to Article XXIX of the treaty of Washington is brought from a very far distance to aid in the array of surmises with which to meet the array of facts that have made negotiation indispensable, unless we have resolved upon hostilities with Great Britain, and to condemn the President for what he has not done.

A criticism upon the language of Article XI of the treaty suggests the inquiry, why did not the committee present to the Senate an amendment that would relieve that article of all doubt and obscurity as to its meaning if there is, in fact, any such difficulty? The answer is that the committee hold to their main ground as to our relations with Great Britain, that the time for negotiation has passed. No treaty that could have been made would have met the demand of the committee unless it had abrogated the treaty af 1818 as to its effects upon the commercial rights and privileges of our fishermen.

If that treaty is in our way we should find some means of getting it out of our way, and not allow it to remain an incubus on our prosperity, if it is such, or as a pretext to justify constant interference with our people.

Congress alone has the power to open the road to this result if the people desire it and will support Congress with men and money.

The majority of the committee are not willing that the treaty of 1818 should be improved by a new negotiation, and hence they decline to amend Article XI of the present treaty so as to make the meaning clear as to clauses that are a great improvement upon the former treaty.

There is no real obscurity in Article XI, and it does confer on our fishing vessels, on all occasions, the right to purchase needful or casual supplies for their voyages, whether or not they are homeward bound. It is not the present destination of the ship, but the occasion that creates the necessity for the supplies that controls the privilege of purchase in the Canadian ports. "Needful provisions and supplies" and "casual provisions and supplies" are such as necessity or casualty has made reasonably necessary for the support of the ship's company or the purposes of the voyage. They are not such as are required for the mere purposes of commerce or economy in conducting a fishing venture.

Believing this article of the treaty to be clear, I did not have occasion to try to improve it by amendment. But I am quite willing to vote for its amendment, if any one who is in doubt prefers to change the language of this or any other article in the treaty. If the privilege intended to be provided for is valuable, it should not be thrown away by a refusal to amend the language of this article.

I will not go further now in making answer to the objections and criticisms of the majority as to the several articles of the treaty. I believe they are all fully answered in the views presented in the minority report.

The allusions in the report to the language of Senators give to their utterances in debate on other issues a significance that is not due to their intrinsic importance, and are very embarrassing to their freedom of action when they represent the Senate in committee.

If the minority had thought it proper to array before the country the utterances of Senators in respect to the fisheries question they could have brought together a jumble of wild and excited declarations that would have shocked the common sense of mankind. They never thought of holding the country responsible for either the animus or the forms of these expressions of opinions, nor did anybody else.

So far as my expressions in debate are concerned, or my votes on questions, I have no trouble in reversing them at any moment I may find it right to reverse them. But I have uttered no opinion, nor have I given any vote on these questions that I find it necessary now to reverse. In speaking on these topics in the Senate, in advance of diplomatic or other effort to secure justice and peace to our country, I have spoken and voted with the reserve that every Senator must feel in the open discussion of matters that can only be properly considered when we are in confidential session. I did not, therefore, speak of the remedies that bore upon my mind with great weight as being the just, patriotic, and most beneficial method of settling our fisheries disputes.

I have always felt that the treaty of 1818 was a disgraceful surrender

of an important part of the independence we won from Great Britain in the war of the Revolution, and was conceded to us in our treaty of peace. I am prepared to advise and vote for a demand that shall be nothing but an ultimatum that all those rights shall be restored to us, and to sustain that demand with any exercise of power that may be necessary. But I could not afford to say this in the open Senate, as I have said it in committee, for I would have been ridiculed for making a vainglorious effort to gain notoriety; yet every Senator here feels that this is the true measure of American duty to American honor and history.

I did not say in the Senate, as I say now, that every trouble that had arisen, or will arise, under the treaty of 1818, would disappear the moment Congress shall repeal the duty on fish. In this opinion I am sure I must have the concurrence of the Senator from Maine [Mr. FRYE]. Why did I not then speak out on that question? It was because we were then dealing in the Senate with Great Britain, and not with differences of opinion on domestic questions, and I thought it hardly fair to add even my feeble influence to stimulate the hope of Great Britain for a free market for fish. I want that duty repealed for many reasons, the chief one being that it will lower the price and increase the supply of food to the great body of our industrial classes.

I could advance and prove another reason, as I believe, for the support of this conviction to which I give great weight. It is that the duty on fish does not increase the wages of the fishermen, while it does increase the cost to the consumer. It enables the "Fisheries Union," the "Halibut Syndicate," the trusts and other monopolies to make great profit at the expense of hunger to the poor. It enables the owners of fleets of fishing vessels to hire Canadians to man their ships and to drive the American fishermen into other pursuits by their low capacity to live and thrive on low wages. Thus has been stolen from the United States by private monopoly and cupidity the hope of training hardy mariners for our fleets for which we have paid enormous sums in bounties to our fishermen.

I did not think that, as a Senator, I could afford to bring into any discussion respecting the conduct of so great a government as Great Britain towards our people, a domestic question, even if I felt, as I do, that the repeal of the duty on fish imported from Canada and Newfoundland would forever settle this whole fisheries question.

I will reserve any further remarks until the treaty is taken up by articles for consideration by the Senate.

Now, Mr. President, I withdraw the appeal which I took from the decision of the Chair.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The appeal is withdrawn. The resolutions go over under objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. CLARK, its Clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the President *pro tempore:*

A bill (S. 300) granting a pension to Mrs. Juliet G. Howe;
A bill (S. 393) for the relief of Frances Anne Pyne Ricketts;
A bill (S. 1037) granting a pension to the infant children of Michael A. Moran;
A bill (S. 1146) granting a pension to L. J. McGoffin;
A bill (S. 1299) granting a pension to George Park;
A bill (S. 1948) to authorize the Fort Smith and Choctaw Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Poteau River in the Choctaw Nation, near Fort Smith, Ark.;
A bill (S. 1957) granting a pension to Virtue Smith;
A bill (S. 2167) granting a pension to Mary E. Woodward;
A bill (S. 2332) granting a pension to John Linsley;
A bill (S. 2551) to amend section 993 of the Revised Statutes of the United States for the District of Columbia, so as to make Inauguration Day a holiday within said District;
A bill (H. R. 322) for the relief of B. M. Parish;
A bill (H. R. 417) granting a pension to David Strunk;
A bill (H. R. 488) granting a pension to Elizabeth Burr;
A bill (H. R. 611) for the relief of Mrs. P. L. Ward, widow and executrix of William Ward, deceased;
A bill (H. R. 955) granting a pension to Mary M. Sweet;
A bill (H. R. 1483) for the erection of a public building at Monroe, La.;
A bill (H. R. 1184) to authorize the construction of a bridge across Rock Creek at the Woodley Lane road, in the District of Columbia;
A bill (H. R. 1599) to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Sedalia, in the State of Missouri;
A bill (H. R. 1844) to promote agriculture, and for other purposes;
A bill (H. R. 2151) for the relief of Joseph B. Burton;
A bill (H. R. 2167) for the relief of George E. Oliphant;
A bill (H. R. 2695) for the relief of Charles V. Mesler;
A bill (H. R. 3922) to place the name of Casper Seibel on the pension-roll;
A bill (H. R. 3959) granting a pension to Dolly Blazer;
A bill (H. R. 5522) for the relief of Elijah Martin;
A bill (H. R. 5844) to increase the pension of William Clark;
A bill (H. R. 6520) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Ward;
A bill (H. R. 6575) for the relief of James L. Alslip;
A bill (H. R. 6845) granting a pension to John Witham;
A bill (H. R. 7052) relating to postal crimes and amendatory of the statutes therein mentioned;
A bill (H. R. 7265) for the erection of a public building at Hoboken, N. J.;
A bill (H. R. 7490) for the relief of Sidney W. Whitelock;
A bill (H. R. 7509) granting to the New York Harbor and Beach Railroad Company a right of way;
A bill (H. R. 7913) granting a pension to Nellie Palfrey Goodwin;
A bill (H. R. 8266) for the relief of Mrs. Clarissa G. Green;
A bill (H. R. 8279) to authorize the county of Laurens, in the State of Georgia, to construct a bridge across the Oconee River, at or near Dublin, in said county and State; and
A bill (H. R. 8965) to authorize the Postmaster-General to cancel mail contract on route No. 30100, and for other purposes.

INDIAN APPROPRIATION BILL.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8565) making appropriations for the current and contingent expenses of the Indian Department, and for fulfilling treaty stipulations with various Indian tribes, for the year ending June 30, 1889, and for other purposes, and asking a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

On motion of Mr. DAWES, it was

Resolved, That the Senate insist on its amendments to the said bill disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agree to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

By unanimous consent, it was

Ordered, That the conferees on the part of the Senate be appointed by the President *pro tempore*.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore* appointed Mr. DAWES, Mr. PLUMB, and Mr. CALL.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY.

Mr. MORRILL. I move that when the Senate adjourn to-day it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

Mr. HOAR. Will the Senator yield to me to make another motion, which is that the Senate do now adjourn until Monday?

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The motion of the Senator from Massachusetts takes precedence. The Senator from Massachusetts moves that the Senate do now adjourn until Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 11, 1888, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *June 7*, 1888.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m. The House was called to order by Mr. MCMILLIN, as Speaker *pro tempore*, who directed the reading of the following communication:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., June 7, 1888.

SIR: I hereby designate Hon. BENTON MCMILLIN to preside as Speaker *pro tempore* at the session of the House to-day.

J. G. CARLISLE, *Speaker.*

Hon. JOHN B. CLARK,
Clerk House of Representatives.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

STEAMER CHAMPION.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* laid before the House a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Fish Commission, submitting an estimate of an appropriation to pay damages sustained by the steamer Champion by collision with the steamer Fish Hawk; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

SPOLIATION CLAIMS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House a letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting conclusions of fact and of law in certain spoliation claims; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. KERR, until the 26th instant, on account of important business.

DIPLOMATIC APPROPRIATION BILL.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 6833) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service of the United States for the fiscal year 1889, with amendments of the Senate thereto; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and the amendments ordered to be printed.

UNLAWFUL GRAZING ON INDIAN LANDS.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the bill (H. R. 8393) to protect lands belonging to Indians from unlawful grazing, and for other purposes, with the amendments of the Senate thereto.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, that is the bill that I asked yesterday should be allowed to lie on the Speaker's table for the present.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection it will be so ordered.

PARIS, CHOCTAW AND LITTLE ROCK RAILWAY COMPANY.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the bill (S. 2929) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct and operate a railway, telegraph, and telephone line through the Indian Territory, and for other purposes.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, a bill which is substantially a copy of that Senate bill has been reported favorably by the House Committee on Indian Affairs, and I ask unanimous consent that the Senate bill be considered at this time.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I object. I call for the regular order.

Mr. CULBERSON. I desire to state to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. ANDERSON] that a bill, which is substantially this Senate bill, has been recommended unanimously by the House Committee on Indian Affairs, and I appeal to the gentleman to withdraw his objection.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I object.

Mr. CULBERSON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill lie on the Speaker's table for the present.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

SUSAN E. ALGER.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore* also laid before the House the following:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES, *June* 6, 1888.

Ordered, That the Secretary be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill of the Senate No. 1162 for the relief of Susan E. Alger.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If there be no objection, this request will be complied with.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

BRIDGE ACROSS THE TOMBIGBEE RIVER IN ALABAMA.

Mr. DAVIDSON, of Alabama. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 9610) to authorize the Birmingham, Selma and New Orleans Railway Company to build a bridge across the Tombigbee River in Alabama, and that the bill be now put upon its passage.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I object.

PUBLIC BUILDING, BRIDGEPORT, CONN.

Mr. DIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a privileged report from the committee of conference.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill of the House 7264 for the erection of a public building at Bridgeport, Conn., having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the same.

SAMUEL DIBBLE,
WILLIAM H. SOWDEN,
HERMAN LEHLBACH,
Managers on the part of the House.
JUSTIN S. MORRILL,
J. C. SPOONER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The following is the accompanying statement under the rule submitted by the House conferees:

The managers on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House bill 7264, for the erection of a public building at Bridgeport, Conn., beg leave to submit with the conference report the following statement:

The limit of cost in the bill is $100,000; and this, by the Senate amendment, is increased to $150,000. The conference report recommends the latter amount.

SAMUEL DIBBLE,
WM. H. SOWDEN,
HERMAN LEHLBACH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. DIBBLE. I move the adoption of the conference report.

The report was adopted.

Mr. DIBBLE moved to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

PUBLIC BUILDING, BAY CITY, MICH.

Mr. DIBBLE. Mr. Speaker, I desire to present another conference report.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill of the House 7263 for the erection of a public building at Bay City, Mich., having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate, and agree to the same.

SAMUEL DIBBLE,
C. NEWTON,
Managers on the part of the House.
J. C. SPOONER,
JUSTIN S. MORRILL,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

The conferees on the part of the House submitted under the rule the following:

The managers on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House bill 7263, for the erection of a public building at Bay City, Mich., beg leave to submit with the conference report the following statement:

The limit of cost in the bill is $150,000; and this, by the Senate amendment, is increased to $200,000. The conference report recommends the latter amount.

SAMUEL DIBBLE,
C. NEWTON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. DIBBLE. I move the adoption of the report.

The conference report was adopted.

Mr. DIBBLE moved to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was adopted; and also moved that the motion to reconsider be laid on the table.

The latter motion was agreed to.

MINING DÉBRIS IN CALIFORNIA.

Mr. BIGGS. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union be discharged from the further consideration of House bill No. 1216, providing for the investigation of the mining-débris question in the State of California.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I object.

Mr. SPRINGER. Let us have the regular order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The regular order is the call of committees for reports.

LIGHT-HOUSES AT LUBEC NARROWS, ETC.

On motion of Mr. LONG, by unanimous consent, the Committee on Appropriations was discharged from the further consideration of a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of the communication from the Light-House Board relative to additional appropriations to complete the construction of light-houses at Lubec Narrows, Deer Island, and Crabtree Ledge; and the same was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

W. J. BLACKBURN.

On motion of Mr. CRISP, by unanimous consent, the Committee on Elections was discharged from the further consideration of the petition of W. J. Blackburn, for pay as a Representative in the Fortieth Congress from the State of Louisiana; and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

SAMUEL M'KEE.

On motion of Mr. CRISP, by unanimous consent, the Committee on Elections was discharged from the further consideration of the petition of Samuel McKee, formerly of Montgomery County, Kentucky, now of Louisville, Ky., asking to be paid expenses of contest for a seat in the Fortieth Congress; and the same was referred to the Committee on Claims.

J. EDWIN PILCHER.

Mr. CULBERSON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 10340) for the relief of J. Edwin Pilcher; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

COMMISSIONS IN THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE.

Mr. SENEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back favorably the bill (S. 143) to provide for the issuing and recording of certain commissions in the Department of Justice; which was referred to the House Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

NATIONAL ACADEMY OF DENTAL SCIENCE.

Mr. SENEY also, from the Committee on the Judiciary, reported back adversely the bill (S. 2941) to incorporate the National Academy of Dental Science; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BUILDING AT STERLING, ILL.

Mr. NEWTON, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, reported back with amendment the bill (S. 1940) to provide for the construction of a public building at Sterling, Ill.; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

REAR-ADMIRAL CARTER.

Mr. WHITTHORNE. The Committee on Naval Affairs have directed me to report back favorably the bill (S. 71) for the relief of Rear-Admiral Carter, and to ask leave that a minority of the committee have leave hereafter to file their views on this bill. The committee has also

instructed me to ask that they be discharged from the further consideration of House bill No. 572, on the same subject, and that it be laid on the table.

The bill (S. 71) for the relief of Rear-Admiral Carter was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed; and the bill H. R. 572 was, by unanimous consent, laid on the table.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. In the absence of objection, a minority of the Committee on Naval Affairs will have leave to file their views upon Senate bill No. 71, just reported.

BRIDGE ACROSS RED RIVER.

Mr. PHELAN, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back with amendment the bill (H. R. 10063) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct a bridge across Red River at or near Hooks' Ferry, Red River County, Texas; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

RAILROAD BRIDGE ACROSS SNAKE RIVER, ETC.

Mr. PHELAN also, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back with amendment the bill (S. 2607) authorizing the construction of railroad bridges across the Snake River and across the Clear Water River by the Oregon Railway and Navigation Company; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

BRIDGE ACROSS BAYOU D'ARBONNE.

Mr. PHELAN also, from the Committee on Commerce, reported back with amendment the bill (S. 2199) authorizing the Little Rock and Alexandria Railway Company to maintain and construct a bridge across Bayou D'Arbonne, in Louisiana; which was referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the Private Calendar, and, with the accompanying report, ordered to be printed.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the further consideration of bills raising revenue.

Mr. STEELE. I hope the gentleman from Texas will allow us to have the morning hour to-day for business of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. MILLS, there were—ayes 75, noes 57.

Mr. STEELE. No quorum.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. STEELE and Mr. MILLS were appointed.

Mr. MCKINLEY. I hope the gentleman from Texas will allow the Committee on Military Affairs to have the consideration hour for their business.

Mr. MILLS. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs is not here; and I am unwilling to consent to this proposition except on his request.

The House proceeded to divide by tellers; but before the result of the count was announced,

Mr. MILLS said: We lack so many of a quorum at present that I am indisposed to press my motion just now. I withdraw it in order to allow the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE] to bring up the business of the Committee on Military Affairs in the consideration hour.

Mr. STEELE. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, my object being the consideration of business of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. LANHAM. I desire to state that in the consideration hour we have already entered upon the consideration of a bill which I now understand to be pending in that hour—the bill (H. R. 3255) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle and pay the claim of the State of Florida on account of expenditures made in suppressing Indian hostilities, and for other purposes. I do not remember that the Committee on Military Affairs has the right of way.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If the bill to which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] refers has not been finished, it would be first entitled to consideration.

Mr. LANHAM. I have no objection to the Committee on Military Affairs occupying this morning hour, provided it does not interfere with the status of the bill to which I have just referred.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. If the bill to which the gentleman from Texas refers is the unfinished business it can only be postponed by unanimous consent.

Mr. STEELE. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

Mr. BYNUM. I object.

Mr. STEELE. I think an examination of the Journal will sustain my supposition that the business of the Committee on Military Affairs is now in order.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will have the Journal examined, and will afterward make the proper announcement.

Mr. STEELE. I hope my colleague [Mr. BYNUM] will withdraw his objection. The bill which the Committee on Military Affairs desires to bring up is a public bill.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Indiana that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union.

The motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. COX in the chair.

Mr. STEELE. I call up Senate bill——

Mr. BYNUM. What is the unfinished business before the committee. I demand the regular order.

Mr. LANHAM. I will state to the gentleman from Indiana that the bill to which I referred a few moments ago, with reference to the claim of the State of Florida, is the unfinished business; but I ask unanimous consent that that bill be passed over informally, not to lose its place on the Calendar.

Mr. OATES. I join in that request for the reason that neither of the gentlemen from Florida is present. It is a claim of the State of Florida as I understand.

The CHAIRMAN. The regular order is the consideration of the bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3255) to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle and pay the claim of the State of Florida on account of expenditures made in suppressing Indian hostilities, and for other purposes.

Mr. BYNUM. Can the committee pass over this bill?

The CHAIRMAN. It can be done by unanimous consent. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent. Does the gentleman from Indiana object?

Mr. BYNUM. I call for the regular order; and I make the point that this can only be passed over by the House in the regular way.

Mr. LANHAM. It can be done by unanimous consent in the committee, and I have asked that consent be given.

Mr. BYNUM. And I object.

Mr. SPRINGER. Objection being made to the consideration of the bill, the committee must rise and report the objection to the House.

Mr. KERR. I move that the objection be reported to the House——

Mr. LANHAM. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry first.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANHAM. In the event that the committee should now rise, I desire to know if the bill will still retain its place on the Calendar? It has been considered during a part of one morning hour, and is, as I understand it, the unfinished business.

The CHAIRMAN. It is up for consideration now, and the committee must either consider it, or if objection is made to its consideration, it is for the House to determine whether it will pass it over or not.

Mr. LANHAM. But if the committee should rise now it would still come up for consideration hereafter when the committee again resumes its session?

The CHAIRMAN. So the Chair thinks.

Mr. STEELE. I desire to know whether or not this bill would lose its place if that order were made; and in the event that the bill was ordered to be passed over, whether it would be in order then to call the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. LANHAM. I have no objection to the Committee on Military Affairs taking up such bills as they desire during this morning hour, provided that the bill for the relief of the State of Florida may go over without prejudice, to be taken up in the next morning hour.

Mr. STEELE. I do not desire to prejudice that bill. I think it ought to be considered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit the request to the committee. Is there objection to passing over this bill informally? [After a pause.] The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BYNUM. I did not hear the statement of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair put the question to the House for unanimous consent that the Florida bill go over without losing its place on the Calendar.

Mr. BYNUM. I have already objected to that. I did not suppose it was necessary to rise and interpose an objection every fifteen minutes.

Mr. KERR. I make the point of order that it is now too late to object.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman as not insisting upon the objection; but on the statement that he did not withdraw it, the Chair must recognize that objection.

Mr. BAYNE. I rise to make a parliamentary inquiry. Can the objection of the gentleman be obviated by asking that the committee rise and report to the House for action?

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Chairman, it is evidently impossible for gentlemen to reach the consideration of business from the Committee on Military Affairs this morning. I therefore move that the committee rise, with a view to resuming the consideration of the tariff bill.

Mr. BAYNE. And I move to amend that motion, if amendable, by reporting the objection to the House, so as to reach the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. SPINOLA. Before that motion is submitted I desire to ask unanimous consent to make a statement not exceeding one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman from New York making a brief statement?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPINOLA. I would ask, Mr. Chairman, before the committee rises——

Mr. BURROWS. What is the request?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is on the floor by unanimous consent.

Mr. BURROWS. I understood the Chair to ask if there was objection. Objection to what?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asked unanimous consent to occupy the floor for a minute.

Mr. MILLS. My motion is pending, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. The pending motion is that the committee rise.

Mr. HOLMAN. I rise to a question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOLMAN. The Chair had recognized the gentleman from New York; unanimous consent had been given him, and it was so announced by the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has half a minute in which he proposes to make a statement by consent.

Mr. SPINOLA. I understood the Chair to rule——

Mr. McMILLIN. I believe the motion to rise is not debatable.

Mr. REED. But the gentleman from New York asked unanimous consent to make a brief statement.

Mr. SPINOLA. I have but a word.

I understood, sir, that the measures reported to this House by the Committee on Military Affairs would be taken up this morning. I hold in my hand a resolution reported unanimously by that committee, asking for a small appropriation to pay some legitimate expenses to be incurred by the reunion of the two armies who fought the great battle of Gettysburgh. It comes to our committee and this House recommended by every soldier who fought in that great battle belonging to the Union arms. They have extended a cordial invitation to those who fought against them on the other side to meet there on the Fourth of July to indicate the positions occupied on those three terrible days by the Confederate forces. Both armies will come there together, and our side has already, as is well known to every member of the House, clearly defined the positions occupied by them during those three days. I would therefore ask unanimous consent——

Mr. McMILLIN. Regular order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks this is not in order pending the motion that the committee rise.

Mr. LANHAM. I rise to a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LANHAM. Suppose the committee will rise now, not having entered upon the consideration of the Florida bill, would that bill lose its place on the Calendar?

Mr. BURROWS. But its consideration has been entered upon. It has been called up.

The CHAIRMAN. It was the unfinished business before the committee.

Mr. LANHAM. But its consideration has not been entered upon.

Mr. BURROWS. It has been called up.

Mr. LANHAM. I assume that it would be the unfinished business hereafter when the committee again resumes its session.

Mr. BURROWS. I think that would be a question to be determined by the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not determine that matter now. It would be for the House to determine.

The motion of Mr. MILLS was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. McMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. COX reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 3255, had come to no resolution thereon, objection having been made to its consideration.

TARIFF.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union to further consider the tariff bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker *pro tempore* decided that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. STEELE. I demand a division; but pending that I desire to know if this bill goes over—this bill for the relief of the State of Florida—if the Committee on Claims has the morning hour when we next reach the consideration of business in that hour.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair thinks it would.

Mr. STEELE. I would like to know if the Military Committee would follow that committee.

The SPEAKER *pro tempore*. The Chair will state for the information of the House that when the Committee on Military Affairs was reached an agreement was entered into that it should be passed over informally, its call not being lost, and that being the case the Committee on Claims was called and this bill was reached as the unfinished business from that committee.

Mr. STEELE. With that understanding on the part of the Chair I withdraw the demand for a division.

So (no further count being demanded) the motion of Mr. MILLS was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is now in Committee of the Whole for the consideration of a bill the title of which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 9051) to reduce taxation and simplify the laws in relation to the collection of the revenue.

The CHAIRMAN. When the committee rose yesterday lines 22 to 25 of this bill were under consideration, and the question before the committee was on the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] to the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY]. Debate upon the amendment to the amendment was exhausted, but unanimous consent had been given for the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] to continue his remarks upon this amendment for ten minutes.

[Mr. DINGLEY withholds his remarks for revision. See APPENDIX.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate is exhausted. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] to the amendment of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY].

The amendment of Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky, was read.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I would like to say a few words on this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I move to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. There is already pending an amendment in the second degree. If there is no objection, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] can proceed.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I hope consent may be given that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] may occupy five minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the difference between the proposition submitted by my friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] and the first proposition embraced in the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky is this: It is proposed in the pending bill to admit into the markets of the United States all classes of lumber free of duty. In response to that the gentleman from Maine suggests that as an equivalent certain rights which we have claimed and which have been conceded to us practically for more than half a century should be guaranteed to us by Canada; that is, that there should be this reciprocal recognition and guaranty for the granting and yielding of the privileges proposed by the Mills bill in reference to lumber. The proposition of my friend from Kentucky is, that in consideration of a bare recognition by Canada of a right which we not only claim but have substantially enjoyed for more than half a century with hardly a protest from Canada or the English Government, we shall open our markets to the produce of their seas and lakes and rivers with the few exceptions mentioned. In other words, the effect of the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky is to compel us to acknowledge practically the right of the Canadians, under the treaty of 1818, to exclude our fishing vessels from their ports; we are to concede that they have been right in this controversy and we have been wrong; and in consideration of our abandoning our position and recognizing the soundness of theirs, we are, in addition to our humiliation, to accord to them certain rights and privileges, to wit, the admission into the United States of the product of their fisheries free of duty.

Now, I favor the proposition of the gentleman from Maine, because if we concede to the Canadians these privileges we have a right to exact of them at least that they shall acknowledge rights which we demand as a fair equivalent. I oppose the proposition as submitted by my friend from Kentucky because it does what I have already suggested—makes a tacit or implied admission that we have been wrong all these years, and places us in the position of tendering Canada a consideration for recognizing that which we have asserted all along to be our right.

As to the other proposition submitted by the honorable gentleman from Kentucky, which looks in the direction of reciprocal trade with our neighbors on the north, my attitude is well known to this House, for in that regard I have done nothing and said nothing in a corner. His proposition, however, has not been well considered, nor is it in any wise guarded; nor would it even tend to the consummation of that which many of us desire in the matter of extending our commercial relations with our neighbors upon the north. There is no provision here which would protect us against the importation into the United States of goods manufactured outside of Canada and in Europe and which might seek admission into our ports. It is true, the letter of the proposition provides that it shall apply only to articles manufactured or produced in Canada; but there is no provision in the amendment looking to the enforcement of the letter or spirit of the proposition. More than that, there is no provision with reference to our internal-revenue system; none whatever. It will be observed that under our internal-

revenue law high taxes are imposed upon spirits. Not so in Canada. The result would be the shipment of the products of the stills and vineyards of Canada into the markets of the United States and then sale in the markets at less than the tax our producers pay.

The proposition is not well advised or well considered, and hence I am constrained to oppose it; and in all this, I submit to my friend from Kentucky, I am perfectly consistent. I would make the tariff system continental, and place at the feet of my countrymen wealth enough to enrich a thousand million of people. But it can not be done in this way. This measure, it seems to me, has not had that considerate thought and attention which my friend from Kentucky usually bestows upon propositions which he submits to this House.

Now to recapitulate, for I have not time in five minutes to discuss the whole aspect of the question presented by the second clause of the proposition before the House. My friend from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] proposes simply to say to the Canadians, "If you want to bring into the United States your lumber free of duty, you shall at least bestow upon the fishermen of this country the right to go into your harbors, the right they have hitherto enjoyed, at least in practical experience, for more than half a century." In addition to that, he says, "We will not concede that we have been wrong in insisting upon this right, and pay you for the privilege of enjoying that which is already our own, though you interfere temporarily with its enjoyment by our fishermen."

As to the other branch of the proposition of the gentleman from Kentucky, it is only necessary that attention should be called to it to see that it needs enlarging, changing, modifying, before it could properly meet with the acceptance of any one here, however thoroughly devoted to the policy of the widest and fullest commercial relations between ourselves and our neighbors on the north.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. PARKER. Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a formal motion and to ask recognition on this question.

The CHAIRMAN. There is now an amendment in the second degree, and no other can be entertained until the amendment to the amendment is disposed of. After that the Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. PARKER. I wish to make a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. PARKER. I wish to know whether it is in order to ask a vote upon the last portion of this proposition separately.

The CHAIRMAN. It is; the amendment can be divided.

Mr. PARKER. Then I propose to ask for a division of this question, and I wish to submit to this House whether it desires to vote, after half an hour's discussion, upon a proposition which seems to be the most outrageous that has been presented during the last four Congresses.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER] having called for a division, the first question will be on the first branch of the proviso; afterward on the second part.

Mr. PARKER. I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this question be allowed to run on without objection for the present.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I ask that the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARKER], if he desires to speak, be allowed to do so.

Mr. PARKER. Let the debate run on for, say, one hour.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I trust my friend from Kentucky will allow my friend from Illinois and some other gentlemen to submit observations on this question.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. So far as I can, I am willing that this five-minute debate proceed for a time without objection; but I would not like to commit myself to its continuance for any specific time.

Mr. REED. This is a serious question, which ought to be fully debated. I suggest to the gentleman from Kentucky that he can permit the debate to proceed by withdrawing his amendment and allowing it to be renewed afterward by some other member seeking the floor.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I have no objection to that. If it be understood that my amendment shall be renewed, I withdraw it.

Mr. REED. The amendment can be renewed from time to time, as the time allowed by the rules for debate upon it is exhausted.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the arrangement suggested will be carried out; and gentlemen will be permitted for the present to speak upon this question without reference to the pendency of the amendment.

Mr. HITT. Mr. Chairman, here are two propositions, two amendments offered, both relating to the commercial privileges of our vessels in Canadian ports, and we have to consider them together; but how different! The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], like a careful statesman, proposes that inasmuch as the Democratic majority of this House has voted to take the duty off of the principal Canadian products coming to this country, by which they will receive a great boon, we now simply add this condition to that boon that they shall not enjoy all these great advantages if they continue to abuse our vessels and fishermen, refuse them the commercial privileges of coming into port and buying supplies, privileges granted by us to them and by all civilized nations except them. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] humbly proposes that after we give Canadians the advantage of all these articles, like lumber, which they sell, being admitted without paying duty, after giving this gratuitously, we shall propose to them that whenever they will grant to us the commercial privileges we claim and all Christendom recognizes, then their fish also shall come in without paying duty. Such humiliation of our nation and admission of the wrong on our part is new to our ears.

The proposition of the gentleman from Maine to make sensible use of the enormous concessions by the United States to Canadian interests already voted by this House, amounting to a trade of many millions of dollars, in order to get something in return, is a business method and procedure so common in conducting international affairs, requiring some concession in return for every valuable advantage granted, that all he has said, and ably said, in the way of argument in support of it has only shown its self-evident merit, has only illustrated, not proven, the manifest good sense and wisdom of the proposition. I have before me the statement of a leading Tory paper of Canada, rejoicing over the hope of the passage of this Mills tariff bill, which estimates the advantages to the trade of Canada that will accrue from it at over $9,000,000. This is urged by the Tory newspaper, inspired by English interests, and opposing the movement in Canada now going on friendly to enlarging commerce with us by taking away all barriers on their side as well. "Wait," he says, "and the Mills bill will do the work for us, and we will get every advantage without granting anything to the Americans."

Mr. Chairman, the privileges demanded in the amendment of the gentleman from Maine are our rights now, and for many years they have been solemnly asserted and vindicated by our Government—always till these last few months, when we have fallen upon different men and different times. Why, even during the present Administration those rights were at first maintained with vigor. None of our statesmen have stated and urged them with more logical clearness than Minister Phelps at London, who never was refuted, nor with braver spirit than the stout-hearted Secretary Manning; and who of us did not feel some humiliation when the gentleman from Kentucky (and Kentuckians are generally high-spirited men) proposed that we should offer to give the Canadians our much-coveted market for their fish free of duty whenever they would grant commercial privileges. "Grant" is the word he uses. Sir, they are our rights, and are not to be granted under such humble purchase.

Canada should recognize and admit these long-vindicated rights, which all other civilized nations recognize. Not a diplomatist among those who have contended over this question for over fifty years, not an English or Canadian statesman has ever claimed more in exchange for all they have to give than the gentleman from Kentucky now wishes to throw into their laps. But we have never yet admitted, and I trust this House will not lower the country by admitting, that the position we have maintained for so many years was all wrong and untenable; that we had no rights and should buy the grant of this privilege of decent treatment by giving them the fish duty.

Shall we abandon all that was said in the earlier dispatches of Secretary Bayard and the dispatches of Mr. Phelps in defense of the right of our vessels to humane treatment? I am sorry to know that the words of that Department have been followed since by acts that have lost much of our vantage ground, and after the unfortunate treaty was negotiated lately with Mr. Chamberlain and Sir Charles Tupper the President indorsed it in a message, and thus placed us officially in the world's public opinion as a government in very bad position for any negotiation hereafter, though this treaty may soon be rejected. All this I knew, but it should not have been crowned by this complete humiliation and purchase proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky.

He has attached to his amendment a proviso proposing in a few and, I think, hasty words complete reciprocity with Canada. I am in favor of unrestricted trade with Canada, and, still more, of commercial union; and with a hope of such a solution of all our troubles on the north, I have thought we should not at this time touch the tariff on lumber and the other products of Canada, but keep those duties up while they are a motive for an active movement toward us from the side of Canada. Besides, this is not proposed seriously by the gentleman, but his whole amendment is contrived as a parliamentary device to load down the proposition of the gentleman from Maine.

When so comprehensive and important a measure as one providing for unrestricted reciprocity, to go into immediate effect, is proposed, it should be carefully framed and in the form in which we expect it will be accepted and actually put into operation, for before long they will be ready to accept it. Recently it was proposed and elaborately discussed in the Canadian Parliament. That debate, running through weeks, was of marked ability and thoroughness, and at the end, despite the whole power and patronage of the government pressing against it, the measure received 66 votes in that parliament. I observed, too, that the members voting for it represented the districts of greatest wealth and activity in the Dominion. They were in favor of unrestricted reciprocity with the United States. It is therefore our duty to treat this vast question as a practical one—not a thing to play with as party fencing over amendments to a partisan tariff bill. We will, I hope, before long, take it up and frame such a measure as the Canadians will accept and act upon; and the importance of such legislation

can hardly be exaggerated. I believe the best method would be to form a commercial union and extend our revenue system all round the north to the sea——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I move that the gentleman's time be extended for another five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HITT. I thank the gentleman and the House.

Such a measure should not be put in a crude, careless form, as it is now before us, where no mention is found, or provision made, for the different internal-revenue systems of the two countries, which would bring on infinite fraud and confusion if the tariffs of the two countries were removed and the internal taxes on spirits and tobacco left different. A careful measure of this kind was introduced by my friend from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH]. Better still would it be to assimilate the tariff and internal taxes of the two countries—make them alike, the same in rate, and divide the proceeds equitably. This would at once give us the full benefit of Canadian trade, which our manufacturers have been excluded from. Nor is the problem of assimilating the tariff so very difficult. It is said that their tariff is far below ours. Gentlemen are fond of saying in this debate that our average tariff rate is above 47 per cent. That depends on the classes of articles of which the trade is composed. The tariff levied last year by the United States on articles coming from Canada was far lower than that. Let me give you some new figures. By a careful and laborious computation made by the Bureau of Statistics at my suggestion, a comparison has been made of the tariff rate of the United States and the tariff levied by Canada upon every article imported from the United States into Canada last year. I will not give you the long details, but the final result, to show how near the tariff systems of the two countries are. On $30,578,332 of dutiable goods the Canadian Government levied $7,265,135.73, or 23.76 per cent., while the duty on the same articles under United States law would have been $8,099,686.92, or 26.49 per cent. The difference between the two systems is the difference between 23.76 and 26.49, or 2.73 per cent.—not quite 2¾ per cent. So slight is the difference to be reconciled in the problem of reconciling the tariffs of Canada and the United States and making one common tariff for both. It should be considered in connection with the internal-revenue systems of the two countries, which ought also to be made alike if we have commercial union, or excepted altogether as to the articles subjected to internal taxes if we have unrestricted reciprocity. In a commercial union we will have to provide an equitable method of dividing the proceeds of the common tariff.

Now, I would be glad to vote for such a proposition properly and carefully framed—either unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union; but I can not approve this nor any other when you couple with it this proposition to abandon our position so long maintained as to the commercial privileges of our vessels, and propose to buy for a great price what is by right ours now. It is discreditable to us; it is but a step from what would be national dishonor. That part of his amendment condemns it hopelessly, and I shall vote against it all, as we will vote on it altogether.

It was bad enough to see the principle we had so long contended for in our disputes with England frittered away in the Chamberlain treaty, by concession after concession, all on our side and all along the line; but to have the House of Representatives, who should stand for the people themselves, turn back from the stout words of other days, give up the whole vantage-ground of our position, all the rights we have claimed, and come in praying to be allowed to purchase from the Canadians, with the fish trade, the favor to our vessels of such humane treatment, such commercial privileges as civilized nations ordinarily extend every one, is more than I ever looked for to hear in the Congress of the United States, more than the Canadians ever asked and expected, more than Mr. Chamberlain or Sir Charles Tupper ever thought possible or dared hope for. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Chairman, the Forty-ninth Congress, in both branches, with hardly a dissenting voice, took the ground that the true policy of the United States, after the outrages committed by Canada upon our fishermen, was the policy of vigor and courage, a policy of retaliation. That attitude was assumed by the Congress as I believe Congress should always act in regard to foreign matters, without distinction of party. They took in that connection a decided stand. How far, sir, have we drifted from that position since that time? The attitude then taken by Congress, expressive as they believed of the popular will, has been completely abandoned and disregarded by the present Administration in control of the Government.

This Administration has passed by the legislation of Congress as if it was of but little importance, and they have entered into a treaty that gives to us as a boon the rights of humanity which the semi-civilized and barbarous people of the world would not think of refusing and would scorn to make a matter of barter and sale. That is what is conceded to us as a gracious boon by the emissaries and commissioners of England and Canada.

In that treaty we surrender the claim which we have made from the very outset, that we are entitled as of right, under the doctrine of international reciprocity and under the proclamations of 1830, to the ordinary commercial privileges, and that they have no business to draw any distinction between our fishing vessels and our other vessels in Canadian waters. That is conceded by this treaty when we undertake to get these commercial privileges by altering our domestic laws in deference to Canadian wishes.

Mr. Chairman, there never has been such an attitude taken by any American administration in the history of this country. No administration hitherto has sought to alter our domestic laws in deference to the harassments and bullyings of a British province. But this is not all that is given up by us in that treaty.

For instance, under the delimitation clause we have conceded thousands of square miles of fishing water of which we have had the free use before, and we have admitted, in a large measure, the headland theory, which we have always held to be preposterous, and, as I think, have rightly so held.

But we have gone even further than that. There is a clause here in the treaty by which the United States agree to have the numbers of the fishing vessels placed upon the bows of each of such vessels, and regulations are to be made by the Secretary of the Treasury, and the regulations so made by the American Secretary of the Treasury are to be submitted to Her Majesty's Government. That clause is not reciprocal by any means. It stands alone in the treaty. Pending the delay of this treaty we are offered that precious *modus vivendi*, by which an American fisherman is to be allowed to go into the Canadian port and buy for money the right to touch and trade, a right which we concede to Canada and to all the world—the ordinary commercial advantages which we refuse to no one—and our fishermen to-day are obliged to buy these rights. In the Senate of the United States, which stood up in a solid phalanx only a year ago against such a position as that, the Democratic party, under the pressure of post-offices and patronage, has been whipped into line until they have accepted this treaty as a party measure, and now the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] comes into this House and offers an amendment to this bill which places the Democratic party in the House also squarely on the ground of that treaty.

It is no time, sir, in my judgment, to talk of reciprocity until these questions involved in our present relations with Canada are settled in accordance with the dictates of national honor.

And now, sir, I wish to say one further word in regard to some of the defenses which have been made of this treaty policy. It is said—I have read it in the organs of the Administration—that the American fishermen or the crews of our fishing vessels are aliens. Why, sir, the statistics of the State of Massachusetts of 1886, compiled by Colonel Wright, show that 60 per cent. of these men are native born—not simply American citizens, but native-born citizens; and Mr. Manning, the late Secretary of the Treasury, in his report, said that 75 per cent. of them were American citizens. In a wandering and varying occupation, such as the occupation of fishing and following the sea generally, this is an exceedingly large percentage of American citizens. But if the crews were aliens, they are American ships, owned by Americans, navigated by Americans, and they fly the American flag; and our contention is, Mr. Chairman, that every man whom that flag covers in the United States or elsewhere is bound to be protected, whether it be on the deck of a fishing vessel or anywhere else. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BAYNE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for five minutes longer.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman will be allowed five minutes additional time.

There was no objection.

Mr. LODGE. It is also said, Mr. Chairman, that they are few in number. Compared to the great body of this great nation they are few in number. There are, I think, thirty-one thousand of them in New England.

Mr. DINGLEY. Thirty-seven thousand.

Mr. LODGE. There are thirty-seven thousand of them in New England. That number represents some one hundred and seventy thousand people who are directly dependent on this industry for their support. But, Mr. Chairman, whether they are few or many, it does not touch in the least the duty of the United States to defend them, and I think the sneers which have been cast upon them by certain of the Administration newspapers come with a very ill grace. The fishermen of New England, the fishermen of my own State of Massachusetts, are the men who have been associated with the defense of the country from the days of the Revolution. It was the fishermen of Marblehead that ferried Washington across the Delaware to the battle of Trenton. They manned our ships and they enlisted in our regiments in the war of the rebellion. They were with Farragut and Porter. They shed their blood on every deck and on every battle-field of the Republic. They are a bold, hardy, resolute set of men. Our fisheries are the nurseries of seamen, to which you must turn if you are ever involved in war with a foreign country. I lay aside now the economic question of a tariff duty. It has always been the policy of a great nation to encourage and defend and protect and build up its fishing industries, because out of the fishing industry come the men to man its ships of

war, and I think the question involved in this proposition is something far more important than the mere economic question. It is a question of national honor and of national dignity, which has been but little understood by the people of this country, and I trust that the discussion which is going on upon this treaty in the Senate and which is going on in this House will be carried outside and onto every platform in the country. I believe that it is the feeling of the American people that they want to protect American citizens in their rights, whether they live North, South, East, or West. Whether few in number or many; whether native-born or adopted citizens, it is the wish of the people of this country that all shall be protected; and although this treaty has been made in response to outrages heaped upon the American fishermen, it contains not one line of apology, not one word of reparation.

To-day you have all seen in the newspapers the case of a vessel which is not a fishing vessel, the Bridgewater, which was taken into a Nova Scotia port in distress, and the owners of which have been harassed and insulted by the Canadian Government. Why should not the Canadians treat us as they do? Why should they have any opinion of a country which so palters with the rights of its citizens as this treaty does? We go to them "with bated breath and whispering humbleness" and in a bondeman's key we say, "Fair sirs, you spit on us on Wednesday last; you spurned us such a day; another day you called us dog, and for these many courtesies we will give you free lumber and free fish." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. NUTTING. Mr. Chairman, the question that is now under discussion is not a new one. Once or twice before in our history the same question practically has been up; but I think that never before has the House of Representatives or the National Legislature attempted to enact into law a proposition as broad as that which is contained in the last part of the resolution offered yesterday by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE].

The part of the resolution referred to is as follows:

And provided further, That whenever the Dominion of Canada admits products, wares, and merchandise grown, produced, or manufactured in the United States free of duty, then the products, wares, and merchandise grown, produced, or manufactured in said Dominion of Canada shall be admitted free of duty.

It has been charged repeatedly by Republicans during the discussion of the tariff bill in the House that the real meaning and intent of the movement made under the guise of the Mills bill was free trade. Here and there that has been denied in a weak way, and I am glad, for one, that the part of this resolution quoted has been introduced by the gentleman from Kentucky, if for no other reason than to show that the charge that the Democratic party now, backed up by the Administration, is really in favor of free trade. No other construction can be put upon the latter part of this resolution than that it means free trade, unrestricted, with Canada—4,000 miles of American territory opened with four lines of a resolution to free trade with the subjects of England. That is what it means.

In 1854 the United States entered into a treaty called "the reciprocity treaty," in which a few articles were made the subject of reciprocal free trade between Canada and the United States. For ten years and more that law was in operation between the two countries, and what was the result? The result was that the American Congress, with hardly a dissenting voice, directed the abrogation of that treaty simply because it was found that the Canadians were not fair in the administration of it. It was in operation, too, at a time which was most favorable for the success of such a scheme if it were desirable as an economic measure, because during almost five years of the time we were engaged in war. Nevertheless, sir, it was found that it was not a success as an economic proposition, and the United States abrogated that treaty. And, Mr. Chairman, we did not receive any favors or friendships from Canada in return for extending to them in this treaty access to our markets. They were unfriendly to us during the whole period of the late civil war. If any scheme was to be concocted for the assistance of the Confederacy it was concocted nine times out of ten upon Canadian soil, and they even went so far as to organize and carry out raids from Canada across the border into the United States. Our vessels on the Great Lakes were seized. Those raids, organized by the agents of the Confederacy, came from Canadian soil, and yet, sir, we had opened to them by this treaty our territory and our markets when we had from thirty-one to forty millions of people.

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of this House, you will find that when you establish free trade with Canada you are not establishing it with the Government of Canada alone. You will find that Canada is merely the paw of the lion. The lion lies back of it—the British lion at that. And when you propose by six lines of a resolution to throw wide open the doors along 4,000 miles of our frontier, so that the British Government, by its Canadian subjects, and by others coming into Canada, can walk into your territory and get the benefit of our markets, you do an act which is subversive of the very principles upon which our Government is founded. Our Government was founded upon the principle of protection to our products and our labor through a tariff placed upon foreign products coming here for a market, and there has been no time within the last one hundred years and more when we have not had a protective tariff. England has always fought against our policy in that regard, and England now in such resolutions as this is fighting against this national policy.

Mr. Chairman, in 1871 we made another treaty with Canada. That treaty provided that she should have the privilege of navigating our waters, our inland lakes and our canals, free. Even the great Erie Canal, running through the State of New York, Canada, under this treaty, navigates free of toll. In the same treaty, article 27, it was provided that we might navigate the Canadian waters, the Welland and Lachine Canals and the St. Lawrence, from the forty-fifth degree down. What has been the result? Has that treaty been carried out in good faith? Not at all. While Canada has navigated our waters freely and without charge, let, or hinderance, if an American vessel, loaded with American products from the great West, seeks to-day to pass through the Welland Canal into Lake Ontario, and so on down the St. Lawrence, and to an American port, she is charged tolls upon the amount of freight which she carries, upon her tonnage. This is a plain discrimination against our commerce. This is a plain violation of a solemn understanding. It discriminates against our ports of entry, and discrimination against our ports of entry is a discrimination against our Government, and discrimination against our Government is a discrimination against every American citizen.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SHERMAN. I ask that the time of my colleague [Mr. NUTTING] be extended.

There was no objection.

Mr. NUTTING. When one of our vessels, loaded with the produce of the West, attempts to pass through the Welland Canal into Lake Ontario, with its 7,000 square miles of navigable water, or to go down the St. Lawrence, she is charged toll upon every bushel of grain or every foot of lumber that constitutes her cargo, provided she is bound for an American port. If that vessel is to unload at a Canadian port down the St. Lawrence, those tolls, when she gets to such port, are paid back; but the tolls collected from an American vessel are never paid back. This twenty-seventh article, which declares in so many words that the American people shall be treated in the same manner as the Canadians in the navigation of this canal, is, for the purpose of committing this act of injustice, construed by the Canadians in this way: They say that in making this discrimination against a vessel which unloads at an American port they are not making a discrimination against American citizens, but against the American port. No man with the honesty which should belong to any one living in a civilized community would put such a construction as that upon a treaty, even for the purpose of gaining a suit in a court of justice. Yet they do it.

What further? In this twenty-seventh article—and I hope gentlemen of the House will read it—we are given the privilege of navigating the waters of the Welland Canal free and on the same terms as the Canadians. This canal is entirely in Canadian territory. In 1882 one of our vessels, carrying the American flag, with American sailors on board, loaded with American produce, being carried to an American market, was sunk in the waters of the Welland Canal. The vessel was in danger, the cargo was in danger, and even the sailors were in danger. A telegram was sent to the Canadian authorities asking that an American tug be allowed to come from Buffalo, 22 miles distant, to assist this distressed vessel, her cargo and crew. The permission asked by telegraph of the Canadian authorities for this purpose was refused. They said it must be a Canadian tug and Canadian wrecking appliances that should go there to take care of that property. They said it was in Canadian waters. Then it was that this vessel in distress was obliged to wait until Canadian wrecking appliances could come from a distance of more than 200 miles.

By the time the Canadian float could get there the vessel and cargo were greatly damaged. This is only one of many instances which might be cited where the Canadian Government has violated not only the spirit of this treaty, but the rights which ought to be and usually are granted by civilized nations without treaty.

My friend from Iowa who sits near me [Mr. GEAR] asks me whether a claim for salvage was made. It seems to me, sir, that the injustice of the act itself is enough, without stating the fact, if it were true, that the Canadian tug asked salvage. This is the kind of treatment we have had from Canada. Yet the gentleman from Kentucky to-day, by this resolution, seeks to allow our farmers, our laborers, our manufacturing establishments in the United States to come into competition with the products of Canada from across the border. Remember, Mr. Chairman, what you give to Canada you give to England. I will never give my vote to such a measure as this; nor will the American people hold any man in Congress blameless who may give his vote for it under existing circumstances. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Mr. Chairman, before entering upon this question I would like to ask, so that some of the gentleman's colleagues may answer it hereafter, what the Republican administration then in existence did to rectify the injustice which, in the instance he has stated, was perpetrated upon an American vessel in Canadian waters.

Mr. NUTTING. I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Take your own time hereafter and answer the question. [Derisive cries on the Republican side.] If I can have my

time extended I am willing the gentleman should answer it now. Go on.

Mr. NUTTING. Mr. Evarts, who was at that time Secretary of State, sent letter after letter——

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Letters!

Mr. NUTTING. He sent letter after letter—he did not go himself; he did what any Secretary of State would do—he sent letter after letter to the authorities of Canada asking the privilege that when our vessels and our sailors were in distress we might go to their assistance.

Mr. GROUT. In what year was that?

Mr. NUTTING. It was when Mr. Evarts was Secretary of State.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. As I understand, then, the Secretary of State begged for the permission or the privilege on the part of our citizens——

Mr. NUTTING. He demanded it.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. To exercise the same equal rights in regard to which your side has been abusing this Administration, which has been pursuing just as vigorous, just as straightforward, just as effective measures to secure the rights of American citizens as did your Secretary of State.

Mr. REED. Your Administration has made a full surrender.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to bring this debate back to the point from which it started.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. The gentleman will allow me a moment. Mr. Chairman, four or five gentlemen on the other side have spoken on this question and nobody has interrupted; but now when the first gentleman on our side speaks he is met with a series of interruptions——

Several MEMBERS (on the Republican side). He asked an answer to a question.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I asked that it be answered in your time.

Mr. NUTTING. But you asked the question in your time.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. A habit has grown up on that side of half a dozen gentlemen interrupting any member on this side who begins to talk.

Mr. BOUTELLE. The trouble is that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] asks questions which he does not want to have answered.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. I said that you could answer in your own time.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. This is simply another evidence of what I am calling attention to. Four or five gentlemen on the other side by the courtesy of the House have had extensions of their time—the gentleman from Maine had thirty minutes—and there has been no interruption at all; but as soon as a gentleman on our side takes the floor to make a reply, he is subjected to repeated interruptions.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I am satisfied that no one desires to interrupt the gentleman from Ohio, if he will not invite interruptions in a very aggressive manner.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. That is just another demonstration of what I have been saying.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OUTHWAITE] has the floor.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Now, Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to proceed, I want to repeat, so that it may be emphasized, so far as any repetition of mine may emphasize it, that gentlemen here have been bristling with patriotic ardor as if they wanted somebody in this country to take up arms and march against Canada because certain things had been done there during this Administration which were no worse than those done in the preceding administrations which were under the control of the Republican party. It is all for effect. It is not because they believe any such proceeding should be had. It is not because they believe that, in a tariff debate, it is the proper place to bring in a discussion of treaties which have been made and are being considered at the other end of the Capitol.

Mr. Chairman, I want to get this debate back to the point at which it belongs. I made the point of order, when the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] introduced his resolution, that it was not germane to this part of the bill. If the point of order was properly overruled, we have an illustration in the tendency of this discussion here that there ought to be some limit to it.

We were discussing, not concessions to Canada, not grants to Canada, not grants to this country, but we were discussing the question of the reduction of taxes to millions of people. [Applause.]

I would be inclined to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] if such amendment were in my opinion proper to this section of the bill and provided simply for free fish.

There is a proviso which is pertinent to the subject, and that is:

Provided, That if any export duty is laid upon the above-mentioned articles, or either of them, by any country whence imported, all said articles imported from said country shall be subject to duty as now provided by law.

This relates to lumber. The gentleman from Maine, by his amendment, brings in the fish-bait question, and then from that we have the fishery question. Now, if it be proposed to consider what shall be done in regard to the duty on fish, let us take that subject up separately and apart from this amendment and in its proper place. I will vote to put fish on the free-list, so as to give cheaper food to our people. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. REED. I think the gentleman from Ohio is entitled to an additional five minutes. I hope the House will grant it. That was the understanding.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. OUTHWAITE. Now, Mr. Chairman, in the course of this discussion we find in the first amendment offered to the lines under consideration a proposition with regard to including the right to buy provisions, bait, and supplies, and the right to transship any portion of the cargoes as are granted to similar vessels of the United States in ports of other countries. The gentleman from Kentucky in his amendment applies it to other countries, and gentlemen upon that seek to spread the impression abroad in this country that this side of the House is about to grant or concede great privileges to the Dominion of Canada. There is no such intention. That is not the proposition. The main proposition which must be kept clearly before the minds of this House is the question as to the duty or no duty on lumber.

If it were desirable to reply to the attack made upon this Administration as to its want of vigor, its want of stamina, its want of boldness in standing up for the rights of American citizens, nothing would be necessary except to quote from remarks of gentlemen here showing that the Department of State and all the officials of the Department of State have done their duty fully and clearly in that particular. Let us not forget that among the first acts of this Administration was one to vindicate the rights of Americans when some slight disturbance occurred in Central America. It was not twenty-four hours before the Navy Depaftment had in progress movements which had the effect to settle, and finally did settle, the question favorably to this Government.

Let us then vote down both of these amendments, as the one has no more business here than the other.

The second has been introduced properly for the purpose of putting the matter fairly before this committee and the people. If you begin to make concessions of one kind or the other, if you begin to deal on a purely revenue bill in a bargain and sale with foreign countries, one is as properly there as the other.

Mr. Chairman, as to this proposition that is presented by the gentleman from Kentucky, I want it distinctly understood that I am not in favor of its adoption. I trust that it will be voted down with unanimity, and I trust that the other amendment will be voted down with the same emphasis. Let us clear this matter entirely out of the way and go on and consider the reduction of the taxes that are provided for in this bill. If the subject of free fish is to be considered let it be offered as an amendment, so that those on both sides who wish may vote in favor of getting free fish from all parts of the world.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. COGSWELL. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, that I represent the largest fishing district in this country. This discussion comes up by no invitation of mine. I think the discussion of this great fisheries question is belittled by bringing it into the discussion of a tariff bill.

It is not an economic question, nor is it a question upon which the great parties of this country should divide politically for a moment. It is a question simple in its statement, but far reaching in its consequence; a question of American rights and of American honor. It is not a question of a few fishermen on the Eastern shores of New England, but it is a question interesting and involving the rights of every American citizen. It is purely a question whether we shall have our rights which we are entitled to as they exist under international comity, that comity which prevails amongst all of the civilized nations of the world; those rights which are ours under mutual and reciprocal proclamations between this country and Great Britain—rights which are the commonest rights of humanity. This is the question that presents itself to us, and I repeat, it is belittling such a question to bring it into debate here and now in the manner it is presented, in my judgment.

Why, Mr. Chairman, do you know for the last three seasons in Canadian waters the an American fisherman, falling from the icy rigging to the deck of his schooner, breaking his bones, could not be landed on Canadian shores to seek the services of a surgeon without risk of the seizure and confiscation of his vessel? Do you know that? Such is the fact. I do not put the statement too strong, for I use almost the exact language and the exact illustration that was used by our minister to England, Mr. Phelps, in the discussion of this very question; and now I find myself confronted with the question, that this great nation shall buy from Canada these rights, instead of our demanding them, and demanding them, Mr. Chairman, in a spirit worthy of the patriotism and the courage of the American people. [Applause.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. LONG. I ask unanimous consent that my colleague be permitted to proceed for five minutes longer.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I hope that consent will be given.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection the gentleman will be permitted to proceed.

Mr. COGSWELL. Mr. Chairman, the question confronts us now in this debate, shall we buy a recognition of our rights, or shall we demand them? And let me say to you, when we do demand these rights

in a spirit which means that we intend to back up that demand they will be granted, and granted in an hour. [Applause.] If not granted, then in a dignified, manly way let us retaliate in kind by withdrawing from them the privileges they withhold from us, and reason will mighty soon return to them.

Mr. Chairman, in this connection I am reminded of and desire to read a word from Henry Clay.

He says:

If there be any description of rights which more than any other should unite all parties in all quarters of the Union, it is unquestionably the rights of the person. No matter what his vocation, whether he seeks subsistence amid the dangers of the sea, or draws them from the bowels of the earth, or from the humblest occupations of mechanic life, wherever the sacred rights of American freemen are assailed, all hearts ought to unite and every arm be braced to vindicate his cause.

And, sir, I regret from the very bottom of my heart that so soon there should rise from the seat which Henry Clay so honored and so filled with American patriotism, an occupant who would sell or barter away American rights and American honor for a paltry kettle of fish. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I welcome the gentleman to the record he is making or trying to make for his party. I dare him to make it. And I tell him that next November every Northern State will be an Oregon for him and his party if in this way they go back upon the rights and honor that flag represents, or ought to. [Applause on the Republican side.] I welcome the gentleman from Kentucky, I repeat, to the record he would make. Add, if you will to add it, to that which you have already made, and if you do, gentlemen, that record will stand as too ignorant to govern, too cowardly to protect American rights and honor, and only successful in its abject toadyism to Great Britain. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the argument of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. COGSWELL] ought to be, and I apprehend will be, deeply offensive to my friend from Maine, Governor DINGLEY, who introduced into this House the discussion of this question, which, he avers, has been belittled thereby. It must have been also offensive to my friend from Maine to have the gentleman denounce with such vigorous rhetoric the attempt to purchase these rights of our fishermen, which he declares it is dishonorable to make an object of barter and sale, as my friend from Maine introduced that question, and as it was he who desired to purchase those rights by offering his amendment that they should be purchased with lumber, or, I confess, I am unable to see the difference so far as the question of honor is concerned in offering to buy these rights with free lumber or offering to buy them with free fish, or with both.

But I leave that question to be settled between the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] and the eloquent and somewhat passionate gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. COGSWELL] who has just taken his seat. It will be borne in mind, I hope, that the gentleman who last took his seat [Mr. COGSWELL] is wholly mistaken, as is the scholarly and literary gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and other gentlemen who have spoken upon that side, as to the point that this question is one which gives up any rights to which American fishermen are entitled in Canadian waters, or in any way changes our attitude so far as the diplomatic relations of the two countries are concerned. Whatever are the rights of our fishermen under the treaty of 1818, which is the treaty under which we are now probably living, or under the subsequent commercial treaties which have been made between us and Great Britain, still remain, after that amendment is adopted, precisely as they do now. All that this does is to provide that if Canada accords certain rights and privileges, which even if they are technically ours, are not ours practically, we will admit from Canada not only lumber but free fish.

But, Mr. Chairman, I desire to go one step further back. So far as our side of the House is concerned, we had not touched that question. That was a matter which the treaty-making power had under consideration. A majority of the Senate is Republican. Twelve Senators from New England sit in that body. No treaty, therefore, could possibly be adopted which was not approved by the Republican majority; and it was not from this side of the House that the offer came to interfere in any way with the diplomatic negotiations that were going on between the two countries, and which, so far as we were concerned, were in the hands of the Senate, which is itself controlled by a Republican majority. So that when the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] introduced his proposition he introduced the subject into the House, I will not say with the purpose, but with the effect, that if it was adopted it would render the schedule which the Committee of the Whole had agreed to absolutely nugatory.

The real effect of the proposition of the gentleman from Maine was that the schedule embracing free lumber should not take effect, because it could not take effect until a certain thing was done, which thing would not be done without the consent of the Republican Senate to the treaty which is now being discussed by that body. Therefore, I say, whether the gentleman meant that or not, the effect of his proposition was to adopt an indirect mode of defeating the schedule which had been agreed to here. The gentleman's proposition was based upon the idea that the economic changes made in the present tariff by that schedule were made for the benefit of Canada—an assumption wholly unfounded and absolutely gratuitous. Those changes were made for the benefit of sixty millions of American citizens. In the assorting of taxes, in the elimination of articles upon which duties were laid, the Committee of the Whole determined that it would reduce the revenue by $1,000,000 received from duties upon these various articles of lumber, which is just about one day's revenue and less than 1½ per cent. of our annual surplus.

To that determination the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] interposes an objection in the form of a proposition, which, if adopted, would have the effect to prevent the reduction of the revenue and indefinitely postpone the operation of the law. So much with respect to the introduction of these questions into this House.

As to all that has been said about the defense of the fishermen and their rights, I have no other response to make than the response which was made by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. REAGAN] in the last House, to which all on this side cordially agreed, that whenever the American Government was driven by the necessity for the protection of any of its citizens to take steps more rigorous than diplomatic negotiation it should be sustained in that action by the patriotic and willing assistance of everybody on this side of the House, and by every form of legislative or personal support that the circumstances then arising should require.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. MILLS was recognized and yielded his time to Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. But, Mr. Chairman, none of us contemplate—certainly none contemplate without very great sorrow—the possibility of a war between Great Britain and America. He is indeed a man to be pitied who contemplates without sorrow a war between these two great English-speaking peoples, and it is to the credit of the Republican administrations which preceded the Democratic Administration that with all the subjects of irritation which existed between these two great English-speaking peoples, modes were found for preserving the peace.

I do not hesitate to express my profound hope that the Democratic Administration, with the assistance of all right-minded and patriotic Republicans, as well as that of all Democrats, will find an honorable solution of all difficulties between this country and Great Britain and her colonies, one consistent with peace and with honor; and he scarcely deserves the name of demagogue even who, in a discussion in this House or anywhere else, will attempt, for personal or partisan or temporary reasons, to inflame the mind of the American people so as to render the continuance of peace with honor doubtful or hazardous. I desire to say also, although it is not quite relevant to this discussion, that the treaty which was made by the present Administration has seemed to me to be a fair settlement of the questions involved.

Personally I do not care very much whether it is adopted or not, because I look forward to a day not far remote when the fishery questions on the Pacific Slope and the questions growing out of the purchase of Alaska and the Bering Sea and the ownership of the Aleutian Islands will be of great importance, and I have felt that this treaty, if adopted, might possibly affect the questions arising in connection with those subjects. I have once before said in an official report, in which my colleague from Indiana, General BROWNE, united with me against the majority of my colleagues and the majority of his colleagues on the Ways and Means Committee, that the questions which would soon confront us on the Pacific Slope were of such importance that I hesitated to take any step that would settle these questions in a way which would not leave us entirely free.

Therefore, so far as that treaty is concerned, while I approve its spirit and think it a fair treaty, I have not taken the same interest in its ratification that most persons on my side of the House have felt.

One more observation. As to all this fishery question in Massachusetts and other Eastern States there are some branches of it which have been wholly ignored. That great population in the Northwest who use salt fish do not, as a rule, use American or Canadian salt fish. They use fish that are cured in the countries from which they come.

Because of this question between us and Canada we are putting a duty upon their food which is wholly unnecessary and absolutely without justification, and one of the reasons why I introduced these amendments was that we might emphasize in the sight of the American people the fact that no question between us and Canada, no question between us and Mexico, no question between us and any other foreign government was capable of a fair, free, and separate discussion and settlement without those who advocate protection putting in the economic advantages which some of their constituents get as heavier than the broader and weightier reasons which ought to control in the settlement of those questions.

As to the reciprocity amendment which I have offered, and which I do not expect the House to put on to this bill—for I frankly say that while I hope these two amendments will be appended to the amendment of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY], I hope that the House will then vote the whole amendment down, so as to leave the bill exactly as it came from the Committee on Ways and Means; as to reciprocity I say to my friend from Illinois [Mr. HITT] who offered the joint resolution which is now before the Committee on Ways and Means, that I am perfectly willing to accept an amendment to that amendment, providing that those articles upon which there are internal-revenue taxes

shall be excluded from the operation of this amendment. I am willing to go farther and accept an amendment that will allow the adjustment of exchanges to be made under regulations made by the Treasury Department.

As to my friend from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH], whose love for reciprocity with Canada has proven this morning to be entirely Platonic [laughter], poetic, eloquent, and wholly unprofitable, he is always advocating it where it can do no good and opposing it at the only time and place where it is possible to do good, and I do not know that I can do better than put into the RECORD the preamble of the bill which he has submitted on that subject.

And, Mr. Chairman, before the gavel drops I ask leave also to put into the RECORD some facts taken from a speech which my literary friend from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has made heretofore and published in the North American Review, a speech which I beg leave to say is somewhat more accurate than the one which he did us the honor to submit on the floor this morning, and also some other extracts showing the extent of this fishing industry and the number of aliens who are engaged in it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] includes in the estimate of the extent of the business the men and vessels engaged in all the fisheries of every kind in all of the United States. The deep-sea fisheries on our Eastern coast are very much smaller. Mr. LODGE, of Massachusetts, in a late number of the North American Review, wrote:

The New England fisheries, which are chiefly involved in this contest, employed, in 1880, 37,043 men, 2,066 vessels, 14,787 boats, and yield an annual product of $14,270,393.

And I accept this statement as correct. What proportion of these fishermen are either native or naturalized citizens seems to be a matter of dispute. I append two extracts from the testimony reported to the Senate in the Forty-ninth Congress.

And lately the Boston Post has been attempting to ascertain the exact facts, and the discussion may result in the establishment of the facts as to this industry.

I append extracts from that paper. If the statements in these papers are at all accurate, it is another demonstration of the mockery of the oft-reiterated plea that protection is for the benefit of the American workingmen. The people of Gloucester and New England know what the facts are, and they will gradually become known to the public. These statements also puncture with fatal accuracy the rhetorical declamation that these deep-sea fisheries are the nurseries of the American Navy—for much more are they the training-school of the Canadian marine.

The gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] is unwilling to have free lumber granted to our own citizens unless Canada will recognize certain claims made by our fishermen. We meet him on his own ground and say we will obtain for our citizens a larger boon than free lumber out of this bargain; we will, in addition to free lumber, get an article of universal and prime necessity, free from taxation, fish, an article of food to the poor and the laboring classes. Because of these unsettled questions on our northeastern coast all salted foreign fish are subject to duty. If Canada recognizes the claims we make, and thereby these questions are settled, then all plausible claim for the retention of tax on foreign fish passes away, and this duty ought to be removed. And the amendment offered by me to the proposition of the gentleman [Mr. DINGLEY] will, if adopted, secure this result.

SAINT PAUL, MINN.

SIR: We, the undersigned, importers, dealers, and consumers of salt fish, respectfully request that your honorable committee will take into consideration the matter of placing food-fish on the free-list for the following reasons:

That the salt fish imported from Norway, Holland, Scotland, Newfoundland, and Nova Scotia form a very important part of the food of the farming and laboring population of the Northwest, and the duty, which is now from 25 to 40 per cent. of the first cost of the goods, bears especially hard on the class least able to pay it.

These foreign packed fish do not enter into competition with the fish produced on the American coast, being of entirely different quality and cure, being cured in a manner that is impossible in this country on account of the climate, and as it appears to be the desire of the present Government to relieve the people of any unnecessary taxes, we ask that the food of the people may be among the items selected to be free of duty.

GOLDSMITH & CULLEN and 27 others.

The CHAIRMAN *of the Committee of Ways and Means,*
Washington, D. C.

Petition of 74 citizens of Michigan and Indiana: "The undersigned respectfully ask for the removal of the existing duties on salt fish and that they be placed on the free-list."

Twenty-two merchants of Memphis say: "The undersigned, believing that the exaction of duties on fish is detrimental to our interests and a hardship to the great body of consumers throughout the country, and that the settlement of the fisheries question is, in the words of the President's message, 'of much importance,' respectfully ask for the appointment of commissioners on the part of the United States to confer with those of Canada, as recommended by the President."

Sixty-two citizens of Michigan "respectfully but must earnestly petition that fresh fish and frozen fish be imported free of all duties. Or should a reciprocity treaty be negotiated, fresh and frozen fish be one of the articles included."

One hundred and twenty-six citizens of Minnesota and Wisconsin ask for the removal of the existing duties on salt fish and that they be placed on the free-list.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever it shall be duly certified to the President of the United States that the Government of the Dominion of Canada has declared a desire to establish commercial union with the United States, having a uniform revenue system, like internal taxes to be collected, and like import duties to be imposed on articles brought into either country from other nations, with no duties upon trade between the United States and Canada, he shall appoint three commissioners to meet those who may be likewise designated to represent the Government of Canada, to prepare a plan for the assimilation of the import duties and internal-revenue taxes of the two countries, and an equitable division of receipts, in a commercial union; and said commissioners shall report to the President, who shall lay the report before Congress.

A bill (H. R. 6668) to extend the trade and commerce of the United States and to provide for full reciprocity between the United States and the Dominion of Canada.

Whereas certain controversies have arisen and are still pending between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Dominion of Canada, respecting commercial intercourse; and

Whereas by reason of the contiguity of the two countries and the similarity of the interests and occupations of the people thereof, it is desired by the United States to remove all existing controversies and all causes of controversy in the future, and to promote and encourage business and commercial intercourse between the people of both countries, and to promote harmony between the two Governments, and to enable the citizens of each to trade with the citizens of the other without unnecessary restrictions: Therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That whenever, and as soon as the Government of the Dominion of Canada shall permit all articles of trade and commerce of whatever name or nature, whether the product of the soil or of the waters of the United States, all manufactured articles, live-stock of all kinds, and its products, and all minerals the produce of the mines of the United States, to enter the ports of the Dominion of Canada free of duty, then all articles manufactured in Canada, and all products of the soil and waters, and all minerals the produce of the mines of Canada, and all other articles of every name and description produced in said Dominion of Canada, shall be permitted to enter the ports of the United States free of duty: *Provided, however,* That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any product or article upon which an internal-revenue tax is imposed by the laws of the United States.

SEC. 2. That when it shall be certified to the President of the United States by the Government of the said Dominion of Canada that by the authority of its Parliament it has authorized the admission into the ports of said Dominion of all articles of trade and commerce the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States, free of duty, the President shall make proclamation thereof, and shall likewise proclaim that all articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of the said Dominion of Canada shall be admitted into all the ports of the United States free of duty, and such articles shall be so admitted into the ports of the United States free of duty so long as the said Dominion of Canada shall admit the products of the United States, as herein provided, into the ports of the Dominion free of duty.

SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, with the approval of the President of the United States, and in conjunction with the proper officials of the government of the Dominion of Canada, to make rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this act, and to protect the said respective governments against the importation of foreign goods or articles through either into the other without payment of duty; and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall furnish to the customs officers of the United States all such rules and regulations for the purpose of guiding them in the discharge of their duties in the premises.

SEC. 4. That before making the proclamations or either of them authorized by this act the President shall be satisfied that all citizens and subjects of the United States may have and enjoy the right of commercial intercourse in all the ports, harbors, and places in Canada with the citizens and subjects of the Dominion, in as full and ample a manner in all respects as may be had or enjoyed by the latter in the ports, harbors, and places of the United States, with the citizens and subjects thereof.

MARINE INTELLIGENCE—FISH RECEIPTS AND ARRIVALS AT GLOUCESTER.

GLOUCESTER, MASS., *March* 12.

Schooner Uncle Sam arrived to-day from Pubnico, Nova Scotia, bringing 100 men who go fishing from this port. Of late it has been hard to secure crews. Schooner Herman Babson, New York, from the Georges, to-day brings 500,000 pounds of codfish.

MARINE INTELLIGENCE—BRITISH FISHERMEN TO SHIP FROM GLOUCESTER.

GLOUCESTER, MASS., *March* 20.

British schooner On Time arrived to-day from Liverpool, N. S., bringing 60 men to go fishing. Among them are several skippers who will command vessels from here. The Sentinel, from Philadelphia, and the Senator Morgan, from New York, have arrived.

GLOUCESTER FISHERMEN DO NOT LIKE THE IDEA OF BEING SUPPLEMENTED BY NOVA SCOTIANS.

GLOUCESTER, *March* 22.

The exposure of the gigantic halibut monopoly has been the common conversation among the fishermen on the street corners, around the wharves, and on board the vessels, wherever one may chance to go. "Well," said the spokesman of a crowd of men who were on Parkhurst's wharf, "the Post and Herald deserve credit for the enterprising spirit they have shown in giving the public some light on this halibut pool and how it has been using the fishermen." "But," interrupted another, "there are other things which want to be shown up which are of vast importance to the fishermen. One is the importing of men from the Provinces to man the vessels. That is the worst outrage that has been committed upon the rights of the American fishermen."

The reporter, out of curiosity, perambulated the wharves to see what knowledge could be gained. With the aid of two ex-skippers who volunteered their services, nearly every wharf was visited, and it was found that the large fleet of vessels which have been hauled up all winter were being rapidly fitted out for the various fishing grounds. The first part of the season there was some difficulty in procuring crews to man the early fleet for Georges and Western Bank. Since the 1st of March a large number of men have arrived here to engage in fishing from this port, principally from Pubnico and Argyle, N. S. These men are expert fishermen and can be hired cheaper than Americans, consequently their services are eagerly sought, and they are shipped in preference to the men who live here and have families to maintain.

Among the fleet fitting out, wholly commanded and manned by Provincial crews, are the schooners William H. Jordon, Fernwood, John W. Bray, Marguerite, Epes Tan, Mist, Nellie N. Davis, Druid, Margaret Mather, Plymouth Rock, Wildfire, and others too numerous to mention. The owners here who so strenuously cry for protection by excluding Canadian fish from the markets of the United States, throw their arms wide open and hail with great joy the advent of those men, whom they want to man their vessels and whom they could not get along without. Now, the way those men are shipped and the method that the owners are adopting are worthy of note.

After the season is over a large majority of the vessels are hauled up, with the exception of those which go halibuting, haddocking, and to Newfoundland. The crews in most cases are Nova Scotians, and when the season is over they

return to their provincial homes, taking what money they have earned with them and spending it there. But before leaving they are engaged for the next season, and about the first of March they put in their appearance, the masters who live there coming with them. On their arrival here they go on board, when the vessel is used for a boarding-house, they in most every case buying their own food. They take out ballast or put it in, as the case may require; put in salt; put the vessel on the railway and clean her, and, in fact, every conceivable thing is done to make her ready for the voyage.

Now, this is what our men are claiming is an injustice on the part of the owners; for the men who brave the storms of winter are often turned on shore to make room for the imported foreigners. This work once was all done by the fishermen and 'longshoremen who live here and who have families to support, receiving a considerable sum during the season. Said a group of excited fishermen and lumpers who stood on the Atlantic wharf and saw the British schooner On Time haul in and land sixty men just from Liverpool, N. S., who had been engaged the season before to come here, among them being several who were going as masters:

"This is what the owners call protecting the fishermen, importing foreign labor. Is not what they have been preaching a farce?" 'Well," said John F. Cunen, "it is time this was shown up. Our local papers will not say anything about it for fear they would insult some selfish owner who is trying to get up a fishing trust. The Boston papers should have a true statement of these facts and expose this as well as the halibut pool." "What a pity the investigating committee of the Senate was not here now," shouted out another; "they could see if what was told them two years ago was true—that there were but few Nova Scotians going from here."

The American fishermen here say they do not blame the men for coming, but they blame the owners for importing foreign labor; and it is the general opinion that if the men are coming here fish should be admitted free and make it cheaper to the consumer, for the price is such that it is almost impossible for a poor man to buy it. Fishermen say they do not make as much as when there was free fish. And there is not so much money among the laboring class as there was in former years.

It is the opinion of all the fishermen and laboring men that they are being treated unjustly by the men who shout for protection by excluding Canadian fish from the markets of the United States. Two years ago the testimony was given by those same ardent advocates of protection that they wanted nothing from Canada, and it was detrimental to the fishermen to go there. At the same time they were importing provincial crews at wholesale, and in many cases paying their passage here and feeding them on board the vessels for a number of days while getting ready for the voyage—something they would not do for the men here.

In looking over the testimony given in this city before the subcommittee of the United States Senate, Mr. EDMUNDS, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, submits his report, and in that document will be found (January 19, 1887, No. 1683) the evidence of several parties from this city interested in the fishing business; and on page 140 is the testimony of Capt. John Chisholm, who says, in answer to questions by Senator EDMUNDS, that he had four Nova Scotians on board his vessel, and he had engaged them to come here, sending them money to pay their passage.

Is this not importing foreign labor? And what other men in various ports of the country have been prohibited from doing? Others testified that not more than 1 per cent. of the Gloucester fishermen were foreign born and but few were provincial. The statement of things to-day is in contradiction to that story, for a large majority of the vessels are manned by Nova Scotians, and a talk with them will reveal the fact that they are the most loyal of British citizens, and not a trained reserve for the American Navy, whom the United States can rely on in time of war, as Capt. Fitz J. Babson and other ardent advocates of a Chinese war policy are endeavoring to make the people believe. Some of these alleged American fishermen jumped to arms when a call was made for men to help to put down the Riel insurrection in the Northwest. Our fishermen need protection, but not in the way they are receiving it at the hands of a few selfish fishing owners, who are trying to keep them from getting a living by engaging men six months in advance to come from the provinces to man their vessels.

[Boston Post, May 1, 1888.]

NOVA SCOTIA CAPTAINS COMMAND VESSELS MANNED BY PROVINCIAL CREWS—SOME MORE ADDITIONS TO THE LISTS PREVIOUSLY PRINTED IN THE POST—A NOVEL SCHEME FOR EVADING THE LAW.

GLOUCESTER, *April* 30, 1888.

The interest in the Post's articles on alien fishermen continues unabated. The resident fishermen rejoice at the exposure of the owners, who, in their turn, claim that they are being persecuted. Facts, however, are stubborn things. Of the names of non-resident masters already published not one can be found upon the voting list used at the last election. In addition to the names of those already published, the following masters are residents of Nova Scotia, and are not upon the voting list here:

Isaac Goodwin, schooner Lizzie, owned by Daniel Allen & Son; has a provincial crew.

Benjamin Goodwin, schooner William H. Jordan, owned by James L. Anderson; provincial crew.

Michael Swim, schooner Carleton, owned by John F. Wonson & Co.; crew principally provincial.

Charles Rudolph, schooner Daniel Marcy, of Beverly; crew brought from the provinces.

Stillman Goodwin, schooner S. P. Putnam, of Beverly; brought his crew from the provinces.

Thomas Cunningham, schooner Everett Pierce, owned by John F. Wonson & Co.

All of those mentioned above came from the provinces this spring. Isaac Gayton, who is master and part owner of schooner Carrie and Andie, resides here. He went to Nova Scotia last winter and returned this spring with his crew, who are, with a few exceptions, stated to be on wages. The crews of schooners Wildfire, carrying about twenty men, and H. A. Duncan, carrying about fourteen men, are, with the exception of the master of the Duncan, men who arrived from Nova Scotia this spring. These two vessels are owned by George Steele.

That the influx of Canadian fishermen has worked injury to local fishermen is shown by the following statement of an ex-fisherman:

"I went fishing for the ten years preceding 1881. In those ten years my greatest year's work was $840, and my lowest $450; now an average year's work will not exceed $300."

It is said that a method of evading the law requiring masters to be citizens is for a member of the crew who is a citizen to take out the vessel's papers, the actual captain taking command when the vessel sails. The vessel-owners are uneasy at the exposure of their methods, which will affect the securing of provincial seamen for the large mackerel fleet that will fit out in May. Interesting local developments are expected soon.

Extracts from testimony taken by subcommittee (Senators EDMUNDS, FRYE, and SAULSBURY) of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, under a resolution of the Senate of inquiry into American Fisheries Interests, page 81, testimony of William F. Jones:

Q. Now state anything else that you want to.

A. I don't know that there is anything else that I have in mind to say, unless it is on the question of the nationality of the fishermen.

Q. Vessel-owners and officers, of course, are all Americans?

A. A good many of the captains are Americans, as a matter of form, but they reside in Nova Scotia.

Q. But they are American citizens?

A. They are American citizens; they have been naturalized as a matter of form, but a great many of them go home when the fishing season is over and live in Nova Scotia. I suppose 75 per cent. of the crews of American vessels are not natives of the United States. The two counties of Inverness and Cape Breton, in the island of Cape Breton, and Shelburne and Yarmouth, in Nova Scotia, furnish about five thousand men to our fleet. As to what other localities furnish I do not know. The cry was made last year that the fisheries were a training-school for the Navy, but that was so absurd that I thought it worth while to mention it.

Page 93, testimony of Edwin R. De Long:

Q. State anything else that you desire.

A. In my dealings with the provinces I have been made acquainted with the nationality of our crews to some extent. We have a great many orders sent us from the provinces. These American vessels leave America with a sufficient number of men to go the provinces, and there they ship new men, and then after the catch they land that part of the crew before returning home. Those men that are landed down in the provinces send orders here on the American fishing-houses for their shares of the proceeds of the catch, as they fish on shares largely. So I know that a large number of men in our vessels, both masters and sailors, are simply provincial people.

Q. How can the masters be so?

A. They take out papers to become American citizens, but whether they ever complete their citizenship I do not know. Some claim to be natives of the United States when they are not. I have known a great many masters of vessels to make that claim when I knew that they came from the provinces.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee rose informally, when

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate requested the return of the bill (S. 2058) to increase the pension of John Taylor.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, in which the concurrence of the House was requested, bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 5932) providing for the holding of the terms of the United States courts in the district of Minnesota;

A bill (H. R. 5903) for the relief of Lewis Davis, a soldier of the war of 1812;

A bill (H. R. 6440) to authorize the construction of a bridge over the Missouri River at or near the city of Omaha, Nebr.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

A bill (H. R. 152) granting a pension to Mrs. Therese Guelich;
A bill (H. R. 354) granting a pension to Samuel McClure;
A bill (H. R. 432) granting a pension to Columbus Bosteder;
A bill (H. R. 600) increasing the pension of Mary Minor Hoxey;
A bill (H. R. 780) granting a pension to James H. Darling;
A bill (H. R. 809) granting a pension to Ephraim Reynolds;
A bill (H. R. 1074) granting a pension to Linnæus W. Risley;
A bill (H. R. 2156) granting a pension to Warren Ohaver;
A bill (H. R. 2174) granting a pension to Lewis Fichthorn;
A bill (H. R. 2215) granting a pension to Charles Glamann;
A bill (H. R. 2413) granting a pension to Mrs. Mercy Knight;
A bill (H. R. 2535) granting a pension to Ellen St. Cyr;
A bill (H. R. 3016) granting a pension to Mary F. Harkins;
A bill (H. R. 3690) granting a pension to Penelope Morton, widow of Lieutenant Morton;
A bill (H. R. 3706) granting a pension to Henry C. Richardson;
A bill (H. R. 3712) increasing the pension of Milton Judd;
A bill (H. R. 3745) granting a pension to Mary O'Neill;
A bill (H. R. 4103) granting a pension to Edna M. Hildreth;
A bill (H. R. 4864) to place the name of Jacob Behr on the pension-roll;
A bill (H. R. 4891) granting a pension to Alpheus Dyer;
A bill (H. R. 5177) granting a pension to Pleman Cook;
A bill (H. R. 5378) for the relief of Tillman Faux;
A bill (H. R. 5429) to place the name of Smith V. Campbell on the pension-roll;
A bill (H. R. 5756) granting a pension to David Gibbons;
A bill (H. R. 5812) granting a pension to Catharine Tierney;
A bill (H. R. 6245) for the relief of William Burk;
A bill (H. R. 6531) to pension Leah Roark;
A bill (H. R. 6545) to increase the pension of Henry T. Bridges;
A bill (H. R. 6552) to increase the pension of James R. Porter;
A bill (H. R. 6574) for the relief of William Compton;
A bill (H. R. 6577) granting a pension to Abigail Sullivan;
A bill (H. R. 6583) granting a pension to Sally B. Wilson;
A bill (H. R. 6770) granting a pension to Miss Carrie A. Luey;
A bill (H. R. 6840) for the relief of Hiram M. Goss;
A bill (H. R. 6973) for the relief of Enoch Weathers;
A bill (H. R. 6990) to place the name of Rebecca E. Shoemaker on the pension-roll;
A bill (H. R. 7007) granting a pension to Edmund Ryan;
A bill (H. R. 7115) granting a pension to William Scott;

A bill (H. R. 7466) granting a pension to Hannah H. Grant;
A bill (H. R. 7471) granting a pension to Moses L. Chase;
A bill (H. R. 7574) granting a pension to Frank Lewis;
A bill (H. R. 7642) granting a pension to Abbie R. Brown;
A bill (H. R. 7688) granting a pension to John Glenning;
A bill (H. R. 7721) granting a pension to Martha Linton;
A bill (H. R. 7829) granting a pension to Thomas McGuire;
A bill (H. R. 7857) to increase the pension of Henry L. Potter;
A bill (H. R. 7944) granting a pension to Ann V. Ferguson;
A bill (H. R. 7974) granting a pension to Hannah Rankins;
A bill (H. R. 8159) granting a pension to Jane Brown Dunn;
A bill (H. R. 8174) granting a pension to Ellen Sexton;
A bill (H. R. 8217) granting a pension to Raphael Fowler;
A bill (H. R. 8260) granting a pension to Lydia A. Hicks;
A bill (H. R. 8281) for the relief of Lieut. James G. W. Hardy;
A bill (H. R. 8400) for the relief of Lydia Burridge;
A bill (H. R. 8496) to increase the pension of Albert E. Magoffin;
A bill (H. R. 8629) granting a pension to Mrs. Abba E. Jackson;
A bill (H. R. 8722) granting a pension to Jessie M. Barthauer;
A bill (H. R. 8771) to place the name of Mrs. Flora C. Andrews on the pension-roll;
A bill (H. R. 8798) granting a pension to Nettie Ellicott;
A bill (H. R. 8884) granting a pension to Emily McClure;
A bill (H. R. 9170) granting a pension to James W. Poag; and
A bill (H. R. 9682) increasing the pension to Jesse Dickey.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

A bill (S. 332) granting a pension to Harrison Wagner;
A bill (S. 849) granting a pension to Morgan Gordon;
A bill (S. 876) granting a pension to Catharine Simmonds;
A bill (S. 885) to increase the pension of Adrian C. Dodge;
A bill (S. 889) granting a pension to Mary O. Hall;
A bill (S. 1002) granting a pension to Thomas Todd;
A bill (S. 1307) to increase the pension of Washington T. Otey;
A bill (S. 1427) granting an increase of pension to Elnathan Meade;
A bill (S. 1719) granting a pension to Levi B. Smith;
A bill (S. 1750) granting a pension to George W. Wilburn;
A bill (S. 2101) granting a pension to Daniel K. Smith;
A bill (S. 2162) for the relief of Mary M. Strong;
A bill (S. 2275) granting a pension to Mary Calvert Truxtun;
A bill (S. 2344) granting a pension to Minnie A. Bailey;
A bill (S. 2385) granting a pension to Caroline R. Haseltine;
A bill (S. 2483) granting a pension to Catherine Tate;
A bill (S. 2549) for the relief of Mary Isabella R. Clements;
A bill (S. 2593) granting a pension to Sarah E. McNamara;
A bill (S. 2639) granting a pension to Mrs. Louisa Ward;
A bill (S. 2665) granting a pension to Charles J. Esty;
A bill (S. 2666) granting a pension to Lemuel S. Skinner;
A bill (S. 2675) granting an increase of pension to Lieut. James R. Darham;
A bill (S. 2677) granting a pension to Jane Reilly;
A bill (S. 2683) granting a pension to Andrew J. Foust;
A bill (S. 2711) restoring Phebe McLaughlin to the pension-roll;
A bill (S. 2724) for the relief of H. H. Helper;
A bill (S. 2726) granting an increase of pension to Margaret S. Heintzelman;
A bill (S. 2733) granting an increase of pension to Shadrach Brown;
A bill (S. 2746) granting a pension to Ezra E. Annis;
A bill (S. 2750) to increase the pension of Samuel A. Tate;
A bill (S. 2759) granting a pension to James M. Frost;
A bill (S. 2782) granting a pension to Charity J. Towns and minor children;
A bill (S. 2825) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin T. Baker;
A bill (S. 2833) granting a pension to Caspar Blanke, of Portland, Oregon;
A bill (S. 2838) granting a pension to Betsey A. Mower;
A bill (S. 2842) granting an increase of pension to William H. H. Welsh;
A bill (S. 2861) granting a pension to David A. Hall;
A bill (S. 2862) granting a pension to William M. Dean;
A bill (S. 2874) granting a pension to George W. Padgett;
A bill (S. 2879) increasing the pension of Sophia Schimmelfennig, widow of Alexander Schimmelfennig, late brigadier-general and major-general by brevet;
A bill (S. 2880) granting an increase of pension to Adam Dennis;
A bill (S. 2890) granting a pension to Fannie A. Kimball;
A bill (S. 2898) granting a pension to Sarah E. Boulter;
A bill (S. 2899) granting a pension to Harriet Welch;
A bill (S. 2910) to increase the pension now paid to Elizabeth B. Smith, widow of Bvt. Maj. Gen. Thomas Kilby Smith, United States Volunteers;
A bill (S. 2945) granting a pension to James McDonald;
A bill (S. 2945) granting a pension to J. S. May;
A bill (S. 2947) granting an increase of pension to William C. Shimoneck;
A bill (S. 2995) granting a pension to Mrs. Elizabeth Stewart;
A bill (S. 2979) granting a pension to Laura J. Ives;
A bill (S. 3021) granting a pension to Carrie V. Miller;
A bill (S. 3076) granting a pension to Mary M. Shattuck;
A bill (S. 905) to incorporate the District of Columbia Suburban Railway Company;
A bill (S. 1497) to provide for two additional associate justices of the supreme court of Dakota, and for other purposes;
A bill (S. 2252) to incorporate the Georgetown Barge, Dock, Elevator, and Railway Company;
A bill (S. 2305) to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the Executive Departments;
A bill (S. 2662) for the erection of a public building at Salt Lake City, Utah;
A bill (S. 2727) authorizing the purchase of a site for a building for the accommodation of the Supreme Court of the United States;
A bill (S. 2925) in relation to cadets at the Naval Academy; and
A bill (S. 2930) to authorize the Paris, Choctaw and Little Rock Railway Company to construct a bridge across Red River at or near Hook's Ferry, Red River County, Texas.

TARIFF.

The Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union resumed its session.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] who has just taken his seat has gotten himself, during the last few weeks, into that condition of mind which seems to render it exceedingly difficult for him to state a proposition clearly, not to say fairly.

He has never known the time, place, or occasion when the gentleman from Ohio would hesitate a moment to declare his conviction in regard to reciprocity or any other question which affects the well-being of his country. So his statement in that behalf is entirely gratuitous.

He had no reason to believe that I would hesitate to plainly express my views touching the wisdom of a full, complete, and unrestricted reciprocity of trade between this country and our kinsmen on the north. There is not a line or syllable I have written or uttered in this place or elsewhere which properly authorizes the statement he has been pleased to make.

I have before me a bill which I introduced, and which under the rules of this House was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, proposing to do that which the statesmen of this nation have advocated from the foundation of the Government, and which looks to the fullest enlargement of the commercial opportunities of the people of this country so far as Canada is concerned.

But I do not propose to go into the discussion of the question involved in the bill, and only because I have not the time to do so. The measure is one to which I have given not merely a passing consideration; on the contrary, I have given to it patient study and careful investigation, and in that I have but followed in the footsteps of those we have been accustomed to account the wise men of this country. In the Thirtieth Congress, first session, a bill in the words following passed this House without a division:

Be it enacted, etc. SECTION 1. That when the President of the United States shall issue his proclamation that the articles hereinafter enumerated, being of the growth or production of the United States, are admitted into the province of Canada by law free of duty, that on and after that day the like articles, being the growth or production of the said province of Canada, shall be admitted into the United States free of duty when imported direct from said province, so long as the said enumerated articles are admitted into said province of Canada from the United States free of duty, unless otherwise directed by Congress, to wit: Grain and breadstuffs of all kinds, vegetables, fruits, animals, hides, wool, tallow, horns, salted and fresh meats, ores of all kinds of metals, timber, staves, wood and lumber of all kinds, seeds, pot and pearl ashes, butter and cheese.

Passed the House of Representatives July 12, 1848.

This bill was passed by a House made up as follows: Whigs, 117; Democrats, 110; Native American, 1.

Robert C. Winthrop was Speaker. John Quincy Adams was the master spirit in that House. Abraham Lincoln was a member. Mr. Grinnell, of Massachusetts, was the author of the bill. Robert C. Schenck, Caleb B. Smith, Joshua R. Giddings, Richard W. Thompson, and the leading protectionists of that day were members of that Congress. All New England and the border States on the North were present. And so obvious and vast were the blessings that would follow in the wake of this commercial alliance no voice was raised against it.

In my judgment, not only would the prosperity of all our people be enhanced by the enlarged opportunities and increased facilities which closer relations between ourselves and our neighbors across the northern border would bring, but beyond that I deemed and now deem the necessities of the conditions and civilization of the age to demand in as large a degree as is possible the unification of the Anglo-Saxon race upon this continent, representing as we do the most advanced and enlightened civilization of the earth, and it was in recognition of this demand, as well as from the more sordid level of business or financial advantage, that I introduced at the beginning of the session the bill which I hold in my hand, and which I shall insert at length in my printed remarks.

But first let me call attention to the fact that in the same line of broad and comprehensive statesmanship President Grant and Secretary Hamilton Fish negotiated a treaty which embodied in the main, or in large part, the substance of the bill I introduced.

That bill reached the Senate very late in the session, and was not

considered. That its consideration was not postponed in the interest of the people—I mean the whole people—is certain. What influence selfish and sordid interest had in permitting it to slumber I do not know. For myself I can say I would rather have had the honor of negotiating and carrying that treaty into successful operation than to have been the victor at Appomattox. So, gentlemen, I am not ashamed of the company I am in, nor do I hesitate to advocate a measure which promises such beneficent results in its practical operation. [Applause.] The measure in no wise makes war upon the protective system.

A tariff deals, as I have before asserted, with conditions, and not merely with national boundary lines. If it dealt with boundary lines, and was useful in the abstract and without reference to competitive conditions, every man who is possessed of ordinary reasoning faculties could see that our industrial salvation and financial prosperity would be best subserved by proceeding at once to carve our country up into at least six divisions (the greater number the better), and each division get rich by taxing themselves and their neighbors beyond the line whenever they attempted to cross it to get to market. [Laughter and applause.]

The office of the protective system, when philosophically and honestly applied, is to guard against the influences of a certain kind and character of competition which unjustly places the manufacturers and workmen of the United States at disadvantage, not only in the markets of the world outside, but even in our home market. This hurtful influence at present results from the difference in the wages paid workmen here and in Europe. I endeavored to point this out in my remarks addressed to this House on the 15th of May. I regret that the few moments allowed me now will not permit me again to review the subject as pertaining to the amendment now under consideration.

Touching the amendment submitted by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], which relates to enlarged trade relations with Canada, and which he asserts I have hesitated to advocate here and now when the opportunity is presented, I submit that I have at all times, and do here and now, declare my devotion to full, complete, and unrestricted reciprocal trade and commerce between the United States and Canada, subject to such restrictions and regulations as will protect us from unfair competition with other foreign countries. And he [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] is not justified in calling in question my advocacy of that measure because I refuse to vote for an amendment to the pending bill which does not accomplish the result sought, and was not conceived for that purpose. And that it does not even approximate to the proper accomplishment of what is suggested, but not formally proposed by it, becomes apparent on a moment's careful consideration of the amendment in connection with the subject-matter of which it treats. I pointed out its defects this morning, both as it would affect our internal-revenue system and otherwise.

It is ill-considered and out of place and seemingly intended to direct this discussion away from its proper line and apart from its legitimate field. [Applause.]

And if I desired to be as free in my criticism as the gentleman has been I might with more propriety charge that it is an attempt to rescue the administration of the Government from the embarrassing situation into which it has fallen, in that it has apparently been willing to surrender or barter away the rights of American citizens, American fishermen upon the high seas, and pay a bonus for the enjoyment of a right they have freely enjoyed for generations. [Applause.]

In saying this I might be unjust to the Administration, and I am far from desiring to do such an injustice, for I earnestly sympathize with the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] in his deprecation of any unnecessary word or act that could provoke a conflict of arms between ourselves and the Canadians. It would be akin to barbarism to consider favorably the contingency of war with the people of the Dominion over the border. The words of John Quincy Adams, uttered upon this floor during his last term of service here, reflected the enlightened civilization of the age, and are even more applicable to the conditions of to-day. Standing in his place and replying to some gentleman who was shouting for war, he said:

> I neither desire the friendship nor the sympathy of that man who can regard with satisfaction the possibility of war between ourselves and our kinsmen of Canada or Great Britain.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I ask five minutes more.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I move the gentleman have five minutes more.

There was no objection, and it was ordered accordingly.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. These words of the venerable statesman of Massachusetts neither involved nor suggested a surrender of any right of an American citizen, for it is known that our fathers, as we do, knew that the surest way to peace is in the just and honorable maintenance of every right and privilege which belongs to the citizen. And I am in full accord with the honorable gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. COGSWELL] in his patriotic and earnest protestations against any course on the part of this nation which would tolerate brutal and inhuman treatment of New England fishermen by the Canadian authorities. No right must be surrendered and no wrong tolerated without proper redress, is the position, and properly so, of the gentleman from Massachusetts. But I have no fear that our rights will not be vindicated and maintained without resort to methods which, although sometimes inevitable, savor none the less of a ruder civilization and a condition of barbarism. And I do not err in asserting that not infrequently jingoism and partisan or personal ambition have more to do with kindling the war spirit than any just sense of wrong suffered or right withheld.

In saying this, I in nothing lose sight of the fact that national honor is inseparable from the maintenance of national right, and that firmness, with dignity and justice, is the surest road to that security which results from peace preserved with honor. Individuals are for a day or a year. Nations endure, or ought to, for centuries. I deprecate any condition and every influence that in anywise tends to separate us from the other branch of the English-speaking family on this continent. Our social relations should be friendly, our commercial relations unrestrained and intimate, for, I believe, Mr. Chairman, that under a fiat above that of congresses or kings our destiny upon these shores is bound to be one. It is inevitable. The civilization which the Anglo-Saxon (and I use the words Anglo-Saxon in their broadest significance) represents on this continent is bound to dominate through all its border or be dominated by worse influences; and I submit that we should have little sympathy with those who can contemplate with serenity and favor a condition of things which would lead us into a conflict of arms with those who by our side are bound by an inexorable decree of Providence to work out with us the great problem of progressive civilization, which shall in its unfolding bless the nations with freedom and equality.

My object in calling attention to this bill in the early part of this session was that it might be considered fairly as an economic measure, not from a partisan or political standpoint, and I discussed it somewhat throughout the country, because I thought it a question that rose far above the low level of partisan politics. Here is the bill.

> A bill to extend the trade and commerce of the United States and to provide for full reciprocity between the United States and the Dominion of Canada.
>
> Whereas certain controversies have arisen and are still pending between the Government of the United States and the Government of the Dominion of Canada, respecting commercial intercourse; and
>
> Whereas by reason of the contiguity of the two countries and the similarity of the interests and occupations of the people thereof, it is desired by the United States to remove all existing controversies and all causes of controversy in the future, and to promote and encourage business and commercial intercourse between the people of both countries, and to promote harmony between the two Governments, and to enable the citizens of each to trade with the citizens of the other without unnecessary restrictions: Therefore,
>
> *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled*, That whenever and as soon as the Government of the Dominion of Canada shall permit all articles of trade and commerce of whatever name or nature, whether the product of the soil or of the waters of the United States, all manufactured articles, live stock of all kinds, and its products, and all minerals the produce of the mines of the United States, to enter the ports of the Dominion of Canada free of duty, then all articles manufactured in Canada, and all the products of the soil and waters, and all minerals the produce of the mines of Canada, and all other articles of every name and description produced in said Dominion of Canada, shall be permitted to enter the ports of the United States free of duty: *Provided, however*, That the provisions of this act shall not apply to any product or article upon which an internal-revenue tax is imposed by the laws of the United States.
>
> SEC. 2. That when it shall be certified to the President of the United States by the Government of the said Dominion of Canada, that by the authority of its Parliament it has authorized the admission into the ports of said Dominion of all articles of trade and commerce the growth, produce, or manufacture of the United States, free of duty, the President shall make proclamation thereof, and shall likewise proclaim that all articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of the said Dominion of Canada shall be admitted into all the ports of the United States free of duty, and such articles shall be so admitted into the ports of the United States free of duty so long as the said Dominion of Canada shall admit the products of the United States, as herein provided, into the ports of the Dominion free of duty.
>
> SEC. 3. That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized, with the approval of the President of the United States, and in conjunction with the proper officials of the Government of the Dominion of Canada, to make rules and regulations for the purpose of carrying into effect the provisions of this act, and to protect the said respective Governments against the importation of foreign goods or articles through either into the other without payment of duty; and the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States shall furnish to the customs officers of the United States all such rules and regulations for the purpose of guiding them in the discharge of their duties in the premises.
>
> SEC. 4. That before making the proclamations or either of them authorized by this act the President shall be satisfied that all citizens and subjects of the United States may have and enjoy the right of commercial intercourse in all the ports, harbors, and places in Canada with the citizens and subjects of the Dominion, in as full and ample a manner in all respects as may be had or enjoyed by the latter in the ports, harbors, and places of the United States with the citizens and subjects thereof.

In its provisions I submit that it rises clear above that low level, and does not sound merely in that advantage which is to be measured in shekels. And my object in introducing it early in the session was that it might receive at the hands of this House that consideration to which its importance as a great economic and political measure entitled it to receive.

It will be observed at a glance that it opens up to us the commerce of a continent, and, as I have before stated, places at our feet enough in kind and quality of rare and varied resources to enrich a thousand millions of people. It would make our protective system continental in scope and operation, and would thus accomplish a vastly greater good than the bill which received the support of the honorable gentlemen whose names I have before mentioned, to wit, John Quincy Adams, Robert C. Winthrop, Abraham Lincoln, Robert C. Schenck, Caleb B.

Smith, Richard W. Thompson, and others whose names were glorious in the earth, and whose achievements in behalf of the Republic were the boast of that and are the pride of this generation.

I will be glad when this measure shall come before the House for discussion and careful consideration. But, Mr. Chairman, I bide my time. I am not concerned as to the future, and the effect that the advocacy of this measure will have upon me or my political fortunes.

I know, sir, that it is of little consequence whether, as an individual, I am voted up or voted down; but it is of great consequence whether an economic and political measure which enlarges the opportunity of all our people, gives to our protective system a broader field, and the civilization of our country permanent control upon this continent, shall be adopted.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that if the protective policy which we advocate is good for half the continent it is good for the whole continent. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, I did not expect when I took the floor to have occupied the few minutes allowed me, and I regret that my remarks have been somewhat disjointed. Still, since my consistency or candor has been called in question, in that I refuse to vote for the amendment submitted, permit me to say there never will be a time, there will be no place, nor any circumstances, when, where, or in the presence of which I will be deterred or prevented, whatever the result to me politically, from advocating and demanding what I believe to be just to my country and in the interest of its people.

I will not pay the doubtful compliment to my countrymen of saying that in every field of industrial endeavor in which they are engaged they are not more than the peers of any other people upon earth where we hold an equal opportunity with them. [Applause.] Where the competition is, as our own, leavened with humanity, and that spirit of justice which fairly apportions to the workman his just share in the product of his labor, our workmen enter the lists without fear and asking no favor. [Applause.]

My friend says, why not vote upon a separate item, that is for free lumber and free fish? Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of international arrangement and adjustment, and invokes an economic policy or system as a whole. I have not sought in the bill I introduced to take up the matter piecemeal. I have not sought to take it up by reference to single items or by sections, but to deal with the great question presented as an entirety, unifying, if you please, the Anglo-Saxon race on this continent and enlarging the opportunities of our people and removing all cause of attrition between us. I insist there are no reasons which can be deduced from any sound political or economic philosophy why the swelling tide of our commerce should stop at the fortieth parallel of north latitude any more than it should stop at the one hundredth meridian of west longitude, unless the conditions across that fortieth parallel are such as to make the competition we encounter unfair to our people and wanting in humanity.

I must stop here long enough to illustrate the idea presented. What is it in the Old World against the influence of which we interpose the protection of our tariff shield? We say to foreign producers that we fear nothing in the field of competition if you temper the character of your competition with fairness and humanity; but you refuse to do it.

In this country we proceed on the assumption that capital is entitled to have its fair share of the profits, but we say and will maintain that labor shall have its fair share as well. [Applause on the Republican side.]

On the other side of the ocean they say, in practice, in this field of competition capital must have its profit whatever the result to labor, and in order to meet the competition of American producers and undersell them in the markets you consent to rob labor of its fair share and the laborer of his hire. I repeat, we say to Europe and the world, leaven your competition with the humanity that enables the workman to clothe, to feed, and to educate the children at his fireside; leaven it with the spirit of fairness and Christianity, and against you we ask no odds. We can not make you humane or just to your workmen, or compel you to give them what they are entitled to when their effort, united with capital, produces a certain result; but we can, by a tariff, shut out the influence of your inhumanity so it will not reach the homes and hearthstones of our American laborers. [Applause on the Republican side.] And this we will do if our Democratic friends do not prevent it.

But, Mr. Chairman, where these hard conditions do not exist, where the competition is free from this inhumanity and is fair and equal, I still say that a protective tariff has no proper mission. There is no philosophy in the maintenance of the system where these conditions do not exist, but wherever they do exist, wherever the line that marks the boundary of these hurtful influences, then, in the interest of American labor, in the interest of our common humanity, we ask you to erect the tariff wall. [Applause.]

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Certainly, Brother WILSON; any number of questions.

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. Do these conditions to which you have referred exist as between Canada and the United States?

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I have already stated that I do not regard those conditions as existing in Canada; and therefore I am ready, as we hold the coign of vantage against Canada, to throw down the barriers that separate us and extend the tariff wall around that country, making us one great country for commercial purposes, and ultimately to be, under God's providence, one great nation, dominating the civilization of the world. [Applause.]

Mr. WILSON, of Minnesota. That is, you would do all the good you can in the gross, but not as to the items.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. That is in nowise a fair or true statement of my position. Does it follow that because I desire, as a business venture, to buy a drug store, that I should as evidence of my desire be willing to purchase a mustard plaster?

This is a subject of arrangement between two nations of the world, and there is no other way of getting at the matter except as I have suggested—that is, an arrangement that embraces the whole field and relation of commercial exchanges and the course of trade.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, in answer to what has fallen from the lips of my friend from Ohio, while I express my regret that I should have said anything to irritate him, yet I feel that I ought to be grateful that it has caused so sound and eloquent a speech. I did not mean to put a coal of fire upon his back, but I am glad I did so when it produced such good results; and if there has been anything either in my remarks or in my manner that tended to irritate my friend from Ohio he ought to have known that nothing was further from my desire or intention than to wound or offend him.

All I meant to say was that his advocacy of reciprocity with Canada had always displayed itself where it could do no good, and had failed here to-day where it might do some good. Now, I remit to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NUTTING] the discussion with my friend from Ohio as to whether this is absolutely free trade or not, and when my friend from New York demonstrates that the Democratic party is an absolutely wicked party, given over to a strong delusion to believe a lie, because it is willing to have free lumber, I hope he will explain to his constituents how my good friend from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] and my friend from Illinois [Mr. HITT] can be good Republicans in view of the bills which they have introduced into this House.

[Here the hammer fell.]

By unanimous consent, Mr. BRECKINRIDGE'S time was extended for five minutes.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I am glad that the gentleman from Ohio has explained to us why he thinks protection necessary and why Canada does not come within his system; for, first, the Canadians are an English-speaking people nearer probably to an equality with the American people than any other in the world; and secondly, they have a co-terminus line of frontier with this country across which no transportation has to be paid. They have not the burden of freight, which is equal to about 10 or 12 per cent. of protection to all American products as against foreign products from countries beyond the seas. Therefore, if our relations with Canada are favorable to free trade, why are not the conditions favorable to free trade with every other country? That is the conundrum which the gentleman's argument will submit to the American people and upon which, having the benefit of his great and deservedly distinguished name, they will be set thinking.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I very heartily concur in the sentiment expressed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH] when he declares not only his hope but his belief that the Anglo-Saxon race, the people of this Republic, will dominate this continent. And I am glad, sir, to note a further fact in connection with my friend; that is that he seems to be doctrinally sound, but simply drawn to one side and made to deflect from the line of his own doctrine by reason of extraneous influences; but my judgment, Mr. Chairman, in view of the history and growth of this principle which they call "protection," and which they dub their great "American system," is that the time will never come when, struggle as he may, those extraneous influences will not be sufficient to dominate him and withhold him from the practical application of his own doctrine.

What is the history of this question in this country? Henry Clay, who has been referred to here this morning by my friend from Massachusetts in most eloquent terms, never, in the greatest length to which he went on this question, contended that protection to home industries ought to exist longer than those industries continued in a condition of infancy. Now, sir, I believe firmly, and that belief is so largely and fully developed in me that I am willing to experiment upon it, that our American industries are to-day fully grown to the estate of manhood, fully able to open the gates and throw down the gantlet to the civilized world and offer a general challenge to all competitors. [Applause.]

But, Mr. Chairman, just note the growth of this doctrine of protection. We passed some years ago from the Henry Clay doctrine of giving protection to our industries in their infancy into another stage when they pleaded another condition of misfortune, based upon the misfortunes of their country. First, their plea was infancy; then, later, in the midst of the throes of civil war they came to this House and implored protection in consequence of the great burdens that were imposed upon manufactured articles by the internal-revenue laws. And

in connection with this point I want to read the language of an eminent tariff Republican of New England, giving a distinct pledge that when the necessity disappeared, then these war duties should disappear also and these taxes and burdens upon the American people should cease.

Speaking for New England and for its industries in this second condition of infancy, as it were, Mr. MORRILL, of Vermont, in 1864, when the protectionists were exacting this great consideration from the American people, said here:

This is intended as a war measure, a temporary war measure, and we must give it our support as such.

Again he said that it was—

A war measure imposed by the necessities of the Government, the scarcity of laborers, and the enormous direct taxation.

When the stage of "infancy" was passed and that was no longer their rallying cry we found them making another pledge; and now when both "infancy" and the direct taxes of the war have passed away and the time has come to give relief to the American people from these burdens, we find these gentlemen here running the whole gamut of subterfuges, saying that the time has not yet come, and attempting to fasten upon this country as a permanent institution this system of taxing one man in order to support the business of another.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. DOCKERY was recognized, and yielded his time to Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Now that the gentleman has additional time, will he permit a question?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Certainly.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. The gentleman will admit, I take it, that while we have eliminated the difficulty and overcome our disadvantages as to the three factors of capital, plant, and skill, yet where labor enters so largely into the production of an article, we can not successfully compete with rivals who do not pay more than 25 or 50 per cent. as much wages as we pay. How does the gentleman solve that question?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I will solve that by telling you, as to the matter now under consideration, that you bring men across the border from Canada into Maine and the other lumber States, and feed them upon the high wages that are paid there—that is, conceding that there is anything in your argument that wages are increased in consequence of the tariff.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. But my friend sees that that proposition goes to admitting away his case.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I can not yield further. I have not time to say what I want to say. I would like to answer your questions. If I had unlimited time nothing would give me greater pleasure, because you are struggling in the way. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I hope the committee will award unlimited time to the gentleman from Iowa. He will certainly make a very interesting speech if he keeps on in his present line of remark.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I thank the gentleman very kindly, but I do not ask unlimited time, because I am not loaded in an unlimited way. [Laughter.]

But, Mr. Chairman, in view of the record which our protection friends have made, what answer can they make to the people in this country who suspect that they have not been dealing with them in good faith? First, the plea was infancy; but at the time that plea was made they conceded that when they had arrived at the estate of manhood they would be able to open the gates and go out and meet all competitors upon any field. Yet now they seek to take refuge behind the other pleas which I have mentioned.

A MEMBER. We have learned something.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Yes, you have learned something, and you need not criticise those who suspect the cause of the great conversion (to which I want to allude if I have time) that has taken place in this country, which is attributed simply to an enlightened statesmanship and greater scope of view. They passed the stage of "infant industries;" they came on to the stage of "war necessities;" they pleaded the misfortunes of the country; they took a new position before the American people, took it in order to "go back" on it directly and to prove as recreant to it as they had proved to the pledges which they gave the country when in consideration of "infant industries" the first protective duties were imposed.

Under these circumstances I ask my friends on this side, Republicans with whom I have trained all my life, in the face of the distinct pledges that have marked the history of this business from its beginning—I ask, how do they account for the wonderful strides they have made with reference to this question? I am a Republican, and always have been. I learned all my political knowledge, though it may be little, in the Republican household; and while there are those who may criticise me with reference to my party fealty, it does not alter the fact that I am familiar with the history of the Republican party of this country. I know its record not only in my State but in this Union with reference to this great economic question, and I want to produce, if I am allowed to do so, some authority with reference to this matter.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WARNER. If I can be recognized I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. ANDERSON].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WARNER] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa be permitted to proceed five minutes longer. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. WARNER. Now, if the gentleman will pardon me, I understood him to avow the doctrine of protection of "infant industries" to be correct.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I am a protectionist; and I am willing to extend protection wherever in my judgment it is needed, to the extent of the requirements of this Government for revenue in connection with the taxes it now imposes on whisky and tobacco.

Mr. WARNER. Will the gentleman answer me whether he is in favor of protecting "infant industries" and only "infant industries?"

A MEMBER. And the sugar industry.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. No, I am for free sugar.

Mr. WARNER. Will the gentleman tell me whether he believes that the rice industry, the sugar industry, the iron industry, or any of the industries protected in the Mills bill are "infant industries?"

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I want to say in answer to all such questions that, as for myself, I have made up my mind the tax burden upon the people of the country, which is $100,000,000 in excess of what it ought to be, should be reduced to that extent. As to matters of detail, I challenge this side of the House, in spite of all its boasted glee in tackling this great question, to bring in a bill on which you can align your own forces. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I have agreed in my own mind that a reduction should be made. How it shall be done is a matter of detail; and while the bill under consideration does not in many particulars satisfy me, I undertake to say that it is a step in the right direction and that it is more reductive; there is a less per cent. of protection in it than there would be in any bill now pending in this House if the Republican side dominated the House. This is, as already suggested, a question of details; and you have not during the long months that this question has been here exhibited any disposition to get yourselves together upon the matter of details and point out the items upon which you will agree to a reduction; but you stand here in the way, finding fault with the men who are making honest effort in the direction of reduction of taxation.

Mr. WARNER. I understood the gentleman to say he is in favor of the Mills bill because there is less of protection in it than in bills produced by this side of the House.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I am in favor of the Mills bill, so far as I am in favor of it at all, because it is a step in the direction of obedience to the commands of all parties in this country, including that party with which I have acted all my life.

A MEMBER. Which is that?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. The Republican party.

Mr. WARNER. Will the gentleman answer whether he is in favor of the Mills bill because there is less protection in it than in any bill which could be framed by this side of the House?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I undertake to say that these men who are standing here opposing all kinds of reduction of impost duties are outside the pale of Republicanism as it has been known in the State where I have lived for thirty years.

Mr. WARNER. Will you answer my question? Have you not stated that you are in favor of this bill because there is less of protection in it than in any bill emanating from this side of the House?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I have said—and I do not want to be misunderstood or misquoted—that in my judgment there is no bill, taking it all in all, presented to this House for the reduction of taxation that is as satisfactory in all particulars as the one under consideration to-day. By that declaration I am willing to stand; and you may make the most of it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WARNER. I hope unanimous consent will be given for an extension of the gentleman's time. I unwittingly occupied a considerable part of his time with interruptions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WARNER] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Iowa may continue his remarks for five minutes. Is there objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Now, Mr. Chairman, on what meat do these our modern self-constituted Republican leaders feed, that they have grown so great and know so much more than the rank and file and body of the party as it has declared time and again the doctrine of the party in State and national conventions?

A MEMBER. How about Oregon?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Oregon! I presume that the lumber trusts have got together and declared that they must stamp out this principle of reduction of taxation.

Mr. HERMANN. Let me say that the greater portion of the 7,000 majority in Oregon is right along the line of the agricultural counties, the wheat-growing, wool-growing, and lumber counties. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I do not doubt the results which can be produced by these combinations where their greed prompts them to contend for that which will do them the most good.

Mr. BOUTELLE. It must be a pretty lively "trust" that could create a majority of 7,000.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. It is a lively trust; and therein is the danger of the principle of protection advocated here, unless it is put under the most stringent control. In politics the principle of protection is what poison is in medicine; it must be handled in the same guarded manner. It is the fell influence of this institution, growing and widening like a Upas tree, that accounts for the great strides Republican leaders in certain quarters have taken in reference to this question. They have found this principle not only a politic thing in certain quarters, but they have found that it is or may be an exceedingly lucrative thing.

Mr. HERMANN. The gentleman will allow me to say that the largest product of the people of Oregon is wheat; the next largest product is wool; and the third largest, lumber; and within the confines of that State there is not a single "trust," lumber, wool, or otherwise.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. You have made your speech, now let me make mine. The question which the gentleman said he would put to me is less of a question than it is a speech, but I believe I can supply a sufficient answer to it by asking the gentleman from Oregon whether he was not crushed out of a lumber trust in the State of Oregon. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HERMANN. I most emphatically deny that, or anything like it, under any circumstances. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. You make a special denial. You do not deny there is a lumber trust in that State, and you will not deny it. And you will not deny that you attempted to gain admittance into that lumber trust in your State but you could not do it. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HERMANN. I do deny that most emphatically, and I deny there is any such trust in the State of Oregon.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Oh, yes; it has been denied there is any lumber trust in the State of Iowa, where I have knowledge of its existence; where I know it as a fact that there is a lumber trust in the State of Iowa; where I know it as an open and a notorious fact, as fully as I can possibly know of any other business arrangements. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. REED. Stick to your Oregon text. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. That is not all. But I do not rely on vague statements as to the existence of a lumber trust in the State of Iowa, but I refer to the columns of the State Register, which is the head and front of protection in that country. That paper in denunciation of a member of the Legislature of its own party said that he should be gotten rid of for the reason he was a member of the Green Bay lumber trust. [Laughter and applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. I hope the gentleman will be allowed to proceed to the conclusion of his remarks.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I will not object to the extension of the gentleman's time if he is allowed to proceed with his remarks, and not subjected to a continued cross-examination by gentlemen on the other side.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair hears no objection, and the gentleman will proceed.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I will not indulge, gentlemen, any further in cross-examination, but will proceed with the remarks which I was submitting.

Mr. GEAR. I hope my colleague will permit me to ask him a question.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Certainly I will yield to Governor GEAR.

Mr. GEAR. My colleague has stated that there is a lumber trust existing in the State of Iowa. Let him state who compose that trust, if he knows.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Oh, yes, gentlemen, when I say there is a lumber trust in the State of Iowa——

Mr. GEAR. Answer that statement of mine. You say there is a lumber trust in the State of Iowa. Now who are the men that control that trust?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. It will not do for gentlemen simply to ask questions with a sneer, a leer, a jeer, into which gentlemen unwittingly drift in their questions, and which compose at least three-fourths of their arguments. [Laughter and applause.] I have stated that there was a lumber trust in Iowa and you ask me to prove it. Where there is no proof of a trust you all deny its existence until it becomes as patent and as open to everybody as the existence of the Standard Oil Trust. You denied the existence of the Standard Oil Trust, and you asked who composed it, and you would not acknowledge that any such trust as the Standard Oil Trust existed until its existence was known to everybody. Until the existence of the Standard Oil Trust became palpable to all you continued to deny in the face of the country that there was any such trust, just as you deny the existence of any lumber trust in the State of Iowa.

I have said that there is such a lumber trust in the State of Iowa, and if you want to learn all the facts, why do you not go before your Congressional committee and make an investigation? The Committee on Manufactures has been investigating during this session into these very matters; why do you not go before that committee and find out whether there is a lumber trust in Iowa or not?

Mr. REED. Answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. You go before the committees of the House; go before the Committee on Manufactures, investigating this matter, and they come upon the floor and report to you after they have investigated the matter whether there is or not a lumber trust. That committee has at its back all the machinery of the House. They can send for witnesses. They can examine them as to the facts within their knowledge, but frequently fail under these circumstances to elicit any reliable information. Yet when I say upon the floor of this House that there is a lumber trust in the State of Iowa you sneer and say because I do not come here with proof full and complete and palpable in every particular, therefore there is no such trust.

Mr. REED. Now give us the names.

Mr. GEAR. I ask my colleague who compose that lumber trust in the State of Iowa?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I do not know. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. GEAR rose.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Wait a moment.

Mr. GEAR. Do you know of your own knowledge there is any such trust in the State of Iowa?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I know of my own knowledge there is such a trust in the State of Iowa. I know as well as I possibly can know things notoriously proclaimed in the columns of the daily press and throughout the community and the State where I have lived for thirty years.

Mr. GEAR. Who compose it?

Mr. WEAVER. I will answer it.

Mr. REED. Let your protégé take care of himself. [Laughter.]

Mr. WEAVER. I will tell you who compose it.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. It is immaterial who compose it. I say there is such a lumber trust, and that is not the way to prove that it does not exist. You only ask these questions to divert attention. Statutes are not suggested in advance of the presence of the crimes they seek to prohibit, and you know that Iowa's last Legislature enacted a statute prohibiting trusts, and that such statute largely grew out of the agitation of the lumber trusts of the State.

The State Register said a member of the Legislature from Polk County, Hon. James G. Berryhill, was one of the leading members of the Green Bay lumber trust; and he was a member of the Republican party holding a position in the State Legislature for two successive terms, and held it by the votes of the Republican party of that State.

Mr. GEAR. Is that an answer to my question?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Your question is answered now. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

His questions, I submit to all sensible, fair-minded men, as to who are the individual members of this trust, are so absolutely and utterly immaterial, and he knows it, that they are unworthy of an answer; and it is just by that class of immaterial questions and answers——

Mr. McCOMAS. Answers! [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. That you propose to stave off the reduction of the taxes on the people of this country, that they are now paying, of more than one hundred millions of dollars a year.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Would it be fair to ask the gentleman where this trust is, as he does not seem inclined to state who are the parties composing it?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Where the trust is?

Mr. BOUTELLE. Yes.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. It is coextensive with the trade; and I know personally that there exist good reasons why anybody in my State who enters that business without leave of a given syndicate or secret power abiding somewhere, is absolutely driven out of business or into bankruptcy. [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.] Ay! you may answer with your laughter, gentlemen, and you may answer with your sneers, because those are the most potential arguments you have to employ in defense of your views and in opposition to the people on this great question. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. Will you be kind enough to state, as you are on the subject of trusts, the process by which the lumber trusts accomplish this?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I will not be deprived of the time so courteously extended to me by the House by these irrelevant questions. I have already had a considerable extension of the time, and have been indulgent in the matter of answering questions.

Mr. GEAR. You have not answered my question.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. And I do not propose to be side-tracked to answer these irrelevant suggestions further than I have already answered them.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But this is on the main track. I want to keep you on that. [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Well, you are from the Maine State [laughter] and you want the Maine business well taken care of. It is the duty on lumber that you are mainly interested in.

Mr. BOUTELLE. But, I repeat, I want to keep you on the main track. You say that you do not propose to be side-tracked by irrelevant questions. Now, these are pertinent questions to keep you on the track.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. That is the State of Maine, and $2 a thousand feet bonus for your people paid by the people of my district, and paid by people generally not in the business, to those Maine men who are in the business, is the main business with you. Now I decline to be interrupted any further. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. But you have had twenty minutes by unanimous consent, and I think the gentleman ought to give us some information upon this subject of which he talks so knowingly.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I want to show, Mr. Chairman, now by the record which I propose to quote that I am strictly in the line of the party in the position I occupy.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. FELTON, Mr. ADAMS, and others asked unanimous consent that Mr. ANDERSON be permitted to proceed five minutes longer.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I ask to be allowed to continue my remarks a little further. I am nearly through.

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. We have taken up a good deal of the gentleman's time by interruptions.

Mr. REED. But he has not answered any questions. [Cries of "Regular order!"]

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have not occupied any time in this discussion——

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I hope five minutes additional time will be given to the gentleman in view of the interruptions.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that five minutes additional time be granted to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SEYMOUR. I object until the committee is in order. I object to anything in this disorder and confusion.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order, and the business of the committee will be suspended until order is restored on the floor.

Is there objection to the request?

Mr. BOUTELLE. I have no objection to extending this courtesy to the gentleman from Iowa if he will occupy a portion of it in the way of answering fair and proper questions.

Mr. MORSE. Oh, he will speak for himself on that subject. Do not be afraid.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I desire to go on for one moment longer. It seems that gentlemen are not only determined that we shall have an embargo on trade in lumber, but even free speech; and if you can not grant me the time without imposing a duty upon it, I tell you frankly, gentlemen, that I do not want it at all. [Laughter and applause.] I will and have answered all questions material and pertinent to the facts I am discussing.

Mr. BOUTELLE. I withdraw any objection I may have made. I think the gentleman is doing a pretty reasonable amount of talking on his own hook.

Mr. LAWLER. I object unless the gentleman can proceed in his own way. It is contrary to parliamentary rules to have the gentleman's time taken up by so many others.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that objection is made.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I have not been recognized in this debate, and if I can be recognized I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SEYMOUR. I insist that we have order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will again state that no business will be transacted until gentlemen resume their seats.

Mr. BROWNE, of Indiana, addressed the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will again submit the request that the gentleman from Iowa be permitted to proceed.

Mr. LAWLER. I will withdraw the objection.

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE, of Kentucky. I ask, then, that the gentleman be permitted to occupy five minutes additional time.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I am very much obliged to the committee, for I did not expect so much indulgence. There is one further point, however, that I wanted to make, and it is in the trend of the argument, if I may call it such, to show what progress, and in connection with showing what progress to show what danger there is in this principle of so-called protection if it is not properly and carefully guarded and restrained.

Why, my predecessor on this floor, whose loyalty to the country and the party has not been questioned by those men who have thought fit to differ with me, when he came fresh from the people, with his homely virtues, such as we have upon the prairies, was occupying the position as to the question of lumber that would to-day put his standing in the party, as far as the would-be leaders of the party are concerned, in jeopardy, and I want to show what his opinion was with reference to this subject in some of the debates that took place on this floor some years ago, and which he, no doubt, entertains to-day, unless, forsooth, he has made as much progress as some of his colleagues on this floor. In the Forty-seventh Congress, on the 14th day of February, 1883, in his place in this Hall, my distinguished predecessor made these remarks, and I wish to repeat that his whole political standing in the party, if some of those self-constituted bosses are allowed to determine the question, would be jeopardized.

Mr. HEPBURN said: It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin—

I think he referred to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GUENTHER] who sits near me—

as well as the gentleman from Maine, is unnecessarily indignant towards those of us who have said something with reference to the preservation of the forests of this country. No one has proposed to say that the gentleman from Maine and the gentleman from Wisconsin may not destroy their forests as rapidly as they choose. It is not the question presented in this paragraph. The question is as to whether we will offer them a bonus of ten, fifteen, or twenty dollars an acre for the destruction of their forests. That is what they ask us to do.

He does not put it on the doubtful ground that is suggested here by some. He wants to protect the forests by a broad and manly and defensible plan in the interests of his constituents and of all the people of the country.

Mr. BOUTELLE. Verily.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. You can not go further in indorsing his ability than I do.

Mr. GUENTHER. Why did not his people elect him again?

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Because he had gone into the ranks of the monopolistic powers of this country body and breeches. [Laughter.]

Mr. BOUTELLE. I wish we had his breeches here. [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Yes; and I do not doubt that every other member on this floor, who wants to tax somebody else's business in order to keep up his own, would join in the wish. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Chairman, this is what my colleague said further:

It is not the question presented in this paragraph. The question is as to whether we will offer them a bonus of $10, $15, or $20 an acre for the destruction of their forests. That is what they ask us to do. There is no objection to these forests being destroyed, perhaps. There is no question of the right of these gentlemen who own them to destroy them if they see fit.

Mr. Chairman, I concur with my predecessor in that, and I put my belief in free trade in lumber on no such ground as the protection of the forests. My predecessor went on to say:

But they have no right to quarrel with us because we refuse to give them this bonus of one, two, three, and three and a half dollars a thousand feet for their destruction, which amounts to from $20 to $25 an acre of the forests.

Mr. Chairman, I invite attention to the reason which my predecessor gives at this point. He says further:

Here is a difference, it seems to me, between the position of this now under consideration and any of the other protected industries of this country. It is claimed that the reason why this protection should be given is to protect the laborer, and yet a gentleman speaking by authority for the State of Michigan only a few days ago in another place admitted that ten thousand and more laborers from the Dominion of Canada each winter cross the river, or an imaginary line, and become competitors with our people in the forests of Michigan. We know that in Maine it is an easy matter to introduce all the cheap labor—the pauper labor, if you choose—from Canada. Now, why should we offer this bonus to that class of laborers?

Mr. GUENTHER. Have you heard from Oregon? [Laughter.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I have.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. GEAR. Mr. Chairman, I have taken no part in this debate, having been paired. My colleague from Iowa [Mr. ANDERSON] has stated in his place here that there is a trust among the lumber manufacturers of Iowa. I deny that.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Prove your denial. [Laughter.]

A MEMBER. Prove a negative.

Mr. GEAR. I will come as near proving my denial as you have come to proving your assertion.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I want to show the gentleman the absurdity of the assault he makes. If its putrid carcass was not fully exposed so that it is a stink in the nostrils of all men I suppose he would deny the existence of the Standard Oil Trust.

Mr. GEAR. I say I will come as near proving my denial as the gentleman has come to proving his assertion. Now, Mr. Chairman, the timber interest in my State, while we have no pine timber, is quite a large one. The millmen of my State cut 350,000,000 feet of lumber annually, amounting to about $4,000,000. Some of them own their stumpage, but the majority buy logs which are floated down that great artery of commerce, the Mississippi.

The largest lumber manufacturers in the State of Iowa live in my own district. One of those gentlemen is here to-day on the floor of this House, and he assures me that as between the lumber manufacturers there is not, so far as he knows, and there never has been, a lumber trust in the State of Iowa. But there are large dealers who should not be confounded with the manufacturers. It is true that these dealers have had an arrangement by and under which they each have control of certain territory, an arrangement of the character of that described by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. FUNSTON].

But, sir, the Republican party of my State, having ever in mind, as

it has had for the last thirty years, the welfare of the people, has enacted a law under which a trust or trade league can not stand on the soil of Republican Iowa for one minute [applause on the Republican side]; and when my colleague states that there is a lumber trust there, he makes a statement which, in my judgment, is not warranted by the facts.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. One question. Is it not true the Iowa State Register, published by Mr. John S. Clarkson, a member of the National Republican Committee, made the charge directly and continuously that James G. Berryhill, a Republican member of the Legislature from Polk County, was a member of a lumber trust, and that the case ought to be investigated by the Legislature?

Mr. GEAR. I do not know whether it did or not, as I was not a subscriber at that time to the State Register.

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. I supposed you could not keep house without it.

Mr. GEAR. But Mr. James G. Berryhill was a member of the Legislature which enacted the anti-trust law, and he voted for it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa. Of course he did. You do not deny, though, that I state facts, do you?

Mr. WEAVER was recognized.

Mr. BLAND. I ask the gentleman to yield to me for a few minutes, in order that I may have read a dispatch sent to the New York Herald showing why and how Oregon has been carried by the Republicans.

The dispatch was read, as follows:

OREGON GOES REPUBLICAN—RAILROAD INFLUENCES CONTROL WITH A VIEW TO THE SENATORSHIP.

[By telegraph to the Herald.]

PORTLAND, *June* 5, 1888.

This State went Republican yesterday by about 4,000 majority. The real issue was the Senatorship. The Legislature just elected will choose a United States Senator, and the corporation influences—the Northern Pacific Railroad—are powerful in the State, and on the Republican side, because the Democratic policy about land grants has been bitterly opposed and resented by the railroad.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, here again we find the great monopolies arrayed against the Democratic party. Gentlemen on the other side of the House have claimed to be the friends of the laboring men, and of homes for the laboring classes, places to which they can retreat when they have been driven from the employ of the monopolies; and yet, sir, because the Democratic party in this House has passed a bill forfeiting over fifty million acres of the public lands which had been granted to railroads, and forfeiting the land-grant of the Northern Pacific Railroad, the party has been proscribed by that great monopoly, and the combine of the tariff monopoly and the railroad monopoly has carried Oregon against the Democratic party, which has always been fighting those monopolies in the interest of labor and in the interest of homes for the people of this country. In that interest the House of Representatives passed the bill forfeiting the land grant of the Northern Pacific, and that monopoly has fought the Democratic party in Oregon in order to secure a United States Senator for the Republican party. That bill, which passed this House in the last Congress, sleeps now in the Senate, and hence the importance of the Republicans keeping control of the Senate, so as to continue to throttle the interests of labor and of the people of this country generally. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I was very much astonished at the remarks of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. HERMANN] in reply to the questions of my colleague [Mr. ANDERSON, of Iowa]. Now I want to ask the gentleman from Oregon a question, and I want him to answer yes or no.

Mr. HERMANN. I will answer you.

Mr. WEAVER. I want you to answer yes or no. Then you can have the floor to say what you please after I get through.

Mr. HERMANN. I will answer you.

Mr. WEAVER. Now, I ask the gentleman whether it is not true that he owned some saw-mills in Oregon.

Mr. HERMANN. I do not.

Mr. WEAVER. I ask whether it is not true that you did own and operate saw-mills in that State.

Mr. HERMANN. Several years ago, probably four or five years ago, I did own one small saw-mill.

Mr. WEAVER. And is it not true that you took your lumber to Portland, and that you could not land it or get a man to measure it for you unless you paid $500 for the privilege of going into the organization that controlled the wharfage at Portland? And did you not refuse to pay that, or rather did you not at first agree to pay it, and then did not they notify you that they had all the members they wanted and refuse to let you into the combine; and were you not compelled to sell your lumber at a reduced rate and at a heavy loss? I want to ask you one other question: Did you not make substantially that statement in the presence of four or five gentlemen, members of this House, who are here listening to me while I put these questions? Now, answer that.

Mr. HERMANN. Do you wish it answered now, or do you propose I shall have my five minutes to give the answer?

Mr. WEAVER. You may answer it now, and afterward you can explain in your five minutes.

Mr. HERMANN. Then I will say "no" now, and I will answer more fully in my five minutes.

Mr. WEAVER. You say "no" to all those propositions?

Mr. HERMANN. I say that in the main the statement is incorrect; and as to the exact particulars, I will answer in my five minutes.

Mr. WEAVER. Did you not make that statement in substance in the presence of four or five members of this House?

Mr. HERMANN. I will answer the gentleman in my five minutes fully and completely.

Mr. WEAVER. I will yield, and let the gentleman take his five minutes now, and I will reserve the residue of my time. [Cries of "Oh, no."]

Mr. HERMANN. Say what you desire to say in full now, so that I shall have five minutes to answer what you may say.

Mr. WEAVER. I have said all that I want to say to the gentleman from Oregon now. He can take his five minutes, and I will reserve the remainder of my time. [Cries of "Oh, no."]

Mr. BAYNE. I object to any reservation.

A MEMBER. You can not object.

Mr. BAYNE. I will see whether I can not.

Mr. WEAVER. Very well; I will yield the floor to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. BAYNE. That will do.

Mr. WEAVER. And I will ask to be recognized after he is through. [Laughter.]

Mr. HERMANN. Mr. Chairman, I am not at all surprised that my friend on the other side [Mr. WEAVER], and those of my friends who are near him prompting him, should be very desirous to avail themselves of this opportunity to put the questions which have just now been addressed to me. It is proper I should say this: In the first place, I was, four or five years ago, the owner of a small saw-mill in the State of Oregon, and was shipping lumber from that State. My shipments were confined almost exclusively to cedar—white cedar—what is called Port Orford cedar, which is grown almost exclusively upon the Pacific coast, in the State of Oregon. It may really be called a luxury in the lumber business, being used exclusively for the finest finishing work. No lumber of that class is produced in Canada, British Columbia, or anywhere else, so far as I have knowledge, than where I have stated. A few men controlled the business in California, and entered there into a combination; so that it became impossible for me to place my cedar upon the markets of San Francisco on equal terms with theirs. I was refused admittance into their combination. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side; cries of "Wait!" "Wait!" on the Republican side.]

This species of lumber has no connection with the great bulk of the lumber manufactures of the Pacific coast; it is possibly about the one-thousandth part of the lumber manufacture of that coast. It has no connection with Canada lumber. You may put it on the free-list or leave it off, and it will make no difference. It has no connection with any tariff regulation. There was a combination among a few lumber manufacturers on our own coast, which existed for about six months, and after that was dissolved. That is the history of that "lumber trust;" and it has now no existence, so far as I understand. That is the whole sum and substance of this matter. It had no relation to the great lumber production there, which is Oregon pine, of which Oregon produces to-day 300,000,000 feet and the Pacific coast 1,000,000,000 feet. It has no connection with the great lumber traffic of the United States, and the combination to which I have referred existed but a short time, but was never in any sense a trust, merely an association of lumber dealers in San Francisco, not manufacturers.

This is the matter which I related in ordinary conversation in connection with trust combinations to my associates, some of them political opponents, in the Committee on Manufactures. The facts are as I now state them, and it is due to them and to me that I should make this statement.

So far as regards putting this lumber upon the Portland market, we have no Portland market for it, and there is no combination, no trust in the State of Oregon. We are all manufacturers there; we are engaged in the logging business; we are engaged in raising the products of the soil for the support and sustenance of the loggers. We have no dealers, no combinations, in that State. Our markets are in San Francisco; they are up and down the coast; they are in China. We have no associations of dealers in our State. Consequently, when the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. ANDERSON], who preceded the gentleman that last spoke, charged that trust combinations had exercised some interference in the recent election in the State of Oregon, he said that which is entirely without foundation; but I will do him the justice to say he would not have made so reckless an assertion if he had not been prompted by gentlemen on the other side who are now seeking so anxiously to get here the admission on my part of the existence of a cedar trust between three or four wealthy firms, which existed only six or seven months, and had relation to an article of luxury in the lumber business—had no connection whatever with the great body of the lumber business in the State of Oregon or California or on the Pacific coast.

Let me repeat that if there was a cedar trust it had no more relation to the tariff than has the anthracite trust or the coal-oil trust, which seems to figure so conspicuously in the omissions of the gentlemen on the other side, or a long list of trust organizations which might be mentioned. It was, let me say, the hay-makers, the hop growers, the fruit-growers, the wheat-growers, the laborers, the wage-earners of Oregon who rose up in that State. One-fourth of the Democratic party of Oregon rose up in their might and concluded that now was the time to administer a rebuke to these industry-smashers, these "sheep-stealers," if I may use the term [laughter], who are seeking to destroy the great interests of my State, lumber, wool, fruit, hops, and other industries which have pushed that State forward in great strides to a prosperity and greatness which are not equaled among all the States of the Union. It was not the Republicans alone who joined in that rebuke, but the records show that more than one-fourth of the Democratic party arose in their might to administer this rebuke. The consumers of that country joined with the producers and the manufacturers in administering this rebuke.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. WEAVER obtained the floor and said: I will yield to the gentleman if I can afterward be recognized.

Mr. HERMANN. Nothing probably can furnish so strong a confirmation of what I have been stating; no better proof can be presented of every suggestion I have made than this telegram which I have received this morning from the chairman of the Republican State central committee of Oregon, who has been receiving returns from all portions of that widely-extended State:

Your majority will reach about 7,000. Democrats have less than twenty members in both houses.

The aggregate membership being ninety.

Tariff question did it.

[Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. BLAND. Hurrah for the Northern Pacific Railroad land grant! [Laughter and applause.]

Several MEMBERS. Hurrah for BILL SCOTT. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. WEAVER. I send to the Clerk's desk, to have read as a part of my remarks, a telegram which has just been received by Mr. MILLS.

The Clerk read as follows:

CONVENTION HALL, ST. LOUIS, *June* 7, 1888—11.19 a. m.

SCOTT of Pennsylvania, greeted with applause, presented from committee on resolutions a resolution indorsing and recommending early passage of Mills bill.

[Great applause.]

Previous question ordered and resolution passed amid great cheering and waving of hats.

[Laughter and applause.]

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. WEAVER. Certainly.

Mr. KELLEY. Did Mr. SCOTT or the convention fix the date at which the Mills bill will go into effect? [Renewed applause.]

Mr. WEAVER. This House will fix that early enough for the gentleman from Pennsylvania. [Applause on the Democratic side of the House.]

Mr. BAYNE rose.

Mr. WEAVER. I do not desire to be interrupted.

Several MEMBERS. Allow a dispatch to be read.

Mr. WEAVER. You can get the floor after I am through.

Mr. BIGGS. I hope the gentleman from Iowa will yield and allow the gentleman from Pennsylvania to have a telegram read.

Mr. WEAVER. No. When the gentleman from Oregon put in his speech of confession and avoidance he said it was a small saw-mill he owned [laughter], and that it was a small part of the lumber business in Oregon. I want to say that the lumber trust was large enough to crush out his small business it seems, and he could not get in, just as he states it.

The evidence seems to be cumulative in favor of the existence of the lumber trust. Will any sane man say that that lumber trust was confined to the cedar lumber? I ask the Clerk to read the following extract from the New York Tribune of March 7 last.

The Clerk read as follows:

The pine lumber pool has succeeded during the past year in advancing the prices of lumber $12 to $15 per thousand, on the ground of high shipping rates and increased wages. The grounds for the advance are trivial, as the wages of the men are only $5 more per month and the running expenses of the vessels are no greater. The pool, which has adopted all the methods of newly invented trusts, has simply made the people of California pay about one and a half millions into its pocket. It controls ships and mills, and regulates the prices of pine lumber to suit itself.

Mr. WEAVER. The article which has just been read is from the New York Tribune, a Republican journal, the services of which they can not do without in the coming campaign.

My honored colleague, Governor GEAR, also denies the existence of a lumber trust in the State of Iowa.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. BUTTERWORTH. Let us hear who has been nominated at St. Louis for the Vice-Presidency.

Mr. COX sent up the following telegram to be read:

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. LOUIS, *June* 7.

Thurman is nominated.

[Long-continued applause.]

Mr. OUTHWAITE stood at the Clerk's desk exhibiting a large photograph of Mr. Thurman, which was greeted with applause.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have worked for over thirty years to secure the nomination of Mr. Thurman for the first place; I wanted him put at the head of the ticket. He has now been put in the second place, and I tell you that California will give him a majority at the coming election of over 15,000. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, when the gentleman from Missouri refers to the active part taken by the Democratic party in the forfeiture of the unearned land grant to the Northern Pacific Railroad, I wish to say to him that the man who took the most active part in getting through this House the bill forfeiting those lands and returning them to the public domain was not a Democrat at all, but a Republican member on this side of the House. I refer to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PAYSON]. [Applause on the Republican side of the House.]

The man who made the strongest speech in opposition to that measure was not a Republican, but he was the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Van Eaton, a Democrat on that side of the House. [Applause on the Republican side.] The statement of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BLAND] was in keeping, so far as veracity is concerned, with the platform adopted by his party in 1884, in which it declared that the Democratic party had forfeited over 100,000,000 acres of land grants in the United States. A letter was written to the Commissioner of the General Land Office, asking for information upon that subject, and his reply was that there were only 8,000,000 acres up to that time which had been forfeited. [Laughter.] So that the Democratic party of Missouri in its platform came within ninety-two millions of the truth; and that is pretty near for the Democrats. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MCMILLIN. Will you permit a question?

Mr. PETERS. No; I want to yield one minute now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BAYNE].

Mr. MCMILLIN. Let me ask this question——

Mr. BLAND. Let me ask the gentleman what became of that bill in the Senate, which was passed by the House but hung up in the Senate, forfeiting the entire Northern Pacific land grants?

Mr. BAYNE. The gentleman from Kansas yields to me, and I desire to have read a telegram in that time. I want to have this dispatch read for the information of the House; and while it is going to the desk I will simply inquire why it is that this enthusiasm is manifested on that side of the House over the tail of the Democratic ticket when so little was manifested over the head of it? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] I ask the Clerk to read the telegram.

The Clerk read as follows:

ST. LOUIS, *June* 7, 1888.

Hon. BENJAMIN BUTTERWORTH,
House of Representatives.

Democratic committee refuse to pay for transportation——

Mr. BUTTERWORTH (interrupting the reading). One moment. You need not read that telegram. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas has the floor.

Mr. PETERS. I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR].

Mr. GROSVENOR. Telegrams being in order, I have sought the floor to enable me only to ask the Clerk to read two, which I think will throw some light upon the measures which have been taken looking to the precipitation of that war amongst the people of this country which the gentleman from Kentucky was so eloquent in describing this forenoon. I did not know that we had just gone through a war; but I discovered that the measures adopted on yesterday to strangle ultimately the Committee on Ways and Means by a direct refusal to indorse their bill in St. Louis, and then ultimately to come in with a supplemental proposition, was worked out through means which are described in these telegrams which I now ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Watterson received the following telegram from Washington to-day:

"Failure to indorse the Mills bill may defeat it.

"WILLIAM C. BRECKINRIDGE."

Governor John C. Brown handed the following telegram he had just received from Congressman MCMILLIN to Mr. Watterson:

Governor J. C. BROWN, *Southern Hotel:*

"Failure to indorse the Mills bill in platform or separate resolutions may defeat it. We charged bayonets here. Have the convention do its duty.

"BENTON MCMILLIN."

[Laughter.]

Mr. MCMILLIN. With my compliments, gentlemen. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. BLAND. The question is, who stole that telegram? [Derisive laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. GROSVENOR. May not the suggestion of the gentleman from

Missouri be born of the spirit that always attributes to somebody else that which is prominent in a man's own mind. These telegrams, I will state to him, were cut from the current issue of the public press of to-day, and were doubtless handed to the press by the gentlemen who are thus being called upon to aid the Ways and Means Committee in the hour of its distress.

Mr. BLAND. The mind and character of the gentleman inspired the question.

Mr. KELLEY. Let me state that they are in the New York Tribune of this morning, both of them.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I do not know what it was that made my friend from Tennessee suggest this reference to a charge of bayonets, unless it was because of the refusal of the Chair on that day to recognize anybody on this side of the House to move a suspension of the rules and fix a day for the consideration of pension legislation. [Laughter.] I suppose it must have been that, because that was the only thing that has recently occurred that did look like a charge of cavalry.

Mr. KELLEY. Will the gentleman permit me to supplement the telegram of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MCMILLIN] by adding the remainder of it? He should have continued:

Have the convention do its duty.

[Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MILLS. That is all right.

Mr. MCMILLIN. And the convention has done its duty, and that duty will result, I can tell the gentleman, in no comfort to him and his side of the House.

Mr. KELLEY. Can you inform us whether it gives the date when the Mills bill is to go into effect? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. MCMILLIN. This Congress will fix that date, and I will tell the gentleman that he will then have less comfort, for the people are going to have relief from oppressive taxation and the gentleman and his party can not prevent it. [Applause.] All the powers of sophistry, all the interests of monopoly which can be brought to bear in this connection will not fortify the gentleman and his side in preventing that action. [Renewed applause.] Even filibustering will not do it.

A MEMBER. We will see.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee rise for the purpose of limiting debate, unless, by consent, we can come to some understanding that this discussion shall terminate. We have had politics enough for a time.

Mr. REED. I should like to make a few remarks myself on the amendment.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the committee now rise.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 100, noes 92.

So the motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and Mr. MCMILLIN having taken the chair as Speaker *pro tempore*, Mr. SPRINGER reported that the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the tariff bill, had come to no resolution thereon.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. MCCOOK, its Secretary, announced that the Senate insisted on its amendments disagreed to by the House on the Indian appropriation bill, and agreed to the conference asked by the House thereon, and had appointed Mr. DAWES, Mr. PLUMB, and Mr. CALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. FISHER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found duly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same, namely:

A bill (H. R. 2017) to incorporate the Rock Creek Railway Company of the District of Columbia;

A bill (H. R. 7263) for the erection of a public building at Bay City, Mich.; and

A bill (H. R. 7340) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Hickman, Ky.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. MILLS. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union; and pending that I move that all debate on the pending paragraph and amendments thereto be limited to forty minutes.

Mr. ADAMS. I should like to have at least ten minutes myself on this question.

Mr. MILLS. We spent all day yesterday on it.

Mr. ADAMS. That was not my fault.

Mr. REED. I suggest that the gentleman allow thirty minutes on each side.

Mr. MILLS. I will accept that, and move that the debate close in one hour on this paragraph and all amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole was agreed to.

THE TARIFF.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, Mr. SPRINGER in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole for the further consideration of the pending bill, all debate upon the pending amendment being limited to thirty minutes. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. REED] is recognized.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, before I begin, I ask unanimous consent that I may have ten minutes.

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. REED. Mr. Chairman, what, with the telegrams from nominating conventions and the interesting revelations of private conversations upon the floor of the House, we have wandered somewhat from the matter under immediate discussion. I desire to call back the attention of the House to the amendments on which we are to vote, because I believe them to be full of importance not only to my immediate constituency but to the country at large. This nation was founded by a union of States for the purpose of presenting to foreign powers an unbroken front. It was founded upon the basis which is expressed in the constitution of the Knights of Labor, that an injury to one was the concern of all; and, however remote the northeastern corner of this country may be from the southern region represented by the gentleman from Kentucky, it is as much the concern of the nation as is the whole region bordered by the Mississippi River. This nation has an interest to see that no foreign government is allowed to trample upon the rights of our citizens.

Some years ago we had a treaty by which the fishery question was arranged. That treaty arranged it to our disadvantage, as the facts and figures prove. Two years before the advent of the Democratic Administration notice was given of the intention to abrogate that treaty, and the abrogation took place after the incoming of the present Administration. The abrogation of that treaty deprived Canada of one of its richest sources of revenue, namely, the American market for the product of her fisheries. Thereupon commenced, in defiance of all the principles of comity among civilized nations, a series of persecutions of American citizens for the purpose of so annoying them that the United States might be driven again to give to Canada free access to our markets. Those persecutions had their origin in no other motive, and the history of no civilized community for the last fifty years has been polluted by such outrages. Privileges which the Barbary states in the times of piracy were forced to give us have been denied by a civilized nation to another civilized nation to such an extent that the President of the United States in a message upon the treaty actually congratulates himself that he has wrested from a foreign Christian power the right for our vessels in distress to receive the ordinary succor that is universally accorded among civilized countries. That is the attitude of Canada towards us. Towards her we have maintained an attitude of the most perfect fairness. We allow the Canadian fishermen to purchase bait upon our shores. We allow their disabled vessels all the rights which civilized communities allow anywhere, and in 1887, last year, this Congress solemnly resolved that unless the policy of non-intercourse was abandoned by Canada the policy of non-intercourse should be adopted by us. In coming to that determination the only struggle between the two sides of this Chamber was as to which should go farthest, and the Democratic side based their opposition to the action of the Senate upon the ground that it did not go far enough to satisfy their wishes and their desires. Yet here to-day there is presented upon the proposition of my colleague [Mr. DINGLEY] a proposition of surrender, so utter and absolute that it was followed by silence on the Democratic side for the space of half an hour, after which came a complete, but not vigorous, retraction on the part of the gentleman from Kentucky himself [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE], who frankly confessed that his amendment was simply a parliamentary device to enable the Democratic party, by voting a worse proposition, to vote down a good one.

Now, then, paying no further attention to the proposition of the gentleman from Kentucky, the futility and impropriety of which he himself has confessed, which confession was enforced by the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BUTTERWORTH], I confine myself to the proposition of my colleague from the State of Maine [Mr. DINGLEY]. We are here proposing to give to Canada our markets for lumber. Canada is the only nation that is going to be affected by the repeal of the tariff upon sawed lumber. She is to have free access to our markets. The nation which has refused to our fishermen the common courtesies of civilized intercourse, which has refused to our citizens the decencies granted by every civilized country, is now to be dowered with the right to enter our market free with the products of her forests, a market the advantages of which have been forcibly set forth by the gentleman from Texas himself.

As against this proposition my colleague [Mr. DINGLEY] proposes that our markets shall not be open to any nation that refuses to our fishermen the same rights which we grant to the citizens of a friendly nation, and which all the civilized nations of the world grant from one pole to the other; and the question now is what do the Democratic side mean to do upon that proposition? Do they mean to stand up to their vote of the year 1887? Do they mean to give our fishermen the benefit of all the powers of this nation for their protection? Do they mean to say to the Canadians: Not only shall reciprocity be refused to you when you refuse it to us, but you shall not have access to our market for your lumber unless you allow our fishermen the rights which you know belong to them? I tell you, gentlemen, that the rights of our fishermen date away back of the treaty of 1818.

Years ago we and the Canadians were fellow-colonists of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and as such colonists we not only had a right to participate in these fisheries, but we did participate in them year in and year out, and when we separated from that country we separated with all the rights that we had had as colonists. It is true that for years we struggled in weakness, in disaster, in doubt, and that some of our rights were wrested from us in our days of weakness; but to-day we stand the peer of any nation on earth, able enough and strong enough to assert our rights, and nothing can prevent our doing it but cowardice in the House of Representatives. [Applause on the Republican side.] Now, those who love America and believe that it should assert its rights, those who believe in standing by this great country and in backing up the demands made even by your Democratic Secretary of State, will join at once in voting down the pusillanimous surrender offered by the gentleman from Kentucky and in voting up the rightful proposition of my colleague from the State of Maine. [Renewed applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I do not understand that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] is any more "pusillanimous" in its nature than the amendment which was offered by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY.] If the House can for a moment throw off the thrall of the eloquence of the gentleman who has just addressed us [Mr. REED], I wish to say a few words upon the point which he has brought up for the second time in this debate. I would state to gentlemen on the other side who have heretofore spoken, as well as to the gentleman from Maine, that the relations between this country and Canada at the present time are based upon the treaty of 1818, a fact that several speakers seem to have overlooked; and I can not agree with the gentleman in saying that that treaty was wrung from the weakness of this country. No, sir; that treaty was made with Great Britain by three commissioners of the United States who could not be called weak or liable to be imposed upon.

If my memory serves me, these commissioners were John Quincy Adams, Mr. Rush, and Mr. Gallatin, three of the most distinguished men in our history. We had just come out of the second war with the greatest power on the earth; we had come out triumphantly, and our flag had an equality with the flag of Great Britain on every ocean, upon seas where it is now less known than the flags of the least important nations of Europe. Those most eminent American statesmen negotiated the treaty, under which, since the lapse of the treaty of Washington, we have been living for the last three years, and under which these difficulties with the government of the Dominion of Canada have arisen. When the gentleman from Maine says that nothing like the existing difficulty has ever been known before in our history, I will remind him that there has not been a time when we have been under this treaty, unmodified by any other act, that we have not had the same difficulties as now beset us.

From the hour almost of the ratification of this treaty Canada and the British Parliament passed laws to render it effective that were severe upon our interests in the fisheries. Later on, in the administrations of Jackson, Van Buren, Tyler, and Fillmore, vessels were seized and condemned without redress, and this continued until the reciprocity treaty of 1854. All trouble then ceased until the abrogation of that treaty twelve years afterwards, when the difficulties were renewed. In 1870, under Grant, many vessels were seized and condemned, but as it was under a treaty to which we were contracting parties no cause of war was thought to exist by that administration, which only sought to make peaceful negotiation without threat or bluster.

The treaty of 1818, contrary to the statement made by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] this morning, never authorized our people to go into the ports of Canada to buy bait.

Mr. DINGLEY. Secretary Bayard so states. I have his letter here.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. Secretary Bayard did not make the treaty of 1818.

Mr. DINGLEY. He states that it gives that authority to our fishing vessels.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. The treaty of 1818, as I stated before, was made by diplomats upon whose tombs the moss has long since grown. Furthermore, the fishermen of this country did not then claim through those commissioners the "right" to enter Canadian harbors to touch or to deal there. Or if they did make such claim it was not conceded. They accepted it as a "liberty" given by the people of Canada. That is the word used in the text of the treaty. I have the very words here, having sought for them while the gentleman from Maine was speaking:

> American fishermen shall be admitted to enter such bays or harbors for the purpose of shelter and of repairing damages therein, of purchasing wood, of obtaining water, and for no other purpose whatever.

It is known that the claim to buy bait was urged on our side, but it was strenuously resisted, and the American commissioners did not insist upon it.

It was the lapse of the treaty of Washington that brought the treaty of 1818 again into operation as the only ground upon which our Government could stand; and it was to obviate the great difficulties and hardships arising under this treaty that the present Administration appointed a commission to negotiate a new treaty which has been so despitefully treated by my colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] this morning.

It will, I am well aware, be said in answer to me that this treaty has been modified by the maritime reciprocity of 1822 and 1830, the reciprocity that was declared by the proclamations of William IV and of Andrew Jackson; but, sir, the Canadian people have never allowed that vessels engaged in fishing were entitled to the benefits of these regulations. They have looked upon a fishing vessel as *sui generis*, and as not included in the maritime reciprocity which we now demand.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. FORD. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts be allowed further time.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the gentleman from Massachusetts will be permitted to continue his remarks for five minutes. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL, of Massachusetts. I will occupy but a moment more, for I do not wish to take the time of the committee. We should be acting upon these amendments. I do not propose to vote for the amendment of the gentleman from Maine or the antagonizing amendment of the gentleman from Kentucky. But this question of the treaty having been raised, and the Administration sharply criticised, I desire to present another view and to recall to gentlemen's minds the facts in the case that they seem to overlook in their eager haste to condemn.

It has been the duty of the Administration to make a *modus vivendi*, and they have done it to their best ability. In the making of a treaty both sides are interested. It is a diplomatic war in which each strives to get the better of the other. In this, if we have not succeeded in getting everything, we have at least got what we could and as much as our predecessors secured. We have a better way of living. We have an arrangement modifying the harsh features of the treaty of 1818, upon which we are now standing. If that arrangement fails at the other end of the Capitol, what will be the result? Certainly we shall not appeal to arms. Such a failure will only lead to the negotiation of another treaty.

If we went to war with Great Britain on this case, what would be the result? Incalculable injury and then a treaty. A treaty is made at the close of hostilities. We have made a treaty like wise and brave men, without bluster or threat, with due regard to the rights of others, and I believe that if it is ratified the difficulties of which our fishermen complain will be obviated and we shall have honorable peace and content. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. ADAMS. Mr. Chairman, the amendment of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. DINGLEY] and the amendment to that amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BRECKINRIDGE] stand on entirely different ground. When the gentleman from Maine offered his amendment the House in Committee of the Whole had already decided to place lumber on the free-list. It was a gift to the Dominion of an American market for one of the most important products of Canada. It was an important and valuable gift. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MILLS] had said so a day or two before.

I do not mean to intimate that in putting lumber on the free-list the gentleman from Texas was actuated mainly or at all by good-will to Canada. His motive was to change the tariff policy of the United States. It was not to reduce the revenue. The gentleman from Texas had himself said in regard to some of the items which we had considered that the amount of surplus revenue thereby reduced was insignificant. His motive was to substitute, so far as he could, the system of a tariff for revenue only in place of the existing tariff for protection. He said, however, only the other day that the effect of the enactment of this part of the pending bill would be to confer a benefit upon Canada.

What could be more reasonable than to propose, as the gentleman from Maine has proposed, that this benefit to Canada should be granted only on condition? Even from the standpoint of gentlemen on the other side, is it not far better and more patriotic to forego for the present the benefit of free Canadian lumber, if free Canadian lumber be indeed a benefit, rather than confer even incidentally a pecuniary benefit upon a foreign country which has never willingly conferred a benefit upon ourselves and has even refused to concede to our fishing vessels the privileges freely accorded elsewhere in the ports of all civilized nations except for the very large and substantial consideration of a free American market for Canadian fish? The amendment of the gentleman from Maine was therefore not only reasonable, but patriotic.

It provided that Canada should not receive the benefit of the free-list which the Committee of the Whole had adopted so long as Canada denied in its ports to fishing or other vessels of the United States the commercial privileges granted to similar Canadian vessels in the ports of the United States.

Now, what does the gentleman from Kentucky propose in his amendment to the amendment of the gentleman from Maine? He proposes that if the Dominion of Canada shall comply with the reasonable condition imposed by the amendment of the gentleman from Maine the Dominion shall get the benefit not only of the American market for Canadian lumber, which his side of the House had already decided to give to the Dominion without any condition at all, but the additional advantage of a free market in the United States for Canadian fish.

